

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

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

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

THE
CHURCHMAN

MAY, 1897.

ART. I.—THE QUEEN VICTORIA CLERGY SUSTENTATION FUND.

“IT’S not my turn for dinner to-day.”

Such was the confession of a growing boy, one of the olive-branches of the Vicar in an agricultural East Anglian parish. His father had sent him to the Hall with a message immediately after morning service, and the Squire kindly told him to run home quick or he would be late for dinner. But, alas, poor little man! it was not his turn for dinner that Sunday. In every agricultural labourer’s cottage the whole family would be gathered round their substantial midday meal; but the parson could only afford to give his children a dinner on alternate Sundays.

This story illustrates no isolated case. It represents privations which, beginning some eighteen years ago, when tenants could no longer be found for glebe farms in the Midland counties, have become year by year more widespread and acute as the income from tithe has steadily diminished. In 1878 the country clergy received £112 for every nominal £100 of the tithe rent-charge. Now they receive only £69 17s. 11½d. Thus, the income of a parson who twenty years ago enjoyed from this source a stipend of £200 a year, is now reduced to £122 12s. Concurrently with this gradual pauperization of the clergy in the rural districts, the growth of the population in our urban districts has given rise to the creation of a number of new parishes, with very insufficient provision for the maintenance of the incumbents who have been put in charge of them. As the result of these two processes, the number of benefices of the annual value of between £100 and £200 increased between 1880 and 1892—two years in which statistics of them were specially obtained—from 2,597 to

4,173, and at present, out of the 13,688 incumbents in England and Wales, more than one half are computed to be in receipt of an income of less than £180 a year. The distress of the tithe-receiving clergy, which would be great if it were due only to the causes already mentioned, is further enhanced by the fact that they are the only persons who pay rates in respect of their professional income, and that while this, and as well as their private income, has been steadily falling, the rates have been as steadily rising.

The amount of privation endured by the beneficed clergy at the present time cannot be actually gauged. Some idea might be formed of it by exploring the pigeon-holes in the offices of our various clerical charities, but many of the most deserving sufferers decline to figure as suitors for alms. We hear now and then of one of these sinking into a premature grave for want of sufficient nourishment; but the diminution of physical and mental power which is inflicted on the survivors from the same cause will always remain a matter of conjecture. This much, however, is abundantly clear: the old clerical charities and the various recently-formed diocesan funds for the augmentation of poor benefices, as well as the Church of England Incumbents' Sustentation Fund, which was established in 1873 for making grants to poor incumbents throughout the country, have all proved utterly inadequate to relieve the growing clerical destitution. The idea has been more and more forced upon the minds of Churchmen that nothing can satisfactorily meet the case but a general fund which will embrace the whole Church, will evoke support from all classes of Churchmen, and will remedy all the instances of insufficient clerical incomes.

We may remember that ten years ago a suggestion was made to establish such a Fund as a memorial of the Queen's Jubilee. That suggestion was set aside in favour of the Church House; but the idea was not abandoned. It has since been recommended by Convocation and Diocesan Conferences, and has been urged at Church Congresses; but it was not till last year that a serious attempt was made to set it on foot. In March, 1896, however, Archbishop Benson and the Archbishop of York, in response to a memorial presented to them, appointed a committee of laymen to prepare a definite scheme under which (a) the Church, in her corporate capacity, should take up the whole matter of providing an adequate maintenance for the beneficed clergy; (b) a central fund should be formed to supplement the existing diocesan organizations and to adjust the balance between the richer and poorer dioceses; and (c) a central body should be established with authority to impress upon all Churchmen, from the highest to the

lowest, rich and poor alike, the clearly-defined Christian duty of each man contributing towards the support of the clergy.

The present Clergy Sustentation Fund is the outcome of the deliberations of this committee. It was actually launched on June 26 in last year, when the Archbishops gave their written approval to its constitution, and earnestly commended it to the Church and people of England.

How far does it fulfil the threefold object for which it was called into existence? In the first place, the corporate action of the whole Church is attained by the Fund being under the patronage of the Archbishops and all the Diocesan Bishops of the two provinces of Canterbury and York, and being governed by a board of laymen to which each Diocesan Conference has the right of sending three representatives, and an executive committee of forty-two members, six of whom are nominated by each Archbishop, and the remaining thirty are to be elected by the board. Whether the Fund will eventually secure that all the beneficed clergy shall receive adequate maintenance must, of course, depend on the liberality of Church people; but, at any rate, it provides ample machinery for the purpose. While proposing to effect the object mainly by annual grants, it affords to contributors the opportunity of otherwise appropriating their gifts if they prefer the method of permanent endowment. They may also, if they please, select the unbeneficed instead of the beneficed clergy as the objects of their liberality, and may assign their contributions to a particular diocese or locality. Secondly, the Fund is carefully framed so as to supplement, and not to supersede, diocesan organizations. It encourages the collection of money by and through them, and instead of undertaking itself to select the incumbents which it will aid, it entrusts this responsibility to the diocesan organizations, making block grants to the dioceses according to their needs, and leaving these grants to be allocated by the diocesan authorities in accordance with their local knowledge of the circumstances of the incumbents who require help. The adjustment of the balance between the richer and poorer dioceses is proposed to be effected by requiring each diocese, as a condition of receiving assistance from the Fund, to send up one-fifth of what it collects during the year for annual grants for incumbents. These fifths, together with all direct contributions to the Fund, are to be then lumped together, and the aggregate amount will be distributed among the dioceses according to their necessities. As to the third point—the impressing upon Churchmen the duty of supporting the clergy—the powers of the governing body of the Fund are, it must be confessed, limited. As laymen, they cannot usurp

the position of authoritative teachers. Rather does it lie with the Episcopal Bench, as patrons of the Fund, and custodians of the interests of the Church and clergy, to take the lead in this matter, and with the clergy themselves to educate the people to a sense of their responsibility. By the way, it may be here pointed out that while the central governing body of the Fund is composed exclusively of laymen, there is nothing to prevent a clerical element in the diocesan organizations affiliated to it, and such an element may with advantage be introduced.

There are two points in the above scheme to which serious objection has been taken in some quarters, and a few words of explanation upon them may not be out of place. The policy has been questioned of making annual grants to poor incumbents rather than aiming at the permanent augmentation of the endowment of their benefices. It is true that grants for the latter purpose might evoke similar sums from the Ecclesiastical Commissioners or Queen Anne's Bounty; but against this advantage there are several counterbalancing considerations. Obviously, the same amount of money will go much further towards relieving present distress if distributed annually, than it would if capitalized as endowment. Then the Fund appeals to all classes of Churchmen; but the poor amongst us, while they may fairly be expected to assist in supporting the clergy of their own day, can hardly be asked to provide for the wants of a future generation. Further, many poor benefices are in private patronage, and, as the law now stands, their permanent augmentation would enhance the value of private property by adding to the price at which the advowsons could be sold. Then, again, population is migratory, and many of these benefices are in parts of the country where it is diminishing, and may diminish still further. If it were practically to vanish, the transfer of a permanent endowment to a place where it was really required, would be attended with great expense and difficulty; but no such obstacles would stand in the way of the annual grant being transferred to a parish where it would be of practical use. Lastly, the case is not unknown of a poor benefice being held by a very undesirable incumbent, who, though he cannot be got rid of by law, is by no means deserving of an extra subsidy for his maintenance. An annual grant can be withdrawn in such a case, but if there had been a permanent augmentation of the benefice the unworthy incumbent would continue to enjoy the benefit of it.

The other point in the rules of the Fund on which a doubt has arisen is the policy of requiring one-fifth of the sum collected in a diocese to be sent up to the head office as a condition of the diocese being affiliated to the Fund, and

entitled to share its benefits. It should be stated that this requirement is confined to contributions collected in the diocese for immediate grants to incumbents, and does not extend to money raised for the permanent endowment of benefices. Insistence upon it appears, however, to be essential, if the Fund is to maintain its position as a general fund for the whole Church, and a channel for conveying the superabundant wealth of one portion of it into a quarter which stands in need of external assistance. So long as the Central Fund receives large contributions directly into its own coffers, each affiliated diocese may reckon with confidence on receiving back its fifth with an addition of more or less besides. But the Fund encourages decentralization as regards the collection no less than the distribution of the money, and the time might come when, but for this rule of pooling, so to speak, a certain proportion of the diocesan funds, each diocese would be reduced to provide for its own wants, and the poorer districts would receive no assistance from those in which greater wealth was located. The principle in question lies, therefore, at the root of the whole scheme of the Fund, and a diocese which objects to it can hardly avoid the imputation that it is more regardful of its own interests than of those of the whole Church.

But it is time now that we should pass on to inquire what progress the Fund has actually made during the first ten months of its existence. The total sum contributed or promised to it up to the present time, including affiliation payments from eight dioceses, amounts to upwards of £29,000. Out of this, £5,500 was voted in February to eight dioceses which qualified themselves for receiving grants by sending up their prescribed fifth in respect of the year 1896. The apportionment of the amount between these dioceses was arrived at by taking into account (a) the number of poor benefices in each; (b) the extent to which the diocese had suffered from agricultural depression; (c) its capacity for self-help; and (d) the amount of contribution for affiliation remitted to the Central Fund. As the outcome of these considerations, the total was divided between the dioceses according to the following table :

				£
Norwich	1,350
St. Albans	900
Exeter	700
Salisbury	700
Carlisle	500
Llandaff	500
Peterborough	500
Truro	350
				5,500

This vote immediately enabled the St. Albans Diocesan Poor Benefices Fund to distribute £1,215 among eighty-five of the most necessitous benefices in the diocese.

Nor is it only in the general work of the Fund that a beginning has been made. Although the present idea is to assist the incumbents of poor livings by yearly grants, its constitution expressly contemplates its instrumentality being made use of to help the unbeneficed clergy as well, and to provide, if thought desirable, permanent endowments instead of annual subsidies. And advantage has already been taken of the facilities which it affords for the creation of special forms of clerical sustentation. An anonymous London merchant, after contributing £500 to the general purposes of the Fund, has offered to give another £1,500 towards augmenting the permanent endowment of fifteen poor livings within what is known as Greater London, in the patronage of the Bishop of the Diocese or the incumbent of the mother church, provided that in each case his gift is met by benefactions from the Ecclesiastical Commissioners, Queen Anne's Bounty, or private sources, sufficient in the whole, with his own gift, to augment the endowment of the living by at least £1,200.

But the contributions to the Central Fund, and the amount of direct assistance afforded by it to necessitous incumbents, represent only a part of its operation and value. Considerable progress has already been made in the work of stimulating diocesan efforts in the same direction. Since the Fund was started, several new diocesan organizations for clergy sustentation have been founded as a result of the interest in the subject which the formation of the Central Fund has evoked. Out of the thirty-four dioceses of the two provinces, seventeen have already attached their local organizations to the new Fund, and six others are in course of doing so; and, as the advantages of affiliation to it become gradually realized by experience, the remaining eleven dioceses will doubtless connect themselves with the general scheme.

This is something by way of a beginning, but it would be idle to pretend that it can be regarded as satisfactory in view of what is actually required. It was calculated in 1893 that if all the benefices below £100 a year were passed over as too hopeless for adequate assistance, and an attempt were to be made to raise to £200 a year the 4,173 benefices which were then between that figure and £100 in annual value, this process alone would require £210,000 a year, or a capital sum of £7,000,000. The Fund, as we have seen, actually began its career within a week after the commencement of the sixtieth year of Her Majesty's reign. Having regard to this circumstance, and to the fact that a similar fund would have been

established in 1886-7 to commemorate the Queen's Jubilee, if the project of the Church House had not at that time been considered to possess a prior claim on the liberality of Churchmen, it has been very widely felt that the new Fund ought to be generally adopted as the Church's memorial of the present year. Her Majesty has herself recognised the fitness of this course by granting permission for the Fund to be called the Queen Victoria Clergy Sustentation Fund. How is it to be rendered worthy of the Church, of the occasion with which its inception will always be inseparably linked, and of the want which it is designed to meet? This is the problem before us, and it can only be solved by concerted local action throughout the country. The Fund is wisely anxious not to create an expensive central machinery in London. For the accomplishment of its objects it appeals to the various dioceses, and it looks to the bishops to take the lead in pressing the movement upon the attention of clergy and laity alike. It has been suggested that collections for the object should be universally made on June 20 or 27, and episcopal authority will be of the utmost value in pressing this suggestion. Efforts, however, must not only be general, they must be also sustained. The Sixtieth Year commemoration will come and go, but clergy distress will remain with us as a constant problem. The same line of action is required to grapple with it as was selected by the late Archbishop for his system of Church Defence. The organization of the Fund must be carried out in dioceses, rural deaneries and parishes. Large contributions from a few wealthy Churchmen very properly form its nucleus; but if it is to take root as a permanent institution, and to grow to the dimensions to which it must attain in order adequately to meet the necessities of the case, it must rely mainly on the small contributions of the many, collected without cost by voluntary effort.

Archbishop Benson's network of Church Committees supplies more than a mere model upon which the Fund might be locally developed. It may appropriately become the actual machinery of the Fund itself. Church Defence and Church Sustentation are near akin, and now that the immediate urgency of the former object is for a time suspended, the discovery of a further object to which the Ruridecanal and Parochial committees may devote their energies will stimulate these committees where they exist, and help towards their formation where they have not yet been organized. Let them, then, be called together on the occasion of this summer's commemoration, just as they would be convened if a fresh attack on the Church were imminent. It is no deplorable conflict in which they are now asked to engage. Their

services are required in promoting the discharge of one of the foremost of Christian duties—the support of the Christian ministry. Gratitude for national blessings in general is being widely put forward as a ground for responding to the other appeals which are crowded upon us in this auspicious year. Surely the preservation of our ancient Church endowments and property from the spoliation with which they were not long ago threatened, is a special mercy which Churchmen ought peculiarly to recognise. And in what more fitting way could they show their thankfulness for it than by making up the deficiencies which, owing to various changes of circumstances, those endowments have become incapable of supplying? For other objects, the means of canvassing and collection require to be carefully elaborated. But for this enterprise we already possess a machinery ready to hand, and all that is required is that we should be at the pains to use it. The Fund, it must be regretfully confessed, has not been put forward as a Sixtieth Year scheme with quite such promptitude as some other less important objects. But, with these advantages in its favour, it will more than hold its own, if Churchmen in every parish and rural deanery will put their shoulders to the wheel in promoting it. It is to be hoped that the clergy will not, through any false modesty, be backward in urging the laity to their duty. In the face of the Offertory Sentences which they are bidden to read in the Communion Service, they cannot pretend that it is wrong or indelicate to set this duty before their people in reference to themselves, and still less in reference to their needy fellow-clergy. Rather does the Church teach them that they are under a positive obligation to do it. While, however, the clergy should encourage and foster local efforts in support of the Fund, it is by the people themselves that the active work in each rural deanery and parish must be done. Laymen with considerable expenditure of time and thought have started the scheme. They expect with confidence that the laity throughout the country, under the teaching of the clergy, will, by persevering exertions begun in the present year and continued in the years to come, make the Queen Victoria Clergy Sustentation Fund a permanent and adequate agency for removing from the Church of England the reproach and danger of possessing an ill-paid ministry.

PHILIP VERNON SMITH.

ART. II.—THE GREAT PHILANTHROPIC AND RELIGIOUS SOCIETIES: THE CHURCH PASTORAL AID SOCIETY.

THE history of the Society covers the whole period which we are accustomed to describe as the "Victorian era"—in fact, it even goes back some little way into the time beyond.

How much of real history is contained within that brief period, which is full of all that goes to make up "history," except in one particular—war!

For, although the years of Victoria's reign have not been exempt from the ravages of war, yet the reign has been on the whole a peaceable one, and the triumphs by which it is distinguished are those of peace and not of war. With all of these triumphs our Society has been more or less personally concerned. Unnoticed by the statesman, unhonoured by popular applause, steadily and silently the influence of the Society has been exerted on the side of peace and righteousness, of religion and piety.

Events move so fast in these days of steam and electricity that we are apt to disregard the immense gulf which separates the England of to-day from the England of 1836. Historians are accustomed to wax eloquent over the wonderful transformation which followed upon the invention of printing in the fifteenth century, telling us that all the arts and sciences, and eventually all the conditions of life, were remodelled in consequence of the new facility for acquiring knowledge.

Yet a change not less beneficial and far-reaching has resulted from the discovery of steam and electricity, and the progress and development which have followed are almost beyond calculation. For example, the revenue of the United Kingdom now exceeds one hundred millions sterling, while when the Queen came to the throne it was forty-seven millions.

In those good old days, every one of which the Society remembers, there was no railway between London and Birmingham, and people went to Blackwall Docks in carriages drawn by a rope. No electric wire spanned the air, or burrowed through the earth, or crawled beneath the sea.

The earliest steamers had yet to cross the Atlantic, and India could only be approached by sailing vessels round the Cape. . . . Where everything has been transformed, and all the conveniences of life have been multiplied and increased a thousand-fold, we can only stay to point out one advance in which, as a Society of Christian men, banded together for the highest purposes, we feel the greatest personal interest. This

advance is the improved conditions of industrial life. The working man of to-day would not know himself or his family if he could put back the clock only sixty years. It is difficult to believe that when our Society was started boys and girls were taken into coal-mines as early as at the age of four, and that a large proportion of the persons employed were under thirteen. These young children worked the same hours as adults, many of them never seeing daylight for weeks together, except on Sundays. They were harnessed like dogs to the trucks containing the coal, and these they drew from the workings to the shaft, thence to be hoisted to the surface. Persons of both sexes worked together, and the details given in the Report of the Royal Commission in 1843 must be read to be believed.

In trades and manufactures the condition of things was equally bad. Children mostly began work at eight or nine years old, sometimes as early as three or four. The regular hours were ten, eleven, or twelve, with very many cases of sixteen to eighteen hours every day, except Sunday. No one cared for the education, whether secular or religious, of these children—in fact, their whole condition, social and moral, was entirely neglected.

In the agricultural districts the hours were equally long, and the gang system in the fields was atrociously cruel and degrading.

In the brickfields young children of both sexes kneaded the clay with their bare feet from four in the morning until nine at night all through the summer months, to say nothing of carrying great masses of clay upon their heads to the place where bricks were made, and afterwards carrying and storing vast numbers of finished bricks.

At last legislation stepped in, largely promoted by our first president, the great and good Lord Shaftesbury. The same spirit which had prompted him and others to provide for men's souls the means of grace in the establishment of the Society, taught them also to care for men's bodies, and especially for the physical protection of women and children.

There were Mines Regulation Acts, Factory and Workshops Acts, Agricultural Gangs Acts, and many more of kindred object.

To-day no child can be lawfully put to work under eleven years of age; health and education, hours of work and hours of rest, are all regulated by Acts of Parliament.

As regards adults in 1836, the general run of hours of

labour for skilled trades was sixty a week, not allowing any time for meals, while the wage was sixpence an hour. Other employments called for twelve or fourteen hours every day, except Sunday, at a wage of threepence or fourpence an hour. At the same period the agricultural labourer earned a shilling a day while unmarried, with a maximum of eighteenthpence when married. Coupled with these long hours and meagre payments, the first harvest that the Society saw—that of 1836—was bad, the next year's was very bad, and that of 1838 was the worst harvest since 1816. Under such conditions we cannot wonder that there was widespread discontent, violence, and wrong, and Chartism was everywhere prevalent, while all the higher attributes of our common humanity were entirely undeveloped. Such was the condition of the working classes when the Church Pastoral Aid Society was originated.

The letter which convened this first meeting dwells upon the regard paid by the founders to "the true interests of our National Church, as well as to the spiritual welfare of multitudes who are wholly or greatly deprived of her pastoral care." It was felt at that time that the bounden duty of the Government of a Christian country was to provide means out of the national resources for the religious instruction and welfare of the people, and it was thought by the committee that the indifference existing on the subject was due to the great deficiency of church accommodation and of pastoral care of the people. Until men had been brought by the means of grace to value the ordinances of religion, it was not likely that the nation would take steps to deal with the question of religious destitution. Accordingly a scheme was framed by the committee, and was forwarded to the Archbishops, and to some of the Bishops, asking for suggestions and inviting criticism. It was at this point that the Society's first trouble began, because of the prejudice then existing in episcopal minds against the principle of lay agency. The committee insisted upon the value and necessity of such agency in the following terms: "It is by such an agency in great measure that the mass of the people are to be brought, by God's blessing, to become willing and desirous to place themselves under the ministry of the Word." Every layman engaged in the service of the Society received this commission at starting: "Remember that your business is to be simply this: the visiting from day to day the people of the district in which you are placed for the purpose of inquiring into their spiritual state, conversing with them on the things of God, entreating their attention to the care of their souls, and, in one word, seeking by all Scriptural means to bring them to Christ." It was

thought at that time that some at least of the lay agents might become candidates for holy orders, and there were some who wished the Society to employ none other but these ; but the committee adhered to their original proposal, and claimed that they were not introducing any innovation, because godly laymen had been employed ever since Apostolic times, and the same practice had prevailed in our own Church, being sanctioned by the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, as well as by the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel, both of these employing Lay Catechists in the colonies and in heathen lands. In fact, the position of our committee was even stronger, because they did not employ, and never have employed, any agents whatsoever, whether clerical or lay, on their own responsibility, but have always accepted them on the nomination of incumbents, to whom alone these agents became responsible.

Yet there were many who refused to be satisfied, maintaining that the discipline of the Church would be largely infringed by a voluntary society, which ventured to require assurances that the men employed were men of faith and prayer, having an adequate sense of their high responsibilities.

Here, again, we may apply the *tu quoque* argument, for just as the S.P.C.K. and S.P.G. set us the example of employing lay agents, so it is instructive to note that they made their own inquiries as to the character of the agents employed, whether clerical or lay. Rule XVII. of the S.P.G. ran as follows : " That no missionary be employed until the fullest inquiry has been made into his fitness and efficiency, and that all persons applying for missions shall produce testimonials signed by three beneficed clergymen, and countersigned by the Bishop of the diocese in which those clergymen are beneficed." This is the principle of the veto, which, when applied by our Society to missionaries in England, called forth the most vigorous opposition.

Let us now briefly consider some of the special classes of people who have benefited by the Society's help. The first class consists of men employed on rivers and canals. Long before Mr. Smith of Coalville was heard of, the Rev. John Davies was at work among the boatmen, and his services were so valued that he became known as the " Apostle of the Watermen." Speaking of the year 1838, there were then 120 canals in the United Kingdom, extending over 3,000 miles, with a floating population of nearly 10,000. The spiritual condition of these boatmen may be inferred from the fact that over 300 of them were committed to Worcester Gaol alone during the first ten years of the Society's history,

and of these only one could read and write well. Mr. Davies devised the plan for a watermen's floating church; the Society found the money to pay for a chaplain. Encouraged by the support thus afforded, which was afterwards increased to meet increasing needs, Mr. Davies had the privilege of laying the foundation stones of three separate churches, and by his influence and that of others, the complete cessation of Sunday traffic on several canals was at length secured. In 1849, Mr. Davies and others interested themselves in obtaining similar provision for the spiritual needs of mariners and boatmen at Gloucester, and from that date to the present the Society has made a grant at Gloucester for the purpose. Services have been held, as occasion offered, on board vessels and in the open air, as well as in the Mariners' Church. On one occasion the captain of a ship estimated the congregation present to weigh forty-eight tons, because the vessel had sunk eight inches in the water since they came on board for service; this would represent about 1,000 people. It is pleasant to read the hearty words of gratitude from the local committee to the Society which has so long assisted them.

Another class who have benefited by the Society's help in the past, and, thanks to the forward movement, are likely to benefit again, are the scattered dwellers in country districts. So long ago as 1840, clergymen were stationed by the Society in hitherto neglected hamlets, congregations were gathered, and most happy consequences, temporal and spiritual, resulted.

In the third place, chaplains paid by the Society attended the construction of some of our principal railways in England. In 1846 a chaplain was placed in charge of 1,600 railway labourers engaged in the construction of one of the northern lines, and similar help was afforded throughout the country. At the present time, in connection with this branch of our work, it is interesting to notice the labours of the Society's grantees at the terminus in Plymouth of the South-Western, and at Stratford E. of the Great Eastern, also at Darlington and Crewe, where the North-Eastern and North-Western respectively have thousands of men employed.

A fourth department of work, not less necessary and encouraging than any other, is the assistance rendered to the Church in Wales. The mining districts of South Wales especially have called for much help from England, because of the marvellous increase of population, and also because of the special difficulty arising from the use of two languages in

public worship and in everyday life. Practically, this has involved in many places the necessity for doubling the clerical staff. So early as 1848 the Society had twenty-five agents employed in Wales, at a cost of £1,950 a year. This compares with eighty-one agents at the present time, at an expenditure of £4,175 a year.

Closely akin to the work done in Wales has been the help afforded to colliery and manufacturing districts in England. The Society has lived to see the population of the country doubled, and yet the whole increase has been in certain well-defined localities and has been owing very largely to the changes wrought by steam. In earlier times the balance between town and country was fairly preserved, and there was no quarter of the land in which the pressure of ministerial responsibility was so excessive as to render the task impossible. But when the bulk of the population began to gather around certain centres, all the old conditions were changed, and the parochial system in such places proved unequal to the strain put upon it. Comparing the census of 1861 with that of 1891, it appears that the town population of England increased during that period by more than 8,000,000, and the country population by 800,000. That is to say, for one additional dweller in the country, there were ten additional dwellers in the town. And out of 2,000 country districts, at least one half showed an actual decrease at the end of these thirty years.

While this migration and multiplication were taking place, the value of the Society became more and more apparent. Being a voluntary agency, with no preference in favour of one parish or of one diocese rather than another, it could throw all its strength wherever the need was seen to be greatest. A single glance at the map, showing the distribution of the Society's grants, will serve to prove this statement. For out of 10,000,000 people, living in twenty-nine great towns, more than one-third are benefited by the Society's grants, at a cost of £36,000 a year.

Our policy in this respect has been uniform, for at the time of the Hartley Colliery Explosion in 1862, it was stated that more than one-third of the agents of the Society were working in Lancashire and the West Riding of Yorkshire. Although subdivision of parishes, to meet these growing numbers, has been in progress for all these years, yet the average population of the parishes receiving grants remains almost at the same point as in 1836. The average was then 8,699 for each parish, it is now (1897) 8,416. Clearly the Society has done its best

to cope with the spiritual needs of the multitudes, wherever they were most densely congregated.

Time would fail me to tell of the numberless cases in which the Society has been able to lend a helping hand to the cause of Temperance, the sanctity of the Lord's Day, and the holding of special missions in parishes.

Suffice it to say that there is no present indication that the Society is no longer needed because its work is done.

On the contrary, an ever-widening field of usefulness is opening out before us, and we have only to step in and to occupy the ground now lying fallow.

May God give us grace to recognise and seize the opportunities which He Himself provides.

As we see around us so many tokens that the time is short, and as we realize that our redemption draweth nigh, let us once more, as fellow-workers with God, renew our resolution that by His grace we will be found waiting and watching, and hastening our Lord's return.

RICHARD G. FOWELL.



ART. III.—THE BENEFICES BILL OF 1897.

IT is a wholesome sign of the revived and increasing activity of the Church of England, that schemes for reform are both abundantly propounded and receive on all hands careful attention. Time was when it was otherwise. Any thought of change or suggestion of improvement was either regarded as revolutionary, and therefore dangerous, or as an unwelcome disturber of somnolent indifference.

In that, as in many other things, we may say, *Tempora mutantur*. Most ecclesiastical periodicals of the day have occasionally had able articles on the subject, written by men whose very name is a guarantee for sober as well as able treatment of the subject they tackle. This magazine has been no exception.

The projected schemes of reform wisely refrain from the formularies of the Church; they address themselves more to its discipline, its machinery and temporal interests. Hence have arisen the insistence of the increase of the Episcopate, the desire for a reformed convocation, the amalgamation, occasionally at least, of the two Provinces, and now a society has been floated with extensive schemes for Church Reform, calling itself the Church Reform League. This league, instead of being scouted and denounced, as would have been the case in

the memory of some of us, has received very great encouragement, even from members of the Episcopal Bench. One prelate, the Archbishop of York, has shown his earnestness for reform by a willingness to sacrifice one-fifth of his income for one scheme alone. These, it may be repeated, are wholesome signs, and should gladden the hearts of English Churchmen.

Perhaps there is no point on which Churchmen are more unanimous than the reform of Church patronage, especially as regards the unhallowed traffic in livings. Other points of reform receive partial support, but it may be safely said that on this point Churchmen are of one heart and one soul. That a pastor should be appointed to a parish, not because he has earned an excellent reputation as a minister of the Church of God, not because he is of blameless life and of tried ability, but simply because he can pay so much money down or can get it paid for him, shocks, and has long shocked, the religious instincts of mankind, excepting those whose moral judgment is warped by vested interests in the traffic.

Perhaps the Church of England has been more assailed on account of the continuance of this abuse than on any other faults, real or supposed. If a Liberationist aims an onslaught on "The Establishment" either by speech or pamphlet, his paragraphs are filled with descriptions of unseemly scenes at such sales when public, or with the glowing advertisements of the negotiating agents. It is of a verity a sickening literature; "pity 'tis 'tis true." Nonconformist pulpits have portrayed these practices as characteristic of "a State Church," and Roman Catholic preachers both at home and abroad have held them up as specimens of the worldly degeneracy resulting from Protestantism.

This universal reprobation has not been solely external. Archbishop Thomson never failed to express his condemnation, whether addressing his own diocese at his conferences, or when seeking the aid of legislation from the peers of the realm. Archbishop Magee, with that impassioned eloquence which marked his public utterances, made the exposure still more painful and harrowing to the religious sense of the nation. When, then, a Bill was brought into the House of Commons, which was called "The Benefices Bill," and which was designed in some measure to mitigate the crying evil, Churchmen hailed it with acclamation. The framers trod, indeed, very gingerly, and were very moderate in their proposals. But it was a step in the right direction; it was a public admission of an ugly spot, and the simple admission was something gained.

Alas for the vanity of human wishes! The promoters of

the Bill were unable to carry it to a successful issue, and the hopes of English Churchmen were blighted.

It is not difficult to account for the defeat of the movement thus far. It was a first attempt, and there never was a reform, however salutary in its scope and general in demand, that was carried without opposition on its first proposal. Every institution has some vested interests, and in the benefices of the Church of England the vested interests are very strong. It is calculated that at least 6,000 benefices are in private patronage; it is an admitted fact that the presentation to these by purchase is lamentably on the increase; depressed incomes and other causes are making patrons mercenary who would otherwise have scorned it. Thus their opposition is intelligible. A few arguments also are brought forward in their favour, though not of any great value if tested.

It is said, for instance, that such a measure takes away private patronage. That is not the case, nor is it ever intended. Private patronage, if rightly used, is a great blessing to the Church, as the owner of an estate is most likely to present an incumbent who will be acceptable to himself and his neighbours.

The object of the reformers is not to take away his right, but to prevent his abusing it. When he shows no sense of conscientiousness himself the law would rightly step in, as it does in multitudes of other cases, such as the sale of poisons, gunpowder, explosives; the liberty of the subject is interfered with for the common weal. The common weal demands that patronage should be regarded as a trust, implying responsibility in the bestower, and not a bit of property to be bought and sold.

It is also alleged that the loser of such a vested interest is entitled to *compensation*; that pretext is more plausible than real. Were the patronage taken away *absolutely*, the demand for compensation would be legitimate; but no one seeks to take it away, but to control it; the holders of the livings will still preserve their holding undisturbed. It may be illustrated by a somewhat parallel case. Some eighty years ago, Wilberforce and Clarkson roused the mind of England against the iniquities of the slave trade. Like all other projected reforms, the proposed abolition of the traffic encountered a strenuous opposition from the vested interests, and Thomas Clarkson was told that if he went to Liverpool he would find a watery grave in the Mersey. But the philanthropists persevered with indomitable energy; no midway measures would satisfy, such as emancipation after a certain term of years, or the prohibition of future sales; they insisted on a measure granting unconditional and immediate emancipa-

tion. It was then pointed out that such an immediate abolition meant certain ruin to the planters. The slaves numbered 800,000; their pecuniary value was enormous; it was certain that no free labour would be available in their place; what was to become of the estates? Certainly the owners ought to have compensation for the immediate abstraction of their all. The case was clear; they demanded compensation, and they got it. The philanthropy of England was at fever heat; £20,000,000 were voted for the compensation, and, in 1834, 800,000 slaves were at once emancipated.

No reformer is now asking for the holder of a purchased living to vacate it; he holds what he has purchased, but the money-seeking *patron's* claim for compensation, being an abuse of a trust, will not hold.

It may be remarked, finally, that the opposition to the Benefices Bill was materially aided by the sworn enemies of the Church. There is a section of the House of Commons animated by intolerant hatred of the Church of England; these dread the removal of any abuse, lest it should weaken their case for her extermination. In the discussion on the Criminous Clerks Bill this section roused the indignation of Mr. Gladstone himself; more recently these same men have aided in the defeat of the Benefices Bill.

But Church reformers are thoroughly in earnest, and a new measure bearing the same name as that of last year is to occupy the attention of the House of Commons, if its supporters can get a hearing. It bears on its back the name of men whom every English Churchman is delighted to honour, and if it is disappointing to Churchmen at large, it may be safely considered as the elaboration not of choice but of grim compulsion.

The new Bill omits the very reform about which Churchmen have been half a century most anxious, the abolition of the traffic in livings. Scared by the opposition, the promoters have produced the play of Hamlet with the part of Hamlet expunged. Such as it is the Bill demands attention.

The first part is intended to give the Bishops increased power as to the institution of presentees, with a view to the rejection of unworthy applicants. On paper the emendation appears admirable, and deserves the approbation which it has already received. In practice the result will be found otherwise. As the system of presentation is to remain by this Bill untouched, there will still be hundreds of presentees who will regard the benefice purchased as a *bona fide property*. A Bishop's hesitation to institute will be regarded as an interference with the "rights of property," and that class of men, not being troubled with high views of their sacred

profession, much less of a Bishop's responsibility, will to a certainty stand upon their rights, resist the Bishop and demand institution. Thus the Bishop will be involved in expensive and protracted litigation; for the malcontent if defeated in one court will appeal to another. That this is not a mere empty conjecture may be seen from past experience. A former Bishop of Exeter (Philpotts) refused to institute to a benefice a nominee, as, in the Bishop's judgment, corroborated in that case by general opinion, unfit for the sacred office. The nominee sued the Bishop at law, and the judges decided against the Bishop, as interfering with the "rights of property." The Bishop had no alternative but to institute. More recently an incumbent deprived of his benefice under the "Criminous Clerks Act," prosecuted the depriving Bishop, and obtained a verdict quashing the deprivation. At this very moment the Archbishop of York is threatened with an action by a "clerk," deprived of his benefice under the provisions of the same Act. It may be therefore safely predicted that if the first part of this Bill should ever become law, it will be a fruitful source of litigation. A Bishop may feel a firm conviction that a nominee is unfit for the post desired, and perhaps most clergymen would endorse his impression; but to put his objections in legal form so as to gain the ear of a court of law would be a difficult matter. From a strong sense of duty a Bishop under the proposed Act may still determine to refuse, but when he has been resisted, prosecuted, and defeated in a lawsuit costing hundreds of pounds, he will not be eager to repeat the process. It may therefore be safely predicted that after two or three experiments, the first part of the proposed Bill would become practically a dead letter.

Parts two and three have reference to such clergy as are negligent in the duties of their sacred office, or are incapacitated by advancing years or impaired health from showing the energy that marked their prime. The details of both parts are elaborately worked out, the care bestowed thereon showing that the promoters at least of the measure, if no one else, conceive that they are attacking an evil alike rampant and pernicious. But if such be their conviction, why do they aim their shafts at the inferior clergy alone? Is it nothing that dignitaries should be inefficient? or, if the energetic discharge of their duties is as essential to the welfare of the Church of Christ as that of the operative clergy, why does this Bill connive at and so perpetuate their inefficiency? A dean may be absent from his deanery for months in the year, sometimes for the greater part of the twelve—such has been the case; or he may be resident in his deanery, but be

utterly incapable of "discharging the usual functions of a cathedral dean" (the language in which one of them described his office), and yet his position is unassailable. There may be murmurs loud and deep, as there always is at neglected duties, but this Bill suggests no commission, and the dignitary may smile at the murmurs, knowing his impregnable position. So a prelate may be absent from his diocese for months, as was often the case with the Irish bishops, or he may hold on to his office when his incapacity is painfully evident. Not so many years ago a northern prelate officiated at confirmations in a state of health painfully expressed on his countenance. He reduced the whole service to forty minutes. That prelate could have retired on £1,200 a year under the Resignation Act, but it was generally stated and believed that his lordship had insured his life to such an amount that the undivided income of the see was essential to him. And yet this Bill would in no way touch that abuse: the divinity that hedges a king protects the prelate, and the dean, and the canon.

Nor can it be said that such cases as are referred to above are quite exceptional. They are less exceptional in proportion than those of the inferior clergy whose eviction is contemplated by this measure. This Bill, therefore, is open to that stigma so opprobrious in the eyes of Englishmen, of making one law for the rich and another for the poor. That stigma will insure its rejection.

The title of this article is "On the Benefices Bill *so called*." These last words are appended because in its present mutilated form the title of the Bill is misleading. The Bill has nothing to do with benefices. As the first part of the present measure, if passed, would most probably remain a dead letter, this Bill might be more appropriately styled "A Bill for the Eviction of Veteran Poor Clergy."

Sir Isaac Newton, when complimented on his wonderful discoveries in science, replied that he felt like a little child picking up a few pebbles by the sea-shore while the great ocean of truth lay before him unapproached. The estimable reformers who are propounding this measure, dismayed by the opposition experienced, are contenting themselves with a few pebbles, small changes affecting very few, and leaving untouched the black spot on the Church of England—that 2,000 of her benefices are made a matter of merchandise. Their process should have been reversed: the other parts of their original Bill should have been dropped, and Part I. pressed with dogged pertinacity. The hearts of Englishmen would have been with them; men would have been full of

admiration at the sturdy courage the reformers displayed, protesting ever, like the Roman senator in every speech, "Censeo tamen delenda est Carthago."

RICHARD W. HILEY.



ART. IV.—WHAT CONSTITUTES A SUCCESSFUL MINISTRY?

IT is with no affected diffidence that I attempt to answer a question so vitally important and so deeply interesting to every faithful minister of Christ. I can only hope that the shortcomings of my own remarks may be fully supplied by the words of those speakers who may follow me.

What do we in general understand by success? Is it not the attainment of the object towards which our efforts have been directed? A man of business is successful if he realizes large profits, a statesman if his measures command the confidence of his supporters and result in adding to the prosperity of the country. Or, coming down to everyday life, a farmer meets with success if his diligence in cultivating his land, sowing his seeds at the fitting opportunity, and duly tending the advancing growth, result, through a favouring season, in his securing a plentiful harvest and obtaining a remunerative price for his grain. A fisherman meets with success if his efforts in throwing his line or casting his net result in an abundant take of fish.

In all these cases the degree of success depends largely on the fitness of the means used and the diligence with which they are applied; but it also depends in varying degree on causes which lie altogether beyond human control; so that, speaking generally of human affairs, we may say that in order to success (1) the object in view must in itself be an attainable one, and there must be sufficient warrant for believing success to be possible in our own case; (2) the right means must be employed in the right way; (3) external conditions must be favourable.

It is the same in spiritual things, and more particularly in respect of our present subject—the work of the Christian ministry. The object aimed at must be one which we have a reasonable prospect of attaining, (2) the right means must be employed in the right way, (3) external conditions must be favourable. But I may add that whilst in human affairs man often works for self, for the attainment of his own ends and object, the Christian minister has to aim at the object set before him by his Lord and Heavenly Master.

What, then, are (1) the objects in view? And what is our warrant for hoping to attain them?

Fulfilment of the Lord's command to preach His Gospel, baptizing in His name, and teaching men to observe all things whatsoever He had committed to His disciples, the feeding His lambs and His sheep, and (Eph. iv. 11, 12) the edifying of the body of Christ; for the Apostle assures us that the gift of Apostles, prophets, and evangelists, pastors and teachers, was for the perfecting of the saints, for the work of the ministry, for the edifying of the body of Christ.

Our warrant for expecting success is the Master's own assurance: "Lo, I am with you always, even to the end of the world," as well as the Old Testament promise (Isa. lv. 11): "My word that goeth forth out of My mouth shall not return unto Me void, but it shall accomplish that which I please, and it shall prosper in the thing whereto I sent it."

But the object in view is not merely the use of means in obedience to the Lord's command, but the attainment of the end for which the Lord would have those means to be used. The object in view must for every faithful minister be the bringing souls into saving union with Christ through the reception of the message of the Gospel; with less than this he cannot, and ought not, to rest satisfied. The Gospel may be faithfully set forth; but if souls refuse to accept it, the ministry cannot, so far as they are concerned, be counted successful.

Nor is it only the bringing souls into saving union with Christ which must be aimed at; there is the work of the pastor and teacher—"the perfecting of the saints, the work of the ministry, the edifying of the body of Christ, till we all attain unto the unity of the faith and of the knowledge of the Son of God, unto a full-grown man, unto the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ" (Eph. iv. 12, 13); or, as elsewhere stated, "the work of warning every man, and teaching every man in all wisdom, that we may present every man perfect in Christ."

And this is not all: the real aim should be not merely that souls may be saved from perdition and fitted for the joys of heaven, and so that multitudes of living stones may be added to the spiritual temple, but that God may be glorified thereby. This must be the paramount aim, and if this be absent the highest and chiefest object is lacking; for if every tongue is to confess that Jesus Christ is Lord, it is to be to the glory of God the Father (Phil. ii. 11), even as the Lord said of Himself (John viii. 49, 50)—"I honour My Father—I seek not Mine own glory."

What shall be said as to the means and the employment of

them? What are the means which are right in themselves and what is the right employment of them?

As to means, spiritual men are wanted for spiritual work. God can work, if He so please, even by the false professor. Christ may be preached even "of contention," and "not sincerely," and the message may be used to effect conversions; but ordinarily if a man is with success to hold up Christ to the sinner, it must be because he is himself acquainted with Him and in living union with Him. His knowledge of the Saviour must moreover be employed with all diligence. There must be some degree of that sense of responsibility, of the danger of unsaved souls, and of the worth of Christ which led St. Paul by the space of three years to cease not to warn every one night and day with tears (Acts xx. 31), and to be able to say to the Ephesian converts that he had kept back nothing that was profitable, but had showed them and taught them publicly and from house to house.

Such a ministry, whatever the results as regards others, must at least succeed in carrying out the Master's will.

But what of external conditions? Here lies the chief knot to be untied. They lie beyond human control. The Gospel may be faithfully preached by word and illustrated by the life, yet it may be rejected, as it was at Athens, "For it is not of him that willeth, nor of him that runneth, but of God that showeth mercy" (Rom. ix. 16). "Neither is he that planteth anything, neither he that watereth, but God that giveth the increase" (1 Cor. iii. 7). "No man can come to Me, said Christ, except the Father which hath sent Me draw him. Every man therefore that hath heard and hath learned of the Father cometh unto Me" (St. John vi. 44, 45).

In the object which we set before us, in the means we adopt, in the degree of diligence with which we employ them, human responsibility comes in; but there it ceases. Through the power and gifts of the Holy Spirit we may succeed in the delivery of our message and in the prayerful discharge of our ministry; the reception of the message lies wholly beyond our control; and in a large degree the effect of our teaching and watching must do so likewise.

But now, supposing our object to have been right and our efforts rightly directed, we come to a very vital branch of our main question, namely, How is success to be estimated? what are the standards by which it is to be judged? Success may be apparent to the eye of sense, or it may be visible only to the eye of faith. These do not exclude one another, but the one does not necessarily imply the existence of the other. The test must be found in the application of the first principles from which we started.

How far, then, has any given ministry kept in view the primary aim of all—the glory of God—the glory of God first and the bringing of souls into vital union with Christ, and their growth in holiness as promoting the glory of God? Is the building up of a visible society to be the first aim, or is this to be regarded as secondary, useful only so far as it contributes to the higher purpose of winning and training souls for Christ? Is success necessarily involved in a large array of professing Church members, in crowded congregations attracted by ornate services, or in the active promotion of church agencies, in attention to church music and artistic decoration, or even in a large roll of communicants? or, again, is success involved in personal attachment to the minister? All these things are obvious to the eye of sense, and where the most real and abundant success in all respects is found, there some at least of these externals will, without doubt, be present. Yet, on the other hand, many of these externals may be seen as the result of a given ministry, and yet that ministry, if judged by the true standard, may after all lack true success. The vital question is, Has the ministry aimed at leading lost souls to a saving union with the great Head of the Church? Has it been directed to the training and feeding of the lambs and the flock, and this not that the instrument may be admired or beloved, but that God may be glorified thereby?

Then, again, Have the fitting means been used? Has there been a trusting to mere human methods of civilizing and raising human nature from a degraded social and moral condition, or has it been clearly seen and kept in view that spiritual results, results which an Almighty Spirit alone can accomplish, can only be brought about by spiritual means; that, whilst human instrumentality is employed, the only effective agent is the Divine Almighty Power of the Spirit? Have all the efforts made, and all the means employed, been conceived and carried out with this in view?

Has, then, the result of means rightly chosen and rightly used been that a large number of souls have manifestly, through the instrumentality of that ministry, been brought from darkness into light, and from the power of Satan unto God? Is it evident that the Christian life of believers has been helped forward, that desponding souls have been cheered, that the lambs of the flock have been tended, guarded, and led on to full-grown spiritual life? Has the outcome of these things been that year by year there has been an increasing proportion of living Christians in the congregation? Has a spirit of unreserved consecration to the Master's service, and of brotherly love and concord, been more and more apparent?

Has there been more and more of activity and self-denying effort in the cause of Christ and in the relief of suffering humanity, and this because Christ wills it thus? In such a case there can be no difficulty in saying, Here at least is a successful ministry. The aim has been right, so has the choice and use of means, and the power and blessing of the Holy Spirit have assuredly been vouchsafed. The Lord will indeed have given testimony to the Word of His grace.

But it is not always thus. It may be that the servant has rightly delivered his message; it may be that he has been diligent in the use of means, and yet that the indispensable condition of success—the presence and work of the Holy Spirit—has apparently been withheld. Few or no distinct conversions have resulted from the efforts made; souls seem to be still asleep, and dead in carelessness and sin. Such cases are surely not unknown. Whether it is often thus when the aim has truly been the glory of God before all else, I do not dare to say. God only can read the secrets of the heart; but we do know that He who ever did the will of His Father, and who sought not His own glory but the glory of Him that sent Him found cause to weep over impenitent Israel, and to say, “Ye will not come to Me that ye might have life” (John v. 40). “It is enough then for the disciple that he be as his Master, and for the servant as his Lord” (St. Matt. x. 25). The Master Himself cannot have failed; if rejected by Israel He succeeded in doing the will of His Father. Then must we say, when the invitation has been given in the Master’s name and has been refused, that the servant’s work has met with no success? If he has faithfully given the message and sought diligently to tend the flock, will he not have succeeded in doing his Master’s will?

There may be little success discernible to the eye of sense, but to the eye of faith the result in working out the eternal purposes of God is seen to be a certainty, though that result may not be made apparent until after many days. Meanwhile, the servant’s reward must lie in his Master’s approving smile. If the servant can but in some degree and with truth say, with St. Paul, “We have the testimony of our conscience that in simplicity and godly sincerity, not with fleshly wisdom, but by the grace of God we have had our conversation in the world” he will not have laboured in vain, he will at least have done the will of his heavenly Lord.

The proud rebellious heart may sometimes be ready to say, Why should I have been sent to a portion of the field where the Master knew beforehand that the invitation would be rejected, and from whence few if any souls could be

gathered out ? It may be, and perhaps too often is the case, that the answer to such a question, should it arise, is that the all-wise and all-loving Head of the Church saw that the servant could not with safety to himself be entrusted with manifest and visible results of his labours, and that thus out of very love a more humbling position has been assigned him. Or, again, it may be the Lord's will that even on so thankless a soil the seed shall yet be scattered, in order that the hearts which reject it may be left without excuse. It is a sorrow and grief to think that it should be so ; but the humble and obedient servant will be willing to do his Master's behest, and will bear in mind that after all it is not he who is rejected, but He that sent him. And must not the Master's pain at rejection be infinitely greater than the servant's ?

Then, again, it may be, and sometimes is, the case that whilst the aim has been right, and the work right, the result is not immediate, although eventually, to become visible. The seed may slumber in the ground, and after many years spring up and bear fruit, even when the sower has passed to his rest. Can we say that he has had no success ? From time to time it does seem as if when a minister has brought the Gospel to a place or congregation which had previously been a stranger to it, and a large harvest of souls has been vouchsafed to him, the abundant crop seems to have exhausted the soil, and a series of years with their attendant changes have to pass over the place before any marked ingathering is again to be witnessed. And it may be that in the great scheme of Redemption—it may be the will of God that this or that servant shall be used more often as a savour of death unto them that perish than a savour of life unto them that believe. Then, moreover, the winning souls to Christ is not the only work of the ministry, there is the tending and feeding of the sheep and lambs who are already in the fold ; that work is dear to Christ, and although it may seem less striking in the eyes of man than the work of gathering souls, it is the Master's work. He prayed not for the world, but for those whom the Father had given Him out of the world, that they might be kept from evil ; and the servant who, taught by the Spirit and mighty in the Scriptures, is used to feed the flock cannot be said to be wholly destitute of success.

And yet more, although there may be no evident ingathering of souls, although there may be no very conspicuous change for good in the sphere of our ministry as a manifest result of our efforts, there may yet be a silent and effectual opposition to the current of evil which would otherwise reach to far greater proportions, and there may be a bettering of the moral

and social condition of our parish, good so far as it goes, although so grievously short of the change we have so longed to see.

We must also remember, in estimating the result of our efforts, that the work—the successful work of each and every minister—is not the same. One soweth, another reapeth. The Master has need, it may be, of different tools and different workmen; the reaping may not come until the sower has long slept in his grave, yet the sower has nevertheless been successful. As yet the eye of faith only can see it. Faith's warrant is the word—"Lo, I am with you alway, even to the end of the world"—and the assurance, "My word shall accomplish that whereto I sent it." Happy is he who has learned that "it is good that a man should both hope and quietly wait for the salvation of the Lord" (Lam. iii. 26), and that "every man's work shall be made manifest, for the day shall declare it" (1 Cor. iii. 13).

Success, then, may lie both in having faithfully done the Master's will, and also in present visible results manifest even to the eye of sense; or it may lie as yet only in having aimed at the Master's honour and glory, and in doing His will in His way. As yet results may be visible only to the eye of faith, but the faithful servant will have been successful, although it may not be in the way he would himself have chosen.

Whilst, however, we bear in mind that results are beyond all human control, whilst the eye of faith may and must look beyond what is present and evident, the lack of manifest blessing on our work ought ever to lead to deep searchings of heart before God. Is there anything in us which leads to the great cause of barrenness, namely, the withholding of the Holy Spirit's influence? Is our aim the right one? Are we working with constant believing dependence on the promises, content if only we may do the will of our Father and of Him who gave Himself for us? If it be indeed thus with us, we have the chief constituents of a successful ministry. To know the real results we must wait for the day when the secrets of all hearts shall be made manifest—when each one shall have his fitting praise of God.

W. H. PURCHAS.



ART. V.—A SCHEME FOR THE AID OF THE CLERGY
IN VERY POOR PARISHES.

MANY of the clergy of the Church of England are in real want. The question is, how to raise a fund which would be annually sufficiently large to grant a considerable alleviation, by adding to the money for one minister in a certain number of the very poorest parishes in every diocese. The suggestion is, to organize help by inducing every member of the Church of England to give *one penny per annum*. This would impoverish no one; it would take in all—even children above twelve years of age, even the really poor among us—those who gain their bread by hard work. It need not impoverish other large and noble charities; the donor of £100 to a great established fund would yet be able to contribute his penny to this. It would unite peer and peasant in a grand work of mercy, and that simple fact would make the Church more to the masses than it now is. We think the collection should have some clear, telling, popular name—such, perhaps, as “The People’s Gift,” or “The Parson’s Penny.” Grand and difficult names do not suit our lower classes; few would understand or remember a word (for instance, we may say “Sustentation” Fund) which they very seldom hear or use.

There should be some very simple yet safe means of paying in the penny. This is a matter which, I am told, a clever man of business could easily arrange. Perhaps one week in each year, or in six months—the first week in June and the first week in December—might be called the penny week, and collections be made *every* day in those seasons in every church family, in schools, factories, workshops, etc.; or it has been said some sort of pillar might be used into which the pence might be dropped, in a public spot easily accessible. This is only a matter of detail. The money would, when collected, be made over to the Bishop or to the Archdeacons, or other ecclesiastical authorities, and at their discretion it would be distributed among the five or six most needy of the clergy in the least endowed parishes in each diocese. It would seem better to give substantial satisfactory help to a few parishes, than to fritter the money away, so that the aid given to any of the clergymen would be utterly inconsiderable. Three years ago, in 1894, it was estimated that the Church people in England numbered about 13,750,000; one penny from each would amount to £57,291 13s. 4d. Church sittings were, it is said, provided for about 6,255,000 people; a penny from each of these would come to £26,062 10s. Then many would give

sixpence or more in the year. Travellers might drop in a penny, and from large towns and seaports *very* considerable sums might be gathered. We should fancy that not less than £100,000 might be at the disposal of the Church *every year*—the voluntary small tax, self-imposed, and willingly given to the National Church by its thirteen or fourteen millions of loyal sons and daughters.

ANNE W. FANSHAWE.

ART. VI.—SLOTH.

A POWERFUL enemy of true or spiritual life is Sloth, Sluggishness, or Idleness. The broad facts about this vice have been well put by an economical writer, Karl Blind: “The idle man is a sponge upon the world, and a curse to his fellow-creatures. Every man that remains idle, or gets his living without work—that is, without doing anything in return for such a privilege—is adding to the misery of the world, is really injuring the morals and happiness of the human family, and should be held responsible for it. None can be happy without employment, mental and physical; the idler becomes a fit subject for the penitentiary or the gallows.”

Our blessed Lord, both by precept and example, set the virtue of strenuous work and the vice of wilful laziness in the very front of the contrasts belonging to the Christian life. “He went about doing good.” The number of kind and beautiful actions crowded into one day was extraordinary. He never allowed fatigue to interfere with opportunity. As if to emphasize the dignity of labour, He was born in the family of an artizan, and spent thirty years of His life in a carpenter’s shop. At twelve years old His one idea was to be about His Father’s business. He thought not of food: “My meat is to do the will of Him that sent Me and to finish His work.” Whenever occasion offered He was ready: “I must work the works of Him that sent Me while it is day: the night cometh when no man can work.” “Let your light so shine before men that they may see your good works.” “Go work to-day in My vineyard.” “Why stand ye here all the day idle?” “O thou wicked and slothful servant!”

It is obvious, of course, that listlessness in the case of that great majority of mankind who have to earn their daily bread and provide for their families is something very like insanity. On that point no lesson needs to be enforced. There are only two classes who do not acknowledge it: the drunkards and the thieves, and neither of them are we likely to reach by

anything that we urge here. But what are we to say to those who have by birth inherited enough for comfortable subsistence, and who decline to bestir themselves or make their lives in any way useful? We would speak in the words of Robert Hall of the extreme folly of idleness:

"I can wonder at nothing more than how a man can be idle, but of all others one who can read; in so many improvements of reason, in such sweetness of knowledge, in such a variety of studies, in such importunity of thoughts. To find wit in poetry; in philosophy, profoundness; in history, wonder of events; in oratory, sweet eloquence; in divinity, supernatural life and holy devotion, as so many rich metals in their proper mines—whom would it not ravish with delight!"

Or we might urge him to recollect that unless he does something useful he will become perfectly *vacuous*, like the young men satirized in the comic journals, who, from excessive repose of mind, can hardly put together a single articulate sentence.

"It is no more possible," said the witty Canon of St. Paul's, Sydney Smith, "for an idle man to keep together a certain stock of knowledge than it is possible to keep together a stock of ice exposed to the meridian sun. Every day destroys a fact, a relation, or an influence; and the only method of preserving the bulk and value of the pile is by constantly adding to it."

We might tell him in plain words that in his present condition, in his utter, entire selfishness, whatever his hereditary claims may be, and whatever the undeveloped possibilities lying dormant in his mind, he is simply *offensive and hurtful*.

"The idle man," says a popular writer, Sala, "is an annoyance, a nuisance; he is of no benefit to anybody; he is an intruder in the busy thoroughfare of every-day life; he stands in our path, and we push him contemptuously aside; he is of no advantage to anybody; he annoys busy men; he makes them unhappy; he is an unnecessary unit in what should be social life. Therefore, young man, do something in this busy, bustling, wide-awake world! Move about for the benefit of mankind, if not for yourself. Do not be idle. God's law is that by the sweat of our brow we shall earn our bread. Do not be idle: every man and every woman, however exalted or however humble, can do good in this short life. Therefore, do not be idle."

"*Idleness*," wrote Jeremy Collier, "is an inlet to disorder, and makes way for licentiousness. People that have nothing to do are quickly tired of their own company."

"*Idleness*," wrote Richard Baxter, "is a constant sin, and labour is a duty. Idleness is the devil's home for temptation,

and for unprofitable, distracting musings, while labour profiteth others and ourselves."

Idleness is utterly *unreasonable*, and admits of neither defence nor excuse :

What is man,

asks Shakespeare's Hamlet with perennial point and truth,

If his chief good and market of his time
Be but to sleep and feed ? A beast, no more.
Sure He that made us with such large discourse,
Looking before and after, gave us not
That capability and god-like reason
To rust in us unused.

The time of the loiterer hangs heavy on his hands. He sleeps as long as he can, and then follows day after day the tedious pursuit of listless pleasure. Very soon no excitement under the sun is new. On no single day can he look back with satisfaction. He has a dim memory that there are truer objects, and happier ways of living ; but his conscience and brain are drugged with the enchantments of pleasure. He is partly conscious that he is out of harmony with the law of the universe and of his being ; but the habit of doing nothing, long cherished, is fatally strong. What he does take any trouble about is mere selfish indulgence :

All nature seems at work. Slugs leave their lair,
The bees are stirring, birds are on the wing,
And Winter, slumbering in the open air,
Wears on his smiling face a dream of spring ;
And I, the while, the sole unbusy thing,
Nor honey make, nor pair, nor build, nor sing.
Yet well I ken the banks where amaranths blow,
Have traced the fount whence streams of nectar flow.
Bloom, O ye amaranths ! bloom for whom ye may,
For me ye bloom not ! Glide, rich streams, away !
With lips unbrightened, wreathless brow, I stroll.
And would you learn the spells that drowse my soul ?
Work without hope draws nectar in a sieve,
And hope without an object cannot live.—COLERIDGE.

I had rather myself have too much to do than too little. Wisely is it the rule of the Imperial family of Germany that each of its members should in youth be taught a trade, in order that they may know something of the happiness of industrial production and creation. Happiest are those who have a definite task for every day, and who can feel at a certain regular hour that it is finished—"something accomplished, something done." Miserable are those whom evil training, or too great wealth suddenly inherited without preparation, or perverse inclinations, have hardened to the empty, purposeless life.

The keenest pangs the wretched find
 Are rapture to the dreary void,
 The leafless desert of the mind,
 The waste of feelings unemployed.
 Who would be doomed to gaze upon
 A sky without a cloud or sun?
 Less hideous far the tempest's roar
 Than ne'er to brave the billows more,
 Thrown, when the war of winds is o'er,
 A lonely wreck on Fortune's shore,
 Mid sullen calm and silent bay,
 Unseen, to drop by dull decay.
 Better to sink beneath the shock
 Than moulder piecemeal on the rock.—BYRON.

Now we will look on the other side of the question: the necessity, the nobleness, the happiness of work. "Our birth-right consists in the useful effects of the labours of our forefathers; but we cannot enjoy them unless we ourselves take part in the work. All must labour either with head or hand. Without work life is worthless; it becomes a mere state of moral coma. I do not mean merely physical work. There is a great deal of far higher work—the works of action and endurance, of trial and patience, of enterprise and philanthropy, of spreading truth and civilization, of diminishing suffering and relieving the poor, of helping the weak and enabling them to help themselves."¹

"A noble heart," says Barrow, "will disdain to subsist like a drone upon others' labours, like a vermin to filch its food out of the public granary, or like a shark to prey upon the lesser fry; but it will rather outdo his private obligations to other men's care and toil, by considerable service and beneficence to the public; for there is no calling of any sort, from the sceptre to the spade, the management whereof with any good success, any credit, any satisfaction, doth not demand much work of the head, or of the hands, or of both."

Labour is not only a necessity, but it is also a pleasure. What would otherwise be a curse, by the constitution of our physical nature becomes a blessing. Our life is a conflict with Nature in some respects, but it is also a co-operation with Nature in others.

In an infinite variety of ways men co-operate with each other for the mutual sustenance and comfort of all. The husbandman tills the ground and provides food, and the manufacturer weaves tissues which others transform into clothes. The mason, the bricklayer, the carpenter, the glazier, the painter, the upholsterer build and furnish the houses in

¹ Smiles.

which we enjoy household life. An infinite series of workmen thus contribute and help to create the general result.

Nature works with us. She provides the earth which we furrow; she grows and ripens the seeds which we sow and gather. With the help of human labour she furnishes the wool that we spin, the materials that we manufacture, the food that we eat. And it ought never to be forgotten that however rich or poor we may be, all that we eat, all that we are clothed with, all the infinities of inventions that we use, all that shelters us, from the palace to the cottage, is the result of labour.

Labour and skill applied to the commonest things invest them at once with precious value. Labour is indeed the life of humanity; take it away, banish it, and we're at once stricken with death. "He that will not work," said St. Paul, "neither shall he eat"; and he glorified himself in that he had laboured with his own hands, and had not been chargeable to any man.

Work is *noble*. "There is a perennial nobleness," said Carlyle, "and even sacredness in work; were he never so benighted, forgetful of his high calling, there is always hope in a man that actually and earnestly works; in idleness alone there is perpetual despair. Work, never so mean, is in communication with Nature; the real desire to get work done will itself lead one more and more to truth, to Nature's appointments and regulations which are truth; the latest gospel in the world is, Know thy work and do it."

Work is *necessary*. "Work, according to my feeling," said one of the most strenuous and fruitful of workers, Humboldt, "is as much a necessity to man as eating or sleeping. Even those who do nothing which to a sensible man can be called work, still imagine that they are doing something; the world possesses not a man who is an idler in his own eyes."

Work is *the source of happiness*. "If," said the serene worker and thinker, Marcus Aurelius, "thou workest at that which is before thee vigorously, calmly, without allowing anything else to distract thee; if thou holdest to this, expecting nothing, fearing nothing, but satisfied with thy present activity according to Nature, and with heroic truth in every word thou utterest, thou wilt live happy, and there is no man who is able to prevent this."

There is no more inspiring, hopeful, or truly wise motto than the ancient apothegm of Scripture: "Whatsoever thy hand findeth to do, do it with thy might."

How speaks the present hour? Act!

Walk upward glancing;

So shall thy footsteps in glory be tracked

Slow, but advancing.

Scorn not the smallness of daily endeavour,
 Let the great meaning ennoble it ever ;
 Droop not o'er efforts expended in vain ;
 Work as believing that labour is gain.

What doth the future say ? Hope !

Turn thy face sunward !

Look where light fringes the far-rising slope,
 Day cometh onward.

Watch, though so long be the daylight delaying,
 Let the first sunbeam arise on thee praying ;
 Fear not, for greater is God by thy side
 Than armies of Satan against thee allied.

But there is a sluggishness in spiritual things which is fatal to the truly happy life. Who will not admit that there is in almost all of us a *proneness to inattention*? Which of us prays every prayer through the whole of our beautiful service? Which of us could say at the end of each of our Christian assemblies what the lessons from Scripture were about? Is there not again in most men a *habit of desultoriness*—of life without purpose and days without plans? Is not there often a *general dreaminess, listlessness and vagueness*, fatal to resolute faith and determined action? Remember that *you cannot indulge in slothfulness in one part of your nature without affecting the whole*. Remember that if the body is slothful, the whole man is slothful; that if the mind is slothful, the whole man is in the same way slothful also. Remember that *diligence has to be exercised in the spiritual life as in all other things. Revelation is not given to save a man trouble*. In the life of the soul it is true that God co-operates with man, but it is no less true that man has actively to co-operate with God. Remember that *one man who is afflicted with indolence in religion quickly becomes a bigot*. He takes a lump of doctrine second-hand, never attempts to realize it in his own soul, and thinks it may be applied all round, like a prescription. *Another man this disastrous habit makes a sceptic*. He will not be at the pains to examine any of the numerous branches of evidences that there are for the truth of the Christian faith; he jumps hastily at the conclusion that all religious thought is superannuated; and so he loses the comfort and inspiration of religious principle. There is *nothing so deadening to the spiritual ear as sloth*. There is *nothing so operative as sloth in keeping multitudes of men who are in other respects active, vigorous, and not self-indulgent, from the necessary practice of beginning each day with an earnest, thoughtful, deliberate act of self-dedication and devotion*. Prayer—true prayer—requires more of effort, more of exertion, than any other act of the life. In every part of the region of Christian action, there is a special warfare to be waged with the spirit of sloth. Remember the wise and well-directed

urgency of Holy Scripture: *That ye be not slothful, but followers of them who through faith and patience inherit the promises.*

The removal of two true and exemplary workers of the most strenuous kind we have to lament within the past season. Frederick Edward Wigram, a Prebendary of St. Paul's, was through his life of sixty-two years a rare instance of absolute thoroughness of conception and execution. The sixteen years of his work as a parish priest at Portswood, Southampton, showed what energy and sympathy could effect. His fourteen years as secretary of the vast operations of the Church Missionary Society were a time of laborious and diligent development, the value of which it is impossible fully to estimate. Born to great wealth, he gave his own life; it is said that he gave £200,000 from the fortune which he had inherited; he gave three of his children—one to be Principal of the College at Lahore, one to be a missionary at Uganda; and a daughter to work amongst Indian women in Tinnevely, all of whom supported themselves. He was a high-minded Christian gentleman, whose office became like the department of a Secretary of State, and who did more than anyone else to foster the missionary spirit of the Church. I wrote to him once that the martyr Bishops should be commemorated at St. Paul's, where they had been consecrated. He replied that every penny of the friends of missions was needed for the evangelization of the heathen.

The other worker whose departure we deplore is Professor Henry Drummond. His career was sixteen years short of that of Prebendary Wigram, as he was only forty-six when he was taken from us. His scientific sympathies were consecrated by religious earnestness, and though he may not have convinced many scientific sceptics, as his reasoning was not always very strict nor his position very clear, still the trains of thought which he suggested, and the analogies which he drew from the laws and discoveries of modern science, were an invaluable supplement to the more closely-reasoned work of Bishop Butler, and contained hints of the highest importance of the way to bridge the difficulties which the advance of self-contained and unsympathetic science entailed. We are not surprised that "Natural Law in the Spiritual World" went through twenty-nine editions, and was published in many foreign languages, nor at the impression made by "The Ascent of Man," "The Greatest Thing in the World," and "Pax Vobiscum."

I said just now that there is a great deal of far higher work than that which can be measured by physical or tangible results. I spoke of the works of action and endurance, of

trial and patience, of wisdom and thought, of enterprise and philanthropy, of spreading truth and civilization. May I pay a tribute to one whom during the past four years we have learned to love and honour in the highest degree as a very genuine, sincere, and able contributor to this kind of permanent result. The two greatest branches of the Anglo-Saxon race live on the eastern and western shores of the Atlantic. They ought to be all one people, but differences have from time to time arisen to cloud the friendly and pleasant intercourse of these great kinsfolk. It is not too much to say that nobody has done more to remove such disagreements, to clear up such misunderstandings, and to re-unite the sacred and natural ties of kinship, than that sincerely-beloved guest whom this country has with one consent delighted to honour. Wherever the opportunity has offered, with a noble, lofty, and memorable eloquence he has upheld the principles of passionless justice and eternal right and divine sympathy. It is with unfeigned sorrow that we realize henceforth that in his official capacity as interpreter and peacemaker between two great Christian peoples of the same blood, we shall hear his voice and see his presence no more. The genuine ring of the earnest and elevated tones of that voice, the dignity and entire friendliness of that presence, we shall never forget. In bidding him farewell, it is not unfitting in this central cathedral¹ of English life that in the name of the Church of Christ in this country we offer him our heartfelt acknowledgments for his unaffected kindness to ourselves, his loyalty to his own magnificent people, and the powerful contributions which he has made to the peace of the world. And wherever he goes, and to whatever work he may be called, with no dissentient voice we invoke upon him and the great sister nation which he has so worthily represented the best blessings of the King of Righteousness and the Prince of Peace.

WILLIAM SINCLAIR.

ART. VII.—ARMENIA.²

THE recurrence of massacres at Tokat in Armenia recalls our attention to that unhappy country from the more recent phase of the Easter Question in Crete.

Armenia was at one time an independent kingdom, but is now divided between Russia, Turkey, and Persia. It was

¹ The substance of this paper was a sermon preached at St. Paul's Cathedral on Sunday afternoon, March 14, 1897.

² Armenian Papers.

separated formerly into Greater Armenia, *i.e.*, the country east of the Euphrates, and Lesser Armenia, *i.e.*, west of the Euphrates. Armenia is a high table-land from whence flow the rivers Euphrates, Tigris, Kur, and Aras.

The Armenians are said to be descended from Haik, the great-grandson of Japhet, and so their country is called in their language Haikh. Armenia was conquered by Semiramis, then at a later period it passed to the Macedonians, who in their turn (317 B.C.) were driven out of the country by the Armenians themselves, who elected their own king, at whose death Armenia submitted to the Seleucids of Syria. About 150 B.C. Mithridates appointed his brother, Valarsaces, ruler of Armenia, and he was founder of the Arsacid dynasty. Armenia became subject to Persia, 232 A.D., when her King was assassinated and the Royal Family massacred. One only escaped—Tiridates; he went to Rome and the Romans replaced him on his throne, 259 A.D. In the first century A.D. Christianity had begun to spread in the country, and on Tiridates' return, he at first persecuted the Christians, but eventually he and most of his people embraced the faith, and from that time the Armenians have been again and again attacked and persecuted by Romans, Greeks, Persians, and their Mohammedan neighbours of to-day. Since 1604 the Armenians have ceased to be a nation.

In 1813 Georgia was ceded by Persia to Russia, and Erivan followed in 1827, and finally Kars and Ardahan were ceded to Russia after the war with Turkey in 1878.

The old country known by the name of Armenia represents a total area of 89,264 square miles, and a population formerly of about five millions. Tradition assigns the origin of the human race to Armenia. Its name in the Bible is Ararat, from the great mountain which is its centre. The root in both words is "ar." The second half of the word *Armenia* is the Bible name *Minni* used by Jeremiah for part of that country. In Jeremiah's prophecy against Babylon (chapter li. 27) we find: "Set ye up a standard in the land, blow the trumpet among the nations, prepare the nations against her, call together against her the kingdoms of *Ararat*, *Minni*, and *Ashkenaz*."

The country is that lofty plateau whence the rivers Euphrates, Tigris, Araxes, and Acampis pour down their waters in different directions; the two first to the Persian Gulf, the two last to the Caspian and Euxine. It may be called the nucleus of the mountain system of Western Asia; from the centre of the plateau rise two lofty chains of mountains, Abus or Ararat, and Niphates. The climate of Armenia is severe, the degree of severity varying with the

altitude; the valleys being sufficiently warm to ripen the grape, while the high lands are bleak, and only adapted for pasture. The pastures supported vast numbers of mules and horses, on which the wealth of the country chiefly depended. Strabo calls Armenia richly productive in horses, and says that the breed was held in the highest estimation. The inhabitants were keen traders in ancient as in modern times. It is no use pretending that they are an attractive people. The Christianity of the mass of them, though strongly held, does not greatly affect their conduct. The vices of cheating, lying, and dishonesty are deeply rooted amongst them, and they are considered worse in that respect than the Eastern Jew and the modern Greek. This, of course, in no way and in no degree justifies the abominable persecutions to which they have been subjected.

The Bible references to Armenia are not many. It is represented as the home of Noah and his sons after the Deluge. Isaiah (xiii. 4) in his prophecy against Babylon summons the hosts from "the mountain," by which he means Armenia. Jeremiah's similar reference I have already quoted. Sennacherib fled to Armenia from his sons. Ezekiel, in enumerating the riches of Tyre, says: "They of the house of Tog-Armah traded in thy fairs with horses, and horsemen, and mules." And again in chap. xxxviii. 6 he speaks of "The house of Tog-Armah from the north quarters, and all his bands." And in Genesis x. 3 Togarmah is said to be son of Gomer, son of Japheth. The Armenians themselves have a traditional belief that they are descended from Thorgomars, or Tiorgarmah.

The country contains some mineral wealth, but it needs developing. This is not likely to take place under the Turkish Government, as the Armenians have no civil rights, and are not allowed to bear arms or serve in the Turkish army. Massacres have taken place there at various times, and are nothing new. In 1850, for instance, 10,000 Nestorians and Armenians were massacred by the Turks in Kurdistan. The origin of the latest persecution was in 1893. Serious disturbances occurred in various places in the early part of that year. Turkish injustice and oppression drove the unhappy people to acts of revolt, and the Armenian Christian College at Marsovan was held by the authorities to be the chief instigator. The truth merely was, that owing to evangelistic work in Armenia, of which the college was the centre, the people had naturally aspired to a higher degree of religious and educational freedom, and the uprisings of the oppressed people were made the excuse for throwing scores of innocent Christians into prison, and for closing the college and

burning a part of it. From 1893 to the present day the massacres have continued at intervals. The latest until that at Tokat was in Constantinople itself, when all Europe was struck with horror and consternation at seeing through the eyes of its ambassadors and consuls more than 2,000 Armenians clubbed to death in the very streets of that beautiful city, and before the very palace of the Sultan.

This is what was said about the massacres by the Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, Mr. Curzon, from his place in the House of Commons, in March last, before the more recent massacres :

I do not see how it is possible to deny, or even to minimize, the appalling character of those events. I suppose I have read more about them than any other man in the House, because, in addition to the papers in the Blue-books, I have had other information, public and private, put before me, and my impression of the massacres is this : There are certain common characteristics that may be traced in the history of all those events. They all occurred posterior to the granting of reforms in Constantinople, which in itself suggests some connection with that step. They occurred almost simultaneously in widely-scattered parts of Asia Minor. They were begun in most cases by the Turks. I regard the counter-charge, though true in a few instances, to have broken down in the great majority of cases. The massacres were openly participated in by the Turkish soldiers. The proceedings were conducted with an organization that was perfect and almost mathematical. The massacres in some cases began and ended by sound of trumpet. The Armenians were almost the only Christians who suffered. The lives of other Christians were spared, and the number of Turks killed was quite insignificant. And, finally, these massacres were followed by the forcible conversion of the survivors to Mahomedanism, accompanied by the greatest cruelty. The number of 25,000 has been given on the authority of the delegates of the six Embassies at Constantinople ; and, further, the evidence on which they acted was evidence derived from their Consuls on the spot—the evidence of eye-witnesses, missionaries, priests, travellers, and others—and these figures are only given where the data for a correct estimate exist, and many of the districts are omitted altogether. I myself believe that the number of 25,000, instead of being a maximum, is rather a minimum. It is fair also to bear in mind the incidents that have followed this carnival of blood. Whole districts have been desolated ; whole villages have been destroyed. Thousands of persons are at the present moment wandering about in the cold mountain districts of Asia Minor, homeless, penniless, clotheless, foodless, and capable of absorbing every penny of the tens of thousands of pounds that you can send them. I do say deliberately—and I am only repeating what has been said by others of greater responsibility than myself—that this is one of the most appalling stories of misery I have ever read. If the old saying is true that “Mortal tears to mortal woes are due,” I cannot myself imagine a more pathetic spectacle in history (cheers).

Here is an extract from Père Charmetant's French pamphlet :

The number of victims published in the official table of whom accurate information was obtainable was from 25,000 to 30,000. These figures represent scarcely a quarter of the total number of those massacred, and

one may state without exaggeration that more than 100,000 is the number of the victims.

With regard to the sufferers who have not actually been slaughtered, the Duke of Westminster has received trustworthy information that there are no less than 400,000 Armenian men, women, and children in Asiatic Turkey who are in a most deplorable condition, and on the verge of starvation. Many are wandering in the forests, without food and almost naked. All funds received at Grosvenor House are sent to Her Majesty's Ambassador at Constantinople, who directs their distribution, aided by a local European committee. Twenty depots have been opened in Anatolia, and at least £100,000 is required to provide for these destitute people, as they have been unable to obtain seed corn, and therefore, having no harvest to reap, must perish unless aided by charity.

Take some descriptions from Her Majesty's Blue-book of 1896 :

Acting-Consul Fontana, of Angora, on December 9, 1895, encloses a Substance of Report respecting the massacre at Gurun :

"Towards the middle of November, thousands of Turks, Kurds, and Circassians, from the villages of Azizié, Darenté, Kangal, and Albistan, after burning the Armenian villages of Manjillik, Darenté, Kasar, and Ashut (?), in the neighbourhood of Gurun, and slaughtering the inhabitants, attacked the town of Gurun itself. They swept through the Armenian quarter like a flood, shouting : 'Our Padishah wills it!' They broke into the houses, killed the men, and outraged the young women and girls. They cut open mothers with child, and tossed little children from knife to knife. After killing the people and plundering their all, the rabble set fire to the houses; old men and children, who had been hidden, perished in the flames."

On December 12 a letter was written at Cæsarea, which Acting-Consul Fontana, of Angora, forwarded to Sir P. Currie :

"The plundering and massacre began on Saturday afternoon, November 30, at from 9 to 9.30 o'clock (Turkish). It broke out in all quarters at the same time, and raged with unabated fury for four hours. During that time no real effort was made by the military to check it, but after that time order was gradually restored, although there were outbreaks on Sunday and Monday mornings.

"I watched the progress of things from the roof of my house, which is situated in the very heart of the city, and I report nothing as *facts* which I do not know from actual observation. Local Turks, aided by villagers from neighbouring villages, swept the streets, killing with knives and clubs every Armenian on whom they could lay hands.

"A large part of the markets were gutted, and hundreds (note, thus far reported, 518 houses) of houses broken open and destroyed. I say *hundreds* deliberately.

"Immense quantities of plunder were carried off by Turkish women, as well as by the men and boys. Soldiers confined themselves chiefly to gold and articles easily concealed, although I saw some carrying off larger plunder. Soldiers, while taking bodies of Christians from the

markets to the Government headquarters for *safety*, robbed them of watches, gold, or anything of value.

"This I know to be true from the most reliable evidence. In my presence a band of soldiers refused to do anything to protect a house near mine which was being plundered. I did not see a soldier kill anyone, although I have no doubt that some of the Christians were shot by soldiers.

"Women were most horribly mutilated. The universal procedure seems to have been to insist on their becoming Moslems. If they refused, they were cut down mercilessly—fairly hacked to death with knives, sickles, or anything which came handy.

"The young women were taken off by the Turks and taken to Hadjilar, an adjacent village. Some have been returned, but others are still in the hands of the Turks.

"As to the cause of the outbreak, the Government, and it alone, should be held responsible. The Armenians have been perfectly quiet from first to last in Cæsarea, and never gave the slightest cause for disturbance. In this respect Cæsarea has been quite different from many other places.

"There is ample evidence, on the contrary, that the Government deliberately gave permission for plunder and murder to continue for four hours. Soldiers said so plainly while seated here in my house. The soldiers had positive orders not to fire on the rioters until orders to that effect should come from Constantinople! And such orders were conveniently delayed until the end of the four hours, *i.e.*, at 1.30 o'clock (Turkish)."

A letter which reached London on February 8, 1896, tells how, in a village near Kharput, the Kurds and Turks plundered and burned houses and stripped the people day after day. "On the eighth day, as they had finished their work, they came to us who were on the banks of the stream. They killed Brother Baghdo's son and Pastor Melcon on the other side of the stream, because they would not change their religion. It became night, darkness was upon us, but they came with lanterns, and selected forty-five of the young men, saying that the Government wished them. Knowing what would befall them, they asked for an hour's grace. They prayed and sang, they asked forgiveness of each other, they kissed the hands of their parents, and parted with tears, with the expectation of never again seeing each other. Taken to a desolate place half an hour distant, they were taken apart two by two, and threatened with death if they would not change their religion. They all with one voice agreed in saying boldly, 'We will not deny our religion; we are ready to die for our Saviour's love.' Only five succeeded in making their escape, but the remaining forty became martyrs for the love of Jesus. My son Samuel was among the forty-five, but he escaped with four others, and hid in a cave for ten to twelve days. My youngest son, twenty-two years old, was killed."

MALATIA,

August, 1896.

In one of the churches fifty people were burned. . . . The Protestant church and schools are a mere pile of bare walls. Of the houses in the Christian quarter 560 were destroyed. . . . Add to all this wreck of property the wholesale robbery of everything that could be carried away, the violence done to the women (600 girls and brides carried off to Kurdish and Turkish houses), and the ruin of families by the murder of the men—and you will get a faint idea of the state of things in Malatia.

What is to be done? It would take an immense sum to rebuild the ruined quarter. . . . Yet some shelters must be found for the people against next winter, or they will die like sheep. They cannot live in the

gardens when the frost and snow come, nor sleep on the ground without beds, as many are doing now. . . . Then there are the widows and orphans and the ruined schools, etc.

England is more concerned than even other nations for the security and good government of Armenia. During the discussion of the Treaty of Berlin (1878) Britain entered into an agreement with Turkey, promising to preserve intact the Asiatic provinces of the Sultan, on condition that certain reforms were made in the government of these provinces. This condition has not been carried out by Turkey, as the Kurds invaded Armenia in 1882, destroyed the lives and property of many Armenians, and this year the same story of Armenian atrocities is being told again.

The following are the treaty obligations of England to Armenia :

By the Berlin Treaty, 61st Article, "The Sublime Porte undertakes to carry out, without further delay, the amelioration and reforms demanded by local requirements in the provinces inhabited by the Armenians, and to guarantee their security against the Circassians and Kurds. It will periodically make known the steps taken to this effect to the Powers, who will superintend their application."

By the Cyprus Convention, 1st Article, ". . . H.I.M. the Sultan promises to England to introduce necessary reforms, to be agreed upon later between the two Powers, into the government, and for the protection of the Christian and other subjects of the Porte in these territories [Armenia]; and in order to enable England to make necessary provision for executing her engagements, H.I.M. the Sultan further consents to assign the Island of Cyprus to be occupied and administered by England."

Two years after this treaty the Ministers who made it fell from power, and an Administration from the opposite side succeeded for five years. Since then the Ministers who made the treaty have been in power about seven years, and the opposite side about three. Both sides have found the difficulties of insisting on the Armenian reforms insuperable.

Some days before the terrible massacre at Ourfa the Armenians had warning of the impending catastrophe. They were prevented from leaving the town by the Turkish authorities. During these days of awful suspense the Gregorian clergy wrote a letter, of which the following is a translation, and sent it secretly to Aintab, from which town it has been forwarded to Europe. The Archpriest Stephen and four other clergy were slain before the altar of the church during the celebration of the Holy Communion. Their letter is one of the most pathetic documents in all history. It sounds to us with all the solemnity of a voice from the dead :

We are doomed to die. Everywhere it is whispered that the Armenians of Ourfa have but the fearful alternative of "Islam or the Sword." Before this reaches you we may have joined those who have gone before

to the city of God. The attitude of relentless hostility of the Sultan and the ferocious aspect of our Moslem neighbours has not abated. We are as sheep waiting to be slaughtered, and while waiting, with bleeding hearts, the last act in this tragedy, we desire to send a farewell message to our fellow-men.

TO OUR SULTAN.

SOVEREIGN,—You have apparently been persuaded that we are a rebellious people, deserving only speedy extermination, and we easily recognise in what has occurred the evidence of your relentless energy and of your vast power; for such as you this destruction of a whole people is no doubt an easy task, and in accomplishing it you will perhaps win from your admirers the proud title of "The Victorious." For ourselves we can only make our last solemn protest that we are not, and never have been, rebels, and we regret that your energy and valour and that of your soldiers should have been displayed not against the enemies of the empire, but in the massacre and plunder of your unarmed and loyal subjects. When we see the widespread and indescribable ruin which your imperial anger has caused, we cannot persuade ourselves that such fury and wrath could be poured upon the heads of so feeble a people, even though we had been in armed rebellion. In any case, we beseech you to reflect that however absolute may be your will and power in this empire which God permits you to rule, He is alike your judge and ours, and will take account of us all concerning these terrible days of blood and suffering, and will make inquiry for the justice of your dealing with the humblest of your subjects. In this respect the verdict of men may be bought or corrupted, but the judgment of God is "true and righteous altogether." It is possible that you have been displeased with us in part on account of the progressive ideas which have found so ready and hearty acceptance among us. In this respect we have nothing to conceal. It is quite true that our highest hopes for the glory of your reign and for the progress and power of your empire have sprung from our trust that the enlightened and liberal policy to which your predecessors have repeatedly pledged themselves and the Government of this country, would mark the line along which you would be pleased to lead your people into the larger liberty, intelligence, and prosperity which this distracted land so sadly needs. If in cherishing these hopes and aspirations we have incurred your anger, and if it is to eradicate such longings from the hearts of your people that you wipe us out of your dominions, we conjure you to remember that many very mighty men have in the past flung themselves in the way of human progress, only to be crushed by it. We know very well that your Majesty is mighty, but we know also that human progress is of God, and that no man can suppress the truths and the hopes which He breathes into the hearts of His people. They are like birds; the trees in which they have built their nests may be hewn down, but they only find refuge in higher and securer places. We are rejoiced to know that these ideas have already found a place in the hearts of many of your Moslem subjects. We cannot doubt that they will yet find successful advocates and defenders in this land.

TO OUR MOSLEM FELLOW COUNTRYMEN.

With some of you humanity has been stronger than passion and race prejudice, and you have generously helped and sympathized with us in these days of calamity and bloodshed. For this we heartily honour and thank you, and we pray that in addition to the approval of your own

consciences and the praise of all good men, the blessing of the God whom we alike worship may be yours. To those of you who have robbed and massacred and plundered Armenian houses we have chiefly feelings of compassion; you have perhaps done these terrible things by order of the Sultan, and therefore in what has seemed to you the service of your religion and Government. We think this a fearful mistake; no religion and no Government can be really served, but only injured, by such doings. Our prayer for you is that you may soon be led to see and heartily repent of the great wrong you are perpetrating.

We call God to witness that the Armenians did not incite any of the wars that have shaken this empire; we did not even suggest the "Tanzimat." It was not our will that we were begotten to a new political life by the Treaty of 1856. We, as a people, have attempted to raise no political questions nor difficulties; our complaints and appeals have been based solely on the sentiment of humanity and the common rights of men. It was Britain who arranged the "Scheme of Reforms," and urged it upon our Sultan till he was irritated to the extent that he seems to have adopted the plan of ridding himself finally of this annoyance by exterminating our nation; and now, while he is relentlessly carrying out his plan, our European brethren are standing by as spectators and witnesses of the bloody work. We wonder if sympathy and the brotherhood of man and chivalry are wholly things of the past, or are selfish, material, and political interests so great that the massacre of a whole people is a secondary matter? In either case, "Morituri vos salutamus." Let God judge between us in the Great Day.

TO THE CHRISTIANS OF AMERICA.

We have been strenuously opposed to your mission work among us, on the ground that it was divisive and subversive of our national Church traditions, but these bloody days have shown us that some of our Protestant brethren have been staunch defenders of our honour and of our faith. You have laboured to promote among us Christian intelligence and piety; it is not your fault that one result of your teaching and example has been to excite our masters against us. You at least know the situation too well to believe that we are being punished for our political offences; you have seen that so far as we have been the occasion of the bloody massacres which have come upon us, our crime in the eyes of the Turk has been that we have adopted the civilization which you have commended to us. You know the Turkish Government dreads and dislikes nothing so much as the seeds of progress which you have been sowing. Behold now the missions and schools which you have planted among us at the cost of many millions of dollars and hundreds of precious lives, they are in ruins, and now the Turk is planning to rid himself of missionaries and teachers, by leaving them nobody among and for whom to labour. A short year ago, and nobody could have believed that at the end of this nineteenth century—a century characterized by the collapse of Islam and the advance of Christianity to a position of undoubted supremacy in the government of the world—a Christian people could, on account of their loyalty to Christian civilization, under the very eyes of Christendom, be exterminated by a Moslem Power. Yet just this fearful tragedy is being consummated to-day, and we are the unhappy victims. We see no signs of relenting on the part of our destroyers, and no hand is reached out to rescue us. We have only to say farewell to you and to any who have loved and cared for us, and prepare ourselves for death, counting ourselves honoured in being called to seal our faith with our lives. To the Armenian colonies in free lands we send our heartfelt thanks for all they have done for us

at Ourfa. We ask their prayers, and implore them to be steadfast in the faith of our ancient national Church, and to follow the example of our Lord and Saint Gregory. Glory be to Jesus, who has saved us by His blood.

(Signed) STEPHEN,
Arch-priest.

And four other priests of Ourfa.

What is to be the end of these things? England cannot go to war with Turkey alone. We must put that out of our heads altogether. Turkey could easily call 1,000,000 of the bravest soldiers in the world into the field. Our own estimates are for 155,000, but the effective force is always far less than that.

Nor can England stir up a European war. It would be the most dreadful that ever was waged—far worse than the massacres. But there are four things that we can do:

1. We can stir up the feelings of the continental nations till they are unanimous with ourselves.

2. We can convince the continental nations that England is disinterested in the matter.

3. We can join in earnest prayer to Almighty God to consider our earnestness and sincerity, and to arise and help the helpless.

4. We can prove the sincerity of our prayers by subscribing liberally, with all our heart and soul, to the fund which the chivalrous and heroic Duke of Westminster, backed by the Lord Mayor, is raising for the 400,000 destitute, homeless, ruined, outraged, helpless Armenians on whom has fallen this awful and unspeakable woe.



Short Notices.

The Queen's Diamond Jubilee Bible. Oxford University Press.

THE Oxford University Press has been bringing out lately some marvels of typography and of paper. Their editions of Burns, Tennyson, Browning, etc., each in one volume, in admirable type, and on the thinnest possible and yet perfectly strong paper, have been triumphs of English printing. They have now brought out the Bible in the same exquisitely beautiful form. The frontispiece has a photograph of Dawe's picture of the Queen in 1837, and a recent photograph of Her Majesty in 1897. It is also illustrated by photographs from Sir Joshua Reynolds' drawings of the cardinal virtues in New College window. Mrs. Sheridan sat for Charity, and Julia, 3rd Viscountess Dudley and Ward, for Fortitude.

The Queen's Diamond Jubilee Prayer-Book. Various sizes, bindings, and prices. Oxford University Press.

This edition of the Prayer-Book corresponds to the Bible. The double frontispiece has two photographs of the Queen, robed and crowned, in 1837, and after the long interval. There are also illustrations from the Passion, and the volume contains Hymns Ancient and Modern.

Four Foundation Truths. Pp. 104. Elliot Stock.

This little book gives sound instruction suitable to present controversies on four important and critical points: the Church and the Bible, the Church View of Baptism, the Lord's Supper, and the Prayer-Book and Absolution. They are by the Revs. Walter Abbott, A. E. Barnes-Lawrence, Canon R. B. Girdlestone, and Prebendary Eardley Wilmot. The standpoint is at once that of the Prayer-Book, the Reformation, and the Bible; and the treatment is thorough, and, it may be hoped, convincing.

The Three Creeds. By the REV. J. R. LESLIE. Pp. 132. Price 2s. 6d. Elliot Stock.

The writer is Principal of the Episcopal Training College at Edinburgh. His work is learned, careful, moderate, and orthodox, and is the result of much practice in teaching, and of wide reading. It is an excellent manual, both for teacher and student.

Set to Obey. By the REV. F. S. WEBSTER. Pp. 185. Price 2s. 6d. Nisbet and Co.

This is one of the useful "Deeper Life" Series, and consists of twenty-four chapters on taking Christ into the daily life. Mr. Webster's practical preaching has brought him great influence in Birmingham. His style is striking and vigorous, and his thoughts will be found helpful to many.

Secrets of Sanctity. ("The Deeper Life" Series.) By the REV. A. E. BARNES-LAWRENCE. Pp. 166. Price 2s. 6d. Nisbet and Co.

The writer has won a wide reputation as a thoughtful and experienced teacher, and his present work is wise, penetrating, and stimulating. It shows knowledge of contemporary life and conditions, and will be found a practical help to a genuine spirituality of mind.

The Biblical Illustrator. 2 Corinthians. By the REV. T. S. EXELL. Pp. 142. Price 7s. 6d. Nisbet and Co.

We are glad to welcome another of these indefatigable compilations as a valuable help to the preacher, when far from libraries and books of reference. The work is done with great care and thought.

Lectures on Disendowment. By the BISHOPS OF LONDON, BANGOR, and STEPNEY, the ARCHDEACON OF LONDON, PREBENDARY HARRY JONES, and the REV. J. MOORE. Pp. 118. S.P.C.K.

Knowledge about the material facts of the Church of England should be diligently pressed in this present time of quiet before another general election. These lectures were delivered under the auspices of the National Church Reading Union, and deal with such topics as the Clergy and Party Politics, the Church and the Welsh People, Continuity of

Possession at the Reformation, How the Church received Her Property, Village Disendowment, and the Uselessness of Confiscation.

They may, perhaps, be useful for repetition or adaptation in the Provinces.

Christian Men of Science. By various authors. R.T.S.

The biographical series of the R.T.S. is one of the most admirable features of its work. In his introduction Professor Gladstone says: "It was no part of God's purpose to teach natural science through inspired men of old, but to leave men to ascertain it through the reverent study of Nature itself. Such students of both Nature and the Bible are, happily, far from rare, and it may be hoped that the examples given in this book will do good service in increasing their number."

Many people have in general a notion that some of the most important scientists have been genuine Christians; here they will find some of the most notable, ready for illustration and quotation. The list includes Bacon, Pascal, Robert Boyle, Sir Isaac Newton, Baron Von Haller, Dr. Abercrombie, Sir David Brewster, Adam Sedgwick, Michael Faraday, Sir James Simpson, George Wilson, and Professor Clarke Maxwell.

Confessions of St Augustine. Pp. 331. Price 2s. 6d. Andrew Melrose.

This immortal work has been brought out in choice type, readable form, and graceful appearance.

Among the Menabe. By the REV. G. H. SMITH. Pp. 112. S.P.C.K.

The writer has been a missionary for the S.P.G. on the west coast of Madagascar, and gives his experience of thirteen months' work in that region. At a time when Madagascar has been going through such startling experiences, this record of a missionary will have a special interest.

In the House of the Pilgrimage. By PRINCIPAL MOULE. Pp. 106. Price 2s. 6d. Seeley and Co.

The poems of the divine and scholar are always interesting. The Principal of Ridley has a happy gift of poetic thought and melodious versification, and has made a lasting contribution to English sacred verse.

The Four Temperaments. By DR. ALEXANDER WHYTE. Pp. 101. Price 1s. 6d. Hodder and Stoughton.

This work belongs to the series of "Little Books on Religion." The temperaments are the sanguine, the choleric, the phlegmatic, and the melancholy. Most people come under one or other of these heads; and they will find something useful and discriminating for themselves in the treatment of their case by an experienced hand.

Jubilee of the Evangelical Alliance. Pp. 519. Shaw and Co., Paternoster Row.

This is the record of the tenth International Conference, held in London in June and July, 1896. It is admirably got up, and capitally illustrated. It is well worth possessing, for here men of Reformation principles from all parts of the world have given the cream of their experience and knowledge.

Some Criticism of the Text of the New Testament. By GEORGE SALMON, D.D., Provost of Trinity College, Dublin. Pp. 161. Price 3s. 6d. John Murray.

Modest as are the proportions of this book, the contents are weighty in the extreme. The effect, if not the intention of the work, is to cast doubt upon some of the conclusions arrived at by Westcott and Hort in the matters of New Testament criticism, and put forward by them as almost final and impregnable. The book is sure to be widely read, and we are justified in hoping that Bishop Westcott will publish a rejoinder. The qualities which made Dr. Salmon's lectures on the Introduction to the New Testament and on the Infallibility of the Church such delightful reading are apparent in the present work in equal fulness. We miss nothing of the lucidity of style, the ripeness of learning, the circumspect sobriety of judgment, the easy strength, and the Irish gaiety which distinguished the Provost's larger treatises. It needs not to be added that where Dr. Salmon differs most decisively from the Bishop of Durham and the late Professor Hort, he differs only as one Christian scholar and loving friend may always and must sometimes differ from another.

The Institutions of Italy. By JOHN P. COLDSTREAM. Pp. 147. Price 2s. Archibald Constable and Co.

This writer is the author of a corresponding book on "The Institutions of Austria," which was very well received. We know very little of the way in which our Continental neighbours live, except superficially; and these little handbooks are full of light and illustration. The subjects dealt with are: History and Geography, Justice, Betrothal and Marriage, Succession, Parents and Children, Nobility, Religion, Education, Land, Army and Navy, Commerce, Trade, and Relief. The style is simple and interesting, and the treatment free from pedantry. It forms a pleasant inlook into the internal life of a charming and friendly nation.

The Popular Religion and Folk-Lore of Northern India. By W. CROOKE, B.A. 2 vols. Pp. 653. Price 21s. net. Archibald Constable and Co.

The author, who belongs to the Bengal Civil Service, has spent the spare time of his life as a district officer in India on an examination into the early and popular beliefs of the Hindus, apart from the official creed of Brahmanism. His object has been to discover the basis on which Hinduism has been founded. Many of these beliefs and opinions are held to have come from races which were not Aryan. Hinduism was probably itself a Nature-worship introduced by Aryan missionaries; but it has assimilated an enormous amount of demonolatry, fetishism, and kindred forms of primitive religion belonging to older races which can only be described as aboriginal or autochthonous. The general interest of the book can be seen by a glance at its contents: "The Godlings of Nature," "Heroic and Village Godlings," "Godlings of Disease," "Worship of the Sainted Dead," "Worship of the Malevolent Dead," "Evil Eye," "Scaring of Ghosts," "Tree and Serpent Worship," "Totemism" (worship of the Family Badge), "Fetishism," "Animal Worship," "Magic," "Rural Festivals and Ceremonies." There is also a comprehensive bibliography on the subject, and a good index. Mr. Crooke has made a valuable contribution to the history of natural religion.

Records of the South American Missionary Society. By Mrs. ALLEN GARDINER. Pp. 101. Home Words Office.

Englishmen have not yet taken sufficient interest in the great South American continent, or recognised the serious obligations which the development of our trade and commerce in that region has brought to

this country. This is the record of fifty years' work, and should help to arouse attention to that most splendid and remarkable of all the divisions of the earth.

The Literature of Music. By JAMES E. MATTHEW. Pp. 281. Elliot Stock.

This volume is one of "The Book Lover's Library," and is by the author of "A Manual of Musical History." He tells us in a very interesting manner about the literature of ancient music, the mediæval writers on music, early works on music after the invention of printing, musical literature in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, musical histories, biographies and dictionaries, the literature of sacred music, opera, musical instruments, and science; and the last chapter gives us a bibliography of the subject. It is a pleasant excursion into one of the by-paths of knowledge.

York Minster. By DEAN PUSEY-CUST. Illustrated by Ansted. Pp. 66. Price 1s.

Winchester Cathedral. By CANON BENHAM. Illustrated by Herbert RAILTON. Pp. 59. Price 1s.

St. Alban's Abbey. By CANON LIDDELL. Illustrated by F. G. Kitton. Pp. 59. Price 1s. Isbister and Co.

These fascinating little monographs are valuable either as an introduction or as a remembrance of the great buildings and the wealth of associations which they commemorate. They are all written by those who love their subject and are familiar with it, and the illustrations are exquisite and characteristic.

The Official Year-Book of the Church of England. Pp. 370. S.P.C.K.

It is impossible to praise too highly the diligence and method of Canon Burnside, the editor of this invaluable work. There could hardly be a better witness for Church defence than this wonderful and clearly-arranged record.

Albert the Good. By W. J. WINTLE. Pp. 143. Price 1s. S.-S.U.

Short as the Prince Consort's life unhappily was, yet from his unique position and his admirable intellect few men have had so much influence for good during the present century. This charming volume, which recounts the main facts of his life and character, is appropriately issued in this year of the Diamond Jubilee. Mr. Wintle has done his work with sympathy and ability.

Ethics of Temperance. By A. E. GARBIE. Pp. 80. Price 1s. S.-S.U.

This is a series of eight very thoughtful papers, which go to the very root of the various questions involved.

We have also received the following magazines: *Blackwood's, Cornhill, Good Words, Quiver, Sunday Magazine, The Leisure Hour, The Critical Review, The Anglican Church Magazine, The Church Missionary Intelligencer, The Evangelical Churchman, The Church Sunday-School Magazine, The Fireside, Sunday at Home, The Girl's Own Paper, The Boy's Own Paper, Sunday Hours, The Church Worker, The Church Monthly, The Church Missionary Gleaner, Light in the Home, Awake, India's Women, The Cottager and Artisan, Friendly Greetings, Little Folks, Our Little Dots, The Child's Companion, Boy's and Girl's Companion, The Children's World, Daybreak, Day of Days, Home Words, Hand and Heart, and Church and People.*

The Month.

EDUCATION.

THE Voluntary Schools Bill has been read a third time in the House of Lords, and now only awaits the royal assent.

A draft scheme for the association of Church schools to receive the aid under the new Education Act has been issued by the National Society. The proposed method of working is as follows: Managers of Voluntary schools in rural deaneries are to signify their willingness to associate, and are then to elect representatives. These representatives are to be summoned by the Rural Dean, and to elect representatives for every ten, or fraction of ten, schools or departments to serve on the governing body for the three years ensuing. The governing body shall be convened by the Bishop of the diocese or his representative. It shall have the power to co-opt one-third as many additional members beside those elected to serve for three years. The whole governing body shall elect a president, not more than three vice-presidents, a treasurer, and a secretary. An important provision is made that the election shall be so arranged that at least half of the governing body shall consist of laymen.

The business of these governing bodies for Church schools in every diocese will be to "prepare and submit to the Educational Department a scheme for the distribution of the special aid-grant allocated by the Department under the Education Act of 1897." This will be the limit of their powers. They will have no right to interfere in the management of any associated school, unless the managers should delegate this authority.

Possibly some managers of Voluntary schools, presumably, the well-to-do ones, will refuse to co-operate in any scheme of association. They will take this course under the serious responsibility of following a policy of selfish separation. During the past years of single-handed struggle, hundreds of our schools have perished because they were obliged to stand alone. Here is an opportunity of combination by which the permanence, the strength, the efficiency, and the growth of our schools can be secured. The Archbishop of Canterbury has written concerning these diocesan associations: "It will take trouble to form them. It will take some sacrifice to work them effectively when they have been formed. It will need an unselfish, patriotic spirit to use them rightly. But the associations so worked will be a source of fresh strength; we shall be drawn closer to one another, and help each other to a perpetual increase of the efficacy of all our service." This is the rock upon which our adversaries predict we shall split. But it may well become a foundation for mutual support and consolidation.

Sir John Gorst has, according to promise, moved a resolution to enable the Government to bring in a Bill for the assistance of necessitous Board schools. The principle proposed is an automatic sliding-scale to add 4d. for every penny of the rate above 3d., until the highest limit, a 2s. 6d.

rate, is reached. The average rate in England and Wales is 9d. in the pound. Of all the school districts with rates above 1s., only forty-five will not get relief. London will be the only borough unrelieved, for the reason that the school rate for London exceeds the cost per head fixed by the scale.

Of course, every sort of desultory opposition has been showered upon this scheme. It has been styled unfair as compared with the aid given to Voluntary schools, inadequate as regards the needs of the Board schools, and unsatisfactory as regards the ratepayer. But the poverty of the arguments brought forward, and the cursory nature of the resistance, leads to the expectation of a rapid passage for the measure.

WOMEN'S DEGREES.

Cambridge is being as much stirred this year over the question of women's degrees as was the sister University last year. For a considerable time past women have been coming in continually increasing numbers to the two older Universities. They have built for themselves colleges, and have entered with zest upon all the permitted paths of university life. From the first they were welcomed by the authorities, and all reasonable facilities were placed in their way. Libraries and museums and all the sources of study were thrown open to them, and they were permitted to attend the lectures of college and university teachers. They could enter for the examinations of the University, and whenever they secured a place in the honours list, a certificate to that effect was granted them. But we are now told that these concessions are looked upon by their leaders as merely preliminary. They now ask in the clearest possible terms that they may be admitted to full membership of the Universities. Especially they complain that the fact of not possessing a degree is a serious disability to a woman in the teaching profession.

Few persons who have any intimate knowledge of either University would care to yield to the demand for full membership. Through a long period of years Oxford and Cambridge have grown up as residential Universities for men. All their institutions, rules, and customs were framed and are suited to the needs of the education of men. Women's education is different as women are different. To permit such a complete and unwarrantable alteration and overturning of the objects for which these Universities were founded, and the manner of their working, would be a course which only the visionary and the ignorant would recommend.

But, it may be asked, could not the degree be granted without membership of the Universities, and therefore a share in their government? A scheme to this effect has just been recommended to Cambridge by a syndicate appointed to consider the matter. By nine votes to five the syndicate urges that the *titles* of the degrees B.A., B.Sc., etc., be granted to all women who fulfil the regular requirements of the University. This is evading the logical outcome by a sleight. It is claimed that the distinction between the titles of the degrees, and the actual degrees as ordinarily conferred by the University, will preclude women from any share in the government of the University, while removing the injustice of not granting the degree when the examination has been passed.

This is a course which is certainly just within the range of practical politics. But, on the one hand, the present injustice is by no means so great as at first appears. While the general public may perhaps be struck by the degree, the value of the certificate is fully understood and appreciated as a guarantee of mental capacity by those to whom the teacher makes application. If a degree is thought necessary, it may be obtained from other Universities. On the other hand, if women were granted titular degrees they would be brought under the full control of the statutes of the University; they would keep the same terms, pay the same fees, and be subject to the same conditions as other members of the University. Is it reasonable to suppose they would consent to all this without having any share in its government? Would it be right or advisable or seemly for men to monopolize the control of a mixed University? The injustice would be far greater than that which is now said to exist. In short, the condition of things recommended by the majority of the syndicate could not last. The full demand, to which the titular degree is looked upon by the women as a stepping-stone, would from grounds of fairness and necessity be soon conceded.

There are other ways out of the difficulty. The five dissentient syndics were in favour of bestowing other titles, such as M.Litt., M.Sc., etc. A suggestion from the President of Harvard is that the plan of Barnard College should be adopted, which is a women's college empowered to grant its own degrees, while freely using the educational advantages of the men's University. Both of these suggestions are improvements upon the recommendation of the syndicate. But the ideal plan is that suggested by the Bishop of Durham, whose knowledge of Cambridge is perhaps greater than that of any other man. He thinks that "the time has now come for dealing comprehensively with the whole question," and proposes that a University for women should be founded, with a charter to grant degrees, and so constituted as to meet all the requirements for the higher education of women. If this could only be established, all existing colleges for women might be affiliated to it if they saw fit.

Undoubtedly the present is a crisis in the history of higher education. Oxford has already spoken against the proposal of mixed Universities with no uncertain voice. It will be not from any aversion to the fullest progress of women's education, but from hearty desire to forward it in every best way, that members of Cambridge University will vote positively against this disastrous motion whenever it is brought before the Senate by its well-meaning but misguided supporters.

THE REVENUE AND THE SURPLUS.

The revenue returns for the financial year just closed amount to £103,950,000. This is an increase of £1,976,000 over the receipts of the previous year, and exceeds by £3,470,000 the estimate of the Chancellor of the Exchequer. Thus the tide of national prosperity continues to flow. We are assured, however, that this large balance cannot be used to lessen the present high rate of income-tax. Voluntary schools and necessitous Board schools will swallow up the greater part of a million, while expenditure under the Agricultural Rating Act will soon reach

seven figures. A surplus of about £900,000 will probably be the most at the disposal of the Chancellor of the Exchequer, a sum resembling Mother Shipton's bonnet-strings—too long to tie once, and too short to tie twice; *i.e.*, too small for any important fiscal purpose, yet too large to be disregarded.

We have it upon our mind to mention in this connection the debate in the House of Commons on March 24 upon the taxation of clerical incomes. Mr. Round, the member for the Harwich Division of Essex, showed that more than half of the incumbents in England and Wales receive a stipend of less than £130 *per annum*. Notwithstanding this, their tithe rent-charge is subject to a threefold taxation, namely, income-tax, land-tax, and rates. Necessary outgoings, such as the stipend of a curate, procure no relief in assessment. This inequality has long been felt as a hard and grievous burden.

The Agricultural Rating Act of last year was passed for the relief of those suffering from agricultural depression. Now the rural clergy are among the greatest sufferers, yet they obtain no help under the Act because their holding is not directly land, but tithe rent-charge. The distinction is altogether academical. That tithe and tithe rent-charge should be rated for the relief of the poor is undeniably just. It has been customary from 1601 and 1836 respectively. But why those who receive nine-tenths of the income from land should be relieved under the Agricultural Rating Act, while the clergy, who receive only the remaining tenth, should be unrelieved, seems neither logical nor fair. We trust that the sympathetic manner in which Mr. Round's motion was received by Sir Michael Hicks-Beach and by Ministerialists generally, will lead to the inclusion of tithe rent-charge in the scheme of relief now in operation under the Agricultural Rating Act. In no better direction could some of the Chancellor of the Exchequer's surplus be directed.

S.P.G., 1896.

The Society for the Propagation of the Gospel has ended its 195th year. It has from the first pursued the plan of making religious provision for our colonists and settlers, such churches becoming eventually the bases for extending direct missionary work. Its first work was to provide missions for English traders at Archangel and Moscow in 1701. From 1702 the Society's missionaries laboured among our American colonies, until they became the United States in 1784. This indebtedness was cordially acknowledged by the Episcopal Church of the United States at its recent Triennial Convention, by a motion which expressed "with deep and unfeigned gratitude that whatever this Church has been in the past, is now, or will be in the future, is largely due, under God, to the long-continued nursing, care, and protection of the venerable Society." Such a fact forms a strong bond of union between the two countries. Many of our Colonial Churches, which have been founded and fostered by the S.P.G., are now able to maintain themselves. Hence the larger portion of the Society's income, which now amounts to £133,516, is spent on the evangelization of the heathen and on educational and medical work. Red Indians of North America, Kaffirs of

Africa, natives of India, of China, of Japan, of Madagascar, and the Isles of the Sea hear the Gospel from the lips of the missionaries of this society. It employs 763 missionaries, of whom 12 are bishops and 178 are natives of the countries in which they labour.

THE BISHOP OF NEWCASTLE ON THE C.P.A.S.

As chairman at the annual meeting of the Newcastle Auxiliary of the Church Pastoral Aid Society, the Bishop spoke in warm commendation of the Society's work. He observed that in the Church they did some things better in pairs. They had two Societies for Foreign Missions and two for Home Missions; and, viewed from a broad standpoint, these varieties of organization enlisted a wider amount of interest and co-operation than single societies could effect. His own diocese was greatly indebted to the C.P.A.S. It had received £650 in the past year, but it had only returned £330. Some people had objected to that principle of the Society which required that its committee should be fully satisfied as to the character and qualifications of the agents which it employed. They held that it was better for the incumbent to select his fellow-worker without any restriction, subject only to the control of the Ordinary. But in his opinion he held it to be perfectly legitimate for the Society to take steps to assure itself that those receiving its grants were such as the subscribers of the Society would desire to see employed. He trusted that the returns from his diocese would very largely increase in the future.

A JANSENIST VIEW OF ANGLICAN ORDERS.

One reply to the Archbishops' letter on Anglican Orders, which was addressed to the Bishops of the Catholic Church, has already arrived. It is from the Jansenist Archbishop of Utrecht, the spiritual head of a small and schismatic church which claims to be Catholic in doctrine, acknowledges the Primacy of the Papal See, but holds that the Pope is subject to the authority of a General Council. The Dutch prelate points out that the Thirty-Nine Articles of the Anglican Church expressly declare against Transubstantiation, and that therefore there is in her ordinal no donation of the power to offer the Sacrifice of the Mass. Accordingly, he expresses his opinion that her orders are not valid in a Catholic sense, though he wishes to suspend judgment for the decision of the whole Church. It is refreshing to have the Thirty-Nine Articles for once placed in their rightful and authoritative position. The Archbishop declares that there can be no question of reunion until we renounce them. This is just the position in which we are content to remain.

SLAVERY IN ZANZIBAR AND PEMBA.

A Parliamentary paper has just been issued respecting slavery in the islands of Zanzibar and Pemba. The British Agent at Zanzibar has been ordered to tender the following advice to the Sultan: A decree should be at once issued abolishing the legal status of slavery. Assurance should be given that no interference with family life is contemplated. The

form of apprentice labour is deprecated. Those holding slaves under Seyyid Ali's decree of 1890 should receive compensation, and the money should not be seizable for past debt. Her Majesty's Government are willing to help the Zanzibar Government to effect these measures without injustice to individuals, and without detriment to the public welfare. Mr. Hardinge has telegraphed from Zanzibar to say that the Sultan accepts the proposed decree, and will himself call together the leading Arabs and explain the measures to them.

CHURCH DEFENCE.

In the autumn of last year the Church Defence Institution and the Central Church Committee were amalgamated into one body, styled the Church Committee for Church Defence and Church Instruction. At the annual meeting it was reported that upwards of 1,000 lectures had been delivered during the past year. The Archbishop of Canterbury, who presided, strongly urged the necessity of continuing the work of instruction in the history and nature of the English Church.

APPOINTMENT.

The vacant deanery of St. David's has been filled by the appointment of the Ven. David Howell, B.D., Canon of St. Asaph, Archdeacon of Wrexham, and Vicar of Gresford. The new dean was ordained deacon in 1855 to the curacy of Neath. He was an Assistant Secretary of the Church Pastoral Aid Society from 1857 to 1861, when he became Vicar of Pwllheli. For ten years he was Vicar of St. John's, Cardiff, and Vicar of Wrexham from 1875 to 1891. He became a Canon of St. Asaph in 1885, Archdeacon of Wrexham in 1889, and Examining Chaplain to the Bishop. Archbishop Tait conferred the degree of B.D. upon him in 1878. He is well known as an eloquent speaker, and at the time of the Welsh Disestablishment crisis he rendered invaluable service.



Obituary.

DEATH OF THE ARCHBISHOP OF DUBLIN.

THE Right Hon. and Most Rev. William Conyngham Plunket, Lord Archbishop of Dublin, died on the morning of April 1 at the Palace, St. Stephen's Green, Dublin, after a short illness. The late Archbishop was the eldest son of John, third Baron Plunket, and was born in 1828. His school education was at Cheltenham College, where he came under the influence of Dr. Close, afterwards Dean of Carlisle, and to this he owed much of his subsequent warm attachment to Evangelical doctrine and principles. He graduated at Trinity College, Dublin, B.A. in 1853, M.A. in 1864. His health did not allow of his taking honours. Ordained in 1857, he became Rector of Kilmoylan the following year, and laboured

there until 1864, acting at the same time as chaplain to his uncle the Bishop of Tuam. He married in 1863 Annie, only daughter of Sir Benjamin Lee Guinness, Bart., by whom he had two sons and four daughters. His eldest son, who succeeds as fifth Lord Plunket, married in 1894 the Lady Victoria, daughter of the Marquis of Dufferin and Ava.

In 1869 Mr. Gladstone's Bill for the disestablishment and disendowment of the Irish Church became law, and this gave the future Archbishop excellent scope for his powers. He was now associated with St. Patrick's Cathedral as Treasurer and Precentor. He threw himself into the work of reconstructing the organization of the Church of Ireland with unflagging industry and courageous hopefulness. The excellent constitution of that Church bears everywhere traces of his views and influence. In 1871 his father died, and he became the fourth Baron. In 1876 the Diocesan Synod of Meath elected him as ninety-first Bishop; and when Archbishop Trench resigned in 1884, the united synods chose him as the sixty-first Archbishop of Dublin.

From his first official connection with Dublin Archbishop Plunket zealously forwarded the cause of education. The Church of Ireland Training College in Kildare Place owes its existence to him. Many other schools and institutions found in him a practical supporter. During recent years he has worked as one of the Commissioners for National Education. He was instrumental in founding the West Connaught Endowment Society, which built several churches in the West of Ireland, and he even took a close interest in the Irish Church Missionary Society to Roman Catholics. He has taken a leading part in the Protestant movement in Spain and Portugal, which culminated in 1894 in the consecration of Señor Cabrera, a converted Spanish monk, to be first Bishop of the Church at Madrid. The Archbishop was to have spoken upon the subject at the Lambeth Conference had he lived.

In politics he was a true patriot. He believed in his countrymen and in the future of his country. In his private religious convictions he was ever an Evangelical. But though his personal opinions were strong, he refused as a Bishop to side with only one portion of his clergy, and showed the utmost Christian kindness and fairness to all. During the twenty years in which he held high ecclesiastical position he earned the warm esteem of those he ruled. His tolerance, his gentle courtesy and considerateness, his accessibility, his hospitality, all made him beloved. He was not a clever man, but an indefatigable worker. He was not a brilliant speaker, but his deliberateness and clearness made him effective. He was essentially a good and conscientious man, gracious and thoughtful, and the moral loss of the Irish Church from his death is very great.

