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

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

THE

CHURCHMAN

FEBRUARY, 1886.

Art. I.—CHURCH ELEMENTARY EDUCATION.

THE history of Elementary Education in this country has been treated by various writers in a fragmentary way, but has never yet been satisfactorily handled, though many interesting facts relating to it may be found in Mr. Bartley's "Schools for the People," and Dr. Craik's admirable little book, "The State in its Relation to Education."

During the Middle Ages the only schools open to the lower classes were the Cathedral schools, and the schools attached to the various religious houses. Even so late as the sixteenth century we find grave doubts expressed as to the desirability of teaching the children of the poor. An anecdote well illustrating this condition of things is told by the Rev. R. Whiston in his "Cathedral Trusts." It relates to the substitution of seculars for monks in the Cathedral Church of Canterbury in the days of Henry VIII., for which purpose a Commission had been appointed, headed by Archbishop Cranmer: "It came to pass that when they should elect the children of the Grammar School, there were of the Commissioners more than one or two who would have none admitted but sons or younger brethren of gentlemen. As for husbandmen's children, they were more meet, they said, for the plough and to be artificers than to occupy the place of the learned sort; so that they wished none else to be put to school but only gentlemen's children. Whereunto the most reverend father the Archbishop, being of a contrary mind, said 'that he thought it not indifferent so to order the matter, for,' said he, 'poor men's children are many times endued with more singular gifts of nature, which are also the gifts of God, as with eloquence, memory, apt pronunciation, sobriety, and such like; and also commonly more apt to apply their study than in the gentleman's son delicately educated.' Hereunto it was on the other

part replied 'that it was meet for the ploughman's son to go to the plough, and the artificer's son to apply to the trade of his parent's vocation, and the gentlemen's children are meet to have the knowledge of government, and rule the commonwealth. For we have,' said they, 'as much need of ploughmen as any other state, and all sorts of men may not go to school.' 'I grant,' replied the Archbishop, 'much of your meaning herein, as needful in a commonwealth; but yet utterly to exclude the ploughman's son and the poor man's child from the benefits of learning, as though they were unworthy to have the gifts of the Holy Ghost bestowed upon them as well as upon others, is as much as to say that Almighty God should not be at liberty to bestow His great gifts of grace upon any person. Wherefore, if the gentleman's son be apt to learning, let him be admitted; if not apt, let the poor man's child that is apt enter his room.'" These noble words deserve to be remembered. They indicate that already godly and thoughtful Churchmen were beginning to recognise the duty of affording opportunities to the poorest children in the land for receiving a suitable education.

The foundation of Grammar Schools began in the previous century. These schools were, in many cases, free, and were originally intended, though not exclusively, for the poorer classes. Thus we find that at the Manchester Grammar School the master and usher were to "teach grammar freely and indifferently" to the pupils without receiving "any money or awards, as cock-penny, victor-penny, potation-penny, or any other." The Reformation gave a great stimulus to education, and led to the rapid multiplication of grammar schools; but although these schools, like their predecessors, were open to all classes, the poor do not appear to have largely used them. Provision was made for the religious instruction of the poor by means of public catechizing; and when this was carried on, as it was carried on by men like George Herbert, much good was doubtless effected.

But it was not for a century and a half after the Reformation that any systematic endeavour was made to provide a suitable education for the children of the poor. A Mr. Nedham proposed in 1663 that parish clerks should be paid for the instruction of such children, but we are not told whether the suggestion was carried out. In 1698 the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge was founded, and one of its first efforts was the establishment of "Catechetical Schools in every parish in and about London," "for poor children whose parents or friends were not able to give them learning." The course of instruction given in these schools was to include reading, writing and arithmetic, and the Church Catechism.

The first schools set up were at St. Botolph, Aldgate, and St. Giles, Cripplegate, in 1698: and at St. Andrew, Holborn; St. James, Clerkenwell; St. Martin-in-the-Fields; and at St. Paul, Shadwell, in 1699. By 1714 the total number of such schools in England and Ireland had risen to 1,073, with an attendance of 19,453 scholars. The funds needed for maintaining these schools, in many of which the children were lodged, boarded, and clothed as well as educated, were raised mainly by Church offertories. Among other extraordinary expedients for raising money for this good work, we read that in one parish the clergyman "hath provided two palls, the one of which is let out for 2s. 6d. and the other for 1s. a time, for the more decent funerals of the dead, and the money so arising bears a good part of the charge of teaching the children there." An annual gathering of the children attending the Parochial Schools in the metropolis was first held at St. Andrew's, Holborn, when 2,000 children were present. These gatherings have been continued to the present time, and since 1782 have been held at St. Paul's Cathedral. They suggested Blake's beautiful poem "Holy Thursday." The necessity for periodical examinations was soon felt, and as early as 1700 a clergyman was appointed Inspector of all the schools of the S.P.C.K. in and about London and Westminster. In country towns the examinations were conducted by the local clergy.

The teachers of these schools were to be over twenty-three years of age, to have an aptitude for teaching, to be well grounded in the principles of the Christian religion; and "to be of meek tempers and humble behaviour; to have a good government of themselves and their passions; and to keep good order." The masters were, in addition, to be able to write a good hand and have some knowledge of arithmetic; but this was not insisted on at first in the case of schoolmistresses.

In 1711 the Society issued a circular recommending the teachers of Charity Schools to appoint "some hours in the evening on certain days of the week, to teach such grown persons to read as have been neglected in their youth." In the following year they issued another circular recommending instruction in sewing, spinning, knitting, gardening, ploughing, harrowing, and other handicrafts, on alternate days with the ordinary subjects of the school course. These efforts show how fully alive the Church was, in the early part of the last century, to the need of educating the people, and how far-sighted was her policy, the demand for technical education in our own day being precisely identical in its intention with the half-time system recommended by the Christian Knowledge Society. Unfortunately this educational zeal gradually

abated, and though provincial schools continued to be founded throughout the country, they do not appear to have increased in efficiency. In many cases they were provided for by endowments which were administered without much supervision of the ways in which the schools were conducted.

For nearly a century the Parochial Charity Schools were the only schools for the education of the poorer classes. They rendered a valuable service in towns, but they failed to meet the wants of the agricultural districts, and, on account of their strictly denominational character, they did not satisfy Nonconformists, who, as yet, had no elementary schools of their own.

In 1763 the first Sunday-school in England was opened by the Rev. Theophilus Lindsay, Vicar of Catterick, in Yorkshire; and his example was speedily followed by others. But the first attempt to establish Sunday-schools on a large scale was made by Robert Raikes, a printer of Gloucester, and editor of the *Gloucester Journal*, whose attention had been drawn to the matter by the wretched way in which the young in his native city spent their Sundays. In a short time there were few parishes throughout the kingdom in which a Sunday-school of some sort was not to be found. It has been computed that by 1787 some 230,000 children were to be found in the Sunday-schools of England and Wales. At first the teachers in these schools were paid, but, after the first enthusiasm which had led to the establishment of Sunday-schools had died off, it was found difficult to raise the funds for supporting paid teachers, and voluntary teachers were substituted for them.

Towards the end of the eighteenth century Nonconformists began to establish schools of their own, in which the Scriptures were to be read, but no catechism or other denominational formulary was to be used. In the carrying out of this object they were largely assisted by the enthusiastic labours of Joseph Lancaster, a Quaker, who opened a school in 1798 at his father's house in St. George's Fields, nearly opposite the present British and Foreign Training College. Lancaster was an educational genius, and the rapid increase in the number of pupils attending his school compelled him to seek for means for carrying on the education of large numbers of children at the least possible expense. In the solution of this problem he was greatly assisted by the experiments of Dr. Bell in a similar direction at Madras. He contended that, by classifying pupils and by employing monitors one master was able to conduct a school of a thousand pupils; that by using sheets printed in large type instead of separate books, one book of such sheets would serve for a whole school; that by means of

dictation five hundred boys could speak and write the same word at the same instant of time; that by an entirely new method of instruction any child who could read might teach arithmetic with the utmost certainty; that the expense of education could be reduced, in a school of 300 children, to 7s. per annum for each child; and that religious instruction might be given without touching on controverted points of theology. Lancaster's school attracted great attraction, and was visited by crowds of distinguished persons interested in education, George III. himself becoming a subscriber towards its maintenance. In 1805 the King sent for him to receive an account of his work from his own lips. The interview is thus related by one of Lancaster's friends: "On entering the royal presence, the King said, 'Lancaster, I have sent for you to give me an account of your system of education, which I hear has met with opposition. One master teach 500 children at the same time! How do you keep them in order, Lancaster?' Lancaster replied, 'Please thy Majesty, by the same principle that thy Majesty's army is kept in order—by the word of command.' His Majesty replied, 'Good, good; it does not require an aged general to give the command. One of younger years can do it.' Lancaster observed that in his school the teaching branch was performed by youths who acted as monitors. The King assented, and said 'Good.' Lancaster then described his system, and he informed me that all present paid great attention and were highly delighted; and, as soon as he had finished, his Majesty said, 'Lancaster, I highly approve of your system, and it is my wish that every poor child in my dominions should be taught to read the Bible. I will do anything you wish to promote this object.'"

These marks of public and royal favour appear to have turned Lancaster's head. He began to believe that he was divinely called to establish a universal system of education on the lines of his own school, and he proceeded to visit all the chief towns in the kingdom for the purpose of carrying out his plans. His enthusiasm communicated itself to others; large numbers of schools were established at his instigation, and, for a time, he received considerable pecuniary support. But Lancaster was extravagant and reckless in his expenditure, and before long his affairs became hopelessly involved. Happily, in 1808, a gentleman, Mr. Joseph Fox, came to his rescue by advancing him £2,000; his affairs were soon after handed over to trustees, and an association, called after him, was started, under the name of "The Royal Lancastrian Institution," for promoting the education of the children of the poor. From 1807 to 1813 Lancaster continued his

travels. In one year (1810) he started fifty new schools, and travelled 3,775 miles.

In 1814 the name of "The Royal Lancastrian Institution" was changed into that of "The British and Foreign Society," and the new Society put forth as its two leading objects (i.) the furnishing of a practical example in the Borough Road Schools of the working of Lancaster's plans, and (ii.) the training of teachers for the carrying on of similar unsectarian schools elsewhere. It was now found necessary to define Lancaster's position, and prevent the lavish expenditure in which he had indulged as long as he had the supreme management of his school in his own hands. The new arrangements did not suit him. He broke off his connection with the Society, and, after an ineffectual endeavour to establish a boarding-school at Tooting, emigrated to America, where he died in 1839. The work he commenced was destined to prosper, and had no inconsiderable effect in leading the Church of England to re-organize its educational machinery. It is a great mistake, however, to regard Lancaster as the founder of our modern system of elementary education. What he did was to show that, by means of the monitorial system devised by Dr. Bell, education could be vastly cheapened, and that, by sinking denominational differences, large numbers of persons who were indifferent to distinctive religious teaching could be got to support unsectarian schools.

In order of time another distinguished educational reformer should have been noticed before Lancaster. This was Dr. Andrew Bell, who, when a chaplain at Madras, had had charge of a school for educating the orphan children of soldiers. In this position he was led, some time before 1791, to try the effect of employing children to teach children. The school was divided into classes of from twenty-five to thirty boys. The boys in each class were paired off, one superior boy, called a tutor, being placed next an inferior boy, whom he had to assist. Each class had an assistant-teacher (one of the abler senior boys), whose duty was to instruct his class, and to see that the tutors did the work assigned to them. Above the assistant-teachers were the teachers (still taken from the ranks of the pupils), who had the oversight of one or more classes. In the whole school, consisting of two hundred boys, there were in all fourteen teachers and assistants, ranging in age from seven to fourteen years. The function of the schoolmaster was to supervise the whole school, to inspect the classes, and to administer praise or censure where and when it was required. In 1796 Dr. Bell's health compelled him to return to England, where he published an account of his system under the title of "An Experiment in

Education, made at the Male Asylum, Madras; suggesting a System by which a School or Family may Teach itself, under the Superintendence of the Master or Parent." It ought not to surprise us that the author formed an exaggerated estimate of the value of his system, such exaggerations being common to all inventors. "The system," he says, "has no parallel in scholastic history. In a school it gives to the master the hundred eyes of Argus, the hundred hands of Briareus, and the wings of Mercury. By multiplying his ministers at pleasure, it gives him indefinite powers; in other words, it enables him to instruct as many pupils as his schoolroom will contain." We are now able to form a more correct opinion of the value of the monitorial system. It is possible to profitably employ monitors for various routine parts of school-work; they may look after children occupied in mechanical exercises, but they cannot teach what they do not know, nor develop the intelligence of others while their own is undeveloped. The "hundred eyes of Argus" will, after all, be only children's eyes; "the hundred hands of Briareus" will only be children's hands. The chief recommendation of the monitorial system is that it is economical, and renders possible a system of classification by which a master can keep a large number of children profitably occupied, while he himself passes from class to class to teach those subjects that most need handling by an adult.

Dr. Bell was appointed Rector of Swanage in Dorsetshire soon after his return to England, and here he introduced his system for the purpose of working a Sunday-school. His system was also tried in London and various other places, but did not attract much attention till the success of the Lancastrian Schools alarmed the friends of distinctive Church teaching, and led them to see in Dr. Bell's system the means for establishing schools of their own in which such teaching could be given. The famous Mrs. Trimmer was the first to sound the alarm with regard to the danger arising from the spread of the Lancastrian Schools. The cry was quickly caught up, and in a short time England was divided into two hostile camps, under the banners of Bell and Lancaster. Southey, Coleridge, and the *Quarterly Review* took up the quarrel in behalf of Bell; Sydney Smith, Brougham, and the *Edinburgh* came to the rescue of Lancaster. If the reader wishes to form some idea of the bitterness with which this warfare was waged, he need only look into Sydney Smith's review on "Trimmer and Lancaster" (1806). A note to the review in Sydney Smith's collected works says, "Lancaster invented the new method of education. The Church was sorely vexed at its success, endeavoured to set up Dr. Bell as the discoverer,

and to run down poor Lancaster." This is a ridiculous version of the relations subsisting between the two rival educationists. Lancaster himself had already written in his first pamphlet in 1803, "I ought not to close my account without acknowledging the obligations I lie under to Dr. Bell. I much regret that I was not acquainted with the beauty of his system till somewhat advanced in my plan. If I had known it, it would have saved me much trouble and some retrograde movements." Good sometimes comes out of evil. The strife between the partisans of Bell and Lancaster gave a great stimulus to education. We have seen how Lancaster's difficulties led to the establishment of the British and Foreign School Society. The dread of a national system of unsectarian education contributed to the establishment in 1811 of the National Society.

The object of the National Society, as set forth in its first report, was "that the national religion of the country should be made the foundation of national education, which should be the first and chief thing taught to the poor, according to the excellent Liturgy and Catechism provided by our Church for that purpose." The Society was supported at once by the Archbishops, Bishops, and many influential persons among the laity, and the Prince Regent became its Patron. The first efforts of the Society were directed to the establishment, under Dr. Bell's able and energetic superintendence, of a Central Model School, where his system could be seen at work. This experiment commenced at 45, Holborn Hill, but was speedily removed to premises capable of accommodating 1,000 children at Baldwin's Gardens. It was at first intended that the Society should establish similar schools in other districts, but this idea was speedily abandoned, it being rightly considered that the localities themselves should take the initiative, and that the Society could best assist education by making grants in aid of local effort. By 1815 there were at work no fewer than 564 National Schools, containing over 100,000 scholars, and officered in many cases by teachers who had been trained at the Central School.

From an early period in its history district branches of the Society were formed in every diocese, and this organization largely contributed to the rapidity with which National Schools were established all over the country. Grants of from £20 to £300 were made toward the building of local schools, and by 1821 there were 300,000 scholars in the 1,700 or 1,800 schools that had been started with the help of the Society. The magnitude of the Society's operations began at last to tell upon its exchequer, and in 1823 it became necessary to consider how its funds were to be increased. In this strait, George IV. issued a Royal Letter, addressed, through the

Bishops, to the provincial clergy, asking them to get their parishes to contribute to the Society's funds. A sum of £27,000 was in this way raised, and, what was of greater importance, the attention of the Church was once more forcibly directed to the importance of elementary education. In order to stimulate teachers, the Society was soon after led to issue a memorandum, drawn up by Dr. Bell, recommending that their salaries should be made partly dependent on their success and on the fees of the children. This important suggestion was very generally acted upon, and thenceforward fees became an important part of school revenue. It was soon found that they rendered the still more valuable service of making the attendance of the children more regular.

In 1832 the Central School was removed to Westminster, where it continued in operation until the establishment of Training Colleges rendered it unnecessary as a nursery for teachers. A second King's Letter was issued by William IV., which brought in a sum of £23,500. We now approach times when the State was beginning to recognise its duties in the matter of education, duties which had been too long left to voluntary effort. The first Parliamentary vote for elementary education was made in 1834; it was for the modest sum of £20,000, which was to be expended in the erection of school-buildings, the vote being left to be administered by the National Society and the British and Foreign Society. By 1838 the total annual grants of the State to the National Society had amounted to £70,122. Several Royal Letters were issued during the early part of the present reign asking for increased support of the Society, which was thereby enabled to multiply its grants. In 1844-5 alone these grants amounted to £63,267. Another important service rendered by the Society at this juncture was the appointment of traveling organizing masters, whose business it was to visit the various schools in connection with the Society for the purpose of advising the teachers in regard to the best methods of organization, teaching and discipline.

It is easier to start a good work than to continue it. The supporters of Church Schools found it very difficult to maintain them, and it was generally felt that the time had now come when the State should not only help to found schools but should contribute to support them. In 1847 this duty was practically recognised, and from that year forward an ever-increasing annual grant, amounting in 1884 to £2,721,000, has been made to elementary schools.

Since the Education Act of 1870 was passed, the State, except during the year of grace allowed after the passing of the Act, has discontinued building grants to elementary

schools, and all new Church Elementary Schools have had to be started by voluntary effort. It is satisfactory to find that during that period the National Society has granted £149,700 for building and enlarging schools in 3,333 places, thereby assisting to provide school accommodation for 410,000 children, But this is only a small part of the Society's operations. The Society makes grants to poor day-schools and Sunday-schools for fittings, books, and repairs; it has an admirable depository for the publication and sale of religious and secular school-books and school apparatus; it makes grants for the Diocesan inspection of schools in religious knowledge; it watches over educational legislation; and it helps to maintain colleges for the training of Church teachers. During the past fourteen years it has voted £50,683 towards the maintenance of students in those colleges, and £12,243 for their examination in religious knowledge.

Altogether the Society, since its formation in 1811, has expended more than £1,100,000 in promoting elementary education, involving an expenditure of at least twelve times as much from other sources for the same end. At the present time Church Schools have accommodation for 2,454,788 children, and have an average attendance of 1,607,823. These figures represent a splendid achievement, and should not be forgotten at a time like the present when the Church is being tried in the balance of public opinion. It is impossible to measure the extent to which the Church has contributed to the welfare and prosperity of our beloved country; but in the matter of education she can put her finger on unanswerable facts to testify to her zeal for the eternal and temporal interests of the poor. She took up the cause of elementary education long before the State contributed a penny towards it, and was mainly instrumental in educating the State to a sense of its duty in this respect. One half of the children attending our elementary schools are to be found in her schools; two-thirds of the teachers who are being trained for elementary school-work are trained in her colleges.

The work of the National Society is by no means accomplished. As long as English Churchmen value religious education they will need the Society to assist local effort; to train teachers not merely for Church Schools, but even for those schools in which distinctive teaching is not permitted; to provide school literature and apparatus; to criticize contemplated changes in our educational machinery, and to organize resistance to any legislation that is likely to injure the interests of Church Schools and religious education. Nor is it on Church Schools alone that the beneficial effect of the Society's operations will be exerted. As long as Church

Schools give religious education, School Boards will be bound to give some sort of religious education also. The existence of the Society is a standing protest against any creedless and godless system of education.

EVAN DANIEL.

ART. II.—THE TEXTUS RECEPTUS OF THE OLD TESTAMENT.

IN the October number of the *Quarterly Review* for 1885 there is an article upon the Revised Version of the Old Testament, written in a pungent style, and remarkable for the great breadth of its assertion. There is also an abundance of genuine learning, but unfortunately an equally remarkable absence of it upon that subject with which the Reviewer chose to deal, namely, the text of the Old Testament Scriptures, and the relation of the Versions to it.

I do not intend to follow this article step by step, but if its learned writer knows so little of the subject, what must be the case with others? I therefore propose to give some account of the Received, or, as it is commonly called, the Massoretic text; and in a subsequent paper I shall hope to show wherein the value of the ancient Versions consists. But I must venture first gravely to remonstrate against statements of which it is mild merely to say that they are misleading. Thus in p. 292 the Reviewer says, "The Targum on Genesis is an ancient authority, no doubt; but then it is 1,500 years later than the text which the Revisers propose to improve by its means." What should we think of a scholar who should say, "The manuscripts of the New Testament are ancient, no doubt; but the oldest of them is 400 years later than the text which critics propose to settle by their means"? We believe that Moses wrote 1,500 years before the Christian era; but the Targum is one of the oldest witnesses to what Moses wrote, and it is by the careful use of these ancient authorities that we obtain the conviction that the Massoretic is a most valuable and trustworthy text. But had there been neither Targums nor Versions to bear witness to its accuracy, then the Hebrew text, coming to us as a work centuries later than our era, and with no early and independent authorities to vouch for it, would have been surrounded with uncertainty of the gravest kind; for it would have had only the testimony of the Jewish synagogue on its behalf. As it is, many reject the vowels as

a Rabbinic addition, and without the Versions the consonants would have been exposed to similar treatment.

In p. 314 he makes a similar remark. "Here," he says, "is a book which in its latest part is acknowledged to be at least two centuries—in its earliest part at least twelve centuries—older than the oldest of its Versions. Does not common-sense guide us, as it were, by the hand to see at once that what the Targum, the LXX., etc., exhibit in their actual texts is about as efficacious to determine the *ipsissima verba* of the Old Testament Scriptures as Martin Luther's Version?" Common-sense guides me to the opposite conclusion; for supposing that we had no MSS. that were not a thousand years later than Luther's translation, and a text accepted by the Church, but of which the documents were several centuries later than Luther, we should certainly be justified in attaching very great importance to that or even a very inferior Version, in judging of the correctness of the later text. It is to me a painful thought that so many scholars make so light of these most precious gifts of God's good providence to us. We have in the Targums, the LXX., the Peshito-Syriac, and the Vulgate, aids not merely of incalculable value, but absolutely indispensable for the accurate study of God's holy Word; and all alike are neglected. Thanks to the present Bishop of Salisbury, we may at length look forward to a critical edition of Jerome's great work, the Vulgate. More has been done for the Septuagint, but no one apparently is willing to undertake the thankless task of using the large materials collected, and giving us a standard edition of this work, which did so much to prepare the way for the reception of Christianity, is so often quoted in the New Testament, and for centuries was the Bible of the Christian Church. Of the Peshito-Syriac, MSS. have been collected and stored up in the British Museum; and the late Philip Pusey had collated several of them with a view of giving us at least the New Testament with the authority for its readings carried back to an ancient date. It is Pharaoh-like for the Reviewer to twit the Revisers because we had to make our bricks of the best materials extant, but often of materials not in a scholar-like condition. But while reading the ridicule he casts upon the text of the LXX., I could not help calling to mind that we had in the company Dr. Field, the first English authority on the subject; and it is a pleasure to remember how much we owe to his learning and sound judgment. As for the Hebrew text, we had made at one time arrangements for collating a very ancient Hebrew MS., now at Aleppo. The purpose was frustrated by the breaking out of the Russo-Turkish War, and the work must be left to others. It may perhaps surprise the Reviewer to be told that even of

the Massoretic text there is no absolutely correct edition extant. Baer has revised some books by the help of what he had of the Massorah; but it was left to Dr. Ginsburg, a Reviser, to edit the Massorah in a complete form, and we are looking forward to a really trustworthy edition of all the Hebrew Scriptures by the same able hands. And it will be evident, after reading the following account of the work of the Massorites, that it is possible for him to edit with absolute certainty the result of the labours of the Jewish scholars to whom we are indebted for their "received text."

I pass over the extraordinary remark that the Massoretic text is without vowels (p. 284). I thought that it was the office of the Massorites first to settle what were the traditional vowels belonging to the consonants of the Hebrew text, and then to write them down. And if what he says is true, namely, that the text of the Old Testament underwent a revision somewhere between 300 and 600 A.D., then I think that we cannot value too highly the LXX., which gives us the knowledge of what was the general purport of it two centuries before Christ. The authors of this Revision, he tells us, were the Massorites, and he sees them busy at work with MSS. before them, from which they culled out various readings and marked them as Kri and Ch'tib. It is a pity that the whole picture is entirely imaginary, or, rather, it is a happy deliverance for us. No company of Revisers could have produced the Massoretic text.

Let me then say what it really is. And first I must distinguish between the Massorah itself and the Massoretic text. Massorah means *tradition*, and the Massoretic text is the traditional, and therefore the authoritative text of the Jewish Church. The Massorites did not form it, but simply guarded what they had received. And as for dates, Ginsburg says that the Massorah began three centuries before our era, and not after, while the committal of it to writing, with vowels and accents, began in 570 A.D., and the transcription and formation of the notes, which guard the text against the errors of copyists, went on until the eleventh or twelfth century of our era. These notes are specifically called the Massorah, as being the embodiment of the old tradition; and the scribes who collected, and arranged, and completed them are called the Massorites, not because they created the text, but because their business was to commit to writing that "fence of the law," which previously had been handed down from teacher to teacher orally.

In so commonplace a book as Zanolini's "Rabbinic Lexicon" I find the following account: "The Massorah takes its name from the Chaldee Targum on Job xv. 18, and is a Critica Sacra of the Jews, by which the differences between the written text

(Ch'tib) and that read in the synagogue (Kri) is handed down: it also records how often, where, and in what shape each sentence, verse, and letter in it is found. And the Jews consider that it was contrived by their learned men for the purpose of preserving the true and real text of the Sacred Scriptures free from all corruption and change." It was a very gradual growth, beginning with short technical rules to guard against the blunders of copyists in places liable to misconception, but slowly it extended itself to the text generally. And it was only after it had been handed down orally through many generations of scribes, that at length the troubles and dangers to which the Jews were exposed, led to the commital of this system to writing.

The destruction of Jerusalem crushed Judaism for the time; but it revived again, and on the sea of Gennesaret, at Tiberias and the neighbouring towns, Jewish scribes enjoyed a safe retreat for two centuries, and used their time of peace well; but the Talmud was the chief product of Jewish study, the text of their Holy Book held with them but a secondary place. At Tiberias, Judaism reigned supreme—no Christian, no Samaritan, no heathen might dwell there; it was a holy land where they restored their sanctuary after the model of Jerusalem, and their numbers may be estimated by the fact that they had thirteen synagogues, besides schools and a university. It was here that Rabbi Judah completed the Mishna and Rabbi Johanan the Gemara. But along with the Talmud there was the study of the Bible; the Holy Books never ceased to be an object of care and reverence, though Talmudic studies took the first place. For in the second century of our era we find the Jews busy with their sacred text. Aquila, who translated the Old Testament into Greek in the reign of Hadrian (117-138), and Symmachus, who made another translation during the reign of Severus (193-211), are both said to have been pupils of Rabbi Akiba of Tiberias. Both were converts to Judaism; and a third, Theodotion, said to have been, like Symmachus, both a convert and an Ebionite, made another translation at some period between the two, probably about twenty years before the close of the century. The remains of these Versions have been edited by Dr. Field, in his scholarly work "Origenis Hexapla," published by the Cambridge University Press. They prove to us two things, the first, that the Jews were then actively at work upon the Holy Scriptures; the second, that the text of the second century was much the same as that of the Massorites. But these three men were all perverts, and Tiberias was a place which no Christian might enter. Was this second-century text identical with the text which preceded the uprise of

Christianity? Let us take as an example a matter upon which the Reviewer strongly condemns the Revisers. In Isa. vii. 14, we have kept *virgin* in the text, but have placed *maiden* in the margin. Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion all render *young woman* or *girl*. Jerome notices this, and that the Septuagint has *virgin*. He also notices that the Hebrew has not *bethula*, the distinctive word for *virgin*, but *alma*, a word which we have always rendered *maiden*, believing that it refers to age and means a young girl, one possibly who, as Jerome thinks, was still *abscondita*—shut up in the women's apartments. It is the word used of Rebekah in Gen. xxiv. 43, where the LXX. has *virgin;* and of Miriam in Exod. ii. 8, where the LXX. has *young girl*. We might then well ask, Did the LXX. read in their text *bethula?* Have the Jews at Tiberias played falsely with a passage so important to Christians, and substituted *alma* for it? This is but an instance of the numerous doubts and questionings which would arise had we only the Massoretic text, and mere hangers-on to it like Aquila, Theodotion, and Symmachus. And while Christians impugned some texts, sceptics would refuse any credence to a Revision made, as our Reviewer thinks, somewhere between 300 and 600 A.D., but of which no record has been kept. But these doubts disappear at the presence of a number of independent witnesses. The LXX. Version was made in Egypt two centuries before Christ, and by scribes who were uninfluenced by the Palestinian schools. The Peshito was the work of Christians at an early date, in Mesopotamia. The Vulgate was also the work of a Christian, who went to Palestine that he might study the language upon the spot. The Targums are the works of Jews, and so not independent testimonies. But that of Onkelos on the Pentateuch was committed to writing in the second century, and is therefore valuable for its antiquity. Of this, too, we have no good edition, though valuable MSS. exist. These Targums are translations from Hebrew into Aramaean, and while the older are simple and intelligible, those of later date become wild and visionary.

Thus, then, there was first of all a traditional text—that is, the consonants originally having been written without vowels, and probably without distinction into words, there was a method handed down by oral tradition of separating them, of giving them their pronunciation, and of grouping them into sentences and verses. And one most important part of this work was the distinguishing between the conjugations and persons of the verbs, as the same consonants may have very different meanings. But the word Massorah, as I have mentioned, has a more technical meaning than this. It means

also a method of "fencing" the sacred text, to use their own word, by an elaborate system of notes. And when the Jews spoke of Massorah, *tradition*, they were thinking, not of their text itself, but of notes for its safeguard, which formed the main point of the oral teaching of the scribes in their schools. And this teaching became more important when their rest at Tiberias was broken up. For when the Roman empire became Christian, spots so intimately connected with our Lord's life could not long remain outside His Church. We soon find Christian bishops at Tiberias, and it ceased to be the centre of Jewish learning. The Jews left it and went to Babylonia, where at Sura and other towns on the Euphrates flourishing schools sprang up; and the Babylonian Talmud, written by Rabbi Asche, of Sura, is the proof that they rivalled the Rabbis of Tiberias in learning.

But their Scriptures still could not be read without a vast amount of knowledge, which could be gained only by oral instruction. And, as I have said, it was this traditional teaching, the object of which was to protect their method of reading from corruption, which was strictly called the Massorah. In a text consisting solely of consonants, and of which even the divisions into words had to be settled by authority, it is easy to imagine that the ingenuity of the scribes would soon lead them to methods for guarding their students from error. Wherever those whom they were instructing found constantly a difficulty, there the teachers would devise a bridge for passing safely over it. And we have reason to believe that copies made of the Scriptures were the object of learned care. One of the busiest periods for the transcription of such copies began about a century before the Christian era. From that time and during our Lord's sojourn on earth such copying was a recognised part of the duties of the Soferim or scribes. And in the second century we find in the Jerusalem Talmud, that attention was already called to errors which the scribes had made. Thus in the *Tikkun Soferim* sixteen places are mentioned where a different (and right) reading was to be restored; *tikkun* meaning restoration. These Soferim also began the custom of placing a small circle over letters or words not to be found in certain MSS.; and if, as there is reason for believing, this was the *tittle*, or *little horn*, referred to by our Lord in Matt. v. 18, then this custom is older than our era. Besides this, they seem to have invented technical methods of verifying their copies. These methods and notes gradually became the Massorah, when they had been handed down by oral teaching through a succession of teachers.

At first there would be safeguards only for those passages where errors of transcription were easy, or where the con-

sonants were capable of two methods of interpretation. But gradually every word of Holy Scripture was protected from change, and thus we can understand how it came to pass that six centuries, from A.D. 570, were occupied in perfecting the system. The notes, moreover, were of a mysterious and technical kind, which required a living voice to explain them. Let us take an instance. In the margin of Gen. i. 5 we read, "The blind man cried intending to go out by night, and he rose in the morning." What can possibly be the meaning of this absurdity? Ask a Massorite, and he will tell you that the word *la-or, to the light*, is so written in Gen. i. 5; Isai. xlii. 16, lix. 9; Zeph. iii. 5; Micah vii. 9; Job xii. 22, xxiv. 14. In other words in these seven places *or*, light, has the definite article, and the preposition *to*.

The Massorah, then, implies, not only a text in existence, but one of high and settled authority. The picture of the Massorites busy among MSS., revising the text, and giving various readings, somewhere between 300 and 600 A.D., is the most unkind attack upon the Massoretic text that was ever penned. The text was the work of Jewish Soferim, beginning with Ezra, ha-sofer—the scribe *par excellence*. At what date the text was perfected we do not know. We gather from the Septuagint that the consonants were not always divided in the same manner as in our text; and hence some of the renderings, which are looked upon by half-taught men as miserable blunders, are really of exceeding interest and value. Possibly it was by gradual thought and study that the verbs were read with the vowels now assigned them. I fear that the scribes were stern grammarians, who showed scant mercy to archaic forms. But there was a text long before the Massorites invented for it their system of noting where every word occurred, and how it was spelt, with the one view of preserving it inviolable for ever.

This thought is, of course, at the bottom of the strange confusion of which the Reviewer is guilty in saying that he possesses a text fifteen hundred years older than the Targum on Genesis. The autograph of Moses would be, did it exist, of that extreme antiquity, and would supersede all other texts whatsoever. So if the autograph of St. Matthew's Gospel existed, we might throw all our MSS. into the fire. As it is, we have to arrive at our conclusions by long and patient study, and at best we arrive only at probability, and not at absolute certainty. So the text of the Old Testament requires study, and thought, and patient labour. But there is this difference, that the Jewish scribes—Soferim and not Massorites—have elaborated a *textus receptus*, more carefully than Erasmus did that of the New Testament; and that the Massorites have

committed their elaborate system to writing. But their work began only in 570 A.D. The Reviewer thinks they were "long-headed men;" if so, my confidence in them would be *nil*. Long-headed men would mould their text to party purposes, and Christians so ill-treated the Jews that they met hatred by hatred. Christians, too, were so ignorant of Hebrew that they had no means of supervising the work of the Jews, or even of judging of it. Where then is our security? How does the Reviewer attain to his conviction that he has a text which is identical with the autographs of Moses, and Samuel, and Isaiah? I am sure I do not know. The utmost that I can say is that the Vulgate, the Versions of Aquila and his compeers, and the Targum of Onkelos enable me to form a judgment upon the Hebrew text, and upon the work of the Massorites some centuries before they actually put their hand to their task; and that in the Peshito and Septuagint I have two Recensions of that text from perfectly independent sources. I may even add that so great was the contempt of the Christian Church for Hebrew, and so good were the Versions, that these two Recensions and the Vulgate sufficed for the supply of the spiritual needs of believers until the Reformation, when Luther made his famous translation of the Old Testament Scriptures directly from the Hebrew.

I shall conclude by saying a few words upon the committal to writing of the Massorah, and finally upon the fact that there are two Recensions of the Massoretic text. Oh! what will the Reviewer say? For he is full of wrath because the Revisers mention the fact that there are several Recensions of the Old Testament text, forgetting that by the mouth of two or three witnesses the Word is established.

We have seen, then, that in the time of our Lord the Hebrew Scriptures consisted of consonants only. Possibly dots were already put between words, but there was no division as yet into sentences. Thus reading was a very difficult task, and could be learnt only of a scribe who knew the traditions. It surprised the people, therefore, that our Lord, who had been brought up in Galilee, and had studied at the feet of no Rabbi, read the Scriptures in the traditional way; for had He divided the consonants differently, and pronounced them with other vowels, there would have been nothing to excite their astonishment (John vii. 15). We notice, then, that our Lord followed, and so gave a general approval to, the traditional text of the Jewish synagogue. Of course the people of Jerusalem knew how they were accustomed to hear it read, but not everyone even there would have ventured to read for himself.

For centuries this method of reading continued. Virtually, it was the repeating the text by heart with the aid of the con-

sonants to guide them. It was not until the sixth century of our era that the scribes attempted to give a permanent form to their inherited knowledge by inventing signs to represent the vowel-sounds, and accents for the arrangement of words into sentences. For the Massoretic text has not vowels only but accents.

Dr. Ginsburg, in his edition of the Massoreth ha-Massoreth of Elias Levita—and we could have no more competent authority—says that it was one Acha, or Achai, of Irak, *i.e.* Babylonia, who first represented the vowel-sounds by marks which he placed over the letters, and that the date of his so doing was about 550 A.C. There are three or four MSS. of the tenth century which have this system of vowels. One of these contains the prophetical books, which include the histories, while the others are fragmentary. This system was followed not only by the Babylonian Jews, but also by the Karaites, until the Jews of Palestine sent missionaries to them, and about the middle of the tenth century converted them to their method of writing. As the Crimea was the chief home of the Karaites, it is possible that among the MSS. discovered there some may be of a date anterior to this conversion; if so, they will be of especial value, because they will hold the place of independent witnesses. And a multitude of independent witnesses, if in the main they agree, produces, not uncertainty, as the Reviewer assumes, but exactly the reverse.

Once started, the idea took root, and in 570 A.C. Mocha of Tiberias contrived the elaborate system which has preserved for us the division of the consonants into words, their pronunciation, their intonation, and their arrangement into sentences, verses, and paragraphs. It is so perfect that it could scarcely have been produced at one effort. Like most great improvements, it was probably gradual. But we are expressly told that the accents formed part of Rabbi Mocha's system, and are an integral portion of it.

The six centuries which followed were not spent in adding vowels and accents to the text, but in perfecting that elaborate system of notes referred to above, of which they had received a large proportion by tradition. Their method was that of the well-instructed scribe described by our Lord (Matt. xiii. 52), who not only brings out of his treasure the old, which his teachers had delivered to him, but completes and perfects their method. It is the ancient notes which, strictly speaking, form the Massorah—the tradition; but the Massorites completed the system, and in Biblical MSS. we find these notes written in the margins, or between the lines, or in fantastic shapes of animals, and so on, with a Massorah finalis often;

that is, an appendix containing such notes as had been squeezed out of the pages of the MS. by want of room.

Lastly, this Massoretic text, being, as I have shown, the received text of the Jewish Synagogue, has come down to us in two Recensions, known as the Palestinian and the Babylonian. As early as the eleventh century these two texts were collated by Aharon ben Asher of Tiberias, and Jacob ben Naphtali, the president of a Babylonian school. They enumerate no less than eight hundred discrepancies—a terrible number. But what are they? Anyone can find them in that well-known book, Walton's "Polyglot Bible," and an account of the collation is given in the Prolegomena. From Walton it appears that about six hundred consist in attaching to the consonants different vowels, and in only two hundred places are the consonants different; and in almost every case these are mere differences of spelling, and involve no important difference of meaning.

There is confessedly a considerable difference between the Massoretic text and the quotations from the Old Testament Scripture given in the New Testament. The accusation has therefore often been brought against the Massoretic text, that it was framed by men with a strong anti-Christian bias. In the same way the Jewish Versions into Greek, made by Aquila, Theodotion, and Symmachus, are often accused of having been made for controversial purposes. We may, therefore, be thankful to God's good providence, for having given us independent testimony to the general trustworthiness of the Massoretic text; and the Revisers came to a sound conclusion when they determined to adhere to this text, its consonants, its vowels, and even its accents, except where there was good authority the other way. I shall hope next month to show more fully what those authorities are.

R. Payne-Smith.

Art. III.—JAN ZISKA, "THE MODERN HANNIBAL."

JAN ZISKA of Trotznow, afterwards of Kalich, was one of the most extraordinary men ever produced by any nationality. Whatever views the supporters of different parties might take of the character and conduct of the man himself, in one respect all were unanimous. He was designated by his enemies a butcher, a villain, a double-dyed traitor; while by his friends he was termed a zealot for God's law, "our true brother Ziska,"

a faithful servant of God, with whom God always was, who loved God and always trusted in God's help. But as regards his military genius, all looked upon him with equal admiration. Many stories were set on foot in later times as to how and where he learnt the art of war, of which he showed himself so great a master; but the real fact is, that he was never beyond the limits of his native country, Bohemia, until he crossed its frontiers at the head of a Hussite army, in order to assume the offensive against its enemies. And the most marvellous thing of all is, that his greatest military exploits were performed when he was totally blind.

Taking advantage of a system of defence by means of a movable fortress composed of waggons, which had to a certain extent been practised in Bohemia, his organizing power and genius enabled what might be termed a half-armed rabble first to repel, and then, issuing forth, to put to flight with shame and disgrace, the finest feudal armies, composed of so-called "iron lords," horsemen sheathed in complete armour. It was not on material strength, or on the personal valour of his men, that he placed his main reliance, but on scientific use of the advantages of position, on the discipline and careful drawing up of his forces, on the skilful movements of bodies of men and waggon-fortresses, and on the management and use of artillery, in which he was unrivalled.

The exact date of his birth is unknown, but there is a story that he was unexpectedly born under an oak in a wood belonging to the little estate of Trotznow, in the south of Bohemia, which belonged to his father. In the time of King Wenceslas IV. domestic wars or feuds on a considerable scale raged in several parts of Bohemia, mainly owing to the variances between the Crown and a large number of the Barons. Among these Henry of Rosenberg was a principal leader, and Ziska appears to have early incurred his enmity, and to have been ousted from his paternal estate of Trotznow. Under these circumstances he entered the service of the King, but it is not known exactly in what capacity. If he were the Chamberlain of Queen Sophia, he would doubtless have accompanied her to the sermons of Hus in the Chapel Bethlehem in 1411 and 1412. But he was not merely employed in the duties of a civilian, but also in war, and is recorded to have lost an eye "while fighting valiantly" before the death of Wenceslas IV. In 1414 mention is made of a certain "one-eyed Johnny," who held the position of royal doorkeeper (*portulanus regius*). It is not unlikely, though by no means certain, that this person may have been Ziska.

Ziska must have been married, and perhaps a widower, before he entered the King's service, for he had a daughter

who was married before the year 1424 to Lord Andrew of Duba.

The strife between the superior clergy—who maintained the existing simoniacal system—and the reforming party led by Hus, was at its height while Ziska was in the King's service. It is said that, some time after the burning of Hus, King Wenceslas noticed Ziska unusually pensive and gloomy, and inquired the reason thereof. Ziska replied, "How can I be merry, when our faithful leaders and faithful teachers of God's law are guiltlessly and unrighteously burned by a faithless priesthood?" The King answered, "Dear John! what have we to say thereto? Can we now amend it? If thou knowest any way thereto, set it right; we gladly grant thee this." Ziska took the King at his word, and said that with his permission he would do so.

Through the threats of his brother Sigismund, King of Hungary and of the Romans, Wenceslas finally adopted a new line of policy inimical to the Hussite party. Seventeen days before his death, the populace, irritated by stones being thrown from the corridors of the town-hall of the New Town of Prague at a Hussite priest, John of Zelau, who was bearing the host at the head of a procession, forced the door, threw the town-councillors out of window, and massacred them in the street. Some say that Ziska participated in this affray, while other authorities make no mention of him in the matter, though they describe the event at considerable length.

After the death of Wenceslas (1419), the Bohemian Estates sent an embassy to Sigismund, announcing his accession to the crown, but withal petitioning him to grant full freedom of participation in the Eucharist under both kinds, and to carry out reforms in the condition of the clergy according to the principles laid down by Hus. Meanwhile, the widowed Queen Sophia, assisted by several high officials, the principal of whom was the Utraquist, Lord Czenek of Wartenberg, acted as regent. But many so utterly distrusted Sigismund, that they began at once to contemplate protecting themselves against him by arms. Among these was Ziska, who never wavered for an instant in this respect. Nicholas of Hus induced the people of Prague to follow him in an attack upon the Royalists posted in the Kleinseite or Lesser Town of Prague on the opposite side of the Moldava. At a decisive moment Ziska assumed the command, and the victory was mainly due to his genius. After this the Queen-regent fled from the capital. A truce, however, shortly afterwards was made between the people of Prague and the Royalist nobles, and Ziska quitted Prague for Pilsen.

The town of Austi on the Luznitz was seized, February,

1420, by a somewhat fanatical brotherhood which had formed itself in the neighbourhood. But about eight English miles distant were the ruins of a town also on the Luznitz, which had been destroyed two centuries and a half before. The site of this offered a position so strong and so easily fortified, that Austi was given up, and the brotherhood established itself permanently in the ruined town, giving it the name of Tabor.

Divisions in Pilsen weakened the position of Ziska so much, that he came to terms with the Royalists, and quitted Pilsen under covenant of a free passage for himself, his men, and their wives and children, to Tabor. His warriors were 400 in number, and he had twelve waggons equipped for war, and nine horses which could be used for cavalry. Ziska had forded the river Otava not far from the village of Sudomer, when he was assailed by two armies advancing in opposite directions. He halted by a fishpond called Skaredy, where he took up a position such that the lofty dam of the pond protected him on one side, while his little force protected itself on the other with waggons. He is said also to have ordered the women to spread their long veils in front of his army among the long reeds at the edge of the fishpond, which had lately been drawn, and was without water. From east and west came on the enemy, who reckoned over 2,000 horsemen in full armour, expecting to trample the little band of infantry under their horses' hoofs. But the position selected by Ziska compelled them to dismount and advance on foot. It is said that many of the assailants caught their spurs in the veils spread amongst the reeds, and fell to the ground. Nevertheless, there was a terrible contest of few against many. At the vesper hour the assault began, the "iron lords" attacking with swords and spears, under cover of a shower of bolts from crossbows. They succeeded in damaging some of the waggons, and forcing their way so far into Ziska's entrenchment as to capture about thirty of his men; but they could not overcome the resistance of the remainder. Darkness came on, and the Royalists were able to effect nothing further, but in the confusion came into collision and fought with each other. Thus they were obliged to give up the contest, and retired, each party by the way it had come, with loss and shame. Ziska remained on the field of battle in token of victory, and then marched quietly on in the direction of Tabor.

The next thing was to organize the Taborite brotherhood. Four "captains" (*capitanei*) were elected—Nicholas of Hus, Jan Ziska, Zbynek of Buchow, and Chwal of Machowitz; but the military organization was left almost entirely in the hands of Ziska. In this he looked principally to his infantry, which

must be armed with weapons easily procurable, and the use of which could be easily learnt. Spears of different kinds, partisans, maces, and crossbows were adopted, but the more especial weapon was the iron-shod flail. The bigger boys were armed with slings. War-waggons were employed as a perpetual and movable defence against steel-clad cavalry. The greatest attention was paid to the drill and discipline of the drivers of these waggons. By a night-attack upon the army from Kuttenberg, which had taken part in the battle of Sudomer, and had halted at Ozice on its return home, Ziska obtained not only considerable booty and many prisoners, but also horses and suits of armour, of which he stood in great need. An exchange of prisoners was arranged, and Ziska proceeded to organize a Taborite cavalry. Whenever he saw a likely peasant lad, he put him in a suit of armour, and taught him to ride and fight on horseback. The usual position of the Taborite cavalry was on the wings of the army. Peasants crowded into Tabor, which Ziska fortified with equal skill and diligence. He was never on friendly terms with the Taborite clergy, whose innovations he disliked, and who had more influence with the soldiers than himself, though they always had the good sense to leave matters in his hand till the victory was won or the assault successful. It is to them, rather than to him, that we must ascribe the cruelties practised by the Taborites in warfare, which, however, were not so great as those of their Catholic adversaries. Children were usually spared by the Taborites; by their adversaries, especially the Crusaders, never.

It was time, indeed, to organize armed forces for the defence of the country; for on March 1, 1420, Pope Martin proclaimed a crusade against the Hussites, which King Sigismund formally announced at Breslau on the 17th, and immediately proceeded to form alliances with the German Princes for a joint campaign in Bohemia. Even Lord Czenek of Wartenberg, the Grand Burgrave, united with the communities of the Old and New Towns of Prague in making a solemn league and covenant to defend the right of partaking in both kinds; but ere long he wavered, and purchased Sigismund's favour by treacherously putting the great Castle of Prague into the hands of nobles devoted to him, who occupied it with a strong garrison. At Sigismund's approach the men of Prague themselves wavered; but Sigismund's arrogant and unconciliatory demands revived their courage, and they sent messengers to ask for speedy aid from the brethren at Tabor.

Through Ziska's exertions all was there in readiness, and he took the field with the three other captains, the principal Taborite clergy, and an army of 9,000 men, well provided with

waggons and artillery. On the way he took Beneschow in the teeth of a force sent against him from the Castle of Prague, and in the course of the night repulsed an attack made upon him by 10,000 cavalry from Kuttenberg, 1,600 from Prague, and another body from Konopiste. On May 20 he and his army entered the New Town of Prague, where they were received with welcome and hospitality. A short time before a reinforcement of some hundreds of men had arrived at Prague from Mount Oreb, a hill in the circle of Königingratz, where a smaller society like that of Tabor had been formed.

Sigismund declined battle in the open field, but by a clever manœuvre succeeded in provisioning the Castle of Prague. He waited for the arrival of the German princes with their armies, and Crusaders continued to pour into his camp at Zbraslaw. When he arrived before Prague, his camp on the north side of the city appeared like three towns, composed of tents standing in long rows.

Meanwhile Tabor was besieged by Lord Ulric of Rosenberg, and Nicholas of Hus was detached from Prague with 300 cavalry to assist in its defence. On hearing of his approach, the Taborites, at dawn on Sunday, June 30, sallied from their town and attacked Ulric's camp, with loud shouts and outcries, an unexpected movement which scared the besiegers into flight. As they fled they were charged by Nicholas of Hus and his 300 men, and utterly dispersed, leaving rich booty and a large cannon to the Taborites.

The management of the defence of Prague was placed in the hands of Ziska. Sigismund's army before Prague numbered from 100,000 to 150,000 men, among whom were 40 princes, temporal and spiritual. Sigismund contemplated the occupation of a ridge called *Witkow*, now *Ziskow*, on the eastern side of Prague, which with the Vyssegrad and the castle would have formed a triangle of fortresses, sufficient to prevent the importation of provisions into the city. But Ziska was beforehand with him, and occupied the highest and most defensible portion of the ridge with two square wooden stockades, each of which was surrounded by a hastily run-up wall and a ditch. The space between them was protected by the steepness of the ascent, which, especially on the northern side, is nearly precipitous.

For a fortnight little was done, but, on the occupation and fortification of the Witkow, Sigismund determined to try the mettle of the besieged. He sent, therefore, a body of men-at-arms across the Moldava to assault the town, the gates of which stood always open. Out rushed a number of the citizens of the Old Town, without any order. These, of course, were easily defeated and put to flight by the heavy cavalry.

This was a lesson by which the besieged had the good sense to profit.

The next day, July 14, was appointed for a more serious attack. The stockades on the Witkow were to be taken, and Ziska and his Taborites to be driven from Prague, which was then to be assaulted on three sides at once. The assault on the Witkow was entrusted to the Princes of Meissen, whose division numbered about 18,000 men, to which were added 7,000 or 8,000 Hungarians and Austrians. All the divisions of Sigismund's army were ready in their several positions by 4 o'clock in the afternoon, when the Meissners crossed the Moldava, and their cavalry ascended the Witkow on the eastern side, where the ascent is less steep, and the ridge itself lower. They then attacked the stockade on that side, with loud blasts of trumpets, and endeavoured to storm it.

The defenders of the stockades appear to have been panic-stricken at the first shock, and the Meissners got possession of the ditch, and of a vineyard hard by, which was no doubt included in the fortification of the stockade. Only twenty-six men, two women, and one girl remained in the stockade, resisting the enemy, who were endeavouring to climb the stone and mud wall beyond the ditch. Having no other missile weapons the few defenders threw stones at the assailants. "A faithful Christian," cried one of the women, "must not flee before Antichrist," and fought valiantly, unarmed as she was, until she was killed. Ziska now hastened up in person, and was soon in the forefront of the struggle. He was ere long in imminent danger, and the Meissners were dragging him by the feet from the wall that surrounded the stockade, when up came his faithful flailmen and rescued him. Encouraged by the valour of their leader, the defenders returned to their posts, and the enemy were unable to take the stockade, especially as they had forgotten to bring with them ladders and other appliances requisite for the assault of fortifications. Meanwhile Ziska, not being required any longer to engage personally in the combat, attacked the enemy on the left flank with a body of infantry detached from their position between the stockades. The heavily armed dismounted horsemen were unable to retreat, owing to the numbers pressing forward from their rear. Some of them sat down on the ground and protected themselves as well as they could with their shields against the storm of stones and arrows from the stockade, and from the infantry on their flank, while others were pressed on to the precipice on the northern side of the ridge, fell down head-foremost and broke their necks.

At the first sight of the danger in which Ziska and his army were, the citizens of Prague were panic-stricken, but

soon recovered their courage, and issued forth in better order than on the preceding day to aid their friends. In front went a priest with the Holy Sacrament, a bell ringing before him as usual; and after him about fifty artillerymen with field-pieces, and then a large body of peasants armed with flails. Terror seized the Meissners, Austrians, and Hungarians lest their retreat should be cut off, and they broke into flight in the wildest confusion. The Taborites chased them in the rear, the men of Prague charged them in flank; and in about an hour from 300 to 500 were slain, and many others carried away mortally wounded, while many were drowned in attempting to cross the river. One hundred and forty-four, with Henry of Isenburg, their general, lay dead on and about the ridge. The King viewed this unexpected disaster with rage and grief from the other side of the Moldava; and the divisions of the army intended for the attack of the city returned disheartened to their tents. The men of Prague fell on their knees on the "Spitalfield" (*i.e.* "Hospital Field") and gave loud thanks to God, ascribing the happy conclusion of the battle to a miracle rather than to their own strength.

Ziska, to whom, under Providence, the merit of the victory was ascribed, immediately proceeded to strengthen the fortifications on the Witkow, the name of which was soon changed to Ziskow in his honour. But the exasperated Germans began to exercise frightful cruelties on the unarmed population in the neighbourhood, especially the women and children. Dissensions broke out between the Bohemians and Moravians on the one side, and the Germans on the other, and ere long the mighty host melted away; and Sigismund, after causing himself to be crowned King of Bohemia in the cathedral, retired altogether from Prague. On the other hand, the Taborites annoyed the people of Prague by their iconoclastic proclivities, from the proceedings connected with which Ziska appears to have kept aloof. Confidential communications took place between the magistrates of Prague and the Taborite leaders as to the permanent rejection of Sigismund and the election of a Polish prince in his stead. Finally the Taborites quitted Prague under Ziska, on September 22, to carry on war—which they did with considerable success—against Ulric of Rosenberg, in the south of Bohemia. It was probably by Ziska's advice that Nicholas of Pelgrim was elected "elder," or "bishop," of the Taborites, in order to check the innovating spirit of the Taborite clergy. He was afterwards known as the *Biskupetz*, or "Little Bishop."

Little is known of Ziska's movements till we find him, on November 12, before the walls of Prachatitz, when a cruel

persecution had been raging against the Utraquists. He personally summoned the citizens to open their gates, and admit his army peacefully into the town with the Holy Sacrament and their priests, promising that no one should be molested in person or property. The besieged replied contemptuously that they did not want their Sacrament or their priests, as their own were sufficient. On this Ziska cried with a loud voice: "I swear this day to God, that, if I capture you by force, I will not leave one man alive, but will cause all to be slain, however many there may be of you!" and gave the signal for the assault. The besieged defended themselves manfully with artillery, boiling pitch, and stones; but the hail of arrows and stones from the archers and slingers of the Taborites so confounded them that they did not know which way to turn. The walls were scaled, the gates opened, and a frightful massacre took place, only women and children being spared. Only seven prisoners were given their lives, and they were Utraquists. Two hundred and thirty corpses were counted in the streets, and eighty-five were burnt to death in the sacristy of the church. This struck terror on all sides; and surrender followed surrender till Ulric of Rosenberg engaged to grant freedom of worship to the Utraquists on his estates, and concluded a truce till February 4, 1421.

But Ulric fulfilled his agreement only on the Bohemian, and not on the German, portion of his vast estates, which caused a circular to be issued by Ziska and the other Taborite leaders, dated Prachatitz, November 22. In this they cautioned the neighbouring towns against believing Ulric's statements that the Taborites were their enemies; they were only the enemies of all wicked priests and laymen who were against the Holy Gospel. "And we have against us all wicked Christians, on account of the *Four Articles:* (1) That the Word of God should be preached everywhere, which is not done; (2) that the Divine Body and Blood should be delivered to all faithful Christians, young and old; (3) that the secular dominion of the clergy should be put an end to; and (4) that open sins should be checked in all people—in the King, in lords, in esquires, in beneficed clergy, in all men, lay and spiritual."

A public discussion took place at Prague, on December 10, between the Prague and Taborite clergy, upon the order of the Mass and the vestment question, of which Ziska procured an adjournment, in order to prevent anything from taking place which should hinder the two parties from acting together against the common enemy. It was also determined to send a solemn embassy to invite the King of Poland to accept the crown of Bohemia.

Early in 1421 Ziska forced Sigismund to retire from the siege of Kladruby and disband his army.[1]

The surrender of Leitmeritz is interesting from the circumstance that Ziska, while preparing to assault it, seized a wooden tower on a conical hill, about two miles distant, to which he gave the name of *Kalich* (chalice). From that time forth he signed himself Jan Ziska of Kalich; and the little estate attached to this tower appears to have been the only recompense received by Ziska for his vast and extraordinary services.

A parliament was opened at Prague on June 1, 1421, and Ziska now came forward as a statesman. The Four Articles were acknowledged, and Sigismund was declared to have forfeited the crown. Ziska was, of course, one of the twenty "regulators," or managers, of the realm, who were appointed for a limited time. On the day of the conclusion of the parliament the Castle of Prague surrendered with all belonging to it. Ziska's aim was to establish a Polish dynasty in place of Sigismund. Wladislaw of Poland referred the Bohemian ambassadors to his cousin Witold of Lithuania, who eventually sent an embassy to Prague.

Ziska marched from Tabor against the strong Castles of Rabi and Bor. An arrow from the walls of the former struck him in his remaining eye and all but deprived him of life. He was immediately conducted to Prague, where the arrow was successfully extracted; and his mere presence in his wounded condition exercised a great and beneficial effect upon matters in the city.

A German army of 125,000 men crossed the frontier and proceeded to besiege the town of Saatz. But after six desperate assaults had been made in vain (September 19), the Germans began to complain of the inactivity of Sigismund —who ought to have invaded Bohemia from the south-east simultaneously with their own irruption—and returned in disorder on hearing of the approach of a relieving army from Prague.

Early in October Sigismund sent a large Hungarian army into Moravia, which was to effect a junction with the Silesians and then to invade Bohemia. Sigismund appeared ere long in Moravia himself, and obtained the renunciation of the Four Articles from the Moravian nobility, while John of Zelau was endeavouring to upset everything in the shape of order at

[1] He also compelled the "Landfried" of Pilsen to make a truce till January 1, 1422, allowing in the meantime full freedom to the Four Articles of Prague and the Utraquist mode of administering the Eucharist. Afterwards, Lord Czenek of Wartenberg was forced to do public penance for his former treacherous conduct.

Prague. In these difficulties the people of Prague applied for aid to Ziska, who, though totally blind, was deemed the only person capable of uniting the whole Utraquist party against their formidable foes. Ziska quitted Saatz and entered Prague on December 1. He was welcomed with as grand a reception as if he had been a monarch. He designated himself "Superintendent of the communities of the land of Bohemia that adhere to fulfil the law of God." The next day he marched, followed by the army of Prague, to Kuttenberg.

On Sunday, December 21, the Utraquist army marched out of Kuttenberg in a westerly direction, and soon espied the royal host advancing towards them in several divisions. The King was with the largest division. The Bohemians, nothing daunted, drew up in battle array under protection of their waggon fortress, and successfully repelled the assaults of the enemy by the fire of their artillery. But meanwhile a bloody conspiracy broke out in Kuttenberg; a number of Sigismund's soldiers were admitted within the walls, and all who were unacquainted with the password of the conspirators were ruthlessly slaughtered. The King's army approached Kuttenberg, whence it received abundance of provisions, while Ziska's forces, separated by treachery from their magazines, which were in the town, suffered greatly from cold and hunger. So Ziska set his waggon-fortress in motion and opened such a fire upon the royal army that it was forced to retreat, and the King himself was compelled to quit the town. But as Kuttenberg was lost, Ziska, on December 22, took up a stronger position and offered battle. The enemy, thrice as strong, surrounded him, intending to starve him out without fighting. But at nightfall Ziska rose up with his army, cut his way through the hostile forces, and by daybreak was ready for battle at the distance of about a mile from the enemy. The King, however, preferred to wait for reinforcements, and Ziska finally retired to Kolin.

The royal army now committed all manner of excesses in the neighbourhood. Ziska sent far and wide with success for reinforcements. On Tuesday, January 6, Ziska marched unexpectedly from Kolin, and placed himself opposite to the largest division of Sigismund's army, which was very strongly posted on high ground. Ziska's warriors were thirsting for battle, and infuriated by the cruelties practised upon the population by the Hungarians. Confusion and panic were spreading in the royal army, no doubt from recollection of Ziska's late successful night attack, and at dusk it began to take to flight. Sigismund gave notice to the inhabitants of Kuttenberg to quit the town, and left it himself at eight in the evening, after setting it on fire in several places.

The next day, January 7, the whole of Sigismund's haughty host was in full flight from Kuttenberg for Böhmisch Brod, the Bohemians making all speed in pursuit. They were overtaken at a place called Habry. One portion only of the fugitive army drew up in array on a hill and raised its banners on high. But the van was soon driven in, and the rear, especially the Hungarians, fled in confusion. Sigismund quitted Böhmisch Brod, and took the road for Iglau in Moravia, leaving a garrison behind him. The next day Ziska assaulted Böhmisch Brod, and silenced the fire from the walls by his superior artillery. The day after the town was entered through an accident, and a bloody massacre took place, but the women and children were spared and conducted out of the town, which was then, and not till then, given to the flames.

The day after the taking of Böhmisch Brod the blind leader of the Taborites, Brother Ziska, was solemnly invested with the order of knighthood.

A great change now took place in Polish and Lithuanian policy. Witold of Lithuania determined to accept the Bohemian crown, and sent his cousin, Sigismund Korybutowicz, King Wladislaw's nephew, with several thousand Polish horsemen, as his representative. Korybut wrote an angry letter to Ziska while on his way through Moravia, bidding him cease from injuring and plundering the country, to which Ziska, who had always been a firm supporter of the Polish alliance, replied in similar terms. But Ziska's embittered feelings did not lead him to oppose Korybut's assumption of power as Witold's representative, and he was solemnly accepted as Regent by the Utraquist Estates in Parliament assembled, at Czaslau, and made his formal entry into Prague on May 17. He soon altered his views with regard to Ziska, whose sentiments he found very much in accordance with his own. Ziska induced the Taborites also to accept Prince Korybut as Regent.[1]

Ere long Ziska himself visited Prague and came to a complete understanding with Prince Korybut, so that the Prince addressed Ziska as "Father," and Ziska the Prince as "My lord Son."

The Bavarian bands seem at this time to have inflicted

[1] He addressed a memorable letter to the people of Prague, dated June 11, 1422. In this he informed them that the Taborites and others had accepted Prince Sigismund "as an ally and as chief Regent of the land, and that they were willing to obey him, and in all fitting matters to aid and counsel him faithfully." Secondly, he admonished them very impressively to give up all the ill-will, anger and agitation, which they had had amongst themselves during the preceding year or still entertained, that they might be able rightly to recite the Lord's Prayer, "Forgive us our trespasses, as we also forgive."

damage upon the inhabitants of Tauss. For we find Ziska exhorting them to endure, in the fear of God, and "valiantly to resist the injuries inflicted by the Germans."[1]

A strong party among the Taborites at this time exhibited great antagonism both towards the Regent and towards Ziska, who refused to attend their services, which were conducted without vestments and in ordinary apparel. The Taborites nicknamed Ziska's vested clergy "Linendrapers," and Ziska retorted by designating the unvested Taborites "Cobblers." Even in Prague a rising took place in favour of the Taborites, but it was soon put down by the Regent.

In order to obtain the assistance of King Sigismund against the Teutonic knights, Witold now recalled Prince Korybut from Bohemia, and the people of Prague actually formed a league with the Catholic lords against the Taborites. "War against the faithless hypocrites" became Ziska's watchword, and civil war broke out in the Utraquist party. Ziska attacked the Royalist nobles in the circle of Königingratz; and when confronted by superior forces, executed a masterly retreat to an advantageous position on the slope of a hill above the river Cedlina, on which stands the little town of Horitz. Here he placed his artillery in position on two lines of waggons, and when the lords dismounted to ascend the hill, waited till they approached, out of breath with the weight of their armour, greeted them with a heavy fire, charged them down hill, drove them away in headlong flight, and captured all their waggons and cannon.

Meanwhile the army of Prague was ineffectually besieging the little fortress of Krizenetz. Relief approached, and the path of negotiation was preferred to the shock of war. Prague renounced its alliance with the Catholics, and a disputation between the Prague and Taborite clergy was agreed upon, in the interests of peace. Accordingly, the parties met; and after a temporary fit of exasperation umpires were appointed, who determined that mass-vestments were not of divine but human appointment, and that the Taborite priests were for the nonce in acknowledgment thereof to celebrate with, and those of Prague without, vestments. The Taborite, Prokop the Shaveling, accordingly celebrated in full vestments; but the Prague clergy made use of plain white surplices, thus not completely fulfilling the prescribed arrangement.

Ere long, however, dissensions broke out more violently

[1] "I give you to know," he wrote, "that we are collecting people on all sides against such enemies of God and ravagers of the realm of Bohemia. Therefore bid your priests in sermon rouse the people to war against such an Antichrist, and yourselves proclaim in the market, that all whose age and youth allow them, be up and ready every hour."

than ever, although the immediate causes are unknown. Königingratz rejected the sway of Prague, and admitted Ziska and his forces within its walls, beneath which he was confronted by the army of Prague. This was the first battle of Ziska's in which "ark went against ark;" *i.e.*, in which both armies were preceded by clergy bearing the Holy Sacrament. The blind Ziska was completely victorious, and with his own hand slew the priest who had borne the Sacrament before the army of Prague, by striking him on the head with his mace.

In the spring of 1423 Ziska quitted Tabor, not intentionally, but, as a matter of fact, for ever, attended, in all probability, by but few of the genuine Taborite warriors, and intending to form an Utraquist army in Eastern Bohemia. Here his especial allies were the Orebites, or brethren of Lesser Tabor, a confederation which grew stronger and stronger under Ziska's command. He remodelled its loose and irregular formation, and gave it a permanent and systematic constitution. He purposed remaining with it permanently himself, though he did not intend actually to forsake the Taborites.

As the prime foundation in a religious point of view, the Four Articles of Prague were accepted with certain extensions: (1) That freedom should be granted everywhere by the brotherhood to the Word of God; that they should receive it affectionately into their hearts, should in deed fulfil and hold it, and lead and instruct others thereto. (2) That all should receive the Body and Blood of the Lord with fear, with devotion, and with reverence, old and young, without excepting infants or any other persons; that the Sacrament should be given to infants immediately after baptism, and that others should receive at least weekly on Sundays. (3) That the priesthood should be brought to a Christ-like and Apostolic life—even a life of poverty; and that the endowments and property of the priests, as well as all simony, should be done away with and put an end to. (4) That the brethren should put an end to all mortal sins, firstly in themselves, and secondly in others of every station: "in kings, in princes, and in lords, in citizens, in artisans, in labourers," and in both sexes.[1]

Ziska appears to have entered Moravia with little more than the forces of the newly established fraternity. After a time, at the request of the brethren, he undertook an expedition into Hungary for the purpose of harassing Sigismund, who was then residing at Buda, in his own especial territory.

[1] A strict rule was laid down for the army, that "no faithless or disobedient people, no liars, thieves, dicers, robbers, plunderers, drunkards, swearers, fornicators, adulterers, harlots, adulteresses, or any other sinners, male or female," should be permitted in it.

Ziska's army marched in four lines of waggons, and was provided with a large number of cannon, as many, indeed, as he had been able to obtain. During his advance he met with no resistance, the Hungarians hoping to deal with him the more easily, the deeper he penetrated into their country. At length, somewhere in the plain between Gran and Komorn, a powerful force of cavalry, well provided with artillery, assembled, before which he deemed it necessary to retreat. All his genius was now required to preserve his army from destruction or great loss during a retreat of about 100 English miles, from the Danube to the frontiers of Moravia. And that in a strange country, he himself being totally blind.

In the plain the protection of the waggons was required against a superior cavalry. Ziska therefore enclosed the whole of his army, horse and foot, within the waggon fortress, posting artillerymen, protected by shields, on the outer waggons, to repulse the enemy by their fire, should any attack be made. The pursuers opened fire upon the Bohemians whenever they halted, so that during the day-time they were obliged to keep in continual motion, while the numerous Hungarian cavalry rode round them at their pleasure. At night Ziska allowed no fires to be lighted in the camp, so that his exact position was unknown; and moreover the Hungarians retired at nightfall to distant valleys, both to refresh their horses and also to secure themselves against a night attack.

The next day he started before the Hungarians had assembled their forces, and posted himself between a lake and a hill. On the hill he constructed two bulwarks with provision waggons, one in front and one in rear of his army, planting cannon in position upon both. Thus the Bohemians enjoyed a day's rest, and at nightfall the Hungarians again retired. Early on the third day Ziska made his way to the river Neutra, taking up a position close to a ford. The Hungarians did not venture to assail him in his waggon fortress, and the next night he began to prepare for crossing. On the upstream side he fixed in the bed of the river a row of heavy "edge" or war-waggons, and on the downstream side a row of lighter provision-waggons. In the morning he began to cross in four files of waggons. The Hungarians seized the opportunity to attack him in front and rear, but so heavy a fire was opened upon them from the fixed waggons, that they were obliged to retire, and Ziska led his army triumphantly across, though not without considerable loss in both men and waggons. He then directed his march along the river Waag, where a succession of woods, morasses, and meadows secured him against both cavalry and artillery.

On the fifth day Ziska arrived at some fish-ponds south of

Tyrnau, the dams of which afforded a partial shelter for his encampment. No enemy appearing, the day was spent in repairing injured waggons, and fitting up the best of the inner waggons to replace such of the outer ones as had become unserviceable. On the sixth day the Hungarians outstripped him, and he was compelled to change his course towards the left, alongside of a ridge which runs west of Tyrnau by a brook, so that he had only one flank to defend.

On the 7th day he moved onwards, intending to cross the White Mountains. Here were narrow places in which he could only traverse the forest with his waggons in single file, and the Hungarians thought they had him in a trap. But Ziska, at the entrance of the forest, selected a position under a small hill, which protected him against the enemy's artillery, and also planted some cannon upon it to reply to their fire. He then caused the horses to be unharnessed from the waggons, and sent men forward upon them with axes, shovels, and spades, to see that the way was clear, to repair the road, and also, wherever on the other slope of the mountain-chain the level ground widened out, to construct two new roads, one on each side of the old road, each about 200 paces long. The war-waggons were prepared for the march in two files, the provision-waggons being placed in four lines close together from one side of the wood to the other, so as to serve for a barricade. When these preparations were complete on both sides of the White Mountains he ordered his men to proceed in a peculiar order, invented to meet all possible contingencies. In front he sent a certain number of field-pieces into the forest, after them a body of infantry, then fifty waggons, and then again infantry. Divisions of fifty waggons and infantry followed each other regularly, so that the waggons would always have defenders in front and rear in case of a flank attack. As long as there was only one road through narrow places the waggons went on in single file, but when they came to the wider spaces, where the two new roads had been made, the artillery kept the old road in the middle, and the waggons went with their escort, fifty by the road on the right and fifty by that on the left, so that the artillery was always protected.

The Hungarians waited till the last war-waggons had disappeared in the forest, and then made a rush, intending to capture the artillery in position on the little hill in front of the forest. But the field-pieces there were speedily removed behind the barricade constructed of the provision-waggons, which was valiantly defended by a division of infantry left behind for the purpose. When the last of the field-pieces were well advanced on their way through the forest these

brave men followed them, and left the waggons to the enemy. During their retreat, while the Hungarians were employed in removing the waggons, they also broke up the road to the utmost of their power, so that the cavalry found it no easy task to continue the pursuit. Out of temper at finding that Ziska had escaped from the trap, many of the Hungarians now returned to their homes, saying that it was not a man, but a devil, that had made him master of such tricks. Others rode over the mountains by other roads, intending to stop him at his egress from the forest.

But Ziska was ready for them. Where the Bohemian army was about to issue from the forest there ran a valley, between two declivities right and left. First came artillery, with an escort of infantry on the ancient road in the middle. The cannon were immediately levelled at the enemy, who were blocking the road, and who were soon forced to retire into the lower part of the valley. Then forth issued fifty waggons on the right and fifty on the left in single file, keeping along the declivities on each side. The infantry marched between the lines of waggons and the declivities, being thus protected against the hostile cavalry on one side by the waggons and on the other by the sides of the hills. Divisions of fifty waggons and infantry followed each other in succession until all the waggons as well as the artillery in the rear were clear of the forest. By the continuous fire of the artillery in the centre of the vanguard and by the steady advance of the army under protection of the waggons on both sides, the enemy was pushed further and further, and when in this way complete mastery of the ground in the valley had been obtained, the waggons closed up into a kind of garland, within which the Bohemians formed into marching order, after which there was no further attempt at pursuit. Ziska's admirers, and probably Ziska himself, considered this the greatest and most difficult exploit achieved by him during his career as a military commander. And all this tactical and strategical skill was displayed, and all these remarkable combinations were devised, by a man totally devoid of sight!

During Ziska's absence in Hungary, the citizens of Prague and many of the Utraquist nobles, who were only half-hearted in the national cause, had been coquetting with King Sigismund through the King of Poland and the Grand Duke of Lithuania. A religious disputation between the Utraquists and Catholics had been agreed upon, and "regulators," or "captains," had been appointed, who were to act against the "destroyers of the country," meaning Ziska and the brotherhoods. An embassy was actually sent to Sigismund. The attitude of the Pope's

legate was not conciliatory, but an agreement was eventually come to.

Having quitted the north of Bohemia, Ziska directed his course against the main stronghold of the Catholic party in the circle of Pilsen. The "Landfried" of Pilsen, however, was reinforced by the armies of Prague and of the Utraquist lords in alliance with it; and Ziska found himself obliged to retreat to the town of Elbekosteletz, where he was blockaded by superior forces. He was at this time, indeed, so hard pressed that his enemies considered his destruction inevitable. Sigismund, however, in his court at Buda, maintained that he would extricate himself, and betted a palfrey on the result. Sigismund won his bet; Ziska was relieved.

Making his retreat in a southern direction, he occupied a height with which he was acquainted, by a forced march, and enclosed himself with his waggons closely packed together, wheel to wheel, on the right and left, and perhaps also in rear. On the tableland on the top he drew up his army, with the van facing east, the cavalry in front, and the infantry behind them. He, moreover, caused some provision-waggons to be filled with stones, and placed them in the foremost body of cavalry in such a manner as to be invisible to the enemy. Infantry soldiers were told off to conduct these waggons.

The men of Prague marched in battle array through the valley, in which they could not properly develop their strength. In their haste they did not even wait for all their corps to be in position. Ziska waited till about half their army had entered the valley, and were beginning to charge up the hill. Then he ordered his cavalry to advance against them. But when the shock of battle was just about to take place, Ziska's cavalry gave place to the waggons, which had been conducted unseen between their ranks, and the word was given for the heavy stone-filled waggons to be let loose downhill against the Prague army. The downward crash of the waggons produced a terrible effect; the ranks of Prague were shattered in a moment. Ziska then opened a fire of artillery upon his foes, and immediately afterward his whole army charged downhill upon them. Then took place a bloody conflict, in which the men of Prague suffered great loss, crowded as they were in the narrow valley. The foremost ranks turned to flight, and carried the rest away with them in the universal confusion. In consequence of this victory Ziska took Kuttenberg, and carried the war again into the circle of Pilsen.

Meanwhile, weary of the see-saw of negotiation in which Poland and Lithuania kept oscillating between King Sigismund and the Bohemians, Prince Sigismund Korybutowicz accepted

the crown of Bohemia, which was now offered to him personally, and entered Prague at the head of 400 horsemen on June 29, 1424. Thus all alliances and engagements were put an end to, and an opportunity was offered for a reunion of the Bohemians against the common enemy. King Sigismund endeavoured to negotiate with Ziska, offering to make him his viceroy. Unprincipled himself, the King little thought that he was dealing with a man of high principle, and was disappointed at finding how vain and futile his advances were. To friendly overtures from Prague Ziska yielded, though with hesitation, and saying that peace would last no longer—he was afraid—than the reconciliation at Konopiste had done. No doubt the personal friendship between Ziska and Prince Korybut was renewed, and perhaps contributed not a little to the reconciliation.

Ziska was now unanimously designated commander-in-chief of the united army of 20,000 men which was to enter Moravia, and there quell the power of Sigismund and his son-in-law, Albert of Austria, in whose favour Sigismund had just resigned that margravate. A division was sent forward into Moravia, while the main army under Ziska besieged the town and castle of Pribislaw. Here a premature death cut short the victorious career of the blind hero, just as he was entering upon a great and perhaps decisive enterprise. In the camp under Pribislaw he was attacked by the plague, which in a few days put an end to his eventful life. Exhorting his devoted friends, Lord Victorin of Kunstat, John Bzdinka, and Kuncs of Belovitz, who stood around his bed, to abide in the fear of God, and faithfully to defend God's truth for the sake of an eternal reward, he commended his soul to God, and expired on October 11, 1424.

He was buried in the Church of the Holy Ghost at Königingratz, by Ambrose, curé of that place, and the priest Prokupek, who afterwards became celebrated as military commander of Ziska's brotherhood, the members of which after their great founder's death took the title of "Orphans." Some time about the middle of the fifteenth century his remains were transferred to the Church of St. Peter and St. Paul at Czaslaw, but the reason of this removal is unknown.

No really satisfactory likeness of Ziska is in existence, numerous as they appear to have been during the remainder of the Hussite epoch. He left behind him a general, Prokop the Shaveling, but not a statesman, equal to himself, and civil war eventually deprived the Utraquists of half their strength. Yet there was sufficient left to wrest the Compactata from the Council of Basel, which allowed the Bohemian laity the privilege of the use of the chalice in the Eucharist. The

faithless policy of Rome, and the election of the Hapsburg dynasty to the vacant throne of Bohemia, undermined the liberties of the country; and finally the battle of the White Hill in 1620 reduced it to a miserable state of servitude. The language and literature were proscribed, and only since 1848 can we point to the revival of self-consciousness and nationality in that once mighty Czeskish race, which singlehanded withstood and repelled the assaults of the whole of Western Europe, and that not for greed or rapacity, but verily and indeed *for conscience' sake.*

A. H. WRATISLAW.

NOTE.—The wildest and even silliest stories became in course of time connected with the name of Ziska. As the researches of Palacký and Tomek, and the publication of Hus's Bohemian works, by Erben, have only lately rendered it possible to write the biography of Hus, so also has it only lately become possible to write that of Ziska from reliable data. Tomek has supplemented his great history of the City of Prague by a detailed Life of Ziska, of which the above pages are virtually only a very condensed abridgment.

ART IV.—CHURCH REFORM.

THE dust and turmoil of the General Election have cleared off, and left Churchmen face to face with some problems which, if not strange, were, until the autumn, regarded as not so very pressing. At one time the cry for Disestablishment and Disendowment was thought likely to prove attractive, in the ears of the new voters at any rate. But it did not meet with the welcome that those who raised it expected, and they hastily did what they could to withdraw it for the time from notice. But only for the time. We were plainly warned by Mr. Chamberlain—whose candour renders us invaluable services—that the attack on the Church will be resumed at the next opportunity. Hence the obvious duty of doing what we can to prepare whilst the lull lasts. We should try to make good weak places—to get rid of anything that may give a handle to opponents—to strengthen our institutions for their proper work, assuring ourselves that in these days they will be secure only so long as they are efficient.

The various Addresses and Declarations on Church Reform which have appeared since the Elections began, show plainly enough that the whole subject is now fully before the public mind; and that it is undergoing those tentative processes of exposition, explanation, and discussion which precede the

forming of definite opinions—which definite opinions themselves are the immediate precursors in our times of legislative action. At present an outsider reading the miscellaneous and diverging utterances from many quarters would be inclined to say, "Quot homines tot sententiæ." And yet there are certain reforms which seem to be emerging and taking shape out of the seething mass of demands and suggestions; and there are some proposals, too, which might conceivably acquire consistence speedily, and which require to be very carefully scanned and appraised.

Let us, above all things, fix it in our minds that we are not intending to reform "the faith once delivered to the saints." The Church of England is above all things a religious institution, with a message from God to deliver to this and to every age until her Lord returns. This is the very reason of her existence. Better by far to let her bitterest enemies work their will upon her property and her national status, than to part with or wrap up out of sight one jewel of those deposited with her by her Lord and Founder. And we are sure that this caution is not superfluous. What is meant by the demand that "the basis of the Church be so widened as to include the entire Christian thought and life of the nation"? The words are conspicuous in one document which has been signed by clergymen and Dissenting ministers also; amongst the latter by some Unitarians, we believe, and some Anabaptists. If this demand means anything definite, it points to aims and projects that are doctrinal rather than practical; to Latitudinarianism rather than to administrative reforms. Some of those who have signed evidently desire to have a Church Establishment in which Infant Baptism, and even the doctrine of the Holy Trinity, shall be deemed to be "open questions." Let us mark the principle involved in such suggestions. They assume that doctrine is merely the formulated expression of the passing opinions of men; that truth is simply "what man troweth." Against such notions Churchmen cannot protest too early or too warmly. Doubtless a National Church should be comprehensive. We should ourselves be the first to resist attempts to make the Church of England narrow in dimensions. But her comprehensiveness is to be asserted by holding fast to the clear broad lines which she has drawn in her formularies, and by refusing to brand as disloyal varieties clearly within them. Comprehensiveness is a different thing from compromise. If we water down our Church teaching till there is nothing left for any group of men that call themselves Christians to object to, we shall have nothing left that will be worth keeping at all. Our very *raison d'être* as a Church will have ceased to be.

Dismissing, then, all proposals for tampering with our standards of doctrine—though we very much fear that these are what some Church Reformers have specially in view—we come to questions of a practical nature; to measures for removing abuses; for improving the administrative machinery of the Church; for increasing her working efficiency. And the signs of the times surely indicate that something in the way of legislation is at hand for abating, if not extirpating, the traffic in benefices. After the Report of the Select Committee of the House of Commons in 1884, we ought not to have long to wait for this. And we remark as we write that notice has already been given in the House of Commons by Mr. Rylands of his intention to introduce a Bill on the subject, which Bill ought to have the watchful attention of Churchmen through every step of its progress. We are quite aware of what may be urged, and we will not say urged without plausibility, in apology or defence of the present usages in this matter; but the truth is that the scandals are simply intolerable. There are, to take but one sample, not a few owners of advowsons who regularly sell their next presentation to the highest bidder so soon as the age of the incumbent makes it a marketable commodity. We do not believe that it is beyond the power of contemporary statesmanship to devise a measure which will secure the assent of the legislature and will greatly relieve us; especially when we bear in mind that Sir R. A. Cross carried through the House of Commons, during Mr. Gladstone's former administration, a Bill for prohibiting the Sale of Next Presentations, which Bill did not pass through the House of Lords. The question of compensation may present difficulties; but these have been already greatly diminished by the fall in the value of advowsons which has taken place within the last few years; and perhaps a hint for their solution may be found in the fact that the difference in price between a next presentation and a perpetual advowson is comparatively trifling. We need only add now that we would not wish to be understood as recommending each and every one of the recommendations made by the Committee of the Commons in 1884.

Probably there is a considerable consensus of opinion on one or two other points. We should most of us be willing to grant to parishioners, if not a veto, at least a right of memorializing the Bishop against an objectionable appointment to a vacant parish; and most of us also would wish to see the Bishop's power of rejecting unfit nominees greatly strengthened. Safeguards and limits of course would have to be provided; but we can here and now speak of principles only. Equally clear and more nearly unanimous would be the desire to get rid more cheaply and expeditiously of "crimi-

nous clerks;" and we must not forget that the Ecclesiastical Courts Commission made recommendations in 1883 which in the judgment of the experienced lawyers who signed them would have conduced to that most desirable end. Whether the time be yet ripe for attempting legislation is for our rulers to say. But it is evident that something in the direction of the reform and restoration of our Ecclesiastical Courts ought to be done, and the sooner the better. Similar remarks might be made as regards clerks who are not legally speaking "criminous," but neglectful, indolent, or incompetent. Clerks of this sort—as of the sort last alluded to—are, indeed, very few, far fewer than might be supposed from the rather too frequent talk about them this last few years. But they are to be found; and the same wholesome pressure of public opinion which has served in this, as in other departments, as almost a practical substitute for a working system of discipline, and has brought about the general demand for efficiency in pastoral duties, expects also that when such cases do occur they should be promptly and effectually dealt with. The Pluralities Act of last session is in truth an attempt in this direction. Amongst its leading provisions are those which give renewed powers to the Bishop to interpose in parishes where he has reason to deem the duties to be inadequately performed. There is nothing new in the powers themselves. They had been already recognised in the Act 1 and 2 Vict., c. 106, of which the Act of last year is in truth an amendment. But the disciplinary clauses of that Act have remained very nearly if not altogether a dead letter. Can we expect that the corresponding provisions of the new Act will prove more serviceable? All they do is in effect to give a new and enlarged definition of clerical duties, and to remodel the Commission which the Bishop may appoint to inquire. It might have been better to have followed the lines laid down in the Report of the Ecclesiastical Courts Commissioners in this attempt to introduce a necessary element of discipline. These temporary Commissions are a bad substitute for regular Courts with precedents and rules of practice, and, moreover, have no power of giving costs. We suspect that the absence of any provision as regards costs will make the Bishop chary in using the powers provided to his hand in the new statute, though we believe that the very existence of these powers has already in a few instances been used *in terrorem* with salutary effect.

We observe that a relaxation of the Act of Uniformity figures frequently amongst reforms that are demanded. And it may be that the time has come when greater liberty might be safely conceded. It must not be forgotten that the excessive stringency of the Act of 1662 was dictated more by

political than by properly religious motives. The penalties of the Act were not aimed at all at men who were quite ready to use and accept *ex animo* each and every thing in the Book of Common Prayer, but desired something in the way of what the American Convention styles flexibility in the use of the Book, and enrichment of it by additional offices. Such men were hardly to be found then; but there were many who would not use the Book at all if they could help it, and who had suppressed its use by the strong arm when they had the power to do so. But if the Acts of Uniformity are to be altered, we earnestly hope that clear limits for permitted varieties in Ritual and Offices of Worship will be laid down, and measures taken to cause those limits to be respected.

Another very important item, and one which is, perhaps, not so often mentioned as it deserves to be, is the superannuation of incumbents. We are not sure that any greater boon could be conferred on the Church of England at this time than the organizing of a liberal plan of half-pay. The Incumbents' Resignation Act of 1871 is good as far as it goes. But it is inapplicable to a very large proportion of our benefices, because the maximum pension of a third of their value would not yield enough for the retiring clerk to live upon, whilst the deduction of that third would leave the benefice so slenderly salaried that it could not command the services of a good successor. We do not doubt that our laymen would come forward to help if any general scheme could be devised with proper securities and safeguards for ensuring that their bounty would be really applied as it ought to be;—applied both to secure well-earned comfort for the declining years of those who have spent their strength in the work of Christ, and to obtain a strong and able incumbent for many a large parish now held by a worn-out veteran who would gladly retire if he could afford to do so.

The Reform of Convocation, so as to make it a more adequate representation of the clergy, is another matter about which all are agreed that action ought to be taken. The number of representatives of the parochial clergy is insufficient, notably in the Southern Province; and the exclusion of the now very numerous body of unbeneficed clergy from the right to vote at the election of proctors cannot any longer be justified. It arises, of course, from the fact that a main, and often the only business transacted up to 1665, was the taxing of the benefices. Convocation has now no such function. It is concerned with purely ecclesiastical affairs, and as regards these the unbeneficed have a claim to be heard. But it is easier to see this than to suggest a remedy. The Crown lawyers declare that no enlargement of Convocation can be effected without the intervention of Parliament. This intervention Convoca-

tion will apparently neither solicit nor accept. It looks like a deadlock, unless further research shall discover helpful precedents, or legal ingenuity devise some unexpected solution.

Generally speaking, there is no one particular in the whole very large subject of Church Reform that seems more important and more urgent than that of improving and invigorating the Church's representative institutions. The State is now governed by an elaborately organized and much revised machinery of representation. Corporate life in the Church—and we mean the whole Church, clergy and laity—sadly needs a reconstructed apparatus for expressing itself. Is it too much to say that this divergence between the principles on which Church and State are administered is at the bottom of most of the difficulties between them? "The admission of laymen of all classes who are *bonâ fide* Churchmen to a substantial share in the control of Church affairs," to quote the words of the Cambridge Address to the Bishops, means this. We should not ourselves be inclined to think it difficult to define the "*bonâ fide*" laymen, treacherous though that phrase has proved to be in another connection. The rubric in the Communion Office does that for us. The Colonial Churches do not find it at all difficult to apply the "communicant test." A communicants' roll kept in every church, with the provision that no one should be deemed for legal purposes a communicant until his name had been there for a year at least, has been found to work well. Every clergyman—at least every right-minded clergyman—would be ready to welcome such "*bonâ fide* Churchmen" to a very "substantial share in the control of Church affairs." But it is utterly futile to hope that statutable powers will be given in our day at least to "*bonâ fide* Churchmen" defined thus. Those who are not at all "*bonâ fide* Churchmen," specially those who claim to be Churchmen when any harm is to be done to the Church, but Dissenters when they are asked to aid her, would energetically resist any attempts at legislation in that direction. And Mr. Albert Grey and Canon Fremantle may assure themselves, on the contrary, that "*bonâ fide* Churchmen" will never consent to transfer control over Church finances and Church worship to those who neither contribute to the one nor share personally in the other. For our own part, we regard the Church as "National" because she offers her services to the whole nation; because she recognises the claims of every Englishman to her privileges, on condition, of course, that he will conform to her rules; not because every citizen of the State ought as of right and of course to have a vote and voice in her affairs. For the present it seems clear that we can only develop the institutions of the Church on a voluntary basis;

and there is still room for a good deal to be done in this direction, and in many quarters.

The purpose of this paper has been less to recommend particular measures of Church Reform than to contribute a few hints towards the general discussion, and to make mention of particulars which ought not, in the opinion of the writer, to be forgotten. He has not much hope at present from legislation. But the present respite ought to be turned to account by all "*bonâ fide* Churchmen" in their own sphere. Every one of us may do much to invigorate our Church machinery, and to make good shortcomings in his own parish and neighbourhood. And when this manner of Church Reform—which has already made much progress—shall have had its perfect work, we shall be in a position to ask with irresistible effect what help may be found indispensable from Parliamentary enactments.

T. E. Espin.

Art. V.—MONEY-GETTING; OR, THE LIFE OF AN AMERICAN MERCHANT-PRINCE.

THE Americans are a money-getting, but they are also a money-giving, people. The resources of the United States offer a wider scope for commercial enterprise and industrial activity than the Old Country presents. A man has a better market for brains in America than in Great Britain. He has greater facilities for exertion. The pressure arising from social exclusiveness does not affect a man to the same extent there as in England. Men will put their hand to anything that comes uppermost in a new country. There is little or no loss of caste by engaging in any kind of hard work. Nothing is considered menial that tends to make and keep a man honest. It is not, therefore, very wonderful that men should succeed in making money in a country where the dignity of labour is so thoroughly respected.

> Shame and contempt from no condition rise;
> Act well your part: 'tis there true honour lies.

It is not because the native American is a man of shrewder ways and sharper intellect than the Englishman that he becomes rich. Emigrants from the Old Country get on just as well and are equally successful as the Americans. Vanderbilt was an American by birth, and A. P. Stewart was an Irishman. The former began life with sixteen millions of pounds sterling, which he increased to forty millions before his death. Stewart began

with nothing, or next to nothing, and amassed upwards of twenty millions sterling after fifty-three years' experience. He told me himself in October, 1873, when I was his guest, that he paid income tax for the previous year on a million and a quarter sterling. This colossal fortune was all made in what is technically termed "dry goods," such as silks, satins, velvets, cotton prints, and all sorts of hosiery, linen, etc., etc. His motto was "ten per cent., and no lies." The idea with which he began business was steadily kept up all through his eventful life. The principle of buying cheap and selling as dearly as possible seemed to him unbusinesslike and unfair. His notion was that a man should be content with ten per cent. profit, and make no mystery about the original cost of any article in his store. "I could guarantee," was his remark one evening to me, "certain success to any trader of ordinary ability, but with more than ordinary perseverance, if he were willing to carry on business on these terms. The plan so prevalent both in Europe and in America, to get the highest possible percentage for the least possible outlay, works badly in many ways; and it certainly does not tend as much to the merchant's advantage, as a smaller return upon the best materials that can be had in the market. You turn over more goods in a given time, and in the long-run you acquire more money."

It must, however, be admitted that the times have undergone a very considerable change since Stewart opened his first humble and unpretending shop in Canal Street on the 6th of August, 1823. I have heard it said that he could not succeed now as he did then. Perhaps not; but this at least must be said, that it is not so much the complexion of the times as the character of the man, that ensures success. In the world of commerce, as in the world of nature, the survival of the fittest is a well-established law. Stewart would have made his mark in any occupation, no matter where or when he lived. He had all the good qualities both of the Irishman and of the Scotchman, having had the good fortune to be born and educated in the Scotch-North of Ireland. That province has furnished many, very many, eminent and successful men, who have done the world's work and their own with credit and renown. They are a hard-headed, painstaking, and thrifty people.

Few men in Stewart's line of business ever began their career so utterly ignorant of the technicalities of business. He had no practical experience of the value of the goods he undertook to dispose of. Hence he was forced to employ a salesman whose knowledge, as an expert, enabled him to sell the very slender stock of merchandise in which his employer had invested "the patrimony," as Stewart facetiously called the sum of three hundred pounds to which he became entitled at his father's

death, in the same year that he opened his store in New York. At the end of one month the salesman, one of the old type who wanted to make the highest possible profit from the buyer, was so irritated and disgusted at seeing such first-rate materials "given away," as he said, "for such paltry profit," that he retired from a position in which he felt confident that he could do no justice either to his employer or to himself. He did not leave without delivering a prediction that "before six months Mr. Stewart would be bankrupt." By degrees Stewart began to obtain an insight into the details of business for himself, and he worked his way steadily until he attained a degree of eminence in the commercial world which has never perhaps been exceeded, or even equalled, by his competitors. He soon removed from the obscurity of a side street into the commanding position of Broadway, where he erected his first grand store on a scale of architectural beauty seldom in those days seen in any house of business. In a few years his unparalleled and unlooked-for success compelled him to pull down this edifice, much to his regret, and build a larger one, which, if not presenting lines of beauty to the eye, had the advantage of solidity and space. It was constructed of white marble, and was the largest of its kind then known in America. This was his retail house of business, but higher up in the same street he erected another building of somewhat similar dimensions. There he carried on extensive dealings in the wholesale department. In these two houses he employed no fewer than two thousand five hundred hands, all kept going by the calm and calculating foresight of the one-man-power which exercised such a domineering mastery over the entire dry-goods market. He then set his ever-active brain to work in order to build a private dwelling for himself on a scale of such dimensions and magnificence as has never yet been seen in the busy capital of the United States. An idea may be had of the expense and magnitude of this building from the fact that the first contract for the erection of the exterior only, amounted to eleven millions of dollars—that is, something over two millions and a half of English sovereigns. His ambition was to leave behind him monuments of architecture in his adopted country, such as might serve to point out to posterity the lesson of his self-denying labours, and his consistent life, as illustrating the truth and value of the old saying that "honesty is the best policy." Single-handed he began and carried on his enormous business. He had no limited or unlimited liability company. The one head contrived all the plans, ordered all the goods, anticipated all the wants of the public, whether due to actual necessity or to the caprice of fashion; and his hand alone set the price on all his stock-in-trade, from the least valuable piece of cotton-stuff to the most expensive materials

in his stores. His memory was astonishing. Stories are current as to the manner in which he often called forth from its hiding-place some article which had been forgotten by the shop-assistants, but which Mr. Stewart had indelibly fixed in the great storehouse of his capacious mind. From a piece of tape to the costliest camel-hair shawl, Stewart knew exactly the price of everything; and what is more remarkable still, he was aware of the very spot where each article was to be found. In appearance he did not look more than fifty-eight years of age, although in reality he was in his seventieth year. This was in 1873. He dressed with faultless simplicity. If the apparel oft proclaims the man, never was the co-operative harmony of mind and body more thoroughly consistent. His manner of life was frugality itself. He lived as simply as possible. From eight in the morning, when he generally left home, till almost the same hour in the evening, he spent the whole day in the city. Sunday was his only quiet day, and to him it was a perfect day of rest. He was very undemonstrative in his manner, but at all times he impressed one with a sense of that quiet energy which characterized his whole life. His keen but kindly glance showed the hidden power which kept the machine of business in perpetual motion. He was never in a hurry or agitated, even at the busiest hour of the day, or when, as in 1873, a sudden and serious panic paralyzed all commercial enterprise in America. He possessed powers of perception of a very high order, which enabled him with rare success to select the right men for his varied and extensive work.

Such was Alexander Turner Stewart, who began life with almost nothing, and ended, at the age of seventy-two, one of the most successful, if not the most successful money-getting merchant in the world. But he was also a money-giving man. If he was princely in his acquired fortune, he was also princely in his way of spending it. The tongue of evil report has done its best and its worst in the way of detraction, and a censorious world has only been too ready to believe what the detractors uttered. Through evil report and good report Stewart kept on the even tenor of his way, alike unmoved by the censure, or elated by the applause of the multitude. When the fearful famine in 1846 had decimated the Irish people, it was with no niggard respectability that he contributed to the funds for the relief of his famine-stricken compatriots. While others were subscribing their hundreds, he chartered the largest ship that could be found —filled it with provisions and every comfort that could possibly be required for the starving, and subsequently fever-smitten population. And, in order that the vessel should not return with useless ballast to New York, he made arrangements whereby three hundred married couples should be taken back

to the United States, the only condition being that they should be able to read and to write.

On their passage out, and after their arrival in America, they were amply provided for wholly at his own expense, from first to last, including outfit, journey, and subsequent settlement in some remunerative labour. And more recently, when the big fire in Chicago had rendered more than a hundred thousand persons homeless in a single night, he ordered the largest possible train of railway carriages to be filled with cooked provisions, and everything that the burnt-out citizens could require in their time of distress, and despatched it with all speed to the ruined city. I happened to be in Chicago all the time, so that I speak from personal observation.

Yet there are not wanting people who say that he was "mean" and "hard." No doubt those who are jealous at the prosperity and success of their fellows, and particularly of their rivals, will always find scope for their "envious tongues" to suggest or invent shallow or injurious imputations. But Stewart was neither "hard" nor "mean." He was strict in business relations, for, as he once said, "I must choose between weak benevolence and losses, or strict habits of business and fair results." Public men cannot afford to enter into private feeling, and examine into each case that comes before them in the ordinary way of trade. Every public man has two characters, the official and the personal.

As an individual Stewart was the soul of honour, integrity, and fair dealing. During the protracted period of fifty-three years of incessant application to business, and with an ever-widening horizon of mercantile transactions in all parts of the world, not a single act of his has ever been challenged as calculated to throw discredit upon him as a man, or to tarnish him with dishonour as a merchant. He was just, and he feared not what the world might think or say, so long as they could prove nothing against him. "Uprightness hath boldness" is an old motto, and never did it receive a more fitting illustration than in the public and private life of one who by self-reliance and by self-respect conferred dignity upon honest labour, and adorned the position and character of an American merchant-prince. The indignity which no one could cast upon him in life was reserved for some miscreant to do to his clay-cold relics after death. Fate, with its grim irony, delights to surprise mankind. If it cannot always succeed in reversing the order of things in the course of human existence this side the grave, it occasionally gratifies its grudge either by engulfing in oblivion the great men of the earth, or by allowing the strife of tongues to tear their character to pieces. But in poor Stewart's case a more eccentric course was adopted. His lifeless body was stolen from what

one might have reasonably supposed would have been its last resting-place. The sacrilegious thief hoped that by such infamy he might have obtained a good round sum of money for the restoration of the mortal remains—a hope which, it is satisfactory to think, has never been realized.[1] Owing to the cupidity and perverted ingenuity of this wretched pilferer of the dead, Mr. Stewart, the millionnaire, who for more than half a century, by many a toilsome step, and after unflagging energy and perseverance, had emerged out of obscurity into a position of fame, opulence, and honour, was at last denied a quiet grave, the common privilege of the poorest beggar. Such is the penalty of great wealth.

But if great riches have their penalties, they have their privileges also. The over-wealthy are free from the misery of the man upon whom the pressure of contracted means acts like some ghastly nightmare. There is no conceivable condition, amid the manifold varieties of human employment, more depressing than that which arises from pinching poverty. The successful man of the world enjoys that delightful feeling of perfect freedom as regards money-matters, which imparts an air of independence utterly unknown to him who is always breathing an atmosphere of impecuniosity. There are, no doubt, poor men who, in spite of the *res angusta domi*, are very happy and contented. The genial current of their souls is not frozen by the chilling influences of penury. They enjoy life, notwithstanding the daily, almost hourly, struggle to keep the wolf from the door. Yet, for all that, it must be admitted that there is a wonderfully soothing effect produced upon our nervous system and its collateral agencies by the conscious security against debt and dejection, which the felt presence of poverty so frequently engenders. It is all well enough to sound the praises of the humble poor, and to enumerate with solemnity the moral advantages to be gained in the school of adversity. No sensible man would encourage poverty for its own sake. If it be the will of God that a man's position in life renders it next to impossible for him to make money on a large scale, and that, in consequence, he has to struggle on, year by year, counting every penny, and seeing that it is spent to the best advantage, the

[1] It has been stated in a daily paper, after this article was in print, that the body has been recovered, but no one knows the price paid for it. On very good authority I have been told that Mrs. Stewart was advised not to offer any reward, for it would only lead to the repetition of the foul crime. So far as I know, the body has not been recovered. At this moment, in order to guard the body of Mr. Vanderbilt against a similar indignity, guards have been told off by day and by night to watch the grave, lest some other human ghoul should violate the sacredness of the tomb.

wise man will accept the situation, and realize in his own history that gentle submission to the inevitable is no mean feature of philosophy. The well-known words of Robert Burns state the case fairly well when he writes concerning money and its uses. He did not wish to be the possessor of wealth merely that he might secretly gloat over piles of gold. He valued money not so much for its own sake, as for what it could confer upon him by its legitimate employment:

"Not for to hide it in a hedge,
Nor for a train attendant;
But for the glorious privilege,
Of being independent."

Next to immortality, Heaven's best gift to man is independence. It is not meant by this to limit the term merely to the possession of more money than a man wants for his ordinary requirements in that position of life in which Providence may have placed him. That would be a very narrow definition of the term. As money enables a man to do what he pleases, and to live where he likes, and to go here and there, or anywhere without let or hindrance, or any *vincula mercenaria,* mercenary servitude to the public, it necessarily raises a man's mind above the petty scramble for position to which the needy and the poverty-stricken are perpetually exposed. Plenty of money is a very great convenience. In spite of all the solemn denunciation of wealth by morbid mystics, money has a value quite distinct from its importance as the recognised medium of commercial currency. The advantages which arise to the individual by his acquisition of money as the result of "scorning delights, and living laborious days," are of a very high order. The Bible tells us that "the blessing of the Lord it maketh rich, and He addeth no sorrow with it." Our blessed Lord never uttered a single word against the lawful possession and use of money. His remarks were directed against the abuse of it. It was when "the cursed thirst of gold," as the Pagan poet says, perverted the mind and hardened the heart, that our Lord condemned the possession of superabounding wealth. The teaching of the Bible is very clear upon this point. "Riches and honour" are again and again spoken of as God's special gifts. We read that the good king Hezekiah "had exceeding riches." It was only when men "trusted" in them—made their gold their god; became over-zealous in their pursuit of it; lived for it; neglected their relative duties in social and domestic life on account of it; in a word, set up "the almighty Dollar," or "the golden Sovereign," as a sort of Fetish worship that the censure came. The words of Holy Writ are loud and clear in the ringing tones of warning which they address to persons tainted by such a form of idolatry. The thoughts become gradually con-

centrated upon the one all-absorbing passion, a habit of action is set up, and after a time the avenue to the soul is choked by the dust of human selfishness or vanity, and then, no doubt, "the love of money becomes the root of all evil." Like every other good thing—for unquestionably wealth is a good thing—riches may be abused; like the ordinary supplies of food and drink for the purposes of bodily health, they may prove to be a curse and not a blessing. Money may be perverted from its legitimate use, and, as the author of the Book of Ecclesiastes tells us, "There is a sore evil which I have seen under the sun, namely, riches kept for the owners thereof to their hurt."

There is a shallow notion—and, it is to be feared, somewhat popular in this country—that all that is required in order to make money is to emigrate to America, and that once there a fortune is sure to be realized somehow or other. That is a very great mistake. There is no doubt whatever as to the greater facilities for success in the United States than in England. Many openings present themselves to a hardworking and enterprising man; but there are plenty of native-born Americans at this moment who cannot obtain remunerative employment. There are hundreds of persons in New York whose daily effort is the devising of plans to enable them to economize against starvation. This does not arise from any fault of theirs, but simply from the over-supply of a certain class of young men in the various branches of trade and commerce in the large cities. It must not be forgotten that it is not every young man who can become an American merchant-prince, like Stewart. He was a man of remarkable gifts by natural endowment, and these were greatly improved and stirred up by more than ordinary perseverance and industry. To be a successful merchant, either in London or in New York, a man must possess qualifications of a special order. I do not refer to men whose fathers managed to reach the top of the ladder by their personal exertions, and bequeathed an ample fortune to their sons, who began life where their fathers ended. I allude only to those men of business who have been the architects of their own fortunes, like Moore, or Morrison, and many other London merchants, past and present, who entered on their path of life without money, friends, or patrons, and who after years of persistent labour have risen, step by step, from comparative humble positions until they reached the honourable and commanding influence which has ever been, and I trust will never cease to be, exercised by English merchants, both at home and abroad. No man comes to the front in the commercial world by mere chance. He must have brains and the resolute will by which he determines to work them to the best advantage. Insufficiently endowed and unambitious men soon go to the wall, being pushed

aside by their more vigorous competitors in the race of life. We seldom, if ever, see the men who have failed. As only the successful ones survive, we have none else from whom we can gather facts to enable us to form a just conclusion as to the process whereby they have become rich. It must, however, be admitted, whatever be the reason, that larger fortunes have been made in America than in the Old Country. Mr. Stewart once told me that in his early struggles, having heard that Mr. Morrison had realized a fortune of about three millions sterling, his ambition was so much aroused that he determined, if it were possible, to become his equal in wealth. The extraordinary spurt which he put on certainly enabled him to come up with his *beau idéal* of a millionnaire, and by the habit of action which such a strain upon body and mind demanded, he in the end left Mr. Morrison far, very far, behind.

It would be absurd, however, to deny that there is considerable danger in thus striving after riches for their own sake. The man with one idea incessantly present to his mind runs the risk of being so wholly occupied in the pursuit of his darling project, that he may at length become the victim of his own delusion. To become not merely a rich man, but the richest of rich men, may assume such a domineering mastery over him, that he has no power of resisting the pressure which drives him onward towards the goal of his ambition. In this state of mind there is imminent peril lest the higher claims of human effort may be lost sight of, and in the struggle for ascendency in the world of wealth, a man may become indifferent or feebly conscious of any other world beyond. The Anglo-Saxon race everywhere, and perhaps specially in America, is on its trial as to the effect of prosperity upon the moral nature of man. The question is, will prosperity promote the well-being of the individual? Or will it blunt the moral impressions so as to render the mind insensible to the higher claims of the more substantial wealth, which "neither rust nor moth doth corrupt." That is a very important question, and on the testimony of some of the most thoughtful Americans the verdict does not seem too favourable to the millionnaires. Judging from the accounts which have appeared in the public press in the United States on the occasion of the sudden death of Mr. Vanderbilt, the ownership of enormous wealth does not seem to confer upon its possessor a sufficient measure for the capacity of its enjoyment in the best and truest sense of the word. In many millionnaires, both in the Old and in the New World, there appears sometimes a state of unrest—an anxiety of mind amounting almost to depression of spirits in prosecuting their plans for personal aggrandisement. To men whose incomes may be counted by hundreds, and who can make ends meet only by judicious management, it must

seem to be a paradox how anyone who can command millions by the stroke of his pen could possibly suffer from lowness of spirits in the pursuit of further gain. It certainly does present a strange enigma, which can only be accounted for by that retributive reaction which almost always waits upon the abnormal development of human nature along the line of covetousness. One fact at least appears to be a fixed one, as regards the weariness of mind and the worry from which very rich men occasionally suffer. They seem to lose sight of the common-sense view of human existence, as stated by Him Who alone was entitled to pronounce so positively upon the point. If it be true that "a man's life consisteth not in the *abundance* of the things that he possesseth," it is to be feared that some very rich men have but faintly realized the importance of those words. To be very rich, and at the same time to be the victim of mental uneasiness as to how to become richer, is one of those problems belonging to the perverted ingenuity of man that defies solution. That such is the case it is impossible to deny, because it is in evidence on the authority of rich men themselves. It almost tends to reconcile poor men to the humble fare of "the dry crust," and "the dinner of herbs," without carefulness, when they see that over-success in life does not always enable the man who has succeeded to live free from carking care, and in co-operative harmony with himself, his fellow-creatures, and his God.

G. W. WELDON.

ART. VI.—ADMINISTRATIVE REFORMS.

"Then said the guide, Look to your feet, for we shall presently be among the snares."—PILGRIM'S PROGRESS.

IF "threatened men live long," as the proverb tells us they do, it is because they take more care of themselves than men whose lives are not in danger. The Church of England received a very startling warning just before the recent elections; and though the result of those elections may be to give her a respite, it does not encourage the idea that the eventual danger is less than before. It is generally felt that if, like a threatened man, she would live long, she must, like him, take due precautions, and live circumspectly. This is the meaning of the sudden kindling of a zeal for Church Reform. Zeal in a good cause is good; but never was there more imperative need that it should be largely tempered with discretion, for never were the ecclesiastical projectors more numerous. Amateur constitution-monger-

ing in all departments is quite a fashionable craze, and the appetite of its professors is only whetted by such morsels as a transfer of the basis of power in England and the prospect of revolution in Ireland. A Church, too, whose best friends acknowledge her need of remedial treatment, almost invites every ecclesiastical quack to urge the application of his particular nostrum. Those who desire to direct public opinion in the Church should see that they keep a clear head amid the Babel of suggestions, remembering that a reform is not an end in itself, but a means to an end. That end is the greater efficiency of the Church in doing her Master's work among His people.

Church Reform is naturally comprised under two heads. There are abuses and anomalies to be swept away, and there is an organization to be improved and perfected. The two are as separable in fact as they are in idea. It is not necessary to have, nor desirable to wait for, a perfect organization before we begin to rid ourselves of some of those evils which hinder the Church from her work; and men would gladly co-operate to achieve the one object who would shrink from the risks inseparable from an endeavour to obtain the other. There exists already an admirable scheme, which might be carried through the first friendly Parliament, for putting an end to the abuses of the traffic in livings and next presentations. The present Prime Minister has almost promised a measure to relieve the clergy from the burden of glebe lands. Another heavy clog upon the Church would be removed by any equitable arrangement for the extinction of tithe, or an abolition of the invidious arrangement by which the tenant pays for the landlord. I admit the risk of consolidating Church property into what I may call the "portable" form, most ready to the spoliating hand of a needy Minister; but this is more than outweighed by the evils of a system against which deliberate misrepresentation is effectively employed by opponents to fan the discontent which ignorance and self-interest have kindled. For my own part, I should also think it a great help to the Church in the rural districts if the clergy were never magistrates. The two functions are not a little incompatible, however well they may sometimes work together. On the one hand, the paternal side of the country justices is rapidly giving way to the merely official; and on the other, it is more and more become necessary for the clergyman to move about among the poorest and most degraded of his people, to win their confidence and be consulted in all their troubles. He will uphold the law better by being excused from administering it. All these reforms could be effected without any change in Church organization; and to them might be added some scheme, receiving the general approval of Churchmen, for readjusting the incomes of Church

benefices. I do not say that, as a matter of fact, we shall get these things without some change by which the voice of the Church may be made more powerful and more articulate than at present; but if Churchmen are in earnest, they are quite feasible without that preliminary; and there is, therefore, no need to prejudice the discussion of organic change by the assertion that nothing can be done without it.

On the other hand, there are Reforms which are certainly desirable, but of such a kind that the Church can hardly expect Parliament to undertake them, or, indeed, to do anything more than receive them at the hands of some representative body, and give them the force of law. Almost all schemes of Reform hitherto brought forward involve putting an end to the farce called *congé d'élire*, not by simply vesting the appointment of Bishops in the Crown, without the show of deference to the Dean and Chapter; but by allowing even a larger constituency than the Cathedral body to have a voice in the election. So, too, the Cambridge Memorial, briefly noticed in the last CHURCHMAN, and that of Mr. Main Walrond, as well as the Programme of the Layman's League, for which the Rev. B. Fryer is sponsor, propose to give parishioners a veto on the appointment of objectionable incumbents, and to define more clearly the powers of the Bishop in refusing to institute. These are rightful objects to be aimed at, but not in a "*ruat cœlum*" spirit. Both are "tangled with the thunder at one end." A real *congé d'élire* will hardly be given without the exclusion of the Bishops from the House of Lords, and that in its turn is very closely connected with Disestablishment. So, again, the veto of the parishioners on nominations to benefices, unless strictly limited, slides rapidly into the power of appointment—and of all varieties of patronage popular election is the worst—and this would be as pure confiscation as any scheme of disendowment that was ever promulgated. Reforms in either of these directions, unless controlled and conducted from within the Church, will certainly be seized upon by the enemy as occasions for mischief; and before taking them up, the Church must first show a hand strong enough to grasp them. The providing for the retirement of aged and incapacitated clergy, and the legalisation of a greater variety of services, are also Reforms which should be carried out entirely by the Church within herself. To urge that so much liberty for the Church involves Disestablishment is to speak in the face of facts. The Presbyterian Church of Scotland has insisted on, and has obtained, greater freedom than this, and still is Established.

These considerations bring us to the other branch of Reform—the necessity for improving—we might almost say constructing—the machinery by means of which the Church may ascertain,

express, and carry out her wishes. Here again almost all the published proposals are at one. The genius of the age suggests a representative body—a thing well known from the first in the early democratic constitution of the Church, though overborne in later times by preponderant states or usurping hierarchies. Convocation clearly will not answer our purpose. It is essentially a clerical body, representing the clergy very inadequately, and the laity not at all. The key-note of the situation is the necessity for associating the laity in the life and work of the Church. The idea that the Church is a merely clerical institution—a notion which has firmly established itself in many minds, and has even infected our everyday language—must be promptly scouted, not in deference to modern views, but because the strength of the Church as a visible institution must always be in the laity, and because their co-operation is essential to the proper performance of a good deal of necessary Church work. Unquestionably some modification of the ancient Synod, in which the laity as well as both orders of the clergy might be fully represented, would add greatly to the power of the Church, and would be a fairly manageable body, capable of doing much good work. If its functions were purely administrative and practical, and not extending to questions of faith and doctrine, the formation of such a body would not meet with much opposition from any party in the Church. Nevertheless this, too, is beset by special difficulties and dangers, which need not, indeed, deter us from the enterprise, but for which it is as well to be prepared. Already there are clear signs that the first steps taken towards organizing a truly representative Church body will be the signal for a determined attempt at what will be plausibly called "nationalizing" the Church. Already a document—on which the names of Dr. Abbot and Canon Fremantle stand conspicuous among a rather motley multitude—is sent round for signature, setting forth the desirability of so "widening the basis of the Church as to include, as far as possible, the entire Christian thought and life of the nation." Could this process be carried out, all such distinctive teaching as, *e.g.*, Infant Baptism and Confirmation would have to be surrendered, together with Episcopacy and Holy Orders; and in the end we might perhaps preserve an Establishment, but should certainly have no Catholic Church. If the scheme means anything else than this, it means concurrent endowment of all Christian bodies on the basis of a "redistribution" of Church property. We might dismiss the monstrous proposal with a smile, but for one fact. If we are to have a representative Church body to settle Church legislation, we must fix our franchise. It will be argued with some force that the State must decide what it will recognise as the voice of the Church, and it will be added that so long as the Church claims

to be a "national" institution, her constituency can be nothing short of the nation at large. This palpable sophism will be eagerly adopted by some, and will impose upon many. In resisting it Churchmen will need to show a very determined front, and must insist upon a franchise similar to that of the Established Church of Scotland. The Scottish precedent is one for which English Churchmen ought to be grateful, as it disposes of the whole argument. If we are to have an administrative Church body, in which the laity shall be represented, let us not fail to use with vigour the powerful weapon which the General Assembly of the Established Church of Scotland affords us.

Another proposal for change which meets with a considerable share of approval is that for the establishment of "Parochial Councils." In Mr. Main Walrond's Memorial this proposal is fenced about with many explanations to show that it is made only vaguely and tentatively; and it is to be hoped that the subject will be approached with much caution. That it is desirable to associate laymen in the work and management of a parish will be admitted as a general principle by almost everybody. If the truth must be told, most of the clergy have to complain not that the laity are without power or influence in the parish, but that they are devoid of interest in it. They will hardly even stir out of their homes to elect a churchwarden. But while most clergy would welcome a co-operating laity with open arms, few things could be more mischievous than a crude measure compelling every parish to form a council. Considerable experience is necessary before coming to a conclusion on the matter, but, meanwhile, any believer in the system may try it to-morrow. If we bear in mind what we said as to all reforms being a means to an end, it will be easily understood that in different localities and circumstances there must be great variety in the ways in which the best results for the Church may be obtained from the combined action of minister and people. The object should be to make any council representative of workers. There is nothing to be gained by multiplying chatterers, and there is a great danger of engendering strife. I personally know of one Parochial Council, at the present moment, which works very well. It consists of all the working departments—clergy, churchwardens, and organist, with representatives of the choir, the sidesmen, the teachers, the district visitors, etc. These all meet for mutual consultation and help, and keep the books of their departments; and their knowledge of the work is such that if the parish were to change hands to-morrow the Council could tell the incoming parson more about it in a week than he would find out for himself in six months. That method suits very well a London parish of some two to

five thousand souls. Other plans might be better in other localities, and in some the benevolent despotism of the vicar would be preferable to any council. But a wise clergyman will always take his people more or less into council, and, after all, without a wise and understanding clergy there is no hope for the Church from the best forms of government that wit can devise. A parish governed by a foolish, irritable, or weak minister is bad enough; but to add a parochial council to such a man would be to create feuds and discords from which the cause of true religion might suffer for a generation to come. The sum of the whole matter is that we should enter on the work of Reform with a good courage, indeed, but circumspectly, seeing that every step has its own dangers. We must be prepared, too, for less improvement than we would wish to see, for the most perfect plans will not give perfect success so long as they are carried out by imperfect instruments. But we must neither recoil nor hesitate. Our opportunity is now or never.

GILBERT VENABLES.

ART. VII.—THE LESSONS OF THE LATE ATTACK UPON THE CHURCH.

IT is possible at length to estimate with some degree of accuracy the position in which the Church has been left by the recent General Election.

Never before was the Church question so prominently raised in the constituencies, or so warmly debated in the press. And from this fact certain very erroneous deductions have been drawn. It has been held that the Church was the main issue before the electors, that Churchmen put out their full strength to defeat the attacks made upon her, and that the result has been very detrimental to the cause which they championed. This is a deduction much in favour with Liberationists and their various organs, and doubtless gives great satisfaction to all who can accept and adopt it. It is, however, founded on false premises, and will not bear analysis.

It is true that at one time it appeared likely that the Elections would turn wholly upon the question of Establishment or Disestablishment. The Liberationists had secured pledges of some kind or other from as many as 500 Liberal candidates, and it really seemed as though the Liberal party, with a few distinguished exceptions, might on good ground be claimed as favouring the policy of the Liberation Society.

We have it on the unimpeachable authority of the *Liberator*, the Society's organ in the press, that in the new House of Commons there will be rather more than 230 members "who, in one form or another, are favourable to the policy of Disestablishment." Of course the *Liberator* professes to be highly pleased even with this result, but remembering the confident hopes of twelve months ago as to what the new electors would do with the Church as soon as they had the opportunity, remembering the strenuous efforts made to force the Society's programme both on candidates and constituencies, it is obvious that the result must be, from the Liberationist point of view, a dismal disappointment and failure.

To take our arguments in chronological order. It is not the fact that the Church question was, as once promised to be the case, the main issue before the electors. Mr. Chamberlain, at Glasgow on September 15 and at Bradford on October 1, did his utmost to make it so, and at that time all the Liberationist faction applauded and cheered him on. Moreover, Mr. Gladstone in his manifesto to the Midlothian electors on September 18, though he talked vaguely about "the dim and distant courses of the future," appeared to hold that Disestablishment was, if remote, inevitable, and again Liberationists were encouraged and stimulated. Churchmen were, however, by this time sufficiently roused, and putting together these utterances of Liberal statesmen with the fact of the 500 candidates more or less pledged to Disestablishment whom the *Record* had exposed, seemed to think the time had come to make their voices heard. The chorus of indignation swelled rapidly. There had been a strange ignorance of the nature of Liberationist designs, but the opportune appearance of the *Radical Programme*, to which a preface by Mr. Chamberlain drew general attention, gave Churchmen an occasion for studying the proposals of our friend the enemy. "If I want to convert an apathetic Churchman into an ardent Church defender," said a friend of mine, "I give him the *Radical Programme* to read. If it does not make his blood boil and send him to work forthwith, it is indeed surprising." That section of the *Radical Programme* which deals with the Church is, I may say, substantially identical with the "Practical Suggestions of the Liberation Society." He therefore who supports the *Radical Programme*, like Mr. Chamberlain, and he who repudiates it with scorn, as Mr. Gladstone did at Edinburgh, supports or repudiates the Liberation Society. This is a fact the significance of which the most casual reader will appreciate.

Liberal statesmen—even the most extreme men—were quick to discern the danger of the rising storm. Those who had

been silent hitherto, spoke out boldly against Disestablishment, as though they had long been wishing to unburden their full hearts; while those who had committed themselves on the unpopular side proceeded, with a haste which was not dignified nor even decent, to modify, explain away, or contradict their utterances of a few weeks before. It became a commonplace of politics to say the Disestablishment cry was a Tory move; but as I ventured to point out in the *Times* of November 12, unless Liberationists were Tories in disguise—which, seeing that they were very bad Liberals, was possibly a fair explanation—it was hard to understand how the Tories could be credited with raising a cry which they had been slow enough to realize had been raised by anybody at all. However, Liberal politicians of all gradations, Mr. John Morley equally with Mr. Gladstone, deprecated the question being in any way put before the constituencies; pleaded for the unity of the Liberal party, which to press forward Disestablishment would assuredly rend in twain; and as a party question the matter was thenceforward dead. Liberal Churchmen had made it abundantly clear that they would not support their party if it took up so illiberal a cry, and the rank and file of the candidates proceeded to scuttle out of their false position "like rats from a sinking ship." The manifesto of Liberal peers and others, to which such men as Lord Selborne, the Dukes of Westminster and Bedford, Lord Enfield, Mr. Tom Hughes, Lord Normanby and Sir Thomas Brassey put their names, gave the final touch; and when Mr. Gladstone got to Edinburgh on November 10, it was clear that he simply would not have a word to say to Disestablishment. Good service to the Church cause was likewise rendered by Lord Selborne in a letter advising Liberals generally to refuse to vote for Liberationists; and by Lord Hartington, who declared at Accrington on October 30, that Disestablishment would bring the nation nearer to civil war than anything he could conceive of. The result of the Election is, so far as the Church is concerned, as we have above stated, accepting for the nonce the probably sanguine estimate of the *Liberator* as to the strength of the Liberationist contingent.

Roughly speaking, therefore, the Liberationists think they can depend upon a third of the present House of Commons, while ranged amongst Church Defenders, for this Parliament at any rate, must be placed all the leaders of the Liberal party. This being so, I may be allowed to have shown that while the Church question was practically withdrawn from among the issues to be debated before the constituencies, the result of the election to the Church has not been unfavourable, but distinctly the reverse.

The mistake which our opponents make is in affirming that

the Church did her utmost and failed. She did not fail, we say—much less did she put out her utmost strength. This last may be shown very briefly.

The attack found Churchmen generally little prepared for it, and taken by surprise. It ought not to have been so, but it cannot be denied that it was, though surely through no fault of the Church Defence Institution. Urged by that body, Archbishop Tait had in 1881 drawn public attention to the drastic proposals of the Liberation Society; but in four years all seems to have been forgotten, and nine Churchmen out of ten then first came to realize what the meaningless word "Disestablishment" practically involved. When the truth began to dawn, there was plenty of indignation, enthusiasm, zeal, but there was very insufficient organization.

Meetings were held in all the large towns, and left nothing to be desired either in tone or numbers; but it was impossible in so short a time, and with a limited staff, to take the villages in anything like completeness or system, and it was in the rural districts, remote from the great centres of intelligence, that the Liberationist triumphs were won. This defect of organization is being already made good, and another election will, I am confident, tell another tale. The arts, moreover, by which the labourer was induced to go against the Church will assuredly entail a speedy Nemesis, and induce an angry reaction against those by whom he has been deceived. He has now served the agitator's turn, and will not be long in discovering that that personage has very little more to do for him or even to promise him. And upon that discovery the agitator's influence will be happily and hopelessly destroyed. In fact, unless I am grievously mistaken, the Liberation Society has now done its worst. It has appealed to the lowest stratum of the electorate, having previously appealed in vain to the better informed, and its success is far from commensurate with its hopes; for practical purposes it is absolutely futile.

Churchmen are very much stronger than many of their number, not all, were aware of; they are the strongest party in the country. If 85 Irish members are a perplexity to the two great political parties, what would 400 Churchmen be? It will be the wisdom of Liberal leaders not to force Churchmen thus to separate themselves; but it will be for Churchmen to make it understood that their interests and wishes must be treated with respect and consideration by the imperial legislature, and that coquetting with the Liberationist faction must not even be suspected. As to Church Reform, there is doubtless room for it, and the present time may be convenient for promoting it. Let Churchmen, however, beware of com-

mitting themselves to any wild scheme that may be thrust upon them, under the belief that something must be done and speedily, and that better have it ill done than not at all. The contrary is the fact. We have defects and anomalies in our system, which it will be well to correct and remove, deliberately and thoughtfully; but do not let us be in a hurry to go to Parliament, as at present constituted, and ask that heterogeneous body to show us the way. Let us decide among ourselves what we want, and then demand legal sanction for the changes we desire. But even should Reform be delayed, we may rest assured that this is preferable to endangering the continuance of that union between the Church and the civil power, under which the State of England has been and is so richly blessed.

H. GRANVILLE DICKSON.

Reviews.

The Life of William Carey, D.D., Shoemaker and Missionary, Professor of Sanskrit, Bengali, and Marathi in the College of Fort William, Calcutta. By GEORGE SMITH, LL.D., C.I.E. With portrait and illustrations. Pp. 450. John Murray.

DR. SMITH'S present work will meet with a hearty welcome. We have now three admirable Biographies by Dr. Smith—Duff of Calcutta, Wilson of Bombay, and Carey of Serampore. These works, covering a period of nearly a century and a quarter, from 1761 to 1878, are a treasury of material for that history of the Church of India which, as he says, one of its native sons must some day attempt; but they were written also as contributions to the "annals of the Evangelical Revival, which may well be called the Second Reformation," and to the history of English-speaking peoples, rulers and civilizers, in connection with Foreign Missions.

When Dr. Smith first went to Serampore, in 1854, Carey had not been twenty years dead. "During my long residence there as Editor of the *Friend of India*," he says, "I came to know, in most of its details, the nature of the work done by Carey for India and for Christendom, in the first third of the century. I began to collect such materials for the Biography as were to be found in the office, the press, and the college, and among the Native Christians and Brahman pundits whom he had influenced. In addition to such materials and experience I have been favoured with the use of many unpublished letters written by Carey or referring to him." The work before us, therefore—marked by great ability—is the result of diligent inquiry and careful preparation under the most favourable circumstances, and has a singular interest and value. It is a full and sympathetic Memoir of a most remarkable Missionary; but—as we have said—it is more than this, and as a contribution to the history of Christian devotedness and influence, especially in relation to enterprise in heathen lands, its worth in many ways is great.

In the present review we shall content ourselves with a sketch or summary of the earlier life of Carey, as it is here given us.

William Carey was born in 1761, at Paulerspury, a village eleven miles south of Northampton. His grandfather was parish clerk and first schoolmaster of Paulerspury. One of his sons enlisted as a soldier. The second son, Edmund Carey, set up the loom on which he wove the woollen cloth known as "tammy," in a two-storied cottage. There his eldest child, WILLIAM, was born, and lived for six years, till his father was appointed schoolmaster, when the family removed to the free school-house. In the schoolhouse he lived, as a scholar, till he was fourteen. The village surroundings and the county scenery—says our author—coloured the whole of the boy's after-life, and did much to make him the first agricultural improver and naturalist of Bengal, which he became. As a child he showed an eager thirst for knowledge and perseverance in attaining his object. "Whatever he began he finished," and whatever he did he did heartily, whether in his play or in his work. He was a capital hand in the garden; the schoolmaster's garden, indeed, was the best kept in the neighbourhood. The love of a garden grew upon him. Wherever after that he lived, as boy or man, poor or in comfort, William Carey made and perfected his garden, and always for others, until he erected at Serampore the botanical park which, for more than half a century, was unique in Southern Asia.

When fourteen years of age, it seems, he was awkward and useless at any agricultural work. But he worked in the fields for two years. Like many a clever, studious boy in the country, he was fond of natural history; he also read books of science. Amusements he rather avoided. Other lads said to him, "Well, if you won't play, preach us a sermon;" and mounting an old dwarf witch-elm (standing till recently), his favourite resort for reading, he would hold forth. He knew the Prayer Book, of course, and had been accustomed from his infancy to read the Bible. The family training, indeed, says Dr. Smith, "was exceptionally scriptural and thorough, though not evangelical." His grandmother, a devout widow, had watched over his early childhood with tender care.

When sixteen, William was apprenticed to a shoemaker in Hackleton, a neighbouring hamlet. During twelve years, *i.e.*, from the sixteenth to the twenty-eighth year of his life, he worked at shoemaking and cobbling. Our author has an interesting passage on this: "The providence which "made and kept young Carey so long a shoemaker put him in the very "position in which he could most fruitfully receive and nurse the sacred "fire that made him the first English Missionary and the most learned "scholar and Bible translator of his day in the East. The same provi- "dence thus linked him to the earliest Latin Missionaries of Alexandria, "of Asia Minor, and of Gaul, who were shoemakers, and to a succession "of scholars and divines, poets and critics, reformers and philanthropists, "who have used the shoemaker's life to become illustrious. St. Mark "chose for his successor, as first Bishop of Alexandria, that Annianus "whom he had been the means of converting to Christ when he found "him at the cobbler's stall. The Talmud commemorates the courage and "the wisdom of 'Rabbi Jochanan, the shoemaker,' whose learning soon "after found a parallel in Carey's. Like Annianus, 'a poor shoemaker "named Alexander, despised in the world, but great in the sight of God, "who did honour to so exalted a station in the Church,' became famous "as Bishop of Comana in Cappadocia, as saint, preacher, and Missionary "martyr. Soon after there perished in the persecutions of Diocletian, at "Soissons, the two Missionary brothers whose name of Crispin has ever "since been gloried in by the trade, which they chose at once as their "only means of livelihood and of helping their poor converts. The

"Hackleton apprentice was still a child when the great Goethe was again "adding to the then artificial literature of his country, his own true pre- "decessor, Hans Sachs, the shoemaker of Nuremberg, the friend of "Luther, the *meistersinger* of the Reformation. And it was another "German shoemaker, Boehme, whose exalted theosophy, as expounded by "William Law, became one link in the chain that drew Carey to Christ, "as it influenced Wesley and Whitefield, Samuel Johnson and Coleridge. "George Fox was only nineteen when, after eight years' service with a "shoemaker in Drayton, Leicestershire, not far from Carey's county, he "heard the voice from heaven which sent him forth in 1643 to preach all "over the Midlands righteousness, temperance, and judgment to come, "till Cromwell sought converse with him, and the Friends became a "power among men." The Memoir before us—which "general readers" who care little for Missions may call a thoroughly "readable" book—has many passages like the preceding, showing the learned author's literary skill. He quotes Carlyle's remarks on the "shoeshop," and Coleridge's saying that shoemakers had given to the world a larger amount of eminent men than any other handicraft. Thos. Shillitoe and John Pounds were contemporaries of Carey. Whittier, whose own experience in Massachusetts fitted him to be the poet laureate of the gentle craft, wrote, some thirty years ago :

> Thy songs, Hans Sachs, are living yet,
> In strong and hearty German,
> And Bloomfield's lay and Gifford's wit,
> And patriot fame of Sherman ;
>
> Still from his book, a mystic seer,
> The soul of Behmen teaches,
> And England's priestcraft shakes to hear
> Of Fox's leathern breeches.

Quaker, philanthropist, and countryman of Judson, says Dr. Smith, Whittier might well have found, in his "Songs of Labour," a place for cobbler Carey. But this is a digression ; and we return.

The religious experience of a brother apprentice, a pious Dissenter, was of great service to Carey. Of any spiritual benefit from the representative of the Church in Hackleton we read nothing. Those days were days of apathy and formalism, of pluralities, non-residence, and "hack" curates "doing the duty." About many a resident Incumbent the best thing that could be said was that he was decent and respectable. It was indeed a dreary period. Of spiritual life and zeal, in Dissenting bodies as well as in the Church, there was sadly little. Here and there, however, Gospel light was shining.

At eighteen, Carey, seeking after truth, for a time consorted with some followers of Law. At twenty, he was "piecing together" doctrines from the Bible. Somewhat suddenly—according to his own account—he became a Baptist. This was in the year 1783 ; and "he never wavered," we read, in his views.

At a meeting of the Association of the Baptist Churches at Olney, he first met with his lifelong colleague, the future secretary of their Mission, Andrew Fuller. The mention of Olney reminds us that William Cowper was writing "The Task" in Olney, while William Carey was studying theology on the opposite side of the market-place.[1]

[1] Olney was not far from Hackleton. Thomas Scott, on his walks from Olney, where he had succeeded John Newton, sometimes rested a little while in the house of Carey's master. He conversed with the young man. Forty years afterwards, just before Scott's death, Dr. Carey sent him a message, that what there was of the work of God in his soul owed much to Mr. Scott's teaching.

In the cobbler's shed, which Scott called Carey's "college," he mended shoes, and studied. He worked hard at Greek and Divinity. By the aid of neighbouring ministers he learned Hebrew. He had the linguistic gift, says Dr. Smith, that talent which soon after made a young carpenter of Bologna, Mezzofanti, famous and a cardinal. His thirst after knowledge was remarkable. He never sat on his stall without his book before him. In order to buy a book he would sometimes starve himself. "As we stand in the Hackleton shed, over which Carey placed the rude sign-board prepared by his own hands, *Second-Hand Shoes Bought and Sold*, we can realize the low estate to which Carey fell, even below his father's loom and schoolhouse, and from which he was called to become the apostle of North India, as Schwartz was of the South."

The Missionary idea arose in his mind while, as a schoolmaster, he tried to teach geography; and it grew upon him. Between the years 1787 and 1790, at several meetings of Baptist Ministers, the topic of his conversation was a mission to the heathen. In 1792, at Leicester, appeared his "Enquiry into the Obligations of Christians . . ." a wealthy tradesman having given him £10 to print his manuscript; and a truly remarkable publication it is. "Thomas Clarkson, born a year before Carey, was beginning his assaults on the slave-trade by translating into English his Latin prize poem on the day-star of African liberty, when the shoemaker, whom no University knew, was writing his *Enquiry into the Obligations of Christians to use means for the Conversion of the Heathen*." "The 'Enquiry,'" says our author, "the first and still greatest Missionary treatise in the English language," has a literary interest of its own, from its ability, and cultured style. In the same year, 1792, at Nottingham, Carey preached his famous sermon. He had met with considerable opposition from the hyper-Calvinism of his associates, "particular" Baptists. The Gospel was meant, they said, for the *elect*. But this false Calvinism which, as our author remarks, the French theologian of Geneva would have been the first to denounce, was dying down. It was no longer to be a barrier against that Pauline enthusiasm which the poems of Cowper were praising; and Carey's two Missionary maxims—

EXPECT GREAT THINGS FROM GOD:
ATTEMPT GREAT THINGS FOR GOD—

have ever since been accepted as leading principles of Christianity according to the New Testament. Shortly after this sermon was preached, a Baptist Society "for promoting the Gospel among the Heathen" was formed at Kettering. Carey was sent to India. At first he desired to go to Tahiti or Western Africa; but after consultation with John Thomas, a surgeon, who had done some spiritual work under Charles Grant, India was chosen. Five years previously Mr. Grant had written to Simeon and Wilberforce for eight Missionaries, but not one Church of England clergyman, says our author, could be found to go. Thirty years after, when Chairman of the Court of Directors and father of Lord Glenelg and Sir Robert Grant, he wrote: "I had formed the design of a mission to Bengal; Providence reserved that honour for the Baptists."

When in London, Carey had asked John Newton: "What if the Company should send us home, on our arrival in Bengal?" "Then conclude," was the reply, "that your Lord has nothing there for you to accomplish. But if He have, no power on earth can hinder you." Providentially the Missionary's passage was secured in a Danish Indiaman, bound from Copenhagen to Serampore; and thus it came to pass that the "interloper" landed at Calcutta unmolested. He passed the home-going Governor-General (Cornwallis) in the Bay of Bengal. This was in November, 1793. Sir John Shore, afterwards Lord Teignmouth, had entered on his high office a fortnight before.

The condition of Bengal at this time was pitiable in the extreme. After the great famine, Lord Cornwallis described one-third of Bengal as a jungle inhabited only by wild beasts. There had been oppression, distress, degradation, anarchy, misery unspeakable. "Chaos" was a fitting term to describe it.

Before Carey, asks our author, what had been done to Christianize the millions of North India? Was there a single genuine convert?[1]

In South India, for the greater part of the century, the Coast Mission had been carried on from Tranquebar as a centre by the Lutherans, whom, from Ziegenbalg to Schwartz, Friedrich IV. of Denmark had sent forth to its East India Company's settlement. The first convert was baptized in 1707, and the illustrious Schwartz died in 1798. To these German Missionaries, the existing English Church Societies, the S.P.G. and S.P.C.K., had sent occasional aid.

Into any discussion of the two principles which, according to our author, regulated the course of the Mission which Carey began, we shall not now enter:

> These principles are that (1) a Missionary must be one of the companions and equals of the people to whom he is sent; and (2) a Missionary must, as soon as possible, become indigenous, self-supporting, self-propagating, alike by the labours of the Mission and of the converts.

In 1798 Carey was making progress in Sanskrit, the mother language, without which he found he could not satisfactorily translate the Scriptures. Side by side with his daily public preaching, and with more private conversations with inquirers in Bengali, he carried on the work of Bible translation.[2] Schools were planned and planted. Everywhere, from the first, the Missionary laid stress on the educational work. All his native schools, we read, were conducted upon Lancaster's plan.

On a visit to Calcutta in 1799, to get types cast for printing the Bible, Carey witnessed, for the first time, that sight of widow-burning which was to continue to disgrace alike the Hindoos and the Company's Government until his incessant appeals in India and in England led to its prevention in 1829. What he did for humanity is well set forth, at length, in this Memoir.

Carey's letters were received at home, of course, with deep thankfulness; and in 1799, Marshman, Ward, and two others, were sent to Serampore—the Iona, the Canterbury, of Southern Asia. Ward, having obtained a Danish passport, paid a visit to Dinajpoor, and held consultation with Carey. It seemed to Carey expedient to give up his own pioneer mission, and on January 10, 1800, he took up his residence in Serampore. On the 11th he was presented to the Governor (a disciple of Schwartz), and went out and preached to the natives. His novitiate, says Dr. Smith, was over; so began his full apostolate, instant in season and out of season, to end only with his life thirty-four years later.

For seven years he had daily preached Christ in Bengali without a convert. But at the close of the year 1800, Krishna Chandra Pal offered

---

[1] The career of Kiernander, twenty-eight years in Calcutta, has an interest of its own. But Carey could find no trace of his work *among the natives* six years after his death. Guneshan Das, the first man of caste to visit England, was baptized, on his return, in 1774, by Kiernander. The question of what Missionary work was really done before Carey's days is not as yet, we think, precisely settled. Whether Dr. Smith appears to claim too much for the work and influence of Dr. Carey is also a question on which many will differ.

[2] On January 24th, 1809, Carey announced at the dinner-table that he had that evening finished the Bengali translation of the whole Bible. A very serious illness—the result of overwork—then ensued. At this time he was nearly forty-eight years old. The New Testament had been translated in 1800.

himself for baptism. "God is making way for us," wrote Carey, "and giving success to the Word of His grace." Nor did the year close without fruit from other and higher castes. In the year 1802 Carey wrote: "I think there is such a fermentation raised in Bengal by the little leaven that there is a hope of the whole lump by degrees being leavened." Eight years later, there were 300 converts. The Serampore Mission naturally spread itself out into numerous stations and districts.

Carey's work was now largely in Calcutta; and, as an agent of the Government, the Missionary's influence and opportunities were immeasurably increased. From the middle of 1801 and for the next thirty years, indeed, Carey spent as much of his time in the metropolis as in Serampore. His work in Calcutta was of a varied character. As teacher of Bengali, in Lord Wellesley's new College, he spent the day in training the governing class of India; when the sun went down he preached in several tongues the glad tidings of the Kingdom, addressing the heathen of England as well as of India,—visiting the poor, the blind, the sick, and the leprous. Each week was divided thus: He usually rowed down the eighteen miles of the winding river to Calcutta on a Tuesday evening; and he returned to Serampore on the Friday night.

In 1810, five "United Missions" were formed. Felix Carey, a clever and learned Medical Missionary, went to Burmah; and, in 1813, Judson found shelter in the Mission House at Rangoon. In 1814, Jabez Carey began work among the natives of Amboyna. "Thus, by the labours of "himself, his sons, his colleagues, and his children in the faith, William "Carey saw the Gospel, the press, and the influence of a divine philan- "thropy extending among Mohammedans, Buddhists, and Hindoos from "the shores of the Pacific Ocean west to the Arabian Sea."

In 1802, David Bruce, the senior chaplain and provost of Fort William College, took possession of Aldeen House, separated only by a park from the Serampore Mission House. He secured a deserted temple and changed it into a Christian oratory, ever since known as Henry Martyn's Pagoda. It was in Martyn's Pagoda that Claudius Buchanan broached his plan of an ecclesiastical establishment for India.[1] And during ten years the pagoda became the meeting-place of "Carey and his Nonconformist friends, with Buchanan, Martyn, Bishop Corrie, Thomason, and the little band of evangelical Anglicans who, under the protection of Lords Wellesley and Hastings, sweetened Anglo-Indian Society." Here too there gathered many a civilian and officer seeking the charms of Christian family life. Buchanan died in 1812.

Chapter IX., in the volume under review, is headed "Professor of Sanskrit, Bengali, and Marathi;" and for not a few readers it will prove interesting in the extreme. It shows how Carey during thirty years, through the College of Fort William, influenced the ablest men in the Bengal Civil Service, and some in Madras and Bombay.

Chapter X., headed "The Wiclif of the East," brings before us, in a very graphic manner, the wonderful work accomplished by Carey in translating the Scriptures into the languages of the East. That which he did with his own hand, that which his colleagues accomplished, that which he revised and edited both of their work and the pundits, and that

[1] One sentence in the book under review might well be omitted. On page 195 we read: "Whatever be the judgment of our readers on an establishment which, during the seventy years of its existence, at a cost of ten millions sterling, *has given us at least the brief and beautiful episcopates of Heber and Cotton*, we may regret that Carey's principles were not applied so as to enable civilians to help themselves, while the Government should confine its care to the supply of military chaplains only on a non-intolerant system." The clause which we have italicized is not in harmony with other passages.

which he corrected and printed for others at his Serampore press under the care of Ward, is to be clearly seen. It is to these four lines of work, which centred in Carey, that the saying that he translated the Bible into forty languages and dialects must be applied.

Carey's services to literature and science were remarkable, and deserve to be borne in mind.

In the year 1815, Andrew Fuller, Carey's loyal friend, entered into rest. Up to Fuller's death, says our author, the home management of the Mission had been almost ideally perfect. "Fuller was not only the first of Foreign Mission Secretaries; he was the model of all." Afterwards, there was an unhappy change, and the Serampore Missionaries suffered. The first act of Carey and Marshman, finding themselves opposed by their Committee, was to complete and perpetuate the Mission by a College. The corner-stones of Carey's enterprise had been (1) preaching the Gospel in the vulgar tongue, (2) translating the Bible into all the languages of Southern and Eastern Asia, (3) teaching the young in vernacular schools. On those three he built well; and he soon saw that a fourth was necessary, a College. But we must cease; our limits are overpassed.

In February, 1833, Daniel Wilson, Bishop of Calcutta, first visited Dr. Carey, "his interview with whom, confined as he was to his room, and apparently on the verge of the celestial world, was peculiarly affecting." In the last of subsequent visits, as is well known, the Bishop asked the dying Missionary's blessing.

We should add that this delightful book is well printed in clear large type.

Are we to Modify Fundamental Doctrine? Five Addresses delivered at the Visitation of the Archdeaconry of Bristol, October, 1885. By C. J. ELLICOTT, D.D., Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol. Pp. 60. Bristol: J. W. Arrowsmith. London: Simpkin, Marshall and Co.

Do the recent discoveries of Science necessitate any modification in our statement of Fundamental Doctrine?

This question is forced upon us, and forced upon us, says Bishop Ellicott, under circumstances which add to our present difficulties. For many sincere Christians hold that the forms which ages of faith have given to our doctrine must be harmonized with the conclusions to which we are said to be compelled by modern scientific generalization. "And this more particularly," says the Bishop, "in regard of our own race —its origin, its earliest spiritual history, its past, and its future. In regard of most of these subjects, the popular generalization, which we know by the name of Evolution, is said now by many of our brother-Christians simply to drive us into positions which are inconsistent with our maintenance, in their integrity, of old truths."

The Bishop refers to a work recently reviewed in THE CHURCHMAN, "Can the Old Faith Live with the New?" which gives the advice that "Theology should take its seat where men of science sit—at the feet of Nature." We must thus take for granted inferences of Science which, safe as they may seem to be now, may be reversed or dissipated before many years.

The Bishop alludes to Dr. Pfleiderer's recent "Hibbert" Lectures. "To such lengths," says the Bishop, "is modern religious thought prepared to go in the modification, or really rather surrender, of distinctive and fundamental truth." His Lordship proceeds as follows:

But if we are exposed to the gravest possible dangers from such startling attitudes of modern Theology, no less pronounced is the other peril, to which I have

above alluded—the peril that arises from an over-readiness to accept as a certain and indisputable truth what is, at best, no more than a good working hypothesis—the principle of Evolution—to apply it to our own race, as well as to animals, and then forthwith to try and show how Christianity can be accommodated to such an application. "Let the theologian," says a Presbyterian writer to whom I have alluded, "begin by taking for granted the inferences of Science, by assuming that the conclusions at which he has arrived have become recognised laws of Nature. He will then be in a position to consider the real question—and the only question with which in this matter he has any concern—What effect will the establishment of these conclusions exert upon the old belief? To what extent will it modify, in what measure shall it overthrow, the religious conclusions of the past? This, we say, is the real attitude in which modern Theology should approach modern Science."[1]

If such be the real attitude, the less we approach modern Science the better will it be for the purity and consistency of the Christian faith, the better for those who, led away by the so-called liberal spirit of the age, are only too ready to stretch Creeds and Articles until they have ceased to exhibit any trace of distinctiveness. It may be quite conceded that if we wish to convert scientific Agnostics, some such procedure may meet with some passing success. The popularity of a book that was in the hands of many last year was due to its being an effort in this direction. But such a mode of proceeding, though it might for a moment arrest the attention of men of science, has been found to work incredible mischief in the rank and file of ordinary readers.

What is the true method? "Our first duty," says the Right Rev. Prelate, "is to ascertain what those statements of fundamental doctrine really are, which are alleged to be out of harmony with the discoveries of Science; next, to assure ourselves that these statements are really and truly consonant with the carefully weighed language of Holy Scripture, and with the teaching, as based thereon, of the primitive Church; then, and not till then, in the third place, to enter into the inquiry whether the provisional interpretation of the book of Nature leads directly to conclusions that are opposed to, or inconsistent with, the tested interpretations of the Book of Life." "This I am persuaded," says the venerable Bishop, "is the only true course. This is the only way by which the "loyal believer can enter into the unsettled questions between Theology "and Science. *We must begin by postulating the truths of Religion*, and "then, if we desire to do so, we may contrast with them the truths that "Science may claim to have established. It may be, that the contrast "properly instituted may at once show that the truths alleged to be in "opposition belong really to two different planes of thought and of "reasoning; and that any opposition that may appear to exist is due to "the introduction into the spiritual realm of principles and deductions "which belong exclusively, or presumably exclusively, to the physical "and material. It may be that further investigation may show that "assumptions have been intercalated on either side that cannot be sub-"stantiated; or finally, it may be, that in some points the opposition "may appear to be real and substantive. Even in this last case there "need be no cause for disquietude if we have only faith in the plain "teaching of God's Holy Word, and the abiding conviction that the God "of Nature is also the God of Revelation, and that He Who has permitted "this trial of faith to emerge, will, in His own good time, vouchsafe con-"vincingly to remove it.

"This is our true attitude in days like the present—to postulate "Revealed truth, and then fearlessly to examine whatever may seem to "be opposed to it. To adopt the converse procedure—to assume the "truth of hypotheses, evolutionary or otherwise, and then to devote all "our ingenuity to show that fundamental truths may be stretched into

[1] Matheson, "Can the Old Faith Live with the New?" p. 18.

"accordance with them—is to act detrimentally both to Science and to "Theology."

Now, Holy Scripture teaches us that man was a *special creation.* The Bishop says:

> In a word, the broad teaching of Scripture is that man was a special creation—a direct emergence when all was fully prepared, allied to the living world around by community of origination from the earth on which he was to dwell, and by all the mysterious significance of structural similitude, and allied to the God and Father of all by the sacrament of an inbreathed life.

This is the first fundamental truth of Holy Scripture. And the second is that man was not only a special creation, but pre-eminently so, as being formed in the image of God. The gift was no merely "latent seed to be developed by long ages of evolution." Scriptural truth is "*utterly incompatible with the idea of a gradual acquisition of the image by a slow and long-continued evolution.*" We have italicised the Bishop's words; they will be welcomed by many as a timely protest against recent utterances in newspapers and periodicals, and elsewhere, as to the growth of the spiritual sense.[1] The Bishop proceeds:

> There is not a hint, nor the shadow of a hint, that the spiritual endowment was other than a divine gift, conferred at a given epoch—that epoch being the time when man was called into being. What was given was to be afterwards more fully realized; but the giving itself was an historical act contemporaneous with the historical act of the creation of man.

A Critical and Expository Commentary on the Book of Judges. By the Rev. A. R. Fausset, M.A. London: Nisbet and Co.

This fresh contribution to Biblical interpretation and criticism will be welcomed by students of the Bible, and will be found to sustain the author's high reputation as an expositor and commentator on Holy Scripture.

The method of treatment pursued in the book has been—first, by a critical examination of the original Hebrew, to place the reader in possession of the literal meaning of the sacred text, interspersing it with illustrative and explanatory references to Scripture itself, and to the latest results of modern research, and then to subjoin to each section of the narrative the moral and spiritual lessons which it suggests.

To attempt a detailed review would be impossible here, and we must content ourselves with drawing attention to one or two of the more salient features of the work, as indicative of its general value.

Thus the endeavour to solve the well-known difficulty, as to the length of time embraced by the Judges, deserves notice. The book itself furnishes no sufficient data for determining this question; but St. Paul (Acts xiii. 20) states that Israel was ruled by judges for *about* 450 years. Adding to this period the forty years spent in the wilderness, forty years of Saul's reign, forty of David's, and three of Solomon's, we have 573 years as the whole interval which elapsed between the Exodus and the commencement of the Temple, in the fourth year of Solomon; but, in 1 Kings vi. 1, this same interval is reckoned at only 480 years, which, supposing St. Paul to be correct, is ninety-three years too little.

---

[1] A student who desires to see the lengths which Evolution is leading some, just now, may consult a work by Mr. S. Laing, M.P., *Modern Science and Modern Thought* (1885). Mr. Laing speaks of germs containing the "possibilities of conscious and civilized man, to be developed from the rudest origins by slow and painful progress over countless ages." Mr. Laing rejects miracles. The Ascension, he thinks, is a *parable!!*

Canon Fausset (following Mr. Pember's "Great Prophecies") shows how this apparent discrepancy may be reconciled, by supposing that the reckoning in Kings (the *mystical* as opposed to the *ordinary*) omits those various periods, amounting together to just ninety-three years, during which Israel, in the time of the Judges, was rejected by God for apostasy and handed over to her enemies for punishment. If, however, these ninety-three years of Israel's non-existence as God's people be added to the 450 years of Kings, we get 573, which would allow 450 years for the duration of the Judges, as stated by St. Paul.

In dealing with the disputed question as to the fulfilment of Jephthah's vow, the author follows the modern view, first started by Rabbi Kimchi (*circa* 1200), and adopted by Grotius, Hengstenberg, and others. He maintains the theory of the *spiritual* as against the *literal* offering of Jephthah's daughter, and supports his view with great skill and variety of argument.

An ethical purpose runs through the Book of Judges, its design being not so much to give a continuous history of the period, as to illustrate a divine principle of government—viz., that when the professing Church is faithful to her Lord, and is separate from the world for His sake, He, in his faithfulness, gives her dominion over the world; and conversely, when she forsakes Him and becomes conformed to the world, He not only visits her for sin, but visits her *in kind*, using, in righteous retribution, the world as His instrument to chastise the Church, until, by the cry of penitence, she again enlists His favour on her side.

This idea has been kept steadily in view throughout, and constitutes quite a feature of the book; the author developing it in a striking manner, not only in connection with the leading events, but also with the minor incidents of the history, as, for example, in the case of Abimelech's death (p. 177).

The lesson thus emphasized is true for all ages, and its enforcement may not be out of season at a time when, in the opinion of many, the dangers which threaten our Church from within and from without are attributable to forgetfulness of her true mission—to float with sanctifying and purifying influence above the waters of worldliness, not to allow them to enter and swamp the ship.

To conclude this brief notice, we cannot doubt that the work before us will meet with wide acceptance, and prove a valuable addition to Biblical literature. We commend it with every confidence to the teacher and preacher, who cannot fail to profit from its exhaustive treatment of the subject, its suggestiveness, the vast store of information here accumulated, and the flood of light shed upon the period of the Judges; whilst its lessons of life and godliness, its deeply practical and experimental treatment of the history, will render it eminently useful to the general reader.

M. A.

Short Notices.

Thoughts for Saints' Days. Short Readings arranged for Festivals of the Church's Year. By the Very Rev. J. S. Howson, D.D., Dean of Chester. Pp. 153. Elliot Stock.

THIS is the latest work of the loved and lamented Dean of Chester. The final proof-sheets were corrected, so to speak, while he was passing "through the valley," and just before he asked to listen to that

Psalm, "The LORD is my shepherd . . ." The last letter which we received from our honoured friend related to this book, in which we had taken some interest; and it is, at least for ourselves, a coincidence that the very last words before "*The End*" are these: "Having served his own generation through the will of God, he *fell on sleep*."

There are twelve Chapters in the book; and each Chapter is truly admirable. There is an ably-written Preface, short but full and timely.

The little volume is well printed, and cheap. To those who had the privilege of knowing Dr. Howson it will prove especially welcome; but all devout and thoughtful Church-folk will find it a pleasure to read and recommend it.

Jacob Boehme. By the late Dr. H. L. Martensen, Metropolitan of Denmark. Translated by T. RHYS EVANS. Pp. 344. Hodder and Stoughton.

Bishop Martensen's estimate of the great sixteenth-century mystic will have, for many readers at all events, a peculiar interest. The quotations from Böhme are taken, the Translator tells us, from Law's edition (1781).

Hints and Outlines for Children's Services (on Church Lines). By Rev. C. A. GOODHART, M.A., Vicar of St. Barnabas, Sheffield. Nisbet and Co.

This little book will be found very useful.

Pastor's Hand Book. By W. W. EVERTS. Funk and Wagnalls, 44, Fleet Street, London.

This is a curious little book, American. The first edition, Dr. Everts says, was published forty years ago. It contains forms of marriage (one form being in the main that of our Prayer Book), selections for funerals, etc.

The Expositor. Edited by the Rev. W. ROBERTSON NICOLL, M.A. Third series. Vol. II. Hodder and Stoughton.

The new series of the *Expositor* may be said in scholarship to rank higher, while doctrinally it remains much the same. The second volume is as interesting and as ably written as the first. The chief contributors are Dr. Driver and Messrs. Jennings and Lowe, on the Revised Version of the Old Testament, and Dr. Maclaren on the Colossians.

The Throne of Eloquence. Great Preachers, ancient and modern. By E. Paxton Hood. Pp. 475. Hodder and Stoughton.

The writings of the late Mr. Paxton Hood are generally known. The present volume has many suggestive passages.

Mr. Murray sends us the new *Quarterly*. The first article is "Church and State;" vigorous, full, and fresh, it will be read with much satisfaction.[1] It quotes Mr. Dibdin's excellent edition of Professor Brewer's book, "The Endowments and Establishment of the Church of England," which was strongly recommended in the October CHURCHMAN. The learned barrister's note on Establishment is certainly a great addition. "The House of Condé," "Mr. Ormsby's 'Don Quixote,'" "The Country Banker" and "Pindar's Odes of Victory," are ably written.

[1] Many of the quotations in this admirable article are very telling. For instance, the *Quarterly* quotes Mr. T. Hughes, about voluntaryism in the United

There is a readable review of Dr. Schliemann's "Tiryns." Of course the *Quarterly* has an article on Burma. With "The New Parliament" all Conservatives and not a few Liberals will be greatly pleased.

In the *National Review* appear several interesting papers; for example, Mr. Courthope's reply on "Poetry and Politics," and "My Election Experiences" by Lady John Manners.

From Messrs. Longmans' we have received (Jan. 16th) the new *Edinburgh Review*. It contains several timely and very readable articles. That on Cathedral Chapters has for ourselves an especial interest; and we must return to it. "England, Afghanistan, and Russia," "The French in Madagascar," "The Scarcity of Gold," and "Victor Hugo," will attract many. With the review of Friedmann's "Anne Boleyn" (see CHURCHMAN, vol. xii., p. 48) we are somewhat disappointed. The reviewer leans rather, in some matters, to the Romanist side; but he points out (as we ourselves showed) that there is no evidence whatever in support of Chapuis. The *Edinburgh* has also a review of Mr. Butler's "Ancient Coptic Churches." "Popular Government" is a slashing attack on Mr. Chamberlain. The *Edinburgh* refers to "Free Schools," and so forth, and proceeds: "When the country took fire at "this threatened attack on the Church—which, in fact, embodied the "precise views of the Liberation Society, and was the result of the "exertions of that body—it was thought prudent to retreat from so "dangerous a position, and accordingly assurances were given that it was "not the intention of the assailants of the Church to vote for its over-"throw and spoliation *in the next Parliament.*

Non defensoribus istis
Tempus eget!

"Conscientious members of the Church of England, whether Liberal "or Conservative, require not only a pledge that it shall not be attacked "in the new Parliament, but that it shall be defended, maintained, en-"larged, and if necessary in some particulars reformed, as the chief "guardian of the faith of the people of England against foes without and "foes within, alike against Romanism and against infidelity. We do not "believe that these destructive propositions are accepted by the Liberal "party, or that they would command the assent of any considerable "fraction of the House of Commons. Our conviction is that they would "be rejected as decisively by the present Liberal majority of the House "of Commons as they would be rejected by the Conservatives; and that "not one of these measures will find support, or indeed is likely to be "brought forward, in the new Parliament.

"But this is not Mr. Chamberlain's opinion. He has hastened to "inform the public in explicit terms that he adheres to all the terms of

States: "With more places of public worship in proportion to numbers than England, there is far more spiritual destitution and neglect than with us. The number of churches to which no minister is attached is very large. *In the Report of the American Tract Society two years ago it was put down at* 12,000. The proportion of persons belonging to no religious community is even larger. It was stated in the same Report, 'that from eight to ten millions are unreached by the ordinary means of grace,' whilst not more than one-sixth even profess to be members of any Christian Church."

"the Radical programme; he deplores the concessions that the Radical "party were induced to make by accepting the comparatively temperate "and guarded manifesto of Mr. Gladstone, limited to four points; he "looks forward to a renewal of the contest at no distant period, when his "own policy, undiluted, will be presented to the electorate, and especially "the disestablishment of the Church of England will be brought into the "front of the battle. Mr. Chamberlain may at least be congratulated on "his sincerity. He sticks to the red flag, and apparently he believes in "its future success. But in truth he has rendered greater services to the "Conservative party than to his own; and his language compels the "Moderate Liberals to prepare for fresh attacks on the part of men who "have called themselves their allies, and have thriven under their protec- "tion." Such an article in the *Edinburgh* has a special value just now.

The *St. James's Gazette*, we are pleased to observe, warmly recommends Miss Gordon Cumming's "Wanderings in China" (reviewed in our January number). The *Gazette* says: "Miss Gordon Cumming's journal should stand in the very first rank of books of travel; for it is always interesting, often amusing, and full of valuable information gathered at first hand. On the whole, the grave predominates over the gay: it could not be otherwise in a faithful record of things seen and heard in China. The best news contained in its pages relates to the progress which has recently been made by [Missions] the most beneficent of all civilizing agencies."

The Ministry of Flowers, by the Rev. H. FRIEND, F.L.S., may strike some readers here and there as rather fanciful. Nevertheless, these "thoughts respecting Life, suggested by the Book of Nature," are well worth studying; admirers of Dr. Macmillan's well-known books will find them interesting and profitable.

John Gordon will have an interest for many. Its full title is "John Gordon of Pitlurg and Parkhill; or, Memories of a Standard Bearer," by his Widow, author of "Home Life of Sir David Brewster," "Life of Hay Macdowall Grant," "Chief Women," etc., etc. (Nisbet.) We have much pleasure also in recommending a new edition of the *Letters* of Miss Havergal.

In *Blackwood*, Part IV. of "Reminiscences of an Attaché" has a specially interesting portion about Lacordaire and Guizot speaking at the Academy in 1861. "'Three hundred years ago, monsieur,' began, in "sonorous and ponderous tones, the old Minister of Louis Philippe, 'your "ancestors and mine were fighting a bitter fight, the fight of religious "liberty; and across these centuries I, the steadfast follower of that "great principle, extend the hand of reconciliation to one whose life has "been spent in the same cause. It is the privilege of this great body to "know no difference of religious tenets, and it is mine to welcome with- "in these walls the great Dominican friar.' This reference to the days of "the Bartholomew massacres which were planned by the bigotry of the "Guises, and to the change which had come over the times, when a "Dominican friar could thus speak of liberty, was so happy a thought, "that it sent a thrill through the audience and won the day's honours to "M. Guizot." *Blackwood* has a readable paper by Mr. Lawrence Oliphant (first of what will be an interesting series) about Garibaldi. Cavour, he says, could not have created United Italy without Garibaldi, nor could Garibaldi have achieved success without Cavour.

The December number of the *Foreign Church Chronicle* (Rivingtons) contains, as usual, a good deal of information about the Old Catholics and other reforming movements on the Continent. Here is a "short notice":

Vespro; Ufficio Quotidiano (Roma, 1885, pp. 16) is the form of Evensong at present used in the Church of the Via di Genova, in Rome. It is framed in the spirit and from the materials of the Anglican Prayer Book. Its use is temporary, until a Vesper office has been framed from the Italian service-books, by Monsignore Savarese.

THE MONTH.

CHURCH REFORM is being discussed, we gladly note, with increasing earnestness. Leading articles and letters in the newspapers upon this subject are full of interest and promise. The reforms which appear to receive rather general approval have been pleaded for in THE CHURCHMAN during the last four or five years.

The Bishop of Carlisle, in his annual "Pastoral Letter," refers to the Cambridge Address upon which Professor Swainson made a brief but pregnant comment in the January CHURCHMAN. His lordship says:

I quite adopt the following comment, which is taken from an article in the *Times*: "It is not easy to exaggerate the importance of a document of this character. Alike from the time of its appearance, the locality of its origin, the weight of its signatures, and the nature of its contents, the Cambridge Address to the Prelates is likely to mark an epoch in the history of the Church of England. The whole country has been resounding from end to end with the conflict about Disestablishment. The Church has been roused from its sense of security, and warned that the time has come for setting its house in order. If it has the wisdom to give heed to the warning, the General Election has shown that it need not fear to meet its enemies at the gate. The Cambridge Address is a proof that the warning will not pass unheeded."

The following is the other Address to which reference was made in the January CHURCHMAN:

TO HIS GRACE THE LORD ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY AND HIS GRACE THE LORD ARCHBISHOP OF YORK.

We, the undersigned Clergy of the Church of England, desire respectfully to express to your Lordships our feeling that the question of Church Reform has become one of pressing urgency, and to beg that, in the interests of the nation, you will take such steps as may seem best to forward legislation on the subject as early as possible in the coming Parliament.

The reforms which are most pressing are, in our opinion, these:—

1. To give a clearly defined share to the laity, by means of Parochial Councils and otherwise, in the administration of Church affairs.

We are aware that a movement in the direction of lay co-operation, initiated by the Convocation of the Province of Canterbury in 1870, has

made in recent years, and with the hearty approval of your Lordships, some progress, by means of ruridecanal, diocesan, and provincial conferences. But though parochial councils were, equally with the other bodies above named, recommended by Convocation, little or nothing has been done towards their formation. It appears to us that the establishment of parochial councils, or of some such bodies, with well-defined statutory powers, is of primary importance, as tending in the most effectual way to increase the local interest of the laity in Church affairs, and to stimulate and maintain in them a feeling that the national Church is theirs, and that they have a responsible share in its life.

2. To reform Church Patronage, so as to put an end to the traffic in livings, and to secure that no one be appointed to a living without previous consultation of the parishioners or their representatives.

With respect to these points, the Report of the Select Committee of the House of Commons in 1884 on the Church Patronage Bill appears to us to be of great value. We would venture to express our hope that your Lordships may be willing to promote a Bill which shall give legal effect to those of its Resolutions which prohibit the sale of next presentations, and, except to public bodies, of advowsons; as well as to those which give to the parishioners the power of objecting to the presentee, and which propose to define more clearly the power of the Bishop to refuse to institute.

3. To provide further security against ministerial inefficiency, from whatever causes it may arise.

The Pluralities Acts Amendment Act of last Session will, we believe, be useful in this direction; but we are of opinion that greater power and facility should be placed in the hands of the Bishop (if deemed necessary, supported by assessors) to remove incompetent and criminous clerks.

4. To reduce the anomalies of the present distribution of the Endowments of the Church.

Though much has been already done in this direction, further readjustment is, we believe, needed to meet the changed character of many localities and the shifting of population.

5. So far to relax the Act of Uniformity as to make it lawful to hold in our Churches a greater variety of services, according to the needs and circumstances of the population in different parishes and districts.

There are other questions of grave importance on which many Churchmen hold strong convictions. As, however, there is not the same unanimity concerning these questions, we desire to confine this memorial to the points mentioned above; but most respectfully and most earnestly we appeal to your Lordships to use the weight of your high authority in favour of such reforms as we have indicated, believing that they cannot be delayed without detriment to the Church's influence and hindrance to her usefulness. We do so in the sincere belief that this expression of our opinions will not be unwelcome or altogether valueless. If your Lordships should be enabled to set on foot such a body of reforms, we feel assured that your work will meet with the grateful recognition of the Nation.

We are, etc.

To this Address (Mr. Walrond's) has been appended a large number of influential signatures.[1]

---

[1] Among the representative men who have signed this Address may be mentioned Bishop Perry, the Deans of Salisbury, Gloucester, Bristol, Carlisle, Peterborough, Wells, and Ely; Prebendary Daniel Wilson,

At the Islington Clerical Meeting, on the 12th, Canon Cadman (Chairman in the absence of the venerated President) made some timely and weighty observations upon Reforms:

Where abuses exist we should help to clear them away (hear, hear). Where imperfections are manifest we would seek to perfect and strengthen that which remains. We do not wish to put aside the lamp—a term which I use to denote the Church in its organization—as we have it. We do not wish to put aside the lamp, the external organization, as if of no further use. We do not even wish to alter its shape or configuration, much less do we wish to substitute new lights or adopt strange doctrines or teaching of which we must needs say, the old is better (hear, hear). If there are any dark shades that obscure the true light, or anything whatever that hinders or interferes with the brightness or clearness of the light shed from the lamp, by all means let us, who love and profess and teach Evangelical truth, be the first and most hearty in wishing and seeking to improve and rectify all that is found wanting (hear, hear). But—I say this solemnly—never, no never, will we consent to any intended or proposed reform which would adopt any standard of opinion but God's revealed Word (applause). Whatever be the issues, never—no, never—will we consent to any alteration or reconstruction of even the external organization of the Church which would leave any doubt as to the importance we attach to the essential verities connected with the person, and work, and glory, and kingdom of Christ our Lord.

Papers on "The Church's Real Relation to the State" (Canon Bernard), "The Church's need of well-considered Reform" (Sir E. Bayley), "The Church's Actual Service to the Nation" (Dr. Bardsley), "The Church's Special Witness to the World" (Canon Hoare), will, we trust, be published. An admirable report appeared in the *Record*. Sir Emilius Bayley's summary of reforms has value. He said:

Upon some points, however, there is a strong, an almost unanimous consensus of opinion. There are, at least, four of which this may be said:

1. The abolition of all traffic in livings. Upon this the condemnation is absolute and universal.
2. The removal of criminous and incompetent clerks.
3. The redistribution of revenues.
4. The admission of the laity to a share in the government of the Church.

To these may be added as of less universal acceptance:

1. The right of veto in the congregations.
2. The provision of a system of pensions.
3. The popularizing of cathedrals.
4. The relaxation of the Act of Uniformity.
5. The enforcement of clerical discipline.

In an outspoken article on "The Clergy and the Agricultural Labourers," in the *Guardian* (January 13th), we read that

---

Archdeacons Cheetham, Hornby, and Canon Girdlestone; Dr. Plummer, Canons Morse and Brooke; Professors Sanday, Cheyne, Gandell, and Pritchard; Canon Saumarez Smith, Dr. Forrest, Prebendary Harry Jones, the Revs. J. F. Kitto, J. E. C. Welldon (Head-Master of Harrow).

the fact seems to be that "the clergy have, as a rule, lost the sympathy and regard of the labourers." "The rural clergy are unpopular."[1] For ourselves, we are inclined to doubt this; at all events, instead of "as a rule," we should say "to a great extent," and particularly in certain counties. But the *Guardian* article is ably written, and with its statements and deductions, on the whole, we thoroughly agree. In more than one CHURCHMAN during the last few years, we have pointed out the danger of the incumbent, in a rural parish, being regarded as an autocrat, and the Church as largely aristocratic. But the question of farmer on the one hand and labourers on the other is in many districts by no means an easy one.

On the day when "The Month" of the January CHURCHMAN was being printed, a greatly esteemed and valued contributor, whose ill health had long been known to us, the revered Dean of Chester, died at Bournemouth. A biography of our friend and co-worker will afford us an opportunity for paying a tribute to the memory of a dignitary of the Church, whose piety, candour, learning, generosity, and faithful work are acknowledged on every side. An eminent scholar writes to us: "Dean Howson was one of the excellent of the earth." Another dignitary writes: "I had an affectionate regard for him."[2] Other private letters are similar. In the *Record* of the 8th appeared a brief but deeply interesting "In Memoriam." It opens thus:

---

[1] "We are not sure that the country clergy have learnt to recognise the change that the course of events has produced in the agricultural labourer. What has happened in the towns is now happening in the country; the labourers are passing from a state of more or less unreasoning submission into a state of independence, which is, perhaps, not more rational, but is natural and inevitable. The gift of the franchise has only confirmed the feeling that has been growing up for some time. If, therefore, the country clergy wish to regain their influence with the labourers, they must recognise this change, and learn to treat them as the town clergy for the most part have learnt to treat the artisans, as fellow-citizens and fellow-Churchmen. The days of somewhat dictatorial patronage are over, and the sooner this is realized the better. If the country clergy will consent to come down to an equality with their labouring parishioners, to recognise their feeling of independence, and to attempt to realize their wants and wishes, they will find themselves in a position to exercise a most salutary influence on the difficult relations between farmers and their workmen."—*Guardian.*

[2] It was stated in the *Times* notice of Dean Howson that a reply to his article on "Alms and Oblations" was inserted by the Editor in THE CHURCHMAN. The fact is, that we inserted Canon Simmons' reply at the suggestion, and indeed request, of our Very Rev. friend. The esteemed Canon's CHURCHMAN article was, in truth, the result of a conversation with the Dean.

Dean Howson was, perhaps, better known in the north of England generally from the leading position into which he at once stepped, on his promotion to the Deanery of Chester, in the Convocation of York, than even from his literary labours or his indefatigable energy in connection with the Diocese and Cathedral of Chester.

In an interesting letter on "Church Extension in 1884," the Rev. F. Burnside (Hon. Sec. to the "Year Book" Committee) shows that a sum approaching a million and a half has been contributed during the year.

Lord Alwyne Compton has been appointed to the Bishopric of Ely. Dr. Gott, Vicar of Leeds, has been appointed to the Deanery of Worcester. Dr. Moorhouse, Bishop of Melbourne, is to be the successor of Dr. Fraser, Bishop of Manchester.

Parliament met on the 12th. Mr. Arthur Peel (proposed by Sir John Mowbray, seconded by Mr. Bright) was unanimously elected Speaker. Sir M. Hicks-Beach (the leader of the House) and Mr. Gladstone made appropriate speeches. Mr. Bradlaugh was sworn in, no debate being allowed.

Archdeacon Sumner, as was expected, has been elected Prolocutor of the Lower House.

Elections of representatives for the House of Laymen have taken place in the various dioceses.

Lord Robert Montagu has returned to the Church of England.

Two masterly letters on Home Rule, from Sir James Stephen, have appeared in the *Times*. The condition of Ireland is deplorable.

Under M. Grévy, re-elected President, M. de Freycinet has formed a Cabinet.

The celebration of the twentieth anniversary of the accession of the Emperor William to the throne of Prussia was made the occasion of great rejoicings in Berlin.

An armistice has been concluded between Servia and Bulgaria. Lord Salisbury's policy, here and elsewhere, has been successful. The delimitation of the Afghan frontier is proceeding with smoothness. The final arrangements in Burmah wait for the presence of Lord Dufferin. The newspapers of January 1st contained the following proclamation:

By command of the Queen-Empress it is hereby notified that the territories formerly governed by King Theebaw will no longer be under his rule, but have become part of Her Majesty's dominions, and will, during Her Majesty's pleasure, be administered by such officers as the Viceroy and Governor-General of India may from time to time appoint. —(Signed) DUFFERIN.

Mukhtar Pasha, the Commissioner appointed by the Porte, has met Sir H. Drummond Wolff and the Khedive in secret conclave. A satisfactory arrangement seems probable.