Keep

SUPPLEMENT
TO
# The Guardian.

No. 1900.] WEDNESDAY, MAY 3, 1882.

## Fine Arts and Music.

ROYAL ACADEMY—FIRST NOTICE.

It may have occurred to more than one visitor who enjoyed on Wednesday last the invaluable quiet of the press day, on which the newest works of art share the repose which is proper to old masters, that the past gives us reason for regretting to some extent the strong bias towards portraiture which now prevails among artists. Our loss would have been great indeed if Hogarth had simply given us presentments of living men and women, if Gainsborough had shown no taste for landscape, if Wilkie had studied Scotch faces to the exclusion of Scotch humour, if Rembrandt had been as purely a portrait painter as Frans Hals or Van der Helst, if Raphael had only painted Popes and Cardinals, and Titian, when he studied the taste of Imperial and Royal personages, had found it his interest to anticipate the devotion of Velasquez to the features of rulers and courtiers. Without forgetting that the Exhibition of the Royal Academy has no longer something like a monopoly in the representation of English contemporary art, we may still be struck by the almost too successful strides which portraiture has made in its galleries. There is now little reason to complain that the walls are simply crowded with portraits of ladies and gentlemen for whom few people care by artists whom few people know. Painters, both of rising and of established fame, demand, with much emphasis and effect, our repeated attention for their sitters. No one expects Mr. Ouless to digress from strict portraiture into landscape, history, or highly imaginative work. But we cannot acquiesce without a feeling of disappointment when Mr. Millais sends to the Academy portraits and nothing more; when Mr. Holl gives us no group of figures, either sad or cheerful; when Mr. Watts, who was lately in his glory at the Grosvenor Gallery, is represented only by two portraits of no remarkable attractiveness; when Mr. Frith and Mr. Alma Tadema contribute nothing but a portrait apiece; and Mr. Orchardson, Mr. Herkomer, and Mr. Collier are each saved only by a solitary work from appearing for the nonce as portrait-painters pure and simple. The portraits, it must be confessed, are good, and testify to a careful study of fact, which has brought into approximation with each other artists who, if they had obeyed spontaneous impulses, might have somewhat scattered their strength. But a great loss is involved to higher aspects of art in this devotion to a single form of realism; and we do not find other and younger artists coming forward vigorously to occupy the ground left vacant by men of great name. Consequently, the Exhibition, as a whole, is flat. The offence of pictures far too large for their motives is not so common as in some late years; but works which are both good and large are not forthcoming in sufficient abundance to fill respectably the places of honour. A large amount of honest and able brush-work, and much careful study of detail, add, in one sense, to the feeling of shortcoming. Art is not in a healthy state when its means are better than its ends.

An early approach to history is made in the galleries by Mr. Pettie. His version (18) of Eugene Aram, telling to the wonder-ing boy, as in a parable, the tale of his own crime, has some good in some sense artistic commander-in-chief, does not this year exhibit works from which it is easy to extract a complete and consistent order-of-the-day. The girl who, as she stands erect in well-arranged drapery before a back-ground of tapestry, indulges at her leisure in day-dreams (56), has not the tendency to waxiness which has often of late appeared in Sir Frederick's studies from the life. There is good drawing in his picture called "Wedded" (71), in which a bride, belonging to antique times, leans her head back on the shoulder of the bridegroom, who kisses her captive finger. The great Phryne (307), who displays her charms so liberally in the third gallery, has her skin charged with a monotonous colour which may not prevent her from pleasing critics or even fascinating judges. Leaving the courtesan who served as a model to Apelles behind, we find in the fifth gallery, also from the pencil of Sir Frederick, a fine and vigorous head of Antigone (474). Without quite completing the list of his exhibited works, we may call attention to his share (1,244) in a design, to be executed in mosaic, for the decoration of the dome of St. Paul's. These works are able, but have not a character of marked and impressive unity. The contributions of Mr. Poynter to the exhibition are limited to the proposed decoration of St. Paul's (1,133), of which the President's panel forms a part, and the small figure (224) of a young woman in the tepidarium. It is easy enough to see that the figure is graceful; but a peculiar training is probably required to judge how the portion of a dome which is now at Burlington House would look when greatly magnified and suspended high in air. We are told of some mistaken monks who despised a fine picture by Murillo before it was placed in the position to suit which it had been painted.

It is generally, if not universally, true of the seven portraits this year exhibited by Mr. Millais, that, while equally skilful, they are not so exceedingly bold in execution as the works of some former years. His ladies and children are graceful and decorous, but they will enrapture the bulk of spectators by other qualities than the magnificent unfinish of their lace. Mr. Millais' portrait of Sir Henry Thompson (127) is an excellent example of direct representation. It has a not unworthy pendant in an admirable portrait of Mr. Norman (122) by Mr. Ouless. It is natural to institute a comparison between the portrait of Cardinal Newman, exhibited by Mr. Ouless in 1880, and the rendering of the same distinguished sitter by Mr. Millais, now to be seen in the eleventh gallery. Mr. Ouless was contented with but little red, and gave a strong if not very exact version of remarkable features. In the work of Mr. Millais there is a free and effective use made of the so-called purple proper to Cardinals in skull-cap, robes, and biretta, while the face, which is an undoubted likeness, is marked by a peculiar sensitiveness which the artist did not invent, but observed. The portrait of Dr. Newman (1,514) hangs low on one side of the gallery. On the other side, a little higher up, is a portrait of Mr. Darwin, who, wearing a dark cloak and holding a "wide-awake" in his hand, seems to be turning from under his shaggy brows the whole strength of his perceptive powers on the brilliant ecclesiastical phenomenon before him. This excellent work (1,465) is due to Mr. Collier, to whom we also owe a natural and forcible likeness (683) of the Lord Chancellor, or, as there is nothing legally demonstrative about the picture, we might rather say of Lord Selborne. Mr. Collier's "Clytemnestra" (272) is a successful essay in a very different department of art. The cruel queen stands with a defiant air, holding in her right hand the bloody axe, while with her left arm she throws back the curtain of the room in which lies the body of her murdered husband. There is here a true union of reserve and power, as there should be in the treatment of the Æschylean theme.

It is pleasant to observe among painters of established reputation who take their subjects from nature, with or without figures, an unwillingness to settle down upon favourite themes, and simply to repeat themselves. Mr. Vicat Cole, to whom honour is [illegible] with the two pretty market women who are passing by, or a group of amphibious men and women discussing the new fashionable arrivals (363) at a Dutch sea-side resort. There was once some justification for calling Mr. Boughton sickly. It is now abundantly clear that he can combine tenderness and strength.

---

Some of our best artists are many-sided, and it is only to be expected that in their different spheres of action their work should be to a certain extent intermittent. We explain thus the unwelcome fact that Mr. Alma Tadema and Mr. Stacy Marks are among the absentees from the present Exhibition of the *Royal Society of Painters in Water-colours*. But while this pleasing art attracts the amount of talent it now does, there may be a considerable number of defaulters, and yet the collection of works in the familiar gallery in Pall-mall East may retain its high and agreeable character. The drawings of the five newly elected associates form a leading point of interest. They are not quite so numerous or important as might have been expected. We have known Mr. Beavis well at the Institute and on other ground. He justifies his election here by a good, solid drawing of a woodland scene on the "Skirts of the Forest of Fontainebleau" (32), where the men have a pair of black oxen and a horse ready to take part in the removal of some fallen timber. The four works of Mr. C. Gregory are carefully finished but somewhat tentative renderings of the garden, the thicket, or green field, with figures among which children are prominent. The chief work of Mr. S. J. Hodson, "Der Gänsemarkt, Nürnberg" (60), is dark in tone. Wide umbrellas shade some stalls, and crowds of people fill the open spaces. His minor subjects, a good though simple rendering of a street with a house projecting at the angle where two ways meet, at "Troyes, France" (92), and a gateway "In Old Toledo" (152), are much more luminous. Mr. J. J. Hardwick paints only flowers and fruit. His primroses (128) and azaleas (249) come nearly in contact with similar flowers painted by Mrs. Angell, and they can bear the test of comparison. The drawings of Miss Constance Phillott are placed on the screens, in company with those of Mrs. Allingham. They consist of well-executed portrait studies of a fair-haired lady (199), and of a pretty curly-headed boy of five years old (247), a more ambitious but less successful "Electra" (205), drawn against a leafy, green background, and a small landscape (258), in tone tender and refined rather than strong. In a general survey of the contents of the Gallery, it is perhaps most convenient to follow the leading of the catalogue. Mr. Boyce appears to have taken a distaste to the red-tiled roofs and old town buildings which he used to colour with such good effect, and to prefer now the delicate grey and transparent green tints that we see in his "Halton Castle, Northumberland" (2), a picturesque castellated house with stone out-buildings attached to it. A warmer light is thrown by Mr. E. A. Goodall over his view of "The Kasbah (Citadel) Tangiers" (3). A small drawing by Mr. Goodall shows well the fine outline of "Our Great Fortress from the Bay of Gibraltar" (253). The moist freshness of the green grass and the solidity of the rugged mountain side, as drawn by Mr. Danby, "Up in the Pass of Llanberis" (18), combine to make one of his most satisfactory works. A similar forcible character and cool tone belong to a drawing near at hand, by Mr. M. Hale, "Across the Moor" (23), where light breaks through the clouded sky above the dark range of hills. Mr. Albert Goodwin, giving play to his fancy, treats more than one kind of subject well. His "Nightfall" (36) is a woody landscape with red sun-set colours barred by the dark stems of the closely grown fir-trees. Another of his works is "The Castle Rock, Lynton" (111). Mr. Wallis adds two brilliantly coloured scenes (58 and 64) to his series of illustrations of "The Merchant of Venice," and, by way of variety, has drawn in a realistic vein a gentleman sitting in the shade of his orchard in spring-time (210). Mr. George Fripp touches upon no new ground in his "Farm Buildings at Sonning, Berks" (65), or his "Harbour in the Isle of Sark" (236), but these and his

in this devotion to a single form of realism; and we do not find other and younger artists coming forward vigorously to occupy the ground left vacant by men of great name. Consequently, the Exhibition, as a whole, is flat. The offence of pictures far too large for their motives is not so common as in some late years; but works which are both good and large are not forthcoming in sufficient abundance to fill respectably the places of honour. A large amount of honest and able brush-work, and much careful study of detail, add, in one sense, to the feeling of shortcoming. Art is not in a healthy state when its means are better than its ends.

An early approach to history is made in the galleries by Mr. Pettie. His version (18) of Eugene Aram, telling to the wondering boy, as in a parable, the tale of his own crime, has some good points, and is not unduly painful; but his picture (30) of the Duke of Monmouth, with his arms bound behind him, grovelling at the feet of James II., is a repulsive work, to which mere technical merit cannot reconcile us. Even in the plethora of portraits we may feel that it would have been better for Mr. Pettie to persevere in drawing gentlemen in fancy dresses; and the theatrical character of his Palmer (252) who, duly adorned with huge hat and cockle-shell, sits in a mediæval hall haranguing the members of a family party, who listen at their ease, is, by contrast, highly agreeable.

The place which Sir Frederick Roberts holds among the modern makers of history gives his portrait more than purely artistic interest. In the first gallery (23) he appears as drawn by Mr. Ouless; in the third gallery (223) there hangs his picture by Mr. Holl. There is a predominance of sheer force in Mr. Holl's simpler and smaller work; the intellectual penetration which a general also requires receives more attention from Mr. Ouless. Military painting, if cultivated with more success in France than in England, is not neglected in our island. There is careful and vigorous drawing in Mr. Croft's version (102) of a pause in the attack at Hougoumont, Waterloo. Both in this picture, and in Mr. Croft's "Mont St. Jean, Waterloo" (730), there is, perhaps, something too artificial in the management of the lights. Mr. Woodville has rendered with much animation the effort of our troops to save the guns at Maiwand (567). The desperate exertions of horses and men are brought out powerfully, yet without confusion. From Mrs. Butler we have, under the title of "Floreat Etona" (499), a small yet spirited representation of the courage of Eton boys in the field; while Sir John Gilbert, in his "Fight for the Standard" (813), locks the combatants together in a desperate tangle which, whether true or not to anything which has happened in definite time and space, has the life and motion of semi-barbarous combat.

Sir Frederick Leighton, who, as President of the Academy, is seems to be turning from under his shaggy brows the whole strength of his perceptive powers on the brilliant ecclesiastical phenomenon before him. This excellent work (1,465) is due to Mr. Collier, to whom we also owe a natural and forcible likeness (683) of the Lord Chancellor, or, as there is nothing legally demonstrative about the picture, we might rather say of Lord Selborne. Mr. Collier's "Clytemnestra" (272) is a successful essay in a very different department of art. The cruel queen stands with a defiant air, holding in her right hand the bloody axe, while with her left arm she throws back the curtain of the room in which lies the body of her murdered husband. There is here a true union of reserve and power, as there should be in the treatment of the Æschylean theme.

It is pleasant to observe among painters of established reputation who take their subjects from nature, with or without figures, an unwillingness to settle down upon favourite themes, and simply to repeat themselves. Mr. Vicat Cole, to whom harvest fields in the hot glow of summer might seem most congenial, has rendered with good effect a pool encompassed with "sylvan solitude" (92), and overhung with rather colourless vegetation. His "Abingdon" (289) is also a good representation of a scene which had its attractions for Turner. Mr. Brett, who has so often given to pictures of our English shores some of the luminous glory which he studied in the vale of Aosta, inclines this year to coldness. In one of his exhibited works the combined tints of grey sky, black rocks, and blue water, are indications of "a falling barometer" (128); in the other, which according to the catalogue represents "the grey of the morning" (506), blue predominates, tempered with black and the colour of wet sand. There are, of course, exceptions to this obvious aim at variety. That able painter, Mr. Oakes, whether he renders Porchester Pool (70), on which ancient towers look down, or a mountain road through Wastdale (117), or the Mewstone, beaten by the restless waves (427), inclines to a misty effect, which detracts from the power of oils, and is best given by repeated washings in water colour. We cannot wish Mr. Hook to change. Year after year in spring we return to his pictures as many families go autumn after autumn to some favourite place at the sea-side, which, to its other charms, has added that of familiarity. His children on the shore, supplied by stones, wreckage, and broken earthenware, with material for their game of "Castle-building" (123), and the fishermen and fisher-lasses who transport the brilliant "Caller Herrin'" (303) in baskets, to submit them at a distance to processes with which familiarity, if useless, is an evil, have quite the air of old friends. If the atmosphere which surrounds Mr. Hook's "Devon harvest cart" (308) strikes us as rather dull and heavy, perhaps this is but the natural reaction when we are carried inland from the freshness of the sea. Mr. Boughton seems bent on making us entertain towards the flat shores of Holland feelings like those which Mr. Hook has taught us to associate with the coasts of Cornwall and Scotland. The two artists are so far alike that neither of them can be adequately described either as figure painter or landscape painter. They have the double gift implied in the power of rendering both figures and atmosphere. It is not merely humour, still less is it only an eye for subtle colour and a hand which is dexterous in the interpretation of form, to which we must ascribe the high attractiveness of the pictures in which, under Mr. Boughton's guidance, we see the rough sailors sitting on a wall in North Holland "exchanging Compliments" (342) freshness of the green grass and the solidity of the rugged mountain side, as drawn by Mr. Danby, "Up in the Pass of Llanberis" (18), combine to make one of his most satisfactory works. A similar forcible character and cool tone belong to a drawing near at hand, by Mr. M. Hale, "Across the Moor" (23), where light breaks through the clouded sky above the dark range of hills. Mr. Albert Goodwin, giving play to his fancy, treats more than one kind of subject well. His "Nightfall" (36) is a woody landscape with red sun-set colours barred by the dark stems of the closely grown fir-trees. Another of his works is "The Castle Rock, Lynton" (111). Mr. Wallis adds two brilliantly coloured scenes (58 and 64) to his series of illustrations of "The Merchant of Venice," and, by way of variety, has drawn in a realistic vein a gentleman sitting in the shade of his orchard in spring-time (210). Mr. George Fripp touches upon no new ground in his "Farm Buildings at Sonning, Berks" (65), or his "Harbour in the Isle of Sark" (236), but these and his several other home subjects retain their full charm of clear softness and harmony of tone. "A North Sea Pilot" (80), buoyantly afloat with his hand upon the tiller of his boat, is a vigorous study by Mr. Marsh. The views of London and its shipping produced by Mr. Marshall are so effective that they bear a considerable amount of repetition. His "Westminster—Evening after Rain" (91), with the towers standing out against a sky flecked over with bright, unsettled clouds, and his rather gloomy "City Square—St. Bartholomew" (49) are both good samples of his work. Passing the costume study of Herr Menzel, the "Head of a Knight" (93), which is grave and low in tone and executed in an opaque medium, and the more sparkling "Sheikh Abdul Rahman" (98) of Mr. Carl Haag, we reach the one contribution of Sir John Gilbert. His "Head of the Procession" (105) is a *tour de force*, with children and ladies carrying flowers, who seem in some danger from the men and chargers of the advancing crowd, while overhead, lifted and puffed out by the wind, float banners rich in red, blue, and gold. "Lulworth" (96) is one of the clear and sunny views of our south coast in which Mr. Alfred Fripp delights. Mr. Rigby is happy in the tender colour and expression of his view, "Among the Cumberland Falls" (100), where deep gashes break the surface of the rough ground. Mr. Birket Foster has drawn a white, foamy sea beating upon the coast, where there are standing the slight remains of "Turnberry Castle, Ayrshire, the early home of Robert Bruce" (116). In Mr. Foster's second work, "The Watering Place" (161), horses are brought to drink at a stream under the shade of tall trees in full, heavy summer foliage. The "Beatrix" (121) of Mr. Du Maurier is a pretty, fair girl, simply clad and simply drawn. The artist has given more variety in colour and more ornament in furniture to his second young lady, "La Belle Distraite" (264), who, however, has not the charm of her companion. "Potato Gatherers" (143), drawn by Mr. Tom Lloyd, men, women, and children, getting in their crop from land near the sea, have not the poetic character which belongs to many of his rustic figures and their landscape setting. Though the works of Mr. Naftel seldom fail to please, he has given an exceptional attraction to his "Pass of Dolwydelen" (144), in its rich brown autumn tints upon the mountains, and the dark cattle straying along the green pasture or road. Mr. H. Moore adds life and interest to the grey sea by a cleverly drawn line of figures on the shore, in his "Scheveningen—Waiting for the Boats" (162). The light is soft and warm which Mr. Clarence Whaite has thrown upon the massive round towers and walls of

© Reproduced with the permission of Cambridge University Library

his "Stronghold of Edward I." (176). Two works by Mr. North are upon the screens. In both the touch is minute and the tone sober. His "April" (256) has a tender gleam of bright light upon the green grass. The castle walls are seen behind and above the houses in the "Crossgate, Durham" (261), of Mr. A. W. Hunt. The cathedral appears in his other drawings. The place of honour in the Gallery is given to "The Bellman" (61), one of the large Miltonic subjects of the late Samuel Palmer, a fine specimen of his work, though not of his strongest colour. The late Mr. Duncan, who for many years has been one of the most constant contributors to these exhibitions, is also represented by two drawings. In addition to its ordinary catalogues, the society now publishes a handsome illustrated catalogue, comprising sixty-seven *fac-similes* of sketches by the artists.

---

The *Summer Exhibition of the United Arts Gallery, New Bond-street*, now open, is the third international exhibition which has occupied this agreeable gallery. In interest it is not behind either of its predecessors, and its cosmopolitan character is beyond question. There are comparatively few works here by English artists; one among them is the small, striking study of the head of an old French wood-cutter (45) by Mr. Armitage. From France come two notable pictures by M. Bastien-Lepage. The artist's model in each case is a girl, and the back-grounds are alike slight and sketchy when compared with the figures. "La Petite Coquette" (31) is placed in a village street. Her pretty face does not look too consciously proud or vain as it peers from under a light brown wrapping hood with rose-coloured trimmings. "La Pauvre Fauvette" (165) stands in a meadow or orchard taking charge of a cow. She is not all misery and dejection, though it is sack-cloth which protects her head and shoulders from the chill winds of early spring. Three works are contributed by Mr. Welden Hawkins, who is of mixed English and German parentage, but is French in his art culture, and whose merits were recognised in the Paris Salon of last year. They are all of the sadly sentimental character which might flow from the constant contemplation of the graveyard and the convent garden. The various scenes from the coast of Normandy, by M. Emile Vernier, are quietly toned and pleasing. In the work of M. José Jimenez-Aranda, "A Sermon in the Cour des Orangers, Seville Cathedral" (134), there are many figures. Its clear, decisive drawing, and the absence of shade, are characteristic of the school to which it belongs. The collection contains nearly four hundred works, widely varied in style and subject. The catalogue is now, as it was for the previous exhibitions, well and fully illustrated.

---

It is to Messrs. Agnew that we owe the exhibition, in the Gallery attached to the Architectural Society's rooms in Conduit-street, Regent-street, of the *Christ before Pilate*, the last great work of Herr Munkacsy. Having excited a high degree of admiration and enthusiasm at Pesth, Vienna, and Paris, it will not fail to attract in London its well-deserved measure of applause. The artist is, perhaps, until now best known among us from his "genre" pictures, which have appeared from time to time at the Royal Academy and at other exhibitions. The present work places him beyond question among painters of the first rank. Opinions may differ as to the central figure in the picture. Aiming at no especial beauty or dignity of form, it gains its power only by its extreme simplicity and the moral force which it expresses. But it is upon no single figure that the success of the work depends. Each part of the composition falls into its due place, the doubting Judge, the Jew of higher class, self-satisfied, eager, or supercilious, the young mother, with her child upon her arm, the Roman soldier, and the madly excited rabble. If in its general character the work belongs to any particular school, it may be to that of Spain, but the nomadic race and the exceptional experience of life of the artist seem to be impressed upon it. He was born in Hungary in troublous times, and, having when young worked as a village carpenter, he struggled with many difficulties in obtaining his art education. Munich, Düsseldorf, and Paris have all had a share in his training, but his originality has been strong enough to keep him from being the regular disciple of any school. Various foreign criticisms and comments on the picture have been collected and printed, and are to be obtained at the Gallery.

## THE BACH CHOIR.

The second concert given by this well-deserving and admirable choir on Wednesday, 26th ult., was full of interest. For the first time in London one of J. S. Bach's short Masses, of which he wrote four, was given with full orchestral and organ accompaniments. The expression *missa brevis* is applied in this case, not to the length of the movements themselves, but to their number; in each Mass the composer set to music only the *Kyrie* and *Gloria*. The short Mass in A selected for performance on this occasion is the third of the four, and was composed in 1737. The second movement (the *Gloria*) is an ingenious reproduction of subjects already existing in other works of its author, but, according to Spitta, the latest and most careful biographer of Bach, the *Kyrie* is entirely original; under any circumstances, this portion can only be classed among the most interesting and beautiful conceptions of the composer. The division of the Kyrie into three distinct parts proves at once that Bach intended to give great importance to it, and the second division, *Christe eleison*, seems to have called forth his highest efforts; although rich in contrapuntal and canonic devices, there is a religious and emotional depth in the music which cannot be too greatly praised. This movement was excellently rendered by Miss C. Elliot, Madame Fassett, and Messrs. Kenningham and King. The *Gloria* contains no less than three elaborate songs, the first for a bass voice with an *obbligato* violin accompaniment, the second for a soprano voice, with a closely interwoven part for two flutes *obbligati*, the third for a contralto; all were given in the most satisfactory manner. In the original instrumental score of this *Missa brevis in A* the voice parts are only from Max Bruch's *Odysseus*. The latter has been several times given in England, and has always been well received; of the former it can only be said that Gluck, while often showing a profound insight into the dramatic power of recitative and musical declamation, is as often guilty of producing themes of almost a trivial stamp; thus it happened that the musical historians present derived more pleasure from this fragment of *Armida* than ordinary concert-goers. The overture seemed specially weak, but as Gluck thought it worthy to be attached to *Armida*, although originally brought out twenty-seven years before, we must assume that he valued it as a good specimen of his powers. But the unique and important position held by Gluck in the story of musical progress will always justify the production of his works, notwithstanding their inequalities. Mr. Otto Goldschmidt conducted with his well-known care and skill, and Mr. Carrodus led the band most ably, and contributed the *solo obbligato* to the song *Domine Deus* with admirable effect.

## THE "CYCLOPS" OF EURIPIDES AT MAGDALEN COLLEGE SCHOOL, OXFORD, APRIL 28TH AND 29TH.

The successful representations of the *Agamemnon* at Oxford in 1880, and the *Alcestis* at Bradfield in the present year, appear to have inaugurated a new departure for school "speech-days;" and it may be expected that more and more of our Public Schools will substitute for the miscellaneous programme of "recitations," or the uninteresting delivery of prize compositions, some representation of ancient drama. So long as the expenditure of time and money is kept within due bounds there is no more legitimate diversion from the work of school; nor need it be altogether a diversion, inasmuch as the play to be performed can always be included in the regular school curriculum, and its representation is so far an educational work that the author's meaning is thereby brought more clearly and vividly home. It is also a legitimate means—we will not say of advertisement—but of maintaining that place in the public mind which is essential to the well-being of any school; and a reputation for special excellence in such representations may indirectly affect the fortunes of even well-known schools. The name and fame of Westminster, for example, depends more than might at first sight be supposed upon the traditional "Westminster Play;" the abolition of which might, under present circumstances, do serious damage to its interests. Within due bounds, and with due economy of time and money, we think these performances are distinctly to be encouraged; and as the scenery required is usually simple, and the dresses with a little care may be inexpensively got up, we do not think that parents need object to a Greek play on the score of expense.

The *Cyclops* is a variation upon previous attempts. As our readers are probably aware, it is the sole extant specimen of the "satyric" drama or "sportive tragedy," which grew out of the rustic and jovial "dithyramb," or choral song and dance, in honour of Dionysius, as tragedy out of the more serious and respectable dithyramb. The rustic chorus imitated the manners and dances (and no doubt occasionally the coarse language) of satyrs in attendance on the god; and when their dithyramb took permanent literary shape and was transplanted to the Athenian stage as a burlesque afterpiece to tragedy, the chorus of this "satyric" drama (as its name imports) was conventionally composed of satyrs. It was, as we have indicated, in the nature of a burlesque upon the heroic legends which formed the material of tragedy; but, though essentially humorous, it so far preserved the tradition of their common origin, that it was always associated with *tragic* representations, and never composed by comic poets. Mr. Mahaffy, in his *History of Greek Literature* (Vol. I., p. 232), illustrates it by the adaptation of well-known legends or fairy tales, such as "Sinbad" or "Bluebeard," in our pantomimes, in which there is a combination of tragic adventure with grotesque accessories and conventional dancing: a comparison which may help English readers to appreciate the nature of the *Cyclops*. They have, too, a translation of the whole play (with the exception of a few expressions too "satyric" for publication) by Shelley, which, though not altogether worthy of his genius, is readable and faithful. This translation was considerately reprinted *in toto* by the Magdalen School stage managers and distributed among their audience.

The scene throughout is the entrance of the large rocky cavern at the foot of Mount Aetna, in which Homer places the abode of the one-eyed Cyclops, Polyphemus. The *dramatis personæ* are—1. *Silenus*, with his chorus of attendant satyrs, supposed to have been cast ashore on Sicily and made slaves by Polyphemus; 2. *Ulysses*, who lands with his men in search of provisions, and meeting Silenus and the satyrs in the absence of Polyphemus, bribes them with wine to give him food from the Cyclops' store; and 3. *Polyphemus* himself, the one-eyed cannibal monster, who (as in the Odyssey) is first made drunk and then blinded by the crafty Ulysses. Homer's story is, in fact, adhered to as closely as possible, consistently with the addition of a chorus of satyrs, and the necessity for Ulysses' free egress from the cave to narrate the horrid feast of the Cyclops upon two of his companions.

The "cast" was thus arranged:—

| | |
|---|---|
| Ulysses | W. S. Hatch. |
| The Cyclops | H. S. Allnutt. |
| Silenus | R. G. W. Sneaton. |

*Chorus.*

| First Semi-chorus. | Second Semi-chorus. |
|---|---|
| H. A. P. Sawyer, Coryphæus. | R. C. Bates. |
| G. Cross. | H. D. Baker. |
| W. A. G. Etheridge. | C. Dunn. |
| H. G. Harper. | E. G. Mackie. |
| C. Harris. | H. W. Mence. |
| E. Lister. | L. E. Parkhurst. |

Attendants, Companions of Ulysses, &c.

| | |
|---|---|
| Chorodidascalus | Franklin Harrey. |
| Chorodidascalus (Pianist or Accompanist) | W. Parratt, Mus. Bac. |

— "EPODE.

"An Iacchic melody
To the golden Aphrodite
Will I lift, as erst did I
Seeking her and her delight
With the Mænads, whose white feet
To the music glance and fleet.
Bacchus, O beloved, where,
Shaking wide thy yellow hair,
Wanderest thou alone, afar?
To the one-eyed Cyclops, we,
Who by right thy servants are,
Minister in misery,
In these wretched goat-skins clad,
Far from thy delights and thee."

Ulysses and his men appear, having just landed, with empty baskets and pitchers. After a dialogue with Silenus and the Chorus, during which he has successfully appealed to the former's wine-bibbing propensities, he has just been provided with cheese and a curious looking goat's carcass, when a noise is heard, and amid general trepidation, the Cyclops, a tall figure, well padded out and wearing a one-eyed mask, stalks in with a roar, brandishing a huge club. The Chorus stand still and look glum, while Polyphemus demands if his dinner is ready: when the monster suddenly turns round and sees Silenus and Ulysses squabbling. Silenus comes forward accusing Ulysses of beating him and stealing provisions. Ulysses, backed by the Chorus, asserts that Silenus gave them; but the Cyclops expresses confidence in Silenus, and patting his huge paunch significantly, declares that he will eat the strangers. Ulysses appeals for mercy in true tragic style, addressing Polyphemus as "great offspring of the Ocean-God," and urging him to prefer piety to impiety; to which the Cyclops replies in a speech of outspoken cynicism and selfishness:—

ὁ πλοῦτος ἀνθρώποισιν, τοῖς σόφοις θεός· κ.τ.λ.,—

asking, as he lays his hand affectionately on his stomach—

"To what other God but to myself
And this great belly, first of deities,
Should I be bound to sacrifice?"

Ulysses, on hearing it, bursts out:—

"Ay! ay! I have escaped the Trojan toils,
I have escaped the sea, and now I fall
Under the cruel grasp of one impious man.
O Pallas, mistress, Goddess, sprung from Jove,
Now, now, assist me! Mightier toils than Troy
Are these;—I totter on the chasms of peril;—
And thou who inhabitest the thrones
Of the bright stars, look, hospitable Jove,
Upon this outrage of thy deity,
Otherwise be consider'd as no God!"

Polyphemus goes into the cave, followed by Ulysses; and the Chorus sing an appropriate ode:—

"For your gaping gulf, and your gullet wide
The ravine is ready on every side,
The limbs of the strangers are cook'd and done,
There is boil'd meat, and roast meat, and meat from the coal,
You may chop it, and tear it, and gnash it for fun,
An hairy goat's-skin contains the whole." . . . . &c. &c.

Ulysses comes out, telling how he has seen the Cyclops devour two of his comrades, and propounds his plan for making the monster drunk, and boring out his eye. Polyphemus soon staggers out, followed by Silenus, and demands more wine, which Ulysses supplies from a large skin. They both sit down with the bowl between them, Silenus every now and then taking furtive pulls: until finally both have had enough, and reel back into the cave. The Chorus sing, while Ulysses goes in to make everything ready. He soon comes out, and calls on the Chorus to lend a hand with the stake, now "delightfully red-hot;" but they suddenly discover that they are lame, and cannot see. Ulysses in disgust at their cowardice goes in, and the butt end of the great stake can just be seen through the cave's mouth with an arm working and twisting it, while the Cyclops roars with pain. Out he comes, blinded, and trying to stop the cave's mouth with his hands, while Ulysses and his comrades dodge out under his arms. The Chorus, now very courageous, jeer him (the Homeric joke of Οὖτις being duly reproduced):—

"*Cho.* What are you roaring out, Cyclops?
*Cycl.* I perish!
*Cho.* For you are wicked.
*Cycl.* And besides, miserable.
*Cho.* What, did you fall into the fire when drunk?
*Cycl.* 'Twas Nobody destroy'd me.
*Cho.* Why, then, no one
Can be to blame.
*Cycl.* I say 'twas Nobody
Who blinded me.
*Cho.* Why then you are not blind.
*Cycl.* I wish you were as blind as I am.
*Cho.* Nay,
It cannot be that no one made you blind.
*Cycl.* You jeer me; where, I ask, is Nobody?
*Cho.* No where, O Cyclops. . . . ."

Ulysses discloses his real name, and the Cyclops recognises the fulfilment of an oracle. The scene then ends with his threats to destroy the ship as they sail away.

The whole play is short (about 750 lines in the original), and occupied less than an hour in representation; but we thought that the dialogue—and more particularly the set speeches—was delivered much too fast; and the piece ought probably to have taken longer. Silenus especially rattled off the prologue like a schoolboy (not in a very high form) hurrying through a piece of repetition, and Ulysses might also have studied his elocution better; Polyphemus being the only one of the three who spoke his part well. Silenus, however, was better in some of the comic by-play, for which the piece affords considerable scope; requiring as it does throughout more real *acting* than the ordinary Greek tragedy. The Chorus were very good, and contributed in no slight degree to the success of the performance—for successful it was, in spite of the drawbacks that we have noticed in two of the principal characters. So far as shortcomings were due to want of practice, this was at any rate a sign that the preparations had [illegible] time, and where the

© Reproduced with the permission of Cambridge University Library.

us from his "genre" pictures, which have appeared from time to time at the Royal Academy and at other exhibitions. The present work places him beyond question among painters of the first rank. Opinions may differ as to the central figure in the picture. Aiming at no especial beauty or dignity of form, it gains its power only by its extreme simplicity and the moral force which it expresses. But it is upon no single figure that the success of the work depends. Each part of the composition falls into its due place, the doubting Judge, the Jew of higher class, self-satisfied, eager, or supercilious, the young mother, with her child upon her arm, the Roman soldier, and the madly excited rabble. If in its general character the work belongs to any particular school, it may be to that of Spain, but the nomadic race and the exceptional experience of life of the artist seem to be impressed upon it. He was born in Hungary in troublous times, and, having when young worked as a village carpenter, he struggled with many difficulties in obtaining his art education. Munich, Düsseldorf, and Paris have all had a share in his training, but his originality has been strong enough to keep him from being the regular disciple of any school. Various foreign criticisms and comments on the picture have been collected and printed, and are to be obtained at the Gallery.

## THE BACH CHOIR.

The second concert given by this well-deserving and admirable choir on Wednesday, 26th ult., was full of interest. For the first time in London one of J. S. Bach's short Masses, of which he wrote four, was given with full orchestral and organ accompaniments. The expression *missa brevis* is applied in this case, not to the length of the movements themselves, but to their number; in each Mass the composer set to music only the *Kyrie* and *Gloria*. The short Mass in A selected for performance on this occasion is the third of the four, and was composed in 1737. The second movement (the *Gloria*) is an ingenious reproduction of subjects already existing in other works of its author, but, according to Spitta, the latest and most careful biographer of Bach, the *Kyrie* is entirely original; under any circumstances, this portion can only be classed among the most interesting and beautiful conceptions of the composer. The division of the Kyrie into three distinct parts proves at once that Bach intended to give great importance to it, and the second division, *Christe eleison*, seems to have called forth his highest efforts; although rich in contrapuntal and canonic devices, there is a religious and emotional depth in the music which cannot be too greatly praised. This movement was excellently rendered by Miss C. Elliot, Madame Fassett, and Messrs. Kenningham and King. The *Gloria* contains no less than three elaborate songs, the first for a bass voice with an *obbligato* violin accompaniment, the second for a soprano voice, with a closely interwoven part for two flutes *obbligati*, the third for a contralto; all were given in the most satisfactory manner. In the original instrumental score of this *Missa brevis in A* the voice parts are only thinly supported by flutes, violins, viola, and organ (*basso continuo*), but Mr. Prout had been called upon to add such additional accompaniments as would utilise the resources of a more extended orchestra without overshadowing the special characteristics of the original. It is hardly necessary to say that Mr. Prout, who possesses as much good taste as knowledge in such matters, carried out his task well; the additional accompaniments gave strength and fulness to the whole without any obtrusiveness. Mendelssohn's Ninety-eighth Psalm, one of the many of his valuable contributions to Church music made during his directorate of the choir of Berlin cathedral, was the next piece of special interest in the programme. It was excellently sung both by choir and soloists. The *Credo* from Palestrina's Missa Papae Marcelli was repeated by desire; on the whole, the performance was capital, Mr. Kempton doing good work as bass soloist; but the singing of the choir was not characterised by that easy and smooth style so necessary to music of this school; one or more of the *soprani* could occasionally be heard with unpleasant predominance. The second part of the programme consisted of the overture and third act of Gluck's *Armida*, and a scene, "the banquet of the Phæacians," and respectable dithyrambs. The rustic chorus imitated the manners and dances (and no doubt occasionally the coarse language) of satyrs in attendance on the god; and when their dithyramb took permanent literary shape and was transplanted to the Athenian stage as a burlesque afterpiece to tragedy, the chorus of this "satyric" drama (as its name imports) was conventionally composed of satyrs. It was, as we have indicated, in the nature of a burlesque upon the heroic legends which formed the material of tragedy; but, though essentially humorous, it so far preserved the tradition of their common origin, that it was always associated with *tragic* representations, and never composed by comic poets. Mr. Mahaffy, in his *History of Greek Literature* (Vol. I., p. 232), illustrates it by the adaptation of well-known legends or fairy-tales, such as "Sinbad" or "Bluebeard," in our pantomimes, in which there is a combination of tragic adventure with grotesque accessories and conventional dancing: a comparison which may help English readers to appreciate the nature of the *Cyclops*. They have, too, a translation of the whole play (with the exception of a few expressions too "satyric" for publication) by Shelley, which, though not altogether worthy of his genius, is readable and faithful. This translation was considerately reprinted *in toto* by the Magdalen School stage managers and distributed among their audience.

The scene throughout is the entrance of the large rocky cavern at the foot of Mount Aetna, in which Homer places the abode of the one-eyed Cyclops, Polyphemus. The *dramatis personae* are—1. *Silenus*, with his chorus of attendant satyrs, supposed to have been cast ashore on Sicily and made slaves by Polyphemus; 2. *Ulysses*, who lands with his men in search of provisions, and meeting Silenus and the satyrs in the absence of Polyphemus, bribes them with wine to give him food from the Cyclops' store; and 3. *Polyphemus* himself, the one-eyed cannibal monster, who (as in the Odyssey) is first made drunk and then blinded by the crafty Ulysses. Homer's story is, in fact, adhered to as closely as possible, consistently with the addition of a chorus of satyrs, and the necessity for Ulysses' free egress from the cave to narrate the horrid feast of the Cyclops upon two of his companions.

The "cast" was thus arranged:—

| | |
|---|---|
| Ulysses | W. S. Hatch. |
| The Cyclops | H. S. Allnutt. |
| Silenus | R. G. W. Smeaton. |

*Chorus.*

| First Semi-chorus. | Second Semi-chorus. |
|---|---|
| H. A. P. Sawyer, Coryphaeus. | R. C. Bates. |
| G. Cross. | H. D. Baker. |
| W. A. G. Etheridge. | C. Dunn. |
| H. G. Harper. | E. G. Mackie. |
| C. Harris. | H. W. Mence. |
| E. Lister. | L. E. Parkhurst. |

Attendants, Companions of Ulysses, &c.

| | |
|---|---|
| Chorodidascalus | Franklin Harvey. |
| Choraules (χοραύλης, or Accompanyist) | W. Parratt, Mus. Bac. |

Silenus, a dissipated-looking old satyr, with horns and large ears and hairy lower limbs, first appears and explains the situation in a prologue, during which the Chorus, similarly got up, come jumping in and execute a wild, fantastic dance upon the stage. Then drawing up on each side to allow the action to continue, they sing a graceful ode, thus rendered by Shelley:—

"STROPHE.

"Where has he of race divine
Wander'd in the winding rock?
Here the air is calm and fine
For the father of the flocks;—
Here the grass is soft and sweet,
And the river-eddies meet
In the trough beside the cave,
Bright as in their fountain wave.—
Neither here, nor on the dew
Of the lawny uplands feeding?
Oh, you come!—a stone at you
Will I throw to mend your breeding.
Get along, you horrid thing,
Wild, seditious, rambling!
You may chop it, and tear it, and gnash it for fun,
An hairy goat's-skin contains the whole." . . . . &c. &c.

Ulysses comes out, telling how he has seen the Cyclops devour two of his comrades, and propounds his plan for making the monster drunk, and boring out his eye. Polyphemus soon staggers out, followed by Silenus, and demands more wine, which Ulysses supplies from a large skin. They both sit down with the bowl between them, Silenus every now and then taking furtive pulls: until finally both have had enough, and reel back into the cave. The Chorus sing, while Ulysses goes in to make everything ready. He soon comes out, and call on the Chorus to lend a hand with the stake, now "delightfully red-hot;" but they suddenly discover that they are lame, and cannot see. Ulysses in disgust at their cowardice goes in, and the butt end of the great stake can just be seen through the cave's mouth with an arm working and twisting it, while the Cyclops roars with pain. Out he comes, blinded, and trying to stop the cave's mouth with his hands, while Ulysses and his comrades dodge out under his arms. The Chorus, now very courageous, jeer him (the Homeric joke of Οὖτις being duly reproduced):—

"*Cho.* What are you roaring out, Cyclops?
*Cycl.* I perish!
*Cho.* For you are wicked.
*Cycl.* And besides, miserable.
*Cho.* What, did you fall into the fire when drunk?
*Cycl.* 'Twas Nobody destroy'd me.
*Cho.* Why, then, no one
Can be to blame.
*Cycl.* I say 'twas Nobody
Who blinded me.
*Cho.* Why then you are not blind.
*Cycl.* I wish you were as blind as I am.
*Cho.* Nay,
It cannot be that no one made you blind.
*Cycl.* You jeer me; where, I ask, is Nobody?
*Cho.* No where, O Cyclops. . . . ."

Ulysses discloses his real name, and the Cyclops recognises the fulfilment of an oracle. The scene then ends with his threats to destroy the ship as they sail away.

The whole play is short (about 750 lines in the original), and occupied less than an hour in representation; but we thought that the dialogue—and more particularly the set speeches—was delivered much too fast; and the piece ought probably to have taken longer. Silenus especially rattled off the prologue like a schoolboy (not in a very high form) hurrying through a piece of repetition, and Ulysses might also have studied his elocution better; Polyphemus being the only one of the three who spoke his part well. Silenus, however, was better in some of the comic by-play, for which the piece affords considerable scope: requiring as it does throughout more real *acting* than the ordinary Greek tragedy. The Chorus were very good, and contributed in no slight degree to the success of the performance—for successful it was, in spite of the drawbacks that we have noticed in two of the principal characters. So far as shortcomings were due to want of practice, this was at any rate a sign that the preparations had not taken up an undue share of the boys' time, and where the general effect was good, it would be ungracious to dwell upon deficiencies of detail. We must not omit to compliment the "Chorodidascalus" (Mr. Harvey) upon the effective training of his Chorus, and the "Choraules" (Mr. Parratt) upon his accompaniment—composed, as we understand, by himself. The name of the Magdalen College organist is, indeed, sufficient guarantee for the musical part of this or any other performance, as those who heard the *Agamemnon* can testify.

There have been rumours in Oxford of a Commemoration performance of the *Birds* of Aristophanes, under the auspices of Mr. F. Benson and some of his companions in the *Agamemnon* and *Alcestis*; but it seems now that the scheme will fall through for this term, owing to many of the performers being engaged with their "Schools." Even were this not so, to attempt such a representation at such short notice (nothing being yet done) would be to court serious risk of failure. It is not every play whose overpowering dramatic force, as in the case of the *Agamemnon*, will carry off almost any amount of individual shortcomings.

© Reproduced with the permission of Cambridge University Library

## LECTURES AT NORTHAMPTON ON DIFFICULTIES OF BELIEF.

An effort recently made at Northampton to reach the large class of men, more especially of intelligent workmen, that is to be found in all manufacturing towns, who are sceptical or indifferent with regard to religion, claims some notice from us. Attempts on the part of the Church to bring influence to bear upon this class have been hitherto so rare, that each one is important. And the circumstance of place will in the present instance give an added interest for many readers; though, in spite of recent occurrences, it would, probably, be a mistake to suppose that the class in question is larger at Northampton than elsewhere. Feeling that here was a need not met by the ordinary ministrations of the Church, and which the more emotional Evangelistic efforts are also quite powerless to meet, the Rev. N. T. Hughes, the vicar of St. Edmund's, Northampton, determined last Advent to add to the vigorous and effective work carried on by and under him on the lines usual in a church and parish served by clergy who are earnest Churchmen, a series of highly thoughtful addresses to men on Sunday afternoons on Difficulties of Belief, with meetings after evening service in a schoolroom, at which questions might be asked and objections stated in regard to points in the lecture that day given, and replied to by the lecturer. The way in which the course of lectures and discussions in Advent passed off was considered so satisfactory that he arranged for another course during Lent, which has been not less successful. The first lecture of the Advent course was given by the Rev. J. E. Symes, M.A., Professor in the new University College at Nottingham, who took for his subject, "The Moral Difficulties of the Old Testament." He was followed on successive Sundays by the Rev. C. R. J. Loxley, B.A., senior curate of St. Edmund's, on "The Existence of Evil," the Rev. H. E. B. Arnold, M.A., curate of St. Edmund's, on "The Bible and Science," and the Rev. N. T. Hughes, M.A., vicar of St. Edmund's, on "Christianity and the Progress of the People." In the second course the subjects and lecturers were as follows:—"Amos, Prophet of God and Social Reformer," lecturer, the Rev. C. E. Escreet, M.A., curate of St. Mary's, Battersea; "Secularism and Morality," lecturer, the Rev. R. E. Bartlett, M.A., formerly Fellow of Trinity College, Oxford; "The Laws of Nature in Relation to Miracles and Prayer," lecturer, the Rev. C. Pritchard, D.D., F.R.S., Savilian Professor of Astronomy in the University of Oxford; "Christ and Liberty, the Sovereign Forces of Social Life," lecturer, the Rev. C. Stubbs, M.A., vicar of Granborough, Bucks; "The Revelation in Jesus Christ that God is Love," lecturer, the Rev. V. H. Stanton, M.A., Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge, and Examining Chaplain to the Bishop of Ely.

The attendance on the whole was good, and among those present there were many of the kind whom it was especially desired to attract. It was notified on the handbills that the lectures and discussions were for men, and that "men of any religion or of no religion would be welcome." A processional and recessional hymn before and after the lecture were sung by the choir, but there were no prayers, not even a Collect before the lecture. When people who do not believe in Christianity are invited, it seems suitable that they should not be asked to join in prayers offered in the Name of Christ. At each evening meeting the discussion was confined, as far as possible, to the subject of the lecture which had been given that day. Mr. Hughes, who took the chair at all the meetings except that which followed his own lecture, ruled objections and questions out of order which were beside the actual subject, more especially if they were not of a nature to be readily disposed of; while he would at the same time indicate, if possible, the occasion on which the point might more suitably be raised. In general the lecturer replied to each question or objection as soon as it had been made. The tone maintained in the discussions was good. There were evidences of very great ignorance and misapprehension, and of the strange working of minds untrained to think; but the difficulties which were stated in the way of accepting articles of Christian faith appeared to be *bonâ fide* ones for those who stated them, and there was very little mere contentiousness or effort after display. The idea that a man should be punished for his opinions, everlasting punishment, and the doctrines of the Incarnation and the Atonement, were points which there was a clear and sound answer. But if, in addition to possessing in a moderate degree these qualifications, he is determined to be thoroughly frank and straightforward, and, laying aside all patronising, condescending airs, to manifest a thoroughly brotherly spirit, we venture to promise that his efforts will be well recei ved and will not be altogether unfruitful.

## GENERAL SYNOD OF THE CHURCH OF IRELAND.

*(From a Dublin Correspondent.)*

At the sitting on Saturday week, the *Bishop of Down* presiding, on the motion of *Judge Warren*, the bill to regulate the management of glebes was read a third time and passed.

*Union of Parishes.*

With reference to the "union of parishes," the *Rev. Canon Jellett* moved the second reading of the bill to amend c. 3, s. ii. of the Constitution of the Church by adding:—

"Provided that when a union of parishes shall have been duly made, and shall have taken effect, the component parts of such unions shall cease to exist as parishes within the meaning of this statute."

The result of the present definition of the word "union" was that when they had two parishes under one incumbent, the different parishes retained their registers of vestrymen as before, and they continued to be separate parishes although they had been made one parish by the act. Each parish retained the power of selecting its own select vestrymen, churchwardens, and other officials, and in most cases this arrangement led to much inconvenience. It was essential that when a union was made the parishes should cease to exist as separate parishes, so far as these different sets of officials were concerned, and so avoid much confusion. He did not mean to hold that there were not cases in which it might be necessary to retain separate parishes and staffs on account of the extent of the parishes and their distance from each other, and he therefore proposed to add the following words in committee:—"Unless the diocesan council shall otherwise order."

The *Rev. Dr. Meade* said it had been complained to him that where a small parish with funds was united to a small parish without funds, and its staff of officials were abolished, it would lose all control of the funds, and would suffer. He believed that Canon Scott's amendment would meet this, as the union could not then be made to this extent without the consent of the diocesan council.

The *Rev. Mr. Fleming* believed the small parishes should not be allowed to appoint churchwardens, if for no other reason than that it misled the public.

*Mr. Macartney, M.P.*, said if Canon Jellett's bill became law some portion of the parishes would absorb the entire of the select vestry, and leave other districts totally unrepresented.

The *Archdeacon of Dromore* opposed the bill as disastrous to small parishes.

On a division, there were for the motion (clergy) 40, (laity) 30; against (clergy) 23, (laity) 30.

The *Chairman* said, as there was not a quorum of laity present, the house should adjourn.

The *Rev. Canon Jellett* said he would not press for a division, but put the motion on the paper for another day.

The *Lord Primate* obtained leave to bring in "A bill to repeal Statute IV., 1881, to separate the diocese of Armagh and Clogher, the consent of the synod of the diocese of Armagh being conditional, and there being no evidence of the fulfilment of the condition."

*Education.*

*Judge Warren* resumed the adjourned debate upon the third of the series of the resolutions moved by the Recorder of Dublin, with regard to training-schools, as follows:—

"That such scheme be presented to the Board of Religious Education, and that the board be hereby empowered to carry same into execution, either wholly or in part, or with such modifications as to them shall seem fit."

He (Judge Warren) objected to any committee or board being allowed to usurp the functions of the synod. Had the members of the Board of Religious Education done their duty so efficiently that they were to be entrusted with these powers? He had no hesitation in saying that they had not; and, further, that the members of the Church of Ireland had not done their duty by this training college in Kildare-street was apparent on the very face of the the annual subscriptions of the public 380*l.* These figures, with the diocesan contributions, made 1,957*l.* The Offertory collection, notwithstanding the overflowing attendances on Sundays, was only 718*l.* last year, being less than a halfpenny a-head for those who worshipped. A box collection gave 102*l.*; and, adding receipts from the performance of oratorios, the total income for last year was 3,300*l.* The total expenditure during the same period had been nearly 3,000*l.*, but that did not include anything for the maintenance of the fabrics of the cathedral.

The motion for the adoption of the report was agreed to.

*Dr. Norwood* moved that the Representative Body be requested to reconsider a decision at which they had arrived declining to allocate 1,000*l.* towards the repairs of St. Patrick's Cathedral. Since its restoration by the late Sir Benjamin Guinness water had accumulated in its foundations to such an extent as to sap the walls and render the fabric insecure. During a Parliament which sat in Dublin in 1493, in the reign of Henry VII., an act was passed for draining and cleansing the site of St. Patrick's Cathedral. It was time that that should be carried out. A noble-minded citizen, Mr. Edward Cecil Guinness, had paid 750*l.* to the Corporation for the making of a culvert to drain the water into the Liffey: and, besides that, he and Lord Ardilaun had contributed 250*l.* each towards the necessary repairs. Other subscriptions had been gathered in by the cathedral authorities, making a total of 2,050*l.* The cost of the repairs, however, which were actually in progress, was estimated at over 3,200*l.*

The *Dean of St. Patrick's* seconded the motion.

The *Rev. Dr. King Irwin*, in opposing the motion, said a statement was made some time ago in one of the police-courts to the effect that the Representative Body had laid down certain principles with respect to the granting of money for the repair of churches, and that they were afterwards obliged to eat their own words. They were obliged to publish a *précis* in the newspapers in order to show the falsehood of this, and to make it clear that the funds they were dealing with on that occasion were the private funds of a parish, and not those entrusted to them on behalf of the Church generally. It would be setting a very bad precedent to comply with the present motion—in fact, it would be a slap in the face to the Representative Body.

The *Rev. Canon Jellett* said that, as a member of the Representative Body, he would be content to bear the slap in the face provided the money were given. There was no analogy whatever between St. Bride's Church and St. Patrick's Cathedral. The Representative Body had never said that the synod could not authorise such grants as that now asked for. The cathedral should not be allowed to tumble down for want of a paltry 1,000*l.*

*Judge Warren*, in opposing the motion, said, if the synod did anything let them take on themselves the responsibility of voting the money. The collections in St. Patrick's Cathedral were most disgraceful—hundreds gave nothing at all, and hundreds gave only halfpence.

The *Provost of Trinity College* (the Rev. J. H. Jellett) said, if the synod liked to let St. Patrick's Cathedral fall into ruin they could do so: it would be very cheap. No doubt it was a great shame for the congregations who attended in St. Patrick's Cathedral—he supposed largely to hear the music—not to contribute more liberally; but if the synod did not want the cathedral to fall into ruin, they must spend money on it.

*Archdeacon Reichel* moved, the *Rev. Canon Jellett* seconded, and it was resolved by a majority of 88 to 47:—

"That the synod request the Representative Body to allocate 1,000*l.* for the repair of the cathedral in question."

*Education.*

The debate on a resolution moved by the *Hon. the Recorder*, relative to a teacher's boarding-house, was resumed, when an amendment by the *Archdeacon of Dromore* was carried, which provided that the scheme should be presented to the Board of Religious Education, and that they should be empowered to carry it out as regarded a residence house for the training of male teachers in common with Marlborough-street Training-school, provided that no such arrangement should affect the Kildare-place Training-college without the sanction of the synod.

The resolution of the Recorder, as varied by the amendment, was put and agreed to, and the synod adjourned.

Yesterday week, the *Bishop of Cork* presided. *Mr. J. H. Nunn*

©Reproduced with the permission of Cambridge University Library

point might more suitably be raised. In general the lecturer replied to each question or objection as soon as it had been made. The tone maintained in the discussions was good. There were evidences of very great ignorance and misapprehension, and of the strange working of minds untrained to think; but the difficulties which were stated in the way of accepting articles of Christian faith appeared to be *bonâ fide* ones for those who stated them, and there was very little mere contentiousness or effort after display. The idea that a man should be punished for his opinions, everlasting punishment, and the doctrines of the Incarnation and the Atonement, were points which there was a disposition to recur to most frequently.

Of results it is in all cases somewhat unsafe to speak, and in work of this particular kind speedy conversions are not to be expected. But there is no doubt that a better, more cordial understanding than usually exists between the clergy and the men of the class whom we have described has been created, and this is in itself a great point gained. We think also that some grave mistakes have been corrected, and that a truer idea has been conveyed to some minds of what the Christian faith in reality is. And effects may have been produced upon others besides those who were present in the church and the schoolroom. The local papers gave full reports both of the lectures and the evening talks, and these accounts are said to have been widely read.

The clergy of St. Edmund's, Northampton, feel so far encouraged that they look forward to similar courses in the future; and we believe that there are other places where something of the same kind might with advantage be tried. There are certainly dangers to be incurred. The clergy who take part in such schemes expose themselves to misunderstanding on the part of some pious people. The Christian apologist, if he would do real service at the present day, often has to begin by clearing away accretions to the faith or misstatements of truths which he would not be willing to defend, but which are sacred in the eyes of many believers; and he is especially likely to feel the need of doing this, or even to be challenged to do it, in direct encounters with scepticism among the working classes, among whom distorted views of Christianity form some of the chief hindrances to its reception. Or, again, he may find it advisable to waive for the moment truths which he holds, in order to put the evidence for other truths more important or more fundamental in the simplest and most convincing form; and minds not accustomed to reason may sometimes think he is making final concessions, when he is only making momentary ones for a logical purpose. And worse than any loss of confidence which he may thus bring upon himself, disturbance may be caused to the faith of some, who before were at peace, by the difficulties brought to light, or by the line of argument he may have felt it necessary to adopt. But we must be willing to incur such risks for the sake of the important end to be gained. True generals, masterly workers of every kind, have always been willing to run risks when needful. And no other way presents itself of coming face to face with the many more or less intelligent working men whom it is so hard to find or to have satisfactory talks with in their own homes, and of seeking to remove their scepticism and alienation from Christianity and the Church.

Every one is not fitted for such work. Any one who undertakes it should have some true comprehension of the general condition of thought among working men and sympathy with all that is good in their temper of mind and aims. He must also have matured his own views sufficiently on the points in regard to which questions are likely to be put to him, to be able to give

"That such scheme be presented to the Board of Religious Education, and that the board be hereby empowered to carry same into execution, either wholly or in part, or with such modifications as to them shall seem fit."

He (Judge Warren) objected to any committee or board being allowed to usurp the functions of the synod. Had the members of the Board of Religious Education done their duty so efficiently that they were to be entrusted with these powers? He had no hesitation in saying that they had not; and, further, that the members of the Church of Ireland had not done their duty by this training college in Kildare-street was apparent on the very face of the report. He disapproved of the national system of education, but could say that, thanks to the Bishops and priests of the Roman Catholic Church, and the Sisters of Charity, and the Ultramontane spirit in the Church, the undenominational schools were being influenced in an opposite direction, and he trusted the schools would become in principle what in fact they were, undenominational, and that the Church of Ireland would soon be able to place her schools without any conscientious scruples in connection with the board.

The *Bishop of Killaloe* said that the question before the synod was not what was the character of the National schools throughout the country—whether they were denominational or undenominational, good or bad—but had reference to the religious training of the masters and mistresses in the schools, and to the most economical way in which they could be given the education that was considered necessary. Was there anything mean in trying to get from the State that for which they must themselves pay if otherwise obtained? Was it wise for them to pay for both the secular and religious training of the teachers, when one of these could be got for nothing?

The *Bishop of Cork* proposed, and *Colonel Archdall* seconded, an amendment to the effect that the Board of Religious Education should report to the synod upon the subject at its next meeting.

The *Archdeacon of Dromore* moved, as a further amendment, that after the word "execution" in the Recorder's resolution it read, "as regards a residence house for the training of male teachers."

As it was found there was not a quorum, the synod adjourned till Monday.

*Cathedrals.*

At the sitting of the synod on Monday week, the *Bishop of Cork* presiding, the *Dean of Limerick* moved the adoption of a report from the Cathedrals Committee recommending that assistance be given to the following cathedrals, which are insufficiently provided for:—St. Patrick's, Dublin; the cathedral of Holy Trinity, Downpatrick; St. Canice, Kilkenny; St. Finn Bar's, Cork; St. Mary's, Limerick; Christ's Cathedral, Waterford; St. Mary's, Tuam; St. Maccartan, Clogher; and St. Colomb, Derry. He also moved that the report be referred to the Representative Body for their consideration, and with a view that they should report on the subject to the next meeting of the synod.

*Mr. J. C. Delmege* having seconded the motion, *Col. Archdall* objected to any money in the hands of the Representative Body being devoted to keeping up cathedrals.

*Dr. Norwood* said no cathedral had a better claim to be on the list than St. Patrick's. It had been taken out of the hands of the people of Dublin, and declared by their own legislation to be their national cathedral; and several dioceses throughout the country had recognised this by contributing last year 376*l.* towards the support of its services. The Sustentation Fund for the year was 763*l.*; its composition balance yielded 436*l.*, and provided that the scheme should be presented to the Board of Religious Education, and that they should be empowered to carry it out as regarded a residence house for the training of male teachers in common with Marlborough-street Training-school, provided that no such arrangement should affect the Kildare-place Training-college without the sanction of the synod.

The resolution of the Recorder, as varied by the amendment, was put and agreed to, and the synod adjourned.

Yesterday week, the *Bishop of Cork* presided. *Mr. J. H. Nunn* moved, *Colonel Archdall* seconded, and it was resolved—

"That a committee be appointed for the purpose of collecting from any sources to which they can have access information on the state of the Church and its working during the present year, and report same in a condensed form to the synod at its next meeting."

The committee was then appointed.

On the religious education question *Colonel Dennis* moved and *Colonel Archdall* seconded, and it was resolved—

"That, in view of the fact that many schools under the patronage of members of the Church of Ireland are now in connection with the Board of National Education, this synod considers the maintenance of an institution or institutions for imparting religious education to those training for the situation of master in such schools to be absolutely necessary, and therefore hopes that the several diocesan synods will, at their next meeting, take the matter into their serious consideration, particularly as it appears that seven gentlemen are now personally responsible for all the expenses of the only institution now existing for religious training of schoolmasters and schoolmistresses belonging to the Church of Ireland."

*Procedure.*

*Mr. Chamberlaine* said he had given notice of the following motion:—

"That it be referred to the standing orders committee to report to the next General Synod whether any alteration ought to be made in cap. 1, sec. 20, of 'the constitution,' respecting the enacting of statutes, or in the practice of the synod respecting the same."

His object was to expedite the passing of bills, particularly because there was doubt as to their present practice being consistent with the statutes of the Church. At present bills fell through owing to the great delay in passing them through the different stages. He would ask that instead of the standing orders committee this matter should be referred to the legislative committee, to report to the next General Synod on the advisability of making a change in the procedure as regards bills, and that the following names be added to the committee:—The Vice-Provost of Trinity College, Judge Warren, Mr. Pilkington, Q.C., and Dr. Ball, Q.C.

The *Rev. Dr. Campbell* having seconded the motion,

*Colonel Dennis* said he thought it would be very dangerous if a bill could be passed in one day. There was great danger of over-legislation, for at present their constitution was working very well.

*Mr. Miller, Q.C.*, did not think it desirable that it should go before the committee that their sole object was to see whether they could shorten the time for passing bills. It was not expedient that a bill should be rushed though the synod.

The motion to refer the matter to the legislative committee was adopted, Mr. Chamberlaine withdrawing that portion of his motion adding a number of names to the committee.

*Union of Dioceses.*

The *Lord Primate* moved the second reading of the bill to repeal cap. 4 of the statute of 1881, which provided for the severance of the united dioceses of Armagh and Clogher, and expressed a hope that the matter would yet be amicably settled.

The *Rev. Dr. Chadwick* seconded the motion.

© Reproduced with the permission of Cambridge University Library

*Colonel Dennis*, on principle, opposed the second reading of the bill, which was to repeal a bill passed at the very last synod. He maintained that they had too few Bishops, and that the more they had the better.

The bill was then read a second time, and the house went into committee.

On the motion of the *Rev. Dr. Chadwick* the title of the bill was made to read, "A bill to amend Statute IV., 1881," and the bill amended as follows passed through committee:—

"Whereas, an act for separating the diocese of Armagh from the diocese of Clogher was passed by the General Synod of 1881; and whereas a consent to such separation was previously given by the Synod of Armagh upon the condition that it shall appear to the Representative Body that a provision of 1,500*l.* a year is forthcoming for the see of Armagh, and an adequate sum for the diocese of Clogher, and a further provision of 1,000*l.* a year for the Primacy, in accordance with a report of the Primate's committee; and whereas the said resolution of the Synod of Armagh is not set forth at length in and by the said statute of the General Synod: Be it enacted that the aforesaid statute shall not take effect unless and until the conditions imposed by the diocese of Armagh shall have been fulfilled, or the synod of the said diocese shall have removed or modified such conditions."

The *Rev. Canon Henry Jellett* moved, and the *Rev. Dr. King Irwin* seconded, the second reading of the bill to amend chapter iii., sec. i. of the constitution, which provided that where a union of parishes took place the separate officers and vestries should be abolished, and that one central set of officers should regulate the affairs of the united parishes, and that in cases where such an arrangement could not be made the diocesan council should otherwise regulate. After some discussion, it was deferred till next session.

On Thursday, the *Bishop of Cork* presiding, after some notices of motions for the next session, the *Lord Primate* moved the third reading of the bill to amend chapter iv., 1881, which provided for the separation of the dioceses of Armagh and Clogher. The *Rev. Dr. Chadwick* seconded the motion, which was carried, and the bill was read a third time and declared passed.

The *Te Deum* having been recited, the Lord Primate pronounced the Benediction, and the session was brought to a close.

## THE SALISBURY DIOCESAN SYNOD.

The second session of the fourth synod was held in the Chapter-house on Wednesday and Thursday week.

*Mr. Green's Case.*

In opening the proceedings *Bishop Moberly*, as reported by the *Salisbury Journal*, observed that this matter had been very wisely omitted from the *agenda*. "For what (asked the right rev. prelate) were we to do? It is a very idle thing, and it is against our first principles, that we should talk in the air. What would be the good of fulminating a certain quantity of strong words upon a subject when it was to lead to no practical consequence? (Cheers.) We had a meeting of the Bishops on the subject some time since, and the Bishops could do exactly as much as the synod could do, and not an atom more. Neither they nor the synod can do anything, and therefore to express regret and distress and so forth is an unpractical thing, and unpractical things are entirely alien to the business and principles which regulate our synods. Besides this, I should like rather to ask you the question, 'Are you so sure that Mr. Green desires to be liberated?' ('No,' and laughter.) I believe that personally he not only feels the inconvenience very greatly, but that personally he does desire his release—desires it as a man of peace, as a man of conscience, and as a man who has suffered, as he holds, for conscience' sake, but I am not at all so sure that those who support Mr. Green desire him to be quietly let out of prison, leaving all other questions exactly where they were. I think, on the contrary, everybody knows that there is no treasure to a party half so great as a grievance, and a greater or more patent grievance than this can hardly be devised—(cheers)—a clergyman thrown into prison and detained there for more than a year. Why, the whole country sees and feels and knows and acknowledges the scandal. What can be a finer grievance than that? Moreover, it is not only a grievance, but it is a lever towards a great object, and the lever tells upon that object with a force which is to a certain degree irresistible as the thing stands now; but open the door and let Mr. Green walk out, and you have no further opportunity of making use of it for the great object in view. There is no doubt at all that one great object which those who support Mr. Green, and perhaps support him rather beyond what he himself would like—that I think is very possible—there is no doubt that what they desire is a much greater thing than the mere opening of the door of the prison-house for Mr. Green. They desire the reform to be in the ecclesiastical courts mainly; they want the court of first instance and the court of final appeal to be entirely reconstructed on principles which they are ready to petition for to any extent. Therefore I think that it is a very happy thing that we have not got this matter brought forward in any definite shape here; and yet I do not think I should have been satisfied not to have given small utterance to the feeling which I think everybody shares alike of the extreme unfortunateness and scandal of the condition of things now. It is not only that Mr. Green has been more than a year in prison, but the three years required for deprivation are constantly running out. Let the time run on two years more, and *ipso facto* the living he now holds is vacated under the act. Moreover, there was that very remarkable and notable conversation which took place in the House of Commons just before the vacation, when Mr. Hubbard asked the Prime Minister whether it was not possible to do something to alleviate the scandal, and the Prime Minister, as far as I remember his words, said that he supposed that Mr. Hubbard was referring to legislative action of some kind, and he could only say about that that those high and eminent personages who had introduced and carried the Public Worship Regulation Act were the persons to deal with it. Well, what dealing with it there may be I know but little of, and the little I do know I am not at liberty to state, but you will hardly doubt that I for one never did like one single line of that Act—(cheers)—I think it was a mistake from beginning to end—(cheers)—and anything therefore that would undo it I should most cordially accept and maintain and further as far as my power would go. I must not say more, because I have no business to say even the little that I do know. I only mean to say that that answer of the Prime Minister indicated—at least I suppose I may take it to indicate—a suggestion almost to the heads of the clergy, to the two Archbishops in fact, to do something towards alleviating the scandal. But there again the probability is that that would be to alleviate the scandal and not to satisfy the demand. (Cheers.) These are two very different things, and, as I said before, I doubt extremely whether those who want the scandal alleviated are by any means the same, or feel so strongly as those who would rather that Mr. Green went through the whole course and went on to deprivation. Only clergy and laity in Convocation should sit together by Act of Parliament in the Convocations. The objection to that was that it would overthrow the connection between Church and State, and he thought it would be much better if they could get that lay body into existence in some less official manner. The noble lord having read the names of the Central Council, so far as it had been elected, said they were enough to show that there was a nucleus of a representative body which, if they approved of the work of Convocation, might be of very great use in enabling the scheme of the Bishop of London's bill to be carried out.

*Mr. R. M. Wilson* having seconded the motion, the *Rev. E. B. Ottley*, Principal of the Theological College, strongly objected to the proposal on the ground that it came before the synod with no authority, either Episcopal or derived from Convocation. It was a mixture of clergy and laity of a character to which Church history could afford no parallel. It was not a lay representative body, and what was worse it cumbered the ground, and rendered the formation of true lay representation, which was most earnestly desired, an impossibility. It would be easy to construct a body of that kind, but very hard to dissolve it. What he would recommend was that the Lower House of Convocation should ask the Bishops to consider how a conference might be formed. Let them have a scheme of a synod or conference put before them, and then, when they knew what they were dealing with, have a uniform system. Let them by all means have lay representation, but let the body meet in London with authority. There were excellent people on the Central Council, and he did not say that they might not be of great use if they confined themselves to bringing about the better organisation of diocesan conferences, but they had already begun to exceed all reasonable limits, and were, he believed, becoming an extremely dangerous body for the Church of England in its influence upon the mind of the public in general.

*Archdeacon Lear* denied that the Central Council had received no Episcopal support. At any rate, the Bishops at their meeting at Lambeth had considered the proposal, and had not condemned it. The great object of the council was that the diocesan conferences, from Truro to Carlisle, instead of speaking with twenty voices, would speak with one voice. (Cheers.) It had been said by the Prime Minister that what the Ministers and what Parliament wanted to know was the voice of the Church. If they could gather up the opinions of the various dioceses and help Mr. Gladstone and Sir Stafford Northcote to ascertain what the Church meant and what the Church wanted, they might be able to get what they required.

The motion was opposed by *Mr. Floyer*, *Archdeacon Sanctuary*, the *Rev. M. Hankey* (Maiden Newton), the *Rev. Sir J. E. Philipps* (Warminster), and *Mr. H. P. Jones*. On the other hand, it was supported by *Mr. C. H. Baskett*. *Earl Nelson* having replied,

The *Bishop* said that if the Central Council had been the natural outcome of the synod nothing would please him better than to see it carried out. But what were the facts? Let them remember that three or four of the diocesan conferences were not yet established at all, and that some of them were in such a state of infirmity as regarded their constitution that they could not afford to have a second story built upon them. His own personal feeling on the matter was against the proposal; but if it was the wish of the synod to send representatives he would not oppose it, though he should cherish the secret hope that the proposal would come to nothing. (Laughter.) What they wanted, and what they ought to have, first of all, was a well-reformed Convocation. (Cheers.) Convocation was an ancient Church constitutional body, and he should like to see it made as perfect in its kind as it could possibly be made; but he did not want to see a Convocation of laity.

The motion was then rejected by 109 to 39.

*The Itinerant Mission.*

*Lord Ashley*, in moving a resolution approving of the Itinerant Mission set on foot by the Spiritual Aid Board, said the times had passed away when the Church of England could lie quietly by, trusting to her ancient traditions and glorious past, and to her *prestige*, while other agencies of narrower opinions and more or less injurious qualities were doing the work which she ought to have made her own. (Cheers.) He was thankful to say that this was in a great measure owing to the action of their Bishops in instituting those gatherings of Churchmen which were called synods or conferences. (Cheers.) The other day a distinguished statesman said, "Before all this country requires the very best religion that can be got, or else no religion at all." He did not, however, think that those of them who had had any experience of the people of this county could say that that was quite the right way to look at the question of religion. It appeared to him that there was no form of fanaticism or superstition so gross that it would not be gradually swallowed by many people, if the necessary amount of clap-trap eloquence was delivered in support of it. He remembered, in a village in this county, the case of a poor labouring man who got a certain amount of following, simply because he persisted in saying that he saw visions. That man's visions consisted in the alleged seeing of a large golden bowl or basin, constantly descending from the skies, the bowl being full of what he was pleased to call "speckled dough," otherwise plum pudding. (Laughter.) That secured him for a time some following, though not of an influential character; and it afforded an instance of what some people would easily believe. He was perfectly convinced that the movement about to be started in this diocese, as set forth in the resolution he had proposed, would, next to the temperance movement, prove to be one of the best they could possibly have inaugurated. He was glad to see that an ordained priest of the Church of England was going to undertake the work, for he was sure he would have a much greater influence among the nomad populations he would be thrown amongst. (Cheers.)

*Archdeacon Buchanan* seconded the motion. In the course of the discussion the *Bishop* said he had licensed the Rev. Mr. Holt. He also read a letter from the Rev. H. P. Stokes, of Wareham, who said the diocese of Salisbury ought to be deeply grateful for having secured the services of such an experienced man. The letter, the Bishop added, was a most satisfactory one, and he was sure they would be only too glad to welcome this new clergyman amongst them. The movement was a modern one. He had never heard of it elsewhere, and he thought their thanks were due to Canon Olivier for having started it. (Cheers.)

*Canon Olivier* said Mr. Holt was fomerly a working man in an iron foundry, and was ordained by the Bishop of Lincoln. He had begun work in Wilton, and had been to Wareham; so far he had been well received. In the whole of the thirty years at fairs Mr. Holt visited, it was satisfactory to find that all the children, without exception, had been baptised. The motion was agreed to.

*The Cathedral Commission.*

The Dean next moved the following resolution:—

"That this synod desires to express to the Cathedral Commissioners its approval of the recommendations to her Majesty, contained in the first report of the Royal Commission on Cathedrals, and recognises in these recommendations a desire to revive the true spirit of cathedral institutions, and to adapt them to the requirements of the respective dioceses of England."

After summarising the recommendations of the Commissioners, Dean Boyle said a good story was told of the late Lord Althorp, in whose integrity the House of Commons had the utmost

*Archdeacon Sanctuary* having seconded the motion, *Earl Nelson* was glad that they had amongst them such a good man as the present Dean of Salisbury, but he confessed that he could not place such implicit confidence in him as the House of Commons did in Lord Althorp. (Laughter.) He begged, therefore, to move the previous question. He confessed that he had not read the report, and could not agree in the proposition that any new statutes suggested by the Royal Commission, through the committee of council for cathedral purposes, should have the force of law. The Dean appeared to be of opinion that that committee would be composed of persons who were friendly to our cathedrals, but that would depend upon circumstances. They might, for instance, have a Prime Minister under whose guidance the whole of our cathedral institutions might be swept from the surface of the earth. (Cheers.) The religious element was being swept away in our Universities, and it would be a most dangerous thing to say that it should be also swept away in our cathedrals. (Cheers.)

*Canon Eddrup* (Bremhill) seconded the previous question, which was carried by an overwhelming majority.

*Committees.*

On the motion of *Canon Jacob* (Horningsham), a committee was unanimously appointed to inquire into the necessity for further efforts to save young girls from bad surroundings; and to collect information respecting associations for the care of friendless girls, which had been founded in other dioceses.

A committee was also appointed, at the instance of *Archdeacon Lear*, to inquire into the alleged neglect of holy baptism, both in towns and villages, and to report how such neglect might be best remedied.

On the motion of the *Rev. C. H. Powell* (Stanton St. Bernard), a third committee was appointed to inquire to what extent infidelity existed or was increasing amongst the less educated classes of the diocese, and whether any means could be taken to extinguish or to check it.

*Thrift.*

The *Rev. C. J. Cowley-Brown* (St. Edmund's, Salisbury), seconded by the *Rev. C. H. Cholmeley* (Dinton), moved:—

"That, in view of the prevalence of pauperism, and the failure of existing methods for its prevention, a committee be appointed to report upon Mr. Blackley's scheme of compulsory national insurance."

The *Marquis of Bath*, besides thinking the scheme impracticable, said that if they looked into it thoroughly they would see that it was not one of mutual assurance, but one for a national instead of a parochial poor-rate, and a distinct encouragement to the contrary of thrift and self-support. *Mr. G. E. Elliot* moved to substitute for the reference to Mr. Blackley's scheme the words—

"The best means of encouraging provident habits amongst the working classes."

After some discussion this was carried by 48 to 28.

THURSDAY.

At the reassembling of the synod to-day the following resolution was adopted, on the motion of *Archdeacon Sanctuary*, seconded by *Earl Nelson*:—

"That the Spiritual Aid Board be instructed to consider the state of the law relating to pluralities and union of benefices, and to report upon its present practical bearing on the welfare of the Church in this diocese."

*Church Finance.*

The *Rev. J. Lee-Warner* (Tarrant Gunville) moved the following resolution:—

"That, with a view to the augmentation of poorer benefices, legislation is desirable, in order to extend further the principle of Queen Anne's Bounty and to levy a per-centage of 2*l.* per cent. on benefices whose net income exceeds 300*l.* per annum, and whose population is less than 600."

After considerable discussion the proposal was rejected almost unanimously.

*Bills in Parliament.*

On the motion of *Archdeacon Lear*, petitions were adopted in favour of the Places of Worship Sites Bill, and against the Burial Fees Bill and the Cemeteries Bill, and the Churchwardens Admission Bill. On the motion of *Mr. Buckley*, it was also resolved:—

"That the ordinaries of the diocese be requested to take some means of providing facilities for churchwardens who have been unable to attend the Visitation to make their declaration without the payment of a fee."

*The Sister's Marriage Bill.*

*Archdeacon Lear*, in moving the adoption of a petition against this measure, said he believed that the people who were advocating it were more or less selfish, and he believed that for the sake of those selfish persistent agitators, hundreds of households in this Christian land were in great danger. Such a reckless law as that would open the flood-gates of such a tide of misery as would carry them they knew not whither. He held in his hands a very remarkable pamphlet, entitled *A Village Talk between Two Parishioners*. He knew of no document which put forward in a clearer way the Scriptural arguments for maintaining the present marriage law as it was; and one of the advantages of that pamphlet was that it could be obtained for a penny. It was written by the Rev. Thomas Vincent, rector of Pusey. It was recommended to him by Bishop Hobhouse. An extremely valuable paper on the same subject was read by the Dean of Lichfield at the Lichfield Diocesan Conference.

*Admiral Fulford* seconded the adoption of the petition, which was carried *nem. con.*, though *Mr. C. H. Baskett* had spoken against it.

*Tithe.*

*Mr. J. N. Parham* moved the following resolution:—

"That the practice which generally prevails of the payment of tithe rent-charge by the occupiers of land is apparently contrary to the intention of the Tithe Commutation Act, in many cases conduces to ill-feeling between the clergy and their parishioners, and works a hardship on both of them; and that petitions be presented to Parliament in favour of Mr. Stanley Leighton's Tithe Rent-Charge Bill for the abolition of the present remedy by distress for the recovery of tithe rent-charge."

*Mr. R. M. Wilson*, in seconding the motion, said it had been said that the clergy had no other remedy than distress, but that was not strictly correct; for in the event of there being nothing to distrain on they had power to appeal to the sheriff to summon a jury to try the case, and if decided in their favour they had the privilege of holding the land for one year. But he did not think the clergy cared much about that *habere facias possessionem*. Supposing it were put into effect with regard to forty acres on Salisbury Plain. (Laughter.) It might be said the land could be cultivated, but he did not think the clergyman who took advantage of *habere facias possessionem* would be very well satisfied with it. (Laughter.) Mr. Wilson mentioned a case where the sum of 6*s.* 8*d.* had to be collected in respect of five cottages. Now each one of those five tenants was separately liable to be distrained upon for the whole 6*s.* 8*d.* Well, three or four of them put down their sixteen pence, and said, "I shan't pay any more; that's my share." Sometimes it would be a woman who refused to pay; he tried to reason with her, but there was a difficulty in reasoning with women—(laughter)—and it was not easy to impress upon them that they were, as tenants, bound to pay the tithes in respect of which the houses they occupied were assessed. One honest man once said to him, "You would not mislead me, so I'll pay" but the other tenants, whose share he paid, did not repay him, and he (the speaker) could not conscientiously take the full amount from him the following year. In one case under a threat of distress he got the money from a man who

© Reproduced with permission of the Canterbury Cathedral Archives and Library

[illegible] that the synod can do anything, and therefore to express regret and distress and so forth is an unpractical thing, and unpractical things are entirely alien to the business and principles which regulate our synods. Besides this, I should like rather to ask you the question, 'Are you so sure that Mr. Green desires to be liberated?' ('No,' and laughter.) I believe that personally he not only feels the inconvenience very greatly, but that personally he does desire his release—desires it as a man of peace, as a man of conscience, and as a man who has suffered, as he holds, for conscience' sake, but I am not at all so sure that those who support Mr. Green desire him to be quietly let out of prison, leaving all other questions exactly where they were. I think, on the contrary, everybody knows that there is no treasure to a party half so great as a grievance, and a greater or more patent grievance than this can hardly be devised—(cheers)—a clergyman thrown into prison and detained there for more than a year. Why, the whole country sees and feels and knows and acknowledges the scandal. What can be a finer grievance than that? Moreover, it is not only a grievance, but it is a lever towards a great object, and the lever tells upon that object with a force which is to a certain degree irresistible as the thing stands now; but open the door and let Mr. Green walk out, and you have no further opportunity of making use of it for the great object in view. There is no doubt at all that one great object which those who support Mr. Green, and perhaps support him rather beyond what he himself would like—that I think is very possible—there is no doubt that what they desire is a much greater thing than the mere opening of the door of the prison-house for Mr. Green. They desire the reform to be in the ecclesiastical courts mainly; they want the court of first instance and the court of final appeal to be entirely reconstructed on principles which they are ready to petition for to any extent. Therefore I think that it is a very happy thing that we have not got this matter brought forward in any definite shape here; and yet I do not think I should have been satisfied not to have given small utterance to the feeling which I think everybody shares alike of the extreme unfortunateness and scandal of the condition of things now. It is not only that Mr. Green has been more than a year in prison, but the three years required for deprivation are constantly running out. Let the time run on two years more, and *ipso facto* the living he now holds is vacated under the act. Moreover, there was that very remarkable and notable conversation which took place in the House of Commons just before the vacation, when Mr. Hubbard asked the Prime Minister whether it was not possible to do something to alleviate the scandal, and the Prime Minister, as far as I remember his words, said that he supposed that Mr. Hubbard was referring to legislative action of some kind, and he could only say about that that those high and eminent personages who had introduced and carried the Public Worship Regulation Act were the persons to deal with it. Well, what dealing with it there may be I know but little of, and the little I do know I am not at liberty to state, but you will hardly doubt that I for one never did like one single line of that Act—(cheers)—I think it was a mistake from beginning to end—(cheers)—and anything therefore that would undo it I should most cordially accept and maintain and further as far as my power would go. I must not say more, because I have no business to say even the little that I do know. I only mean to say that that answer of the Prime Minister indicated—at least I suppose I may take it to indicate—a suggestion almost to the heads of the clergy, to the two Archbishops in fact, to do something towards alleviating the scandal. But there again the probability is that that would be to alleviate the scandal and not to satisfy the demand. (Cheers.) These are two very different things, and, as I said before, I doubt extremely whether those who want the scandal alleviated are by any means the same, or feel so strongly as those who would rather that Mr. Green went through the whole course and went on to deprivation. Only think what a scandal that would be—after three years of imprisonment to be deprived of his means of living, whether everybody would be then thinking that they had done a good deal more than simply alleviate a scandal, and whether it would have told very strongly upon the objects that they have in view—objects which are very dear to them indeed, and objects which I sympathise with to a great extent. I am not one of those who would keep Mr. Green in prison for the sake of compassing their own ends, but we want the condition and constitution of our ecclesiastical courts to be—as they are now in the course of being—carefully, impartially, and wisely looked into, and remedies suggested, and not suggested only, but, if it may so be, carried through by Act of Parliament in consequence of the Commission, which, as you know, is now sitting, having duly reported.

An address expressive of horror and indignation at the recent attempt on the life of her Majesty having been unanimously adopted, the synod proceeded to discuss the subject of

*The Central Council of Diocesan Conferences.*

*Earl Nelson* moved that representatives should be elected. They were all very anxious, he said, that the communicant laity should be in some way represented in the councils of the Church; and it had been proposed that they should be directly represented—that the [illegible] constitutional body, and he should like to see it made as perfect in its kind as it could possibly be made; but he did not want to see a Convocation of laity.

The motion was then rejected by **109** to **39**.

*The Itinerant Mission.*

*Lord Ashley*, in moving a resolution approving of the Itinerant Mission set on foot by the Spiritual Aid Board, said the times had passed away when the Church of England could lie quietly by, trusting to her ancient traditions and glorious past, and to her *prestige*, while other agencies of narrower opinions and more or less injurious qualities were doing the work which she ought to have made her own. (Cheers.) He was thankful to say that this was in a great measure owing to the action of their Bishops in instituting those gatherings of Churchmen which were called synods or conferences. (Cheers.) The other day a distinguished statesman said, "Before all this country requires the very best religion that can be got, or else no religion at all." He did not, however, think that those of them who had had any experience of the people of this county could say that that was quite the right way to look at the question of religion. It appeared to him that there was no form of fanaticism or superstition so gross that it would not be gradually swallowed by many people, if the necessary amount of clap-trap eloquence was delivered in support of it. He remembered, in a village in this county, the case of a poor labouring man who got a certain amount of following, simply because he persisted in saying that he saw visions. That man's visions consisted in the alleged seeing of a large golden bowl or basin, constantly descending from the skies, the bowl being full of what he was pleased to call "speckled dough," otherwise plum pudding. (Laughter.) That secured him for a time some following, though not of an influential character; and it afforded an instance of what some people would easily believe. He was perfectly convinced that the movement about to be started in this diocese, as set forth in the resolution he had proposed, would, next to the temperance movement, prove to be one of the best they could possibly have inaugurated. He was glad to see that an ordained priest of the Church of England was going to undertake the work, for he was sure he would have a much greater influence among the nomad populations he would be thrown amongst. (Cheers.)

*Archdeacon Buchanan* seconded the motion. In the course of the discussion the *Bishop* said he had licensed the Rev. Mr. Holt. He also read a letter from the Rev. H. P. Stokes, of Wareham, who said the diocese of Salisbury ought to be deeply grateful for having secured the services of such an experienced man. The letter, the Bishop added, was a most satisfactory one, and he was sure they would be only too glad to welcome this new clergyman amongst them. The movement was a modern one. He had never heard of it elsewhere, and he thought their thanks were due to Canon Olivier for having started it. (Cheers.)

*Canon Olivier* said Mr. Holt was fomerly a working man in an iron foundry, and was ordained by the Bishop of Lincoln. He had begun work in Wilton, and had been to Wareham; so far he had been well received. In the whole of the thirty vans at fairs Mr. Holt visited, it was satisfactory to find that all the children, without exception, had been baptised. The motion was agreed to.

*The Cathedral Commission.*

The *Dean* next moved the following resolution:—

"That the synod desires to express to the Cathedral Commissioners its approval of the recommendations to her Majesty, contained in the first report of the Royal Commission on Cathedrals, and recognises in these recommendations a desire to revive the true spirit of cathedral institutions, and to adapt them to the requirements of the respective dioceses of England."

After summarising the recommendations of the Commissioners, Dean Boyle said a good story was told of the late Lord Althorp, in whose integrity the House of Commons had the utmost confidence. He had fought the Reform Bill stage by stage, and won the admiration of both friends and foes. On one occasion an objection was raised, and his reply was, "There is an answer to that, but I forget what it is." (Laughter.) So great and absolute, however, was the confidence reposed in him that his motion was carried upon his mere *ipse dixit*. He (the Dean) was not claiming the same absolute confidence for the Royal Cathedral Commission, but still he was of opinion that there existed amongst its members great harmony of thought in promoting the best interests of the great cathedrals of the land. He would go further, and say that absolute harmony of opinion prevailed amongst the Canons of Salisbury Cathedral, and that the Bishop, the clergy, or the laity would have no reason to find fault with any practical suggestions which they might make to the Commissioners. Their great desire was to do everything they possibly could to preserve the historical associations and the *personnel* of the great institution with which it was their pride to be connected—to make it for ever a shrine for the worship of God in the most becoming and stately way—a place in which both the rich and poor, high and low, could find a religious home. They were proud of their old cathedral, and hoped and believed that as much good would be derived from it in the future as in the past. (Cheers.)

[illegible] resolution:

"That, with a view to the augmentation of poorer benefices, legislation is desirable, in order to extend further the principle of Queen Anne's Bounty and to levy a per-centage of 2l. per cent. on benefices whose net income exceeds 300l. per annum, and whose population is less than 600."

After considerable discussion the proposal was rejected almost unanimously.

*Bills in Parliament.*

On the motion of *Archdeacon Lear*, petitions were adopted in favour of the Places of Worship Sites Bill, and against the Burial Fees Bill and the Cemeteries Bill, and the Churchwardens Admission Bill. On the motion of *Mr. Buckley*, it was also resolved:—

"That the ordinaries of the diocese be requested to take some means of providing facilities for churchwardens who have been unable to attend the Visitation to make their declaration without the payment of a fee."

*The Sister's Marriage Bill.*

*Archdeacon Lear*, in moving the adoption of a petition against this measure, said he believed that the people who were advocating it were more or less selfish, and he believed that for the sake of those selfish persistent agitators, hundreds of households in this Christian land were in great danger. Such a reckless law as that would open the flood-gates of such a tide of misery as would carry them they knew not whither. He held in his hands a very remarkable pamphlet, entitled *A Village Talk between Two Parishioners*. He knew of no document which put forward in a clearer way the Scriptural arguments for maintaining the present marriage law as it was; and one of the advantages of that pamphlet was that it could be obtained for a penny. It was written by the Rev. Thomas Vincent, rector of Pusey. It was recommended to him by Bishop Hobhouse. An extremely valuable paper on the same subject was read by the Dean of Lichfield at the Lichfield Diocesan Conference.

*Admiral Fulford* seconded the adoption of the petition, which was carried *nem. con.*, though *Mr. C. H. Baskett* had spoken against it.

*Tithe.*

*Mr. J. N. Parham* moved the following resolution:—

"That the practice which generally prevails of the payment of tithe rent-charge by the occupiers of land is apparently contrary to the intention of the Tithe Commutation Act, in many cases conduces to ill-feeling between the clergy and their parishioners, and works a hardship on both of them; and that petitions be presented to Parliament in favour of Mr. Stanley Leighton's Tithe Rent-Charge Bill for the abolition of the present remedy by distress for the recovery of tithe rent-charge."

*Mr. R. M. Wilson*, in seconding the motion, said it had been said that the clergy had no other remedy than distress, but that was not strictly correct; for in the event of there being nothing to distrain on they had power to appeal to the sheriff to summon a jury to try the case, and if decided in their favour they had the privilege of holding the land for one year. But he did not think the clergy cared much about that *habere facias possessionem*. Supposing it were put into effect with regard to forty acres on Salisbury Plain. (Laughter.) It might be said the land could be cultivated, but he did not think the clergyman who took advantage of *habere facias possessionem* would be very well satisfied with it. (Laughter.) Mr. Wilson mentioned a case where the sum of 6s. 8d. had to be collected in respect of five cottages. Now each one of those five tenants was separately liable to be distrained upon for the whole 6s. 8d. Well, three or four of them put down their sixteen pence, and said, "I shan't pay any more; that's my share." Sometimes it would be a woman who refused to pay; he tried to reason with her, but there was a difficulty in reasoning with women—(laughter)—and it was not easy to impress upon them that they were, as tenants, bound to pay the tithes in respect of which the houses they occupied were assessed. One honest man once said to him, "You would not mislead me, so I'll pay;" but the other tenants, whose share he paid, did not repay him, and he (the speaker) could not conscientiously take the full amount from him the following year. In one case under a threat of distress he got the money from a man who was liable; and for that he got an uncommonly good wigging from Earl Nelson for having acted so cruelly. (Laughter.)

The *Marquis of Bath* thought the proposal would do little harm and as little good. No doubt it would be a great advantage to the clergy to receive their tithes in one payment from the landlord; but if the responsibility of collecting the tithes at their own risk were thrown on the landlords, a sufficient deduction to defray the cost of collection would have to be made. *Mr. Floyer* thought it would be an improvement to make a small addition to the rent in lieu of tithe; but he did not think it would be desirable that the land should be sold to pay arrears. *Mr. E. P. Squarey* approved of the proposal to collect the tithe from the landlord.

*Canon Hutchings* (Alderbury) said the proposal would make it more evident that the tenure by the tithe-owner and the landowner rested on the same footing. In 1869 the property of the Irish Church was confiscated on the plea of political necessity. The landowners in Ireland acquiesced in the spoliation of the Church because their property was increased in value thereby. But the very next year their turn came. The Land Act of 1870 obliged them to submit to sacrifices; eleven years later still greater sacrifices were required of them, and what might be the case ten years hence human foresight

© Reproduced with the permission of Cambridge University Library

could not tell. The very same process was now proposed for England. The Church might easily be robbed, but not with impunity to the State that robbed it. Let the masses once learn that by persistent and clamorous agitation they get a slice of other people's property, and they would never cease to agitate while anything remained to be got. It would be the beginning of the end for the happiness and glory of our country, and it was because the proposed motion would be a valuable help in staving off such a calamity that he hoped it would be unanimously accepted by the synod. (Cheers.)

*Mr. Walter Long* was strongly of opinion that if a grievance really existed it could easily be settled between landlords and the tithe-owners, without having recourse to legislation. *Sir Thomas Grove* said the money, after all, came from the pocket of the landlord, and there was no difficulty in the matter where a good feeling prevailed between landlord and tenant. *Mr. S. R. Baskett* and *J. G. Attwater* opposed the motion; but it was carried by a very large majority.

*Temperance.*

It having been resolved to reconstitute the Temperance Board of the diocese, and to place it on a footing similar to that of the Board of Missions, the *Rev. G. B. Oldfield* (Berwick St. Leonard's) moved:—

"That petitions be presented to both Houses of Parliament, praying that, in any amendment of the law relating to the liquor traffic, it be provided that all houses licensed for the sale of intoxicating liquors, whether to be consumed on the premises or not, be closed on Sunday, except for the sale of liquor to *bonâ fide* travellers."

The *Rev. H. C. Howard* (Aldbourne) seconded the motion. The *Rev. W. Savage* (Buscombe) moved:—

"That after the word 'travellers' there be added the words, 'and for consumption off the premises for one hour at midday, and between the hours of 8 and 9 p.m.'"

After some discussion the original motion was carried *nem. con.*, and the rider by 36 to 32.

*The Jews.*

*Sir J. E. Philipps* moved:—

"That whereas it is a duty incumbent on all Christians to endeavour to bring the Jews, especially those living in our midst, to the faith of Christ—and whereas it is to be feared that in many parishes of this diocese their claim on our sympathy is not brought before the congregations—and whereas, in addition to the London Society for Promoting Christianity among the Jews, there is now also the association of Parochial Missions to the Jews, working by means of licensed curates—this synod respectfully asks the Lord Bishop to take the subject into his consideration, and to devise means (whether by an instruction to the Board of Missions to take some action in the matter, or otherwise) for drawing forth more interest in this diocese in behalf of God's ancient people."

The *Bishop* said he was perfectly willing to do what was asked of him.

*Conclusion.*

On the motion of *Earl Nelson* it was agreed to establish a Diocesan Branch of the Young Men's Friendly Society; and after disposing of a few other matters.

The *Bishop* said—I wish to announce that the number of the members attending the synod has amounted to 252, of whom 6 were *ex officio* members; 77 from the archdeaconry of Sarum—33 clergy and 44 laity; 47 from the rural deanery of Wilts—26 clergy and 21 laymen; and 122 on the whole from Dorset—59 clergy and 63 laymen. It is very remarkable how the numbers tally. From the county of Wilts there have been 124 altogether, and from the county of Dorset there have been 122. The attendance has been good. It has not been so large as once or twice, but it has been a good average attendance, and I may venture to say it has been a very interesting session. (Cheers.) I think that in some respects it has been eminently good. I think that if we had done no more than to set on foot and receive the reports we have of the promise and prospects of the Itinerant Missions, that is a very considerable thing done. I have never heard of such a thing done in any other diocese. It is a new thought. We owe it to our good friend Canon Olivier, and I think there is every prospect of its being an extremely valuable operation. (Cheers.) I think it has been a very valuable session, and I thank God for it.

His lordship then pronounced the Benediction.

## CHURCH OF ENGLAND TEMPERANCE SOCIETY.

The annual meeting was held yesterday week in the Library of Lambeth Palace, *Canon Ellison*, the chairman of the executive committee, presiding. Letters of apology were read from the Archbishop of Canterbury, the Duke of Westminster, the Bishops of London, Winchester, Carlisle, and Bedford, and the Dean of York. Last year returns were reported from 20 dioceses, showing 302,610 members; this year there are 339,687 members in 25 dioceses, including 160,357 juvenile total abstainers in 20 dioceses. Last year the total receipts were 7,311l.; from the 18th of April, 1881, to 22nd of Feb. last they were 7,551l.

In opening the proceedings, the *Chairman* warmly congratulated the meeting on the figures in the Chancellor of the Exchequer's Budget. "He says that the revenue from strong drink, which in the year 1868 amounted to 23 millions, had in 1875 reached 31 millions, but in 1882 has fallen to 28½ millions, a diminution of one-eighth. In wine, the article which, of course, circulates most freely amongst the higher classes, the decrease is actually one-fifth. He goes on to say that in 1874 and 1875 we levied 51 per cent. of the whole taxes from alcoholic liquor, and 49 per cent. from other sources. Now, only 46½ per cent. is raised from liquor, and 53½ per cent. from other sources. It is a most terrible fact, that very nearly half of the whole revenue of the country should be derived from alcoholic liquors. I quite believe that when Mr. Gladstone—whom we all know is a good man—(loud cheers)—was casting about to see what the causes of the falling-off were, there must have been in his mind, as Chancellor of the Exchequer, many a lingering retrospect of those wonderful years when the revenue went up by leaps and bounds through the consumption of alcoholic drinks. But I am quite sure that when Mr. Gladstone came to think of the matter in his own inmost heart, he rejoiced to be able to say what he has said." The Savings-bank returns, increasing largely as they had done in the face of lower wages, showed that the diminished consumption of liquor must in part at least be attributed to the more temperate habits of the people. The rev. gentleman proceeded to dwell on the great importance of systematic prayer as the necessary concomitant of other means. He regretted to find that the yield of the duty on coffee had decreased from 207,000l. in 1874 to 189,000 in 1881, instead of growing, as they had hoped to see it; but he rejoiced to find that Mr. Gladstone was proposing to inflict a heavy penalty upon adulteration. The most painful feature in the present aspect of the drink question was that in the face of a general diminution of the consumption of intoxicating drinks, there was an alarming increase of intemperance among women:—"The report of the committee of the House of Lords speaks of this increase as 'on a scale so vast, and at a rate of progression so rapid, as to constitute a new reproach and danger.' The clergy all bear witness to the same thing. They say that they have far greater difficulty now with the householder who had a sick wife or child, for whom brandy was recommended, could not get it except by going to the public-house; and therefore Mr. Gladstone said, 'Let us have these licenses which will enable us to send the householder to another and to a better vehicle for distribution.' Observe what it has issued in. When Mr. Gilbey, who has two thousand agencies throughout the country, was asked whether it would not be possible to separate the spirit from the wine license, he said, 'That will never do.' 'Why not?' 'Because you would take away the greater source of our profit.' 'You do not mean to say that the spirit license is the greater source of profit to you?' 'Yes,' he said, 'I do.' 'Tell us what is the amount of spirits that you circulate through your two thousand agencies in proportion to wine?' 'Bottle for bottle, about the same.' That is a terrible thing; but I believe there is a still more terrible thing looming before us, and it is, that the Legislature having made one false step may follow it up by another even worse. There is a bill before the House of Commons proposing to put these licences into the hands of the magistrates, exactly as the public-houses are, the result of which no doubt would be that for a time you would stop the growth and increase of them: but you would stereotype the evil. You give them immediately a *status* that they have never had before. You constitute a new monopoly, and with that monopoly a new vested interest, and the moment we come to deal with it, as we hope we shall do when we get the principle of local control conceded, the holders of these licences may come before us and say 'We are now in the position of publicans. If we are to be got rid of it can only be by a large amount of compensation,' and there the difficulty will be in every way increased. I am afraid we have no power of doing anything at all to stop that. Individually, perhaps, we may. In the meanwhile let us bear in mind our Women's Union, which has been organised for the express purpose of dealing with female intemperance. We say that the women need special treatment; they have their own special habits, and if women will only organise themselves, take this matter up, and bring into it all their own sympathy, earnestness, tenderness, and love, of which we have experience in so many other respects, we say that then those spared to meet together at the end of another ten years will be able to add to all the additional—I don't like the word triumphs—blessings which God hath conferred upon us, that they shall no longer say that the intemperance of women is increasing in a terrible way." (Cheers.)

*Canon Ernest Wilberforce* moved the first resolution, which expressed thankfulness for the blessing which had been vouchsafed to the work of the society during the last twenty years. The rev. gentleman stated that in Liverpool there was last year 7,000 fewer committals for drunkenness in the streets than in 1876; and the success of the coffee palaces was something wonderful, no less than 70,000l. having been taken in them last year. Still the society must not allow itself to live in anything like a fool's paradise or shut its eyes to the vastness of the work. Its two arms or branches must be used with all the power and all the enthusiasm that could be found in English hearts and English breasts. For his own part, he believed most firmly in one of those arms, as the real one to reach the suffering poor—(cheers)—but let them not think for a moment that he undervalued the other. He believed that with both arms they could gather into the broad bosom of the society all the real strength they needed in this great contest, and that unless they had both those arms they would lose a vast part of that strength, and would never bring their work to a successful issue.

*Earl Stanhope* seconded the motion, which was agreed to.

*Sir John Coode* then moved the following:—

"That in view of the rapid increase of female intemperance and the excessive public and private drinking which still remained unchecked, this meeting pledges itself to renewed efforts during the coming year to extend and promote the threefold objects of this society by means of the various agencies recommended in the report.

Sir John enforced the benefits of total abstinence by his personal experience in all sorts of climate. "On one occasion I was walking, in the middle of the day, in the snow on the top of the Sierra Nevada, and on the next day I travelled across the burning plains of California under a July sun—and they are burning plains there, I can tell you. I said to my travelling companions, 'I really never experienced anything like this in all my life; it is just like driving before a burning furnace.' It happened a few days after that I learned what I was quite ignorant of then, that the name 'California' is derived from two Spanish words, which really mean 'burning furnace.' Having driven a whole day across that hot plain, after the day before being in the snows of the Sierra Nevada, everybody else in the public conveyance in which I found myself freely resorted to alcoholic drinks. I did not, and I am bound to say that I came out of the ordeal as well as most of them. (Cheers.) It was my misfortune some six years ago, to be one of a number who suffered most severely from a case of blood-poisoning. I was almost in *extremis*. Thank God, I was in London, where the best medical skill was available. A most critical operation was performed. The operation was critical in itself, but, as I learned afterwards, it was far more critical in what might happen afterwards. Within the short space of three days and four nights I had arrived at the stage which, in similar cases, occupies sometimes weeks and sometimes months, and the medical men distinctly assured me that, under God, I owed my life to the fact of my having been a total abstainer for so many years." (Cheers.)

*Mr. Frank A. Bevan* seconded the resolution, which was unanimously adopted; and the meeting closed with votes of thanks to the Archbishop for the use of the Library, and to Canon Ellison for presiding. The *Bishop of Ballanrat* then pronounced the Benediction.

On Wednesday *Lord Mount-Temple* presided at a large meeting of the Total Abstinence Society, which was held at Exeter Hall. The noble lord, in opening the meeting, dwelt upon the many auspicious circumstances now attended the movement. One of these was the fact that the Home Secretary had given up wine for the sake of his health, "and I venture to think," said Lord Mount-Temple, "that the cheerful wit and sanguine good humour which Sir W. Harcourt displays, arise from the fact that he is a water drinker." (Cheers and laughter.) The noble lord said that it was now seven years since he had abandoned all alcoholic drinks, and his experience was that his brain was clearer, his nerves stronger, his heart lighter, and his purse heavier for the change. (Cheers.)

The *Rev. G. Everard*, of Wolverhampton, drew a striking picture of the spectacle which would meet the eyes of those on the platform if the hall were filled with the victims of drink that might be gathered out of the neighbourhood, or out of any other neighbourhood in any of our large towns. He allowed himself a single glass of wine a day till he stood by the grave of Frances Ridley Havergal, and the thought occurred to him that if she, a delicate woman, had been able to abstain for so many years, why should not he? (Cheers.)

The meeting was also addressed by the *Hon. T. H. W. Pelham* and the *Rev. J. W. Horsley*, Chaplain of Clerkenwell prison, who spoke on the subject of legislative action, announcing that though a clergyman he humorous speech, presented himself as an awful example of temperance, having, as he said, walked 56,000 miles in fourteen years. While in America he had been frowned upon by other religious bodies, because they said that his feats tended to encourage gambling and breaking the Sabbath, both of which imputations he earnestly denied. The clergy of the Episcopal Church, on the other hand, had given him their patronage, because they thought he was doing good service, by instilling into young men a love for athletic sports instead of loafing about bar-rooms. He also spoke in the warmest terms of the result he had seen from the establishment of society's coffee taverns and barrows, which the publicans admitted had struck the only real blow that the trade had yet received.

During the evening an excellent musical entertainment was given by the band of the Holy Trinity, Kilburn, branch, and by a choir of three hundred voices, under the direction of Mr. G. J. Chapple.

On Thursday afternoon the annual conference of the Women's Union was held at St. James's Hall, the *Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol* in the chair. The Secretary, *Miss Haslam*, read the report, from which it appeared that the Union, which was organised at a meeting presided over by the right rev. prelate in February, 1881, had already two diocesan centres—Exeter and Oxford—and that its total membership could not be far short of a thousand. The report having, on the motion of *Mr. H. S. Wyld*, seconded by *Mr. Robert Sawyer*, been adopted, *Bishop Ellicott* addressed the meeting on the great importance of women's work in the cause of temperance; and called upon *Mrs. Reaney*, author of *Our Daughters*, to read a paper on "What to do with our Children." Premising that to be earnest one must sometimes seem a little narrow, she urged on parents not only to bring up their little ones in the principles of the strictest abstinence, but to interest them from their earliest years in the good cause. In the course of her paper Mrs. Reaney related an extremely telling incident which had been witnessed in one of the Welsh mountains. A mother, sending off her two little children to school, was heard telling them again and again not to go near the cliff; and a bystander having remarked to her, "I wonder you can send them that way by themselves," she turned upon the speaker almost fiercely, and asked, "Do you think that if there were any other road I would do so?" Mrs. Reaney's application of the story was to point out that parents had another road besides that which lay by the side of the awful cliff of intemperance—the way of total abstinence. *Mrs. Casson*, a member of the executive, read a paper, "The Woman's Union, and its branches of work." In it she suggested the allowance to servants of extra tea, coffee, cocoa, and milk, instead of beer, and the proper ventilation of kitchens. Even to coachmen, and even cabmen, who had frequently to wait for hours in the wet and cold, she suggested similar treatment; but she thought it was idle to attempt to improve the position of barmaids. In America they were unknown, and it was a disgrace to this country that an occupation so unsuitable for young women should be tolerated. A paper by *Mrs. Wightman*, of Shrewsbury, author of *Haste to the Rescue*, was read by the Secretary. It chiefly inculcated the display of more interest by mistresses in their servants. Papers had also been promised by *Mrs. Papillon*, a member of the executive of the Young Women's Help Society, and *Miss Ada Leigh*, of the Young Englishwomen's Home, Paris, but neither was able to attend.

In a conversation which followed, *Mr. Harriot* deprecated the idea of taking tea or coffee except at the usual hours, feeling confident that to do so would only excite a habit of thirst. *Mrs. Piper*, the wife of a Church Missionary Society's missionary in Japan, home on furlough, stated that when she went out she was assured by everybody that she and her husband would never be able to abstain because the water was so bad. But they did abstain for all that. They boiled and filtered their water, and did very well. But even if it had been true that beer or wine was necessary to sustain our bodily strength, who said it was necessary that we should be strong in order to serve the Lord? As for self-denial, to those who had left home and friends and travelled to the other side of the world in order to preach the Gospel, it seemed strange to hear people talk of the self-denial of giving up a particular drink. *Mrs. Sands* followed, with an interesting account of a work in which she was engaged amongst the sailors and soldiers at Cork.

In the evening a festival service was held at St. Paul's, the choir of the Lay-Helpers' Association mustering in great force for the occasion. The anthem was "Strike your timbrels," from Schubert's *Song of Miriam*. The following was

*The Bishop of Carlisle's Sermon.*

Verily I say unto you, If ye have faith as a grain of mustard-seed, ye shall say unto this mountain, Remove hence to yonder place; and it shall remove; and nothing shall be impossible unto you.—St. Matt. xvii. 20.

The disciples had failed in an attempt to perform a great work of mercy which the word of Jesus Christ effected at once—"Jesus rebuked the devil; and he departed out of him, and the child was cured from that very hour." Why could not they cast him out? Why was the word of command, when spoken by delegated power, less effectual than when it came direct from the source of power itself? Want of faith would seem to have been the cause: not precisely "unbelief," according to the ordinary signification attached to the word, but rather "little faith," according to the more accurate rendering of the Revised Version; it was not blank "unbelief" which caused Peter to sink upon the Lake of Galilee, when Jesus put forth His hand and saved him, saying—"O thou, of little faith;" it is not "unbelief" in any harsh sense of the word that cripples the hands of many a disciple of Christ in our own days, who would willingly do works of mercy in his Master's name, but feels himself constantly unable to do them; it is the little energy, the little vital force, the little wisdom, which correspond to "little faith." And when the disciples failed to do a great work which they wished and tried to do, the Lord opened their minds to perceive a defect in their ministry and a defect in themselves, which apparently they did not suspect, certainly the importance of which they did not realise, and He gave them a lesson which should last during their whole lives, and be applicable to all the difficulties of their Apostolic work. Nay, He gave a lesson, not only to the twelve to whom He spoke, but also to all His servants, and their successors to the end of the world. He taught that in all efforts made for Him, "little faith" can do nothing, and that real faith, even "as a grain of mustard-seed," can remove mountains. The very charter of the Christian ministry—and in the Christian ministry I would include all work undertaken in the name and for the sake of Christ—may be said to be contained in the words, "If ye have faith as a grain of mustard-seed, ye shall say unto this mountain, Remove hence to yonder place; and it shall remove; and nothing shall be impossible unto you."

I must not go on to quote the next words, because the Revised Version omits them, although they seem to have not a little authority in their favour. In fact, in the parallel passage of St. Mark you find the words, "This kind can come out by nothing, save by prayer." I

© Reproduced with the permission of Cambridge University Library

## [illegible] SOCIETY.

The annual meeting was held yesterday week in the Library of Lambeth Palace, *Canon Ellison*, the chairman of the executive committee, presiding. Letters of apology were read from the Archbishop of Canterbury, the Duke of Westminster, the Bishops of London, Winchester, Carlisle, and Bedford, and the Dean of York. Last year returns were reported from 20 dioceses, showing 302,610 members; this year there are 339,687 members in 25 dioceses, including 160,357 juvenile total abstainers in 20 dioceses. Last year the total receipts were 7,311*l.*; from the 18th of April, 1881, to 22nd of Feb. last they were 7,551*l.*

In opening the proceedings, the *Chairman* warmly congratulated the meeting on the figures in the Chancellor of the Exchequer's Budget. "He says that the revenue from strong drink, which in the year 1868 amounted to 23 millions, had in 1875 reached 31 millions, but in 1882 has fallen to 28½ millions, a diminution of one-eighth. In wine, the article which, of course, circulates most freely amongst the higher classes, the decrease is actually one-fifth. He goes on to say that in 1874 and 1875 we levied 51 per cent. of the whole taxes from alcoholic liquor, and 49 per cent. from other sources. Now, only 46½ per cent. is raised from liquor, and 53½ per cent. from other sources. It is a most terrible fact, that very nearly half of the whole revenue of the country should be derived from alcoholic liquors. I quite believe that when Mr. Gladstone—whom we all know is a good man—(loud cheers)—was casting about to see what the causes of the falling-off were, there must have been in his mind, as Chancellor of the Exchequer, many a lingering retrospect of those wonderful years when the revenue went up by leaps and bounds through the consumption of alcoholic drinks. But I am quite sure that when Mr. Gladstone came to think of the matter in his own inmost heart, he rejoiced to be able to say what he has said." The Savings-bank returns, increasing largely as they had done in the face of lower wages, showed that the diminished consumption of liquor must in part at least be attributed to the more temperate habits of the people. The rev. gentleman proceeded to dwell on the great importance of systematic prayer as the necessary concomitant of other means. He regretted to find that the yield of the duty on coffee had decreased from 207,000*l.* in 1874 to 189,000 in 1881, instead of growing, as they had hoped to see it; but he rejoiced to find that Mr. Gladstone was proposing to inflict a heavy penalty upon adulteration. The most painful feature in the present aspect of the drink question was that in the face of a general diminution of the consumption of intoxicating drinks, there was an alarming increase of intemperance among women:—"The report of the committee of the House of Lords speaks of this increase as 'on a scale so vast, and at a rate of progression so rapid, as to constitute a new reproach and danger.' The clergy all bear witness to the same thing. They say that they have far greater difficulty now with the women than they have with the men. In one police-court where a brother of mine is a magistrate—it is the police-court of this parish—the returns for the first three months of the present year were as follows:—Men, 301; women, 240—only, therefore, one-fifth less. Now, just carry your mind's eye over all the other police-courts of the metropolis, and of our towns throughout the country, and remember that these poor things who fall into the hands of the police are only those who have come down at last to the miserable state of things which leads them into the public-house, and then brings them out into the streets to fall into the hands of the first policeman who will take pity on them. Remember what an enormous amount of drinking, quite apart from that, the returns represent. Remember that the doctrine of hereditary transmission, which has been proved beyond all doubt as a scientific fact, shows that if drunkards become mothers they must transmit to their posterity the tendency to their own vice, which will go on multiplying and ramifying through endless progenies, very soon, as the old heathen poet says, 'to bring into the world a progeny more vicious than themselves.' Remember what the family life in England is becoming, and ask yourselves what are the causes? I believe one is the grocers' spirit licenses, which have been in existence since 1861. They were introduced with a totally different object, and I wish to separate these from the wine licenses of the previous year. The wine licenses were given to grocers to introduce light French wines, but the spirit licenses were given to give effect to a recommendation of another committee of the House of Lords in 1854, which suggested that as the wholesale dealer in spirits was not permitted to retail spirits in quantities less than two gallons, the poor [illegible] burning furnace there, I can tell you. I said to my travelling companions, 'I really never experienced anything like this in all my life; it is just like driving before a burning furnace.' It happened a few days after that I learned what I was quite ignorant of then, that the name 'California' is derived from two Spanish words, which really mean 'burning furnace.' Having driven a whole day across that hot plain, after the day before being in the snows of the Sierra Nevada, everybody else in the public conveyance in which I found myself freely resorted to alcoholic drinks. I did not, and I am bound to say that I came out of the ordeal as well as most of them. (Cheers.) It was my misfortune some six years ago, to be one of a number who suffered most severely from a case of blood-poisoning. I was almost *in extremis*. Thank God, I was in London, where the best medical skill was available. A most critical operation was performed. The operation was critical in itself, but, as I learned afterwards, it was far more critical in what might happen afterwards. Within the short space of three days and four nights I had arrived at the stage which, in similar cases, occupies sometimes weeks and sometimes months, and the medical men distinctly assured me that, under God, I owed my life to the fact of my having been a total abstainer for so many years." (Cheers.)

*Mr. Frank A. Bevan* seconded the resolution, which was unanimously adopted; and the meeting closed with votes of thanks to the Archbishop for the use of the Library, and to Canon Ellison for presiding. The *Bishop of Ballaarat* then pronounced the Benediction.

---

On Wednesday *Lord Mount-Temple* presided at a large meeting of the Total Abstinence Society, which was held at Exeter Hall. The noble lord, in opening the meeting, dwelt upon the many auspicious circumstances which now attended the movement. One of these was the fact that the Home Secretary had given up wine for the sake of his health, "and I venture to think," said Lord Mount-Temple, "that the cheerful wit and sanguine good humour which Sir W. Harcourt displays, arise from the fact that he is a water drinker." (Cheers and laughter.) The noble lord said that it was now seven years since he had abandoned all alcoholic drinks, and his experience was that his brain was clearer, his nerves stronger, his heart lighter, and his purse heavier for the change. (Cheers.)

The *Rev. G. Everard*, of Wolverhampton, drew a striking picture of the spectacle which would meet the eyes of those on the platform if the hall were filled with the victims of drink that might be gathered out of the neighbourhood, or out of any other neighbourhood in any of our large towns. He allowed himself a single glass of wine a day till he stood by the grave of Frances Ridley Havergal, and the thought occurred to him that if she, a delicate woman, had been able to abstain for so many years, why should not he? (Cheers.)

The meeting was also addressed by the *Hon. T. H. W. Pelham* and the *Rev. J. W. Horsley*, Chaplain of Clerkenwell prison, who spoke on the subject of legislative action, announcing that though a clergyman he was a citizen, if not a democrat. The phrase that you could not make men sober or moral by Act of Parliament, was partly a truism and partly an untruth. If our Lord wept over Jerusalem because she would not listen to His loving entreaties, it was clear that no edict of Pontius Pilate would have made her better. Therefore the phrase was a truism; but it was also untrue because it was obviously in the power of Parliament to make it easier for men to walk in the right path. At all events two of the most notable men in our history had given it a flat denial, the Duke of Wellington and Mr. Gladstone, for both of them had attempted to make England sober by Act of Parliament, and both of them had lamentably failed—the Duke with his Beer Act and Mr. Gladstone's proposals with regard to light wines and spirits. The Church of England Temperance Society could not accept the platform of the United Kingdom Alliance, but they wanted to have the Beer Act and the grocers' licenses abolished. (Cheers.) They also desired to see the order withdrawn by which the police were instructed to let persons arrested for drunkenness go if they would give their addresses, and then to summons them. Such an order was a mere farce. Then he desired to see the question of licensing committed to local boards elected *ad hoc*. (Cheers.) That step would decide the question of Sunday and early closing, for which the society, as a body, was unable to go. (Loud cries of dissent.) Lastly, no good would be done until penalties for drunkenness were made cumulative, and the endorsement of licences compulsory. (Cheers.)

*Mr. E. P. Weston*, the celebrated American pedestrian, in a [illegible] to hear people talk of the self-denial of giving up a particular drink. *Mrs. Sands* followed, with an interesting account of a work in which she was engaged amongst the sailors and soldiers at Cork.

---

In the evening a festival service was held at St. Paul's, the choir of the Lay-Helpers' Association mustering in great force for the occasion. The anthem was "Strike your timbrels," from Schubert's *Song of Miriam*. The following was

### *The Bishop of Carlisle's Sermon.*

Verily I say unto you, If ye have faith as a grain of mustard-seed, ye shall say unto this mountain, Remove hence to yonder place; and it shall remove; and nothing shall be impossible unto you.—*St. Matt.* xvii. 20.

The disciples had failed in an attempt to perform a great work of mercy which the word of Jesus Christ effected at once—"Jesus rebuked the devil; and he departed out of him, and the child was cured from that very hour." Why could not they cast him out? Why was the word of command, when spoken by delegated power, less effectual than when it came direct from the source of power itself? Want of faith would seem to have been the cause: not precisely "unbelief," according to the ordinary signification attached to the word, but rather "little faith," according to the more accurate rendering of the Revised Version; it was not blank "unbelief" which caused Peter to sink upon the Lake of Galilee, when Jesus put forth His hand and saved him, saying—"O thou, of little faith;" it is not "unbelief" in any harsh sense of the word that cripples the hands of many a disciple of Christ in our own days, who would willingly do works of mercy in his Master's name, but finds himself somehow unable to do them; it is the little energy, the little vital force, the little wisdom, which correspond to "little faith." And when the disciples failed to do a great work which they wished and tried to do, the Lord opened their minds to perceive a defect in their ministry and a defect in themselves, which apparently they did not suspect, certainly the importance of which they did not realise, and He gave them a lesson which should last during their whole lives, and be applicable to all the difficulties of their Apostolic work. Nay, He gave a lesson, not only to the twelve to whom He spoke, but also to all His servants, and their successors to the end of the world. He taught that in all efforts made for Him, "little faith" can do nothing, and that real faith, even "as a grain of mustard-seed," can remove mountains. The very charter of the Christian ministry—and in the Christian ministry I would include all work undertaken in the name and for the sake of Christ—may be said to be contained in the words, "If ye have faith as a grain of mustard-seed, ye shall say unto this mountain, Remove hence to yonder place; and it shall remove; and nothing shall be impossible unto you."

I must not go on to quote the next words, because the Revised Version omits them, although they seem to have not a little authority in their favour. In fact, in the parallel passage of St. Mark you find the words, "This kind can come out by nothing, save by prayer." I observe also that in the somewhat parallel passage in St. Matt. xxi., where the Lord takes occasion from the barren fig tree which had died under His curse to give a lesson concerning faith almost the same as that which I have taken for a text, the words follow, and are admitted as genuine, "All things whatsoever ye shall ask in prayer, believing, ye shall receive." I am thankful that these words concerning prayer have stood the ordeal of the late revision. One seems to crave a reference to prayer after a lesson on the importance of faith. Prayer seems to be the voice by which faith must express itself: it is almost, or even quite, impossible to conceive of faith coming into action except in connection with and by means of the utterance of prayer.

For the faith of which our Lord speaks is emphatically "faith in God." According to St. Mark our Lord used the very words while drawing His lesson from the withered fig-tree; not merely have faith, but have faith in God; there are things lower and less than God in which faith may be placed, and faith so placed may do great wonders. Faith in a principle is a mighty power; faith in himself is sometimes the foundation of remarkable deeds, and of success in life. Faith in some supposed truth, which one man sees clearly and which the multitude cannot see, has not unfrequently proved to be "the substance of things hoped for, and the evidence of things not seen." Thus it was that Mahomet succeeded in founding a religion, which, for evil or for good, has been one of the influential features in the world's history. Thus it was that Columbus with his two small barques steered westward till he found the anticipated land; thus it was that Clarkson and Wilberforce abolished the slave-trade: thus it was that

© Reproduced with the permission of Cambridge University Library

Richard Cobden transformed an whole commercial system: the history of the world, secular as well as religious, is full of the records of deeds of faith. But faith in God is the highest faith of all: and the Apostles were bid to have this; they, too, were to have faith in the Gospel which they preached: they were to have faith in the truths concerning Christ crucified and risen again and ascended into heaven, which they held in trust for mankind: they, too, in a certain sense, might have faith in themselves and in the goodness of their cause; but, above all, they were to have faith in a personal God, in a heavenly Father, in a just and righteous Ruler, in One Who had sent His Holy Spirit to be ever with them, to guide them into all truth, to make His strength perfect in their weakness, to be with them to the end of the world.

Now I think it is interesting in general, and in particular useful with reference to the subject which we have specially in mind to-day, to consider in what way the Apostles actually worked out the lessons which our Lord gave them concerning faith. The lessons which the Lord gave them while He was yet with them were doubtless intended to guide them when they were left to themselves; they were at school with Him; He dropped into their minds many maxims and precepts and seeds of thought which He knew that they would not understand at the time, intending that the things said should be brought to remembrance by the power of the Holy Ghost, and should then be comprehended in all their fulness, and be guides to their feet and lanterns to their paths. Well, then, how did they deal with the mountains of difficulty which they had to remove in order to lay the foundations of the Church? How did they put in practice the precept of their Lord, that they should command the mountains in faith to be removed? and in what way and to what degree did they realise the fulfilment of the promise that a command so given and backed by prayer should be forthwith obeyed, and that nothing should be impossible?

It is plain that you may easily conceive a very wild and fanatical system of attempts to propagate the Gospel being based upon our Lord's words literally taken. You may conceive, for example, of St. Peter on the day of Pentecost, instead of arguing calmly with the people and declaring the facts connected with the life and death of Jesus of Nazareth, attempting some striking miracle which would batter down all opposition; or you can conceive St. Paul at Ephesus, instead of pleading his cause in the theatre, commanding the great Temple of Diana to be removed and cast into the sea; in fact, you may conceive a course of conduct as different as possible from that which the Apostles with one consent and in their corporate capacity actually adopted. Look at the history contained in the Book of the Acts of the Apostles, or at the incidental living history which comes out in the Epistles, and you will see that the whole work of the Apostles is a combination of faith and prayer with judgment and calm, quiet, good sense: they were conspicuously what we should call—I know of no better phrase than the common one—good men of business; like all such men they attended to small matters as well as great: when difficulties arose they took counsel together, and discussed the difficulties in a general meeting; they framed rules when rules were necessary; they never forgot that in this world prudence is as necessary with regard to the kingdom of God as it is with regard to mere worldly success: this was the way in which the Apostles founded and governed the Church of Christ. Look at the New Testament, and you will perceive that it was so: the Acts and the Epistles, as I have already said, tell the same tale. And yet the Apostles would have been the last men to put trust in their own wisdom, or their business capacity, or their powers of organisation. At all times of their ministry, in bright days and in dark, in the Council Chamber at Jerusalem, or in prison for the name of Christ, in legislating the Churches, or in dealing with individual hearts and consciences, in striving by all manner of means to cast out the legion of devils by which mankind was possessed, they would have in their minds such words as these, "If ye have faith as a grain of mustard seed, ye shall say unto this mountain, Remove hence to yonder place, and it shall remove; and nothing shall be impossible unto you."

It seems to me that we may very well, in the light and under the influence of such considerations as these which I have been putting before you, discuss that special subject which is in our mind just now. Discuss? Well, perhaps that is not quite the word. It is too large a subject and too difficult a one to be discussed in the pulpit, and by one person who has the argument all in his own hands; but, at all events, I think that I may use the remarks, which I have hitherto been engaged in making, as the basis of a few others on the subject of the temperance question and of the Church of England Temperance Society, which may commend themselves to the minds of those who have taken part in this festival service.

For, in truth, what I should desire above all things to do upon this occasion is to impress upon you the deep necessity of dealing with the temperance question in the spirit and upon the principles which were instilled into the minds of the Apostles by the Lord Himself, and which they carried out and exemplified when He was gone to the right hand of God. I do not care to draw terrible pictures of the evil with which you desire to contend. I believe that it is impossible to exaggerate the evil or to draw pictures of misery and want, and crime, and inherited tendency to sin and depravity, more horrible than the stern reality exhibited by daily life; but it is just because the evils connected with drink are so patent and so undeniable, that I am content to pass over that side of the subject, to assume that you know as much of the said subject as you need to know. What I would rather do would be to say something as to the manner in which the mountain may be moved, and as to the progress which has been made in moving it.

Now I think that we are acting in a way which the Apostles would approve, when we bring all the appliances of the Church to bear upon this question. To say that the Church of England has become awake only during the past few years to the evil and sin of intemperance, is to say what is absurd and false; but it is quite true that it is only within the last few years that the Church has had a distinct organisation and machinery for this purpose. The necessity of the case seemed to call for this special organisation, and it is matter for thankfulness, and I trust a sign of vigorous life, that the new work has been taken up as it has been. So far as my experience informs me, there are scarcely any public meetings which are more enthusiastic than those which are held in connection with the temperance question; and though there is sometimes a tendency to exaggeration and one-sidedness in such meetings, and a temptation to follow the example of Moses, of whom we heard last Sunday, as smiting the rock rather than speaking to it, in order to procure water for the people, still it cannot be doubted that the minds of men have been deeply stirred by the statements and appeals that have been made, that the opinions formed in these meetings influence Parliament, and that the way is prepared for legislation so soon as the statesman arises who can say what the legislation should be.

But besides public demonstration, there is much quiet valuable work going on in the way of spreading information, pleading the cause of temperance by books and tracts, and specially by the bringing up the young in good ways. In hundreds of parishes temperance is [illegible] which it never was before. Temper-

But the point which I am chiefly led by the line of thought adopted in this sermon, and by the solemn surroundings of this place, to impress upon you is, that while all this organisation and machinery, these efforts direct and indirect, these labours public and private, are working in the cause of temperance, the basis of faith in God must not be wanting: it is a case in which pre-eminently you need faith in God to bring success and to comfort you in apparent or temporary failure. David was once much troubled and puzzled with the anomalies of the world, and betook his troubles and his puzzles into the Temple of the Lord: and Hezekiah, that good and righteous king, when he had received a letter which almost overwhelmed him, went up to the Lord's house and spread it and his grief before his God: may not we also do the same? nay, are we not bound as wise men and as Christians to do so? The sin of drunkenness is heavy upon our dear native country: we feel the weight: we would try to lift it: we will use all the means that parochial organisations, and cheap literature, and popular lectures, and counter attractions, and the opportunities of teaching the young, and public meetings, and appeals to Parliament—all these and other means for emancipating our native land; but after all we will not forget that it is faith in God that can alone work miracles, and that all our honest and industrious efforts may fail, unless we stir up our faith, and say to the great mountain, "In the Name of God the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, be thou removed and cast into the sea!"

Is the mountain moving? I believe that it is. I am not sanguine enough—I might, perhaps, say foolish enough—to believe that England will within a short time assert her character as a conspicuously temperate country; but I think that we have seen the worst, that much improvement has been made, that there are indications of more improvement still.

I am convinced that the tone of public opinion is much altered for the better. A little earnestness about temperance is not considered a sign of folly. Candidates for seats in Parliament have to accept temperance as one of the questions with which they have to deal. The temperance vote is an important factor in most elections. Moreover the young men are much in earnest on the subject, and the young men of this generation will be the chief influence in the next. I can easily understand that some persons may think that the course which public opinion is following is not a wise course: they have a right to their opinion; but that public opinion is strengthening in the direction in which the Church of England Temperance Society would wish it to strengthen, I think there can be no manner of doubt.

Then, again, the tone of discussion in Parliament is improved. I do not say that Parliament, as yet, sees its way as to what should be done; I do not think it does, and I am not surprised. The question is beset by difficulties; but certainly whenever the subject does come forward for practical legislation, we may be quite certain that no other principle will be tolerated except that which deals with the question as a great moral and religious question, in which the deepest interests are involved.

And still further, if you look at actual results you may find indication of the abatement of the plague. In his Budget speech on Monday last Mr. Gladstone spoke of the falling off of the revenue arising from beer and spirits, and he distinctly attributed this falling off to the increase of temperate habits. It is, of course, somewhat difficult to arrive at certainty on a subject of this kind: one year's or a few years' experience does not prove much: still it is something to find the Chancellor of the Exchequer speaking as he did, and when one knows of the great increase of houses of refreshment where intoxicating drinks are not sold, when one knows that these houses are flourishing and paying, and when we find the revenue raised from the tax on tea amounting to no less than four millions, it does seem difficult to believe that the mountain is not moving perceptibly, though it may be still a long way from the sea.

But, perhaps, the most hopeful—at all events one of the most hopeful signs of progress—is the gathering together of such congregations as this, for the purpose of invoking the blessing of God upon the temperance cause and upon temperance work. Can such gatherings—and this is only one of a multitude, only the most conspicuous, not necessarily the most effective or the most blessed—can such gatherings as this be wholly in vain? Are we all men of little faith, whose hands are paralysed and whose tongues are incapable of speaking words of power, because the live coal of faith from the altar of God has not touched them? Is there not faith as a grain of mustard seed in the heart of each or any of those who are here present, or of those who sympathise with us? God forbid that we should believe that it can be thus. No, we will show our faith by our works, and our faith will grow as we go on working for God. We will give all our wisdom and all our might, and yet, after all, we will bear in mind those eternally living words, "Not by wisdom, nor by might; but by My Spirit, saith the Lord of Hosts." Ah! those words also were spoken in connection with the moving of a mountain. There were mountains to be moved in the days of Zerubbabel, as there were in the days of the Apostles, as there are now. Why should we not go on with the quotation, and say as the prophet Zechariah said, "Who art thou, O great mountain? Before Zerubbabel thou shalt become a plain; and he shall bring forth the headstone with shoutings, crying, Grace, grace unto it!"

## MR. DARWIN'S FUNERAL.

On Wednesday the funeral of Mr. Darwin took place at Westminster Abbey. On the previous evening the body was brought up from his Kentish residence, Downe Court, and deposited in the chapel formerly called that of St. Blaise, but more correctly, as it would seem, St. Faith's. It is the dim and gloomy chamber which stands between the vestibule of the Chapter-house and the south transept, or "Poet's Corner." Soon after eleven on Wednesday morning the mourners began to assemble in the Chapter-house. They included representatives of French, German, Italian, and Spanish Embassies; the other invitations, most of which were accepted, being as follows:—The Marquis of Salisbury, Chancellor of Oxford; Lord Aberdare, President of the Geographical Society; the Speaker, Mr. Childers, M.P., Sir Stafford Northcote, M.P., Mr. Fawcett, M.P., Mr. Mundella, M.P., Sir T. Brassey, M.P., Sir Charles Dilke, M.P., Lord Kensington, M.P., the members for the University of Cambridge (Mr. Walpole and Mr. Beresford Hope); for Oxford (Sir J. Mowbray and Mr. J. G. Talbot); for Glasgow and Aberdeen (Mr. Campbell); for Dublin (Mr. Plunket and Mr. Edward Gibson); for Edinburgh and St. Andrew's (Dr. Playfair); Lord A. Russell, Sir Farrer Herschell, M.P., Sir D. Wedderburn, M.P., Sir H. Holland, M.P., Professor Story Maskelyne, M.P., Mr. Broadhurst, M.P., Mr. Burt, M.P., Professor Bryce, M.P.; the Vice-Chancellor of Oxford, the Master of Balliol, the Regius Professor of Medicine (Dr. Acland) and the Linacre Professor of Zoology (Mr. Moseley) as representing the University of Oxford; the President of the College of Surgeons, the President of the College of Physicians, the Council of the Royal Society, the Council of the Linnean Society, the Council of the Royal Geographical Society, the Council of the Geological Society, the Master of Christ's College, Cambridge, the Head Master of Shrewsbury School; the Rev. Professor Kennedy, the Rev. Professor Pritchard, Professor Humphry, Professor Max Müller, Professor H. S. [illegible] Professor Babington, Mr. Hyde Clarke, Professor Flower, Mr. Francis Galton, Dr. Allen Thomson, Mr. F. W. Rudler, Mr. Brabook, Mr. J. E. Price, Colonel Godwin-Austen, Professor Huxley, Mr. Martin, M.P., Mr. Alfred Tylor, and Mr. George W. Bloxam, assistant secretary.

Shortly before half-past twelve the coffin, which was of plain oak, with a plate inscribed, "Charles Robert Darwin. Born Feb. 12, 1809. Died April 19, 1882," was brought into the west cloister, where it was covered with a black velvet pall edged with white silk; with many wreaths of beautiful white flowers, one of them sent by some members of scientific societies in Liverpool, represented by Mr. Isaac Thompson, honorary secretary of the Microscopical Society. The pall-bearers were the Duke of Devonshire, the Duke of Argyll, the Earl of Derby, the American Minister (Mr. Lowell), Mr. Spottiswoode, President of the Royal Society; Sir Joseph Hooker, Mr. A. R. Wallace, Professor Huxley, Sir John Lubbock, and Canon Farrar. At the west entrance the procession was met by the following members of the family and other intimate friends:—

Mr. William Erasmus Darwin, chief mourner; Mr. George Darwin, F.R.S., Mrs. William Darwin, Miss Darwin, Mrs. Litchfield, Mr. Francis Darwin, Mr. R. B. Litchfield, Mr. Horace Darwin, Mr. Leonard Darwin, R.E., Mr. Darwin, of Elston Hall; Mr. F. Alvey Darwin, Captain Charles Darwin, Mr. Reginald Darwin, of Buxton; Mrs. Vaughan Williams, Miss Wedgwood, the Rev. Charles Parker, Mr. Robert Parker, Mr. H. F. Bristowe, Q.C., Mr. Francis Galton, F.R.S., Mr. Ernest Wedgwood, Mr. Henslegh Wedgwood, Mr. T. H. Farrer, Secretary of the Board of Trade; Mrs. Farrer, Mr. Godfrey Wedgwood, Miss A. Wedgwood, Mrs. Ruck, the Rev. Arthur Wedgwood, Mr. J. C. Hawkshaw, Mrs. Hawkshaw, Mr. George Allen, Mr. Henry Allen, M.P.; servant, Mr. William Jackson, and Mr. Joseph Parslow.

In the Abbey there was a large congregation, including Earl Spencer, President of the Council, who represented her Majesty's Ministers; Viscount Sherbrooke, Sir William Jenner, Mr. Moncure D. Conway, Dr. Siemens, Sir William Gull, Professor Marshall, Mr. Ernest Hart, Mr. W. H. Smith, M.P., Dr. Farquharson, Mr. Ellis, the Baroness and Mr. Burdett-Coutts, the Masters and Queen's scholars of the Westminster School, and many others. The Dean being abroad, Canon Prothero read the opening sentences; and the service was then taken up by the choir and sung to the usual setting of Purcell and Croft. The Lesson was read by Canon Duckworth, after which followed Dr. Bridge's anthem, composed for the occasion, "Happy is the man that findeth wisdom." The coffin was then removed to the grave, at the north-east corner of the nave, next to that of Sir John Herschell, Dr. Bridge playing Beethoven's Funeral March, and then a march by Franz Schubert in B minor. The rest of the service was read by Canon Prothero. At its close Handel's anthem, "His body is buried in peace," which has so often and so appropriately served as a farewell to the ashes of the illustrious dead, brought the function to a stately conclusion. The vast crowd, filling the aisles up to the western door, who could have seen but little of what had been passing, were afterwards permitted to pass round the grave, and so more than an hour had elapsed before the cathedral had resumed its wonted air of solemn repose.

---

The following sermon was preached at Westminster Abbey on Sunday afternoon by the *Bishop of Carlisle*:—

"Complete in Him."—*Colossians* ii., part of v. 10.

Amongst other solemn words which were uttered upon the solemn occasion which filled this church with mourners on Wednesday last, were these—"The Lord gave, and the Lord hath taken away: blessed be the name of the Lord." Those words, if accepted fully, and pronounced firmly, must often require the exertion of strong faith. To acknowledge that God has in wisdom and in love taken away some one whose life seemed to be unspeakably precious, and whose death is an unspeakable bereavement to a family, or a disaster to a nation, or a loss to the world—this is no easy thing for a thoughtful and honest man or woman to do. Neither do I think that our heavenly Father, Who knows our infirmities, and above all Who knows that "it is He that hath made us and not we ourselves," will be extreme to mark what is done amiss if we candidly confess that our hearts will not unreservedly accept and that our lips will not distinctly pronounce the words. It is one thing for the reason to say that all things are under the government of an all-wise and righteous Ruler, and that, therefore, whatever is is right; it is another thing for the heart and feelings to yield a full assent. It is one thing for a believing soul to take its stand upon the revelation which God has made of Himself; it is another thing to stifle such feelings as those which, on a notable occasion, called forth the touching complaint and lamentation, "Lord, if Thou hadst been here, my brother had not died."

But there is a portion of the funeral sentence quoted by me just now, which, perhaps, on most occasions is almost forgotten by the side of that other which speaks of bereavement and loss. "The Lord hath taken away." There can be no question concerning that part of the assertion: the living man is gone: his earthly joys and sorrows and labours and troubles have come to an end: upon him "the night" has come "in which no man can work:" and the Lord has done it. You may look, and, of course, you do look, to secondary causes: a constitution impaired by study, or an inherited infirmity, or a severe cold caught by imprudent exposure, or the natural decay of age, or a railway accident, or what not: any one of these may be the immediate cause of the assembling of a sorrowful group at the burial of one who is gone; but if this world be under the government of a supreme Ruler, still more if that Ruler be one without Whom "not a sparrow falls to the ground," then when you have cleared away all the veils which the material conditions of human existence have interposed between you and God, you must come to the ultimate truth, that it is He and no other Who has "taken away." But the certainty of this truth, and the painful manner in which a funeral brings it home to us, should not prevent us from realising that other side of the truth—that God was the original Giver of that which has been taken away. Surely as we walk round this church and look at the monuments which it contains, memorials of great poets, and great statesmen, and great discoverers, and great commanders, and patriots, and philanthropists—memorials of the great and good in all the varied forms in which greatness and goodness happily manifest themselves in this world, which contains so much that is neither great nor good—surely the impression made upon our minds must be that these great and good men are nothing else but the gift of God? Shakespeares and Newtons would be inconceivable in a world that was not governed by a loving Father. I do not know upon what principle such gifts are given, any more than I know why it is that monsters in human form have been permitted from time to time to lay waste God's earth and to spread misery amongst God's creatures; but if I try to devise a theory of man and his origin and his destiny, which shall not involve belief in an Almighty and all-merciful God, it is man himself that stands as the greatest and most insuperable difficulty in the way: great and good men seem to me to postulate the existence of an all-great and all-good God: and so when I see in Westminster Abbey the memorials of those whom God has taken away, I forget the loss in the recollection of the original gift; the congregation of such memorials in a house dedicated as this house is, in a house which we call emphatically the house of God, the giving back the mortal remains to be deposited in this hallowed spot, "in sure and certain hope of the resurrection to eternal life,"—all this seems to emphasise the truth, that good and great men are in a very real sense the best gift of God. "The Lord gave: blessed be the name of the Lord."

[illegible] nothing might, perhaps

© Reproduced with the permission of Cambridge University Library

name of Christ, in legislating the Churches, or in dealing with individual hearts and consciences, in striving by all manner of means to cast out the legion of devils by which mankind was possessed, they would have in their minds such words as these, "If ye have faith as a grain of mustard seed, ye shall say unto this mountain, Remove hence to yonder place, and it shall remove; and nothing shall be impossible unto you."

It seems to me that we may very well, in the light and under the influence of such considerations as these which I have been putting before you, discuss that special subject which is in our mind just now. Discuss? Well, perhaps that is not quite the word. It is too large a subject and too difficult a one to be discussed in the pulpit, and by one person who has the argument all in his own hands; but, at all events, I think that I may use the remarks, which I have hitherto been engaged in making, as the basis of a few others on the subject of the temperance question and of the Church of England Temperance Society, which may commend themselves to the minds of those who have taken part in this festival service.

For, in truth, what I should desire above all things to do upon this occasion is to impress upon you the deep necessity of dealing with the temperance question in the spirit and upon the principles which were instilled into the minds of the Apostles by the Lord Himself, and which they carried out and exemplified when He was gone to the right hand of God. I do not care to draw terrible pictures of the evil with which you desire to contend. I believe that it is impossible to exaggerate the evil or to draw pictures of misery and want, and crime, and inherited tendency to sin and depravity, more horrible than the stern reality exhibited by daily life; but it is just because the evils connected with drink are so patent and so undeniable, that I am content to pass over that side of the subject, to assume that you know as much of the said subject as you need to know. What I would rather do would be to say something as to the manner in which the mountain may be moved, and as to the progress which has been made in moving it.

Now I think that we are acting in a way which the Apostles would approve, when we bring all the appliances of the Church to bear upon this question. To say that the Church of England has become awake only during the past few years to the evil and sin of intemperance, is to say what is absurd and false; but it is quite true that it is only within the last few years that the Church has had a distinct organisation and machinery for this purpose. The necessity of the case seemed to call for this special organisation, and it is matter for thankfulness, and I trust a sign of vigorous life, that the new work has been taken up as it has been. So far as my experience informs me, there are scarcely any public meetings which are more enthusiastic than those which are held in connection with the temperance question; and though there is sometimes a tendency to exaggeration and one-sidedness in such meetings, and a temptation to follow the example of Moses, of whom we heard last Sunday, as smiting the rock rather than speaking to it, in order to procure water for the people, still it cannot be doubted that the minds of men have been deeply stirred by the statements and appeals that have been made, that the opinions formed in these meetings influence Parliament, and that the way is prepared for legislation so soon as the statesman arises who can say what the legislation should be.

But besides public demonstration, there is much quiet valuable work going on in the way of spreading information, pleading the cause of temperance by books and tracts, and specially by the bringing up the young in good ways. In hundreds of parishes temperance is being enforced in a manner in which it never was before. Temperance formerly took its chance, so to speak, with other virtues; and on general principles there was no reason why it should be otherwise: but the terrible prevalence of drunkenness made it unsafe to deal with it only thus. It stood up like a great mountain; there was nothing for it but to endeavour to remove it into the sea.

But, still further, the stir that has been made by the Church of England Temperance Society and the organisation which has been established have brought into prominence the duty which is incumbent upon each Christian man and woman to do what may be possible for the rescue of brethren who are in captivity to drink, or in danger of being led into captivity. Many a man who has never himself been intemperate, and who therefore has perhaps underrated the evil and the danger of drink, has been led to think more carefully on the subject, and to try to lend a hand to his brother in need. Oh! how much a man or a woman, even a boy or a girl, may do to turn a sinner from the error of his way and save a soul alive. A word in season, a little self-denial in things innocent, sometimes even a look, may be of priceless value to a weak brother. This is individual, personal work: doubtless it is so; yet it is work that is strengthened and organised by a society like the Church of England Temperance Society.

believe that the mountain is not moving perceptibly, though it may be still a long way from the sea.

But, perhaps, the most hopeful—at all events one of the most hopeful signs of progress—is the gathering together of such congregations as this, for the purpose of invoking the blessing of God upon the temperance cause and upon temperance work. Can such gatherings—and this is only one of a multitude, only the most conspicuous, not necessarily the most effective or the most blessed—can such gatherings as this be wholly in vain? Are we all men of little faith, whose hands are paralysed and whose tongues are incapable of speaking words of power, because the live coal of faith from the altar of God has not touched them? Is there not faith as a grain of mustard seed in the heart of each or any of those who are here present, or of those who sympathise with us? God forbid that we should believe that it can be thus. No, we will show our faith by our works, and our faith will grow as we go on working for God. We will give all our wisdom and all our might, and yet, after all, we will bear in mind those eternally living words, "Not by wisdom, nor by might; but by My Spirit, saith the Lord of Hosts." Ah! those words also were spoken in connection with the moving of a mountain. There were mountains to be moved in the days of Zerubbabel, as there were in the days of the Apostles, as there are now. Why should we not go on with the quotation, and say as the prophet Zechariah said, "Who art thou, O great mountain? Before Zerubbabel thou shalt become a plain; and he shall bring forth the headstone with shoutings, crying, Grace, grace unto it!"

## MR. DARWIN'S FUNERAL.

On Wednesday the funeral of Mr. Darwin took place at Westminster Abbey. On the previous evening the body was brought up from his Kentish residence, Downe Court, and deposited in the chapel formerly called that of St. Blaise, but more correctly, as it would seem, St. Faith's. It is the dim and gloomy chamber which stands between the vestibule of the Chapter-house and the south transept, or "Poet's Corner." Soon after eleven on Wednesday morning the mourners began to assemble in the Chapter-house. They included representatives of French, German, Italian, and Spanish Embassies; the other invitations, most of which were accepted, being as follows:—The Marquis of Salisbury, Chancellor of Oxford; Lord Aberdare, President of the Geographical Society; the Speaker, Mr. Childers, M.P., Sir Stafford Northcote, M.P., Mr. Fawcett, M.P., Mr. Mundella, M.P., Sir T. Brassey, M.P., Sir Charles Dilke, M.P., Lord Kensington, M.P., the members for the University of Cambridge (Mr. Walpole and Mr. Beresford Hope); for Oxford (Sir J. Mowbray and Mr. J. G. Talbot); for Glasgow and Aberdeen (Mr. Campbell); for Dublin (Mr. Plunket and Mr. Edward Gibson); for Edinburgh and St. Andrew's (Dr. Playfair); Lord A. Russell, Sir Farrer Herschell, M.P., Sir D. Wedderburn, M.P., Sir H. Holland, M.P., Professor Story Maskelyne, M.P., Mr. Broadhurst, M.P., Mr. Burt, M.P., Professor Bryce, M.P.; the Vice-Chancellor of Oxford, the Master of Balliol, the Regius Professor of Medicine (Dr. Acland) and the Linacre Professor of Zoology (Mr. Moseley) as representing the University of Oxford; the President of the College of Surgeons, the President of the College of Physicians, the Council of the Royal Society, the Council of the Linnean Society, the Council of the Royal Geographical Society, the Council of the Geological Society, the Master of Christ's College, Cambridge, the Head Master of Shrewsbury School; the Rev. Professor Kennedy, the Rev. Professor Pritchard, Professor Humphry, Professor Max Müller, Professor H. S. Smith, Professor Prestwich, Professor Hirst, Professor Babington, Professor De Chaumont, Sir William Thomson, Sir John Hawkshaw, Dr. W. B. Carpenter, Mr. Ray Lankester, Sir Henry Maine, Mr. John Simon, C.B., Professor Chandler Roberts, Mr. John Murray, Captain Douglas Galton, secretary to the British Association; Mr. W. Ouless, R.A., Professor Richmond, R.A., Mr. George Atherley, Mr. W. Dallas, Mr. H. W. Bates, Mr. Walter White, Mr. J. W. Judd, Mr. G. A. Spottiswoode, Mr. R. C. Hankinson, Mr. John Morley, Mr. R. H. Hutton, Mr. W. C. Leckie, Mr. Frederic Harrison, Captain Abney, R.E., Mr. Frederick Pollock, Mr. W. R. S. Ralston, the Hon. Robert Winthrop, Professor Flower, and Mr. Herbert Spencer.

In consequence of the election of the Regius Professor of Hebrew, Cambridge was rather poorly represented, the Vice-Chancellor and the members of the Council being required by the statutes to be present during the whole time each of the candidates delivers his exposition on the portions of Hebrew books assigned to him. The times for the delivery of these dissertations had been fixed nearly a month ago, and it was impossible to postpone them or to defer the election. The following deputation from the Anthropological Society also attended:—

Sir John Lubbock, M.P., Mr. John Evans, Mr. E. B. Tylor, Professor Busk,

and honest man or woman to do. Neither do I think that our heavenly Father, Who knows our infirmities, and above all Who knows that "it is He that hath made us and not we ourselves," will be extreme to mark what is done amiss if we candidly confess that our hearts will not unreservedly accept and that our lips will not distinctly pronounce the words. It is one thing for the reason to say that all things are under the government of an all-wise and righteous Ruler, and that, therefore, whatever is is right; it is another thing for the heart and feelings to yield a full assent. It is one thing for a believing soul to take its stand upon the revelation which God has made of Himself; it is another thing to stifle such feelings as those which, on a notable occasion, called forth the touching complaint and lamentation, "Lord, if Thou hadst been here, my brother had not died."

But there is a portion of the funeral sentence quoted by me just now, which, perhaps, on most occasions is almost forgotten by the side of that other which speaks of bereavement and loss. "The Lord hath taken away." There can be no question concerning that part of the assertion: the living man is gone: his earthly joys and sorrows and labours and troubles have come to an end: upon him "the night" has come "in which no man can work:" and the Lord has done it. You may look, and, of course, you do look, to secondary causes: a constitution impaired by study, or an inherited infirmity, or a severe cold caught by imprudent exposure, or the natural decay of age, or a railway accident, or what not: any one of these may be the immediate cause of the assembling of a sorrowful group at the burial of one who is gone; but if this world be under the government of a supreme Ruler, still more if that Ruler be one without Whom "not a sparrow falls to the ground," then when you have cleared away all the veils which the material conditions of human existence have interposed between you and God, you must come to the ultimate truth, that it is He and no other Who has "taken away." But the certainty of this truth, and the painful manner in which a funeral brings it home to us, should not prevent us from realising that other side of the truth—that God was the original Giver of that which has been taken away. Surely as we walk round this church and look at the monuments which it contains, memorials of great poets, and great statesmen, and great discoverers, and great commanders, and patriots, and philanthropists—memorials of the great and good in all the varied forms in which greatness and goodness happily manifest themselves in this world, which contains so much that is neither great nor good—surely the impression made upon our minds must be that these great and good men are nothing else but the gift of God? Shakespeares and Newtons would be inconceivable in a world that was not governed by a loving Father. I do not know upon what principle such gifts are given, any more than I know why it is that monsters in human form have been permitted from time to time to lay waste God's earth and to spread misery amongst God's creatures; but if I try to devise a theory of man and his origin and his destiny, which shall not involve belief in an Almighty and all-merciful God, it is man himself that stands as the greatest and most insuperable difficulty in the way: great and good men seem to me to postulate the existence of an all-great and all-good God: and so when I see in Westminster Abbey the memorials of those whom God has taken away, I forget the loss in the recollection of the original gift; the congregation of such memorials in a house dedicated as this house is, in a house which we call emphatically the house of God, the giving back the mortal remains to be deposited in this hallowed spot, "in sure and certain hope of the resurrection to eternal life,"—all this seems to emphasise the truth, that good and great men are in a very real sense the best gift of God. "The Lord *gave*: blessed be the name of the Lord."

Such remarks as those which I have been making might, perhaps, be not unsuitable in connection with any interment within the walls of this Church. To me at least they seem to contain essentially Westminster Abbey thoughts; something of the kind must, I think, almost of necessity suggest itself as part of the manifold contemplations which seem to grow spontaneously within the walls of this solemnly suggestive building. But I conceive that it is a duty necessarily imposed upon him who occupies this pulpit to-day, that he should say something more immediately bearing upon the funeral of last week, and upon him whose mortal remains were then deposited with so much honour and by so many mourners. It is always a difficult and delicate task to speak concerning the departed; besides the well-known maxim which tells us that we should say concerning the dead nothing but what is good, there is the duty also of saying nothing but what is true, what is necessary, what is wise, what is profitable. It is obvious that in the present instance the always difficult task is not less difficult than usual.

Let me say, in the first place, and in general, how much I think that the interment of the remains of Mr. Darwin in Westminster Abbey is in accordance with the judgment of the wisest of his

© Reproduced with the permission of Cambridge University Library

countrymen. It would have been an unfortunate thing if it had been supposed, that he himself or those dearest to him recognised an incompatibility between the results of his scentific studies and the solemn committal with prayer and thanksgiving to the ground of that mortal material frame which had done its work. It would have been unfortunate if anything had occurred to give weight and currency to the foolish notion which some have diligently propagated, but for which Mr. Darwin was not responsible, that there is a necessary conflict between a knowledge of nature and a belief in God. On the other hand, it was a happy thing, and one of good augury for our country—of good augury, perhaps, for the world—that it should be thought suitable to bury the remains of the most conspicuous man of science in this generation with the fullest expressions of Christian hope, that no objection should be offered by those who had the power of objection, and that the course so taken should commend itself to the conscience of the country. A distinguished man who was present at the funeral remarked to me, that as he witnessed the ceremony he felt thankful for his native land. "Had this death," said he, "occurred in France, no priest would have taken part in the funeral, or if he had, no scientific man would have been present." I imagine that there was much of mournful truth in this remark. Thank God that no such remark would be possible as applied to England! God grant that such possibility may never arise!

This is not the place, nor this the occasion, nor am I competent to speak of Mr. Darwin's position and merits as a man of science; moreover the accurate evaluation of the position and merits of every remarkable man must be left chiefly to posterity; time alone can try the real strength of a reputation. For us, however, it is sufficient to observe, that beyond all doubt and question Mr. Darwin has been the means of producing a greater change in the current of thought on certain subjects than any other man. He did it by perfectly legitimate means; he observed nature with a strength of purpose, and a pertinacity, and an honesty, and an ingenuity, which have never been surpassed, and upon his observations he based his hypotheses and theories. He was fully within his right in doing so. Time will test the correctness of his results: some may become established, some may prove untenable. The laws which Kepler thought he had discovered did not all survive; Descartes' vortices have passed into oblivion; Newton's hypothesis concerning light has yielded to that which he thought he had weighed and found wanting; but meanwhile it is thus by careful questioning of nature and by freedom of speculation and acute suggestion that true knowledge grows and thrives: we may be quite certain that a theory with a flaw in it will sooner or later cease to be a theory: a baseless hypothesis will sooner or later be seen to be baseless: those who are not scientific themselves—and the mass of mankind never can be—but who imagine that the progress of science involves dangers to truths which to the mass of mankind are immeasurably precious, need not be over anxious and unhappy. Speculations, unless they contain truth, will never be long-lived; and if they do contain truth, then they have in them a life which nothing can destroy, and with which no wise man would wish to interfere.

Thus much in general is suggested by the memory of the illustrious dead. In particular may I say how much we may all learn from the example which he has given us in the duties of life? I think it is generally the case with great men, that while there is much in them which ordinary folks can only admire at a distance—in fact, if this were not so the great men would not be great, nor the ordinary men ordinary—there are also subsidiary qualities which help to constitute the great man's greatness, and which, nevertheless, the ordinary man may admire and imitate. And, taking this view of Mr. Darwin, how admirable was his devotion to the one great work of his life: he gave himself to the study of nature with all his heart and soul and strength; in a coarse, worldly sense, he had nothing to gain by it; nay, much of his work seems to have cost him not only labour but suffering, and his first great scientific journey is said to have entailed weakness of health through his whole life. Is there nothing to be learnt from such steady devotion and industry? And then, like other great men, he seems to have been conspicuous for modesty; fancying that other men could do as much as himself if they only tried, convincing one somewhat of Newton when he maintained that the chief difference between himself and other men was that he took more trouble to think about things than they. And then so calm, and apparently living in an atmosphere so much removed from the storms of passion and controversy: what a lesson there is here: no doubt it is more easy to be calm in the regions of natural science and observation than in those of politics or theology or morals; but politicians and theologians may very well in their more exciting fields of controversy take example from the dignified composure with which such men as Darwin pursue their work. Moreover, the particular form which Mr. Darwin's studies assumed prevented him from enjoying the calm, retired peace which belongs to many branches of science: the views concerning evolution connected with his name have not unnaturally given rise to more excited feelings and caused more terror and alarm than perhaps any that were ever propagated; but I do not know that his temper was ever moved by this, and he never appeared before the public as one who felt aggrieved. I may add that though many attacks have been made upon religious truth in his name, he never made such himself; nay, I have every reason to believe that such attacks had not his sympathy, but were contrary to his most solemn convictions.

I cannot but think that a touching mark of greatness is to be found in the subject of his last scientific publication. Who has not read with wonder and delight the volume upon earth worms? How many of us had realised before we read that work the marvellous agency of these humble creatures? Who would have thought that the crowning effort of one who had searched all nature and had been bold enough to speculate concerning the descent of man, would be a laborious investigation of the habits, and the part in the general economy of nature, of the lowliest and nearly the least attractive amongst the creatures of God?

A brave, simple-hearted, truth-loving man: one whom I knew only by his writings and through common friends, and concerning whom, thus known, I have ventured to make the few remarks which I have now offered to you. I have said that I think, like other great men, he has presented to us in his life and his works points of character and conduct which we may well admire and imitate, though we ourselves may have no title to greatness, and though also we do not accept as necessarily great and good everything which a great man may have said or done. But I cannot be content to leave the subject at the point at which we have now arrived: like the prophet of whom we heard in the First Lesson of this afternoon, I feel that I must speak the words which God bids me to speak, and that He has bidden me to speak not merely concerning natural science or the greatness of scientific men, but concerning Jesus Christ His only Son our Lord. I have picked up a few words from the Second Lesson, which seem to me to express in a pithy and pointed way exactly that which I should wish to say in connection with the subject which has forced itself upon our minds this afternoon. Mr. Darwin has gone to his rest: his grave has received every honour that an Englishman's grave can receive: I, who have been invited to preach here this afternoon, have endeavoured to deal respectfully with his memory: but there will be, and must be for a long time to come, connected with his name, not merely the thought of a remarkable scientific epoch, but also the thought of an intense emphasis

hending the secrets of this wonderful creation, of which he himself is the crown; but if I am told that because Newton discovered gravitation, therefore I can dispense with the Apostles' Creed, or that having got the works of Darwin I may burn my Bible, I reject the conclusion, not only as illogical and monstrous, but as contradicting a voice within me which has as much right to be heard as my logical understanding. I reject the conclusion because I am certain that to accept it, or anything like it, would be to permit myself to be "spoiled," robbed, beggared, "by philosophy and vain deceit," according to the language of St. Paul, which we heard this afternoon. I am not only a being who can investigate the secrets of nature, and bend nature's forces to my purposes, and perform wonders of ingenuity; but I am a being who can suffer pain, can feel sorrow, can commit sin: I have a moral nature which is as much and as truly a fact as is my intellect: I meet with experiences in this poor, sinful, anomalous world, which are just as true, just as necessary to be taken into consideration in forming a philosophy, just as important, or it may be ten thousand times more so, to the vast mass of mankind, as any truth which natural science can reveal; and God, as I believe, has recognised this side of my nature and my experience by taking human flesh and becoming man. "The Word became flesh." "God so loved the world, that He sent His only begotten Son." Do not try to deprive me of that blessed truth: they who hold it, who live upon it, who believe that they would be infinitely, hopelessly, pitiably poor without it, have no desire to speak lightly of other truths, but only they feel that they cannot give up this. "Complete in *Him*." Those few emphatic words of St. Paul seem to me exactly to meet the case: the knowledge of Christ supporting, supplementing, completing all other knowledge: ministering to wants which would be otherwise overwhelming: binding up wounds which human knowledge cannot heal: giving rest to weary souls which have sought rest elsewhere, and have not been able to find it.

Oh! my Christian brethren, if the world-wide fame of such men as Newton and Darwin makes us wonder at the princely intellects with which they and other chiefs of the human race have been endowed—if by the tribute of a nation's homage at their open graves we bear our testimony to their greatness, and thank God for His mighty gift—if we feel that mankind in general, and our own dear land in particular, is enriched and glorified by the possession of such men—let us also be reminded by their return to dust that we need some knowledge which they cannot give us. No human light can illuminate the other side of the grave: the mystery of man's infinite being defies the treatment of all human *calculus*: the knowledge which man's soul requires is only "complete in Him," whom God has sent into the world in order that, knowing Him, we may know the Father.

"This is life eternal, that we might know Thee, the only true God, and Jesus Christ Whom Thou has sent."

Grant us grace and power to know Thee! Amen.

---

*Canon Prothero*, in the course of a sermon at Westminster Abbey on the 23rd, made the following reference to Mr. Darwin:—

"It is the spirit of Christ that has revolutionised the morality and religion of the world. . . . . It is by this spirit that He, Who to outward seeming was an obscure Galilean peasant, founded an empire more enduring, more vast in extent, more powerful in practical life, more imperious in its claims, more absolute in its rule, than all the dynasties of all the earthly empires. The extent and the duration of this marvellous reign dazzled the visions, and confused the understandings of His earthly subjects—and theologians asserted claims which their Divine Master never sanctioned. They annexed province after province of human thought, claimed authority over field after field of human life, till nothing escaped the reach of their usurpations. They had missed the spirit of Him Who lived among men to found no earthly kingdom.

"The human intellect long ago began its revolt against the trammels of theology, and few will be found to regret the commencement of the change. Authority is but hungry food for the full grown man, and the spirit of Christ has nothing to fear and everything to hope for the progress of science. The removal of the excrescences—the gilding and the plaster with which the hand of man has overlaid the temple of Christ—serve but to reveal the greater the divine beauties beneath.

"The God of truth is the God both of Nature and of Revelation; the words that are engraven by God's hand on the everlasting rocks, or in the face of Nature, cannot really contradict the words that are written in God's Book. Here, indeed, our knowledge is but in part, our vision is dark, but we may look forward with hope to the day when our knowledge will be perfect, and we shall see face to face.

"Scientific inquiry will but serve to confirm the truth that 'All Thy works praise Thee, O God, and Thy saints give thanks to Thee,' and labourers in the world of science will only aid in rendering the inarticulate praises of creation into the treasure-house of God.

"The greatest man of science of the day has passed away in Charles Darwin, and few men of the present century have left behind them a more enduring name, or earned so immediate, so splendid a fame during their lifetime. No one, be his prejudices ever so strong, can deny him the applause due to a well-spent, useful, and distinguished life, and none can hesitate to affirm that he investigated in no spirit of flippant scepticism, that he doubted to conquer his doubts, that he was animated by no desire to find an excuse for indifference, but was stimulated by the lofty motive of learning what was true to do what was right.

"Though he possessed a true genius for scientific investigation, no feature in his character was more marked than his humility. Among the illustrious dead who are interred in this Abbey he will lie by the side of Sir Isaac Newton, and, like the illustrious man whom fate has made his brother in the tomb, he ever recognised that he was but as a child picking up pebbles on the shores of the vast ocean of truth. His genuine love for science, his scrupulous care, his unwearying patience, his faithfulness to truth, his impartiality, and his moderation gave his works the highest value. This is no place—nor have I the ability—to discuss the merits of his theories; yet Darwin was no Darwinian in the sense of excluding the intellectual element from the creation of the world; rather would I dwell on the sweet and gentle disposition which no envy of rivals disturbed, which no intellectual pride ever swelled to arrogance, no impatience ever excited to contempt. His opinions were, as he well knew, a rude shock to many; but the modesty and the respect for the feelings of other men, which displayed itself in an habitual courtesy, softened the blow which his genuine devotion to truth forbade him to refrain from inflicting.

"In such men live that charity which is the essence of the true spirit of Christ; by such men is the spirit of Christ most truly honoured, of such men are the true kingdom of Christ."

A correspondent of the *Pall-Mall Gazette* suggested that at churches where reference was made to Mr. Darwin in sermons the *Benedicite* should be used. He adds:—A stained glass window in Westminster Abbey, symbolising verses of the same canticle, would be a beautiful monument to the memory of Charles Darwin, and quite in harmony with the surroundings. It would afford a desired opportunity for other countries to share in the erection of a memorial without merging their several contributions indistinguishably into one, as each country might contribute a separate panel.

*Admiral Lort Stokes*, of Scotchwell, has written to the papers:—

Perhaps no one can better testify to Charles Darwin's early and most trying labours than myself. We worked together for several years at the same table

## Correspondence.

### CHURCH SALVATION ARMY.

*To the Editor of the Guardian.*

SIR—A correspondent in your paper of last Wednesday asks the question:—

"Is there any reason why the principles adopted by the Salvation Army so successfully for reaching the masses of the people should not also, with slight modifications, be adopted with equal success by the Church of England?"

And another, writing upon the same subject, refers to "the very able article in the *Church Quarterly*" upon the Salvation Army, and recalls a lesson of history with regard to the action of the Pope in a similar matter.

It may interest your readers if I am permitted to present to them through your columns an account of certain proceedings of the Pope in our own country, with which they may possibly not be acquainted.

When I entered upon my duties in this diocese, finding that its population had so marvellously increased in the course of this century that, in several parts of it, the parochial system was utterly incapable of providing for their spiritual necessities, I set myself to consider by what method those necessities might, in some measure at least, be practically supplied.

Knowing that the University of Cambridge possessed a power of appointing certain persons to be "University Preachers," and having some idea that the office carried with it the legal right of itinerant preaching throughout a diocese, as it was practised by Bernard Gilpin and others, I wrote to the Rev. Joseph Romilly, then Registrar of the University, to ask if there would be any possibility of my inducing the Senate to assist me by appointing preachers for an itinerant ministry.

In reply Mr. Romilly was so good as to send in full a copy of a Bull, which Julian, Bishop of Ostia, obtained in 1503, at the earnest entreaty of Thomas Cobold, authorising the University of Cambridge to send out annually twelve preachers to all parts of England, Scotland, and Ireland. The earliest patent of a University Preacher preserved in the Registrar's office is dated 1506. The terms of the patent were that, "ex ejus abundanti gratiâ et speciali mandato," the Pope granted:—

"Licentiam ac liberam facultatem in perpetuum eligendi singulis annis 12 doctores seu magistros et graduatos in ordine sacerdotii institutos et ad prædicandi officium magistros idoneos, qui, sub Universitatis communi sigillo electi, ubique per totum regnum Angliæ, Scotiæ, et Hibernie populo et clero verbum Dei prædicare et seminare possint. Dummodo prædicti doctores et magistri et graduati præfati ad hujus modi prædicandi officium sic electi et deputati non prædicent in locis ubi ordinarii locorum prædicant. . . . ."

Mr. Romilly goes on to say:—

"This power of sending out twelve preachers annually was confirmed by the Charter of 3rd of Eliz. (26 Apr.).

"The grace for the appointment of these preachers used to be brought forward as regularly as the appointment of Proctors, &c., till the close of the seventeenth century, when there was no longer one single grace for twelve, but a grace for one preacher or more at intervals. There were only sixteen preachers appointed in the eighteenth century. Since the year 1733 no preachers have been appointed except Emmanuel men. The reason of their appointment is, that in the reign of Queen Elizabeth, the Earl of Huntingdon gave to Emmanuel College the three livings of Aller, Loughborough, and North Cadbury, requiring that no person should be presented to those livings except a University preacher.

"You make three queries with regard to these licences of University preachers:—First, whether the University can now grant such a licence; secondly, whether they would be likely to grant it; thirdly, whether they would confine their licence to their own graduates. With regard to the first query, I think it clear that the University have still the power, for in the year 1848 they granted such licences to Mr. Bunch and Mr. Fearon. With regard to the second query, I think it certain that the University would grant no such licence which was to be carried out literally, and constitute the bearer of it an itinerant preacher, without taking an opinion in Doctors'-commons. In the cases of Mr. Bunch and Mr. Fearon it was notorious that they meant to officiate nowhere but in the two parts of the divided parish of Loughborough. . . . . With regard to your third query, the University have never hitherto granted licences to any persons except their own graduates; nor do I conceive it at all probable that this rule would ever be deviated from.

"I am very sorry to throw so much cold water upon the project which you contemplated for the spiritual good of your diocese, which has so greatly increased in population.—Believe me, most truly yours,

"JOS. ROMILLY."

My first idea being thus shown to be impracticable, a circular was issued by me throughout the diocese, the result of which was the establishment of a Home Missionary Society. I am sorry to say that the society, partly from want of adequate support and partly from other causes, which need not here be specified, has not answered my expectations.

Of the absolute necessity of something being done in this direction, there cannot be two opinions among those who desire to bring our Church into contact with the lower classes of the community. Possibly the information given in this letter may help to deepen this conviction.

A. LLANDAFF.

Bishop's Court, Llandaff, April 28, 1882.

### PLUMPTRE TESTIMONIAL FUND.

SIR—I venture to ask your permission to announce to those pupils and friends of Dr. Plumptre, whom we may not have been able to reach, that this testimonial fund is still open for contributions, although we now desire to close it as soon as possible. The fund is to be devoted, first to some personal gift to Dr. Plumptre, and next to the foundation of a prize or prizes, to perpetuate his name in the college which owes so much to his teaching and influence. We have already received numerous contributions, varying from 5*l.* to 5*s.*; but we believe that there are still many who may wish to subscribe, but who may not have been reached by our circulars; and I shall be glad if, by your favour, I may bring the matter to their notice, and invite contributions, great or small (to be sent to J. W. Cunningham, Esq., or to myself, at King's College), before the close of the present term.

ALFRED BARRY.

King's College, London, April 29, 1882.

### CANON PEARSON.

SIR—You may, perhaps, like to add a simple anecdote to your *In Memoriam* of last week of one whom you rightly call "the

[illegible], and apparently living in an atmosphere so much removed from the storms of passion and controversy: what a lesson there is here: no doubt it is more easy to be calm in the regions of natural science and observation than in those of politics or theology or morals; but politicians and theologians may very well in their more exciting fields of controversy take example from the dignified composure with which such men as Darwin pursue their work. Moreover, the particular form which Mr. Darwin's studies assumed prevented him from enjoying the calm, retired peace which belongs to many branches of science: the views concerning evolution connected with his name have not unnaturally given rise to more excited feelings and caused more terror and alarm than perhaps any that were ever propagated; but I do not know that his temper was ever moved by this, and he never appeared before the public as one who felt aggrieved. I may add that though many attacks have been made upon religious truth in his name, he never made such himself; nay, I have every reason to believe that such attacks had not his sympathy, but were contrary to his most solemn convictions.

I cannot but think that a touching mark of greatness is to be found in the subject of his last scientific publication. Who has not read with wonder and delight the volume upon earth worms? How many of us had realised before we read that work the marvellous agency of these humble creatures? Who would have thought that the crowning effort of one who had searched all nature and had been bold enough to speculate concerning the descent of man, would be a laborious investigation of the habits, and the part in the general economy of nature, of the lowliest and nearly the least attractive amongst the creatures of God?

A brave, simple-hearted, truth-loving man: one whom I knew only by his writings and through common friends, and concerning whom, thus known, I have ventured to make the few remarks which I have now offered to you. I have said that I think, like other great men, he has presented to us in his life and his works points of character and conduct which we may well admire and imitate, though we ourselves may have no title to greatness, and though also we do not accept as necessarily great and good everything which a great man may have said or done. But I cannot be content to leave the subject at the point at which we have now arrived: like the prophet of whom we heard in the First Lesson of this afternoon, I feel that I must speak the words which God bids me to speak, and that He has bidden me to speak not merely concerning natural science or the greatness of scientific men, but concerning Jesus Christ His only Son our Lord. I have picked up a few words from the Second Lesson, which seem to me to express in a pithy and pointed way exactly that which I should wish to say in connection with the subject which has forced itself upon our minds this afternoon. Mr. Darwin has gone to his rest: his grave has received every honour that an Englishman's grave can receive: I, who have been invited to preach here this afternoon, have endeavoured to deal respectfully with his memory: but there will be, and must be for a long time to come, connected with his name, not merely the thought of a remarkable scientific epoch, but also the thought of an intense emphasis given to the question, What is the relation in which natural science stands to religious faith? This is no new question: it is one which is inherent in the very substance of thought and speculation: it is one of a number of questions which are always alive, but which sometimes seem to be in a condition of suspended animation, and then burst forth into impetuous life, like a volcano which has been quiescent for a while. Of course it is impossible even to attempt to answer questions of this kind in a few sentences of a sermon; but I wish to suggest, or rather to remind you, not only that religious faith rests upon foundations which no physical discoveries can impair, but also that positive knowledge and religious belief are not antagonistic, but more properly supplemental, the one to the other. *I* believe—I am sure that *you* all believe—that such intellects as those which were given to Newton and to Darwin were given for the purpose of being applied to the examination of the universe which God Who gave the intellect created and made. I cannot conceive the constitution of that man's mind who does not feel uplifted and triumphant and joyous when he realises the great steps which man has made in comprehe- the words that are engraven by God's hand on the everlasting rocks, or in the face of Nature, cannot really contradict the words that are written in God's Book. Here, indeed, our knowledge is but in part, our vision is dark, but we may look forward with hope to the day when our knowledge will be perfect, and we shall see face to face.

"Scientific inquiry will but serve to confirm the truth that 'All Thy works praise Thee, O God, and Thy saints give thanks to Thee,' and labourers in the world of science will only aid in rendering the inarticulate praises of creation into the treasure-house of God.

"The greatest man of science of the day has passed away in Charles Darwin, and few men of the present century have left behind them a more enduring name, or earned so immediate, so splendid a fame during their lifetime. No one, be his prejudices ever so strong, can deny him the applause due to a well-spent, useful, and distinguished life, and none can hesitate to affirm that he investigated in no spirit of flippant scepticism, that he doubted to conquer his doubts, that he was animated by no desire to find an excuse for indifference, but was stimulated by the lofty motive of learning what was true to do what was right.

"Though he possessed a true genius for scientific investigation, no feature in his character was more marked than his humility. Among the illustrious dead who are interred in this Abbey he will lie by the side of Sir Isaac Newton, and, like the illustrious man whom fate has made his brother in the tomb, he ever recognised that he was but as a child picking up pebbles on the shores of the vast ocean of truth. His genuine love for science, his scrupulous care, his unwearying patience, his faithfulness to truth, his impartiality, and his moderation gave his works the highest value. This is no place—nor have I the ability—to discuss the merits of his theories; yet Darwin was no Darwinian in the sense of excluding the intellectual element from the creation of the world; rather would I dwell on the sweet and gentle disposition which no envy of rivals disturbed, which no intellectual pride ever swelled to arrogance, no impatience ever excited to contempt. His opinions were, as he well knew, a rude shock to many; but the modesty and the respect for the feelings of other men, which displayed itself in an habitual courtesy, softened the blow which his genuine devotion to truth forbade him to refrain from inflicting.

"In such men live that charity which is the essence of the true spirit of Christ; by such men is the spirit of Christ most truly honoured, of such men are the true kingdom of Christ."

---

A correspondent of the *Pall-Mall Gazette* suggested that at churches where reference was made to Mr. Darwin in sermons the *Benedicite* should be used. He adds:—A stained glass window in Westminster Abbey, symbolising verses of the same canticle, would be a beautiful monument to the memory of Charles Darwin, and quite in harmony with the surroundings. It would afford a desired opportunity for other countries to share in the erection of a memorial without merging their several contributions indistinguishably into one, as each country might contribute a separate panel.

*Admiral Lort Stokes*, of Scotchwell, has written to the papers:—

Perhaps no one can better testify to Charles Darwin's early and most trying labours than myself. We worked together for several years at the same table in the poop cabin of the *Beagle* during her celebrated voyage, he with his microscope and myself at the charts. It was often a very lively end of the little craft, and distressingly so to my old friend, who suffered greatly from sea-sickness. After, perhaps, an hour's work he would say to me, "Old fellow, I must take the horizontal for it," that being the best relief position from ship motion; a stretch out on one side of the table for some time would enable him to resume his labours for awhile, when he had again to lie down. It was distressing to witness this early sacrifice of Mr. Darwin's health, who ever afterwards seriously felt the ill-effects of the *Beagle's* voyage.

In answer to a question from Herr Otto Zacharias, a German naturalist, Mr. Darwin wrote a short time ago:—"When I was on board the *Beagle* I believed in the permanence of species, but, as far as I can remember, vague doubts occasionally flitted across my mind. On my return home in the autumn of 1836 I immediately began to prepare my journal for publication, and then saw how many facts indicated the common descent of species, so that in July, 1837, I opened a note-book to record any facts which might bear on the question. But I did not become convinced that species were mutable until, I think, two or three years more had elapsed."

have still the power, for in the year 1848 they granted such licences to Mr. Bunch and Mr. Fearon. With regard to the second query, I think it certain that the University would grant no such licence which was to be carried out literally, and constitute the bearer of it an itinerant preacher, without taking an opinion in Doctors'-commons. In the cases of Mr. Bunch and Mr. Fearon it was notorious that they meant to officiate nowhere but in the two parts of the divided parish of Loughborough. . . . . With regard to your third query, the University have never hitherto granted licences to any persons except their own graduates; nor do I conceive it at all probable that this rule would ever be deviated from.

"I am very sorry to throw so much cold water upon the project which you contemplated for the spiritual good of your diocese, which has so greatly increased in population.—Believe me, most truly yours,

"Jos. Romilly."

My first idea being thus shown to be impracticable, a circular was issued by me throughout the diocese, the result of which was the establishment of a Home Missionary Society. I am sorry to say that the society, partly from want of adequate support and partly from other causes, which need not here be specified, has not answered my expectations.

Of the absolute necessity of something being done in this direction, there cannot be two opinions among those who desire to bring our Church into contact with the lower classes of the community. Possibly the information given in this letter may help to deepen this conviction. A. Llandaff.

Bishop's Court, Llandaff, April 28, 1882.

---

## PLUMPTRE TESTIMONIAL FUND.

Sir—I venture to ask your permission to announce to those pupils and friends of Dr. Plumptre, whom we may not have been able to reach, that this testimonial fund is still open for contributions, although we now desire to close it as soon as possible. The fund is to be devoted, first to some personal gift to Dr. Plumptre, and next to the foundation of a prize or prizes, to perpetuate his name in the college which owes so much to his teaching and influence. We have already received numerous contributions, varying from 5*l.* to 5*s.*; but we believe that there are still many who may wish to subscribe, but who may not have been reached by our circulars; and I shall be glad if, by your favour, I may bring the matter to their notice, and invite contributions, great or small (to be sent to J. W. Cunningham, Esq., or to myself, at King's College), before the close of the present term. Alfred Barry.

King's College, London, April 29, 1882.

---

## CANON PEARSON.

Sir—You may, perhaps, like to add a simple anecdote to your *In Memoriam* of last week of one whom you rightly call "the dearly loved and deeply regretted Hugh Pearson"—an anecdote which, I think, brings out touchingly his love for his parishioners and his constant thought to die, as he had lived, among them in the bonds of a very close fellowship.

A common friend, telling me of his last hours, after saying "how the poor were admitted to him until he became insensible, and he had a loving word for each," adds, "They buried him as he used to tell them, sitting in the porch. 'Yes, it will be so and so, and you will all stand round thus, whilst they bring me out of the church to the grave.'" T. T. Carter.

St. John's Lodge, Clewer, April 30, 1882.

---

## THE LATE BISHOP OF SYDNEY.

Sir—In the interesting notice of Bishop Barker's life, which appears in your issue of April 19th, your correspondent inad-

© Reproduced with the permission of Cambridge University Library

vertently mentions the diocese of Grafton and Armidale as one of those which he was instrumental in founding.

Bishop Barker procured, as stated, the separation of the dioceses of Goulburn and Bathurst, and subsequently North Queensland, from that of Sydney; but Grafton and Armidale was formed by Bishop Tyrrell out of the diocese of Newcastle, from the northern end of which he had in 1860 formed the see of Brisbane.

R. GEORGE BOODLE, Author of the *Life and Labours of Bishop Tyrrell.*

Cloford Vicarage, April 26, 1882.

## COLONIAL BISHOPS.

SIR—I fear the attempt to cast obloquy on the returned colonial Bishops will not increase the willingness of home clergy to undertake the hardships and responsibilities of the colonial Episcopate. The range of choice would unquestionably lie within a larger circle if it was understood that the severance from one's native land was not to be permanent; and colonial synods seem to prefer to send for a home clergyman to rule over them, even though his stay be not extended beyond a period of eleven or twelve years. They are surely the best judges on such a point as this. Your correspondents "Aquila" and others seem to have in view the interests of the Church at home rather than abroad, and the grievance of one writer appears to be that it is a great shame that returned colonial Bishops should step into some decent pieces of preferment which ought to be reserved for home priests. I don't deny that it might be better for some reasons that colonial Bishops should remain at their posts until they die or are worn out; but I have known colonists themselves speak of their Bishop as having been too long in the colony and rusted, and boldly assert that a little infusion of fresh blood from home would be a good thing for their Church, and keep it *au courant* with the progress that was being made by their mother. It would tend to remove some of the causes of complaint if means could be devised whereby the home board appointed to select could ascertain what clergy were willing to go abroad, to what colony their inclinations pointed, and whether they were willing to go for life. They might then scan the lists of those clergy, and, in the event of there being none, in their opinion, suitable, they might then look out elsewhere. This would tend to prevent another grievance, and that is the fact of a colonial bishopric going a begging, which seems from the letter of Bishop Hobhouse to be by no means an uncommon occurrence. It must be very annoying to the colonial Churches to find their invitations so frequently declined; and it takes off sadly from the *éclat* of a man's appointment to have ill-natured people saying that he has only got what nobody else would take. I leave to more ingenious heads the devising of a plan whereby selecting boards may first ascertain what men are willing to go abroad; but, if such a thing could be done, it would do away with much of the complaint of which we are now hearing, and save a large amount of disappointment and delay. W. P. INSLEY.

Bow Rectory, E., April 27, 1882.

## PROPAGATION SOCIETY MEETING, 1882.

SIR—I have come home from St. James's Hall with a sad heart. We have had interesting speeches and stirring, but there was to my mind a cloud of depression overhanging us, and I venture to ask through your columns, "Why?" I have a parochial association for both the great missionary societies, and therefore do not write as a partisan when I say that the contrast between to-day's meeting and the anniversaries of the Church Missionary Society is painful to supporters of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel. The *tokens* of depression are simple facts, and are these—the beautiful organ was silent, no inspiriting hymns; the body of the hall was not three-quarters full; I sat at the end of the third quarter and had a bench to myself; the galleries had, perhaps, thirty or forty people in them. I have seen Exeter Hall crowded with Church Missionary Society supporters in every part, and the platform (which to-day at St. James's was *so* thinly attended) filled to the roof. At first entering I could not realise the occasion at all, and for some time could not attend for asking myself, Where are the home Bishops? Where are the clergy, London and country? Where are the layworkers, the deaconesses and sisters, the Church councilmen and guilds? We heard much of "this great society," but it was hard to feel enthusiasm until Canon Wilkinson's rousing words recalled one's thoughts from the surroundings. Sir, I am only a country parson; and, though I have my own suspicions of the causes at work to depress, it does not matter what I think. But I do respectfully and earnestly commend the state of things to the esteemed secretary and the committee for their consideration. EAST ANGLIAN VICAR.

## S.P.G.—ARCHDEACONRY OF GLOUCESTER.

SIR—Will you kindly admit the following correspondence into your paper? It refers to a statement which you reported on April 19, respecting the support that the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel receives in the diocese of Gloucester and Bristol.

Minchinhampton, Stroud, April 29, 1882. E. C. OLDFIELD.

"Minchinhampton, Stroud, 21st April, 1882.

"Dear Mr. Randall—In the *Guardian* of last Wednesday you are reported to have said that 'nearly a third of the diocesan contributions to the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel come from All Saints', Clifton.' I am certain that this is not what you really stated, for it cannot be borne out by the facts; but as an injury might be done to the society if people were led to suppose it had so limited a circle of supporters, I hope you will kindly inform me of what you *did* say, that I may correct the reporter.—Yours very truly,

"E. C. OLDFIELD."

"Binfield Rectory, April 25, 1882.

"My dear Mr. Oldfield—I was quoting the words of our secretary for the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in what I wrote, and they have reference *only to the Bristol part of the diocese*, not to the combined dioceses of Gloucester and Bristol. I should hope that no harm could happen to the society such as you seem to apprehend. It did not occur to me that my words would be taken to bear the application which I now see they may bear.—Yours very truly,

"R. W. RANDALL."

"Minchinhampton, Stroud, April 29, 1882.

"Dear Mr. Randall—Many thanks for your reply to my inquiry. Your local secretary, however, is misleading in his statement, even though he refers to the archdeaconry of Bristol alone. He says that 'nearly a third of the contributions to the Society for the Propaga- [illegible] All Saints', Clifton.' The total amount

the Day of Intercession for Missions; when in at least one other diocese (and probably in several) the Bishop ceases formally to recommend that day to the notice of his clergy; and when, as everybody knows, the parish in any diocese in which the attempt even is made to keep the day for its new-fangled purpose is so completely a *rara avis* that but few of us can count two such parishes—I cannot count one—in their own immediate neighbourhood, it must be pretty evident to any one who does not wilfully shut his eyes that the alteration of the day to Rogation Tuesday has resulted in almost universal failure, and that unless soon the Bishops, or the Convocations, or both combined, take the matter in hand and reappoint St. Andrew's Day, or, better still, fix upon a day in the week before Septuagesima instead of the present most unhappy fixture of Rogation Tuesday, the Church *in England* will have utterly lost the practice of acting as a body in making intercession to Almighty God for a blessing upon the missionary work of the Church.

On the "authority" of the Hundred at Lambeth the Archbishop of Canterbury has hitherto annually invited the Church *in England* to make use of Rogation Tuesday for that purpose; but, unless I greatly mistake, this year even he is departing from his usual practice, for I have seen no letter or paragraph in any paper setting forth that it is his desire that day shall be so observed! If this be so, then I think the Church may be congratulated: for if his Grace recognises the utter futility of trying to accomplish what is impossible, we may be sure he will not long rest before hitting upon a possibility to recommend to the clergy and congregations of his province.

Hundreds of clergy are doing their utmost to revive the Rogation days and to restore them to their proper use. Thousands have been working for years to try and get Ascension Day observed with the honour due to the crowning festival of the Christian year. And they all appeal to you, Mr. Editor, and beg you to lift up your powerful voice that their work may not suffer distraction by having any longer foisted into it what, like the new wine poured into old bottles, is sure at one and the same time to destroy the "old" and to waste the "new." HENRY ROE.

Poyntington Rectory, Sherborne, April 27, 1882.

## PARISH CHURCHES BILL.

SIR—I am glad that your correspondent "An Ex-Churchwarden" gives me the opportunity of a further letter upon a subject so much misunderstood as the assumed control by churchwardens over church seats, which it is one of the objects of the Parish Churches Bill to get rid of. After much necessary investigation and thought, I am prepared to maintain that this claim by churchwardens is quite a modern one, and, therefore, not entitled even to respect as a custom of long standing.

In proof of this, let me say that there is not the slightest hint or the faintest suggestion of the churchwardens' power over seats in any Canon, Rubric, Article, Advertisement, Royal Injunction, Proclamation, or Statute. Indeed, almost all these documents are silent on the subject. The only seat mentioned in the canons is "a convenient seat for the minister to read service in," and one of the homilies contains a reference to the church being "well adorned with places convenient to sit in," but that is all.

Then, if we take the text writers of the seventeenth and eighteenth century, what do we find? Some are entirely silent, and all the others contain but very guarded and limited statements of the powers of churchwardens over seats. The gradual "development" of the doctrine may be traced by comparing successive editions of the same work. For instance, Burns' *Ecclesiastical Law*, first published in 1763, was for nearly a century a work of considerable repute, and has passed through nine editions. The following extract from the original book shows how the law has "progressed," the sentence in brackets (the very quotation your correspondent makes!) appearing *for the first time* in Sir Robert Phillimore's edition, published in 1842:—

"For the disposal of the seats in the nave of the church appertaineth of common right to the Bishop of the diocese; so that he may place and displace whomsoever he pleaseth. (Parishioners are not at liberty to choose what seats they like; the distribution of seats among them rests in the discretion of the ordinary, which he generally exercises by the churchwardens, who are his officers as well as those of the parish.)"

But the change is still more strikingly shown by a reference to Blackstone's *Commentaries*. In the third edition of that work, published in 1768, there is *not a single word on the subject of churchwardens' powers of appropriating seats.* After the lapse of a century, however, Mr. Serjeant Stephen, in his edition published in 1874 (vol. ii., p. 699), states the law as follows:—

"Churchwardens are also to make such order relative to seats in the church and chancel not appropriated to particular persons as the ordinary—who has in general the sole power in this matter—shall direct. And in practice the arrangements are usually made by the churchwardens, even without any special direction from the ordinary."

Sir John Nicholl, Dean of the Arches, certainly said, in the course of his judgment in a perturbation case ("Pettman *v.* Bridger") in 1811, where, however, the question of churchwardens' powers was not before the court at all:—

"By the general law, and of common right, all pews belong to the parishioners at large for their use and accommodation; but the distribution of seats among them rests with the ordinary. The churchwardens are the officers of the ordinary—they are to place the parishioners according to their rank and station, but they are subject to the control of the ordinary if any complaint should be made against them. *The vestry, as such, has no authority whatever on the subject.*"

But this is not a *legal decision*; it is a mere *judicial opinion*, and is entirely independent of the judgment eventually pronounced on the particular issue the Judge was then engaged in trying. The soundness of the views put forth may well be questioned when the very same Judge, only a few months before, is found giving utterance to an opinion totally at variance with that above stated. In the case of "Tattersall *v.* Knight," which was an application for a faculty to erect a gallery and to appropriate the seats therein, he said:—

"As to the mere arrangement of seats, if the parishioners can settle that amongst themselves and to their own satisfaction, and can agree about the expense, there seems but little necessity for the interference of the incumbent; the expense is that of the parishioners. The churchwardens are bound to repair with the consent of the vestry. It is not the vicar, *but the vestry which appropriates the seats*; the general superintendence and authority in allotting them resting with the ordinary."

In Sir John Nicholl's day the practice of appropriation was at [illegible] regarded as quite proper. His declaration that they will duly execute the duties of the office. Their power to assign seats, and the right of parishioners to require them to do so, rests upon no ancient historical basis or statute. It is not founded upon a number of decided cases, but upon a conflicting body of *judicial opinion*, varying with the general current of popular feeling. In brief, it is a *purely legal fiction, which was never heard of before the last century.*

How far the Parish Churches Bill will receive the support of the Liberationists in Parliament, as "An Ex-Churchwarden" suggests, may be conjectured from the petulant opposition offered to its second reading by Mr. Illingworth, the Radical Liberationist member for Bradford. The Conservative Churchmen who also opposed the second reading will surely find themselves in strange company if the bill is fortunate enough to get to any divisions in committee on July 12.

I have received a large number of applications for copies of the bill and "reasons" as offered in my last letter. May I now add the offer of a report of the important debate upon the second reading, which we have reprinted?

T. BOWATER VERNON, Secretary.

The Incorporated Free and Open Church Association, 33, Southampton-street, Strand, W.C., April 24, 1882.

## THE ECCLESIASTICAL COMMISSION—LOCAL CLAIMS.

SIR—My experience with the Ecclesiastical Commissioners in the matter of local claims is probably unique. Will you allow me to state it as a plea for giving them elasticity in dealing with these cases?

In 1878, when vicar of Sutton-le-Marsh (Lincolnshire), the tithes of which (formerly belonging to the Prebendal) were still held on a lease of two lives, I applied to the Ecclesiastical Commissioners and got a grant of 80*l.* a year and 1,500*l.* for a house.

In 1879, having, before this grant was declared, accepted the benefice of Hambleton-cum-Braunston, I applied to the Ecclesiastical Commissioners to ask whether they would give a grant or pay off the mortgage on the vicarage-house, but without success, except so far as that they promised to deal with the case in 1884.

The benefice is in the patronage of the Dean and Chapter of Lincoln. There are two churches *six miles* apart. Population—Hambleton, 245; Braunston, 387. From Hambleton alone the Ecclesiastical Commissioners took 16,000*l.* at one blow about seventeen years ago. In Braunston they have an estate of about 160 acres, some of it very good land, the lease of which will fall in in 1888. The net income of the united benefice is under 180*l.* a year.

This, then, is my experience. In the one parish, from which the Ecclesiastical Commissioners had received nothing, they could give 80*l.* a year and 1,500*l.* for a house. In the other, from which they have received 16,000*l.* at one blow, and still have property, they can give nothing until 1884. BENJ. BARRETT.

Hambleton Vicarage, Oakham, April 29, 1882.

## "PONTESBURY THIRD PORTION."

SIR—In the hope that this letter may assist in some small measure in doing away with an anomaly within our Church, I send you a few particulars which I trust you will deem worthy of a place in your columns.

Pontesbury is a peculiar parish and covers a very large area. It was divided some years ago into three portions, called respectively, first, second, and third portions, with a separate rector for each portion. One large parish church is used by all as a *parish church*. The rector of the first portion takes two Sundays in the month. The rectors of second and third take a Sunday each.

The rectors of the second and third portions have each a district and chapels in their districts, and have services there.

Rector No. 1 is a High Churchman (so-called); Rector No. 2 is a Low Churchman, although an excellent man and a scholar; Rector No. 3 is *non est.*

The patronage of these *quasi*-livings is in different hands. Rector No. 1 is his own patron: Rector No. 2 is appointed by Queen's College, Oxford. The patronage of the third is in private hands (a solicitor's, I believe). It is notorious that this living is sold repeatedly. It is now vacant. This portion has a beautiful chapel, in a district one and a half miles from the parish church; but because the last rector had a donative at Longden, about the same distance on the other side of Pontesbury, he closed the chapel, and left his parish to the tender mercies of Dissent. This rector has been appointed to the living of Atcham, on the south side of Shrewsbury, but retains the donative still, and drives over on Sunday afternoon to do the service at Longden and gets back to Atcham in time for evening service.

It is quite customary to hear the remark when the third portion of the living is vacant—"Yes, it is a paying thing to keep it vacant as long as the law will allow, as they only provide for two services a month."

I should be glad to know whether the Bishop of Hereford cannot compel the holding of a service in the chapel aforementioned, although it is only licensed. The churchwardens, of course, are not to blame, for they do not know that they are at liberty to act for themselves. A NEIGHBOURING CLERGYMAN.

## REGISTERS.

SIR—The interesting inquiry of Mr. Hedges in your issue of April 19 must on every ground, I think, be answered in the negative, for even if the register of Alfriston began regularly at 1504, which it does not, there are others claiming precedence of it. Mr. Hedges will be aware that, in pursuance of an act passed 11th Geo. IV. (1830), a return was made by the clergy in 1831-2 of all parish registers then in their possession of an earlier date than 1813. As to the particular merits of this return I will now only say that the printed abstract (1833) seems, at all events, to state the truth with regard to the register of Alfriston—viz., that it begins with the year 1538; on referring, however, to the original MS. returns, now in the British Museum (Add. MSS., 9355—60), I find the following statement and letters:—

"*List of Register Books of Baptisms and Burials of the parish of Alfriston, Sussex, previous to 1813.*

"No. 1. An old book of baptisms and burials commencing Oct. 12th, 1538, ending July 12th, 1734.

"No. 2. Ditto ditto commencing Dec. 6th, 1734, ending Oct. 30th, 1812.

"No. 3. Book of marriages, commencing May 4th, 1754, ending Nov. 30th, 1812.

[illegible] books of registers preserved in the

© Reproduced with the permission of Cambridge University Library

heart. We have had interesting speeches and stirring, but there was to my mind a cloud of depression overhanging us, and I venture to ask through your columns, "Why?" I have a parochial association for both the great missionary societies, and therefore do not write as a partisan when I say that the contrast between to-day's meeting and the anniversaries of the Church Missionary Society is painful to supporters of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel. The *tokens* of depression are simple facts, and are these—the beautiful organ was silent, no inspiriting hymns; the body of the hall was *not* three-quarters full, I sat at the end of the third quarter and had a bench to myself; the galleries had, perhaps, thirty or forty people in them. I have seen Exeter Hall crowded with Church Missionary Society supporters in every part, and the platform (which to-day at St. James's was *so* thinly attended) filled to the roof. At first entering I could not realise the occasion at all, and for some time could not attend for asking myself, Where are the home Bishops? Where are the clergy, London and country? Where are the layworkers, the deaconesses and sisters, the Church councilmen and guilds? We heard much of "this great society," but it was hard to feel enthusiasm until Canon Wilkinson's rousing words recalled one's thoughts from the surroundings. Sir, I am only a country parson; and, though I have my own suspicions of the causes at work to depress, it does not matter what I think. But I do respectfully and earnestly commend the state of things to the esteemed secretary and the committee for their consideration. EAST ANGLIAN VICAR.

## S.P.G.—ARCHDEACONRY OF GLOUCESTER.

SIR—Will you kindly admit the following correspondence into your paper? It refers to a statement which you reported on April 19, respecting the support that the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel receives in the diocese of Gloucester and Bristol.

Minchinhampton, Stroud, April 29, 1882. E. C. OLDFIELD.

"Minchinhampton, Stroud, 21st April, 1882.

"Dear Mr. Randall—In the *Guardian* of last Wednesday you are reported to have said that 'nearly a third of the diocesan contributions to the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel come from All Saints', Clifton.' I am certain that this is not what you really stated, for it cannot be borne out by the facts; but as an injury might be done to the society if people were led to suppose it had so limited a circle of supporters, I hope you will kindly inform me of what you *did* say, that I may correct the reporter.—Yours very truly,

"E. C. OLDFIELD."

"Binfield Rectory, April 25, 1882.

"My dear Mr. Oldfield—I was quoting the words of our secretary for the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in what I wrote, and they have reference *only to the Bristol part of the diocese*, not to the combined dioceses of Gloucester and Bristol. I should hope that no harm could happen to the society such as you seem to apprehend. It did not occur to me that my words would be taken to bear the application which I now see they may bear.—Yours very truly,

"R. W. RANDALL."

"Minchinhampton, Stroud, April 29, 1882.

"Dear Mr. Randall—Many thanks for your reply to my inquiry. Your local secretary, however, is misleading in his statement, even though he refers to the archdeaconry of Bristol alone. He says that 'nearly a third of the contributions to the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel come from All Saints', Clifton.' The total amount sent in 1881 from Bristol archdeaconry was 1,076*l.* 5s. 11d., of which your congregation gave 80*l.* 2s. 6d. They also collected a large sum for the missionary works in which they were specially interested; but this money was not given to the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel; it was given through the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel bankers to the Bishops for whose use it was raised. It does injury to the society when these special gifts are spoken of as collections for the funds of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel.—Yours very truly,

"E. C. OLDFIELD."

## DAY OF INTERCESSION FOR MISSIONS.

SIR—When a whole diocese of such great importance as is the diocese of Lincoln bodily gives up observing Rogation Tuesday as

Then, if we take the text writers of the seventeenth and eighteenth century, what do we find? Some are entirely silent, and all the others contain but very guarded and limited statements of the powers of churchwardens over seats. The gradual "development" of the doctrine may be traced by comparing successive editions of the same work. For instance, Burns' *Ecclesiastical Law*, first published in 1763, was for nearly a century a work of considerable repute, and has passed through nine editions. The following extract from the original book shows how the law has "progressed," the sentence in brackets (the very quotation your correspondent makes!) appearing *for the first time* in Sir Robert Phillimore's edition, published in 1842:—

"For the disposal of the seats in the nave of the church appertaineth of common right to the Bishop of the diocese; so that he may place and displace whomsoever he pleaseth. (Parishioners are not at liberty to choose what seats they like; the distribution of seats among them rests in the discretion of the ordinary, which he generally exercises by the churchwardens, who are his officers as well as those of the parish.)"

But the change is still more strikingly shown by a reference to Blackstone's *Commentaries*. In the third edition of that work, published in 1768, there is *not a single word on the subject of churchwardens' powers of appropriating seats*. After the lapse of a century, however, Mr. Serjeant Stephen, in his edition published in 1874 (vol. ii., p. 699), states the law as follows:—

"Churchwardens are also to make such order relative to seats in the church and chancel not appropriated to particular persons as the ordinary—who has in general the sole power in this matter—shall direct. And in practice the arrangements are usually made by the churchwardens, even without any special direction from the ordinary."

Sir John Nicholl, Dean of the Arches, certainly said, in the course of his judgment in a perturbation case ("Pettman *v.* Bridger") in 1811, where, however, the question of churchwardens' powers was not before the court at all:—

"By the general law, and of common right, all pews belong to the parishioners at large for their use and accommodation; but the distribution of seats among them rests with the ordinary. The churchwardens are the officers of the ordinary—they are to place the parishioners according to their rank and station, but they are subject to the control of the ordinary if any complaint should be made against them. *The vestry, as such, has no authority whatever on the subject.*"

But this is not a *legal decision*; it is a mere *judicial opinion*, and is entirely independent of the judgment eventually pronounced on the particular issue the Judge was then engaged in trying. The soundness of the views put forth may well be questioned when the very same Judge, only a few months before, is found giving utterance to an opinion totally at variance with that above stated. In the case of "Tattersall *v.* Knight," which was an application for a faculty to erect a gallery and to appropriate the seats therein, he said:—

"As to the mere arrangement of seats, if the parishioners can settle that amongst themselves and to their own satisfaction, and can agree about the expense, there seems but little necessity for the interference of the incumbent; the expense is that of the parishioners. The churchwardens are bound to repair with the consent of the vestry. It is not the vicar, *but the vestry which appropriates the seats*; the general superintendence and authority in allotting them resting with the ordinary."

In Sir John Nicholl's day the practice of appropriation was at its height, and was doubtless regarded as quite proper. His *dictum* was simply an attempt, unconscious, no doubt, to bring the then existing practice into harmony with the law. It was sought to do this by clothing the churchwardens with a power similar to that formerly exercised by the ordinary, of appropriating seats by *faculty*, through the diocesan court—a power which is now seldom exercised, and would be altogether abolished by the Parish Churches Bill.

To sum up. Churchwardens are *not* officers of the ordinary, but officers of the parishioners, to whom alone they are responsible. The ordinary has no voice whatever in their election, nor do they take an oath of obedience to him. They simply make a

send you a few particulars which I trust you will deem worthy of a place in your columns.

Pontesbury is a peculiar parish and covers a very large area. It was divided some years ago into three portions, called respectively, first, second, and third portions, with a separate rector for each portion. One large parish church is used by all as a *parish church*. The rector of the first portion takes two Sundays in the month. The rectors of second and third take a Sunday each.

The rectors of the second and third portions have each a district and chapels in their districts, and have services there.

Rector No. 1 is a High Churchman (so-called); Rector No. 2 is a Low Churchman, although an excellent man and a scholar; Rector No. 3 is *non est*.

The patronage of these *quasi*-livings is in different hands. Rector No. 1 is his own patron: Rector No. 2 is appointed by Queen's College, Oxford. The patronage of the third is in private hands (a solicitor's, I believe). It is notorious that this living is sold repeatedly. It is now vacant. This portion has a beautiful chapel, in a district one and a half miles from the parish church; but because the last rector had a donative at Longden, about the same distance on the other side of Pontesbury, he closed the chapel, and left his parish to the tender mercies of Dissent. This rector has been appointed to the living of Atcham, on the south side of Shrewsbury, but retains the donative still, and drives over on Sunday afternoon to do the service at Longden and gets back to Atcham in time for evening service.

It is quite customary to hear the remark when the third portion of the living is vacant—"Yes, it is a paying thing to keep it vacant as long as the law will allow, as they only provide for two services a month."

I should be glad to know whether the Bishop of Hereford cannot compel the holding of a service in the chapel aforementioned, although it is only licensed. The churchwardens, of course, are not to blame, for they do not know that they are at liberty to act for themselves. A NEIGHBOURING CLERGYMAN.

## REGISTERS.

SIR—The interesting inquiry of Mr. Hedges in your issue of April 19 must on every ground, I think, be answered in the negative, for even if the register of Alfriston began regularly at 1504, which it does not, there are others claiming precedence of it. Mr. Hedges will be aware that, in pursuance of an act passed 11th Geo. IV. (1830), a return was made by the clergy in 1831-2 of all parish registers then in their possession of an earlier date than 1813. As to the particular merits of this return I will now only say that the printed abstract (1833) seems, at all events, to state the truth with regard to the register of Alfriston—viz., that it begins with the year 1538; on referring, however, to the original MS. returns, now in the British Museum (Add. MSS., 9355—60), I find the following statement and letters:—

"*List of Register Books of Baptisms and Burials of the parish of Alfriston, Sussex, previous to* 1813.

"No. 1. An old book of baptisms and burials commencing Oct. 12th, 1538, ending July 12th, 1734.

"No. 2. Ditto ditto commencing Dec. 6th, 1734, ending Oct. 30th, 1812.

"No. 3. Book of marriages, commencing May 4th, 1754, ending Nov. 30th, 1812.

"Sir—The above are the only books of registers preserved in the parish of Alfriston. They are in very tolerable preservation, and, I believe, perfect as far as they go. I was not aware of any omission, or, indeed, of the necessity of sending a list of the old books, no special application having been made to me for it. Probably my vicar, who lately died, was applied to.

"There is no copy of the list sent to the registrar in 1813 retained.—I have the honour to be, sir, yours very obediently,

"H. R. FOWLER, Minr. *pro. tem.* of Alfriston.

"May 29, 1832."

"Alfriston, Sussex.

"Sir—According to the best information I can give respecting

Printed by WILLIAM ODHAMS, and Published by JOHN JAMES, at the Office, 5, Burleigh-street, Strand, in the Parish of St. Martin-in-the-Fields and City of Westminster.—WEDNESDAY, MAY 3, 1882.

© Reproduced with the permission of Cambridge University Library