

Theology on *the Web.org.uk*

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

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

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



Buy me a coffee

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



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbadshaw>

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

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

THE
CHURCHMAN

JANUARY, 1887.

ART. I.—THE CHURCH AND THE PEOPLE.

THE assertion is very freely hazarded in the present day that the Church of England has lost her hold upon the affections of the people, and that her ministrations and methods are no longer adapted for supplying their spiritual needs. It is not denied that the Clergy and faithful Laity are doing all in their power to make the work of the Church effective. Recent statistics have made such a denial inadmissible. But it is alleged that, in spite of much zealous, self-denying effort, the Church's system is so out of harmony with the requirements of the times that little or no influence is exerted over the hearts and lives of the people.

Our own experience is so entirely at variance with these conclusions that we should hardly see the necessity of taking up our pen to combat them if it were not that we often meet devout Churchmen who accept them without question, and become, in consequence, more interested in the promotion of unauthorized and irregular methods of evangelization than in maintaining the efficiency and the spread of those opportunities of grace which they themselves have found so precious.

Under the circumstances, it shall be our endeavour to show first of all that the Church of England as a body has not lost her hold upon the affections of the people; secondly, that the ministrations and methods of the Church, when faithfully employed, are admirably suited to the spiritual requirements of the day; and thirdly, that the influence of faithful Church work upon the hearts and lives of the people is deep-rooted, conspicuous, and enduring.

Perhaps it is here necessary for us to define who it is that we mean by the People. Such a term should naturally

include the whole nation ; and we, for our part, are prepared to maintain the theses which we have just laid down, in their most general application. But for convenience' sake, and with a view to limiting the scope of our discussion, we will adopt the definition of the People suggested in the subtle distinction recently drawn by an eminent statesman between the classes and the masses. Let it, however, be clearly understood that in so doing we accept no deductions which either reflect injuriously upon the classes or attribute any monopoly of virtue and enlightenment to the masses. By the masses we simply understand the vast population of artisans, labourers, and struggling poor who form the great majority of our nation, and consequently possess the greatest claim upon the energies of the Church.

In maintaining our first proposition, that the Church of England as a body has not lost her hold upon the affections of the people thus defined, we shall not rely exclusively upon statistics. Any statistics upon such a point must of necessity be more or less unreliable, while the principal fact which it would be important for us to know (namely, the proportion of professed Church-people to the rest of the population) is hidden from us by the refusal of the State to make a census of religions. It is, however, worthy of note that, notwithstanding the facilities which are now given for marriage in Nonconformist chapels and before the registrar, 72 per 100 of the marriages that take place are still solemnized in Church. Moreover, of seamen and mariners who from among the people join the royal navy 75 per 100, and of soldiers who enlist in the army 62 per 100, declare themselves members of the Church of England. Facts such as these, while they should not be taken to prove too much, are nevertheless sufficient to justify us in emphatically denying the statement which is sometimes made, that at least a half of the nation is entirely alienated from the Church.

But we will leave dry statistics, and turn our attention to other more lively indications of the general attachment of the people to the Church. These indications appear everywhere. It is often surprising to observe how, in the face of all that is said against the Church, the people rally round her as the natural centre of their religious life wherever the opportunity is given them. Even those who attach themselves to Nonconformist places of worship for the most part disclaim anything like formal separation, and are glad from time to time to seize occasions of joining in the Church's worship. Thus we often see Friendly and Benefit Societies, whose members are drawn from many Denominations, eagerly assembling for a united service in some central Parish Church in their neigh-

bourhood. The same may be noted with regard to the various organizations for the promotion of Temperance. Good Templars, Rechabites, Sons of the Phœnix, etc., are all found uniting of their own accord with their brethren of the Church of England Temperance Society in public acts of worship.

But it is not only on these public occasions that the attachment of the people to the ministrations of the Church is manifested. There is also a general disposition to give a hearty welcome to the Clergy and other Church-workers in their house-to-house visitation. The instances are few indeed where any opposition is offered to such attentions. In fact, we have never known of a refusal in any case of sickness or distress. In the matter of the education of their children the people, so far as our experience goes, seem to have almost unbounded confidence in the Church. Church day-schools are, as a rule, preferred, even when the fee is higher, to Board schools, and the Conscience Clause, over which politicians were so much exercised, is scarcely ever required to be brought into operation.

We have no wish to undervalue the work of Nonconformist bodies, or to dispute their claim to some share in the affections of the people. On the contrary, while we regret, on what we believe to be the highest grounds, the fact that Nonconformity exists among us, we readily admit that Nonconformists have in some instances supplied a want which the Church has failed to meet. We are, nevertheless, still of opinion that the hold of Nonconformity upon the people is accidental and superficial, whereas their attachment to the Church is inborn and fundamental. To illustrate our meaning we may mention that we know of not a few parishes where, under a revival of Church-work, Nonconformist chapels have been abandoned for want of a congregation, and either completely secularized else or handed over to the Church.

But we have no desire to overstate our case, and we shall not attempt to deny that the people sometimes manifest indifference and hostility to the Church. We can expect nothing else. The Church on earth is a militant body, formed to contend with opposing forces. Sin, the world, and the devil confront her in various ways. In some instances, unhappily, the root of bitterness springs up from within, in the form of neglect on the part of the Clergy, or of religious discord provoked by an injudicious insistence upon trifling changes of ritual. A whole parish is thus for a time demoralized, and a large proportion of the inhabitants temporarily alienated from the Church. Sometimes indifference and hostility to the Church are the unprovoked outcome of

the party strife of politicians. It is humiliating to observe how often even those who profess to be Churchmen forget themselves in the heat of an electoral contest, and either indulge in wanton attacks upon the Church on their own account or allow statements to pass in their presence which they know to be unfair and unjust. The people are deliberately taught at such times to regard the Church as an institution which stands in the way of their full possession of their rights and liberties, and they are advised to treat the Clergy and all other Church officials with suspicion and mistrust. We have before us at the present moment the report of a speech delivered by an able Churchman, who in his own parish is a member of several Church committees and a devout communicant, who nevertheless, in the disappointment of defeat at the poll, which he chose to attribute to Churchpeople, urges his supporters not to rest until they have in every town and in every village in the division which he had contested an organization to counteract the influence of the Church authorities. Ill-judged, hasty utterances of this kind are not without their injurious effect upon those who hear them; and indeed, considering their frequency, it is only to be wondered at that after a general election the Church retains the affections of the people so generally as she does. Then it is hardly necessary to add that there is always a certain amount of indifference and hostility to the Church among the openly godless and vicious. It is impossible that those who forget God and take delight in sin should have any real affection for the society whose very existence is a standing rebuke to their conduct.

We do not, however, think it can be said that the exceptions which we have admitted in any way affect the truth of the general proposition that the Church, as a body, still retains her hold upon the affections of the people.

We come now to our second proposition, that the ministrations and methods of the Church, when faithfully employed, are admirably suited to the spiritual requirements of the day. In support of this proposition we shall point first of all to the simplicity and directness of the Church's teaching. Nothing could be more clear than the way in which the great truths of Christianity, with the privileges and responsibilities which result from their acceptance, are everywhere set forth in her formularies. We do not know of a greater insult to the intelligence of the people than the allegation which is sometimes made, that the Book of Common Prayer is altogether beyond their comprehension. We cannot admit for one moment that the lengthy, laboured, and flowing extempore prayers which are often indulged in at religious meetings are

half so intelligible or devotional as the short, pithy, pointed collects and suffrages which are used in the worship of the Church. In a compilation such as the Book of Common Prayer, there must of necessity be some words that are hard to be understood; but while these are only occasional, the pages generally abound with the plainest possible devotional exercises and doctrinal teaching, based upon the plainest instructions from Holy Scripture. It has often been our privilege to witness the intelligent spiritual joy with which sick and aged Church-people, who can only just read, will pore over their Prayer Books at home, and find consolation in the familiar worship which they are prevented by infirmity from offering any longer in the house of God. We claim next, that there is completeness and harmony, as well as simplicity and directness, in the teaching of the Church. Where the course of the Christian Year is followed, and the Scriptural teaching of the Prayer Book adhered to, the whole counsel of God is annually declared. No single article of the Christian faith is magnified to the exclusion of the rest, but all are set forth in their proper proportion, so that the devout Churchman cannot fail to be thoroughly furnished for the fulfilment of the duties and privileges which belong to his high calling, and their completeness and harmony secure reasonableness and sobriety to the teaching of the Church, conditions which seem to us to be often wanting in the appeals made to the religious sense of the people by other bodies. In the beautiful logical sequence of Church Doctrine, the people can find conviction for the mind as well as for the heart. Not only are their feelings and affections worked upon, but their understandings also; and they are placed in a better position to give a reason when challenged for the hope that is in them. Doctrine thus taught and received produces sobriety of character. Religion becomes the atmosphere of everyday life, and ceases to be the mere occasional effervescence of mental and physical excitement. And the Church which provides this teaching possesses every opportunity for disseminating it as widely as possible. Her organization is capable of reaching all grades of society, and of grappling with every form of vice. It is not necessary that we should here enter upon a full explanation of the Church's system. Suffice it for our purpose to say that within the boundaries of their own parishes there is nothing to prevent the Clergy and faithful Laity from prosecuting the work of Christ in every possible direction. Not only is every branch of Christ's service open to them, but they are simply bound to fight manfully under His banner in every direction against sin, the world, and the devil; and we claim that in parishes where the ministrations and methods of the Church

are faithfully employed, no effort is spared, no organization neglected, which offers the faintest prospect of winning and keeping souls for Christ. We are sometimes told, as a recommendation of other religious bodies, that their agents can visit in places where the Clergy and other Church-workers would be afraid to go. But we emphatically dispute the statement, and entirely deny that there is any house or lodging, however degraded, which the conscientious Church-worker, whether Clergyman or District-visitor, would be deterred from entering by any motive of fear.

Our third proposition, that the influence of faithful Church-work upon the hearts and lives of the people is deep-rooted, conspicuous, and enduring, requires no proof to those who admit the truth of the first and second propositions. If, for instance, the Church still retains her hold upon the affections of the people, it is clear that the people have been deeply influenced by her ministrations, otherwise they would not still value them as they do. Or, again, if the ministrations and methods of the Church are admirably adapted for the spiritual requirements of the day, it is impossible that they should not exercise a powerful influence over the people when faithfully applied. But we may further appeal to our experience of every well-worked town or country parish. Whatever may be the peculiar difficulties or hindrances in such places, there are never wanting some signs of a pious public opinion resulting from the upright consistent examples of those among their fellows, perhaps few in number to start with, who have learned in the fellowship of the Church what it is to know Christ and to follow Him. The Kingdom of Heaven, of which the Church on earth is the visible expression, is still like leaven, deep-seated and secret in its operations, evident in its outward effects. Nor do we find that the people are only influenced passively by the Church. Many of the Church's most active workers are drawn from their ranks. In some parishes, indeed, if it were not for workers from among the people, there would be no workers at all; while in every parish where the Church is vigorous, the people contribute their full share to the activity of the organization. We could tell of parochial undertakings the success of which has been entirely due, under God, to the efforts of working-men. We know of one parish, at least, where, not content with giving their services for the promotion of Mission-work, delegates from the people have banded themselves together for the purpose of collecting the stipend of an Assistant-Curate. Facts such as these leave us no doubt that the Church is capable of inspiring enthusiasm in the hearts of the people for the spread of the Gospel.

Our conclusions may be summed up as follows: While the Church in her human relations is not altogether free from abuses or exempt from failure, she nevertheless retains as a body all the conditions of a Divine Vitality, and has at her disposal all the means for fulfilling her great mission of evangelizing the people. Her abuses are not inherent, but incidental; her failures are not general and permanent, but occasional and temporary. The ordinances of the Church are only formal to those who use them formally; the work of the Church is only fruitless to those who follow it aimlessly and heartlessly. The sincere and devout Churchman can hardly fail to regard the Church as the only body completely fitted to continue the work of Christ among the people. In the faithful ministration of the Word and Sacraments, in the careful instruction of the young, in the diligent visitation of the sick and dying, in the active prosecution of every crusade against sin and unbelief according to the methods of the Church of England, lies, in our opinion, the only well-grounded hope of maintaining the greatness of the nation by preserving the people in the fear of God.

JOHN M. BRAITHWAITE.

ART. II.—NEW TESTAMENT SAINTS NOT
COMMEMORATED.—EPAPHRAS.

THE name of Epaphras occurs only three times in the New Testament; twice in the Epistle of St. Paul to the Colossians, and once in the Epistle sent by him, at the same time and by the same messengers, to Philemon at Colossæ. In none of the three places does the mention of him extend beyond one or two verses. In one of them it consists simply of his name, with a significant epithet attached to it, as the sender of a salutation. Yet out of these three brief notices an interesting and instructive memoir of an uncommemorated Saint may be constructed, by an attentive and thoughtful reader.

I. The first mention which we have of Epaphras presents him to us as, in all probability, the chief if not the exclusive founder of one or more Christian churches; while at the same time it gives us an insight into the manner, in which the Gospel was carried in those early times into regions beyond the reach of the personal agency of the Apostles. At the

commencement of his Epistle to the Colossians,¹ St. Paul speaks with commendation and thankfulness of their fruitfulness and growth in "the word of the truth of the gospel," "since the day they heard and knew the grace of God in truth;" and then, with obvious reference to the Teacher from whom they first heard and knew it, he adds, "Even as ye learned of Epaphras, our beloved fellow-servant." Now even if, with our Authorized Version, we retain the word "also" ("as ye also learned")² in the clause last quoted, we are not driven to the conclusion that St. Paul intends to affirm that the Colossians had only heard the Gospel from Epaphras *as well as* from himself—from him "also," as ye did from me. We may still, even in that case, believe with Calvin³ and others, that St. Paul had never been at Colossæ when he wrote the Epistle, and that Epaphras was the proper founder of the Church. But if, with the Revised Version, we omit the word "also," against which the weight of manuscript authority greatly preponderates, and which is rejected by the principal critical editors, and read "even as ye learned of Epaphras,"⁴ the honour of having first preached the Gospel in Colossæ is even more clearly assigned to this uncommemorated Saint. That St. Paul is writing this Epistle to those to whom he is personally unknown seems certain, from the contents of the Epistle itself. Not only does he tell them more than once that he has "heard"⁵ of their faith and progress, and add that their love to him "in the spirit" (with a possible contrast to that love "in the flesh"⁶ which personal intercourse would have awakened) had been "declared unto him by Epaphras,"⁷ but he appears distinctly to include them and the Christians of the neighbouring Church of Laodicea in the number of those who "had not seen his face in the flesh."⁸ And if this be so, we may reasonably conclude that, in referring to Epaphras as he does, he intends to distinguish him, as one, at least, of the most prominent introducers of the Gospel into Colossæ.

Have we, then, any reliable data for determining the time at which this introduction took place, and the manner in which it was probably brought about? If St. Paul did not visit the valley of the Lycus, when he "went through the

¹ Colossians i. 3-8.

² *Ibid.*, i. 7.

³ Colossensibus nunquam visus fuerat.

⁵ Colossians i. 4, 9.

⁴ καθὼς ἐμάθετε, instead of καθὼς καὶ ἐμάθετε.

⁷ Colossians i. 8.

⁶ Philemon 16.

⁸ *Ibid.*, ii. 1. "There would be no meaning in singling out *individuals* who were known to him, and then mentioning comprehensively *all* who were unknown to him. Hence we may infer from the expression here that St. Paul had never visited Colossæ."—Bishop Lightfoot, whose note is worth consulting.

region of Galatia and Phrygia in order, establishing all the disciples,”¹ we may suppose that it was because there were as yet no disciples in that part of the country, and that therefore it did not fall within the scope of his journey. It was not a missionary tour, but an Apostolic visitation. We must look therefore to a later date for the founding of the Colossian Church. And this date may be fixed, with a high degree of probability, as falling within the three years of the Apostle’s subsequent sojourn at Ephesus.² During that interval we learn from St. Luke that, “all they which dwelt in Asia heard the word of the Lord, both Jews and Greeks,”³ while an enemy of the faith confirms this testimony, by complaining that “not alone at Ephesus, but almost throughout all Asia, this Paul hath persuaded and turned away much people.”⁴ Doubtless from Ephesus St. Paul may have made occasional short missionary tours (as we have seen reason, in a former paper, to think that he did from Corinth) into the neighbouring districts. But in addition to and beyond his personal activity, his work was multiplied and increased, in accordance with the unfailing law of the Gospel, by his converts and coadjutors. Thus it may well have been that Epaphras—converted himself to the faith of Christ by the Apostle, with whom he had come in contact on some visit to Ephesus—returned as the first herald of the Gospel to his own city of Colossæ.⁵ Some twelve miles lower down the Lycus, which flowed through the town of Colossa, stood opposite to each other, on the rising ground on either side of the river, the more important towns of Laodicea and Hierapolis. In them also the good tidings were proclaimed, and Christian churches were founded.⁶ Philemon and his son Archippus helped greatly in the work.⁷ But Epaphras was the leader and chief. From him it was, as St. Paul testifies, that they heard “the word of the truth of the Gospel,” and learned “the grace of God in truth.” He it is whom the Apostle acknowledges as his own representative, “a faithful minister of Christ on our behalf,”⁸ in his work at Colossa.

¹ Acts xviii. 23. That St. Paul did not probably come near Colossæ, either on this or his previous journey (ch. xvi. 6) is shown by Lightfoot, “Colossians,” Introduction, pp. 23-25.

² Acts xx. 31. ³ *Ibid.*, xix. 10. ⁴ *Ibid.*, xix. 26.

⁵ “Epaphras, who is one of you.” Colossians iv. 12.

⁶ Colossians ii. 1; iv. 13, 16. For an interesting description of these towns, and of the valley of the Lycus, a tributary of the Mæander, see Bishop Lightfoot on the “Colossians,” Introduction, p. 1 *seq.*

⁷ “Philemon, our fellow-worker;” “Archippus, our fellow-soldier.” Philemon i. 2. Comp. Colos. iv. 17.

⁸ The reading of the Revised Version, instead of “for you” (*ἵμων* for *ἐμῶν*) of the Authorised Version.

II. But the portraiture of Epaphras in this Epistle is not yet completed. In few but forcible lines another side of his character is also brought out. He is with St. Paul at Rome as he writes the letter. The Churches which he had helped to found, and in which he took so deep an interest, were in danger, as the Epistle shows, of being drawn away from the simplicity of their first faith by that strange admixture of Judaism and philosophy which afterwards developed into the eclectic heresy of Gnosticism.¹ It may be that his anxiety for his converts took him to Rome to seek counsel and aid from the Apostle, from whom he himself had first heard the Gospel, and who counted all the churches of the Gentiles his peculiar charge. But whether that were so, or whether being in Rome on some other errand he availed himself of the opportunity thus afforded him, it is clear that he called in the great Apostle to stem by his authority, and by his loving admonitions and powerful arguments, the rising tide of error. This, however, was not all he did for them. Though debarred for a time by absence from active effort on their behalf, there was still one way open to him, in which to labour for their good: he could pray for them. And this he did, with a constancy which knew no intermission,² with a fervency like that of St. Paul in his pleadings for absent brethren, and akin even to the Great Agony of the Lord Himself in its earnest "striving."³ His "much labour"⁴ for them, by which he won for himself the honourable title of a "servant of Christ Jesus,"⁵ and called forth the high encomium of his spiritual father, lay no less in the sphere of prayer than it did in that of active exertion. In the combination of the two are to be found at once the secret of his success and the force of his example. All the energy that he would have expended in warning and exhorting them, had he been with them, against the errors which threatened to corrupt their faith, was now thrown into his prayers for them that they might "stand perfect and assured in all the will of God."⁶

¹ "That Judaic form of incipient gnosticism," as Archdeacon Farrar calls it. Observe how St. Paul sets in contrast to this the teaching of Epaphras: "The word of the truth of the gospel," "The grace of God in truth." Colossians i. 5, 6.

² "πάντοτε, always." Colossians iv. 12.

³ ἀγωνίζεμενος. *Ibid.*, Comp. ιηλίκον ἀγῶνα, ch. ii. 1; and γενόμενος ἐν ἀγωνίᾳ, Luke xxii. 44.

⁴ πολὺν πόνον, Colossians iv. 13. A word of rare use in the New Testament, occurring only here (where it is the best supported reading) and in the Apocalypse.

⁵ δοῦλος.

⁶ Boni pastoris exemplum, cui locorum distantia ecclesiae oblivionem minime inducit quin trans mare ejus curam secum deferat. Et notanda vis orationis, quæ exprimitur in verbo certandi."—Calvin.

III. The remaining brief notice adds a single particular to our knowledge of Epaphras. In his Epistle to Philemon, St. Paul bestows upon him the honourable title of his "fellow-prisoner."¹ The word literally means a "prisoner of war."² But assuming it to have here a spiritual and not a literal signification, we are struck by the way in which in two Epistles, written almost at the same time, this title is given alternately to two different persons. In the Epistle to the Colossians it is, "Aristarchus, my fellow-prisoner;" "Epaphras, a servant of Christ."³ In the Epistle to Philemon it is, "Epaphras, my fellow-prisoner;" "Aristarchus, my fellow-labourer."⁴ It has been suggested that the difference may be accounted for, either by their having changed places, in the short interval between the writing of the two letters, in a *voluntary* imprisonment, undertaken by them in turn, to comfort and minister to St. Paul; or else that "as the result of some trial" in the meantime, the one had been incarcerated and the other set at liberty. The evident anxiety of Epaphras for the Church at Colossæ might seem to be inconsistent with voluntary absence, even for so worthy an object as ministering to the Apostle in his bonds, and to point rather to compulsory incarceration. But other considerations, personal to himself or connected with the Churches—the refreshing of his own spirit or the quieting of some irritation on their part—may have made his prolonged absence from Colossæ desirable. And in the lack of further information we must content ourselves with the undoubted fact that, whether willingly or by constraint, he shared the Apostle's imprisonment at Rome.

To the minister of Christ first, and then to every true servant of His, the lesson of the life of Epaphras is clear and weighty. *Ora et labora.* Pray and labour. In fervency of zeal, in purity of doctrine, in watchful solicitude, in wise precaution, let this uncommemorated Saint be your example in working. In constancy of intercession, in energy of supplication, in singleness of aim, let him be your example in praying also. Labour as he laboured. Pray as he prayed. And your prayer and labour shall not be in vain in the Lord.

T. T. PEROWNE.

¹ ὁ συναιχμάλωτός μου, verse 23.

² "Designat hastā superatum et captum."—Davenant, quoted by Ellicott.

³ Colossians iv. 10, 12.

⁴ Verses 23, 24.



ART. III.—THE CHURCH PATRONAGE BILL.

THE sudden dissolution last summer of the very short-lived Parliament of 1885 extinguished the bright hopes we all had that the more glaring abuses connected with Church Patronage were at last to be taken away. In May everything seemed to promise speedy and effective legislation. A Bill promoted by Mr. Rylands and Mr. Leatham had passed its second reading in the Commons, and the Archbishop of Canterbury had safely conducted another Bill dealing with the same subject through the like crisis in the Lords. Not only had the whole group of questions been debated, and that with an unusual degree of accord on all sides, in both Houses of Parliament, but the Convocations had also discussed those questions at length, and the House of Laymen, which is becoming so important and influential an adjunct to the Synod of the Southern Province, had carefully revised the Archbishop's Bill, and expressed its judgment upon its several clauses. And we cannot forbear to notice at the outset with what goodwill that Lay House was animated towards this important branch of Church Reform. There is hardly anything in Church matters that could be mentioned which so nearly touches their worldly interests as this. It concerns, and very nearly too, those "sacred rights of property" which have so often stood in the way when anything to advance the practical efficiency of our church machinery was mooted. Yet hardly anything of jealousy about these rights appeared. Our picked laymen were in most cases patrons themselves; but they showed zeal in pushing on, out of their love for the Church, a great reform which they saw to be expedient, in spite of its involving a serious abridgment of their own powers, and a considerable depreciation of what the law, at any rate, regards as their property.

The Select Committee of the Lords, to which the Archbishop's Bill was by general consent referred on May 13, reported on June 4; and if the Session had run its normal course, the Bill as thus amended would undoubtedly have passed its third reading, and have reached the Commons before July. There it would no doubt have undergone fresh debate. Its proposals differed in some leading particulars from those which found favour with the House of Commons. Mr. Rylands's Bill, for instance, had given power to raise the purchase-money, when an advowson was sold, by mortgage of the benefice to Queen Anne's Bounty: and this proposal was most strongly and justly objected to in many quarters, and accordingly has no place in the Archbishop's Bill. Another difference between

the two Bills is found in the patrons to which advowsons, when sold under the provisions of the Bill, are to be transferred. Mr. Rylands and Mr. Leatham wished to make the Bishop and churchwardens the patrons in such cases, the majority to present in case of difference of opinion. Mr. Leatham had in the Parliament preceding proposed to hand over this right to the Crown, and on a previous occasion to the Crown and Bishop alternately. None of these suggestions found much favour; and instead of them the Archbishop's Bill offers us a Diocesan Board of Patronage. How far this Board would have found favour with the House of Commons we cannot say. Mr. Rylands's Bill in the Commons and the Archbishop's Bill in the Lords were both dropped when Mr. Gladstone wrecked his Government upon the Irish Bill, and the whole subject stands over intact for the new Parliament.

It certainly ought not to be a matter of insuperable difficulty, nor one involving any great delay, to secure an Act of Parliament from the present House which shall deal with the whole subject in a way that will satisfy loyal and reasonable Churchmen. Since the General Election in the summer, the Church Congress has held its annual group of meetings at Wakefield, and its discussion of Church Patronage manifested once more what a very general agreement there is amongst us about nearly all the most important particulars. We shall evidently hear no more of the scheme for taxing the revenues of benefices for thirty years in order to raise the means for effecting one last sale of the patron's rights over a parish. The Archbishop's Bill passes *sicco pede* over the difficulty. It says nothing whatever about the purchase-money. And again, nobody appears to have a good word to say about Donatives. These, which are benefices in the mere gift of the patron, to which he presents his nominee without any institution or induction by the Bishop or his officers, are a curious survival. They no doubt represent extraordinary favours originally conferred on a patron in acknowledgment of extraordinary munificence towards the Church and parish. Their number has been by various processes diminished, and the once almost absolute exemption from the jurisdiction of the ordinary has been by statute after statute encroached upon; but there are still about a hundred of them left, with their old peculiarity intact as regards patronage. Several of them are in the hands of ecclesiastical agents, and they serve the purpose of cloaking many an unsavoury or irregular transaction in the traffic in benefices. When we see an advertisement that a living is to be sold "with immediate possession," it may strongly be suspected that a Donative is the means by which the desired vacancy will speedily be brought about.

When once the price is agreed on and secured, the agent presents the incumbent to his Donative, perhaps having taken security for its being resigned again on demand; and so the incumbency that has been made merchandise of becomes void, and the new patron may exercise his purchased rights immediately. The Bishop will never hear anything of the business until he is called upon by that patron to institute the clerk on whose behalf the living is bought, and is utterly powerless throughout. It is quite time that these anomalies should cease. Donatives will assuredly be made presentative benefices, and the change in their legal status will do no harm at all to the reasonable rights of their owners.

There is no less agreement of opinion on other very important particulars. Such, for instance, as prohibiting the sale of the rights of the patron to anyone "engaged in negotiating sales or exchanges," and of prohibiting that of next presentations to any purchaser whatever. There are those, indeed, who doubt whether it will prove to be practicable effectually to do this: whether the ingenuity of lawyers, and the unscrupulousness of some few owners and would-be owners of livings, will not find the means of evading any clauses in an Act of Parliament, however stringent those clauses may be in their prohibition of such sales. And Canon Trevor denied at the York Convocation in February, that there is "any substantial difference between a next presentation and an advowson. The difference, he added, was the difference between a loin of mutton and a mutton-chop. A next presentation was a slice, and the advowson a number of slices. Or the next presentation was a slice one was helped to; the advowson the joint that remained on the dish." Yet he failed to carry the judgment of the Lower House of York with him. When so many men of experience and skill in such matters see their way, it appears presumptuous to doubt that the thing can be done. And unquestionably, to stop the sale of next presentations would at one stroke abolish the most and the worst of the scandals which are complained of. For it is not the mere parting with the right of presentation which is so much resented, even though it be done in consideration of a money payment; it is the intolerable and cynical cupidity of some few who systematically sell this solemn trust, time after time, as soon as it becomes valuable. There are certain benefices in every diocese which are always sold as soon as the incumbent becomes old enough to make it worth while to put them on the market. The advowsons of these unhappy parishes are simply treated as sources of revenue; as affording every few years a sort of windfall to their owners. Is it wonderful that an incumbent, coming in under such circumstances, is apt to be not over-

lovingly regarded ; or that there is a sort of chronic difficulty about Church-work in such parishes, and disaffection to the Church system, which is incrusted with such abuses ?

It will greatly help to check irregular transactions in the transfer of Church patronage, if the proposed clauses be enacted which will put an end to the secrecy of them. The thirteenth clause of the Archbishop's Bill will, we believe, effectively secure the Church in this particular. At present the Bishop never at any time knows for certain, as regards a benefice in private gift, who is really the patron. It may have been sold since the last incumbent was presented, or the next presentation may have been so ; and until an actual vacancy occurs, and a clerk comes with the Deed of Presentation in hand, and claims to be instantly instituted upon it, nothing will in all likelihood be heard about the business by the chief pastor of the diocese. It is quite right that all transfers should be at once made known to him, and the legal papers filed in the Diocesan Registry. And we observe with satisfaction that the Bill proposes to require a declaration, in stringent terms, that all is regular and incorrupt, from the patron. At present the oath about simony is required from the presentee ; whereas it is the patron in most cases who ought to be interrogated about the character of the transaction, because it is he who will pocket the money if any sale has taken place.

Not less worthy of approval are the clauses which limit the period for which a benefice may be placed under sequestration for debt, or because of the lunacy of the incumbent. It is monstrous that a parish should suffer for years and years under the disadvantages attending the abstraction of its income, to pay off, it may be, the college debts of its vicar's youth ; or should for no less a period have to bear the burden of an incumbent who is non-resident, simply because he is, and must for life remain, the inmate of an asylum. The present writer knows a parish well that was under sequestration, from the former of these two causes, for nearly thirty years ; and knows now another parish that has been in the same predicament, from the latter cause, for thirty-six years ! In the former case the glebe-house had fallen down, the chancel was ruinous, the farm buildings but little better, and yet the sequestrator could not be compelled to find anything out of the revenue except the bare salary of a curate, nor to answer for dilapidations when the impoverished rector at last died. Since those days the powers of the Bishop have been somewhat enlarged by recent statute. He can now require more to be done than he then could for the parish before the incumbent's creditors seize their due from its income. But it is

high time that these prolonged diversions of parochial endowments from their proper application—the maintenance of a resident incumbent—were put an end to. We are not sure, however, whether the clause—the twentieth of the Archbishop's Bill—which would declare a benefice void if sequestration for debt continue for one whole year, is not somewhat too severe.

The clause which will abolish “Resignation Bonds” is surely a wise provision. These bonds are exacted when a man is “put in” to a benefice for a temporary purpose; perhaps to give time for arranging a sale; perhaps to hold it until some young man is of age to be legally qualified for institution to it, or has been forced through the required examinations academical and episcopal. In such cases the stopgap incumbent, who has sometimes been termed a “warming-pan,” is required to execute a bond binding him under heavy penalties to resign when called upon to do so. These jobs, though made legally valid by a special statute of 9 Geo. IV., c. 94, are scandalous, and ought no longer to be tolerated.

Church-people generally will likewise observe with satisfaction that the Archbishop's Bill will require that one month's public notice be given in a vacant parish of the name of the proposed presentee, and that any parishioner or parishioners may submit objections to the Bishop. These objections must be based, not on doctrines or ritual, but on what may be briefly described as moral grounds, such as indebtedness or evil report, or on the ground of physical or mental unfitness for the work. And of course a corresponding enlargement is accorded of the Bishop's power to refuse institution. Doubtless provisions of this nature, involving allegations about matters of opinion or of rumour, need to be somewhat narrowly scrutinized and carefully guarded. It might be possible, under shelter of such clauses, to do cruel injustice, and there would be no redress for an injured man, because the Bill carefully enacts that such communications as it suggests shall be “privileged.” But some legislation of this sort is clearly right and necessary, and we deem the particular proposals before us to have been, perhaps, as considerably framed as the case admits of. It is emphatically an affair to which the maxim applies, “*Salus populi suprema lex.*”

The portion of the Bill which creates most serious misgivings is that concerning the “Council of Presentations.” Anyone who will refer back to the debate in the Lords, on May 13th, will observe that there also this element of the Bill was regarded with a certain doubt and mistrust. As it then stood the Council (termed the Council of Public Patronage) was to consist of an equal number of clerical and lay

members. In a diocese having two archdeaconries the Council would have had twelve members. The clergy would be the Bishop, the two Archdeacons, two representatives of the beneficed clergy, one of the cathedral chapter; whilst the lay members would have been two, representing the archdeaconries, and chosen by the Churchwardens, and four others named by the Lord-Lieutenant and Chairman of Quarter Sessions. This constitution was, however, greatly modified in Select Committee as regards the lay element, and the Board as now proposed would—when the diocese contained two archdeaconries—consist of ten persons, with the Bishop as chairman making an eleventh. The lay members would be the Chancellor of the Diocese when a layman, or a barrister nominated by him if he were a clergyman, and two laymen for each archdeaconry, elected by a representative body deputed for that purpose by the parishes, two being sent up from each parish vestry. This certainly seems simpler machinery than that originally proposed; and the element of nomination, to which great objection was at once taken in the Lords, is appreciably curtailed. But we do not know that the very serious objections entertained by many to the whole principle of a Diocesan Board of Patronage has been very much mitigated by the change. The proposed Board would have two sets of duties to discharge. It would have to act as the Bishop's Council when a patron made proposals for selling an advowson, or presented to him an objectionable nominee, and probably in other questions connected with patronage in his diocese; and it would itself exercise patronage in its own name, for which purpose it is to be constituted a body corporate, and to have power to acquire advowsons and to receive and hold moneys for the purchase of rights of patronage. As regards the former set of duties, we have little to say. The enlarged powers of the Bishop as regards rejection of a presentee doubtless entail a seriously increased responsibility; and we are not at all surprised that the Bishops should be willing to have that burden shared with them by such a Council as is proposed. Whilst many of us would prefer that the duty should rest with those on whom Church principle, as we hold, has placed it, we would not object to the Council if it were merely one to advise and help the Bishop. It is quite possible that such a body as that suggested in the Bill might give many useful hints, much local information which otherwise might never reach him, and would be a protection to him against unjust censures. It is another question whether it would be deemed worth while to set the rather cumbrous elective machinery of the Bill in motion merely to elect an advisory committee. But the really

weighty objections to the proposals of the Bill attach to the Diocesan Board in its capacity as patron. Can it be said that experience, so far as we have had it, has proved that Boards are, as a rule, better patrons than individuals? The sense of responsibility is divided amongst the members of a corporate body, and they have been not seldom known to do collectively what no one of them would venture to do singly. There is sometimes a certain timidity also in the action of a Board in the face of popular feeling, real or supposed. The nominees of a Board might be apt to be rather safe than brilliant, rather respectable than eminent; mediocrities more often than men of original power and independent views. Has not the experience of the Church of Ireland pointed in this direction? Does not the Church need from time to time that bold appointments should be made? and have they not usually been made, when made, by the private patrons whose rights and powers are to be taken over by these Diocesan Boards? Is it not through private patronage that our dioceses mostly get that new blood which they often very much want?

And this brings us to the last point which space permits us now to mention. We mean the abridgment of the area of private patronage which must, as it appears to us, result in time from the operation of the Archbishop's Bill, if enacted. The Diocesan Board would be always in presence. It is the way of such bodies to be acquisitive and somewhat aggressive. Probably they would in time, in one way or another, obtain a good deal of money to buy up advowsons, for which the Bill gives them a certain kind of right of pre-emption, and would secure in one way or another a considerable slice out of the private patronage of each diocese. And, once obtained, their patronage would change hands no more. It is "*vestigia nulla retrorsum.*" The Diocesan Board might buy, but apparently cannot sell. The process might not be rapid, for a Board would have no funds except from free gifts; but it would be continuous, and the number of livings in the gift of private individuals would undergo a steady if gradual diminution. Is this desirable in the interests of the Church, broadly considered? We greatly doubt it. The Bill is of course levelled directly against private patronage, and this cannot be helped, because the gross scandals and abuses connected with patronage have, so far as the law can remedy them, attached exclusively to this class of patrons. But it must not be forgotten that, taken on the whole, private patrons have discharged their responsibilities quite as well and with quite as high a degree of conscientiousness as any other. Those who have been merely venal, or lent themselves to corrupt transactions in any form, are exceptions, and far more rare exceptions than

is generally supposed from the noise there has been about them, and exceptions, also, that tend ever to become more rare. Moreover, there has been in every quarter an anxious disclaimer amongst reformers of any wish to do away with private patronage in the Church of England. Nothing could be more emphatic in its way than the testimonies in this direction delivered at Wakefield by the Archbishop of York in his admirable inaugural sermon, and by speakers on the subject subsequently. But if this be so, is not the natural and the politic course one that would remove the scandals and abuses whilst not tending to transfer private patronage from individuals to Diocesan Boards? There are many, we think, who would be very glad to see the "Council of Presentations" disappear from the Archbishop's Bill; or, if that may not be, that the functions of the Council should be limited to advising the Bishop in cases which he may see fit to refer to it. And, perhaps, a shorter and simpler Bill, which should contain only those provisions which strike directly at corruptions and abuses, might be easier to pass. No one now ventures to defend these scandals in either House of Parliament, and if they were taken away we should probably have on the whole as good a system of patronage as we can expect in a world where everything is imperfect.

T. E. ESPIN.



ART. IV.—FRANCIS MORSE.

IN MEMORIAM.

IN one of the most delightful and characteristic papers by Dean Stanley, the sketch of Archdeacon Hare, there is a remarkable passage. The Dean observes, if a foreigner who landed in England in 1853 wished to find the man best acquainted with the philosophical and theological thought of the Continent, he would have found him, "not in Oxford, not in Cambridge, not in London. He must have turned far away from academic towns or public libraries to a secluded parish in Sussex, and in the minister of that parish, in an Archdeacon of one of the least important of English dioceses, he would have found what he sought." Ten years after this, if the same foreigner had asked, "Can I find among the working ministry of the Church of England a man who combines real learning with intense faith, and who gives himself absolutely and entirely to the duties of his office?" many who were well acquainted with the hard-working clergy of populous Birmingham would have directed his steps to the church, the school,

or the study, where for many years, in season and out of season, early and late, bright, hopeful, faithful, and enduring, the constant friend of rich and poor, such a pastor might have been found in the person of Francis Morse.

He was born in the year 1818, and was educated at the great Shrewsbury Grammar School, under Dr. Butler and Dr. Kennedy. Dr. Kennedy many years afterwards described "the boy as the father of the man." From Shrewsbury he went to Cambridge, and in 1842 appeared as a Senior Optime in Mathematics and a First Classman in the Classical Tripos. Those who knew him well in his Cambridge days speak most warmly of the great interest he constantly showed in all branches of study. His circle of friends was wide and well chosen, and his character, according to one of them, was marked by the purity of thought and feeling, the candour, modesty, and true moderation, distinctive of his whole life and career. He often dwelt in later years upon the pleasant aspects of Cambridge life, and delighted in every attempt to raise the standard of religious life in the University. For some time he was curate of North Cave, Suffolk, and of Tamworth. His sermons at Cambridge as Select Preacher were greatly prized.

The mark made by University sermons, even of the highest character, is often soon effaced. Cambridge has rejoiced, however, in the possession of preachers who had the real secret of moving souls. Julius Hare by his "Victory of Faith"—the stirring series of sermons still read with interest—made a revolution in Cambridge preaching. To the powerful strains of Henry Melvill another generation listened with eager enthusiasm. Morse had no pretension to be reckoned amongst great orators, but those who heard his sermons were attracted by the pithy language and sweet persuasion of a preacher who seemed to feel an affectionate interest for his younger brethren. Reality and vigour are the characteristics of the volume dearly prized by many, who owe to the preacher lessons never to be forgotten. Much may be expected from a volume which, it is said, he left nearly ready for the press, dealing with the Service for the Visitation of the Sick, and the purifying influences of suffering.

The great work of Morse's life began when he was appointed perpetual curate of St. John's, Ladywood, Birmingham, where he remained from 1854 to 1864.

The work which he had undertaken was one of great difficulty. There was a large and increasing district of poor; but in order to establish firmly the various institutions of the parish, it was necessary to enlist the sympathy and energies of richer neighbours, many of whom attended the church, but

who were sometimes hardly alive to the responsibilities of their position. Morse, like Chalmers many years before in Glasgow, saw what had to be done, and determined how it was to be done. He had a real deep vein of the enthusiasm of humanity within him. He had also what few had, the power of creating a similar feeling in others. In a very short time St. John's, Ladywood, became a model parish. Incumbent, curates, schoolmasters and schoolmistresses, teachers and visitors, worked together with a heartiness and energy that made some think of Rugby under Arnold, and others of the early days of Hook in Leeds, or Slade in Bolton. The teaching from the pulpit of St. John's was admirable and telling. "It is not eloquence," said a Birmingham man of great ability, "it is something far better than eloquence." The plain, direct appeal to the highest instincts of loyal faith was not in vain. The church became the refuge and the home of many cultivated and thoughtful people who had hitherto failed to find real support and nurture for spiritual life. Morse was a really helpful preacher. He showed the truest sympathy with real, earnest doubters. But the intensity of his own personal feeling for the Person and work of the Redeemer pervaded every utterance, and gave life and spirit to every address. To dwell on those days when, to the astonishment of all who knew him, at clerical meetings or at occasional gatherings, he seemed to be able to find time for theological study and acquaintance with great subjects, must always be delightful. He touched every subject in which he was interested with light and distinction, and many will remember how in a circle of friends, somewhat narrow perhaps in their sympathies, he would quietly and steadily show how some great divine, not altogether in favour in Birmingham circles, had illustrated some particular point, or cleared up some acknowledged difficulty. With brethren who found themselves in difficulties as to their work he always had the fullest sympathy, and he never wearied in his efforts to raise the standard of life and study amongst his own curates and other younger men with whom he came in contact. Like other parishes, St. John's had its own difficulties. There were strong spirits sometimes requiring gentle repression, and others who needed the stimulus of pastoral exhortation. But after a few years, one who was as indefatigable in his ministry as Morse had the satisfaction of knowing that there were some at least who had been gradually won to hearty co-operation in his many schemes, and who had at one time looked with disfavour on much that he was attempting to do.

It was his custom at this period of his life occasionally to escape from the unceasing routine of parochial work to the

kindly home of a friend in the country, where he was at all times a welcome guest. But while absent from his people, he was often in thought and in word apt to recall some experience gained from a sick-bed, or some striking thought suggested by one of his artisan parishioners. He became to many the ideal vicar of a town parish, and when the time came when he was summoned to a larger and more important sphere at Nottingham, it was felt by those who knew Birmingham best that one had departed, who had left an enduring mark upon the practical religion and higher culture of that great community. Mr. Shorthouse, in the too brief notice contributed by him to the *Guardian*, has said : "It seems to me, as I look back upon those days, that the life of every one of us is changed and exalted by our acquaintance with him. To know him was an inspiration." This is indeed high praise, but to those who knew and valued the man and his work it does not seem exaggerated. Nothing could be simpler or more natural than the way in which Morse accepted his call to work in Nottingham. He was personally a stranger to the patron of the living, Earl Manvers, who, at the suggestion of Bishop Jackson, offered him the Vicarage of St. Mary's.

In the year 1864 a new and most important stage of his ministry was commenced. He at once took his place as the principal representative of the Church in Nottingham. The sphere was changed, but the activity and energy were the same. "The Need of Christianity to Great Cities"—the title of a sermon by a sometime celebrated London preacher—he once said to an old friend who visited him at Nottingham, "is often in my heart as I pace these streets." It may be said of Morse with truth that he yearned and longed to bring working-men to God. "What more beautiful words are there in the whole Bible," he said once at the commencement of a telling and touching sermon, "than these, 'He brought him to Jesus'?" It was the motive of his life. It was impossible to be with him without feeling that the aim and object of Francis Morse was to induce all whom he had any influence over whatever to take the same interest as he did in spiritual life. He was most anxious to promote every well-meant effort to advance education and culture. He longed for a day of greater unity and fuller life; but the intense desire of his heart was to deepen in himself and others the channels of spiritual life, and he hailed with earnest enthusiasm the efforts of men who were working with the same object, although often differing from them widely in opinion. His relations with Bishops Jackson and Wordsworth, and with Bishop Ridding, the first Bishop of Southwell, were of the most kindly and affectionate nature. When he first made acquaintance with the late Bishop

of Lincoln, Morse was inclined to think that the Bishop was somewhat rigid and exacting in parochial requirements; but as he knew him more, he admired and loved him more, and those who were present at the funeral of that remarkable prelate carried away with them a touching recollection of the deep feeling manifested by Morse on that occasion. Many now regret that the office of a canonry at Lincoln most kindly pressed by Bishop Wordsworth on Morse was not accepted; but at the time when the Bishop wished him to leave his work at Nottingham he still hoped for some years of hard work. Very shortly afterwards, however, he was overtaken by a serious illness, and for more than a year disabled from active duty. It was observed by those who knew him best, when he returned to his place at Nottingham, that intensity of spiritual experience, the experience gathered in times of quiet, had imparted to his utterances a peculiar and remarkable charm. He worked as those work who feel that the days of their pilgrimage are drawing to an end; and although his increasing deafness gave a certain sadness to his expression, he seemed at times to be almost carried away by his absorbing and consuming energy. From first to last during his life in Nottingham, without any compromise of his own distinctive position, he had desired to promote unity of feeling between Churchmen and those who are separated from the communion of the National Church. When the Wesleyan Conference met in 1886 at Nottingham, Morse invited them to unite in worship at the old parish church, "where our forefathers once worshipped, and now sleep, together in Christ our Lord." The invitation was cordially accepted, and the sermon preached by the vicar on the occasion is in such perfect harmony with the whole of the teaching of the preacher's ministry, that an extract from it may well be given in this place:

We must bear with surfaces—aye, and with what is some way below the surface—different to our own. We must have patience with other views, and charity with other systems; and looking for the best, not the worst, in them, search to see if their foundation be not our foundation, our Christ their Christ, and ourselves therefore truly one in heart with them. I do not know why we do not do this more. Perhaps it is pride; perhaps it is shyness, or some of both, such as leads an Englishman so often to get into a railway carriage alone rather than with strangers. But the circumstances of the Church of Christ in the world, the cold wintry apathy of agnosticism and unbelief, which is the atmosphere round us now, should, I think, lead us who rest on the one foundation into closer communion with one another, by sending us nearer to Christ our Lord. We are travelling together as on a wintry day, and now and then, as at this your Conference, we are thrown together in a common waiting-room. Englishman-like, we are apt still to stand aloof from one another, and keep our deepest selves still to ourselves; but as we draw nearer to the fire in the circle round it, we draw nearer, whether we wish it or not, to one another. It is a true parable. The world around us is cold

and dreary in matters of deepest interest to all Christian people, and in its chilly atmosphere we travel in various ways to seek the warmth of the love of God. We know little of our fellow-travellers. We are shy and stand aloof from them, and look askance at them. But as surely as we draw nearer to the Saviour, so certainly do we draw nearer to one another. The more truly we love with the love of Christ, the more really shall we, and the more truly, love one another. And therefore, my brethren, longing as I do, and as I think you must also, for the Christian union of all Christian people that our Saviour prayed for, which will come—certainly hereafter, possibly here—I am led by such thoughts to believe that the surest way to promote it is to live as near to Christ ourselves as we can, and to manifest to others as much as we can of that humility and love and holiness which dwelt so fully in Him. And if we all do so we cannot be very far off from one another, for we shall be very close to Him. Let me endeavour to put it under another image, which just now is immediately before our eyes. The organ, which has, I trust, just been giving pleasure to us all, is composed of several instruments—the choir, the swell, the pedal, the great; and many stops, the diapason, the flute, the trumpet, the clarion—and yet is one. And the Church of Christ is one—one body. There have been, that is, and there are, scattered throughout the world, of every people, and nation, and kindred, and tongue, a people whose God is the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, whose citizenship is in heaven, whose religion “is the faith of Christ”—who, with every variety of national and individual character, and with great variety of external organization, as of private opinion, have *this* as their most distinctive feature—*this* at the bottom and foundation—“Christ in them”; and in this they are *one*—*one* body. We do not indeed at present *see* them all collected into *one* body. The Church is being builded, not built yet. Just as in the case of an organ, this part is being wrought out by one, and that by another, process, but every pipe has its chief characteristic in common; it is a musical instrument, and each is planned and completed, not only with reference to some others, but to the whole, which is eventually—the Builder only knows how soon—to become *one* organ.

The gradual failure of health and inability to perform the duties required of the Vicar of St. Mary's determined Morse to resign his living. The resignation had not been completed, and in September, at the residence of a friend, the end came suddenly. Failure of the action of the heart was the immediate cause of death. He was in the sixty-eighth year of his age, and had been for twenty-two years Vicar of St. Mary's. Enough has perhaps been said of the special qualities which won for him the admiration of all who knew him intimately. But there was one feature of his character so remarkable and memorable that it seems to call for special notice. He looked always at the bright side of human character, theological disputes, and political troubles. When he could say nothing very good of some particular person, or event, he preserved an effective reticence, though at times he would flash out in generous indignation at the betrayal of some great cause, or the open neglect of duty. “What a true man that is!” said Dean Stanley, when he met him on an occasion which called forth the sympathies of both men, the unveiling of a statue of

Richard Baxter, in the town where he laboured so faithfully. From the noble Church where he delivered his message so fearlessly, Morse will long be missed. It is impossible to speak of what he was to his family and friends. The English Church has had many faithful sons, many who ought to have occupied high positions, and who have adorned their humble spheres in contented resignation. But there have been few more loyal, more intense in devoted service to a Master who had all their heart and all their love, than Francis Morse.

G. D. BOYLE.



ART. V.—HAVE THE TEN TRIBES BEEN LOST ?

*T*H^E ten tribes of Israel—have they been lost? To most persons the question would seem to admit of but one answer: Certainly they are lost; do we not always speak of them as the “lost tribes”? After the fall of the northern kingdom they were not only carried into captivity, as at a later period were their brethren of Judah, but, unlike them, they in course of time disappeared or in some way ceased to be recognisable as Israelites in the land of their exile. Yet Jew and Christian believe that in the more or less remote future they will equally with their brethren be restored, if not to the Holy Land, at any rate to a national existence and the Divine favour.

Now if we consider the different ways in which a people may be lost, we shall see that to reconcile these beliefs but two alternatives are possible. For if a people disappear owing to their abandonment of their own language and religion, and the adoption of those of the peoples by whom they are surrounded, their racial identity is inevitably destroyed. The preservation of the Jewish race in our midst is entirely due to their obstinate adhesion to a faith which precludes inter-marriage with Gentiles, for so many as form such alliances are speedily merged in the general population, and it is in consequence of this physical impossibility of further distinguishing such mixed families that the number of Jews recognisable as such does not increase perceptibly, notwithstanding the proverbial fertility of the race. In like manner the existence of the factors of different creeds and languages preserves the identity, even in the same villages, of the numerous petty nationalities of the Ottoman empire, and it is their absence that gives a seeming homogeneity to the nations of Europe, though originally composed of no less heterogeneous elements. In Hungary alone, where on the side of the Magyars pride

of race is superadded to the other factors, do we find the same absence of a tendency to coalescence among the several elements of the population.

If the ten tribes, then, are "lost," but still to be restored, they must either be hidden or *incog.*; that is, they must be located in some undiscovered region, or must exist as a distinct nation known to us by some other name. The former hypothesis is no longer admissible; Russian and other explorers have penetrated the remotest regions of Central Asia, and none but the wildest enthusiasts would venture to suggest the interior of Africa, Australia, or South America as the place of their concealment. The other alternative is that they must be sought among some peoples who have maintained their nationality more or less distinct, but whose true origin has been masked by their adoption of other languages and creeds. They have thus been identified with the Afghans with some degree of plausibility, not to mention such baseless conjectures as those which would recognise them in the Mexicans, Redskins, or English.

But once more I ask—Is there any evidence in history, sacred or profane, that they ever were lost in either of the usually accepted senses? I unhesitatingly answer, No! Except the outrageous legend in the apocryphal fourth Book of Esdras (xiii. 40-49), from which I suppose the whole belief has sprung, there is not one passage in Scripture or in the earlier Jewish, Christian or pagan writers in favour of the notion, but many in support of the contrary position.

Our Lord does, indeed, speak of being sent to the "lost sheep of the house of Israel" (Matt. xv. 24), and bade His disciples (Matt. x. 6) go to them and not to the Samaritans or Gentiles. But, in the first place, the persons spoken of as "lost sheep" (*not* lost tribes) could not have been lost in the sense of being undiscovered or unrecognisable; and in the second, under the name of Israel our Lord did certainly not mean to indicate the ten tribes to the exclusion of the Jews, His own people according to the flesh.

St. James addresses his Epistle to the "twelve tribes scattered abroad," and St. Paul (Acts xxvi. 7) speaks of "our twelve tribes, instantly serving God day and night." Some persons understand these words as mere figures of speech; others admit that individuals of each tribe were still to be found among the Jews, like the prophetess Anna of the tribe of Aser, though the vast majority were lost.

I maintain, however, that the whole doctrine of the disappearance of the tribes which at one time formed the kingdom of Israel is a "tradition" which, like the wings of angels or the female sex of the seraphim, has no justification in

Scripture, though so long handed down from mouth to mouth that its origin is forgotten. Adhering strictly to facts and history, I shall not appeal to the poetical and the prophetic writings—not that I would cast doubts on their authority or value, but that, assuming the prophetic and the historical books to be equally of divine authority, should there seem to be any discrepancy between them, there can be no question as to their respective values as evidence on matters of fact.

We know how in a style in any degree rhetorical we read of armies being annihilated and cities razed to the ground, yet we meet the survivors and revisit the towns. The fervid language of Oriental poetry, the figures of prophetic rhapsody, cannot be set against a positive statement of an inspired scribe that certain men in certain places did such and such things. There is no evading evidence of this kind, and to such I shall adhere. These, then, are my assertions :

I. That the separation of the kingdoms of Judah and Israel was not so well defined and complete as is commonly supposed ; and that besides the tribes of Judah and Benjamin, those of Simeon and the Danites of the south formed from a very early period parts of the kingdom of Judah.

II. That the deportation of the inhabitants of the northern kingdom was not by any means so complete as is generally believed ; since, though the transjordanic provinces were entirely dispeopled and the inhabitants of the city of Samaria and of the surrounding district were deported and their place filled with Cutheans, there is no mention whatever of any captivity of Issachar, Zebulon or Asher, while we have evidence that many of Naphtali, Ephraim, and Western Manasseh remained in the land, and that after the fall of the kingdom of Israel the kings of Judah resumed their sovereignty over the northern provinces.

III. That while the Jews who returned from Babylon settled, at any rate for the most part, within the ancient territory of Judah and Benjamin, we find that of Zebulon, Issachar and Asher, the very area of the depopulation of which we have no evidence, occupied at a period not long subsequent to the return of the Jews from Babylon by a dense population of Israelites other than Jews proper.

The Cuthean Samaritan was loathed by the Jew as worse than a heathen, but the Galilean was recognised as a child of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, and yet despised as of an inferior order. Why so regarded, if not as representing the once rebellious and schismatic and often apostate northern kingdom ?

I am aware that this contempt in which the Galileans were held has been attributed to an alleged intermixture of Gentile

blood, and that much has been made of the expression "Galilee of the Gentiles." But we must remember that the name of Galilee was applied at different times to very different areas. The word itself means simply a "circle," and was originally appropriated to a small district around Kedesh in Naphtali, one of the cities of refuge (Josh. xx. 7), which formed the centre of the group of twenty villages granted by Solomon to Hiram (1 Kings xi. 11) for his services in providing cedar wood for the temple. It consequently became a Phoenician colony, and acquired the name of "Galilee of the Gentiles" (Isa. ix. 1), and in the time of the Maccabees the population was almost exclusively Gentile (1 Macc. v. 20-23). But this description in no way applies to the Roman province of Galilee, which included the whole area of the former kingdom of Israel, excepting Samaria, to the west of the river Jordan, the teeming population of which was as truly Hebrew as that of Judea, the birthplace or home of all the Apostles, and after the fall of Jerusalem the chief seat of the Rabbinical schools of learning.

Such are my theses.

In support of the first, I can show that whatever part the tribes of Simeon and Dan may have taken in the first act of disruption under Jeroboam so as to justify the description of the secession as that of ten tribes, those two very early returned to, or were brought under, the rule of the kings of Judah; for in the course of the wars with the Philistines we find these kings, from Rehoboam to Uzziah, taking, losing, retaking and fortifying cities lying within the territories assigned to these tribes at the division of the land by Joshua on the borders of the maritime tract where the Philistines so long and obstinately held their ground. Among the frontier towns which Rehoboam built and fortified (2 Chron. xi. 5, 11) were Gath, Elam, and Ajalon; and Uzziah, having retaken and dismantled Gath, Jabneh, and Ashdod, fortified a number of new and stronger positions, and probably planted colonies within the land of the Philistines; *i.e.*, in the unappropriated portion of Simeon's inheritance. These, then, did not share in the fortunes of the kingdom of Israel.

My second thesis involves the more important question of the fate of the more northerly and numerous tribes; and here we find the extent and consequences of each successive Assyrian invasion given with the utmost precision. First, in the days of Pekah (2 Kings xv. 29), Tiglath-pileser ravaged the transjordanic provinces and the contiguous territory of Naphtali, taking the inhabitants captive to Assyria. I need scarcely remark that the Galilee here spoken of is the small district to which Hiram gave the name of

Cabul, and has no connection with the Roman province of Galilee. The depopulation of the country to the east of Jordan, the inheritance of Reuben, Gad, and the half tribe of Manasseh, was as nearly as possible complete, and in our Lord's time the inhabitants, Gadarenes, etc., were heathen. That of Naphtali, as we shall see, was less so. The place of their exile is described (1 Chron. v. 26) as Halah, Habor, Hara, and Gozan in Assyria, and in the cities of the Medes, the country now known as Armenia and Koordistan.¹ In the reign of Hoshea, the king of Israel, Samaria itself was captured after a three years' siege by Shalmanezer (2 Kings xvii. 6), and its inhabitants transported to the same regions as their brethren and to the cities of the Medes, a colony of Cutheans and others from Babylon, Ava, Hamath, and Sepharvaim (2 Kings xvii. 24) being planted by the conqueror in "Samaria and the cities thereof." Nothing is said of any evacuation or colonization of the rest of the country, and we know that the descendants of these Cutheans long continued under the name of Samaritans to form a compact and well-defined community, surrounded on all sides by Jews, but perfectly distinct from their neighbours.

Any deportation of the other tribes rests on pure assumption, unsupported by a tittle of evidence. On the contrary, we have ample evidence that they remained in the land, and for the most part acknowledged the political and religious supremacy of the Jewish monarchy.²

King Hezekiah (2 Chron. xxx. 1, 10, 11, 18 and xxxi. 1) summoned to the restoration of the temple worship "all Israel and Judah," and "wrote letters to Ephraim and Manasseh," imploring them not "to be like their fathers and brethren, who had been given to desolation." He speaks of them as "a remnant escaped out of the hand of the King of Assyria." The posts "went from city to city through the country of Ephraim and Manasseh, even to Zebulon," and "divers of Asher, Manasseh, and Zebulon humbled themselves and came to Jerusalem." After the Passover, it was found that a multitude of the people, even many of Ephraim and Manasseh, Issachar and Zebulon, had not cleansed themselves in strict conformity with the law. After this Hezekiah made a progress through his kingdom for the purpose of exterminating idolatry, thus asserting his authority over the whole land.

¹ In 2 Kings xv. 29, Assyria alone is named, and Hara is omitted in 2 Kings xvii. 6. נֶגֶן from גָּנֵן however, plainly indicates a mountainous region, such as the area in question; the mountains of Media or Assyria.

² I grant that 2 Kings xvii. 18 states that "none were left but the tribe of Judah only," but in the light of what follows here one must take it to mean as an independent state.

"Then all the children of Israel returned every man to his possession into their own cities," not only in "Judah and Benjamin," but also in "Ephraim and Manasseh" (xxxii. 1). Josiah did the same (xxxiv. 6) throughout Simeon, Ephraim, Manasseh, and Naphtali (xxxiv. 6, 7, 33); and after that (xxxiv. 17, 18) we find the remarkable statement that the "children of Israel" kept such a passover as "the kings of Israel" had not kept "since the days of Samuel the prophet." Now, since none of the kings of the dynasties of Jeroboam, Baasha, Omri, or even Jehu had ever kept a passover at all, the kings of Israel here alluded to must be Saul, David, and Solomon before the separation, and Hezekiah since the reunion of the northern and southern tribes.

In short, the use of the words "children" and "kings of Israel" shows that no sooner had the fall of Samaria and its king ended the schism, than the conscious unity of the children of Jacob or Israel reasserted itself, and the name which had so long been appropriated by a part—because the larger part—of the family, became again, as it had been of old, the common designation of the race; and it is interesting to notice that while Ezra and Nehemiah frequently apply the name of Israel to those who returned with them from Babylon, and who, as we learn from the list of names and localities, belonged mainly to the tribes of Judah and Benjamin, those who remained behind in the hundred and twenty-seven provinces of the Persian empire, from India to Ethiopia (Esth. viii. 9) and who must have included the captives from Reuben, Gad, and parts of Ephraim, Manasseh, and Naphtali, are invariably called Jews in the Book of Esther, the name probably then, as since, implying a degree of contempt.

In consequence of the obstinate resistance presented to the Babylonish, as at a later period to the Roman, arms by the inhabitants of the capital, the brunt of Nebuchadnezzar's vengeance and the deportation that followed was confined to the territory of Judah and Benjamin. Those who returned after seventy years belonged almost exclusively to these tribes, because the others had not shared in the Babylonish captivity.

But to return to the northern tribes: I have shown that while Simeon and Southern Dan were absorbed into and shared the fortunes of the kingdom of Judah, the tribes of Asher, Issachar, Zebulon, and a large proportion of those of Naphtali, Ephraim, and Manasseh were never removed from their ancient homes, but that their descendants were none other than the Galileans of the Gospel history; and that they, therefore, were not lost, at any rate till long after the fall of the Roman empire.

But what became of the captives carried away from

the transjordanic provinces by Tiglath-pileser, and from Samaria and the surrounding country by Shalmanezer? Were they, have they not been lost? Nearly 250 years after we are told by Ezra (1 Chron. v. 26) that they were still in the place of their exile: 550 years later, or after 800 years, Josephus (A. xi. 5, 2) says that "beyond the Euphrates" there were in his time "an immense multitude" of the ten tribes "not to be estimated by numbers."

In the fifth century, or after the lapse of 1,100 years, Jerome (tom. vi. 9, Ed. Vallarsii: Veronae, 1736), in his notes on Hosea i. 6, 7 says, "Unto this day the ten tribes are subject to the kings of Persia, nor has their captivity ever been loosed;" and again, "The ten tribes inhabit at this day the cities and mountains of the Medes." Are any of them there still? Considering the migratory habits of Jews in general, it would not be a matter for surprise if they were not, but Dr. Asahel Grant, who laboured among the Nestorians for many years, has demonstrated the identity of that people with the Israelitish exiles beyond a doubt. To his work,¹ and to the Rev. John Wilkinson, who availed himself of the recent visits of Deacon Abraham and other Nestorians to this country to learn the fact from their own mouths, I am indebted for this part of my answer. Here, from the banks of a river which still bears its ancient name of Khabour, to the shores of the lakes Wan and Oorumieh are a people numbering a million and a half, speaking Syriac, the language of Israel in their captivity, with strong Jewish features and Jewish names, calling themselves Ben i Israel, children of Israel, part of them professing the Jewish faith, and part Christians; these, however, retaining all such Jewish customs and ceremonials even to the peace offerings (Lev. vii.), vows, and purifications as are not incompatible with a belief in Jesus as the Messiah, just as did the Jewish Christians and the Apostle St. James. They are called Apostates by their unconverted brethren, Nestorians by ecclesiastical writers (not by themselves), because they supported Nestorius in his opposition to the expression Θεοτόκος, without however adopting his heresy concerning the Incarnation. They themselves state that some of their forefathers having gone up to Jerusalem at the Feast of Pentecost, "the Parthians, Medes, Elamites, and dwellers in Mesopotamia," of whose presence the writer of the Acts makes mention, caught the Pentecostal fire, and preached Jesus to their countrymen on their return, and that at their request the Church of Jerusalem sent down the Apostles SS. Thomas, Thaddeus, and Bar-

¹ "The Nestorian Christians, or the Lost Tribes." Murray & Co., 3rd Edition, 1844.

tholomew, names still honoured among them, to confirm them in their faith. What a wonderful light does not this throw on the address of the Epistle by St. James, Bishop of Jerusalem, "to the twelve tribes scattered abroad"!

Besides these, the various communities of Jews in Central Asia, in China, in India, and elsewhere, some of whom have no records of the captivity at Babylon, or acquaintance with the later Scriptures, who do not keep the feast of Purim or of the dedication of the second temple, and the St. Thomas' Christians of Travancore, may represent the rest of the strangers scattered, the dispersed among the Gentiles, descendants of the exiles of Reuben, Gad, Manasseh, and Ephraim.

But no one has yet ventured to point out, I believe, as I have done in this paper, the entire absence of any evidence of a deportation of the maritime tribes, and the very partial depopulation of any region to the west of the Jordan, or to suggest the identity of these tribes with the despised Galileans. For myself, I believe that these are still in our midst, and, as would follow from the relative populations of Galilee and Judea, in numbers far greater than those of the Jews of the tribes of Judah and Benjamin.

The Jews, as we know them in Europe, Africa, and Western Asia, are divided into two great families or classes, distinguished among themselves as Sephardim and Ashkenazim, and among others as Spanish and German or Polish Jews, the Hebrew names being respectively the equivalents of Spanish and German. They have the same creed, observe the same rites, and marriages, though discouraged, are not forbidden between them; but they worship in different synagogues, and are buried in different cemeteries. Except when they have Hebrew names, the surnames of the former are Arabic, Spanish, Portuguese, or Italian, and those of the latter German, Dutch, or Polish. Individuals of each are found in every country, but generally the former are spread over Northern Africa, Italy, and Portugal, and the latter over Holland, Germany, Hungary, Poland, and Roumania, England and Turkey forming the opposite points of contact.

But the most remarkable contrast exists between the general character of the two classes. The Sephardim are liberal, generous, and most honourable in all their dealings, as anyone who has had much to do with them will testify; while the Ashkenazim, though I admit there are many bright exceptions, are marked by the commercial vices that have brought the name of Jew into ill repute.¹ It is not easy to explain and

¹ When the position of the Jews of Roumania, some years ago, attracted the sympathy of Western Europe, M. Geo. Ghika, ex-premier, stated in a

excuse their practices as the outcome of generations of Christian ill-usage, for if there be a difference, the Sephardim have been the more downtrodden in the past. But why this difference if it be not one of race, and the conscious superiority of the Sephardim, and their scarce concealed contempt of the others? Indeed, not only do the Sephardim consider themselves as belonging to a higher caste, but many of them assert that they alone are the tribe of Judah. If we admit the Galileans to have been the descendants of the northern tribes; if we remember how, in the wars between the Ptolemies and the Jews, thousands and hundreds of thousands of the inhabitants of Judah and Jerusalem were carried into Egypt; and if we then consider what would be the natural lines of further emigration and dispersion, whether in search of trade or in escape from persecution, it is not unreasonable to conclude that these two families are none other than the representatives respectively of the proud Jews of Judah and of the humble, despised—perhaps deservedly despised—Galileans.

EDWARD F. WILLOUGHBY.



ART. VI.—“FIFTY YEARS OF A GOOD QUEEN’S REIGN.”

Fifty Years of a Good Queen’s Reign. By A. H. WALL. Pp. 330. Ward and Downey.

M R. A. H. WALL has produced a book which will be read with pleasure at this remarkable juncture in our national history. The author occupies the vantage-ground of one who has lived through the entire period of which he writes. In a sense, therefore, the work may be said to consist of the reminiscences of one who is sufficiently patriotic to be in hearty sympathy with the changes for the better which have been brought about in the country during the last half-century, a period more remarkable for general progress than any other taken notice of in history. The celebration of a royal jubilee at all is one of the rarest things in our national annals; and those of Henry III., Edward III., and George III. had little or nothing associated with them to inspire that joy and gratitude which animate us in this jubilee year of Queen Victoria. In the older days, especially in mediæval times, the country was,

letter to the *Times*, that his countrymen would gladly admit the Spanish Jews, who numbered amongst them many of their most eminent professional men, to full citizenship, if it were possible to make the distinction in law and practice.

as it were, stationary ; the fashions of one generation were those of another, and even the population very slowly increased, if it advanced at all. If prompted to do so by illuminations, by banners, music, and conduits flowing with wine, it was always easy for the populace to be made hilarious without there being much cause for merriment ; but our present surroundings are very different from those of yore. Monarch and people have now in reality good reason for congratulation. The achievements of the last fifty years are something more substantial than the barren victories, however brilliant, from which our more warlike ancestors tried to derive satisfaction. Though occasional errors may have been made in regard to war, the Victorian era is a great epoch, because its most notable gains have been those of peace. Who save those who have lived through the eventful years can properly realize the difference between the older England and "our youthful Queen," as our Sovereign was wont to be called, and the great Empire of to-day with its teeming industrial hives ? "I remember hamlets and villages that are now great towns and cities," says Mr. Wall ; "the coaches that carried tourists and travellers, both stage and mail ; and I have in my memory a patch of dim light from an aged watchman's lantern, travelling ghost-like along the ceiling of my little bedroom as I heard his quavering voice crying the hour." Thus, while the population has enormously increased, our mode of travelling has been revolutionized ; and while the comforts and conveniences of life have been wonderfully multiplied, the security in which we dwell, and the liberties which we have guaranteed, are such as our fathers never knew. But though we have gone forward, we are still far from the goal we desire to reach. Much has been accomplished, but there remains still more to be done.

The very treatment of Prince Edward, the Queen's father, by George III. and the Government of the day, is in itself sufficient to show the difference between those times and our own. The fourth son of his parents, and born in 1767, Prince Edward in the earlier part of his life enjoyed no enviable heritage. Though a man of some piety, the King was not a model father, and none of his children appear to have been happy in their education. Nor was the Prince more fortunate when he became a soldier ; for Baron Wangenheim, under whom, at Lüneberg, in Hanover, he was placed, was "a mercenary tyrant." When no longer a neophyte in the profession of arms, the Prince saw plenty of hard service in Canada and elsewhere, where he sufficiently proved his bravery and nobleness of nature ; but such was the niggardly disposition of the Court, that his allowance far from sufficed for his very moderate requirements. The straits and embarrassments from which the Prince suffered

after he became Duke of Kent excite genuine wonder ; and even during her years of widowhood, when the Duchess had to discharge her duty as a mother; and as guardian of the nation's hope, she had necessarily to be indebted to the bounty of her kinsman, Leopold of Belgium. Then, in addition to other crosses, the Duke was too much ahead of his times, both as a politician and a philanthropist, to be popular either at Court or among the coteries of that day, when, as we are reminded, "party politics raged most fiercely, and partisan prejudices were blindly prevalent." What his principles were may be inferred from the words he used when speaking at a banquet early in the century : "I am a friend of civil and religious liberty all the world over. I am an enemy to all religious tests. I am a supporter of a general system of education. All men are my brethren, and I hold that power is only delegated for the benefit of the people." These principles were shared by the Duke of Sussex, and both brothers held them tenaciously until they passed away.

In what sense this brave man could act out his principles despite the opposition of the vulgar, and the ridicule of others from whom better things might have been expected, is especially seen in what he attempted to do at Gibraltar while acting as Governor of the fortress in 1802. The place was probably not worse than other garrisons ; but finding his spirit vexed by the licentious dissipation of the wine-houses, the royal Governor made a determined attempt to put some limit to their license, and the good effects which immediately followed would now cause the name of such a reformer to be mentioned with honour throughout the country. "The wine-licenses were withdrawn," remarks one of his earliest biographers ; "and for a time the peaceful inhabitants of Gibraltar could carry on their business, and walk the streets, and repose within their dwellings, at less risk of insult or outrage than before ; drunkenness disappeared from among the soldiers ; cleanliness and discipline were restored, while military punishments were reduced in frequency, the hospitals emptied of their numerous inmates, and the sexton disappointed of his daily work." This must have been naturally very gratifying to such moralists and lovers of order as were content to judge a tree by its fruits, but the reforms did not render the Duke less obnoxious to those whose pecuniary interests were touched. "The liquor merchants were driven from the enjoyment of their enormous profit," it is added, "and instigated the unreflecting soldiery to vengeance for the loss of those indulgences which devoured their pay and destroyed their health. Insubordination broke out on all sides ; the Governor was not supported by the local authorities ; and after receiving the grateful and unanimous

acknowledgments of the civil population of Gibraltar, he returned from a post in which his efforts for public good were more zealous than fortunate."¹ No stronger proof could be adduced than this, that the Duke was a reformer in advance of his time. He was, in point of fact, a large-hearted philanthropist, ever ready to advance the cause of religion and morality, to plead the cause of the poor, and, so far as his slender means allowed, to help the needy out of his own resources.

When, in 1818, the Duke married Victoria Marie, the sister of his brother-in-law Leopold, and widow of Prince Leiningen, the match was one of genuine love on both sides ; but at first it seemed as though this scion of the royal House of Brunswick was literally too poor to think of lightly taking unto himself a wife. As we are told :

Obstacles deferred the proposed union. As her children's guardian, the Princess could not marry without sacrificing five thousand a year ; and he, involved in debt and serious difficulties, did not dare to urge the completion of their loving contract—they were to love, live, and hope. When the Princess Charlotte heard of this love-affair, she exerted herself in every way to bring about the match. Queen Adelaide, too, was secretly in favour of it. But it was not until the death of the Princess Charlotte brought more closely home a much-dreaded failure in the royal succession, that the prospects of the royal lovers suddenly brightened. The Duke of Kent's position and income were now a matter of national interest. It was the business of the Government to promote the match.

The match prospered, indeed ; but even after their marriage the happy couple found that they were still objects of jealousy. At all events, while living in the west, soon after the birth of his only child, and very shortly before his own death, the Duke wrote : "My little girl thrives under the influence of a Devonshire climate, and is, I am delighted to say, strong and healthy ; too healthy, I fear, in the opinion of some members of my family, by whom she is regarded as an intruder." Unpopular himself, the Prince Regent is thought to have been "childishly jealous" of his relatives, who had the heir to the Throne in their keeping, and who with their infant were always cordially greeted by the populace. When the Duke soon after died, the public appear to have still further realized his worth. He seems to have been a lover of Evangelical preaching ; and from a resolution moved by Lord Teignmouth at a meeting of the British and Foreign Bible Society, we learn how ardently he desired the diffusion of the Scriptures among the people of all lands.

How well the Duchess of Kent discharged her duty during

¹ "Annual Register," vol. lxii.

her widowhood as a stranger in a strange land is known to all, and so are the circumstances attending the death of the old King, and the accession of the youthful maiden Queen. When the mourning on the one hand, and the rejoicing on the other, had subsided, the people very naturally next concerned themselves with the question of their Sovereign's marriage. It was a topic of conversation at Brussels; the London newspapers discussed the matter, although when one journal cautiously mentioned the rumours which were current concerning "A Prince of the ancient royal family of Saxe-Coburg," the more knowing *quidnuncs* scouted such a nonsensical idea. The Queen's mother, her uncle Leopold, as well as Queen Adelaide, held the youthful German Prince in favour, however, although at first the shrewd and cautious Baron Stockmar harboured some doubts in regard to the expediency of the match.

The eye of the old physician had then detected in the Prince sufficient signs of latent constitutional weakness to make him uneasy on that account, and one of these signs which he regarded most seriously was a tendency towards indolence—a disinclination for making long-sustained efforts. Still, he thought, with proper dietetic management, the amiable Saxon Prince might secure both strength and stability, and with them greater powers of vigour and endurance.

How the marriage was eventually arranged is an oft-told story.

Although she had hardly finished her school-lessons when she ascended the throne of this great Empire, the youthful Queen settled down to her work with a self-possessed determination which augured well for the future. A new political era was opening upon the country, and it was in consequence a time of profound interest to competent observers. The number of conflicting interests which were battling for the mastery were in part the outcome of the Reform Bill of 1832, and the leaders who represented them bore names that are still well remembered.

To ourselves, the most interesting of these are not the older men who had already made their mark, but those who, being then young, afterwards rose to eminence. Messrs. W. E. Gladstone and B. Disraeli both sat in the Queen's first Parliament, the one "almost exclusively a novelist and writer of sparkling political and social satires," while the other was a concocter of "laboriously wrought out essays." Are any of our readers old enough to recognise the following portraiture of our ex-Premier as he was in the year of the Queen's accession?

Like his father, he was a Tory of almost antique pattern: opposed the liberty of the press, quoted Scripture in defence of slavery, defended the Established Church in Ireland, found excuses for wholesale bribery at elections, and when the Universities Admission Bill proposed to do away with the necessity of students, on entering the University of Oxford, subscribing to the Thirty-nine Articles, denounced it as an act of the

grossest tyranny. When, in 1834, the Reform Party, already displaying signs of mutual weakness, was summarily dismissed by the King, Sir Robert Peel, becoming Premier, made young Mr. Gladstone Junior Lord of the Treasury. In re-appealing to his constituents, Mr. Gladstone denounced reform as "leading, through the medium of the ballot, short Parliaments, and other questions called popular, into Republicanism or anarchy, and upheld Conservatism as transmitting in safety those old and valuable institutions under which our country has greatly flourished."

The politics of the old man of to-day have thus little in common with the political creed of the young aspirant of half a century ago. In respect to his sacerdotal proclivities alone is he the same. Mr. Gladstone's apparently growing regard for "his great friend and adviser Cardinal Manning"¹ would almost warrant the inference that he has even made some advances towards so-called Catholicism. Mr. Disraeli, on the contrary, appears on the scenes as a "perfumed boy-exquisite;" but there may be something of exaggeration in the picture.

Turning from politics to lighter matters, we find that the accession of the youthful maiden Queen inaugurated a new and happier era for literature and art, which had not found very liberal patrons in the preceding monarchs of the House of Brunswick. As Mr. Wall says :

The social position of artists was little better than it had been in the preceding century. Consequently they had a tendency to isolate themselves, shunning alike their social superiors and their vulgar inferiors, each for the same reason, for neither understood them. They were poor and proud, very jolly and happy among their shabby selves, in their Bohemian studios or garret-homes ; but very shy, awkward, and reserved if by any strange chance they found themselves out of their element, in what we call Society. The lowest looked down upon the artist.

This was, of course, characteristic of a coarser age ; but old things were passing away, the new days of progress were coming on ; and not only poor artists, but others who by their callings could confer any benefits on society, were encouraged to come forth from their seclusion and to work in the open day. In the literary world a spirit of enterprise was manifest such as had never been known before, and publishers were only waiting for the removal of the taxes on knowledge to make new experiments in diffusing useful knowledge. What is said about Charles Knight's unfortunately named *Penny Cyclopaedia* vividly shows in what sense publishers were handicapped by the State half a century ago. "Its literature and engravings alone cost forty thousand pounds, and the paper duty—then so strongly upheld by Mr. Gladstone, who appears to have regarded the tax on no higher ground than

¹ The words quoted are those of Lord R. Montagu in "Recent Events, and a Clue to their Solution."

that of partisan expediency—absorbed, directly and indirectly, another twenty-five thousand." The perfect freedom of the press, to which statesmen under the Georges had been bitterly opposed, was not yet thoroughly understood; although a healthy public opinion was being rapidly developed, encouraged as it was by the admirable cheap issues of many firms which now successfully competed with the pernicious wares of the chapmen or flying stationers.

The new era of iron and steam, and consequently of rapid travelling, was also setting in, although in 1837 Edinburgh and London were still forty-two hours apart, measured by time. Coaching reached its most perfect development in its last days; and so careful were the drivers in keeping time, that persons on the road confidently set their watches by the coaches. Some hundreds of miles of railway had been completed in the preceding reign; but at the date of the young Queen's accession the great main lines had yet to be constructed. It was a golden age for engineers; and yet, while their earnings were great, their complete ignorance of the general characteristics of railways was sometimes quite ludicrous. Thus one "very eminent" engineer, when instructing a Parliamentary Committee, "was unable to say whether the wheels of the locomotive turned *with* their axles or *upon* them." The railways gave force to the arguments in favour of the penny post; and this measure of Post Office reform was one of the most beneficent concessions which came with the first years of the Queen's reign.

Speaking of the coronation ceremony, Carlyle remarked: "Poor little Queen! she is at an age when a girl can hardly be trusted to choose a bonnet for herself, and yet a task is laid upon her from which an archangel might shrink." Probably the coronation itself excited a popular interest such as had never been known before—e.g.:

Commissioners to secure apartments poured into London from every part of the Continent, and all parts of the kingdom; even noblemen of the highest rank were induced to let parts of their houses by the high rents obtainable. . . . Every hotel was full weeks before the event, and lodging-house keepers were all either mournfully regretful that they had not asked enough, or greedily striving to get more by not letting too soon. . . . "From morning to night," says one of my authorities, verified by all I afterwards heard, "the streets were crowded by such masses of people of all ranks, among whom the provincials were easily distinguishable, that it might have been imagined the whole population of the kingdom had been concentrated in one focus." . . . Cabmen had a riotous high time of it, charging in some instances as much as a sovereign for conveying a passenger from Islington to Charing Cross; and a common fare for hiring a hackney-coach for the day was ten guineas. Omnibuses running from the suburbs into the City and West End raised their fares on the coronation morning to four and seven shillings, and most of them commenced running at four in the morning.

All this would seem to testify to the great popularity of the young Sovereign ; but although she was in some respects so exceptionally favoured, the Queen realized that her exalted position entailed many penalties ; and especially was this the case just before her marriage. The Trades Unions, which Lord Brougham had held in supreme contempt, probably helped to foment the Chartist agitation, which was destined to occasion the Government some trouble. The times were hard, trade was depressed ; and when they wanted work and bread, the working-classes were willing to listen to any cries got up for interested party purposes. Hence there were those who grew intensely jealous of the secretary, Baron Stockmar, just as in after years they were jealous of Prince Albert ; and the rumours which got abroad, that the Queen "was scheming with her foreign advisers to upset the Protestant religion," made the Orangemen of Ireland frantic, while some in England may have believed in the libels. These things were eventually lived down, however, and many journalists who misjudged the Prince Consort in his lifetime lived to see how grievously they had been mistaken. It is manifestly impossible for a constitutional sovereign to act in such a manner as will yield satisfaction to all classes of subjects, eccentric and otherwise. On the one hand, the fashionable world, accustomed to its full round of pleasures, was quite unable to appreciate the simpler tastes of the royal couple, whose enjoyments were of a domestic rather than of a frivolous kind, and who loved the country better than the town ; and, on the other hand, court festivities could not be given without their wanton extravagance being dwelt upon by such as desired to lower the Queen in the estimation of her people.

The Queen and the Prince were not only happy in their home life, they set an example to the nation at large which was not without its good and lasting effects ; and when a family grew up around them the wisdom of their procedure became more than ever apparent. The discipline of the royal household was always well maintained, and from first to last the education of their children engaged a large share of the attention of the royal pair. Some years ago an American writer gave an anecdote which well shows how uncompromising the Monarch was in enforcing proper discipline on all occasions. The story is said to have come from one who actually witnessed the occurrence, and it is borrowed in order to pleasantly illustrate this part of the subject :

One day when the Queen was present in her carriage at a military review, the Princess Royal, then rather a wilful girl of about thirteen, sitting on the front seat, seemed disposed to be rather familiar and coquettish with some young officers of the escort. Her Majesty gave

several reproving looks, without avail ; "winked at her, but she wouldn't stay winked." At length, in flirting her handkerchief over the side of the carriage, she dropped it—too evidently *not* accidentally. Instantly two or three young heroes sprang from their saddles to return it to her fair hand ; but the awful voice of Royalty stayed them. "Stop, gentlemen!" exclaimed the Queen. "Leave it just where it lies. Now, my daughter, get down from the carriage and pick up your handkerchief." There was no help for it. The royal footmen let down the steps for the little royal lady, who proceeded to lift from the dust the pretty piece of cambric and lace. She blushed a good deal, though she tossed her head saucily, and she was doubtless angry enough. But the mortifying lesson may have nipped in the bud her first impulse towards coquetry. It was hard, but it was wholesome. How many mothers would be equal to such a piece of Spartan discipline?¹

The celebration of the royal jubilee ought to be a specially joyous occasion, on account of the great improvement in the condition of the people which has taken place in a single reign. In 1837 Lord Ashley had already set out on his philanthropic course, and the general outlook of town and country might have inspired a less courageous pioneer with despair. Popular education was in its infancy; Christian work among the poor, as we understand it, was hardly known; the condition of the disease-breeding slums of London was a disgrace to a civilized nation ; while, if possible, many of the provincial towns had reached a still lower depth of degradation than the capital. The increase of crime, and especially the growth of juvenile offenders, began seriously to alarm the authorities ; and proved to certain shrewd observers that there would have to be more schools or more prisons erected. If we contrast all this with the general condition of the country to-day—far as we may still be from the goal we desire to reach—we shall find much cause for gratitude and encouragement. Subject as we may still be to depression of trade, the sufferings of the industrial classes, from this and kindred causes, are far less than they were fifty years ago ; while, on the other hand, their advantages have greatly multiplied. No such jubilee has ever been celebrated before, because never before has the country seen such an auspicious reign.

It is a great achievement even for an English monarch to have reigned nearly fifty years, and not to have outlived her popularity ; but as she has grown older, our Sovereign has undoubtedly taken a still greater hold of the affections of the people. She has had her share of domestic afflictions ; but faith has held her own, while enlarged sympathies have gone out towards others who have suffered in like manner. Political and social troubles have at times gathered thickly to

¹ James Parton, in "Eminent Women of the Age." Hartford, Conn., 1867.

bring painful perplexity to the occupant of the throne; but through the Divine blessing, and the Monarch's confidence in the people, the clouds have dispersed. It is meet, therefore, that after fifty years of mutual confidence, of trials and of triumphs, Queen and people should rejoice together during this year of jubilee.

A LAYMAN.



ART. VII.—PROFESSOR STOKES' "IRELAND AND THE CELTIC CHURCH."

Ireland and the Celtic Church. A History of Ireland from St. Patrick to the English Conquest in 1172. By Rev. GEORGE T. STOKES, D.D., Vicar of All Saints, Blackrock; Professor of Ecclesiastical History, Trinity College, Dublin. Hodder and Stoughton, Paternoster Row.

THE name of "Silent Sister," which used to be reproachfully applied to the Irish University, has happily of recent years been altogether undeserved. The classical publications of Mahaffy and Tyrrell; Provost Jellett's "Sermons on the Efficacy of Prayer;" Dr. Salmon's "Introduction to the Study of the New Testament;" Mr. Barlow's "Ultimatum of Pessimism;" and now Professor Stokes' "Lectures on Irish Ecclesiastical History," are all indications of the productive power of Dublin University men in the various spheres wherein their special studies lie.

We welcome Professor Stokes' work with great pleasure, because Irish history is comparatively little read; and the style of his lectures, learned though they are, is so lucid and readable, that it will naturally attract persons desirous of a better acquaintance with the subject to study it in his pleasant pages.

As the title shows, the work covers the period from the arrival of St. Patrick in 432 until the English Conquest in 1172. There is an opening chapter on the Ancient Celtic Church; and among its further contents are Biographical Sketches of St. Columba and Columbanus; Dissertations on Irish Eighth Century Social Life; State of Learning in Irish Monasteries; Round Towers; Danish Invasion; See of Dublin; See of Armagh, etc., etc. All these topics are treated in a way at once learned and interesting. In the brief space at our disposal, we must chiefly devote ourselves to the period of St. Patrick. But first of all, a word or two about the opening chapter. It shows very clearly that the terms Celtic and Irish are by no means co-extensive; e.g., the Galatian Church of the New Testament was a Celtic

Church, Gallic Christianity was Celtic, and there was an ancient British Celtic Church. As regards the subject of the existence of Christianity in Ireland previous to St. Patrick's mission, this, says Dr. Stokes, depends on the further question, Was Ireland known to the Romans?—a question which he has no difficulty in answering clearly in the affirmative, and in a most interesting manner. The chronicle of Prosper of Aquitaine also recognises the existence of Irish Christianity; for he mentions that in 431 “Palladius was consecrated by Pope Coelestine, and sent to the Scots (*i.e.*, the Irish) believing in Christ as their first bishop.” We may add here that St. Patrick, in the twenty-second section of his Confession, seems to imply the same thing, where he speaks of having gone to distant parts, “where no one had ever come to baptize or ordain clergymen, or confirm the people.” This apparently recognises that in the more accessible parts of the island there had been visits from some Christian teachers.

With regard to the vexed question of the “Mission” of St. Patrick—viz., as to whether he was sent by the Pope to Ireland or not—Professor Stokes writes with the same calmness and candour which so happily pervades his whole work. The late Dr. Todd, S.F.T.C.D., whose “Life of St. Patrick” is the best book on the subject, rejects the theory of the Papal mission, and so does Professor Stokes, whose views we shall give presently. On the other hand, it must be borne in mind that Archbishop Usher in his valuable work, “The Religion of the Ancient Irish,” in no less than three places, mentions that St. Patrick was sent to Ireland from Rome; and, moreover, never treats this as a doubtful or open question—*e.g.*, he says: “Among our Irish, the grounds of sound doctrine in these points were at the beginning well settled by Palladius and Patricius, sent hither by Celestinus, Bishop of Rome” (p. 537). Again he couples these two missionaries together—“From the first legation of Palladius and Patricius” (p. 585). Again: “It is most likely that St. Patrick had a special regard unto the Church of Rome, from whence he was sent for the conversion of this island” (p. 595). Again: “In the Confession of St. Patrick, I observe that the Roman Psalter is followed rather than the Gallican” (p. 527). The great argument against St. Patrick’s Roman mission, according to Dr. Todd, is the complete silence of the Confession concerning it. But it is well to bear in mind that the Confession is also equally entirely silent about Palladius and his mission. The question, no doubt, is difficult, but it seems strange to us that so candid and well-informed a writer as Professor Stokes should have quite omitted all reference to Archbishop Usher’s views in weighing the probabilities.

Professor Stokes considers that Papal mission was not at all sought for in the fifth century, as it became much later on; that, e.g., neither Columba nor Columbanus sought it, and that most likely Germanus of Auxerre himself consecrated and sent St. Patrick. Still, as Dr. Stokes adds that Palladius—St. Patrick's predecessor—had been the friend and probably the Archdeacon of Germanus, surely it is as natural or more natural to suppose that Germanus would suggest to Patrick to seek and obtain the same Papal sanction which his friend Palladius had received, as to suppose that he personally delegated him without it. "But," as our author says, "after all, why should there be bitter contention about the mission of St. Patrick?"

Suppose that he was consecrated and sent to Ireland by Celestine himself, what does it matter? Everyone confesses that Augustine of Canterbury was sent to England direct from the Pope; does that fact in any way affect the independent claims of the English Church? A parallel instance is a sufficient reply. Everyone admits that the first bishop who ministered in the United States derived his orders from the Church of Scotland; does that fact imply the supremacy of the Scotch bishops over the American Church?

Before leaving the St. Patrick section it may be observed that the learned author accepts the view that Dumbarton was the saint's birthplace, and he throws a very interesting sidelight on the question of the marriage of the clergy in the fifth century. St. Patrick describes himself as being the son of Calpurnius, a deacon, and the grandson of Potitus, a priest. Professor Stokes quotes here from a letter of Exuperius, Bishop of Toulouse, to Pope Innocent I., in which, among other questions, he asks how he should treat married priests and their children. The Pope replied that, while in general disapproving of clerical marriage, he tolerated it under certain circumstances. It is, indeed, a familiar fact to every student of Church history that until the time of Gregory VII., in the last quarter of the eleventh century, celibacy of the clergy was not an accomplished fact. Our readers will find further interesting details connected with this point in Usher's "Religion of the Ancient Irish" (p. 565).

The Early Celtic Church, however, was, as Professor Stokes says, intensely monastic; and in fairness we must here remember Usher's remark, "What hath been said of the married clergy concerneth the Seculars and not the Regulars, whereof there was a very great number in Ireland, because here almost all the prelates were wont to be chosen out of monasteries."

The question of early Irish Episcopacy seems not to have been at all clearly understood. We have already seen that St. Patrick declared himself to be the son of a deacon and the

grandson of a priest—this is the opening sentence of his Confession. And in his epistle to Coroticus he says: “I, Patrick, a sinner and unlearned, declare that I was made a Bishop in Ireland.” Here we gladly quote a passage from Professor Stokes, concerning the early Irish Episcopate :

The Church was, as I have often said, intensely monastic in all its arrangements. Its monasteries were ruled by abbots, who were sometimes bishops but most usually presbyters. This does not prove that they were Presbyterians in Church government; for if not themselves bishops, the abbots kept a bishop on the premises for the purpose of conferring Holy Orders. The abbot was ruler of the monastery by virtue of his monastic position, and was so far superior to the bishop; but recognised his own inferiority in ecclesiastical matters, whether in celebrating the Eucharist or in conferring Holy Orders—a function which appertained to the bishops alone. Attention to this distinction would have saved our Presbyterian friends from the mistakes they have made when claiming the ancient Irish Church as an adherent of their modern ecclesiastical polity.¹

If Nennius is to be trusted, the number of bishops consecrated by St. Patrick himself was very large, viz., 365. And St. Bernard complains, in his “Life of Malachi,” that “Every church almost had then a separate bishop.” The great number of these Irish chorepiscopi probably led the Presbyterians to believe they were only presbyters. But Nennius leaves no opening for doubt on the point, for he says St. Patrick founded 365 churches, and ordained 365 bishops, *besides* 3,000 presbyters.

As regards the important question of the recognition of Papal Supremacy by the Irish Church, the matter is put in a nutshell thus by Archbishop Usher: “That the Irish doctors consulted with the Bishop of Rome when difficult questions did arise we easily grant; but that they thought they were bound in conscience to stand to his judgment, whatsoever it should be, and to entertain all his resolutions as certain ‘oracles of truth,’ is the point that we would fain see proved.” We quote Professor Stokes here to the same effect:

Though the Celtic Church by the beginning of the eighth century had thus consented to the universal practice of the Church, both East and West alike (*i.e.*, concerning the computation of Easter), this consent involved no submission upon other matters to the supremacy of the See of Rome. Nay, rather we shall see hereafter that down to the twelfth century the Celtic Church differed from Rome on very important questions, which, indeed, formed a pretext for the conquest of this country by the Normans.

We regret that want of space precludes us from any further notice of this interesting work; but we hope we have given

¹ Compare Montalembert here. “At that period of the ecclesiastical history of the Celtic nations, the Episcopate was entirely in the shade. The Abbots and Monks alone appear to be influential.”

our readers a sufficient taste of its quality to make them purchase and peruse it for themselves. The author is no mere bookworm; for while he appears, on one hand, to be "a man covered with academic dust," he is, on the other, a field Church historian, who has found many sermons in the stones of the ancient buildings which he has personally inspected. The book abounds in incidental illustrative antiquarian lore, with one good specimen of which we conclude:

Walk out of our own front entrance and passing the iron gate which leadeth into the city, you find yourselves at once under the jurisdiction of the city police, because you are no longer in College, but are now on College Green. Now this word "Green," brings you back to the days of the Danish kingdom. Every Scandinavian settlement had attached to it a Green, or place of assembly surrounding a Thingmote, or hill on which the leaders or chiefs took their seats, and from whence the laws and determinations of the assembled freemen were proclaimed. . . . Now, exercise your imaginations. Remove every house from College Green. Sweep away this College and all its buildings. Remove the Bank of Ireland, and leave an open space down to the shelving banks of the Liffey. Place a steep hill on the site of St. Andrew's Church. Carve that hill out into terraces and call it the Thingmote, and then you have Hogges Green, or the assembly-ground of the Danes of Dublin as it existed 900 years ago.

We now say good-bye to Professor Stokes, congratulating him on his work, which we regard as highly creditable not only to himself, but also to the University of Dublin and the Irish Church.

COURTENAY MOORE.

Review.

James Hannington, D.D., F.L.S., F.R.G.S., first Bishop of Eastern Equatorial Africa. A History of his Life and Work. By E. C. DAWSON, M.A., Incumbent of St. Thomas's Church, Edinburgh. With portrait, map, and illustrations. P. 448. Seeley and Co.

THIS is a delightful book. James Hannington was a man of no ordinary gifts, and the type of Christianity which he exhibited is far from being common. Almost everything he said or did, as his biographer remarks, was stamped with the impress of his own distinct individuality; and persons who knew little or nothing of the man himself might easily misapprehend some of his words and actions, although only for a time would any misjudge him, for his nature was attractive, and his mode of living spoke for itself. Those who knew him best appreciated him most. The excellence of his character, indeed, shone with an increasing brightness, so that he grew in esteem and honour as well as in affection. The village youths whom he taught and trained, the divines whose counsel he now and then sought, the trusted leaders of a grand Society, the companions of his "Mission" and Missionary labours, the intimate friends of his family circle, all saw and experienced his realness.

He was true to the core.¹ And he gave himself to serve Christ truly with his whole heart. His generosity, and unwearied labour, cheery, hopeful, modest, are points on which many of his friends delight to dwell. He has been happy in his biographer. Mr. Dawson was a College friend, and knew him intimately for many years.

Of his boyhood and youth little need here be written. He was rather wayward and erratic. He was a born naturalist. Taking his education as a whole, says his biographer, "we cannot feel satisfied that the best plan was adopted in the upbringing of the child. There seems to have been much liberty, checked by an occasional vigorous application of the birch rod, but little systematic teaching, or sustained and orderly training." Certainly not a prudent method under which to bring up any lad, especially "a headstrong and passionate boy with a marked individuality." When thirteen years old James was sent to school. With masters as well as boys he became a prime favourite; but he was a confirmed "pickle," constantly in mischief.

He once lit a bonfire in the middle of his dormitory; at another time pelted the German master with his rejected papers; and we are not much surprised to learn that, on one particularly unlucky day, he was "camed more than a dozen times," till, smarting in every inch of his body, he had serious thoughts of running away.

At the age of fifteen he was sent to the counting-house at Brighton, and there he remained more or less during six years. But pleasuring rather than "business" was the leading mark of this period. In the end, it was agreed that he was not the man for a commercial life. In 1868, when twenty-one years old, he went to Oxford. He was not an industrious student. The present writer has heard him, as a Minister of Christ, regret the missing of a golden opportunity. Nevertheless, he was being trained;² and the day on which he could rejoice in Christ was drawing near. In 1874 he was ordained by the Bishop of Exeter: it was required that he should remain a deacon for two years.

In the year 1875 he preached his introductory sermon in St. George's Chapel, Hurst. Mr. Dawson has given an admirable account of his ministry in Hurst. Early in the year 1882 he offered himself as a Missionary. During the past four years the conviction had been steadily deepening within him, we read, "that his constitutional gifts and aptitudes were such as to qualify him in a special manner for work of toil and danger among a savage race." He sought for guidance. "When the C.M.S. appealed for more men" he wrote, "I seemed to hear the Master asking, 'Who will go?' and I said, 'Lord, send me.'"

Of his Missionary journey in the year 1882-3, a full account was given by Hannington himself, after his return to England, in three numbers of *THE CHURCHMAN*.³ In June, 1883, he was at home again. About the Bishopric of Eastern Equatorial Africa, it seems, Mr. Wright had corresponded with Bishop Steere in the year 1880, and in the year 1884 this scheme was revived. By the personal influence of a man of high character, who would have authority to command and wisdom to organize, the widely scattered churches might be bound together. Who should be the Bishop?

¹ "Hannington was sensitively conscientious and trustworthy. Hatred of a lie was inborn and inbred in him. . . . His word was in the most rigid sense his bond. This fidelity of mind was developed in him very early."—"Life," p. 18.

² Here is a statement of one Sunday: "7 a.m., Holy Communion; 9 a.m., chapel; 10.30, 'Varsity sermon by Dr. Goulburn; twenty-mile walk with E. Ashmead-Bartlett; 5.15, chapel; 7.30, service in St. Mary's; 9 p.m., Greek Testament lecture under Burgon."

³ *THE CHURCHMAN*, vol. ix., "My Journey in Africa," pp. 161, 282, 333.

The post [says Mr. Dawson] demanded a man of dauntless personal courage, tact, spirituality of mind, and prompt, business-like habits—a man who coupled gentleness with a strong personality. Hannington had proved that he combined these opposite characteristics in himself to a very remarkable extent. The eyes of the Committee naturally turned to him. His health had so rapidly improved during the past six months that Sir Joseph Fayre, the climatologist, gave it as his unqualified opinion that he might now return to Africa with a good prospect of being able to live and labour there for many years.

It was under the influence of no shallow self-confidence, says Mr. Dawson, that Hannington undertook this great responsibility. He knew that "not merely energy and courage, but tact, guidance, and patient endurance not only of toil, but what is far harder to bear, of contradiction, would be required of him." The day after his consecration, we read, he had occasion to call at the C.M.S. House. A well-known member of the Committee met him on the staircase, and greeted him with, "I must *congratulate* you, Bishop Hannington;" to which he replied half-humorously, yet not without serious meaning, "*Commiserate* me, you mean."

The consecration took place on St. John Baptist's Day, 1884. The four months which he spent in England after his consecration were employed in organizing and making preparations. He was of course in much request, and was invited to many places. In a letter to his wife mention is made of an Undenominational Conference, arranged by Canon Basil Wilberforce, at Southampton, as follows :

Well, we had a curious gathering down here. On arrival I found myself forming one of a select party—the Canon, Mr. Spurgeon, Lord Radstock, and the Earl of Lichfield. Every word of the conversation (after they had got to the end of cross-questioning me, which took about an hour) seemed worth listening to. On Thursday we commenced with prayer at eight; conference at eleven. . . Afterwards Lord and Lady Ailsa and Lady Mt. Edgecombe came to lunch, and spent the day. They all seemed bright Christians. Spurgeon and I had a good time together, and I enjoyed his society immensely.

Writing to a Sussex friend about this time, the Bishop stated, as in a letter to Mr. Dawson, that he had a commission from the Primate to exercise episcopal functions in the Holy Land, adding as a postscript, "Pray for us." Mr. Dawson well observes that this request was seldom absent from Hannington's letters; but the word *prayer* was never with him "a conventional platitude." The thought of 2 Corinthians i. 11—helping by prayer—was indeed a leading note of his Christian life.

New Year's Day, 1885, was the last day of his sojourn in Palestine. He had done much work. Mr. Fitch, his Chaplain, remarks that he "was so kind and genial everybody loved him. Wherever he went there was a brightness. On board ship all loved him. Wherever he went in Palestine the people complained that their time with him was too short." On January 24, the Bishop arrived at Frere Town. "There was a grand welcome," he wrote, "and the moment we could get a little quiet we knelt down and thanked God." The whole of his working-staff in Central Africa consisted of 12 clergy, 11 laymen, and 4 ladies, wives of missionaries—27 in all. An excellent map in the volume before us, with the stations clearly marked, shows what an enormous extent of country these workers were scattered over. One of his earliest cares, we are told, was to arrange for the building of a church that should be worthy of the headquarters of the Mission. Writing to Mr. Wigram, he says :

And now, be frightened, and talk about "new brooms;" but we have quite decided to appeal for a new church. I won't fulminate by this mail, but we must have a decent church. Not a tin ark or a cocoa-nut barn, but a proper stone church—a church to the glory of God; and so, in spite of famine and other difficulties, let us strike for it now.

On Sunday, February 1st, he was enthroned. The next day he left in the *Henry Wright* for Zanzibar, to visit the Sultan and Sir John Kirk. He was also anxious to have a talk with Bishop Smythies. He wrote as follows :

The Bishop held a Confirmation. Mitre and Cope. Address very good. After the services of the day, in the cool of the afternoon, I had a long talk with the Bishop ; with all his ritualism he is strong on the point of conversion, and is very particular about Baptism and Communion not being administered before conversion, either to heathen or professing Christians.

Interesting letters from Frere Town, official and otherwise, are here published (pp. 318). The following passage occurs in a private letter to Mr. Eugene Stock :

I am simply boiling over with passion at the gross neglect of East Africa at the May Meeting. Does such a place exist in the mind of the Committee? If it had ever entered my head that no representation was to be made, I believe I should have slipped home the night before and back again the following day, had it only been to have shouted, "*East Equatorial Africa needs your prayers.*"

On Hannington's style when writing to his intimate friends his biographer makes some pertinent remarks : "The golden rule to be observed in reading his private letters is to remember that his emphatic diction *must not be taken too literally.*" He was well aware that his friends understood him. In a letter to the present writer, for example, in 1884, touching the omission of certain expressions in his journals, Hannington referred to himself as a "harum-scarum" sort of person ;¹ but then he knew his correspondent very well.

The Bishop was soon called upon to consider the condition of Taita. The Missionary at that advanced post—Mr Wray—owing to a prolonged famine, which had brought down the anger of the tribes upon his head as the possible cause of it, was in much distress and sorely tried. The Bishop resolved to go to the front. At the pretty Mission Station of Rabai the people were expecting the Bishop, and a tumultuous welcome awaited him :

The firing of guns, and the dancing and shouting of the excited natives continued without intermission from six o'clock until ten. The Bishop says : "I joined in one of the dances—a kind of puss-in-the-corner-drop-handkerchief—to the immense delight of the natives. Henceforth we are friends."

The travelling party numbered about a hundred, as they had to carry with them a month's food for the starving people, besides their own goods. The first day's journey, as is usual, had its full share of troubles :²

The first time nothing goes right ; nobody seems to know what to do or where to go, so some one has to show them. Gaiters, shovel-hat, and apron have all been laid aside for the journey, and so, unmindful of dignity, we rush hither and thither for firewood and light the fire ; then with a mallet, not without much shouting, we manage to erect the tent ; next the bed, a mysterious puzzle which entirely defies an African head ; and so, pushing one boy in one direction and one in another, we do the thing for ourself, and by eleven o'clock we are ready to lie down and get some rest. Soon after two a.m. we begin to get under weigh again.

Part of the march, referred to by Mr. Johnston as that "terrible journey"—a dismal road, passing through closely-packed thorn-bushes—

¹ "St. Aldegonde is one of the least conventional men of my acquaintance," says one of Mr. Disraeli's characters. Some of James Hannington's sayings and doings were undoubtedly very eccentric. But his was a strong character, with a good deal of common-sense ; and the expression "Jim Hannington all over" was never, in any year of his life, used in connection with what was bitter or mean.

² Thomson, p. 63 ; Johnston, p. 48.

was one of fierce heat. "I retched with the intense heat," wrote the Bishop. "The sun literally seemed to bake one through."

The description of Kilima-njaro is graphic. "As we topped a rise," wrote the Bishop, "suddenly before our astonished gaze flashed Kilima-njaro in all his glory! How lovely the great mountain looked!"

In the middle of April the Bishop brought his whole party safely through to Rabai, and he himself went straight on to Frere Town, praising God for one of the most successful journeys, as a journey, that he ever took. He had enjoyed, he wrote, "most excellent health almost the whole way, during a tramp of four hundred [probably five hundred] miles. May its result," he added, "be the PLANTING OF THE CROSS OF CHRIST ON KILIMA-NJARO." This has been the result, says his biographer; a Mission Station being now established at Moschi in Chagga, where Messrs. Wray and Fitch do outpost duty.

At this portion of the biography (p. 358) we come to the Bishop's decision, made after careful consideration, touching a journey by the new route westward—that journey in which he met his death. From this point to the end the biography has an interest which has seldom, if ever, been equalled in works of this kind.

Arrived at his house in Frere Town, the Bishop thought much about the westward route. As he compared his experiences on the journey so happily completed with those of his terrible march from Zanzibar to the Lake in the previous year, he was filled with a kind of triumph. What if it were possible to push straight through, as Thomson had done, to the north end of the Nyanza! Lives might be saved, incalculable suffering averted! Such an idea, in Hannington's mind, formulated itself rapidly. The way was not only healthier; it was shorter. The Masai, he thought (and with justice), might be managed. There was no reason to suppose that the Ba-ganda would offer any opposition to an approach from the north-east; and this, as Mr. Dawson remarks, was the weak link in the chain of thought.

On July 23rd the fatal journey was begun. The Bishop led the way out of Rabai at the head of a caravan two hundred strong. On the 11th of August, at Kikumbuli, he wrote to his wife: "There is a remote chance of this reaching the coast. I have found a man who says that he is going before long, so you may get it. The burden of my song must be Praise, and the teaching of every lesson has been Trust." It is a characteristic letter. And here all correspondence ceases. His friends heard no more of him till the telegram from Zanzibar on New Year's Day, 1886, told of his arrest "within two days' march of U-Ganda." Happily the Bishop's pocket-diary, with its daily jottings, has been recovered by a Christian lad at Rubaga, who bought it from one of the band that murdered him. Happily, also, his native friend, the Rev. W. Jones, who accompanied him as far as Kwa Sundu, kept a journal. From these two sources, providentially preserved, showing much of what occurred from day to day almost until the end, Mr. Dawson has compiled an interesting narrative, adding to what may be called the romance of Missionary travel a striking and stimulating chapter. At one place, we read, the caravan was harassed by three bands of Masai—the third gang was satisfied:

But now the Masai [Mr. Jones writes] seemed bent on robbery. They threatened our men with the spears, and teased and insulted everybody. All of a sudden a cry was raised that the women should leave the boma. They at once retreated, and the El Moran [warriors] stood to their spears. As many of our men as were bold enough held their guns in readiness, but more than half of our strength was away, as the men were hunting by the lake. Happily the riot was quelled somehow, and nothing came of it.

The Bishop writes, "I strove in prayer, and each time trouble seemed

to be averted." The Masai expressed their admiration. As they examined him closely, stroked his hair and smoothed his beard, and then drew back to contemplate his manly and well-set figure, rivalling their own tall race in height, they would murmur, "Lumuruo Kitó!" (A very great old man!) At another place Mr. Jones's journal says :

On September 18, about mid-day, we came across a herd of elephants. The Bishop saw an opportunity of supplying the hungry caravan, and at once charged them. A cow elephant in return charged his lordship furiously. While the Bishop was thus engaged with the elephants two rhinoceroses started up and made straight towards where he stood. . . . Just as the cow elephant was charging the Bishop the rhinoceroses got in between, and the elephant at once turned her attention to them. . . . And now, from the top of my rock, I witnessed a very singular spectacle. The Bishop running and volleying the elephants, the elephants chasing the rhinoceroses, a leopard hunting my dog Tom, and the caravan-men dashing down their loads and scattering in every direction before the great beasts. . . . The Bishop bagged his elephant.

Kwa Sundu was reached on October 4th, and on the 11th the Bishop decided to proceed to the Lake with fifty men, leaving Mr. Jones in charge of the rest of the caravan. On November 8th three members of the Bishop's party reached Kwa Sundu with a dreadful report : "The Bishop and his party have been killed!" The pathetic story of the following period is worthily told ; but we refrain from quotation, and even from a summary. On October 29th the last entry was made in the little pocket-diary. Mr. Dawson writes :

It seems that until the very end Hannington had little or no suspicion that Mwanga was concerned in his arrest. He looked forward to the return of the messengers sent to U-Ganda as the signal for his immediate release. On Wednesday, the 28th, there had been much drumming and shouting among the natives. When the Bishop's men asked the meaning of the demonstration they were told that the king had sent word that Mzungu (European) should be allowed to proceed to U-Ganda. They were much relieved, and hoped that their trouble was over. Probably the same story was told to the Bishop on the following day as an excuse for hurrying him out of his prison-hut to the place of execution.

When, therefore, conducted to an open space without the village, he found himself surrounded by his own men, we can well imagine that he concluded that the worst was over. "He was not, however, left long in "doubt as to the fate which was in store for him. With a wild shout the "warriors fell upon his helpless caravan-men, and their flashing spears "soon covered the ground with the dead and dying. In that supreme "moment we have the happiness of knowing that the Bishop faced his "destiny like a Christian and a man. As the soldiers told off to murder "him closed round, he made one last use of that commanding mien which "never failed to secure for him the respect of the most savage. Drawing "himself up, he looked around, and as they momentarily hesitated, with "poised weapons, he spoke a few words which graved themselves upon "their memories, and which they afterwards repeated just as they were "heard. He bade them tell the king that he was about to die for the "Ba-Ganda, and that he had purchased the road to Buganda with his "own life. Then, as they still hesitated, he pointed to his own gun, "which one of them discharged, and the great and noble spirit leapt "forth from its broken house of clay, and entered with exceeding joy "into the presence of the King."

* * * * *

Many reviews of this "Life" have already appeared, and most of them have had some special feature. The review presented in this magazine—with which Hannington, as a contributor, was linked—has one particular

note ; it is written by a clerical friend residing not many miles from Hurst, who met Hannington from time to time in the Chapter of the Rural Deanery, and who esteems it a privilege to add somewhat of personal testimony to his Ministerial career in Sussex. In the gathering at the Vicarage, Brighton, January, 1879, when the Bishop of the diocese (Dr. Durnford) spoke to such Clergy of the Deanery as were about to have a *Mission* in their parish, we sat side by side. Hannington's conversation, as a rule, easily and naturally moved to spiritual things. On one occasion, we remember, after a week-night service, he was (to use a dear and honoured friend's word) "jocose" and full of anecdote ; but before we retired to rest he spoke without reserve of the phases of spiritual life. After his return from Africa in 1884, as Mr. Dawson remarks, many of his friends noticed a great change in him. He was quieter and more tender ($\pi\acute{a}\theta\epsilon\mu\acute{a}\theta\omega\varsigma$). The discipline had been blessed. But many things which we heard each year, of his Ministerial devotion, testified how truly he was—to quote the Burmese saying of Judson—"Jesus Christ's man." And the happy experience of many whom he exhorted and rebuked illustrates what was said by Madame de Staël about her friend M. de Montmorency : "He only sought to do good to my soul."

The present writer has requested his venerated friend, the Rev. Carey Borrer, Rector of Hurstpierpoint, and the Rural Dean, to supply him with a few reminiscences.

"I knew James Hannington more or less from his childhood. But as his family, when they first came to Hurst, were somewhat rigid Baptists, the intimacy was not great, and the lad was not baptized by me, nor until advanced youth. Indeed, from disparity of years I can scarcely say I knew him until the time that his father was led to seek communion with the Church of England, and James went to College. After he was ordained I knew really but little of his inner feelings, until I had the gratification of being able to offer him the Curacy of St. George's Chapel,¹ which the Bishop had licensed for services. From the time that he came into the parish to work I found I had a coadjutor who would zealously work for our Master. He was ever ready to help me in every good undertaking, and he ever brought an amount of cheerful earnestness which won its way with everyone. I must say that at the outset he had some—what I should call rather extravagant opinions, which I have reason to believe he considerably modified in later days. For instance, and it was the only disagreement he and I ever had, he introduced a Mission hymn-book into St. George's without consulting me ; but it was not that which I complained of—for I ever desired to give the Curate in Charge all reasonable liberty—but it was the style of hymn—very well suited, perhaps, for grateful hearts on conversion and rejoicing in the salvation they have found in Jesus Christ, but very unsuited to a general congregation. I know he felt it deeply ; but he loyally obeyed, and I believe he never used the particular hymns that I felt it right to object to. On the other hand, as an instance of how I valued his co-operation, I may mention that in the autumn before he came as curate I had made acquaintance with Canon Ellison, and had determined to set on foot a temperance society. So soon as James Hannington came I felt I had by me the very auxiliary that I desired (as neither my brother curate at the church nor I had any experience in temperance work, and neither of us then were teetotalers), and that under God's blessing the cause would

¹ The opening service at St. George's was preached by me, not by "Mr. Methuen" (*Life*, p. 39). I find in my diary, "1867, December 1st. To St. George's Chapel, where, to my inexpressible satisfaction, I preached the first sermon."

be energetically worked. It proved so ; and Hannington's influence was felt, and is felt to this day. Indeed, I thankfully say, from the time he took charge of St. George's it was a centre of spiritual life to the parish. It was at Hannington's request that I consented to a Mission being held at the church. Due preparation was made, and an excellent Missioner came to us ; a man more of Hannington's mind and ways of thinking than of my own.¹ And considerable benefit by God's goodness followed from it —and the fruits have not died out. From this time a real love and intimacy sprung up between us. We lived together as a father with a son ; and he never tired of giving me any help I needed. He was always at the church when we had any extra service. I gave him free license to visit, not only in a conventional district connected with St. George's, but through the length and breadth of the parish. He suggested a workman's club, and I was thankful to revive what has twice died here. But his plant still thrives. When he left first for Africa I mourned and missed him. I met him on his return as he reached St. George's ; he seized my hand and kissed it ! After that he resumed the charge of the chapel and district, and frequently spoke to me of the expected Bishopric. And when he took his second and last farewell of me he came up to my sick-room to say good-bye, and knelt at my feet for a blessing. I said, 'Dear Bishop, I should receive blessing from you !' but he insisted on it, and he received his old friend's prayer—which never ceased for him day by day until the time we knew not whether his spirit was in Paradise or still struggling in faith and charity upon earth. His last letter to me was from Bethlehem, on Christmas Eve, 1884, enclosing an olive twig from Jerusalem. He would have me marry him and baptize all his children. It was a painful duty and gratification to help put up a really beautiful tablet to his memory in the parish church on St. Andrew's Day last. His memory will never die here ; and it is that of a man who was in earnest in trying to win sinners to the Saviour, who was ever cheerful, jocose in a very quiet but telling way, a pleasant companion in the homes of rich or poor, and whose sermons were always listened to with interest and profit by us. He never wearied in his tender sympathy with the sick and needy. I am grateful to God for the work he did among us. To God be the praise.

"CALEY H. BORRER."



Short Notices.



Through Unknown Ways. The Journal-book of Dorothea Trundel. By L. E. GUERNSEY, author of "Winifred," "The Foster Sisters," etc. John F. Shaw and Co.

This is an excellent gift-book for young ladies, a worthy companion of "Lady Betty's Governess" and other interesting historical Tales by the same author. The time is that of James II., and Baxter is introduced. Dorothea is happily married.

Church Missionary Intelligencer. December, 1886. C.M. House.

The current number of the *Intelligencer* is rich in matter of exceptional interest. "The late Captain Maude" is admirable. Principal Moule's sermon at Bishop Parker's consecration, of high value, has these sen-

¹ With regard to the "Revisiting Mission" (*Life*, p. 169), the Missioner came on Hannington's invitation, not on mine. I recommended that he should pass his time at St. George's. But he preached for us on the Sunday, at my desire.

tences : "In the heart of the region, nine years ago, O'Neill and Smith "were slain. There, again, within these two years, the altar first-fruits "of U-Ganda unto Christ, a brotherhood of young native martyrs, sus- "pended bleeding above the fire, died, as their executioners bore witness, "with the praises of Jesus on their lips ; and now we know not how "many more have followed them through violent death within these few "months. And there meanwhile, on a pilgrimage of daring love, has "fallen the martyr Bishop, in the prime of his life of buoyant devotion "—a blessed and memorable sacrifice to Africa and Christ. And now "his successor is before us, ready in the same Name for death or for life "in this great sacred field."

We have much pleasure in mentioning that new, cheap editions of those valuable works, Archbishop Trench's Notes on the Parables and the Miracles, are now issued.

Peter Parley's Annual is published as usual (Ben. George), but our notice must stand over.—The *Clergyman's Visiting List* (John Smith and Co.) is excellent.—Messrs. Bemrose and Sons' Calendars (the *Daily Calendar*, *Proverbial*, and *Scripture*) are, as usual, cheap and useful. The same must be said of *The City Diary* (Collingridge).—We have received some delightful specimens of Mr. Frowde's Prayer Books (Oxford University Press Warehouse) ; a notice will appear in the next CHURCHMAN.

From the Religious Tract Society we have received *Our Pets and Companions*, a charming little volume of "Pictures and Stories illustrating Kindness to Animals."—*The Clevelands of Oaklands*, a pleasing and wholesome story, is an attractive gift-book.—Two new volumes of "The R.T.S. Library" are *The Jerusalem Sinner Saved* and *Paradise Regained*.—We heartily commend the volumes of the *Boy's Own Paper* and the *Girl's Own Paper*, for 1886. These two excellent Magazines are frequently mentioned in the CHURCHMAN ; and we have much pleasure in inviting the attention of our readers to the Annuals.

A Life of Charles Wesley, by Rev. J. TELFORD, B.A., author of "Wesley Anecdotes" (R.T.S.), is well written, and gives a great deal of information. Mr. Telford has, of course, his own views, and he is entitled to refer to American Methodism of to-day with "28,000 ministers and 3,000,000 Church members."—The second volume of "The Church History Series" of the R.T.S. is *The Reformation in France*, by RICHARD HEATH, author of "Historic Landmarks."—We strongly commend *Sunset Glories*, compiled by E. A. L. The object of this little book, says a prefatory note, is to confirm the faith of God's children. Many hitherto fearful ones, as they read how the Saviour has helped and strengthened His servants in the hour of nature's weakness, may henceforth leave their home-going in their Father's hands.

The Sunday Book of Biography (Hodder and Stoughton) contains thirty-six sketches of "eminent men and women :" Moffat and Duff, Agnes Jones and Sister Dora, Binney and Bonar, Guizot and Guthrie, etc. A large volume, with full-page portraits.

Bosworth's Clerical Guide and Ecclesiastical Directory is published by Messrs. Hamilton, Adams, and Co. A well got-up volume ; the present issue contains much more information than in previous years.

The Church Missionary Gleaner, 1886, is very attractive. There are of course several papers about the Martyr Bishop ; a page of his diary and his sketch of his prison are photographed.—The *C.M. Juvenile Instructor*, in its way, is perfect ; a charming little prize or gift-book.—The *C.M.S. Pocket Almanack* is as acceptable as usual.

Another volume of the "Cambridge Bible for Schools and Colleges" series has just been issued, *The First Book of the Kings*, by Rev. Professor LUMBY, D.D. (Cambridge University Press Warehouse). As soon as the Professor's Commentary on the second portion of "The Book of Kings" appears we shall notice the work as a whole.

A new cheap illustrated edition of *Hymns for Infant Minds* has just been published, by Messrs. Hodder and Stoughton. This is the fiftieth edition of Anne and Jane Taylor's Hymns.

The Annuals of the *Sunday at Home* and *Leisure Hour* merit, perhaps, even more than one's customary commendation. In each volume there are many excellent papers; some of them have already been mentioned in the CHURCHMAN. There is assuredly no falling off in these ably edited Magazines. The illustrations are admirable.

The Annual of *Cassell's Family Magazine* is one of the best and brightest volumes of this season, to purchase or present. Its contents have been commended, now and then, in these pages.

Blackwood has a very interesting paper on the "Gude and Godly Ballates."—With Part I. of *Our National Cathedrals* (Ward, Lock, and Co.) many will be pleased.—In the December *Art Journal*, together with many excellent illustrations, is an admirable reproduction of Meissonier's "1814," Napoleon on horseback; "Art Teaching at Uppingham School" is very good. Looking back on the issues of the year 1886, we observe that the *Art Journal* has well kept up its very high standard; and the announcements for 1887 are rich in promise.

From Messrs. Routledge and Sons we have received, for the eighth time, the two volumes, *Every Boy's Annual* and *Little Wideawake*. These books are very attractive; considering all things, they are remarkably cheap. We heartily recommend them.

Messrs. Eyre and Spottiswoode have sent us, as usual, some specimens of their tasteful Cards; bright and cheap.—Mr. Jessop's new book, *The Knight and the Dragon*, is very amusing.

Among Messrs. Seeley's choice "Christmas Books," tasteful and attractive, are *Pearl of the Sea*, by the author of "A Nest of Sparrows," and *Father Aldur*, one of Miss Giberne's charming stories.

Links of Lovingkindness, a new book by Rev. GEORGE EVERARD (Nisbet), will be welcomed by many: simple and earnest addresses.—*St. Paul the Author of the Last Twelve Verses of the Second Gospel* (Nisbet and Co.) is the work of Rev. H. H. EVANS, whose "St. Paul the Author of the Acts of the Apostles and of the Third Gospel" was reviewed in these pages a few months ago. The little book is ingenious and interesting.—*The Book of Joshua*, a critical and expository Commentary, by the Rev. JOHN LLOYD, Rector of Llanvapley, pp. 353 (Hodder and Stoughton), is a good piece of work.—*Kyries, Ancient and Modern*, "edited by W. F. A. LAMBERT, M.A., Clerk in Orders, and Director of the choir of St. James', Piccadilly" (Weekes and Co.), and *The Lowestoft Supplemental Tune Book*, containing fifty-six Hymn Tunes, by Mr. J. D. FARRER, composer of "Gladness," usually sung to "Saviour, Blessed Saviour" (Low, Marston, and Co.), will be found useful.

* * * Many "Short Notices" are unavoidably postponed.



THE MONTH.

THE Charge of the Bishop of Durham contains some welcome passages commending Mission labours. The work of the Canon Missioner, the Bishop says, is a fresh illustration of the real importance to the Church of endowed canonries. "I could never consent to regard the canonries at Durham as appendages to some parochial or other ecclesiastical charge, or as a mere place of dignified ease." On "Lay Readers and Evangelists" the Bishop says :

The parish which most needs such lay agents ["Readers"] to supplement the spiritual work of the clergy is often least able to supply them. It is necessary, therefore, to look outside the parish. This necessity has led during the present year to a new departure in this diocese—the creation of the office of lay evangelist. The unit here is not the parish, but the rural deanery. Nearly a year ago I was consulted as to the practicability of instituting an order of itinerant lay preachers, who should go about and take services in neglected parts of our great towns and outlying hamlets, either in Mission-rooms or in the open air. The movement arose simultaneously in two separate rural deaneries—Auckland and Wearmouth. It was further commended to me by the fact that the initiative was taken by the laymen themselves, who were in some cases working men.

Referring to the very practical proposal of the Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol, Dr. Lightfoot says :

He [Bishop Ellicott] proposes that the Episcopal incomes shall be taxed, and that the money thus raised shall be devoted to the founding of six additional sees. I trust that this proposal will receive the consideration which it deserves.

The memorial stone of the Henry Martyn Memorial Hall, at Cambridge, has been laid by the Rev. Alfred Peache.¹

The Bishop of Bath and Wells has written :

You ask my opinion whether, in the present state of agriculture, a rector ought to make any abatement in respect of tithe rent-charge. I think there can be no question that he ought not. The tithes are not a rent; they are a fixed charge upon the land, and a first charge, and are really paid by the landlord. It would introduce an intolerable uncertainty among the clergy as to their narrow incomes if they were liable to be called upon to make reductions. The main point, however, is that it is unjust in principle. Tithe is a fixed payment (varying only according to the averages), due by the land to the clergy, and all the calculations of the farmer in agreeing with his landlord as to rent are based upon the fact that the tithe rent-charge is a fixed payment.

St. Andrew's Day was very generally observed as a day of intercession for Foreign Missionary work.

At a great Conference of the Liberal Unionist Association, under the presidency of the Marquis of Hartington, Mr. Goschen said :

We must see to it that the Liberal Party—the great historical, traditional Liberal Party—should not be identified with the party of anarchy (loud cheering). We began by defending the bonds which hold these islands together, and we now defend the bonds which hold together the structure of our social fabric.

The Archbishop of Canterbury, in a letter to the clergy of his diocese, commands the Church of England Temperance Society.²

¹ A very interesting report of the proceedings appeared in the *Record*, December 3.

² In many "Jubilee" articles, the progress of the Temperance Cause has had special mention. The *Standard*, referring to an edition of "Pickwick" just issued, to mark the period of fifty years, says : "It was remarked by Dean Stanley in his funeral sermon on Dickens that one of the most curious features in 'Pickwick' is the intolerable quantity of brandy-and-water that is distributed over its pages. All the Pickwickians are respectable; there is not one among them resembling Dick Swiveller or Lord Frederick Verisopht; yet they all take to intoxication as naturally as ducks to water, and Mr. Pickwick at the head of them. This is, perhaps, the most instructive of all the contrasts suggested by the volume now before us."