

have, therefore, accepted, for argumentative purposes, the generally accepted division of Genesis amongst its sources, though I do not accept the dates to which they are assigned, and I have not attempted to make any independent analysis of the book.

H. A. REDPATH.

(To be continued.)



ART. IV.—BIBLE REASONS FOR CHURCH ESTABLISHMENT.

THE division of the Liberal Party on the question of Home Rule for Ireland removed the Disestablishment of the Church of England from the sphere of immediate politics ; the Liberal Unionists considering the continued Establishment of the English Church far less objectionable than Irish Home Rule. But Tariff Reform has now so strangely broken up the whole Unionist party, Conservative and Liberal alike, that the next General Election may again bring Disestablishment to the front, while the unhappy disputes about the schools will have had an unfavourable influence over those of our fellow-citizens who see no scriptural grounds for Church Establishment. I believe there are such grounds, and I write this present paper because I have arrived at conclusions on this subject which are not generally apprehended, but which, if they are true, are of supreme importance, and which appear to me to be such as no one who takes the New Testament as authoritative can intelligently deny.

That the Disestablishment of the Church of England was one main object of at least the Radical section of the Liberal party as early as 1885 is plainly shown in "The Radical Programme," published in that year. Besides one whole article on Disestablishment out of the eleven which the book contains, the subject is dealt with at considerable length in another article, and the strong dislike of the writers to the clergy shows itself in more than one of the others. I do not altogether wonder at that dislike, for while everything else has changed in England, the clergy are trying to grapple with the complicated problems of these days under an ecclesiastical constitution substantially the same as that of the Middle Ages. Still, as I shall show, the unsatisfactory position of the clergy, and with them of the Church, is no sufficient ground for Disestablishment. We have not disestablished the State, but reformed it. Both Church and State are divine institutions. The relation between them, called Establishment, is also

divine. The only Christian course is to reform the Church in itself, and in its relations to the State, as we have reformed the State itself. The substance of what I shall now write has appeared in former numbers of *THE CHURCHMAN*. But the subject is one that will bear restatement.

The article on Disestablishment in "The Radical Programme" is divided into two sections. It is undeniably clever. Glancing at the noble gravity of Hooker, the shrewd reason of Paley and Warburton, the practical wisdom of Chalmers, the vehemence of Arnold, and the eager tenacity of Stanley, the writer assured his readers that though these and others had done much to build up and fortify a theory of abstract polity, that theory had then a steadily and rapidly lessening relation to real affairs. He marshals the usual arguments with great clearness and skill, though he sometimes makes mistakes. He points out the great changes by which Parliament, instead of representing in any exclusive manner the Protestant and Episcopal Church, had come to include several Jews, a great many Presbyterians, a host of Nonconformists, and a host of Roman Catholics. He thinks the Ecclesiastical Commission amounts to a surrender of the inviolability of Church property. He points to the enormous growth of Nonconformity. So great had been its growth in Wales (largely caused by English mismanagement) that Welsh Disestablishment he looked upon as imminent. The Church of Scotland also had, in his opinion, but little to say for itself. Then comes the phrase "Religious Equality," which indeed gives the article its title, and is the keynote to it all. Traffic in livings, liberalized theology, scandals in the Church, the unsatisfactory nature of the Church courts, the example of the United States and our colonies, the narrow-mindedness of the clergy in times past, the disadvantages of an official position for the clergy—omitting its advantages—the hostility of the agricultural labourer, these and other items are arranged with undeniable skill. But the indictment reminds me of a discription of a former rector of a Yorkshire parish. given many years ago to one of his successors, a friend of mine, by one of his parishioners: "As to Mr. Q., sir, he would have been a varry good sairt ov a mon if there hadn't a bin nae sic a thing as Christianity." But there is such a thing as Christianity; and I shall attempt to show that this lands us on a level where "religious equality" has no place. Even if this were not so—if the Church of England were only one association among thousands which Englishmen have desired at various times and in various manners for purposes of religion or learning, for business or amusement, no one of which had any claim, on distinctly Christian grounds,

for preferential treatment by the State—still, I should not be able to regard the *second* part of the article in question with as much tolerance as the Yorkshire parishioner felt for the genial but immoral parson. The scheme for Disestablishment and, of course, Disendowment, approved therein, is substantially the same as one which had been put forth some years before by the Liberation Society, and which I dealt with pretty fully in one of the Hulsean Lectures of 1881, some passages from which I will take the liberty of reproducing here and in other parts of this article, instead of rewriting what I have ready to hand.

“Disestablishment” and “Disendowment” are words more frequently uttered than understood. The Church of Ireland has been disestablished and disendowed, and because it has survived we are sometimes told that the process might not harm the Church of England. But the scheme put forth by the Liberation Society for England is totally different from what Parliament did in Ireland. It is not merely disestablishment and disendowment, but dissolution. In Ireland every cathedral and parish church remained for Divine worship as aforetime. In England the cathedrals and other “monumental buildings” are to be seized by the State, and maintained for such purposes as Parliament may determine. Parish churches built before 1818—the date of the first of the Church Building Acts—are to go to the ratepayers to use, to let, or to sell; but lest they should restore them to their rightful trustees for a nominal payment, they must sell them only at a “fair valuation.” Churches built since 1818, if by individuals still living, may be claimed by them, otherwise they are to be offered, not to the Church of England, but to the congregations for the time being. In Ireland all laws that held the Church together remained in force till they were dissolved or replaced by the Church’s own council. In England they are all to be swept away. The Bishops and clergy are to receive, not, as in Ireland, the full amount of their incomes and the use of their parsonages for life, but a pension proportioned to their ages, and the use of their houses under conditions which in many cases would be impossible, in many more very difficult. The bond between ministers and people is entirely severed. The generosity and self-denial that called the churches into being; their solemn consecration to Almighty God by the authority of His Church and by His own promised presence to many generations; the many millions that have been collected from rich and poor in our own day and spent upon the fabrics; the sacred trusts under which the churches were committed by their founders to the guardianship of the clergy for offering the means of grace and the hope of immor-

tality free to all ; the various ministrations, thrust upon none, but open to all, in church and house, at the bedside and at the grave—are all to be as if they had not been. In short, that vast institution which is still claimed, in some sort, as their spiritual home by a considerable majority of the population—witness the public returns of marriages—is to be, not merely disestablished and disendowed, but, like the monasteries under Henry VIII., completely *dissolved*.

This scheme, we are told, was prepared after the gravest deliberation. A special committee spent two years in preparing it. They considered it feasible and just.

Men who would never dream of confiscating a free hospital because they preferred their own physician, or a free park because they were satisfied with their private grounds, or a free museum because they had no taste for antiquities, are quite ready, because they do not care to go to church, to take the church away from those who care and go. A measure that would never be thought of for our Mohammedan, Hindoo, or Buddhist fellow-subjects in India or Burmah, or for our Roman Catholic fellow-subjects in Canada or Malta, out of all comparison with that which has been applied by law to the Church of Ireland, is to be applied without mercy to the churchgoers of England. Thousands of clergymen, with their habits of life fixed, unfitted for other employment, are to be turned out of home, and church, and work, to seek some hired abode for their families. And the congregations! How slight the threads that now hold many a man to faith and duty! In such a wreck millions of those threads would be broken ; thousands and tens of thousands of simple souls, let loose from the safe moorings of Christian custom, must drift away into dangerous currents. How many must be lost! But there was no time in those two long years of earnest, possibly prayerful, deliberation to weigh but for a moment the risk of their reproaches.

I know the Church of England needs reform, and needs it badly. The training of the clergy, their ordination, appointment, and tenure, their powers and duties, their pay, with the terrible incubus of dilapidations, the rightful place and powers of the laity, all need careful looking into. The clergy cannot all become eloquent preachers ; but there is one thing without which none of them should be allowed to officiate—they should be able to read ; and some of them either can't or won't do that—at least, not so as to be heard and understood. Our whole patronage system should be swept away. It may have done well enough in the twelfth century, but in the twentieth it is ridiculous. It is so distinctly a class institution that it tempts the labouring classes to think they and the

parsons have nothing in common. The Prayer-Book needs both pruning and enriching, and in some places translating, for the English we now speak is already beginning to differ from the English of the sixteenth century, as Italian differs from Latin, though not yet to the same extent. And there are some doctrinal statements in the Prayer-Book and Articles which would be better removed. So long as we retain the grand outlines of the faith in the Apostles' and Nicene Creeds, there is no need to ask young men of three-and-twenty to bind themselves to everything else which was fixed upon as necessary at the Reformation. Indeed, it is probably through accepting some of these statements in non-natural senses that some clerics have gone on to deny even the foundations of Christianity.

All this, however, is no excuse for the ignoring of religion by the State, still less for the brutal scheme which I have been describing. But for the solemnity with which that scheme was originally put forth, and for the careful detail with which it was restated in "The Radical Programme," it might have been regarded as the programme of some political cheap-jack, who asked five shillings, but was prepared to take sixpence. And the Welsh Disestablishment Bill which passed the Commons retained the parish churches for Churchmen's use, and after Mr. Gladstone's intervention made some compromise about the cathedrals. But some of the Welsh educational authorities have refused all aid to Church schools under the Act of 1902. At a meeting of the West Riding Authority it has been proposed to reduce the teachers' salaries in proportion to the time spent on religious teaching in such schools. Meantime, many or most of the leading Nonconformist ministers, representing a large following, are bent upon an alteration of the law, so that all Christian parents in England, except such as can afford to pay for their children's education at expensive Christian schools, shall be compelled to place them four or five hours a day, five days a week, some forty weeks every year, from the age of five to twelve or fourteen, with permission and encouragement to begin at three, under the influence of teachers who may be not only non-Christian, but anti-Christian. Surely such a demand on the part of Christian men and Christian ministers can be characterized as nothing less than absurd—an assumption by them that there is no such thing as Christianity.

But when we look closely into the relations of Church and Dissent during the last fifty years, shall we not find that the main cause of offence has been given by what is called "Ritualism"? Is it the Church of England in itself, with all its faults, that is so much hated? or is it the reintroduction

into it, contrary to law, of unscriptural doctrines and practices which the Church's martyrs in the sixteenth century were burnt for rejecting? I do not believe there would have been more than a small fraction of the present Disestablishment movement if it had not been for the unfortunate movement of Newman and his followers at Oxford seventy years ago, and the reckless Romanizing which it has led to in a very large section of the English clergy. At Oxford itself that movement seems to have led to, or to have been followed by, an attitude, with regard to the Honour School of Theology, strongly resembling that of the Nonconformist ministers with regard to Church schools; it being now proposed to appoint examiners for that school with no guarantee that they have any theology at all. It seems as if superstition and unbelief were near akin.

Yes: if Churchmen wish to save their schools, and their churches, and the Christianity of the nation, they must no longer play with "Ritualism." The Epistle which goes by the name of St. Barnabas is of small value in matters of doctrine, but it may be trusted as a witness to contemporary facts; and it regards the absence of a $\text{NAO}\Sigma$ among Christians as a clear distinction between them on the one hand, and both Jews and heathens on the other. A $\text{NAO}\Sigma$ is a material dwelling-place of adorable deity. Such a dwelling-place the heathen believed they had in that part of their temples in which they placed their idols. Such a dwelling-place the Jews really had, first in the tabernacle and afterwards in the temple, beyond the inner veil, which veil, however, was rent in two from top to bottom when Jesus died, to show that a great change was taking place. 'Such a dwelling-place Roman Catholics and "Ritualists" believe they have in the consecrated elements of the Eucharist. Consequently, in defiance of an absolutely indisputable direction in the Prayer-Book, the purpose of which is also as indisputable as its meaning, we have now in various churches portions of the Eucharist reserved as local centres of adoration; and in hundreds or thousands of churches where Reservation is not yet practised the main purpose of the "high" celebration is not Communion, but the supposed offering and adoring of the Son of God as contained in the bread and wine. With this material habitation of deity are associated ceremonial lights and the offering of incense, as in the Jewish temple, and, of course, as with the Jews, a separated order of priesthood.

But the Epistle to the Hebrews teaches us that all these things were only "carnal ordinances imposed until a time of reformation" (Heb. ix. 10). Their meaning and purpose were fulfilled in Christ, who entered, once for all, not into

a holy place made with hands, but into heaven itself. And there is no hint given us in all the New Testament that Christians are at liberty to have holy places made with hands for Him to enter into. The whole idea is as absolutely foreign to the Gospel as circumcision itself; and there can be no reasonable doubt that, if St. Paul had to deal with "Ritualism," he would apply to it as scathing language as he addressed to the Galatians. Christian churches in the New Testament are not temples with priests, but synagogues (Jas. ii. 2) with elders. Nay, the Mass itself, as said to-day by Roman priests all over the world, bears conclusive witness against the comparatively recent doctrine and ritual which, a few centuries before the Reformation, became associated with it. Twice over the priest speaks of all those who are present as "circumstantes," standing around, though nobody is standing except himself, and all the rest are kneeling behind him. Almost immediately after the words of institution, and the intrusive adoration of the elements in dumb-show, the priest goes on to speak of the bread and wine as plural and neuter, and prays that the Almighty Father will look as graciously upon them as He did upon the offerings of Abel, Abraham, and Melchizedek. Such a prayer would be blasphemous, if the miracle which the adoration is based upon had taken place. And if those who compiled the Mass had believed in such miracle they would have provided words to express the adoration. Later on, the consecrated bread and wine are classed with all other good things which the Almighty is always sanctifying, quickening, and bestowing upon us. At the end of the service, when it is assumed that all present have communicated, though often it has been the priest alone, he says, "Quod ore sumpsimus, Domine, pura mente capiamus; et de munere temporali fiat nobis remedium sempiternum"—"*What* (not Whom) we have taken with our mouth, O Lord, may we receive with a pure mind; and from a temporal gift (2 Cor. iv. 18) may it be made unto us an everlasting remedy." The Infallible does not understand his own prayer-book.

I know attempts have been made to build a sacerdotal Eucharist, and with it a renewal of the Jewish ΝΑΟΣ and its "carnal ordinances," on the words in Heb. xiii. 10, "We have an altar," etc. But whatever be the exact meaning of those words, St. John in his vision of the New Jerusalem says: *Καὶ ναὸν οὐκ εἶδον ἐν αὐτῇ, ὁ γὰρ Κύριος, ὁ Θεός, ὁ παντοκράτωρ, ναὸς αὐτῆς ἐστίν, καὶ τὸ ἅγιον* (*And a sanctuary I saw not therein, for the Lord God the Almighty and the Lamb are the sanctuary thereof*), even as Isaiah had said (Isa. viii. 13, 14): "The Lord of hosts, Him shall ye sanctify, and let Him be your fear, and let Him be your dread. And

He shall be for a sanctuary," where the Hebrew for "sanctuary" is the same as in Exod. xxvi. 33 for the holy place in the tabernacle. Consequently, the sanctuaries which are made with hands in Roman or Anglican Churches are *not in the city*. They are "without," and in such company as I do not care to describe.

That the New Jerusalem, as described by St. John, and as revealed by One greater than St. John, is symbolical of the Holy Catholic Church as it ought to be at the present time is quite certain. The popular relegation of the vision to a dim and distant future, or, it may be, to a near future, eagerly expected by curious calculators, but never fulfilling their calculations, is no more than has befallen the similar prophecies in the Gospel. Indeed, the Revelation to St. John at Patmos is only a larger form of the revelation given long years before to all the disciples on the Mount of Olives. I have noted in it at least twenty-seven passages—twenty of them in the first three chapters—all of which have more or less resemblance to passages in the Synoptical Gospels, and not a few of them come very close both in phrase and in meaning to their Gospel parallels. And the imminence of the Gospel prophecies has been as presumptuously discredited as that of those in the Revelation. It is not uncommon for writers and speakers to lay great stress on our Lord's words in Matt. xxiv. 36, "Of that day and hour knoweth no man," etc., and to entirely ignore the plain statement in the verse next but one before it, "Verily I say unto you, This generation shall not pass away till all these things be accomplished," a statement which in slightly varied forms recurs in the Gospels several times.

Two or three days after the discourses on the Mount of Olives our Saviour said something to the high priest and his companions which was even stronger than that: "*Henceforth ye shall see the Son of man sitting at the right hand of power, and coming on the clouds of heaven*" (Matt. xxvi. 64). This and the parallel passage (Luke xxii. 69) were disguised for English readers in the old version by the ambiguous word "Hereafter." A little thought of what happened at Jerusalem within a few hours, a few days, and a few weeks of the time when our Lord spoke those words will show that He spoke truly. He began His public ministry by saying: "The time is fulfilled, and the kingdom of God is at hand"; His last words in the Revelation were: "Yea, I come quickly." From Galilee to Patmos all is consistent. Is not the key to the whole mystery just this: "The kingdom of God cometh not with observation; neither shall they say, 'Lo, here! or, There! for lo, the kingdom of God is within you'?"

Twice over in the prologue to what is expressly called the

Revelation of Jesus Christ we are assured that the things revealed in it were not distant, but near—"The things which must shortly come to pass," "The time is at hand." And in the epilogue, xxii. 6-21, we have the very same statements repeated with other expressions of the same meaning. That was in the first century; we are in the twentieth; and to persist in thrusting what was near then into some time still future can be nothing less than taking away from the words of the book, and running a very serious risk of losing our share in the tree of life and in the holy city which the book describes.

One reason why the New Jerusalem has been so generally unrecognised as a present possession for all faithful Christians is probably the unhappy limitation of "the nations" in xxi. 24 of the old version to "the nations of them which are saved," a mistake which has no more venerable origin than a slip made by a clerk whom Erasmus employed in preparing a copy for the first printed edition of the Greek Testament. But I am writing nearly twenty-three years after the Revised Version came before the public, and it is time now to brush that unhappy blunder aside, and to vindicate the whole vision as plain and precious Gospel teaching, most necessary for these times. I have shown how it deals with "Ritualism." The verse I have just referred to deals as thoroughly with Disestablishment. *The nations are to walk amidst the light of the City, and they and their kings* (verse 26) *bring their glory and honour into it.* If this does not mean the public, national, and political recognition, honour, and protection of the visible Church, it means nothing. Nations and kings are not souls without bodies. Let those ardent Non-conformists who are so justly opposed to "Ritualism" take notice that Divisions and Disestablishment are at least as contrary to Scripture as Ritualism, and then let them join their forces with those Churchmen who, amidst many temptations to despair, are still labouring to "strengthen the things which remain." Ought not the highest form of human society to be Christian? And can it be Christian if it leaves out of its creed "the Holy Catholic Church"—that Church which Christ said He would build, and build for ever? Can that Church be a medley of manifold sects competing with one another for supporters till the Cross disappears from the young child's brow, and the earliest and most permanent idea of religion is an idea of conferring a favour by submitting to be taught? Common-sense agrees with Scripture.

Faith is no subject for force. Neither is worship, which is an expression of faith. But religious equality—or, rather, the equality of religions—is only a euphemism for despair of

religion. If adopted by the nation, it would be a national declaration that in religion there is no ascertainable or even probable truth, and that the grand utterances of Isaiah and the other prophets as to the support to be given to the Church by the powers of the world are of no account. Nor can the State evade the duty of recognising and honouring the Church of God on the plea that the legislature or the executive consists of men of diverse minds. When there arises among men any one individual whose mind is perfect and always the same, such a plea may be examined. The Church comes to the individual, amidst all his perplexities, his conflicts of will, his aspirations, his passions, and demands his allegiance in the name of his Creator. So it comes to the State. Christ, the Head of the Church, is King of Kings and Lord of Lords.

Briefly thus: St. Paul says Jerusalem, which is above, is our mother (Gal. iv. 26). St. John saw it coming down from heaven, and said it would soon be here (Rev. xxi. 10; xxii. 6, 10). The Epistle to the Hebrews says we are come to it (Heb. xii. 22). In it there is no *ναός* (Rev. xxi. 22), no material habitation of adorable deity; therefore no official priest in the sense of *ιερεύς*, and no "Ritualism." The nations were to walk in the light of it, and they and their kings were to bring their honour into it—that is, to recognise and establish it. And this Jerusalem can be nothing else than the Church of Christ.

In this article I claim to have deduced from the Revelation an absolute proof, for all who receive the Revelation as authoritative, that "Ritualism" and Disestablishment are both opposed to the mind of Christ. And I earnestly call upon those who, either by the offices they hold or by their personal influence, stand in the front rank of our Church, to look seriously into the matter, and if they find I am right, then to put the proofs plainly and forcibly before the Christian public. I cannot suppose that there is anything original in the line I take, though I do not know that I have seen it taken by anyone else. But I am sure it is not often taken, and I believe it ought to be one of the commonplaces of Christianity. I believe also that if the Christian public could be brought to see that Christianity condemns both "Ritualism" and Disestablishment, and condemns them in the inspired revelation of God's holy city, large parts of what now passes for Christian thought and action would soon be revolutionized. My argument does not stop at these two negations, nor at a third, which naturally follows from one of them, the negation of Romanism. I must go on to point out that the New

Jerusalem is positive, and as such within reach of all Christian people, being, indeed, that same kingdom of heaven which we tell our children in the Catechism that they inherit—meaning “possess.”

Why, then, some may ask—why do we not see the new heaven and the new earth? Has God made all things new, or was the Apostle mistaken? Death is not passed away. Mourning, crying, and pain are still upon the earth. All things are old, and not new. Tears still come, and often there is no kindly hand to wipe them away. But let us think. When we have stood and knelt by the bedside of some dear Christian friend, for whom in all appearance the time of dissolution was drawing near—at such a time has not the brief, bright Gospel of the Communion of the Sick, once or twice in our lifetime, flashed into our hearts, if but for a moment, and in another form, that same secret of the heavenly citizenship which I have already mentioned? “Verily, verily, I say unto you, He that heareth my word, and believeth Him that sent me, HATH ETERNAL LIFE, and cometh not into judgment, but hath passed out of death into life” (John v. 24)? Passed out of death into life! Christians have been used to believe that he who recorded these words was the same Apostle as he who wrote of the new earth in which death should be no more.

And St. Paul, in his second Epistle to the Corinthians, the fifth chapter, writes: “If any man is in Christ, he is a new creature: the old things are passed away; behold, they are become new.” “But,” says the great prophet of the Old Testament, “the wicked are like the troubled sea when it cannot rest, whose waters cast up mire and dirt. There is no peace, saith my God, to the wicked.” The new creation is within. “The kingdom of God cometh not with observation.” “Ye must be born anew.” No change may happen to sun or moon or natural ocean; though the sea was not to the ancients, and especially not to Jews, what it is to us. Horace called it *dissociabilis*. To Daniel it was a symbol of those stormy elements out of which arose the brute kingdoms of the world. And for St. John at Patmos it rolled and tossed and threatened between him and the Churches which he loved so well. Rains and winds may keep their courses. The body may sicken, business may fail, friends may prove false; the love of many for the Friend of all may wax cold. Yet with a heart believing in God’s righteousness, and firmly grounded on the Eternal Word, all will be new. Not all at once, but enough, even from the moment that we ask the way to Zion, and set our faces thitherward; enough to cheer us onward and upward, changing us from glory into glory, while with unveiled face we

reflect, as in a mirror, the glory of the Lord, and are led by His Spirit. They that overcome the evil overcome the sorrow. For them—gentle souls they are, most of them, unknown to the great ones of the earth, but dear to the Almighty—for them, in the midst of life's trials, there is always peace; for them dying is not death, but the gate to a nobler form of life; for them there is safe passage over life's troublesome waves. They know nothing of storms when they hear the voice that says, "It is I; be not afraid." They walk with their Lord; the waters are firm beneath their feet; no more sea casting up mire and dirt, but that which rests and shines before the throne. They walk in the light; they have fellowship one with another; and the blood of Jesus cleanseth them from all sin. The sea is no more, nor the night. The great vision of the Revelation is no mere dream of a world yet to come in which everybody is to be made comfortable by a change of circumstances. It is an ideal which may become real in this world, here and now, to all who are willing to have it realized. The unwilling are "without," with everyone that loveth and maketh a lie. For them there is no Immanuel, God with us; for them the tears are not wiped away; for them death reigns as heretofore, and death's forerunners and followers, mourning and crying and pain; whole seas of trouble—yes, and even before they die the first or natural death, their part may be in the second or spiritual death. (Rev. xx. 6, 9; xxi. 8.)

J. FOXLEY.



ART. V.—DEAN FARRAR.

AMONG the religious teachers of the nineteenth century Dean Farrar held a foremost place, and the details of his "Life," written by his son, Mr. Reginald Farrar, and published by Messrs. Nisbet at the modest price of 6s., will be eagerly read by thousands of persons in England and America who owe to him a debt of undying gratitude. The biography is not a long one, and consists in a great measure of "reminiscences" written by various friends who had special knowledge of his work at different periods of his career.

Of Farrar's early life there are but few incidents to record. He was born at Bombay in 1831, his father at that time being a chaplain of the Church Missionary Society. At the age of three he was sent to England, and placed under the care of two maiden aunts who lived at Aylesbury. Here he passed