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

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

THE

CHURCHMAN

JULY, 1880.

ART. I.—THE ORNAMENTS RUBRIC.

ITS HISTORY AND LEGAL INTERPRETATION IN THE LIGHT OF RECENT PUBLICATIONS.[1]

MY object in writing this Paper is twofold: to vindicate the decision of the Folkestone case against the strictures of Mr. James Parker; and with his aid and that of Lord Selborne, Mr. Milton, and Canon Swainson, to clear up some historical difficulties connected with the Rubric; putting the matter in as plain a manner as possible, so that the substantial justice of the decision may be clear even to those who are not "learned in the law."

As some take a distinction between Church Law and State Law, I may point out that *under the former*, there is no difficulty at all about the present question, for any rule or order which may have sanctioned the vestments must long since have been *abrogated by disuser*.[2] But by the Law of the *State* it is otherwise: and therefore, as we are under the State, we have only to inquire about the meaning of the Rubric according to the law of the State, of which indeed it was entirely the creature. Here then I admit that, judging only by the words, the contention of the

[1] I refer especially to the following:—
1. The Folkestone Ritual Case.
2. Mr. James Parker's Introduction to Revisions.
3. Lord Selborne's Notes.
4. Mr. James Parker's Letter to Lord Selborne and Postscript.
5. Rev. W. Milton's Letter to Lord Selborne.
6. Canon Swainson's Historical Inquiry.

For brevity also I must assume that my readers know something of the history of the controversy. Among the many earlier publications relating to it, I may refer to a pamphlet of my own ("The Vestments and the Rubric," 1867).

[2] "The Law of the Church on Ritual," by the Bishop of Lincoln.

Ritualists is plausible. And, as long ago as 1867, I wrote to the *Times*, to urge that the Rubric should be revised and made to correspond in words with what I believed, and do still believe to be, its real meaning. Such a revision then made would have saved much expense and much heart-burning.

We ought not perhaps to wonder that the decision was not received with universal satisfaction. Those who have formed a very strong opinion, are, for a time, generally dissatisfied with a decision which goes against them. And so, in this case, many people maintained stoutly that the judges were wrong. But this feeling would most likely have subsided, if the researches of Mr. James Parker had not been affirmed by himself and believed by others to have proved that the grounds of the decision were wrong.

Lord Selborne, Mr. Milton, and now Canon Swainson, have to a great extent answered Mr. Parker; but Lord Selborne is by his position restrained from taking up the legal question. And both as a matter of law and of history, I think there is yet further light to be thrown on the question.[1] And surely, when the Church has so much work to do, and so many enemies to fight, and is in so great danger by her "unhappy divisions," I cannot be wrong in attempting to remove even one of the many bones of contention. For one sore left unhealed is a source of irritation and division, and therefore of weakness. And I appeal to those who are called "high" as well as those who are called "low," to consider the matter fairly and dispassionately.

For our present purpose the Rubric must be considered as part of the Act of Uniformity of 1662. And for its interpretation we must, as Blackstone teaches us, "enquire and find out by the most certain signs, *what was the intention of the legislators at the time when the law was made.*" (Comm. i. 59.)

It is therefore not enough for us to ascertain what the words mean in themselves. For if the legislators of 1662 used them in one sense, and we take them in another, even though it be a more correct one, we make ourselves legislators instead of them.

A simple illustration will show the justice of this rule. Suppose I take a liking to a lad whom I believe to be the son of A. B., and leave him a legacy so describing him. After my death it turns out that A. B. had only one son, who had run away,

[1] The confusion, as well as unrest, which exists in the minds of many, is proved by what took place in the Southern Convocation last year. It was assumed that the legal question might be reopened. A desire was expressed that nothing should be done to prevent this. But a resolution was passed to add to the rubric a note, WHICH WOULD HAVE LEGALIZED THE VESTMENTS!!

and of whom it appears I had never heard, and that he had adopted this lad in his place. The words of my will are perfectly clear. But any court in the world would construe the will, not according to the words, but according to my intention.

In the present case the words are certainly not clear *in themselves*. We must go back at all events to the history of the year 1549, to ascertain their meaning. Now there is this further source of uncertainty, or at least difficulty, that the clause was not a new one in 1662. It was a continuation, with some verbal alterations which at first sight seem very trivial, of one which had existed since 1559. This original Rubric again had referred to, and derived its validity from, a certain section in Queen Elizabeth's Act of Uniformity. And it is an obvious rule, that the interpretation of an old clause which is repeated with or without alteration in a later Act, is not necessarily the same as if it was altogether new. Hence the question resolves itself into these two: First, what was the law before 1662; secondly, whether any and what alteration in the law was effected in 1662.

I. Mr. Parker considers that there is no question about the original meaning of the Rubric, or rather the corresponding Section of the Act, and that it refers to Edward's First Prayer Book. But some of the extreme Ritualists think it refers to what the law was before that Prayer Book came out (see *Church Quarterly*, vol. viii. p. 474); and Mr. Milton thinks that it never legalized the chasuble or alb at all. But assuming that Mr. Parker's view is correct as to its original meaning, another question arises as to the power given to the Queen of making "other order."

The Act directs that the ornaments shall be used "until other order" shall be taken by the authority of the Queen, with the consent of certain Commissioners or of the Metropolitan. Mr. Parker contends that such order was never taken.

His first argument, and one which he lays great stress on, is this: that as the Queen in 1561 exercised in a very formal way another power given to her by the same Act, she is not likely to have exercised *this* power except with the same formalities; and that as there is no evidence of her ever having done this, that which goes to show that she exercised the power in a different way, must be erroneous. But this argument, as an *à priori* one, resting on a mere presumption, needs no refutation. Naturally, however, he devotes his main strength to disprove the authority of the "Advertisements," as it was this document which the Judicial Committee considered to be the "other order" referred to in the Act.

And his first argument is this: that whereas the Advertisements are now quoted as an entirely new order, by which a great

change was made in the law of ornaments, nothing having been done previously since the passing of the Act, they were—

> In the main a repetition of injunctions or orders previously issued, the principle and main features of which may be found in those issued by Queen Elizabeth in 1559, with variations and modifications suited to the requirements of the time.—*Letter to Lord Selborne*, p. 17.

Now suppose this to be true, as I believe it is, it does not invalidate the decision. If the Advertisements conform to the requisitions of the Act, then, as the Injunctions were not clearly expressed, and it was not clear that they had the requisite consent, the judges did right in resting their decision on the latter and not the earlier document. But as a matter of history it seems to me that the alteration, which in the Folkestone case is attributed to the Advertisements, was, by the Queen herself and by those who acted under her, considered to have been made by the 30th Injunction of 1559. Mr. Parker attempts to disprove this, by maintaining that that Injunction referred only to the "apparel" not the "vestments;" which he says are "distinct." (Letter, p. 73.) But in this he is clearly wrong. (1) Of a document which he quotes in p. 84, he kindly gives the original Latin, in which the habits ordered to be worn out of church and those to be used at the Lord's Supper are both called by the same word, "*vestes.*" (2) In his quotation of this Injunction in p. 21, he omits the words on which the question hangs, namely, "*in all places and assemblies both in the Church and without.*" (3) The Injunction, in speaking of the habits used "in the *latter* year of King Edward," seems to refer to the change made under King Edward's Second Prayer-Book, by which the surplice was ordered, and albs, vestments and copes forbidden.[1] The Bishops, soon after the Injunctions came out, prepared "Interpretations" for the better explaining of what was obscure in them. And in these Interpretations they say "there is to be used only one apparel, as the cope in the Lord's Supper, and the surplice in all other ministrations." Here they call the cope and surplice by the term "apparel;" and they show that these things are in their opinion treated of in the Injunctions which they thus interpret. (5) There are other authoritative documents quoted by Mr. Parker himself, in which the surplice is treated

[1] I am justified in this inference by the language of Bishop Madox's Vindication, published in 1733, and quoted in Soames's "Elizabethan Religious History," p. 28. He says: "The Protestant habits worn in King Edward's time, *in the last year of his reign* . . . were . . . gown, cap, tippet, or scarf . . . . and in the Church a white surplice." I notice also that Mr. Parker, though he contends that the Injunction only referred to the ordinary walking dress, does not attempt to prove that there was *in this respect* any difference between what was worn in the earlier and later years of Edward's reign.

as being ordered by the Injunctions. I refer to Archbishop Parker's Articles (Letter, p. 60); and Bishop Cox's Injunction (*ib.* p. 62). And in p. 71, Mr. Parker, quoting Gualter's letter to Humphrey, admits that the cope and surplice *were understood* to have been ordained by the Injunctions of 1559.

If then there was a general opinion to this effect, and if those who were most likely to know what the Queen meant by her Injunctions, considered that they dealt with the dress of the clergy in their ministrations as well as in their walking abroad, we have at least some evidence that this really was her intention. Though before the passing of the Act, (May 8) she might, both from her own prepossessions and from a desire to conciliate the Romish party, desire to have vestments of Edward's First Book, she might have found before the 24th of June (the probable date of the Injunctions being issued) that the opposition of the Protestants was more to be feared than that of the Romanists, and that she was more likely to succeed in carrying the ornaments of the "latter year" of Edward than those of the second year.

I press this point as absolutely necessary to the right understanding of the history, and the only hypothesis by which the facts can be reconciled.

It is true that these Injunctions were issued by the Queen as under her own prerogative, and says nothing about the advice of the Commissioners. She disliked that restriction, and wished to be recognised as an untrammelled sovereign. But she was quite clever enough and prudent enough to comply with the condition, while she assumed to be independent of it.[1] And as the Injunctions were issued with express reference to the Queen's general Visitation, for which Commissioners were appointed, and as about the same time a general Commission was also appointed (Swainson, p. 21), it is highly probable that their "advice" was obtained. But this is not certain. The decision in the Folkestone case, therefore, was most properly made to rest on the Advertisements, and not on the Injunctions.[2]

It is clear that the Queen was not only acted on by different external influences, but also led by a variety of feelings in her

[1] See, in confirmation, the Archbishop's letter to Cecil. (P.S. p. 375).

[2] Whether the history of the Advertisements as given in the judgment is perfectly accurate in all its details, or Mr. Parker is right in his criticisms on certain passages of that judgment, is a matter which does not at all affect the main question. We are told by Solomon that "the heart of kings is unsearchable;" and many different views may be taken of Elizabeth's conduct in this matter. But I think it appears most consistent if we suppose that she looked on these Advertisements, not as an altogether new thing, but as a step towards the carrying out and enforcing of the law as laid down in the Rubric and Injunctions, a clearer definition and some slight modification of the law being made for that purpose.

own mind. She liked a good deal of outward display, but she was willing to abate something of this, in order to secure what she valued much more, namely, obedience and uniformity. These, if possible, she was determined to have: but at the same time she wanted to keep up her popularity, and to throw the odium of stringent measures on the Bishops. Therefore she made them take as on their own authority the measures which she had ordered. This entirely accounts for all that Mr. Parker makes so much of. The facts he has collected with great diligence only show the success of the Queen's manœuvre.

But the policy which led her to conceal her part in the affair, and not to give the "sign manual" behind which the Archbishop might have sheltered himself, only lasted for a time. "The Parker Correspondence" (P.S. p. 386) gives a letter from her to the Archbishop, dated August 28th, 1571, which seems to me unmistakable.[1] The Queen speaks indeed of her Injunctions as the declaration and explanation of the law; but as all that the Archbishop had done for uniformity since the Advertisements, was done under them, it follows that the Queen, in sanctioning his action, sanctioned the Advertisements.

Looked at in this light, the whole history is consistent. Whether the Queen gave her sanction to the Advertisements before they were issued or afterwards is immaterial. In either case their legal validity is established. Of her subsequent sanction there are many evidences, besides the letter of Aug. 1571. I may specially notice Whitgift's Articles of 1583–4, which were laid before the Queen, and afterwards with some alterations published by her authority. (Lord Selborne's Notes, p. 25, and App.) The original draft as presented to the Queen with mar-

[1] "When we required you as the Metropolitan, and the principal person in our commission for causes ecclesiastical, to have good regard that such uniform order in the Divine service and rules of the Church might be duly kept as by the laws in that behalf is provided, and by our Injunctions also declared and explained; and that you should call unto you for your assistance certain of our Bishops to reform the abuses and disorders of sundry persons seeking to make alteration therein: we understanding that with the help of the Bishops of Winchester and Ely, and some others, ye have well entered into some convenient reformation of things disordered, and that now the said Bishop of Ely is repaired into his diocese whereby you shall want his assistance: we minding earnestly to have a uniformity prescribed by our laws and Injunctions, and that none should be suffered to decline either on the left or on the right hand from the direct line limited by authority of our said laws and Injunctions, do earnestly, by our authority royal, will and charge you by all means lawful to proceed herein as you have begun.

"And for your assistance we will that you shall, by authority hereof, and in our name, send for the Bishops of London and Sarum and communicate these our letters with them and straightly charge them to assist you," &c.

ginal notes for her consideration, and the alterations afterwards made, seem conclusive. In the draft the Advertisements are referred to as the leading authority. In the Articles as printed, the reference to the Advertisements remains, the Injunctions being coupled with them. In the marginal notes the two documents had also been coupled together, *the Advertisements being expressly stated to have been set out by her Majesty's authority.* What further evidence can be needed I am at a loss to conceive. Mr. Parker himself admits (Letter, p. 66) that "towards the end of Elizabeth's reign the Advertisements seem to be more directly referred to as authoritative." And this in itself is evidence that sooner or later they must have been authorized by the Queen.

On Mr. Parker's attempt to prove that the Advertisements themselves were not intended to limit the ornaments, but only to bring them *up to* a certain standard, while divergence *beyond* that standard was allowed, I need say very little. Whatever other things the Queen might wish for, her main endeavour was to secure uniformity in this matter of vestments, "and that none should be suffered to decline either on the left or right hand." (Her Letter of 28th August, 1571, as above.)

I now pause to notice more particularly the other works mentioned at the beginning of this paper. For lack of room I must do this very briefly. Indeed, their value consists for the most part of a number of details, which for their full effect ought to be taken together.

Lord Selborne's Notes, suggested by the perusal of Mr. Parker's earlier publication, are, I need not say, most clear, as far as they go. But they could not anticipate the difficulties which Mr. Parker has since raised. Lord Selborne shows (pp. 11, 12) the STATE origin of the ornaments Rubric; also the general rejection of albs and chasubles, and the partial disuse of copes from 1559 to 1664. He also notices the then prevalent opinion, that the 30th Injunction excluded the albs, &c., though "without much inquiry into the sufficiency of that authority for such a purpose." Lord Selborne affirms the authority of the Advertisements, dwelling much on the Articles of 1584, as showing that the Advertisements had been sanctioned by her.

Mr. Milton's pamphlet is, with one exception, very forcible. He shows in several particulars the fallacy of Mr. Parker's reasoning. And he goes very near to establish the legal authority of the Injunctions as a duly qualified order under the Act, though he quotes them for another purpose. But he adopts as a solution of the difficulty, a rendering of the Rubric, which I cannot think sound—namely, that it did not *in itself* legalize the albs, &c. It is remarkable, that in order to fortify this construction of the Rubric by showing what was done *under it*,

he produces evidence of what was done by the Commissioners in the Queen's Visitation of 1559, when what was done may have been done *under the Injunction.*

Canon Swainson's "Inquiry" is limited to Queen Elizabeth's reign. But within that period it contains a vast repertory of facts and documents, which throw very great light on our present subject. On the Injunctions, indeed, he has bestowed less attention than might have been expected. And I think he must have been misled by Mr. Parker's imperfect account of the 30th, as he inserts, parenthetically, in his brief account of the habits which it ordered to be worn (p. 18), the words ("clearly out of doors"), whereas the Injunction expressly says, "both in the Church and without." But in all other respects his "Inquiry" is most valuable. He completely destroys the force of Mr. Parker's comparison between the order given by the Queen in 1561, and that in 1564–5, under which the Advertisements were made. He shows, first, that the contrast which Mr. Parker draws is unfair, as being between a copy of the Queen's Letter of 1561, as it had been received by the Archbishop, and a draft (though not the original one) of the Letter of 1565, before it had been sent, the one being a copy of a finished, the other of an unfinished letter, as the actual letters in both cases are lost. And he shows that in all the most important particulars there was not a contrast, but a very great similarity between the two transactions. He shows further, by induction from a large number of instances, that the Queen's general way of acting was quite in accordance with that which she pursued in relation to the Advertisements. And the impression derived from the whole is, that Mr. Parker's notion of a letter concocted between Cecil and the Archbishop, and then sent to the latter as from the Queen, without her knowing anything about it, is absurd to the greatest degree.

I am glad also to see that Canon Swainson confirms my view of the Queen's Letter of August, 1571, of which he says: "I cannot but think that" it "refers to the previous letter of January 25th, 1565, and the Advertisements which resulted from it."

Leaving now the reign of Queen Elizabeth, we must pause for a moment at the Canons of 1603, as they contain evidence of what the law was then considered to be by the highest authorities in the Church.

First, the Canons not only follow in the lines marked out by the Advertisements, but quote them as a leading authority. (Canon 24.) Secondly, Canon 58 is inconsistent with the notion that copes might be worn in parish churches. For ministers who are not graduates are forbidden to wear hoods, and only permitted to wear "upon their surplices some decent tippet of black, *so it be not silk.*" This restriction would be utterly absurd if it was

lawful for a non-graduate minister to wear a gorgeous cope of silk, satin, or velvet.

II. Now we proceed to the reign of Charles II. And on this I make the following observations:—

1. It is clear that the *general* practice of the Church had, from the early part of Queen Elizabeth's reign, been in accordance with what I consider to have been the law under the Injunctions and Advertisements.

2. Edward's First Prayer Book had become very scarce, and was practically unknown to the Church and the nation at large.

3. Although Cosin *in his younger days* had taken up the idea that the "vestments" were still legal, and ought to be worn, the notes in which he expressed that idea, had not been published, and were never published, till long after his death. He had in a subsequent note expressed at least a doubt as to the correctness of his former impression; and the probability is, that in 1662 he had forgotten all about it. His exile in France, and his intercourse with the French Protestants, had greatly modified his views, and he is mentioned by Baxter as one willing to make concession. There is no evidence that he then or afterwards considered the vestments legal.

4. The diligence of some Puritans had ferretted out from old books some notions about the vestments, and they tried to frighten people from the surplice by talking about copes, &c. But the highest Churchmen only spoke of the surplice. They professed to be satisfied with the Church as it had been before the rebellion. And whatever may have been the case with some few clerical antiquarians, it is certain that in the minds of the great body, whether in Convocation or Parliament, the surplice was the only thing really thought of.

Now I ask any candid man to answer this question. If Convocation had ventured in their revision to specify the ornaments in detail, and had ordered the clergy to wear albs and chasubles, would it have passed either House of Parliament? Would there not have been a storm of indignation? And is it not then certain that in the *intention of the Legislature*, surplices, and surplices only, were ordered? And although we may now think, or even know, that the words of the Rubric include other "vestments," yet when we consider that for the most part the surplice only had in fact been worn since the very year 1559, when the Rubric was first framed, that the changes in the law effected by Queen Elizabeth's Injunctions and Advertisements were gradual, and rather followed the custom than led it, and that the whole revision was greatly hurried over; and, as far as appears, no public attention was called to the wording of the Rubric, we shall have little hesitation in concluding that the Legislature must have supposed that the reference in the Rubric really

included the surplice only, and that they meant this, and this only, to be worn.

This conclusion is strongly fortified by the fact that the Canons of 1603 were reprinted in 1660 and 1662 ("The Vestments and the Rubrics," p. 31), and ordered by the King to be observed.

It is, I think, admitted on all hands, that the whole evidence of what was done under the Act of 1662 negatives the legality of the "vestments," except on the supposition that the authorities of the Church thought themselves at liberty to enforce only a part of what they knew that the law commanded. It is very difficult to understand how this supposition can be seriously entertained. But I may notice two things: First, it necessitates the assumption, that every individual Bishop exercised universally and by universal consent, that *power of dispensation* which was peremptorily refused to the King!! Secondly, it is not enough to show, even if it could be shown, that Bishop Cosin and a few other Churchmen in their "inner consciousness," knew what Edward's First Prayer-Book had ordered, and what the words of the Rubric included, unless it can also be shown that the facts are consistent with a general knowledge of this by the Legislature. The contrary of both these things is clear.

On the whole then, I think I have shown, 1st, that Queen Elizabeth did by her Injunctions and Advertisements taken together legally abolish the "vestments;" and 2nd, that, according to the true intention of the Legislature of 1662, the "vestments" were not then, and are not now, legal ornaments of the Minister.[1]

ROBERT W. KENNION.

---

[1] I ought perhaps to notice a curious dilemma which Mr. Parker has fallen into. His main argument would lead us to suppose that the law stands as it did in 1549, under Edward's First Prayer-Book, no "other order" having been taken within the terms of the Act. But throughout, he says comparatively little of albs and chasubles. And in p. 190 he makes this most remarkable admission. He says: "We are now dealing with the cope (since albs and chasubles have already been declared illegal on other grounds"). I cannot find anything on which to ground this, unless it refers to the Bishops' "Interpretations." If this is what he means, I may thank him for it, and quote him as an authority for the view that the "Interpretations," which have no independent legal validity, not only show the true meaning of the Injunctions, but prove that the latter had the requisite consent to make them legal.

ART. II.—THE RISE OF THE HUGUENOTS.

1. *History of the Rise of the Huguenots.* By HENRY M. BAIRD, Professor in the University of the City of New York. Two volumes, pp. 577, 681. Hodder and Stoughton. 1880.
2. *History of the Reformation in the Sixteenth Century.* By J. H. MERLE D'AUBIGNÉ, D.D. Pp. 867. Simpkin, Marshall and Co.
3. *Life of Marguerite d'Angoulême, Queen of Navarre.* By MARTHA WALKER FREER. Two volumes, pp. 352, 331. Hurst and Blackett. 1856.
4. *Life of Jeanne d'Albret, Queen of Navarre.* By MARTHA WALKER FREER. Two volumes, pp. 361, 359. Hurst and Blackett .1855.

A DISTINGUISHED ecclesiastic of the Church of Rome once remarked that his Church had recruited her members from all sects and religions but one. No Calvinist was ever known to have joined the ranks of the Papacy. Whether the statement were not a little too sweeping may perhaps be questioned; but the observation shows that Rome looks upon that phase of Protestantism, known as Calvinism, as especially antagonistic to her. And in France, during the struggle of the Reformation—which may be said, roughly speaking, to have lasted from the accession of Francis I. to the Edict of Nantes—Calvinist and Huguenot were interchangeable terms.

As to the origin and meaning of the word Huguenot antiquaries are so much at variance that the wisest course is to let the matter alone.

There is remarkable similarity between the condition of the world at the time of the Advent of Christ, and its condition at the time of the Reformation. Might it not be justly added that the same condition is reproduced for a third time in these last days, with respect to many, though not all, of the details? In both of the earlier instances civilized society had become somewhat like a seething volcano, covered with a veil of flowers. There was the usual division of the religious world into Pharisees and Sadducees, and the usual division of the secular world into worshippers of pleasure and worshippers of Mammon, both alike votaries of self. These divisions were patent on the surface. But beneath this crust lay a fearful gulf of molten lava, ready at any moment to break forth and overwhelm religion and society alike. With a few bright exceptions, such principles as honesty, disinterestedness, true love, and even common morality, were scarcely to be found anywhere. Expediency

was the rule of all lives. No sense of responsibility to God restrained either the oppressions of the great, or the murmurings and evasions of duty practised by the mean. And worst of all were the lives of the clergy.

Beneath this moral and social gulf, a political gulf, a deeper depth, had been slowly opening, and was now ripe for eruption. The old traditions of paternal government, and passive obedience, and popular ignorance, were gradually, but universally, passing away. The long night of the Middle Ages was beginning to be tinged by the streaks of rosy dawn. Ignorance was to give place to knowledge, oppression to freedom, superstition to truth. Was it any marvel if here and there the birds waked their morning song—if here and there a man roused himself from slumber? On those first awakeners it mainly depended, under God, whether the ignorance was to give place to airy speculations rather than wisdom, whether the liberty was to degenerate into lawless license, whether the superstition was to despise truth and culminate in Atheism.

At this junction, says D'Aubigné, "God raised up the Reformation, and Christianity was saved."

It was in France that the awakening first took place. "Neither to Switzerland, nor to Germany, belongs the honour of having begun this work, although hitherto these two countries alone have contended for it. This honour belongs to France."

"The Gallican Church," writes Professor Baird, "had for many centuries been distinguished for a manly defence of its liberties against the encroachment of the Papal Court. Tenacious of the maintenance of doctrinal unity with the See of Rome, the French prelates early met the growing assumption of the Popes with determined courage." (Vol. i. p. 25.) Strange to say, "the first decided step in repressing the arrogant claims of the Papal See was taken by a monarch whose singular merits have been deemed worthy of canonization by the Roman Church. Louis IX.," better known as St. Louis, "had witnessed with alarm the rapid strides of the Papacy towards universal dominion. . . . . He issued, in 1268, a solemn edict," in which he stated that France had always been subject to the sole jurisdiction of God Almighty, and so he desired it to remain. About a quarter of a century later, when Philippe IV. appealed to the States-General, "all the three orders indignantly repudiated the suggestion that their country had ever stood to the Papacy in the relation of a fief."

The French Reformation, like most great movements, began with one man, and that one of no consequence in the eyes of the world. Jacques Lefèvre, a little, insignificant-looking man, of plebeian Picard origin, was the person who first set in motion the golden ball which was to roll through all the world,

but stronger hands than his were quickly laid upon it, and furnished the continued impetus:—stronger, not merely as to position in the world, but as to force of character, and power of heroism. Lefèvre, a professor in the University of Paris, though an enlightened man, was by no means strong-souled. If it were his to initiate the action, it was reserved for others to brave the consequences. He never fell away, but he seems to have been almost frightened at the result of his own proceedings. He had not calculated on going quite so fast, nor quite so far. In his old age, spent in the safe shelter of the Court of Nérac, under the protection of the Queen of Navarre, Lefèvre expressed bitter regret that he had not done more, and especially that he had not borne more for the cause of that Master who had done so much for him—that he had been too timid and compromising in his dealings with the enemy.

One of Lefèvre's pupils was Guillaume Farel, a scion of a noble family of Dauphiné. It was he who took the torch from the timid hand of his master, and lighted that bonfire which was never to be put out.

Like Luther, these two Reformers began life as abject devotees of Pope and Church. Lefèvre was "unsurpassed in his devotion to images," and Farel tells us of himself, that "the Papacy was not more papal than my heart." Together they made numerous pilgrimages, and offered abundant flowers at the shrines of the saints.

The dispositions of these two men were almost the opposites of each other. They doubtless tempered one another in the work of reformation; but each must have been a source of sore irritation to the other. While Lefèvre resembled the hare, Farel must be symbolized by the lion. Fear or compromise were not in him; indiscretion and recklessness, alas! were very much so.

The light broke on the mind of Lefèvre very gradually. Again, like Luther, the first Scriptural point which he clearly grasped was the cardinal doctrine of justification by faith. Five years before Luther posted his famous theses on the door of the church at Wittemberg, Lefèvre had distinctly enunciated this point in his Commentary on the Epistles of St. Paul. Yet, in 1516, Luther regarded him as "strangely deficient in clear apprehension of spiritual truths," and it was not until 1519 that he was convinced—by his own pupil, Farel—of the unscriptural character of saint-worship, and prayers for the dead.

It seems strange to us, who look back over the whole campaign, as a spectator standing on a hill may take a bird's-eye view of the battle-field, that the Reformers did not at once, and without hesitation, break off from the corrupt system in which they had been brought up. But their eyes were not opened to all the errors of Rome at once. They were like men

walking in a mist, which was slowly clearing, and one landmark after another stood out in succession before them. At the first beginning of the Reformation in all countries, the aim and hope of all was that the needed reforms should arise from within. They entertained no idea, whether nationally or individually, of separating from Rome; their object was to purify her. It was not until a long time had elapsed, and not without the bitterest disappointment, that one after another unwillingly and mournfully recognized that the corruption was ingrain, and that what they had fondly hoped was but a defiled sanctuary had proved to be a house with fretting leprosy in the walls, for which there was no remedy except utter destruction.

Some among the Reformers themselves never arrived at this conclusion. They shrank from it as from a terrible impossibility. Ready to go all lengths of reform short of that, nothing would induce them to pass beyond the barrier.

We have seen that it was in the University of Paris that the first germ of reform arose. But it was a living plant, and it spread rapidly. Other pupils of Lefèvre soon joined him and Farel; and a more illustrious colleague appeared in Guillaume Briçonnet, Bishop of Meaux and Count of Montbrun. But, after all, the chief converts were among those "common people" who heard Christ's words in the sixteenth century with the same manifestations of gladness which characterized them in the first. The wool-carders, weavers, and fullers of Meaux accepted the "new doctrine" with delight. They drank it in as a starving child drinks milk. There was no pause for analysis. God, who had ready for them food which would satisfy their needs, had first evoked within them the sense of want which caused them to recognize it as food. We cannot be too ready to echo the Divine cry, "If any man thirst, let him come unto Me and drink." Yet are we always quite ready enough to perceive that the thirst itself is no mere motion of natural law, but the Divine gift of the Holy Ghost?

The plant had spread, and now it began to climb. The adhesion of the Bishop of Meaux and so many members of the University called the attention of the Court to this new thing. At this time the Royal Family of France consisted of four adults —King Francis I., Queen Claude, his wife, Louise of Savoy, his mother, and Marguerite, Duchess of Alençon, his sister. The Queen may be at once dismissed from consideration, as one of those amiable nonentities who never presume to think for themselves. But the other three were in the habit of thinking for themselves to considerable purpose. They were highly educated, and the training had been bestowed on intellects of a naturally rich order.

The Duchess Marguerite was a Lydia whose heart the Lord

opened, and it became her dearest wish that her mother and brother should share her joy and usefulness. At first nothing seemed more likely. Both were prepared to look favourably on the new doctrine. So long as the object was to oppose the pretensions of the Papacy, which clashed with the prerogatives of the Crown, or to humble the clergy, who were disposed to more self-assertion than was agreeable to the King, he was perfectly ready to go with the Reformers. So long, also, as the Reformation presented itself to his mind—which at first it did—as a literary movement, tending to increase the spread of that knowledge in which he took delight, he was willing to support it with all his power. But when it went further—when the new doctrine touched himself, claimed his heart-loyalty, laid a repressive hand upon his pride, and said "Thou shalt not," to his favourite sins—from that hour Francis I. ceased to further the Reformation. Professor Baird has justly appreciated the three principal motives which induced the King to withdraw his support. He was afraid lest ecclesiastical reformation should lead the way to a political revolution; he hesitated to offend the Pope, whose aid in political affairs was at that time of importance to him; and he resented the pure morality of the Scriptures.

Professor Baird finds a difficulty, amusing to a European mind, though natural enough to an American, in comprehending the position of the King of France in the sixteenth century. His evident puzzled astonishment at the expectation of this one man that all other men would and must obey his pleasure, is so patent as to be comic. But Francis I. looked on this matter in a very different light. The Kings of France, it is not too much to say, were considered by their subjects as little less than superhuman. The Queens, we are gravely told by authority, were anointed in order that they might be made worthy of associating with "the sacred persons of the Kings their spouses." The very idea of resisting an order of this superior being was regarded not merely as improper, but as impossible. Nothing shows this more plainly than the reverential awe with which the Most Christian King was approached, even by his own nearest relations. A perilous position this, for any human being! "Surely Thou didst set them in slippery places."

The hopes of the Reformers might well be aroused when the King appeared to be with them. "I assure you," his sister Marguerite had written to Briçonnet in 1521, "that the King and Madame are entirely decided to let it be known that the truth of God is not heresy." And a little later she alluded to the Bishop's "piteous desires for the Reformation of the Church, to which the King and Madame are more attached than ever." For a time the prospects of the infant Church were indeed

golden. Briçonnet, impulsive and fervent, went far at first—burned all images except the crucifix, widely distributed Lefèvre's translation of the Bible, giving many copies to those who could not afford to buy them, read the Scriptures in French in his churches, and so far as in him lay spread evangelical knowledge throughout his diocese. The books were eagerly bought, the readings attracted vast crowds; the day-labourers hired to help the Meaux farmers carried back the new doctrine to mountain villages and into far provinces. The Reformation was spreading like wild-fire. An attempt, made under the authority of the Parliament of Paris, to stop the Bishop's proceedings, had exactly the contrary effect, for King Francis himself interfered, and declared it his pleasure that his kingdom "should hear the Word of God freely and without hindrance, in the language it understands."

Was it any wonder that Lefèvre triumphantly exulted in "the pervading of a great part of Europe by the pure knowledge of Christ?" Or was it any wonder that Satan felt his sceptre in danger and drew his sword to save it?

Some time before he gave in his adhesion to Lefèvre, the Bishop of Meaux had the misfortune, in pursuing his ecclesiastical reforms, to offend the Franciscan monks. They carried their complaint to the Sorbonne, which, originally a college for theological students, had become so closely attached to the Parliament of Paris, that, for practical purposes, they were virtually a single body. For three hundred years the authority of the Sorbonne had been accepted throughout France as "final on almost all questions affecting the doctrine and practice of the Church." The learned men of the Sorbonne, who adhered to the old doctrine, and in particular one Noël Bédier (more commonly called Béda), an ecclesiastical lawyer who dearly loved hot water, were enraptured with the hope of humiliating the Bishop of Meaux, and overturning the nascent Reformation. They had, however, no desire to make a martyr of Briçonnet: their object was to induce him to recant and join their ranks, which would be for them by far the greater triumph.

The time had arrived when, humanly speaking, the question whether France should become a Protestant country or not rested with two men, the King and the Bishop of Meaux. Had these two been less time-servers—had Francis been less jealous of his power and less attached to his sins, and had Briçonnet been less timid and fearful of martyrdom—humanly speaking, again—France would have been Protestant to-day. And is it too much to say that in that case the succession would in all probability have been sure to the posterity of Francis—that they would have been better and nobler men—that there might have been no Holy League, and no French Revolution? Long years

before, Louise of Savoy had consulted Francisco de Paula, whom she regarded as a prophet, to inquire whether her son would ever be King of France. The answer was remarkable. "Your son, Madame, will be King of France, and will surpass in glory, riches, and honour, all the princes of his age—provided he applies himself to the reformation of the Church; but if he does not diligently devote himself to this affair, he will be a very unfortunate prince." The saint was a shrewd man: but neither Louise nor her son profited by his prediction.

The Bishop of Meaux, thus weighed in the balances, was like his royal master found wanting. He shrank, wavered for a moment, and fell. Condemned by the Sorbonne to public penance, he went back to his diocese to expel the evangelical preachers, to denounce the Lutheran books, and generally to undo the previous work of his tenure of the episcopate. From that day he disappears from history. He hesitated between God and honour, and chose the latter. But he forgot that those who honour God He will honour; and on the page of Reformation history his name is linked with dishonour for ever.

Two results followed the expulsion of the preachers. Those who were scattered abroad, as of old, went everywhere preaching the Word. This had been anticipated. It is said that it was even one of the consolations with which the Bishop soothed his uncomfortable conscience. But the second result surprised and dismayed him. The common people whom the preachers had aroused from the sleep of ages, declined to go to sleep again when requested. "The shepherds had been dispersed, but the flock refused to forsake the fold."

It became necessary, in the eyes of the Sorbonne, to make an example of some of these unreasonable beings. The experiment, of course, was first tried on the lowest stratum. A poor woolcarder of Meaux, Jean Leclerc, whom the Huguenots had come to consider one of their ministers, and who was mighty in the Scriptures, was selected as one of the first scapegoats. It had always been a vexation to the aristocratic soul of Bishop Briçonnet that men should presume to exercise spiritual functions without his episcopal sanction. Doubtless it was irregular, and had circumstances been smoother, undesirable. Yet when a man has to drag another out of a burning house, he does not usually wait till he has apologized for taking the liberty. And Jean Leclerc was particularly irregular and inconvenient in his doings. Not content with tearing down the Pope's Bulls granting indulgences for the jubilee, and substituting a placard describing the Pope in uncompromising language as Antichrist, nor deterred by being whipped and branded in consequence, he actually proceeded to the length of destroying some "holy" images which were the next day to figure in a solemn procession. Arrested on sus-

picion, he boldly confessed the action. The most terrible tortures drew from him no cry of anguish. When the agony must have been at the worst, he lifted up his voice, calm and distinct, as though he were giving forth his text in the pulpit, with "Their idols are silver and gold, the work of men's hands." He went on with the passage. But he was not allowed to finish. Those who stood round, enraged by the fortitude and audacity of the martyr, flung him into the fire, and with those words upon his lips Jean Leclerc went up to God.

The Sorbonne was alarmed. Men do not act thus in behalf of a faith which they hold lightly. And if Leclerc were a fair sample of his co-religionists, to what was the country coming? They went higher, and made a bolder stroke—at Louis de Berquin, a nobleman, and a gentleman of the King's chamber. He had been already before the Sorbonne, and had been saved by the personal interference of his royal master, under the influence of the Duchess Marguerite. But the Sorbonne chose a propitious time for the blow. The King was a prisoner in Spain, and his mother, Louise of Savoy, held the reins of power. At her side was the Chancellor Duprat, a man to whom truth was nothing compared with the interests of the Church. He was careful to instil into the mind of Louise that the recent peasant insurrections in Germany were entirely the work of the Lutherans, with whom reformation was but another word for sedition; that if she continued to protect the Huguenots, she must expect the same kind of thing to spread to France—nay, had it not touched Burgundy and Champagne already? It was a suicidal policy to assist such a movement. And was it not, insinuated the wily priest, a proof of the displeasure of God that King Francis, who had so long withheld just punishment from these heretics, was now languishing in a Spanish prison? The Regent was convinced. She gave up Berquin, entered into friendly relations with the Pope, and sent to request advice of the Sorbonne as to the best means of extirpating heresy. Marguerite, unable to move her mother, sent earnest entreaties for the interference of the King, though a prisoner. Francis responded at once to the appeal of his sister, whose personal influence over him was very great. He sent stringent commands to the Regent that Berquin was to be set free, and the Parliament was to suspend all proceedings against "those men of excellent learning," the Lutherans, until the King himself should return to France. The angry Sorbonne expostulated in vain. Louise replied that both she and they must obey.

At last the King returned; but it was not, as the Huguenots fondly hoped, to put an immediate and final stop to the persecution. Circumstances had altered the case. Francis had been compelled to make extremely hard terms with his captor, and had

only been released by the exchange of his eldest and second sons for himself. His aim now was to obtain the liberation of his children, and to humble the power of the Emperor. For a short time, however, his proceedings gave hope to the Huguenots. He freed Berquin, to the intense disgust of the Sorbonne, recalled Lefèvre, and at the request of his sister, appointed him tutor to his younger children. But it soon became evident to Francis that the aid of the Pope was politically indispensable to the furtherance of his objects. And that was only to be secured by sacrificing the Huguenots. When the Assembly of Notables met at Paris, eight months after the release of the King, he sounded the knell of the French Reformation by assuring the assembly that he was determined not to endure heresies, and would cause them to be wholly extirpated

The Huguenots, deprived of their pastors, we are told by Professor Baird, "continued for years to assemble for mutual encouragement and edification, as they had opportunity, in private houses, in retired valleys or caverns, or in thickets and woods. Their minister was that person of their own number who was seen to be the best versed in the Holy Scriptures. After he had discharged his functions in the humble service, by a simple address of instruction or exhortation, the entire company with one voice supplicated the Almighty for his blessing, and returned to their homes with fervent hopes for the speedy conversion of France to the Gospel. Thus matters stood for about a score of years."

The meeting of the Assembly of Notables was followed by three provincial Councils, of which the Council of Sens was the most important. The "Lutheran heresy" was distinctly dealt with, and strong measures of suppression were passed. Imprisonment for life was to be the portion of obstinate heretics; relapsed priests were to be delivered to the secular arm without a hearing. All persons were ordered to denounce heretics, and any who refused to bear such testimony were to be regarded as heretics themselves.

Before the Council of Sens had concluded its sitting, the heretics gave unpleasant evidence of their existence. An image of the Virgin which stood in a niche at the corner of two streets in Paris, was found thrown down and beheaded. This outrage to their great goddess set the whole University and Court in an uproar. King Francis himself headed a solemn procession which installed in the place of the broken idol an image of solid silver, protected from covetous or iconoclastic fingers by a strong iron grating. But despite this public reparation, the street images and pictures continued to sustain such severe and unaccountable mutilation, that Parliament found it necessary to forbid their erection on exterior walls within ten feet of

the ground. Alas, for the gods which could not protect themselves!

De Berquin, whose courage no hair-breadth escapes could subdue, had soon given fresh offence to the Sorbonne. Determined that their irrepressible enemy should not escape them this time, he was seized, sentenced, and put in the pillory in haste. The remainder of his penalty involved branding and imprisonment for life. But Berquin appealed to the royal master who had hitherto never failed to rescue him. The maddened Sorbonne, set on vengeance, rushed through the forms of a fresh trial and sentence, and before an answer could be received from King Francis, Louis de Berquin, his voice purposely drowned by shouts, had ascended to Heaven in the chariot of fire. A new persecution had begun.

The Huguenot *prêches* were now prohibited, and all evangelical books strictly suppressed. The King's sister, Marguerite, who had recently been married to the King of Navarre, withdrew to her husband's dominions, where she protected her co-religionists to the utmost of her power. King Francis was thoroughly incensed against his Huguenot subjects, and the priests who surrounded him took care to fan the flame. Meanwhile political events succeeded each other with rapidity. Peace was made with the Emperor; the young princes were released; the King married the Emperor's sister. All this while the Sorbonne, now unhindered, "proscribed, censured, and punished with fearless rigour, sure of support from the Government," and even ventured to begin a proceeding for heresy against the venerable Lefèvre, the librarian of the King, the tutor of the Duke of Orleans, and the friend of the Queen of Navarre. The aged Reformer, now eighty-eight years of age, was warned of his danger, and with the help of Marguerite, he obtained the royal permission to leave Blois "on a visit to a friend." This friend, discreetly left unmentioned, was Queen Marguerite herself, in the shelter of whose Court, at Nérac, Lefèvre passed in safety the short remainder of life.

Shortly after this incident, died Louise of Savoy, the King's mother, who had been Regent of France during the minority and captivity of her son. As the rule of her life had been political expediency, she was a favourer or a persecutor of the Huguenots by turns. She was one of the cleverest women of her time, but had very little principle. Yet, as Miss Freer not unreasonably urges, the mother who retained to her life's end the heart-love of such a daughter as the Queen of Navarre, could scarcely be the hard, spiteful, dissolute woman depicted by most modern historians.

It was soon after the death of her mother that Marguerite avowed herself—so far as she can ever be said to have done so—

confessedly a Huguenot, by publishing for the use of her subjects the expurgated Missal which she had long used for herself. It had been translated for her into French by Guillaume Petit, Bishop of Sens, and Confessor of King Francis. All invocations of Virgin or saints were carefully omitted. But this did not content the Queen; nor was she satisfied with gathering around her the little band of exiled preachers—Lefèvre, Farel, Roussel, and others, with the poet Clément Marot. She went further, and drew up a Confession of Faith, termed *La Messe à Sept Points*, which she presented to her brother, earnestly begging him to restore peace to his distracted kingdom by causing the adoption of this creed by the Gallican Church. Marguerite, in common with most Reformers, still hoped for a reform of the Church from within. "They expected the signal for this reformation to proceed from the Supreme Head of the Roman Church: and while they waited, the season when it might have been accomplished, as respected the Church in France, passed away." A still bolder stroke was struck by the determined Queen. She dragged King Francis himself to a Huguenot *prêche*. Of course, her chaplains were exempt from the usual proscription. The sermon was against transubstantiation, and it produced on the King the same effect which (if his words are to be taken seriously) the eloquence of St. Paul produced upon Agrippa. He was "almost persuaded." But into that little rift left by the *almost*, two Cardinals crept subtlely, and succeeded in quite undoing the work of the Huguenot preacher. Since Francis himself had no personal convictions, the work was not difficult on either side. There is one class harder to convince, for any permanent good, than even the honest bigots who think themselves doing God service,—and that is the Gallios, who care for none of these things.

The Sorbonne saw the absolute necessity of extinguishing the influence of the Queen of Navarre. It was by no means an easy task, for she was the only person in the world whom Francis really loved. Other influences might be stronger for the moment, but hers was profound and permanent. And now she was introducing the exiled Huguenot preachers into the chief pulpits of Paris. The exasperated Sorbonne shot out a stream of arrows against her. They put her sacred poems (feigning ignorance of the author) into the list of prohibited books. They attacked her in the yearly play performed at the College of Navarre, which resembled our Winchester play. They persuaded a *curé* to preach a sermon aimed directly at her. But this was quickly stopped. King Francis rapidly indicated a stern determination to allow no affront, even the slightest, to the Queen of Navarre. The Sorbonne was at liberty to interdict *curés* and

burn wool-combers; but his sister must be let alone. Her pleasure was his pleasure.

A scapegoat, however, was found, and in a very eminent place. The Rector of the University himself, Nicholas Cop, for many years a concealed Huguenot, now came to the front in the sermon annually delivered in the Church of the Mathurins, wherein he boldly proclaimed that salvation was the free gift of God, and not to be earned by good works. Warned of his peril, the Rector fled from France, pursued by an offer of three hundred crowns, dead or alive. After his flight, it was discovered that the sermon had been written for him by an obscure young student of the name of Calvin. The Rector and the student were fair game. King Francis admitted himself alarmed at the spread of heresy, and ready to grant the earnest prayer of the Sorbonne for new provisions against it.

A few months earlier—against his own will, and to the dissatisfaction of the whole kingdom—the Dauphin had been married to a girl of fourteen years, the niece of the Pope. She was very beautiful, very clever, and her manners were soft and prepossessing. As the Huguenots of Marseilles watched her landing on the quay, and as the Huguenots of Paris greeted her entrance into the capital, it was not possible for them to foresee that the very demon incarnate of persecution and death had been let loose among them, shrouded in that fair young form of Catherine de Medici.

EMILY S. HOLT.

(To be continued).

ART. III.—THE CHURCH IN WALES.

(Concluding Paper.)

THE Church at length felt the power of the revival; but the effect it produced appeared later, and the progress it made was slower in the Church than among the Dissenters. The cause of this is not far to seek; the Church, like a cruel mother, attempted at first to devour her own offspring; she endeavoured to suppress the spirit that was moving within her—she threw obstacles in the way of its progress and diverted its course into channels that were outside her pale. But this work of obstruction and exclusion was not thorough, it did not make clean riddance of the fruit which the revival had produced on her inner life. There was left within her a holy seed which in process of time

developed itself and brought forth fruit to the praise and glory of God. Its effects became tangible and unmistakable. They are seen in the activity that has been shown and the improvements that have been made in the Church in the present century. We have only to look round and we see signs of life and renovation on every side. We see this in the intellectual and moral improvement of the clergy—a result to which Lampeter College has materially contributed—in cathedrals and old churches restored and new churches and school-chapels built; in training colleges and elementary schools established and maintained; in grammar schools quickened into life and remodelled, and in the increase of their number; in church extension societies and boards of education formed and worked in the different dioceses; in choral associations and choral festivals and harvest thanksgiving services, at which the churches are crowded to overflowing; in Sunday schools vigorously worked, the absence of which in a parish is now the exception and not the rule; in the increase of services, Sunday and weekly, left no longer to the clergyman and the clerk, but heartily joined in by the congregations; in the devout and edifying use of the rite of Confirmation; in the more frequent celebration of the Holy Communion, and in the increase of communicants; in greater appreciation of the ministrations of the Church and increased attendances at public worship, and in the extended influence she has acquired and is still acquiring among the people.

All this bespeaks life; it indicates no decay or decrepitude, but shows renewed strength and vigour; its force has indeed been chiefly at work in improving, strengthening, and extending the external frame-work of the Church; but that work has not been simply mechanical—the production of artificial means—but it is the development of life, the outgrowth of power within the Church asserting itself in works of improvement and expansion; the seed whence these germs of life appear is truth, which the Church retains in her forms of sound words, and which is imperishable; it liveth and abideth for ever. The work of renovation has been less rapid, but, as I think, more solid, and is likely to be more durable within the Church than among the Dissenters. The Dissenters were free from the obstacles and impediments which within the Church retarded its progress. The parochial system, owing to the decay of true religion among the clergy, impeded rather than expedited the work. It had defects that called for remedies, and abuses had crept into it which required to be removed, and these defects and abuses could not be touched except by process of law, and when law is set in motion the process, though sure, is necessarily slow. The Church had to work through a machinery which was defective, and by abuse had become out of joint; but it is a machinery which, when re-

paired and put in working order, is most efficient for the purpose it was intended to accomplish.

I shall now enter into particulars, and endeavour to explain the difficulties which the Church has encountered in her work. Among these I shall mention first the large extent of some of the parishes, and the scanty endowment of the benefices. Mr. H. Hussey Vivian, the honourable Member for Glamorganshire, referred to this difficulty in the address he delivered on the "Church in Wales," at the Swansea Congress. His words, as given in the Report, page 373, are these :—

> I do not think the position of the Church in Wales can be wondered at when we think of what exists in our own immediate neighbourhood. Take the parish of Llangyfelach, which contains 27,000 acres. The income of that parish is £1,050 a year. Of that the vicar receives £205, and the lay impropriator £854. I believe that there is more vitality in a voluntary religion, a religion voluntarily supported—and I think that Welshmen have every ground for saying so—than in a fully endowed religion. At the same time I cannot but feel, that if the vicar of Llangyfelach had been in the possession of £1,050 a year, we might not have at this moment to deplore the miserable condition in which that parish stands in regard to Church accommodation. I will not take up time by alluding to other large parishes in this neighbourhood, such as Cadoxton, with its 31,000 acres; but I will say that such things partly explain why the Church has got into this condition.

This witness is true, and Llangyfelach and Cadoxton are simply quoted as instances of other large parishes throughout the Principality, and especially in Glamorganshire; but the statement, as the honourable gentleman observes, "partly explains," and does not fully account for the reason why the Church has been reduced to its present depressed condition in these large and unwieldy parishes; other and more potent causes, besides extent of area and scantiness of endowments, have been at work which have produced this result. Among these I may mention the increase of population; this increase in the mining and manufacturing districts has been rapid and extensive; it has been, and is still, going on at an enormous rate; houses have sprung up by scores, and hundreds, and thousands like mushrooms. Remote nooks, retired dingles, and barren mountain slopes, where years ago the voice of man was seldom, if ever heard, are now become hives of industry, and teem with population. In the presence of this vast and scattered population, the incumbent, single-handed, is helpless; he finds that he is powerless to meet the emergency, and that the parochial system within his cure breaks down, and is completely swamped.

We must add to this the abuse to which, until recent

times, the parochial system was subjected. Incumbents of large and important parishes were absentees, and the spiritual charge of the people was committed to curates, whose stipends hardly exceeded a workman's wages. Within my own memory, the vicar of Llangyfelach resided in England, and was not seen in the parish from one Christmas to another. He deputed his duties, extensive as the parish was, and populous as it was becoming, to a curate, who was an incumbent of an adjoining parish, and who on Sunday served one church as curate in the morning, and the other as incumbent in the afternoon, and left the doors of both churches closed during the week; and I could name half a dozen parishes adjoining Llangyfelach in a line, and covering together a tract of country that could not be in extent less than thirty by fifteen miles, all the incumbents of which, within my memory, were absentees, and in some instances the same curate served two parishes. This state of things generally prevailed; it was the rule, and not the exception, and when it is taken into consideration, "the position of the Church in Wales cannot be wondered at." And yet this is not all; I have more to say, and the worst remains to be told. In some instances curates, who, in the absence of incumbents, served important parishes, and in other instances incumbents themselves, were men not only of indifferent morals, but even of scandalous lives. Lord Aberdare refers to this, and speaks on the subject, from personal observation, in the speech which he delivered on "the Church in Wales," at the Swansea Congress. His Lordship's words, as given in page 364 of the Report, are as follows:—

> Fortunately I was not born in the era of the gross degradation of the Welsh Church which we have heard described, and I believe it has not been too strongly painted; but when I was a young man, the majority of the incumbents in my neighbourhood were men of whom it was not too much or too bad to say that they were indifferent to their duty, leading, some of them, flagrantly immoral lives. My recollection does not extend to days in which my father saw the pastor of the parish led home by two farmers from the public-house, with his face to the horse's tail; but I do remember a time when the immense majority of the Welsh clergy were, I do not scruple to say, utterly unfit for the sacred duties imposed upon them. Where they were respectable there was a want of feeling and sympathy with the people, and the consequences were what might be expected.

This is a sad picture, but it is true; the immorality of the Clergy at one time was proverbial among the people; it produced on their minds an impression, which they imbibed with their mother's milk, that true piety could not thrive within the pale of the Church; and it was one of the chief causes of their alienation from her Communion; it was a sore evil; like a

moth fretting a garment, it ate up the strength of the Church, and paralyzed her efforts for good when she awoke to a sense of her responsibility and arose to the fulfilment of her mission; like the plague of leprosy it was deeper than the skin; it took a long time, and required strong measures, to effect its cure; but remedies were applied and answered the purpose; the work of renovation has shown itself in nothing more clearly and effectually than in the intellectual and moral improvement of the clergy. Good Bishop Burgess worked hard for this object, and he saw the fruit of his efforts even in his own days; it was a common remark constantly repeated among pious old Nonconformists forty years ago, that if the clergy had been in former times what they were in their time, there would have been no need of dissent; and by the remark they meant that they would have found within the Church the food which they had gone astray to seek in other pastures.

Another difficulty which is peculiar to the Church in Wales, and which seriously cripples her in her operations, is that which arises from the existence of the two languages; both languages —English and Welsh—still prevail. English is gaining ground, and is gradually displacing Welsh and driving it out of the field; but the struggle is severe. I believe that in the long run Welsh will have to yield and to disappear, but it will die hard, and it is not going to die yet. It is still extensively spoken; it is the religious language of a large portion of the people who understand and talk English quite as well as Welsh; it lives in the Press and wields it with power; it revels in poetry and delights in music. As the vernacular language of the country it retains a strong position on the family hearth, although it is losing its hold on "the olive branches round about the table." The parents speak it, but the children take to English; and as the language of the Pulpit and the Press—of poetry and song—it possesses a charm which touches the feelings and kindles the enthusiasm of a native, and makes him exclaim; "Oes y byd i'r iaith Gymraeg,"—the age of the world to the Welsh language.

The "bilingual difficulty" was largely discussed at the Swansea Congress, and important facts bearing on the subject transpired in the discussion. The question naturally arose to what extent the Welsh language still prevails among the people; this question cropped up at different sittings, and opinions founded on different data were given upon it.

The Dean of Bangor delivered his opinion on the question in these words (Report, p. 355):—

Now Wales, with the Welsh parts of Monmouthshire, in 1871, had about 1,300,000 souls. Some 300,000 use English only, and of them a majority probably conform. Thus some 400,000 may profess more or less allegiance to the Church. But she has lost the mass of the

Welsh-speaking population, of whom 500,000 must be virtually monoglots. There are many proofs which confirm this conclusion. Twelve weekly journals, eighteen magazines, and a large number of books are published in Welsh.

And again, Canon Evan Lewis entered elaborately into the question and stated it as we see in page 250 of the Report as follows:—

The Church in Wales is represented by four dioceses, and it will be convenient to present here a general view of the position of matters in the several dioceses as regards this question—how many parishes there are in each in which one language only, whether English or Welsh, is used in the public worship of the Church; and how many there are in which both languages are used? Relying on the information derived from local sources, without pledging myself to the absolute accuracy of the figures in every instance, I think the following estimate may be accepted as fairly correct of Churches and languages in which separate services are held in the four dioceses:—

	English.		Welsh.		Bilingual.		Total.
St. David's.....	191	...	117	...	165	=	473
Llandaff.....	207	...	7	...	52	=	266
St. Asaph	42	...	30	...	133	=	205
Bangor	8	...	152	...	52	=	212
	448	...	306	...	402		1156

It will be observed from these figures that there are 448 buildings used for English services, 306 for Welsh, and 402 for bilingual. But no satisfactory inference can be drawn from them as to the relative strength of the two elements of Welsh and English respectively; for many of the buildings set apart for English services exclusively, are within parishes in which the Welsh-speaking population form a large majority and worship in the parish church. Again, from the large number of buildings devoted to bilingual services, a stranger to the country might think that the English language was increasing rapidly and on the eve of superseding its rival altogether. Such an inference, however, would not be warranted by the facts. The churches used for bilingual services supply no clue whatever as to the relative numerical strength of the Welsh and English congregations worshipping within them. It is well known that English services are in churches where a mere fraction of the parishioners, perhaps only one family, prefer the English language; and in a large number of these bilingual churches only a portion of the service is given in English, it may be one lesson or the Litany, and a summary of the sermon delivered afterwards in Welsh.

Canon Lewis here justly remarks that "no satisfactory inference can be drawn" from the services in the churches and church buildings "as to the relative strength of the two elements of Welsh and English respectively" among the people. The Dean of Bangor, commenting on this point, as raised in Canon

Lewis's paper, added the following important explanation, which is given in page 274 of the Report:—

We must not be guided by the number of Welsh services tha may be given in the parish churches. It is not enough to know the number of parishes returned as Welsh and bilingual, unless we also know the population of those parishes. In Llandaff half a dozen large mining parishes in the hill districts of Monmouth and Glamorgan, called bilingual, but mainly Welsh, contain about half the entire population of the diocese. Ystradyfodwg, Aberdare, Merthyr, Dowlais, Gelligaer, Rhymney, Tredegar, contain nearly a quarter of a million souls, mainly Welsh-speaking. In St. David's also the most populous mining parishes are chiefly Welsh-speaking. A true clue to the lingual state of the country may easily be found in this way. When the Welsh people pay for religious ministrations they insist upon those ministrations being given in the language which they prefer. If we honestly desire to know to what extent the Welsh language really prevails we have only to obtain accurate statistics showing the number of Nonconformist chapels in every district in which ministrations are given in the Welsh language. I was surprised a short time ago to be told by a clergyman that Welsh was dying out in his parish, and that if he had enough moral courage to do so, it would be wise to put an end to Welsh ministrations in his churches. Now what is the real state of that parish? The Noncomformist communicants worshipping in Welsh are counted, not by scores or hundreds, but by thousands. In this town of Swansea in which we are assembled, I am told that the number of Welsh communicants in the Noncomformist chapels exceeds the number of the English communicants in all the churches and chapels put together.

Evidence of the prevalence of the Welsh language is also seen in the press and in the current literature of the day. Among the testimonies borne to this fact at the Swansea Congress that of the Rev. D. W. Thomas is perhaps the most remarkable. It is found in p. 573 of the Report.[1]

[1] "Reference (he said) has already been made to the weeklies and monthlies (and he might have added quarterlies) which exist because of the demand for them, and not because Welsh publishers are more benevolent and patriotic than other people. I have looked over two catalogues belonging respectively to two large publishing firms in Wales, one located at Wrexham, and the other at Denbigh. . . . . In the first catalogue I noticed, amidst others, several works on Biblical Exegesis, Homiletic Theology, Sunday-School Aids, Biographies of Nonconformist Ministers, Hymnals, and particularly a volume of Essays by Dr. Edwards, of Bala, price 10s., on subjects which those unacquainted with Welsh books would suppose to be far above the comprehension of any possible Welsh readers. The subjects are:—The Works and Lives of Homer, Shakspeare, Milton, Coleridge, Morgan Lloyd, Gladstone, Goethe, Kant, Chalmers, Irving, Arnold, Hamilton, and Mill; the Periodicals of the Welsh; Logic; the Poetry of Wales; the Evangelical Alliance; the History of the Church in Geneva, &c. No one has better opportunities of knowing whether these articles, which, many of them,

I believe the facts contained in these extracts are substantially true. The figures may not be absolutely accurate, but there can be no doubt that they are approximately correct. The facts and the figures taken together sufficiently show that the Welsh language extensively prevails, and is studiously cultivated, and that it is indispensable that the Church, in supplying the spiritual wants of the people, should acknowledge its existence; and yet it can be said of the two languages, as it was said of the house of David and the house of Saul, that the one "waxeth stronger and stronger" and the other "waxeth weaker and weaker." The English is steadily advancing, and the Welsh is gradually receding. The town of Swansea, to which reference has been made, is an illustration of this remark. It would be found on inquiry that Welsh families who have removed from the rural districts to the lower part of that town retain their language and attend Welsh places of worship, and that their children follow their example, but that the grandchildren lose the language of their parents, and are lost to Welsh services. This transition from Welsh to English is so great and uniform that the Welsh Nonconformists in the principal towns of Wales take active measures to meet the change of circumstances which it produces. In these towns they form English congregations and build English places of worship; and they do this not so much for the purpose of supplying the spiritual wants of the English-speaking portion of the population, which lies outside their pale, as for the use of their own young people who are become Anglicized within their respective communions. Rev. Canon Griffiths, Rector of Machynlleth, referred to this feature of the case in the speech which he delivered at the Swansea Congress, and quoted his own parish in confirmation of his remarks. His words (Report, p. 267) were as follows:—

The Presbyterian (*i.e.*, Calvinistic) Methodist body in the town, who had not the one-third our English congregation, is permitted to be

---

would not be out of place in an English quarterly, are suited to his countrymen, than Dr. Edwards, the leading minister of the largest Welsh Dissenting denomination. In the other catalogue, belonging to the Denbigh firm, I notice a series on the Elements of Mechanics, Archæology, an English and Welsh Dictionary, Butler's Analogy, Paley's Horæ Paulinæ, but the most striking book in the list is a Welsh Encyclopædia (the Gwyddionadur), a work of unequal merit throughout, but partaking of the nature of Smith's "Dictionary of the Bible" and "The Encyclopædia Metropolitana." The publishers say that the venture has cost him 20,000*l*, and that he hopes to be reimbursed in time. I confess there was a time when, like most clergymen in Wales, I should not have believed there would be readers and buyers of such ambitious literature, but experience has taught me otherwise, and, by a just Nemesis, my incredulity has been overcome by a residence of twenty years in a purely monoglot Welsh parish.

beforehand with us, and have erected a most attractive English chapel for the use of its adherents; whereas we are still obliged to hold our six o'clock service (English)—the popular hour with the English as well as the Welsh lower orders—on Sunday, in one of the above uninviting buildings. So long as this apathy, this neglect, is suffered to prevail to any great extent, the Church must not be surprised if she finds the English portion of the community slipping out of her hands, as the Welsh did before.

The remark here made is just, and the warning is timely. While attention is awakened and specially called to the spiritual wants of the Welsh portion of the population, care should be taken that those of the English should not be overlooked; the strength of the Church in the Principality lies in the English element, and the cultivation of that element on the part of the Church—not to mention other paramount reasons—is on the ground of expediency imperative; the two languages exist, one losing and the other gaining ground, and where they are spoken together the Church has to provide for two classes of people, and this provision, if adequate, must supply "dual" churches and a double ministry, and in any case where the parish is bilingual it is important that the incumbent should be perfect master of both languages.

Here, then, we stand face to face with the "bilingual difficulty." It is a difficulty that cripples the Church in various ways; the obstructions which it throws in her path, and the disturbances which it creates in her machinery, crop up in different directions, and seriously embarrass her in her operations. One source of the embarrassment which it causes rises from the conflicting interests which exist between the two classes of people whose spiritual wants are to be supplied; it often happens that the clergyman—although qualified for the duties of a bilingual parish—while he endeavours to please both classes, satisfies neither; he fails to arrange his services and to divide his labours so as to meet the convenience and to suit the tastes of both people. The Bishop of Llandaff referred to this feature of the case in one of the speeches which he delivered at the Swansea Congress. His Lordship said (Report, p. 272):—

With regard to the difficulties of the case, it appears to me that this is, perhaps, one of the greatest with which Welsh bishops have to deal. I have to provide for parishes, as I have said, of various shades of greyness (*i.e.*, bilingual parishes); I have to provide for parishes, the incomes of which barely support one clergyman, and yet ministrations have to be provided in two languages. I have parishes in which are fastidious English people who do not wish to hear a word of Welsh, and in the same parish there may be Welsh people who are dissatisfied if they have not exclusively Welsh

ministrations. Under these circumstances it is most difficult to provide for the necessities and the wishes of all the parishioners.

The case is as it is here stated, but in this conflict of interests the English, generally speaking, win the day, and attain their object, and the Welsh are driven to a corner, left out in the cold, and deprived of "the inheritance of their fathers."

Again, another source of embarrassment which the "bilingual difficulty" creates is the dearth of clergy who are competently qualified to minister with efficiency and effect in both languages. Welsh acquired in mature years has been attempted, but it has proved a failure, in the ministrations of the Church; it may stand the test of examinations, but subsequently in the practical discharge of the public duties of the ministry it is found to be of little value, and in most instances its use is entirely discontinued; it fails to touch the feelings and to win the sympathies of a native. Canon Lewis, in his Congress Paper (Report, p. 251), supplies an instance in illustration of this truth, and probably he refers to a case that had fallen under his own observation.

The clergyman (he said) was an excellent man in all respects, pious, and foremost in all good works—a man of culture and high Christian character. Holding two benefices, he kept a permanent substitute in one . . . . and being a conscientious man, he thought it his duty to give his own personal services occasionally to the parish which he was obliged to consign to the care of another. Although he officiated constantly in Welsh during a long life, he never acquired a complete mastery of the language, or that facility of expression and natural intonation which mark native utterances. Consequently, his services were not greatly appreciated, and his Sunday visits to his distant parish, when repeated too often, had the invariable effect of thinning the congregation, and it sometimes happened that many left the churchyard by one gate as he entered it by another.[1]

The Welshman appreciates not preaching unless it has the "thrilling ring" of his own language, and if he fails to get it in church he will find it in the Dissenting chapel. The Dean of Bangor bore witness to this at the Congress. In reply to a statement that "the Nonconformists in their chapels are content to listen to unutterable religious rubbish," he said:—

[1] The testimony of Chancellor Phillips is to the same effect (Report, p. 276:—"To be efficient," he said, "the incumbents and curates of all Welsh and bilingual parishes must be those who have been Welsh-speaking from their childhood; Welsh first, English next, or both side by side. I never knew of an Englishman who had learnt Welsh after twenty—or who attempted to do so—efficient or even moderately acceptable. The sermons of Bishop Thirlwall, which I had the pleasure of editing, are wonderful to read, and the Welsh is, as a rule, good; but those who heard him preach them could not but feel that the thrilling Welsh ring was wanting." This witness is true; I can confirm its truth by my own testimony.

The testimony is utterly untrue, and could never have been made by any man able to read and understand the Welsh language. No man can read such sermons as those of Mr. Henry Rees, or such poetry as is found in the chief poem of Gwilym Hiraethog, without acknowledging that there are Welsh Nonconformist ministers who are men of very high culture in their own language. If the Welsh clergy expect to hold their own against such, they must not neglect to cultivate the Welsh language.

Deficiency in the ranks of the clergy of men able to "hold their own" in this respect, is one serious source of embarrassment in the ministration of the Church in Wales. Further, Canon Lewis in his Paper at the Congress, contended that "the bilingual difficulty is by no means limited to parish priests, but extends to all ministers of the Church who have duties to perform in relation to the people;" and he quotes in defence of his statement an instance showing the manner in which the rite of Confirmation was administered in Wales not many years ago.

On the day appointed (he said) the Bishop appeared in the church, accompanied by his Welsh Chaplain. The preface as to the order of Confirmation having been read in Welsh by the Chaplain, the Bishop put the question to the candidates in English, which the Chaplain repeated immediately after in Welsh. Then the Bishop said the versicles and the prayer in English, which the Chaplain repeated as before in Welsh. The words accompanying the laying on of hands were said first in Welsh by the Chaplain, with an explanation to the candidates that the Bishop would say, in substance, the same thing in English while in the act of confirming. The Bishop's address was also delivered twice, and the service was concluded in the same manner.

The Canon justly adds that this manner of administering the rite was "the reverse of edifying, and was looked back upon as having in it much that was greatly disappointing." Confirmation thus administered in the midst of people, whose religious services in their own chapels are conducted in their native language in such a way as to warm and thrill their hearts, is brought into contempt and converted into ridicule before their eyes; and the inference is clear that an English bishop unacquainted with the Welsh language administering Confirmation in a purely Welsh parish puts the machinery of the Church out of joint; he is a clog on her wheels, and an obstruction in the way of her progress. His want of the knowledge of the language of the people embarrasses the action of the Church among them. And further, knowledge of Welsh in a bishop presiding over a Welsh diocese enables him to exercise an independent judgment as to the qualifications required in the clergy whom he institutes into Welsh benefices and licenses into Welsh curacies. And I cannot help thinking that Welsh sermons delivered by bishops in

the Welsh fashion on stated occasions, such as the opening of churches affords, might go far to revive the reverence which I believe to be still lurking in undying embers within the bosom of many a Welshman towards the Church of his fathers, and to fan it into a flame. Such sermons on such occasions would show the people that the Church, when properly worked in the entire routine of her machinery, is able to supply their wants and to satisfy their aspirations.

There is another source of embarrassment in the ministration of the Church in Wales, arising from the bilingual difficulty, which I am anxious to notice. It is the want of sufficient staff of clergy to meet the extra and additional duties which the prevalence of the two languages creates. I more particularly refer to this point that I may invite public attention to the fact that the Ecclesiastical Commissioners, in making their grants to Wales, entirely ignore "the bilingual difficulty." They vote their grants on the same principle and under the same regulations to bilingual as to monoglot parishes. In both cases they take the population *per se*, and make no exception where the population is mixed, and, on account, of the existence of the two languages, is practically doubled in number.[1]

I have now done. The facts I have stated tend to show that there is vitality and growth in the Welsh Church, that she contends with exceptional difficulties, and strives against adverse currents, and that in her efforts to arise she is entitled to the

[1] The Bishop of St. David's called the attention of the Congress at Swansea to this point, and stated it clearly. His Lordship's words are given in page 379 of the Report, thus:—"The two great difficulties we have to contend against are the poverty of our endowments and the bilingual character of most of the Welsh parishes, combined with the very large area of many of them. The Ecclesiastical Commissioners, it is well known, in the distribution of the funds at their disposal take account of population, but take no account of area. I have on a former occasion stated that this is in my opinion eminently unfair. The question is not how many sheep a man has to attend, but how widely they are scattered. Again, the Commissioners take no note whatever of the bilingual difficulty; they do not consider that this difficulty gives a clergyman a double amount of services to perform. I would ask the Right Reverend Prelates, the Noble Lords, and the Members of Parliament who are behind me, to consider whether it would not be possible to induce the Commissioners to make a change in their policy in these respects; and if they have not the power to do this, then whether it would not be possible to pass an enabling Act to meet these two difficulties, the former of which we share with the North of England, while the other is peculiar to ourselves."

The Bishop of St. Asaph also referred to the same question, as may be seen in page 378 of the Report, and further showed that the Commissioners in dealing with local claims, as well as with population, completely ignore the bilingual difficulty, and his Lordship added that "the question might be advantageously discussed in either House of Parliament."

sympathy and the help of the Church in England. It may be that "there is hope in her end, that her children shall come again to their own border;" but in that event she must offer them "the sincere milk of the word," which "the breasts of her consolations" supply, and not husks that are bred of superstition and scepticism. Her name will not "be called Hephzibah and her land Beulah"—"the Lord will not delight in her, and her sons will not marry her,"—if, instead of putting on "the garments of salvation" and "covering herself with the robe of righteousness" she permits either Rationalism, on the one hand, to make her bare and to expose her to nakedness and shame, or Ritualism, on the other, to deck her in gaudy and meretricious habiliments, and to make her appear in "the attire of an harlot."

J. Powell Jones.

Art IV.—JAMES II. AND THE SEVEN BISHOPS.

THE reign of James II. is a period of English history which has left a greater mark on this country than any period since the Reformation. It is a period to which we owe our civil and religious liberties, and the maintenance of our Protestantism, and as such it deserves the attention of every true-hearted Englishman. I propose in this Paper to give a general sketch of the leading events in the reign of James II., and a more particular account of the famous trial of the Seven Bishops. If the whole subject does not throw broad, clear light on our position and duties in the present day, I am greatly mistaken.

The reign of James II. was a singularly short one. It began in February, 1685, and ended in December, 1688. Short as his reign was it is no exaggeration to say that it contains a more disgraceful list of cruel, stupid, unjust, and tyrannical actions, for which the Sovereign alone can be held responsible, than the reign of any constitutional monarch of this land with the single exception of Bloody Mary. It is a reign, in fact, in our English annals without one redeeming feature. Not one grand victory stirs our patriotic feelings; not one first-class statesman or general, and hardly a bishop beside Ken and Pearson, rouses our admiration; and the majestic name of Sir Isaac Newton among men of science stands almost alone. There were few giants in the land. It was an era of mediocrity; it was an age not of gold, or silver, or brass, or iron, but of lead. We turn away from the picture with shame and disgust, and it abides in our memories as a picture in which there is no light and all shade.

The chief explanation of this singularly disgraceful reign is to be found in the fact that James II. was a narrow-minded, obstinate, zealous, thorough-going member of the Church of Rome. As soon as he ascended the throne he surrounded himself with priests and Popish advisers, and placed confidence in none but Papists. Within a month of his accession, says Evelyn in his diary, "the Romanists were swarming at Court with greater confidence than had ever been seen in England since the Reformation."[1] At his coronation he refused to receive the Sacrament according to the rites of the Church of England. He set up a Popish chapel at his Court, and attended Mass. He strained every nerve throughout his reign to encourage the spread of Popery and discourage Protestanism. He procured the visit of a Popish nuncio, and demeaned himself before him as no English sovereign ever did since the days of King John. He told Barillon, the French Ambassador, that his first object was to obtain for the Romanists the free exercise of their religion, and then at last to give them absolute supremacy.[2] All this was done in a country which, little more than a century before had been freed from Popery by the Martyred Reformers, and blessed with organized Protestantism by the reign of Elizabeth. Can any one wonder that the God of Providence was displeased, and refused to show the light of his countenance on the land? James II.'s reign was an unhappy and discreditable time in the annals of England because the King was a thorough-going Papist.

The second explanation of the disgraceful character of James II.'s times is to be found in the low moral condition of the whole nation when he came to the throne. The misgovernment of James I. and Charles I., the semi-Popish proceedings of Archbishop Laud, the fierce civil war of the Commonwealth, the iron rule of Oliver Cromwell, the rebound into unbridled licentiousness which attended the Restoration and reign of Charles II., the miserably unwise and unjust Act of Uniformity, the unceasing persecution of true religion, under the pretence of doing God service, and making men of one mind—all these things had borne their natural fruit. The England of James II.'s time was morally vile and rotten to the core. The Court seems to have thrown aside common decency, and to have regarded adultery and fornication as no sin at all. Evelyn's description of what he saw at Whitehall the very week that Charles II. died, is sad and disgusting.[3]

---

[1] Knight, "History of England," iv. 383.

[2] If any one doubts this, I refer him to the Histories of England, Hallam, iii. 73; Ranke, iv. 216, 218, 219; Stoughton, ii. 108.

On Sunday evening, the 1st of February, 1685, Evelyn was at White-

Charles Knight (History of England) truly says:—

"The high public spirit, the true sense of honour, which had characterized the nobles and gentry of England during the Civil War, was lost in the selfishness, the meanness, the profligacy, of the twenty-eight years that succeeded the Restoration. Traitors were hatched in the sunshine of corruption. The basest expediency had been the governing principle of statesmen and lawyers; the most abject servility had been the leading creed of divines. Loyalty always wore the livery of the menial. Patriotism was ever flaunting the badges of faction. The bulk of the people were unmoved by any proud resentments or eager hopes. They went on in their course of industrious occupation, without much caring whether they were under an absolute or a constitutional government, as long as they could eat, drink, and be merry. They had got rid of the puritan severity; and if decency was outraged in the Court and laughed at on the stage, there was greater license for popular indulgences."

The leading statesmen were too often utterly untruthful, and ready to take bribes. The judges were, as a rule, mean, corrupt, ignorant creatures of the Court. The Church of England, which ought to have been a bulwark against wickedness, had never recovered the suicidal loss of its life-blood caused by the Act of Uniformity in 1662, and was a weak, timid, servile body. The bishops and clergy, with a few brilliant exceptions, were very unlike the Reformers, and always unwilling to find fault with any great man, or to dispute the divine right of kings to do as they pleased. The Dissenters were crushed to the earth by petty intolerant restrictions; and, between fines, imprisonments and persecutions, were little able to do anything to mend the times, and could barely keep their heads above water.

Last, but not least, we must not forget that for at least a hundred years England had been incessantly exposed to the untiring machinations of the Jesuits. Ever since the accession of Elizabeth, those mischievous agents of Popery had been compassing sea and land to undo the work of the Reformation, and to bring back our country to the thraldom of the Church of Rome. Disguised in every possible way, and professing anything by the Pope's permission and dispensation, in order to accomplish their end, these Jesuits throughout the days of the Stuarts were incessantly at work. To set Churchmen against

---

hall. A week after he recorded his impressions of the scene which he then witnessed: "I can never forget the inexpressible luxury and profaneness, and as it were total forgetfulness of God, it being Sunday evening. The King sitting and toying with his concubines, Portsmouth, Cleveland, Mazarin, &c.: a French boy singing love songs in that glorious gallery; whilst above twenty of the great courtiers and other dissolute persons were at Basset around a large table, a bank of at least two thousand in gold before them." On Monday morning the 2nd of February, the King was struck with apoplexy.

Dissenters, Calvinists against Arminians, sect against sect, party against party, and so to weaken the Protestant cause, was their one constant employment. How much of the bitter divisions between Churchmen and Nonconformists, how much of the religious strife which defiled the early part of the seventeenth century is owing to the Jesuits, I believe the last day alone will declare. Those only who read "Panzani's Memoirs," or Dean Goode's "Rome's Tactics," can have any idea of the mischief they did. In short, if there ever was an era in modern history when a Popish King of England could promote Popery, and do deeds of astounding cruelty and injustice without let or hindrance, that era was the reign of James II. What might have been the final result, with such a king and such a field, if he had not gone too fast and overshot his mark, is impossible to say. God in His infinite goodness had mercy on England, and delivered us from his wicked designs. But the things that he did, while he reigned,[1] and the singular manner in which he at last over-reached himself by the trial of the Seven Bishops, and lost his throne, ought never to be forgotten by any Englishman who is a true Protestant and loves his country.

There are five leading events, or salient points, in this reign, which are specially worth remembering. They follow each other in regular order, from the accession of James to his abdication. One common aim and object underlaid them all; that aim was to pull down Protestantism and to plant Popery on its ruins.

(1.) The first disgraceful page in the history of James II.'s reign is *his savage and brutal treatment of the Nonconformists and Dissenters.* Our great historian, Macaulay, says: "He hated the Puritan sect with a manifold hatred, theological and political, hereditary and personal. He regarded them as the foes of heaven as well as the foes of all legitimate authority in Church and State."[2] The plain truth is, that James, with all his natural dulness of character, had sense enough to know that for many years the most decided and zealous advocates of Protestantism had been the Nonconformists, and that when Churchmen under Archbishop Laud's mischievous influence had become lukewarm, Nonconformists had been the most inveterate enemies of Popery. Knowing this, he began his reign by attempting to crush the Nonconformists entirely. If his predecessors had chastised them with rods, he tried to chastise

[1] Those who wish to make themselves acquainted with the reign of James II., would do well to study Burnet, Hallam, Macaulay, Charles Knight, Ranke, and Stoughton's "History of the Church of the Restoration."

[2] Macaulay, i. 494.

them with scorpions. If he could not convert them, he would silence them by prosecutions, fines, and imprisonments, and make their lives grievous by hard measures. He argued no doubt that, if he could only stop the mouths of the Nonconformists, he would soon make short work of the Church of England, and he cunningly began with the weaker party. In both cases, happily, he reckoned without his host.

To describe how the unhappy Nonconformists at that period were summoned, fined, silenced, driven from their homes, and allowed no rest for the sole of their foot, would be an endless task. Two pictures will suffice to give an idea of the treatment to which they were subjected. One picture shall be taken from England and the other from Scotland. Each picture shows things which happened with James' sanction within three months after he came to the throne.

The English picture is the so-called trial of Baxter, the famous author of "The Saints Rest," a book which is deservedly held in honour down to this day. Baxter was tried at Westminster Hall before James' detestable tool, Chief Justice Jeffreys, in May, 1685. He was charged with having published seditious matter reflecting on the bishops in his "Paraphrase on the New Testament." A more absurd and unfounded accusation could not have been made. The book is still extant, and any one will see at a glance that there was no ground for the charge. From the very opening of the trial it was clear which way the verdict was intended to go. The Lord Chief Justice of England behaved as if he was counsel for the prosecution and not judge. He used abusive language towards the defendant, such as was more suited to Billinsgate than a court of law; while the counsel for the defence were brow-beaten, silenced, and put down, or else interrupted by violent invectives against their client. At one stage the Lord Chief Justice exclaimed: "This is an old rogue who hath poisoned the world with his Kidderminster doctrines. He encouraged all the women and maids to bring their bodkins and thimbles to carry on war against the King of ever blessed memory. An old schismatical knave! A hypocritical villain!" By-and-by he called Baxter "an old blockhead, an unthankful villain, a conceited, stubborn, fanatical dog." "Hang him!" he said, "this one old fellow hath cast more reproaches on the constitution and discipline of our Church than will be wiped off for a hundred years. But I'll handle him for it; for he deserves to be whipped through the City." Shortly afterwards, when Baxter began to say a few words on his own behalf, Jeffreys stopped him, crying out: "Richard, Richard, dost thou think we'll hear thee poison the court? Richard, thou art an old fellow, and an old knave; thou hast written books enough to load a cart, every one as full of sedition, I might say of treason,

as an egg is full of meat. Hadst thou been whipped out of thy writing trade forty years ago, it had been happy." It is needless to say in such a court as this, Baxter was at once found guilty. He was fined five hundred marks, which it was known he could not pay; condemned to lie in prison till he paid it, and bound over to good behaviour for seven years. And the issue of the matter was that the holy author of "The Saints Rest," a poor, old, diseased, childless widower, lay for two years in Southwark gaol.

The Scotch picture of the Nonconformists' sufferings under James II. is even blacker than the English one. I shall take it substantially from Wodrow's and Macaulay's history. In the very same month that Baxter was tried, two women named Margaret Maclachlan and Margaret Wilson, the former an aged widow, the latter a girl of eighteen, suffered death for their religion in Wigtonshire, at the hands of James II.'s myrmidons. They were both godly women, innocent of any crime but Nonconformity. They were offered their lives if they would abjure the cause of the insurgent Covenanters, and attend the Episcopal worship. They both refused; and they were sentenced to be drowned. They were carried to a spot on the shore of the Solway Firth, which the tide overflowed twice a day, and were fastened to stakes fixed in the sand between high and low water-mark. The elder woman was placed nearest to the advancing water, in the hopes that her last agonies might terrify the younger one into submission. The sight was dreadful. But the courage of the young survivor did not fail. She saw her fellow-sufferer drowned, and saw the sea draw nearer and nearer to herself, but gave no signs of alarm. She prayed and sang verses of Psalms, till the waves choked her voice. When she had tasted the bitterness of death, she was, by cruel mercy, unbound and restored to life. When she came to herself, pitying friends and neighbours implored her to yield. "Dear Margaret," they cried, "only say, God save the King." The poor girl, true to her theology, gasped out, "May God save him if it be God's will." Her friends crowded round the presiding officer, crying, "she has said it, indeed, sir, she has said it." "Will she take the abjuration?" he sternly demanded. "Never," she exclaimed, "I am Christ's; let me go." And once more bound to the stake, the waters of the Solway closed over her for the last time. Her epitaph may be seen to this day in Wigton churchyard.

Such were the dealings of James with Protestant Nonconformists at the beginning of his reign. I make no comment on them. These two examples speak for themselves; and they do not stand alone. The story of the murder of John Brown, of Priesthill, by Claverhouse, is as sad as that of Margaret Wilson.

No wonder that a deep dislike to Episcopacy is rooted down in the hearts of Scotch people to this very day! They never forget such stories as Margaret Wilson's. Even in England I wish I could add that vile prosecutions like that of Baxter had called forth any expression of disapproval from English Churchmen. But, alas! for a season, James persecuted and prospered, and no man opposed him.

(2.) The second black page in the history of James II.'s reign is *the detestable cruelty with which he punished those English counties which had taken any part in Monmouth's rebellion*, in the autumn of 1685. Concerning that miserable rebellion there can of course be but one opinion among sensible men. It is vain to deny that the brief insurrection, which ended with the battle of Sedgemoor, was an enormous folly as well as a crime. We all know how Monmouth, its unhappy leader, paid for it by dying on the scaffold. But it is equally vain to deny that the bloodthirsty ferocity with which James avenged himself on all who had favoured Monmouth's cause, or taken arms in his support, is unparalleled in the annals of English History.

The proceedings of that military monster, Colonel Kirke, immediately after the defeat and dispersion of the rebel army, surpassed anything that we heard of in the Indian Mutiny, or even in Bulgaria. At Taunton he is said to have hanged at least a hundred so-called rebels within a week after the battle of Sedgemoor, and many without even the form of a trial. Not a few of his wretched victims were quartered, and their heads and limbs sent to be hanged in chains in the neighbouring villages. "So many dead bodies were quartered," says Macaulay (i. 629), "that the executioner under the gallows stood ankle deep in blood."

But even the diabolical cruelties of Colonel Kirke were surpassed by the execrable sentences of Judge Jeffreys, when he went on Circuit to the Assizes in Hampshire, Dorsetshire, and Somersetshire, two months after the battle of Sedgemoor. In Dorsetshire he hanged about seventy, in Somersetshire no less than two hundred and thirty-three. The number of those transported for life was 841. The greater part of these were poor ignorant rustics, many of them men of blameless private character, who had taken arms under the idea that Protestantism was at stake, and they died for no other offence than simply following Monmouth, a political adventurer, for a few short weeks. The Assize was long known as the bloody Assize. "In Somersetshire," says Macaulay, "on the green of every large village which had furnished Monmouth with soldiers, ironed corpses clattering in the wind, or human heads and quarters stuck on poles poisoned the air, and made the traveller sick with horror. In many parishes the peasantry could not even

assemble in God's house without seeing the ghastly face of some neighbour's skull grinning at them on the porch." In Hampshire, Jeffreys actually sentenced to death a venerable old lady named Lady Lisle, aged above seventy, for no other crime than that of affording temporary shelter to an insurgent; and nothing but the indignant remonstrance of the Winchester clergy prevented her being burned alive. Lord Feversham, the conqueror of Sedgemoor, and Lord Clarendon, the King's brother-in-law, in vain interceded for her. Jeffreys was allowed to work his will, and she was actually beheaded in Winchester market-place.

For all this abominable cruelty, James II. must always be held responsible. The vile agents who shed this blood were his tools, and he had only to speak the word and the work of death would have ceased. Hallam, the historian, expressly says (iii. 93) that the King was the author of all this bloodshed, and that Jeffreys afterward declared "he had not been bloody enough for his employer." But the real secret of his savage and detestable conduct was a determination to put down Protestantism by a reign of terror, and deter men from any future movement in its favour. And, after all, the truth must be spoken. James was a bigoted member of a Church which for ages has been too often "drunken with the blood of saints and the martyrs of Jesus." He only walked in the steps of the Duke of Alva in the Netherlands; in the steps of Charles IX. at the massacre of St. Bartholomew; in the steps of the Duke of Savoy in Piedmont, until Cromwell interfered and obliged him to cease; and in the steps of the hateful Spanish Inquisition. One thing is very certain: there never was a petty insurrection so ruthlessly quenched in blood as Monmouth's rebellion was quenched by James the Papist. Blood makes a great stain. He found to his cost one day that the blood shed by Kirke and Jeffreys with his sanction had cried to heaven, and was not forgotten. When the Prince of Orange landed at Torbay, the western counties joined him to a man, and forsook James.

(3.) The third black page in the history of James II.'s reign was *his daring attempt to gag the pulpit, and stop the mouths of all who preached against Popery.*

Preaching in every age of the Church has always been God's chief instrument for setting forward religious truth, and checking error. Preaching was one principal agency by which the great work of the Reformation was effected in England. The Church of Rome knows that full well, and wherever she dares she has always endeavoured to exalt ceremonials and to depreciate the pulpit. To use old Latimer's quaint words, "Whenever the devil gets into a church, his plan is to cry, 'Up with candles and down with preaching.'" Next to an open and free Bible,

the greatest obstacle to the progress of Popery is a free pulpit, and the public exposition of God's Word. That James II., like all thorough-going Papists, knew all this, we cannot doubt for a moment. We need not, therefore, wonder that in 1686 he commenced an attack on the English pulpit. If he could once silence that mighty organ, he hoped to pave the way for the advance of Popery. "He took on himself," says Macaulay (ii. 91)—

> To charge the clergy of the Established Church to abstain from touching on controverted points of doctrine in their discourses. Thus, while sermons in defence of the Roman Catholic religion were preached every Sunday and holiday in the Royal Chapel, the Church of the State, the Church of the great majority of the nation, was forbidden to explain and vindicate her own principles.

William Sherlock, Master of the Temple, was the first to feel the royal displeasure. His pension was stopped, and he was severely reprimanded. John Sharpe, Dean of Norwich, and Rector of St. Giles, gave even greater offence. In reply to an appeal from a parishioner, he delivered an animated discourse against the pretensions of the Church of Rome. At once, Compton, the Bishop of London, was ordered to suspend him, and on his objecting to do so, he was himself suspended from all spiritual functions, and the charge of his diocese was committed to two time-serving prelates named Spratt and Crewe. Compton was already famous for his dislike to Popery. When James came to the throne he had boldly declared in the House of Lords that "the Constitution was in danger." We can well understand that James was anxious to suppress him (Ranke, iv. 277).

Singularly enough, this high-handed proceeding worked round for good. For the first time since his accession to the throne, James received a distinct check. The attacks on Sherlock, Sharpe, and Bishop Compton, roused the spirit of the whole body of the English clergy. To preach against the errors of Popery was now regarded as a point of honour and duty. The London clergy set an example which was bravely followed all over the country. The King's prohibition to handle controversial subjects was everywhere disregarded. It was impossible to punish an offence which was committed every Sunday by thousands of divines from the Isle of Wight to Berwick-upon-Tweed, and from the Land's End to the North Foreland. Moreover, the spirit of the congregations was thoroughly roused. There were old men living in London whose grandfathers had heard Latimer preach, and had seen John Rogers burnt at Smithfield. There were others whose parents had seen Laud beheaded for trying to Romanize the Church, and prosecuting Protestant Churchmen. Such men as these were thoroughly stirred and disgusted by James's movement; and if the clergy had been

silent about Popery, they would have resented their silence as unfaithfulness and sin.

The printing-presses, besides, both at London, Oxford, and Cambridge, poured forth a constant stream of anti-Popish literature, and supplied all who could read with ample information about every error of the Church of Rome. Tillotson, Stillingfleet, Sherlock, Patrick, Tenison, Wake, Fowler, Clagett, and many others wrote numerous treatises of all kinds to expose Popery, which exist to this day, and which at the time produced an immense effect. Many of these are to be found in the three huge folios called "Gibson's Preservative," and Macaulay estimates that as many as 20,000 pages of them are to be found in the British Museum.

The whole affair is a striking instance of God's power to bring good out of evil. The very step by which this unhappy Popish monarch thought to silence his strongest foe, proved the first step towards his own ruin. Up to this date he seemed to carry everything before him. From this date he began to fall. From the moment he put forth his hand to touch the ark, to interfere with the Word of God, to silence its preachers, he never prospered, and every succeeding step in his reign was in the downward direction. Like Haman, he had dared to meddle with God's peculiar servants, and like Haman he fell never to rise again.

(4.) The fourth black page in the history of James II.'s reign is *his tyrannical invasion of the rights of the two great Universities of Oxford and Cambridge in* 1687.

The influence of these two venerable bodies in England has always been very great, and I trust they will always be so governed that it will never become less. But it is no exaggeration to say that it never was so great as towards the end of the seventeenth century. Beside them there were no universities or colleges. King's College, London; University College, Durham; St. Aidan's, Highbury; Cuddesdon, did not exist. Oxford and Cambridge stood alone. They were the fountains of all the learning of the day, and the training school of all the ablest divines and lawyers, poets and orators of the land. Even among the Puritans it would be hard to find any man of ability who had not begun his career and picked up his first knowledge at some college in Oxford or Cambridge. In short, the two Universities were the intellectual heart of England, and every pulsation of that heart was felt throughout the kingdom.

All this, we need not doubt, even the dull mind of James II. clearly perceived. He saw that he had little chance of Romanizing England until he could get hold of the two Universities, and this he resolved to try. He was encouraged, probably, to make the attempt by the notorious loyalty to the House of Stuart which Oxford and Cambridge had always exhibited. Both

the Universities had suffered heavily for their attachment to the King's side during the unhappy Commonwealth wars. Many a Head of a college had been displaced and his position filled by one of Cromwell's Puritans. Owen had ruled at Christ Church and Goodwin at Magdalen. Many a college plate-chest was sadly empty compared to its state in olden times, having given up its silver to be melted down in aid of Charles I. and to buy arms and ammunition. Ever since the Reformation, the two Universities had exhibited the most obsequious subserviency to the Crown, had stoutly maintained the divine right of kings, and had often approached the throne in addresses full of fulsome adulation. I believe that James flattered himself that they would go on yielding everything to his will, and fondly dreamed that in a few years they would be completely under the Pope's command, and the education of young England would be in the hands of the Church of Rome. It was a grand and intoxicating prospect. But he reckoned without his host. He little knew the spirit that was yet left by the Isis and the Cam.

James opened his campaign and crossed the Rubicon by attacking the University of Cambridge. The law was clear and distinct, that no person should be admitted to any degree without taking the "Oath of Supremacy," and another oath called the "Oath of Obedience." Nevertheless, in February, 1687, a royal letter was sent to Cambridge directing that a Benedictine monk, named Alban Francis, should be admitted as Master of Arts. Between reverence for the King and reverence for their own statutes, the academical officers were naturally placed in a most perplexing position. To their infinite credit they took the right course, and steadily refused to admit the King's nominee unless he took the oaths. The result was that the Vice-Chancellor of Cambridge was summoned to appear before the New Court of High Commission, presided over by Jeffreys, together with deputies appointed by the Senate. When the day arrived, Dr. Pechell, the Vice-Chancellor, a man of no particular vigour or ability, accompanied by eight distinguished men, of whom the famous Isaac Newton was one, appeared before this formidable tribunal. Their case was as clear as daylight. They offered to prove that they had done nothing contrary to law and practice, and had only carried out the plain meaning of their statutes. But Jeffreys would hear nothing. He treated the whole party with as much vulgar insolence as if they were felons being tried before him at the Old Bailey, and they were thrust out of court without a hearing. They were soon called in and informed that the Commission had determined to deprive Pechell of the Vice-Chancellorship, and to suspend him from all the emoluments to which he was entitled as Master of a College. "As for you," said Jeffreys to Isaac Newton and his seven com-

panions, with disgusting levity, "I send you home with a text of Scripture, 'Go your way and sin no more, lest a worse thing come upon you.'"

From Cambridge, James turned to Oxford. Here, it must be avowed, he began his operations with great advantages. Popery had already effected a lodgment in the citadel, and got allies in the heart of the University. Already a Roman Catholic named Massey, had been made Dean of Christ Church by the nomination of the Crown, and the House had submitted. Already University College was little better than a Romish seminary by the perversion of the Master, Obadiah Walker, to Popery. Mass was daily said in both colleges. But this state of things had caused an immense amount of smouldering dissatisfaction throughout Oxford. The undergraduates hooted Walker's congregation, and chanted satirical ballads under his windows without the interference of Proctors. The burden of one of their songs has been preserved to this day, and you might have heard at night in High Street, near the fine old college, such words as these:—

Here old Obadiah
Sings Ave Maria.

In short, any careful observer might have foreseen that Oxford feeling towards the King was undergoing a great change, and that it would take very little to create a blaze.

Just at this crisis the President of Magdalen College died, and it became the duty of the Fellows, according to their statutes, to elect a successor, either from their own society or from New College. With an astounding mixture of folly and audacity, the King actually recommended the Fellows to elect to the vacant place a man named Anthony Farmer, a person of infamous moral character, utterly destitute of any claim to govern a college; a drunkard, a Papist, and a person disqualified by the statutes of Waynflete, as he was neither Fellow of New College nor of Magdalen. To their infinite credit the Fellows of Magdalen, by an overwhelming majority, refused to elect the King's nominee, resolved to face his displeasure, and deliberately chose for their President a man named John Hough, a Fellow of eminent virtue and prudence. At once they were treated with the utmost violence, injustice, and indignity. The King insisted on their accepting another President of his own selection, and commanded them to take a mean creature of the Court named Parker, Bishop of Oxford. The Fellows firmly refused, saying they had lawfully elected Hough, and they would have no other President. In vain they were threatened and insulted, first by the King himself, and then by a Special Commission sent down from London. They stood firm, and would not give

way one inch. The Commission finally pronounced Hough an intruder, dismissed him from his presidency, and charged the Fellows no longer to recognize his authority, but to assist at the admission of the Bishop of Oxford. It was then that the gallant Hough publicly addressed the following remarkable words to the Commission: "My Lords, you have this day deprived me of my freehold. I hereby protest against all your proceedings as illegal, unjust and null, and I appeal from you to our sovereign Lord the King in his Courts of Justice." But though thus driven from his office by force, Hough was backed by the general feeling of the whole University, and of almost every one connected with Magdalen. At the installation of his successor (Parker) only two Fellows out of forty attended the ceremony. The college porter, Robert Gardner, threw down his keys. The butler refused to scratch Hough's name out of the buttery books. No blacksmith in all the city of Oxford could be found to force the locks of the President's lodge, and the Commissioners were obliged to employ their own servants to break open the doors with iron bars.

But the matter did not end here. On the day that Hough was expelled from his presidency and Parker installed, the Commission invited the Vice-Chancellor of 1687 to dine with them. The Vice-Chancellor that year was Gilbert Ironside, Warden of Wadham, and afterwards Bishop of Hereford. He refused. "My taste," he said, "differs from that of Colonel Kirke's. I cannot eat my meals with appetite under a gallows." The scholars of Magdalen refused to pull off their caps to the new ruler of Magdalen. The demies refused to perform their academical exercises and attend lectures, saying that they were deprived of their lawful governor, and would submit to no usurped authority. Attempts were made to bribe them by the offer of some of the lucrative fellowships declared vacant. But one undergraduate after another refused, and one who did accept was turned out of the hall by the rest. The expulsion of the Fellows was followed by the expulsion of a crowd of demies. A few weeks after this Parker died, some said of mortification and a broken heart. He was buried in the antechapel of Magdalen; but no stone marks his grave. Then the King's whole plan was carried into effect. The College was turned into a Popish seminary, and Bonaventure Giffard, a Roman Catholic Bishop, was made President. In one day twelve Papists were made Fellows. The Roman Catholic service was performed in the chapel, and the whole work of violence and spoliation was completed.

Such were the dealings of James II. with Oxford and Cambridge. Their gross injustice was only equalled by their gross impolicy. In his furious zeal for Popery, the King com-

pletely over-reached himself. He alienated the affections of the two most powerful educational institutions in the land, and filled the hearts of thousands of the ablest minds in England with a deep sense of wrong. And when the end came, as it did within eighteen months, he found that no places deserted his cause so readily as the two over which he had ridden roughshod, the two great English Universities of Oxford and Cambridge.

(5.) The fifth dark page in the history of James II.'s reign is his *rash attempt to trample down the English nobility and gentry in the counties*, and substitute for them servile creatures of his own who would help forward his designs.

In order to understand this move of the misguided king, it must be remembered that he wanted to get a new House of Commons which would do his bidding and not oppose his Romanizing plans. He knew enough of England to be aware that ever since the days of Simon de Montfort every intelligent Englishman has attached great importance to an elected Parliament. He had not entirely forgotten the iron hand of the Long Parliament in his father's days. He rightly judged that he would never succeed in overthrowing Protestantism without the sanction of a House of Commons, and that sanction he resolved to try to obtain.

"Having determined to pack a Parliament," says Macaulay, "James set himself energetically and methodically to the work. A proclamation appeared in the Gazette" (at the end of 1687) "announcing that the King had determined to revise the Commissions of Peace and of Lieutenancy, and to retain in public employment only such gentlemen as would support his policy." At the same time a Committee of Seven Privy Councillors sat at Whitehall, including Father Petre, an ambitious Jesuit, for the purpose of "regulating," as it was called, all the municipal corporations in boroughs:—

> The persons on whom James principally relied for assistance, [continues Macaulay] were the Lord Lieutenants. Every Lord Lieutenant received written orders directing him to go down immediately into his county. There he was to summon before him all his deputies, and all the Justices of the Peace, and to put to them a set of interrogatories framed for the purpose of finding out how they would act at a general election. He was to take down their answers in writing, and transmit them to the Government. He was to furnish a list of such Romanists and Protestant Dissenters as were best qualified for commissions as magistrates, and for command in the Militia. He was also to examine the state of all the boroughs in his county, and to make such reports as might be needful to guide the London board of regulators. And it was intimated to each Lord Lieutenant that he must perform these duties himself and not delegate them to any other person.

The first effect of these audacious and unconstitutional orders might have opened the eyes of any king of common sense. The spirit of the old barons who met at Runnymede proved to be not extinct. Even before this time the Duke of Norfolk had stopped at the door of the Popish chapel which James attended, and when James remonstrated and said, "Your Grace's father would have gone farther," had boldly replied, "Your Majesty's father would not have gone so far." But now it became clear that many other peers beside the Duke of Norfolk were Protestant to the backbone. Half the Lord Lieutenants in England flatly refused to do the King's dirty work, and to stoop to the odious service imposed on them. They were immediately dismissed, and inferior men, of more pliant and supple consciences, were pitchforked into their places.

The list of high-minded noblemen who resisted the King's will on this memorable occasion is even now most remarkable, and deserves to be had in remembrance. One great name follows another in grand succession in Macaulay's pages, until one's breath is almost taken away by the sight of the King's folly. In Essex, the Earl of Oxford; in Staffordshire, the Earl of Shrewsbury; in Sussex, the Earl of Dorset; in Yorkshire, the Duke of Somerset in the East Riding, and Lord Fauconberg in the North Riding; in Shropshire, Lord Newport; in Lancashire, the Earl of Derby; in Wiltshire, the Earl of Pembroke; in Leicestershire, the Earl of Rutland; in Buckinghamshire, the Earl of Bridgwater; in Cumberland, the Earl of Thanet; in Warwickshire, the Earl of Northampton; in Oxfordshire, the Earl of Abingdon; in Derbyshire, the Earl of Scarsdale; and in Hampshire, the Earl of Gainsborough—all were summarily sent to the rightabout; and for what? Simply, as every one knew, because they preferred a good conscience to Crown favour, principle to place, and Protestantism to Popery. The gallant words of the Earl of Oxford, who was turned out in Essex, when the King demanded an explanation of his refusal to obey, spoke the sentiments of all: "Sir, I will stand by your Majesty against all enemies to the last drop of blood; but this is a matter of conscience, and I cannot comply."

A viler piece of ingratitude than this move of James can hardly be conceived. Most of the noblemen whom he dismissed were the representatives of great families who in the Commonwealth wars made immense sacrifices in his father's cause. Some of them, like the Earl of Derby, could tell of fathers and grandfathers, who had died for King Charles. Many of them could show swords and helmets hanging over their Elizabethan fireplaces which had been notched and dented in fighting against the Parliamentary forces at Edgehill, Marston Moor and Naseby. Not a few of them could point to ruined castles and

halls, to parks despoiled of their timber, plate-chests emptied of their contents, and properties sadly impoverished in the days when Cavaliers fought against Roundheads. And now forsooth the son of the martyred Charles, as they had fondly called him, turned round upon them, trampled on their feelings, and required them to lie down, and let him walk over their consciences. Can we wonder that they keenly resented the King's conduct! At one fell swoop he destroyed the affection of half the leading men in the English counties, and from being his friends they became his foes.

In fact the ingratitude of the King was now only equalled by its folly and impolicy. No sooner was his new machinery for packing a subservient Parliament put in motion, than it broke down and utterly failed. From every corner of the realm there came the tidings of failure. The new Lord Lieutenants could do nothing. The Magistrates and candidates for Parliament evaded inquiries, and refused to pledge themselves to do the King's will. Arguments, promises, and threats were alike in vain. A deep rooted suspicion had got into men's minds that James wanted to subvert Protestantism, and re-introduce Popery, and they would not give way. From Norfolk, the Duke of Norfolk reported that out of seventy leading gentlemen in the county only six held out any hopes of supporting the Court. In Hertfordshire the Squires told Lord Rochester that they would send no man to Parliament who would vote for taking away the safeguards of the Protestant religion. The gentry of Bucks, Shropshire, and Wiltshire, held the same language. The Magistrates and Deputy-Lieutenants of Cornwall and Devonshire told Lord Bath, without a dissenting voice, that they would sacrifice life and property for the Crown, but that the Protestant religion was dearer to them than either. "And Sir," said Lord Bath to the King, "if your Majesty dismisses them, their successors would give the same answer." In Lancashire, a very Romish county, the new Lord Lieutenant reported that one third of the Magistrates were opposed to the Court. In Hampshire the whole of the Magistrates, excepting five or six, declared they would take no part in the civil or military government of the county while the King was represented there by the Duke of Berwick, a Papist.

The sum of the whole matter is this. The attack of James on the independence of the county gentry and nobility was as completely a failure as his attack on the pulpit and the Universities. It was worse than this. It sowed the seeds of disaffection to his person from one end of England to the other, and alienated from him thousands of leading men who under other circumstances would perhaps have stood by him to the last. And the result was that when the Prince of Orange landed at

Tor-Bay a year afterwards he found friends in half the counties in England. By the over-ruling providence of God and his own judicial blindness, James paved the way to his own ruin. The thanes fell from him. The nobility, one after another forsook him, and he was left friendless and alone.

J. C. RYLE.

(*To be continued.*)

ART. V.—TWO THOUSAND YEARS AGO.

A WORK has been slowly passing through the press which should be in the hands of every student of the Chinese language, but which will probably never meet the eye of many of the readers of this Magazine; and for this reason I think it may be interesting if I cull from its pages a few points which have struck me in the perusal.

The book to which I allude is a beautifully printed and admirably executed edition of the Chinese Classics, or Canonical Books, as they may more properly be called, consisting of the writings of Confucius and Mencius, China's greatest sages. The text is translated with full commentary and notes by the learned veteran missionary, Dr. Legge, formerly of Hong Kong, and now Professor of Chinese at Oxford. His first volume, with the omission of the Chinese Text, has appeared in England under the title "The Life and Writings of Confucius." But it is to the volumes more recently issued from the press that I shall confine my attention. They contain the Ch'un-tseu (literally, "Spring and Autumn"), an historical compilation, the last work of Confucius. A translation is also given of a very full and elaborate Chinese Commentary on the text of the sage. This Historical Classic covers the ground between the years B.C. 721 and 460, or, roughly speaking, from the early days of legendary Rome till the shouts and the clash of Thermopylæ and Salamis had died away. Confucius undertook this literary labour, so says Mencius (writing 100 years later), because of his dismay and grief at the disorganized state of society—ministers slaying princes, and sons their fathers. "The Ch'un-tseu was produced, and all the wicked were awed into morality." Dr. Legge would be inclined to entertain grave doubts as to the genuineness of the work; but if this genuineness be maintained (and the proofs are strong that it is in truth the work of Confucius), he would transfer his doubts and misgivings to the character of the sage himself—so much tampering is there with historical facts. The text is dry as dust, amazingly dull reading, even to the eye and mind of the prejudiced Chinese literati; and one wonders how so heavy a work

could awe bad men and bad sons. If I mistake not, we have here an anticipation two thousand years and more old of the restraining power of the press. Confucius dragged into light, and put down in black and white the names and deeds of the actors on China's political stage for two hundred years back, and it seems to have been the dread of having their names handed down on history's page blackened by crime, which awed these turbulent persons, if awed they really were. Perhaps one cannot estimate aright the rein which is drawn so tightly upon lawlessness, oppression, and vice in England by the dread of public opinion which the press will draw forth, even if it fail to raise the power of law. The dryness of the text of the Ch'un-tseu is, however, entirely made up for by the vivacity and fulness of the Chinese Commentary—a work produced not many years after Confucius' death by a philosopher named Tso. This Commentary is so minute, and bears on it such unmistakable marks of genuineness and authenticity, that Dr. Legge does not hesitate to pronounce it "the most precious literary treasure which has come down to posterity from the Tsin dynasty, that long-lived line which lasted nine hundred years." The events and characters of the time pass as in reality and life before us. In no ancient history have we such a vivid picture of its annals as we have of the two hundred and seventy years embraced in this work. It is from this work chiefly that I propose to draw a few incidents of life in China two thousand years ago. From the narratives of Tso there may be gathered as full and interesting an account of the history of China from B.C. 721 to 460 as we have of any of the nations of Europe during the Middle Ages.

Let us imagine and live again for a few moments the days and nights of the year B.C. 717. Romulus has disappeared from the Field of Mars in the darkness of the storm. Numa's peaceful reign is beginning. And passing from the mist of legend to the clear light of history, we see the ten tribes in captivity, and Assyrian colonists coming to fill the vacant homes in the Holy Land. What was going on in China at this early period? It is a curious picture which the Commentary of Tso presents to us. Duke Yin who reigned from B.C. 721 to 711, was governor of Loo, one of the large feudal states under the Tsin dynasty; his dominion comprising the western divisions of the modern province of Shantung, in which Confucius was born. Its southern face was washed by the erratic Yellow River; and the old state of Loo is now cut through by the Grand Canal. "In his fifth year," says Confucius in the Ch'un-tseu, "in spring, the Duke went to see the fishermen at T'ang." This entry is made without note or comment by the sage; but in the Commentary of Tso, the Duke is represented as an idle pleasure-seeking fellow, and is roundly lectured for his sporting propen-

sities. T'ang it must be remembered was a long distance from his dominions; (the incident is retained in the present name of the district, Yu-t'æ "Fisherman's Tower,") and the Duke's first fault was, waste of time and neglect of duties. What would Mr. Bright (who is surely a "*superior man*" to quote the favourite Confucian phrase) say to the following definitions of lawful sport, and to the denunciation of the contrary? Mr. Bright is not satisfied with "seeing" the fishermen; he will fling the fly himself, and play the wiry salmon. And other statesmen wearied with hot debates, may be found sometimes watching on the seashores of England the fishermen hauling their nets to land. Duke Yin must not do so. Tsang He-pih reproves him to his face:—

All pursuit of creatures in which the great affairs of the State are not illustrated, and when they do not supply materials available for use in its various requirements, the ruler does not engage in. With the creatures in the mountains, forests, streams, and marshes, the ruler has nothing to do.

The Duke did not seem to see it in this light. "I will walk over the country," said he; and off he started, had the fishermen drawn up in order, and looked at their operations. His faithful censor He-pih pretended to be ill, and so avoided the necessity of sharing in his ruler's disgrace. "The Duke *reviewed* a display of fishermen," says the History—a sly sarcasm at his Grace; implying that this was the only military review which he felt competent to superintend. Perhaps the Duke, now two thousand years in his grave, maintained that the operation of fishing *does* illustrate the great affairs of State—baits thrown out to electors, hustings' cries, countings out of the house, and sudden sweeping measures; are not these exact counterparts of the fisherman's art and toil? But we leave the sport-loving Duke of ancient days and pass to another incident.

It is the year B.C. 574, Ezekiel is wrapt in the visions of God. Pythagoras is six years old. And what is going on in China? "In the Duke Ch'ing's sixteenth year in the spring, in the king's first month it rained, and the trees became encrusted with ice." "The Chinese critics," says Dr. Legge, "bring all their power of interpretation into the field to find the moral and political significance of this phenomenon, but very needlessly; we have simply the record of a striking fact." Not a *very* striking fact, if I may venture to say so. I remember well a precisely similar phenomenon in England some twenty years ago, when the tall sycamores were bent like weeping willows; and great boughs along an avenue snapped with the weight of the frozen rain. And though far rarer than snow-storms, yet the phenomenon must often have occurred in the province of Shantung, where the cold in winter is very severe. In fact, such extracts from these ancient records may seem to my readers

paltry and trifling; and yet, little matters as they are, they seem to make the dead live again even more vividly than the records of battles and great political changes. They remind me of what geologists have discovered in the secrets of the rocks; the ripples of waves which broke on the shores of past creations; the dimples in the petrified sands left by rain-drops which fell from skies in long-lost ages.

My third and last extract cannot be despised as paltry.

Much has been urged in favour of the arbitration of calm debate and sober consultation as superseding the arbitration of the sword. General Grant, replying to an address presented to him by the Universal Peace Society, said that "although he had been trained as a soldier, and had participated in many battles, there never was a time when in his opinion some way could not have been found of preventing the drawing of the sword. He looked forward to an epoch when a court, recognized by all nations, would settle international differences." Is this a modern fancy, and, from its results thus far, distasteful to many Englishmen?

We carry back our thoughts once more to the year B.C. 535. Zerubbabel has returned with the exiles to Jerusalem; the rebuilding of the Temple has begun; Tullia at Rome has driven home with her father's blood on her chariot wheels. In China a *Peace Society* has been formed, and a meeting comprising the representatives of fourteen of the feudal states is assembled in the capital of Sung. A Minister of that State, distressed at the miseries caused by the incessant warfare between the great rival powers of Tsoo and Tsin, and ambitious also of a name, if not of more substantial advantage, negotiated with great ability and with temporary success an agreement amongst the warring powers that there should be *war no more*. A noble idea! An ideal to be realized at last under the eternal reign of the King of Peace; an idea, too, the beauty and grandeur of which may make us pardon his Excellency Hêang-Seuh for demanding, when the Peace Congress had closed its sittings with apparent success, a grant of land as his reward. The grant was made, but the deeds of transfer were torn into shreds by the holders of the lands. Hêang-Seuh retired into obscurity empty-handed, and China plunged once again into long war and dreary confusion. Yet let not the name of Hêang-Seuh be forgotten. Let his imagination and his attempt at the realization shine as a sunbeam on a day of cloud and wind across the sorrows and the commotions of ancient days.

My readers may possibly question the genuineness and authenticity of these records, but an interesting evidence of their age and accuracy, to a certain extent at least, is supplied by the record of eclipses, which occur frequently in the pages of the Ch'un-tseu. Dr. Legge supplies a table of thirty-eight solar

eclipses recorded in this Classic, thirty-four of which have been verified by modern astronomical calculations, as synchronizing with the dates assigned to them by the compilers of these records. Lunar eclipses are scarcely noticed, indeed the classic of poetry asserts that "the sun was eclipsed, a thing of very evil omen. For the moon to be eclipsed, is but an ordinary matter." And, for this reason, I suppose the lunar eclipse which occurred as I wrote the above lines (February 13th, 1875), was unnoticed in our almanacs. The phenomena which accompanied it were remarkable. An hour before the first contact with the shadow of the earth, two mock moons were distinctly visible. When the eclipse began, the sky, from a serene and cloudless face, put on a mantle of dim fleecy clouds. The following day there was a bright display of mock suns, yet without any atmospheric disturbance following. These phenomena would possibly have found a place in the Ch'un-tseu; but Chinese statesmen and historiographers are constrained now, against their wills, to observe not so much the face of the sky as the signs of the times. The tide of western revolution, for I cannot honour it indiscriminately with the high title of civilization, is coming in on the shores of China. Japan, at her side, has been caught and twirled inside out by the eddies of the flood, and China cannot long resist the influence. Foreign-built steamers, both for war and merchandise, are plying on the coast under the Chinese flag; rifled cannon and small arms are manufactured in Chinese arsenals; daily newspapers and weekly and monthly magazines under Chinese inspiration are appearing; and telegraph messages (though too often checked by the fury of the cyclone or the theft of the wreckers), flash up and down the coast and join China with the outer world. We may almost now write of China, as Froude, in his eloquent periods writes of old England: "A change is coming on the land, the meaning and direction of which is still hidden from us, the paths trodden by the footsteps of ages are broken up, old things are passing away, and the faith and the life of thirty centuries are dissolving like a dream."

"A new continent has risen up before the eyes of the Chinese beyond the sea;" for, forty years ago, the very existence of America was disbelieved, "since," as they said, "she had no king." "The floor of heaven inlaid with stars has sunk back to the astonished eyes of Chinese readers" as they peruse the scientific articles in magazine literature now within their reach. "In the fabric of habit which they have so laboriously built for themselves, the Chinese are to remain no longer. And when it has all gone, faded like an unsubstantial pageant," perhaps we shall have to listen to the records of these old historical documents in order to realize what China was, as to the sound of

church-bells falling on the ear, like echoes of a vanished world. Yet there is good hope for the Christian philosopher as to the eventual result of these great changes in the old East—a hope, which the perusal of the Ch'un-tseu of Confucius may suggest and illustrate. The China of that period (2,300 years ago) was but a little spot compared with the present huge empire and its dependencies. It comprised, roughly speaking, scarcely more than the modern province of Shantung, a part of Pechile, Shansi, and part of Kiangsu—not a sixth part in area of the present eighteen provinces. Yet this small nucleus, though convulsed and distracted by petty wars, from its superior civilization, gradually absorbed the encircling barbarous tribes, and pushed the light into the darkness. And in this small territory lived and worked a man, whose name and fame still exert a magic and mighty influence over all Chinamen, though 2,200 years have rolled away since his death.

Our missions to China are but as lighthouse gleams amidst the darkness of the night of superstition and idolatry. Christians, alas, like the feudal states of the Tsin dynasty, are rent by divisions. But if we could but act as the Chinese Book of Poetry has it:—

> Brothers may squabble inside the walls,
> But they will resist insult from without.

If, still better, Christians could agree to have war no more, and not to squabble at all; but, holding the Head in exalted and triumphant faith, not merely resist insult, but advance as one against the army of the aliens—shall not the conquering power of Christianity be more rapid and more widespread than that of civilization? And with us there is not a western Confucius, but the wisdom of God—not a man, but Immanuel—not a sage whose fame is waning, but the Lord of Glory, the might of Whose love and power shall be felt for evermore.

ARTHUR E. MOULE.

ART. VI.—CHURCH AND STATE IN FRANCE.

IV.

IN the midst of the carnage at Vassy, in 1562, the Bible of the Calvinists was brought to the Duke of Guise. He handed it over to his brother, the Cardinal Louis de Guise, who was present. Here, said he, look at the title of these books of the Huguenots. There is no harm in this, replied the Cardinal, it is Holy Scripture. "Comment, sang Dieu, La Sainte Ecriture? Il y'a quinze cent ans et plus qu'elle est faite, et il n'y a qu'un an que ces livres sont imprimés; tout n'en vaut rien." The Cardinal

could not help saying, "My brother is wrong." The story, in a very apposite manner, represents the supercilious indifference and ignorance which still largely prevails in French society concerning the value and importance of the Bible. Only recently a celebrated French writer, engaged in controversy, has borne witness to the general want of acquaintance with its contents. He is himself a profane man, but he is a man of letters, and his reading has been extensive enough to include the Bible, in which he has found a convenient arsenal for weapons against his adversaries. The licentious author has betrayed more familiarity with the Bible than the priest. But whatever may be the unconsciousness in France of the power of the Bible; however sceptical many may now be of its producing the effects it did of old, it is still the tree whose leaves are "for the healing of the nations." The spiritual, and we may add, too, the moral, state of France is confessedly in need of some powerful remedy. On that point the Romish priesthood, which is loud in its lamentations over the atheistical state of the country, as it terms it, and has felt so often cruelly its indignation against itself, is at one with the Protestant Reformers. But Rome has only its own nostrums, the most of which are becoming more contemptible than they ever were to modern intelligence. Of some of them itself is partially ashamed. It cannot enforce its opinions in France as it did of old, for it can no longer persecute or ban. The tendency of legislation is to emancipate the people from its yoke. There is to be no longer ignorance of the common elements of education. Frenchmen will at least know how to read and write. These are, to a certain extent, mechanical arts, but the country has been singularly deficient in them. The State now undertakes authoritatively to supply them. Violent reclamations are made by the Romish priesthood, which is now clamouring for liberty, which means liberty for Jesuits and other Congregations, persistently banished by law from France, to teach subjugation to Rome in France. This appeal is not likely to be listened to. The petitions on its behalf, when examined into, have been found deceptions. If the French priesthood are to exert any influence in the matter they will have, no matter how reluctantly, to purge themselves from complicity with Jesuitism, if they can. As France in so many ways imitates America, it is likely that she will do so in education, and if she would copy America in this matter in all respects it would be gain.

But what disquiets Rome ought to encourage Protestantism. Rome sits as a queen in the midst of ignorance. Protestantism prevails where ignorance decays. To a population which could not read, the Bible might be a sealed book. Some knowledge most precious was communicated by preaching, even amongst the most illiterate, in periods when books were scarce. It was

then the appointed means; it will ever be of infinite value. But those who can read the Scriptures with ease and comfort for themselves enjoy an inestimable advantage. The Bible will be, if free elementary education is extended in France, of more consequence than ever to France. Each one will then be able to draw "water out of the wells of salvation." It is, then, to the free circulation of the Holy Scriptures, with capacity to profit by them, that we look for the true remedy for the ills afflicting France. The country has need of spiritual and moral regeneration, which can proceed from God alone. Nominally Christian, it is ignorant of Christianity. There is a large amount of superstition, in many respects almost undisguised Paganism, still rife in the rural districts. There is also extensive unbelief in the classes usually denominated *bourgeois* and *ouvriers*, mixed with no small hostility to the priesthood. But is there real unwillingness to listen to the Word of God? This might have been, to many, a matter of doubt, and upon grounds fairly plausible. Recent experience has, however, demonstrated the contrary. The experiments made during the last few years in Paris, in Lyons, and other places, have abundantly demonstrated that there is eager desire for the Word of God combined with the most profound ignorance of it. Dr. Bonar, in his "White Fields of France," has supplied a most interesting account of this movement, which we earnestly commend to the attention and sympathy of all Christian people. In it he describes the eagerness with which multitudes have flocked in Belleville, in Montmartre, in the Faubourg St. Antoine, to the proclamation of God's Word "without money and without price." The strongholds of the Communists of Paris have been fearlessly invaded by the messengers of the Gospel of Jesus Christ, and have been heartily welcomed there. Never before, not even in the brief dawn of the Reformation, so speedily overcast, has there been so much Bible reading, so much Gospel preaching, so much psalm singing, by the countrymen of Calvin, of Beza, and of Marot, in the city of Paris. Never, before, have such strange audiences listened there to the simple truth as it is in Jesus. Nothing can have been simpler than the means which have been employed. Rooms have been hired, open to the street; the only ornamentation has been that they have been clean and well-lighted, with a few texts of framed calico. There has been faithful, earnest preaching, and hearty singing, which has delighted the people. "They make great efforts to sing," often it is most touching to hear their voices. There have been no preachers with celebrated names or world-wide reputations. Many have been strangers, speaking in a language foreign to themselves. Such is the simple apparatus which has been employed, with powerful influence, to sway the hearts and consciences of men conspicuous

for their previous hostility to religion, and violently opposed to all law and order. We cannot tell whether Dr. Bonar could be borne out in his assertion that it "would not be easy to get up a revolution in Belleville now," but most unquestionably many in that quarter, of the class who have heretofore been foremost in such movements, have not proved insensible to spiritual teaching and have shown themselves willing to listen, in some cases to be converted. Twice over has Mr. M'All received public thanks from the authorities for his labours, and two medals of honour have been decreed from two of the great Public Societies of Paris. As a specimen of the work actually accomplished we subjoin, in a footnote,[1] a conspectus of some of the principal items of the last year's work in this mission. It is impossible to be an eye-witness without being convinced of the reality of it, and that there is in it a genuine instance of the success of the divinely-appointed means for bringing souls, ignorant of the Lord Jesus Christ, into a knowledge of Him as their Saviour. Dr. Bonar sums up the present condition of the movement as follows:—

> Mr. M'All's 23 stations—the 8,000 old and 3,000 young, in Paris, under Protestant instruction—are the exhibitions of a wondrous change. Disgusted with Popery, wearied with infidelity, France is seeking rest in the simple Gospel of Christ, asking her way from the crucifix to the Cross; from the mass book to the Bible, and wondering if the liberty of Christ be not better than the bondage of the Pope; if the *Cantiques Populaires* be not more intelligible, at least to the *ouvrier*, than the Latin *Hymni Ecclesiæ* of the Paris Breviary.

It is due to the Evangelical section of the Protestant Reformed Church to notice that they have heartily welcomed this extraneous movement, of which they ought naturally to reap the fruits; that they have co-operated in it freely, giving it much valuable counsel and assistance, and in many ways have shown themselves fellow-workers unto the kingdom of God. As yet this effort may be

[1]

French meetings for adults in Paris in 1878	2,788
Aggregate attendance at ditto.	431,370
Adult Bible classes	294
Aggregate attendance at ditto.	13,374
French prayer meetings	151
Attendance at ditto	10,356
Total of religious meetings in Paris during the year	5,471
Total attendance at ditto.	556,218
Attendance at psalmody meetings	43,710
Scripture portions distributed	24,203
Tracts distributed	151,535
Meetings held in Lyons (during three months)	41
Aggregate attendance at ditto.	5,815
Tracts, &c., distributed	4,838
Sittings in stations in Paris	5,192

said to be almost in its infancy. The experiment was only begun at the close of the year 1872. It has been carried on with limited means and only too few helpers. But yet the Lord hath done great things, whereof true Christians should be glad. Most important of all, a way has been opened up into the heart of France which Rome cannot, and dare not, tread. It has been demonstrated that the ideas of God and liberty can co-exist in one and the same heart, in one and the same city. There is no reason why there should not be further and more extensive application of the same principle throughout the length and breadth of France. Towards the close of the reign of Francis I. it was calculated that nearly one-sixth of the population had, in a few years, embraced the Reformation. The Bible was everywhere ' ans le manoir du noble et sous le chaume du villageois." It is worse than a delusion to assert that the clear, bright intellect of France delights in the childishness and slavery of Popery. Where it clings to it, it is because it knows of nothing else in the shape of religion, and it does not really wish to be "without God," though it can dispense with the Romish priesthood.

But what, in the present crisis, is the attitude of the State? Beyond a doubt, there is much to cause anxiety. It would be folly not to recognize an element hostile to all revelation, and indiscriminate in its opposition to every phase of religion. It is the violent recoil from clericalism and superstition. It is not freedom but licentiousness. There is, however, beyond it a Conservative-Republican element both among the peasantry, among the bourgeoisie, and among those who wield supreme power. This is violently opposed to all priestcraft. It is resolutely bent on the sweeping away of all institutions which, in the past, have proved themselves incompatible with liberty. It has little sympathy with the bishops and priests who now represent the Church of France, because it distrusts their intentions; consequently it has some difficulty in maintaining even official relations with them. There is plainly a determined intention to rescue the education of the young from the thraldom of the priesthood, and to place it, if they can, in neutral hands. Toleration of religion is the attitude rather than support of it, except within the strictest official limits. Of course, for the French clergy, this is a most uncomfortable condition of things; but if so many of them are wearing a foreign uniform they can hardly expect to be recognized as Frenchmen.[1] In consequence many hard things have been said of the present Government of France, for which,

[1] "L'habit monastique est l'uniforme des soldats du Pape, souverain étranger."

possibly, there may be some justification. But although men have risen to power during the present Republic, who must be held to be indifferent to religion, more especially that which is true and spiritual, this is no novelty in France. Talleyrand, Thiers, Louis Napoleon, were not Christians of a high order, nor were Louis XVIII., or Charles X. ornaments of religion. This much, however, can be said upon behalf of the new régime, that they have not been hostile to the preaching of the Gospel. The present French Government "has authorised the opening of twenty-three places of evangelical worship, without asking permission of Pope or Bishop. . . . . Religious liberty is not fully legalized in France, but it is making progress. To a large extent the Word of the Lord has free course and is glorified. Paris is certainly listening to the Gospel, "no man forbidding and not a few rejoicing." On the testimony of M. Reveillaud, a most competent witness, never before has "Protestantism found a more favourable opportunity for propagandism."* The prefects now make no difficulty in granting authorization for religious meetings. Bibles and controversial pamphlets can be freely circulated. Officials and the police-force show all possible courtesy, nay, are willing to help in the work of invitation. When has this ever before been the case in the history of France? We do not think that we are unduly sanguine in imagining that, in some dim and imperfect fashion, those who now bear rule in France have a sort of conception that it is, after all, possible to reconcile the ideas of God and liberty through the medium of Protestant teaching. Many of them may not be over sanguine about this, but they are willing to give the experiment a fair trial. There may be some wild fanatics who have no thought but for chaos and anarchy; these, however, are not in authority, nor is it likely that France would tolerate them in power. Her present statesmen would assuredly be glad if peace, and order, and contentment could be augmented without trenching upon liberty. Rome is not trusted by them, for it has proclaimed aloud its hostility to all liberty, except that of doing what it pleases. Protestantism has not committed itself, even partially, to so fatal a dogma. It can, therefore, be encouraged. It affords a *juste milieu* between Popery and Infidelity, between superstition and Atheism. It is thus possible for Frenchmen "to stand fast in the liberty wherewith Christ hath made them free, without being entangled again with the yoke of bondage."

There is, then, a remedy for the sore disease under which

[1] M. de Pressensé reports that at Saint Just, in the Department of the Oise, one thousand five hundred persons were manifesting the earnest interest in the Gospel. It seems as if the entire town, with the mayor at its head, would pass over to the Protestant Church. Similar conditions, he adds, exist in many other parts of the country.

France has been so long labouring. There are the means of emancipation provided for her sons, while at the same time their religious instincts can be satisfied. As in the year of jubilee, "liberty is proclaimed," and that in the name of God, "throughout all the land unto the inhabitants thereof." M. Reveillaud declares that "Romish priests, whatever aversion they have inspired towards themselves, have not succeeded in making Christ and his gospel unpopular" among the masses. There is manifestly no indisposition to accept the remedy. France has unquestionably, as have other nations, exposed itself to righteous condemnation for its manifold crimes against God and man. Paris has outdone France in its hostility to God. It has been the seat of licentiousness and outrage; of all possible corruption. But can we venture to say that the day of grace is past for it, or that it is not knowing the time of its visitation? One thing seems clearly established, that if there is to be "God" in France there must be "liberty."

But what have we, as English Churchmen, to do with all this? A very great deal. However grossly Frenchmen may have been misled, and truth has departed from them, still they are nominally, and by outward profession, Christians. We do not doubt, too, that even in the Church of Rome God has His secret ones, "elect, according to the foreknowledge of God the Father, through sanctification of the Spirit, unto obedience and sprinkling of the blood of Jesus Christ." If, then, one member suffer, all the members should suffer with it. For this one main reason all Christians should feel interested in the religious fortunes of France. Then, moreover, we have been rivals. A silver streak has divided us, and we have been, and still are, living on either side of it. The odious element in this rivalry has now, we trust for ever, passed away. We are, rather, neighbours, and we are taught by our Master that we owe a duty to our neighbours. Again, intercourse has been great between us. We have borrowed much that is valuable from the admirable genius as from the rich commerce of France. It is our duty and our privilege to repay it as we can, if possible, with still more excellent gifts. We can hardly expect to make our own peculiar institutions prevail in France. The spirit of modern France is now distinctly Republican, that of England is, and we trust will continue to be for many generations yet to come, Monarchical. We have found that "God" and "Liberty" can co-exist with an Established Church; that under its shadow they can grow and thrive. Under the upas tree of Romanism both have withered, and were in a fair way of becoming extinct. There is every appearance that there has a cry come forth from "a watcher, and a Holy One coming down from heaven and saying, 'Hew the tree down and destroy it.'" As being more akin

to Republicanism, it is likely that any new phase of Christianity in France would assimilate itself to the Protestantism already existing, if it did not fuse with it. Presbyterianism is the form in which—through the hostility of the hierarchy, and the grievous cruelties and errors of the past—protest against Romish error and subjugation has presented itself to the French mind. Now it is most fully consistent to prize our own especial blessings—for such are our monarchy, our episcopate, under which, though not without serious struggles, we have realized an amount of civil and religious liberty not to be found elsewhere in the world—and yet to sympathize with the efforts of French Christians to procure some analogous advantages in themselves. We, with excellent reason, have for ourselves serious objections to the formula "l'Eglise libre dans l'état libre." In England this would reproduce the sacerdotalism fatal to France with grievous spiritual bondage, for there are various sorts of tyranny. Law is a safeguard to religion when rightly understood and administered. There can be more freedom inside an Establishment than out of it, as many in England are beginning to perceive. The yoke of sacerdotalism might be heavier upon us but for the Court of Queen's Bench. It is not, however, easy to conceive how anything of the kind could be realized in France. Gallicanism, for a long period the dream of Frenchmen, was encumbered with Romanism, which eventually strangled it. This has not been forgotten or forgiven. But with it has gone the possibility of a national hierarchy asserting and upholding national freedom. Roman legions are encamped in the country, but these are as inconsistent with freedom as in the days of Cæsar. Whether an Episcopal Church could be evolved out of the ruins of Rome, is too abstruse a problem to meddle with, nor is it easy to see how it would assimilate with Republican France. It might spring up, but probably still more as a sect than it is in America, where the Episcopal Church holds an honourable position.

It is, however, when we review the fearful trials through which France has laboured, and the deplorable condition to which religion has been reduced in that country by the prevalence of superstition and infidelity, that we should learn to prize more and more the blessings that we ourselves enjoy. We have had our conflicts in the days that are past; there is much to sadden and discourage now, when we contemplate how imperfectly Christian effort overtakes abounding evil; but when we contrast our assured religious freedom with the struggles of foreign nations to possess an approximation to it, and when we compare the hold which Christianity has, not only over multitudes among the masses, but also over a large portion of the more enlightened in the country, and place this in juxtaposition with the avowed

irreligion of a great country like France, we are called upon reverently to acknowledge God's great mercies to ourselves. In England Protestantism has been dominant since the period of the Reformation. In France Romanism has ruled for the last three hundred years with fire and sword, undisputed mistress "drunken with the blood of the saints, and with the blood of the martyrs of Jesus." It is not one of the least wonders of the times in which we are living that, on the 2nd November, 1879, a large audience assembled within the Palace of Versailles when the Bible and the Huguenot Liturgy were read close to the very room where Louis XIV., two hundred years ago, signed the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes, if we mistake not, in the Œil de Bœuf!

GEORGE KNOX.

NOTE.—Two books have recently been published which will enable general readers to form some true estimate of the extent and amount of the strength of Clericalism, as it is termed in France, which is now in open and avowed conflict with the State. One is English, the other is French. To a certain extent they both coincide, but the one may be fairly looked upon as the complement of the other. Possibly some may be familiar with Mr. Hamerton's lively and truthful sketches embodied in his volume, "Round About my House." In a very genial manner Mr. Hamerton displays what may be termed the fair outside of Clericalism and the means by which it is upheld. Its strength consists in "good society;" it is promoted by Legitimism, which is not yet without prestige in France, and can command a certain amount of influence over aspirants to social distinction, women especially. In a very pleasant bantering vein, which almost recalls Addison, in the "Spectator," Mr. Hamerton furnishes some pictures creditable to his skill as an artist. Mr. Edgar Monteil, in his "Henriette Grey," a book in the form of a novel, but a political manifesto, dwells upon the same theme, but in a spirit surcharged with hostility to Clericalism. He is singularly at one with Mr. Hamerton in his explanation of the sources of clerical strength, such as they are. The one fully confirms the other. But, instead of the fair outside, we have the foul inside put before us. The exposure of the vices and absurdities of Romish Clericalism in France is ghastly. The chapters on the La Salette imposture, and on Convent Education, deserve especial notice. If even a portion of the intrigues laid bare, of the political interference, of the accumulation of wealth by nefarious means for the advancement, not of Christianity, but of Papalism, of the more than childish education imparted under clerical auspices, could be substantiated—and there is strong presumption that it can—we can be at no loss to understand why opposition to Clericalism is, in France, so bitter and so resolute. At any rate, it is plainly under the dominion of these ideas that French statesmen are proceeding in their present course of action. The pent-up hostility accumulated during the rule of Louis Philippe and Napoleon III. is now pouring itself forth like lava down the sides of a volcano. Even the most strenuous upholders of Clericalism in France must admit that it has managed to concentrate for itself an intensity of ill feeling which menaces its existence. Both the authors we have referred to have made it clear that clerical influence depends purely upon a clique which the nation repudiates. This is a poor basis for a Church to rest upon. He, however, who would rightly understand the present posture of affairs, must

distinctly understand that, although Romanism may be the nominal creed of the majority of Frenchmen, a vast proportion of them hate it bitterly, and that only a fraction of the men of France have any sort of sympathy with it. France is by law not a Roman Catholic country, but one in which all creeds are equally recognized by the State.

G. K.

IN EGYPT.

"*No man knoweth the Son, but the Father.*"—St. Matt. xi. 27.

1.

HERE the mysterious river sweeps,
Mute, with some wondrous word unsaid;
And here the silent pyramid keeps
The secret of the silent dead;
And here, above a Babe that sleeps,
The silent Virgin bows her head.

2.

Still is the shadowy night around,
And still the silver stars above;
What plummet may their mystery sound?
Hush, lest the awful Infant move!
He yet shall speak some word profound,
And wonder shall give place to love.

3.

Creation travails and makes moan:
Death smites: our ashes crumbling lie:
Time like a voiceless flood rolls on,
With lives like foamflakes wafted by—
Of Him their secret shall be known,
But who shall search His mystery?

GEORGE A. CHADWICK.

Reviews.

Curiosities of Puritan Nomenclature. By CHARLES W. BARDSLEY, Author of "English Surnames, their Sources and Significations." Pp. 240. Chatto and Windus. 1880.

FROM the time of William the Conqueror Norman names began to prevail in this country, and before the year 1200 the great mass of the old English names had been ousted. Bible names, Saint names, and his own Teutonic names, were brought in by William; and the Norman influence was so strong that, about the year 1300, in every community of one hundred Englishmen, there would be an average of twenty Johns and fifteen Williams, while Thomas, Bartholomew, and Nicholas, or Robert, Roger, and Guy, were largely represented. During this "Pet-name Epoch," surnames were adopted. Such names as John Atte-wood, John the Bigg, and John Richard's son, were to be met with in every community. Not till 1450 or 1500, however, did surnames become hereditary among the middle or lower classes. There might, indeed, be two or three Johns in the same family. In 1550, it appears, one John Barker had three sons named John Barker. About the same time the will of John Parnell de Gyrton runs:—

> Alice, my wife, and Old John, my son, to occupy my farm together, till Olde John marries; Young John, my son, shall have Brenlay's land, plowed and sowed at Old John's cost.

Protector Somerset had three sons christened Edward; all were living at the same time. John Leland the antiquary had a brother John; and John White, Bishop of Winchester 1556-1560, was brother to Sir John White, Knight, Lord Mayor in 1563. It was in the reign of Edward I. that the name John came forward, William, hitherto, having been first favourite. The Reformation and the Puritan Commonwealth for a time darkened the fortunes of John as well as of William; but the Protestant accession befriended the latter, and now, as 800 years ago, William is first, and John second.

The introduction to the very interesting work before us deals with the epoch of pet-names, and Mr. Bardsley concludes it with pointing out that the Scripture names in use before the Reformation implied no direct acquaintance with the Scriptures. Bible names, which came through the Church, were all—with the single exception of the Crusade name, Jordan—in the full tide of prosperity at the time when the Bible was printed in English, and set up in our churches; but within the space of forty years our nomenclature was revolutionized, and every home felt the effect of the Scriptures being issued in the vulgar tongue.

The first portion of Mr. Bardsley's work, therefore, deals with what he terms "the Hebrew Invasion." The Genevan Bible was published in the year 1560, and the fondness for such names as Gershom, Aholiab, Bezaleell, Rebecca, and Repentance, dates from the decade 1560-1570, a decade which marks the rise of Puritanism. The Puritan, writes Mr. Bardsley, kept in sight his two big "P's"—Pagan and Popish. "Under the first he placed every name that could not be found in the Scriptures, and under the latter every title in the same Scriptures, and the Church system founded on them, that had been employed previous, say, to the coronation day of Edward VI." Accordingly, he rejected the Richards, Mileses, and Henrys of the Teutonic class, and the Bartholomews, Simons, Peters, and Nicholases of the ecclesiastical class. And baptismal entries like the following from the Canterbury Cathedral register, became common:—

1564, Dec. 3. Abdias, the sonne of Robert Pownoll.
1567, April 26. Barnabas, the sonne of Robert Pownoll.
1569, June 1. Ezeckiell, the sonne of Robert Pownoll.
1572, Feb. 10. Posthumus, the sonne of Robert Pownoll.

In 1582, "Zachary, the sonne of Thomas Newton, minister," was baptized at Barking, Essex; and in 1613, "a daughter of Roger Mainwaring, preacher," was baptized Jaell, in St. Helen's, Bishopsgate. In 1590, Emond Snape, curate of St. Peter's, Northampton, refused to baptize a child Richard, declaring that the Christian name ought to be one "allowed in the Scriptures." This case was one of the articles furnished by Archbishop Whitgift to the Lord Treasurer against Mr. Snape. As a rule New Testament names spread the most rapidly, especially Martha, Damaris, Priscilla, Dorcas, Tabitha, Phebe, Persis. Esther, or Hadassah, had a share of favour.

In Yorkshire Puritanism made early stand. As the seventeenth century progressed, Phineas, Caleb, Joel, Amos, Obadiah, Malachi, and Zephaniah, become more and more popular.

From Yorkshire [writes Mr. Bardsley], about the close of the seventeenth century, the rage for Scripture names passed into Lancashire. Nonconformity was making progress; the new industries were already turning villages into small centres of population, and the Church of England not providing for the increase, chapels were built. If we look over the pages of the directories of West Yorkshire and East Lancashire, and strike out the surnames, we could imagine we were consulting anciently inscribed registers of Joppa or Jericho. It would seem as if Canaan and the West Riding had got inextricably mixed. What a spectacle meets our eye! Within the limits of ten leaves we have three Pharaohs, while as many Hephzibahs are to be found on one single page. Adah and Zillah Pickles, sisters, are milliners. Jehoiada Rhodes makes saws —not Solomon's sort—and Hariph Crawshaw keeps a farm. Vashni, from somewhere in the Chronicles, is rescued from oblivion by Vashni Wilkinson, coal merchant, who very likely goes to Barzillai Williamson, on the same page, for his joints, Barzillai being a butcher. Jachin, known to but a few as situated in the Book of Kings, is in the person of Jacin Firth, a beer retailer, familiar to all his neighbours. Heber Holdsworth on one page is faced by Er Illingworth on another. Asa and Joel are extremely popular, while Abner, Adna, Ashael, Erastus, Eunice, Benaiah, Aqnila, Elihu, and Philemon, enjoy a fair share of patronage. Shadrach, Meshach, and Abednego, having been rescued from Chaldæan fire, have been deluged with baptismal water. How curious it is to contemplate such entries as Lemuel Wilson, Kelita Wilkinson, Shelah Haggas, Shadrach Newbold, Neriah Pearce, Jeduthan Jempson, Azariah Griffiths, Naphtali Matson, Philemon Jakes, Hameth Fell, Eleph Bisat, Malachi Ford, or Shallum Richardson. As to other parts of the Scriptures, I have lighted upon name after name that I did not know existed in the Bible at all till I looked into the Lancashire and Yorkshire directories.

The Bible, continues Mr. Bardsley, has decided the nomenclature of the northern counties:—

In towns like Oldham [he says], Bolton, Ashton, and Blackburn, the clergyman's baptismal register is but a record of Bible names. A clerical friend of mine christened twins Cain and Abel only the other day, much against his own wishes. Another parson on the Derbyshire border was gravely informed, at the proper moment, that the name of baptism was Ramoth-Gilead. "Boy or girl, eh?" he asked, in a somewhat agitated voice. The parents had opened the Bible haphazard, according to the village tradition, and selected the first name the eye fell on. It was but a year ago a little child was christened Tellno, in a town within six miles of Manchester, at the suggestion of a cotton-spinner, the father, a workman of the name of Lees, having asked his advice. "I suppose it must be a Scripture name," said his master. "Oh, yes! that's of course." "Suppose you choose *Tellno*," said his employer. "That'll do," replied the other, who had never heard it before, and liked it

the better on that account. The child is now Tell-no Lees, the father, too late, finding that he had been hoaxed.[1] "*Sirs*," was the answer given to a bewildered curate, after the usual demand to name the child. He objected, but was informed that it was a Scripture name, and the verse, "Sirs, what must I do to be saved?" was triumphantly appealed to. This reminds one of the Puritan who styled his dog "*Moreover*" after the dog in the Gospel: "*Moreover* the dog came and licked his sores."

Another story, somewhat different in character, is here given. From a knot of women round the font, says Mr. Bardsley, a clergyman made the usual demand. "Ax her," said one. Turning to the woman who appeared to be indicated, he again asked, "What name?" "Ax her," she replied. The third woman, being questioned, gave the same answer. At last he discovered the name to be the Scriptural Achsah, Caleb's daughter. No wonder this mistake arose, when Achsah used to be entered in some such manner as this:—

1743-4. Jan. 3. Baptised Axar Starrs (a woman of ripe years) of Stock port.

1743-4. Jan. 3. Married Warren Devonport, of Stockport, Esq., and Axar Starrs, aforesaid, spinster.—Marple, Cheshire.

Axar's father, says Mr. Bardsley, was Caleb Starrs. The scriptural relationship was thus preserved. Achsah crossed the Atlantic with the Pilgrim Fathers, and has prospered there ever since. It is still popular in Devonshire and the South-west of England.

The Northern Counties are specially referred to by our author, because he has studied its Directories with care. But in the shires of Devon, Dorset, and Hampshire, an inquirer will discover that Hebrew won the day. In fact, go where and when we will, he says, from the reign of Elizabeth we find the same influence at work. Thus, the will of Kerenhappuch Benett was proved in 1762, and Kerenhappuch Horrocks figures in the Manchester Directory for 1877. Onesiphorus Luffe appears on a halfpenny token of 1666; and about the same time we find the names of Habakkuk, Enodias, Melchisedek, Elnathan, and Abdiah. Again:—

Shallum Stent was married in 1681 (Racton, Sussex); Gershom Baylie was constable of Lewes in 1619, Araunah Verrall fulfilling the same office in 1784. Captain Epenetus Johnson presented a petition to Privy Council in 1660 (C.S.P. Colonial); Erastus Johnson was defendant in 1724, and Cressens Boote twenty years earlier. Barjonah Dove was vicar of Croxton in 1694; Tryphena Monger was buried in Putney churchyard in 1702; and Tryphosa Saunders at St. Peter's, Worcester, in 1770. Mahaliel Payne, Azarias Phesant, and Pelatiah Barnard are recorded in State Papers, 1650-1663 (C.S.P.), and Aminadab Henley was dwelling in Kent in 1640 ("Proceedings in Kent." Camden Society). Shadrach Pride is a collector of hearth-money in 1699;' and Gamaliel Chase is communicated with in 1635 (C.S.P.). Onesiphorus Albin proposes a better plan of collecting the alien duty in 1692 (C.S.P.), while Mordecai Abbott is appointed Deputy-Paymaster of the Forces in 1697 (C.S.P.). Eliakim Palmer is married at Somerset House Chapel in 1740; Delilah White is buried at Cowley in 1791; and Keziah Simmons is christened there in 1850. Selah Collins is baptized at Dyrham, Gloucestershire, in 1752; and Keturah Jones is interred at Clifton in 1778. Eli-lama-Sabachthani Pressnail was existing in 1862 (*Notes and Queries*); and the *Times* recorded a Talitha-Cumi People about the same time. The will of Mahershalalhashbaz Christmas was proved not very long ago. Mrs. Mahershalalhasbaz Bradford, was dwelling in Kingwood, Hampshire, in 1863; and on January 31, 1802, the register of Beccles Church received the entry, "Mahershalalhashbaz, son of Henry and Sarah Clarke, baptized," the same being followed, October 14, 1804, by the baptismal entry of Zaphnaphpaaneah, another son of the same couple. A grant of administration

[1] To tell a lie is to tell a *lee* in Lancashire.

in the estate of Acts-Apostles Pegden, was made in 1865. His four brothers older than himself were of course the four Evangelists, and had there been a sixth, I dare say his name would have been "Romans." An older member of this family, many years one of the kennel-keepers of Tickham foxhounds, was Pontius Pilate Pegden. At a confirmation at Faversham in 1847, the incumbent of Dunkirk presented to the amazed archbishop a boy named "Acts-Apostles."

Names of melancholy import during a period of religious oppression became common. "*Lamentations* Chapman" appeared as a defendant in a Chancery suit towards the close of Elizabeth's reign. Mordecai was common. According to Camden, "Dust" and "Ashes" were names in use in the days of Elizabeth and James. These, no doubt, were translations of the Hebrew "Aphrah" into the vulgar tongue, the name having become common. The prophet Micah, in a mournful passage, says:—"In the house of Aphrah [Beth-Aphrah, in the house of dust] roll thyself in the dust." The Puritans adopted this name, and Affray, Affera, Afra, appear in baptismal registers from 1599 to 1614. Mr. Bardsley, quoting Canterbury registers, remarks that we see here the origin of the licentious Aphra Behn's name, which looks so like a *nom-de-plume*, and has puzzled many. Aphra Johnson was born in Canterbury, and she married a Dutch merchant named Behn. Readers of Lockhart's Sir Walter Scott will remember a passage concerning the works of Aphra Behn, happily known, in these days, only within a small antiquarian circle. Mr. Bardsley quotes her signature in 1666 as Aphara. He points out, with regard to such names as Barabas and "Judas-not-Iscariot," that a remedy might have been found in former days by changing the name at confirmation. Until 1552, the Bishop confirmed by name.

And here we must pause. In the second portion of his work, equally graphic and instructive, he shows how another series of names came in. Mr. Bardsley points out the mistakes made as to date by several writers in regard to these names when he proves that during the latter portion of Elizabeth's reign, the whole of James's reign, and great part of Charles's reign, there prevailed, in a large portion of southern England, a practice of baptizing children by Scriptural phrases, and religious ejaculations or admonitions. Thus, in the years 1587–96, and onwards, long before Cromwell's time, baptismal registers reveal such names as Stedfast, Renewed, Safe-on-Highe, Much-merceye, Increased, More-fruit, From-above, Fear-not. *No-merit* Vinall was a standing denunciation of works, and *Sorry-for-sin* Coupard was a peripatetic exhortation to repentance. John Frewen, Puritan Rector of Northiam, Sussex, from 1583 to 1628, had two sons baptized in his church, *Accepted*, and *Thankful*. Accepted Frewen died Archbishop of York.

St. Hippolytus and the Church of Rome in the earlier part of the Third Century. From the newly-discovered "Refutation of all Heresies." By CHR. WORDSWORTH, D.D., Bishop of Lincoln. Second and greatly enlarged edition. Pp. 320. Rivingtons: 1880.

A LEARNED Greek, Minoïdes Mynas, having been sent out by M. Villemain, Minister of Public Instruction in France under King Louis Philippe, to make researches in Greek monasteries for ancient MSS., brought some literary treasures from Mount Athos in the year 1842. Among these, deposited in the Royal Library at Paris, was a Greek MS. of the earlier part of the fourteenth century. This MS., prepared for publication by M. Miller, was printed at the instance of the Oxford University Press Delegates in the year 1851. The work consisted, when perfect, of ten Books. In the first four Books, the Author gave an account

of the various systems of ancient Philosophy; in the fifth Book, the work becomes theological, its writer describing the various heresies which had appeared in the Christian Church from the beginning down to his own day. The double title of the work, in fact, describes its contents:—*Philosophumena*, or, *a Refutation of all Heresies*. In the latter portion, passing over the same ground as that traversed by Irenæus, the Author frequently acknowledges his obligations to that Father, and quotes from him. In some instances, indeed, his work presents to us the original Greek of Irenæus, where till now we possessed only the Latin version.

The last two books of this volume are those which impart to its discovery an historical importance. They bring before us a portion of ancient Church History of which hitherto we have had but little knowledge; and they throw light upon certain questions of peculiar interest and importance in the present period. The author places us at Rome; he describes, with graphic minuteness, events which took place in the Church of Rome in the second and third centuries. He writes as an eye-witness, and he represents himself as occupying an important position in the Church of Rome at that time, and as taking a prominent part in the events which he narrates. We have here, in short, an author professing to be a Roman bishop, and presenting us with a "History of his own Time." But is his recital trustworthy? Who is the author?

The copies of the edition printed at Oxford in 1851 bear the name of Origen, but there are several strong arguments against the Origen authorship. To mention only one. The feelings which induced that Father to palliate the errors of heretics beguiled him into exercising his ingenuity in tampering with the declarations of Scripture concerning future punishments; but the author of the newly-discovered treatise declares, in plain and positive language, that the pains of hell are not temporal but eternal. Certainly Origen is not the author of "Refutation of all Heresies."

Another name is brought before us in connection with the discovery of a statue. In the year 1551, some excavations being made at Rome, on the Via Tiburtina, near an ancient church of St. Hippolytus, a marble statue of a venerable figure, sitting in a chair, as a Christian Teacher, was brought to light. The sides and back of the chair were found to be covered with inscriptions in Greek uncial letters; there was a Calendar, or Paschal Table, with a catalogue of titles of writings. Examination of the dates and the books—to sum up briefly—demonstrates that the person represented in this statue is Bishop Hippolytus, author of the treatise against heresies, written about A.D. 223, and discovered in the year 1842. When the statue, restored by Pope Pius IV., was removed to the Vatican, the following inscription, assigning to Hippolytus the title of "Bishop of Portus," the harbour of Rome, was engraved on its pedestal:—

STATVA
S. HIPPOLYTI
PORTVENSIS EPISCOPI
QVI VIXIT ALEXANDRO
PIO. IMP.
EX VRBIS RVINIS EFFOSSA
A PIO. IIII. MEDICEO
PONT. MAX.
RESTITVTA.

The Hippolytus of this statue is the author of the work first printed at Oxford in 1851, more than sixteen centuries after its composition. The newly-discovered treatise, writes Bishop Christopher Wordsworth, "has now been acknowledged to be the work of St. Hippolytus, the scholar of St. Irenæus, the bishop and martyr of the Roman Church, the

most learned and eloquent of the writers of that Church in the earlier part of the third century, by the concurrent judgment of some of the most eminent theologians, Roman Catholic as well as Protestant; such as Dr. Von Döllinger, Bishop Lightfoot, Dean Milman, Archdeacon Churton, Canon Robertson, Baron Bunsen, Dr. G. Volckmar, Dr. Gieseler, Professor Jacobi, Dr. Schaff, and others; and this treatise has been published as a genuine work of St. Hippolytus by Dr. Duncker at Göttingen, in 1859." The testimony on this matter, adds Bishop Wordsworth, may be summed up in the words of Dr. Von Döllinger:—

That the celebrated Doctor of the Church, Hippolytus, was the author of the newly-discovered work on the Heresies, is declared simultaneously by the majority of those who have investigated this question.

In relation to other works ascribed to Hippolytus, the "Refutation of all Heresies" possesses, of course, no small value; and the Bishop of Lincoln believes we may appeal to those works with confidence as authentic witnesses of the Doctrine and Discipline of this Church in the earlier part of the third century.

The point of importance, however, in the work before us, is the position of Hippolytus in regard to Rome. Bishop Wordsworth quotes the well-known passage in Irenæus concerning the Church of Rome; and his lordship's criticisms on this passage, which we have only in Latin, are conclusive against Papal Supremacy. But the original Greek, he adds, was in the hands of Hippolytus. Bishop Hippolytus was a scholar of Irenæus; he passed part of his life near Rome, and wrote concerning two of its bishops; he was honoured in his day; and the Church of Rome now regards him as a martyr and a saint, keeping his statue with honour in the Lateran Museum. What, then, is his testimony with regard to the Bishop of Rome? Did he regard him as Supreme Head of the Church Universal? Did he venerate him as infallible?

First, as to Infallibility. Hippolytus shows that two Roman bishops, Zephyrinus and Callistus, lapsed into heresy, in a primary article of the Christian Faith, and in opposition to the exhortations of orthodox teachers. "They maintained that heresy and propagated it by their official authority, as bishops of Rome. They promulgated publicly a doctrine, which the Church of Rome herself, with all other Churches of Christendom, now declares to be heretical."

Secondly, as to Supremacy. When Zephyrinus and Callistus endeavoured to disseminate false doctrines they were resisted by St. Hippolytus. He stood boldly forth and rebuked them.[1] He thus gave a practical reply to the question concerning the sense of St. Irenæus in the passage now so often quoted by Romanists. Not only did Hippolytus oppose two Bishops of Rome, but he continued his opposition; his resistance was deliberate and successful. When Zephyrinus and Callistus were in their graves he committed to writing the history of their heresy, and of his own opposition to it. He affirms that he wrote this treatise in discharge of his duty as a bishop; and he promises himself, evidently not in vain, that gratitude would be shown to him for it.[2]

In the volume before us, a second, much-enlarged edition of Bishop

---

[1] The allusion to Hippolytus in that remarkable book "The Pope and the Council," by *Janus*, we may remark, and in other similar works, is incomplete.

[2] Cardinal Baronius bears this testimony to Hippolytus:—"To the very great misfortune and detriment of the whole Catholic Church, many writings of this orthodox writer have perished; but, as is agreed by the Eastern and Western Church, he is deservedly called a great ornament of them both." Cardinal Mai,

Wordsworth's well-known work, these matters are clearly and ably set forth. There are many points of interest in the work on which we might dwell.[1] Having giving a sketch of its argument, however, we must content ourselves with remarking that the portion of the manuscript which relates to the Church of Rome is given with a translation and notes. The book is printed in large, clear type, and displays throughout that accurate and graceful scholarship for which the eminent bishop is famed.

Saint John Chrysostom: His Life and Times. A Sketch of the Church and the Empire in the Fourth Century. By W. R. W. STEPHENS, M.A., Prebendary of Chichester and Rector of Woolbeding. Second edition. Pp. 456. Murray. 1880.

THE characteristics of this work are known probably to many of our readers, and more than a brief notice of the new edition is not necessary. The book well answers to its title. A great deal of information concerning "the Church and the Empire" in the Chrysostom period is presented in a very readable form; it is accurate and impartial.

A few quotations may be given. The second chapter, for example, opens thus:—

It has been well remarked by Sir Henry Savile, in the preface to his noble edition of Chrysostom's works, published in 1612, that, as with great rivers, so often with great men, the middle and the close of their career are dignified and distinguished, but the primary source and early progress of the stream are difficult to ascertain and trace. No one, he says, has been able to fix the exact date, the year, and the consulship of Chrysostom's birth. This is true; but at the same time his birth, parentage, and education are not involved in such obscurity as surrounds the earlier years of some other great luminaries of the Eastern Church; his own friend, for instance, Theodore, Bishop of Mopsuestia,

---

referring to a commentary of this "great Doctor and Martyr," adds:—"Statuam ejus cum paschali cyclo operumque Catalogo inscripto prope Urbem in agro Verano Marcelli Card. Cervini auspiciis effossam, deinde a Pio IV. in Bibliothecâ Vaticanâ, ubi adhuc asservatur, positam, in fronte libri mei incidendam curavi." (Scriptorum Veterum Nova Collectio Vat. Rom. 1825.) It is worthy of note that Pius IV. was the Pope who promulgated the Trent Creed in which Papal Supremacy is laid down as an Article of Faith.

[1] One passage has a special interest. Bishop Wordsworth quotes from an oration by the present Pope, Leo XIII., Dec. 8, 1879. The Pope said:—"La Concezione Immacolata ci rivela il segreto della potenza grandissima di Maria sopra il comune nemico (Satan).—Giacchè ne insegna la fede, che Maria fin dai primordii del mondo fu destinata ad exercitare contro il Demonio e contro il suo seme implacabile ed eterna inimicizia, '*inimicitias ponam inter te et mulierem*,' e che fin dal primo istante dell'essere suo potè schiacciargli vittoriosamente la superba cervice, '*Ipsa conteret caput tuum*' (Genesis iii. 15)." And thus, on a memorable occasion, writes the Bishop, "The Roman Pontiff, who claims infallibility in matters of Faith, proved himself fallible, and greatly erred, by misinterpreting that divine prophecy—the first prophecy in Scripture (Gen. iii. 15), and by ascribing to a *Woman* (the Blessed Virgin) the power which Almighty God there assigns to the *Seed* of the Woman—namely, CHRIST. Pope Leo XIII. is reported to be a scholar. How he could venture to substitute Ipsa for Ipse, if he were not blinded by some mysterious influence, is inexplicable." The same Pope, adds Dr. Wordsworth, has ordered all men to take their theology from Thomas Aquinas. Yet Thomas Aquinas *rejected the dogma of the Immaculate Conception*. Thus Popes contradict one another and themselves, and yet claim infallibility!

and yet more notably, the great Athanasius. . . . . There is little doubt that his birth occurred not later than the year A.D. 347, and not earlier than the year A.D. 345; and there is no doubt that Antioch in Syria was the place of his birth, that his mother's name was Anthusa, his father's Secundus, and that both were well born. His mother was, if not actually baptized, very favourably inclined to Christianity, and, indeed, a woman of no ordinary piety.

The father died when John was an infant, leaving a young widow about twenty years of age, in comfortable circumstances :—

How long a sister older than himself may have lived we do not know; but the conversation between him and his mother, when he was meditating a retreat into a monastery, seems to imply that he was the only child. All her love, all her care, all her means and energies, were concentrated on the boy destined to become so great a man, and exhibiting even in childhood no common ability and aptitude for learning. But her chief anxiety was to train him in pious habits, and to preserve him uncontaminated from the pollutions of the vicious city in which they resided. She was to him what Monica was to Augustine, and Nonna to Gregory Nazianzen.

At the age of twenty, designed for the legal profession, John began to attend the lectures of one of the first sophists of the day, Libanius, an eloquent defender of Paganism, the friend and correspondent of Julian. When on his death-bed Libanius was asked by his friends who was in his opinion capable of succeeding him. "It would have been John," he said, "had not the Christians stolen him from us." John did indeed commence practice as a lawyer; and a brilliant career of worldly ambition was open to him :—

But the pure and upright disposition of the youthful advocate recoiled from the licentiousness which corrupted society; from the avarice, fraud, and artifice which marked the transactions of men of business; from the chicanery and rapacity that sullied the profession which he had entered. He was accustomed to say later in life that the Bible was the fountain for watering the soul. If he had drunk of the classical fountains in the school of Libanius, he had imbibed draughts yet deeper of the spiritual well-spring in quiet study of Holy Scripture at home. And like many another in that degraded age, his whole soul revolted from the glaring contrast presented by the ordinary life of the world around him to that standard of holiness which was held up in the Gospels.

In the year 397 died Nectarius, Archbishop of Constantinople. At that time several bishops happened to be sojourning in Constantinople on business, and as tidings of the vacancy of the see got abroad the number of episcopal visitors largely increased :—

Constantinople became convulsed by all those factious disputes and dissensions which *usually attended* the election of a bishop to an important see, and which Chrysostom has so vividly described in his treatise on the priesthood. From dawn of day the places of public resort were occupied by candidates and their partisans, paying court, or paying bribes to the common people; canvassing the nobles and the wealthy, not without the potent aid of rich and costly gifts—some statue from Greece, or silk from India, or perfumes from Arabia.

The italics, of course, are our own; and as the principle of election, in regard at least to clerical electors, was referred to in the recent *congé d'élire* debate in the House of Commons, the remark of Prebendary Stephens is worth quoting. When the name of Chrysostom, a man who had not come forward at all, was submitted to the Emperor by the clergy and the people, he immediately approved their choice; it is probable, indeed, that he suggested the eloquent preacher of Antioch.

It may be added, in recommending the volume before us, that it is printed with clear type on good paper. The present edition is substantially a reproduction of the first.

In the Advertisements of 1566 was Order taken by the Authority of the Queen with the Advice of the Commissioners for Causes Ecclesiastical or of the Metropolitan of the Realm?

An Historical Enquiry. With a few Notes on Mr. Parker's Letter to Lord Selborne. By C. A. SWAINSON, D.D., Canon of Chichester Cathedral, Lady Margaret's Professor of Divinity, Cambridge. Pp. 80. Cambridge: Deighton, Bell, and Co. London: George Bell & Sons.

"A Committee of the Lower House of the Convocation of Canterbury was appointed on April 27th, 1877, to consider the constitutional "relations between the authorities ecclesiastical and civil in this Church "and realm, and the best methods whereby common action may be taken "by them in matters affecting the Church. The report of the Committee "was dated 11th July, 1878, and came on for discussion in Convocation in "the earlier sessions of 1879. The Report was of course prepared after "the argument in the Folkestone case, and it was signed by the Chairman "of the Committee nearly fourteen months after the judgment in that "case was delivered. It was not without great surprise, therefore, that I "found, on page 5 of this Report, in a 'list of ordinances' arranged in "chronological order, the following, viz.:—

> '1564. Advertisements. No copy of these bearing the royal signature has 'been discovered; hence it is a matter of controversy whether they have 'legal force or authority.'

"The date, 1564, assigned here to a document of the year 1566, to which "recent controversy had drawn very great attention, was sufficient to "show that even amongst gentlemen of high position, character, and at- "tainments, who had been entrusted by Convocation with official duties, "much uncertainty as to the nature of these Advertisements existed; "and as the Lower House did me the honour of adding me to the com- "mittee when the Report was referred back to it for reconsideration, I was "led to investigate once more, for myself, the history of these advertise- "ments. Inasmuch as the results of my investigations may help others "to form an opinion of their history, founded upon more complete evidence "than yet has been collected, I have forced myself to commit these pages "to the press. The labour certainly has not been a labour of love.

"Of course I have had before me Mr. James Parker's letter to Lord "Selborne (1878) and the postscript to that letter (1879). And I have "expressed my obligations to Mr. Parker for documents which he has dis- "covered and published. But here my obligations end. For the very "title of his letter, 'Did Queen Elizabeth take other order in the Adver- "tisements of 1566?' raised a false issue. The question which had to be "answered was this: In these Advertisements 'was order taken by the "authority of the Queen's Majesty with the advice of the Commissioners "appointed and authorised under the great seal of England for causes "ecclesiastical, or of the Metropolitan of this Realm?'"

The preceding paragraph, which we have quoted in full and without alteration, forms the opening of the Introduction to Canon Swainson's masterly argument. For extracts from the body of the pamphlet—and a choice passage occurs on almost every page—we regret we have no space. The point and purpose of the learned Professor's work, however, will be understood if to the preceding quotation we add his concluding sentences. He concludes as follows:—

I conceive that Archbishop Parker was bound as Metropolitan, and as one of the Commissioners for Ecclesiastical Causes, to act upon the Royal letter of Jan. 25, 156$\frac{4}{5}$: just as much as the Archbishop of Canterbury in the present day is bound to prepare a form of prayer for any emergency at the command of the Queen in Council. Thus Parker, under the authority of the Queen and by

virtue of her letter, was bound by his allegiance to proceed "by order, injunction, or censure, so as uniformity of order may be kept in every church without variety and contention." Then by virtue of her verbal charge to him, in the presence of the Bishop of London, he was bound "to see her laws executed and good orders decreed and observed." In the present day the Archbishop under the authority of the Queen in Council, and by virtue of the command given to him, issues a form of prayer. But as it is not necesary now that the form of prayer when composed shall be submitted again to the Queen for her approval, either under the great seal or under her signet, so it seems that it was not necessary 300 years ago that the notices which were issued by the Archbishop and Commissioners, and the orders which they decreed in obedience to the Queen, should, after they were prepared, be submitted to the Queen for her approval.

As a matter of fact, however, these notices were submitted to and, in their final shape, approved by the Secretary of State.

We tender our hearty thanks to the eminent divine to whom the Church is indebted for this very valuable "Historical Inquiry," and we lose no time in earnestly commending it to the attention of our readers.

Short Notices.

Memorials of Frances Ridley Havergal. By her Sister, "M. V. G. H." Pp. 391. Nisbet and Co. 1880.

An *In Memoriam* article on Frances Havergal appeared in the first number of this magazine. We content ourselves at present with merely noticing the volume, just published, which lies before us. It has an interest and value of its own, and we heartily recommend it. After reading these Memorials, many, no doubt, will understand the secret of Miss Havergal's influence; her life was one of prayer, and her humility was as marked as her trustful earnestness. The following is the inscription on the north side of Mr. Havergal's tomb, in Astley churchyard:—

FRANCES RIDLEY HAVERGAL,
Youngest Daughter of the Rev. W. H. Havergal,
and Jane his Wife,
Born at Astley Rectory, 14th December, 1836. Died at Caswell Bay, Swansea, 3rd June, 1879. Aged 42.
By her writings in prose and verse, she, "being dead yet speaketh."
"*The blood of Jesus Christ, His Son, cleanseth us from all sin.*"
1 John i. 7.

The Hymnal Companion to the Book of Common Prayer. Revised and enlarged Edition, with Introduction and Notes. Edited by EDWARD HENRY BICKERSTETH, M.A., Vicar of Christ Church, Hampstead, Rural Dean and Chaplain to the Lord Bishop of Ripon. Sampson Low, Marston, Searle, and Rivington. 1880.

The Introduction to this Hymnal was first written in the year 1870; it has been revised for the present edition, and contains much interesting information. "Many of the editor's anticipations, as expressed ten years ago," we read, "have already been verified." It appears from a paper on Hymns, by Prebendary Bulling, read at the Swansea Congress, that "in place of the multiplicity and endless diversity in 1858, there are now *three* books which practically cover nearly all the ground, and meet the present requirements of the Church, (1), 'Hymns Ancient and Modern;' (2), 'The Hymnal Companion to the Prayer Book;' (3), 'The Compilation of the

Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge." ' For ourselves, we are bound to say that having studied many Hymn-Books, we prefer Mr. Bickersteth's. To "Hymns Ancient and Modern" our objections are great, and we confess that the more we examine it the less we like it. But with several selections which are not from their sacerdotalism objectionable, we are on one ground or another more or less dissatisfied. Of the Hymnal Companion, however, we have made use from the first issue, and we have carefully studied the present revised edition; the book seems to us a remarkably good one; whether we regard the number of approved, generally popular, hymns which it contains, or test it with respect to its Protestant evangelical teaching, we are well satisfied. The number of hymns is sufficiently large, and the arrangement is really admirable. Of the notes we need hardly say they add much to the interest of this edition. Everywhere, indeed, appear tokens of the refined taste and deep devoutness of the editor, himself a poet of no mean order. Of the smaller editions and the musical edition we may write hereafter.

The Religious Condition of Christendom. A Series of Papers presented to the Seventh General Conference of the Evangelical Alliance, held at Basle, 1879. Published by authority of the Council of the British Organization of the Alliance. Edited by the Rev. J. MURRAY MITCHELL, M.A., LL.D. Pp. 490. Hodder and Stoughton, 1880.

A Report of the proceedings of the Basle Conference was published partly in German and partly in French towards the close of last year. The volume before us is a reproduction in English of that Report, but with a fuller account of the proceedings in the Anglo-American section. The report on the state of religion in Great Britain was read by the Hon. and Rev. E. V. Bligh, that on North America by Professor Schaff, that on Holland by Professor van Oosterzee. Papers were read by Pastor Fisch, Professor Godet, Dr. Stoughton, Professor Christlieb, Dr. Rigg, and other representative men from various countries. The volume contains a great deal of interesting information, and some of the Papers, Dr. Christlieb's on Missions, for example, are of a high order of merit, and are well worth reading.

The Lives of the most Eminent British Painters. By ALLEN CUNNINGHAM. Revised edition. Annotated and continued to the present time by Mrs. C. HEATON. Vol. III. pp. 480. George Bell & Sons, 1880.

The title explains the character of this work; but it may be mentioned that the last life by Cunningham in this third volume is that of James Burnett. Mrs. Heaton begins with Stothard. The lives of Turner, Constable, Wilkie, Maclise, Landseer, and others, are well done; neither too long nor too short. The volume has a neat cover.

My Spectacles; and what I Saw with them. By the Rev. GEORGE EVERARD, M.A., Vicar of St. Mark's, Wolverhampton. Author of "Day by Day," &c. Pp. 109. W. Hunt & Co. 1880.

A little book which deserves hearty praise; suggestive, cheery, practical. The headings of some of the chapters will show its character: "Catch the Shower," "Ramsgate Harbour," "The Telephone," "Show your Ticket." Mr. Everard evidently made good use of his "spectacles;" and he has well written what he has seen and thought over. A capital little gift-book.

Destruction of life by Snakes, Hydrophobia, &c., in Western India. By an EX-COMMISSIONER. Pp. 120. W. H. Allen and Co. 1880.

According to a return published in January, 1878, 22,000 lives were lost by snake-bites in India. In 1875, snakes killed in all India were 270,185; in 1876, 212,371. Total deaths by snakes and wild animals in

1875, 21,000; in 1876, 15,000. The unusually high floods of 1875, it is stated, afforded greater facilities for the destruction of snakes (to go back two thousand years, we learn from Arrian that many snakes were destroyed by the floods of the Hydaspes; *otherwise the country would have been deserted*); in the Punjaub, during 1875, the snakes destroyed were 144,542. The *Echis carinata* is not known in Bengal, but is the chief agent of destruction in Western India; it is considered by Dr. Imlach in Scinde and others in Rutnagherry as the most destructive of the tribes of poisonous reptiles. The people in Rutnagherry, 257 deaths having occurred in one year, destroyed snakes in immense numbers, proving that it is possible to exterminate these poisonous creatures. In some districts, however, offering a reward seems to be of no use. Of the greater number of snakes the poison acts on the nervous system; some were said to be more rapidly fatal than even the *cobra;* but recent experiments have proved that this is an error. The *Echis carinata* is known as "Kupper" in Sind, "Foorsa" in Concan, Malabar, and Ceylon, "Viryen Pam" in the Tamal country. It seems to have no fear of the approach of man. Ancient writers called this snake *Hæmorrois*; the oozing of blood through the pores distinguish its poison from that of any other snake. The poison of Russell's viper (*polonga*) and others produces convulsions, vomiting, &c. The *cobra* bite, as is well known, is quickly followed by coma; and a very small quantity of the poison of this snake will destroy life. According to "Ex-Commissioner," a remedy exists for the poison of the *Echis carinata*, which acts on the blood; deadly without treatment, it has been found to be susceptible of cure. One of these determined, deadly, little creatures, we may add, has just been introduced into the Regent's Park Zoological Gardens.

Prophecy,—not "Forecast," but (in the words of Bishop Butler) "the history of events before they come to pass."

A Sermon preached before the University of Oxford, February 15, 1880, *with Introductory Remarks: being a Reply to the Rev. Brownlow Maitland's "Argument from Prophecy."* By JOHN WILLIAM BURGON, B.D., Dean of Chichester. Pp. 47. James Parker & Co.

This pamphlet has somehow not reached us in time for so full a notice in the present CHURCHMAN as the importance of the subject demands. The Introduction occupies twenty pages, and its concluding sentences are as follows:—

I now submit my Sermon—of which these introductory remarks are the necessary complement—to the judgment of the bishops and doctors of the Church, here at home, and in America. Whatever may be the result of the present appeal, it shall comfort me to remember that I did my best to wipe off from the Church of my baptism what I consider to be a grievous stain upon her reputation. At all events, it can no longer be said that a book purporting to form part of a "Christian Evidence Series," was put forth in 1877 by an English clergyman, and under high sanction too, with the avowed object of resolving PROPHECY into "*Forecast*,"—and that no one bearing a commission in the army of the Great King was found to call attention to its fatal teaching, and to demand reparation for the insult which had been offered to his Divine Master's honour. J. W. B.

History of the Jews. By W. H. MILMAN, D.D. Ward, Lock, & Co.

This volume, well printed and neatly bound, forms one of "The World Library of Standard Books." The character of the present edition of Dean Milman's work will be understood from the prefatory notes which we quote in full, as follows:—

Mr. Milman, in his History of the Jews, has explained away the miracles of the Old Testament, till all that is supernatural, grand, and impressive disappears.—*Cham. Cyc. of Eng. Lit.*

MEMO.—*In this edition the Bible record of the miracles has been given—the "philosophical explainings away" ignored; otherwise this reprint is faithful and full.*

The Old Testament with a Brief Commentary. Prophetical Books—Isaiah to Malachi. With Maps. Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge. 1880.

In the present volume—rather too bulky, but probably unavoidably so—the Dean of Canterbury writes on Isaiah, Dr. Kay on Jeremiah, and Dr. Bailey on Obadiah, Jonah, and Micah. Other commentators are the Revs. H. Deane, E. C. Woollcombe, Giles's, Oxford; Canon Curteis, and Prebendary Churton. The Commentary on Daniel is the work of the late Rev. W. T. Bullock. Many passages, opening the volume here and there, we have read with satisfaction; and so far as our examination has extended we can cordially commend this portion of the S. P. C. K. Commentary. Some remarks of the Dean of Canterbury have an especial value, in regard to Rationalistic views; but the tone of the whole seems firm and sound. Good, clear type ought to be mentioned.

From Messrs. Marcus Ward & Co. (67, Chandos Street) we have received some charming packets of cards. *Sunday School Centenary*: A packet of twelve cards in commemoration of the event, with life and portrait of Raikes. *Confirmation Card. Dogs' heads and what's in them*: With lectures on kindness to animals. *Evening and Morning*: A packet of cards with selections by Hesba Dora Stretton. We do not know that we have ever seen such tasteful cards; the dogs' heads are delightful.

With one of the recent smaller publications of the Religious Tract Society we are greatly pleased, namely, No. 23 of a tinted-paper tract series, entitled *The Death of the Cross*. From the combined narratives of the four Evangelists is woven a connected history of the last twenty-four hours of our Lord's earthly life. Evidently the result of reverential study, it shows literary skill and judgment of a high order, and, in brief, is decidedly the best publication of the kind so far as we know. We may suggest the preparation of other similar expository harmony tracts.

From Messrs. T. Nelson & Son we have received a copy of *The Boy's Country Book*, by William Howitt,—new edition. An exceedingly interesting series of country life sketches, which boys in towns, perhaps, will appreciate as much as their school friends who live in villages. Though it goes back some sixty years the descriptions are, in the main, as fresh as they were when written. Like all Messrs. Nelson's gift-books it is well printed and tastefully got up.

A third, cheap, edition of *Spent in the Service*, published by Messrs. Hodder and Stoughton, has reached us. A notice of Mr. Wynne's memoir of that devoted and honoured servant of Christ, Achilles Daunt, has already appeared in our columns. We are pleased to have so soon another opportunity of recommending it, not only because of its own merits as a Christian biography, but because it brings before us the work of an ancient Church in which just now we ought to take a special interest.

From the Religious Tract Society we have received six large-sized illustrations, printed in colours on linen, for Sunday School centenary gatherings of several kinds. The Queen in Manchester, the first Sunday School in Gloucester, a Swiss Sunday School, are three specially interesting—but each of the six is good—well sketched, bright, and attractive. We have made use of this capital wall series in teaching, and we cordially commend it. Such map-lesson pictures are very useful. *A Key to the Series of Pictorial Diagrams illustrative of Sunday Schools*, 32 pages, is well written.

THE MONTH.

THE second reading of the Burials Bill was carried, as we expected, by a decisive majority. The Bishop of Lincoln, in opposing the Bill, was supported by Viscount Cranbrook in an eloquent speech; but the Archbishops, followed by eight Bishops,[1] voted for the second reading. In introducing the Bill in the Upper House, the Government showed a wise discretion. Lord Chancellor Selborne is greatly respected among loyal Churchmen, particularly, perhaps, among the majority of the clergy; and his conciliatory speech smoothed the way for a consideration of the Bill, which as it stood was by no means a mere reprint of the Liberationist programme. The clerical relief provisions were welcomed by many Church Reformers as at the least a step in the right direction.

In Committee, on the 15th, several amendments were proposed. The Earl of Mount-Edgcumbe proposed the insertion in line 13, after "place," of the words "where there is no unconsecrated burial-ground or cemetery in which the parishioners or inhabitants have rights of burial." The Lord Chancellor objected that this amendment would draw a line between parish and parish throughout the kingdom. In one parish a Nonconformist would be able to avail himself of the provisions of the Act; in an adjoining parish a Nonconformist would not be able to do so. The Archbishop of York, in supporting the amendment, remarked that a line between parish and parish already existed. On a division there appeared—Contents, 130; Non-contents, 106; by a majority of 24, therefore, this important amendment was carried. Of the prelates present, eleven, including the Archbishop of York, voted for, and seven, including the Archbishop of Canterbury, against the amendment. An amendment moved by the Archbishop of York for the exemption of cemeteries was carried by a majority

[1] The Bishop of Carlisle informed the clergy of his diocese by letter of his reasons for supporting the present Bill. He had not changed his opinion with regard to the general merits of the case as between the Church and the Nonconformists; but there were two considerations which brought him to the conclusion that it would be the safer and more courageous course to vote for the measure. "In the first place, whether the grievance alleged in the matter of burials be great or small, reasonable or unreasonable, sentimental or otherwise, there can be no doubt that it has been blown to such a heat and made to assume such proportions as to render its existence a practical evil, and to furnish a mischievous weapon of offence to the hands of those who like so to use it. It appeared to me, therefore, that to defeat the Government upon the Bill would be to play into the hands of those who wish mischief to the Church. In the second place, I think it would be unfair and ungenerous not to recognize the kindly and considerate spirit in which the Government Bill is conceived. It distinctly recognizes the fact that the clergy have consciences and feelings as well as Nonconformists, and it proposes to effect for them a practical emancipation from a great difficulty which not unfrequently presents itself."

of 19; but the proposal of the Marquis of Salisbury to exempt "any consecrated burial-ground given as a free gift within sixty years before the passing of this Act, unless the consent of the donor or his representatives shall have been previously obtained in writing," was negatived by a majority of 13. The Lord Chancellor moved an amendment to define a Christian service as including "every religious service used by any Church, denomination, or person professing to be Christian."

At the annual meeting of the Scripture Reader's Society for Ireland the Right Hon. W. Brooke told the story of the formation of the Society in 1822, adding that he was the sole survivor of the committee which met for that purpose.

On Friday, the 11th, the Festival of St. Barnabas, Dr. Ryle was consecrated in York Minster to the newly-constituted see of Liverpool, and in St. Paul's Cathedral seventeen Islington students received deacon's orders.[1] In York the attendance was described as unprecedented; the grand old minster was densely crowded. It is believed, indeed, that at no previous consecration has so large a number of surpliced clergymen been present. Among them were the Rev. Alex. Stewart, Rector of Liverpool; Rev. J. W. Bardsley, Incumbent of St. Saviour's, Liverpool (nominated Archdeacon); Rev. W. L. Feilden, Rector of Knowsley; and the Rev. Canon Clarke, Vicar of Southport, chaplains to the new Bishop. The Archbishop was assisted by the Bishops of Durham, Chester, and Manchester. In an eloquent sermon, worthy of the occasion, Canon Garbett contrasted Antioch and Liverpool. The service is said to have been throughout of a most impressive character. Subsequently, the Lord Mayor of York entertained the dignitaries and eminent laymen at luncheon. The Primate said he had noticed with pleasure the manner in which the endowment for the see of Liverpool had been raised, the intense satisfaction which the appointment of the first bishop had caused, and the welcome he had received, not only from those who agreed with him, but from all who respected English manliness and honesty.

Clerical and lay meetings, we are glad to see, are giving promise of usefulness in many districts. At the Devon and Cornwall gathering, the Dean of Exeter spoke against paring

[1] It was a special Ordination for the C.M.S.; seventeen deacons and five priests. The sermon was preached by the Rev. Prebendary Wright (Hon. Sec.), from Acts xi. 22–24. He mentioned that, although the Society had been successful in obtaining missionaries, those who were then to be ordained could not be sent forth to their work immediately, owing to the want of funds. The Bishop was assisted in the laying on of hands in the case of the Presbyters by Bishop Piers Claughton, and Prebendaries Cadman, D. Wilson, and H. Wright. The text for this ordination sermon included the words selected by Canon Garbett for his sermon in York Minster.

down doctrinal differences. Dr. Wilkinson, like Canon Clarke at Southport, spoke of the importance of union among those holding evangelical principles.

In a Bible Society speech, the Dean of Carlisle—vigorous and pointed as ever—has called attention to the spread of Rationalism within the family circle.

An important meeting in connexion with the new theological halls in the old universities has been held, under the presidency of the Archbishop of Canterbury.

A meeting was held in Exeter Hall, on the 18th, to protest against the appointment of Lord Ripon, a pervert, to the Viceroyalty of India. Mr. Spurgeon has so far withdrawn from his unbounded admiration for Mr. Gladstone as to express, in a published letter, his regret at this appointment.

The debate in the Assembly of the Scottish Free Church ended by a sort of compromise; the Professor was admonished.

The Select Committee has reported to the House that Mr. Bradlaugh ought not to be allowed to take the oath. The Secretary of the Wesleyan Conference, we are glad to see, has protested against certain Radical free-thought suggestions in regard to the Bradlaugh case.

The Rev. G. E. Moule, Bishop-designate of Ningpo, has written to the *Times* concerning the recent opium-traffic debate in the House of Commons. It is high time something should be done to abate so great a scandal.

The Mackonochie proceedings at present are at a deadlock. Lord Penzance refused to pass sentence of deprivation, and the Church Association see no adequate reason for incurring the expense of appearing on the appeal to the House of Lords.

In Convocation, on the 2nd, the Bishop of Llandaff made some remarks on the recently-issued volume of Prayers. There are two forms prepared by Convocation committees, one for family prayer, and one for private prayer:—

> The particular passage which I wish to refer to (said the Bishop) is from a prayer of Jeremy Taylor. It is a petition which I could myself devoutly and properly put up, and no doubt others could do the same; but I feel convinced that a very dishonest use of that passage from the prayer of Jeremy Taylor might be made, and in all probability will be made, if this book is in any way supposed to represent the opinion of the bishops. The passage to which I objected was this:—"Give me the opportunity of a prudent and spiritual guide and of receiving the Holy Sacrament."

Mr. Gladstone has shewn his wonted financial skill and courage in providing for the abolition of that farmer's grievance, the Malt Tax. Sir Wilfrid Lawson's Local Option resolution was carried on the 18th by 229 votes to 203. The Prime Minister announced that he esteems it an essential part of the mission of his Government to "deal with" the Liquor Laws.