

filling us with horror against the men who did, or are said to have done, such things. It is almost a reasonable question, indeed, as to whether the publication of such details is wise, involving as it does the future of men entitled to some consideration on account of the terrible privations to which they were reduced, and the temptation in which they found themselves. This we say especially in relation to those who ate the flesh of their companions after these had died; for the men who would put a helpless comrade to death merely in an attempt to save their own lives may, perhaps, justly be surrendered to the contempt of everyone with whom they meet, even if they are not adjudged to be criminals, deserving of severe punishment. The aspect of human nature thus presented to us, moreover, is one that it can scarcely be elevating to study. The only use of such publications is the humility they might teach if read aright, but that is a lesson comparatively few can learn from them, and on the rest their effect must be injurious for the most part.

ECCLESIASTICAL history is an important study, and therefore it is with much interest that we find a **CATHOLICITY** whole chapter of it given in a letter from the Right **QUEERLY** Rev. Dr. Nevill to the *Otago Daily Times*. Dr. **ESTABLISHED.** Nevill writes to prevent any historic doubts that might arise from the difficulties attending on the fact of his having taken part in the consecration of a Canadian Bishop almost immediately after his Lordship's own consecration in 1871, and it seems that unless the explanation were made there would be imminent danger that the historian of the future might fall into the mistake that there had actually been two Dr. Nevills—and only think of what confusion that might cause among ecclesiastical students in the ages to come. The matter, however, when rightly considered, admits of easy explanation—nothing more startling, in fact, occurred, than a journey of Dr. Nevill's to England, in which he passed through America and Canada, encountering on his way a certain metropolitan who asked him to deviate a little from his course in order that he might take part in the consecration of one Dr. Helmuth, a converted Jew, of whom they were about to make a bishop, and whom Dr. Nevill had previously met in England, as he afterwards met him on the steps of the throne in the House of Lords when they both had gone to listen to Lord Beaconsfield proposing a vote of condolence to the Queen on the death of the Princess Alice—most striking marks of Catholicity, we may observe in passing. We further learn that Dr. Helmuth could not have been very well pleased with his Canadian See, for he afterwards became assistant to the late Bishop of Ripon, an extreme "Evangelical," and who would certainly have regarded Dr. Nevill as nothing short of a son of Perdition. Dr. Helmuth, in being elected to act as assistant to Dr. Bickersteth, must have cleared himself of every suspicion of a leaning towards High Church doctrines. To return, however, to the particular phase of ecclesiastical history with which we are concerned. At the consecration in Canada, then, the churches of New Zealand, Canada and America were represented by the presence of Bishops from those countries—a remarkable fact, considering the present means of travelling, and most conclusive as to the Catholicity of the Church of England. Bishop Nevill afterwards was near taking part in a consecration at Lambeth, and actually took part in one at Lichfield—although here also some hitch occurred that almost hindered him from officiating. It was surmounted, however, and when the ceremony concluded the new bishop thanked his Lordship for his action and the "emblem of Catholicity thus afforded." We have, then, as we said, a most important and interesting chapter of contemporary ecclesiastical history, and one which should certainly be preserved for the guidance of the historian of the future. As to the "emblem of Catholicity," however, afforded by the very praiseworthy activity of Dr. Nevill, it is rather obscure, and would require an explanatory chapter all to itself. The presence of a Bishop of the Church of England at the consecration of another Bishop of the same Church in any distant part of the world would hardly seem to the uninitiated a more striking mark of Catholicity than, for example, the presence of a Presbyterian or a Wesleyan minister at an ordination of ministers in some place remote from that in which he himself was situated—and we might, moreover, accept it as most probable that all the Presbyterians or all the Wesleyans present were unanimous in their religious convictions whereas it is pretty certain that Dr. Helmuth, at least, must have differed very widely from Dr. Nevill in his opinions, if they were the same when he was consecrated as they were when he acted as assistant Bishop of Ripon—that, however, may be reasonably open to doubt. Meantime, the Catholicity of the Church of England is proved by the activity and speed displayed by her bishops in travelling about the world, and verily that is just as good a proof as can be advanced in the matter.

A STRANGE IF there is one objection which more than another **REPUDIATION.** it surprises us to see advanced by a Protestant people against the domination of England, it is that of religion. Of all things in the world we should have thought that such a people would have felt for England

and confidence because of her religion. Is it not she who boasts herself the protectress and advocate of Protestantism everywhere? Where is the nation to whom she has not sent out missionaries. Here she has planted a Protestant bishop, there she has established an Evangelical elder with his staff, and all over the world she has distributed the Bible translated into almost every known tongue, or in some instances into what is supposed by the translator to be a known tongue. It might have been thought that the "union of Christendom" beneath her fostering sway would have been the strong desire of every Protestant people. Such, however, proves not to be the case, and, stranger still to find, the objection comes from a people to whom English sympathies have ever very strongly gone out, that that is from the descendants of those very Huguenots and Gueux of whose cause English writers of all classes have been the champions from of old. To find the descendants of those people or any branch of them rejecting English sympathies and declaring them alien, is what we might hardly have expected to witness. We do, however, find one of the principal organs of the Boers of South Africa laying claim to independence of England, amongst other things because she differs from them in religion,—the newspaper alluded to is named *Die Patriot*, and in an article recently published by it we find a vigorous denial made of the assertion that the Cape is an English Colony. Nothing at all of the kind, says *Die Patriot* "It differs for the greater part from English in language, manners, descent, habits, religion." The Cape was not founded as were Australia and New Zealand by English colonists. It was founded and peopled by Holland, and if the greater part of the early settlers there were French and German, the Dutch element as it was natural took the upper hand. Not that the people became Dutch:—"The people assumed a national character, with a good deal that was Dutch in it, and much that was not. This is our Africaner nationality. The descendants of Hollanders, Germans and French became fused and are distinguishable now only by their family names. They form an African nationality, and are called Africaners. They are just as little Hollanders as they are English, French or German. They have their own language, their own manners and customs, and are as much a people as any other. The Cape Colony was conquered by England and afterwards Holland surrendered it voluntarily; if you please, you must surrender it. Whether a Government has the right to sell a country or people without the consent of the people themselves we will not discuss. Each one judge for himself whether a people can be bartered away like a lot of cattle. Any way, the Cape came under the rule of England, certainly not without the Divine will. This, however, does not prevent the people remaining African, and having their own rights." The African people then claim to be governed according to their rights. They do not exactly demand a total independence of England, at least we suppose not until that neat saying of Paul Kruger's repeated the other day, a propos of the Convention, in the Transvaal Volksraad is fulfilled, and which we find translated as follows by our contemporary the *Graaf Reinet Advertiser*, who also gives us the extract from *Die Patriot*:—"The day would come when he could say: the point of my sword is sharp enough or as sharp as yours." But they demand a system of Government suited to their peculiar situation, African not English nor Dutch. "Our duty is to keep calling to our people, 'Preserve your nationality which the Lord has given you.' It is an inheritance from our fathers, our religion and our manners are bound up with it. We do not by any means preach and publish rebellion; our nationality has nothing to do with the flag that flies over us. So it was with the Israelites in exile; they were a people of themselves under foreign domination or rule, which they did not resist. The sooner this delusion, that this is an English colony, disappears the better; and with it the term English and Anti-English. If this does not disappear it will have to be changed to 'African and Anti-African.'" But, as we said, the peculiarly strange feature of the whole thing is that English religion should not be found suitable for these Africaners, that on the contrary it should seem to be regarded by them as bearing a relation to their creed somewhat like what was borne by the religion of the Egyptians to that of their bondsmen the Children of Israel.

The ravages of the plague in Asia Minor have of late been much greater in proportion to the population than those of the cholera along the Mediterranean. The epidemic has been most virulent in the vilayet of Bagdad. At Berd, in that district, a place which contains scarcely 4,000 persons, there were 770 deaths in two months. The mortality was much slighter in the other portions of the vilayet. Quarantine has been established at Bakud and Kat-el-Amara, on the left bank at the Tigris. The panic in the infected area is described by a Kars newspaper as being terrible in its effects. All who possess the means have left, and a large proportion of those remaining are plague-stricken. The poor creatures can obtain neither nursing nor medicine, owing to the miserable terror of those who have not been attacked. When an epidemic does attack an Asiatic district, the result is unfortunately only too well known. Even with the Mussulman, cleanliness does not extend beyond the person; while sanitary science, even in its most primitive forms, is undreamed of.