

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

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

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



Buy me a coffee

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



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

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

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

THE
CHURCHMAN

NOVEMBER, 1886.

ART. I.—ON THE SECOND COMING OF CHRIST, AND
THE RESTORATION OF THE JEWS TO THE
HOLY LAND.

AS a member of the committee of the Church Missionary Society, and a frequent speaker at its meetings, I have often been challenged with the question, "What are you hoping to do? Do you expect to convert the world, or to gather out a few here, and a few there, from the heathen? Are you sending men only to 'preach the gospel as a witness' before the end comes?" Being invited last year to speak at the meeting of the London Society for Promoting Christianity among the Jews, I studied its publications, and found frequent mention of the restoration of the Jews to "their own land," as *the* event hoped for by the supporters of the Society, and to be hastened by its exertions; and I was asked whether this was *my* object in speaking on the Society's behalf.

To these queries my reply was that such questions are among "the secret things that belong unto the Lord our God;" but that it has been revealed unto us that we should (Deut. xxix. 29) do the words of His law; that the law is plain: "Go ye into all the world and preach the gospel to every creature;" (Mark xvi. 15); and I am content to assist in doing this, and leave the result to God.

Soon afterwards I was invited by a certain prophetic society to read a paper on this very subject. Preparing to do so, and intimating the view that I was disposed to take, I was informed that it was a fundamental law of the Society that they who do not adopt its opinions in the main, are to be treated like those "which feign that the old fathers did look only for transitory promises" (Art. VII.), and "are not to be heard." This interdict set me thinking, and I resolved to study the question more attentively, and venture now to submit this paper as the result of my study, conscious, indeed, of

its many defects and failings, yet hoping that it may show that there is some force in the reasons that prevent me from adopting the views of the said prophetic society, which feigns that the Jewish nation can now look only for transitory promises, and not for the glorious privilege of becoming the sons of God (John i. 12).

The question stated generally, is this: "Shall the future glory of the Church of Christ on earth be the result of means already employed by the Lord for the purpose of bringing it about, or is it to be the result of some other means to be employed in a new dispensation after Christ's second coming?" And as subsidiary and corollary to this, "Will these other means be the restoration of the Jews to Palestine, and the extension from thence of an earthly kingdom of the Messiah?"

In the Apostles' Creed every Christian states his belief that the Lord Jesus Christ "sitteth on the right hand of God the Father Almighty," and from thence "shall come to judge the quick and the dead." The Nicene Creed states that the Lord Jesus Christ "sitteth on the right hand of the Father," and that "He shall come again with glory to judge both the quick and the dead," and that His "kingdom shall have no end." The Creed of St. Athanasius teaches that the one Christ, "God and Man, sitteth on the right hand of the Father, God Almighty; from whence He shall come to judge the quick and the dead:" that at His "coming all men shall rise again with their bodies, and shall give account for their own works; and they that have done good shall go into life everlasting, and they that have done evil into everlasting fire."

Every Churchman prays that "in the last day when Jesus Christ shall come again in His glorious majesty to judge both the quick and the dead, we may rise to the life immortal;"¹ and that "at the second coming of the Lord Jesus Christ to judge the world, we may be found an acceptable people in His sight."² And when he stands by the open grave of a friend who has gone before, he asks that "at the general Resurrection in the last day, we may be found acceptable" in the sight of God, and receive that blessing which His well-beloved Son "shall *then* pronounce to all that love and fear" God, "saying, 'Come, ye blessed children of my Father, receive the kingdom prepared for you from the beginning of the world.'"

Thus, the teaching of the three Creeds and of our Prayer Book is, that there will be one last day in which Christ's second coming will take place, when all the dead will arise with their bodies, and the final judgment of both quick and dead, both good and evil, will be irrevocably pronounced by

¹ Collect for 1st Sunday in Advent.

² For the 3rd Sunday.

the Lord Jesus Christ. This teaching ought thoroughly to be received and believed, for it may be proved by most certain warrants of Holy Scripture.¹

Hear first the words of the Lord Jesus Himself, "When the Son of Man shall come in His glory, and all the holy angels with Him, then shall He sit upon the throne of His glory, and before Him shall be gathered all the nations." "Then shall the King" pronounce judgment on both the blessed and the cursed (Matt. xxv. 31). It may, indeed, be, as Dean Alford thought, that the words *πάντα τὰ ἔθνη* relate to the heathen, or at least to non-professors of Christianity, as distinct from the professing Christians whom he thought to be described in the Parables of the Ten Virgins and of the Talents; but even then, the judgment of all is described as continuous, and as taking place on the same day; which term is of course not limited to twenty-four hours, but must mean a continuous portion of time.

Again, Christ tells us "The hour is coming in the which all that are in the graves shall hear His voice, and shall come forth: they that have done good to the resurrection of life, and they that have done evil to the resurrection of damnation" (John v. 28, 29). And further, He says, "This is the will of Him that sent Me, that every one which seeth the Son and believeth in Him, shall have everlasting life. And I will raise him up at the last day" (John vi. 40).

It is clear from these passages that our Lord taught that at His coming again (and only one coming again is spoken of) all that are in their graves shall rise, and the sequence of events shall be, first the acceptance of the righteous, and then the rejection of the wicked—but both on the same last day.

St. Paul, writing to the Romans,² and also to the Corinthians, tells us that we must all (good and bad) appear before the judgment-seat of Christ; and in his Epistle to the Philipians (iii. 20), speaking only of the righteous, he says, from heaven "we look for the Saviour, Who shall change our vile body;" and he writes to the Corinthians about believers (1 Cor. xv. 52), "We shall not all sleep" (*i.e.*, some will then be living), "but we shall all be changed, in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye, at the last trump: for the trumpet shall sound, and the dead shall be raised," where *οἱ νεκροί* surely, means all the dead. St. Paul again, in 1 Thess. iv. 14, comforts bereaved Christians by telling them that the dead in Christ shall rise first, and then all living believers, of whom he apparently expected to be one, shall together with them be caught up in the clouds to meet the Lord in the air, and be

¹ Art. VIII.

² Rom. xiv. 10; 2 Cor. v. 10.

for ever with Him as from that day. Throughout the New Testament there are numerous references to "the day of the Lord." "That day when God shall judge the world in righteousness by that man Christ Jesus" (Acts xvii. 31); "that day when the Lord, the righteous Judge, will give a crown of righteousness to all them that love His appearing" (2 Tim. iv. 8); that day which is identified with the time when Christ shall appear to those that look for Him the second time, and with the day of the Lord in which "the heavens shall pass away and the earth be burnt up" (2 Peter iii. 10).

Thus the Church of England follows Holy Scripture in teaching that there will be one day or period, and one only, at which all these things will take place consecutively, in pre-arranged order.

Let me now consider the bearing which these statements have upon the questions proposed.

As I read these passages of Holy Scripture, the second coming of our Lord Jesus Christ will be for the judgment of all men, quick and dead—real and professing Christians, heathen who have rejected and heathen who have not heard the gospel. He will then appear and establish His kingdom; and the heavens and the earth—the universal *κοσμος*—will be dissolved and pass away. And if this be so, it is obvious that the completion of the work of Christ on earth must be accomplished before this great catastrophe, and therefore, before His coming again; and the language of the last collect but one in the Burial Service is in strict accordance with the Holy Scripture, and we rightly pray that the Lord will "shortly accomplish the number of His elect, and hasten His kingdom." His kingdom is not to come until all the elect are gathered in. The elect are those who, being called of God, through grace obey the calling, are justified and sanctified, and at length, by God's mercy, attain to everlasting felicity.

It may, of course, be argued that, even granting that the Church of Christ will be completed and made meet for the inheritance of the saints in light before the second coming of Christ, still it does not necessarily follow that that blessed consummation will be brought about by the preaching of the gospel, but by some new and extraordinary manifestation of Christ's power.

But is there any reason why any such manifestation should be looked for or be required? Our Lord's dying commission to His Apostles and His Church was to preach the gospel to every creature throughout the whole world. That gospel has been declared to be the power of God unto salvation to every human being. The preaching of the Word is the manifesta-

tion of the Spirit, Whose office it is to take of the things of Christ and show them unto men; and our Lord promised to be always with the preachers of the gospel, from the day on which He gave the Apostles their "marching orders" even unto the end of the ages.

What more than this—what else beside this, can possibly be needed for the conversion of sinners at any time or in any country? St. Paul suggests no other means than preaching the Word, when, in his Epistle to the Romans (x. 13-15), he traces all the steps: first, the universality of the gospel—"Whosoever shall call on the name of the Lord shall be saved;" then the necessity of faith in the Lord, for without it they cannot call on Him; then the obvious necessity of their hearing of God before they can believe in Him; and, lastly, he shows that men must be sent to preach the gospel in order that they may hear.

Not a word is said about some other means, some other time, some fresh mercy, some new dispensation. "Whosoever" excludes none. If three thousand were converted at once on the Day of Pentecost by the Holy Spirit carrying home to their hearts the preaching of Peter; if to the same Holy Spirit every individual believer in every age and in every clime owes his adoption into the family of God; if that Holy Spirit still works mightily and effectually, why may not millions, and hundreds of millions, be converted, in God's own time, by the same instrumentality—the preaching of the gospel—and the same agency—the divine influence of the Holy Ghost? Is it conceivable that Christ, the Son of God, gave Himself to save man, and did not with Himself freely give all things necessary to enable man to be saved?

Nevertheless, the members of that prophetic society—persons of no mean authority—will assail my position, and deny the assertion that the work of Christ in accomplishing the number of His elect must be completed before He shall come again. In fact, if I rightly understand them, they contend that real Christianity will not prevail throughout the world until after our Lord's second coming; that the Jewish nation, having been first restored to the Holy Land, will then be converted to Christianity, and become successful missionaries to the Gentiles; and that all this will take place during the personal reign on earth of the Lord Jesus Christ for a thousand years. Some, I believe, differ on the second point, and teach that, not the Jews, but the glorified Church of Christ, will remain on earth after the second coming, and preach the gospel successfully to those still unconverted.

Consistently with this doctrine, and as an inevitable result of it, these persons teach that the second coming will not take

place on "the last day," but a thousand years before; that the resurrection which does take place at the appearing of Christ will not be universal; and that the judgment for which He is then to come will not be the final judgment, but only, to borrow a legal phrase, interlocutory. They further, on the authority of certain apocalyptic visions—of which we have no authoritative explanation—maintain that this partial resurrection will be of the saints alone; that the living who are Christ's will be caught up to meet Him, together with the revived saints, not to commence the fruition of the promise that they shall together be with the Lord for ever, but merely to be sheltered for a time from the awful judgment with which He will avenge Him of His enemies, (after which they will, I suppose, return to this earth); and that our Lord, at His second coming, will not judge the quick and the dead, but will complete in some way His saving work among the children of men, and will judge the world in righteousness finally, either at the end of the millennium or (it is not clear which) when some indefinitely long period has been accomplished.

As to the theory of a first partial resurrection, it may be sufficient to say, with Bishop Wordsworth, that it seems a strange reason for believing in a first resurrection of men's *bodies*, that the Apostle St. John saw in a vision the resurrection of *some* souls.

In justification of my own disbelief of this theory, I may mention that it was examined and rejected by Jerome and Augustine; by Luther, Melancthon, and Calvin; by Cranmer, Ridley, and Jewell; by the compilers and authors of the Book of Common Prayer, as the quotations given above are sufficient to show, and by a long catena of the most learned divines, ending with Bishop Wordsworth. In the estimation of all of these the second coming of our Lord will be His final coming, and will introduce the ultimate consummation of all things.

There are, however, brief passages in our Lord's discourses on which reliance is placed for construction of the theory that His work in the completion of His Church and in preparing it for glory will not be finished before He comes. One of these is His question, "When the Son of Man cometh shall He find faith on the earth?" (Luke xviii. 8), which is interpreted to mean that when He comes He will find no faith at all on the earth. But surely, having regard to the context, the meaning is that when He comes He will not find men acting generally on the belief in God's retributive justice. St. Peter tells us that in the last days scoffers will ask scornfully, "Where is the promise of His coming?" and no one supposes that *all* the quick will be real Christians. But there will be many looking for Him, to whom He will appear with-

out sin unto salvation, and they will be caught up to meet their Lord in the air.

The second passage relied upon is Matt. xxiv. 14: "This gospel of the kingdom shall be preached in all the world for a witness unto all nations, and *then* shall the end come." Here it is alleged that the words *εις μαρτύριον πᾶσι τοῖς ἔθνεσι* mean that the gospel shall be preached, not as a means of converting all nations, but as a witness of its own truth—as a witness against the nations who reject it; and I have heard it stated at Missionary meetings that this has already been done, even to such peoples as the Chinese and the inhabitants of Central Africa, and that therefore our Lord's second coming may be immediately expected.

My reply is, first, that of all the 187 passages in the New Testament in which *μαρτυρῶ, μαρτυροῦμαι, μαρτυρία, and μαρτύριον* occur, there is not one, unless this *εις μαρτύριον* be one, in which the word is used for any other purpose than to have credence given to the assertion made, whatever it may be. What other use can there be in a witness, in evidence, in bearing testimony? Must we—can we believe, without one word being said to that effect, that the gospel of the kingdom is to be preached to all nations only as a witness *against* them for not receiving it? Surely a gospel so preached would not be good news, but bad!

Next I must contend (and may refer to Matthew Henry, the most spiritual, and Thomas Scott, the most sensible, of modern commentators as supporting me in the contention) that this passage in St. Matthew refers mainly to the destruction of Jerusalem, and has little, if any, reference to the last day. Thus understood, the prophecy was literally fulfilled. After the persecution about Stephen, the saints went everywhere preaching the Word. St. Paul tells us that the sound of the gospel had, even in his time, already gone into all the earth, and their words to the end of the world, and that the gospel was in all the world, and had been preached to every creature under heaven¹—a hyperbole not to be taken too literally, but enough to prove that our Lord's prediction had been fulfilled.²

¹ Rom. x. 18; Col. i. 6, 23.

² Doddridge writes upon this passage: "It appears from the most credible records that the gospel was preached in Idumea, Syria, and Mesopotamia by Jude; in Egypt, Marmorica, Mauritania, and other parts of Africa by Mark, Simon, and Jude; in Ethiopia by Candace's Eunuch and Matthias; in Pontus, Galatia, and the neighbouring parts of Asia by Peter; in the territories of the seven Asiatic Churches by John; in Parthia by Matthew; in Scythia by Philip and Andrew; in the northern and western parts of Asia by Bartholomew; in Persia by Simon and Jude; in Media, Carmania, and several eastern parts by Thomas; through the vast tract from Jerusalem round about unto Illyricum by Paul, as also in Italy, and probably in Spain, Gaul, and

I am disposed to think that many of our Lord's predictions had a much more immediate fulfilment than is generally taught. We have no Christian account of the prodigies or portents which attended the close of the first dispensation in the destruction of Jerusalem and the Temple; but the narratives given by Josephus and Tacitus indicate that there were signs in the heavens above and tribulation on the earth, such as had never been known before.

A remarkable instance of this speedy and, as it would seem to us, partial fulfilment of one of our Lord's predictions (were not the phrase a contradiction in terms) may be noticed in comparing John xvii. 12 with xviii. 9.

Another passage quoted is St. Paul's query to the litigants in the church at Corinth (1 Cor. vi. 2), "Do ye not know that the saints shall judge the world?" But this will be fulfilled when the saints, having joined the Lord in the air, and been placed on His right hand, shall sit as His assessors in the immediately following judgment of the world, just as the Apostles are to sit with Him on twelve thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel.

Something is attempted to be made by the advocates of a first and second resurrection, in opposition to the one general resurrection at the last day, of the use of the two words, *ἔπειτα* and *εἶτα* in 1 Cor. xv. 23, 24: "*afterward . . . then.*"¹ But if there be any real difference in the meaning of these two words, the longer word would seem to signify the longer interval of time, for *ἔπειτα* is used for the whole time between the resurrection of our Lord and His second coming (which cannot be much short of 1900 years, and may be much longer); and *εἶτα*, on the contrary, may fairly be rendered "immediately afterwards," as in John xiii. 5, and 1 Cor. xv. 5. So that, if there be a distinction at all, it points the other way.

On the whole, then, I can find nothing to shake my faith in the declaration of the Creeds and of our Common Prayer Book, that the second will be the only coming of Christ: that this

Great Britain, in most of which places Christian Churches were planted in less than thirty years after the death of Christ, which was before the destruction of Jerusalem."

¹ *ἀπαρχὴ* Χριστός, *ἔπειτα* οἱ Χριστοῦ ἐν τῇ παρουσίᾳ αὐτοῦ, *εἶτα* τὸ τέλος. It is argued that *εἶτα* signifies a much longer interval of time than *ἔπειτα*. But this distinction of meaning between the two words is unsupported by classical Greek, *εἶτα* and *ἔπειτα* being used interchangeably for "then" or "next in order of time;" and in Hellenistic Greek the usage is the same. The only two passages, besides this, in the Septuagint and New Testament, in which both words occur, are in the same 1st Epistle to Corinthians, viz., xii. 28—*ἔπειτα* δυνάμεις, *εἶτα* χαρίσματα ἰαμάτων; and xv. 7, *ἔπειτα* ὤφθη Ἰακώβω, *εἶτα* τοῖς ἀποστόλοις πάνσιν. In neither of these verses is it possible to contend that there is any difference in meaning.

His second coming will be at the last day: that His redeeming work will then have been completed, and the day of grace have ended; that His glory will have been fully manifested upon earth by the establishment there of His universal Church, and of His kingdom of grace; and that He will then take all the subjects of that kingdom to reign together with Him in the kingdom of glory in heaven for ever and ever.

In short, I believe in the words of the narrator of the vision so much relied on, that when the Son of Man comes with clouds, every eye shall see Him—including those who pierced Him—and all nations shall mourn, over Him; and how shall they be able to see or to mourn, if they have not risen with their bodies but are still lying fast asleep in their graves waiting for another resurrection?

Next as to the subsidiary question:

It is believed by the members of the prophetic society alluded to above—and by many other excellent men, and by very many pious women—that there is in reserve for the people of God a glorious earthly kingdom. The Lord Jesus Christ, when He comes the second time, is to personally lead the Jews into the land of Canaan and to reign over them there. And some think that the Jewish nation, thus restored, will go out into all the parts of the earth as missionaries and declare God's glory among the Gentiles, until all the ends of the earth have seen the salvation of God.

Let me make the preliminary observation that a future glory of the Jews is one thing, their re-establishment as a nation in the earthly Canaan is another. Presently I will show from the Holy Scriptures what seems to me to be their teaching as to the future glory; but I will first examine the theories put forward by those who, as they express it, look for "the restoration of the Jews to their own land." While there is amongst "the prophets" a general consensus as to the broad fact, there is a vast diversity of opinion as to the details. Whether by the Jews we are to understand all the descendants of Jacob, or only the two tribes; whether the restored will be only the one generation which will happen to be alive at the particular period of the second coming of Christ, or whether all Jacob's descendants from the time of the birth of Reuben unto that great day, shall either as quick or as raised from the dead, enter bodily into Canaan; whether they shall return thither as Christians or as unbelieving Jews; whether they shall abide there for ever, or be at some future time removed to heaven; whether, while there, they shall again worship and offer sacrifices in a temple at Jerusalem, rebuilt upon the plan of Ezekiel, or shall only offer up to God

spiritual worship, acceptable in Christ Jesus—about all these most important points, and many others, those who call on us to believe that the Jews will be restored to their own land differ widely. *Tot homines, quot sententia.*

This variety of opinion in no way surprises me ; and for this simple reason, that there is not one word on the subject in the New Testament. No ! Although all the writers of the New Testament (with the possible exception of St. Luke) were Jews ; though the gospel was first preached to the Jews ; though the writers continually appeal to and frequently quote the Jewish Prophets ; though Christianity is set forth both by our Lord Himself and by every one of His Apostles and Disciples as the full development of Judaism ; though the New Testament is not contrary to the Old ; though all that is contained in the Law and the Prophets is to find its fulfilment in the new dispensation, there is not one syllable from the first verse of St. Matthew's Gospel to the last verse of the Revelation of St. John the Divine which gives the slightest hint of any future earthly glory for the Jews, individually or as a nation, much less of any future return to Canaan as their own land.

So far from there being anything of the kind, the Apostle Peter in his very first address to the Jews on the Day of Pentecost, told them that the famous promise of God that a descendant of King David should sit upon his throne had been already fulfilled by the resurrection of the crucified Jesus to be both Lord and Christ.

Again, at the first Council of the Church in Jerusalem, St. James declared that the prophecy of Amos concerning the rebuilding of the tabernacle of David had had its fulfilment in the setting up amongst the Gentiles of the Kingdom of Christ. As to any future earthly kingdom of the Jews, we have not only the clear predictions of the destruction of Jerusalem, of the dissolution of the Jewish state and nation, and of the dispersion of the Jews over all the world, but also the express declaration of our Lord that the kingdom should be taken from them and given to another nation (Matt. xxi. 43), and all this without the least suggestion that it should ever be given back to them, or that they should return home. Surely, when our Lord wept over the impending desolation of Jerusalem, this crumb of comfort would have been given, if there had been any foundation for it in fact !

For it was not so with the Old Testament prophecies concerning the first destruction of Jerusalem and of the Temple, and the carrying away of the Jews and Israelites into Babylonish captivity. That catastrophe, with all its attendant miseries, was foretold by Isaiah, Jeremiah, and Ezekiel. But

then the wrath was tempered by mercy. Their dark clouds of foretold calamity had the silver lining of promises that the sorrow should have an end; that after seventy years of exile the banished people should come back, if they would, to their own land, and that although their city and their temple were about to be destroyed, the House of the Lord should again be frequented by godly worshippers, and that boys and girls should again play in the streets of Jerusalem.

No such words of consolation fell from the lips of the loving Jesus when He forewarned His countrymen of their approaching ruin and dissension. But why? because far better things were in store for them. It was not the country from which they went out that they were to be mindful of, or to which they were to seek opportunity to return. They were to desire a better country—that is, a heavenly—and there God had prepared for them a city, a new Jerusalem above (Heb. xi. 16).

It is true that the Jews did despise and reject the Messiah, and deliver Him up to be crucified. It is true that for many centuries they have resisted the Holy Ghost, and refused the offer of salvation through faith in the crucified One. It is true that they have drawn upon themselves by their unbelief and ungodliness the destruction of Jerusalem, the dispersion of their race among all nations, with much affliction and persecution, and their present separation from God.

But are these evil things to last for ever? No: a time is coming when the great body of the Gentiles shall be as wild slips (Rom. xi.) grafted contrary to nature into that good olive tree which has its root in Abraham, and when, much more, the great body of the Jews shall be grafted again into their own olive tree, from which at present, through unbelief, they are broken off. By faith they will resume their place—by faith, that is, in Christ; becoming united to Him, they will resume their place as the people of God; they will regain their privileges among the spiritual seed of Abraham, and attain to that heavenly country which Abraham and the patriarchs sought, in which the crucified Jesus is already seated on the Throne at God's right hand, King of Kings and Lord of Lords.

To Jews and Gentiles alike, as I understand my Bible, are these blessed privileges given, on one and the same condition. They must be children of God, through faith in Christ Jesus. Then, all distinction ceasing between Jew and Greek, between bond and free, they all become one in Christ; and being Christ's, they are all Abraham's seed, and as the true Israelites, heirs according to the promise—heirs, that is, of all the blessings of every kind promised to the people of God (Gal. iii. 26-29).

In the Epistle to the Ephesians (iii. 4-6) St. Paul teaches this

in the clearest language. The mystery, he says, hidden for ages, but now made known, is this : that the Gentiles shall be fellow-heirs with the Jews, and fellow-members of the same body, and fellow-partakers with them in the promise—of what? of the land of Canaan? To state the proposition is to refute it. No, truly; of the heavenly inheritance. This was the promise unto which the twelve tribes hoped to attain, earnestly serving God night and day (Acts xxvi. 6, 7).

These passages, and many others like them, seem to me to show conclusively that in Christ—the seed of Abraham—all nations on the earth are to be blessed alike; that except for the curse as long as the Jews continue in unbelief, the distinction between them and the Gentiles has ceased in the gospel dispensation; that there is no promise to believing Gentiles in which believing Jews will not share, and no promise to faithful Jews in which faithful Gentiles will not share; and that in Christ all the prophecies, as well as all the law, are fulfilled.

In conclusion, let me bring the matter to a practical test. Let me take the case of a Missionary to the Jews. Is he to offer them the choice of two gospels? Is he to say: "Repent, and believe in the Lord Jesus Christ, and accept Him as your Messiah, and you shall be saved from sin and death and hell. You shall lose, indeed, your nationality in becoming a member of Christ, for in Him there is neither Jew nor Gentile; and your descendants will do so literally, because intermarriages between them and Gentiles will speedily in the future, as they have done (in similar cases) in the past, put an end to all such distinctions. But, in exchange, you shall be forthwith admitted into the city of the living God (Heb. xii.); you shall be enrolled as a citizen of the heavenly Jerusalem and a member of the general assembly and Church of the firstborn whose names are written in heaven; and you shall reign with Christ for ever in heaven." Or is the Missionary to say: "Reject Jesus as your Saviour and King, and you shall retain your nationality; and your descendants, also rejecting, shall retain theirs, and continue Jews according to the flesh; and at some time or other, when the Messiah, Whom you have rejected, comes again, you, perhaps—or, at all events, those of your descendants who will then be living on the earth—shall, with the rest of the unbelieving Jewish nation, be restored to the land of Canaan, and shall dwell again in an earthly Jerusalem, and again worship in a temple rebuilt according to Ezekiel's description; and there, for many ages, shall sojourn under the beneficent rule of the Lord Jesus Christ, to Whom you shall then be gradually reconciled, and you shall from thence carry the gospel to the uttermost parts of the earth."

This statement of the case is no caricature; it follows of necessity from the earthly, as distinguished from the spiritual, interpretation of the Scriptures; and in my choice there is no hesitation and no doubt. To the Jew, as well as to the Gentile, would I offer the loss of all things—nationality, Canaan, Jerusalem, temple—so that he may win CHRIST.

SYDNEY GEDGE.

MITCHAM HALL, SURREY,
August, 1886.



ART. II.—NEW TESTAMENT SAINTS NOT COMMEMORATED.

I.—AQUILA AND PRISCILLA.

WE first hear of Aquila and Priscilla when St. Paul reached Corinth, in the course of that great missionary journey which introduced the Gospel into Europe.¹ Saddened and disappointed, as we may well believe, by the indifference—far more discouraging than active opposition—which he had encountered at Athens, the Apostle came to Corinth. Alone and on foot—for so, even if he came by sea, the last eight miles from the port of Cenchreæ would no doubt be travelled—he entered the city. Very striking was the contrast which it presented to the city which he had just quitted. Rebuilt by Julius Cæsar, after lying for a century in the ruins to which Mummius had reduced it, Corinth was now the commercial capital of Greece, a vast crowded mart, commanding by its two harbours, one on either side of the isthmus on which it stood, the trade of the East and of the West, and uniting the Morea and the Continent by the same isthmus; across which, moreover, to facilitate traffic, ships of smaller burden could be drawn.² A very sink, too, of vice and profligacy the Corinth of that day had become. To the demoralizing influences to which great trading cities have always been exposed, was added the shameless worship of impurity under the name of religion.

In this city, however, a great work was before him. Already, perhaps, as he entered it, inward hopes and promptings did battle with loneliness and dejection, and forestalled the later assurance of his Lord that He had much people in that city.³

¹ Acts xviii. 1—3.

² Over the *διολκος*, as the narrowest part of the isthmus—about three miles wide—was called.

³ Acts xviii. 10.

His first concern on arriving would be to find an opening for the pursuit of the trade, which he had learned in the usual course of his education as a Jew, that so he might provide for his own wants, and obviate from the outset all valid charge of mercenary motives in delivering his message. For this end, as well as in obedience to the law of his mission, "To the Jew first," he would naturally turn his steps to the Jewish quarter. In a trading city like Corinth Jews would always abound. At that time they were probably more numerous than usual, because, as St. Luke informs us—and here, as elsewhere, his accuracy is vouched for by extraneous testimony—the Emperor Claudius had expelled them from Rome.¹ Two such Jewish exiles, Aquila with his wife Priscilla, had at any rate found their way to Corinth. They were natives of Pontus, a district of Asia Minor on the shores of the Euxine, in which, as we learn from other passages of the New Testament, Jews were at that time to be found,² and of which another well-known Jewish Aquila, the translator of the Old Testament into Greek, was also a native.³ St. Luke is careful to tell us that they had only recently⁴ come to Corinth. But it would seem that they had already begun to work at the trade, to which, as strangers in a strange city, they must look as their only source of maintenance. "By their trade they were tentmakers;"⁵ either weavers, that is, of coarse goat-hair into cloth for tents, or perhaps, more probably, makers of tents of the cloth when woven. It was "the staple manufacture"⁶ of St. Paul's native city, Tarsus, and it was the trade which he himself had learned in youth. Here, then, was the opportunity of which he was in search. By associating himself with Aquila and Priscilla, who had already gained

¹ Acts xviii. 2. The often-quoted words of Suetonius, *Judeos impulsore Chresto assidue tumultuantes Romam expulit*, clearly affirm the passing of the edict, whether we understand *Chrestus* to be the name of a Jewish leader, or a mis-spelling for *Christus*. The apparent contradiction of Dion Cassius probably amounts only to an intimation that, owing to the vast number of Jews in Rome, it was found impossible to carry out the edict fully. Many Jews, however, and Aquila and Priscilla among the number, actually left.

² Acts ii. 10; 1 Peter i. 1.

³ The suggestion that St. Luke has fallen into an error in describing Aquila as "a man of Pontus by race," and that he was really a freedman of the house of Pontius Aquila, a noble Roman, has therefore been rightly characterized as "very gratuitous."

⁴ προσφάτως, Acts xviii. 2.

⁵ Acts xviii. 3, σκηνοποιοί.

⁶ "The staple manufacture of the city was the weaving, first into ropes, then into tent-covers and garments, of the hair which was supplied in boundless quantities by the goat flocks of the Taurus."—Archdeacon Farrar, *Life of St. Paul*, i. 23.

a footing for their occupation, and who were willing to receive him into their home as a fellow-worker, he would be able to gain a livelihood, and maintain that independence which was to be his "glorying in the regions of Achaia."¹ Community of race and religion as Jews; community of circumstances as strangers in a strange place; community of interest as looking to the same occupation for necessary support—these were the cords which first drew St. Paul into an acquaintanceship with Aquila and Priscilla, which quickly ripened into friendship, and which issued in Christian brotherhood, and in close and affectionate union as "fellow-workers in Christ Jesus."²

Reserving the later stages and mature fruits of this remarkable friendship for another short paper, it may suffice now to make two brief remarks upon the history so far considered.

1. To his connection with Aquila and Priscilla we are indebted for a knowledge of the trade at which St. Paul worked. Through them we come to know what that manual occupation was, to which, without himself defining it, he so often refers.³ On that coarse hair-cloth those hands were busied night and day, which had worked miracles of healing, and consecrated elders to the ministry of the Church; and those eyes were bent in long and weary toil which had seen the Just One, and gazed on the unspeakable glories of the third heaven. And thus by an example only less constraining than that of Him Who deigned not only to be called "the carpenter's son," but to be "the carpenter," we are taught the dignity of honest toil. Not only may holy thoughts and holy words mingle now, as doubtless they mingled then, with the humblest labour, but the labour itself, if it be done for God, is holy. "The Creator of the world Himself, with His own most holy hands, practised the art of a carpenter (Matt. xiii. 55, Mark vi. 3). In like manner the chief of the Apostles, who laboured more than all in setting up the Tabernacle of the Church (1 Cor. xv. 10), was wont to seek his living by making tents, and from stitching earthly tents was called to dwell in everlasting habitations."⁴

2. They were not, so far as we know, spiritual affinities, or directly religious aims, which first brought together St. Paul and Aquila and Priscilla. Though it has the support of not a few weighty names, the view that Aquila and Priscilla were already converts to Christianity when St. Paul met with them, while it cannot appeal to any positive statement of St. Luke's, appears to run entirely counter to what may be termed the

¹ 2 Cor. xi. 10.

² Rom. xvi. 3, 4.

³ Acts xx. 34; 1 Cor. iv. 12; 1 Thess. ii. 9; 2 Thess. iii. 8.

⁴ See Bishop Wordsworth on Acts xviii. 3.

negative evidence of his account. He gives prominence, as we have seen, to their common race, circumstances, and trade. By these, as he intimates, they were brought together. Is it conceivable that if by the single word "disciple" he could have indicated a far stronger reason for the intimacy that sprang up between them, that one word would have been withheld? What a thrill of joy would have shot through his heart, and through theirs, if the Apostle of Christ had lighted on brethren in the Lord when first he set foot, lonely and dejected, in that vast heathen city! How worthy the fact to be recorded! How obvious the consequence that they should live and work together! How inexplicable that this reason should be passed over, while other less cogent reasons for their friendship are mentioned! But if this be so—if St. Paul did not find, but made Aquila and Priscilla converts to the faith of Christ—how forcibly are we taught the lesson that not the business only, but what we call the chance associations of life—the interlacings and points of contact between the paths that seem to cross one another at random, like the endless mazes of a labyrinth, are all traced by the never-failing Providence that ordereth all things both in heaven and earth; may all be consecrated to noblest ends and conduct to highest issues. Our natural affections may "be grafted into the tree of Christ's everlasting love, and so partake of its eternity." Our human relationships may issue in the salvation of ourselves and others.

T. T. PEROWNE.

ART. III.—SUSSEX—NOTES OF SCENERY ARCHÆOLOGY AND HISTORY.

PART I.

I SHOULD be happy if any suggestions of mine could have the result of leading the readers of the *CHURCHMAN* to take a keener and more instructed interest in the fair scenes and rich historical remains of one of the most favoured counties in England.

I will begin this paper by a very brief description of the more prominent natural features which are combined with political arrangements to constitute the map of Sussex. From east to west the natural divisions are four; but the four divisions are not equal in length nor uniform in direction. Their lines do not follow the parallels of latitude, but trend rather from the south-east to the north-west. First, the forest ridge, on the Hastings sand, extends from Hastings to East Grinstead, and connects itself on the west with the remains of the Forests of

Ashdown, Tilgate, and St. Leonard's, by Horsham. Next, the weald stretches along the clays from the broad seaward opening of the bay at Pevensey, as far as Petersfield, in Hampshire—a scene of rich and varied beauty. Most visitors to Sussex have surveyed it from the Dyke, with its picturesque alternations of field and wood, the gold of the cornlands and the verdure of the meadows broken here and there by the red roofs and pointed spires of villages or the gables of some ancient hall. Thirdly come the South Downs—our own familiar South Downs; that “chain of majestic mountains,” as Gilbert White too grandly called them; the chalk hills which stretch away, with their rolling succession of calm beauties, from Beachy Head along Sussex, and across Hampshire, to find their western termination in the uplands of Salisbury Plain and the Marlborough Downs. The fourth division reaches from Brighton to the south-west corner of the county, and consists in the gravel of the Sussex level by the sea.

Let us bear in mind these four great lateral divisions to begin with—the forest, the weald, the South Downs, and the shore. Across these slanting lines, from north to south, come the longitudinal divisions of the Rapes of Sussex, an arrangement of political origin, but sufficiently connected with the natural features of our river-system to claim mention here in the forefront of our subject. It has been often stated that this division was introduced, or more probably adopted and utilized by the Norman Conqueror,¹ who may be imagined to have planned out his first conquest into rapes by ropes, as mechanically as you could twice trisect a piece of bride-cake, and with the same desire, to secure to each rape as completely as he could a specimen of every part of what he was dividing—the forest, the clay-level, the chalk-hills, and the plain. He bridled his rapes by six strong castles—those of Hastings and Pevensey, of Lewes and Bramber, of Arundel and Chichester. And he took care that every rape should have its own river, such as it was (for their rivers are not exactly the possessions of which Sussex men are proudest). They furnished, however, sufficient harbours for the light ships of that age, so that the lord of each rape could keep an open eye towards the Norman land beyond the sea. These rivers were the Eastern

¹ So Sir F. Palgrave and others. But the division itself was probably older than the Conquest; and “may represent,” says Bishop Stubbs, “the undershires of the Heptarchic kingdom” (“Constit. Hist.,” i. 100). The Conqueror may have utilized an older civil division for military purposes. “It is probable that the Rapes of Sussex were military districts for the supply of the castles which existed in each” (“Glossary to Sussex Domesday Book,” *s.v.*) “*Hrepp* is still a territorial division in Iceland” (*Ibid.*).

Rother, the Cuckmere, the Ouse, the Adur, the Arun, and the Lavant. I will leave the reader to complete the picture for himself, by finding names for the six old forests on the north and for the ancient ports along the shore,¹ the coast-line of which has been a good deal altered since the days of the Conquest.

I have begun with these divisions, four by six, to bring out as clear a picture as I can of the general shape and outline of the land we have to deal with. But before we pass from scenery to history I had better interpose a brief summary of the chronology, to the sequence of which I shall not be able to confine myself in what follows. The nineteen centuries of our history since the birth of Christ may be broadly divided into three great periods. The first four centuries and a half belong to the Britons and the Romans. The next six centuries belong to the time of the Saxons and other kindred races—our true English forefathers—and may be subdivided according as they were heathen or Christian. The remaining eight centuries and a fraction continue the history of England from the Conquest to the present time. More exactly; 477 A.D. is the date accepted for the landing in the future Sussex of the Saxon Ella and his sons. The Norman William landed in the September of 1066, and the great battle was fought on the 14th of October in that year.

It is possible, as I have said, to assign the division by rapes, or, at all events, their complete military equipment, to the time immediately succeeding the Conquest; but we know something of the state of the land for many centuries before the Normans came. The white cliffs which guard the shores have remained unaltered since the days of the earliest record, though the coast beneath them has here and there advanced or retreated. In all other respects the county has undergone great changes. Few traces are now left of the great dim forest of the Andredswald, that trackless land with no inhabitants, which cut off the people of these borders from all intercourse with the people on the north. That natural barrier was a huge "wedge of forest and scrub,"² which stretched westward for about 120 miles by 30, from the opening of the

¹ "This whole county," says Camden, "as to its civil partitions, is divided into six parts, which by a peculiar term they call Rapes; . . . every one of which, besides their hundreds, has a castle, river, and forest of its own" ("Britannia," by Gibson, i. 197). The details are worked out by Mr. M. A. Lower, in "Sussex Archæol. Coll.," xv. 150, in connection with the river-system; a paper continued in xvi. 247.

² Green, "Making of England," 11. So in "History of the English People," i. 24:—"a vast sheet of scrub, woodland, and waste." See the "Anglo-Saxon Chronicle," s.a. 893.

weald at Pevensey. It had a great deal to answer for in the early history of Sussex. Its fringes gave shelter to a hardy British population of charcoal-burners and iron-smelters as far back as the days of the Roman tenure. When the Romans had departed and the Saxons had fought their blood-stained way from Chichester, through Seaford, to Pevensey, and had slain the British defenders of that ancient fortress with so complete a destruction that not one of them was left,¹ we cannot doubt that their great forest was a main instrument for keeping them so long in heathen darkness. The men of Sussex continued to worship Woden for three generations after most part of the land had again received the light of the gospel, which had been extinguished for above a century elsewhere, and for nearly two centuries in Sussex, after the earlier British churches had been destroyed.

Again to interpose a chronological notice: Ella landed, as I said before, in A.D. 477; St. Augustine came to Kent in 597; St. Wilfrid's first visit to Sussex was in 666, exactly four centuries before the Norman Conquest; and in 681 he returned and founded the South Saxon Bishopric at Selsey. From the invasion by the Saxon to its conquest by the Norman—*i.e.*, from the fifth to the eleventh century—was the obscure time during which our England was a-making; but in which Milton could see nothing but mere skirmishes of kites and crows. It is one of the most noteworthy features of Sussex that the legacies of all the successive races are blended in our heritage; from the British barrows on the hills, which were adapted to their own purposes by both Roman and Saxon, and the Roman remains which we admire in the pavements of Bignor and the strong outer walls of Pevensey, onward through Saxon churches at Worth and Sompting and elsewhere, to the statelier work of Norman builders and the successive gifts of every age.

The land we live in is a book,
 In which is written much to read. . . .
 Here you may trace a Roman's hand,
 Here the rude Saxon work, and there
 How Norman skill did once repair
 The ruined churches of the land.²

Or we may look at the matter politically, in regard to these successive but amalgamated races. Let us take for guidance, for instance, the Poet Laureate's "Harold." You will find that in setting forth this truth of history, he makes the voices

¹ "Anglo-Saxon Chronicle," s.a. 491.

² Walford's *Antiquarian Magazine*, August, 1884, p. 52.

of both leaders blend. Says Harold the Englishman, quoting an old English worthy—

and yet he held that Dane,
Jute, Angle, Saxon, were or should be, all
One England.

And again:

Knut, who coming Dane,
Died English. †

There is exactly the same ring in the voice of Duke William the Norman. He offers to come, to

rule according to your laws,
And make your ever-jarring earldoms move
To music and in order—Angle, Jute,
Dane, Saxon, Norman, help to, build a throne
Out-towering hers of France.

And finally, when he had conquered:

of one self-stock at first,
Make them again one people—Norman, English ;
And English, Norman.¹

And so it came to pass in the wise Providence of God.

And now I am embarrassed by the profusion of our riches. It is not easy to select the fittest material for the remainder of this paper. I need not dwell on the traces of those who preceded the Saxons; the footprints remaining of the Briton and the Roman; except, perhaps, to suggest that the visitor to Sussex may exercise his ingenuity in making out which is which if he can. I need not dwell now on the industries of Sussex, a subject on which much information can be gathered from books that have been recently published. But I may remark in passing, that the most important of our older industries tended to waste, and not increase, our inheritance. The unthrifty proceedings of the old Saxon iron-masters left the country almost bankrupt in some districts, in the matter of the forest-timber, which they used to cast into their furnaces. So Drayton makes the wood-nymphs of Sussex complain:

Jove's oak, the warlike ash, veined elm, the softer beech,
Short hazel, maple plain, light asp, the bending wych,
Tough holly, and smooth birch, must altogether burn ;
What should the builder serve supplies the forgers' turn.²

"These iron times," they cried, "breed none that mind posterity." And not only the industries, but the geology, the scenery, the field-walks, the folk-lore, the dialect, the ancient families and mansions of Sussex have recently received a very large share of attention from competent writers.³ I may

¹ Tennyson's "Harold," pp. 102, 117, 70, 161.

² Drayton's "Polyolbion" Song xvii., ad fin.

³ e.g. "Dictionary of the Sussex Dialect," by W. D. Parish; "Field Paths and Green Lanes, being Country Walks, chiefly in Surrey and Sussex," by

especially mention two volumes, full of interesting information, which Mr. Charles Fleet has published under the title of "Glimpses of our Sussex Ancestors." The subject is large and space is limited. What more I have to offer now shall be confined to a few of the old buildings of Sussex, and I will defer to another paper the more full consideration of events that have made the county famous in the history of England.

There are two ancient buildings prominent among the rest; the Castle of Pevensey, and the group that crowns the grand historic site of Battle.

It would be difficult to find a spot in England which combines in one centre more memories than Pevensey, the old Roman fortress of Anderida, surrounded by massive walls which cannot be younger than 1600 years. Those ruined ramparts were 800 years old when they met the eye of the Norman William on his landing: for the Conquest itself is scarcely half as old as Pevensey. Within those walls, towards the beginning of that long period, occurred, as I have said before, the most ruthless of all the massacres of the Saxon invasion. Before those walls, at the close of that time, the Norman Conqueror stumbled as he landed from his ship, and took *seizin* of the soil of England. Within their mighty cincture there soon arose a Norman castle. It was used sometimes as a residence, sometimes as a royal prison; but it was always a fortress, withstanding many a siege. One of these occasions had a special interest for men of Sussex. It was defended by the Lady Pelham of the time; and a letter which she wrote to her lord from the Castle of Pevensey is said to be one of the earliest existing specimens of English correspondence.¹

The importance of Battle, instead of ranging over centuries like that of Pevensey, is mainly concentrated on a single day.

L. J. Jennings; a set of interesting little books published at Lewes, on "Quaint Industries and Interesting Places in Sussex," on "Sussex Industries," and on "Sussex Folk and Sussex Ways," the last by Mr. J. C. Egerton. Of larger works I may refer to the "Castles, Mansions, and Manors of Western Sussex," by D. G. C. Elwes and Rev. C. J. Robinson; to the noble quarto on the "Geology of Sussex," by Dixon and Jones, 1878; and to the inexhaustible treasury of the 34 volumes of the "Sussex Archaeological Collections," crowned by the stately folio of the "Domesday Book of Sussex," edited by Mr. Chancellor Parish.

¹ Hallam, "Literature of Europe," i. 53, note. "Till any other shall prefer a claim, it may pass for the oldest private letter in the English language." The date is A.D. 1399. It concludes (the spelling modernized), "Farewell, my dear lord; the Holy Trinity you keep from your enemies, and ever send me good tidings of you. Written at Pevensey in the Castle, on St. Jacob day last past, by your own poor J. PELHAM."

But that day was the turning-point in the history of England,
the day when

fancy hears the ring
Of harness, and that deathful arrow sing,
And Saxon battleaxe clang on Norman helm.¹

I would earnestly recommend the visitor to Sussex, when he has the opportunity, to study three things carefully upon the spot; (1) the ruins of the abbey, as they can be traced beneath and amidst the domestic additions of the later buildings; (2), the sites of all the stages of the battle, which a succession of accomplished historians, crowned by Mr. Freeman, has worked out in every deeply interesting detail; and (3), the well-restored parish church of St. Mary's at Battle, which enables us to connect our own prayers and praises with a grateful memory of God's Providence throughout the past.

From Battle we pass by an easy transition to a building only second in interest to those of which we have been speaking—the Great House of Cowdray, at the west end of the county. Sir Anthony Browne, K.G., to whom Battle Abbey, with a great deal more forfeited Church property was granted—who converted the Abbot's Lodge into his own private residence, while he pulled down the Great Abbey Church to be the site of his garden—Sir Anthony Browne, the Master of the Horse to King Henry, sleeps under his great tomb in the parish church of Battle. But his name is connected also with the splendid mansion of Cowdray, one of the greatest houses, says Mr. Freeman, of the best house-building time, now so lovely in the decay of its ivy-clustered ruins. We may read the whole story of Cowdray and its owners in the charming volume of Mrs. Charles Roundell, "The History of a Great English House." It was said that the curse of fire and water was denounced against the destroyers of Battle and Easebourne, by a monk of the ruined abbey in the one case, by the Sub-Prioress of Easebourne in the other. It was nearly two centuries and a half before that curse took effect; and this fact strengthens our disinclination to read such judgments as our Lord condemns, in the misfortunes which befell the remote and innocent descendants of the spoiler. But it cannot be denied that the doom, when it came, was dramatic and appalling.

In the autumn of 1793, and within the space of a few days, the stately house was burnt at Cowdray, and its last owner in the direct ancient line was drowned in the rushing waters of the Rhine at Laufenburg, between Bâle and Schaffhausen. It is said that the two messengers of evil tidings met each other

¹ Tennyson, sonnet prefixed to "Harold."

on the road. I fear that meeting rests on no historical authority. But we can imagine the scene, as though it were the encounter of two heralds of woe in some tragedy of old—the English courier crying, when he sees his friend, “Behold! I bring you sad tidings of sorrow. The curse of fire has descended, and the great house of Cowdray is a heap of ruin!” and his returning colleague answers in despair, “Tidings for tidings, and sorrow for sorrow! The curse of water also has prevailed at last, and the Lord of Cowdray lies drowned beneath the rapids of the Rhine!” There is a strange, sad sequel to this woeful history. Only a few years later, two little boys on whom the inheritance would have descended in the female line were drowned in open daylight on the beach at Bognor—drowned by the upsetting of a pleasure-boat on a calm summer’s day, before the very eyes of their parents and their sisters. Which of us would like to say that the poor lads perished as victims of a slow-footed curse, pronounced long centuries before by lips of woman or of man? If we must write their epitaph, let us rather recollect the old Greek proverb, that those whom the gods love die young, and think that perhaps those innocent children were snatched by their Heavenly Father from the evil to come.

But space would fail me if I tried to carry out a longer programme. How could I write, within any reasonable limits, of the ruins of Bodiam and Hurstmonceaux, or of the still flourishing houses, with their treasures, of Goodwood, and Parham, and Ashburnham, and Petworth, and Wiston? How guide the reader to the birthplaces of Collins and Shelley, or to the graves of Wilberforce, and Hare, and Gibbon? The churches of Sussex would require a whole long paper to themselves, so full are they of antiquarian interest; so rich in every stage of architectural construction—from the great Norman nave of the cathedral, or the noble fragments at Winchelsea, and Shoreham, and Boxgrove, down to the purest examples of the simplest Early English churches, nestling in their quiet combs among the Downs. We could devote a whole series of papers to such topics as the conversion of Sussex by the great northern Bishop, St. Wilfrid; or the gradual moulding into unity of the successive races I have mentioned; or the vast issues which grew out of the Norman Conquest; or the seed of freedom which was planted by the victory of the barons on the heights above Lewes. In fact the history of Sussex is as full of interest as its scenery or its archæology; and it is our duty to acknowledge with gratitude the great inheritance of political and civil progress, which has been partly won on the South-Saxon hills and shores.

JOHN HANNAH.

ART. IV.—THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO ST. JOHN.

PART II.

“As an eagle stirreth up his nest.”

THE Jewish conception of the Messiah among the ruling classes of the nation was political rather than spiritual, and directed towards one who should “rise to reign over the Gentiles” in Jerusalem, but without the inspired addition, that “in Him shall the Gentiles trust” (Rom. xv. 12).

From this earthly and sensual view of the kingdom of God it was absolutely necessary to rouse the nation, if the Saviour was not to be rejected when He came. How was this to be done?

St. John's Gospel presents us with the working of the problem; and shows that the whole question was before the mind of our Saviour from the very first, and the result of His appeal to His own people foreseen. The Jewish nation would refuse Him; and only a remnant would be saved. Such a view of His life and work must perforce have been concealed from the eyes of men, even from His most intimate followers,¹ until His death was an accomplished fact. Where results are certain, an experiment is no trial. Just as ministers of the gospel, if they hold strong predestinarian doctrine on the negative side, generally make very inefficient evangelists; so we may say with all reverence, that if the results of our Saviour's earthly ministry had been seen by those who followed Him as clearly as He foresaw them Himself, their work would have been paralyzed, and their efforts would have lost all meaning and all force. The probationary side of His ministry necessitated a certain ignorance whither it was tending, on the part of His disciples and the world. But the veil that blinded the eyes of His disciples was no hindrance to His eagle-sight. “The eyes that behold afar off” never failed to discern the end from the beginning. He knew the lowest step of His humiliation before He stooped.

Now this aspect of our Lord's earthly life is laid open before us in the Gospel of St. John. We see Him setting Himself deliberately to the task of awakening the nation from the delusions in which the rulers had settled themselves to rest. From the very beginning, He took the course which was best calculated to disenchant them and disappoint their hopes. He never compromised Himself, or veiled His opposition to their theories for an hour. And when they were convinced that His methods, if persisted in, would destroy the Jewish “nest,”

¹ Note that the intimations of His sufferings given to the disciples were, even to the last, a mere perplexity to them. See Luke xviii. 34.

they took their resolution at once. "If we let Him thus alone, all men will believe on Him. And the Romans shall come and *take away both our place and nation.*" (John xi. 48.)

They had made their nest at Jerusalem on earth; in the shelter of the courts and altars of the temple of the Lord. They felt instinctively that our Saviour's teaching had created a fresh centre of religious life. Where He was, there was the new Jerusalem; and the necessity for their temple, the reason for its protection, was all but gone. The ground was slipping away from beneath their feet. No sooner had they admitted this fact in council, than the high priest of the year spoke out plainly. The "one man" must die, that "the whole nation perish not." The Eagle of Israel bade them choose between Himself and the nest; and they chose that He should die.

Let us briefly review the steps by which the Jewish rulers were brought to this conclusion, as detailed in the Gospel according to St. John.

In the opening sentences the Evangelist indicates, not obscurely, that men's reception of the Messiah is in no way dependent upon their earthly relation to Him. "As many as received Him, to them gave He power to become the sons of God, even to them that believe on His name: which were born, *not of blood*" (John i. 12).

The manner of His introduction to the Jewish people is next indicated. A prophet was sent as His forerunner, to bear witness of His coming; to be what Aaron had been to Moses, or Samuel to David in times past. But the prophet came not to Jerusalem. He abode in the desert, and preached there. The deputation of Pharisees, sent by the Supreme Council of the nation to report upon his message and his claims, were compelled to cross the Jordan before they could receive a reply (John i. 28). And when given, it was so ambiguous that it did not even enable the ruling powers to determine whether John's baptism was "from heaven or of men." He spoke obscurely of "One standing among them, Whom they knew not"—Who had come up behind him, but must take His place in front, and Who would baptize, not with water, but with fire and with the Holy Ghost. Yet this mysterious personage was not indicated to the council, or introduced to the messengers whom they sent. He was pointed out casually to two of John's disciples as "the Lamb of God." They followed Him, and, with a few others who joined them, to the number of half a dozen or thereabouts, had the privilege of witnessing the "manifestation of His glory" at a humble marriage feast in Cana of Galilee, where poverty was so conspicuous that the wine ran short before the feast was done. Our Lord then came to Jerusalem, to the Passover, and

through His miracles made many believers. Yet His public acts were calculated to perplex and prejudice, rather than attract any possible political adherents to His cause. The forcible expulsion of licensed traders from the Court of the Gentiles without authority or apology, except that enigmatical saying, "Destroy this temple, and in three days I will raise it up," was not a conciliatory act. That it made a deep impression is clear from the account already given by the other Evangelists of our Lord's trial. From first to last, our Lord vouchsafed no explanation of the saying. Yet what was it but an intimation that henceforward they must accept *the Person of the Eagle instead of the Place of His nest?* "He spake of the Temple of His Body."

In close connection with this incident we have the story of Nicodemus and his stolen interview with Jesus. Familiar as the story is, it is so utterly divorced from its context by editorial and incidental mishaps, that I almost despair of persuading any one to read it as I feel compelled to do. However, the attempt must be made :

Now when He was in Jerusalem at the passover, many believed on His name, seeing the miracles which He did. But Jesus did not commit Himself unto them, because He knew all men, and needed not that any should testify of man, for He knew what was in man. BUT there was a man of the Pharisees named Nicodemus, a ruler of the Jews. He came to Jesus by night and said unto Him, Rabbi, we know that Thou art a teacher come from God ; for no man can do these miracles that Thou doest, except God be with him.—John ii. 23—iii. 2.

We are so used to end the chapter before Nicodemus is introduced, and omit the conjunction which I have emphasized in iii. 1, that the connection never strikes us. And so Nicodemus gets the disgrace of coming by night for fear of a persecution which *had no existence as yet*, while our Lord's plans were still wrapped in obscurity; and curiosity, rather than opposition, was the feeling of the time. But why did Nicodemus come by night, unless he was afraid? A fair question, but very easily answered. Nicodemus wished to induce our Lord to "commit Himself to him." He came imbued with the prevalent expectation concerning the Messiah, that at the very least He must restore the national independence and break the foreign yoke. But Pontius Pilate was governor in Judæa; and Pontius Pilate was not a governor to be ignored, nor was the power behind him likely to tolerate treason. How could Nicodemus expect the Messiah to discuss the overthrow of the Roman government in public and in the face of day? The obvious flattery of his opening words—the title of "Rabbi," given by a ruler to the poor Man from Nazareth; the readiness to meet Him half-way if He could

but disclose the secrets of His kingdom—show at once what Nicodemus had in mind. And now mark the consummate wisdom of our Lord's reply. Before a word of treason can be uttered He stops the mouth of Nicodemus by lifting the whole question into a higher region, and baffles the "Master of Israel" with "the wisdom that cometh from above." "Verily, verily, I say unto thee, Except a man be born again, HE CANNOT SEE THE KINGDOM OF GOD."

Nicodemus had not mentioned "the kingdom of God." No; but He Who "knew what was in man," saw what Nicodemus had in view. He had come there to play the part of Abner at Hebron, with David: "Make a league with me, and behold my hand (the hand of the teacher of Israel) shall be with thee, to bring about all Israel unto thee" (2 Sam. iii. 12, 21). But this was not what our Lord required. Or, if it was, He must first make sure that this "teacher of Israel" understood his work. What was behind this visit of Nicodemus remains hidden until the secrets of all hearts shall be made known. Whether the rulers had put him forward as a feeler, or whether any tacit understanding left him free to act independently, and them free to use his information if it should prove to have any value in their eyes; or whether he simply came to forestall others, and was fighting for his own hand, it is not likely that we shall ever know in this world. But there are few things that indicate more clearly than this incident of Nicodemus how entirely at cross-purposes the "Eagle" of the fourth Gospel and his nestlings then were. A sentence in the discourse which follows brings this out in its full force. I take leave to render one word as it is usually rendered by the synoptists, to bring out the point before us, and call attention to the striking turn given to the word ($\psi\alpha\lambda\acute{\alpha}\nu$) in the Gospel of St. John. "As Moses EXALTED the serpent in the wilderness, even so" (and so only) "must the Son of Man be EXALTED" (here). The Cross will be Messiah's only throne. "If thou wilt take it, take it; for *there is no other save that here.*" But "there is none like that. Give it Me!"

What an answer to the speculations of Nicodemus respecting a kingdom! Did he hope that the Gentile would immediately be put under the feet of the Jew? But "God sent not His Son into the world to *condemn* the world, but that the world through Him might be saved." And as to his night-visit and its purpose, how he must have been rebuked by what follows: "Every one that *doeth evil* hateth the light, neither cometh to the light, lest his deeds should be reprov'd." Would the projects of Nicodemus have borne discussion in the light of open day? Hardly. But on our Lord's trial before Annas (xviii. 20) He could say without fear of contra-

diction, "I spake openly to the world. *In secret have I said nothing.*" Who does not see that even to have suffered Nicodemus to state in His presence what was evidently working in the Pharisaic mind might easily have led to a charge against Jesus of misprision of treason, if the discourse had been repeated with the ordinary perversion to which all human reports are liable? We cannot wonder that Nicodemus appears to have left the Saviour's presence at last without reply. For him, however, the "nest" was no longer a place of repose. "Doth our law judge any man before it *hear him, and know what he doeth?*" (vii. 51), is a question sufficiently indicative of his frame of mind, and that he, at least, knew more of what the Christ was doing than his brethren at the Council Board. And—best of all—in that dark hour when the serpent in the wilderness found his Anti-type, Nicodemus saw daylight where his countrymen, almost without exception, were in the dark. He "came to Jesus by night" before Israel had discovered what Jesus came to be. When they had utterly rejected Him, Nicodemus was not ashamed to confess Him in the light of day. He became a true child of the Eagle, after all; for "*Where the body is, thither will the eagles be gathered together.*"

I have dwelt long on this incident, because I find in it a key to the whole gospel. From the scene with Nicodemus our Lord passes to another, where human jealousy, if He had been an earthly potentate, would certainly have prevailed. Yet He would not even allow the number of His disciples to rival that of the followers of John the Baptist, until the Fore-runner's race was run. Rather than permit the Pharisees to suppose any such thing, He would retire to Galilee, and even linger in Samaria on the way. While there He let fall an oracle which, once published, was more fatal to the temple than anything He had yet said: "The hour cometh when ye shall *neither in this mountain, nor yet at Jerusalem, worship the Father.*" The "nest" that was broken down on Mount Moriah would not hold its place on Gerizim for a single day.

Next, a nobleman of Cana presents himself. But his son is healed in such a manner as to separate the nobleman from Christ's company and send him home. Once more we note the loss of a political opportunity. Neither the Jerusalem nor the Galilean nobleman were employed as such men would have been by an aspirant after earthly power.

Another visit to Jerusalem follows (ch. v.), which brings the early Judæan ministry¹ to a close. On this occasion we

¹ I use the expression in the sense which it has in Ellicott's Hulsean "Lectures on the Life of our Lord."

find our Lord doing in secret an act which brings the deadly enmity of His people upon Him at once. He bids the man whom He has healed at Bethesda carry his bed home on the Sabbath day. The act and the order are reported, and "therefore did the Jews begin to persecute (*ἐδίωκον*, imperfect) Jesus, and sought (*ἐζήτουν*) to slay Him, because He did (*ἐποίησε*, imperfect, 'persisted in doing') these things on the Sabbath day."¹ The way in which He met the charge was very striking. There was no sort of apology, reticence, or concealment. His reply made matters ten times worse. "My Father worketh hitherto (on the Sabbath), and I work." The significance of that saying is profound, but the offence lies on the surface. "He said that God was His own Father (*ἰδιον*), making Himself equal with God" (v. 18). And, so far from being disposed to soften the impression, He went on to claim identity of action (verse 19), equal honour (verse 23), and equal self-existence (verse 26) with God. No assertion of our Lord's Deity that can be found anywhere among His public utterances is so explicit as this discourse in Jerusalem in the fifth chapter of St. John. But this Evangelist gives no record of the impression produced by it, or of any reply made.

When we put this assumption of Divine honour side by side with the avowed and deliberate rejection of earthly power, the effect is very striking. Anything more certain to disturb all popular notions of what the Messiah was to be, we cannot conceive. The impossibility of making any political capital out of His work or presence must have provoked and thwarted the Jewish statesmen to the last degree.

Between this discourse in St. John v. and the story of the feeding of the five thousand in St. John vi. we must place the greater part of our Lord's Galilean ministry as recorded by the three synoptists. All this is entirely omitted by St. John. If he had not narrated that signal miracle we should be sorely puzzled to harmonize this portion of the gospel at all. The miracle is related by all four Evangelists. But St. John alone brings out three characteristic points: first, that our Lord would have been made king by the five thousand if He had not prevented it; secondly, that He took special pains to conceal the more astonishing display of power which succeeded it (His walking on the sea) from all but His own immediate followers; thirdly, that on the day following He delivered a discourse in Capernaum which alienated a number of His disciples by the highly spiritual, but symbolical, teaching it contained. These three points are peculiar to St. John's

¹ Our Lord's steadfast opposition to the Rabbinical sabbath was another sharp thorn in the Jewish nest throughout the whole of His ministry.

Gospel. The agitation of the Jewish mind is continued throughout. He could neither reign over them, nor feed them (temporally), nor cease to keep their minds upon the strain with spiritual teaching to which they would not rise. A few were found capable of the flight to which he stirred them up. The yearnings of His heart for all betray themselves in the touching appeal to the twelve: "Will ye also go away?" (vi. 67). And the power of His attraction is reflected in the answer: "Lord, to whom shall we go (away)? Thou hast the words of eternal life." Such moving incidents as these are demanded by the course of the story. They show clearly that however sternly our Lord repelled the advances of political Judaism, He had nothing repulsive in Himself. It was because He was bent on *drawing* all men unto Him that He must needs die. The very intensity of His love for the many made Him reject the selfish approaches of the few.

Once fairly on the track, we trace the same footmarks everywhere. The next temptation to court the public favour is presented on the occasion of the Feast of Tabernacles, by His brethren, not as yet believers in Himself. "There is no man that doeth anything in secret, and he himself seeketh to be known openly. If thou do these things, *show thyself to the world*" (vii. 4). It is the invitation of Nicodemus repeated, only more rudely and by coarser minds. But it is just as firmly declined. "In secret," as before, He goes up to Jerusalem, still claiming unearthly honours, still refusing to be drawn into public life. This time the truth that He is the very Christ is made so obvious, that a blind beggar taken from the streets and healed becomes a match for the highest authorities, when the question of our Lord's divine mission is in dispute. The rebukes of this nameless disciple must have been keenly irritating to the Jewish mind. "Why, herein is a marvellous thing, that ye know not from whence He is, and yet He hath opened mine eyes" (ix. 30). It was heresy to admit the possibility that Jesus of Nazareth could be the Son of God. "If any man did confess that he was Christ, he should be put out of the synagogue" (ix. 22). But the children and the beggars in the streets knew it, and all the authority of the Pharisees could not stop their tongues. Blind men and Canaanitish women called Him the "Son of David." His connection with Nazareth made that palpably impossible. And He never condescended to explain. "Ye both know Me, and ye know whence I am," was His answer (vii. 28). Yet He might easily have brought proof that Bethlehem, and not Nazareth, was the city of His birth. Must we say once more that the truth He sought to inculcate was His heavenly origin? His descent, not from David, but from

The Gospel according to St. John.

above? At last, on the Feast of Dedication (kept since the fourth century as Christmas Day), they crowd around Him in Solomon's porch at Jerusalem, and ask in utter despair, "How long dost Thou *lift up our soul* (and keep it in suspense)? If Thou be the Christ, tell us plainly" (x. 22-24). They might well say, "Lift up our soul"! How else could the nestlings of the Eagle be stirred up to fly? This upward strain, which tried them so sorely, was the very thing that the Eagle of Israel had put upon them of set purpose, that they might prove themselves His children. "He came to His own," to teach them to "mount up with wings as eagles," and "His own received Him not." "He laboured in vain; He spent His strength for naught and in vain;" for so it was written of Him by the prophets (Isa. xlix. 4).

This brings us to the close of the tenth chapter of the Gospel. Its last verses significantly record our Lord's retirement beyond Jordan to the place where John at first baptized, and where he had received the deputation from the Senate of which we spoke before. In that region, where the words concerning the Eagle were first spoken to Moses, He found many followers. There, also, was given that most valuable testimony to the truth of the "Word" and the "Voice" together. John did no miracle; "*but all things that John spake of this man were true.*"¹

But little of our Lord's public ministry, as described in the fourth Gospel, now remains. One supreme effort to awaken Jerusalem fills the eleventh chapter, and the twelfth chapter records the result. Then we pass to the upper chamber in Jerusalem, and see the Eagle on the pinnacle of the rock, with the few who dared to follow Him, pluming His wings for the last flight. Before this He had been hovering over Jerusalem from the side of Bethany, to see whether the Word that broke the four days' slumber of the dead Lazarus would avail to stir His people's hearts. But they would not "be persuaded, even though one rose from the dead." May not the inscrutable grief of our Lord as He went to the tomb to perform this act of power be partly traceable to His foreknowledge of the effect which the miracle would have upon the city which He loved! The tears on the way to the grave of Lazarus, and the tears on the way to Jerusalem, were but one sorrow after all. For, in fact, it was the resurrection of Lazarus which determined our Lord's death. The meeting of the Sanhedrin that followed was signalized by the speech of Caiaphas already referred to, which made it clear to

¹ A testimonial, in its form, not beyond the reach of any Christian minister. But what a priceless record of ministry it is!

Sadducees as well as Pharisees that the "One Man" must die.

Our Lord's triumphal entry into Jerusalem receives an entirely fresh light from St. John. He expressly connects it with the raising of Lazarus, and he notes that in consequence of this triumph the desirability of putting Lazarus to death was discussed also, "because that by reason of him many of the Jews went away and believed on Jesus." It is difficult to realize the extreme bitterness of the enmity which could calmly consider such a measure of opposition as this. What a strange perversion of the well-known maxim, *Salus populi suprema lex!* But further, how entirely this aspect of the case discloses the true reason for our Lord's crucifixion, and that it was an act of political expediency rather than religious animosity which brought Him to His end. On religious grounds the Pharisees must have defended the doctrine of the resurrection, and thrown the shelter of their powerful party over every person whose actions lent support to their belief. But the Pharisees themselves, in concert with the chief priests, called the council after the raising of Lazarus; and the Sadducees, who were in office, were able to command the votes of the opposition in the measures adopted against our Lord's life. From first to last, the kingdom He had set before them was "not of this world." But He could not persuade them to rise to it. The Church of Israel, which He had Himself established in Jerusalem, had now become too earthly, and His own teaching was too heavenly, to allow of any compromise between the two. Mere political Christianity in every shape is excluded from St. John's Gospel, and finds no precedent in our Lord's lifetime except among His betrayers and murderers. Space will not permit me to go into the account of our Lord's trial as given by St. John. To gather up the threads of the argument will occupy another paper. We have seen how largely the Divine Portraiture has determined *the subject-matter* of the fourth Gospel. We have seen, also, how entirely suitable it was to *the readers* for whom the Gospel was designed. We shall find that the choice of St. John as the fourth *Evangelist* was no less suitable to the *Portrait* which he was appointed to draw.

C. H. WALLER.

ART. V.—WORK AMONG HOP-PICKERS.

"**H**OW d'ye do, Mr. Cobb; and are you quite well, sir, and the lady, and has your eye got all right, and did you shoot the dog that bit you?" "Is Mr. Bacon [Scripture Reader] coming down this year, and Mr. Grove?" (an evangelist; see

p. 95). "And," eagerly chimed in Tommy, "shall we have the tent, Mr. Cobb, and the singing, and the children's service, and the apples after it?" Such are the greetings and the string of interrogatories which we are apt to encounter on a late August or early September afternoon, as scores of parties come straggling into our little rural parish for the "hopping."

It is gratifying to be treated as 'old and sympathizing friends. These poor people note where their employers and the clergy and other residents take an interest in them, and they come to the same parishes again and again for years, though always with some new elements. We taste, in their case, the universal experience, that consideration and kindness find a response in the most unpromising soil.

Certainly the mass of 50,000 people who for many years have been wont to pour out of all the slums in London into our Kentish hop-gardens could not be considered originally promising. The remembrances of my early days are of swarms of people in blackish garments and with blackish faces, trooping up and down our usually calm and quiet country lanes, filling the air with ribaldry and curses, pigging together in barns and sheds, making it necessary for the farmers to watch their orchards with guns at hand day and night, and loading the clergyman's heart with anxiety on account of the corrupting influences surging all round his young people. Nor do the most competent observers fail to generalize my own early recollections. Thus, before the Royal Commission on the Housing of the Working Classes, 1885, the Rev. J. Y. Stratton¹ gave evidence in point:

Ques.—H.R.H. the Prince of Wales, "Can you tell me what was the moral and social condition of the hop-pickers when you first became acquainted with it?"—*Ans.* "It was as bad as possible. Nothing could be more degraded. The common definition of the 'hoppers' of Kent (as they are called in the district) was 'half-monkey, half-tiger.'"

H.R.H. "Are they very quarrelsome?"—"No. Sometimes you see Irishmen kissing each other, and fighting the next minute possibly."

H.R.H. "They are law-breaking, I suppose, in every sense of the word?"—"Yes."

H.R.H. "I have also heard that many years ago it was almost dangerous for a clergyman to go amongst them. Was that the case?"—"It was. I have known clergymen absolutely afraid. I have been afraid myself. I am ashamed to say so, but it is true."

H.R.H. "Was it at the risk of your life?"—"No; lest something disagreeable should happen to you."

H.R.H. "Do you consider that there has been any improvement?"—"Very great improvement. We have a large number of lay-missionaries

¹ Mr. Stratton is Rector and landowner in the parish of Ditton, near Maidstone, and has been for the past twenty years the chief organizer of efforts both spiritual and secular for the amelioration of the immigrant hop-pickers.

who spend their time among them, and there has been a very considerable reformation. It is now perfectly safe for a clergyman, if he likes, to take his children into a hop-garden without fear of insult."

Mr. Jesse Collings put some questions about their domestic habits. Thus :

"Are there any arrangements for washing in these places" (*i.e.*, the temporary habitations provided for them)?—"No."

"How is that carried on?"—"In the Farnham Union the inspector reports that they do not wash the whole time they are there" (three or four weeks).

Mr. Stratton, however, could and did add: "The Irish are wonderful washers. They are not particular about the basin they use, but you see them washing their faces constantly." In reply to a question by the Prince of Wales: "Are there many Irish among them?" it was stated: "There is a vast number of London Irish." There are, indeed, numbers of "London Irish;" but very few now of those Irish who used early in the century to constitute the chief element of the immigrant hop-pickers. For I need hardly remark that the pickers are of two wholly distinct classes: the villagers of Kent, Sussex, and some parts of Surrey, Hampshire, Herefordshire, and Worcestershire, where the hop is cultivated; and those who migrate into our villages for three or four weeks every autumn for the special business of picking the hops. These, as I said, used to be chiefly Irish, who came from their native bogs and mountains over the water. Of course at harvest-time, and in our fickle climate, a large force of extra hands is required to house safely the crops which our own rural population have sown and cultivated. Accordingly, about June the race of Pat and Mike used to cross over in swarms to Lancashire and Cheshire, and disperse on foot all over the country for hay-making and reaping, finally appearing in our southern counties, and especially in Kent, to help in the rapid ingathering of the critical crop of hops. I am told that they used generally to support themselves on their wanderings by mendicancy, though "*poor* Mike," who begged for a crust or potato to keep him from starving outright, used often to have a few sovereigns tied up in the foot of a stocking on his return journey, which made his winter in the Green Isle more cheerful. That, however, is a thing of the past.

One of our greatest hop-growers in Kent—Mr. Ellis, of East Farleigh—is said to have been the first to employ Londoners, and now they form greatly the majority of the "immigrant hop-pickers." Having tried it, they find the distance—from fifteen miles to eighty or so—not insuperable; and so 40,000 or 50,000 of the London poor look forward to September as their month for a holiday into the country. They have no

guineas a week to pay for their lodgings, very little expense in the way of railway fares, and none for flies, porters, or sundries. Moreover, they come with the hope to win in a pleasant way a nice little fund to pay off scores of rent at home or provide for future emergencies—or present “sprees.”

The localities they come from are as various as their callings. I may illustrate both from our Baptismal Register; for, among other things, we inquire about any who may be unbaptized, and we have the privilege of conferring the rite in not a few instances where it has been neglected, and would probably have still continued so. Thus I find as parents, hawkers from the Borough, Old Kent Road, Tooley Street, West Ham, Woodford, and Colchester; some also of the same class with no address—“migratory;” a labourer, a tanner, a chimney-sweep, and a fellmonger from Bermondsey; labourers from Old Kent Road, Peckham, Poplar, Gravesend, and Chatham; two lightermen from Rotherhithe; one engineer from Woolwich; a fishmonger from Gravesend; another from Edmonton; a parent from Whitechapel (whence we have a *great* supply of pickers); porters from the Borough and from Wapping; a brickmaker from Southend.¹

Now I ask the readers of the CHURCHMAN to picture me, with my little resident population of 325, face to face one autumn day with from 1,000 to 1,200 men, women, and children suddenly brought under my ministerial supervision; or the Vicar of East Farleigh, with his 1,500, all at once surrounded by 4,000 new parishioners; Yalding the same; Horsmonden, usually 1,451, swollen in a day to 5,451. It is no wonder that many a clergyman’s heart failed him under such an appalling increase of his responsibilities, both as regards numbers and their depraved condition and unapproachable temper, until combination and experience gave encouragement and suggested plans. This has now been the case in increasing degrees through the action of three excellent Societies for the good, temporal and spiritual, of our poor “hoppers.”

All honour be to hop-growers and to clergy who, before any such combination, struggled, each according to his own ideas

¹ There are, of course, many other professions and localities represented in the hop-garden (notably St. Giles, Commercial Road, Notting Hill, Paddington, Soho, Marylebone, Islington, Kentish Town, Finsbury, and Westminster). In my register there is a large proportion of dealers, probably because being always on the move, they miss the benefit of pastoral supervision, and their children grow up unbaptized and untaught. This class and gipsies take the hop-picking on their annual circuits, and combine their usual avocations with hop-picking. During the day they are the most expert and successful pickers. In the evening they sell among the other immigrants.

and resources, to meet the desperate need. My revered father was one of the very first clergy to employ a Scripture Reader from London among the immigrants in his parish. He used to have a time of it! The Whitechapel gentry would pick his pocket, albeit they would allow him to find his handkerchief afterwards fluttering in the breeze at the top of a hop-pole. The Vicar of Wateringbury followed suit. I speak of thirty or more years ago. His Missionary went into the hop-garden. "Who are you?" roared out at him a bailiff. "A Missionary from the Vicar, indeed!" he added, with awful cursing. "Here, catch hold of this fellow! I'll be bound his pockets are full of our nuts and apples!" The insulted and discomfited Missionary appealed to the farmer. "Oh!" said he; "yes, he does swear badly, but it's no use; I can't stop him. He swears as bad at me."

Things have improved since then. A brother clergyman helped me this year in going to converse with the people at their work. He found sympathy in one man's heart because the picker had been in gaol as a convict and the parson as a chaplain. "Look, sir," said the picker, pointing up and down the row of bins; "these are all my family. I and they are all of them teetotalers except that young man who married my daughter. Now, if you'll convert him to join us all, I'll give you a new hat!" A very kindly and energetic clerical neighbour goes out all through the scattered habitations of the pickers in his parish on Sundays, and holds short services with them *al fresco* in the intervals of his engagements at church. Sometimes he comes upon them at meal-time, and courteously apologizes. "Oh, never mind, your reverence; we shall have done directly. Here! won't you sit down, sir, and have a hot potato?" The same brother gave a magic-lantern exhibition to a very crowded audience in the schoolroom. He laid his watch by the lantern that he might keep his time. When he had done, his watch was gone. But his parishioners very soon presented him with a far better one. The move was headed by a hop-grower who was not a Churchman.

The worst scenes left among us are of the departure of our friends, when too many of them have gone with their hands full of wages into the beerhouses, and have come to the train full of beer. One clergyman constantly attends the departure of "hopper trains" out of stations in his parish, and finds many opportunities of helping, restraining, and counselling them. Once he offered a tract to a stalwart Irish girl, who took it, and said, "Yes, but I must give you something for it," and threw her strong arms round his neck and gave him a smacking kiss! It was too much for the risibilities even of the three policemen on guard at the barricades. They, how-

ever, showed their respect for the zealous clergyman by wheeling to the right-about, so as at least to conceal their faces!

This year a vast number of starving people strayed down from London before the hops were ready, induced by newspaper reports of work begun here and there, and by fine weather; and also driven to go anywhere by hunger. I have a large old rectory garden, and it got wind that I sometimes give people thus circumstanced a job instead of giving them relief out and out. I was soon besieged, and found that the utmost I could do was to give an hour's work apiece at 3d.; and for this I had twenty or more ragged and hungry people at my gate from hour to hour, and generally managed five or six sets of eight or twelve each a day. I did not carefully note all the days, but I did nine days, and found that in them 412 had thus earned a bare loaf of bread. A few of them had been to me more than once. Of course it was impossible to watch them all day, especially as I have many nooks and corners in the garden. From all these 400 poor fellows, who often had to wait, hungry and tired, half a day before I could put them on, I never but once received a rough word. I never missed from the garden a tool, a peach, or a plum—not anything! Nor was my garden ever robbed at night, though perfectly accessible. In four cases I was asked to advance them a trifle, as 3d. would not even give a mouthful to their families as well as themselves. I did not know with any certainty they would get work in this place, and in truth I forgot what I had done till they brought the money back to me, as soon as they had earned anything, with many words of gratitude for the loan. These men do not fit the old definition of a "hopper, half-monkey, half-tiger."

I trust that my readers will bear with me in speaking chiefly of efforts in this parish, as being best known to me, and will not for a moment conclude that there are not other parishes in which more is done, and done better. In the hop-picking season I have generally had staying with me a brother clergyman to help me—sometimes from the Church Parochial Mission Society. I have also had the assistance for the whole or part of the time of two Missionaries, partly supported by one or other of the Societies for Missions to Hop-pickers. This year one was entirely supported by the hop-growers themselves. In every way these latter assist me, and so does their agent. I have also a man to work the coffee-barrow. At ten every morning I meet my staff for prayer, conference, and arrangements for the day. We disperse to different hop-gardens, where our day's work is to converse with the people at their tasks, leaving tracts where desirable. And when about noon they are "called off" for the dinner hour, two or

three of us together sing a hymn and give a brief address, repeating the little service once or twice to different groups of diners. This branch of the work is as important as any. My brother in a neighbouring parish has for years given himself to it all the hours of every day of the "hopping." We thus become acquainted with the lives and thoughts of our visitors, and try to turn our knowledge to the best account. We meet with plenty of good-humoured chaff, and sometimes make friends of fools by "answering a fool" according to his folly. Cavils which do not reach us in the study or pulpit are here freely urged, and discussed if we find those who urge them candid. It was interesting to me to be told by a *hop-picker* that "there is a stratum of society which the Church has never reached." For his own part, he preferred the Methodists, "because they made you at home, found you a seat, offered you a hymn-book, and last, not least, preached good *long* sermons." I told him that I hoped he would find kindly attentions in many a church also; and as for the long sermons, I only regretted that he was an exception to the rule in preferring them.

In all this we meet now with no interruption. Tracts are sometimes eagerly sought for, but especially the small portions of the Bible. Following lady tract-distributors, I have come upon people reading the tracts. Our Missionaries have found them in the "town-houses" of our visitors when returned—sometimes sewn up together into a little book.

I do not affirm that every tract of the thousands we give hits the mark. A wealthy gentleman, spending his summer in our pretty village, was very kind to the poor hoppers. There was a dealer whose wife was ill, and this gentleman went and ministered to her personally. A few evenings after he was called out from his dinner because a hopper wished to speak to him. It was the dealer, who had brought him a haddock in gratitude for his kindness to his wife. The haddock was *wrapped up in a tract!* Perhaps the dealer had read it. Perhaps he hadn't. Perhaps he had no other paper in which to present his offering with due propriety. Anyhow, the haddock was very good for breakfast, and it won't stop us from distributing tracts.

We sometimes have William Grove for a few days, a well-known evangelist at Mile End. He is a Boanerges, and when he mounts the waggon on our village green my next clerical neighbour over the river can hear his very sentences half a mile away. The sound of his voice travels a mile. He has only to speak a few words at the dinner-hour, and you see the people coming up from every corner of the garden, looking and listening through the vistas of hop-poles. He has only to open his mouth and sing (as he does with his

whole frame), and he gets a sympathizing circle around him, whom he will not let go till they every one sing with him, and go away pretty well knowing the hymn. He knows the people; he was brought up among them; he speaks their vernacular, and talks in illustrations borrowed from their life. Many a one of them talks afterwards about what "that big black feller said." Some of us may have finer harrows and more elegant water-pots than William Grove, but none of us can carry heavier seed-bags or fling the seed so widely.

Do my readers at all understand our surroundings in these efforts? The plantations of hops we call in Kent "hop-gardens;" they are from five to twenty, or even forty acres in extent. Seen from a distance, they look like beautifully-kept woods of thick foliage—solid masses of green. Coming nearer, you find rows upon rows of hop-poles set up vertically, reaching from end to end of the garden, each row six or eight feet from the next; and now covered from the foot to the top (about seven to ten feet high) with the hop-vines (or "bines"), which are sometimes also trained along diagonal strings from pole to pole, or strings horizontal from top to top. At the summit of the poles the leafy bines swell out into an emerald crown, and fling over a cascade of flowing tendrils far and wide, forming exquisite vistas hung with festoons and pendants—crowns and tendrils and festoons and pendants, all studded with bright bunches of hops—bunches in varying size and shape, surpassing those of Italian grapes; in colour, of a light and vivid green, shining out in charming contrast from the dark foliage. And now the hops are all "coming down;" scores of "bins" have been carried in by the pickers and set in lines between the rows of plants. Each bin is surrounded by a group of men, women, and children. The bits of scarlet, white, or blue of the dresses enliven the mass of green; all are busy stripping the hops off the bines into their bins—all, even the children down to six years old. Indeed, the infants pretend to pick, or else mind the baby in the perambulator, or play with the puppy or kitten, which could not be left behind. The women pick the best, and with supple fingers strip off the hops fastest. The adults can earn from 2s. to 3s. a day on an average, and *young* children can make 6d. Some of the men are employed pulling up the poles, some for measuring the hops picked, some for booking the accounts, some for loading up the sacks (*vulgo*, "pokes") of green hops on to the waggons to take them to the "oast-house," to be dried and packed, and some at the oast-house to dry and pack them into "pockets."¹

¹ "Bins" are the receptacles into which the hops are picked. They are somewhat in appearance like a bier—an oblong framework of long

Think over this scene in the hop-garden—think of what has been simply a mass of vegetable life (unless, unfortunately for the hop-grower, entomological life has also entered there with its silent ravages); *now* it is full of human life and the bustle of work, and the hum and shout of multitudes of voices. There is the old man who has crawled down for the last time into the country; there is the baby at its mother's breast, as she sits down on a heap of dismantled poles to satisfy its needs; there are merry children, and there the hardly-pinched and struggling middle-aged. Some people have no shoes and stockings; some on one foot, but not the other; the majority have old clouted boots, for which they certainly were never measured. The young ladies who make slop-shirts in Spitalfields are there—very dowdy now, but they will be in bright blues and reds on Sunday; women, mostly with ragged gowns over sombre petticoats; men, either of the costermonger and lighterman type, in blue shirts; or general loafers in seedy and tattered black suits. Decency forbids that they should take off their coats; their necks look as innocent of collars as of soap. If anyone sports a collar he will be the G.O.M. of Whitechapel. Such are the people at work; such the poor things who are sending up their halfpennies to our barrow for a cup of coffee or tea, or a bun; such the multitude to whom it is our duty to tell of Him Who is the Bread from Heaven, and Who will

horizontal poles on four short legs. A large bag of canvas hangs down inside the framework with its open mouth fastened all round to its edge. Three or four adults, besides children, generally pick into each bin, and five bins go to a "bin's company," which is under a responsible ganger called a "bins-man," who often collects his "company" in town and brings them down with him. Usually twice a day the hops are "measured," being taken out of the bin by bushels, and poured from the bushel-baskets into the "pokes." The payment is made at so much a bushel, or rather, with us, at so many bushels to a shilling. This will vary from two to eight, according as the hops are bad, or large and plentiful. In other words, 6d. is about the highest ever got for picking a bushel, and 1½d. the least. The rate of bushels to the shilling is called the "tally," and is the matter over which pickers and growers chiefly fall out. The "pokes," or sacks of green hops, are taken to the oast-house, or building for drying them. I fancy the affix *oast* must be derived from "ustus," burned. The buildings are a feature of Kent—red-brick squares, or cylinders, tapering off, as the walls rise, into several conical roofs called "kilns," and each kiln surmounted by a white "cowl." You may count fifty of them from a neighbouring hill. The drying is one of the many, and the last, of the critical processes through which the hops pass. They must be thoroughly dried, but not burned or scorched, and a good colour is all-important for sale. Our ablest agricultural labourers are employed to do the drying, and earn from 30s. to 40s. a week for the work.

give them living water, springing up in their hearts unto everlasting life.

Every here and there we come upon the smiling welcome of our own dear villagers, who, although they put by their worst bonnets and aprons for the "hopping," nevertheless are a vast contrast to the "foreigners," both in respectability of appearance and gentleness of manners. They prefer to keep all together as much as they can, and to "keep themselves to themselves."

If our immigrants have three or four fine weeks this is very nice and healthful.¹ If rain comes, the picture is reversed. They will pick under umbrellas (if they have them) for a time, but if it continues it is melancholy to see bare feet and sodden boots wading through the sticky mud, and wet, bedraggled garments, which perhaps will only be dried on the persons of the wearers, and at the expense of sowing the seeds of fever.

About 5.30 to 6.30 our friends are "called off" for the day, and we prepare for our evening work. Our own plan this year was to have a prayer-meeting at the Rectory every evening at seven for our workers and any neighbours who could join us. Sometimes Missionaries from neighbouring villages would drop in, and we would compare notes about our work. Last year and this every such statement was encouraging. Less opposition, less drunkenness, less bad language, greater numbers, and more attention at the services. We could not all be at the prayer-meeting. One of us must be at the church-tent getting it and the lights ready, and one or two at our *al fresco* soup-kitchen, where we sold excellent soup at a penny a quart. And this *must* be done at that hour, for it was their time for tea or supper.

At eight o'clock we went out in one, two, or three parties, according to our strength—some to the tent (procured for us and partly paid for by the Church Society for Missions to Hop-pickers), and some to more distant encampments, where they held open-air services of the usual type—singing, addresses, and short prayers. In the tent we do much the same. It will hold about 150. We often had it full, and many round the entrance. But sometimes we have to get the people in. Sometimes we go round with a house-bell to their tents and the picturesque groups round their camp-fires. Sometimes the response is, "Muffins and crumpets!" "Muffins and crumpets!" Sometimes, "All right, governor; we'll come

¹ I have seen the very donkeys of the costermongers down in our meadows rolling over and over, jumping, kicking, braying, and displaying every symptom of asinine delight at the change from the New Cut to the valley of the Medway.

along just now when we've had some tea, and when we've dried ourselves." Sometimes we try by a singing procession to sing them in. Sometimes we sing through several of Sankey's hymns, in the tent, before the adults come in. Members of our choir help us, and we have the school harmonium.¹

I must say a few words about Sunday. We freely invite our temporary *neighbours* to come to church. Some of the children are very proud to "get themselves washed and to come to church." A few adults drop in. I have had two or three members of the Salvation Army present themselves at the Lord's Table. After divine service ladies and the Missionaries go round with tracts. These are often eagerly sought for, especially when they have pictures.² Sometimes thirty or forty "hoppers" come into church in the evening. It is well to have vacant seats near the open doors, and to have friends looking out to invite them in. When we have a funeral from among them or a baptismal service for them we get our church full, and it is a great opportunity of addressing them on the primary Gospel truths, and telling them how welcome they will be to churches in their own neighbourhood when they go back. The last two years I had them to a baptismal service on the last night after their work was done. A great many came, and I thought it my duty to give them two or three short addresses explaining the service, and insisting on the necessity of the new birth, cleansing by the blood of Christ, a new and holy life, etc. I had a very attentive audience, though the gipsies walked out before it was over because their hour for bed had come. Before they went away the parents received a New Testament with the name of each child baptized inscribed, and the date and place of baptism. I have heard of these Testaments in succeeding years. And

¹ Our audiences are not *always* attentive. A hobbledehoy will be rude and making a laugh, and we have to desire him to leave. He "cuts up rough," and goes round the outside of the tent in the dark whistling to his mates within, and throwing lumps of dirt on our canvas roofs. We must bear it, but the farm-agent does all he can for us, and that is much. A few years ago my brother had meetings of this kind in his schoolroom. Wild Irish girls used to come in "for a lark," and were a sore hindrance. One evening they all sat on one bench, and rocked it to and fro till it went over, and they all sprawled on the ground, and the whole assembly roared in boisterous laughter. Another year he had a tent. The mischiefs got into it at night, filled his harmonium with sand, and turned it upside down. If you have a tent it must be open to observation; or, still better, you must have a care-taker. Our most noisy nights have been when the pickers have fallen out about the "tally," and are on strike.

² In the afternoon we have a children's service in the tent, well attended by an impulsive audience of little ones.

I hear in the hop-garden: "See, Mr. Cobb; this is the child you baptized at such and such a time"—signs that good influences have been sustained. We try to sustain them by posting a copy of our Parish Magazine to the parent of each child baptized, with the record of the baptism, and by mentioning the cases and addresses to the clergy of their parishes.

There is more to say about open-air preaching on Sundays; more about social and sanitary difficulties surrounding these poor people, and efforts to overcome them. But I have exhausted my space, and, I fear, the patience of my readers. Perhaps they may bear with me in a future *CHURCHMAN*.

CLEMENT FRANCIS COBB.

TESTON RECTORY, Oct. 1.

Reviews.

Life of Joseph Hall, D.D., Bishop of Exeter and Norwich. By the Rev. G. LEWIS, B.A., Balliol College, Oxford, pp. 440. Hodder and Stoughton. 1886.

WE divide history into reigns and periods, and for the purposes of memory the division is convenient enough. But we are apt to forget how misleading these divisions may be; that all the subjects of a king or queen do not die with their sovereign, nor even at the end of one of those periods into which it pleases our more modern historians to carve out English history. One great use of a biography is that it reminds us of the artificial character of these divisions. We are introduced, for instance, by this life of Bishop Hall to a section of history which begins shortly before the execution of Mary Queen of Scots, and ends some years after the execution of Charles I. Joseph Hall was thirteen years old when Mary was put to death, and seventy-four years old when her grandson perished on the scaffold. With every turn of the fierce controversies which filled the interval between these dates he was conversant. Again and again he was called upon to make his choice, little dreaming how far the two paths which lay before him were to diverge ere his life closed.

The war between Romanism and Protestantism absorbed Europe at the time of Hall's birth. The massacre of St. Bartholomew, and the fierce strife of the Netherlands for freedom from the Spanish yoke, were household topics in his boyish days. But side by side with this greater controversy was growing up another strife not less important, and in many respects far more perplexing. England as a nation was resolved not to submit to Roman tyranny, but it was not yet clear whether any human power was to step into the place once occupied by the Pope. Nor did the question at first present itself in this plain shape. The form which it assumed was often very complicated. Is the Bible an authority upon rites and ceremonies? Are its civil precepts binding? What does it teach us about free-will and necessity? Under these and many similar guises the real question was concealed and confused, as it so often is, in the transitory phases of daily life. But now, when we look back, we see that as the execution of Mary finally decided the freedom of England

from the Papacy, so the execution of her grandson really decided the question of liberty of conscience in England.

It may be doubted whether Hall ever understood the whole meaning of the great controversy of his time, or saw beyond the lesser conflicts into which the great battle resolved itself. He had not the genius of the general, but was found to be a very useful officer to conduct the defence or assault of subsidiary positions. He was, in fact, though his biographer will not allow it, somewhat deficient from his own point of view in insight and in moral courage. Mr. Lewis belongs to the hero-worshipping order of biographers. He sees in Bishop Hall a good Churchman, who fought his way out of the darkness of Calvinism into sound doctrine upon Episcopacy, ritual, and other cognate points. He loves to think that Bishop Hall would have had the good sense to agree with himself in these quarrels of the frogs and mice. He fails, therefore, to see, though he has the candour to relate, the time-serving conduct of his hero in more than one important crisis. Hall had not the gifts of a leader of thought; for this we do not blame him, though it necessarily makes his biography less interesting. Nor was he the thorough-going partisan, whose devotion to a lost cause may enlist our sympathy, even while we condemn his errors. His mind was rather contemplative, critical, and fanciful. He could write satires, meditations, and polemical tracts. But he had not strength of character to make his own view prevail, even where it was the right view, and some of his writings, as we now have them, represent rather what Laud allowed him to say than that which he conscientiously believed. In short, he was the creature of his times, and it is from this point of view that his life is really interesting. Mr. Lewis, in trying to represent Hall as a master-mind, has turned out a rather dull piece of work; for the life of the good Bishop in itself is devoid of incident, and his dogmatical utterances, which his biographer especially affects, are tedious and inconclusive. The general reader would have been better pleased to hear more of Hall's "Satires" and of his "Contemplations," and could well have spared his dissertations upon doctrine—at least in the form in which Mr. Lewis presents them.

In early years Hall was entirely surrounded by Calvinistic influences. He was destined apparently from childhood for the ministry, but there were two ways in which he might be educated for the office. He might either pass through the university, or serve an apprenticeship of seven years under some godly minister. The latter course had already been chosen, when at the earnest representation of Hall's elder brother his father was induced to send him to Cambridge. That first choice, humanly speaking, was a momentous choice for the young lad. Under the godly minister who was to have taken charge of him in Leicester he must have been brought up to be one of the most quaint and delightful, but no doubt one of the most strict, of our Puritan divines. The dialectical skill which he afterwards displayed in the service of Laud would have been ranged on the side of Milton, and the Nonconformists were robbed of a brilliant and valuable controversialist.

Yet there was no intention of removing the lad from his old moorings. He was sent to Emmanuel College, a new foundation then, designed "as a seminary of learned men for the supply of the Church, and for the sending forth as large a number as possible of those who shall instruct the people in the Christian faith." Queen Elizabeth roundly taxed the founder with having erected a Puritan college—an impeachment which he evaded rather than denied. Among the *alumni* of the college were numbered Harvard, the founder of Harvard College in America, Bradshaw the regicide, and Henry, son of Oliver Cromwell. In building the college, pains had been taken to insult, as it were, the older house of Preaching Friars, upon the ruins of which it stood. The old chapel was

converted into the hall; the fireplace was the site of the high altar; the new chapel faced north and south. Not only was the old order set at naught, even the new was disregarded. The college used its own form of service. "In Emmanuel College they receive the Holy Sacrament sitting upon forms about the Communion Table, and doe pull the loafe, one from the other, after the minister hath begon. And see the Cupp, one drinking as it were to another like good fellows, without any particular application of the saide words, more than once for all." Surplices and hoods, even cap and gown, were contemned, and supper-parties given on Fridays. Whatever college influence could do to make Hall a Puritan was undoubtedly done.

As Hall's early literary essays were not theological, but poetical, it is not easy to say how far he imbibed the teaching of his college, and how far that of the new school of Arminian divines, who were beginning to obtain a footing at Cambridge. At least he heard both sides, and it is not impossible that he divined which of the two schools of teaching was likely to become more fashionable. He would certainly not be the first young man who learned at the University the exact opposite of what he was intended to learn. Every day the controversy with Rome was becoming sharper, and the efforts of Rome to regain lost ground were more zealous. Hall, having now left the university, and accepted the living of Halsted in Essex, was determined to see the Romanists upon their own ground, and visited the Continent in the company of Sir Edmund Bacon, a grandson of the great philosopher. This journey proved to be full of interest and instruction, though he went no farther than the Netherlands. On all sides were ruined churches, flourishing Jesuit seminaries, and pilgrimages to miracle-working shrines. It is remarkable that the miracles at these shrines were alleged as a convincing proof that the Church of Rome was the true Church, and attempts were made upon pilgrims, and upon Hall among the rest, to pervert them to Rome on the ground of these miracles. It might serve as a caution to some modern travellers to Lourdes and other places to read how the local doctor, after professing his belief in these wonders, and failing in debate upon them, handed the travellers over to a Jesuit Father; how ceremoniously the Father received them, and how reluctant he was to let go of them. Fortunately, Hall was more than a match for Roman controversialists, primed, we may suppose, by his early training. Finally he left the Continent, disgusted not a little with the irreverence which he had witnessed; as, for instance, at Antwerp, where, during a celebration of the mass, the church was full of meat, of butchers, of buyers, some kneeling, most bargaining, most talking, all busy." Travellers who are content to observe, and not to imagine, what they see, may notice not a little of the same irreverence still. How often will the apparently devout worshipper rise suddenly from orisons, and be transformed into the volunteer guide or the sturdy beggar! The British tourist is not the cause of all the irreverence which he may witness in a day's journey in Belgium. In later years Hall wrote a book—the "Quo Vadis"—for the express purpose of deterring Englishmen from foreign travel. It is clear that in his days no opportunity for effecting perversion was more commonly used by Rome.

It is not our purpose to follow each step of Hall's preferment. It is not in these that the chief interest of his life centres. Suffice it to say that he was made Chaplain to Henry, Prince of Wales, the elder brother of Charles I., Vicar of Waltham Abbey, and Dean of Worcester, before he reached the Episcopal throne. While Prince Henry lived there was still some hope in the Church of England for the opponents of Laud. The Prince was exemplary in life, "an attentive hearer of sermons, and distinguished such as excelled, a strict attender on public worship, a

watchful guardian of his somewhat large household, which, before he was eighteen, numbered about five hundred, and, unlike his august father was never heard to indulge in an oath." His great ambition was, when he should come to the throne, to reconcile the Puritans to the Church. Whether such reconciliation were possible he was not permitted to try. He died in 1622, and while King James did not even pretend to grieve for his death, nor put the court into mourning for him, he was more lamented by godly men than princes commonly are.

But while holding his chaplaincy to Prince Henry, Hall contrived not to fall out with the dominant party in court. He was no doubt considered a "moderate" man, and as such became the tool of designing men who were the very reverse of moderate. Under some such circumstances he was selected with Andrews and Laud to accompany James on his foolish expedition to Scotland in 1617. James had just instituted the *Tulchan* Bishops, and was determined to lend them the weight of his royal presence. Organs were sent to Scotland; gilded images were disembarked at Leith; service was said after the English fashion, or rather sung by surpliced choristers. Possibly it was hoped that the "moderate" Hall would reconcile the Scotch to these innovations. But their indignation knew no bounds. The ministers tried to protest. The protest was torn in a struggle outside the door of the King's bedroom, and not even the presence of the King, who had rushed out undressed, calmed the disputants. Hall wisely obtained leave to return to England before the controversy should rise to more dangerous heights. But he was not destined to escape without giving an opinion. Appealed to by a Scotch divine for guidance, and warned by the King to answer carefully, Hall set himself to study ritual—may we say, as Mr. Gladstone recently set himself to study Irish history? The result of the studies might have been foreseen. Hall emerged from them convinced that the theology of the court party was the more sound.

Yet he could not break with his old friends, and consequently a still more crucial test awaited him. The Synod of Dort was assembled in 1618 to pronounce upon the controversy between Calvinism and Arminianism, or rather to condemn the Arminians and to formulate Calvinistic doctrines. Now, James had taken a leading part in the persecution of the Arminians abroad, while at home he was beginning to bestow favours upon them. Most perilous, therefore, was the position of his English ambassadors. They were "to endeavour to moderately lay down such positions as might tend to the mitigation of heat on both sides." Theirs was to be the unenviable lot of moderators in a bitter theological strife, exposed to the furious assaults of either faction. Hall again found safety in flight. He was ill, and obtained leave to return home; and, lest the synod should, in too great value of his services, seek to retain him, he *sent* in his resignation. So it came to pass in after years, when his antagonists wished to bind him by consistency to the resolutions of the synod, it was found that he had never been party to them. Mr. Lewis evidently places faith in his hero's illness. We have no wish to disturb his faith; but we feel bound to point out that circumstances, whether wilful or accidental, placed Hall once more in a position far from heroic.

The death of Prince Henry snapped the last tie that bound Hall to the Puritans. Henceforward he began to draw more closely to Laud, though he found no little difficulty in coming up to the standard of his patron's rigour. Every day controversy waxed more rife, and the central point was still the question of free-will and predestination. Political and ecclesiastical parties ranged themselves on either side of this line, and promotion at court or disfavour with Parliament depended upon the view which a man might profess of this abstruse mystery. Each side strove

to silence rather than to convince the other. Hall, shortly after his elevation to the Bishopric of Exeter, made various attempts to publish such moderate opinions as might satisfy Laud without giving offence to Parliament. We need not wonder that the attempts were unsuccessful, and that their only practical result was the imprisonment and well-nigh ruin of Hall's printer, who, for the better sale of his book, ventured to publish a passage which Laud had expunged. On the next occasion of difference with Laud, Hall himself barely escaped the heavy hand of the Primate. The Puritans made great use of lecturers, without any parochial charge for the dissemination of their doctrines; Laud, therefore, was determined to suppress them. But Hall, either for the sake of peace, or because he found that these men were his best agents in withstanding the never-tiring energy of the Jesuits, refused to act with vigour against the lecturers. "The billows went so high that he was three several times upon his knees before the King to answer these great criminations . . . and plainly told the Lord Archbishop of Canterbury that rather than he would be obnoxious to those slanderous tongues of his misinformers, he would cast up his rochet." It is not less to Hall's credit that he refused to proceed against any of his clergy for not reading the "Book of Sports." Hall could remember the profanation of Church and Sabbath in his youthful days; how

The wilde heades of the parish flocking together chuse them a graunde capitaine of mischief, whom they innoble with the title of my lord of misrule . . . in this sorte they go to the church (though the minister be at prayer or preaching), dauncing and swinging their handkerchiefs over their heads, like devils incarnate, with such a confused noise that no man can heare his owne voice. Then the foolish people, they looke, they stare, they laugh, they feere, and mount upon formes and pewes to see these goodly pageants solemnised in this sort. Then after this aboute the church they go againe and againe, and so fourthe into the churchyard, where they have commonly their summer halls, their bowres, arbours, and banqueting-houses, . . . and there they spend their Sabbath day.

Recollecting these wild scenes, and knowing full well how much the Puritans had contributed to the sanctity of the day, Hall was not likely to lend himself to be an instrument in its desecration. Yet he must have been so, had he forced his clergy to exhort their people to spend the latter half of each Sunday in dancing, leaping, vaulting, and other recreations. His resistance to Laud in this matter was as commendable as his yielding would have been disgraceful to an alumnus of Emmanuel College.

We must pass over some eventful years, and hasten on to Hall's last promotion to the Bishopric of Norwich, from which he passed almost at one step to the Tower. With the events of these days, and the fury of the Long Parliament, all readers of English history are familiar; but the following description of the desecration of Norwich Cathedral from the pen of an eye-witness helps us to realize how mere rioting at last obtained the upper hand:

There was not that care and moderation used in reforming the Cathedral Church bordering upon my palace. It is no other than tragical to relate the carriage of that furious sacrilege, whereof our eyes and ears were the sad witnesses. . . . Lord! what work was here! what clattering of glasses! what beating down of walls! what tearing up of monuments! what pulling down of seats! what wresting out of irons and brass from the windows and graves! what defacing of arms! what demolishing of curious stonework, that had not any representation in the world but only of the cost of the founder and skill of the mason! what tooting and piping upon the destroyed organ-pipes! and what a hideous triumph on the market-day before all the country, when in a kind of sacrilegious and profane procession all the organ-pipes, vestments, both copes and surplices, together with the leaden cross which had been newly sawn down from over the greenyard

pulpit, and the service-books and singing-books that could be had, were carried to the fire in the public market-place; a lewd wretch walking before the train in his cope trailing in the dirt, with a service-book in his hand, imitating in an impious scorn the tune, and usurping the words, of the Litany used formerly in the church. Near the public cross all these monuments of idolatry must be sacrificed to the fire, not without much ostentation of a zealous joy in discharging ordinance to the cost of some who professed how much they had longed to see that day. Neither was it any news upon this guild-day to have the cathedral now open on all sides to be filled with musketeers, waiting for the Mayor's return, drinking and tobacconing as freely as if it had turned ale-house.

The good Bishop survived these tragic scenes for some twelve years, and lived on in Norwich supported by a small pension allowed to him out of the revenues of his see. To those who know him only from his "Contemplations" we cannot hope that this account of him will be very pleasing. He was a good man, but not a strong man. In quiet, easy times his devotional writings embalmed in his beautiful English would have won him a name second to few of our divines. Posterity, more kind to him than Mr. Lewis, has treasured the best part of his work, and buried the rest. Had his biographer been content to claim for him the praise of steering his way conscientiously on the whole through most troublous seas, he would have produced a more pleasing, perhaps a more truthful portrait. But the desire to represent Hall as a "good Churchman" and a worthy predecessor of modern ritualists in the technical sense of the word has resulted in bringing into painful prominence the weaker side of Hall's character.

We cannot conclude this notice with words that are to us more characteristic of the author of the "Contemplations" than these:

O God, bless Thou mine eye with this sight of a blessed eternity! I shall not forbear to sing in the night of death itself: much less in the twilight of all these worldly afflictions. Come, then, all ye earthly crosses, and muster up all your forces against me. Here is that which is able to make me more than a conqueror over you all. Have I lost my goods and foregone a fair estate? Had all the earth been mine, what is it to heaven? Had I been the lord of all the world, what were this to a kingdom of glory? Have I parted with a dear consort, the sweet companion of my youth, the tender nurse of my age, the partner of my sorrows for these forty-eight years? She is but stopt a little before me to that happy rest which I am panting towards, and wherein I shall speedily overtake her. . . . Am I afflicted with bodily pain and sickness, which banisheth all sleep from my eyes, and exercises me with a lingering torture? Ere long this momentary distemper shall end in an everlasting rest.

E. A. KNOX.

A History of Greek Literature from the Earliest Period to the Death of Demosthenes. By FRANK BYRON JEVONS, M.A., Tutor in the University of Durham. Pp. 500. Charles Griffin and Co.

THIS is a companion volume to Mr. Cruttwell's "History of Roman Literature," published some years ago, and now most deservedly in a fourth edition: and it is a very worthy companion. We hope that Mr. Jevons will imitate Mr. Cruttwell and follow up the present excellent work with a volume of "Specimens of Greek Literature" to illustrate the criticisms contained in the book before us. Even in the case of well-known authors one sometimes wishes to have a few of the passages which best illustrate what is so justly remarked about them: and in the case of out-of-the-way writers, whose works are not by any means on every student's shelves, quotations are almost indispensable. Mr. Jevons is quite right in not burdening the present volume with such things; but a volume of well-selected specimens is imperatively needed, if this

"History of Greek Literature" is to do its proper work. It is thoroughly intelligible and interesting as it stands, but the student ought not to be left to swallow conclusions wholesale, without knowing something of the facts on which they are built. Even Lord Macaulay's schoolboy would have to confess ignorance of a large number of the writings discussed by Mr. Jevons.

But we should be sorry to convey the impression that this volume is of interest only, or even mainly, to schoolboys competing for places and prizes, or preparing for the University. Not only undergraduates reading for Honours, but those who have to instruct them, will find a great deal that will be of the utmost service to them. And, although there is a great deal of learning involved in the production of such a work, yet the book is by no means a "learned" one, in the sense that it interests no one but professed students. The general reader, who wishes to know something about one of the grandest literatures which the human race has ever produced, and who finds translations of classical authors absolutely unreadable, will find much not only to instruct but to delight him in Mr. Jevons' pages.

Poetry is, as usual, divided into epic, lyric, and the drama; prose into history, oratory, and philosophy. The first five of these six divisions receive from five to eight chapters apiece; which is very adequate treatment. Greek philosophical literature is dismissed in a single chapter! We suspect the publishers of having limited the author to five hundred pages: and as the first five sections almost reached this limit, the philosophers had to receive rather curt treatment. No doubt they are best able to bear it. Every here and there a chapter has a useful Appendix to discuss some special topic. One of the most interesting of these is the one on "Reading, Writing, and Publication in Classical Greek Times," appended to Chap. III. "Classical Greek Times" is a phrase which strikes one as almost as vague as "the time of the Romans," but we have no fault to find with the essay which it covers.

A few details may be singled out for special notice. Mr. Jevons, we are glad to see, believes in one Homer to whom may still be attributed both the "Iliad" and the "Odyssey," each in its integrity. The "Birds" of Aristophanes is pronounced to be neither political nor personal, but to be written without any purpose other than that of getting away from contemporary Athenian life with its restless associations and its stifling political atmosphere. That a law was then in force rendering it penal to caricature anyone by name on the stage hardly settles the question. It is easy enough to caricature individuals, parties, and projects, without committing one's self to anything that a prosecutor can get hold of. And it is at least possible that the "Birds" is intended to convey an indefinite condemnation of the Sicilian Expedition. Nevertheless, we suspect that Mr. Jevons is right in the view which he adopts. There may be passing allusions here and there; but in its main plot and execution this play is as devoid of a moral as "Alice in Wonderland." We are glad to see that Mr. Jevons has a word about the beauty of the lyrics. We had looked to see whether he had given Aristophanes a place among the lyric poets. He has not done so; but such an arrangement would not have needed much defence. Can any poet be named who excels Aristophanes in this form of poetry?

We are inclined to think that Mr. Jevons is at his best in the section on the historians. Every intelligent reader, whether he knows the originals or not, will enjoy the chapters on Herodotus, Thucydides, and Xenophon. The charming story about Thucydides in early life listening in rapture to the recitations of Herodotus, Mr. Jevons seems disposed in one place (p. 313) to reject as an invention of grammarians. But in

another (p. 328) he accepts it as probable, if only the young Thucydides is allowed to be twenty-five years of age. That we believe to be the right solution. Stories of this kind, which give so much life, and reality, and tenderness to history, should not be rejected excepting upon very conclusive evidence. And there is nothing about which memory is more treacherous than dates and places. Stories may be quite true, although the chronology and geography are sadly muddled. Mr. Jevons does not think it worth while to discuss the authorship of the eighth book of Thucydides : on the other hand, he does discuss that of the "Anabasis," and decides quite rightly, as we believe, for Xenophon.

In thanking the author for this solid contribution to a great subject we add one word of special gratitude for the retention of the traditional spelling of proper names. There are no concessions to pedantry.

Short Notices.

"The Cambridge Bible for Schools and Colleges." *The Epistle to the Ephesians*, with Introduction and Notes, by the Rev. H. C. G. MOULE, M.A., Principal of Ridley Hall, and late Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge. University Press Warehouse.

This is a valuable little volume. The Introduction, though brief, is full, and very clear, while of the expository portion of the work we can hardly speak too warmly. Mr. Moule's scholarship is precise and patient; and his Commentaries are not only deeply spiritual, but suggestive and strong. Sound teaching is given plainly, without hesitation, and in small compass. We had marked many inviting paragraphs with a view to quotation; but we recommend our readers—lay as well as clerical—to get so good a Commentary on this great Epistle. The unlearned may enjoy it without fear of Greek.

Mr. Moule pleads, we observe, for "the whole family" (iii. 15). Much is to be said, no doubt, for "every family" or "every fatherhood;" but Dean Alford did not convince us, and we were pleased to notice Mr. Meyrick in the "Speaker's Commentary" supporting the A.V. Mr. Moule's remarks about the Greek article in the N.T. are of weight.¹ He says that there "*may* be communities in the heavenly world to which the idea of family may attach. But if so, this is the solitary hint of it in Scripture." And he observes that the context as a whole makes for the idea of *oneness*. Render "the *whole* family," and this passage presents the great truth so characteristic of the Epistle, the spiritual oneness of the holy Community. The R.V., of course, has stimulated inquiry, and many students, we think, would welcome a worthy discussion on so interesting a passage. Mr. Moule's statement (in his Introduction) as to the Argument here, may well be quoted :

14-19.—And now [returning to the imagery of Temple and Shecinah] he tells them of his prayer to the One Father of the great spiritual Family. It is that He would apply His Divine resources, in granting to them, by the immediate action of the Holy Spirit, power to welcome into their hearts, without reserve, evermore, Christ as the Indweller [power personally to accept all that His Pre-

¹ ii. 21.—A.V., "All the building": R.V., "Each several building." Mr. Moule's Note here is excellent. We recall that Professor Grimm, in his grand Lexicon, holds the idea of the A.V.

sence means]; and this, in order that they may be able, resting on and rooted in the Love of God, to grasp, in the sense of a new realization, the illimitable greatness of that Love. . . .

A Charge delivered to the Clergy and Churchwardens of the Diocese of Norwich. By JOHN THOMAS, Lord Bishop of Norwich. London: Griffith, Farran, Okeden, and Welsh; Norwich: A. H. Goose and Co.

In the August CHURCHMAN, under "The Month," appeared four extracts from the Bishop of Norwich's Charge, as reported at the time of his Visitation. We are pleased to have an opportunity of recommending the Charge, as now published. The counsels of such a prelate as Dr. Pelham, at the present critical moment in the history of the Church, have a peculiar interest. We may therefore quote a passage on matters of "Church Reform." The Bishop touches upon "anomalies of Clerical income." Much has been done, of course, during the last forty years:

I believe that further efforts should be made upon the same principles, viz., (1) by the re-arrangement and better management of existing endowments; (2) by the creation of a central common fund, from which to make grants to supplement local benefactions, having regard in each case to the income and the population of the Cure. Then this common fund might, I think, be largely increased by an equitable tax on all benefices above £300 per annum, taking into consideration the income and the population, and wholly abolishing the present charges of first-fruits and tenths. If, by these means and in many cases at considerable sacrifice, large help should be obtained out of the Church's existing endowments, I cannot doubt that owners of land, and of all other property, would be ready liberally to contribute their voluntary benefactions, even as it is found in the experience of the Ecclesiastical Commission, that for many years the sum offered by voluntary benefactions far exceeded even the large sum which they were able to grant out of the common fund to meet it.

The Bishop remarks, further, that "In not a few benefices annual income would indirectly be helped by a reduction of annual expenditure, if, in providing parsonages for benefices with small endowment, more regard was paid, as to cost and accommodation, to the actual income of the benefice."¹ The Bishop proceeds:

It is thought by some that it would be for the spiritual benefit of the parish, and would give increased efficiency to the ministrations of the Church, if some conditions or limitations were introduced into the present system of life tenure of benefices. There is a good deal to be said in favour of such a scheme, though practically it would be difficult to carry into effect. But in any such plan it would be essential, I think, to establish a system of retiring pensions, and that these should be provided, not out of the income of the benefice when the incumbent has retired from it, but by a compulsory annual payment while he holds it, upon such a plan and conditions as are in operation, as I believe, in the India and in other branches of the public service.

Expositions. By the Rev. SAMUEL COX, D.D. Second Series. Pp. 450. T. Fisher Unwin. 1886.

Of the second volume of Dr. Cox's "Expositions" we may say the same as of the first: many readers who can discriminate, select, and duly measure, will read it with interest and esteem it. Dr. Cox is known as a singularly suggestive expositor, of much insight and power. His standing with reference to eschatology is also known, and no remark need here be made about it.

These "expositions" are really sermons or "expository discourses."

¹ The Bishop of Salisbury's (very similar) observations upon this matter, we may remind our readers, will be found in the September CHURCHMAN, page 470.

Two of them—preached on Matt. xxvi, 30, “When they had sung an hymn”—relate to the Sacraments and Liturgical Forms. He begins by pointing out that the rabbis had added many observances to the original Paschal rite. “Moses had enjoined the Jews to eat the Passover *standing*, with their loins girt, their sandals on their feet, their staves in their hands, as men who were about to be thrust out of the land, as men to whom the feast was the signal for a long and perilous flight.” In after ages, continues Dr. Cox, “this posture was altered, so altered as to bring it into correspondence with their altered circumstances. At their ordinary meals the Jews either sat as we do, or, more commonly, reclined on couches, like the Greeks and Romans. But on this night of the Passover they thought it indecorous to *sit* at meat. They held themselves bound to lie on couches, and thus to mark the freedom, composure, and leisurely festal joy of the time. Nor can there be any doubt that our Lord conformed to this custom.” Noting other changes made by the Jews, Dr. Cox draws the lesson that “the Lord Jesus, in adopting these new forms, not only sanctioned the change, but *recognised their right* to modify and recast the ordinances of the House of God.” He adds: “From this principle—the right and power of the Church to adapt even the most sacred forms and modes of worship to its present circumstances and necessities—there is, I think, no logical escape, at least for those who bow to the teaching and example of Christ.” The argument is thoughtful and well sustained; read together with Article XX. (“Of the Authority of the Church”) Churchmen will to a greater or lesser extent agree with it.

On the fact that our Lord and the Apostles *reclined*, Dr. Cox lays stress, of course, in referring to the Lord’s Supper. Dean Stanley’s remarks on the Eucharist, in his “Christian Institutions,” will come to the recollection of many readers of this sermon. The Dean was of opinion that this posture—*reclining*—continued during the whole Apostolic age. The great pictures of the Catholic Church are, as regards posture, historically incorrect; only one famous painter, Poussin, dared to draw the scene true to fact.

The Evangelical Revival in the Eighteenth Century. By JOHN HENRY OVERTON, Canon of Lincoln, and Rector of Epworth. Pp. 200. Longmans, Green, and Co.

It is hardly necessary to say that this book is well worth reading, for its author is known for ability, judgment, and fairness, with a pleasing style. The book throughout is good, *very good*. The account of Wesley and Whitfield has much of freshness; and the chapter on “Methodism and Evangelicalism” is clear and pithy. To the chapters on the Evangelical Clergy and Laity we may return; meantime, we may say we are particularly pleased with Canon Overton’s appreciative description of Newton. In endeavouring to estimate the *results* of the “Revival,” Canon Overton refers, of course, to the opinion of Mr. Lecky and of Mr. Gladstone. Mr. Lecky asserts that by “the close of the century the Evangelical party were incontestably the most numerous and the most active party in the English Church.” Mr. Gladstone argues that this was not the case. Our author well remarks: “If instead of the words ‘party’ and ‘numerous’ one might substitute ‘influence’ and ‘definite,’ the historian’s assertion would, perhaps, be nearer the truth.” The Evangelical party, he adds, were “more compact,” more aggressive, or, to use Mr. Lecky’s epithet, more active—than any religious School in the Church. We observe that Canon Overton uses Mr. Lecky’s word, “dominant,” and as *he* uses the word it is correct.

The Laity and Church Reform. With a Frontispiece. By Lord EBURY. Pp. 50. Longmans, Green, and Co. 1886.

This pamphlet contains the correspondence between Lord Ebury and the Bishop of Carlisle, which was published in the *Times* during the autumn; also other letters, with leading articles of the *English Churchman* and *Church Intelligencer*. The frontispiece is "a representation of the Bishop of Lincoln as his Lordship appeared after celebrating 'pontifically' at Lincoln." There are several extracts from Canon King's "Letter to Rev. C. J. Elliott," (which was reviewed by an eminent divine in the first volume of *THE CHURCHMAN*), and reference is also made to the case of the Rev. R. Linklater. Lord Ebury is justly esteemed and revered, and his protest against some of Mr. Gladstone's Church appointments will be welcomed by many Liberals as well as by Conservatives.

Australian Pictures drawn with Pen and Pencil. By HOWARD WILLOUGHBY, of the *Melbourne Argus*. R.T.S.

In one respect this volume differs from its predecessors. The other volumes of the "Pen and Pencil" series were written by travellers to the lands which they described, but the "Pictures" of Australia are by an Australian resident. He has done his work with singular skill. The book is very readable, full of information, and in every way attractive.

The Quiver. Vol. XXI. Cassell and Co.

During seven years in *THE CHURCHMAN* we have had the pleasure of recommending *The Quiver* as one of the very best magazines of the kind. It is ably edited, and—so far from falling away—even increases in interest. Its religious teaching is thoroughly evangelical, of a practical, kindly, and liberal sort. The annual before us, rich in pleasing and tasteful illustrations, is a remarkably good and cheap gift-book.

Preludes to the Reformation. By the Rev. A. R. PENNINGTON, M.A., Canon Non-Residentiary of Lincoln Cathedral and Rector of Uterby, Author of the "Life of Wiclif," "The Life of Erasmus," "Epochs of the Papacy," etc. Pp. 186. The Religious Tract Society.

On the title-page of this welcome book we observe the words, "The Church History Series: I.," on which we can only say that if other volumes thus announced prove to be as good as Canon Pennington's, the series will be much valued. As a writer, Canon Pennington is known to the readers of the *CHURCHMAN*, and our notice of his latest work may pardonably be brief. There are five chapters: "The gradual decline of the power of the Papacy;" "Unsuccessful attempts to reform the Church" (correction of *abuses*); "The revival of learning;" "Reformers before Luther;" and "The increasing Brightness." Each chapter has its own points of interest.

Four Essays on the Sabbath. With preface by ANDREW THOMSON, D.D. Edinburgh: James Gemmell. 1886.

In this rather bulky volume appear the four essays to which were awarded prizes by the "Sabbath Alliance of Scotland." The essays are these: "Our Rest Day: its Origin, History, and Claims," by Rev. T. Hamilton (Bedford); "Heaven once a Week," by Rev. C. W. Wood (Secretary, Massachusetts Sabbath Committee, Boston, U. S.); "The Sabbath: Scripturally and practically considered," by Rev. D. Orr (Hawick); and "Some Aspects of the Sabbath Question," by "A Member of the College of Justice, Edinburgh." It must suffice, at present, to add that the book is printed in large clear type.

Glimpses of Maori Land. By ANNIE R. BUTLER. Pp. 258. R.T.S.

This is an interesting and instructive book, with illustrations, and well got up. On the title-page appears a quotation from M. Taine's *Notes sur l'Angleterre*: "Que chacun dise ce qu'il a vu, et seulement ce qu'il a vu ; les observations, pourvu qu'elles soient personnelles et faites de bonne foi, sont toujours utiles." We quote a single sentence :

The conditions of life are simple and unconventional in New Zealand. An Archdeacon will open the street-door to you with the matter-of-course air of one who has done it hundreds of times before ; his daughter (or the Bishop's, for the matter of that) will wait upon you at dinner ; a lady, refined and intelligent, will tell you calmly not to come at such or such a time, as

"It is washing-day, and my daughter will be busy."

Saint Augustine, Melancthon, Neander. Three Biographies. By PHILIP SCHAFF, D.D. Pp. 168. Nisbet.

In any writing by Professor Schaff there is sure to be thought and power, and the book before us has much of interest.

Every Girl's Annual. Edited by ALICIA A. LEITH. Hatchards.

This is a high-class magazine, containing, besides serial stories, a good deal of information. Some of the papers on Great Painters are very clever. For ourselves, we should like to see, here and there, a little distinctive Christianity.

We have received from Mr. Murray the *Quarterly Review*, just published (Oct. 16). The article of highest interest for ourselves is "Historical Criticism of the New Testament." It is mainly a review of Dr. Salmon's remarkable work, "Historical Introduction to the Study of the Books of the New Testament," the merits of which were pointed out in the *CHURCHMAN*, by Dr. Plummer, as soon as the work appeared. The article is admirable. Professor Salmon's book, we are glad to perceive, has reached a second edition. The *Quarterly* article on Mr. Gosse's "From Shakespeare to Pope" is very severe ; how came it to pass that such a book received the *imprimatur* of the University of Cambridge ? The Reviewer criticizes the lecturer and the University and the critics who praised the book. It is a wonderfully clever article. "Salmon Fishing" has charms for many readers who care nothing about the literary standard of Cambridge, or fail to appreciate "American Poets," "The National Gallery" is well-written. The "Bulgarian Plot" is deeply interesting. "The House of Commons as it is" and "The New Government and its Work" are able articles, full of point, and very readable.

Cassell's *Family Magazine* for October is as interesting and attractive as it usually is.—*Blackwood* has, with other admirable papers, Lord Bra-bourne on Mr. Gladstone's Irish policy.—In the *National Review* appears "The Laity in the Protestant Episcopal Church in the U. States," by the Right Rev. Bishop LITTLEJOHN.

From the S.P.C.K. we have received two attractive gift-books : one for the nursery, *Pictures and Rhymes for Holiday Times*, and the other for children a little older, *Robinson Crusoe*, illustrated with forty-eight chromo-lithographs ; both very cheap.—The *Dawn of Day* volume for 1886 (S.P.C.K.) is bright and informing. Here and there, the teaching might well be a little more simple, and of a "popular" cast.

A Letter to the Rev. Samuel Davidson, D.D., LL.D., in answer to his Essay against the Johannine Authorship of the Fourth Gospel, by KENTISH BACHE, third edition (Parker and Co.), will repay reading.

A Peep into Ceylon, by Mrs. A. THOMPSON, is a bright and informing little book of travel "written for children." (S.P.C.K.)

Stories for the Band of Hope, a collection of anecdotes, some very striking, is published by the Sunday School Union (56, Old Bailey), and will be welcomed by many ardent "Blue Ribbon" workers.—*Villegagnon* is a Tale of the Huguenot Persecution, by the late Mr. W. H. G. Kingston.—The annual of *Young England* contains, with much informing and interesting matter, a serial Tale by Dr. Gordon Stables, R.N.

To *The Structure and Method of the Book of Common Prayer*, by J. W. BURGON, B.D., Dean of Chichester (S.P.C.K.), we heartily invite attention. The little pamphlet contains two of the Dean's vigorous Cathedral sermons.

Manual of Common Prayer at Sea on Week-Days, arranged by the Chaplain of the Fleet, and approved by the Archbishop of Canterbury, is published by Messrs. Griffin and Co.—Messrs. Clark have issued, in their "Foreign Theological Library," Vol. I. of Ebrard's *Apologetics*, and Vol. III. of Schürer's *History of the Jewish People in the Time of Jesus Christ* (second division). They announce Schürer's *History*, Division I.—We have pleasure in commending *Short Biographies for the People*, Vol. III. This series of the R.T.S., as we have said before, ought to be widely known.—*The Vocation of the Preacher* (Hodder and Stoughton) is another republication of Mr. Paxton Hood's writings (pp. 520), uniform with "The Throne of Eloquence." Newman, Faber, Andrews of Waltham, and Parsons of York, are some men of the pulpit here referred to. The book will repay perusal.

From the S.P.C.K. we have received several Tales, pleasing gift-books, just published. *Engel the Fearless*, for example, is a well-drawn, though scarcely correct, picture of life in the castle of an earl who prided himself on being like William Rufus, and who had taken away the children of Countess Engel.—*Elma's Trial* has many charms. Elma became lame through an accident; she learned how duty means happiness; she married the new Rector.—*Geoffrey Bennett* is a clever and impressive Tale, with some painful touches, showing how out of evil may come forth good. Letty was married, after all, though Matt, when tired of her, pretended the marriage was illegal. This earnest and pathetic story may help many.—In *Chimney Park* are interesting sketches of working-class life. Dick as a blue-ribboner, led by a bad companion into the public-house, and into evil ways, but afterwards coming out boldly on the Lord's side, is well-drawn; and so is Mrs. Carter. This is a very real little book.—*Josiah Hunslet's Reward*, a good Tale of Work-house life, is written by Rev. E. N. HOARE.—*The Adventurous Voyage of the Polly* is a capital story.

Messrs. Nisbet and Co. have sent us some wholesome stories. *Gran and Cicely* both show the evils of drink and bad companions. *Gran* is a touching story of cottage-life by the sea; it is well told and ends happily. In *Cicely* a sad chapter, "Found Drowned," refers to

One more unfortunate,
Weary of breath.

Hidden Homes, or "The Children's Discoveries," very readable, is by the Author of "Tim's Troubles."—Mr. Ballantyne's Tales have been so often commended in these pages, that it may suffice to state that *Red Rooney* is the latest published, an attractive volume, uniform with "The Young Trawler" and "The Rover of the Andes." It is a Tale of Greenland, and refers to the heroic labours of Moravian Missionaries.

THE MONTH.

THE Church Congress of Wakefield is generally said to have been a very successful gathering.¹ The Bishop (Dr. Carpenter) proved, as everybody expected, an admirable President. The speakers were earnest, well-informed, and practical, and the audience was sympathetic. Last year, at the Portsmouth Congress, the leading thought was *Church Defence*; in the proceedings at Wakefield it was *Church Reform*. And the tone of the speeches, in several important meetings, was most encouraging. As to Patronage, *e.g.*, the *Record* says :

The details of the Patronage Bill naturally called forth a good deal of criticism, but we do not attach much significance to that. The best part of the matter was the firm appeal to Churchmen, made by almost all the speakers, to support the Bill.

The Bishop of Rochester's paper on the "lapsed Masses," and the Bishop of Exeter's on "Polygamy in relation to Foreign Missions," will repay very careful reading. The *Spectator* says that the Bishop of Liverpool's treatment of the question before him—rural parishes—was "altogether admirable." A valuable paper on the Church and Social Questions was read by Canon Straton, the esteemed Vicar of Wakefield, to whose tact and energy much credit is due.

In the Education debate Archdeacon Norris remarked of the portion of Mr. Matthew Arnold's report which deals with the abolition of school fees, that Mr. Arnold's "conclusions were strictly opposed to all his premises."

The Diaconate question was worthily discussed. To another reform which for years we have urged in the *CHURCHMAN*, *viz.*, the union of small contiguous benefices, attention was invited by Canon Bullock.

Lord Randolph Churchill, in a welcome speech at Dartford, announced that the Government, early next Session, will bring in a Bill throwing the payment of tithe upon the landlord,² and another Bill to facilitate the sale of glebes.

The Rev. F. F. Goe, a vigorous speaker and a pastor of high rank, has been nominated, we gladly note, to the See of Melbourne.

At Ramsgate, at the fifteenth annual gathering of the South-Eastern Lay and Clerical Alliance, the President, the Dean of Canterbury, made an admirable address on the National Church. Of the South Eastern College, Ramsgate, the Junior as well as the Senior branch, a most gratifying report was given by the Rev. E. d'Auquier, head-master.

¹ The *Guardian* of the 13th says, "The Congress was, notwithstanding, an emphatic success." "It proved at any rate that Church work in itself, and for its own sake, can command the deepest sympathies and attention of multitudes of people even when it is not commended to them by any special attractions of eloquence or eminent authority. It proved also that the Evangelical principles and policy of the day, for it was Evangelical Churchmanship which predominated—perhaps too much predominated—everywhere at Wakefield, are by no means narrow or unprogressive." The *Record* of the 15th says: "There appears to be a consensus of opinion on two points with respect to the Church Congress held at Wakefield, *viz.*, it was the most Evangelical Congress ever held, and it was one of the most successful of the whole series."

² At the Oxford Diocesan Conference, a resolution (moved by the Chancellor, Mr. Cripps, Q.C.) was passed unanimously: "That it is desirable in the best interests of the Church of England that the tithe rent-charge should be paid by the landowner, and that the present remedy of distress on the property of the occupier should be put an end to."