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

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

THE

CHURCHMAN

MARCH, 1886.

ART. I.—FREE EDUCATION.

THE agitation for Free Education, which failed so signally in 1870, can hardly be said to have achieved any conspicuous success in 1885. Mr. Gladstone pointed out the difficulties which beset the question—"difficulties which demand, at any rate, grave consideration"—and expressly excluded it from his programme. The electors of the London School Board, looking at it, perhaps, from a ratepayer's point of view, pronounced very decidedly against it. . It is true that a considerable number of Liberal candidates, following the lead of the Bradford Conference, gave it a more or less hearty support; but this only served to bring into greater prominence the entire absence of any enthusiasm, and even of any demand for it on the part of the people. The whole agitation was forced, artificial—from above, and not from below. There could be no mistake, indeed, about the earnestness of Mr. Chamberlain, and Mr. John Morley, and Mr. Jesse Collings. Their persistence gave the subject a prominence which there was nothing else in the course of the elections to warrant. Put by Mr. Chamberlain in the forefront of his programme, offered as a boon—I will not say as a bribe—to the working classes, and especially to the agricultural labourers, it failed altogether to arouse their interest; it hardly attracted their attention. I have heard and read almost innumerable explanations of the vote of the agricultural labourers. I do not remember to have met with one, either from Liberals, or Radicals, or Conservatives, which ascribed the slightest importance or effect to the cry for Free Education. The Land question, and still more the question of Free Trade or Fair Trade, and in some parts of the country the question of Disestablishment, excited the strongest feeling on both sides, and were the turning-points of many contests; but I do not suppose that anyone could point to a single election where the cry for Free Education

affected the result. It was recognised almost from the beginning as being factitious—a cry of politicians, and not a want of the people. Here in Plymouth, as I write, we have just had a School Board election. There were four candidates who claimed to represent the working-classes. They were eager for economy; they complained of extravagance in the building and fitting-up of schools; they demanded the reduction of salaries; they were divided about religious instruction; but not one of them made a point of Free Education, nor at any of their meetings did there appear to be the least interest shown in the subject. It is the same in other parts of the country. But for Mr. Chamberlain and his friends, who are still striving laboriously to keep it alive, the agitation would soon die a natural death and be forgotten.

But the persistent efforts of such men as Mr. Chamberlain and Mr. John Morley cannot safely be ignored. Though they do not represent a popular movement, they may at least create it. It is necessary for us to be equally alert. Both as citizens and as Churchmen, we must bear in mind what this cry really means and what it involves, and lose no opportunity of making known the grave issues which lie under a proposal apparently so innocent. Fortunately its advocates have not attempted to conceal their ultimate object. Their programme in 1869—the programme of the Birmingham Education League—was compulsory, free, secular education.[1] Mr. John Morley, speaking at Cambridge on the 29th of September last, said: "Of course I am one who believe that the question will not end with free schools. You must have your primary instruction not only easily accessible, but you must do other things when the time comes. You must first of all make it good and make it better than it now is; and the second thing is, you must bring this whole scheme of popular instruction, which is mainly provided for out of the public purse, under popular and elective management." A few days later Mr. Chamberlain, speaking at Bradford on this same question of Free Education, went on to say: "The existence of sectarian schools supported by State grants is no doubt a very serious question in itself, and one which some day or other ought to receive consideration.

[1] The League adopted the word "unsectarian," but in answer to a member who complained of this, Mr. George Dixon, the chairman, explained, "We do not use the word 'secular,' but we exclude all theological parts of religion, and I am sure that what is left is what even Mr. Dowson himself [the objector] would call 'secular.'" Mr. George Dawson, Mr. Cremer, Professor Thorold Rogers, Mr. Holyoake, and others, plainly called their scheme of education "secular." Mr. Applegarth said, "It is no use trying to mix up a national education with any portion of religion, however small the dose."

Whenever the time comes for its discussion, I for one shall not hesitate to express my opinion that contributions of Government money, whether great or small, ought in all cases to be accompanied by some form of representative control. To my mind, the spectacle of so-called national schools turned into a private preserve by clerical managers, and used for exclusive purposes of politics or religion, is one which the law ought not to tolerate." It is true that Mr. Chamberlain added that "this is a question which can be treated by itself," and that it "should not be mixed up or confused with the just claims of the working-class to a free education in all the common schools of the country." But as if to avoid any possibility of doubt, the Bradford Conference adopted a resolution "That in the opinion of this meeting the public elementary schools of this country should be placed under the management of duly elected representatives of the people, and that they should be ultimately freed, and that any deficiency should be made good out of the national exchequer." There can be no mistake about this. It means not only School Boards everywhere, but Board schools. It means the extinction of the voluntary schools, the abolition of denominational education. It means the complete reversal of the policy of the past.

Our policy hitherto—the policy of the Act of 1870—has been to encourage and assist schools established and managed by religious bodies and philanthropic persons, and to supplement them by rate-supported schools under the management of Boards. The Act found the voluntary system in possession, and did not attempt to dislodge it. It provided, however, for the establishment of School Boards, and the erection of fresh schools wherever they were needed. In the working of the Act it is true that School Boards with their exceptional powers and almost unlimited funds have enjoyed enormous advantages over the managers of voluntary schools. But the intention, no doubt, was to give the voluntary schools fair play; and the experience of fifteen years has amply justified the policy of the Act. If it has proved anything, it has proved this: that the country has no desire for the extinction of the voluntary schools, and that the voluntary schools, in spite of the disadvantages under which they labour, are able fairly to hold their own against their more favoured rivals. The voluntary schools inspected in England and Wales, which numbered 8,281 in 1870, with an average attendance of 1,152,389, had increased in 1884 to 14,580, with an average attendance of 2,157,292; while the Board schools in 1884 numbered only 4,181, with an average attendance of 1,115,832.[1] This is the

[1] "Report of Committee of Council," 1885, p. ix.

answer of the country to the offer of an unsectarian, rate-supported education. Two out of every three children in attendance are attending voluntary schools. Remembering that the voluntary schools comprise the majority of schools in country districts and in the poorer quarters of large towns, and that their buildings and equipment are for the most part older and less complete than those of Board schools, and their teaching staff, for lack of means, often inferior, it cannot be said that they are inefficient or compare badly with the Board schools, when it appears that the percentage of passes in reading, writing, and arithmetic in all voluntary schools in 1884 was 83·89 against 85·47 in the Board schools.[1] The voluntary schools are strong, therefore, in their results, and in the possesssion of the confidence of the country, and an immediate and direct attack upon them would not be likely to be successful. The attack, therefore, is to be made covertly, and even with an outward show of liberality. The proposal now made is to establish a system of Free (or rather tax-paid) Education by a grant from the national exchequer of a sum equivalent to the present amount of school fees in all elementary schools. The ostensible purpose of the proposal is, of course, to relieve the labourer from the payment of school-pence, which Mr. Chamberlain, with his usual extravagance of language, describes as "an intolerable burden"—"a cruel and abominable tax." Let us see what relief the poor would really derive from such a measure.

The amount of school-pence paid in all the elementary schools in England and Wales in 1884 was £1,734,115, an increase of £74,372 upon the previous year.[2] It suits Mr. Chamberlain to describe this as a mere trifle. It is more than a quarter of the income of the schools from all sources. It is nearly double the amount now raised by rates throughout the country. It would add considerably more than half as much again to the present Government grant.[3] It is a sum which, I venture to say, no Chancellor of the Exchequer would be willing to add to the annual taxation of the country without very urgent reason. And it does not include any provision for Scotland or Ireland, which, I presume, would demand to be treated in the same manner; nor can it be taken to be the limit of the cost of such a measure even for England and Wales, as the amount must be expected to increase annually with the increase of the number of children on the books and in average attendance. But it is quite impossible to suppose that the addition to the national expenditure would end with

[1] "Report of Committee of Council," 1855, p. 222. [2] *Ibid.*, p. viii.
[3] See Table XIV., "Report," p. 230.

this large and continually increasing grant. With so great an increase of the Government grant to voluntary schools, there must inevitably come a large increase of Government control, more imperative demands upon managers and teachers, and the exaction of a greater quantity and higher quality of secular instruction, which will still further encroach upon the time and diminish the attention given to religious teaching, and thus vitally affect the very object for which the schools are maintained, and tend to destroy their value in the eyes of their supporters. This would, I fear, be the certain result of such a measure, if it were to take its natural course unaided. But the declarations of Mr. Chamberlain and his friends, which I have already quoted, show that they would endeavour to accelerate such a result by insisting upon "some form of representative control" as a condition or consequence of the increase of the grant. The author of the Radical Programme refers (p. 172) to "the determination of the Liberals" (or rather of his section of the Liberal Party) "to bring up again, when occasion should serve, the whole question of education by means of schools under private management;" and Mr. Chamberlain, in his letter to the Dean of Wells, declared that he regarded "the present position of voluntary schools as anomalous," and would make provision for "some popular representative control of the schools during school hours, leaving the use of the buildings at all times, except those when the secular instruction is being given, to the subscribers and general managers." But we may retain as much use of our school buildings as this on a transfer to a School Board under the 23rd section of the Act of 1870, and is it likely that managers and subscribers would continue to bear the expense and trouble and responsibility of maintaining schools, when they might have just as much use and control of them without? The inevitable result must be that sooner or later the cost of maintaining the present voluntary schools must fall upon School Boards, or their place be supplied by schools under Board management. How vast an increase of expenditure this would involve may be imagined when we remember that while the cost per scholar in average attendance in all the voluntary schools in England and Wales in 1884 was £1 14s. 10½d.,[1] the cost per scholar in Board schools, excluding charges on account of capital, was £3 2s. 8¼d., or, including capital charges, was £4 11s. 5½d.[2] Let me illustrate this by saying that while at

[1] "Report," pp. 236, 237.

[2] The cost per scholar given in the "Report," pp. xxxvii. and 237, as £2 1s. 8½d., includes the cost of "maintenance" only. The figures above given are arrived at by comparing the expenditure of the Boards shown on p. 91, col. 7, with the number of children in average attendance, p. 237.

this rate a voluntary school, with an average attendance of 300 children, would cost £523 per annum, a Board school with the same attendance would cost £940 per annum, or, reckoning—as must, indeed, fairly be reckoned—its proportionate share of capital charges, such as purchase of land, furnishing, and repayment of loans, no less than £1,371 per annum. The absorption of the voluntary schools into the costly School Board system would involve, therefore, a total expenditure, assuming only the present attendance, of at least ten and a half millions; or, including capital charges—which, as I have said, cannot properly be excluded—of upwards of fifteen millions per annum. How rapidly this expenditure would increase may be inferred from a statement in the "Report" for 1885, that "the amount annually required to meet the liabilities incurred by School Boards in providing school accommodation . . . . increased from £627,112 in 1882 to £734,262 in 1884, and now requires a rate of 2·1d. in the pound on the ratable value of school districts, as against a rate of 1·9d. in 1882."[1] The loans to School Boards sanctioned up to the 1st of April, 1885, amounted to £17,355,954 19s. 3d.[2] The "Report" remarks, with a grim humour not common in official documents, that "the School Boards have availed themselves freely of the power of borrowing on the security of the rates given by the Acts of 1870 and 1873."

What relief would the poor derive from this enormous increase of expenditure? Levied though it would be, of course, by direct taxation, the burden must fall upon all classes of the community, and the pressure of it must be felt most severely, as is always the case, by the poorest, because it is the poorest who can least afford any increase of their expenses. The over-taxed shop-keeper must increase the price of his goods, the over-taxed landlord must raise his rent, and the labouring man must suffer. And for what? Not for the schooling of his own children mainly, but for the instruction of the children of

---

The Rev. J. Glendinning Nash, in his letters to the *Morning Post* in September last, estimated the cost of each scholar in Board schools at £5 2s. 5d., and I have hitherto adopted his estimate. But he includes in the total expenditure of the Boards, outstanding liabilities other than loans, which, on consideration, I think ought not to be included, as they may be expected to come into the account next year.

[1] Page xxxiii. How reckless the expenditure has been is shown by the statement (p. xi.) that the average cost of erecting voluntary schools, *with residences for the teachers*, has been about £5 7s. per scholar, including, as a rule, the value of the sites, very often given gratuitously; while the estimated cost per scholar of the School Board schools, including the cost of sites, is about £12 5s. The average salary of 380 masters in voluntary schools in the metropolitan district in the past year was £152 9s. 5d., and that of 313 masters in Board schools was £257 15s. 5d. (p. xxv.).

[2] Page xi.

people who are perfectly well able to pay for it themselves, who do not ask and do not want a remission of fees, but who would in fact derive the greatest benefit from this vast expenditure. Nearly half the entire number of children in elementary schools are paying from 3d. to 9d. a week. These cannot be supposed to be subject to any hardship. The "Report" mentions schools in Cambridge—schools receiving a Government grant, and classed as elementary schools,[1] and therefore included among those in which fees are proposed to be remitted, where "an observer might note, say, a wealthy merchant's children descending at the . . . . school door from a carriage and pair, [or] a clergyman's children coming in daily by rail from the country" (p. 309). The Oxford Garden School of the London School Board is said to be "draining the higher class private schools, not only in its immediate vicinity, but elsewhere."[2] It is children going to such schools as these, and at present paying, as I have said, from 3d. to 9d. a week, children who remain longer at school than the children of the working-classes, who require the instruction of superior teachers, and use more expensive books and materials—it is these children whose education costs the most, and it is the cost of educating these children that this measure would throw upon the labouring classes. The relief would be altogether illusive. The working-man now pays a small sum in school-pence, "the price of a quart of beer a week," as Mr. John Bright said the other day, for the brief period of his children's school-days. This measure would relieve him of this small payment to saddle him in exchange with a burden to be borne throughout his whole lifetime. The French peasant says, according to M. Monod, "I used to pay for my own children, now I pay for other people's." The English labourer might say, if this measure were passed, "I used to pay for my own children for a few years, now I pay for people who can perfectly well afford to pay for themselves, and I have to pay for them all my life long."

And what other advantage is claimed for the system of Free Education, besides this more than doubtful relief of the working-classes? We are told it will promote regularity of attendance. The author of the Radical Programme quotes a comparison made by Dr. Watts of the attendance at the Manchester Free School with the attendance at some of the Board schools in Manchester, in favour of the Free School by

[1] They are so entered on p. 522.

[2] *Kensington News*, October 31, 1885, quoted in *Church Quarterly Review*, January, 1886, p. 352. It appears from the financial statement of the Board that the children are actually supplied with books gratis at the cost of the ratepayers.—*Times*, February 5, 1886.

from 22 to 37 per cent. On the other hand, the Rev. R. R. Hutton, Chairman of the School Attendance Committee for the Barnet Union, compares two schools in Barnet, at which the fees range from 1d. to 6d. with a free school there. The total accommodation of the former is 760, and of the latter about 100. The number of complaints of non-attendance at the former in the three weeks taken was 34, and at the latter in the same three weeks was 20, a difference of at least 16 per cent. in favour of the schools where fees are paid. But I do not believe that the question can be determined by any comparison of individual instances. The attendance at individual schools may depend very much upon the master, or the managers, or the reputation, or even the situation, of the school. The question can only be fairly settled by a large induction. I ascribe more importance to the statement of Mr. Miall in 1870, that the whole of the evidence produced before the Duke of Newcastle's Commission, of which he was a member, went to show that free schools "were the worst possible schools, and that parents who had to pay something for the education of their children valued the instruction thus given much more."[1] And the reports on education in the United States, where the experiment has been tried on the largest scale, point to the same conclusion. It is true that the author of the Radical Programme asserts that "in the United States they get a much better attendance without compulsion than we do with all our irritating compulsory machinery;"[2] but as a matter of fact, there is compulsion in several of the American States, and the percentage of average attendance, according to the "Report of the Commissioner of Education for 1884," shows a percentage of average daily attendance varying from 33·41 in Maryland, where there is no compulsion, to 86·32 in New Hampshire, where there is compulsion. The length of the school year in America varies, however, from only 62 days in North Carolina to 199 in Maryland. Supposing, for the sake of comparison with our own average attendance, a uniform school year of 200 days, the average attendance would vary from 26·93 in Western Virginia to 65·11 (the highest) in Massachusetts.[3] The average attendance in this country being about 75,[4] it cannot be said that the experience of America tends to

[1] The Chairman of the London School Board has stated that "he had obtained statistics to show that the attendance of children whose fees were remitted was worse than the attendance of children whose fees were paid."—*Standard*, 1st February, 1886.

[2] It is delicious to see this attempt to throw odium on compulsion by those who were the strenuous advocates of compulsion in 1869.

[3] Letter of the Rev. T. C. Morse, *Times*, September 12, 1885. See also Dr. Rigg's letter in the *Times* of November 10, 1885.

[4] Report, 1885, p. xvi.

show that free schools promote regularity of attendance. Non-attendance and irregularity of attendance are in fact the standing complaints of educationists in the United States, and Mr. Jacobson, a citizen of Chicago, has lately published a pamphlet in which he gravely proposes that a pecuniary compensation should be made to parents for the loss of their children's labour, in order to induce them to send them to school. In fact, the causes of irregularity are there, as here, not the school-pence, but the want of the children's earnings, or of their help at home; sickness, want of clothing, and especially want of boots; distance from school in country places and bad weather; and, above all, inability of the parents to control their children. Sitting as a magistrate I have over and over again heard parents declare that they were utterly unable to manage children of eight and ten years old; that they sent them to school, but the children did not choose to go, and nobody could make them. These are excuses which Free Education will not affect here, as it has not affected them in America. I do not say that there is no hardship at all. I have no doubt that there are many cases where poor parents have to struggle hard to pay for their children's schooling. They have to struggle much harder, however, to pay for their children's food and clothing, and it would be as reasonable to provide free boots for everybody or free bread, because some people find it hard to pay the shoemaker or the baker, as to provide Free Education for everybody, because some people find it hard to pay the school-pence. It is a hardship, I think, that parents not of the pauper class should have to apply to the guardians for the payment of school fees for their children. To say the least, it must make the road to pauperism easier. But the proportion of children whose fees are paid by the guardians is very small—a little over 3 per cent. of the number on the registers. I am sure that a remedy might be found for these cases. Some of the inspectors suggest that representatives of the school managers should be elected to the Attendance Committee. I have proposed that a committee be appointed by the School Board or Magistrates in every district, of which the Correspondents of voluntary schools should be ex-officio members. Let application for aid be made to this committee. Let them grant certificates which may be accepted by the managers of any school, and the amount due on them be claimed and paid by the Education Department with the annual grant. There will be no disgrace in this, no taint of pauperism. It will secure independence and a due sense of parental responsibility to the great body of parents, and the increase of expense will be almost inappreciable. The payments will probably go almost

entirely to Board schools; but where they do not, being a Government grant, they will not be open to the objections alleged against the 25th clause of the Act of 1870.

Mr. Chamberlain talks about the unpopularity of our present system of education. I do not believe it is unpopular on the whole. But Free Education will not make it less so, for it will not remove either of the complaints which are now made against it. It will not lessen the rates, which are the chief cause of grumbling among the middle class; nor is it proposed, as far as I know, to abolish compulsion, which is the chief cause of grumbling among the poor. I heard, indeed, the other day, of a Wiltshire labourer who, when he was asked why he supported Free Education, said it was because he thought it was quite right that a man should be free to send his children to school or not as he liked, just as it used to be in the old days; but if the good man imagined that this is what Mr. Chamberlain means by Free Education, he is certainly doomed to disappointment. What Mr. Chamberlain does mean by Free Education, however, is a much more serious thing. It is an alteration of the whole basis of our system. It is a shifting of the responsibility from the parent to the State. The Government of 1870 was most careful to leave this responsibility upon the parent, while aiding him, whenever necessary, to fulfil it. The principle is actually enacted in the Act of 1876, in the fourth section of which it is provided that "it shall be the duty of the parent of every child to cause such child to receive efficient elementary instruction in reading, writing, and arithmetic." In opposing Mr. Dixon's amendment in favour of Free Education in 1870, Mr. Forster said: "If they were broadly to lay down the principle that the State ought to pay the cost of the education, they would, in effect, say to the great body of parents throughout the country—'We think it our business rather than yours to educate your children.'" And this is precisely what Mr. Chamberlain and his friends now propose to do. It is true that the parent may still pay in rates or taxes, but he will pay as a ratepayer or taxpayer, and not as a parent. It is true that at the present time he is assisted by the State, and perhaps by private benevolence; but the school-pence are a continual reminder, and the payment of them a constant exercise of his duty. Free Education must inevitably weaken the parent's sense of obligation to his child. And it will as inevitably, I fear, weaken the obligation of the child to the parent. But more than this. In assuming the entire responsibility for the education of the child, the State must necessarily assume a very much larger share of control. And with the extension of State control our schools must lose the independence,

variety and freedom which have hitherto been their characteristic excellences. At the Trades Union Congress, at Southport, last autumn, a resolution was passed protesting against the introduction of drill into elementary schools as a cunningly devised plan to prepare the way for conscription. In this particular case I think the Congress was wrong. I believe that drill was introduced only for the sake of the physical improvement of the children. But the alarm arose out of a right instinct. The Government control of our schools would involve serious danger both to civil and religious liberty. And it is no answer to this to say that the Government is dependent on the will of the people. The despotism of a democracy may be as dangerous as the despotism of an autocrat.

But the most fatal result of Free Education would be the loss of religious teaching. For a system of State education which, as I have shown, must be the result of Free Education, and which is indeed the declared object of its advocates, must be in the end a secular system. For a little time School Boards might maintain that unsectarian teaching which Mr. Holyoake called "Parliamentary piety." But what no one would be much interested in keeping up, and what a great many people would be eager to put down, would not be likely to last very long. Even now I suspect that the religious instruction in Board schools would not bear much looking into. The Devonport School Board professes, and I believe with perfect sincerity, its desire to provide religious instruction in its schools. On the eve of the recent election a ratepayer took the trouble to make some inquiry at the nearest Board school. He found that no religious instruction had been given there for a month. The explanation of the master is that his school was a little backward in some subjects, and he had omitted the religious instruction in order to work up the children in other matters. I have heard of other instances of the same kind, and I believe that if careful inquiry were made, it would be found to be no uncommon occurrence. I say deliberately that I think it would be better to have no religious instruction at all, than to have it treated like this. I can imagine nothing more likely to injure and degrade religion in the eyes of the children than to have it dealt with as a subject of secondary importance, to be set aside for the sake of vulgar fractions or geography. But with the great and constantly increasing requirements of the Code, this is certain to be the case, unless the managers themselves feel the primary importance of religious teaching, and are resolved that before all things the school shall be a religious school.[1] It was declared by the

[1] As a school manager for nearly twenty years, I may venture to urge

Committee of Council in their instructions to their inspectors in 1840, that "no plan of education ought to be encouraged in which intellectual instruction is not subordinate to the regulation of the thoughts and habits of the children by the doctrines and precepts of revealed religion." Five-and-forty years have greatly altered the views of the Committee of Council. Under their present Code, reading, writing and arithmetic are obligatory. Other subjects, such as singing, drawing, and geography are optional. Specific subjects, such as Mechanics, Chemistry, Latin and French, may be taken by individual children in the upper classes. Over and above these, "instruction may be given in other secular subjects, and in religious subjects." This, I believe, is the only mention of religious teaching in the Code. A school may be classed as excellent in which not a prayer is offered, nor one verse of the Bible read, nor one syllable of religious instruction given from the beginning of the year to the end. We, as managers of Church schools, however, still remain faithful to the principle that intellectual instruction should be made "subordinate to the regulation of the thoughts and habits of the children by the doctrines and precepts of revealed religion." It is for this that we are spending our time, our money, and our labour upon our schools, our training colleges, and our system of diocesan inspection. It is this that we are defending against Mr. Chamberlain and his friends. I believe that the country is still loyal to religious teaching. In spite of the lavish expenditure of School Boards, and the great inducements they can offer, two-thirds of the children are still sent to voluntary schools. The result of this agitation, if it were successful, would be to deprive the people of these schools, which they have shown that they prefer. It would be to impose an enormous burden of taxation, under which the poor must chiefly suffer. It would be to take the education of children out of the hands of their parents and entrust it to the State. It would be to destroy a religious system, and to set up a secular system in its place. To all this, when the facts are plainly put before the country, I cannot believe that it will consent.

JOHN SHELLY.

---

on my fellow-managers the importance of attending at the Diocesan Inspection, and of showing the teachers and children that they consider it to be at least of equal importance with the visit of the Government Inspector. It is also most necessary on engaging a new teacher to ask for the Report of the Diocesan Inspector as well as the Government Inspector on the teacher's previous work. I wish it were not needful to add that the religious instruction of the pupil teachers is of vital importance to the future as well as the present usefulness of our schools. Unless religious teaching is so real as to be worth fighting for, Churchmen cannot be expected to fight for it.

ART. II.—THE MASSORETIC TEXT, AND THE VERSIONS OF THE OLD TESTAMENT.

IN the February number of this Magazine, I endeavoured to give some account of the Massorites, and I pointed out that the object of the Massorah was not the formation of the text, but the fencing it round with safeguards, to prevent any deviation whatever from that which they had received. And the great bulk of the notes by which they effected this was not invented by them, but handed down to them by tradition.

Now this word *tradition* has an evil reputation. When the controversy raged between the Buxtorfs and L. Capellus as to the date of the vowels, what made it so bitter was the tacit assumption that if tradition was on one side, truth must be on the other. And when the controversy was ended by the concession that the vowels were modern, or at all events, that the sounds remained unwritten until forms for expressing them were invented in the years 550 and 570 A.D. respectively, some of the most learned scholars of the Reformation period rejected them. And to this day many Hebraists persist in the refusal to concede to them any authority whatsoever. Since the appearance even of the Revised Version a new translation of the Old Testament has been published, the work of Mrs. Spurrell, a lady of no mean attainments; and in it she rejects the vowels, and makes her translation direct from a text consisting of consonants only. And this is nothing new or extraordinary. All Biblical scholars who possess for their studies that indispensable condition for accuracy, a knowledge of the languages in which the Scriptures were written, draw a sharp line of demarcation between the consonants and the vowels; though I for one am prepared to attach considerable authority to the latter. And if I must give my reason, it is because I regard them as having the authority of the Jewish Synagogue. The Palestinian Massorites began to commit them to writing about 570 A.D., but I believe them to be, as far as the sounds went, ancient, and that the work of the Massorites was to contrive a system which made the traditional method of reading the Scriptures independent of oral teaching and memory. And even before this date something had been done to settle doubtful places by the insertion in the text of what are called *matres lectionis*; that is, certain consonants which indicated what were the right vowels.

But what authority had the tradition itself? Had corruptions crept in unawares? Had the text even been falsified wilfully under the influence of dislike to Christianity? The

Jerusalem Talmud, as I mentioned in my last paper, gives an account of the *Tikkun Soferim*, "the Restoration of the Scribes." Might not the scribes have been right, and these *restorations* been amendments without MS. authority? Let me take a suspicious case. St. Paul quotes Hab. i. 5, as follows: "Behold ye despisers, and wonder, and perish." The LXX. has: "Behold ye despisers and regard, and wonder wonderfully and perish." The Syriac: "Look ye audacious ones and regard, and wonder, and be astonished." But the Massoretic text and the Vulgate: "Look on the nations," etc. Now first of all, the preposition is a difficulty, though cleverly got over by rendering, "Behold ye among the nations," so that it does not trouble an English reader as it does one who has a knowledge of Hebrew. He is used to find that preposition indicating the object and not the subject (see Gen. xxi. 16, xxxiv. 1; Exod. ii. 11; Ps. cvi. 5), and would translate, "Look ye on the nations."

And in the second place, commentators always have to explain why the heathen are addressed, when the sense requires that it should be the Jews. Now the whole difference in the Hebrew consists in the lengthening of the top of a single letter, whereby a *w* becomes *d*. Evidently it was read in the second century with a *d* in Palestine, for so it appears in the Versions of Aquila, Theodotion, and Symmachus. In the Vulgate, too, we find "in gentibus;" but Jerome notices that he had found authorities which read, one *contemptores*, the other *declinantes*. But surely St. Paul, who had studied at the feet of Gamaliel, must have known what was the reading in his days, that is, in the first century; and as the LXX. was made, as we have reason for believing, from copies written in the old, now called the Samaritan, character—and as *w* and *d* are quite unlike there, it would not have been easy for the translators of the Septuagint to have made the mistake.

Now I mention this simply as one out of many instances in which the Massoretic text has been accused of an anti-Christian bias. And this is a case in which it is averred that a consonant has been tampered with, and not merely the vowels changed. Was it beyond the power of the scribes at Tiberias, or even of one leading Rabbi, to indoctrinate his pupils with a "restored" text, which suited controversial purposes? Had we only the Massoretic text, with what scorn would the negative critics treat a work which was the outcome of the silent studies of a very obscure body of men, many centuries after the Christian era had begun. And what answer could we give? Where should we find that "reason for the hope that is in us," which St. Peter requires every well-taught Christian to be prepared to give to all questioners?

I venture to think that the Versions alone enable us to give a confident answer to gainsayers. I grant all their imperfections, though the charges brought against them are often greatly exaggerated, and made by men who do not know how to use them rightly. With shame I acknowledge that not one of the chief authorities has received thoroughly satisfactory editing, nor has anyone been examined as to its bearing upon the Massoretic text. Here and there commentators have made a passing remark upon some differences of reading. What we need is, first an accurate edition of the Massoretic text, such as that which Dr. Ginsburg is preparing; and next, accurate editions of the LXX., the Peshito, and the Vulgate; finally, that some company of scholars should collate these with the Hebrew text, treating them as MSS., just as in critical editions of the New Testament the readings are given which are found in the most ancient translations. Such a comparison of the Hebrew text, the weakness of which lies in its modern date, with these ancient authorities, would prove its general trustworthiness, while .in many places it would certainly offer us better readings.

For the Massoretic text, though remarkably good, is, like all human things, not absolutely perfect. I will mention only a solitary instance. In 1 Sam. xiii. 1 it says: "Saul was one year old when he began to reign." I regret that any attempt was made in the margin to amend the passage, because what the Revisers have put there is misleading. The Alexandrian text of the LXX. agrees with the Massorites, and we thus have proof, first, that this error—for it can scarcely be anything else —is of vast antiquity; and secondly, that the Massorites did not tinker up their text.

I propose, then, to give a brief account of these texts and versions, considering them as ancient witnesses, whose testimony really gives us confidence in the general trustworthiness of the work of the Jewish scribes.

And first we have the text of the Pentateuch, written in Samaritan characters, and also a translation of it into the Samaritan dialect. The first is a very important document, if only because it has been in the custody of a sect who were bitter enemies of the Jews, and also because it is in the ancient character. For what is now called the Samaritan alphabet is really that of the Jews before the exile, as is proved by the inscriptions found in the aqueduct of Siloam and on the Moabite Stone.

Now the Samaritans assert that they have at Nablous a copy of the Pentateuch which belonged to Abishah, son of Phinehas, son of Eleazar, son of Aaron. And this they preserve in an antique silver case, photographs of which were taken by the

agents of the Palestine Exploration Fund. We may well believe that what they have is very old, but that its antiquity has been exaggerated. Our editions rest chiefly upon the MSS. brought by Archbishop Ussher from Damascus; and Kennicott, in his great work on the Bible, has noticed all the variations from the Massoretic text. Professor Petermann has edited a new edition of the Samaritan Pentateuch, and Dr. Heidersheim is editing a new edition of the Targum—that is, its translation into the Samaritan dialect. Both offer various readings, but absolutely the same text as the Hebrew.

We next come to a group of works which are the product of Jewish learning at Tiberias in the second century. These are the Targum of Onkelos, and the translations into Greek made by Aquila, Theodotion, and Symmachus. Onkelos is generally supposed to be identical with Aquila, in Greek Akulas; and his Targum is believed to contain much ancient matter, received by him from Jewish Rabbins by tradition. These three men were all Greeks, and converts to Judaism, and hence probably their desire to commit to writing what the Jews were satisfied with having in the form of oral tradition; they wished also to give their countrymen a more accurate translation of the Hebrew text than that found in the LXX. It is curious, nevertheless, that both this Targum and the Samaritan Version and Pentateuch all show signs of the influence of the Septuagint, which is surely a remarkable testimony to its importance. The value of this group, of which, however, the remains, excepting the Targum of Onkelos, are but fragmentary, is, that being of Palestinian origin, they carry the Massoretic text back to the second century, with, upon the whole, unimportant variations. And thus the Hebrew received text no longer rests upon the authority of the Massorites, but is carried back to the age of the Soferim or scribes.

There is yet another Palestinian authority, namely, the Latin Vulgate. It was in the interval between 391-403 A.D. that Jerome made this translation, having settled at Bethlehem about six years previously, and being then a man of middle age. In order to master the Hebrew language, he was visited secretly at night by a Jew named Bar-Aninah, and subsequently had teachers from Lydda, and from Tiberias itself. Jerome's Version was thus made under Jewish influences; but he had devoted many years previously to Biblical studies, and had access to MSS. which have long since perished. He was, moreover, a Christian, and a man of a very controversial mind; so that we may with good reason look upon him as an independent witness, who shows us what was the text current among the Jews at the end of the fourth century of our era.

But these witnesses have not proved as yet very much.

Leaving out of consideration the Samaritan text and Targum, we have had before us five Palestinian authorities, and they at least show that the Massorites did not form the textus receptus of the Jews; for it existed two centuries before in Jerome's days, and four centuries before in the days of Aquila and his compeers. They give us different readings, but the same text. But what security have we that this text had not been tampered with at Tiberias by those translators into Greek, seeing that two at least were perverts, who had abandoned Christianity for Judaism?

We appeal, then, to a document even more important than the Vulgate—namely, the Peshito-Syriac. Here, again, we have a text which deserves a scholar-like edition. The materials for the work lie unused in the British Museum in the shape of valuable MSS.; and whereas in Walton's Polyglott the vowels have little authority, a Syriac Massorah is to be found there, ready for the editor's use. Something was done by Dr. Samuel Lee for an edition of the Peshito published by the Bible Society, but we need much more before we can rely upon its readings. Now, for this translation of the Old Testament into Syriac, the claim has been put forward that it was made centuries before Christ. This I think improbable; but Edessa was converted to Christianity at an early date, and claimed Adai, one of the Seventy, as its apostle. It was its great pride that it accepted Christ in the years immediately following His crucifixion, and it claimed to be impregnable owing to a promise of its inviolability given by Him to Abgarus, its king. Now, we find that the Peshito Version not merely existed in the fourth century, but is treated by the great Syriac poet and commentator, Ephraim Syrus, who flourished in that century, as the received Version of the Bible in his Church. We may well believe that the Christian missionaries to Mesopotamia carried with them there copies of the Hebrew Scriptures, and that a translation was made, gradually perhaps, but early enough for it to be an old book in Ephraim's time. Here, then, we get two things of primary importance: for, first, the Peshito is a Christian translation; and, next, we have good reason for believing that it was made from MSS. older than the time when the Jews might have been induced to tamper with the Scriptures under the influence of feelings hostile to Christianity.

Now, generally this Version supports the Massoretic text, but it offers us many more variations than we find in the Vulgate. It often has a difference of consonants; still more frequently a difference of vowels. But this is just what we should expect; for the second century of our era was the great age of Jewish activity upon their sacred books. It was then

that the right reading in many doubtful places was settled, and notes began to be contrived for preventing uncertainty for the future. In the Peshito we have a text of a date anterior to this labour, and one, therefore, which enables us to form a judgment upon it.

We need not suppose that the MSS. taken into Mesopotamia were very choice and of especial merit; more probably they were average specimens of what was then current. Nor need we condemn the work of the Jewish schools during the second century. It may have removed many errors and settled many difficulties correctly. But in the Peshito we have the materials for forming a judgment both upon the Hebrew text current in our Lord's days, and upon the work of the scribes of Tiberias. And we must add that Ephraim, a competent authority, speaks of "our Version" in a way that shows his respect for it.

There remains one still more venerable witness, namely, the Septuagint. This was the work of Jews, but settled in Egypt, chiefly at Alexandria, and betrays, except in the Pentateuch, a defective knowledge of Hebrew, and the use apparently of indifferent MSS. But it does not, therefore, cease to be of immense value, though it does require care and judgment in its use.

It probably began with the translation of portions of Holy Scripture to be read in the synagogue, and as the Pentateuch would be the part most needed, this would be first turned into Greek, and hence its greater correctness. But the very necessity of the translation arose from the fact that the Jews in Egypt, giving themselves to trade, were losing the knowledge of their mother tongue. There would still be Rabbins and learned men, but as more and more of the commonalty ceased to have a knowledge of Hebrew, it was a wise forethought which led to their Scriptures being given them in a language which they understood. As for the want of knowledge of Hebrew, we must remember that even in Palestine the common people spoke an Aramaean dialect, and that Hebrew was a learned language. And the longer they lived in Egypt, the more the knowledge possessed even by their most learned men would decline; so that we do not wonder that often they could not translate a word at all, but were content to write it down in Greek characters.

The story of the Version having been made by seventy-two men, six from each tribe, was rejected long ago by Jerome, and is scarcely worth referring to. It is more important to notice that the Vatican and our Alexandrine MSS. seem to represent two recensions. Of the former there is a valuable critical edition by Holmes, and Dr. Field has given us a very careful edition of the Codex Alexandrinus, which is one of the many precious treasures of our own British Museum.

Now, as regards the LXX. I shall make but two remarks: the first, that it absolutely knows nothing of the vowels used by the Massorites. Its pronunciation of the words is altogether different, and as the vowels constantly settle the sense, even where it represents the same consonants it often gives them a different meaning. And next as regards the consonants, these it often groups differently; and even where it separates them into the same words, it presents a large number of various readings.

Now, granting that the MSS. used in Egypt were of indifferent quality, and the knowledge of the translators small, yet it was the LXX. which prepared the heathen world to receive Christ. It is quoted as Scripture in the New Testament, and for centuries it sufficed for the sustenance of souls in the Christian Church. And to us it is valuable, not merely for its antiquity, but because it is so absolutely independent of the learning of the Jews in Palestine. I do not believe that such learning existed anywhere at the time when the LXX. was made. It was a slow upgrowth, which arrived at maturity in the second and following centuries at Tiberias and Sura. I believe that the textual work of the scribes there was thoughtful, and, upon the whole, trustworthy. But I could not come to this conclusion unless I had the materials for forming a judgment; and those materials are chiefly given me by the Peshito-Syriac and the Septuagint texts. And for a last word, I find in these many "recensions," to use the word employed in the Preface to the Revised Version of the Old Testament, not a very large uncertainty, but its corrective. I believe the Massoretic text to be eminently good and trustworthy, because I have the materials for forming a judgment; and that is supplied me by the evidence of the many witnesses which the good Providence of God has given us, from various countries and of various dates, but all testifying to the substantial accuracy of the Jewish traditional text. It is not perfect; nothing with any human admixture is so. But it justly holds the post of authority, and emendations can be accepted only if supported by solid proof. To make light of these documents is to turn out of court our witnesses, and depend upon the loud assertions of an advocate. So to do were folly indeed. The true scholar will reverently use all the helps that God has given him, and it is only one weak in faith who fancies that the Word of God cannot endure the most searching inquiry. The believer regards it as the gold that will be made only the more pure by the refiner's fire.

R. Payne Smith.

ART. III.—THE HOUR OF COMMUNION.

WE feel assured that the readers of THE CHURCHMAN will gladly welcome a paper which aims at opening the way for a discussion of this subject in a spirit of historical investigation and honest criticism.

It is a subject of which it may perhaps be said that it has had of late years too much and too little attention directed to it—too little, inasmuch as hasty deductions have sometimes been drawn from premises too lightly investigated—too much, because we believe it will be found, as the result of a more careful inquiry, that in the earliest and purest ages of the Christian Church it was regarded as among things indifferent.

The best known, if not the most noteworthy, utterance in the writings of Christian antiquity on the matter, is found in the oft-quoted Epistle of St. Augustin to Januarius. He regards the prevalent custom of coming to the Communion *fasting* as resting on Apostolic authority, and as due to the teaching or guiding of the Holy Ghost. He says:

Liquido apparet, quando primum acceperunt discipuli Corpus et Sanguinem Domini, non eos accepisse jejunos. Numquid tamen propterea calumniandum est universæ Ecclesiæ quod a jejunis semper accipitur? Ex hoc enim placuit Spiritui Sancto, ut in honorem tanti Sacramenti in os Christiani prius Dominicum Corpus intraret, quam ceteri cibi. Nam ideo per universum orbem mos iste servatur. Neque enim quia post cibos dedit Dominus, propterea pransi aut cœnati fratres ad illud sacramentum accipiendum convenire debent, aut sicut faciebant quos Apostolus arguit et emendat, mensis suis ista miscere. Namque Salvator, quo vehementius commendaret mysterii illius altitudinem, ultimum hoc voluit altius infigere cordibus et memoriæ discipulorum, a quibus ad passionem digressurus erat. Et ideo non præcepit quo deinceps ordine sumeretur, ut Apostolis, per quos ecclesias dispositurus erat, servaret hunc locum. Nam si hoc ille monuisset, ut post cibos alios semper acciperetur, credo quod eum morem nemo variasset. Cum vero ait Apostolus de hoc Sacramento loquens; *Propter quod fratres cum convenitis ad manducandum, invicem expectate: Si quis esurit, domi manducet, ut non ad judicium conveniatis:* statim subtexuit; *Cetera autem, cum venero ordinabo.* Unde intelligi datur (quia multum erat, ut in epistola totum illum agendi insinuaret, quem universa per orbem servat Ecclesia), ab ipso ordinatum esse quod nulla morum diversitate variatur.—Epist., Lib. ii., Ep. liv. § 8. Op., tom. ii., c. 126-7. Edit. Ben., Paris, 1679.

Those who know anything of the paramount influence exercised by the writings of St. Augustin on Western Christendom (an influence for which we should be devoutly thankful) will not be disposed to wonder that after such a *dictum* as this from the Bishop of Hippo, a kind of horror should have affected men's minds at the thought of evening and post-prandial Communions, as if there were danger in allowing them of sinning against the Holy Ghost. We feel

sure that pious minds, in our own days, and in our own reformed Communion (following herein the example of some even of the most ultra-Protestant of the Reformers[1]), have been affected by this influence, as well as those in the ages which more immediately followed the great African theologian.

And in saying this, we do not mean at all to imply that such a feeling was not older than St. Augustin. It appears to have been growing in the previous centuries.

But with respect to the change of practice as to receiving the Holy Communion (and it is generally acknowledged that a change of practice there was), from the more primitive custom of evening celebration to the later habits which prevailed long before St. Augustin's days, we should remember that, scant as are the materials for investigation in the early part of the second century, we are yet, after the lapse of so many ages, in a better position than St. Augustin was for instituting an inquiry as to the origin and history of this very remarkable change.

Will St. Augustin's theory of an Apostolic origin of the later practice bear the light of closer historical inquiry? If not, can history suggest any other cause that may account for so conspicuous a change in the religious customs prevailing throughout the Christian world?

These are questions on the answers to which very much must depend.

As to the first question, there is, we believe, an entire absence of any trace, in the days of St. Augustin or in any previous days, of anything like a tradition bearing witness to an injunction for such a change having proceeded either from the Apostolic College, or from any number of Apostles, or from any single Apostle. St. Augustin's language does not suggest the idea of his having ever heard of such a tradition. His argument in favour of an Apostolic origin for the change seems to rest entirely on the fact of the new custom being so widely prevalent, and on the words of St. Paul, "the rest will I set in order when I come," as suggestive of some regulation which the Apostle was intending to make, and which *might have been* such an admonition as would account for the change.

And this absence of all tradition on the subject, if it be a fact, must be felt to be a very significant fact.

On the theory of any Apostolic ordinance on the matter, this silence would be very difficult to account for, even if there

[1] See *e.g.*, Bullinger. "This banquet requireth fasting and empty guests; but yet not so fasting that a man may not taste of somewhat aforehand for his health's sake" (Decades, V., Sermon IX., . 423. P.S. Edit). See also Hutchinson's Works, P.S. Edit., p. 222.

were no occasions on which an appeal to such a tradition might be expected. But, as a matter of fact, there are sayings to be found in the writings of early Christians in which reference to such a tradition would have been natural—we might almost say, would have been called for—if it had existed.[1]

But the importance of these passages is brought low by the fact that there are statements of history and there are sayings of Fathers which seem sufficient not only to disprove the knowledge of any such tradition, but to prove (or to go a good way towards proving) that the position of such as hold an Apostolic origin for the change is absolutely untenable.

It is not necessary to lay stress on the acknowledged exceptions to the rule of fasting Communion as generally prevalent. It is of course conceivable that an Apostolic ordinance against evening Communion may have allowed the exception of Maundy Thursday, even as St. Augustin allows it in this same Epistle;[2] though, if there were anything in afternoon Communion repugnant to the true doctrine of the Eucharist, or to any sacred instinct awakened in the Church by such doctrine, the exception is not easy to be accounted for.

But the statement of Socrates concerning the custom of evening and post-cœnal Communion in the Thebaid, and the parts of Egypt about Alexandria,[3] must be allowed to present an enormous difficulty in the way of accepting any theory of the Apostolic origin of an injunction forbidding the practice.

It has, indeed, been urged that this remarkable exception serves to "prove the rule."[4] And it may be very well admitted that it does, by its peculiarity, serve to draw attention to the prevalent rule which it violates. But none the less would it avail, even if the Thebaid had been a far less considerable portion of Christendom than it was, to break the neck of any "quod semper, quod ubique, quod ab omnibus" argument. Will anyone believe that a Church which had occupied so prominent a position in the early history of Christianity had in such a matter as this deliberately gone counter to the ordinance of Apostles and the guidance of the Holy Ghost?[5]

---

[1] See *e.g.*, quotations in Bingham, xv., ch. vii. § 8, vol. v., pp. 298, 299. It will be observed that the Canons of Councils (for the most part) have relation especially to the fasting of Presbyters. The Council in Trullo is the first (A.D. 691 or 692) to claim the authority of tradition (*ἀποστολικαῖς καὶ πατρικαῖς ἐπόμενοι παραδόσεσι*, c. xxix).

[2] This was afterwards forbidden by the Council *in Trullo*, and that on the alleged ground of Apostolic tradition.

[3] Socrates, "Hist. Eccles.," v. 22. See Sozomen, "Hist. Eccles.," vii. 19.

[4] "Evening Communions" (Church Press Co.).

[5] Mr. Scudamore "Not. Euch.," p. 34, Edit. 2) says, "There was a

Dean Plumptre has remarked:

The practice noticed as an exception to the practice of all other Churches (comp. Augustin, "Epist. ad Jan." i. 5) was probably a relic of the Primitive Church, both as to time and manner, when the Lord's Supper had been, like other suppers, eaten in the evening; when an evening meeting on "the first day of the week" meant, according to the Jewish mode of speech, the evening of Saturday; when the thought that "fasting" was a necessary condition of partaking of the Supper of the Lord was not only not present to men's minds, but was absolutely excluded by the Apostle's rule, that men who could not wait patiently when the members of the Church met, should satisfy their hunger beforehand in their own houses (1 Cor. xi. 34).—"Dict. of Christian Antiquities," *voc.* Agape, vol. i., p. 41.

But to turn now to some of the sayings found in the writings of Christian antiquity.

St. Chrysostom was accused of having administered the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper to some after eating. He denies the charge, indeed, distinctly and with indignation. But denying it, he says: "If they still go on to object this . . . . let them depose the Lord Himself, Who gave the Communion to His Apostles after supper."[1]

---

considerable exception to the rule in Egypt, but it was regarded as blameworthy."

It is classed by Socrates among the singular customs of certain churches, but without any special note of blame. It must have been known to the Patriarch of Alexandria, and it called forth no patriarchal or synodal condemnation. This is unaccountable on the supposition of its being in contravention of any then known Apostolic or equivalent authority.

The Christians of the Thebaid (which a while later swarmed with hermits) were very little likely to have adopted a less ascetic custom than the rest of Christendom in violation of any Apostolic ordinance. They were likely to have preserved an ancient practice, in spite of changes in all the rest of the world. In Trajan's reign the Gospel had made so little progress in the Thebaid that the sparse Christian population were very little likely to have caused trouble or apprehension to Roman Governors, who may well be supposed to have thought it not worth while to interfere with their evening *agape*. (See Gibbon's "Decline and Fall," ch. xv., vol. ii., pp. 363, 364.)

[1] It is to be observed also that St. Chrysostom had been equally blamed for administering Baptism without fasting. This charge also he denies. He says, "They object against me, 'Thou didst first eat, and then administer Baptism.' If I did so, let me be anathema. . . . But if I had done so, what absurdity had I committed? Let them depose Paul, who baptized the jailor after supper."

Εἰ δὲ ἄπαξ καὶ τοῦτό μοι λέγουσι, καὶ φιλονεικοῦσι, καθελέτωσαν καὶ τὸν Παῦλον, ὃς μετὰ τὸ δειπνῆσαι ὁλόκληρον τὸν οἶκον ἐβάπτισε· καθελέτωσαν καὶ αὐτὸν τὸν Κύριον, ὃς μετὰ τὸ δειπνῆσαι τοῖς ἀποστόλοις τὴν κοινωνίαν ἔδωκε.—"Epist. ad Cyriacum," Edit. Bened., Paris, 1721; tom. iii., p. 668.

It is to be well observed that St. Chrysostom regards the administra-

Could St. Chrysostom have written such words as these, if he had had the faintest suspicion of the practice having been forbidden by Apostolic authority?

Besides this, we have a homily of St. Chrysostom addressed to the people of Antioch, in which, supposing his hearers to come sometimes (however unwillingly) to Communion after eating and drinking, he expressed no horror at such conduct, but speaks of the care that should be taken to preserve moderation and sobriety in such circumstances; and he adds a warning to those who turned away from the Lord's Table because they were not fasting in these words—*σὺ δὲ κατάγνωσιν εἶναι νομίζων τὸ μὴ νηστεῦσαι καὶ ἕτερον προστίθης ἔγκλημα πολλῷ μεῖζον καὶ χαλεπώτερον τὸ μὴ τῆς ἱερᾶς ταύτης μετασχεῖν τραπέζης*;—Edit. Bened., 1718, tom. ii., pp. 97, 98.

Certainly these are not the words of one who regarded fasting Communion to be of Apostolic ordering.

Again, to go back to the middle of the third century, St. Cyprian rebukes the Aquarians for this, that they used for their Communion water only in the morning, though they used also wine in the evening. But in his rebuke is not a word of censure for their practice of administering the Communion at all in the evening.[1] Is it possible that St. Cyprian

---

tion of Baptism and the administration of the Holy Communion after supper as standing on the same ground. And then the following words will be found very important: *Εἰ δὲ καὶ ἔφαγον καὶ ἐβάπτισα, οὐδὲν ἄκαιρον τῶν πραγμάτων ἐποίησα . . . . λέγουσιν ὅτι ἔφαγον καὶ ἐβάπτισα· καθελέτωσαν οὖν Παῦλον, ὅτι, μετὰ τὸ δειπνῆσαι ἐχαρίσατο τῷ δεσμοφύλακι τὸ βάπτισμα. τολμῶ λέγειν, καθελέτωσαν καὶ αὐτὸν τὸν Χριστὸν, ὅτι μετὰ τὸ δεῖπνον τοῖς μαθηταῖς τὴν κοινωνιάν ἐχαρίσατο.*—"Hom. ante Exilium" (Edit. Bened., Paris, 1721; tom. iii., p. 418). Note.—This part of the homily is considered by the Benedictine editor of doubtful authenticity. Whoever the writer may be, he is expressing the opinion of St. Chrysostom as contained in the letter to Cyriacus, which Montfaucon receives as genuine.

[1] Bingham, in reference to this, remarks very well, "He would not so easily have passed over the practice of the Aquarians, in celebrating in the evening, had there been no instances of the like practices in the Church; but as it was customary in Egypt to celebrate the Eucharist on Saturday, after dinner, and in Afric one day in a year after supper; all he pleads for upon this point is only this, that the general custom of the Church to celebrate the Eucharist in the morning only, was not against the rule of Christ, though He gave it in the evening after supper: because Christ had a particular reason for what He did, which He did not intend should oblige the Church. Christ offered in the evening to signify the evening or end of the world; but we offer in the morning to celebrate our Saviour's resurrection. And he gives another reason why they did not celebrate in the evening generally as in the morning, because the people could not so well all come together in the evening as in the morning."—Ant., b. xv., ch. vii., § 8.

could have taken no notice of this if he had known of any Apostolic rule against such a usage?

But, perhaps, the most important witnesses in this matter will be found in documents which have only recently become available as evidence in this case. Whatever date may be assigned to the "Teaching of the Apostles" (*i.e.*, within possible limits), and whatever value may be assigned to this discovery of Bryennius—and we incline to think that, some years to come, its value will not be rated so high as at present—there can be scarcely a doubt that it represents a state of things in the Church, or some portion of it, in which post-prandial or post-cœnal Communion was the ordinary rule and practice.

It has been suggested, indeed, that the words Μετὰ δὲ τὸ ἐμπλησθῆναι[1] may possibly be interpreted metaphorically, as when St. Paul says, "Be filled with the Spirit." But such an interpretation must be acknowledged to be highly forced. And Dean Howson,[2] who made it, adds, "It is more natural to us to see here the *agape*, the combination of a common meal with the Eucharist. 'Cœna communis nondum separata ab agape,' says Hilgenfeld." That such is the true meaning of the Διδαχὴ can hardly, we think, admit of a doubt.[3] But if this is so, the evidence is unmistakably clear, and indissolubly cogent. We are looking at a scene of post-Apostolic times, and we see the Eucharist partaken of by Christians after being filled with a repast (or as a part of a repast), and a repast which none will maintain to have been the meal of the morning. Certainly at this date no known Apostolic ordinance had enjoined early or fasting Communion; nor had any instinct of reverence taught Christians to shun a post-prandial Eucharist.

And this evidence is strongly confirmed by the witness which has just been made available by the learning of the Bishop of Durham. We say "just made available," because the words we are about to quote from the Epistle of St. Ignatius belong to a recension which some (especially since the publication of the "Corpus Ignatianum") have regarded as of doubtful authority, but which is now established as the genuine writing

---

[1] The "Constitutiones Apostolicæ," which stand to the Διδαχὴ in somewhat the same relation as the interpolated Ignatius to the genuine (Professor Harnack regards both these interpolations as coming from the same hand), paraphrases the words by Μετὰ δὲ τὴν μετάληψιν. See Swainson's "Greek Liturgies," postscript, p. xlix.

[2] CHURCHMAN, Aug., 1884, p. 331.

[3] "The Communion and the *agape*," says Dr. P. Schaff, in his edition of the "Didache," "were then inseparably connected, the *agape* preceding, the Communion completing, the Christian Passover."—"The Oldest Church Manual," p. 60, 1885.

of the Martyr.[1] "It is not lawful," says St. Ignatius, "apart from the Bishop, either to baptize or to hold an *agape*" (οὔτε βαπτίζειν οὔτε ἀγάπην ποιεῖν).

Observe the things which are here forbidden to be done without the Bishop's sanction.

The one is to administer the sacrament of Baptism. What should we expect the other to be? Assuredly to administer the sacrament of the Lord's Supper.[2] How is it expressed? By the words ἀγάπην ποιεῖν.

Now we can very well understand how a special pleader, δίσιν διαφυλάττων, might insist on the fact that there is here no distinct mention of the Eucharist at all; that the words may very well be understood of simply keeping a love-feast. But if we are so to interpret St. Ignatius, we are driven to the conclusion that he did not think it necessary to prohibit the celebration of the Eucharist apart from the Bishop, while he did feel it needful to forbid a social meal. Is not this a *reductio ad absurdum?*

And the only alternative is to suppose that ἀγάπην ποιεῖν included the partaking of the Supper of the Lord. In other words, we are driven to the conclusion that at the date of the martyrdom of St. Ignatius, the Eucharist still formed part of the ἀγάπη as it had done, we know, in the Apostolic age.[3]

[1] Professor Harnack, while in some points differing from the Bishop, writes (in *Expositor*, Jan., 1886, pp. 9, 10): "He (Bishop Lightfoot) has discussed the longer Greek recension and the Curetonian Epistles, and has shown that the former was fabricated in the fourth century, and that the latter is a harmless collection made about the year 400, or somewhat earlier. The demonstration is so complete that it is no longer necessary to spend words on the question. . . . After repeated investigation, the genuineness of the Epistles seems to me certain, and I hold the hypothesis of their spuriousness to be untenable."

[2] The Ignatian interpolator accordingly substitutes οὔτε προσφέρειν οὔτε θυσίαν προσκομίζειν οὔτε δοχὴν ἐπιτελεῖν.—See Bishop Lightfoot's note, vol. i., p. 387.

[3] We venture to quote the following from Bishop Lightfoot: "In the Apostolic age the Eucharist formed part of the *agape*. The original form of the Lord's Supper, as it was first instituted by Christ, was thus in a manner kept up. This appears from 1 Cor. xi. 17, *seq.* (comp. Acts xx. 7), from which passage we infer that the celebration of the Eucharist came, as it naturally would, at a late stage in the entertainment. In aftertimes, however, the *agape* was held at a separate time from the Eucharist. Had this change taken place before Ignatius wrote? I think not. The words οὔτε βαπτίζειν οὔτε ἀγάπην ποιεῖν seem to describe the two most important functions in which the Bishop could bear a part, so that the ἀγάπη must include the Eucharist. Indeed, there would be an incongruity in this juxtaposition, as Zahn truly says (I. v. A., p. 348), unless the other great sacrament were intended.—See, *e.g.*, Tertull., 'De Virg. Vel.,' 9: 'Non permittitur mulieri in ecclesiâ loqui, sed nec docere *nec tinguere nec offerre*;'

Early and fasting Communions were not yet the rule of the Christian Church. The date of this writing of St. Ignatius was probably within the first twenty years of the second century.[1] And it will be allowed that this mere *obiter dictum* of his carries with it great weight as evidence, tending to show that an Apostolic rule for receiving the Holy Communion only in the morning, and only before any other food, there could hardly have been.

It would appear, then, that we are driven by a considerable combination of evidence to seek elsewhere for a cause to account for such a remarkable phenomenon as the general change in this matter of the practice of almost the Universal Church. Can any such cause be suggested? We think it can. We believe it may, with considerable probability, be found in the edict of a Roman Emperor. "What!" it will be asked, "could a heathen potentate's command avail to alter the custom of the Christian Church, and that in the matter of their most sacred ordinance? Is it conceivable that Christians of old time would not rather have suffered death than submit to receive orders from a Roman Emperor concerning the observances of their holy mysteries?" We answer —Doubtless in any matter which pertained to what was of sacred obligation, faithful Christians would have shed their blood rather than disobey the injunction of their Lord; but in a matter which they regarded as indifferent, there was no reason why they should not have altered their practice in obedience to the laws of the empire under which they lived. Their religious disobedience in matters which pertained to the faith of the Christian Church was made impressive by their willing obedience in matters non-essential, in accordance with the Apostolic injunction, "Put them in mind to be subject to principalities and powers, to obey magistrates, to be ready to every good work" (Titus iii. 1).

And, indeed, it seems to us somewhat strange that so little account has been taken of the evidence which we have of an edict which seems fairly to satisfy the requirements of the problem, and which (as far as we have the means of judging, and speaking generally) appears also to synchronize with the change to be accounted for.

In the letter[2] from the younger Pliny to Trajan the Emperor, relating to the Christians, he states:

Adfirmabant hanc fuisse summam vel culpæ suæ vel erroris, quod essent soliti stato die ante lucem convenire carmenque Christo quas

'De Exh. Cast.,' 7: '*Et offers et tinguis* et sacerdos es tibi solus."—Vol. ii., Sect. I., p. 313; see also vol. i., p. 386.

[1] See Lightfoot, vol. ii., Sect. I., p. 470; vol. i., p. 30.

[2] Written probably A.D. 112. See Lightfoot, i. 56.

deo dicere secum invicem, seque sacramento non in scelus aliquod obstringere, sed ne furta, ne latrocinia, ne adulteria committerent, ne fidem fallerent, ne depositum appellati abnegarent: quibus peractis morem sibi discedendi fuisse, rursus que [coeundi] ad capiendum cibum, promiscuum tamen et innoxium: quod ipsum facere desisse post edictum meum, quo, secundum mandata tua, hetærias esse vetueram.

The Emperor Trajan had a special dislike to clubs or guilds. He regarded them as having a dangerous political tendency. His exceeding sensitiveness in this particular is strikingly exhibited in a letter to Pliny, who had asked permission to organize a guild of workmen—to consist of not more than one hundred and fifty men—to be used only for the purpose of being ready to act as a fire-brigade. Trajan, in reply, says: "We must remember that this province, and especially those cities, are harassed by party associations of that kind. Whatever name we may give them, and whatever may be the purpose, those who have been brought together will form themselves into clubs all the same."

Again: the people of Amisa had presented a petition to Pliny respecting certain convivial gatherings, where there was a subscription supper. The city of Amisa was one to be dealt with, exceptionally, as being a free city under a special treaty. Their petition was sent by Pliny to the Emperor. And the Emperor's reply is to this effect: "As regards the Amisenes, whose petition you attached to your letter, if they are allowed by their laws, which they enjoy by virtue of the treaty, to hold a subscription supper (benefit club), it is competent for us to abstain from preventing their holding it; and this the more easily, if they employ such a contribution not for making disturbances or for unlawful gatherings, but to support the needs of the poorer members. *In all the other cities, which are subject to our laws, anything of the kind must be prohibited.*"

The reader is requested to give due attention to the sentence in *italics*. Its importance, in its bearing on the subject before us, is obvious.

Bishop Lightfoot, whose translation we have transcribed,[1] adds: "The letters [*i.e.*, the letters of Pliny] relating to the Christians follow almost immediately after this correspondence about Amisa; and Pliny not unnaturally, when this new emergency arose, viewed it in the light of the Emperor's previous instructions."

It was doubtless in reference to this direction of Trajan that Pliny writes concerning the Christians, "They asserted . . . it was their practice . . . to meet together again for a meal. . . But even from this they had desisted after my

[1] "Apostolic Fathers," vol. i., pp. 19, 20.

edict, in which, in pursuance of your commands, I had forbidden the existence of clubs (*hetærias*)."

"Lawful religions," writes Bishop Lightfoot, "held a license from the state for worship or for sacrifice, and thus these gatherings were exempted from the operation of the laws against clubs. Christianity enjoyed no such privilege. The first form in which any Christian body was recognised by the law was as a benefit-club, with special view to the interment of the dead." This fact appears to have been brought into prominence by De Rossi ("Roma Sotterranea").[1]

It seems inevitable, therefore, that the love-feasts of the Christians would fall under the imperial prohibition. And we have the direct evidence of Pliny that, as regards those under his jurisdiction, Christians declared that they had ceased to hold them after the promulgation of his edict.

The *agape* then was, we may suppose, from this time temporarily laid aside. But what as regards the Eucharist which had formed part of it? *That* they could not lay aside. But if it was not an essential part of the ordinance that it should be held in the evening; it might very well be celebrated as part of their early morning service.[2]

Is there anything very unnatural in the supposition that this change was made at this time in the region which came under the proprætorship of Pliny, and that the same cause was operative in the same direction sooner or later in other provinces of the empire?

There is no evidence of any early Communion before this date. After the reign of Trajan, we believe it will be found that although the *agape*[3] has by no means disappeared from view (it was but natural that under succeeding Emperors it should have its revival),[4] the Eucharist has become (though not without exception) the service of the morning.[5]

And if this be so, then it will be admitted that some considerable amount of evidence has been adduced to show that the practice of early and fasting Communion came into the

[1] See Lightfoot, vol. i., p. 20.

[2] That the separation of the Eucharist from the *agape* resulted from the edict of Trajan is the view advocated by Professor Harnack. Probst supposes that the separation had been made earlier. "But he assumes," says Bishop Lightfoot, "without any evidence, that the change took place in St. Paul's time, in consequence of the Apostle's denunciations of the irregularities at Corinth."—See Lightfoot, vol. i., p. 52.

[3] Tertullian's description of the *agape* gives no place for the Eucharist (Apol., c. xxxix.), which, in Justin Martyr's time, had become a separate Service.

[4] It seems to have had power to survive even the prohibition of Councils.

[5] When, on stationary days, it was deferred till 3 p.m., it was still, in the African Church, always received fasting. Conc. Carth. III., c. xxix.

Christian Church, not of Apostolic ordering, but in part, at least, of Christian obedience to imperial regulation.[1]

There are, no doubt, difficulties—some of them sufficiently obvious, and some of them apparently serious—in the way of accepting this theory.

There is, first, the entire absence of any support for the theory from the writings of Christian antiquity. The evidence in its favour, such as it is, comes altogether from without—there is none from within the Christian Church. We look in vain for any statement made by any Christian writer of that age bearing any sort of witness to this imperial command as influencing the practice of the Church. And equally vain is the search (we believe) for any trace of any tradition in succeeding generations such as will give any support to the statement of Pliny. And certainly some trace of such a tradition might have been looked for; its absence undoubtedly seems strange.

In answer, however, to this objection, it may be pleaded that there is an entire absence of *any* reliable tradition of any other cause to account for the change. Some reason for the change there must have been. It may be very strange—it is a curious fact, that we have no account whatever of the change from the internal history of the Church. It is not more strange and unaccountable—it is, perhaps, rather somewhat less strange—that there should be such a silence concerning it from *this* cause than from any other cause that may be assigned.

Another difficulty arises from the way in which, afterwards, a religious character attached itself to the observance of the new rule. There is no question that before long, whatever account may be given of the change, the new practice assumed in the eyes of Christians an appearance of propriety and sacredness, such as is more easily accounted for on the supposition of its having a Christian than a heathen origin. This objection should have due weight given to it. We will only venture to express an opinion that it will lose weight in proportion as we become conversant with the way in which feelings varied and changes grew, and habits of mind developed, and tendencies to asceticism multiplied, and approaches to superstition increased, as years rolled on, even in the early ages of the Christian Church.[2]

---

[1] Other circumstances may doubtless have concurred to bring about the change. Bishop Lightfoot considers it a reasonable inference, from Pliny's language, that the severance was due to those charges of immorality brought against the Christian festivals in the age of Trajan, and to the persecutions ensuing thereupon. Vol. i., p. 386.

[2] Even if, rejecting altogether the testimony of Pliny, we suppose that the growing tendencies of the Church, which enjoined fasting for the

A far more serious difficulty remains. If we are to rely on Pliny's statement, the Christians asserted that as the result of his edict, their love-feasts had already been discontinued. But Ignatius, if we accept the date usually assigned to his martyrdom, writing towards the close of the reign of Trajan, uses language which, as we have already seen, must be understood to connect the Eucharist with the *agape*.

This *is* a difficulty. But it must be remembered that the date of Ignatius's writing is, after all, very uncertain. It *may* have been before the issue of Trajan's edict. And even if it were after that date, it is quite open to us to suppose that the influence of the edict had not yet been felt in the parts with which Ignatius was conversant. It is clear that (to use the words of Bishop Lightfoot) "in some parts of Asia Minor, and probably at Antioch, the two (the *agape* and the Eucharist) were still connected when Ignatius wrote" (i., p. 52).

And this supposition will harmonize with the suggestion we have already made that the mandate of the Emperor with reference to *hetæriæ*, would affect the different parts of the empire, not probably all at once, but gradually, and as circumstances might make its operation to be tardy or expedited.[1]

But at all events the difficulty will not be anyway removed or lessened by supposing, as has been supposed by some learned men, that the separation of the Eucharist from the *agape*, and its removal to the early service, had been effected before the imperial prohibition. There seems to us little to support this supposition, and something considerable to be urged against it.[2] But what we are concerned with now is to

---

sacrament of Baptism, are sufficient to account for the general spread of the requirement that the Eucharist also should be received fasting, which would necessitate its separation from the *agape;* and that this alone was the cause of the change of practice in the Church, it must still (we think) be acknowledged to be a post-Apostolic innovation, which crept in with no real Church authority. Even at the date of the Διδαχή fasting was enjoined before baptism.

[1] It seems not altogether improbable that in some places the first effect of the edict may have been to break up the larger gatherings of the *agape* into more private meetings for the same purpose. And it is not perhaps an impossible supposition that this practice, in part, may have led to the admonition of Ignatius that they should not be held apart from the Bishop. In some provinces the Emperor may not have thought it necessary to issue any instructions on the subject.

[2] It rests on the words of Pliny: "Se sacramento obstringere," etc. But there is nothing in any ancient liturgy to which the description of Pliny could apply. If his *sacramentum* is to be understood as "a sacrament," it could hardly be any other than the sacrament of Baptism. But it is probable that Pliny did not use the word in any ecclesiastical sense. And it must be remembered he is only repeating what had been re-

observe that it leaves this difficulty exactly where it was. We have to reconcile the assertion of Christians, as reported by Pliny, that the *agape* was held no more, with the language of Ignatius, which evidently implies that those to whom he was writing were accustomed to hold their *agape* still. How the language of Pliny is to be reconciled with the language of Ignatius is more than we can presume with any confidence to determine. But certainly that reconciliation will not be expedited by supposing that the Supper of the Lord had before this ceased to form a part of the *agape*. And the connection in which the words of Ignatius stand, serves at least very strongly to suggest that no such separation was so much as known to him.

We are not aware that any other objections of any weight can be urged against the view we have ventured to maintain.

It is too much, doubtless, to expect that we shall carry all our readers with us in all the particulars of our argument. Nor would we ourselves desire to speak too confidently on matters over which the light is dim—too dim for any to see clearly—and on which, therefore, all conclusions must be more or less conjectures.[1] But this much, we venture to submit, may be regarded as pretty certain, that the rule of early and fasting Communion is as destitute of any kind of Apostolic support as it is of any synodal[2] authority in the primitive Christian Church.

And now, in conclusion, we will venture to take with us this deduction, to add force to a very cogent Scriptural argument.[3]

---

ported to him, and what he may probably have very imperfectly understood. See also the well-considered statement of Canon Robertson, "Hist.," vol. i., p. 18.

[1] Many will probably think (perhaps with good reason) that too much prominence has been given to *one* cause of the separation between the *agape* and the Holy Communion. The profound silence of the early Church leaves room for the suggestion of *various* causes. The effects of persecution, rendering the meetings for the *agape* impossible; the strange growth of asceticism, which peopled the deserts with men whose religion largely consisted in fasting—these and other causes must doubtless, at any rate, have conduced to make the change easy and natural. And when the change was once effected, these causes would certainly have operated in the way of making the practice of early Communion to be permanent. But we are disposed to question whether these causes alone are sufficient to account for so remarkable a change being effected *about the same time* so generally throughout the empire.

[2] The Third Council of Carthage which enjoined fasting Communion was held A.D. 397.

[3] If, with Bishop Lightfoot and others, we should be induced to think the Eucharist had been removed to the morning service before the edict of Trajan by reason of persecution and the stigma of "Thyestean banquets," there will be nothing deducted from the force of this argument.

Irreverent abuses, nay, serious profanation did occur in the Corinthian Church in the days of Apostles, in connection with evening Communion. We have in Scripture a severe Apostolic rebuke of the behaviour of some members of that church at their evening gatherings to receive the Supper of the Lord. Bnt we know that, so far as Scripture is concerned, these abuses were not corrected by any injunction that Holy Communion should be received early and fasting. And we certainly think that it is something like a derogation from the high prerogative of Holy Scripture to suppose, that under such circumstances evening Communion should not have been clearly and absolutely prohibited in Holy Scripture, if the mind of the Spirit had been that evening Communions were in themselves reprehensible, or even to be generally avoided on account of the risk of irreverence.

But still it was, perhaps, possible for those who regard evening Communions as always and of necessity evil to suppose that there were some wise reasons unknown to us on account of which the Apostle refrained from expressing his full mind on the subject in his letter, intending to prohibit the practice on his arrival at Corinth; and that he was preparing them for such further ordering when he wrote, "The rest will I set in order when I come."

Against such a theory there are, indeed, objections of enormous weight. To say nothing of the unnatural force which it seems to put on the Apostle's words,[1] how could we reconcile such an intention of the Apostle with the fact that after this, evening Communion was his own Apostolic practice?[2]

But now looking back at the language of Scripture from the

[1] It would make τὰ λοιπά mean, or at least include in its meaning, other and different, and in some points contrary, directions concerning the same matter.

[2] It is, with some probability, inferred indeed from Acts xx. that at Troas the Apostle held the *agape* after administering the Holy Communion; whereas the language of 1 Cor. xi. has (with good reason) led many learned men to conclude that *there* the Eucharist had followed the *agape*. (See Suicer, *in voc.* Ἀγάπη; and Bingham, xv. 7, § 7.) But it is impossible to escape the evidence that at Troas the brethren came together in the evening for the purpose of Communion. It has been argued, indeed, that "as St. Paul's sermon continued till midnight, he did not communicate till some time after" (Rodwell's "Are Evening Communions Scriptural?"); so that this was a *very early* Communion. But will it be maintained that when the brethren came together to break bread they knew that the Apostle's discourse would last till the morning? or that St. Paul purposely prolonged his sermon that the Communion might come after midnight? On the connexion of the *agape* with the Eucharist and the practice of Apostolic times, see Döllinger's "First Age of the Church," pp. 228-300.

standpoint to which (as it seems to us) we have attained—the assurance that the practice of evening Communion was never prohibited by the Apostle St. Paul, nor by other Apostolic authority—how are we to reconcile it with any adequate view of the sufficiency of Holy Scripture or of any divine guidance for the Apostles, that the practice of evening Communion was allowed—and after evil resulting was continued to be allowed—was never reproved, never forbidden (not even temporarily when it led to profanation)—on the hypothesis that now evening Communion ought always to be reproved, and never to be allowed in the Christian Church?

The feeling—the sentiment of St. Augustin and his days, was by St. Augustin made to rest upon—it was felt (and, we think, it is felt) that it needs to be supported by—Apostolic authority; and Apostolic authority is found utterly to fail it.

In Apostolic times we see Apostles sanctioning evening Communion by their own practice. We see an Apostle dealing severely with evils that have connected themselves with the practice; and we find him still not only allowing the practice, but not even suggesting that in consequence of the evil attending it might be well to discontinue it.

In Apostolic and sub-Apostolic times, we have no reason to believe that the sacrament of the Lord's Supper, with all its awful sacredness and all its high significance, was usually received otherwise than (in some sense) as a supper, at supper-time.

And if it be so that the Christian Church was moved, or mainly moved, to deviate in this matter from Apostolic precedent, not by any sense of religious fitness, but by willing accommodation of its practice in things indifferent to the authority of the empire, or to circumstances which made evening assemblies to be dangerous, then certainly there is something to be said in favour—now that he that letteth hath ceased to let—of a reformed Church—a Church reformed on the principle of acknowledging the supremacy of Scripture, and going back to follow the example of the earliest and purest ages of Christianity, returning in this matter—or at least allowing the return—to what was undoubtedly the rule of the Christian Church in the days of Apostles and of Apostolic traditions.

We should be deeply grieved to be, and we should be sorry even to seem to be, advocates of anything tending to irreverence, or of anything that might derogate from the dignity of these holy mysteries. And we gladly acknowledge that the dislike of evening Communion is in many minds associated only with a fear of its possibly leading to a less sacred estimation of the Eucharist, and has no necessary connection with the dangerous and materialistic view of the sacrament which

has of late years been brought into this Church of England. Nevertheless, we believe that the practice of Apostolic times and the revival of that practice in our own times bears a very important testimony against these innovating doctrines.

And we can hardly think that a charge of irreverence can justly be brought against a custom which Apostolic practice has certainly sanctioned, and which in the Scriptures of the New Testament is nowhere disallowed. N. DIMOCK.

ART. IV.—CLERGY PENSIONS.

THE subject of pensions for the clergy has been so long under discussion that it is a relief to have it at last presented to the Church in a practical form, by the promoters of the "CLERGY PENSIONS INSTITUTION." And for this we are mainly indebted to the Rev. C. J. Robinson, Rector of West Hackney, and Mr. John Duncan, F.I.A..

Now that the "Form of Application for Admission" to membership has gone out to every clergyman in England and Wales, it may be worth while to sum up the arguments in favour of the establishment of such a scheme, and to explain the nature and object of this Institution, which proposes to deal with the question at once.

Briefly, the "Clergy Pensions Institution" is a scheme for increasing the endowments of the Church of England, with a view to providing for her clergy the benefit which is secured to officers in the Army and Navy, by the system of retirement on half-pay. The Church of England has no funds at her disposal at the present time for this purpose. Neither the Ecclesiastical Commissioners, nor the Governors of Queen Anne's Bounty, have any monies out of which they could legally grant pensions. Existing endowments are inadequate. If the incomes of the beneficed clergy were equalized they would only provide an average gross income of less than £250 a year. A thousand benefices offer an annual income under £100, and three thousand under £200. The incomes of the beneficed clergy are further reduced by the payment of a very large proportion of the stipends of seven thousand assistant curates; by a diminution of about 20 per cent. (or one-fifth) in the value of tithe rent-charge since 1880; and by the difficulty of letting glebe farms, and the low rent at which it is now alone possible to let them at all. Then there are but fourteen thousand benefices, and the clergy number twenty-four thousand. Of the beneficed clergy many have new

district parishes, in which they are dependent for their income on seat-rents, or on the offertory, sources which suffer by the long-continued depression of trade; and which suffer, too, when age or failing health interferes with the efficiency of the incumbent's ministrations in the parish or in the pulpit.

The only provision now made for the retirement of the beneficed clergy is under the "Incumbents' Resignation Act, 1871." The objections to that Act are—that it deals with the case of the beneficed clergy only; that it is practically useless for the four thousand of those who hold benefices of a less value than £200 a year; that it provides the retiring incumbent with his pension at the expense of his successor, who has done nothing to deserve to forfeit a third of his income, and whose work may be considerably hampered in consequence of his diminished means. It is clear that fresh endowments are needed to supply for the clergy retiring pensions which shall be adequate in amount, securely guaranteed, and claimable by every clergyman who has spent his life in the service of the Church as the reward of that service, and therefore due to him from the Church. The establishment of such pensions would confer a benefit on the Church of England generally. It would benefit the older clergy, by holding out to them the certainty of an income on which they could afford to retire when overtaken by age or infirmity; the younger, by opening the prospect of a more rapid flow of promotion. It would benefit the laity by making far more easy than at present the removal of infirm incumbents, to be replaced by younger and more active men. Above all, it would be an act of justice on the part of the Church to her ministers.

Let us examine the method by which the "Clergy Pensions Institution" proposes to meet the needs of the Church in this respect.

We observe that it is a method which has the approval of the Archbishop of Canterbury, who has accepted the position of President, and of a considerable number of our Bishops, amongst whom are such cautious and practical men as the Bishops of London, Durham, Rochester, and Worcester; and we are in a position to know that financially it has the sanction of the highest actuarial authority. We are further informed that in the first instance it will be registered under the Friendly Societies Acts, and will be in effect a Mutual Provident Society, under the administration of a Board of Directors of influence and business experience. The whole available funds, after meeting necessary expenses, will be devoted to the beneficiaries, there being no shareholders, nor capital, as in a Joint Stock Company. The main feature of the Institution is that there are two Sections, A and B, the former insuring

Deferred Annuities for the clergy in return for definite payments made to them on business terms; the latter proposing to increase these annuities in the case of the clergy who are, or who become, unbeneficed, by a pension derived from an endowment fund created by extraneous contributions.

The deferred annuities under Section A will be granted at exactly the same rates as those of the recently published Government Tables. No clergyman will benefit under Section B who has not become a member of the Institution under Section A; for *Self-help* is the fundamental principle of the Institution. If the laity of the Church are to be expected to do their duty, the clergy must also do theirs.

In order to meet the immediate wants of the clergy, it is intended to admit any clergyman in England or Wales under the age of sixty-five, who applies for admission at once as an "original member," on payment of an annual subscription ranging from £2 2s. up to £7 7s., according to the age of the applicant. Subsequently clergymen not joining under twenty-five years of age can only be admitted by purchasing a deferred annuity of £15, at the tabular cost according to their age; and the Directors will have full power to raise the terms in their case, if necessary.

The position of an "original member" is privileged, because up to the present the clergy have had no opportunity of qualifying for a pension. But the privilege is limited to the amount of the pension which he may hope to receive. The annuity which he can claim by virtue of the annual premium which he pays, will be the same as that which he could purchase at the Post Office on payment of the same amount, beginning at the same age—neither more nor less; but it is intended to allot the pensions under Section B so as to equalize the amount payable to the original members under the two sections together. The amount of pension which can be granted to all who may become beneficiaries in any one year will be determined every year by actuarial advice, and publicly declared. The pension so declared will be guaranteed to the beneficiary for life, either by the purchase of a Government Annuity, or by the hypothecation of the necessary portion of the funds of the Institution itself. It should be observed that as none of the annual payments of the clergy are applied to the purposes of Section B, the younger clergy are not placed at a disadvantage by the plan adopted for the benefit of "original members" of all ages. When the list of "original members" is closed, the normal condition will be at once attained, in which new members will be ordinees under twenty-five years of age, who can qualify for a premium by the annual payment of £2 2s., to secure a deferred annuity of

£15 on reaching the age of sixty-five (premiums repayable at death before that age). In all other cases—viz., that of clergymen neglecting to apply now and applying later on, that of future ordinees over twenty-five years of age at the date of their ordination, and that of future ordinees who neglect to apply till they are over twenty-five years of age, the rule will hold good that they must buy a deferred annuity of £15 at the tabular cost according to their age, or on such other terms as the Directors may deem desirable. Should a member become permanently incapacitated for work before reaching the age of sixty-five, he may retire on such proportion of his annuity as he would be entitled to claim at his then age, together with a pension reduced in the same proportion; or should he retain his vigour, and desire to continue his duties and his payments of premium beyond the age of sixty-five, he would receive a larger annuity on his subsequent retirement, and the full amount of pension to which he would have been entitled at sixty-five under Section B. Provision is also made for the case of members who wish to reduce, or to discontinue, their payments; so that the utmost care is taken that the clergy should not, under any circumstances, be losers by associating themselves with the Institution.

The principal objections that we have heard offered to the scheme are:—1. That it is not compulsory; 2. That it makes no provision for widows and orphans; 3. That it is one more added to the numerous clerical charities; 4. That it does not take into consideration men's private means, nor the value of the benefices which they have held, in regulating the amount of their pensions; 5. That it does not offer sufficient advantages to the members.

We believe that these objections may be satisfactorily disposed of.

1. A compulsory scheme would need an Act of Parliament, in other words, would involve indefinite delay; and it could only be imposed on future ordinees, and therefore would not come into operation for some thirty or thirty-five years after the passing of the Act.

2. Provision is already made for the widows and children of clergymen by existing charities, having an aggregate income of not less than £100,000 a year. No provision is yet made for clergy pensions.

3. The fund which the Institution proposes to raise under Section B is not more in the nature of charity than are the existing endowments of the Church. It is a righteous supplement to those endowments.

4. As a corollary from the above, the amount of the pension could not justly be made to depend on either the private

means, or the previous professional income, of the retiring incumbent. He has the same claim to the full amount that a retiring officer in her Majesty's service has to his half-pay, or a civil servant to his pension. In his case, as in theirs, it is allotted to him as the reward of service; the fact that he has served the Church for so many years of his life is alone taken into account. If a retiring clergyman feels that he does not need the pension, and declines to take it, it is an act of generosity on his part, which will operate to the benefit of his poorer brethren; but if he feels that, being justly entitled to it, he desires to claim it that he may use it as he pleases, he wrongs no one, and no one has a right to complain. The equal right to claim the pension is of the essence of the scheme. The question whether an incumbent availing himself of the Incumbents' Resignation Act would be qualified to draw a pension from the Institution, as well as from the benefice which he has vacated, would require careful consideration. The permission to avail himself of both sources of income would, however, have the advantage of increasing the inducement to retire, and so expediting the flow of promotion in the Church.

5. In adopting the Government Tables as the basis of the deferred annuities which it proposes to purchase for the clergy, the Institution aims at absolute security. The annuities themselves are small, because the scale is that by which the premiums are returnable in case of death; and this scale has been selected in deference to the expressed wishes of the clergy themselves, and for the benefit of their families. But though the annuity purchased by an annual subscription of £2 2s., may be small, members are at liberty to pay any larger premium they please to secure a larger annuity; and it is the pension to be added to the annuity which, it is hoped, will constitute the principal portion of the income on which an aged clergyman will have to depend on his retirement, and which no ordinary insurance office can give him. Considerable sums of money have already been offered to found the Pensions Fund, and there can be little doubt that when wealthy and faithful Churchmen realize the benefit which the Institution is calculated to confer upon the Church at large, they will come forward readily, and contribute largely towards this supplementary Church endowment. That the clergy themselves are alive to the advantages of the scheme is proved by the fact that before the end of January more than a thousand had applied to become "original members."

To sum up the advantages of the "Clergy Pensions Institution." It suggests a method by which adequate pensions may at once be secured to the aged and infirm clergy of our Church;

it offers absolute security; it is not dependent on the number of members, but will work as beneficially for twenty as for two thousand; it is no new charity, but a scheme for doing justice to the clergy; it entails no inquisitorial examinations into the means of the beneficiaries; it is national in its scope; it will welcome co-operation from existing Diocesan and General Clerical Charities; it establishes the two principles of self-help on the part of the clergy, and of the claim which the Church has on the laity to promote the efficiency of the ministrations which she offers them.

A large field is still open for the operations of the clergy charities, and it is much to be hoped that their administrators may see their way in the future to confer a benefit on the Church generally, by assisting the clergy whose means are limited to insure for deferred annuities of a larger amount than that which an annual payment of £2 2s. can secure; and that parishes and congregations may be induced to aid their clergy in the same way; while societies like the Additional Curates, or Church Pastoral Aid, Society might impress on the younger clergy the obligation of making some provision for their later years, by insisting on membership of the Institution as a qualification for the reception of a grant. Above all, we must look to our Bishops to bring the matter before their candidates for ordination, and, so far as they legally can, to stipulate with incumbents who give titles that the payment of the qualifying subscription to the Institution shall be included in the stipend which they undertake to give. By this means an important reform would gradually be effected in Church finance; those objects which the Institution has in view for the benefit of the whole Church would be attained; the clergy would be provided for in their old age; the flow of promotion would be accelerated, and the laity would be secured against inefficient ministrations.

AUGUSTUS LEGGE.

ART. V.—PERSONAL RECOLLECTIONS OF ALGERIA.

AS a general rule, the people who visit Algeria are probably in search of a health-resort either for themselves or others. As a winter residence, it has unquestionably many charms. At the first sight of Algeria, one feels that all its surroundings indicate a state of things as regards climate quite unlike anything which the visitor had ever experienced before, at least in any part of Western Europe. He feels that

he has entered a new quarter of the world, in which there is nothing to remind him of the scenery or the sights of the various countries which he has left behind him on the northern side of the Mediterranean. As he enters the harbour, there rises on his left the peaks of the mighty Atlas range, and the Djurjura with snow-clad summits, not too near, nor yet too far, to spoil the enchantment of the view. On his right the blue waters of the Mediterranean stretch far away into the hazy distance; while immediately before him, full in view, the city of Algiers rises up in a series of terraces, displaying very conspicuously houses of dazzling whiteness as the bright sun shines out upon them from a cloudless sky.

On the arrival of the steamer, the usual bustling energy may be observed among the rank and file of the luggage-carriers and hotel-touters. The features of many of these men is unmistakably of the Arab type. As the passengers land on the quay, the excitement becomes more intense, as each one is trying to secure the necessary arrangement for the transport of himself and family (unless he be what the Irish peasant calls "a lone man"), together with bag and baggage, to the hotel which he may have previously selected.

When fairly fixed in his "quarters," and after a somewhat late breakfast, he saunters forth to take the bearings of the place where, "barring accidents" (to use the phraseology of University boating language), he has made up his mind to spend the next five months. Solemn-visaged Moors, dressed in the peculiar costume of the country, may be seen listlessly loitering about. French soldiers, conspicuous by their well-known uniforms, are easily recognised; French priests, with their beards of nature's growth, pass and repass. Moorish Jews, in groups of twos and threes, stand chatting together. There is a balmy freshness in the air, and a clearness in the atmosphere, which at once impress the visitor the moment he leaves the house. The prominent character of Algerian meteorology is—light. No place has more of it. The sobriquet given to the city in the Arab vernacular language is *El Behejia*, which means "the brilliant." I have had experience of the Riviera, with its many prettily-situated health-resorts along the shore of the Mediterranean from Marseilles to Genoa; but in spite of all the advantages which they undoubtedly possess from their situation and climate, none of them, in my opinion, can be compared to Algiers. Evidently there are very many who inhabit the most favoured cities in Southern Europe who seem to give the preference to Algiers. This may be seen from the variety of nationalities which one meets with in the Arcade, in the streets—everywhere in fact. Marseilles, Lyons, Malaga, Rome, Palermo,

Malta, and many other towns send their contingent to North Africa for permanent residence. Of the French there are, or were, about 15,000; Spaniards and Italians, about the same number; Mussulmans, about 10,000; and a little over 7,000 Jews. To this total we must add the soldiers always forming the garrison, and the visitors who reside here during the winter season. Putting all these figures together, not less than 60,000 persons form the ordinary number of the inhabitants of Algiers each year from November to April.[1]

The French say *on s'ennuie jamais à Alger*. There is always something every day to interest or amuse the visitor, if indeed he is in sufficiently good health to be amused or interested. Things which in themselves are mere nothings, in the aggregate are important. A mind that has the capacity for enjoying little things which are novelties in one's experience, will never fail to find the surroundings of life in Algeria always agreeable. To a new settler in a strange country where

---

[1] The occupation of street porters is generally exercised by the natives of the country about Zab, the capital of Biskra. Hence the name Biskri at Algiers has become a synonym for these useful working-men. They help to load and unload the ships. They are also water-carriers. They form a sort of community at Algiers consisting of about a thousand individuals, and domiciled in a dozen sections, each having its special station.

There is another class of the natives called *Kabyles*. Their ancestors were called Berbers, who have been driven from the plains, their original places of abode, by successive invasions of the Phœnicians, the Romans, the Vandals, and the Arabs. They now inhabit the mountains, and are called Kabyles. One often meets them in the environs of Algiers in the Place d'Isly, scantily and shabbily clad, driving a mule or an ass laden with goatskin bottles, small baskets, etc., etc. They are the tillers of the soil, and cultivate grapes and various kinds of vegetables. The object of their visit to Algiers is mainly to sell eggs, oil, charcoal, and other products of their industry. Their garments are made of wool, and are three in number—one which extends below the knees, called the chelouhha, the haïk, and the burnous. They are all Mohammedans in their religious opinions, and so far as numbers are concerned, they are the most important class of the native population.

The *Arabs* are distinct from the Kabyles, and are far less advanced. They live a wandering life unlike the Kabyles, who remain stationary, and are evidently endowed with the organ of inhabitiveness.

The Arabs are distinguished by three general characteristics: 1st. The influence of consanguinity; 2nd. The aristocratic form of government; and 3rd. Disinclination to fixity of residence. They live in tents, which admits of their easy transit from place to place. They are divided into tribes, amongst whom justice is administered by *Cadis*. Their national food is called taäm, or *couscous*, made out of hard wheat, and granulated by a peculiar process, in which the women are great adepts.

Besides the Kabyles and Arabs there exist also the *Moors*. They are so called from Mauritania, of which they were originally natives. By the word Moors is meant all Arabs who lead a settled life, as distinguished from those who are of a nomadic character.

everything presents unusual appearances, there must necessarily be a good deal which appeals to one's natural curiosity. The types of the various races, and their singular and, in many cases, picturesque costumes, will at first engage the attention of the stranger. Then there is the special charm of the suburban gardens, with their constant verdure. The trees everywhere are clad in the brightest of green; palms, bamboos, orange groves, the eucalyptus, fig-trees. The interesting fact for the stranger is that it is in winter, while he is a resident in the country, that the trees are considerate enough to appear to their best advantage. In the spring the effect is by no means so striking. But what of that? the visitor has gone after enjoying the full benefit of his winter's sojourn.

Apart from the natural advantages of the place, the town itself will always afford the European much interesting research. The high town and the low town into which Algiers is divided are as distinct in their details as if they belonged to different countries separated by continents and by centuries from each other. In the low town are arcades where persons can exercise during all weathers, and never want some object of art to amuse the eye. The high town is particularly distinguished by its Moorish streets. There is nothing in the East which presents a more curious spectacle, which to the stranger supplies a source of inexhaustible explorations and surprises. The streets, if such they can be called, are unlike anything of the kind to be seen in Europe. In some respects they present a faint resemblance to the narrow alleys in the Chinese quarters of San Francisco, and with something of the same low type of demoralization. It would be impossible to describe the tortuosity of these streets—lanes would be a better word—so sombre, and primitive. The mysterious-looking dens which meet the eye as one goes forward, and the Moorish women, with their arabesque ornaments and dress, present a sight which can nowhere be met with except in the far East. Those who have been at Cairo or Constantinople say that on their return to Algiers, this part of the town loses nothing of its singularity and interest in their estimation.

All Arab women, from the age of fifteen to fifty-five, are obliged, in conformity with the rigorous caprice of conventional propriety, to be veiled. Some show both their eyes, others only one. It is said, I do not know whether it may not be in mild irony, that those who go about with both eyes exposed are married women, and that those who have but one eye visible are the unmarried. However this may be, one sees the two forms of head-gear at almost every turn.

There is a very urgent necessity for some kind-hearted Christian women to organize, or to assist in organizing, a

mission to the members of their sex among the population in the high town. The condition of the women is something deplorable, far exceeding anything that could be credited if it were described in its true colours. The women are extravagantly fond of ornaments. Their head-dress is composed mainly of small coins strung together, and carefully arranged so as to fall gracefully from their dark hair. Also chains of the same kind are worn round their necks. In the villages in the country no man who is a stranger is permitted to enter the house of any of the people. While the husband is out working, his wife remains rigidly indoors, engaged probably in making some article of dress. Frequently there are two or more women engaged in this occupation. Then they sit on mats in a sort of work-room, not belonging to their houses, and if anyone wishes to buy a burnous or anything of that kind, they are allowed under certain restrictions to enter.

I saw one young woman in one of the villages, about six miles or so in the country, about twenty years of age, walking from one house to another, and judging from the extraordinarily elaborate way in which her back-hair was plaited and interwoven with some bright yellow material, I should think that it must have taken up some considerable portion of the morning to work it into such a wonderful arrangement. It was all twined together into a single twist, about a foot in length, and so substantially inwrought with the yellow fabric that it stood out in exclusive independence from her head. The guide who was with me, being a Mussulman, was a privileged individual, and through his influence I was permitted to see the interior of some of the houses of the villagers in which there were no women at the time. As to the men—the Mussulmans—with rare exceptions they dress to-day as was the custom in the time of Abraham.

The language we hear in the street is many-tongued. Algiers in a remarkable degree possesses a polyglot population. You could not walk through any of the principal streets for half an hour without hearing a distracting variety of languages. Spanish, French, German, Turkish, Italian, Arabic, English, etc., combine in bewildering mixture all the languages of the world. The Algerians, like every other people, have their good and their bad sides of character. They are quick-tempered and irritable, not too sober as regards strong drink, jealous and vindictive. The least novelty attracts and amuses them like children. Their festivals are carried on with uproarious mirth, for which they have powers of endurance, which few people in other countries possess. On the other hand they are very obliging and kind-hearted, much enduring, and resigned to annoyances against which others would loudly protest.

They are very liberal; whether it be for the help of the poor who have suffered in France from sudden inundation, or whatever be the occasion, they subscribe cheerfully to the calls of philanthropy. On the whole they are a pleasant people to live amongst, and as a stranger, so long as you treat them fairly you will never have reason to complain of them. Owing to their climate they are very precocious. At fifteen they are young men and young women—married, and quite settled. At twenty-five or thirty all the charm of life is over and they begin to look old.

As to the personal experiences of the hybernating strangers, so far as the climate is concerned, there may be somewhat different opinions according to the season, which is not always equally favourable. If his first acquaintance with Algiers be in the early part of the month of November, the change from England to Algiers will be specially noticeable. Anyone who has experienced the depressing influence of a London fog at the setting in of an English winter, and who has had the good fortune to leave the heavy atmosphere of the comfort-killing metropolis behind him, will never forget his first sensation of thankfulness on his landing in Algeria. If you leave London, say on a Thursday morning, Paris is reached the same evening. Starting from the French capital on Friday, Marseilles is reached about noon next day. If speed be of consequence to the health-seeker, he can embark the same day on board a steamer which leaves Marseilles for Algiers at five o'clock in the afternoon. If the passage be tolerably good, Africa should be reached about eleven o'clock on Monday morning. Thus by fair and easy-going locomotion, anyone can arrive at Algiers from London in four days and a few hours. By continuous travelling it could be done in one day less.

The steamers are small, but well found. The passage is generally smooth. In my case I was unfortunate, both in going to and returning from Algeria, to have come in for unusually exceptional weather. It blew a heavy gale on both occasions. In returning to Marseilles we had to make for the Spanish coast, so as to get under shelter, and having wearily beaten about the Gulf for many hours, we turned up at Marseilles after a very unpleasant passage. The most motley group of passengers that I have ever seen on ship-board in any part of the world were congregated on this occasion. Arab traders going to France to purchase their stock-in-trade; soldiers and officers of the French army, representing a contingent of almost every arm of the service, returning home on furlough; Algerian Jews, merchants from Marseilles and the chief towns along the Riviera, together with a few English and French passengers whom "urgent private affairs" compelled to return

to their respective homes—all these formed my *compagnons de voyage*. Nothing could have been more agreeable than our experiences of the Mediterranean, during the first twelve hours after our departure from Algiers. Then the wind shifted round, and we gradually became aware, by the motion of the vessel, that the surface of the water was no longer in that mill-pond smoothness which it presented since we had left port. In a very short time we had all the signs and tokens of a coming hurricane, which lasted for more than thirty hours. One by one the saloon passengers disappeared from the festive board at breakfast or dinner time, until of the whole assembly the captain, the surgeon, and myself were the only persons left to sit down to our quiet repast. So far as I was concerned the sensation was far from being agreeable. Dinner over, I came to the conclusion that the better part of valour was discretion. Accordingly I returned to my cabin, and there I remained until we came well within easy distance of the French harbour. The bustle on our arrival was according to usual experience on such occasions. The only exception seemed to me to arise from the fact that suspicious-looking persons came on board, and in confidential whispers suggested to me and other English passengers that, for a trifling consideration, they could save all trouble as to having our luggage examined by the Custom officers.

But I must return in imagination to Algiers, and describe the society and everyday life there during the temporary migration of our winter visitors, whether as invalids or otherwise.

The first thing which demands attention is your place of residence. When I was there the hotels were not very good. Since then a new and handsome one has been built. Some that looked outwardly very imposing were, as regards their interior economy, badly managed; while one or two that presented no signs of external impressiveness were very fairly organized in everything that concerned the comfort and welfare of the guests.

The custom then was, it may be so still, for everyone to pay the same price for meals, whether one remained a single day or through the whole winter. There was a reduction for apartments according to the time they were occupied, but no abatement for meals, no matter how long one continued there.

A lady on board the steamer, one of our fellow-passengers, who had spent many winters in Algiers, recommended us to go to the Hôtel de la Régence, where she always put up. Accordingly we decided on landing to make for it. If my mind had not been made up, I should have been fairly distracted by the energetic canvassing of hotel-touters, in the interest of their

employers. The approach to our hotel presented a strange contrast, judging from the foliage on the trees and the form of the houses, to everything of the kind in Europe of which I had any previous experience. In front of the principal entrance was a passage well supplied with chairs, in which, under cover of bamboo and palm trees, the inhabitants sat smoking cigars and drinking coffee, with that air of the *dolce far niente* which so strongly marks the people in tropical and semi-tropical countries. Breakfast was well served by French waiters who could speak English with passable fluency. A man must be very hard to be pleased who could find fault with the *cuisine* and general arrangements of this house. They were perfectly satisfactory, though not on such a scale of luxury or refinement as one might find in France at the same price; nothing was left undone by the proprietor to secure the convenience of his guests.

For my own part, I always prefer hotels to boarding-houses. You have very little variety in the latter at any place; but in a health-resort still less so. One never enjoys the privilege of obscurity; there is no margin left for privacy. The same faces, day after day, at the same hours are apt to grow somewhat monotonous. It is, no doubt, cheaper to go to a "pension;" but what you save in money you often lose in comfort. There is, moreover, a demand made upon one's amiability of temper which is not at all times quite at your complete disposal, more especially when you find yourself compelled to sit down two or three times a day with the same people whose idiosyncrasies at times are somewhat too angular. A boarding-house is a miniature republic. "Equality" is the basis of companionship, but it does not always follow that "fraternity" lends its co-operative harmony; whereas in an hotel you are as free as you please. You can come and go just as the suggestions of your "own sweet will" may lead you. You can have your own table with selected friends, or, if sufficiently morose, one by yourself. It is the sense of liberty that makes an hotel preferable, in my opinion, to any boarding-house, however comfortable. Or if you prefer to dine at the *table d'hôte*, there are always some new arrivals who give variety to the scene. At all events, one is not doomed to undergo the experience of all the little pettifogging eccentricities which the *habitués* of boarding-houses sometimes acquire, or the thinly-disguised selfishness of crotchety individuals, men or women. The monotonous atmosphere of the generality of "pensions" which one experiences at the regular health-resorts, either in Europe or Algeria, not unfrequently produce a tameness and a sameness in everyday experience. Life in an hotel, even if it be not of the very first class, is, to my mind, a more enjoyable

place of sojourn than in a boarding-house of the ordinary type. Of course they are very useful places of residence for those who like them, but the hotel gives a greater latitude, and does not interfere so much with your individualism.

In Algiers you have to decide whether you will stay in the town near the sea, or go up to Mustapha Superior, on the hill-side which overlooks and commands the town. The air is perhaps purer, the view more extended, and the walks more isolated than what can be met with down below. Whether you make up your mind to live above or below, it is certain that the air is very fine in either situation, and there is the usual balance of advantage and disadvantage according to the position selected. I tried both, but I prefer the town. There is greater variety, and something or other may be seen almost every hour to interest or amuse one.

The English colony gives to Algiers its chief interest for English visitors who go to sojourn there for a winter's experience. There is no place of the kind where, on the whole, there is better society or more agreeable people. The one drawback is the sight of the number of persons who, so far as appearances go, are under sentence of death. Still, there is a very large percentage of visitors here, as in every other health-resort, who have nothing to do but to consider how they can best dispose of the time on their hands. There are many facilities for making excursions all around, even as far as the very edge of the desert. Sportsmen can have a good time among the mountains. There are plenty of partridges to be had at a little distance, and other kinds of game also. If one wishes to see the native monkeys carrying on their amusing gambols, and enjoying their too short existence among the branches of time-honoured trees, he will be able to gratify his curiosity by paying a visit to Blidah. In fact, for the man of health and wealth, there are ample resources for his passing a very pleasant time in and around Algiers.[1]

The climate, about which so much has been said and written, is, after all, an uncertain one so far as regards rain. The air is always mild and pleasant, but it is not always quite agreeable to the invalid; hence there are seasons in which he is obliged to seek "fresh fields and pastures new." Sometimes I have known persons sent by their physicians in England to Cannes for the winter. On arriving there they have been ordered off without one day's delay to Algiers. Having reached this sup-

[1] As regards travelling in Algeria, the railroad from Algiers to Oran renders it convenient for anyone to visit the interior, or in case of necessity for change of climate, to go to Spain, with which a regular service of steamers is kept up from Oran.

posed goal of their wanderings, the medical authorities there have expressed wonder at their being ordered to that place, and forthwith have told them to go to Malaga or some other winter residence. The climate-doctors are not altogether free from blame in this matter. Sometimes, to gratify a special whim of the invalid, particularly in the case of ladies, they are ordered, it may be, to Egypt, or to Africa, or to France, or to Italy, or to Spain, or perhaps to the South of England. Occasionally there is not sufficient care taken to select just the very place which is best adapted to the circumstances of the person seeking change of air and scene.

I am satisfied that in many instances invalids would, on the whole, be just as well off as regards health, and very much better as regards comfort, if they were to stay in England. Of course there is more sunshine abroad, greater variety, complete change of scenery, more freedom from care by contact with the easy-going inhabitants of continental health-resorts. But there is more "roughing" necessary, and the sanitary arrangements are seldom, except in the case of Cannes, as good as they ought to be. I have known instances in which patients went to Italy or France to arrest the incipient symptoms of consumption, and they died from the effects of typhoid fever, brought on by defective drainage or water containing impurities. However this may be, there can be no doubt that there exists a perfect craze on the part of Englishmen and Englishwomen to go abroad, quite regardless of any other consideration than that of leaving England. It verifies the old saying, "All things are double one against the other." There is much to be said on both sides. But, as a rule, health-seekers seem to consider one side only.

The native customs in social life present hardly any difference from the days of Abraham. Weddings are conducted almost on the same scale as regards the time occupied in the elaborate ceremonial, the feasting, and the fun, as of old. The bride, if she be the daughter of wealthy parents, is decked out with magnificent dresses and jewels, which she is supposed to change several times a day, to suit the ever-varying programme of the wedding festival. There is no end of processions, and each of them demands a different dress. The bride takes up her residence in one part of the house, where she is surrounded with her female friends and attendants. The bridegroom has his apartments at the other side of the house, where he is waited upon by his male friends and acquaintances, who keep up a constant excitement with hilarious glee, and the not very alluring melody of the tom-tom. Processions are, on both sides of the house, formed from time to time by the bride and bridegroom, and approach each other with great pomp

and circumstance, and immediately retire again to their respective quarters. These are the only occasions on which "the happy pair" meet each other during these prolonged and complicated performances connected with the festivities. They last for about four days. The bride's head is decked with profuse ornamentation in the arabesque fashion. Her natural beauty is considerably marred by the profuse application of paint. Her nails are coloured with henna, and she is elaborately made up, as much as possible, by the aid of native art, to look what is considered by the Arabs perfectly beautiful. No curious eyes of the male sex are permitted, under any pretext, to look upon the bride, even at a distance. None but women are suffered to enter her part of the house during these days of hymeneal rejoicings. None but men are allowed to see the bridegroom, so that there is a total separation and an impassable barrier between them until the ceremonial programme has been completely gone through. The bride is often only thirteen years old. The women are all uneducated. Their minds are a complete blank for any intellectual purposes. They think of nothing but their personal adornment. From one end of their lives to the other they continue children, and like them are pleased with toys and trinkets, and sugar-plums. They are kept under the strictest surveillance by their husbands. The women of the wealthy classes seldom, if ever, go out. If they do they are carefully veiled, and always well attended.

Among the natives of North Africa the husband exercises despotic powers over his wife. He has uncontrolled jurisdiction. The relation between husband and wife is a household affair, with which the outside public have no concern. The woman is helpless—a slave of man's convenience, without redress when wronged, and without protection when insulted. They go and come just as servants, when for any reason their services are no longer required. What woman was in the East she still is, wherever the doctrine of Jesus Christ has not permeated the moral nature of man, and has elevated woman to the proper standard of her natural rights.

A visit to the principal mosque in Algiers affords the stranger to Mohammedan ritual an occasion for reflection upon the extraordinary vitality attaching to the perverted ingenuity of an enthusiastic religious adventurer. It is a curious sight to see these Mohammedans at their daily devotions. With their faces turned in the direction of Mecca, and seated on the matted floor, they repeat their prayers with occasionally vehement ejaculations, when they all prostrate themselves to the ground. The building is apparently in the form of a rectangle, surmounted by a dome, and flanked by minarets.

It is divided into naves by columns united by semicircular Moorish porches. An open court in front contains a fountain for the prescribed ablutions. Inside one can see neither altar nor seats, only a matted floor, with the pulpit or *Mimbar* of the *Imâm*, and a niche in the wall on the side towards Mecca, to which the faithful address their prayers. The columns are covered with matting for about six feet from the ground. The only decorations consist of lamps, arabesques, and verses of the Koran inscribed in golden letters. All leave their shoes outside. Forgetting this reverential observance—"Take off thy shoes from off thy feet, for the place whereon thou standest is holy ground"—I unwittingly entered the mosque, but I was very quickly, yet courteously, reminded of my unintentional neglect of the Mohammedan rule in this respect. Having instantly apologized, I withdrew to the porch, and leaving there my shoes, I returned again. I was struck by the extreme earnestness of devotion of these people, which was all the more weird-like and mysterious from the unintelligible sounds which reached my ears.

English society in Algiers consists mainly of the visitors who go there for health, and of a small number of residents who live in the town or neighbourhood all the year round. The latter are very few. From the fact that each season presents a different assemblage of English people, the usual amount of caution and reserve on the part of the strangers may be noticed here as elsewhere. There is no nation whose people are so shy of each other and so exclusive as the English. The feeling of exclusiveness may almost be said to be congenital with us as a nation. We like to travel alone, to live alone, to lodge alone, and to form our own little clique—"We four and no more." There is a certain class of persons who are always self-asserting simply because they are always doubting themselves. They are afraid that they will not get that position to which they think that they are entitled, from whatever cause, unless they are perpetually keeping themselves in evidence before the public. Such persons are always in a state of perpetual unrest. They are self-tormentors. They are "touchy" in the extreme, and both in season and out of season are always reminding the world of their lineal descent from some notable personage who figured in the Crusades, or came over on the military staff of William the Conqueror. An Irishman, who acted as groom to a master who hated all "show," was once twitted by another groom in the employment of a master who, having made a considerable fortune in trade, purchased the property of a ruined country gentleman. The groom of the newly-enriched, looking one day at the harness on the horses of the gentleman who hated all "show," said :

"Why don't you get your master to buy decent harness?" Groom No. 1 replied: "Sure now, and aren't they good enough?"

"No," said groom No. 2; "they are not silver-mounted, and there is no crest upon them, like my master's harness."

"Ah! then, now, you omathaun," said groom No. 1; "what does my master want with his crest stuck all over the backs of his horses, just as if he doubted himself? Not a bit of it, my fine fellow; sure, doesn't all the world know that my master came down straight all the way from *Brian Borohme*, the great King of Ireland who was killed at the battle of Clontarf—and what does he want to do with crests, as if he forgot the ould stock from which he came?"

The Irish groom's remarks remind me of a certain gentleman who, having attained high professional distinction, gave orders to a London broker "to buy up ancestry" for him! Wardour Street contains as many pictures of "knights of old," whether originals or copies, as would satisfy any man's ambition in that respect. It is amusing to watch the airs and affectation of some people at these health-resorts, and to notice how they "spread out their canvas" to get into society, whereas "the-never-doubt-themselves" people are utterly indifferent about the matter. At all fashionable watering-places and health-resorts the vain egotism of many renders them a nuisance. The majority of visitors, however, are usually very pleasant people, sensible and agreeable, for whom the natural advantages of the place are the chief attractions. They abjure gaiety and garish entertainments. So long as they can have fresh air, exercise, and sunshine, and are allowed to enjoy the privilege of obscurity, they are perfectly indifferent as to who may wish to cultivate their acquaintance, or who may desire to avoid them.

There are very pleasant social gatherings in Algiers during the winter at the British Consulate. But evening parties are not very general—at least, were not. There is a fair amount of quiet friendly and informal parties, consisting of the visitors who meet at each other's houses. But as the greater number are more intent upon health-seeking than pleasure, and as many are unwilling or unable from indisposition to take part in evening *réunions*, there is a good deal of home-feeling and home-keeping. In spite of all that one can do to keep off the tinge of melancholy, the sight of many sufferers evidently in the last stage of consumption irresistibly forces upon sensitive minds the sad fact that there are many to whom Algiers will prove their final resting-place; or, at all events, a forlorn hope —the last plank after shipwreck. I cannot recall the name of

a single friend or acquaintance whom I then knew, and were confirmed invalids, who are now alive—*not one.*

No one possessing any tenderness of heart can look without emotion upon the misery of others. The law of friendship is to some extent a community of possession. We are made the confidants of intimate acquaintances, until, little by little, our friends become rather "part of us than ours." A word in secret spoken has more effect than many letters written at a distance; one look has more in it than all the cold processes of pen, ink, and paper. And when one calls to mind the painful experiences of health-resorts in England, on the Continent, and elsewhere, cold indeed must that heart be that can look back upon a sojourn at Bournemouth, or St. Leonard's, or Cannes, or Montreux, or Baden-Weiler, or Algiers, etc., etc., without a feeling of sadness, which all the associations of time to come, however happy, can never obliterate from the mind. Happy indeed must be the retrospect where these places have proved turning-points in the restoration of impaired health and vigour. But when "friends depart and Memory takes them to her caverns pure and deep," a shade of sadness must always pass over one's thoughts when we recall the circumstances connected with the failure of every effort to regain lost ground, and the delusion of every hope that told its flattering tale.

G. W. WELDON.

ART. VI.—DR. EDERSHEIM ON WELLHAUSEN'S THEORY.

Prophecy and History in Relation to the Messiah. The Warburton Lectures for 1880-1884. By ALFRED EDERSHEIM, M.A., Oxon, D.D., PH.D. Longmans.

THE subject chosen by Dr. Edersheim for his Warburton Lectures is one of the most fascinating that can secure the attention of the Christian apologist. It lies at the very heart of Revelation; and to trace the golden thread running through the volume of the Book wherein it is written concerning the Hope of Israel and of Humanity demands the highest gifts of the theologian, coupled with the acuteness of the accomplished critic and the constructive intellect of the scientific historian. This subject may easily become the dominant force in the life of a student, leading him through the well-trodden paths of history, and luring him to explore dark tracts in the past till he finds the light broaden to its

central source, though at first its radiance was but an afterglow that seemed ready to fade from the favoured spots on which it still lingered. To carry out his scheme comprehensively, the writer must conceive a well-defined theory of the history of the Jewish people, and fortify it by trustworthy notice of the sacred Hebrew books. He would be led to compare the Messianic Hope, as it unfolded itself in them, always rising to a higher because more spiritual standard, with the religious ideas of other nations, that are persistently turned to the past rather than the future, and lose all hold upon the heart and conscience the longer we are conversant with them. Such a work would show on a smaller scale what the history of man shows on a larger—how the Christ draws all to Himself, and dominates the whole nature that comes within the circle of His influence. We must not be seduced, however, into writing an ideal sketch of a work that does not exist, but hasten to assure our readers that though these Lectures do not occupy as wide a field as their title seems to indicate, they are deeply interesting as indicating the line on which the attack and defence of Christian faith in the Old Testament Scriptures will move. We are tempted to wish that the arguments adduced in them had been put more tersely, and in a form that would have imprinted itself more firmly upon the memory. We should also have preferred the conflict with negative criticism removed from the body of the work, while the author's conclusions might have been incorporated in his Lectures without any break in the continuity. But we welcome the work as a most useful one, for it shows that many of the conclusions of the negative criticism are based upon insufficient data, that it has omitted to weigh many of the weightiest arguments that are advanced by its opponents, and that it parades as facts what are to a large extent nothing but the play of an unbridled literary fancy, which casts a delusive gleam upon the darkness of the past.

There are twelve Lectures contained in this book. The first traces the origin of Christianity to the Old Testament; the second deals with the "kingdom of God" as the leading idea in it; the third establishes the position that the New Testament presents Christ as the fulfilment of Old Testament prophecy. Lectures IV., V., and VI. lay down some fundamental principles in regard to prophecy and its fulfilment. This section is the least satisfactory in the book. The statements lack the precision that appeals so powerfully to the ordinary reader, and worst of all, the illustrations are neither sufficiently vivid nor full. Had the introductory Lectures been compressed, Dr. Edersheim, without increasing the bulk of his work, might

have furnished a full and satisfactory account of the nature and office of prophecy in the ancient Church, with special reference to the Messianic hopes it awakened and sustained amongst the Hebrews. We purpose returning to consider at length the discussions in Lectures VII. and VIII.; but would draw especial attention to the four remaining Lectures which deal with the Post-Exilian period. The general reader will find much interesting matter here of a kind that he could not have gathered from any one English author, nor from foreign sources without great trouble and research. In this department Dr. Edersheim is an undoubted master, and those who submit themselves to his guidance will find that a guide who is pre-eminently capable is prepared to give them the benefit of his unique knowledge. We will quote one or two passages to show what these chapters contain. Our first quotation presents a vivid picture of Israel at the conclusion of the exile:

Yet here also Israel had failed. It was the beginning of its last fatal failure. Not only did Israel not understand its mission, but it had not heart for it. In the first of the tbree periods—that of the law, holiness, priesthood, and symbolism—Israel had failed through a bare externalism. In the second of the periods—that of teaching, prophetism, and the prospect of conquest of the world for God—Israel had failed, on the one hand, through apostasy to heathenism, and so on the other, through national pride, selfishness, and vainglory. And in the third and final period of completion Israel utterly and finally failed, misunderstood the teaching of God, and perverted its mission; failed even in its repentance of past sins. . . Israel's final apostasy in the time of Christ began not at His appearance; this was only the logical outcome of all that had preceded. And Israel's final rejection also began not with the subjection to Rome, still less with the burning of the city and temple, but with the return from the exile. . . . Israel was baptized in the wilderness unto Moses to a new and promising spiritual life; it was ossified in the exile to a religion of Pharisaism, exclusiveness, and national isolation and pride. No wonder that new forms had to be created for the Divine Spirit, and that no longer Palestinianism but Hellenism became the great factor and connecting link between the kingdom of God and the kingdoms of the world. Thus the old fig-tree withered at its roots. The Diaspora, rather than the Palestinian minority, became the missionaries of the world; Hellenist thought, culture, and modes of presentation—not Pharisaism or Rabbinism—became the medium through which the kingdoms of the world were to be made the kingdom of God.

This passage shows a very clear insight into the mental and spiritual condition of Israel after the Exile, and as a companion to it we quote the discriminating criticism on the Apocrypha, which "themselves mark their line of separation from the Canonical Books:"

The presentation of the Divine Being is no longer as in the Old Testament. Sometimes it is gracious in its form, as chiefly in the Book of Wisdom, and in minor degree in some portions of Ecclesiasticus; in other books, as in Judith and Baruch, it is Judaic, narrow, and nationalistic, while in Tobit we have almost the late Rabbinic view of the propitiation of God by alms. Similar remarks apply to the presentation of the

doctrine of Creation and of Providence. As regards the doctrine of angels the Apocrypha have much more developed teaching, which in the case of Tobit descends to the low level of superstition—a respectable religiosity and a sort of common-sense decency take the place of fervour of love, entireness of devotion ; externalism of work, rather than deep, inward, spiritual views, characterizes the righteousness described. Thus we have in the Apocrypha a marked divergence from the lines followed in the Canonical Books of the Old Testament. The latter, as has been well remarked, led up to the manger of Bethlehem ; the Apocrypha may, as regards dogmatic views, be considered only a kind of preface to later Judaism (p. 309).

The tenth Lecture deals with the Pseudepigrapha—"A series of spurious writings mostly professing to be derived from Old Testament events, but all of them Apocalyptic, though in varying measure, and bearing distinctly, though in different degrees, on the Messianic kingdom." Here, again, the general reader will find much to awaken his curiosity and to arouse his wonder at the great likeness and the yet greater unlikeness to the Christian ideas of the Messianic kingdom which are presented by these writings. In this direction much awaits the patient investigation of the scholar, and unless we are greatly mistaken clearer light will be thrown from these writings upon questions that are now debated rather on *à priori* grounds than on the firm footing of fact.

The eleventh Lecture gives an account and analysis of the Pseudepigraphic literature, which will at least whet the appetite of the reader to know more of this remarkable series of writings, from two of which—the Book of Enoch and the assumption of Moses—quotations are made in the Epistle of St. Jude. The remaining chapter deals with the last stage of Messianic hope, and brings us to the days of Christ Himself, in "Whom is the reality of all to all ages."

We now return to the section on the negative criticism of the Pentateuch, in which the author deals with the latest theories as to its date and composition, and the results that will follow the general adoption of the destructive criticism. It is against this portion of the work that the greatest hostility will be shown, and that from both sides—orthodox and unorthodox. Many will blame the lecturer for broaching the question. They hold with a simplicity that springs from unquestioning faith rather than elaborate logical processes, the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch, and deprecate any acknowledgment of the difficulties their theory encounters. But we think the lecturer has ample justification for his course, and for singling out Wellhausen as the representative of the newest form of doubt on this point.[1] Since these

[1] It is admitted on all hands that for practical purposes Kuenen and Robertson-Smith are Wellhausen masquerading in slightly different costumes.

Lectures have been delivered Wellhausen's "Prolegomena to the History of Israel" has appeared in an English dress, and a widely circulated periodical has given an exceedingly lucid and complete account of his theories, which amply acknowledges the revolutionary character of them, and in which the writer pathetically declares that he is not prepared to attempt an answer to them, while he promises to give in future articles proof how they revolutionize the history of Israel and Old Testament theology. We need say no more in Dr. Edersheim's defence. It has happened again, as it has frequently happened before, that the doubt and scepticism, with which scholars have been too sadly familiar, but which they had hoped to confine to their own circle—as disease in a hospital where it can be confronted and cured by the physicians—have suddenly been carried into the most thickly thronging haunts of men. The escape of pestilence from the hospital, however, is no ground for panic in the physicians. The history of similar movements ought to have taught us—

> To cling to Faith beyond the forms of Faith :
> She reels not in the storm of warring words,
> She brightens at the clash of "Yes" and "No,"
> She sees the best that glimmers through the worst,
> She finds the fountain where they wailed "Mirage."

Those who are enamoured of the results of negative criticism will receive Dr. Edersheim with something more than mild regrets for inopportune frankness. His blows are too heavy and his indictments too direct not to provoke rejoinders, and he must not be surprised if the weak spots of his armour are occasionally pierced to his great discomfort, though his enemies are too weak to deliver a fatal thrust.

We proceed to consider Wellhausen's theory. His first conclusion is that the Pentateuch is composed of different documents so imperfectly, not to say clumsily, amalgamated, that the critical faculty can distinguish the fragments with more or less certainty at the present moment. On this point Dr. Edersheim well replies : "In reference to the Pentateuch it is not requisite, nor in any way implied, that it represents one homogeneous work. As the history of our Lord is derived from different Gospel sources which, in turn, look back upon the universally accredited tradition of the Church and on special sources of information, and as the Gospels view the same Divine Life from different standpoints and mutually supplement each other, so may the Pentateuch consist of several original documents or sources, welded together by one or more redactors; and there may even be emendations and additions—glosses, if you like to call them so—by redactors, revisers, or final editors. This is simply the historical aspect

of the book as it exists at present, and with which criticism has to busy itself" (p. 232). This would seem to reduce the question between the combatants to one of degree, for Dr. Edersheim goes so far as to say in a note, "I might not, in principle, shrink from even such a word as 'interpolations,' if I had only space and time to define what may be meant by that term, with what important explanations and limitations it may be applicable, and to what portions in the Old Testament it might be referred." We are by no means prepared to say that the admissions of the Lecturer are made in language we should have chosen; but to trust to such apparent agreement between Dr. Edersheim and his opponents as these verbal coincidences suggest would be to the last degree fallacious, for Wellhausen has pushed his theory so far as to identify the documents even when they stop short in the middle of a verse, and he has portioned out the dates of the various documents in the most decided fashion. If we put his conclusions in the baldest form, we must hold that the earliest portion was written from 850—770 B.C., and contained the extant ideas of Creation, and continued the history of the conquest of Canaan by the Jews. This is the earliest stratum into which the various stories floating in Jewish circles were gradually incorporated. It underwent several redactions and additions, which negative criticism can discover by an infallible test. The next document at first only comprised Deut. xii.-xxvi. It belongs to the Assyrian period, and was due to a desire to restore the theocracy, and was discovered in the reign of Josiah, 621 B.C. Another document was the "Priest Code." It is now found in the middle of the Pentateuch. It is "after Ezekiel," and is a sort of *olla podrida*, contributed by various members of the priesthood. It is interwoven with another document, and the Ezekiel form was published about 573 B.C. The finishing-touch was put upon the curious conglomerate about 444 B.C., by Ezra, though various alterations and additions were made up to 300 B.C. It is true that both schools of critics agree that the final redaction of the Old Testament took place under Ezra, but what a different work is it in the conception of Wellhausen and an orthodox critic! The latter holds that "what we have to insist upon is the general truthfulness and reliableness of the book, alike as regards its history and legislation; that it is what it professes, an authentic record of the history of Israel, and a trustworthy account of what was really the Mosaic legislation" (p. 252). The negative critic considers the whole to be a series of legends—a sort of ancient novel, to be flouted by reasonable men. He delights in the thought that these ancient and unknown writers, after palming themselves off upon their contemporaries and all succeeding generations for some two

thousand years, are found out at last. Their stories of Creation, of the founding of cities, of the training of a nation by Divine interpositions, of building up an imposing system of worship, and welding a horde of slaves into a homogeneous commonwealth by laws, by prophets, by kings, by national successes and national reverses, is a brilliant romance, or rather series of romances, that has had its day, producing a national character, giving rise to a form of belief that for centuries has ruled Western Europe, and furnished humanity with its noblest ideal, winning its heart and drawing forth from successive generations their passionate love. Physical catastrophes on the grandest scale are feeble things compared with the mental, moral, and spiritual revolution this theory will produce, if accepted. For though some philosophic divines, through the force of early prepossessions, may cling to a simulacrum of their faith, the generation that has never known Moses, except as a myth, nor a Psalmist that lived before the exile, will not believe that One rose from the dead. The force of Dr. Edersheim's words may be blamed by critics who do not see the tremendous issues involved in connection with Christ; but his utterances will find a response in many hearts:

> If there really is no Mosaic legislation; if the largest, the central, and most important part of what professes to be such was the invention of the priesthood about the time of Ezra, foisted upon Moses for a specific purpose; if there was not a "tabernacle" in one sense of it, with its specific institutions, nor a central place of worship, nor the great festivals, nor a real Aaronic priesthood; and if the so-called historical books have been coloured and elaborated deuteronomistically, or in that spirit; if they are full of spurious passages and falsifications: if the anonymous prophets of 1 Kings xx. have all been afterwards inserted because Israelitish history is never complete without this kind of garnish . . . then there is in plain language only one word to designate all this. That word is *fraud*. Then must the Gospel narratives and the preaching of Christ lose their historical basis, and rest in large measure on deception and delusion. For Holy Scripture, as the communication of God to man by man, does indeed contain a distinctively human element, but that element cannot have been one of human imposture (p. 220).[1]

Of course no one thinks of producing these consequences to bar inquiry into the origin and date of the Pentateuch. They are simply alleged to inspire caution; for as no one fondly imagines that depicting the horrors of a colliery explosion will prevent the ignition of fire-damp, so we do not imagine that the prospective ruin of Christianity will close discussion. Only men do not go into dangerous pits with

[1] The coarse terms employed in the negative criticisms of the ancient Hebrew writings by the new German school of critics is decorously veiled before English readers, but the original will show their animus. The "dry light" of knowledge cannot burn when we read of 2 Kings i. "Wo Elias zu einem übermenschlichen Popanz entstellt ist."

naked lights. We must at least have caution in our inquiries; and it may at any rate suggest to us the possibility of error in our methods if we find them ending in the destruction of so much that has been precious to man, and that they land us in such labyrinths of doubt as to right and wrong, truth and falsehood. Nor can we at least ever forget that to attribute to Christ appeals to legends and forged codes founds the throne of truth on the bases of falsehood, and we cannot do Him this wrong, He being so majestical.

Against the assumptions of negative criticisms—for they are immense assumptions that lie at the foundation of these theories—Dr. Edersheim does valiant and successful battle. For instance, he shows (in pp. 261 *et seq.*) that "scholars of admittedly equal competence have on linguistic grounds declared certain parts to be of latest date, which others have for the same reason adjudged to be earliest." He turns the tables upon his opponents by proving that on their own theory clever forgers "did succeed not only in inducing their own contemporaries to accept as archaic what was quite recent, but they similarly eluded the vigilance of succeeding generations—of all the Rabbis, of all the Church, and of all critics—none of whom till the present century discovered, or even suspected, the Post-Exilian composition of the Priest Code." Indeed, the great objection we feel to Wellhausen's theory is that it makes such huge demands upon our fancy, and then multiplies mental and moral *tours de force* till we no longer feel ourselves living in a real world, but only in a Hebrew atmosphere suspiciously akin to that pervading the "Thousand and One Arabian Nights."

It seems impossible, Dr. Edersheim forcefully argues, for the "Priest Code" to have been written at the date assigned to it in these new theories, because of its contents bearing no sort of relation to the times. "Let it be kept in view that it was only a small and comparatively uninfluential minority which returned with Ezra and Nehemiah. The rest remained behind, and rapidly spread over the face of the world. Yet the legislation supposed to have been then introduced made no provision for, took not the slightest notice of, the wants of the great majority. . . . In times which called for the widest comprehension, they concocted the narrowest conceivable legislation, and that in the interests of the small number of priests who returned to Palestine; and they not only succeeded in introducing it as the Mosaic law, but in imposing it upon the educated majority without eliciting a single contradiction! Was there not a single individual among those outside the circle where this fraud was perpetrated wise enough to discover, or honest enough to expose it? no one priest or

layman of those who did not return to Palestine? And what, all this time, had become of JE (*i.e.*, the Jehovistic recension of the Jewish history), or of Deuteronomy, which in some form must have existed, and the provisions of which are supposed to be inconsistent with this new Priest Code? Were these documents latent, lost, or unknown, except within the small circle of priestly forgers?" (p. 260).

The negative criticism, also, must be prepared to answer questions which it provokes in the minds of men conversant not with the niceties of Hebrew literature, but with the subtleties of human motive and conduct. We have seen what astute and able—well, "redactors," the wise call them—these men were; but how is it that they, being possessed of such marvellous literary skill, and troubled with no scientific conscience as to the inviolability of facts and the sanctity of accuracy, cutting and carving documents according to their fancy, inventing prophets, kings, and legislators according to their needs, nevertheless left such masses of contradiction upon their pages? "If the priests were able to introduce such an entirely new code, in which the privileges of their order and other arrangements were so much more emphasized than in the old legislation, why retain the latter, and insert it into the Canon? Or why should Ezra, for example, have read it in the hearing of all the people?—or did he read it?—and why should he have told them that the exile had been the punishment of their transgression of the Mosaic ordinances, when, according to our opponents, he was himself bringing in a new code on many points inconsistent with the old one?" (p. 273).

But it is in dealing with the problems presented by the history and development of the people of Israel that the lecturer most thoroughly traverses the statements of his opponents. He admits very frankly that in the Pentateuch we have an ideal rather than an actual ritual, and emphasizes his opinion. "Many—I had almost said most—of these (*i.e.*, the special legislative, religious, and even political institutions of the Pentateuch) had no place in the wilderness. This holds especially true in regard to what constitutes the central and really all-determining institution of the Mosaic religious legislation—sacrificial worship. Indeed the religious institution of the Pentateuch might be likened to the wood laid in order on the altar; and the actual observance of the Pentateuch sacrifices as the fire, significantly sent from Heaven at the consecration of the Temple, which is to set the whole in flame" (pp. 235, 236). He holds the modification of original precepts contained in Deuteronomy to be explained by the altered circumstances in which the Israelites found themselves when

in view of the immediate entrance into the land of Canaan. The opponents of the historical character of the Pentateuch argue that the notices incidentally afforded by it show that the religious ideas and institutions of the people were in a chaotic state, and, to borrow the technicalities of another science, that they did not undergo differentiation until a late date; that the persons introducing this highly differentiated religion published it in the "Priests' Code," and that it is there overlying the earlier statements. To adopt their ideas, they consider that Judaism, as we know it, was evolved from a chaotic state. The orthodox interpreter takes another method of explaining the facts. He considers the indications of the social position of the people to point to degradation, not to development. As in the case of certain ascidians, degradation and evolution may be present at the same time, and occupy the same field in Nature, so the highest ideal worship and ritual may be embodied in a national code, while much lower and apparently antagonistic forms may be found in the national life. It is impossible in a few pages to compress the necessarily extended arguments of this section, but we may quote a short paragraph that will indicate the course of remark here pursued. "Without entering into particulars," says Dr. Edersheim, "I think I am warranted in saying that the historical notices about the festivals are exactly as might have been expected in the circumstances of the land and of the people. And our reasoning regarding the scanty mention of the great national festivals, seems supported by the frequent references to domestic and communal celebrations, such as the observance of Sabbaths and New Moons, which evidently seems to have been general, because it did not involve the necessity of any central national attendance; and the general conclusion which we derive from a review of the actual state of matters in Israel is to the effect that, so far from the notices in the historical books being inconsistent with a previous Mosaic legislation, they are not only compatible with it, but even presuppose its existence; and without such previous religious institutions, the principal events and the leading personages in Jewish history—not only a Boaz, a Samuel, or a David, but even a Gideon, a Saul, or a Joab—would be unintelligible" (p. 257).

There are many most weighty considerations, and others that in themselves may seem of small importance, but become of cumulative force, and are not easily evaded, which irresistibly lead us to condemn a theory that is brilliant and ingenious. We are ready to admit that it is supported in a most forcible manner, and derives no small assistance from prevalent speculations in morals and religion, and that it

contains elements of truth that will hereafter be acknowledged; but we have no hesitation in adopting Dr. Edersheim's words, "We do not profess to explain every difficulty that may be urged; nor indeed do we believe that, with the material at our command, it is possible to do so. But with all deference for the learning and ability of the scholars who have adopted the views of Wellhausen, we must be allowed to express, in plain language, our conviction that their theory lacks the one element which is primary: it lacks a reliable historical basis."

Here, for the present, we leave this most fallacious and seductive theory, though we hope by the courtesy of the Editor to assign at an early date solid grounds for rejecting it. In the meantime, we cordially recommend this erudite and valuable Warburton Lecture to the attention of our readers. It will furnish them with cogent reasons for refusing to be led away by the rush of contemporary opinion, and will render them able to appreciate the tremendous issues with which this controversy is fraught.

FREDK. E. TOYNE.

Correspondence.

THE DEACON'S YEAR.

To the Editor of "THE CHURCHMAN."

SIR,—The minimum age for ordination to the office of priest in the Church of England is twenty-four years. In the ancient Church thirty years was the minimum fixed, but it has, I believe, been understood that at that time the Bishops had greater liberty to relax "rules" than now exists. It appears, then, that at present, in the English Church, there is but one year necessarily spent in the Diaconate before the ordination into full orders as priest; and thus any young man arriving at the age of twenty-four may attain full orders, and be held qualified to hold any benefice, be it large or small, for which he may obtain the preferment.

I can scarcely meet the end I have in view in this letter by any better means than here quoting from one I not long since wrote in the *Times:* "I would ask any true friend of the English Church, lay or clerical, to "read calmly the service for the ordination of priests, accepting its lan- "guage in a natural sense, as really representing the authority given to "this young man of twenty-four years of age. Can he conceive language "capable of conveying a more solemn bestowal of an authority such as "scarcely any human being, except by special help from Heaven, could "be qualified to exercise? I refrain from quoting it. Is it rational to "suppose that such a youth, having served one year in the Diaconate, "could be willingly accepted by any body of parishioners as qualified to "exercise over them the awful spiritual authority with which he has thus "been invested? He may be a sound theological scholar, really pious "and earnest, but what measure of life's experience can he possess to fit "him to meet the demand made upon him at the bedside of the sick and

" dying; to deal with the mental struggles of those who doubt; to struggle " with all the difficulty of awakening the sinner to repentance; to be the " spiritual adviser in the home, the evangelist in the Church? He would " scarcely be held of the age to be a tutor in a family, and yet the Bishops, " and the congregations, and the parishioners are alike helpless in the " matter. Far better, in my opinion, would it be if the Diaconate stage " was extended, that a more matured line of thought might be acquired, " with the judgment better calculated to meet those exigencies in the " work of a priest that are for ever rising up to try that of the most ex- " perienced in this ministry."

We have no mechanical agency by which we can test the exact growth of spirituality in regard to age; it requires, however, no great knowledge of human nature to arrive at the conclusion that although at the age of twenty-four some advanced habits of thought may have been acquired, it has not as yet done its full work in maturing the character which will form the foundation of life's future.

We have many of what I may call manuals—literary publications adapted to give information relating to clerical work—aids for private devotion and for such devout exercises as parochial ministration may demand; these, if even they could give the willing mind which would accept them, would be, after all, a sort of catechism of clerical mechanics.

Real Apostolic work can never be a matter subject to any mechanical restraint; it deals with elements so variable, so complex in their nature, as to defy the strict definition of means to a given end, which obtains in secular work. The priest has to walk by faith. His path is for ever confronted with obstacles, which only faith in a higher than human power can enable him to struggle with, in the belief that he will conquer them. Faith his support, experience becomes his guide; the two in combination are the highest qualification for his ministry as priest in the Church of Christ.

We must also bear in mind that under the existing system, the Deacon's year has attached to it the task of reading up for the examination for full orders. I have always felt this to be most unwise. It has appeared to me that the whole Diaconate stage should be given to the acquirement of efficiency in the practical work of the ministry. Deacons acting as curates have, if themselves earnest in their work and acting under earnest incumbents, full occupation. They may have been exercised in sermon-writing previous to ordination. They very soon discover the thesis from a text calculated to draw out their knowledge of Scripture is one thing; the composing a sermon to be delivered from the pulpit in the face of the congregation they have to instruct is a very different thing. Again, I would urge the principle that it is important that the Deacon curate should feel that he is no longer under tutorage in regard to further purely scholastic acquirements; that as he is, with some few restrictions, held to be qualified to act as an officiating minister of the Church, daily having to do so, no additional proof of scholarship should be required of him to pass the limited boundary separating him from the office of priest. At the same time, it would be but wise for him to understand that before admission to the priesthood, he should pass some form of examination, to satisfy the Bishop that he has so used the term of his Diaconate as to have obtained full qualification for that higher order in the Church, fitting him to administer all her services.

And now, sir, I feel I cannot do better in connection with the subject of this letter than make some quotations from one of two letters in the *Guardian*, published in 1871, under the signature "Sexagenarian O." No one has a better claim to quote from these letters than myself. It was headed "The Deacon's Year":

"No books ever written, no lectures ever delivered, can afford the "teaching the Deacon has to obtain from the leaves of human nature, "turned for study where they are sadly torn and soiled, wanting for ever "even the slightest approach to any binding in character with our "common Christianity; however heart-stricken and yet hopeful and "undaunted he may be, I have yet to learn that human nature can, with- "out injury to mind and body, go through this experience, and yet find "time to give the hours of many a day to read up for 'priests.'

"In ordinary social intercourse, social tact gives the tone which enables "others to appear blind to our own, just as we so appear blind to the "failings of others. No curate dare be unfaithful in his ministry; he "will, however, soon discover that to become the religious friend and "pastor, he has for ever to go behind the family curtain—read 'homes' as "they are. If he has much to teach, there is a great deal in his teaching, "as regards its scene, he must be careful not to betray, or he will miss "the welcome so invaluable for his work. To know when to be in season "to advise, is to acquire one of the highest qualifications to act as an "adviser; to know when and how best to admonish, is to obtain the "power to do so without offence.

"To become the welcome spiritual adviser of those depraved legions "which go to form the lowest *strata* of our towns, the ear must be "content to hearken to a continual outcry of complaint. The curate's "first work is with the soul; he will soon discover that out of the "abundance of the body's trials, be they the result of sin or sickness, of "poverty hardly deserved or recklessly invited, the heart will speak, and "he must stay and listen. Many are the wearied days he has to pass, "distracted by appeals for compassion he is helpless to prove real or "false. He goes to his home perplexed and harassed, lest he has "been deaf where he should have heard, or has yielded where he may "have been deceived. He has yet to acquire some power of that discern- "ment which shall find in many a profession of religious inquiry the "artful weapon of interested hypocrisy, which shall perceive beneath "little spoken of the soul, little begging for the body, the spirit of an "industrious independence, a really humble, however simple faith.

"There is work to be done in the 'schools,' work altogether new to him, "and requiring from him the learning how best to do it. There are "parish 'associations,' religious and secular meetings to attend, 'collec- "tions' to be obtained, sermons to be prepared, the acquaintance with "the occupants of the best sittings in the church to be cultivated; they "may not require or expect the exercise on his part of purely pastoral "intimacy, he yet has many hours in the week of down-sitting amongst "them. It is not time wasted, far from it; for only thus can he establish "the link between them and himself, by which he may profit when "opportunity is afforded to minister to them in a day of trial.

"The curate Deacon's work grows on him in the doing of it. The "latter months of the Diaconate of a zealous industrious man finds his "daily field of toil increased, in proportion as he has sought to be faithful "in his office, by seeking m'ore and more field for Apostolic work. And "now, alas! must come to the front that dreaded skeleton, whose bones "have rattled on his booksbelves throughout his whole year: there is "yet the work to be done—the books to be got up for 'priests.'

"Would it not be a practice more humane in regard to Deacon humanity, "more wise in the best interest of the Church, for the Bishops to be "content with proof carefully obtained that the Deacon has studied and "worked out the duties of his holy calling, thus acquitting himself 'to "the honour of God and edifying of the Church;' being content with "this, rather than demand of him proof that he has acquired a certain

"further amount of scholarship, in the midst of all his work, to qualify "him to do what it is on proof he has well done?"

The status of curates, as the rule, is one well deserving the compassion of all thoughtful Churchmen. They are made the butts of novelists, servants of incumbents, at wages scarcely equal to the emoluments of the butlers of many parishioners; apprentices, yet doing rarely much less, often far more than their masters; denied all voice in any of the important movements connected with the Church; mere youths, with all youth's disposition, hampered on all sides by the discipline which cuts off from them so much of youth's natural enjoyment; they toil on, battling in these their young days against sin, the flesh, and the devil; but too often with little consideration from those they serve to their utmost, in regard to the fact, that for such warfare, at such an age, all encouragement should be accorded to them, all possible allowance made for any of their shortcomings. If I contend for a prolongation of the Diaconate, I at the same time claim that while it lasts the Deacon should have his just due.

S. G. OSBORNE.

Lewes, Feb. 4.

VOLUNTARY CONTRIBUTIONS OF THE CHURCH FOR TWENTY-FIVE YEARS, 1860-1884.

SIR,—As it will doubtless afford interest to many to be acquainted with the following facts, which, after long and laborious inquiry, I am in the position to represent, may I ask you, on behalf of the Committee of the Official Year-Book of the Church of England, to be good enough to give them publicity? This statement records an endeavour to ascertain what has been contributed by members of the Church of England during the last quarter of a century to the various branches of Christian work indicated by the following summary.

The statement may be accepted as perfectly accurate, inasmuch as the figures have been tabulated from returns made by those officially representing the Societies and Institutions that have been severally dealt with. It will be seen, however, from the explanations appended, that the statement is by no means an exhaustive representation of the Church's voluntary offerings within the given period, as it will be clear to all that it would be impossible to gather the sum of contributions flowing through private channels, or devoted by Churchmen to Societies and Institutions and Charities of a general and unsectarian character.

Explanations of the following Summary.

I. The Summary is *inclusive* of, and confined to, Societies and Institutions organized and administered by the Church of England alone. Every care has been taken to prevent any over-statement of facts. "Balances carried forward" from previous years have, of course, been deducted from the return of the annual income in every instance; dividends and interest from the investment of bequests and such like voluntary offerings being included. With regard to the figures representing the expenditure upon church building and restoration, the endowment of benefices, and the erection of parsonage houses, this total has been arrived at after a careful examination of Lord Hampton's returns, the Parliamentary reports of the Ecclesiastical Commission and Queen Anne's Bounty, and with the practical experience of the Editor of the Year-Book after a three years' systematic inquiry made throughout the Church in reference to this special branch of Church work. In arriving at the

general result as it is given, deduction has been made of grants devoted from the funds of the several Church Building and Extension Societies included under the third division of this Summary relating to Home Missions.

II. The Summary is *exclusive*—

(1) Of certain distinctive Church Societies, Institutions, and Charities, concerning which the Committee have for the present been unable from various circumstances to obtain information.

(2) Of all contributions devoted to parochial purposes; such as the maintenance of the assistant clergy (over and above sums contributed to the Additional Curates Society and Church Pastoral Aid), Church services, institutions of a local character, the relief of the sick, and such-like objects.

(3) Of funds devoted to the founding and maintenance of middle-class schools.

(4) Of all contributions devoted to Societies and Institutions distinctly unsectarian in their aim and administration to which Churchmen give largely, such as the Bible Society, Religious Tract Society, London City Missions; also orphan asylums, hospitals, reformatories, and such-like Institutions as lay claim to general support, the Institutions of a philanthropic description included under Division VI. of this Summary being confined to those organized and maintained by the Church.

(5) The Sisterhoods of the Church, with very few exceptions, preferring to withhold, or unable to give, tho information, the return of their income can scarcely be considered as embraced by this inquiry.

It may be stated, for the satisfaction of those who may read and use these figures, that they have been tabulated from a twenty-five years' return of income made by the secretaries or treasurers of at least 400 different Societies and Institutions, and tested throughout by an experienced actuary.

From these explanations we may fairly conclude that though it can be accurately asserted that Churchmen have, within the last quarter of a century, contributed over £81,000,000 to the several specified branches of Christian work at home and abroad, this sum cannot be said in any way to represent the full extent of the Church's voluntary offerings for the spiritual and social well-being of the nation.

SUMMARY.

		£	£
I.	*Theological Schools*, and education of Candidates for Holy Orders		528,653
II.	*Church building* and restoration, endowments of benefices, building of parsonage houses, and enlargement of burial-grounds (all grants from Church Societies and Corporations being excluded)		35,175,000
III.	*Home Missions:*		
	Bishops' Funds for Church Extension ...	1,055,054	
	Church Extension Societies	1,229,603	
	Church Building Societies	317,436	
	Societies for Employment of Additional Curates	2,543,296	
	General Home Mission Societies	888,623	
	Scripture Readers	490,611	
	Seamen's Mission	352,588	
	Temperance Work	128,590	
	Extension of Home Episcopate	420,677	
			7,426,478

		£	s.	d.	£
IV.	*Foreign Missions:* Contributions raised through the agency of Societies in England for the promotion of Foreign Missions, including Missionary Colleges, Studentship Associations, etc. (contributions locally raised abroad being excluded) ...				10,100,000
V.	*Elementary Education:*				
	1. Building and Enlargement—				
	(*a*) Schools	8,370,294	0	0	
	(*b*) Colleges	115,200	0	0	
	2. Maintenance—				
	(*a*) Schools	12,145,489	3	1	
	(*b*) Colleges	367,317	14	8	
	3. Diocesan Inspection, organization of Schools, etc.	363,740	17	3	
					21,362,041
	Societies for the promotion of education by circulation of literature and other agencies				987,841
	Church Institutes				71,660
VI.	*Charitable Work* (distinctively Church of England Institution):				£
	Nursing Institutions				193,752
	Deaconesses				118,948
	Cottage Hospitals and Convalescent Homes ...				968,936
	Orphanages and Sisterhoods				982,223
	Reformatories				395,187
	Penitentiaries				549,129
	Hospital Sunday, Metropolitan and Provincial ...				610,025
					3,818,200
VII.	*Clergy Charities:* General and Diocesan				2,103,364
					£81,573,237

NOTE.—Explanatory of Division V., Elementary Education:

I. The disbursements of the National Society during the period under consideration are included in the above total.

II. The value of land given as school sites is not, as a rule, included in the above table. Various items of school and college income given in the returns from which the figures have been taken are also omitted, because it is doubtful how far such income has been derived from purely Church sources. The actual total expenditure of the Church on elementary education during the twenty-five years has probably considerably exceeded £22,000,000.

III. No account has been taken of a large voluntary contribution for the promotion of higher education.

I am, faithfully yours,
FREDERICK BURNSIDE,
Hon. Editor and Sec.

Hertingfordbury,
Feb. 6, 1886.

Short Notices.

From Korti to Khartum. A journal of the desert march from Korti to Gubat, and of the ascent of the Nile in General Gordon's steamers. By Col. Sir CHARLES W. WILSON, K.C.B., K.C.M.G., D.C.L. Third edition. Pp. 311. W. Blackwood and Sons. 1886.

THIS ably-written book has a very peculiar interest, and we are not at all surprised to observe that it has quickly reached a fourth edition. The journal of the march from Korti to Gubat and of the venture in Gordon's

steamer to the junction of the two Niles is in its way perfect. Among the many admirable works which show the courage and enterprise of our forces, Sir Charles Wilson's will doubtless occupy high rank, and this not only from the dramatic surroundings of the story, but from the author's skill and frankness. He has brought before us, in a very graphic manner, the incidents of the famous march across the desert; and we are now able to see the whole course of which various glimpses were given us at the time in the telegraphic despatches. The journal of the return to Korti is also admirable, and adds much to our knowledge.

The attack on the square, tidings of which sent such a thrill at the time, is a striking picture. A fine old sheikh on horseback, with his banner in one hand and a book of prayers in the other, plants his banner in the centre of the square. In the gallant advance, he had never swerved to the right or to the left; never ceased chanting his prayers. As he planted his banner in the centre of the square, behind the camels, he was shot down. The Arabs began running in under the camels to the front part of the square. Some of the rear rank thereupon faced about and began firing. By this fire Sir Herbert Stewart's horse was shot. As Sir Herbert fell three Arabs ran at him:

> I was close to his horse's tail [says Sir Charles Wilson], and disposed of the one nearest to me, about three paces off; and the others were, I think, killed by the Mounted Infantry officers close by. Almost immediately afterwards the enemy retired, and loud cheering broke out from the square. Our men had by this time got somewhat out of hand, wild with excitement. It was for a few moments difficult to get them into their places; and if the enemy had charged again, few of us would have escaped.

With regard to the death of General Gordon, our author is of opinion that even if the steamers had left Gubat a week earlier, the result would have been the same.

The Official Year-Book of the Church of England, 1886. — Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge.

The prominence recently given to the proposal for the Disestablishment and Disendowment of the Church has served to show the extreme importance of collecting such authentic records as this publication will be found to furnish. The statistics of Church successes are indeed of high value at the present moment, and have a more than ordinary interest. To the Official Year-Book for 1886, therefore, we earnestly invite the attention of our readers, both lay and clerical. It is truly a treasury for lectures and addresses in the way of Church Defence. Church Reformers, too, welcome the book; its statements of gifts and labours, in fact, are suggestions as well as protests. It supplies interesting information, easily mastered, and thoroughly to be trusted, upon a variety of subjects, and for every thoughtful and earnest Churchman it is an invaluable book of reference. What has been the sale of the Year-Book in previous years, we have no means of knowing, but the present issue should surely find its way into every nook and corner throughout the land. The volume is admirably printed, and is exceedingly cheap.

The book—edited with singular ability—has been entirely written afresh, and must have involved enormous labour. There has been judicious condensation, and several new subjects have been introduced. In the statistical section additions have been made. The leading facts of Work and Progress recorded in the Year-Book are now represented in a brief summary. Under the heading "Church Defence Literature" there is a very useful list of books and pamphlets.

We have spoken of the short Summaries. It was noted in the February

CHURCHMAN (p. 400), under the heading "Church Extension," that during the year 1884 there had been voluntary offerings approaching a million and a half. The figures are these :

Church building and restoration - - -	£1,163,544
Endowment of Benefices - - - - -	189,587
Parsonage-houses - - - - -	95,327
Burial-grounds - - - - -	7,381
	£1,455,839[1]

If to this sum we add Theological Schools, etc., £16,478; Home Missions, £434,208; Foreign Missions, £491,919; Education, etc., £1,057,686; Charitable Work (Deaconesses, hospitals, etc., etc.), £331,556; Clergy Charities, £80,800, we get a grand total of £3,868,499, the voluntary contributions of Church-folk during the year 1884. This summary, it should be observed, does not include the offerings given by Churchmen to such Societies as the British and Foreign Bible Society, the London City Missions, etc.

Classified Gems of Thought, from the great Writers and Preachers of all Ages. In convenient form for use as a Dictionary of ready reference on Religious Subjects. By the Rev. F. B. PROCTOR, M.A. With a preface by the Rev. HENRY WACE, D.D. Pp. 800. Hodder and Stoughton.

Many students and teachers who have never heard of the sixteenth century *Polyanthea*, or of the *Polyanthea Novissima*, a century later, and who have no such collection of true thoughts by later editors upon their shelves, will be glad to hear of Mr. Proctor's work. It is not a cyclopædia; it is a readable book of reference. About three thousand subjects have been treated of. The quotations are taken mainly from modern English authors, but the editor has gleaned from many fields. On one page, for instance, we see the names of Bishop Lightfoot, Bishop Barry, J. Hare, Lange, and M. Stuart; on another, opening the volume at hazard, Bridge, Pascal, Guthrie, Oosterzee, and Storrs. There are several sermon-outlines; frames with more or less flesh upon them, for the benefit of preachers. Mr. Proctor gives the old story about the preacher accused of using Howe's sermons. "I often go to Mr. Howe's shop for tallow," was his excuse, "but I make my own candles." Truly Cecil's "Remains" is a wonderful treasury, and such sermons as Maclaren's, Vaughan's, Spurgeon's, and Robertson's, have helped many. The borrowed *Divisions* of sermons, the "1st," "2nd," "3rd," and so forth, are probably a hindrance to most preachers; but good stuff—pregnant thoughts and striking illustrations—may be readily utilized. On Regeneration, we observe, the learned compiler quotes Owen and Schaff; on the Atonement, Trench. Many a preacher will find real help in Trench expounding the New Testament:

1 ἀπολύτρωσις, or *redemption.*
2 καταλλαγή, or *reconciliation.*
3 ἱλασμός, or *propitiation.*

On Science (Materialism), Mr. Proctor quotes H. Spencer, as follows:

"Evolution is an integration of matter and a concomitant dissipation of motion, during which the matter passes from an indefinite, incoherent homogeneity, to a definite homogeneity, and during which the retained motion undergoes a parallel transformation." Lucid and exhaustive!

[1] Grants received from the Ecclesiastical Commissioners and Queen Anne's Bounty have been excluded from this total.

Then Mr. Proctor gives the epitaph on the late Professor Clifford in a London cemetery :

"I was not, and I was. I did a little, and I was not."

The Duke of Argyll, if we remember right, has spoken of the words in the Scottish Catechism, "Man's chief end is to glorify God, and enjoy Him for ever," as one of the noblest phrases ever penned. Mr. Proctor, we observe, quotes Carlyle's anti-materialist remark upon it : "No gospel of dirt . . . . can ever set that aside."

The Anglican Pulpit of To-day. Forty short Biographies, and forty Sermons of distinguished Preachers of the Church of England. Pp. 450. Hodder and Stoughton.

This collection, says the Preface, "is intended to furnish a fair reflex of the preaching of the Church of England at the present time." The editor has desired "to do justice to all schools of thought." Some of the sermons (we are not told which) have been "specially revised" at the editor's request. "Speaking generally, the sermons have not appeared previously in book form." The Archbishops are Benson and Thomson ; the Bishops are Lightfoot, Browne, Stubbs, Woodford, Fraser, Temple, Ryle, Ellicott, Goodwin, John Wordsworth, Mackarness, Magee, Carpenter, Wilberforce, and How ; the Deans are Church, Goulbourne, and Perowne. Among other preachers are Canon Westcott, Dr. Salmon, Dr. Wace, Canon Bernard, and Professor Sanday. How is it that no sermon of Mr. Hay Aitken, the most distinguished Mission Preacher "of to-day" appears ? Some of the remarks in the Biographies seem rather odd, out of place. For instance, "While cautious, Dr. Driver is in sympathy with the conclusions of modern criticism." The Biographer quotes Dr. Cheyne, that Bishop Browne's notes on Genesis "are in the highest degree superficial ;" and he lays it down that Bishop Temple's Bampton Lectures are "of no very great importance." Again : "It is understood that Dr. Wace is a large contributor to the *Times*." (Instead of "is" we should have suggested "was.")

A Commentary on St. Paul's Epistle to the Galatians. By JOSEPH AGAR BEET. Pp. 230. Hodder and Stoughton. 1885.

Those who have enjoyed Mr. Beet's Commentaries on Romans and Corinthians will find equal pleasure in the Commentary on Galatians. His learning, insight and ability are of a high order. Whether one agrees with his expositions or differs from them, it is always a pleasure to note candour and strength. We had pencilled several passages ; but space is lacking. Only a single brief comment may be made. Mr. Beet objects to *lusteth* (A. V. and R. V.), Galatians v. 17 : he renders, *desires*. The word *desires* is in itself, he says, "neither good nor bad, and may therefore be supplied here as predicate of *the* Holy *Spirit*." ("The flesh desires against the Spirit, and the Spirit against the flesh.") Certainly, in Luke xxii. 15, it is predicated of Christ ("With desire I have desired to eat this Passover") ; and in 1 Peter i. 12, of angels ("which things angels desire to look into") ; and 1 Timothy iii. 1, Hebrews vi. 11, may be compared. The verb is doubtless "to have a longing or strong wish." But though there are objections to the modern English "lusteth" there are clearly objections to "desires."

The Forty Days of the Bible, and their Teachings. By W. PAKENHAM WALSH, D.D., Bishop of Ossory, Ferns and Loughlin. New edition. Pp. 126. Dublin : George Herbert. 1886.

We have much pleasure in inviting the attention of our readers to a new edition of this suggestive work.

Our Collects, Epistles, and Gospels. Twelve Meditations for the months of the year. By the Very Rev. J. S. Howson, D.D. Hodder and Stoughton.

These "twelve meditations" are suggestive and edifying; they will be welcomed by lay as well as clerical readers. Here and there is an interesting reference to history. For example: The occurrence of the word *Turks*, the Dean says, "is enough to show that the third Collect for Good Friday in its present form is modern; for Gelasius, from whose Sacramentaries the two other Collects were translated, was in his grave long before Mahomet was born. The word 'Turks' may, no doubt, very properly be viewed as synonymous and coextensive with Mahometans. But there is something far more pointed in the use of this word than appears at first sight. During the period when the first publication and the various revisions of our English Prayer Book were in progress, the Turks were a terror to Europe. In order to realize this fact it is only necessary to remember that the battle of Lepanto was fought only twenty-two years after the first book of Edward VI. was published, and that the battle before Vienna, that 'began the reaction of Christendom against Islam, which has gone on to our own day,' was fought twenty-two years after our Prayer Book was published in its present form. It is impossible for us now to imagine the intense reality which was connected then in Europe with the word 'Turk,' as representing a pressing danger; and it is a token of the admirable spirit in which our Prayer Book was drawn up, that the word, which was a war-cry elsewhere, is coupled here with intercession." Again, coming to the Collect for the Seventh Sunday after Trinity, the Dean says: "A very distinguished dignitary of the Church of England was once among the guests in a Scotch house along with the writer of this paper, to whom he said one morning, after reading Family Prayers, in the course of which he had used this Collect, 'Do you know why I read that Collect?'—to which the natural reply was that the reason for the choice was not known, but that no choice could have been better, seeing that no Collect in the Prayer Book is more full of instruction and devotion. This, however, was not the true explanation. The dignitary, who had been acting as chaplain, said with mischievous glee, 'In a Scotch household, whenever I read Family Prayers, I always use that Collect; and then I tell the family that this Collect abolished Episcopacy.' In fact it was on this seventh Sunday after Trinity that the great perilous experiment was tried in St. Giles', Edinburgh, the Archbishop being present, and the Bishop directing the Dean how to read the service. At the mention of the word *Collect* the crisis of indignation was reached, and the enraged herb-woman threw her stool at the officiating minister's head, with the expression of a hope that he might have the *colic*. Thus the confusion in the congregation became general; the storm, once begun, spread, and continued to rage; and Episcopacy ceased in Scotland." As to the derivation of the word *Collect*, the "gathering up" of devotions, or the "gathering together" of the people, the Dean prefers the latter. He points to the *collecta* of the Vulgate (Lev. xxiii. 36), and mentions the fact that the same word was used in the earlier Christian ages, for the coming together of a congregation.

The Prayer Book Psalter: pointed for chanting, and with chants adapted thereto, or specially composed for this work. By Sir HERBERT OAKELEY, M.A., Mus. Doc., LL.D., Professor of Music at the University of Edinburgh, and Composer to Her Majesty in Scotland. Nisbet and Co.

This is a book which many may consult with interest.

Juliana Horatia Ewing and her Books. By HORATIA F. GATTY. With a portrait, and sixteen illustrations. S.P.C.K.

A tasteful little volume (remarkably cheap), with touching memories; it will be acceptable to many.

His Grandfather's Bible. A Tale of Furness Fells. By Rev. C. W. BARDSLEY, M.A., Vicar of Ulverston. *Home Words* Publishing Office.

This story is a reprint from last year's *Home Words*. It is cleverly written, with a good deal of wit and practical point. The bits of dialect give a pleasing flavour. In connection with the C.E.T.S. this Tale is likely to do much good. A cheap gift-book; it has a tasteful cover, and is printed in large type.

Lessons on the Gospel of St. John. By the Rev. W. M. SINCLAIR, M.A., Vicar of St. Stephen's, Westminster. Church of England Sunday School Institute.

These lessons—clear, sound, and rich—are reprinted from the *Church Sunday School Magazine*, but they will be found useful for Teachers who are not connected with Sunday-schools, and by many who are not "Teachers." Mr. Sinclair has read much, noted much, and thought much; and this book shows that he is "apt to teach."

Lesson Studies from the Book of Genesis. By EUGENE STOCK, author of "Lessons on the Life of our Lord," etc. Pp. 160. The Religious Tract Society.

By some mischance a notice of this little volume failed to appear in the January CHURCHMAN. We heartily commend the book. To most of our readers, probably, the author needs not a word of introduction. His "Lessons" are widely known, and many have had the pleasure of hearing his suggestive addresses, to both children and teachers. The "Lesson Studies" before us are excellent. They are simple, but strong; an unnecessary word will not be found, nor of anecdotes or illustrations is there one too many. We are glad that the esteemed author has published a portion of his Lesson Studies in this cheap and convenient form; and we have no doubt that many readers who have no connection with classes of any kind will find the book of great advantage.

Present Day Tracts. Vol. VII. R.T.S.

This is a good number of an excellent series, often commended in these pages. We are particularly pleased with the paper by Dr. Maclear, "Historical Illustrations of the New Testament Scriptures."

Synoptical Lectures on the Books of Holy Scripture. By DONALD FRASER, M.A., D.D. Two vols. Fourth edition. Nisbet and Co.

The Preface to this new, fourth, edition tells us that this is in some respects a new book. The stereotyped plates of previous editions have been sacrificed, and the author has revised with care, having in view the recent discoveries of Biblical science. We have read many passages with interest and satisfaction.

We are by no means surprised to see a second edition of that ably-written book *Some Account of Amyot Brough*. Captain Brough fought under the Duke of Cumberland in the Low Countries, and was wounded under the eyes of General Wolfe at the taking of Quebec. The Tale has many graphic sketches of social and religious life. This is one of the high-class gift-books of Messrs. Seeley.

Daisy of "Old Meadow," by Miss GIBERNE, is a simple story (Nisbet and Co.). "Daisy" is well drawn, and many working-class readers will not think the passages about Isaac and his bag of gold are over-coloured.

With *A Crippled Robin* (Seeley), many admirers of "A Nest of Sparrows," and "Under the Shield," will be much pleased. We most heartily commend this Tale.

In the February *Art Journal* (Virtue and Co.) appears "The Favourites of the Emperor Honorius," by Mr. Waterhouse, A.R.A.; a fine picture, admired at the Academy in 1883.—The *Quiver* has a paper on mistakes about prayer, by Rev. George Everard.—In *Cassell's Family Magazine* appears another of the admirable papers on Health. The Doctor, who, if he "visits" as well as he writes, must be a treasure, gives advice about breakfast. He says:

What a person eats for breakfast often gives me a clue to the state of his health. One example: if while sojourning at an hotel I see a man come down to breakfast between ten and eleven, and sit down to devilled kidneys with plenty of sauce (piquant), and perhaps one poor puny egg to follow, I would be willing to aver that he carries a white tongue, and that his liver sadly needs seeing to. Ham and eggs, bacon and eggs, or a beef-steak or underdone chop, with boiled eggs to follow, and *then* a cup of nice tea, is a sensible breakfast for a man who is going out into the fresh air to walk, or ride, or work till noon; but not for a person who has to sit all day in the same position at *manual* labour. I emphasize the word *manual*, because intellectual or mental work conduces to appetite. An author hard at his desk, if his ideas be flowing freely, if he be happy at his work, and time flying swiftly with him, soon gets hungry, which only proves that we must support the body well when there is a strain upon the mind, so that no extra expenditure of tissue may lead to debility. Cheerful conversation ensures the easy digestion of a good breakfast.

The Church Sunday School Magazine has a hymn ("The Holy Innocents") by the Bishop of Exeter, and a paper on St. Mark's Gospel by the late Dean of Chester. Archdeacon Murray's paper, as usual, is very good. In "The Work of the Sunday-school Teacher out of School," by Mr. H. Barker, appears this paragraph:

Several years ago I had the pleasure of attending one of the Conferences in London in connection with the Church Sunday School Institute. The Rev. G. W. Kennion (now Lord Bishop of Adelaide) was speaking very practically on the discouragements of a teacher, and dwelling on the thought that many a teacher felt tempted to give up his work, as it seemed no use going on talking to children about things which he had often talked to them about before, but which they did not seem to understand, when he very simply said: "Has it ever occurred to you that our blessed Lord thought it worth while on the very day of His resurrection to spend two hours on the road to Emmaus talking with two men about things on which He had often talked to them before, but which they did not seem to understand?" And then in simple language he urged the teachers present to follow their Master's example in patient continuance in well-doing. The memory of that query still abides with me, and the simplicity of the illustration and the earnestness of the speaker thrilled many a heart, and doubtless cheered and encouraged many of the teachers present to renewed earnestness and perseverance.

The *Church Worker* always has some interesting "Notes and Comments." In recording the death of the Archbishop of Armagh, the editor says: "Presiding over the Church of Ireland at a time when difficulties beset and dangers encompassed her, after Disestablishment, his admirable qualities were called into exercise, and exhibited with signal advantage." Again, as to Dean Howson, the *Church Worker* says:

So touching a tribute to the memory of a life has never been more deservedly paid than in the words which fell from the lips of the Master of the Temple, in his reference to the Dean as one for whom the mourning was not merely local, but "had its echo all over England, wheresoever a beautiful character, a life at once studious, sociable, and practical, a life given to useful labour in writing and edu-

cating, and a Churchmanship earnest without narrowness and liberal without vagueness, can find appreciative hearts to call it the kind of Christianity best for Englishmen, most truly expressive of the national spirit, in its strength and in its charm, 'in things pertaining to God;'" and one who was fittingly laid to rest "in the cloisters of the cathedral which had drawn from him new life for its worship, and new beauty for its structure."

Platform Aids is a volume of Messrs. Hodder and Stoughton's "Clerical Library." It contains speeches of the "most eminent Christian orators of the present day." The speeches are from newspaper reports.

We have much pleasure in recommending a new cheap edition of *The Way Home*, by the Rev. CHARLES BULLOCK, B.D. This, we observe, is the "seventieth thousand." It is published at the *Home Words* Office, 7, Paternoster Square.

In the *National Review* appears the speech on Patronage which the Bishop of Peterborough delivered in the House of Lords twelve years ago. We had the pleasure of listening to the speech at the time, and we welcome this publication of it, by the Bishop, with a timely and very interesting postscript.

THE MONTH.

MR. GLADSTONE is for the third time Prime Minister. The Cabinet is thus composed: First Lord of the Treasury, Mr. Gladstone; Lord Chancellor, Sir F. Herschell; President of the Council, Earl Spencer; Chancellor of the Exchequer, Sir W. Harcourt; Home Secretary, Mr. Childers; Foreign Secretary, Earl of Rosebery; Colonial Secretary, Earl Granville; Secretary for War, Mr. Campbell-Bannerman; Indian Secretary, Earl of Kimberley; First Lord of the Admiralty, Marquis of Ripon; Secretary for Scotland, Mr. Trevelyan; President of the Board of Trade, Mr. Mundella; President of the Local Government Board, Mr. Chamberlain; Chief Secretary for Ireland, Mr. J. Morley.

The Earl of Aberdeen has accepted the office of Lord Lieutenant of Ireland.

Lord Hartington and Mr. Goschen both spoke and voted against the "abstract resolution"[1] which Mr. Gladstone supported, and which compelled the resignation of the Ministry. They were not able, therefore, to take office under Mr. Gladstone. Lord Derby, Lord Northbrook, and Lord Selborne, members of Mr. Gladstone's Cabinet last year, are in agreement with the Whig, or Moderate Liberal Party. Sir Henry James, Attorney-General last year, has also felt himself unable to join Mr. Gladstone.

Lord Fife has resigned the office of President of the Scottish

[1] The proposal—somewhat in the lines of the "three acres and a cow" policy—was moved by Mr. Jesse Collings, and supported by Mr. Parnell's band.

Liberal Association. He was unable to change at a few days' notice the whole tenor of his political thoughts "at the startling and unexpected dictation of any political leader, however eminent he may be." He repudiates the policy of dallying with disintegration and Socialism.

In the *Guardian* of the 3rd, under the heading "The Lost Leader," appeared a striking article:

> Mr. Gladstone (says the *Guardian*) has chosen lately to describe himself by the title of "an old Parliamentary hand." The phrase declares an undeniable fact; but it does not suggest the character in which his best and most tried friends have loved to regard him.... And it is with a keen and abiding sense of loss that we see Mr. Gladstone, as he and we part company, descending into the common herd of party politicians, and content to be the head of a Government which exists only to tolerate Jacobinism in one kingdom and to coquet with Communism in another.

The *Spectator*, whose devotion to Mr. Gladstone has been so well known, has spoken out with marked ability and decision on the Irish Question.[1]

A serious split in the "National Party" has been closed up again; but the dictatorship of Mr. Parnell is not so stable as Mr. Gladstone seems to suppose. Captain O'Shea, a Liberal (who arranged the "Kilmainham Treaty"), was in the end accepted by the Galway Nationalists; but Mr. Healy's mutiny in this election is significant.

The Metropolis has been the scene of a scandalous outbreak. On the 8th an immense number of unemployed working men met in Trafalgar Square, in order to pass resolutions asking that public works should be started, and that Parliament should facilitate the employment of British capital. Some Social Democrats improved the occasion by haranguing the crowd and inciting them to riot and plunder.

The "Simultaneous Meetings" in connection with the Church Missionary Society—a movement to which reference was made in the January CHURCHMAN—have proved in many ways a singular success. In the *Record* of the 12th appeared deeply interesting reports of Meetings held at nearly 200 centres; and these reports, showing how the Church is stirred, afford solid reasons for thankfulness and hope. So

---

[1] In an article, "The Flabbiness of Public Opinion," the *Spectator* says: "We have taken the Irish case as our illustration because that happens to be the question of the day; but it is much the same with many other questions—as, for example, with the great question affecting the three acres and the cow, a pastoral idyll now withdrawing rapidly to the end of a somewhat distant rural vista. Public opinion is degenerating, because so many men are determined not to be 'out of the running,' that they do not make up their own minds at all, but wait to see how other people make up theirs, and even then act only *as if* they had made up their minds, without really making them up."

prayerful, so truly spiritual a movement, is rich in promise. The letters of the Archbishops to Mr. Wigram (Hon. Sec., C.M.S.) have been read with lively interest.[1]

In Brighton, on the 12th, at an intercessory service in the parish church, Archdeacon Hannah's eloquent address contained a touching reference to Bishop Hannington. In the afternoon Conference, Lord Chichester's speech—scarcely an "In Memoriam," for he hoped against hope—was peculiarly impressive. Few who heard the venerated Chairman (President of the C.M.S. for 50 years) referring to his friend Bishop Hannington, and special prayers, will ever forget that speech.

Tidings which arrived on the 13th leave no hope, it would seem, that the good Bishop escaped. The King of Uganda sent orders that the Bishop with his party should be led to execution.

Archdeacon Darby has been appointed Dean of Chester.

The members of the House of Laymen met yesterday (the 16th). The Archbishop was accompanied by eleven Bishops. In his opening address the Archbishop said:

> My Lords and gentlemen, it is with a grave sense of the significance of this occasion, and with a well-grounded confidence in the advantage of your counsels, through the will of God, to the development of the active work and spiritual life of the Church of England, that I now open in His Name this House of Laymen elected for the province of Canterbury. Answering to the expansion of interest and the increase of self-denying labour and generosity on the part of the laity of the Church in advancing towards the noble ends set before her by her Master and Head, there has for many years existed a fixed desire on the part of the Bishops and most of the clergy to secure in some definite manner, God helping us, a large measure of regular deliberation and counsel from able and devout laymen. To the due consideration of many modern problems the opinion of the laity and the opinion of the clergy are alike essential.

Viscount Cranbrook moved a vote of thanks to the Archbishop for his address. Mr. Beresford Hope seconded the motion, which was agreed to, and acknowledged. The Archbishop and Bishops then retired.[2]

In Convocation the proceedings were important. In the Upper House, on motion of the Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol, a Committee of the whole House was appointed to consider the various proposals for Church Reform.

---

[1] "We are informed that at the Episcopal Meeting at Lambeth this week, on the occasion of the administration of Holy Communion, the Archbishop of Canterbury requested the prayers of the assembled Bishops on behalf of the Simultaneous Meetings."—*Record*, Feb. 12.

[2] Mr. Spottiswoode moved that Lord Selborne be appointed chairman of the House. The Earl of Harrowby seconded the motion, which was agreed to amid cheers. On the motion of Mr. Powell, seconded by Mr. Beresford Hope, Mr. Spottiswoode was elected vice-chairman of the House.

INDEX TO VOL. XIII.