

**THE WORD TRIBULATION.**—The word *Tribulation* is derived from the Latin "*tribulum*," which was the threshing instrument, or roller whereby the Roman husbandman separated the corn from the husk and "tribulation," in its primary significance, was the act of this separation. But some Latin writer of the Christian Church appropriated the word and image for the setting forth of a higher truth; and sorrow, distress, and adversity being the means for separating in men of whatever in them was light, trivial, and poor, from the solid and the true, their chaff from their wheat, therefore he called these sorrows and trials "*tribulationes*," thinnings, that is, of the inner spiritual man, without which there could be no sifting him for the heavenly garner. Now, in proof of my assertion, that a single word is often a concentrated poem, a little grain of gold capable of being beaten out into a broad extent of gold leaf, I will quote in reference to this very word "*tribulation*," a graceful composition by George Wither, an early English poet, which you will at once perceive is all wrapped up in this word, being from the first to the last only the expanding of the image and thought which this word has implicitly given: these are his lines:

Till from the straw, the flail the corn doth beat,  
Until the chaff be purged from the wheat,  
Yea, till the tail the grains in pieces tear,  
The richness of the flour will scarce appear.  
So, till men's persons great afflictions touch,  
If worth be found, their worth is not so much.  
Because, like wheat in straw, they have not yet  
That value which in threshing they may get.  
For till the bruising flail of God's corrections  
Have crushed out of us our vain affections;  
Till those corruptions which do misbecome us  
Are by Thy sacred Spirit winnowed from us;  
Until from us the straw of worldly treasures,  
Till all the dusty chaff of empty pleasures,  
Yea, till His flail upon it doth lay,  
To thresh the husk of this our flesh away;  
And leave the deal uncovered; nay, yet more,  
Till God shall make our very spirit poor,  
We shall not up to highest wealth aspire;  
But then we shall; and that is my desire.

—*Trench on the Study of Words.*

Freemasons in Turkey, says the correspondent of the *Daily News*, eschew polygamy, and only recognise one wife, whom they permit to appear at the lodge-banquets unveiled. At these banquets wine is drunk, toasts are proposed, and the Masons are acquainted with the "Kentish fire," though under another and more barbarous appellation. In addition to a brown shawl or handkerchief, worked with certain Masonic symbols and worn round the neck, the Turkish Freemasons wear in open lodge, also round their necks, as insignia of the order, a flat white marble polished slab of twelve sides and two inches in diameter. On these are a number of reddish brown spots, to represent blood, and indicate that the founder of the order in Turkey, Ali Effendi, suffered martyrdom rather than reveal the secrets of the fraternity. The convent of *Senkedgi Teckar*, belonging to the sect known as the *Dancing Dervishes*, is the largest establishment belonging to the order at Constantinople. In Persia Freemasonry is also widely distributed, the brethren being estimated at 60,000. In Arabia there are about 20,000 Freemasons.

The *Astley Cooper Prize* of £300, presented triennially through the College of Surgeons, has this year been awarded to Dr. B. W. Richardson. The subject of the essay was the Coagulation of the Blood, and it contains, says the *Athenæum*, the announcement of a very important discovery. The cause of the coagulation of the blood has hitherto been a mystery to physiologists. Dr. Richardson has demonstrated that the cause of the fluidity of the blood is the presence in the blood of the volatile alkali ammonia. This fact he has arrived at by a series of well-conducted experiments.

#### News Department.

From Papers by Steamer *Cambridge*, August 30.

#### ENGLAND.

Archdeacon Denison enjoys the distinction of standing quite alone on the field which has been left vacant for him by the disappearance of other objects of public attention. The issue which he has raised has been decided against him; his thesis has been condemned; and, if he does not recant within a limited time, nothing remains for the Court but to pronounce the statutory sentence which appears to be nothing more nor less than deprivation. We may note here in few words what appear to be the effect and rationale of the judgment which has been virtually though not formally delivered. Coupled with the decision in the *Gordham* case, the effect of it is to establish that under the Act of Elizabeth the Articles, as a standard of doctrine, stand on different

ground from the Liturgy; a man who contradicts the literal sense of a positive assertion in the Liturgy may be permitted to shew himself under authority; he may not, if he contradicts the literal sense of an assertion in the Articles, though at the same time willing to subscribe them in another which is not the literal one. The effect of it also is—and this is the broad view which will be popularly taken of it; that a man may be liable to be deprived for teaching what has been taught without objection by some of our greatest divines, whose works are manuals of theological instruction and standards of orthodoxy; may even by the framers of the Articles themselves. An opinion which has been hitherto considered "pious and probable" has become prohibited; and the liberty hitherto allowed with respect to this mysterious doctrine, which touches the inmost sources of the Christian life, is contracted within narrower limits than were established at the Reformation. As regards the principle of the sentence, we see that there have been two lines of statement, formally inconsistent with each other, touching the reception of what theologians call the *res sacramenti*. It is possible that one of these may be untrue; it is possible that both may be inadequate efforts to express parts of a truth not comprehensible in words. One of them has been embodied in the Articles, and the question is whether it absolutely excludes the other. Now it did not exclude it in the mind of St. Augustine, from whom the Article is taken, and to whom it expressly refers for he uses both; it did not in the minds of Cranmer and Ridley. And to prevent, as it seems, the exclusion of either, the words signifying participation or reception have been treated as having two senses, a primary and a secondary; and the phrase "*sacramental*" reception, which conveys no definite idea, has been invented and used in the Church as a middle term, combining, not harmonising, the two. The decision, however, is that the Articles are to be looked at alone, and that the words being unambiguous—as in fact they are unless the secondary sense of the words "*partaking*" and "*partakers*" is taken into account—the commentary which a reference to Scripture, to the writings of divines, to the language of our formularies and the source from whence the Articles themselves were borrowed, would supply, is not admissible. The soundness of that decision, as such is a question for lawyers, and it will bear a good deal of discussion, though the point itself lies within a narrow compass. We are all at liberty to judge for ourselves how far it is a correct enunciation of the mind of the Church. —*London Guardian.*

The British branch of the Evangelical Alliance has been holding its annual conference in Glasgow. Amongst the strangers were Dr. Krummacher (one of the King of Prussia's chaplains). At the introductory meeting on Tuesday, the Rev. Dr. Blackwood, late of Scutari, was the principal speaker. He spoke of Miss Nightingale:—

"Very wrong impressions had gone abroad about the lady's principles. It was supposed that she had intentions in the direction of promoting Romanism or Puseyism, or was made an instrument in that direction. She had her own views, and these led her to suppose that she could employ Roman Catholic nuns and Sisters of Mercy, and those who held the principles of Puseyism as well as Evangelical Protestants, Presbyterians, and all denominations of Christians, irrespective of their various religious opinions—feeling that the work was not a spiritual work, but one of benevolence to the bodies of the sick and dying. But he was confident of this, that in no one respect was her mind tinged with, or tending to, the promotion of any sectarian religion, still less of Popery or Puseyism."

The conference was formally opened on Wednesday, the Rev. James Sherman in the chair. On the moving and seconding of the annual report, the Record tells us—

"The Rev. Mr. McIlwaine, of Belfast, said that he felt considerable reluctance to have even the appearance of dissenting in any way from the report, and it was only a very strong sense of duty that made him rise. There was a passage in the report which he felt constrained to say he thought to be highly injudicious—the reference was to the Scottish Episcopal community. He need not say that he had no sympathy with that community, and that he detested Romanism as much as any one in this room. But he thought it calculated to do injury to the Society when the names of individuals, and some of these persons of distinction, were mentioned in the report."

"The Chairman—Do you propose a motion?"

"Mr. McIlwaine—If necessary, I will propose a substantive motion, but I would rather not; I hope the expressions will be reconsidered. He had another remark to make upon the report. He had great objection to the use of the word 'Puseyism.' He

would prefer that the word 'Tractarianism' should be substituted. This might appear hypocritical, but he thought it of importance that they should avoid giving occasion to any to say that they were making a martyr of any man by using his name.—But what he chiefly rose to object to was the liberty taken with certain names, especially that of an illustrious lady [the Duchess of Buccleuch]."

The Secretary explained that the paragraph referred to was an extract from the report of a sub-committee; there could be no difficulty about making the alteration. The proceedings of Wednesday evening seem to have been devoted to subjects connected with the Alliance in Prussia. The Rev. E. Kurtze and Dr. Krummacher were the principal speakers. The latter, giving an account of the prospects of the Alliance in his own country, said—

"The opponents of the Alliance are composed of different classes and categories. There is a party in every respect honourable, but distinguished by an extreme addiction to the Church. They are to be compared to the Puseyites in England. A Jesuit, who came from Belgium to Scotland, when he approached the Scottish coast, was surrounded by pirates. At this moment the Jesuit took some papers from his pocket and tore them into a thousand pieces, and threw them into the sea. Unfortunately the wind brought them back upon the quarter deck. Every single piece of paper upon the deck was innocent, but the helmsman collected the pieces together and sent them to the Secretary of Queen Elizabeth. He put the pieces artistically together, according to their natural context, and he found a conspiracy of Spain and the Duke of Guise against Scotland. In like manner, when one puts together the different pieces of this party, regarding the ministerial office—the sacrament as a continued sacrifice—when we put these pieces together, we find by the combination there is a conspiracy against Protestantism. The individual doctrines seem trivially innocent considered by themselves, but, when put together, they are extremely dangerous. This party disavows the Evangelical Alliance, for it knows the tendency of the Evangelical Alliance against Romanising tendencies."

Speaking of the King of Prussia, he said—

"We have a King who is not only a great Prince, but the deepest expression of his heart is inscribed upon his coat of arms—'As for me and my house, we will serve the Lord.' He is a man of decided Christian faith; and his country is aware that he is entirely devoted to the Evangelical Alliance. He, however, has found he could not escape the infliction of that word of Scripture—'All who live godly in Christ Jesus must suffer persecution.' Nobility has doubted up to this moment that he has a heart which makes him the father of his country. Everybody knows that his matrimonial relations are a perfect model of domestic life. Hence it has been found necessary, in attacking his private life, to choose another side, which is considered vulnerable, and that—with deep regret I must utter it—even English journals I take advantage of this opportunity to declare that the aspersions thus circulated are nothing but infamous calumnies. (Great cheering.)"

The Rev. W. McIlwaine, on Thursday, reminded the meeting that "it was just exactly ten years ago to a day, perhaps to an hour, that the great Ecumenical Council of Peace (the first conference of the Alliance) was held in London." "The object of this Alliance was not to create but to manifest unity; and that, like all other duties, was of course difficult." The following days were occupied in discussion on various subjects bearing on the position and prospects of the Alliance.—*Ibid.*

Earl Talbot, of Ingestre Hall, Staffordshire, claims to be the eighteenth Earl of Shrewsbury, and a few days back, Viscount Ingestre, in the name and on the behalf of his father, who is abroad, proceeded to Alton Towers, accompanied by his solicitor, and made a formal demand of possession of the mansions and estates. He was informed that the trustees under the will of the late Earl had taken possession, and he was accordingly refused admission into the house. The highest tribunal in the land will have to decide the question of Earl Talbot's title. Should he establish his claim, the disentanglement by the late Earl would be nugatory; and the valuable estates attached to the earldom in Staffordshire, Shropshire, Cheshire, Oxfordshire and Worcestershire, of the value of £35,000 a year, as well as the high honours connected with the house, would become the inheritance of the Talbots. Earl Talbot's solicitor, Mr. Hand, of Stafford, maintains that the estates having been annexed to the title by Act of Parliament, the entail can only be destroyed by another Act, and that the disentanglement executed by the late Earl is therefore nugatory. He, therefore, warns the tenants on the estate not to pay rent to Lord Henry Howard or any of his agents.