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

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

THE

CHURCHMAN

A Monthly Magazine

CONDUCTED BY CLERGYMEN AND LAYMEN

OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND

VOL. XIV.

LONDON
ELLIOT STOCK, 62, PATERNOSTER ROW
1886

THE

CHURCHMAN

APRIL, 1886.

ART. I.—THE IRISH NATIONALIST PARTY AND THE IRISH CHURCH.

A NEW House of Commons has been returned under the new and extended franchise for Great Britain and Ireland. For Great Britain the return has been very much on the lines of the last Parliament, the Conservatives having, indeed, gained somewhat, but the two great parties of Liberals and Conservatives remaining much as they were before. For Ireland, however, a compact body of eighty-five followers of Mr. Parnell has been returned by the new voters; and the number of Conservatives (or Loyalists) who have succeeded in obtaining seats amounts to only eighteen—sixteen of them hailing from the province of Ulster, and two from the University of Dublin.

It does not fall in with our purpose to inquire closely into the circumstances of the return of the eighty-five Parnellites, nor even to dwell upon the fact that if we add together the numbers of those who voted for Conservatives and those who for various reasons abstained from voting, we reach nearly *one half of the whole electorate.* The fact—the hard tangible fact—still remains, that Mr. Parnell has secured a following which, owing to the present state of political parties in England, makes him practically master of the situation, and enables him to bring to the front a question which is about nothing less than the integrity or dismemberment of the Empire.

We have drifted into this state of things; we have been drifting for a long time; but drifting becomes accelerated towards the end. It seems but yesterday—it is not a year ago—since the Prince of Wales and his amiable consort visited Ireland, and received a welcome which, for Dublin, was hearty, for all Ulster enthusiastic, for Belfast magnificent. The country was then under the rule of a nobleman who had

the respect and goodwill of the loyal part of the community. Nothing was farther from the thought of his Government than a separate legislation for Ireland, and the confident expectations of that Government were fixed upon a majority in Great Britain which should bear down all opposition, and make it—and not Mr. Parnell—master of the situation. By the results of the Election the position has been changed, and Mr. Gladstone's Government, driven for a while from office, has found it necessary to make a change of front, and to sue for pardon from those it lately denounced, in order that it may regain the emoluments and power of office.

Few, even of those who have thus eaten their own words, can say that the political complication they have brought about affords a cheerful outlook; if it did so in any sense, the fact would reflect strongly on their old policy as well as on their late denunciations. All that they have hitherto done comes to this downright assertion: "We are the men, and wisdom dwells with us; and if the State is to be defended by any right hands, ours are the right hands to do it!" Let us hope—for there are degrees in hope—that we be not brought ere long to say, "Save us from such a defence, and such defenders!

The subject of our paper leads us in the first instance to discuss the "Nationalist" programme—so far as it can be called by so ambitious a name—and then, having seen what it is likely to do for Ireland as a country, we may go on in the next place to examine more particularly the relation of this Nationalist programme to the interests of the Church of Ireland.

Anyone with the heart of an Irishman must regard the present state of things in Ireland as a Nemesis on England for wrong-doings in the past. Ireland has always been discontented under English rule. Before the Reformation, as well as before and since the legislative union, Ireland has been the paradise of agitators. Any agitator who knew the rudiments of his trade has never had any difficulty in fanning the embers of discontent into a flame, and as there is no smoke or flame without some fire to set it going, we must suppose there has been some cause for a state of feeling in Ireland towards England which Mr. Walter Besant thus expresses by the mouth of Mr. Fagg, of Australia, when down on his luck, and in a pessimistic temper, "We must import more Irishmen —there shall be separation!"

Discontent can only be met by real, honest, generous efforts to produce content. Were these efforts made by England in a continuous way, and upon any system? We must go back a long way to get the answer, and when we do get it, it is not

reassuring. England did not understand Ireland—never tried to do so—and in her dealings with Ireland all through she understood her own interest so well that she took good care that no interest of Ireland should ever come into competition with it. She knew so little of Ireland that she forbore to publish the reformation in a language understanded of the people, and thereby threw those people into the arms of Rome; and she knew so much about her own commercial interests that she destroyed the Irish wool trade, and the hopes of a rising colony, that Yorkshire might prosper and Liverpool sit contented! It may indeed be said that of late years England has laboured to atone for the past, and has made concession after concession to Irish demands, till many in Ireland have been constrained to cry out, "Ohe, jam satis!" But then concessions may not be of the right sort; they may be grudgingly given; the taste may be taken out of them; they may be like a bone thrown to a hungry dog; or food flung by belated travellers to a pack of ravenous wolves; they may be extorted from a sense of fear, and not from the love of righteousness; and the real object of granting them may be the good of those who grant, and not the real good of those to whom they are granted. In any such case concessions constitute a poor remedy for ingrained discontent. If the English Government in Ireland had pursued a firm and even course; if it had spent honest energy in the establishment of truth and justice, religion and piety; if it had laboured honestly to develop industries and resources, and to protect capital; if it had dealt fairly between man and man; it might have failed ("'tis not in mortals to command success"—more especially in Ireland), but it would have failed nobly. However, it did not do so; it was a Government sometimes Whiggish, sometimes imbued with a spirit of Toryism, but always narrow, mean, and self-seeking. It was a Government from hand to mouth, whose aim it was not to remedy evils, but to tide over difficulties, and therefore a Government which, by its own confession, has failed—"Hinc illæ lacrimæ."

And to this difficulty, arising from bad government, may be added a social difficulty, which, to an influential section of the Irish people, has been a fertile cause of discontent. We know what this social difficulty does with Dissenters in England, and, in its own way, it has done as much harm in Ireland. How little does the average Englishman know of Ireland,[1] of her wants, resources, people, or even geography? To the

[1] A friend of the writer took a curacy in England, and in the course of his parochial ministrations was asked by a well-to-do and apparently

average Englishman Ireland is a trouble which he is weary to bear, and it would matter but little to him if the island so near to England were sunk in the depths of the sea, and the waves of the broad Atlantic rolled without let or hindrance to the spacious docks of Liverpool. This contented ignorance of Englishmen of a country so close to theirs, and of a people who are their fellow-subjects, has done quite as much as misgovernment to produce a feeling of alienation and discontent.

But we must take care that we are not led away by sentiment, or by feelings of irritation. If people are now coming forward with a remedy, it is our wisdom to inquire carefully into the character of that remedy. We have to ask: Is it likely to mend matters, or to make them worse? And if we have reason to suppose it would not mend, but make matters worse, we have to ask, Why should we fly from evils which we know, to other evils which we know not of? And we have also to ask—Why should not England, even at the eleventh hour, govern Ireland on principles of justice and mercy, and with a real view to the interests of all?

Mr. Parnell, the most astute, self-contained, and, so far, the most successful of Irish agitators, has not committed himself by formulating his demands in the House of Commons. Still he has spoken his mind pretty freely in other places, and from what he has said we are at liberty to infer that any scheme of local self-government which falls short of full legislative independence is not his "single plank." Why he adopted this metaphor does not appear. It may have been suggested to him by the saw-mill lately set up on his Wicklow property, or he may have intended to illustrate the fact that a plank must come into the business anyhow—for if he wins, the loyal men of Ireland must walk the plank; and if he loses, he must be prepared to walk it himself: but then it *is* a single plank, pure and simple, with no mistake about it—

> All Ireland shall be free, from the centre to the sea—
> Says the Shan Van Vocht;

the "Shan Van Vocht" for this particular occasion being Mr. Charles Stewart Parnell.

Are any proposals of the "old Parliamentary hand" likely to satisfy this demand, and the spirit it has aroused amongst the disaffected part of the Irish population? Mr. John Morley, the new Radical Chief Secretary, speaks at Newcastle of home government and English connection, that English

---

educated parishioner "whether they had gas in Ireland?" My friend asked with a bewildered air, "What *is* gas?" His interrogator proceeded to enlighten him, but evidently pitied his benighted condition.

connection being cemented by the presence of 30,000 English troops in Ireland. Is that the Home Rule for which Mr. Parnell has "taken off his coat"? Is that the Home Rule prophesied by the "Shan Van Voght"? Of course, if it suits his purpose Mr. Parnell will accept any concession which he may regard as a step in the direction of his main object; but if words have any meaning, and if the wishes of the people he leads have any weight, he cannot and dare not close the question, with any less concession than the full, complete, and uncontrolled legislative independence of Ireland.

How far Mr. Parnell has brought this question within the sphere of practical politics, time — perhaps a short time— may tell. So far, he has done wonders for his party; but so far, his efforts in Parliament have been directed towards objects which have commanded the sympathies of many who do not agree with him on the subject of his "single plank." The canny Northern farmer has no objection to have his rent reduced, but for the same reason—*i.e.*, his own interest—he decidedly objects to Home Rule. O'Connell's influence was based on the fact that he carried "Catholic emancipation." He broke down on his repeal agitation. It may be so in the present instance, though it strikes us that Mr. Parnell is a more adroit politician than O'Connell; and O'Connell never had eighty-five members at his absolute beck and call in the British House of Commons!

However, the question is so close upon us, that it behoves us to ask what the consequences to Ireland would be, supposing it were carried to Mr. Parnell's issue? Would the consequences be peace in her borders, and plenty in her stores? Would there be no decay, no leading into captivity, and no complaining in her streets?

The question might be answered by a reference to those halcyon days bounded by the years 1782 and 1801, days over which the advocates of repeal have thrown the glamour of oratory and poetry, but days which, viewed in the ordinary light of prosaic history, are to the full as chequered and sad as most other days in the annals of Ireland. The great orator John Philpot Curran, in his defence of Hamilton Rowan, pleads the benevolence of that gentleman to the then "starving manufacturers of Dublin;" and in the pages of Froude we read, during this period, much more of riots, squabbles, and jobbery, both inside and outside Parliament, than we do of prosperity.

But passing from speculation, let us put the question in a form which sets Home Rule before us under its most favourable conditions. Let us suppose that Ireland was homogeneous, that its inhabitants were all of one race and one religion,

trained not to the breach of the law, but to its observance. Would the country then benefit by full legislative independence, which of course implies practical separation from England? In the first place, Ireland must needs pass through a state of transition; property would change hands, and capital, scared away, would be slow and shy in returning. Ireland would be a small kingdom in the immediate neighbourhood of the richest and most powerful country in the world. In this time of transition, which would necessarily be a time of great distress, efforts would be made to remedy existing evils, and to stimulate native industries by tariffs and duties, which, however well meant, might only tend to make things dearer and might provoke retaliation from that powerful neighbour, which could do much better without Ireland than Ireland could do without her. Then for defence against outer enemies, in what a position would Ireland be? It might be said, Who is going to make the attack? Who can tell? But if the attack be made, as it might, who is going to make the defence? The Fenian Militia will hardly match the science and implements of modern warfare. Perhaps, however, the defence is to be made by Mr. Morley's 30,000 Saxon troops; but if so, who is to pay for those troops? Is England to do all the fighting and find all the money? If so, John Bull is not so bad a fellow after all; and for any good that separation might do—and it would hardly be much under the most favourable circumstances—it would be a pity to part company from one who exhibited a generosity as romantic as it was unwonted. If Ireland had a great extent of territory with abundant natural resources; if the population of Ireland were thrifty, independent, energetic. and all of one mind, then there might be some wisdom in Irishmen setting up for themselves, though even under those conditions—which in the present case do not exist—it might still be a question, could they not do better in partnership with their neighbours, than by setting up for themselves in these bad times?

But Ireland is *not* homogeneous. There are two Irelands in Ireland; and if we desire to trace things to their source, we may fairly arrive at the conclusion that the discontent of one party in Ireland is very much due to the existence of the other party. It is not necessary for us here to go into the history of the "other Ireland." It will be enough to say that in the province of the country in which it is principally to be found, the conditions of the community, socially and commercially, are very different from those which exist in other parts of the country. In this "other Ireland," law and order are generally respected. There are no stories of maiming dumb beasts, of murdering men and women, and, save on the

fringes of the border counties, in Ulster there are no agrarian outrages. This other Ireland is for the most part Protestant, and one of its counties—Antrim, at the last election—did what no other county in England or Scotland succeeded in doing, it returned all the members within its borders, whether for borough or for county proper, of a certain cast in politics; the four members for the county of Antrim, and the four members for the borough of Belfast being all Conservatives.

If we add to the Protestants of Ulster, who number more than 900,000, about 350,000 scattered through the rest of the country, we reach a total of a million and a quarter of loyal men; and if to these we add—as in all fairness we are bound to do—those Roman Catholics who not secretly, but openly and above board, avow their preference for union with England, we reach a grand total of at least one million and a half, out of a population which is certainly under 5,000,000. Now the question arises, what is to become of these? They regard themselves as Irishmen, and what is more, they are the salt of the country. From them have come the great names which have won credit for Ireland, in the field of art and science and literature and commerce, as well as on the field of battle. They comprise, at this present time, the most influential, cultivated, and industrious part of the population. They have shown conclusively that mistakes in government do not utterly mar the prosperity of a people; that in point of fact, whilst government may do a great deal in facilitating and directing matters, it is the character of the people themselves, their disposition to help themselves, and their determination to succeed, which do the main part of the work. Now these people have steadily protested against separation from England, believing that it would be destructive to their best and dearest interests; they have formed this opinion as the result of a long induction, and of a bitter experience. What is to be done with them? They cannot afford to be left out of the account.

Of course the Nationalists will say that this loyal minority is intent on its own miserable interests! Interests, forsooth! and after what, it may be asked, are the Nationalists looking? Have they no individual as distinct from patriotic interests? The loyal minority has a stake in the country, in land, in commerce, in professions and trades; and if the question is to be argued out on the narrow grounds of personal interest, it may be said that it is the interest of the loyal man, having something, to keep what he has, and of the Nationalist, having nothing, to take what he can get. In this case, however, the

interests of the loyal minority are bound up with the real interests of the country at large.

There is, therefore, a double difficulty in the matter of Home Rule. Even on the supposition that Ireland was one in race and religion, there would be room for grave doubt as to her progress and prosperity separate from England. But if we take Ireland as she is, made up of two races and two religions, then the inevitable result of a separation must be that each race and each religion will strive for the mastery. We are not yet far enough removed from periods of similar struggles to look for any other result. Ireland, which has always developed the bump of combativeness, would under such circumstances become a bear-garden or a cockpit, the by-word of Europe, and the disgrace of England. Separation from England must end in a victory for either of the contending parties, with sad results for the conquered; or, more likely, it must end in the utter exhaustion of both, realizing the story of the famous Kilkenny cats who, being shut up in a room all night, fought so bitterly that they finished up by devouring one another, so that nothing was left of them next morning but their tails!

But the question before us has a special as well as a general aspect; one, moreover, which may suggest to us something about an important force which is behind the demands of the Nationalists. We have to consider not simply the effect of separation on Ireland as a nation, nor upon the English in Ireland as a body, but the effect of separation upon the position and prospects of the Church of Ireland.

Every reader of THE CHURCHMAN, of course, knows that the Irish Church does not include the whole body of Protestants in Ireland. The Presbyterians number nearly half a million, and out of a million and a quarter, according to the last census, six hundred and thirty-five thousand, or something more than one-half, belonged to the Church of Ireland.

It is obvious, having regard to the historical traditions of this Church, and to the position, character, and influence of the bulk of its members, that any effect produced by the Nationalist movement on this institution must be of great importance; and when we add to the point already stated, the fact that, unlike the Presbyterian Church, the Church of Ireland is not confined to Ulster, but has her roots and branches in all parts of the country, the effect of the anti-union movement will appear to bear not simply on Churchmanship, but on Protestantism as such throughout the length and breadth of the land.

Now it goes without saying that the Nationalists as a party raise no clamour against the Irish Church. Sometimes,

indeed, Roman Catholic editors of newspapers, or Roman Catholic priests, take exception to what they regard as an invidious name—the term "Church of Ireland." Neither editors nor Roman Catholic priests are singular in this, for Presbyterians have taken exception to the title oftener and more bitterly than the Roman Catholics. But no clamour is raised by the Nationalists, because there is really nothing to clamour against: privileges and endowments have been taken away, only our existence as a self-supporting body is left; and it would hardly suit the book of the Nationalists to clamour openly against *that*, when they are making frantic efforts to bring Ulster and Munster, Protestants and Roman Catholics "into line," as they phrase it, on the Home Rule question. All the same, however, though there is no clamour and no denunciation, and though we are free to confess that the Nationalist leaders have no thought of denunciation, there never was a movement more calculated to do harm to the Irish Church than this Nationalist movement. As a movement in progress it is crippling the most liberal friends of the Church, and removing them slowly but surely from the country; as a movement carried to a successful issue it would entirely sweep away those resources, together with the class to which the resources belonged.

Mr. Parnell lately stated in the House of Commons that he "was born a Protestant, that he lived a Protestant, and that he hoped to die a Protestant." To this confession of faith he might have added the fact that for some time he sat in the Synod of his diocese, and continued to do so until he was no longer elected by his fellow-parishioners; and yet for all this talk—and giving Mr. Parnell all due credit for sincerity—it does not materially assist in bringing round a hopeful solution of the difficulty. It really matters very little to the Church of Ireland that Mr. Parnell is a Protestant, because the question is not about himself or his own religious views and dispositions, *but about the force behind him;* and by this force we do not mean the eighty-five shadows of himself who surround him in Parliament, but the force that is behind them all. That is a force which they feel now, when it is necessary they should feel it, and which by-and-by they are sure to feel pressing them in on every side with a power which they cannot resist.

There never was anything so calculated to win the adherence of all sorts and conditions of discontented people in Ireland as the Nationalist movement. To the tenant-farmer it came not only with the promise, but the performance of the three "F's," as they were called, viz., fair rent, free sale, and fixity of tenure; and with the possibility, in the not very remote future, of no rent at all! To the Roman Catholic priest it

offered the prospect of the gradual drying up of the resources of the Irish Church, and of her final extinction in the rural parishes of the eastern, western, and southern provinces. In most of such parishes the landlord is the chief contributor to the parochial assessment, which is the backbone of the incumbent's income; his family and household form a considerable portion of the scanty congregation, and their presence gives a sense of protection and support to the scattered families of Protestant farmers or labourers who are well-nigh lost in the surging crowd of their Roman Catholic neighbours. Reduce the landlord's income by one-half, and let that half be badly paid, in some instances not paid at all, and how then is he to pay his subscription to the assessment? Oblige him to fly for his life, and he takes his household with him, and the scanty congregation becomes scantier still; the few poor sheep in the wilderness are left with a shepherd as poor as themselves, in daily expectation of the reduction or loss of his income, which the Representative Body cannot pay, because there are no assets.

This is what is going on at present; and there is another possible danger to the Church in the immediate future connected with the progress of the Nationalist movement, and independent of its success.

When the Representative Body received the commutation money of the clergy at the time of Disestablishment, the sum amounted to over six millions. This capital sum was charged with the life incomes of the commuting clergy; and, of course, if it had not been supplemented by the contributions of the faithful, it would have been eaten up by the time the generation of disestablished clergy all passed away. As a matter of fact these contributions have enabled the Representative Body to discharge their liabilities to the disestablished clergy out of the interest of the commutation money—plus the contributions. So far, therefore, the capital sum has been preserved intact.

The investment of more than six millions of money was a large and critical financial operation, and the sub-committee of the Representative Body, made up principally of experts in such matters, showed a wise discrimination in their investments, some of the money being put into Railway Bonds, which have turned out well, and some—about three millions—being placed in what at the time was regarded as the very best security, first-class mortgages on land. But who would *now* lend money on land in Ireland? Or who that has lent it in better days, would not be delighted to call his money in, if only it would be so obliging as to come? The clergy in Ireland, and no doubt also the Representative Body, as a

corporation, would be glad to see this money safe; that is to say, they would be glad to see it in Colonial, or other fair securities, rather than in the depreciated property of Irish landlords.

These remarks, however, have to do with present effects, and effects likely to take place in the immediate future; in fact with a state of things brought about by agitation and conspiracy, Ireland still continuing in union with England. Another question arises, apparently within the sphere of practical politics: "What if the union were dissolved? what if full powers of legislation were conferred on an Irish Parliament? In such a condition of things what would be the position and prospects of the Irish Church?"

In order to approach this question, we may ask in the first place, What would be the constitution of an Irish Parliament, supposing one to be elected by the present franchise, or by such broader franchise as might fall in with the American proclivities of the enthusiastic Nationalists in their first flush of triumph? We are told that in such a Parliament we should have between one-third and one-fourth of Protestant representatives, because between one-third and one-fourth of the population of the country are Protestants. Arguing, however, on this basis, we may ask: Supposing we manage to get a fourth of the representation of an Irish House of Commons, of what practical use would such a number be when pitted against three-fourths of Roman Catholics, and the question in debate being one in which the Roman Church was supposed to have a real interest? How many of the Roman Catholic majority would, in such a case, be likely to join the Protestant minority?

But it would seem that the results of the late election show us pretty clearly that the Protestants could never hope to secure one-fourth of the representation. If the Protestants were equally distributed throughout the country they might easily secure much more than one-fourth of the elected members. But even in Ulster they are so grouped that in some counties they are overwhelmingly strong, and in others proportionably weak. In certain places they easily returned their own men, but in other places—such as Fermanagh—though numerically strong, they failed. The same was the case in Dublin, where, with thousands of voters, they were not able to get in a single member for county or borough. Unless, therefore, the Nationalists are prepared to carve out districts for the special behoof of Protestant candidates and voters—which they are not likely to do, and which, indeed, we can hardly expect them to do—things must remain very much as they are, if they do not become worse.

Well, we have our national Parliament, and to be within

the bounds of a safe calculation, we may say we have one-fifth composed of Protestants, not all—not by any means all—members of the Church of Ireland; the other four-fifths Roman Catholics. Then we must look to the power behind the Roman Catholics, the power which will move the springs of legislation, and mould the wills of the majority. What is that power? Is it Socialism or Communism, or the notions of Irish Americans? No doubt the representatives of these "isms" will find something for their hands to do, and will do it with all their might; but there is a power stronger than all, which is none the less strong because it knows when to speak and when to refrain from speaking, when to keep in the background and when to come to the front. That power is the Church of Rome; nowhere so strong—in what constitutes strength for her—as in Ireland; nowhere so full of the traditions of past wrongs; nowhere so sure of unquestioning obedience whenever she commands anything to be done which does not run directly counter to the political yearnings and aspirations of her members.

What those aspirations are none know so well as those who have lived in Ireland, more especially in Roman Catholic districts. And here we would wish to guard against misconception. We are not speaking of Roman Catholics as individuals, or members of society. We have already noted the fact that there are many loyal Roman Catholics in Ireland, well disposed to the union with England; and we have had ourselves Roman Catholic friends whom we never knew to fail, when the occasion demanded a proof of true friendship. But we are now speaking of the general feeling of the mass of the Roman Catholic population towards the Protestant portion of their fellow-countrymen. When the average Roman Catholic peasant of Kerry, or Wexford, or Tipperary, or Limerick, speaks out his mind—which he occasionally does—he will ask, "What business has a Protestant in a Catholic country?" Those who are his superiors in rank, though they may not speak out so plainly, do not leave us in much doubt as to their meaning. Dr. Walsh, Roman Catholic Archbishop of Dublin, looking with an evil eye on Trinity College—a Protestant foundation of the Protestant Queen Elizabeth—asks with indignation what business an institution like that has to raise its head in a "Catholic" city like Dublin, and in full view of that noble building, once the House of Lords and Commons, now the Bank of Ireland, which, when purified from its present occupiers and their money-boxes, is to hold a regenerated Parliament? The Irish correspondent of the *Catholic Times*, seizing on this utterance of the Archbishop, has pushed it a little farther on its logical journey.

Archbishop Walsh foreshadowed the doom of Trinity College, whilst on a visit at Cashel, to his worthy brother Archbishop Croke, and this is the comment of the correspondent: "The meeting of two patriot prelates within the shadow almost of the rock of ruins, inspires great hopes in the breast of the nation, and seems to confirm the belief which has taken possession of the popular mind, that before very long new edifices, surmounted with the cross, will arise phœnix-like out of the relics of the past, *and old edifices still standing will pass into the hands of those to whom they legitimately belong.* Through this belief we have arrived at the hope that when 'Trinity' is nationalized, *Patrick's and Christ's will be ours once more!*" The allusion here, of course, is to the cathedrals of Christ Church and St. Patrick's, Dublin.

Now whilst we feel that Irish Churchmen have not a word to say about the Rock of Cashel, they or their representatives having in times past suffered the noble cathedral and other buildings there to fall into utter ruin, and never having had the spirit to repair any portion of them, so far as to fit them for the celebration of divine worship, we regard the case of the two cathedrals of Dublin from a very different point of view. These buildings were not only in full use for sacred ministrations at the time of disestablishment, but one of them, St. Patrick's, had just been restored by Mr. Guinness, at a cost of upwards of £100,000; and since the disestablishment Christ Church, the other cathedral, has been restored and endowed at a cost of little less than £200,000, by the munificence of Henry Roe. These are the buildings they threaten to take from us, buildings in which £300,000 of Protestant money have been sunk within the last five-and-twenty years. Of a verity, "if they do these things in the green tree, what shall be done in the dry?" Indeed, Mr. Justin McCarthy, in an article lately written by him in the *Gentleman's Magazine*, has, in his own plausible and airy way, indicated the course which things are to take, when he tells us that "the Church which so long guided the nation through the valley of the shadow of death, will exercise its loftiest duty as the guide and guardian of a regenerated race."

Judging from these and other similar indications, there is much more than a suspicion that high-handed proceedings on a large scale, would be put in force against the loyal minority, should a measure of separation throw the great preponderance of power into the hands of the Nationalist majority; in such a case, the members of the Irish Church, and indeed all Protestants must expect to be ordered to "move on!"

One of the stock grievances of the Home Rulers, at least at the beginning of the movement, was the prevalence of ab-

senteeism. We remember hearing this matter and the evils connected with it strongly urged by a distinguished follower of the late Isaac Butt. This gentleman, a Protestant and a Protestant clergyman, regarded the Home Rule movement as likely to produce a beneficial effect upon the higher schools in Ireland, and upon Trinity College, Dublin, because under the conditions of such Home Rule the gentry would be likely to educate their sons in Irish schools and in the Dublin University, rather than in English schools and in Oxford or Cambridge, as at present. Whether Home Rule would have had such an effect on the landed gentry is doubtful. They would most likely, under any circumstances, wish to push forward their sons on the widest and most promising path, and to send them where they would be in a position to form connections useful to them in after life. But if we look to the particular phase of the Nationalist movement which is now before us, we can at once see that there is little hope for the rehabilitation of the classical schools or Trinity College by the influx of a crowd of the sons of the landed gentry in the event of the accomplishment of Home Rule. The crowd that would then knock at the doors of educational institutions would consist much more of those who were looking for bursaries than of those who came with money in their hands to pay for the education they required.

If absenteeism is an evil, and it is and has been an evil of the first magnitude for unhappy Ireland, the Home Rulers are preparing to make it utterly impossible by abolishing the class which furnished the absentees, *i.e.*, the landlords, and so putting an end to absenteeism by leaving none to be absentees. This may be regarded from one point of view as a terrible piece of vengeance on the landlords, and from another as an Irish way of solving an Irish difficulty.

It is to be feared, however, that absenteeism would go beyond the class of landlords, and reach those industrial and professional classes who would find that the confusion and chaos which must usher in the introduction of Home Rule would be no more beneficial to the advance of trade and influx of capital than the present system of tyrannical boycotting under the direction of the National League. Those who would replace the landlords, the farmers, the tradesmen thus ousted, would be adventurers who have followed Mr. Parnell for pure love of their country and what they could get out of it, and the rank and file of those who did the boycotting and other agrarian work for the National League, and who will naturally look for their reward. And so there would be an advance all along the national line. Those who had been loyal to their Queen and faithful to the Union would be marked out for vengeance;

in some instances they would be openly attacked, in others harassed by petty persecutions — their schools, colleges, churches would be taken from them, their liberties as citizens curtailed, if not annihilated, until at last the remnant that was left must take up arms for their altars and their homes, or go sadly to some land over the sea, where there would be more liberty and more fair play than in regenerated Ireland!

Under these circumstances, we Irish Churchmen "beckon to our partners in the other ship to come and help us." We did so some sixteen or seventeen years ago, but we did so then in vain. Shall our signal of distress be in vain now? We are not asking to be maintained in privileges and endowments—these have been taken from us; we ask for no ascendency but the ascendency of law and order; we, fellow-citizens and of the same household of faith, plead with our English brethren to stand by us in the struggle for existence. Catholic we are, clinging to the eternal verities of the faith once delivered to the saints, but Protestant we also are; for in Ireland, if as a church we are not Protestant, we are nothing. We plead with them, that after the experience of two hundred years, they see to it that Mr. Gladstone shall not repeat history, by bringing round practically another Edict of Nantes revocation; and we plead with them, not for our own sakes only, but for theirs; for if this concession be made, it will prove to be a leap in the dark such as England has never yet taken since she became a nation!

JOHN W. MURRAY, LL.D.

ART. II.—THE ADVENT MISSION IN NEW YORK, 1885.

THE blessing which in many ways and parishes has confessedly attended the revival movement of late years within the Church of England, and which, under the name of a "Mission," has so quickened the spiritual life of pastor and people at home, could not fail to attract the attention and excite the interest of other Churches in communion with her. It was a true report that was heard in other lands. This remarkable and God-owned special effort, which has become now a recognised agency for winning souls to Christ, reclaiming the lapsed, and deepening the spiritual life of believers, has been watched and noted by those who before committing themselves to it, or adopting its methods, desired to be thoroughly satisfied that the movement itself was not of an ephemeral nature, but, under God, productive of solid and enduring good.

Originating within the Church of England, and characterized as our Church is by her general sobriety, and the decorum of her ordinary ministrations, prejudice against anything that savoured of "*revivalism*," though in some quarters strong, was not as strong and invincible as it might have been had the movement had some other origin. That the archbishops and bishops of the staid and sedate Church of England sanctioned and in not a few cases themselves took active part in the Mission, went far to remove prejudice and to reconcile clergy and laity to what at first sight was unwonted and unlike all to which they had long been accustomed. Our pre-composed Liturgy, the restraints of our consecrated places of worship, the requirements of our ritual, afforded some guarantee that there could or would not be anything very *outré* or sensational in the conduct of the Mission itself. The general consensus regarding the Church of England predisposed many to welcome the effort, and to hope the best things of it. Scotland, notwithstanding the proverbial caution of the Scotch, became soon convinced. It was my happy privilege to be associated with the first Mission held in Edinburgh. Two years ago Ireland, associated as Ireland is with "revivalism" in some of its more extravagant phases, expressed a desire to have a Mission held in its metropolis, and again it was my privilege to take part in the Dublin Mission. There the work was beset with peculiar difficulties. Constant self-restraint was necessary, because of the very strong prejudice against introducing into the churches anything approaching what is known in Ireland as "revivalism;" and on the other hand the nearness on all sides of the Roman communion all but forbad our doing what in England is happily done without that suspicion, which seriously interferes with the effective and thorough work of a Mission. But whatever the national peculiarities or local difficulties which both in Edinburgh and Dublin had to be confronted and borne in mind, the blessing was in both cities marked and great.

The Episcopal Church in America, which can boast of many distinguished Bishops, pastors and zealous Churchmen, had also for some time watched the movement, and it was decided, after much deliberation, to have a Mission in New York, not only for any immediate good, but in the hope that such success would attend it as might encourage the like special effort in other dioceses. It was not entered on hurriedly, nor determined on simply because a Mission was the fashion, and because the Episcopal Church across the Atlantic did not wish to appear behind the age. It was not, I am fully persuaded, regarded as a "doubtful experiment," to be ventured on "with much fear and trembling," and that, at the most, it would be over

in ten days. The best was hoped for from what was as yet a new and untried experience, and the spirit in which it was taken up and prepared for, when once the resolution to have a Mission was formed, accounts very largely for the blessing which we are thankful to know rested upon it.

Under the presidency and guidance of one whom to know is to love, Bishop Potter, Assistant Bishop of New York, aided by the counsel and sympathy of the great bulk of the clergy within the diocese, the Mission was prepared for fully one whole year beforehand. Some few met together at stated times for "breaking of bread," and for prayer. Every detail was made at these devotional meetings matter of prayer. It was felt that, if nothing else or more came of the Mission, the remembrance of those hallowed hours, Christian intercourse, and quickened devotion, was in itself a cause of thankfulness. The elaborate and prayerful pains taken by clergy and lay helpers in view of the Mission, when nothing that forethought could devise was left undone, justified them in expecting that of which they were not disappointed, and was only one of many evidences of the spiritual forces which belong to the American Episcopal Church and which only need to be evoked to put her on a par in this respect with our own.

In resolving to have a Mission it was not projected with some vague, hazy, indefinite purpose, nor without high and clear views, founded on practical knowledge of the moral and spiritual condition of New York and the directions in which this special effort might affect their city and its people for good. The ground was well surveyed before the lines were laid down.

I place at the disposal of the readers of THE CHURCHMAN that which cannot but interest them. It is a carefully considered survey of New York life. Some twenty reasons are given why a Mission should be held. In this respect it might be well to take a leaf out of their book, and, in view of some Mission on a large scale, to set forth as clearly and distinctly the reasons which suggest a Mission. As the eye runs down this indictment we see that very much in New York is as it is with ourselves. Human nature is much the same everywhere, only that the river is coloured by the banks through which the same water flows. One cannot but admire the frankness and candour with which in very plain-spoken language the indictment is set forth. My readers may imagine the effect on the congregation when, amidst profound silence, I read this "in the ears of the people." I took an early occasion of doing so, as giving the *raison d'être* of the Mission. It furnished us with our text. It relieved us also of the *odium*, if such there

were, of the indictment itself. It also enabled us Missioners to speak more confidently than we could otherwise, as strangers, have spoken.

THE COMMITTEE'S SPECIAL REASONS FOR A MISSION IN THE CITY OF NEW YORK.

1. A large class of well-to-do and refined people, who have ceased to be, or never have been, Church-goers.
2. Formal communicants.
3. The irreligion of the young men of our well-to-do families.
4. The evils in the life of men and women in fashionable society.
5. The feeble recognition on the part of masters and mistresses of the need of Church attendance by their servants, resulting largely from a want of care for the spiritual welfare of servants.
6. The evils of Glass Churches.
7. The evils which come from the instability of Church connection.
8. The lack of opportunity for private prayer, consequent upon the condition of our tenement and boarding-houses, and the fact that few Churches are constantly open.
9. The want of definite, positive instruction in religious duties, and in what practical Christian living consists.
10. The lack of personal spiritual ministry to the rich.
11. The drain upon the minds, souls, and bodies of two classes: (i.) of those who give themselves up to the demands of society life; (ii.) of those laden down with too much work—unfitting both classes for a healthful Christian life. Among the causes of this drain we specify (*a*) late hours; (*b*) stores open late Saturday nights; (*c*) no Saturday half holidays.
12. The religious deprivation suffered by the large and rapidly increasing portion of the population called to labour at night, in connection with the homeless and the vicious classes abroad under cover of darkness.
13. The wrongs inflicted by employers upon their employees.
14. The lust of wealth, issuing in the manifold evils of unscrupulous competition; over-work, under-pay, scamped work, and mutual enmity and discontent between employer and employee.
15. The immorality and irreligion caused by the unrighteous denial to a large and increasing class of one day's rest in seven.
16. The prevalence of the sins of intemperance and impurity.
17. The special religious difficulties caused by the constant flow of immigrants.
18. The hindrance to the growth of the Christian life caused by our luxuriousness and selfishness.
19. The ostentatious display by Church-goers of all classes.
20. The want of public spirit in its bearing upon both Church and State.

Looking over this list, can we wonder at the resolve of our brethren across the sea, and that the old call should have been heard in nineteenth-century wording, "Come over into Macedonia and help us"?

The Mission was taken up by some twenty churches representing the larger and more influential portion of the Episcopal Church in New York. The reasons which deterred some from not identifying themselves, save in prayerful

sympathy, with it, were no other than obtain under similar circumstances elsewhere. Some did not equally see the necessity; others could not secure a missioner after their own heart; some dreaded excitement; others determined on judging by what they should see and hear as to whether or no they would have a Mission in their own church later on. There are obvious advantages in a simultaneous Mission; on the other hand, much is to be said in favour of a separate Mission in a particular parish held at some other time. I cannot but think that clergy should be very free to do, without censure or reflection cast on them, as they judge best in so momentous a matter. Better a thousand times wait until you secure a qualified missioner, *en rapport* with yourself and your people, than take part in a Mission in deference to or under pressure of outside clamour. Some of the New York clergy were in this respect sorely disappointed. I am, I think, correct in saying that such men as Canons Wilberforce, Body, Hole, and others were invited, but could not come. So far as I know, but five clergy of the Church of England were able to accept the invitation. These were the Rev. W. Hay Aitken, James Stephens, E. Walpole Warren, R. B. Ransford, and myself. Mrs. Crouch assisted Mr. Aitken in various ways, and my wife gave addresses in drawing-room gatherings, in schools, to the members of the G.F.S., and to the inmates of the Workhouse and Penitentiary. These ministrations on the part of ladies were highly appreciated, and my wife was overwhelmed with invitations to deliver addresses in some of the houses of leading families of New York. A sufficient number of churches took part in the Mission to justify its being regarded as "simultaneous," and some were served by bishops and clergy of the American Church. The Bishops of Utah and Western Texas took charge of Calvary Church, Fourth Avenue, and men of great ability and acceptance ministered elsewhere. My own ministrations were in the well-known "Church of the Heavenly Rest," Fifth Avenue, and this being the Belgravia of New York, the congregation would correspond to that which I had in St. Philip's, Regent Street, and to any representative West End congregation. The Mission, it will be seen, was not entirely, as was supposed, under the direction of clergy of the Church of England. My own impression was that it was so to be, that our American brethren were particularly desirous to see our methods, and perhaps to avail themselves of our larger experience; but it was an undoubted feature in this first effort that, failing men from England or without seeking extraneous help, the Church could, as the occasion required, find within her own body men fully equipped for a special work.

Very great interest was excited all throughout the States in

the Mission. Many clergy of note came from considerable distances to attend the Services, and expressed themselves greatly refreshed by what they had enjoyed. This, to my mind, was not the least of the bright and happy features in the Mission.

The leading organs of public opinion—notably the *New York Tribune* and *Herald*—gave a daily record in their crowded columns of the Services, and information was by this means diffused far and wide throughout the States. To enhance the interest, brief biographies, accompanied with singularly well-executed portraits, were given of the Missioners. We had, I may thankfully say, the Press with and not against us. I do not remember at any time reading anything that could be interpreted as otherwise than friendly and well disposed. This is something for which to be thankful, for the Press is a power, and a word written either way might have encouraged or deterred persons from attending the Services. It is only due to the editors of the papers to acknowledge the kindly spirit in which they found space for mention of our work.

We have also to place on record, with great gratitude, the courteous and hospitable reception of ourselves by all classes of society. Not only all my own but my wife's expenses to and fro were entirely defrayed, and one member of the congregation, Mr. Leech, took us most kindly, at his own charges, to Niagara and back. We were at once made to feel at home under the hospitable roof of Mr. John Glover and his charming family; and had I had no experience in the years gone by in Paris of the warmth of heart and spontaneous generosity of Americans, our first visit to their interesting metropolis would have abundantly borne out, as shown towards ourselves and the other missioners, the hospitality for which Americans are proverbial.

In every way, therefore, that could be imagined or devised the way was prepared for us. It was prepared by the best of all preparation, constant intercessory prayer. We may say with truth we were received in the spirit of the Church of old, we were "*received in the Lord.*" We were "esteemed very highly for our work's sake."

Arriving by the Cunard steamer *Oregon*, after a favourable passage of less than eight days, early on the morning of Sunday, November 22, I was enabled to attend divine service on the evening of the same day in the "Church of the Heavenly Rest," Fifth Avenue. It was to this church I had been most cordially invited. The excellent clergyman in charge of it, the Rev. D. Parker Morgan, had left nothing on his part undone to ensure, under God, a successful Mission. He took infinite pains in giving effect to all my wishes in

detail, and by word and example "went before his people." I had a quiet opportunity on that evening not only of worshipping, but of *observation*. My own ministrations were so absolutely restricted to this one church, except for two occasional addresses to the students of the Theological Seminary, that I must of necessity keep within these limits. My "impressions" must not be understood as of more than that with which I myself came immediately in contact. How far they may be correct as relates to other churches in New York I do not say, but some are confirmed by testimony to be afterwards quoted. Everyone who has taken part in a "simultaneous" Mission is well aware how absorbed one becomes in the church in which one is ministering, and how little anything beyond general report reaches you of what is going on in other churches. Looking in, as I did, on some of the churches in New York when service was not being held, one fact, I think, cannot fail to strike you: there is a very evident leaning towards the encouragement of the æsthetic element. I dislike the expression, yet I must be pardoned if I use it: the Churchmen of New York "go in" for "effect." Divine service is of a somewhat luxurious type. I speak, of course, of churches in the "West End." It is not of the vulgar and coarser type which characterizes some of the Roman Catholic churches. It is a restrained and cultured æstheticism. They seem to me fond of paintings on the walls of their churches, and bestow more attention on this than on the furniture and ornaments of the Holy Table. They are careful to have the best stained glass that money can procure, and evidence their love for "effect" in every possible arrangement of artificial lights to enhance it. The floors are well if not richly carpeted; the temperature, to my experience, oppressive, because overheated. It was an unwonted sight to see persons fanning themselves on a December day, as if we were in the tropics! The *entourage* of a West-End church is luxurious. I do not say that it is one whit more so than some churches similarly conditioned in London. It is less luxurious than were one or two chapels-of-ease within the memory of some of us, where an aristocratic flavour predominated, and no footfall was heard as servants in livery followed master and mistress up richly carpeted aisles, with the burden of Prayer Book and Bible, "too heavy to be borne" by other hands.

The Bishop of Ohio, preaching lately in St. Paul's Cathedral on the importance of Endowments, makes this remark: "In all churches of America the Christian religion is very largely the religion of the favoured classes." One of themselves, even a prophet of their own, says what the most superficial observation confirms: The *comfort* of worshippers is in every way studied.

Much attention is bestowed on music, and large sums are spent on this one element of divine service. I was much struck with the "brightness" and "crispness" of the singing generally. Accustomed to a first-rate West Riding choir at my own church, one was able to compare the music in New York churches with our West Riding standard. Some of the men's voices were excellent. The solos were artistically and feelingly rendered; boys' voices were clear and good. The habit of singing an anthem during the offertory, the congregation remaining seated instead of standing during the reading of the sentences, one could wish to see discontinued. It savours too much of the concert-room, and is hardly in keeping with the dignity or even the *discipline* of Divine service. The effect of the choir singing the last verse or verses of the recessional hymn in the vestry, situate immediately behind the chancel, was very sweet and beautiful, and it was observable that the congregation remained singing, even though the choir in recession had passed out of sight. The hymnal in use is good, though not the best. It contains many of our well-known hymns and tunes to the exclusion of many that would have made the collection better.

The churches are, so far as I can gather, managed and controlled by what we should call a Parochial Council. The system works well. It is evident that leading and influential laymen take a deep interest in Church matters. They relieve the Incumbent of much "serving of tables," without in any way, so far as I could see, interfering with his proper and recognised duties. This is certainly so in the case of the "Church of the Heavenly Rest," and I have no reason to doubt it holds good of other churches.

The Book of Common Prayer in use in the Protestant Episcopal Church, though compiled from the same sources, is in some respects an improvement on our own. The opening sentences are of larger and more appropriate selection. There is less of repetition in Morning and Evening Prayer. The frequent complaint of Nonconformists who occasionally attend our services, that they cannot follow us in our somewhat disconnected arrangement, is to a large extent met in the American Prayer Book. An alternate form of Absolution is provided. The *Gloria in Excelsis*, Psalms xcii. and ciii., can be sung as canticles. The Benediction is shortened. The Apostles' or Nicene Creed may be variously used. The Versicles are fewer. More special prayers are drawn up; *e.g.*, for a sick person or child; for persons going to sea; for one under affliction; for malefactors after condemnation; there is one to be used at the meetings of Convention. Corresponding to these are special thanksgivings. Within its pages is to be found an excellent

form of Morning and Evening Prayer for use in families. There is a "Selection of Psalms" which may at any time be used instead of the Psalms for the Day, ten in number, exclusive of those selected for Holy Days. The office for the solemnization of matrimony is considerably abridged. Much that many feel to be objectionable in our own is omitted. In the Burial Service strong expressions respecting doubtful cases are not to be found, to the relief of those who, without desiring to assume the office of a judge, cannot but sometimes have their conscientious qualms and misgivings. The long exhortation in the "Commination Service" is entirely omitted. There is a special Prayer for the Visitation of Prisoners, for the Consecration of a Church or Chapel, and an Office of Institution of Ministers to Almighty God.

There is one service to which I would direct special attention and that is the Form of Prayer and Thanksgiving "for the fruits of the earth and all the other blessings of His merciful Providence." This is to be used yearly, on or about the first Thursday in November. It originated in other sources, but has become now less identified with American independence than with one united national act of praise. I was present at and much impressed with this Service. The day is observed as a general holiday, and corresponds more closely to our Christmas Day observances. The poor are not forgotten; it is a day of family *réunions*. Why cannot we in England have one such Thanksgiving Day? Would it not be very grand and very impressive if, "beginning at Jerusalem," our metropolitan cathedral of St. Paul's taking the initiative, we agreed to sink all our local Harvest Festivals in one great simultaneous national act of praise, agreeing to hold our local festivals on some one day together, and thus, while to a large extent preventing the "gadding about" from church to church to see decorations, testifying to other nations that England was a God-fearing and God-honouring people? In this respect I venture to think the Protestant Episcopal Church in America is in advance of our own, and that we should not do amiss to follow so good an example.

I cannot but draw attention also to the *Office of Holy Communion*. The addition of an eleventh commandment thus prefaced, "Hear also what our Lord Jesus Christ saith,"[1] is a happy union of the covenants of Law and Grace. The Prayer of *Consecration* includes in one the *Oblation* and *Invocation*, and is followed by the singing of a hymn. The prayer is very beautiful, and the singing of a hymn at this break in the service sweet and solemnizing. So far as I know, the "eastward position" is adopted generally, but not necessarily

[1] St. Matt. xxii. 37-40.

with any doctrinal significance. It is curious to notice that clergy and choir turn to the east when saying the "Glorias," but not when reciting the Creeds. I do not know if this "use" is peculiar to the "Church of the Heavenly Rest."

The Americans are fond of preaching, and are good listeners. They prefer, as a rule, an extempore to a written sermon. Their preachers bear in mind Demosthenes' rule, "*Action, action, action.*" Preaching would be more effective but for the habit congregations have, to a degree I have nowhere else noticed, of conversing freely with one another within the precincts of God's House. My friends in New York must not resent my saying that this habit of talking in church, before and after service, is not conducive to devotion, does not promote reverence for sacred places, and is fatal to the retention of good impressions, however earnest the sermon may have been. The sentence with which Divine service commences in the American Church, is one which should have a prominent place assigned to it, on which eye and mind could rest, "The Lord is in His holy temple; let all the earth keep silence before Him."

I had but very little opportunity for ascertaining the general tenor of the pulpit message. I should say that, for the most part, distinctive Evangelical teaching prevails, with much the same defect which we find in Evangelical utterances at home, and to which I shall presently more particularly allude. The ritual is what would be considered "moderate." I doubt there is as much diversity in "use" as in England. In America all places of worship are "churches;" if "chapel" is used, it is understood of a *Mission Chapel.* Large toleration exists. There does not seem to me to be the rancour and bitterness amongst differing schools of thought in America, that unhappily prevails among ourselves; there is less sour milk. This arises, doubtless, partly from the fact that all denominations are, in the eye of the law, on an equal footing. No one communion enjoys any special protection or privileges. In saying this we must not, however, forget that they have never known anything but the Voluntary system, which is not without its felt disadvantages.

In the conduct of a Mission the preacher is not haunted by the thought, as in Ireland, "Will this be considered as savouring of Rome?" He is not restrained, as in Scotland, by the thought, "Will good Churchmen think this savours of Presbyterianism?" Some Missions are *weighted,* if I may so speak, by their peculiar surroundings. Where Romanism and Methodism to any great extent prevail, a Mission conducted on "Church lines" has to steer clear of these, to some, rocks of offence; and one who may have slowly learned to see that

there is good in schools of thought outside his own communion, is not as free as he would otherwise be, probably, in his teaching and method to recognise this. In America you do not feel thus fettered and weighted. Each Church is so absorbed in its own interests, that it does not bestow much thought on those who conscientiously differ.

Whatever the supposed advantages of the Voluntary system may be, and it must not be forgotten that the Bishop of Ohio spoke strongly in St. Paul's Cathedral on "The importance of Endowments," the Voluntary system makes *no provision for the poorer classes*, and "Congregationalism" is the natural result of the purely Voluntary system. More than this, the fact that all parishes are conventional, that they have no well-defined legal boundaries, has this plain disadvantage. The clergy are ministers of particular churches rather than parish priests. For want, therefore, of our parochial system and organization, there can never be the natural grooves or channels for the more active and practical aspects of the Christian religion. In this respect, the Voluntary cannot bear favourable comparison with the Parochial system. There is no natural outlet for Christian sympathy. In our great ironworks you see the channels all ready and prepared into which the molten metal immediately flows. Thus, to my mind—but I may be mistaken—the more practical aspect of the Christian faith, and that by which a creed is judged, is not so much ignored as kept in abeyance. Any religion which does not give full scope for the play of our sympathies must be not only luxurious but defective. This is all the more to be regretted, as this is to deprive a generous, warm-hearted people like the Americans, who need but little provocation to give, of these immediate and near opportunities which our elaborate organization provides. Particular congregations support particular charities, but I should hardly think that the practical sympathies of American congregations cover and comprehend so large and varied an area as our own system covers. I believe the American Church takes great and substantial interest in Foreign Missions. It seems to me, as one fact brought to one's mind during the Mission, that the same interest is not manifested, however much it might be exhibited in work nearer their own doors. Since writing this, purely from my own observation, I find it is confirmed in a Pastoral Letter by Bishop Whitehead, of Pittsburg:[1] "Suffer the word of exhortation with regard to Church institutions in our diocese. *I feel most keenly our deficiency in this respect.*" He points out how much help freely extended to "institutions of a

[1] I quote from the New York *Churchman* of Feb. 13.

general character do but help the Church towards the fulfilment of *her corporate duty* of proving her teaching by her works of love and mercy in her Master's name." He pleads for a Hospital for Children, for Homes for Aged Men, for Parish Schools, for such openings for Christian charity as Friendly Societies, Associations of Bible Readers, Societies of Lay Helpers, Orders of Deaconesses and Sisterhoods. To all this he adds: "An American Churchman may well feel rebuked by the great and self-sacrificing activity manifested in so many ways by the English Church, and almost untried by our own." The copy of the paper in which I read this Pastoral Letter arrived just as I was writing down my own impressions, and I was, of course, relieved to find that such impression is confirmed by men so qualified to speak as Bishop Whitehead. I should take exception, perhaps, to the implied "rebuke" of the American Church. All this seems to me to be charged to the *system*, not to the *people*. "Evil is wrought by want of thought, not by want of heart." So long as the Voluntary system obtains, it lacks not only the organization which affords near and natural scope for Christian sympathy, but it has not the status which is recognised as authoritative and commanding. How to meet all this is a problem for them to solve. We at home have not yet to solve it, but I fear if the Voluntary were to supplant our Parochial system in England, as would be the case were we "disestablished and disendowed," not only would a check be put on the flow of charity, but our poorer classes would be the first to feel and suffer by so great a revolution.

The keynote of the New York Mission was struck in the admirable address given to Clergy and workers by Bishop Potter at the preliminary service in the "Church of the Heavenly Rest." Those who were enabled and privileged to be present at that service will not soon forget its refreshment and inspirations. It has been my lot to hear not a few Episcopal utterances in view of a Mission. I do not remember having ever heard words of greater sobriety and chastened thought than those to which Bishop Potter gave utterance. He had had no experience of a Mission, yet he did not commit the mistake of saying "I hope." His was the language of sober confidence. He spoke in the spirit of Joshua: "Sanctify yourselves, for to-morrow the Lord will do great wonders among you." He did not fall into the opposite mistake of being too sanguine, as if all would be *couleur de rose*. His own ministerial experience would teach him to distinguish between lively impressions, stirred emotions, and solid, enduring perseverance in well-doing. Everyone present felt he had kept well and wisely within those limits which must be

kept by those of whom it may be said, "Ye have not passed this way heretofore." Holy Communion was administered to a large and devout number of communicants, each of whom was to be, directly or indirectly, engaged in a work at all times solemn, but as the first ever held in New York, invested with special interest and with no little anxiety. It was felt that on the success of the Mission in New York and on the results would depend how far Parochial Missions should be adopted in other towns or dioceses.

Our prayer-meeting on Saturday evening in the church was the largest I have ever seen on the eve of a Mission. It was a happy augury of what was to follow. We had all throughout the Mission crowded and interested congregations. The attention was fixed and rapt, and a very large proportion remained for the quiet "after-meetings." The remark made to me by a fellow-passenger on board the *Oregon* I found to be true. It was known on board that I had come out to conduct a Mission. He said, "We hear, sir, that you are coming to us to conduct a Mission. I do not exactly know what is meant by a Mission; but if it means that you are coming all this way to preach some 'modern views' or novel theories, it is hardly worth your while taking so long a journey. We in America get all that is 'modern' straight from France and Germany; but if you are coming to preach the simple Gospel of Jesus Christ, you will have all New York at your feet." And so it was; for human hearts and the soul's needs are everywhere the same. The broad Atlantic, with its separation of nations, does not affect nor vary these.

The attendance at our early celebration was fairly good, but not so large as I have seen at other Missions. In this I was somewhat disappointed, because at that service special opportunity is given for detailed instruction on Holy Communion, as well as for the strengthening and refreshing of our souls. The evening service was generally crowded, and I found that the effect of their not being abruptly addressed or interrogated was to induce many more to remain for the "after-meeting." This after-meeting seems to have been greatly valued, nor shall I ever forget one particular service; viz., that for *women* on the Wednesday afternoon. But, to my own mind, the one service that seemed to me most to interest the people, to draw out the hearts, to excite the deepest devotion, was the *Bible-reading* on 1 St. John. This was given daily, and lasted one hour and a quarter. We had some sweet hymns from my own collection; and again I found in New York what a demand there is for *exposition*, as distinct from a *sermon*. A very considerable number of those present took copious notes. Those hallowed hours are the most frequently recalled by

myself. I am more and more persuaded of the value and importance of a higher class of Bible readings for the cultured classes, through which one may make known, as I always do, to the laity and even clergy present the names of good books as aids to reading the Scriptures, as well as books of private devotion and sacred poetry. I invariably distribute a printed list of these as a *souvenir* of the Readings. This service was immediately followed by one for *intercessory prayer*, which lasted half an hour. Those who attended the services were encouraged to send in, anonymously, special petitions, and these were read aloud and then humbly presented to God. Some of these, turned afterwards into praise, were very interesting. Many present were moved to tears on hearing them read. In the London Mission of 1885 I was struck, conducting the Mission at St. Pancras Church, with the many petitions with reference to *unbelief*. In New York I was equally impressed with the many petitions with reference to *intemperance*. These petitions, sent in anonymously, brought much to light of the real *immediate* effect of the Mission. I should say, reflecting quietly over all that is now as a dream of the past—and it must be remembered my work lay amidst the *élite* of the city—and gauging results so far as we may, *that the petitions*, suggested by God the Holy Ghost, showed *as much as anything* in what direction the Mission *told*.

I have all these petitions by me, carefully preserved for reference. They were the heart-response to our teaching. Looking over them in my study, far removed from the scenes and inspiring influences of the Mission, how these requests for prayer reveal the spiritual condition of many professing Christians in our Churches! There are earnest prayers for enlightenment, and for the illumination of the Holy Ghost; for the grace of "godly sorrow," and for a true conversion; for conviction of sin, and for strength to keep some high and holy resolve made during the Mission. There are touching prayers for the lapsed and fallen that they may be restored to the paths of safety and peace. Some ask that they may be led to a true consecration of themselves to Christ, and that henceforth they may be "living witnesses" for Him. How these petitions bring to light the power of the world, and the hold its attractions have on those who name the name of Jesus! How many parents prayed for their children, some with little ones to bring up in the fear of the Lord, who were neglecting their first and immediate duties, as well as the care of their own souls, in worldly dissipation and gayness! How many husbands, sons, and brothers were mentioned as far from God; some drifting into infidelity, some evidently overmastered with the temptations of a great city! The anxiety

awakened during our Mission for the spiritual health of others showed no little realization on the part of the petitioner of the blessedness of the truth as it is in Jesus then first realized or revived. Often I used to say, and I think not unreasonably, "How I should like some avowed atheist to be present at this one service; let him hear and explain how it is that out of all those petitions that poured in daily, sent anonymously with the opportunity thus afforded for any kind of request, *not one* was for any temporal, but all were for some spiritual blessing." No one could be present at this service without feeling that God the Holy Ghost was also present in great power. We are often reminded that we cannot "tabulate results." We are told we must "wait for eternity" to know what was done by a Mission. This I fully grant, that *all* the results can never be known here. Many carry away a secret blessing. Many, like Mary, "keep all these things and ponder them in their hearts," but there are *certain* results which are quick and recognisable. The subject-matter of special requests for prayer; the acknowledgments made in private interviews; the outpourings of a heart in the letters addressed to you during and after the Mission, as true and as touching as anything can be; the silent acts of conscious consecration; the taking up of some definite work for God—if *these* are not results, what are? Family prayer in households where prayer was not wont to be made; business letters laid aside on Sundays; a worldly and compromising life renounced; the "love of God in Christ" realized and constraining; Holy Communion for the first time received or more fervently and devoutly partaken of; increased value set on all means of grace; some long-standing vice parted company with; some old truth once more embraced; some long drawn-out quarrel bridged over with mutual reconciliation and the kiss of peace; souls quickened into newness of life; if *these* are not results, what are? Are they not what we look and pray for in our stated ministry? Such as these attended—and praise our God for it!—our Mission in New York. If I were asked to put concisely and to summarize thoughtfully the dominant impression left on my mind, it is this: Truths faithfully proclaimed and often before heard were *accentuated*. They seemed to be more vividly impressed; they were more personally embraced. And to what do I attribute this? I attribute it mainly and chiefly to this, that in Mission teaching one *does not assume that all in Churches are true believers*. Hence the importance of insisting much on *fundamental truths* and "first principles" with that *consecutive* teaching, which compels the hearer to "examine himself whether he be in the faith." Next, it is the leading our people to *honour the Holy Ghost*

Who rules this present dispensation, and Who makes truths necessary to salvation *vivid, personal, real.* In proportion as we teach that all true conviction of sin, all saving faith, all realization of the love of God in Christ, are not states of mind into which *we can work ourselves* by any effort of the will, but are of His power, working effectually on our minds, we see the results we desire. If, therefore, a Mission brought about no other than these results that I have named; if it only excited interest, deepened devotion, compelled men and women to think seriously, moved them to pray, led them to supplication for others, and to take up work for God; if it taught the clergy who preach the "truth as it is in Jesus" to remember that God the Holy Ghost must be honoured when they preach, and the people that they must seek His aid to apply the Word preached; if it stirred the stagnant waters of the spiritual life and sweetened their course, then it was well worth while, as it was a high and holy privilege, to be allowed of God to take a part, however humble, in a work which, great as the strain may be on all the powers, so indisputably advances His kingdom.

The readers of this article will, I hope, have gathered from its perusal my own profound conviction that this first Mission in New York was *singularly blessed.* The marvellous gathering of business men daily in Trinity Church to hear Mr. Aitken arrested the attention of New York itself. Some two thousand and more were every day to be seen filling that spacious church to overflowing; and I quote the following sentence from a letter addressed to me by Bishop Potter: "We are seeing fresh fruits of the Mission every day, and the memory of your visit will long live in our hearts as a gracious epoch in the history of our Church life."

It only remains for me to confirm my own impression by the opinions and publicly expressed verdict of Americans themselves.

And first I might cite the concluding Service of Praise and Thanksgiving as bearing its eloquent testimony to the immediate good of the Mission. Those who felt they had received any blessing from the Most High were asked and encouraged to acknowledge "what God had done for their souls." Opportunity for doing this was given at our concluding and memorable Service of Praise. That service consisted entirely of praise, and after the Benediction had been given by the same voice that opened the Mission in the "Church of the Heavenly Rest," the congregation sang the Doxology. I have by me, as I write, the letters in which "mention is made of the lovingkindness of the Lord," and the desire is expressed to show forth His praise for mercies received during those few happy days. They are as touching and bear as

much the evidence of the work of God the Holy Ghost as the requests for prayer. The reading alone of these, without reading some *in extenso*, occupied well-nigh three-quarters of an hour. They would fill a small volume, and what a valuable contribution such a volume would be to the "evidences of Christianity"! How much room there is for such evidence as distinct from what is ordinarily quoted in support of our common faith! How rich it would be to quote passages sometimes from the pages of human hearts, on which the Spirit has written, as well as from dry books of theology! No one could hear these genuine, unaffected acknowledgments of answered prayer and conscious spiritual benefit received without feeling that in no miraculous sense, but through the ordinary means of grace, the Holy Ghost had applied truth with power. Shall I not say that all this which so gladdened us was the Spirit's testimony, Who, while He never "speaks of Himself," makes His power to be known through truth received?

How helpful, how uplifting, how bracing is such a Service of Praise! How full of encouragement to us who minister, to resort to nothing histrionic and sensational, but to have more faith in the weapons God puts into our hands, and to wield them in humble reliance on His most sure promises! How helpful to our people to see and realize that blessings come through *ordinary* and appointed means of grace as devoutly and faithfully used; that any service may be the occasion of a revelation to a waiting soul! How such acknowledgments of spiritual good emphatically rebuke an age which is disposed to ridicule the idea of a world unseen! How the testimony of some, who ten days ago would have scouted the idea of "conversion" as possible in a matter-of-fact age, is unspeakably valuable as the grateful testimony of a personal consciousness which cannot but speak of the things it has heard and seen! I put, first and foremost, the praises and thanksgivings of individual grateful hearts as conveyed in the letters received during and since the Mission. Such testimony as the following, from one himself in the ministry, is very valuable, for his blessing means his people's blessing: "It would be, I fear, a token of ingratitude to God were I to refrain from telling you how helpful you have been to my innermost spiritual nature. Coming as I did nearly a thousand miles to attend the Mission, I am more than repaid for all the expenditure of time and money by the profit received from the 'Bible Readings.' I have been 'taught the way of God more perfectly.' I trust I have learned the deeper sweetness of the 'life hid with Christ in God.' I hope to carry back to my distant home the light, heat, and preciousness of your words,

and hand them out to the flock which God has entrusted to me. May my thanksgiving be thanks-living!"

I quote the comment of a leading lawyer in New York: "I am so thankful that the Mission has proved so great a success. We have every reason to feel that the work has been owned and blessed of God. Not the least important result that I, a resident in New York, feel is, that by its means different 'sects,' as you call them, are now feeling that there is more of the bond of union between us and them than ever existed before. If the Mission has contributed ever so feebly to the grand result for which our Saviour prayed, I know that you will feel repaid for all the share you have had in the good work." Testimony to the same effect might be given *ex abundanti*. I have read with peculiar interest the reflections on the Mission on the part of outside observers, and the conclusions arrived at by those who have been much interested in the movement. I take the following from the *Observer*:

> We have attended many of these services in the Episcopal churches, and bear our testimony to the simplicity and fidelity with which the fundamental truths of the Gospel have been proclaimed, and the faithfulness with which those who profess and call themselves Christians have been urged to a consecration of themselves to Christ in holy living, and earnest effort to bring others to a saving knowledge of Christ as a Saviour.

Amongst other comments, the following are noteworthy. "The Mission teaching allowed of no divorce of the Word and Sacraments. While giving the emotional part of our complex nature its proper place, it did not teach that a spasm of 'feeling' was conversion, still less salvation. Change of heart, as evidenced in change of life, was the great aim of the message." The breaking down of reserve between pastor and people, and the personal interviews between the missioner and seekers after truth, while free in their methods from anything approaching the "confessional," are fully recognised as a most valuable feature in the Mission. The fact that many who had "forgotten their first love," and after long years of wandering have, through this special effort, been recalled into the fold, is allowed to be amongst some of the most blessed results. The Mission has, we read, illustrated and recommended the value of informal methods, of certain departures from the grooves in which devotion was commonly run, and has shown how ready the laity are to fall in with such departures, which, after all, consisted in much simpler services, and less antiquated and stilted modes of conducting them. The Mission is leading the bishops and clergy to ask, Would it not be well to have trained missioners as licensed preachers, whose one distinct work should be to evangelize?

Looking back on it all, we can say, "The Lord hath done great things, whereof we are glad." Many, if not all of us, felt that the work was really only beginning where we left off. We would fain have remained longer amidst what God was so owning and so signally blessing: we would fain have remained longer amongst those whose gratitude and affectionate bearing can never be forgotten. One sorrows to think that three thousand miles lie between ourselves and many dear "children" in New York. We live in the hope we may look into their faces again: we pray that if not here, yet there, where there "shall be no more sea," we may meet and rejoice with a common joy. Meanwhile, we thank our God for the wonders He has wrought. We believe that one more link is added to the chain which binds two great peoples of the same tongue together; and we rejoice to believe that the verdict on the first Mission in New York, in which some of the clergy of the Church of England were privileged to take a part, by those who remain there, and can calmly and dispassionately review it when its more exciting circumstances are withdrawn, is simply and soberly this: "The memory of your visit will long live in our hearts as a gracious epoch in the history of our Church life."

FRANCIS PIGOU, D.D.

ART. III.—THE ALPHA AND THE OMEGA.

WHAT MAY WE SUPPOSE THAT OUR LORD INTENDED BY SAYING OF HIMSELF, ἐγώ εἰμι τὸ *A* καὶ τὸ *Ω*?

THE words ἐγώ εἰμι τὸ Ἄ καὶ τὸ Ὦ, occur three times for certain in the Apocalypse (i. 8, xxi. 6, xxii. 13). In the last of the three passages the context shows that they are our Lord's utterances concerning Himself. "Behold, I come quickly; and My reward is with Me, to render to every man as his work shall be. I AM THE *A* AND THE *Ω*, the beginning and the end, the first and the last."

In the second passage (chap. xxi. 6) the words come to St. John directly from Him that sat upon the throne. If St. John saw the Speaker, again we say that it must have been our Lord, for "No man hath seen God at any time." The only-begotten Son is ever His visible exponent. In chap. i. 8, the saying is given by the sacred writer with this authority, "I am the *A* and the *Ω*, *saith the Lord*, which is, and which was, and which is to come, the Almighty." Whether this sentence, or the threefold repetition of the saying in the Apocalypse

was intended to direct our thoughts to the three Persons of the Holy One (blessed be His Name!), I will not stay to inquire, but only observe that in the first and second of the three passages (in Rev. i. and xxi.), the words are clearly the utterance of Deity; while in the last they belong also to Him Who hath "authority to execute judgment, *because He* is *the Son of Man*."

To the God-Man, therefore, we must look for the full meaning and purport of the words before us; not to our Lord in Deity apart from humanity, far less to His manhood apart from Deity. They are a part of the glory of "*the Word*" Who "was made flesh;" glory of the only-begotten of the Father, wherewith He manifested His Father's name.

These words, "I am the Alpha and the Omega," must surely have some *distinct* meaning of their own. It would be waste of time to demonstrate that they are not merely another way of saying (what our Lord has said both elsewhere and in the immediate context) that He is also the "beginning" and the "end," "the first" and "the last." For these other clauses are by no means the same saying with the one under consideration, though they are in perfect harmony with it. "Alpha" and "Omega" are *letters, and nothing else.* They have each their own place in language, places which cannot be filled by any vocal substitute whatever. If our Lord has undertaken to be Himself the Alpha and the Omega, surely His words must have some definite meaning. Surely He must have known distinctly what He was about to do.

What then are "the Alpha" and "the Omega"? They are, and, so far as I am aware, they always have been the first and last letters of the Greek alphabet, the alphabet of that language in which the New Testament of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ was first given to men. Between Alpha and Omega are comprised all the letters of that Gentile tongue which was chosen in the Divine counsels to be the vehicle of the everlasting Gospel to "all nations." It was not the first Gentile tongue in which the oracles of God were expressed—that was the Chaldee;—but possibly the first Gentile tongue in which Holy Scripture was written down.[1] And the Alpha and Omega are *vowels, not consonants.*

If our Lord had been pleased to express the saying which is

[1] The original Scriptures of the Old Testament were written in Hebrew, *without vowels;* the Chaldee paraphrases used in the synagogues were at first extemporised translations. The date when these were first *written* is matter of dispute. Modern critical opinion seems to incline to the view that the Septuagint is older than the present written and printed Targums. The exact date of the first *written* Targum I cannot pretend to give.

before us in the holy language which He spoke on Sinai (the ancient Hebrew), He would, we are told, have used one vowel and one consonant, the Aleph and the Tau of the Hebrew alphabet. "From Aleph to Tau" is a phrase in use among the Rabbins. But our Lord did not choose to express this thought of His in the language of the Old Testament. Nor did He select that other language of the same family which He spoke familiarly on earth, and in which He called the great Apostle of the Gentiles by a voice from heaven. He chose rather to be "the Alpha and the Omega" of His Word in the chief ancient tongue of the Gentiles; the vehicle that in those days travelled farthest and carried the most of human thought, in which, moreover, those ideas of government were first formulated, which have the widest currency and the most prevailing influence throughout the kingdoms of the heaving world around us even to the present day.

If our Lord had been pleased to express His thought in the Hebrew language, it seems that He must have spoken, not of Alpha and Omega, but of Aleph and Tau. I said before that He would in that case have made use of one vowel and one consonant; but that statement must be slightly modified in order to perfect accuracy. Alpha is a vowel in Greek, and Aleph is practically a vowel in Hebrew; but it is an undecided vowel. In printed Hebrew it needs to be supplemented by some distinguishing mark or point, in order to tell us what vowel it shall be. It may be any one of our five vowel sounds, longer or shorter, according to the usage of the Hebrew tongue. And as it is with Hebrew, so it is with Chaldee. But the Greek Alpha is subject to no such uncertainty. It is a vowel, and a distinct vowel, and it is one vowel only; the first of the scale. In the same scale of vowels Omega is the last. The sound of Alpha comes forth with the first opening of the lips in a horizontal line; the sound of Omega is the fullest vocal utterance that you can make *ore rotundo*. Between these two are included all other vocal modifications which give distinctness to what is written, and make what is spoken intelligible by the human ear. Without a vowel the *consonant* cannot sound.

In view of this fact, can we regard it as a thing indifferent that the language of the Old Testament at the time of our Lord's coming had no written vowels at all? Some slight attempt there was, but very precarious, to supply this want by means of four letters—Aleph, Vau, Yod, and He—three of which have also the power of consonants, while Aleph itself can be any vowel you please from *a* to *o*; but distinct vowel system there was none. The present system (as we know) must be dated within the Christian era. Manuscripts even now

in existence exhibit two distinct systems of Hebrew vowel-pointing. But no known MS. of the Hebrew Scriptures is as old as the older extant Uncial MSS. of the Greek Testament.

How, then, were the Scriptures of the Old Testament read in our Lord's time? One cannot pronounce a string of consonants without vowels, let men abbreviate written words as they will. THS SNTNC CNNT B RD S T HS BN WRTTN, THGH N VRY GRT NTLLGNC S RQRD T MK T CLR. The old Hebrew Scriptures without vowels, in the time of our Lord, were read as any one must read a common edition of the Talmud now, with such vowels as tradition supplies. Men learn to read the Talmud by oral teaching. Only by strong memory and long practice does it become possible to read with fluency at all. In those days, to be sure, Chaldee was still a living language; and there is sufficient resemblance between Biblical Hebrew and Chaldee to enable a person familiar with the one tongue to put some vowels to a sentence of the other, if he had the consonants before his eyes. Whether these would be the vowels properly belonging to the spoken Hebrew might be open to doubt. Is it quite certain that the Massoretic vowel-pointing of the Old Testament, which has now been accepted for centuries, has reproduced the sound of David's language faithfully to our ears? The system may be grammatical, faithful and consistent throughout; but he would be a bold man who would venture to assert that it has preserved the original vowel sounds. The preceding remarks may help us to realize the facts of the case.

But I must not wander off the track. When our Lord came—when, as St. John describes it, "THE WORD was made flesh, and dwelt among us," the original Scriptures were shut up in a book of consonants, written in a dead language. The nation to whom the sacred oracles were committed had been in captivity, and had there returned to the Chaldæan language of their father Abraham, or at least of that part of his family which removed to Haran, and never sojourned in Canaan at all.[1] Thus the chosen people in Palestine, from the time of the Babylonish captivity, used familiarly a Gentile tongue—the tongue of Nebuchadnezzar, the head of that part of mankind whose metropolis is Babylon, not the city of God.[2] But, while speaking Chaldee, they still spoke a Semitic language, and one not well fitted for the purposes of general intercourse among mankind. To that position the Greek language had already made good its claim. Was it not called in Scripture the language of Javan, the son of Japhet? And had not Noah prophesied that God should "enlarge," or (if you will)

[1] See Gen. xxxi. 47.

[2] See Dan. ii.

"persuade Japhet," and he should "dwell in the tents of Shem"? Both the "persuasion" and "enlargement" in question were to come partly through the language of that branch of Japhet's family which owned Javan for its progenitor, and which is described in the Old Testament by Javan's name. It was in the Greek tongue—the tongue of Javan—that the Gospel was most widely and successfully preached. The only book of the New Testament which has even the shadow of a claim to a Chaldæan original is the Gospel according to St. Matthew. And if by any chance the question, in what language that Gospel might best appear, had been submitted beforehand to the members of the Christian community, even so early as the evening of the Day of Pentecost (not to say, after Cornelius had heard St. Peter), and the Christians of the day had been invited to record their preference by vote for a Chaldæan or a Greek Gospel, there cannot be a moment's doubt on which side the majority would have been found. May not one suppose that common-sense counted for something (with all respect to the authority of the Fathers) even then?

The publication of the Scriptures in the Greek tongue was a much more decided step in the direction of Gentile currency, and away from the isolation of the Jew, than the use of Chaldee paraphrases could ever be. The Babylonish captivity caused the Targum, or Chaldee paraphrase, to be heard in the synagogue after the Hebrew. Thus the Gentile portion of the family of Terah (represented by Laban in early days) was promoted to a level with Israel in relation to the Word of Life. The same Targum language was spoken by our Lord habitually in His earthly home. It was the tongue of Laban, not of Jacob; and the tongue of the *mothers*, not the *fathers*, of the chosen race.[1] From the same language our Lord took the names which He bestowed familiarly upon His three leading disciples, as Boanerges and Kephas. In that language He called to the little sleeper, "*Talitha kumi*"—"Wake up, little one;" although to Hebrew ears it might suggest rather, "Little lamb, arise." In the same tongue He expressed His anguish in Gethsemane, "*Abba*, Father;" and His deeper loneliness on the cross. For if we look for the expression "*Lama sabachthani*" in Old Testament Scripture, we find it not entirely in the Hebrew of Ps. xxii. 1, nor in the Chaldee paraphrase of that verse; but in the Targum of Ps. xliii. 2, "Why hast Thou put Me from Thee?"—"Why dost Thou cast Me off?"

In the same tongue, once more, He spake from heaven,

[1] Rebekah, and Leah, and Rachel all spoke the Chaldæan language in their maiden life.

"Saul, Saul, why persecutest thou Me?" But I venture to surmise, with all reverence, that it was not in Chaldee that He communicated the Revelation to St. John. I suspect that when He said, *Ἐγώ εἰμι τὸ Ἄλφα καὶ τὸ ὦ μέγα*, He used those very identical words. It is an interesting thought, however, and I may be pardoned for spending upon it one more sentence, that the native tongue of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ on earth should have thus occupied the middle ground between the decidedly Jewish tongue of Old Testament Scripture and the decidedly Gentile tongue of the New Testament. I do not here touch the question, to me a somewhat uncongenial one, whether He *ever* spoke Greek or not. I see no reason to doubt that all Galilæans who did business with foreign residents were sufficiently possessed of the resources of civilization, to buy and sell in that language which was the common medium of exchange. But if I am told that He preached in Greek to the peasants on the hills of Galilee, or read Isaiah in the synagogue at Nazareth in that tongue, or talked Greek with Peter and James and John and Andrew when they sat on Olivet, I say, *Μὴ γένοιτο*! Kephas, Boanerges, Talitha cumi, Ephphatha, Abba, Lama sabachthani forbid the thought. That He *knew Greek* (Who made them that made it), and could speak and understand it if need were, who doubts? But surely, it cannot have been His native tongue. Afterwards, however, when He said, *Ἐγώ εἰμι τὸ Α καὶ τὸ Ω*, "the Sun was risen upon the earth." "The sound had gone out into all lands, and the words unto the end of the world." In that sound and in those words He had set a tabernacle for the Sun—the Sun of righteousness. Upon the wheels of that language in the fourfold Gospel He "rejoiceth as a giant to run His course." *It is of this Gospel, in this tongue, that the Word made flesh is the A and Ω, the first and last vocalizer, and the distinguisher of every sound that goes between.* The ancient Scriptures were but as the six waterpots of stone, far from full, though certainly not empty, until He came and gave the commandment to fill them with living water; "and they filled them up to the brim." "They are they which testify of Me," He said. "The testimony of Jesus is the spirit of prophecy," is the witness of His angel. And is it strange that He, of Whom the spirit of prophecy can only witness, should claim to give letters to the prophecy itself? What can be more appropriate than that the kind of letters (*the vowels*, namely) which were wanting to the Word of Scripture before He came, should be seen to have been waiting for His utterance? May we not add them to the things which Jewish tradition has marked as lacking in the second Temple, and present the matter somewhat thus?

As in the second Temple there were no tables of the Covenant, because the New Covenant itself was to be there revealed; no ark of the Covenant, because the body of Him Who came to do God's will was to be seen there; no mercy-seat, because God was about to set forth His Son to be a covering of the law (ἱλαστήριον) through faith in His blood; and thus the most Holy Place was empty, because it waited for the Everlasting Priest; as there was no outward manifestation of the visible *Shekinah*, because Christ Himself and the Holy Spirit were to come in the days of that Temple to dwell among men—so also the letter of the sacred oracles was permitted to lose that living interpretation of the prophets which was supplied by the daily use of the Hebrew language, in order that it might be left the more free for Him, Who was to be the Alpha and the Omega, to fill it with His own fulness and to make all of it vocal with His praise.

But at the time of our Lord's appearing was there not already some attempt made to put Alpha and Omega to the Scriptures of the Old Covenant, by translating them into the Greek tongue?

Unquestionably there was. And the mere mention of the fact calls up a host of interesting inquiries regarding the divergences of that ancient version from what has been delivered to us through Jewish hands (yes, and *unchristian hands*) as the proper reading of the original Hebrew. Is it possible that we ought to accept the version *to which Alpha and Omega properly belong* as more true to the Christian sense than the unchristian and traditional Hebrew? or, in plain words, Shall we give preference to the LXX. above the Massoretic text?

Is it altogether an idle suggestion that some such question may possibly have suggested itself, at least in part, to the mind of the beloved disciple, who to all intents has closed the Canon of both Testaments, from whose successors the Church has received nothing which can claim a place in "the Scripture of truth?"

If there were any such question in his mind, or can be in ours, is it not in fact answered by this saying of our Lord's, "I AM the Alpha and the Omega?" I MYSELF! not the Greek Testament; not the Septuagint Version; far less the consensus of the Fathers. Not one of all these, nor all together; but I Myself.

One can hardly avoid the thought that there must have been grave questions in the mind of those who knew the value of Scripture, when the guardians of the Old Testament and the custodians of the New Covenant had finally parted company until the end of the world; when Israel had revolted

from Christ Jesus, and taken away the Hebrew Scriptures to be henceforward, if possible, the stronghold of error, refusing all aid in the use of that store of knowledge to the Christian Church. What schism of the East and West, what "Protestant Revolution"[1] had such momentous effects in the apparent rending of Holy Scripture, as this first great schism of all? Did St. Paul never feel any inconvenience arising from the antagonism between the wisest of the Hebrews and the disciples of that Alpha and Omega which they refused? And if St. Paul may have felt it a little, must not St. John have felt it much? For though he had far less of human learning, he was no whit less zealous for the truth and honour of his Lord. In this light again, what comfort was there in the saying that the voice of Holy Scripture to the multitude of nations should ever be the Voice of Christ! The voice that once "shook the earth," that will yet shake earth and heaven, has pledged itself three times over in the Apocalypse, that the Word of God shall not lack sound and sense for evermore. "For I AM THE ALPHA AND THE OMEGA, saith the Lord, which was, and which is, and which is to come, the Almighty!"

Have we not felt that some such pledge as this has been kept throughout the ages by Him Who walks in the midst of all the Churches, whether the Church herself has been mindful of the pledge or not? What book has been so absolutely abandoned (if we may so say), as the Bible, to the free handling of mankind? Copied, altered, translated, corrected, proscribed, re-published, revised, expounded by the learned, profaned by the ignorant, bandied about in argument, perverted to every use and abuse of controversy;—the Word of the Lord is tried in the fire (*δοκίμιον τῇ γῇ*—Ps. xii. 6, Sept.—a test for all the earth), and with this result only, that it "is purified seven times." *How is it?* Let "the Alpha and Omega" Himself explain. It is His doing, that, let men say what they will, their best or their worst, the Scripture will not and cannot say anything but what He utters, in such a tone that men in general shall hear it and believe. All the Revision Companies in the world will not prevail to establish anything by Revision which is not part of the Alpha and Omega of the Lord. We may take our side as we please. We are not the authorities in the matter, but "I AM!" *Ἐγώ εἰμι τὸ Α καὶ τὸ Ω.* And we may be very sure that the English Bible, with its curious affinities to the old Semitic tongue of the Old Testament[2] on the one side, and its thoroughly Ja-

[1] The new Anglican term for "the Reformation," properly so called.

[2] It is very curious how the English language, which in itself has little more of case or person endings than Hebrew, can be accommodated to

phetic character on the other, has not been made practically *A* and *Ω* for so many millions of people without His will. Not only is He the *A* and the *Ω*, but with Him is "the Yea" to consent to what is proposed, and the "Amen" to all that is done. And,—reverting for one moment to that question about the LXX., only half asked and not half answered just now,—it would seem clear that our acceptance of it, as an authority, must be limited to those places where the seal of the New Testament has been set upon the version which it gives. Outside these passages we do not really know for certain what is the LXX. A recent review[1] has reminded us that the common text is confronted by another, which differs from it to the most alarming extent. There are no certain *A* and *Ω* to be heard there. We may suspect, and surmise, and suggest. But the opposite suggestions are as good as ours, until One has spoken Whose authority is decisive. And that decision remains unspoken still.

But if we may look outside the mere letter of the saying which is before us, and say generally that "the Alpha and the Omega of the written Word" is the living Word Himself, we come to a region where all can follow, and all may contribute to the exegesis of the text. Be the language what it may, is not that interpretation of Holy Scripture truly *vocal* which Christ has spoken with reference to Himself? I do not refer to any forced applications of Scripture wherewith men have bound it for a time to something or other which apparently concerns the Kingdom of Christ. But how many places of the Old Testament were dumb for all practical purposes, until our Lord or His Spirit gave them an intelligible voice!

Take one instance to show how His Alpha and Omega have

---

express the syntactical and antithetical niceties of the most elaborate languages of ancient and modern times. For proof of its Semitic affinity, let anyone who knows the elements of Hebrew take a common English verb, say the verb *to love*, and, discarding all auxiliary words, count up the variations of which the word itself is capable: *love*, *lovest*, *loved*, *lovedst*, *love* (imperative), *loving* (active participle), *loving* (gerund or verbal noun), *loved* (passive participle); and compare a Hebrew Kal form. Or take our simple plural, and our personal pronouns, and compare them in the same way. In simple grammatical forms, the Hebrew is rather more copious than English; and yet English has held its own, and has proved sufficiently receptive of the niceties of all the languages of the civilized world.

[1] The *Quarterly* for last October, on the Revised Old Testament, calls attention to the fact that the Vatican MS. of the LXX. is very generally quoted as if it were *the Septuagint* itself. It is no more *the Septuagint* than the Alexandrian MS. This MS. B, if it were our sole authority, would mutilate the story of David nearly as badly as it does the story of David's Son. Yet it passes for *the Septuagint*, because it is the *common printed text*. Its right to hold this position remains to be proved.

prevailed. In Isaiah xxv. 8 there are three words written, which the traditional Hebrew reads thus, בִּלַּע הַמָּוֶת לָנֶצַח *Billagh Hammaveth Lanetzach.* Our A.V. renders thus, "He will swallow up death in victory"—more precisely the Revisers, "He hath swallowed up death for ever." Both alike take their vowels from the Jew, who does not accept the resurrection of the Lord Jesus as an historical fact.

Let me invite attention to the history of this rendering, as an example of the way in which our Lord by the Holy Spirit has vocalized a single text. The words were undoubtedly *read* as we read them before Christ came. Taken in order they literally mean this:

Billagh,	Hammaveth,	Lanetzach,
Hath swallowed up	Death	Unto victory, *or*, for ever.

Such a sentence is of course ambiguous. It leaves you doubtful whether "death hath swallowed up," or "some one hath swallowed up death." The word "death" may be either the subject or object of the verb. The oldest translation which we possess gave death the victory. This was the version of the LXX.: κατέπιεν ὁ Θάνατος ἰσχύσας, or κατισχύσας—"Death swallowed up and was strong," or "did prevail." The next translation that we find is St. Paul's: "So when this corruptible shall have put on incorruption, and this mortal shall have put on immortality, that is, 'in the resurrection of the just at the last trump,' then shall be brought to pass the saying that is written:" κατεπόθη ὁ Θάνατος εἰς νῖκος, "Death *is swallowed up* in victory." This rendering is unmistakable. But it is not the translation of the Hebrew as read by the LXX., or as printed by the Jews. The word *Billagh* cannot mean *is swallowed up.* But alter just one vowel, and instead of *Billagh* read *Bullagh;* in other words, instead of the vowels Iota and Alpha, read Ω and Α, and you have St. Paul's version at once. Delitzsch actually puts it into Hebrew in his New Testament in that way. In this case the New Testament reading is obtained, literally, by the sound of α and ω. But the truth itself rests not on mere vowels, but on accomplished facts. The victory over death was gained by the Resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead. When that victory has been *given* to us through Him, then we shall see the words accomplished as they were rendered by St. Paul.

It is not a little curious that since the time of St. Paul, all Israel has followed his interpretation, *not* that of the LXX., which was their own. They still read the first of those three words *Billagh.* But they make death the object, not the subject of the verb, and so the Targum renders the passage, "Death shall be *forgotten* for ever;" and the later Jewish com-

mentators with one accord expound the Hebrew in that sense. The Talmud in two places refers us for explanation to Isaiah lxv. 20. Of course one cannot be certain that the Rabbins stole the interpretation from St. Paul. The fact is, that the only *written* translation of Isaiah xxv. 8 which can be dated B.C. gives death the victory. The New Testament takes the victory away from death, and gives it to his conqueror, and every later Jewish version or commentary that I have seen follows in the same track. But the *a* and *ω* here are in fact due to one Person and to one only; the real *A* and *Ω* is our Risen Lord. Another aspect of this particular verse once presented itself to me, which I cannot help noting. It shows how God's Word *will* speak the truth everywhere. I happened to look up the passage in St. Paul in a Hebrew New Testament issued by Bagster. There, instead of St. Paul's "Death is swallowed up," we are presented with the quotation from Isaiah in its traditional form: "Hath swallowed up death unto victory." Reading this sentence with the surroundings of 1 Cor. xv., it suddenly struck me in a new light. Why not take it thus—"Death hath swallowed up his last"? Or, to put it in the words of the Psalm, "O thou enemy, destructions are come *to a perpetual end.*" So, take the sentence which way you will, it bears that meaning which the *A* and *Ω* first put upon it. Whether we read it "He hath swallowed up death," or, "Death hath swallowed up," *i.e.*, hath devoured and made an end of devouring, for ever—either way it comes to the same thing, that "Death is swallowed up in victory." "Behold, the Lion of the tribe of Judah hath *overcome*." "He hath prevailed to open the book," sealed to all before His coming, and has put His own *A* and *Ω* thereto. In so doing He hath won the victory.

This expression suggests to my mind another, which I believe may be used as an illustration of the subject in hand. Every student of the Psalms in their titles knows how many of them, more especially of those ascribed to David, have the heading in our Bibles, "To the Chief Musician," Lam'natsêăch, or, as it is sometimes rendered, "To the Precentor." The LXX. translation B.C. could make nothing out of this. They rendered it εἰς τὸ τέλος (*i.e.*, for, or unto, the end). I do not think they merely confused it with the similar expression Lanêtzach, because I observe they generally render that by εἰς τέλος, and Lam'natzêach, by εἰς τὸ τέλος. Whether this points to any such reading as Lehannetzach, or whether M'natzeach was supposed to be an abstract substantive like *Maschil*, or what their theory of the word was, I do not stay to discuss. That is not the point. Nor do I make any doubt that the word in Hebrew means the "chief musician." But directly the

Hebrews began to speak Chaldee, the word M'natzeach became capable of suggesting a fresh thought. In Chaldee it means *a conqueror*. I have seen it used in Rabbi David Kimchi as a title of Messiah. And when we come to the Book of Revelation, and read again and again in the promises of our Lord and Saviour, τῷ νικῶντι, "To him that overcometh" will I give thus and thus, "even as I also *overcame*;" and again, "Behold the Lion of the tribe of Judah over*came*, to open the book;" it is hardly possible not to be struck with the coincidence between this epithet of Christ's faithful soldiers and servants in the Church militant, and the person to whom the Psalms are addressed. *Victori* was Jerome's rendering of Lam'natzĕăch there. Suppose also that you happen to be daily studying the Psalter with a view to elicit its application, and are daily feeling the pressure of your own conflict and the sympathy of the Psalmist and the Psalm. Under such circumstances it becomes almost impossible to avoid the conclusion that while the experience of conflict is common to many, and many need the victory which Christ gives, the *perfect* conqueror is only one. And herein lies the beauty of the *imperfect* participle, "to him that is overcoming," τῷ νικῶντι, as contrasted with the complete action denoted by ἐνίκησα, "I overcame." The perfect victory belongs to our Lord alone; but it is given to us in its effect daily, and while we gird ourselves to the battle and follow Him, we are permitted also to "put our feet upon the necks" of those enemies whom He Himself has bruised beneath our feet. "To him that is overcoming" the Psalmist speaks words of sympathy and encouragement, but the sole honour and glory of the victory belong to Him that once for all overcame. Thus does the Alpha and Omega Himself make the Old Testament to utter His praise. I have said quite enough to indicate in which direction the meaning of the words before us appears to me to lie, and I leave the suggestion for others to follow out. The whole subject of our Lord's relation to Scripture is full of interest. It seems to me the very foundation of all certainty as to what Scripture is in itself, and was meant to be to us. Modern investigation seems to limit itself too much to the outside of Scripture, if I may so say; to the consonants rather than the vowels of the sacred text; to the shape of the vessel rather than the fulness of its contents.[1] Yet even when we have realized the standpoint of

[1] "Whatever simply puts us on a level with ordinary hearers of ancient days, does no more than inform us what custom, locality, or date is intended by the sacred writer (things which once were obvious, and which *ought not* to be any difficulty now); all this, I say, seems *external* to the province of Interpretation, the purpose of which is to discover the method and the meaning of Holy Writ." So wrote Dean Burgon in

the human writer so exactly, if that be possible, as to be able to put ourselves into his place, we are yet only at the beginning of exegesis. We have still to ask the question, what the Divine voice had to say through this human testimony in relation to our Lord and His kingdom that was to come. His Alpha and Omega, or rather He Himself, as the Alpha and the Omega, can alone furnish the reply. To Himself or to the Spirit, Who is His representative amongst us, we must look for this. I will only add one thought in conclusion, which springs naturally out of the context of Rev. xxii. 13. "Behold, I come quickly; and my reward is with me, to give every man according as his work shall be. I am the Alpha and Omega." Is He Himself the Alpha and Omega of all that we speak or write in His Name? "He that speaketh of himself, seeketh his own glory; but he that seeketh His glory that sent him, the same is true, and no unrighteousness is in him." "To him that worketh righteousness shall be a sure reward."

C. H. WALLER.

ART. IV.—THE PARISH CHURCHES BILL.

THE agitation about Church Reform is already passing out of the stage of discussion into that of action, as it is quite right and time it should. Foremost of these enterprises of reform—so far, at least, as the present Parliament is concerned—is the "Parish Churches Bill," introduced into the House of Lords by the Bishop of Peterborough, and read a first time on January 21st. It is a Bill of no great length, since it contains altogether only seven enacting clauses, and two of those are formal only; but its importance must not be measured by its length. Its title describes it as "An Act to declare and enact the Law as to the Rights of Parishioners in their Parish Churches;" and its preamble recites that "whereas according to the common law of this realm, every parish church in England and Wales is for the free use, in common, of all

"Inspiration and Interpretation," p. 141 (published in 1861, twenty-five years ago). But surely modern exegesis still concerns itself far more with the literal sense which Scripture had to the ears of its first hearers, than with the discovery of its meaning in relation to Christ. The position of Joseph or Moses among the Egyptian dynasties, is far more interesting to most readers than the relation of either of them to Christ. Yet He alone is the Alpha and Omega of either story. The Scripture narrative will make no real history (any more than consonants without vowels can be read intelligibly) apart from Him.

parishioners for the purposes of Divine worship;" and whereas "these rights have, for many years past, been infringed in many places by the appropriation of seats and pews to certain of the parishioners to the exclusion of others, and especially of the poorer classes," etc., it is "expedient that such common law be declared, with a view to its better observance." The main enacting clause, in which the gist of the Bill is to be found, is the fourth, which runs thus:

> From and after the passing of this Act, it shall not be lawful for any Archbishop, Bishop, ordinary, court, or any corporation, or other person or persons whomsoever, to issue any faculty granting or confirming, or purporting to grant or confirm, or in any other way to appropriate, any seat or pew in any parish church to, or in favour of, any person or persons whomsoever, except in the cases hereafter provided.

Then follow clauses preserving existing rights to Church seats, so far as they rest on a legal basis, such as faculty or private proprietorship, and saving also pews and pew-rents authorized by "an instrument or scale" under any of the Church Building Acts—public, local or private; and there is, likewise, a clause warranting the use of the chancel by the officiating ministers and their assistants.

To what extent—upon how many of our churches would the Bill operate if it became an Act of Parliament? What would be the effects produced by it were it applied?

The promoters have furnished us with information upon the first point. They estimate the number of churches which would come under the saving clauses at 2,000 "at the outside;" and thus 13,000 of our churches would remain as the number directly affected by the provisions of the proposed Bill.

This fact of itself shows how carefully those provisions should be scanned. Regarded merely as to the range of its operation, the Bill is an extremely important one; and under the able escort and eloquent advocacy of the Bishop of Peterborough its prospect of success, at any rate in the House of Lords, cannot be deemed inconsiderable.

That prelate has endeavoured to allay the alarm which its somewhat sweeping Clause 4 has excited by a letter of explanation addressed to the *Times* newspaper in the end of January, which was so generally copied into other newspapers and periodicals and commented on that it can hardly have escaped our readers' notice. It appears that the Bill, as formerly launched in the House of Commons, contained in its fourth clause the word "assign" as well as the word "appropriate;" and that the Bishop made it a condition in taking charge of the Bill that the word "assign" should be omitted. The effect of this omission he takes to be that all permanent appropriation of seats in parish churches would be prevented,

"leaving to churchwardens whatever right they now may have of seating the parishioners from time to time, whether from Sunday to Sunday, or for longer periods." The Bishop states also in his letter that he is strongly of opinion that the churchwardens ought to have and exercise this power, and ought to have it too "in the interests of the poor." "The rich under any system may be trusted to take care of themselves; but the poor, on the absolutely free and open system—*i.e.*, a system where there is no regulating of the sittings—would run the risk of being thrust into corners in the struggle for accommodation with their wealthier and more influential neighbours."

We cannot but express our astonishment, at the outset, that the friends of the Bill should have been willing to accept the Bishop of Peterborough's championship on the terms he imposed. Its chief promoters are the London "Free and Open Church Association." In the recent "Official Year Book," the leading claim put forward for the Association is its promotion of the "Parish Churches Bill." Now, it is this very Association which has, for some years past, been most frequent and vehement in denouncing the practice of "assigning" sittings. Again and again its "organ" has returned to the charge, objecting to any interference of the churchwardens in the matter of "seating the parishioners," and even denying, with a magnificent disdain of Church Courts and judicial deliverances, that the churchwardens have any such powers whatever as those which the Bishop of Peterborough thinks so necessary and salutary. Nay, in order to clinch the controversy, it has gone the length of asserting that the churchwardens are not ecclesiastical officers at all!

However, all this ought to be dropped now, and we should be glad to hear no more of it.[1] If the Bishop of Peterborough cannot get their Bill through the Lords, no one else can do so; and we may safely trust the Bishop to have laid down clearly and definitely the conditions on which alone he was willing to take charge of it. But the further question arises, whether the omission stipulated for by the Bishop will secure the points which he desires to safeguard? We must confess to some misgivings on that subject. The very object and purpose of the Bill—at any rate, one main object and purpose of it, as originally conceived and promoted by the "Free and Open Church Association"—was to oust the churchwardens

[1] We remark, however, that the secretary to the Association (Mr. T. Bowater Vernon) reiterates the notions here alluded to in letters to the *Church Times* of March 5th and 12th. How this is to be reconciled with the understanding arrived at with the Bishop of Peterborough we are not informed.

from their ancient functions of allotting pews or sittings in the churches. Now we think it by no means unlikely—for reasons which will appear by-and-by—that the Bill, even if it became an Act, would remain to a very large extent a dead letter. But if it became effective at all, we suspect that its terms, as they now stand, would just as decisively as before shut out the churchwardens from doing that which the Bishop of Peterborough wishes them to do. And we half suspect that the zealots of the "Free and Open Church Association" know this, and mean it too. We do not think they would care much about the Bill at all, if they did not anticipate this result from it. And, indeed, how are we to distinguish in a sufficiently precise and technical manner the "assignment" of sittings which the Bishop of Peterborough intends to permit, from "appropriation," which he proposes to forbid? He thinks that the 4th clause, as it now stands, would prevent "permanent appropriation," whilst the churchwardens might still "assign" seats "from Sunday to Sunday, or for longer periods." But even now no churchwardens can "assign" or "appropriate" for a longer period than their own year of office, at least in the 13,000 churches that are affected by this Bill. Will the clause as now drawn prevent this annual "assignment" or "appropriation," or not? If it will not, the clause is needless and nugatory. There are already ample powers for correcting such an abuse of churchwardens' powers as is involved in "permanent appropriation," *i.e.*, appropriation beyond the term of the churchwardens' office who grant the appropriation. On the contrary, if the clause does interdict such appropriation for the churchwardens' year of office, it also, in effect, interdicts it for six months, or a month, and practically abolishes altogether the churchwardens' control over the business of seating the parishioners. In other words, we do not understand how a churchwarden can "assign" a sitting for such "longer periods than from Sunday to Sunday" —such periods as the Bishop speaks of—without having thereby "appropriated" that sitting for the time to the allottee, and so doing the very thing prohibited in the fourth clause of the Bill.

The Bill has alarmed many incumbents and churchwardens. We think it likely that their apprehensions are very much greater than they need to be. The Bill contains no machinery for giving effect to its own provisions. We feel, indeed, somewhat doubtful whether this defect in it does not place the Imperial Parliament in a somewhat unfitting attitude towards the subject with which the Bill deals. Its preamble tells us that the law has been for many years infringed, and the rights of the parishioners in many places invaded; but it does not propose to do any-

thing to vindicate the law, nor does it offer any remedy whatever to the parishioners supposed to be aggrieved. Is it not rather idle to declare that the law has been systematically set at nought, and then to re-enact it without attempting to secure its better observance? We could wish also—if there is to be any legislation at all about these matters—that greater facilities might be given for getting rid of those pew-rents and pew-proprietorships which modern legislation has created in many places. Circumstances have changed very much in parts of our large towns, and many of the churches built thirty or fifty years ago are saddled with arrangements which now encumber them sorely. The Act 32 and 33 Vict., c. 94, is useful, but does not go far enough, nor give facilities enough. We will add, too, as regards the Parish Churches Bill, that we should greatly prefer to leave dealings with church sittings to the Ordinary. If his jurisdiction is too limited, let it be enlarged and strengthened, and let cheap and easy redress be provided for grievances about sittings, or the want of sittings; but we do not care to see the business transferred to Parliament, nor desire, generally speaking, interference on the part of Parliament with the internal affairs of the Church.

It is stated, we think with truth, that there are many churches in which appropriation and pew-rents prevail without any regular and legal sanction. In some cases no "instrument or scale," such as the Bill alludes to, and such as might lawfully have been framed when the church was consecrated, has ever existed. But matters have gone on very well from the first, and it is quite certain that, had there been no such provision for the incumbent, and no such arrangements for the people, the churches, or some of them at any rate, would never have been built at all. The weekly offertory is not in favour everywhere even now, and to have proposed it twenty or five-and-twenty years ago as the main source of supply for church expenses and incumbent's salary, would have been utterly futile. We are not saying that this ought to have been so, but are simply stating the fact. The Parish Churches Bill would simply confiscate the incomes of clergymen in the position we have described, if it became operative at all; for its saving clauses reserve only those pew-rents which have been "expressly authorized" by legal instrument. No mere understanding that there should be pew-rents, however long and unbroken, would save them. Now if the Ecclesiastical Commissioners were prepared at once to endow these churches, no doubt their incumbents would be only too glad to have it so. But we all know that the Commissioners will, and indeed can, do nothing of the sort; their resources, like those of too many of our country clergy, have been sadly crippled by the agri-

cultural depression. And thus the Parish Churches Bill would, in law at least, sweep away the whole revenues of many incumbencies, and with them, too, those of many churchwardens. For the church expenses in such churches are frequently met by a sum annually set aside out of the pew-rents.

There is another class of churches not so wholly dependent on pew-rents, but which might be much embarrassed by the proposed legislation. We may take St. Peter's, Eaton Square, as an instance. Many of our readers may recollect a public statement made by its late vicar, now Bishop of Truro, since his elevation to the Bench. He said that Bishop Jackson, in collating him to the benefice, made it a condition that he should not seek to do away with the pew-rents; that at the time he much regretted the Bishop's determination in this respect; that he had since been convinced that it was a wise determination, for the pew-rents had furnished the salaries of the clergy who served the church, and left the large offertories—which otherwise would necessarily have been drawn upon for those salaries—free to be devoted entirely to various pious and charitable purposes. Now we never heard that St. Peter's Church was, during Dr. Wilkinson's incumbency, slack in its duties to the poor, or that it was shunned by such of the poor as might be regarded as belonging to it. And we have no doubt at all that this is far from being an isolated case. The sudden and summary abolition of all pew-rents except those saved by legal and statutory securities would undoubtedly involve a severe loss to many a missionary undertaking, and to many a medical charity. Congregations would have to use strenuous efforts to provide the stipends for those who ministered to them. It is most true that the same persons find the money, whether it comes in the shape of pew-rents or oblations. But it does not follow that the same amount would be forthcoming from the latter source alone, if the former method were done away with. Perhaps it ought to be so, but those who have had practical experience in parish work know that it would not be so, at any rate not at first, nor, as we think, for a long time. The truth is that a congregation needs to be trained and taught, and that sometimes for a long period, to value and support the weekly offertory. We hold it to be the more primitive scriptural and excellent system of Church Finance. All we say is that it is not expedient to throw our congregations generally on it all at once; and we believe that not a little anxiety, suffering, and irritation would be caused by such a sharp sweep as the "Free and Open Church Associationists" would seemingly wish to make.

Appropriation is sometimes set off against the rights of

parishioners, as if the two things were opposed. They are not necessarily so at all. On the contrary, there are not a few cases in which the rights of parishioners and their free use of their parish church cannot be secured without appropriation. What is to become of the parishioners in such places as Scarborough, Eastbourne, Torquay, if the rule is to be merely "first come first served"? Or are the residents in such favoured spots to be expected to provide sufficient accommodation, not only for themselves, but for all visitors at the fashionable seasons? The rights of parishioners, if by that term we are to understand those whose homes are in the parish, will assuredly be not only infringed, but utterly destroyed for the time, unless their own places are kept for them in church. It does not follow, of course, that those places ought to be kept empty. In many of the best-regulated churches of our watering-places, all seats unoccupied when the last bell commences five minutes before the hour of service, may be taken by any who want them. Nor is appropriation, thus limited and guarded, necessary in resorts such as those just mentioned only. A church that is served by an eloquent preacher, or has reputation for a superior service, attracts crowds in London and our other large towns, crowds drawn from all parts. In truth, the "Free, Open, and Unappropriated" system is in some of its aspects rather congregational than parochial. If the parishioners, to whom a favourite or fashionable church belongs, intend to keep their rights in a populous district, they can only do it by that very appropriation which the Bill declares to have taken those rights away. And in truth, so pressing has this necessity become, that even churches that proclaim themselves "free and unappropriated" have sometimes to resort to devices which are very inconsistent with that profession, in order to provide some accommodation for their regular worshippers. The writer occasionally, when in London, attends a much-frequented church, which is declared to be and always has been "free and unappropriated." Having more than once been at the doors before they were opened to the public, he has gone in with the first and found to his astonishment the church already three-parts full. On inquiring from a friend, who is a "member of the congregation," he ascertained that those who regularly attend are admitted at a side door in a by-street, upon the production of the incumbent's visiting card. We must say that an acknowledged appropriation would be more straightforward. We will only add to this part of our remarks that where the church sittings are ample in number for the population, we cannot see any reason why each parishioner should not have his own place in church allotted

to him if he so desire. He might well, in such instances, have it without injury to any other parishioner, and this is the great principle to be kept in view throughout. Doubtless churchwardens ought to take care that no quasi-proprietorships are established, and by way of precaution would do wisely to assign, by written circular, certain sittings to certain persons at the commencement of the churchwarden's year of office, and for that year only; thus the churchwardens would in effect resume possession of the sittings on behalf of the parish every year. Annexing of seats to certain tenements is, on many grounds, objectionable, and probably, unless done by faculty, illegal. But we cannot see why the desire to have "one's own place in church" is so censurable as some of our ardent Churchmen of the modern school appear to think it.

There is one thing which the Parish Churches Bill would certainly accomplish. It would put an end to the practice of "Nominal Grants" made by the Ecclesiastical Commissioners, for the purpose of bringing churches under certain of the old Church Building Acts. These Acts provide that four-fifths of the sittings may be let, whereas under the New Parishes Act of 1856 no more than one-half can be so. The history of this practice seems worth rehearsing. It goes back to the conclusion of the great war, when a "thank-offering" of a million and a half of money was voted for the erection of additional churches, and a church-building Commission was created for the purpose of administering it. This Commission was charged to make "a certain number" of free seats in the churches built by it, the exact number not being fixed. In 1856 the present Ecclesiastical Commission took over the functions of the older one, and with them a few thousand pounds that remained of the money voted by Parliament in 1818. This has been doled out in very small sums—as small as £5—and the Commissioners thus bring the churches that receive this grant under the old Church Building Acts, and are statutably enabled to impose a proportion of rented sittings which the more recent Acts do not allow. We may be assured that the Commissioners have believed themselves to be acting for the best in this matter. They have doubtless only resorted to this expedient of making a "nominal grant" when strongly solicited to do so by circumstances, or by the local promoters of some new church, who do not see their way to any better arrangement. At the same time the expedient has rather the appearance of an evasion of the law, and has become something of a scandal. Still, there is no reason why an Act of Parliament should be resorted to. The Bishops are all Ecclesiastical Commissioners, and could bring about the cessation of

this very objectionable practice if they chose to do so at any time.[1] Still better, if they will get their colleagues promptly to vote away the small remaining balance of the old Parliamentary fund—there are a very few thousand pounds only now left—the possibility, and with it the temptation, to create new churches, which are almost wholly pew-rented and so proprietary, will be done away with.

The writer does not wish to conceal his personal opinion, based upon a considerable and somewhat varied experience, that the "Free, Open, and Unappropriated" system is by far the best in itself. He believes that the classes for whom the greatest responsibility and anxiety is now felt, those that live on their weekly earnings, greatly prefer, as a rule—though not without exception—those churches where there is absolutely no distinction attempted between man and man. And those classes of our people, too, are generally found quite as willing as any to support, according to their means, the weekly offertory, which is the financial handmaid of that system. He thinks, too, that when the system has broken down it has sometimes done so because it has not been carefully and thoroughly prepared for, and carried into effect. A church worked on this plan ought to have every sitting provided with its own kneeler, Bible, Prayer Book, and Hymn Book. The people ought to have nothing to take to church but themselves. Separation of the sexes will return inevitably in populous communities. The idea of the church congregation as an aggregate of families, which came in with pews, will depart with them, amidst not a few tender regrets from old-fashioned people. The churches that are well attended ought to have their faithful churchwardens and sidesmen, who will not grudge the trouble of being present as soon as the church doors are opened. They need not, indeed, "seat the parishioners," for the best way of doing that is mostly to leave them in an unappropriated church to seat themselves; but they should be ready to give information, and interpose where there is occasion. It is also a question whether the best way of "seating a church" is not in these days to have chairs only. These are now made in very convenient, comfortable, and cheap forms, and when benches are fixed, even

[1] Since this article was written it has been announced that the Ecclesiastical Commissioners have, on the motion of the Bishop of Peterborough, resolved "That no scales of pew-rents be hereafter authorized, except those under which one-half of the sittings shall be free, and as advantageously situated as those for which a rent may be fixed and reserved." In other words the system of "Nominal Grants" is done away with, by the action of the Commissioners themselves, as is above suggested.

though they be open, it is difficult to prevent those associations growing up which lead to a sense of proprietorship. The naves of our cathedrals, which now contain some of the most remarkable and not least devotional of our congregations, are commonly fitted up in this way. A Parochial Finance Committee to take cognisance of, and make known, the state and progress of the weekly collections, is also useful; and diligent house-to-house visiting is indispensable—without it the minister of an "Unappropriated" church will never know who goes to church and who does not, unless his congregation is sparse indeed.

But all this does not carry with it the writer's approval of the language and policy of the "Free and Open Church Association," or of the Bill introduced under their auspices into the House of Lords by the Bishop of Peterborough. They and their allies have done good work in times past, for which they deserve our gratitude. They have in many places helped to put an end to the practice of keeping pews empty when their "owners" are not at church; they have spread valuable information about the best way of arranging churches so that in these days no one ever proposes to cut up the area of a church into square or oblong blocks; they have done a good deal to bring back into our church life the idea of oblation from our substance as an element of public worship. But their words are often unmeasured, and their imputations against those who do not unreservedly agree with their views are sometimes uncharitable. The "Parish Churches Act" is an attempt to get that done in a summary way which its promoters ought to be satisfied to bring about by fair argument and persuasion. It is a sample of the arbitrary and intolerant temper which is too common in these days. Men will not wait patiently for the result of the more sure and safe method of convincing their neighbours, but are ready whenever they see the chance to coerce them. Our parishes differ very much one from another, and are also in various stages of progressiveness in Church matters. We do not desire to see one and the same rigid system of church arrangements thrust on them everywhere alike. It is also to our mind no recommendation of this Bill that it has the support of Erastian Church Reformers like Mr. Albert Grey, nor yet that the "Liberation Society" is pleased to approve of its principles. Its chances of passing, at any rate in the House of Commons, seem to be very slender for the present session; and if it did pass, we are inclined to think that its practical results would not be by any means such as to justify either the expectations of its friends or the apprehensions of its opponents.

THOMAS E. ESPIN.

ART. V.—"THREE YEARS OF ARCTIC SERVICE."

Three Years of Arctic Service. An account of the Lady Franklin Bay Expedition of 1881-84, and the attainment of the farthest North. By ADOLPHUS W. GREELY, Lieutenant United States Army, commanding the Expedition. With nearly one hundred illustrations made from photographs taken by the party, and with the official maps and charts. Two vols. R. Bentley and Sons. 1886.

JUST three centuries ago—wrote Lieutenant Greely last year—that is in the year 1585, two tiny craft set sail from Dartmouth in quest of the North-west Passage. They were commanded by that daring explorer and skilful seaman, John Davis. Davis's discoveries were remarkable, and his descriptions of the Greenlanders[1] are curious and instructive, showing them to have been the same "tractable" and honest people 300 years ago as they are known to be at the present time. In the year 1616, another of our great discoverers, William Baffin, sailed from Gravesend for the icy North, in a craft of only fifty-five tons. In his wonderful voyage he sailed over 300 miles farther north than his predecessor Davis. His latitude, about 77° 45′ N., remained unequalled in that sea for 236 years. In the year 1852, in the *Isabel*, Captain Inglefield (who opened to the world the Smith Sound route), reached 78° 21′ N.[2]

For two centuries the waters first navigated by Baffin remained unvexed by any keel, and the very credit of his discoveries passed away. Baffin's narrative, indeed, was called in question. On Barrington's chart, in the year 1818, appeared the words, "Baffin's Bay, according to the relation of W. Baffin, in 1616, but not now believed;" and Sir John Barrow, in his history of Arctic voyages, omitted Baffin Bay from his circumpolar chart. But in the same year, 1818, Captain John Ross set sail, and the story of adventure and discovery in the high Northern Seas has been continuous from that time.

It was in March, 1881, that Lieutenant Greely was appointed commander of the U. S. expeditionary force. His instructions were, "to establish a station north of the eighty-first degree of north latitude, at or near Lady Franklin Bay, for the purposes of scientific observations,[3] etc., as set forth" in the Acts of

[1] Speaking of the good work done by Moravian Missionaries in Greenland, Lieutenant Greely says: "These missions were, for a time, as important as the missions in our own State of Pennsylvania, which then, strange as it may seem, constituted with Greenland a diocese, which was visited by the same Bishop."

[2] Captain Markham, in 1876, on the frozen ocean, reached 83° 20′ 26″ N.

[3] Lieutenant Greely's chapter on "International Circumpolar Stations" has a special interest.

Congress. The members of the Expedition were volunteers; they had been highly recommended, and had passed a strict medical examination; there were twenty-one men, three officers, and a surgeon. On July 7th the Expedition sailed from St. John's, Newfoundland; on the 15th they entered the harbour of Godhavn. The usual Greenland hospitality was shown them at Upernivik, and they made a prosperous voyage to Lady Franklin Bay. On the 18th of August, all the supplies having been landed, the steamer left them; a strip of packed floes, however, cut her off from open water, and not until the 26th did she pass from their sight. "Already from August 18th," says Lieutenant Greely, "freezing temperatures occurred daily; and at 3 p.m. of the 29th the temperature fell below the freezing-point, there to remain for a period of nine months." The building of the house, and all preparations for winter, were pushed on with the utmost rapidity.

On Sunday, August 28th, the entire party were assembled, and the commander laid down the programme for future Sundays.

> In dealing with the religious affairs of a party of that kind, which included in it members of many varying sects (says Lieutenant Greely), I felt that any regulations which might be formulated should rest on the broadest and most liberal basis. I said to them that, although separated from the rest of the world, it was most proper and right that the Sabbath should be observed. In consequence, I announced that games of all kinds should be abstained from on that day. On each Sunday morning there would be read, by me, a selection from the Psalms, and it was expected that every member of the Expedition should be present, unless he had conscientious scruples against listening to the reading of the Bible. After service on each Sunday, any parties desiring to hunt or leave the station should have free and full permission, if such exercise was deemed by me especially suited to our surroundings, as serving to break in on the monotony of our life, and thus be conducive both to mental and physical health. The selection of Psalms for the 28th day of the month was then read. Although as a rule, during our stay at Conger,[1] I refrained from any comments on what was then read, I felt obliged that morning to especially invite the attention of the party to that verse which recites how delightful a thing it is for brethren to dwell together in unity.

These were wise and wholesome counsels; and we are glad to read that thereafter, while sledging expeditions were being made, prayers for the travellers were offered at the station.

By the middle of September their observatories were constructed, and much of the necessary station work was happily finished. Autumn-sledging closed about the middle of October; later trips were reckoned part of the winter duty. Twenty-six musk oxen, ten ducks, a hare, two seal, and a

[1] The station was named Conger, after Senator Conger, who had interested himself greatly in the Expedition.

ptarmigan, rewarded their hunter's efforts during September and October, which afforded about six thousand pounds of fresh meat for the party, and nearly an equal amount of offal for their dogs. The first signs of the coming Polar night were noted on the evening of September 9th, when a grateful change to the eyes came, with a bright moon and the sight of a star of the first magnitude. While the mental irritation and depression consequent on the Arctic night, says Lieutenant Greely, are not experienced during the Polar day, yet the latter has disadvantages. In some members of the party a marked tendency to sleeplessness developed, and even the most methodical fell into irregular hours and habits, unless routine was imposed on them. On October 8th the use of lamps became necessary within doors, except for an hour at midday; and on the 15th it was only for a little while that the station was gladdened with sunlight. For four and a half months the sun departed.

The chapters describing the journeys of Lieutenant Lockwood's party in the spring of 1882 are full of interest. On May 13th, in their twenty-fifth and last march—ten hours' work carrying them only sixteen miles, worn out by travel through deep snow—they made 83° 24′ N, the highest latitude ever attained by man. This is the field-note: "We have reached a higher latitude than ever before reached by mortal man, and on a land farther North than was supposed by many to exist. We unfurled the glorious Stars and Stripes to the exhilarating northern breezes with an exultation impossible to describe." The honour which for three centuries England had held now fell to the possession of her "kin across the sea." Lieutenant Lockwood and his inseparable sledge-companion Sergeant Brainard, with proper pride, looked that day from their vantage-ground of the farthest North (Lockwood Island) "to the desolate Cape which, until surpassed in coming ages, may well bear the grand name of Washington."

On August 25th, a year having elapsed since the steamer left them, the commander's journal has this note: "I have quite given up the ship, as indeed have most of the men." Yet, for a few days, they hoped against hope; but no relief came.

The second winter could hardly pass as pleasantly as the first. The novelty of Arctic service was over. A gloom had been cast over the party by the non-arrival of the promised ship; and a restriction in the use of certain articles of food was absolutely necessary. Nevertheless, owing to the commander's care, the men passed the winter in good spirits and condition. The health of the party as a whole, indeed, was excellent; three men, for a few days, were ordered a special

amount of fresh meat, but they speedily returned to their normal diet.

The commander's diary for 1882-3 is almost as interesting as that for 1881-2. On September 8 a fiord seal (*Phoca hispida*)[1] was killed; a large, snowy owl was shot. On September 21, temperature was down to 0·7° (−17·4° C.), showing the approach of winter. A musk-ox (dressing 371 pounds) was joyfully secured; a large fine raven was quite a novelty; an ermine was caught already in his winter fur; foxes were trapped. A bear visited the station in the night, but unhappily he got away. This was the only bear seen at Conger.

On October 1, the temperature fell below zero (−17·8° C). for the first time; on the 15th, it fell (permanently) below zero, sixteen days earlier than in the previous year. The sun was last seen on the 13th.

Thanksgiving Day was celebrated after the following order:

Thursday, Nov. 30, 1882, being without doubt the appointed day of national thanksgiving, is herewith designated as a day of thanksgiving and praise. Exemption from death and disease, success in scientific and geographical work, together with the present possession of health and cheerfulness, may be mentioned as special mercies for which this command has reason to be thankful.

On the 1st of March, 1883, the commander wrote: "The first day of spring brings a sense of relief that the second winter is over, and that the entire party is in perfect health. The unfavourable experiences of other expeditions . . . and the knowledge that no party had ever passed a second winter in such high latitudes . . . caused me much uneasiness." And he added (no wonder!), "Perfect ease of mind cannot come until a ship is again seen."

In the spring of 1883 the coast-line explorations were successful, and between April and July, discoveries were made in Grinnell Land. But all the while a retreat from Conger was kept in view. Early in the year, in fact, preparations were begun, a depôt of provisions being established at a southern point. As the summer days went on—no steamer appearing—packing-up and travelling arrangements became more definite. On the 9th of August, the station was abandoned.[2]

Our means of transportation (wrote Lieutenant Greely) consisted of the 27-foot navy launch, which afforded motive-power for our other boats, which were towed by it. Lieutenant Lockwood was especially put in

[1] In their struggle to make the shore, near Cape Sabine, an Eskimo member of the party killed a large bladder-nose seal, 8 feet 4 inches long; a rare seal along the Greenland coast. The fiord seal (*Phoca fœtida* or *hispida*) is known by the English whalers as the "floe-rat."

[2] At Fort Conger, they had "experienced two years of unequalled cold and darkness. Nine months (less twelve days) had been marked by total absence of the sun, during which the *mean* temperature had been −31·4° (−35·2° C.)."

charge of her, with a crew of six, including engineer and fireman, which, with Lieutenant Kislingbury and myself, raised the number to nine. The remaining sixteen of the party were divided between the three boats in tow; in one of which, the whale boat, Dr. Pavy went by preference. . . . To provide against disaster to any of the boats, the records, provisions, coal, etc., were as generally distributed as possible.

On the 10th they turned their prows into Kennedy Channel, to the southward, and they hoped to safety. They then knew not that one relief steamer ("*nipped*") was at the bottom of the sea, and that its consort—its commander "convinced that this frozen region is not to be trifled with"—was that very day steaming safely southward, with undiminished stores, into the harbour of Upernivik.

Beset fifteen days, drifting with ice, the cold steadily increasing, the party was in a truly pitiable plight. On the 10th of September, they resolved to exchange the boats for the sledge. On the Sunday evening they "offered words of praise to the Almighty," and with the new purpose of action expressed "renewed faith in the Divine Providence."

After a weary and most perilous struggle, they reached the shore (Smith Sound), September 29th. They had preserved their instruments and baggage, scientific and private records, arms and ammunition. The retreat from Conger to Cape Sabine, which had taken fifty-one days, involved over four hundred miles travel by boat, and fully a hundred with sledge and boat; and the greater part of this journey was made under such circumstances as to test their endurance to the utmost. The story of this retreat will rank among the most memorable illustrations of courage, coolness, and indomitable perseverance.

The journal of the winter (the *third* winter)—one of suffering from lack of food, and light, and fuel—we must pass over. Here is an entry in the spring of 1884, April 5th:

The night before, Christiansen, one of the Eskimos, had been somewhat delirious, but in early morning he grew worse, and at nine o'clock died. During the previous week considerable extra food had been issued him in the hope of saving him. His body was carefully examined by Dr. Pavy . . . Death resulted from the action of water on the heart induced by "insufficient nutrition." We dreaded to use or hear the word "starvation," but that was the plain meaning of it.

On April 9th, Lieutenant Lockwood[1] passed away. On May 3rd their last bread was gone, and only nine days' meat remained, even at the small rations then issued. On June 1st Lieutenant Kislingbury died; at the close, in extreme weakness, he sang the Doxology. On the 5th Dr. Pavy died.

---

[1] "A gallant officer, a brave, true, and loyal man. Christian charity, manliness, and gentleness, were the salient points of his character" (Vol. II., p. 288).

By the morning of June 22nd the seven remaining members of the party were all exhausted. At noon, Brainard obtained some water; that and a few square inches of soaked sealskin was all the nutriment which passed their lips for forty-two hours prior to their rescue. About midnight Greely heard the sound of a steamer's whistle. His comrades doubted; nothing could be seen or heard. "We had resigned ourselves to despair, when suddenly strange voices were heard calling me; and in a frenzy of feeling as vehement as our enfeebled condition would permit, we realized that our country had not failed us, that the long agony was over, and the remnant of the Lady Franklin Bay Expedition saved."

Art. VI.—CHURCH PATRONAGE.

FROM the third century, when the Bishopric of Carthage was purchased by a wealthy matron for one of her servants, traffic in Church Preferment has been an evil practice from which the chief officers of the Church have never, at least until recent times, been wholly free. The quasi-parental fondness of celibate Roman Catholic Bishops for their "nephews," shown in collating them to rich benefices, caused a scandal whose memory is kept alive in the word Nepotism, as applied to family jobs generally. The faithful laity branded these transactions as Simony—a misuse of the term, no doubt, but pardonable as marking the height of their indignation. Shakespeare makes it a prominent article in Queen Katharine's indictment of Cardinal Wolsey, that "to him simony was fair play." The Legislature has adopted the term, and defined it—in a manner to which I shall call attention presently.

In no historical work to which I have access can I find any trace of simony on the part of the laity in pre-Reformation days. In the eleventh century (according to Hallam), "Simony, or the corrupt purchase of spiritual benefices, was the characteristic reproach of the clergy." Acting on a shrewd suspicion that the chief inducement to this traffic was the temporalities rather than the spiritualities of the benefice, our kings interposed investiture by the Bishop between the assumption of the spiritual privileges and the possession of the emoluments, in the hope that thus the Bishop might be enabled to check the growing evil. But when, after the Reformation, the action of a Bishop in refusing institution became, in its turn, subject to the control of the Courts of

Common Law, which rigidly limited the legal grounds of refusal, patrons saw their way to evasion, and thought themselves at liberty to do anything not expressly prohibited.

Izaak Walton (in his Life of Bishop Sanderson) complains that "some patrons think they have discharged that great and dangerous trust both to God and man if they take no money for a living, though it may be parted with for other ends less justifiable."

What these "other ends less justifiable" sometimes were, we learn from Thomas Randolph's play, "The Show" (1626), where "The conceited Peddler," vending his wares, says:

> Will you buy any parsonages, vicarages, deaneries, or prebendaries? The price of one is his Lordship's cracked chambermaid, the other is the reserving of his Worship's tithes; or you may buy the knight's horse £300 too dear, who, to make you amends in the bargain, will draw you on fairly to a vicarage. Come, bring in your coin. Livings are majori in pretio than in the days of Doomsday Book. You must give presents for your presentations. There may be several ways to your institution, but this is the only way to induction that ever I knew.

The natural result followed: evasion became an art, and those who were skilful at it grew rich, though their calling was not then disguised under the innocent title of "Clerical Agency." Our ancestors called a spade a spade, and Quarles (1630) wrote:

> The Church sustains the extremes of cold and hunger
> To pamper up the fat advowson-monger.

Three times has the Legislature tried its hand at the work of regulating the sale and purchase of livings, viz., by 31 Eliz., cap. 6; 12 Anne, cap. 12; and 9 George IV., cap. 94. The effect of these Acts and of the various judgments of the courts is briefly as follows:

The sale of an advowson, or even of a next presentation when the Church is empty, is not simoniacal; but it has been held to be illegal for a highly technical reason, viz., that "it is like the rent of an estate become in arrear, which is a chose in action and cannot be assigned"!

The sale may take place when the incumbent is *in extremis*, provided that if only the next presentation be sold under such circumstances, it be made without the privity or a view to the nomination of a particular clerk. A person who has bought a next presentation in his own name, or in that of a Trustee, may not be presented to the living, but he may if he has bought the advowson. If any patron presents to a living in consideration of any pecuniary or other benefit to himself, direct or indirect, the presentation is void.

The last Act (9 Geo. IV., cap. 2) makes a sort of exception in the patron's favour. It allows him to take from his intended

presentee a bond to resign the living in favour of any one named person, or of one of two named persons, provided that those two persons are nearly related, even though they be at the time children in the nursery. This last act savours of the unholy reign in which it was passed. It does its best to establish the theory that the presentation to a benefice is a right to be exercised for the private advantage of the patron, rather than a sacred trust to be exercised for the good of the parish.

It goes without saying that the prospect of an early vacancy renders an advowson or next presentation more valuable, and the ingenuity of advowson-mongers or clerical agents is principally directed to make this certain. There does not appear to be anything illegal in an incumbent making a promise or even a contract to resign at a fixed period; but it is certain that, if the Bishop should find him out, his resignation will be refused, and the purchaser disappointed. Here comes in the use of donatives; a donative advowson is a right to nominate to a benefice by the patron alone without presentation, institution, or induction, and of such a benefice the resignation is made to the patron and not to the Bishop. Your clerical agent becomes the owner or controller of two or more donatives; through his unclean hands passes the sale of the living of Great-Tything. The rector—who probably is patron also—having promised immediate possession, cannot resign to the Bishop, who might be suspicious, and refuse to accept his resignation. The clerical agent or advowson-monger is prepared for the emergency; he is patron of a nice donative. It is full, but no matter; the incumbent resigns to him, and he presents to it the Rector of Great-Tything. The acceptance of this other living avoids that rectory; the purchaser presents himself or his friend, and the Bishop is powerless. As for the poor little donative, that parish keeps its new pastor until its vacating powers are to be again availed of for the purpose of carrying out a similar transaction. Is it a wonder that the parishioners are disgusted with this shuttlecock arrangement; and though they have no quarrel with the doctrines or formularies of our Church, leave her for some dissenting sect, and swell the ranks of her enemies?

On the other hand, the people of Great-Tything, though they have never had any voice in the choice of their rector, are not unnaturally displeased to find that mere money has enabled some clergyman to become the sole judge of his own fitness to have the care of their souls; and if he should turn out ill, attribute to the fact that livings may be sold a fault which is inherent in all systems of patronage.

Ever and anon some bad case comes prominently to light, in which the law has been astutely evaded for the benefit—

well,—of not the best of clergymen. People cry out. Friends are shocked. The enemy blasphemes. The isolated case is made out to be the normal custom. Every sale of livings, however innocent, gets a bad name, and the parties to it may as well be hanged at once without benefit of clergy. They have been guilty of "traffic in souls," of simony, of sin against the Holy Ghost; and the whole system of selling livings is voted so irredeemably bad that an absolute stop must be put to it at any cost, instantly. Otherwise, they argue, the long-impending attack on the Church (which is delayed only until Mr. Gladstone has pacified Ireland with Home Rule, and the expropriation of the landlords, and the expatriation of all Loyalists) will find out this weak spot in her defences; and her foes, marching in by this breach, will demolish her citadel with a triumphant cry of "Down with it! down with it! even to the ground!"

Personally, I am not in favour of legislation in a panic. My desire is to look into the whole matter calmly; to ascertain the facts, and to form a right estimate of them; to balance the advantages and disadvantages of the present system of private patronage taken as a whole; to consider whether it be possible to retain the former, and get rid of or at least minimize the latter, and thus to find the best practicable solution of the difficulties which surround the question.

In so doing, I would take as my guide the wise principle laid down by the Archbishop of Canterbury in his address to the House of Laymen: "Our object must be to extinguish wrongs without injuring rights." But with the utmost respect for his Grace, I must say that this excellent principle has not been kept in view in framing the Church Patronage Bill, which the Bishops have lately introduced into the House of Lords, and submitted to Convocation and the House of Laymen for their opinion. Of some of its provisions, indeed, the latter House has made very short work; but even this House and both Houses of Convocation appear, to my humble but deliberate judgment, to have, with the most laudable intentions, shown a disregard for the rights of property almost sufficient to qualify their lordships for admission into the present Cabinet.

The Church Patronage Bill is framed for three purposes:

I. To enlarge the Bishop's power to refuse institution, so as to include certain defined grounds of unfitness in the patron's nominee.

II. To abridge the existing rights of patrons to dispose of their patronage—

(*a*) By a total prohibition of the sale of next presentations;

(*b*) By restrictions upon the sale of advowsons, and by limiting the number and class of purchasers.

III. To create a new purchaser of livings in a Diocesan Board of Patronage, and to provide this Board in some cases with the purchase-money.

With I. I go heartily—nay, would carry it much further, as shall be shown presently; but such drastic proposals as II. and III. require careful consideration.

The total number of benefices in the Church of England is about 13,800. Of these, 941 are in the gift of cathedral bodies (Dean and Chapter); 716 are in the gift of the Universities and Colleges; 848 are in the hands of Trustees. Therefore for the patronage of 2,495 livings (18 per cent. of the whole) there is joint or divided responsibility. 1,030 (8 per cent.) belong to the Crown, acting through the Lord Chancellor or the Prime Minister. In right of their office, Bishops have 2,654, and Rectors and Vicars 1,142 (altogether 3,796; 28 per cent. of the whole). In all these the patrons are trustees, and have no rights of property. Individual patrons possess 6,469 livings (47 per cent. of the whole); and of these nearly 3,000 belong to patrons who own three or more advowsons, presumably inherited with their family estates, and not likely to be sold unless the old family and the estate be broken up together.

Of the whole number of 13,800 livings, we have it on the authority of the Bishop of Peterborough that only 2,000, or just one in seven, have ever been, or are ever likely to be, sold.

Now, it must be remembered that the patrons of these 6,469 livings have acquired their rights under laws which have existed since the days of the Saxons. Their ancestors or predecessors in title endowed the livings, and often built the churches, on condition that they and their heirs should have the patronage. For many centuries most of these advowsons have been, and they still are, advowsons appendant to the estates with which they were previously connected, and pass by the conveyance or devise of the estate without special mention, as appurtenant to it. Others of these livings have been purchased by the present holders for large sums of money. Some of them were bought under express Parliamentary titles, as when municipal corporations were compelled to sell their advowsons at the best price, or when the Lord Chancellor was permitted to do so on the terms that the purchase-money was to be invested for the increase of the income of the living.

Notwithstanding the obloquy cast upon the King of Israel for his attempt to force Naboth to sell his vineyard at a full price, it is now generally conceded that a man's property may be taken from him, and his rights over it may be diminished, for the public advantage, provided that adequate compensation

be made to him. Without such compensation, to do either of these things is a violation of the eighth commandment, which is not justified even though the motive be sacred; for He Who enacted the commandment said also, "I hate robbery for burnt-offering."

The State has for its own advantage treated advowsons and next presentations as private property. It has charged succession duty on the death of the owner; it has charged stamp duties on their estimated value when they have been settled on a marriage; it has charged higher stamp duties still when they have been sold and conveyed. They are assets in the hands of the trustee in bankruptcy for the benefit of the owner's creditors. Can the State now turn round, because such property has, in a higher sense than other properties, duties as well as rights, and declare that there are no rights at all?

It amazes me that many excellent men—for whose opinion I have the highest respect—while admitting that it would be wrong to deprive a patron of the right to sell an advowson, unless full compensation be given to him, yet contend that he may be rightly deprived of the right to sell a next presentation, without compensation. Yet Euclid taught us long ago that a whole is made up of its parts. The next presentation is worth on an average three-fourths of the value of the advowson. If it be wrong to sell three-fourths, how can it be right to sell the whole? If it be wrong to sell the next turn, how can that wrong be made right by also selling the second turn, and the third, and so on? One most respected member of the House of Laymen (who has himself built and endowed a church in London, and retained the patronage in his family) contended for the prohibition, on the assumption that when the patron of an advowson sells the next presentation only, he must himself present the living to the purchaser's nominee, and must thus retain all the responsibility for a proper exercise of his trust, although he has put it out of his power to use any discretion in the matter.[1] But this is not the case: the patron's rights and duties are transferred to the purchaser for one turn; his responsibility devolves upon another, and there is no reason why that other should not be as conscientious as the first in the fulfilment of his duties and the exercise of his rights.

The proposed restrictions upon the sale of advowsons are open to similar objections. By the Bishop's Bill, a patron may

[1] The present trustee, having already spoken, was unable to correct this misapprehension.

in future sell an advowson only to some one of the following possible purchasers:

(*a*) Any public patron;
(*b*) A body of trustees not having power of sale;
(*c*) A Diocesan Board of Patronage to be constituted under the Bill.

Deferring for a moment the consideration of the important question whether any advantage will be gained by transferring advowsons from private gentlemen to any such patrons as these, I must point out that if you take away a man's right to sell his property at the best price which he can obtain for it—whether you do this by limiting the number of purchasers, or by enacting that his purchaser shall hold it on less advantageous terms as to power of selling or otherwise than he himself does—you rob him of that which the law has professed to secure to him, and no question of the piety of your motive can alter the fact. Their condemnation is just who would do evil that good may come.

I am afraid that the same maxim applies to the only means suggested by the Bishop's Bill, of supplying the fund wherewith the new Board of Patronage is to be provided with the purchase-money of the living, in the solitary case in which the patron, having been by the Act practically debarred from selling to anyone else, is to have the power of compelling the Board to purchase. Hitherto the law has set its face against selling a vacant living, conceiving that to be the worst form of simony, but of this superstition the Bill before us takes no account. Under its provisions, when, and only when, a living is vacant, the patron may compel the Board of Patronage to purchase the advowson. The price is, in case of difference, to be settled by arbitration, and during all the time that is taken up with haggling about the value, with the selection of arbitrators and an umpire, with bringing the case before them, with waiting for their award, with making out the patron's title, and conveying the advowson to the purchaser, the living must remain vacant, and the parish left without a pastor.

It is clear that unless the patron is to be treated worse than an Irish landlord, he ought to receive such a price as he could have obtained in the open market, if this Bill had not been passed. This cannot be put, the living being vacant, at less than ten years' purchase of the net income. The Bill, *mirabile dictu*, enacts that the Board may borrow the amount and charge its payment with interest upon the income of the living for a term of sixty years. With regard to this proposal the House of Laymen resolved unanimously:

That any scheme of Church Patronage Amendment which would directly or indirectly divert any portion of the revenues of a benefice to the advantage of a patron would be inadmissible, as secularizing the property given to the parish for God's service.

Besides this objection on principle, there is a very real practical difficulty not less worthy to be taken into account. £1,000 has to be raised for every £100 of income. To repay this with interest in sixty years will, on the four per cent. tables, take £45 a year, leaving £55 to the parson. Assuming the high average of £500 a year as the income of the living —little enough, surely, to secure the services of an educated gentleman—two generations of the people will see their pastor and his family starving upon a pittance of £265. And the only consolation to him and them will be the thought that the responsibility of selecting his successor will be divided among several gentlemen, of whom one-half may be Dissenters!

But let us now assume that all difficulties in the way of providing the purchase-moneys have been overcome—by funds dropped from the clouds—and that private patronage has ceased to exist. Will there be any gain to the Church and to religion commensurate with the cost? Nay, apart from the cost, will there be any balance of advantage?

All advowsons will be gradually vested in patrons who have no beneficial or saleable interest in them; and the scandals connected with the sales of a few of them will be a thing of the past. So far, so good.

But observe, first, that by this absorption of the patronage now held by about 4,000 people in about forty Diocesan Boards, you lose the real advantage of the interest taken by the patrons in the pecuniary welfare of the churches. One ducal patron of many livings takes upon himself the cost of keeping the parsonages in repair; another repairs the chancels. The erection of many of our best suburban churches must have been stopped had not an arrangement been made by which, in consideration of a large donation, the advowson or one or two presentations have been given to some donor who has presented himself or his son; and there are few parishes better worked than these. The system, though open to objection in theory, works well in practice.

My next point is that, as matters now stand, there lies in the way of disendowing the Church the enormous difficulty of compensating the patrons. None but the Liberation Society will rejoice at the removal of that difficulty.

Let us now consider whether the only worthy objects of all patronage will be better attained under the new system than the old. Those objects are to secure, first, that only men of piety and ministerial aptness shall be admitted to holy orders; second,

that of the ordained men thus presumably fit for the cure of souls generally, none shall be placed in charge of a parish who is unfit for that particular cure. It will be seen that I make the spiritual benefit of the parish the main object of patronage. A secondary good object may fairly be to provide for the promotion of clergymen who have shown themselves worthy.

For all these several purposes there seems to me to be great advantage in the present variety of Church patronage; and upon those who are endeavouring to get rid of one large class —the private patrons—lies the burden of proving that the other classes will do better. I was present recently at a meeting of clergymen and laymen where the whole subject was debated, and numerous instances were given to show the aptness of the parish clerk's blundering notice, "The chair will be taken by the *Incumbrance* of this Parish;" but not one of the incumbents alluded to had been appointed by a private patron. It would be invidious to draw a comparison between the exercise of Church patronage by the Crown or by Bishops on the one side, and by private patrons on the other. It is enough for my present purpose to point out the objections to concentrating much patronage in the hands of Diocesan Boards. We have warning beacons, in our experience of such bodies as the Deans and Chapters, and the Master and Fellows of a College. Individual conscience is more tender than conscience distributed among a Board. "You are excellent men individually," said Archbishop Whately to some such body—"not one of you would hurt a fly; but you would divide a murder amongst you!" Sometimes the right to nominate is given to each member of the Board in turn; sometimes the member of most influence—from rank or pertinacity—gets his way; in either case, the real choice is made by one, but the responsibility is thrown upon all, and being thus subdivided into fractions, weighs upon none. If all the members take their fair share in the choice, it is likely to fall upon some candidate who offends nobody, only because there is nothing in him.

But scandals exist, and they must be abated—true; and in the Archbishop's words may be found the best mode of getting rid of them.

"Our object," said his Grace, "must be to extinguish wrongs, without injuring rights." If you touch a patron's rights, you have him up in arms against you. Lay hold of the other end of the stick, and you may draw him with you. Tell him that property has its duties as well as its rights, and he will assent to so self-evident a proposition. Assure him that you will not injure his rights, but that the duties must be performed, and in case of need enforced, and though he may wince a little, he dares not object. Scarcely any patron will be found in this year

of our Lord 1886 to deny that the good of the parish ought to be taken into consideration by the patron in appointing to a living. The majority of patrons will admit, if pressed, that it ought to be the chief consideration. Some patrons would go so far as to allow that the parishioners might reasonably desire to have some voice in the selection of their pastors. Many more, knowing the evils of popular election, would stop short here, but would give to the parishioners (in the words of the Archbishop), "some power of effective remonstrance against the appointment of a pastor whom they can show to be unfit."

The House of Laymen, in which sit the patrons of many livings, agreed to the following resolutions :—

That the best remedy for the improper use of patronage is to extend the power of the Bishop to refuse institution, and to relieve him in the exercise of such authority by adding a Council to assist him.

That power should be given to parishioners to bring before the Bishop objections to the appointment of the presentee.

These objections should be extended to everything which renders the nominee unfit for the particular living, quite irrespective of his general character as a clergyman.

If the law be altered in accordance with these resolutions, people will cease to buy advowsons or next presentations for the purpose of providing for themselves or their relatives; the risk of rejection by the Bishop and his Council will be too great; and for the same reason parents will no longer deserve Bishop Sanderson's complaint, that "those that have advocations of church livings must needs have some of their children thrust into the ministry."

To these reforms must be added the abolition of donatives by turning them into presentation advowsons, and all the scandalous trickery to secure immediate possession will come to an end. This also is recommended by the House of Laymen. With these safeguards, and others which have been suggested for the prevention of secret dealings with Church Patronage, it would be best to repeal the Acts against simoniacal contracts, and to make sales of advowsons and next presentations as free and open as the sale of other real property. It is the miserable evasions of the present illogical restrictions (resting on no principle) which have caused most of the scandal. If these things be done, no right will have been injured, and no compensation will be due; but the wrongs which have been a blot on our Church system will be abolished. Hard-working, godly, efficient clergymen will not be thrust on one side by men whose character is less high than their connections: these will rather cease to desire ordination, for the ministry will be no profession for them. And our dear old

Church of England will not fear the assaults of the Liberation Society, for she will be happy with her quiver full of loving children, who will speak with her enemies in the gate.

SYDNEY GEDGE.

Mitcham Hall, March 8th.

RECOLLECTIONS OF THE REV. C. P. GOLIGHTLY.

On Christmas Day last there passed away quietly, and without pain, in the eightieth year of his age, a very remarkable character, who had once played a prominent part in the University life of Oxford.

Mr. Mozley, in his "Reminiscences of Oriel," thus writes :—"Golightly must have been as much at home and master of a certain position the day he arrived at Oxford, fifty-eight years ago, as he is to-day. He was always accessible, companionable, and hospitable, and his own kindness and frankness were diffused among those that met in his room and made a social circle. He could criticize the University sermons freely, raise theological questions, and occasionally lay down the law—a very useful thing to be done in the mass of wild sentiment, random utterances, and general feeling of irresponsibility, constituting undergraduates' conversation."

It is not often that the possession of wealth is a distinct drawback to success in life, but in the present instance there is at least some reason to think that this was the case. When Mr. Golightly proceeded to take the degree of Bachelor of Arts, so long ago as the closing years of the reign of King George IV., he found himself disqualified, by the amount of his private income, from standing for election for a fellowship in his own college of Oriel. He therefore determined to take a country curacy, and to devote all his spare time to the study of theology. With this distinct end in view, he settled down in the pretty little village of Pensburst in the county of Kent. Afterwards he was a short time at Godalming. But he soon found that the peaceful and pleasant life of his village home was not quite compatible with the intellectual intercourse and more severe private study in which he delighted. The noble libraries of Oxford, with their endless resources, were now far away. It was impossible now just to cross the High Street and find one's self within the threshold of the Bodleian. The need of books, as well as the genuine love of Alma Mater, very soon brought back Golightly to that ancient seat of learning, where he had been educated, and where he could easily find congenial society. He settled in one of the curious old houses in Holywell Street, whose low portal was distinguished on the exterior by the sign of a cardinal's hat over the door. There he lived for over half a century, thoroughly enjoying the extensive gardens which stretched away towards the parks at the back of his quaint old tenement. Dean Gaisford had at one time occupied the same house, and there was a tradition that Bishop Berkeley had died there. The peculiar interior was characteristic of the owner. The hall consisted of a fair-sized chamber, handsomely panelled and stained in well-seasoned elm. Near the oak staircase were two wooden columns. The drawing-room was on the left and the dining-room on the right of the western extremity of the hall. The former, well-decorated in white and gold, looked into the main street. The latter, with a very dark paper and hangings, faced the gardens. But the owner of this comfortable residence was really of a

truly ascetic turn. His luxurious carved oak armchairs were reserved for visitors; he himself would always occupy a harder seat. The library where he loved to dwell was oft illuminated by the flickering light of the midnight lamp, while some abstruse problem of theology enthralled his restless brain.

His methods of study, indeed, were mediæval rather than modern. Minuteness of detail was never omitted for lack of time, and perhaps it would be true to say that the very elaboration of these details possessed a special attraction for his mind. For his intellect was strong and powerful, but the area over which it was exercised was somewhat narrow. Theology and history were his favourite studies. Of the extensive controversial literature relating to the differences between the Church of England and the Papacy, he was complete master. In advancing years it became his custom to read aloud a portion of history to a select circle of friends, to while away the long winter evenings. On such occasions he seemed for the time to live entirely in the past, so vividly did the words of the historian convey living impressions to his mind. The Dean of Norwich, in his interesting paper, has well illustrated this trait in Mr. Golightly's character:

> Long after I had left Oxford for good, happening to be there for a day, I, in company with the late Edward Woollcombe, of Balliol, paid him a visit. There were current topics of the day in which we both of us expected him to manifest the warmest interest. But we found him so immersed in the history of Celestine V. that he could talk of nothing else, and, indeed, was living wholly in the past. He went out of the room and fetched some ecclesiastical history (I wish I could remember what it was, certainly not Mosheim nor Waddington, but far fuller and more copious in particulars), and read out the story, which seemed to touch and harrow him just as if the events were passing under his own eye. The ascent of the deputation from the Conclave to the hermit's cell on Mount Morone; the savage wildness of the cell and the small reptiles and vermin which crawled about in it; the crass ignorance and total incompetence for affairs which characterized the hermit himself, to whom, by a sudden unanimity (ascribed to Divine inspiration), the offer of St. Peter's Chair was made; his sincerity; his austere virtues and ascetic habits even in his own palace; his conviction, after a five months' reign, that he would do well to abdicate; and his imprisonment for the rest of his life, lest he should again set up pretensions to a post which he had not at first accepted without earnest and agonising prayer—all this Golightly made, by the remarks which he interspersed with his reading, to live again under our eyes, and showed, I think, that he possessed almost as much of the historic imagination as Arthur Stanley himself. Celestine V. made a dint in our minds from that day forward.

Golightly was a great reader. He liked to be alone, as he often used to say, except at meal-time. And whenever he was reading any book carefully, it was his custom to make numerous quaint annotations on the side of the pages, and to underline sentences which he deemed worthy of special notice. He thus dealt with Lady Russell's letters, the third edition of which he had purchased from the library of William Belchier. Her husband, Lord William Russell, had been executed in Lincoln's Inn Fields on a charge of high treason in the reign of Charles II. In reality, he suffered to please the Court on account of his Protestant and patriotic sentiments. Against the following passage Golightly wrote in large letters, "Human Nature." It stands thus: "A flood of tears are ever ready when I permit the least thought of my calamity; this is matter of great humiliation."

There is also a passage condemning the teaching of the Jesuits, which is marked with distinct approval of the late owner of the book, as well as a sentence on friendship, which seems worth isolating from its context: "One may love passionately, but one loves unquietly, if the friend be

not a good man." In truth, quaintness of style and dry humour possessed in his eyes a special charm, as well as honesty of life and simplicity of purpose. "I have always been greatly delighted," he would sometimes say, "with the Queen of Spain's description of the Duke of Berwick, on finding that he could not be induced to be a party to any of the Court intrigues. She pronounced him to be 'un grand diable d'Anglais sec, qui va toujours droit devant lui.'"

He would often call the attention of his friends to a text from the Book of Job on the title-page of a theological book upon an abstruse subject which once had a wide circulation—"Who is this that darkeneth counsel by words without knowledge?" He selected as his motto for the last pamphlet which he ever wrote a curious text from the Book of Proverbs: "He that is first in his own cause seemeth just; but his neighbour cometh and searcheth him." The words are certainly not inappropriate to a little book issued in the form of a letter to the Dean of Ripon, and intended to modify the sketch of the author to be found in the second volume of the published life of the Right Rev. Samuel Wilberforce, some time Bishop of Oxford, and afterwards of Winchester.

At the period of excitement connected with the passing of the measure for the Disestablishment of the Church of Ireland, he would quote with hearty laughter the bitter complaint against the clergy attributed to the people of that unhappy land: "Why, these priests, they take a tenth from us now: they will take a twentieth next!"—which statement tallied well with the justification of the Irish Nationalists put into the mouth of a member of the Imperial Parliament, to the effect that three-fourths of the outrages were gross exaggeration, and the other half had no existence at all.

He once compared a curious negotiation which had been carried through by a very eminent statesman to the extraordinary feat of "an elephant picking up needles with his proboscis." Very justly does the Dean of Norwich observe: "Quaint in his own character and habit of mind, he loved the quaintnesses of such writers as Fuller and George Herbert."

The family of Portales, famous in the annals of the Huguenots, has risen to distinction in France and Switzerland, as well as England. Golightly was proud of his second name, and of his descent from the patient sufferers who in many cases lost all their possessions on the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes.

The history of that time had a peculiar charm for him, and hence he most likely derived his intense dislike of ecclesiastical pretension and his keen love of religious liberty. Acquainted with Cardinal Newman from youth, he had once thought of being his curate at St. Mary's; but it was soon found their views did not coincide, and the scheme was abandoned.

Years afterwards he used sometimes to tell how he was at prayers in St. Mary's Church, and the lesson chanced to be from the Book of the Acts of the Apostles, where the tempestuous journey of the Apostle St. Paul is described, from his old haunts in the land of Judæa to the seat of the imperial throne of Cæsar. "Never," said he, "shall I forget the peculiar emphasis with which the fourteenth verse of the last chapter was uttered—'Where we found brethren, and were desired to tarry with them seven days; and so we went towards *Rome*.'"

The tremendous controversy in which Golightly embarked with the late Bishop of Oxford regarding Cuddesdon College made him unpopular in many quarters, and upon the whole may be considered as a very unfortunate affair. Much personal feeling was excited, and men used strong language. Mr. G. was likened to "a snake in the grass,"

and "the serpent in Paradise." Upon which he is said to have drily remarked that it had been twice his hard fate to be compared to the devil, *but* it was once by a Bishop and once by an Archbishop. On one occasion the Vice-Chancellor compared him to "the robber in Virgil, in whose cave, when it was entered, nothing was to be found but rage and smoke, and a monster easily to be slain." But, as Golightly used to say, with a touch of grim humour and a slight twinkle of the eye, "This same reverend Vice-Chancellor, when promoted to the Episcopal Bench, not only entered the cave of Cacus, but took his seat at his dinner-table, where he made himself very agreeable."

But it is not our business to summon from the dismal abyss the pale shades of dead controversies. Their white shroud we will not remove. It will be better as well as more pleasant to close this once painful subject by quoting, in brief, the last public utterance which Golightly vouchsafed on the general condition of religious opinion within the University of Oxford. In a document given to the world some five years ago, he makes the following observations in a very charitable spirit :—

> But I am not a "laudator temporis acti." I do not ask, 'Why were the former days better than these?" (Eccles. vii. 10). Indeed, after fifty years' residence in Oxford, I am convinced that they are a great deal better, and that the moral and religious condition of the University is vastly improved since my undergraduate days. . . . Religious earnestness is much more common, and what there is of it is real. There is no cant. It is my belief that two of the most useful persons in the University are a late Principal and a late Vice-Principal of Cuddesdon College. Dr. Liddon's lectures are, I am told, very valuable. I am better acquainted with Dr. King (now Lord Bishop of Lincoln), to whom, indeed, I am sincerely attached. We differ, I fear, widely in our views, but how widely I cannot say ; for in long conversations that I have had with him, we have found so much in which we agreed, that we never got on to the points in which we differed. His influence for good among the young men is very great.

Like many men much given to controversial writing, he retained at bottom a warm and affectionate heart. If he made enemies, he was also a man who made firm and fast friends. Neither the lapse of time nor the intervention of space could loosen the bonds of the sacred tie thus created. The Psalmist's idea of true friendship was his own, "We took sweet counsel together, and walked in the House of God as friends." Within certain definite limits, it was possible for him to maintain very friendly relations with persons in very different ranks of society ; while as in some sense a religious leader of a particular school of thought in the Church, he was consulted on difficult points by a great variety of people, from the middle-aged artisan to the newly-appointed curate of some Evangelical parish.

Just a few words must be said upon Mr. Golightly's munificence. Once convinced of the desirability of any given charitable object or good work, his liberality was both wise and unbounded. Even if not altogether convinced, he did not often withhold his hand. The present writer was once much interested in a scheme for the erection of a new cathedral in India. It was thought that interest in the matter might be aroused within the limits of the University, and the Chancellor, the Marquess of Salisbury, headed the subscription list with a liberal donation. Golightly was asked what share he would like to take in this bold effort of missionary enterprise. After due consideration and examination of the various proposals, his reply was in the following strain : "Interested as I am in all foreign missions, yet I am hardly convinced that the British hold over India is of so secure and permanent a character as to make the building of a stone cathedral the most appropriate effort of missionary labour at this present season. Under these circumstances, sir, I trust you will pardon me if I do not give more than £20 to the fund."

On one occasion the course of local events had caused him to take considerable interest in the enlargement of Hinksey Churchyard, a small village in the immediate neighbourhood of Oxford. By the proposed alteration two remarkably fine elms, which stood near the boundary wall, were destined to destruction. But Golightly was horrified at such a barbarous sacrifice, and taking compassion on these princely trees, proceeded to purchase the same from the Earl of Abingdon. A tablet inserted in the west wall of the neat little churchyard records the fact :

The adjoining trees were
Purchased and presented
To the Parish of South Hinksey
By the Rev. C. P. Golightly, M.A.,
1874.

It may be a matter of surprise to some that a clergyman of such acknowledged distinction and worth never proceeded to the degree of Doctor in Divinity, nor ever accepted any important appointment.

At one time, we believe, he had serious thoughts of taking the highest degree in the Faculty of Theology recognised by the University, but it occurred to him that this distinction would ill correspond with his name. Funny people might say, " Doctor, Go lightly." (The same people did once, in the heat of controversy, characterize him as " Dr. Gone slightly.") About the year 1840, when the Bishop of London inaugurated a scheme for the erection of a number of new churches in the East End, Mr. Golightly came forward with a very substantial donation. Indeed, the deficiency of the adequate supply of the means of grace in the great centres of population was always a matter of deep concern to him. Here was the real weak point, which so sorely needed remedy, in the otherwise noble system of administration maintained by the Church of England.

As a general rule, however, he concealed his nobler acts of charity, mindful of the opening verses of the sixth chapter of St. Matthew. It must further be noted that Christ's poor came in for a fair share of his alms. Although he hated idlers, any genuine case of distress was sure to meet with the kindest consideration at his hands. For sick folk he always felt great pity, and the resources of his large gardens and extensive hot-houses were always available for the benefit of those who could not afford to purchase the little luxuries in the way of fruit which the doctor recommended. At the present moment one example of his thoughtful generosity happens to come to mind. A young lad was dying of dropsy, and suffering intense agonies of pain. He could only take nourishment with great difficulty. At last a few grapes, so the doctor said, would be all that he could swallow. But his mother was quite poor, and unable to provide such uncommon and expensive fruit. Directly Golightly happened to hear of the circumstances, he gave special orders to his butler to supply the lowly cottage with the best bunch of grapes from his own greenhouse on every second morning, so long as the child remained alive. Thus, in the most delicate and graceful way, he performed an act of true charity.

He was always ready to render help to any clergyman who required assistance, without fee and without remuneration. Hence in the course of years he became acquainted with a very large number of the parishes in and around Oxford.

In the days when Mr. Hamilton, afterwards for some time Lord Bishop of Salisbury, was Vicar of St. Peter in the East, Mr. Golightly used occasionally to officiate in that curious and ancient church. But his ministry throughout his life was chiefly exercised in quiet country cures ; and his simple sermons were enriched with a goodly fund of illustration, especially adapted to the spiritual requirements of the agricultural classes.

From his nature and temperament, it is obvious that the more exciting, and perhaps laborious work of a town parish would have been uncongenial. Apart from his library and his study, he could not have lived his own proper life, nor worked out his career in his own way, nor made his own particular mark in the world.

Finally, and by way of conclusion, it must be stated that no notice of Charles Portales Golightly can be regarded as at all complete, without touching on a somewhat delicate subject, from which men generally shrink, namely, the calm beauty of his spiritual character. Prayer was to him an intensely real and living thing. It was to be resorted to in due time, and at proper seasons, such as the opening of a new term, after mature deliberation and suitable preparation. He was a man of prayer, and had caught the spirit of those beautiful lines, written by James Montgomery :

> Prayer is the soul's sincere desire,
> Uttered or unexpressed ;
> The motion of a hidden fire
> That trembles in the breast.

Few, who have been present, could fail to be struck by the peculiar solemnity with which he uttered the words of the blessing over his little household after evening prayers. The voice of conscience, too, apt to speak, in his opinion, in clear and audible tones, was a voice which might never be disregarded for any consideration whatsoever. The fulfilment of what seemed a duty must never be neglected, whatever the cost. In plain words which are worth noting, Mr. Mozley observes :

> Golightly was the first human being to talk to me directly and plainly for my soul's good, and that is a debt that no time, no distance, no vicissitudes, no differences can efface, no, not eternity itself, if one may venture to name that which is incomprehensible.

The above quotation recognises, in no unmistakable terms, the special and peculiar kind of usefulness in which Golightly delighted. He was deeply impressed with a profound sense of what he called his duty to the younger members of the University. Whether at one of his charming little breakfast-parties, or on a Sunday excursion to his little parish of Toot Baldon,[1] he ever endeavoured to make fast friends with one race of undergraduates after another, and very numerous must be the clergy and laity now scattered up and down the length and breadth of England, who can look back with pleasure and with profit to his kindly intercourse and wise words of counsel. He ever carried out in practice a favourite text of his : " Let your speech be alway with grace, seasoned with salt."

Much thrown by his own choice with young men at the most impressionable period of life, it is difficult for any man to estimate the actual amount of solid good which he was enabled to do in the course of a lifetime which nearly reached the span of four-score years. Such opportunities as came within his path he was careful never to let slip by, and his very peculiarities in some ways increased the attractiveness of his society. For the Bible, as containing the one true revelation of God to man, he had the most profound reverence and respect. No labour, however arduous, bestowed upon *that* Book was labour in vain.

It was impossible to be at all intimate with him without learning to admire his fearless honesty and wonderful simplicity. Altogether, he was a man cast in no common mould. Somewhat narrow and eccentric,

[1] The other Baldon was for some years served by the late Archbishop Tait. The two friends, warmly attached to each other, often went out from Oxford together.

he was a man of sterling worth, and devout and prayerful spirit. If we sought to find a suitable motto for the days of his earthly pilgrimage, we should be constrained to adopt the old Latin sentence which he loved to call the golden rule of that holy man, St. Bernard, Abbot of Clairvaux: "Orandi curam habe, et studium gere, ac in omni re orationi plus fide, quam tuæ industriæ vel labori."

Golightly was buried in the peaceful cemetery of Holywell, situated near Magdalen College. Beside his own grave there rests the last remains of many of his warmest earthly friends, who together with him await "the coming of the Saviour Whom he served, and in Whom he believed with a faith over which no shadow of doubt ever seemed to pass."

R. S. MYLNE.

Short Notices.

The Rerealer Revealed. Thoughts upon the Revelation of Christ to and in His People. By W. HAY M. H. AITKEN, M.A. Shaw and Co.

THIS is one of the best among the excellent volumes of Mr. Aitken's sermons, and we heartily recommend it as a book to read and read again. It is full of instruction, and is thoroughly practical. Few preachers, perhaps, have had such wide experience in preaching as Mr. Aitken; few have such gifts for a special work. Mr. Aitken's sermons, truly eloquent, are listened to with eager attention; but they also bear reading well, and richly repay it. They are rich, as we have said, in teaching, suggestive, with clear definitions; strong, and deeply spiritual. For *men*, of more than one class, they are emphatically discourses of the present day. Anybody who has watched in a northern congregation miners and artisans—in a metropolitan, men of business—and in a university, undergraduates and divines, impressed by the oratory of Mr. Aitken, will understand what we mean.

The first five sermons in this volume are The Revelation of Christ as the Saviour—the King—the Teacher—the Life-Power—the Bridegroom.

Haggai and Zechariah. With Notes and Introduction by the Ven. T. T. PEROWNE, B.D., Archdeacon of Norwich. Pp. 159. London: C. J. Clay and Son, Cambridge University Press Warehouse, Ave Maria Lane. 1886.

This interesting little volume is of great value. It is one of the best books in that well-known series of scholarly and popular commentaries, "The Cambridge Bible for Schools and Colleges," of which Dean Perowne is the General Editor. In the expositions of Archdeacon Perowne we are always sure to notice learning, ability, judgment, and reverence. His introduction to the Book of Zechariah is excellent; conservative, but in nowise prejudiced or narrow, it shows that we are justified in holding that the Book is throughout the work of the author whose name it bears. The Notes are terse and pointed, but full and readable.

The Lighthouse of St. Peter, and other Addresses. By Rev. A. N. MALAN, M.A., F.G.S. Nisbet.

A volume of addresses by the same author was noticed in these pages a year or two ago. In the volume before us are many good things. One chapter criticizes the question, "Are you *saved?*" For ourselves, adding and altering a little, we should endorse the criticism.

Memorials of Charles Pettit McIlvaine, D.D., D.C.L., LL.D., late Bishop of Ohio. Edited by the Rev. WILLIAM CARUS, M.A. Cheap edition. Elliot Stock. 1886.

We have much pleasure in inviting attention to a new edition of these valuable "Memorials." The first edition was reviewed in THE CHURCHMAN by Dean Law, as soon as it was published, in 1880; and the second edition was briefly noticed by us in the spring of 1882. A very full and interesting Biography, it deserves to be recommended in its present cheap and convenient form.

A Guide to Textual Criticism of the New Testament. By EDWARD MILLER, M.A., Rector of Bucknell. Pp. 140. London: George Bell and Sons.

This modest and unpretending work will win its way, we hope, as it richly merits, to a very general approval. It is clear and full. To many students, both lay and clerical, with whom ponderous volumes are an impossibility, this Manual will prove helpful; it is readable, and easily mastered. The learned author (who contributed a paper to THE CHURCHMAN on this subject some years ago) holds strongly with Scrivener and Burgon. He puts his points well, and appeals to common-sense.

The Clergy List for 1886. John Hall, 291, Strand.

The "Clergy List" for 1886 has been carefully corrected up to the hour of going to press, and every effort, we are sure, has been made to secure accuracy. The official information received from the secretaries of the various dioceses has been checked by postal communication with every clergyman whose address was known. Among the new features of the present issue will be noticed: (1) A list of the Commissaries appointed under the Pluralities Acts Amendment Act, 1885; (2) the names of the Bishops of the Episcopal Church of America, with dates of consecration and addresses, and the names and addresses of the secretaries of the Diocesan Conventions; (3) a list of the new House of Laymen; (4) the principal Church Societies, including clergy charities, with their addresses and the names of their secretaries.

Holy Week in Norwich Cathedral. Seven Lectures on the several members of the most sacred Body of our Lord Jesus Christ. By E. M. GOULBURN, D.D., D.C.L. Pp. 240. Rivingtons.

The characteristics of Dean Goulburn's writings are well known; and these Lectures will be welcomed by many of the laity as well as of the clergy. The critical remarks, which are excellent, are wisely given in notes. In Lecture V., division three treats of "the glorified Breast of the risen and exalted Saviour" (Rev. i. 12); and it is stated that "the breasts of a woman—not the breast of a man—are here ascribed to Him." We have never been able to agree that μαστὸς must here mean the female breast. The High Priest's "garment," "which reached down to the foot," was "girded to the breast," an Josephus tells us; and we have here described a royal as well as a priestly garment. The classical use of μαστὸς, as well as the Septuagint use, must be considered.

A new edition of lectures delivered during Holy Week in 1831, by the Rev. W. F. HOOK, Vicar of Holy Trinity, Coventry, *The Last Days of Our Lord's Ministry*, has been issued by Messrs. Griffith, Farran, Okeden, and Welsh. These lectures, Prebendary Stephens mentions, were the "first literary venture" of the author.

We heartily recommend, as a choice gift-book, *Under the Mendips*, by the author of "In Colston's Days," "In the East Country," etc., etc. (Seeley and Co.). A new story by Mrs. MARSHALL is always welcome;

and we think the book before us is not unworthy of the best of a charming and very serviceable series. A Tale of country life in the West (the Bristol riots of 1831 being introduced), it is simply told, with point and pretty picturing. Mrs. Hannah More and Bishop Law are carefully drawn. We should add that the volume, like its companions, is well got-up and has tasteful illustrations.

The *Pulpit Commentary* series (Kegan Paul, Trench and Co.) seems to be winning its way; its circulation, probably, will yet increase. Certainly it met a want. The editorial work has been ably done. Each volume has its own special excellences and, many critics will add, its own deficiencies. As a whole, the "Pulpit Commentary," in our judgment, deserves the success which it has attained.—*The Second Epistle to the Corinthians*, the volume now before us, is in certain ways exceedingly good. So far as we have read, the Homiletics and the Homilies are quite up to the average. Archdeacon Farrar's Exposition is scholarly, of course, and has many charms: but we cannot in every place agree with him. In reviewing Dr. Farrar's "Life of St. Paul," we expressed our regret at what was advanced about the Apostle's physical afflictions (CHURCHMAN, vol. i., p. 295); and we are sorry to see here—in comment on xii., verse 2 and verse 7—allusions to "occasional cerebral excitement," and "the history of Oriental and mediæval mysticism."

SOUTH-EASTERN COLLEGE, RAMSGATE.

THIS institution continues to be blessed with remarkable success. The number of pupils has nearly doubled during the last year, and now amounts to over two hundred. The college is full to overflowing. Several important additions have been made—a large swimming-bath, workshop, gymnasium, etc., have been erected. The chapel has been enlarged. A museum has been started, and already contains several thousand specimens. The library contains several hundred volumes. The Junior School buildings, which are to accommodate seventy-five boarders, are being rapidly proceeded with, and will be ready in May. The moral and spiritual tone continues to be highly satisfactory. Some twenty-five boys were recently confirmed by the Bishop of Dover. The secular instruction is steadily advancing towards a high standard. The Examiners' report for this year is most satisfactory. Several boys have passed the Matriculation and first B.A. Examination of the University of London, the Law Preliminary, Medical, etc., whilst others have begun residence at Oxford and Cambridge. Altogether the College has achieved a striking success. It is evident that it has met a great need, and we heartily commend it to the prayers of all who value Evangelical principles.

THE MONTH.

THE debates in Convocation, in both Provinces, on Reforms, were of singular interest. York, we gladly note, is to have a House of Laymen.

In the Canterbury House of Laymen the subject of Patronage was debated. The *Record*, which displays the same ability and judgment upon Church Reform as was manifested in the autumn with such general satisfaction upon Church Defence, shows the importance of agreement and action.

Mr. Gladstone's scheme of Home Rule was foreshadowed on the 16th, and the retirement of Mr. Chamberlain and Mr. Trevelyan from the Ministry is said to be certain.

In the course of a masterly address, at the opening of the Northern Convocation, the Archbishop spoke of the disastrous effects of the theory of Evolution as too often taught.

In the London Diocesan Conference there were some interesting debates. Sir W. T. Charley carried a motion in favour of the Permanent Diaconate. The Bishop made a powerful speech on Patronage; but for ourselves, to a large extent, we agree with the *Guardian's* comments upon it.

Mr. Dillwyn's Resolution:—"That as the Church of England in Wales has failed to fulfil its professed object as a means of promoting the religious interests of the Welsh people, and ministers to only a small minority of the population, its continuance as an Established Church in the Principality is an anomaly and an injustice which ought not to exist," was rejected by 243 to 231.[1] In the minority were 45 Irish "Nationalists."

Mr. Labouchere's motion against the House of Lords was rejected by 202 to 166.

Lord Robert Montagu's letter in the *Times* throws light on Home Rule in connection with the Church of Rome. We feel the deepest sympathy with our brethren of the Church of Ireland.

The weather has been excessively cold; and in towns where many are out of work there has been much distress.

Yesterday (the 16th) the Bishop of Peterborough's "Parish Churches Bill" was read a second time, and referred to a Select Committee.

---

[1] The *Spectator* says: "So far as regards the discussion of the religious question, we must say that the (to us unintelligible) obstinacy of the Nonconformists in resisting a religious census is now obviously working to their prejudice. No one can rely on the very inferential sort of figures by which Mr. Dillwyn measures the numerical strength of the Anglican Church in Wales. If this great question is to be discussed properly, it should be discussed by the light of authentic facts.

With deep regret we record the death of our venerated friend the Earl of Chichester. For some weeks he had been "not very well;" and three days ago he renewed his cold. At the Brighton gathering in connection with the C.M.S. "Simultaneous Meetings," the revered Chairman's speech (as we mentioned in the March CHURCHMAN, was very touching. In his own county[1] Lord Chichester was everywhere honoured and esteemed. His interest in religious matters remained keen to the last. Recently, we had some conversation with him in regard to a Central Body of clergy and laity for the consideration of Church matters. Upon that point (with other matters of Church Reform) his lordship's suggestion, some three years ago, appeared in this magazine. He was from the first a subscriber to THE CHURCHMAN, and took a real interest in its prosperity.

In a letter to ourselves from the Rev. Lord Sydney Godolphin Osborne (which we have permission to quote) appears this reference to the lamented Earl: "He never would spare "himself, and of late especially he was anxious to be at work." "As a public man, and in private, from his very early days, he "trod the Christian path, gathering from it all he would show "to others of its true beauty. For more than half a century I "have known his life, and never knew one feature in it which "did not prove him to be 'a man of God.'" Lord Sydney adds, that there was that about the noble Earl, "which won "for him in all society the truest respect for his religious "character; it never left him anywhere. . . . . Ever a true "nobleman, he wore nobility in the bright setting of a real "humble Christianity."[2]

---

[1] See CHURCHMAN, vol. xii., p. 231.

[2] The *Sussex Daily News* says: "The noble and venerable Earl was in Brighton as recently as last Friday, and had promised to preside at the annual meeting of the Religious Tract Society, held on Tuesday at the Royal Pavilion. At this meeting his death was referred to in the most touching language, and the theme of conversation generally was that in the Lord-Lieutenant of Sussex had passed away one whose influence had always been on the side of good, who had never spared himself in bringing happiness and comfort to others, and who was beloved by every one of the very many people with whom he had come in contact."