

of men to another, from tropical to semi-arctic forms of life, presents attractive features peculiar to the "Father of waters."

The wonderful progress of civilization, the contest between man and nature which may be witnessed in all its stages, the magnificent scenery of the Upper River before its confluence with the mud-stained Missouri, all combine to render a voyage up the Mississippi one of the most interesting and instructive now accessible to travellers.

P. CARTERET HILL.

---

ART. IV.—THE WELSH CHURCH QUESTION FROM AN ENGLISH STANDPOINT.

THERE may be those who think an Englishman guilty of something like audacity who ventures to write on the Church in Wales. In the face of such a possibility among readers of the *CHURCHMAN*, I fortify myself by three considerations. In the first place, I met with the other day a charge brought against English Churchmen, as a body, that they had just discovered the Church in Wales, and that, recognising in the organized attack upon her a danger to themselves, they had determined to defend her. To that charge I do not plead guilty. The Church in Wales is no new interest to me. Her story, her difficulties, and her gallant struggle to overcome them have long had a peculiar fascination for me; and if any words of mine can increase the sympathy which ought to exist between the Church in England and the Church in the Principality, I shall indeed feel grateful to the Editor of this Magazine for permitting me to set them down. In the second place, I am encouraged by the language of Lord Selborne, when speaking at Lampeter, last October, before a Welsh audience and in the presence of the four Welsh Bishops. "I do not," he said, "plead guilty to the charge of being an outsider. I hold that there is what the French would call a complete solidarity between the Churches of England and Wales, and no English Churchman, in or out of Wales, can, I believe, feel indifferent to the efficiency, to the fortunes, to the position or prospects of the Church in Wales." And lastly, I have before me a letter from one of the most eminent dignitaries of the Church in Wales, in which he expresses his opinion that the defence of the Church is more properly to be undertaken by those who are not actively engaged in its work.

My interest, I would submit, is no new thing. I am not an outsider because an English Churchman; and yet I am not an active worker in that part of the Church which is attacked. On such grounds I excuse my seeming audacity.

The common places of the attack may be summarized thus: (1) The Church in Wales is alien; (2) Wales is essentially nonconformist; (3) Churchmen constitute a very small minority of the population; (4) The endowments of the Church could be better employed.

With regard to (1), this is no new charge. It was formulated by the late Mr. Watkin Williams, in 1870, when he moved in the House of Commons, "That in the opinion of this House it is right that the Establishment of the Church and its union with the State should cease to exist in the Dominion and Principality of Wales," and was dealt with very effectively by Mr. Gladstone: It has again and again been urged by Mr. Henry Richard, and temperately but with convincing power replied to by Canon Bevan, yet, so recently as the 30th of January last, it reappeared in the columns of the *Daily News*. By no kind of reasoning which will commend itself to logical minds can the Church in Wales be demonstrated "alien." While the story of the British Church has been obscured and overlaid with legend, its existence and continued life is as much a fact of history as the mission of Augustine or the primacy of Theodore. Mr. Henry Richard, in the letter quoted above, calls Canon Pryce to his aid to knock down a man of straw of his own erection, to denolish a theory "that the British Church never succumbed to the authority of Papal Rome, but had not only a separate origin but a distinct succession which never fell into the turbid and impure Popish stream through which the Church of England derived its ecclesiastical life." This kind of reasoning is utterly beside the mark. The "turbid and impure Popish stream"—which flowed, we presume, from Augustine—is a piece of rhetoric meant to strike the imagination of readers whose thoughts as they read it will fly to Alexander VI. or the dogma of Papal Infallibility; but Mr. Richard must be perfectly well aware that no educated person has even questioned the fusion of the English Church as founded by Augustine with the British Church which had taken refuge in Wales. No one claims a distinct succession for the British Church, and there would be no object in doing so; but we do distinctly claim, even in the face of a phrase from such an authority as Mr. Freeman, a very distinct share in the common succession for the British Church, and we confidently challenge any proof of the proposition that the British Church was overpowered and rooted out from the Principality of Wales.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> On other occasions Mr. Richard and his friends have found the Evidence of Conquest in the imposition of Norman Bishops on the

2. It is commonly asserted that Wales is 'essentially Non-conformist. I am disposed to apologize for touching on this point at all, but it will be understood that I am not writing for Welshmen, but for English readers. This is a historical question, and the answer of history to it is that Wales is *not* Nonconformist. The Nonconformity of Wales, however brought about, is a comparatively new thing. Mr. Gladstone, in his speech of 1870, ascribed it to the efforts of William III. in the interests of his newly-founded throne, to anglicize the country and Church in Wales, but it has been clearly shown that William III. was by no means the first offender in this respect. Long before his day the practice of sending English Bishops to Wales had prevailed, and yet the Church flourished and was strong.

Canon Bevan, than whom Wales has no more loyal and able champion, ascribes the growth of Nonconformity to two causes: (1) the inadequacy, at all times and in all parts, of the Church's equipment, and (2) the linguistic condition of Wales. The Church in Wales has ever been poor, and in common with the Church at large, she has been slow to adapt her machinery to changing conditions and sudden accessions of population. She has also suffered from the bilingual difficulty in a way which Nonconformity has not. Nonconformity, speaking broadly, has ministered to the Welsh-speaking population—it has been said that less than 40,000 Nonconformists in Wales worship in the English language—the Church has endeavoured to minister to both English and Welsh. The Church has therefore been in a position of disadvantage; the same man has endeavoured to serve both the educated and the illiterate, both the English and Welsh-speaking people. Let it be candidly acknowledged also that inadequate or negligent supervision has in past times suffered the services of a large number of unworthy Ministers.

Still in spite of these things, Welsh Nonconformity, as a great force, has a history of little more than 100 years, and looking at the undoubted strength of the Church in certain districts at this moment, and its progress throughout the Principality generally, there appears to be no sufficient ground for assuming that Wales is essentially Nonconformist, or that the descendants of the men who were such staunch Churchmen in the seventeenth century are permanently alienated from the faith of their fathers.

The third charge is that Churchmen constitute a very small

---

Church in Wales in the days of Edward I., forgetful that this had been a grievance at least a hundred years before, and that it was, moreover, a grievance common to English Churchmen, and therefore no proof whatever of the alien character of the Church in Wales.

minority of the population. Supposing this were true, it might be a powerful argument (not that it would weigh with me) for Disestablishment, but not for Disendowment. But is it true? We have had various estimates of the proportions of Churchmen to Nonconformists at various times, and some sanguine Liberationists have put down our share of the population at one-ninth, others at one-seventh, and so on. The real question to answer is, What is a Churchman? and the next, Are all who do not come regularly to church to be counted as supporters of Disestablishment? It would not seem so. Either, in fact, Churchmen form a much larger proportion than is commonly allowed, or a vast number of Nonconformists are opposed to Disestablishment. Let the returns for the election of 1885 bear witness. In that election the question of Disestablishment was prominently before the constituencies; it was publicly announced that every Liberal candidate was a Liberationist, and that no other would have a chance of being returned. Yet the Church candidates polled 67,593 votes as against 98,593 for the Liberationists. No words can be more eloquent than these figures. As a complement to them it may be observed that the preference shown by the people of Wales to funerals with the rites of the Established Church has long been a subject of complaint among Nonconformist ministers, and that statistics taken in 272 parishes of the Dioceses of Bangor and St. Asaph show, for five years, 20,598 Church funerals against 1,441 under the Burials Act. It would seem then that when advocates for Welsh Disestablishment contend that Churchmen are but 1 to 9, or perhaps 1 to 7 of the whole population, the retort may fairly be made that, at any rate, the voters for the maintenance of an Established Church are as 7 to 10, while those who seek the rites of the Church in burial are 20 to 1.

The last allegation I propose to consider is that the endowments of the Church might be better employed than at present. These endowments are said to be in round numbers, £242,000 per annum. It is not an overwhelming amount, especially when it is remembered that it has to maintain 1,434 educated gentlemen. There is more than one individual Englishman who has a larger income for his sole personal use. Inefficient and unworthy men there are, of course, in holy orders as there are in every profession; but on the testimony of her adversaries the clergy, as an order, are an industrious, painstaking and thoroughly useful body of men, and we venture to say that it would be hard to point to any other income of a quarter of a million which was made to go further or do more good.

The following passage from the *Cambrian News* of January

20th, illustrates my defence of the Welsh Clergy so aptly that I cannot refrain from quoting it :

The advent and growth of the Salvation Army on the one hand, and the extraordinary activity of the Church of England on the other, tell a story of apathy, or want of adaptability, or loss of spiritual power, or increase of pride amongst Nonconformist bodies, that cannot be ignored. The rank and file of Nonconformist denominations are beginning to inquire amongst themselves how it comes to pass that the clergy of the Church of England, and the officers of the Salvation Army, can be seen hard at work every day of the week in all sorts of places, while Nonconformist ministers seem to have very little to do except on Sundays. Nonconformity has done a great work, and is to-day by far the most powerful influence for good in the Principality. The question whether this is, in the main, a finished work and a waning influence, must be asked in the face of existing conditions . . . Do new needs demand other means? Religion always remains the same living principle, but machinery alters with the times. It was not a new religion that was preached by the Church of England clergymen, who at last were severed from the Establishment in the early part of this century. It is the old religion that the Salvation Army and the Church of England are preaching with so much energy from widely different standpoints. . . . If Nonconformity in Wales becomes formal and professional and crystallized we have no fear that religion will suffer, whatever may become of Nonconformity as it now exists.

Side by side with this should be read some words of Lord Aberdare, an old Liberal, spoken at Aberdare on February 1st, at the opening of a Liberal club :

I read with some astonishment the statement recently made by Mr. Labouchere at Swansea that the Church in Wales had not made a single convert. The slightest acquaintance with the actual state of things would have shown him that almost everywhere in Wales the Church was making healthy progress, and certainly nowhere more than in this county of Glamorgan—perhaps I might say in the borough of Merthyr Tydfil and Aberdare. I can remember the time when the only clerical representative of the Church for Merthyr and Dowlais, with their population even then of some 30,000 people, was the curate, whose rector for thirty years lived at Swansea, receiving the tithes of the most considerable living in the diocese, and doing nothing for his Church but pay the stipend of that one curate. What Merthyr became in the days of Mr. Campbell, how many churches were built, how many districts were cut out of that vast parish, how many active and zealous clergymen ministered to a constantly increasing flock, I need not tell you. For many years of my youth and early manhood there was but one clergyman of the Church of England ministering for the even then populous parish of Aberdare. There was but one church, and that a very small one, in the whole of the valley from Hirwain to what is now the Aberdare Junction. Now there are eleven churches, besides three missionary places of worship, and several of these are already too small for the congregations belonging to them. They are ministered to by sixteen clergymen, of whom I will only say that they seem to me to perform their duties with earnestness and zeal, and in a spirit very different to that which prevailed during the years of which I am speaking. Nor are these great effects due simply to the wiser application of Church endowments. These additional churches were built and the greater part of these sixteen clergymen are maintained by voluntary offerings of Churchmen. For instance, at Mountain Ash we have

one clergyman supported out of the property of the Church. The other four are maintained by the voluntary offerings of Churchmen in one form or other. I might easily accumulate similar examples in other parts of this diocese, and, indeed, throughout Wales. And there can be no question that the Church, in its renewed spirit of life and energy, is conciliating the respect and attracting the interest of large numbers of educated Nonconformists. You would, I am sure, be greatly surprised if I were to give you the numbers of Nonconformist ministers who apply every year to the four bishops of Wales for admission into the Church and into Holy Orders. I might, with pardonable pride, further pursue this subject, and give overwhelming proof of the healthy vitality of the Church at this moment.

A quarter of a million per annum for such a body of men as this—for men on whom, be it remembered, every individual in the community has a claim, which at any time he may choose to exercise! We spend, and few grudge it, £30,000,000 a year on our army and navy; the mere duty on beer and spirits is £25,000,000 per annum, and, in face of this, it is sought to deprive the cause of religion of this comparative trifle of £250,000. It is hardly credible that such a proposal should seriously be made. Again, people talk cheerily about the appropriation of the tithe to education. Do they realize that in case of Disestablishment three-eighths of the elementary schools which are now kept off the rates by the exertions of Church-people would then necessarily be placed upon them? Has any individual tithe-payer calculated, I wonder, what his own share of remitted taxation would be in case he ceased to pay tithe to the clergyman, and paid it to some public office instead? Is he sure that in his lifetime there would be any remission at all?

Of course, if this quarter of a million were doing harm instead of good, one could understand the bitterness with which it is assailed; but that is not pretended. The good it is doing is universally acknowledged. While to the nation it is a very small sum, to the Church it is a large one; a great work would be crippled by its withdrawal; a very doubtful advantage would accrue to the general public.

On the whole, then, except in the interest of that intangible consideration, religious equality, it is hard to see what case there is against the Church in Wales, or why reflecting Englishmen and Welshmen should suffer her to be despoiled. I have read Sir George Trevelyan's speeches through from end to end, but have found no shadow of a reason for the policy he advocates; and when at Swansea he expressed a wish that other politicians would visit Wales, as he had done, and judge for themselves, I could not help echoing the wish, with the added hope that they would not merely see what they were taken to see, and wished to see, but what was really being done both by Churchmen and Dissenters. Englishmen, clergy and

laity, should go to Wales and judge of facts for themselves. We no longer want men to go down and make speeches as soon as they arrive, on one side or the other, but men who will take the advice which the Dean of Llandaff offered to his old pupil, Sir George Trevelyan—advice which, unfortunately, was not followed, first to “inquire, and then reflect.”

The matter is one of vast and abiding interest, not only to Wales but to England, and is not to be decided on *ex parte* statements. The Church has a right to demand from politicians that they should only act after the closest investigation, and on the fullest information.

H. GRANVILLE DICKSON.

---

ART. V.—THE PRONUNCIATION OF LATIN.

*Cambridge Philological Society. Summary of Answers received in Reply to Circular of Inquiry on Reform of Latin Pronunciation. Pronunciation of Latin in the Augustan period. Trübner and Co.*

THE replies sent by head-masters, lecturers, etc., to the questions of the Cambridge Philological Society, show that there is—as there has been for some time—a strong party in favour of changing our English pronunciation of Latin. Out of 51 answers, 41 were favourable, 4 neutral, 6 unfavourable. The scheme of pronunciation, as put forth this last year (1887), may be taken to be the newest utterance on the matter, being mainly the same as that sent round to the members of the Society nearly two years ago.

In Greek as well as in Latin many are nowadays urging a change of pronunciation, ridiculing us as insular and isolated. But, curiously enough, while they bid us pronounce Greek as the Greeks pronounce it now—giving up not only the English, but altogether the so-called Erasmian pronunciation (or attempt at old classical) as guesswork and invention—in Latin we are not to regard much how the Italians speak now, but are to reconstruct a pronunciation—surely guesswork in part, however good the guessers. “Speak Greek as it is spoken in A.D. 1887; Latin as it may have been spoken B.C. 87.” The arguments for the modern Greek, though not quite convincing, seem to me stronger than those for the Augustan Latin; but it is only with the latter I am now to deal.

It is bold to criticise a scheme backed by such names as the Bishop of Durham, Dr. Hayman, Dr. Peile, and Mr. Whitelaw; yet Mr. Mayor and Mr. Weldon oppose, and (I hope) many more who do not appear. Three questions occur: