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

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

THE

CHURCHMAN

FEBRUARY, 1880.

ART. I.—BISHOP BUTLER.

BISHOP BUTLER was born in the year 1692, within less than an hour's journey from Oxford, in the thriving country town of Wantage, where his father was a respected and successful tradesman. Facing the site of the ancient shop, is now erected a modern statue of Alfred the Great, who was himself also a native of the same town. The house to which the family retired from business, and the room in which Butler was born, still exist in a condition almost unchanged. Butler received his earlier education in the Grammar School of the town, under the diligent superintendence of a worthy clergyman, Philip Barton; and it is pleasant to find that in after years, and so soon as Butler had the opportunity, he remembered his old schoolmaster's goodness, and preferred him to a living in his own diocese. Butler's father (who was a member of the Presbyterian communion), on discovering the abilities of his son, resolved to educate him for the ministry amongst Protestant Dissenters of his own denomination; and with this view removed him to a Dissenting academy then established at Gloucester and subsequently at Tewkesbury. It was here that he met with several fellow-students, who ultimately attained to great distinction and eminent usefulness in their respective spheres of life. Notably, there was his young friend Thomas Secker, who, in the lapse of time, became Archbishop of Canterbury, and whose esteem for his modest and earnest companion never wavered while Butler lived.

Butler pursued his theological studies under the able guidance of the distinguished tutor of the Academy at Tewkesbury, with so much diligence and success, that at the early age of twenty-one he attracted the attention and secured the lasting friendship of Dr. Samuel Clarke, well known both then and now as one of

the most learned divines in the Church of England. Dr. Clarke had published a work containing, as he believed, "A Demonstration of the Being and Attributes of God." The young student, however, was not wholly satisfied with some of the arguments adduced, and he engaged in a correspondence with the learned divine, carried on, at the suggestion of Butler's modesty, anonymously; his friend Secker conveying the letters and the replies to and fro between Tewkesbury and the post-office at Gloucester. This correspondence has happily been preserved for the benefit of the Christian Church, and it is a model on the one hand of the modesty and acumen of the young student, and of the patience, courtesy, and sincerity of the learned divine. In one of these now famous letters of Butler's, the young student remarks to Dr. Clarke: "*As I design the search after truth as the business of my life,* I shall not be ashamed to learn from *any* person; though at the same time I cannot be insensible that instruction from some men, is like the gift of a prince; it reflects honour on the person on whom it lays an obligation." Such was the modesty, such was the sincerity of Butler.

And now not in invidious contrast, but for the purposes of an illustration of the moral results ofit at a further stage, I shall here notice the manner in which David Hume (whose writings are to this hour the armoury and the arsenal of religious doubts and disbeliefs) began his attacks on Christianity at an age almost as early as Butler commenced his correspondence with Dr. Clarke. The guiding, ruling principles of the two contemporaries were widely different. "It must be confessed," says his admiring biographer, Mr. Huxley, that on the occasion of his first publication, no less than on that of his others, "Hume exhibits no small share of a craving after mere notoriety and vulgar success as distinct from the pardonable, if not honourable, ambition for solid and enduring fame:" . . . "that sort of success, in fact, which his soul loved." The actuating motives of the two young students, at the outset of life, being thus at variance, we can scarcely wonder that their subsequent careers and their ultimate issues were widely divergent.

The culture in the Nonconformist School at Tewkesbury, like the culture adopted by Dr. Doddridge at Northampton, though it naturally and generally bore good fruit, did not always bear the fruit intended. The Tewkesbury Presbyterian School produced three eminent bishops in the Anglican Church; and Dr. Doddridge, to his dismay, found that, after all his care at his own Evangelical Establishment, he had nurtured Unitarians.

Butler ultimately saw reasons for embracing the doctrine and mode of government of the Established Church, and with the view of becoming qualified for its ministry, he entered himself as

a Commoner at Oriel College, in this University. The portrait of its illustrious member will be found in the College, but, I fear, little or no other record of his residence in Oxford remains. He was awarded no share in the endowments of that religious corporation; neither scholarship nor fellowship was his. Not that any particular individual blame attaches to the unfortunate oversight; for Oxford at that day only shared and followed the general unconcern of a half-hearted age. Surely it would be a nobler and a truer aspiration to claim her right to lead, and direct, and illustrate, rather than be contented to adopt and reflect the morals, motives, and intellectual culture, which chance to be the predominant fashion of the times.

Still it was impossible for a man like Butler not to have reaped many solid and permanent advantages from a residence at Oriel. One, among many others, arose from his attracting the notice and friendship of his fellow-student, Mr. Talbot, who, from his connection with persons of great influence, was able to bring the great abilities and worth of his friend under the notice of the powers that be. In this way Butler before long was appointed to the preachership at the Rolls Chapel. And now began the reaping of that intellectual and moral harvest which had been sown and cultured with such abundant care at Tewkesbury and Oxford. Out of the many sermons preached in that famous chapel, Butler, on retiring to a country living, arranged for publication fifteen, the selection of which he said was mainly accidental, but some of which, and particularly those on the constitution of human nature, are probably unequalled for the truth and depth of their insight by any essays now extant on the same subject in the world. They bear somewhat of the same relation to Moral or Ethical Philosophy, which the Principia of Newton bears to the physical course of Nature. Any student possessing sufficient mental culture who has not read them, if such there be, has reserved for himself a duty and a delight. Immediately after the publication of these remarkable sermons, Butler set himself to work on the subject of the Analogy of Religion to the Constitution and the Course of Nature. In the deep retirement of his parish at Stanhope, not dead, but to the outer world of clamorous activity practically buried, Butler had leisure and freedom from distraction slowly to complete his immortal work; "searching after truth, as the settled business of his life": and it is a law impressed on humanity, that they who thus seek, find the object of their quest.

It is clear that he had long and deeply studied the intrinsic force of all the arguments and difficulties which had been successively urged against the religion of Christ, by the sceptical writers of his age. More than that, whoever attentively reads the pages of the Analogy, so "full of the seeds of thought," will

find that Butler has anticipated, in their principles at least, most, if not all, of those objections which bristle in our modern periodicals, and have made so troublesome a noise in our own day. It was not his habit indeed, or his object, to quote the very language of the host of deistical and infidel writers whose objections he sought to meet and to remove, and still less to designate the several writers by their names, for Butler was dealing with facts, and not with persons—with truth, and not with notoriety; hence the reader of the Analogy will there find a total freedom from all parade of learning, and a general absence of all quotations. Nevertheless, the actual objections of the sceptical writers are stated with a sincerity and a candour beyond the reach of impugnment. They are always fairly met, and in general met with success.

After the publication of the Analogy, and no doubt owing very much to the fact that he was no longer buried from the public gaze, Butler was advanced from one stage to another of dignity and public usefulness. He had for himself chosen the lowest room, but the Divine Master of the House had now come to him and seemed to say by His Providence: "Friend, go up higher." Thus Butler became successively Bishop of Bristol, Dean of St. Paul's, Clerk of the Closet to King George II., and in 1747 he was offered the Primacy. But Butler, judging from the morals and tenor of the age, took a gloomy view, and, feeling himself unequal to cope with the dangers which beset so responsible an office, resolutely declined the offer. It is remarkable to record that eleven years after Butler had declined this exalted position, its duties were wisely and faithfully administered by Secker, the companion of his school-days, and the devoted watchful friend throughout his advancing years. Butler, however, a very few years before his death, was prevailed on to accept the Bishopric of Durham; but by one of those, to us obscure dispensations of Providence, which are the predestined education and discipline of our faith and our love, this eminent man was called away to a better service, though one would have supposed in the very acme of his usefulness on earth. He was buried in the Cathedral of Bristol, in the adornment of which diocese he had spent a larger sum than the whole emolument he had received. In his youth, as we have seen, he had "designed the search after truth as the business of his life:" throughout that life he had pursued the design with a candour, a diligence, and an intellectual grasp not surpassed; and then in his maturest days he was able to say, "I feel my feet upon the Rock."

Such then is a very rapid outline of some of the few particulars which remain to us of this great and good man's life; to me, at least, some such account seemed an essential element in the intelligent conception of his work. Many other interesting

details may be gathered from the excellent biography published by Butler's distant kinsman, Mr. Bartlett, some forty years ago. I have already had occasion to speak of the low state of morals and religion which prevailed in Butler's time. The causes, not far to seek, need not be referred to here. If, by Divine Providence, the Elijah of that age was Butler, then John Wesley may have been the Elisha: assuredly they were the conjoint instruments of doing God's work, each in his own way. These men laboured, and the Church of Christ has largely entered into their labours. But if any of ourselves are inclined to despair at the varied and persistent attacks which in our time are ceaselessly made, not only on the central truths of Christianity, but on the very existence of a personal Creator and Governor of the Universe, he may find his discouragement abated, by a consideration of Butler's description of his own day. "It has come to be taken for granted," he says, "by many persons, that Christianity is not so much a subject of inquiry, but that it is now at length discovered to be fictitious. And, accordingly, they treat it as if, in the present age, this were an agreed point among all people of discernment; and as if nothing remained but to set it up as a principal subject of mirth and ridicule." "Dr. Butler believes," said a well-known sceptic of the day, "that he has proved of Christianity, that, after all, there is really something in it." And now, at length, let us enquire what was Butler's method of stemming the tide of unbelief which in the days of some of our grandfathers threatened to overwhelm the Christian Church. It may avail something under the similar trials which beset ourselves.

Butler, then, commences his work with remarks upon the nature of that evidence which is to us the intellectual foundation of all religious belief. Anterior to careful and accurate reflection on the subject, it might be *pre*supposed, that on questions fraught with such interest and importance to mankind as the Being of an Intelligent Creator and Governor of the world, and the existence of a future state of happiness or misery, the evidence would be of so demonstrative a character, so logical, and so overwhelming when truly stated, as to preclude all reasonable controversy on the subject. Some men might even demand that a Lazarus should be sent from the grave to confront his brethren with a proof and a warning, not to be withstood. But no such demonstrative evidence is to be found in relation to our religious hopes. And this is all of a piece, Butler would argue, all in a strict continuity with what we find in that dispensation of ordinary human society, in which we find ourselves placed. For, to us, probability is the guide of life; and if any man will examine the grounds on which he has determined, not merely the trivial acts of his daily routine, but even the most serious and critical

arrangements of his life, he will find that they have been decided on the principles, not of certainty and pure reason, but on the grounds of probability and faith alone. A perfect intelligence might indeed foresee the consequences of acts with an unerring certainty, but our capacities are limited, and so also must be the imperfect and circumstantial evidence which determines our choice.

Butler's own statement of the case is very striking, and I will quote his words:—

"From these considerations it follows," he says, "that in questions of difficulty, or such as are thought so, where more satisfactory evidence cannot be had, or is not seen; if the result of examination be that there appears upon the whole, any the least presumption on one side, and none on the other; or a greater presumption on one side though in the lowest degree greater, this determines the question, even in matters of speculation; and in matters of practice, it will lay us under an absolute and formal obligation, in point of prudence and of interest, to act upon that presumption or low probability, though it be so low as to leave the mind in very great doubt which is the truth. For surely a man is as really bound in prudence to do what on the whole *appears* to him, according to the best of his judgment, to be for his happiness, as what he certainly *knows* to be so. Nay further, in questions of great consequence, a reasonable man will think it concerns him to remark lower probabilities and presumptions than these: such as amount to no more than showing one side of a question to be as supposable and credible as another: nay, such as amount to much less even than this; for numberless instances might be mentioned respecting the common pursuits of life, where a man would be thought, in a literal sense, distracted, who would not act, and with great application too, not only upon an even chance, but upon much less, and when the probability or chance of his succeeding was greatly against him."

Such then is the general character of the evidence we may expect to find in questions relating to religious difficulties: the evidences are probable, not demonstrative; they are presumptions, not certainties. Butler's mode and principle of arguing on this sort of evidence is an eminently practical one, and it is on this wise. If anything appertaining to religion, and of importance to ourselves, is alleged in the Sacred Scriptures connected with the unknown or the unseen, *i.e.* connected with the life beyond the grave, he examines the known and the seen, *i.e.* the natural things around him, and then, assuming that the seen and the unseen proceed alike from the same Author and Governor of Nature, if he finds that a correspondence, an analogy, exists between the Scriptural allegations and the natural things around him, he concludes that there is so far a presumption, a probability, that the subject of the Scriptural affirmation is true. And Butler then argues that the establishment of this presumption or probability, in a practical matter, lays us under a moral obli-

gation to act, just as much as the certainty of conviction would.

No doubt some of us might passionately desire some greater and clearer light, on subjects that affect our dearest and fondest hopes; but that is no reason why we should fretfully refuse such lights as we can practically obtain. And there is, as I have already observed, a similar imperfection, nay obscurity if you will, in the evidence upon which we are called upon to act in the ordinary concerns of our social existence; yet act we do, and for the most part with a satisfactory issue.

Moreover we find a favourable peculiarity in the evidences for religion which seldom attaches to the evidences on which we commonly act in the ordinary affairs of life. For we shall find on examination that the arguments for the verity of the Christian faith are drawn from a great variety of sources, perfectly independent of each other. These evidences, that is, are not merely cumulative, but they are consilient. These evidences do not, so to speak, lie on the top of each other, and press independently by their respective weights, but, proceeding from a variety of independent and even from unexpected quarters, they are consilient *on one spot;* convergent, from a variety of independent lights, into one focus. And this sort of evidence is, I apprehend, the most convincing species of testimony that can apply to our limited capacities.

Nevertheless, it must fairly be admitted that some of the presumptions thus raised in favour of our Christian Faith and hopes, may be individually weak. Of themselves, individually and taken alone, they might fail to do more than raise an imperfect expectation; it is in and by their consilience, by their convergence alone, that they amount to a moral conviction. And here I am convinced lies the fertile source of a large portion of the religious difficulties which trouble and harass one man more than another.

For it is easy to consider these presumptions and the sources of them, one at a time and finding one or more of them to be, when taken by itself, not wholly convincing, or even very slightly convincing, each is rejected after each; many are not considered patiently at all, and the consilient character of the whole group of arguments is overlooked and disregarded. It is here especially that the force of our moral dispositions and of our intellectual habits, comes into play; and here an unbounded field lies open for the insidious activity of that strange faculty of self-deception, which more or less besets us all. Passion and Temper here play their part, and convert our wishes into our beliefs. A man need carefully examine the secrets of his own heart, and the disposition which, by the contraction of habits, he has engendered in his own mind, before he rejects as delusive what many of the

best and noblest of mankind have admitted to be the very staple of their dearest hopes. It was partly with this view that I ventured to draw your attention to the contrast between the governing principles which appear to have actuated Butler and Hume at the first outset of their respective literary and moral careers. Considerations of this sort I know to be assuredly dangerous and possibly invidious; nevertheless they are real and they are practical. Whenever, for instance, we find a person or a writer indulging in sharp and clever writing, on subjects connected with considerations so solemn as those of our religion, we may so far doubt whether his judgment is to be trusted. If he give way to sarcasm or to ridicule, we may be quite sure that it is *not* to be trusted. And here perhaps I may be permitted to make two remarks which seem to bear with much force upon our present subject; the one is made by Butler himself towards the end of his book; and for the other, we are indebted to the Philosopher, Coleridge, a man second in many ways only to Butler himself. Butler, in speaking of the converging character of the Christian Evidences, and upon the inadvisability of ordinary conversation on matters which, by their very nature, require a patient and continued attention, thus gravely remarks: "It is obvious how much advantage the nature of this evidence gives to those persons who attack Christianity, and especially in conversation. For it is easy to show, in a short and lively manner, that such and such things are liable to objection, that this thing and that thing is of little weight in itself; but it is impossible to reply in like manner by exhibiting the united force of the whole argument in one view." Coleridge, on the other hand, feeling how few persons possess the ability and the freedom from prejudice to judge of the whole complex argument as it lies, fearlessly and directly appeals to the force of experience; and he says, not without reason, that the chief, and the most telling, and the most practical form of the evidences in the Christian religion lies in the spirit of two little words: "Try it." "Try it."

Such, then, is the general scope of Butler's method of arguing throughout his work on the Analogy of Religion to the Course and Constitution of Nature; and having laid down these general principles, he commences by an enquiry as to what light the natural things around us throw upon the fact of our future existence. Of course my readers will all along bear in mind, that in the first instance no reference whatever is made to the light that streams from Revelation. He truly says that it is our imagination alone which invests the King of Terrors with a gloomy mantle of human apprehension, and the suggestions of this forward and delusive

faculty must be silenced before the voice of reason can be heard in the case. "We live at this moment," he says, "and unless you can show reason why death itself should destroy the living being, whatever that living being may be, you have no reason to presume that anything else will destroy it. Now that living thing often exists in the bright exercise of its powers up to the very moment of the dissolution of the mortal framework with which it has been associated; and, moreover, that mortal frame is in a constant state of flux, and has been more than once wholly changed, while the living being, ourselves, has been left unaltered." The various organs of our bodies are, he observes, no more to us than pieces of machinery; props, levers, and lenses, they form no essential parts of our real selves, and hence he concludes that there is no reason for apprehending that the dissolution of the body is necessarily the destruction of ourselves.

Independently of such considerations he urges that the living being, ourselves, is not a composite entity, but a single unit, not discerptible—incapable of division; and hence, he says, it cannot be destroyed, but rather may be set free, by the dissolution of other matter.

Further, he remarks that even if, from the close association which unquestionably exists between ourselves and our corporeal frame, the dissolution of the latter suspends the *active* powers of the former, there is no ground for supposing it so much as suspends, and still less that it destroys, the *reflecting* power after ideas have once been obtained. Thus Butler concludes that the voice of Nature is not wholly mute as to the continuance of our existence through and after death; nay, death may be to us a birth, and the commencement only of a freer and nobler life. And then he argues that this presumption, this probability of an immortality, is sufficient at any rate to answer objections, sufficient to determine our conduct, sufficient to dispose all reasonable persons to listen to the voice of revelation and the Gospel, which latter alone has brought life and immortality really to light.

I know not what the more thoughtful of my readers may say to these arguments of our great philosophical divine, but in all candour I am bound to add a few remarks which may naturally occur to the thinkers of this day, now that our knowledge of Nature has become more enlarged.

In the first place, then, it has been urged that the lesion of certain parts of the brain, and of certain vital nerves, though it does not destroy or suspend the general action of the corporeal system, does certainly either destroy or suspend the powers of consciousness and of accurate reflection.

I admit that this cannot be denied. But in the midst of our

real ignorance as to where the powers of consciousness and of reflection reside, how can I tell whether this lesion of the brain or of vital nerves does not introduce, so long as it lasts, the action of a new force? And how can I be sure that when this new force, arising from the lesion, is removed by the dissolution of the body, the conscious reflecting self may not be set free and recover its liberty? The lesion in question may not be so much the removal of an essential active force, as rather the introduction of a new repressive one. And this, I think, is a sufficient reply to the difficulty suggested.

But I further think that the light of modern knowledge does shed some rays of a more positive and distinctive hope. For we possess a presumptive knowledge of the constitution of matter not possessed by the thinkers of Butler's day. We know tolerably well something of the atomic structure of an elemental vapour, for instance; and this we believe to be the purest and simplest form of matter.

Definite, very definite groups or clusters of indiscerptible atoms are associated, we believe, into molecules, the atoms of each molecular group being in a continuous state of intense vibration, and then, independent of this, the molecular groups themselves are subjected to far wider excursions.

If the dimensions of an average human being be taken as a scale to represent the dimensions of a molecule of gas now consuming in a burner, we have reason to believe the average distance of contiguous molecules would be represented by some 300 yards. There is ample room, therefore, and verge enough, for the insertion of this or that substance, this or that ether or essence, call it by any name, between the contiguous molecules of our corporeal frame. So curiously, so wonderfully, so fearfully are we made.

But, again, there seems to be a generic difference, an absolute difference, in kind, between the molecules of living organisms and those of gross brute matter, such as of stone, or of iron, or of gold. Not all the well-tried ingenuity of modern chemists has ever yet been able to produce an organic substance, from other substances which themselves have not been previously endued with life. A living molecule differs then generically from a molecule of brute matter.

And further still, whatever may be the ultimate fate of that ingenious modern hypothesis of Evolution, denied as not proven by some of the very ablest philosophers of the day, one thing is certain, that he who first, from the resources of his own mind, evolved Evolution, he, I say, entertains no doubt that the living *human* self is not the subject of the same law as that which controls or constitutes the living principle in other animals, or in plants. If this be so, then we have

first of all the gross, complicated, highly manufactured thing called inorganic matter; then we have that still brighter and more beautiful thing called a living thing; and lastly, the still more marvellous thing constituting the living *human* self, standing apart from all other known things in this sublunary sphere, in God-like pre-eminence, apart from matter, and apart from animal protoplasmic life, whatever the latter may be. A wondrous creation, methinks, with the breath of the divine around it or among it. Think for a moment of the vast range of its capacities, far beyond the present field of its action, reaching from the Satanic to the angelic, nigh to the divine. Endued with the singular power of introspection, it contemplates itself: it contemplates also what God contemplates, truth in its absoluteness, the properties of space and number. It geometrizes: ὁ Θεος γεωμετρει. In its holier phases, and specially when disciplined into humility, it aspires to a fellowship, a communion with the Spirit of the Supreme. It assumes for the model of its character, the character of Christ. Like him it can *endure* the cross, and it can *weep* for the sins and the miseries of others.

And consider for a moment that marvellous power of memory. In this world and in this life, it exists not in a form disassociated from that organ called the brain. Yet the brain is ever changing, ever in a state of flux and slow disintegration; ever renewed upon old renewals. Yet the memory remains still the same. Surely then this power of human memory either is, or arises from something impressed, photographed on the living being itself, on the spiritual molecules themselves set into vibration. If this be true, as I for one suspect it to be an approximation to the truth so far as we have capacity to apprehend it, what a vista for hope or for apprehension is here unfolded. All that we have ever thought, or done, or wished; our hates and our loves; our secret aims never wholly disclosed even to a friend, and half concealed even from ourselves, there they are photographed, indelible, on the vibrating molecules of the human spirits. Can this marvellous being perish with the dissolution of a gross material frame? May it not, will it not start up into a freer and more active vibration when liberated by the birth of death? And if it does—what then? Some of us remember,—I remember it well, myself,—that when the old coinage of years gone by had become incognisable by stress of wear and mutilation, much of it was at first refused by authority as probably of spurious origin. The test of the genuine was at once curious, and easy, and certain. The questionable coin was subjected to heat. If genuine, the old image and superscription started into a renewed and a clear existence, patent to observation, and as if by the touch of magic. *Can* we, my friends—*shall* we, abide the fiery scrutiny?

It is also recorded of Butler that when very nigh to the close of his life, a closeness measured by minutes rather than by hours, the dying Prelate remarked to his friend and chaplain, Dr. Foster, then kneeling at the side of his bed, "that he found it a very awful thing—a very awful thing—to appear before the august Governor of the World." His friend—and Bishop Butler was never without a friend—his friend reminded him of that "Blood which cleanseth from all sin." A pause then seems to have ensued, when the dying Bishop,—Butler, the learned, the modest, the devout, the pure, the earnest, the seeker after truth, with faltering, failing lips replied, "Oh this *is* comfortable," and with these words the spirit of the Bishop escaped to Him who gave it. Yes—"The blood of Christ cleanseth from all sin." "The Spirit beareth witness with our spirit that we are the sons of God." "Oh death, where then is thy sting?—Oh grave, where is thy victory?"[1]

C. PRITCHARD.

ART. II.—THE CHURCH IN WALES.

IN the remarks I made on the Welsh Church in the December Number of the CHURCHMAN, I called special attention to the religious revival of last century in the Principality. That revival commenced in the Church of England, but it terminated in a large secession of the Welsh people from her communion. The movement, through the force of circumstances, and under the current of events, had been drifting for years in that direction; but the secession was not finally consummated until the year 1811, when the Calvinistic Methodists set apart a certain number of their lay preachers for the ministration of the Sacraments in the Connexion. By that act they formally separated from the Church of England, and became an independent Christian community. The secession was an event of great moment; it created a new era in the religious history of the Principality, and its results were accompanied with serious consequences to the Church in Wales. On account of its importance it demands special attention, and it is my purpose in this Paper to investigate the circumstances under which it occurred.

I would observe, in the first place, that I consider that the revival was the work of the Spirit of God. I believe that the awakening which under its influence moved the masses was the breath of life which quickened souls that were dead in trespasses

[1] A Lecture recently delivered in St. Mary's in connection with the Oxford Branch of the Christian Evidence Society.

and sins. The means by which it was produced and the effects which followed it lead to this conclusion. The means that produced it was "the preaching of the Cross," which is a stumbling-block to the Jew and foolishness to the Greek, but the power of God unto salvation to them that believe; and this preaching was never more conspicuous nor more appreciated than at the rise and progress of Methodism in Wales. Among the early Methodists their preachers "knew nothing save Jesus Christ and Him crucified." There are ample proofs of this in their writings which are still extant, and in the traditions which have been handed down among the people. And where Christ is preached, there the Spirit of God may be expected to work; the ministration of righteousness—the righteousness of God which is by faith of Jesus Christ unto all that believe—is the ministration of the Spirit. So it was when men of Cyrene and Cyprus came to Antioch preaching the Lord Jesus; the hand of the Lord was with them, and a great number believed and turned unto the Lord, and the grace of God was visibly seen in its effects among them; and so it was in Wales when the early Methodists along its valleys and among its hills—in its towns and through its villages—lifted up an ensign unto the people, and said unto them in accents that could not be mistaken—"Behold the Lamb of God which taketh away the sins of the world," and to it the people sought. I thus believe that the awakening was the genuine work of the Spirit, because it proceeded from a genuine source—the preaching of the Cross. Then, again, the effects which the revival produced lead to the same conclusion; they indicate its origin, that it came from God. There was vitality and growth in the work; it advanced and progressed, and in its progress it gained strength, it grew and was multiplied; it had free course and was glorified. It did not degenerate into wild enthusiasm and fanatical extravagances, but settled down into sober-minded and practical piety; the truth as it is in Jesus was maintained and practised, and the fruit was true godliness. The converts at first were few and far between; they met together in their different localities for prayer and praise and mutual instruction; they were earnest and devout, and fervent in spirit; they bore in their lives marks of their conversion to God; it can be well said of them that they were the epistles of Christ, known and read of all men, written not with ink but with the Spirit of the living God; it could be seen that the law of God was written on the tables of their hearts, and that they served Him in newness of spirit, and not in the oldness of the letter. They adorned by their holy conversation the doctrine which they professed; they abstained from sin and wickedness, and renounced worldly habits and profane customs; they observed and honoured the Lord's Day and the ordinances of religion; they

read and studied the Holy Scriptures, and inwardly digested their truths; they gave themselves to prayer; they set up family worship in their houses, and carefully attended to the religious training of their children and their domestics; on stated occasions they had general gatherings at certain centres for the celebration of the Lord's Supper, and the celebrants were clergymen of the Church of England; immense crowds attended these gatherings, and some came a distance of fifteen and even twenty miles to join their brethren in the commemoration of the death of their Lord. The Sabbaths on which these gatherings occurred were "high days;" the people met and returned with the voice of joy and praise as a multitude that kept holy day; all were satisfied with the blessings they had received, and on their return to their homes they would give vent to their feelings in songs of praises which made the rocks and the valleys and the hills around them resound with the echo; and the theme which thrilled their hearts and kindled their song was ever the same, and it was always new; it never lost its freshness; it was the Lamb who had by his blood redeemed them from all iniquity, and had through his Spirit sealed the forgiveness of sins in their hearts, and had given unto them the hope of eternal life.

Thus, as it seems to me, the effects which the revival produced give ample proofs of its Divine origin; they show that it was the work of God; the tree is known by its fruit; and the fruits of this revival were clusters of grapes, the sight of which makes it clear to the eye that the "noble vine" which bare them was "wholly a right seed."

In the movement Lay-Agency was powerfully at work; it was one of the principal means which advanced and sustained its progress; it was full of life and activity; it had force and vigour which bore down all opposition and carried all before it; it worked in various ways, and its influence was felt in all the religious exercises of the people; but the work in which it chiefly distinguished itself was lay preaching. Among the converts men appeared who spoke and taught publicly in the congregations; they were called, in order to distinguish them from the clergymen who had originated the movement, exhorters, and they were many; they sprang up in all parts of the country, and attended to the spiritual wants of the congregations that had been gathered in their neighbourhoods; they sustained and extended the work in distant localities which the clergymen were able rarely to visit; and the clergymen found them in districts surrounding their homes willing and useful helpers in their work. They were for the most part mechanics and labourers; some few of them were small tradesmen and tenant farmers, and fewer still were petty schoolmasters in country villages. They were men of no learning; very few of them were sufficiently acquainted

with English to enable them to read with profit English authors; but they were well versed in their Welsh Bible; they knew much of it by heart, and could quote it with fluency; they could readily apply passages out of it to the subjects of their discourses; their work was labour of love; it was work and no pay; they received little or nothing from the congregations towards their support, but their hands ministered to their necessities. Their heart was in their work, and they pursued it with diligence and perseverance, and materially contributed to the success of the movement.

Among the exhorters, as they were called, some few arose to the highest eminence as Welsh preachers. I may mention as an instance John Elias, who was born in Carnarvonshire, but resided most of his days in Anglesea. He was a man of low origin, but of great self-culture and refinement; in diction and action he was a finished orator; in principle and bearing he was a perfect gentleman; in his life and conversation he was a genuine Christian; as a preacher of the Gospel he moved and acted among the people as "a man of God." He descended to the grave and entered into rest June 8, 1841, aged 69 years, "full of honour." Churchmen and Nonconformists strove together in generous rivalry to show their last respect for him, when a procession, extending one mile and a half in length, and computed to consist of ten thousand people, followed, on the day of his funeral, his remains to their resting-place in the churchyard of Llanfaes, near Beaumaris. Another man of kindred spirit, but cast in a different mould, was Ebenezer Morris, native of Cardiganshire, who died in 1825, at the early age of 56 years. He was not, like John Elias, a studied orator, and he did not possess his refinement as a speaker; but he was born an orator, and his oratorical powers were of the first order; he had a fine countenance, full of life and fire; his eyes and his look spoke volumes; he possessed a ready utterance, and was never at a loss for a word; he had a voice of great compass and variety, and he had perfect mastery over it; he could modulate it with the greatest ease, and adapt its tone to the subject he handled. At times his sentiments burst forth like flashes of lightning, which electrified his hearers, and his eloquence rushed on like a mountain torrent which carried all before it; and he was never more eloquent or powerful than when he descanted on the glory of Christ and the efficacy of His atonement. He wrote little; there was found hardly a scrip or a scrap of writing in his study after his death, and when this fact transpired, a friend of his made the remark that his sermons were "offshots," and he might have added—but by the remark I must not be understood to depreciate due preparation for the pulpit, but to show the peculiarity of the man and the effects of his preaching—that they were "offshots" that did great execution in the enemy's camp. At the time of his

death he could count his converts, not by hundreds, but by thousands. I have named these two distinguished men, who, as to their character and abilities, would have been an ornament and a blessing to the ministry of any Church, as the most prominent among the lay-preachers who were set apart in 1811 for the ministration of the sacraments in the Connexion—one in North and the other in South Wales. At an Association held at Bala, in the month of June of that year, John Elias and other seven, representing congregations in the six counties of North Wales, were thus qualified, as it was said, for the full work of the ministry; and so were Ebenezer Morris and other twelve, representing congregations in the six counties of South Wales and Monmouthshire, at an Association held in the following month of August, at Landilo-vawr, in Carmarthenshire. The Rev. Thomas Charles, of Bala, was present on both occasions, and took a prominent part in the ceremony; he was the guiding spirit in the transaction; imposition of hands was not used, but the act was done by the vote of the people, which was taken by the lifting up of hands. The event brought matters to a crisis; it completed the separation of the Welsh Calvinistic Methodists from the Church of England; it cut asunder the last tie which attached them to the Church of their fathers.

The reason which led them to take this grave step is given in a pamphlet, which they published in 1823, containing the history, constitution, rules of discipline, and confession of faith of the Connexion as agreed upon at Associations held that year at Aberystwith and Bala. In it I find the following passage which I translate from Welsh to English:—

"Because the number of the clergymen of the Established Church discharging their ministry in our midst is not equal to the increase of the Body and the extent of the work, and in consequence the number of the churches to administer the sacraments and the ordinances to the whole Body in its different branches, and because there is great inconvenience to the churches in towns in England, through want of the administration of the holy ordinances, without seeking ministers of other denominations to administer them to them—because of these reasons, and several others, we see it proper and necessary to set apart a proper number of exhorters in the different counties, to assist the clergymen who at present minister in the Body, in the administration of the ordinances."

In this extract we see the circumstances in which the Connexion, or, as they called themselves, the Body, was placed, and the ground on which it stood when the step was taken. We see that it was taken as a matter of necessity and expediency; little attention was paid to the principle which it involved or the ulterior consequences to which it naturally led. A necessity had indeed arisen; I readily admit this; no one can deny it; and a remedy was required.

The clergymen who administered the sacraments in the Connexion had become fewer in number. Rowlands himself had been dead for twenty years, and his two earliest and most prominent fellow-helpers—Williams, of Pantycelyn, the poet, and Peter Williams, the commentator*—were also dead, and death had made other gaps in their ranks, and those gaps were not filled up or likely to be filled up by fresh recruits from the clergy of the Church of England. The celebrations of the Lord's Supper at the different centres took place after long intervals, and the distance some had to come to attend them was very great, and in the meantime the congregations had increased, and were multiplied; a difficulty had thus arisen, and it became necessary to provide a remedy. The remedy adopted, however, was of doubtful expediency; while it attempted to remove one evil it created other, and, as some thought, greater evils; it cut the knot instead of loosing it. Its adoption was not unanimous in the Connexion; far from it; many strenuously opposed it, and feelings ran very high in the discussions which it excited at Associations and other gatherings; unpleasant, if not unseemly, scenes often occurred. One of its most determined opponents was the Rev. David Jones, Rector of Langan, or as he was known among the people, "the Evangelist of Langan." He had thrown his lot early among the Methodists, and he was now an old man; his hoary head, which in his case had been found in the way of righteousness, was his crown of glory. He had run his race faithfully; he had maintained a consistent course; he was still "fat and flourishing, bringing forth fruit in his old age;" his doctrine still dropped as the rain, and distilled as the dew, as the small rain on the tender herb, or as the showers upon the grass. He was noted as an Evangelist, and the Gospel in his mouth retained its sweet savour until his tongue became silent in the grave; he was loved and respected, honoured and revered among his brethren.

When the question of ordaining lay-preachers to meet the wants of the Connexion was broached, he assumed an attitude of determined opposition to it, and he maintained that attitude to the day of his death. There can be no doubt that his convictions on the subject were very deep, and that he looked upon it with the

* Mr. Peter Williams, strange to say, was excommunicated from the Connexion a few years before his death, after he had preached with the Methodists from forty to fifty years, on the charge of Sabellianism, broached in his exposition of the first chapter of St. John's Gospel. His commentary was the first that appeared on the Welsh Bible; it consisted of notes, containing general reflections at the close of each chapter; it became deservedly popular. Three editions came out in the author's lifetime, numbering eighteen thousand copies. He also wrote a laborious concordance of the Welsh Bible, and it was the first that appeared in the Welsh language.

gravest concern. When at a meeting of the Association at Langeitho, of which he was chairman, a proposition was made that a day of prayer and fasting should be set apart to ask the Lord for guidance in the matter, he exclaimed, "Brethren, do not pray me out of the world!" It is said that on his way to Langeitho on this occasion he called on his friend Mr. Griffiths, Vicar of Nevern, who himself had preached for many years among the Methodists, and who as firmly opposed the innovation as Mr. Jones. He belonged to the second generation of preachers, and was not behind any of them as a public speaker. Knowing that the question was to be discussed at Langeitho, he advised his aged friend not to proceed on his journey, saying that further opposition was useless, but Mr. Jones replied that he would go, and that perhaps the advocates of the movement would hearken to the voice of an old man. He did go, and did speak, but the voice of the old man was not heeded; he called on Mr. Griffiths on his return, and said, "They have broken my heart!" When he reached home he was confined to his bed, and died within a fortnight. When a man of deep piety and sound judgment like Mr. Jones, who had been a burning and a shining light among the Methodists for half a century, opposed the movement, supported as he was by men of the same stamp and spirit as himself, we can now well contend, without incurring the charge of bigotry or narrow-mindedness, that the expediency adopted to meet the difficulty that had arisen was a doubtful remedy.

I have no documents before me which explain the special ground on which Mr. Jones and others maintained their opposition to the movement; but there can be little doubt that the main reason which influenced their action in the matter was their reluctance to become seceders from the communion of the Church of England.

At one of the monthly meetings in Pembrokeshire, when a layman from St. David's broached the question, Mr. Griffiths, of Nevern, said—"You want to become Dissenters." In this remark I see the pith of the matter. Mr. Jones, of Langan, Mr. Griffiths, of Nevern, and others who sided with them, were unwilling to become Dissenters; they were determined to live and to die in communion with the Church of England. They believed her to be a true branch of the Holy Catholic Church; they knew her to be a witness and a keeper of Holy Writ—a repository of the oracles of God. If the food found in her pulpits was dry and insipid, they would say with Wesley that "her desks supplied bread of the finest of the wheat;" although their fathers and themselves had been harshly and cruelly treated by those who sat in the uppermost seats in the Church, yet they drew a distinction between the Church and her unwise and worldly rulers; they knew she had the seed of truth, and they expected the

blessing of God yet to rest upon her, and they were not disappointed. It was so; the history of the Church in Wales within the last fifty years indicates great revival of religion within her pale. God has arisen, and has had mercy upon her. He has taken pleasure in her stones, and has favoured her dust; He has raised up from among her own children those who have built her old waste places, and have raised up the foundations of many generations. They can well be called the repairers of the breach and the restorers of paths to dwell in; the wilderness and the solitary places have been glad for them, and the desert in many a parish church through the Principality has blossomed as the rose. For all this we are thankful, but we expect more; we long to see things yet greater than these.

And, again, the opponents of the separation, as we have seen, adhered to the Church. They would say—Forsake her not, for there is a blessing in her. But this is not all; I can say more, and go a step further. I can venture to affirm that even its advocates raised no objections to her which they advanced in justification of their action. In the authorized account which they give of the transaction, they say nothing against the doctrine of the Church or her form of Church government, they prefer no complaints against her Liturgy as to its substance or its form, and they utter not even a whisper against her union with the State as the Established Church of the country. The theory of separation of Church and State is a later growth; it was unknown to them, but it runs riot among their descendants of the day. It is an exotic plant in their midst, foreign to the principles and consciences of the first, and the second, and the third generation of Calvinistic Methodists. Those of the first generation—and they were the purest—were at one with the great Puritan divines of the seventeenth century on the question, and they as strenuously as Hooker and his school maintained the theory of the establishment of religion by civil Governments on Evangelical and Protestant principles. On the points which I here enumerate, the advocates of the separation are silent, but there is one point on which they have spoken—they complain of the lack of discipline in the Church; they affirm that it wounded the conscience of their brethren to receive the elements at the Lord's Supper from the hands of ministers who in their opinion had not been awakened and converted to God; and to meet at the communion rails of their parish churches men and women who perchance had been excommunicated for immorality from their own societies. Evil livers in all Churches are roots of bitterness, and should not be endured; they are offences and stumbling-blocks to the children of God, and by careful discipline they should be removed; but when the Methodists advanced the immorality that prevailed in the Church as ground of their

separation from her communion on the plea that they were founding a community that would be purged from the plague of moral corruption, they were, in my opinion, weaving a rope of sand; they were indulging in pleasant ideas indeed, but they were ideas which the subsequent history of their own communion shows that they never realized. As a matter of fact it can be safely said that at the present day the communicants of the Church of England will bear comparison on points of morality and virtue with those of the Calvinistic body; the original plea of separation on this head has disappeared. And thus I cannot help thinking, that if the advice of "the Evangelist" of Langan had been taken, a wiser policy would have been pursued, and better results on the permanent interest of religion in the Principality would have been produced.

Things were looking up in the Church; she was awakening to her duties and her responsibilities. Good Bishop Burgess had been appointed to the See of St. David's, and his diocese covered the whole of South Wales, except a portion of Glamorganshire, and he was a man of thorough Christian spirit. A bishop more devoted to his work never wore a mitre; and the work which more specially distinguished his episcopacy in South Wales was the intellectual and moral improvement of the clergy. To this object he applied his entire energies, and his efforts resulted in the erection of St. David's College, Lampeter. He laboured to remove the scandal of which the Methodists complained, and his influence for good was felt throughout the parishes of his vast diocese. And if the Methodists had continued to communicate in their parish churches, instead of isolating themselves into separate religious communities, the improvement which was then appearing in the Church would have been expedited and extended; the leaven of true religion and virtue would have more thoroughly permeated the masses of the people; the bigotry and party zeal, the strife and envy, which contending sects produce would not have been engendered; and the spirit of "truth, unity, and concord" would have more universally prevailed among Christian people throughout the country. And in this they had the example of Howel Harries, whose memory they held in the highest esteem, before their eyes. He preached daily to his people at Trevecca, and gave them religious instruction, but he took them to the parish church for communion; and they attended the services of the Church on Sundays, and took special interest in them. A place was allotted them in the gallery, where they formed a choir for the service. This practice might have been followed through the country with better and happier results than those which the separation produced. Religion and virtue would have been equally spread among the people, and the spirit of disunion and discord would have been avoided.

Then, again, an important principle was involved in the act of separation, and I cannot help thinking that that aspect of the question was not sufficiently weighed and considered. The Methodists separated from a Church the doctrines of which they did not repudiate. Separation in such a case amounted to schism; it cannot be justified on the authority of our Lord and His Apostles; it is contrary to that spirit of unity and forbearance which is so strongly and frequently enforced on the attention of Christian believers in the New Testament. There is no parallel between the separation of the Methodists from the Church of England, and the separation of the Church of England from the Church of Rome at the Reformation. The Church of England repudiated the doctrinal corruptions of the Church of Rome, and entered her protests against them in her Articles of Faith. The Methodists did not repudiate the doctrines of the Church of England, or utter a whisper against her tenets in their "Confession of Faith." The Church of England can stand up, take her Articles in her hand, and tell the Church of Rome—"Renounce the doctrines against which I protest in these Articles, and the middle wall of partition between us will be broken down"; but the Calvinistic Methodists in Wales cannot stand on the same ground and use the same language to the Church of England. They cannot take their "Confession of Faith" in their hands, and say to the Church—"Renounce the doctrinal errors against which we here protest, and the cause of our secession will disappear." In their "Confession of Faith" there is no protest; the Church, on the contrary, can ask them to look into her Articles, and to their own "Confession of Faith," and to compare them, and then say, "We are one—one in faith and the hope of our calling; we build on the same rock, and we are refreshed with the same breezes; we believe in the same Saviour, and we are renewed by the same Spirit; we sail in the same direction, and we seek the same country." The Calvinistic Methodists, at the time of the separation, were one with the Church as to the fundamentals of religion, and it would have been a blessing to the country if their motto had been—"Unity, forbearance, and strength," and not "Schism, strife, and weakness."

J. Powell Jones.

ART. III.—A GLIMPSE AT ANCIENT CHALDÆAN LIFE.

1. *La Magie chez les Chaldéens.* Par FRANÇOIS LENORMANT. Paris: 1874.
2. *La Divination et la Science des Présages chez les Chaldéens.* Par FRANÇOIS LENORMANT. Paris: 1875.
3. *Histoire Ancienne des Peuples de l'Orient.* Par S. MASPERO. Paris: 1876.

DISTINGUISHED as this age has been for the revelations of ancient history and national life which have marked it, in no direction has this been more striking than in the resurrection of ancient ages in the region of the Euphrates and the Tigris. Though the oldest historical country in the world, the recovery of its literature and monuments from the ruins of Babylon and Nineveh has enabled us to restore the busy life of its swarming population with as surprising if not as minute an exactness of detail as has so long charmed us in the case of the ancient dwellers in the valley of the Nile.

The most ancient inscriptions and relics that have reached our times show that two distinct elements of population were mingled in the towns and villages of Chaldæa and Babylonia. To these the names have respectively been given of the Soumirs, or people of Sennaar or Shinar, and the Accadians, a race of a different stock. The bulk of the Accadians lived in the southern provinces, next the Persian Gulf—that is, in Chaldæa, properly so called; and, indeed, that district bears the name of Accad in the cuneiform inscriptions. The bulk of the Soumirs, on the contrary, settled north of this, in Babylonia, or as Scripture calls it, the land of Shinar, a name of which Soumir is only a phonetic variation. The two peoples were, however, at no age of which we have any records, absolutely distinct in their geographical limits: from the first we see them mingled with each other, over the whole country from Assyria to the ocean, though retaining their distinctive languages and genius.

The earlier history of these two races is veiled in obscurity, but the peculiarities of their respective languages, religions, and customs, with the notices of the classics and the evidence of local names, enable us to trace one of the most curious and interesting chapters of the primitive movements of mankind.

The Accadians, it is found, were of a very different family of mankind from the Soumirs, for their language, as still largely preserved in the inscriptions of Nineveh, proves them to have

belonged to what is known as the Turanian or Mongol stock, to which, in our days, the Finns, Lapps, Hungarians, Turks, and Basques of Spain belong, in Europe, while the Tartar nations of Asia, the Turkomans, the Siberian tribes, to the shores of the Arctic Ocean, the Chinese and the Japanese are its Asiatic representatives; the Indians of the New World also apparently belonging to it. Among the ancients the whole race were known as Scythians—"the most ancient of men"—and a tradition existed that as such it had for many centuries before the dawn of history been in possession of all Asia.[1]

A branch of this great race had wandered in pre-historic times to the plains of Mesopotamia, bringing with them the germs of a civilisation which is not readily associated with our ideas of the Turanian races. Their earliest home seems to have been in the lofty regions north of the Hindoo Koosh, and so tenaciously did the recollection of their highland birth-place cling to their hearts that even on the rich flats of the Euphrates and Tigris they still called themselves "Accadians," or Mountaineers, and so fondly cherished their reverence for mountain heights as the places of worship most pleasing to the gods, that they essayed all over their new country to imitate the cloudy peaks of their early fatherland by gigantic temple towers, with tops rising to the heavens.

The physical appearance of this primitive race may perhaps be gathered from the general resemblance, amidst variation in details, amongst all the Turanian races of the present day, from the marshes of Finland to the banks of the Amour. It seems as if it had been the first branch of the human family that separated from the common home of the earliest men, and thus, by its premature isolation, preserved a distinct physiognomy.[2] Yet it nevertheless varies so much that, while some tribes have all the characteristics of white races, others pass imperceptibly into the yellow-skinned; so that, on the one hand, we have the Hungarians, perhaps the handsomest people of Europe, belonging to it; and, on the other, the Chinese. To which of all these the ancient Accadians bore most resemblance might seem a question impossible to settle; but the study of ancient languages and literature, now pursued with so much intelligence, has strangely aided the solution, by showing that the Accadians bore a specially close relation in their language, religion, and superstitions, to the Ougro-Finnish branch of the Turanian stock, which is now represented in Europe by the Finns, the Lapps, and the Hungarians. Even this identification, however, leaves a wide field for conjecture respecting them, for, if it is not to be forgotten

[1] Justin. II. c. 3.
[2] Lenormant's "Histoire Ancienne," i. 64.

that while the Ougro race of Tartars gave us the word Ogre, from their hideousness, the modern Finns and Hungarians stand a splendid comparison for good looks with any other branch of the human family.

From their first arrival on the banks of the lower Euphrates, the Accadians formed a nation, and could boast of the knowledge of writing, of the principal industries of civilisation, of a fixed body of laws, and of a fully-developed religious system. Their writing, indeed, was yet in an early stage, for it still sought to present by an image each object it wished to express, though these pictures had already degenerated into rude hieroglyphics which were little better than arbitrary signs. Thus the idea of God had been originally embodied in the representation of a star with eight rays, and that of a king by the figure of a bee; but the star had gradually passed into a cross of wedge or arrow-shaped characters, and the bee had come to be nothing more than the rudest imitations of the insect by the same wedges or arrows. Of these, however, the cuneiform writing of Babylon and Assyria was only a further development.

Among these hieroglyphics we find special signs to indicate the precious and commoner metals, which must have been known to the Accadians before they left their distant mountain home, where minerals and metals of various kinds crop out to the very surface, and must have early developed the crafts of the miner, the metal worker, and the jeweller. The oldest tombs in the country contain objects in gold and copper; knives, hatchets, sickles, bracelets, and earrings.[1] Metal, however, seems to have as yet been scarce. Iron, unknown in the very earliest tombs, occurs sparingly in somewhat later ones, but there is no silver, zinc, or platinum. They could, however, make bronze from copper and tin, and they used lead for jars and pipes. But bronze was the ordinary metal. The richer fair ones of Accadia might boast of golden earrings of not inelegant pattern, and of golden beads and other ornaments; but most of their sex had to content themselves with bangles of bronze, and it was bronze of which the household bowls, the bolts for tesselating marble pavements, the rings for ornamenting walls, the weapons of the soldier, the implements of the husbandman, the hooks of the fisher, the chains and nails of every-day use, and the toe and finger rings, and the armlets and bracelets, were made. Strange to say, along with these relics occur stone implements of many kinds, exactly similar to those found in ancient caves and barrows, and regarded as indicating the remote antiquity of our race—a deduction entirely discredited by their use along with the

[1] Rawlinson's "Two Great Monarchies," i. 120.

metals in the case of the Accadians, which is only one of many similar instances of the same fact.

Of the laws of the Accadians we know little, and space forbids more than the notice of their established recognition and force. Their religious ideas are of more direct interest, for they formed the groundwork of those amidst which Abraham in later times grew up.

The world, in the conceptions of these early tribes, was like a bowl reversed, the convex representing the expanse of land and sea; the hollow concave, the abyss in which dwelt darkness and the dead. Like other ancient races, they fancied their own country the centre of the world. Far beyond the Tigris rose the mountains of the East, which supported the sky and joined earth and heaven. The sky itself was a vast canopy resting on the edges of the earth, outside the great stream of Ocean which flowed round the whole world, and revolving round the Mountain of the East as its central pivot, drawing the stars with it in its course. Between heaven and earth, wandered sun and moon and the five planets, which were all alike thought to be a kind of living creature; and beneath them passed the snows, the winds, the thunder and the rains. The earth rested on the abyss, but the Accadians did not trouble themselves with asking by what that, in its turn, was supported.

This universe was peopled by a crowd of beings of many kinds, for, while mankind and the lower creatures were limited to the narrow bounds of the earth and the lower air, the world, the abyss beneath, the air above, and the upper sky, had vast mysterious populations of their own.

The primeval revelation of the One Living and True God underlies the ancient religion of the Accadians, but it early became so buried under the inventions of idolatry and the spread of a pantheistic view of Nature, that it was practically lost as early as the days of Abraham. As in India and Egypt, the mystery of the Universe became darker and darker the more men sought to understand it by their unaided reason. Life, as identified with motion and force, was attributed to the vast whole, so that God and Nature became identical. All things were part of the great world-soul, though anything like a philosophic expression of the thought belongs to a later age.

As we see it in its full development in later ages, the Chaldæan religion rested primarily on this conception, but from this all-pervading Essence countless emanations proceeded, which were recognised and worshipped as divine. That the sign for "God" should have been a star, indicates the turn of their thoughts. Over all the East the mighty heavens shine with a surpassing brightness, and the sun by day rules in all the more southern regions with unclouded and immeasurable glory. To the simple

childlike sons of Nature in such lands nothing was so natural as the worship of the heavenly bodies, when once the knowledge of the true God had been virtually lost.

The highest being in the later Chaldæan pantheon was the supreme god, El—a word meaning "the God," and that by which Jehovah is revealed in the early portions of the Scriptures themselves. The attributes or nature of this supreme existence were, however, too vast and comprehensive to permit of any image or tangible conception of Him being formed, and hence He did not attract the adorations of the people, since the human mind instinctively craves a sensuous rather than a spiritual worship. There is no evidence of any temple having been built to Him in Chaldæa, though Babylon owed to Him its name—Bab-El—the gate or city of El. He was "the One God," but without any defined personality; a sublime and mysterious conception too vague to excite the religious emotions or to influence the conduct of life. The after-glow of Paradise was early fading into black night.

Under El, or Ilou, the universal and mysterious source of Being, came a triad emanating from him—Anou, who represented primordial chaos; Nouah, the intelligence which quickens all things; and Bel, the creating power which orders them. Next came a second triad, which showed the influence of the heavenly bodies in the religious system of the nation. It consisted of Sin, the Moon-god; Samas, the Sun; and Bin, the god of the air, the winds, the rain, and the thunder. These three were emanations of the first triad as that was an emanation direct from El. But with each member of both triads there was associated, more or less clearly, a female deity, for the gross conceptions of earth were always transferred in idolatry to the gods. Yet it is striking that the great doctrine of the Trinity should have so strange a parallel in the earliest religions of mankind. In India, as among the Accadians, the Supreme Being was represented from the remotest times in the threefold light of a Father, an acting Power, and a divine enforcing Spirit, as if echoes of the eternal truth had lingered in the world for a time after the voice of God had ceased to speak in Eden.

The descending scale of emanations from the higher deities led, next, to the gods of the five planets, Saturn, Jupiter, Mars, Venus, and Mercury, which were respectively represented by Adar, Mardouk, Nergal, Istar, and Nebo; but these were only secondary manifestations of the higher gods of the second triad. These twelve great gods formed the nobility of the Accadian heaven, and are constantly mentioned in the inscriptions as the objects of public worship throughout the whole country. Their names almost alone enter into the composition of proper names. Beneath these thrones and princes of the sky,

Babylon, and Assyria after it, acknowledged legions of lesser gods —emanations from those higher in rank, but mostly honoured only by local worship. Every city, town, stream, and hill had its god, and there were special divinities of each district. Nor was the divine hierarchy even yet exhausted, for all the stars were regarded as living beings, possessing more or less of divinity, and linked to all the rest, however faintly, by a mysterious emanation from them.

This full development of the Accadian religious system was not, however, attained as yet in pre-historic ages, for the most ancient times appear to have known only of gods and elementary spirits, good and bad, without any graduation into a settled hierarchy. The mysterious El, reigning in lonely, incomprehensible grandeur, over all, seems to have been wanting in their theology, which was more like that of the Chinese of to-day than anything higher. For that supreme after-gleam of Paradise we are indebted to their Cushite conquerors of Semitic race; but even among them it passed away ere long from the worship or living interest of men at large, to reappear only in the faith of Abraham and become through him the great inheritance of mankind as the doctrine of the One Living and True God.

A great religious revolution, about two thousand years before Christ, marks the transition from the simpler faith of former ages and that of the future, on the banks of the Euphrates. About that time—that is, as nearly as may be, about the time of Abraham—a new dynasty united under its rule the two provinces of Chaldæa and Babylon, and introduced a more elaborate idolatry than had been previously known. Was it to separate him from this that the Father of the Faithful was summoned to set out for a distant land? Had he stayed in Mesopotamia the establishment and universal acceptance of the new heathenism must have corrupted his descendants.

The names of many of the old Accadian gods were the same as prevailed in later ages, but there was as yet no attempt at an associated and graduated hierarchy of divinities. Each deity was adored, with his spouse, in a particular town, which in most cases remained the seat of his chief temple even in after-times. Nature-worship, in which the one great principle of life was regarded as manifesting itself in countless forms, varied in each tribe and locality; some worshipping one special influence, some another, as the gross physical knowledge of so remote an age led them to regard one natural object or class of phenomena as of greater importance than others.

Our knowledge of these primitive times has been greatly increased by the discovery in the ruins of the library of the palace of Nineveh, of a document conveying much information respecting the superstitious ideas then prevailing. It has been pub-

lished by Sir Henry Rawlinson and Mr. Norris, in fac-simile, in their collection of the "Cuneiform Inscriptions of Asia," and has been translated and made the subject of his curious book on "La Magie chez les Chaldéens," by M. Lenormant, of Paris. It is interesting as disclosing the superstitions which in later ages became the special care of the Magi, a priestly corporation adopted into the later Chaldæan religion as a heritage from the past, and forming the various classes of "magicians," "wise men," and "astrologers" mentioned in the book of Daniel.

Accadian Magic rested in the belief of the existence of countless personal spirits existing everywhere, at one time separate, at another confounded with the objects they animated. They produced all the phenomena of Nature, and directed and vivified all existences. They caused good and evil, guided the movements of the heavens, led up the seasons in their order, made the winds blow, the rains fall, caused atmospherical phenomena, beneficent or destructive; gave the earth its fecundity, made the plants germinate and grow, presided at the birth and maintained the life of all things; and, on the other hand, scattered abroad death and disease. The whole universe was full of them—the heaven of the stars, the earth, and the regions over it. All the elements gave them dwelling-places—the air, the fire, the solid earth, and the water. Each object had such spirits of its own. But it is noteworthy that there is no trace in the oldest Accadian religion of a conception of one Supreme God, such as we find in the ancient Aryans, and as prevailed afterwards in Babylon through the influence of the Semitic Cushites. Like the Tartar and Mongolian races of to-day, they seem never to have risen above a mere worship of Nature in its several elements and phenomena. The knowledge of the living God had faded away from among them, and was to be restored, first vaguely and ignorantly, and then with a divine fulness, by the nobler races of Shem.

The Accadians strove to solve the mystery of evil, as was afterwards done in Zoroastrianism, by the simple means of a second principle actively opposed to the good. As there were spirits beneficent by nature, so there were others naturally malignant, and these are spread throughout the universe. The sky, the earth, and the air are full of them, and, in all, they are face to face with the good, and wage deadly war with them, day and night, for ever. The triumph of calamity represents their victory for the time: that of happiness, their temporary defeat. Each heavenly body, each element, each phenomenon, each object, and each living being has an attendant evil spirit as well as a good one. Constant strife thus reigns throughout all Nature, for nothing escapes this unending struggle of good and evil. Yet the Accadians had no higher conception than that of

physical evil. Moral evil is scarcely ever hinted at in the writings that have reached us; almost the only sin recognised being, apparently, the neglect of the prescribed propitiatory rites, and especially the failure to maintain friendly relations with evil spirits by magical arts, duly performed by recognised magicians. The only resort to which men can betake themselves to escape diseases and calamities is to avail themselves of the incantations of these functionaries, for all diseases and disasters are caused by evil spirits, and these the magicians can drive off or counteract by the mysterious words of their spells, and by their sacred rites and talismans.

This extraordinary system of demonology, as developed by the Babylonians and Assyrians, had a widely-spread influence on antiquity, and attracts at once by its importance in the history of the human mind, and by its inherent singularity. At the head of the countless army of demons were two classes who came more closely than others to a divine rank—the *mas*, or "soldiers" and "fighters;" the other, the *lammas*, or "giants." These are the genii of the "Arabian Nights" and of Eastern imagination at large. Under these were the *utuq*, who were demons properly so-called; but these have, themselves, classes—the *alal*, or "destroyers;" the *gigim*, a word of which the meaning is unknown; the *telal*, or "warriors;" and the *maskim*, or "spreaders of snares." Of this awful hierarchy of evil some have far higher power than others, ranging through the universe, and being able to disturb the order of Nature at their will. Thus, in one of the formulas of the magicians which remain, we read of seven evil spirits of the heavens—"seven spirits of fire"—who were the exact counterpart of the seven planetary gods invested with the government of the universe. We know most, however, of the *maskim*, or "spreaders of snares," whose abode is in the abyss under the earth, and who surpass all other demons in power and terror. Earthquakes were attributed to them, and they wreak their fell will in the heavens and on earth, troubling even the stars and their movements. Coming forth from the Mountains of the Setting Sun, they pass again to their gloomy abode through those of the rising sun; they are the terror of the solid world, and have "no glory in heaven or on earth." "The god Fire, who raises himself on high, the great Lord, who extends the supreme power of the god of the sky, who exalts the earth, his possession, his delight," tries vainly to oppose their ravages. An incantation still remains in which this god addresses himself to a divinity who acts as mediator before the god Ea, thus:—

The god Fire approaches Silik-moulou-khi, and prays: — And he has heard the prayer, in the silence of the night. He has entered into the palace to his father Ea, and has said to him—Father, the god

Fire has come hither and has uttered his prayer to me. Thou who knowest the actions of the Seven (Maskim) tell us where they dwell; open thine ear! Then Ea answered—"My son, the Seven dwell on the earth—they come out of the earth—they go back into the earth—they shake the walls of the abyss of waters."

Ea then gives directions how to overcome these terrible spirits. Among other aids he reveals a supreme magical name before whose power they may be expected to quail, and appoints divine helpers to support the god Fire in his struggle to conquer and chain down the dread adversaries.

Their fell influence on men is described in a conjuration:—

The vastness of their invasion of the earth burns like fire, east, west, north, and south. They fiercely attack the dwellings of men. In the town and in the field they cause all to wither. They oppress the freeman and the slave alike. They rain like hail in the heavens and on the earth.

It seems also as if they were the same, in some aspects, as "the spirits of the winds" breathing the deadly and burning blasts, which cause so much disease and suffering in the East.

The other classes of demons are more directly mixed up with ordinary human affairs, laying incessant snares for man, and causing all kinds of evils to him.

They, "the brood of hell" (say the conjurations), bring trouble above and confusion below. They go from house to house. They glide into the doors like serpents. The barren woman is made barren by them; the child is snatched by them from the knees of its father. They are the voice that cries and pursues after man. . . . . They sail land after land. They make the slave raise himself above his proper place; they make the son leave his father's house; they scare off the bird; they drive the nestling away into the wild; they make the ox run off; they make the lamb flee—they are the evil spirits who spread snares.

It is curious to find that these dreadful beings habitually live in waste, abandoned, and savage places, and that it is from these they come to the abodes of men, to torment them. The tablets give a list of demons according to the places they choose for their haunts—the desert, the barren tops of mountains, pestilential marshes, and the ocean waters. The *utuq*, it is said, live in the desert; the *mas* keep on the tops of mountains; the *gigim* wander in solitary places, and the *telal* glide about the streets of towns. But the desert especially is their chosen home. In the Magic texts demons are constantly mentioned who lurk for men in the depths of the wilderness, and the exorcisms prescribed have for their object to drive these adversaries away from these lonely spots, when the traveller is passing through them.

All the maladies of life were attributed to the presence and work of demons in the body of the sufferer, an idea which in the twelfth century before Christ led to a very curious incident in the relations of Egypt with Chaldæa. The conquests of Egypt had then been extended to the west border of Mesopotamia, and the King Rameses XII. had married a daughter of the lord of Bakhten, whom he had met on an Eastern progress. Some years after, when Rameses was in Thebes, a messenger from his father-in-law presented himself, asking the king to send a physician to the queen's sister, in Bakhten, to cure her of an unknown malady and from possession by a demon. A priestly physician was forthwith sent from Egypt, but his art entirely failed, and he had to return to Thebes without curing the princess. Eleven years later another messenger presented himself, saying that a physician would not do; the malady could only be cured, and the demon expelled, by the direct power of one of the gods of Egypt. Forthwith the sacred ark of one of the gods of Thebes was sent back with the envoy, and reached Bakhten after a tedious journey of six months. The demon, at last, on its arrival, was vanquished and fled from the person of the princess, but her father was naturally unwilling to return a deity who had wrought such a miracle. Hence, for three years and six months, the sacred ark was detained in Mesopotamia, but at the end of that time the queen's father had a dream, in which he thought he saw the captive god fly off to Egypt in the form of a golden sparrow-hawk, and he was attacked by an illness at the same time. This seemed a warning to return the ark, and it was immediately sent back to its temple at Thebes.

When a demon had once been chased from the body, the only security against its return lay in the strength of the incantations used to prevent its doing so, and by a good spirit taking its place in the lately possessed. To be the habitation of good spirits was the highest wish of any one.

The Chaldæans believed that all diseases were the work of demons, and hence there were no physicians, strictly so called, either in Babylon or Assyria. Medicine was not a science, so much as a branch of Magic. It employed incantations and exorcisms, with the use of philtres and enchanted drinks, which possibly had in them something really curative. The disease, however, was regarded as a personal being. Thus the Plague and Fever are spoken of as two demons specially distinguished by personal attributes.

"The hateful *idpa*," says a fragment, "affects the head of a man; the evil-working *namtar* affects his life; the *utuq*, his forehead; the evil-working *alal* his lungs; the evil-working *gigim* his bowels; the *telal* his hand."

Besides these malevolent beings, there were others which

terrified by apparitions, and were closely connected with the shades of the dead shut up in the dark dwellings of the gloomy under-land. Of these there were ghosts, spectres, and vampires, the two former terrifying by their appearance only, while the third attacked men. Thus, in the Descent of Istar to the lower world, the goddess appeals to the guardian of its gate to open to her:

"Guardian, open thy gate that I may enter. If thou dost not I will assail and break it down. I will assail its bars. I will break its posts. I will make the dead come out to devour the living. I will give them power over the living."

This comprises all we know as yet of the old Chaldæan Magic from the tablets, but the progress of decipherment will doubtless reveal much hereafter. What is thus known reveals a reign of miserable superstition. Life must have been a bondage to imaginary terrors, and hardly less so to the endless ceremonial details by which safety from evil spirits was to be secured. Thus an ailment of the head was to be cured by knotting a woman's turban to the right and arranging it smoothly in the form of a band to the left. It was to be divided into fourteen slips, and with these the forehead was to be encircled—and the hands and feet. The patient was then to sit on his bed and be sprinkled with holy water, and thus the ailment would be carried off into the skies like a strong wind, and would sink into the earth like spilt water. The power of numbers also played a great part in this strange pharmacy, but on this subject our information is very slight. But the special and chief power in expelling the demons of disease and misfortune lay in the secret and mysterious supreme name. It alone could stay the *maskim*. This great name, however, remained known to the god Ea alone, for any man who found it out would, by merely doing so, gain a power greater than that of the gods.

CUNNINGHAM GEIKIE.

ART. IV.—CHURCH MISSIONARY SOCIETY.

III.

THERE are two tests by which all great institutions may be tried, viz., principles and results; and it is a happy thing to know that there is no reason to fear the application of either of these tests to the Church Missionary Society. As for results, we have the concurrent testimony of all classes, civilians, military men, clergy, bishops, governors, and governors-general. And as for principles, we may with the utmost confidence challenge the

most searching inquiry; and whether they are tested by the Scripture or by the Church of England, we have not the least anxiety as to their being found perfectly sound. But, though there are these two tests of every institution, the test of principle is the only one on which we can always rely with reference to Missionary work, for in many of our most favoured Missions there has been a long period of patient waiting before any results have been developed. The principles therefore on which the work of this great Society has been steadily conducted since its foundation in the year 1799 shall be the one subject of the present paper.

And this is the more important because in many minds there is great confusion on the subject. I believe that there are two classes of persons who look coldly on the Society. Some appear to do so more from prejudice than conviction. They have no very definite idea respecting it; they never read anything of its work; and they would probably find it exceedingly difficult to write down the reason for their opinion. It is to them what Dr. Fell was to the old rhymester, who said,

> The reason why I cannot tell—
> I do not like thee, Dr. Fell.

And thus, without any accurate information, they make up their minds that there is something amiss somewhere; and so they decide, if not to oppose, at all events to stand aloof.

But there is another large class who really believe that the Society is defective in Churchmanship, and little better than a kind of semi-dissenting institution. Like the former class they would find it exceedingly difficult to give a reason for their opinion, but they have grown up in it, and they think there must be some foundation for it, though they do not exactly know how to describe it.

There is a curious illustration of the prevalence of this distrust in the monthly paper of the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge for May last. Mr. Hutchinson, one of the secretaries of the Church Missionary Society, applied for a grant of maps for the Society's Schools in Palestine. The grant was liberally given, but the following apologetic clause was added:—"It was also gathered from the report that the teaching given was that of the Church." I should be sorry to imply that the secretary intended by that clause an intentional affront to the Church Missionary Society, but he ought to have known that there was no need of gathering from the report that the teaching in the Church Missionary Schools was the sound, sober, Scriptural teaching of the Church of England.

In the discussion held by the Eclectic Clerical Society referred to in my paper for October, it was resolved that "The Society

should be conducted upon those principles which they believed to be most in accordance with the Gospel of Christ, and the spirit of the reformed Church of England," and to that resolution the long succession of committees and secretaries have ever since steadily adhered. Believing that what are termed Evangelical principles are the principles not of the Bible only, but of the Prayer-book, they have acted not as Christians only, but as Churchmen; and they are not afraid of asking all those who stand aloof from them to study their reports as did the Committee of the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, in the full conviction that they can gather nothing from them at variance with a loyal, consistent, and honest Churchmanship. Let us endeavour to submit its work to the two tests of doctrine and discipline.

(1.) *Doctrine.*—This is obviously by far the most important, inasmuch as the truth taught is of greater importance than the mode of teaching it. If we want to quench our thirst, it is better to have pure water in an ill-made glass than a poisoned draught in a beautiful work of art. Now, whatever we may think of the glass that holds it, we need never be afraid of subjecting the water supplied by the Church Missionary Society to the severest possible tests. I am aware that in the life of the late Bishop Selwyn it is said of the teaching of those noble men who at the most imminent risk of their lives carried the Gospel with heroic courage to the Cannibals of New Zealand, that "the people had accepted Christianity eagerly and sincerely, but an emotional system without a strict system of teaching had left them without backbone, moral or intellectual." Surely it is a matter most deeply to be regretted that the biographer of Bishop Selwyn should have put forth such a statement respecting one of the most heroic missionary enterprises ever known in Christendom. But as he has thrown down the gauntlet we are prepared to maintain against all comers that this emotional system without backbone is neither more nor less than the old-fashioned teaching of the Church of England as taught in the Scripture, as defined in the Articles, and as embodied in the Liturgy. If by the want of backbone is meant the absence of hierarchical claims, sacerdotal assumptions, and what are sometimes called "high Sacramental doctrines," then we readily admit that there is such a want in the work of the Society. But we must go a step further, and affirm that there is the same want in the Church of England, and higher still, in the Word of God itself. But none of these things form the backbone of either our Mission or our Church. It is the truth of God on which both one and the other must rely for strength. It is the truth of God that is the strength of the Church of England, and the same truth of God that is the strength of the Church Missionary

Society. That great Society is not afraid of the Thirty-nine Articles. It has no desire to omit, to alter, or to explain away, any one of them. It accepts them as they stand, and accepts them all; the sixth as teaching the sufficiency of Scripture as a rule of faith; the ninth, not omitting the words, "quam longissime," as descriptive of original sin; the eleventh as maintaining the great doctrine of justification by faith *only;* the seventeenth as teaching that "the consideration of our Predestination and our election in Christ, is full of sweet, pleasant, and unspeakable comfort to godly persons;" the twenty-fifth and six following on the two Sacraments, concluding with the statement in the thirty-first, that "the sacrifices of masses in which it was commonly said that the priest did offer Christ for the quick and the dead, to have remission of pain or guilt, were blasphemous fables and dangerous deceits." If there is no backbone in those Articles, then I freely admit there is no backbone in the work of the Church Missionary Society, for the principles of the one are the principles of the other, and there can be no question about the fact that the two must rise or fall together. As loyal members of the Church of England we are perfectly satisfied with its definitions of truth. We have no desire to go beyond them, and import from extraneous sources opinions which lie outside the limits of the Church's decisions; nor do we desire to fall short of them, or omit any one of the great truths to teach which the Church has entrusted her Ministers with her ministry; and, least of all, do we desire to employ men who shall say a word, or think a thought, at variance with that blessed Gospel to which since the days of the Reformation the Church of England has been so true, so faithful, and so unwavering a witness.

(2.) *Order and Discipline.*—While maintaining the fidelity of the Society to the doctrine of the Church of England, there is still room for enquiry whether it has been equally true to its discipline and order. In the discussion of this subject we fully admit that in foreign missions it is frequently altogether impossible to conduct Church work as we conduct it at home.

For example, in many cases it is utterly impossible to carry out our parochial system. Our parishes at home were created by state arrangement in order to secure religious teaching for the whole of our population, and when the whole population consists of one race speaking one language and living under the same circumstances, we are only too glad to reproduce it in our Mission Stations, as has been done in Sierra Leone. But when there are different races speaking different languages, any attempt at ecclesiastical fusion is certain to end in failure as it has done in Wales and Ireland, and as it did in the early days of Bishop Selwyn. There are many men who are invaluable

amongst the English, but who are perfectly useless in Missionary work amongst the natives; and so, on the other side, the great body of the native clergymen (and our great object is to raise up a native ministry) are altogether unfitted to minister in English to an English population. It is utterly impossible therefore to reproduce in such cases the English arrangement of parishes, and so long as God keeps the races distinct, there must be distinct organisations. But such adaptation to local circumstances involves no departure from the principles of consistent Churchmanship, and those principles have been steadily maintained throughout the eighty years of the Society's history.

It was the sound Churchmanship of the early Evangelical fathers that originally led to its foundation. If they had not been sound Churchmen, they would have saved themselves a vast amount of trouble by simply joining the London Missionary Society which had been established in the year 1795, on the basis of a union of all denominations. Towards that Society there was not the least hostility, but, on the contrary, so friendly a disposition that on hearing of the capture of the ship "Duff," the property of the London Missionary Society, the various members of the New Committee made a subscription amongst themselves, and on the 5th August, 1799, transmitted the sum of a hundred guineas to the treasurer of that Society. But, though thus friendly, they could not be satisfied to act themselves except as Churchmen, and therefore it was that they formed a distinct organization.[1]

So again when the original Committee laid their plans before the Archbishops and Bishops, and then for thirteen months awaited their decision, they proved at the outset of their work their loyal deference to ecclesiastical authority.

The same principles have been steadily maintained throughout their missions, but I shall not have space to trace it except in India, New Zealand, and Ceylon.

India.—There are at the present time as many as at least twenty-four different Missionary Institutions at work in India, but few of them are aware of the deep debt of gratitude which they owe to the Church Missionary Society as the principal instrument by which it pleased God to open the way for their efforts. It was not till the year 1813, that the right to carry on

---

[1] The incident may serve to illustrate the spirit that has characterized the whole of the subsequent conduct of the Society. It has always cultivated a friendly spirit of brotherly co-operation with all those who have been engaged in the same blessed work as itself, whether they were foreign Protestants, Nonconformists at home, or fellow members of their own Church, but it has at the same time held quietly on its own way, adhering consistently to its own principles, and carrying on its work as Church work within the limits of the Church's lines.

their labours within the British Dominions in India was secured to Missionaries by Parliament.[1]

As time advanced there were some devotedly Christian men in high office in India, through whose personal influence there was in some cases a practical relaxation of the exclusive regulations of the Company. But the system remained unchanged, and against this system Wilberforce carried on a noble struggle in the House of Commons. As the charter of the Company was to expire, and would require renewal, in the year 1813, the Church Missionary Committee called a special meeting of the Society on the 24th April, 1812, in order to pass resolutions, and to endeavour to arouse the country, on the subject. The meeting was enthusiastic, and the struggle began in earnest. Dr. Claudius Buchanan, at the request of the Committee, wrote a powerful treatise on the subject of Christianity in India. The Committee sent copies of it to about 800 members of both Houses of Parliament, and in other ways the press was employed in awakening the public to the spiritual interests of our Indian Empire. Petitions were sent to Parliament from different parts of the country; and a deputation had several conferences with his Majesty's ministers on the subject, till at length on the 22nd June, 1813, Lord Castlereagh introduced the subject in the House of Commons. Wilberforce made one of his most brilliant speeches, and carried the whole house before him; so that when the division was taken there was a majority of more than two to one in favour of the Bill, the terms of which almost exactly agreed with the resolutions proposed at the special meeting of the Church Missionary Society.

Closely connected with that great struggle for Christian liberty there was another effort made by the Committee, which is much less generally known, but which is of great importance in its bearing on the principles of the Society, I mean their effort for the establishment of Episcopacy in India. At that time very little had been done for the extension of Episcopacy in our Colonial Empire. Only two colonial bishoprics had been founded, Nova Scotia in 1787, and Quebec in 1793. People had not then learned how much may be accomplished if only men are prepared to make the attempt in the name of the Lord. Thus in India there were thirty-five chaplains, but no bishop. Dr. Buchanan and the Committee, foreseeing the great increase

[1] Thus, Mr. Carey not being allowed to sail for India in any of the Company's ships, was obliged to take a passage in a Danish vessel; and, when in India, to be first registered as an indigo planter; and ultimately compelled to take refuge in the Danish settlement of Serampore. So Judson was first driven from Calcutta, then forbidden to land at Madras, and at last literally hunted to Burmah as the only sphere where he could carry on his labours.

in the number of clergy that was likely to take place in consequence of the new clause in the charter, urged on the Government the importance of establishing Bishoprics for Calcutta, Madras, Bombay, and Ceylon. It is stated by Professor Watkins that the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge "was found joining with others in the attempt to establish Episcopacy in India." I do not know what part they took, but I can easily understand how thankful the Church Missionary Society Committee must have been for so influential an ally. But they were not content with India only. Dr. Buchanan's name is very little known now. He laboured, and others have entered into his labours, but he was the man who boldly struck out the idea of a vigorous extension of the Episcopate. His proposal was that there should be Bishops for the West Indies, Bengal, Madras, Bombay, Ceylon and Java, South Africa, and New South Wales. He also recommended Archdeacons for Java, Mauritius, West Africa, and Malta; and he urged the importance of such an extension of Episcopal superintendence, "in order to ordain natives on the spot; to dispense the ordinance of confirmation; to direct the labours of missionaries; to form and regulate the growing church; and to preserve as much as may be the unity of religion."

The greater part of Dr. Buchanan's scheme remained in abeyance till it was taken up by the powerful hand of Bishop Blomfield in the year 1841. But the Bishopric of Calcutta was founded at once, and in the month of April, 1814, it was announced by Mr. Macaulay, then the editor of the *Christian Observer*, "The Rev. Archdeacon Middleton has been appointed the first Bishop of India. May his appointment prove a source of blessing to the millions of Hindostan!"

New Zealand.—There are few missions more abounding in romantic interest than that in New Zealand, and few respecting which there are greater misconceptions. The fine, noble, enterprising character of Bishop Selwyn has won such enthusiastic admiration that in many eyes every one else is thrown into the shade, and he is constantly represented as the one prominent figure in the New Zealand mission. When he visited America the whole Synod of the Episcopal Church rose on his entering their hall, and the chairman received him as the Apostle of New Zealand. So I remember well a conversation with an eminent Member of Parliament who was filling at the time a high position in Her Majesty's Government, in which he expressed his amazement at the marvellous success of the Bishop, for that he had actually administered the Lord's Supper to more than 400 converts on the first Sunday after his arrival. It is almost impossible to imagine how such a person could have supposed that these 400 converts had been converted, baptised, confirmed, and

received as communicants, in the inside of a single week. But that sentiment of his was but a specimen of the profound ignorance of even intelligent men respecting the hard and life-sacrificing work that had been carried on for twenty-seven years before Bishop Selwyn set his foot on the island. The real Apostle of New Zealand was Samuel Marsden; the real first resident missionaries were John King and William Hall, two devoted laymen; and the real first landing of the messenger of the Cross was, not when Bishop Selwyn received an enthusiastic welcome from a large body of devoted missionaries surrounded by hundreds of convert communicants, but when these brave men stepped out of their boat on the Island, where the South Sea whalers were afraid to touch even for water, and, surrounded by savage cannibals, lay down under a spreading tree for their night's rest, and there slept peacefully, for they knew that God was with them. These men were the real Apostles of New Zealand, and they were the real founders of the mission.

But that is not the immediate subject of this Paper, the object of which is to exhibit the principles on which the mission was conducted. Any person reading Mr. Tucker's life of Bishop Selwyn would suppose that there was an unwillingness on the part of the Society to receive a visit from Bishop Broughton, and a desire to prevent the formation of the New Zealand Bishopric. He says:—

> The idea of having a resident bishop among them was distasteful to the majority of the Church Missionary clergy, and was loudly condemned by the Secretary at home; but ultimately a grant of £600 per annum was voted by the Society towards the Bishop's income.

As Mr. Tucker gives no names, and no authority, it is impossible either to verify or dispute his statement. But those who were intimate with that great man, the Rev. H. Venn, know perfectly well that, if he was the secretary alluded to, Mr. Tucker is entirely mistaken in his fact. There was certainly nothing of the kind indicated in his Reports of the Society. In that for 1838 it was stated that the Committee had "opened a communication with the Bishop of Australia with a view to arrange for the mission such an increase of the Episcopal functions as the case would admit, and that the Bishop had most willingly complied with their request." This did not look as if the Committee were interposing obstacles to his Lordship's visit. In the Report for 1839 they express the full confidence that the communications then in hand may "lead to such an arrangement as may secure to the mission the advantages of the Episcopal office." In that for 1840 the confident hope is expressed that the Bishop of Australia's visit will lead to the planting of the Church of England in the full integrity of its system, "the im-

portance of which they deeply feel." In that for 1841 they announce the proposal of the New Zealand Bishopric, and add, "The Committee on principle, and from a deep conviction of the necessity of the measure for their missionaries in that island, have undertaken to aid largely in providing the endowment." And in that for 1842 it is said:—

> The necessity for Episcopal superintendence has been long felt both by the missionaries and the Committee in the advanced state of the Mission. The Committee can now report that New Zealand has been erected into an Episcopal See, and that the full benefit of an Ecclesiastical Constitution has thus been provided for the infant Church of those Islands.

I am aware that these extracts may seem dull to some of the readers of THE CHURCHMAN, but they are important as showing the extreme ignorance of the facts that prevails even amongst those who ought to be acquainted with them.

If the biographer of Bishop Selwyn had only taken the trouble to examine the documents of the Society, he never could have written as he has done in his memoir. The real fact was that the time had come for the widespread extension of the native ministry. There were many congregations throughout the Island for which clergymen were urgently required, and many New Zealanders, whom the missionaries considered well qualified for the ministry, so that the urgent need of a Bishop was deeply felt by all parties. I cannot deny that a bitter disappointment was felt by the line adopted by Bishop Selwyn. He arrived in his new diocese full of zeal and self-denying energy, and he was thankfully welcomed by the whole missionary staff. But, as Mr. Tucker informs us, he went out with "his diagram complete," a diagram, formed not in New Zealand, but at Eton; not from experience, but theory. The result was that he made the fatal mistake of hoping to fuse the races, and of deciding to ordain no natives till they had passed through his new college, and were qualified by a knowledge of either Greek or Hebrew to minister amongst the English settlers. The result was inexpressibly disastrous, for unhappily no less than nine years were permitted to pass before a single native was ordained. The scattered congregations were thus left through sheer necessity to the care of catechists, and therefore without the habitual enjoyment of the Sacraments. To what extent the dire calamities that subsequently befel the promising Church in the outbreak of the "Hau-hau" superstition were the consequence of that fatal mistake of the inexperienced Bishop, God only knows.

But, notwithstanding this bitter disappointment, the relationship between the Bishop and the Society was always of a friendly character. He entertained the highest theories of Episcopal pre-

rogative, but he was true to the Church of England, and they were so thoroughly sound in their Church principles, that through the twenty-five years of his bishopric there was no collision on ecclesiastical matters. Many of the missionaries were amongst his most beloved and most faithful friends; two of them were raised to the Episcopal office; and it is most satisfactory to the friends of the Church Missionary Society to know that the principles which the Committee had advocated from the beginning respecting the extension of the native Church, were adopted before the close of his career, so that his last act in New Zealand was to receive an address from the Synod in which it was said, "With respect to the Native Church, a Maori diocese has been constituted, and Maori Synods have been held, seventeen native clergy have ministered, or do minister faithfully and loyally in different parts of the country." That Maori diocese was founded through the action of the Church Missionary Society and is to this day chiefly maintained by it. Its first Bishop was the venerable Williams, one of the leading missionaries of the Society; and the whole transaction may serve to show how well men may act together even though they do not always see alike, and how remarkably the consistent maintenance of sound principles is sure in the long run to bring them to the front.

Ceylon.—I trust that through the wise intervention of the Archbishop of Canterbury the day may come, and that before very long, when there will be a similar result at Ceylon. Nor am I in the least afraid that when his Grace investigates the conduct of either the Missionaries or the Committee he will find anything at variance with a loyal, consistent, and intelligent fidelity to the great principles of the Church of England. It is, in fact, a zeal for these principles that has brought the missionaries into collision with their Bishop. If ever a difficulty arises between a clergyman and his Bishop, it is usually taken for granted that the clergyman alone is to blame, and that the Bishop is compelled in the painful discharge of duty to restrain the clergyman's irregularity. The result is that the majority of those who do not take the trouble to investigate, assume at once that the Bishop is right and the clergyman wrong. But it is just possible that when the case is examined it will be found that the clergyman has been standing steadily on the foundations of his Church, and that the real cause of offence is that he has firmly refused to acquiesce in irregularities, which have been introduced under the sanction of his Bishop. And this, I do not hesitate to say, has been the case in Ceylon. It has been the steady, sound, firm, English Churchmanship of the missionaries that has been the cause of the painful difficulty that has arisen between them and their Bishop.

A single example may be quoted in illustration, and as it is the one which has been made the occasion of the greatest reproach on the Society, it is the best that can be selected. It is also peculiarly adapted to the purpose of this Paper, as it will show the standpoint of the Society with reference to ritual, doctrine, and discipline. I allude to the objection entertained by the missionaries to receiving the Holy Communion in the Cathedral as administered with the usual Cathedral ritual.

Ritual.—When invited by the Bishop to attend a voluntary conference the missionaries in a quiet, calm, and most respectful letter requested to be excused attendance at the Lord's Supper in the Cathedral, as there were certain practices usually adopted there, to which they entertained a strong objection. Of these practices, three had been pronounced illegal (viz., the cross on the table, the elevation of the elements, and the mixed chalice), and surely it was no want of loyal fidelity to Church principles that made them unwilling to take a part in that which the Church of England had condemned.

Doctrine.—That which ultimately became the turning point of the controversy was the eastward position, and this the Bishop said he could never surrender, because it was "of the highest value as an exponent of doctrine." I respect the Bishop for his conscientious maintenance of what he believed to be the truth. But by so doing he placed the missionaries in a terrible difficulty; for if they had given way they would practically have admitted the doctrine of which the act was declared to be an exponent. I am sure, therefore, that those who love the principles of the Reformation will be thankful to God for the unwavering support with which the Committee upheld them in their objection. Their words were :—

> The doctrine of which it is generally supposed to be an exponent, and which may be presumed to be that to which the Bishop refers, is the doctrine of a propitiatory sacrifice by a priest. If this be so, the Committee dare not advise a concession. They must rather maintain that the Bishop has placed the missionaries in a position in which they cannot possibly give way, but rather are bound by their duty to the truth of God, and to their ordination promises, to stand firm in their resistance to that which they believe to be opposed to the teaching of Holy Scripture, and to some of the fundamental principles of the Church of England which are drawn from it."

Surely on reading that passage we may say, "Well done, good and faithful servants."

Discipline.—The result of this correspondence has been that the Bishop has refused to license any new missionaries of the Society unless they will first submit to the test of receiving the Lord's Supper in the Cathedral. Against the imposition of such

a test the missionaries and the Committee most firmly protest; and, although three of their number have been refused licenses, and seven young men have been refused ordination, to the most grievous loss and injury of the Mission, they stand out perfectly firm, and as loyal Churchmen decline to submit. The principle involved is of the utmost possible importance. The Church of England requires certain guarantees as to faith and character from all who are admitted to her ministry, and if these guarantees are given no Bishop has a right to impose fresh tests of his own. Imagine for one moment what would become of the Church of England if any Bishop who was opposed to the Church Association were to refuse to license any curate unless he would first receive the Communion at St. Alban's, Holborn; or, if any Bishop who objected to the English Church Union were to license none who would not first receive the Lord's Supper in the evening at St. Mary's, Islington. A Church, if it is to enjoy stability, must be governed by its laws, and not by the arbitrary will of individual Bishops. So that firmly to resist the imposition of a new test of any kind is not only the right but the duty of all those who value the fixed principles and abiding testimony of the Church of England. If an individual Bishop may impose any test he pleases, there is an end of all constitutional discipline. And few who value principles can fail to admire the concluding paragraph of a long letter to the Bishop by the senior missionary. He writes :—

> You speak of us as "men whom the Church cannot satisfy.". . . That statement shows how utterly you have misapprehended our position. It is because the Church of England *does* satisfy us that we continue what we have always sought to be, loyal clergy of her communion. . . . . because it *does* satisfy us that we declined to be moved from the standpoint which we have hitherto occupied, or to take part in a ritual which, as I have shown, her reformers and divines repudiate.

Such have been the principles of this great Society during the whole of its honourable career. It has been faithful in doctrine, and loyal in Churchmanship. It has been true to the great truths of Scripture, and therefore true also to the exhibition of these truths in the Liturgy and Articles of the Church of England. It has shown no desire to explain away the Articles, and it has been firm in its determination not to Romanize the ritual. It has adhered stedfastly to its own principles of Episcopal Churchmanship, but has always cultivated a friendly relationship with those engaged in the same sacred service, even though they belong to other bodies. It has been ready on every occasion to enter on work amongst the heathen wherever God has opened the door, but it has never intruded on the work of others. Such it has been for the last eighty years, and such, I trust, it

will be to the end of its history; upheld by the mercy of God; supported by the people of God; employed to do the work of God; encouraged by the blessing of God; and in all that it does, all at home, and all abroad, guided and accompanied by the Spirit of God.

EDWARD HOARE.

ART. V.—LIFE OF BISHOP WILBERFORCE.

Life of the Right Rev. Samuel Wilberforce, D.D., Lord Bishop of Oxford, and afterwards of Winchester. With Selections from his Diaries and Correspondence. By A. R. ASHWELL, M.A., late Canon of the Cathedral and Principal of the Theological College, Chichester. In three Vols. Vol. I. Portrait. Pp. 550. Murray, 1880.

IN the present notice of this volume we confine ourselves to a mention of the main incidents in the "Life," with a few extracts from the earlier letters. Canon Ashwell's Introduction is brief, and Mr. R. G. Wilberforce's Preface consists of a few lines. For the next two volumes, it appears, some letters have been arranged, and notes made, but nothing written.

"Samuel Wilberforce, the third son of William Wilberforce, and his wife Barbara Ann, eldest daughter of Isaac Spooner, Esq., of Elmdon Hall, in the county of Warwick, was born at Clapham Common," on September 7th, 1805. It is somewhat singular that while the Wilberforce lineage and ancestry can be traced back so far as the days of Henry II., no Wilberfoss, or Wilberforce, as the name has been spelt from the time of his great-grandfather, is found to have entered Holy Orders until the time of Samuel Wilberforce and his two brothers Robert and Henry. The career and character of William Wilberforce "have left their mark upon English life and English society, and they have been vividly set forth in the well-known Biography" of which a revised and condensed edition was sent forth in the year 1868. One feature in his character is beautifully portrayed in the opening pages of the volume before us. From the beginning of the year 1817, when Samuel Wilberforce was in his twelfth year, the father's devotion to his son is exhibited by a "series of not fewer than 600 letters, which are still extant, all carefully numbered and noted in the handwriting of Samuel Wilberforce's maturer years." The biographer remarks that these letters "must have exercised the most powerful influence on the

formation of his character. Compare these letters with his subsequent career, and it will at once be seen that Samuel Wilberforce was indeed his father's son." The shrewd practical counsels of these letters, it is added, are "strung upon the one thread of ever-repeated inculcation of the duty of private prayer as the one holdfast of life." And herein are exhibited, writes Canon Ashwell, the "influences which formed that solid substratum of character which underlay the brilliant gifts and the striking career of Samuel Wilberforce." That this early training was Evangelical, Canon Ashwell, as might have been expected, passes by almost unnoticed. Samuel Wilberforce himself, however, never forgot the fact, or sought to dilute it. Some seventeen years ago, in private conversation with an Evangelical clergyman, he said, "I hold all that my dear father held, with a little more." And we have heard him preach in Evangelical churches sermons which with power and beauty brought out the doctrines of grace; many persons would have termed them decidedly Calvinistic. The truth is, indeed, that the better part of his teaching and preaching, together with the glow of his Missionary zeal, was Evangelical.

In the year 1817 Samuel Wilberforce was a pupil in the house of the Rev. S. Langston, at Hastings, and for a short time with the Rev. E. G. Marsh, at Nuneham, near Oxford. In 1819 he became the pupil of the Rev. George Hodson, chaplain to Mr. Lewis Way, of Stanstead Park, in Sussex, near Emsworth. Mr. Way was an old friend of Wilberforce; and Mrs. Hodson was the niece of Mr. Stephen, who had married his elder sister, and was his enthusiastic ally in the anti-slavery cause. It was at the eagle-lectern in Mr. Way's domestic chapel that Samuel's voice was first heard in the service of the Church. At no great distance from Stanstead was Lavington, with which the future Bishop's name was to be indissolubly connected; and Mr. and Mrs. Sargent were constant visitors at Stanstead Park. Mrs. Sargent, the Bishop's future mother-in-law, was the daughter of Mr. Abel Smith, the elder brother of the first Lord Carrington, and first cousin to Mr. Wilberforce. "Mr. Sargent, as heir to the Lavington property, had been brought up to the bar, but at Cambridge he had come under Mr. Simeon's influence, and received a strong bias towards the ministry of the Church, which resulted ere long in his being ordained and becoming rector of the parish." "Mr. Sargent was the friend and correspondent, and afterwards the biographer, of Henry Martyn, and likewise of Mr. Thomason, the Indian Missionary, and a slight sketch of his life and character was prefixed by his son-in-law, Samuel Wilberforce, to the edition of Henry Martyn's 'Journals and Letters,' which he published while rector of Brighstone, in 1837." Described by Mr. Wilberforce as "one of the very first Christians I know,"

Mr. Sargent remained the beloved and respected Incumbent of Lavington-cum-Graffham until his decease in 1833.

In October, 1823, Samuel Wilberforce went into residence at Oriel College, Oxford. Hitherto his education had been wholly private. It is evident, we read, from the traits of character noticed in him at the age of seventeen, that his father's careful training had been bestowed on a kindly soil. We may quote here two or three extracts from the father's letters.

One of the earliest letters runs as follows:—

Kensington Gore,
Thursday, March 6th, 1817.

I hope my dear lamb will, during his absence from his earthly father and mother, look up the more earnestly to that Heavenly Father who watches over all that put their trust in Him, and has given special encouragement to apply to Him for every needful blessing. Above all, my dear boy, strive against *formality* in your private prayers. Endeavour to *realise the presence* of your God and Saviour, and to be assured that, though not visible by your bodily eyes, they are really present with you. Try to bring on Henry in all good, ever remembering my advice, not to be satisfied with merely not being unkind, but trying positively to *be* kind. May God bless you, my very dear Boy, and make you a blessing to many hereafter, as well as a comfort to the advancing years of your affect^e^ father,

W. WILBERFORCE.

The following, two years later, was written after Samuel had gone to Mr. Hodson's:—

Near Worcester, October 5, 1819.

MY VERY DEAR SAMUEL,—Though I have now by my side a large mass of unanswered letters, which accumulated while we were travelling from place to place, yet I must not suffer any other correspondents to prevent my writing to my dearest Saml, especially when I have to reply to so interesting a letter as that which I last received from you . . . .

My dear Boy asks me what are his chief faults, that he may pray and watch and strive against them. This is all right; but then I must premise, that is, I must previously suggest to him, that the most effectual way in which a Christian can get the better of any particular fault is by cultivating the *Root of all Holiness*, by endeavouring to obtain a closer union with Jesus Christ, and to acquire more of that blessed Spirit instead of *grieving* it, which will enable him to conquer all his corruptions, and to improve and strengthen all his Christian graces.

I will mention a very striking illustration of the difference between men's striving to improve one or another individual good quality and the improving the common Root of all of them, and thereby improving them all at once. The former is the way in which a human artificer works—a statuary, for instance, sometimes making a finger, sometimes a leg, and so on—while the latter, the workmanship of the Divine Artificer, is like the growth of a plant or a tree, in which all the various

parts are swelling out and increasing, or, as we term it, *growing*, at the same time. I thought this remark would please my dear Saml, so I wrote it down for him. But it teaches us a most important truth, that we should strive to obtain the heavenly principle of growth in grace and in goodness by obtaining more of the Holy Spirit of God, and then we shall improve in every particular grace or virtue. But then we must also examine ourselves, and recollect either at night when we go to bed, or in the morning, as we find best (I am always sleepy at night), what have been the instances in which we have chiefly sinned, and thus we shall ourselves discover our besetting sin. But I will write to you on this subject in another letter.

May God bless my dear Boy with His choicest blessings. I am ever his most affectionate father, W. WILBERFORCE.

Later on, in 1820, was written a letter "to be read *on Sunday*," of which the following is the chief portion:—

You should do your business and try to excel in it to please your Saviour, as a small return for all that He has done for you, but a return which He will by no means despise. It is this which constitutes the character of a real Christian, that considering himself as bought with a price—viz., that of the blood of Jesus Christ—he regards it as his duty to try and please his Saviour in everything.

It was in a letter of 1821, when Samuel was just sixteen, that his father first wrote to him on the subject of seeking Holy Orders. In 1822, he wrote concerning the importance of steadily and sturdily setting oneself to the work of acting on that beautiful description of the character of true Christians—shining "as Lights." "O my dearest Samuel, what would I give to see you a *φωστὴρ ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ*. O my dearest Boy, *aim high*."

In the first letter which he received from his father, after settling in College, occurs the following:—

There is one practice I remember you one day mentioning to me, and I am sorry I did not recollect to name it to you again before you left us, that of friends breakfasting with each other on Sunday mornings. I own to you I think it a very injurious one, and the less excusable because at that early hour of the day the spirit of young men especially can need no such cordial. If you wish I will hereafter give you my sentiments on this point more at large. For the present let it suffice that there are few things not actually sinful (for I do not call this such, but inexpedient) so likely to impair spirituality of the mind in the religious exercises of the day.

Again and again, we read, during his undergraduateship, did his father's letter reiterate this caution as to the Sunday breakfast-party.

In the Michaelmas term of 1823 he began his Oxford life as a Commoner of Oriel. The then Provost was Dr. Copleston, afterwards Bishop of Llandaff; its tutors were Mr. (afterwards Provost) Hawkins, Mr. Tyler, and Mr. Jelf, afterwards Canon of

Christ Church, and Principal of King's College, London; and among its Fellows were Mr. John Keble, Mr. J. H. Newman, Mr. E. B. Pusey, and Mr. H. Jenkyns. Among the commoners were Mr. Richard Hurrell Froude, and Mr. Robert Hurrell Froude. The account of his College life is meagre in the extreme.[1] He took a first class in Mathematics, and a second in Classics, in the Michaelmas term of 1826. In the same autumn he was a candidate for a Balliol Fellowship. Moberly (now Bishop of Salisbury) and F. Newman were elected; and before another vacancy occurred his plans were changed. His attachment to his future wife had been formed at an unusually early age, and though there was no positive engagement, there was no secret about the attachment, nor was it ever interrupted. Part of 1827 was spent in a foreign tour. "On June 11th, 1828, St. Barnabas' day—Barnabas the son of consolation as he often used to say with satisfaction, S. Wilberforce and Emily Sargent were married in Lavington Church, Mr. C. Simeon, his father-in-law's old friend, officiating on the occasion." On Sunday, December 21st, after he had been examined by Dr. Burton, he was ordained Deacon in Christ Church, Oxford, by Bishop Lloyd, and in about a month he entered upon his duties as Curate in sole charge of Checkendon, a quiet village near Henley-on-Thames. The parish and church were small, the rectory was a sufficient house. It had been expected that Mr. J. B. Sumner, Vicar of Mapledurham, would have been a neighbour; but he was promoted to the Bishopric of Chester. After sixteen cheerful, happy months at Checkendon, Bishop Sumner, of Winchester, offered him the pleasant Rectory of Brighstone in the Isle of Wight, to which he was inducted in June, 1830, while yet under five-and-twenty.

During the whole of the Brighstone period, 1830—1840, he "kept a remarkably minute and accurate diary of each day's work and movements," and further he was an active correspondent, his letters being "unreserved and open-hearted." From the year 1830, therefore, the Memoirs become fuller and increase in interest. To the many points which come before us during those years, however, we cannot now even refer. To complete our sketch we may simply state that he received the offer of the Arch-

[1] There is no doubt that, owing to the influences of Oriel, his views became High Church before his ordination. The air of Oxford was sacerdotal. Still he did not take in all the Tractarian opinions. In particular he protested against several of Pusey's views. Nor would he ever give countenance to that new-fangled, utterly un-Anglican, most mischievous theory about the Eucharist which has led so many to Rome. Many of the extreme opinions, we may add, which appeared in the *Church Quarterly Review*, edited by Canon Ashwell, are either virtually or openly condemned in the writings of Bishop Wilberforce.

deaconry of Surrey in the year 1839, made a "striking public appearance" at Exeter Hall, at a great anti-slavery meeting, in the year 1840, Prince Albert in the chair (he was nominated one of the Prince's Chaplains six months later), and received his Canonry as Archdeacon about the same time. In September he delivered his primary charge, as Archdeacon of Surrey, and in October he accepted his Bishop's offer of the important Rectory of Alverstoke, thus severing a connection with the Isle of Wight which had lasted for ten years and three months—"a period to which he always looked back as one of the most unclouded happiness."

He had been appointed to deliver the Bampton Lectures in 1841, and while occupied in reading during his residence at Winchester, the blow fell which he had in some measure anticipated, and which coloured his whole after-life to a degree which only those who knew him intimately were aware of—the death of his wife. Their fourth son, Basil Orme, was born on February 8th; on the morning of the 10th she passed away.

The extracts from his diary at this time form, in our judgment, the most striking, as unquestionably they form the most touching, portion of the volume before us. Of his happy married life—homely details, and ways of living—of Mrs. Wilberforce's character and influence, we are told absolutely nothing. But as to his great affliction his diary is full and eloquent. We quote some verses which were written nearly eight years after his loss:—

A VISION.

Lavington, Feb. 10th, 1849.

I sat within my glad home, and round about me played
Four children in their merriment, and happy noises made;
Beside me sat their mother in her loveliness and light—
I ne'er saw any like her, save in some vision bright.

It was in life's young morning that our hearts together grew
Beneath its sparkling sunlight, and in its steeping dew;
And the sorrows and the joys of a twelve years' changeful life
Had drawn more closely to me, my own, my blessed wife.

Then at our door One knocked, and we rose to let him in,
For the night was wild and stormy and to turn him thence were sin.
With a "Peace be to this household" His shelterers He blest,
And sat Him down amongst us like some expected guest.

The children's noise was hushed, the mother softly spoke,
And my inmost spirit thrilled with the thoughts which in me woke;
For it seemed like other days within my memory stored,
Like Mamre's evening plain, or Emmaus' evening board.

His form was veiléd from us, His mantle was not raised,
But we felt that eyes of tenderness and love upon us gazed:
His lips we saw not moving, but a deep and inward tone
Spake like thunder's distant voices unto each of us alone.

"Full often have ye called me and bid me to your home,
And I have listened to your words and at your prayer am come;
And now my voice is strange to you, and 'wherefore art thou here?'
Your throbbing hearts are asking with struggling hope and fear.

"It was My love which shielded your helpless infant days;
It was My care which guided you through all life's dangerous ways.
I joined your hearts together, I blessed your marriage vow,
Then trust and be not fearful though my ways seem bitter now."

We spoke no word of answer, nor said He any more,
But as one about to leave us He passéd to the door;
Then ere He crossed the threshold, He beckoned with His hand
That she who sat beside should come at His command.

Then rose that wife and mother, and went into the night,
She followed at His bidding, and was hidden from our sight;
And though my heart was breaking I strove my will to bow,
For I saw His hands were piercéd, and thorns had torn His brow.

In the year 1842 Archdeacon Wilberforce was summoned frequently to preach at Court. In March, 1845, he received the offer of the Deanery of Westminster, and in October the same year, he was offered the Bishopric of Oxford. On November 30th, he was consecrated at Lambeth, and on December 13th he was enthroned in Christ Church Cathedral. The volume closes with the end of the miserable Hampden controversy, in which he lost the favour of Prince Albert, December, 1848.

Art. VI.—SIMEON, THORNTON, AND NEWTON.

THE following letters were addressed to Mr. Simeon when commencing his ministry at Trinity Church. They will be read with special interest, when it is remembered what trials he had then to encounter, and what that ministry was afterwards, by the grace of God, in its eminent faithfulness, wisdom, and devotion, and ever-increasing influence for more than half a century.

Charles Simeon was ordained on Trinity Sunday, May 26, 1782, by the Bishop of Ely on his fellowship at King's College, and began his ministry in St. Edward's Church ("in good old Latimer's pulpit"), serving that parish for Mr. Atkinson during the long vacation.

I have reason to hope (Mr. Simeon writes in 1813) that some good was done then. In the space of a month or six weeks, the church became quite crowded; the Lord's table was attended by three times the usual number of communicants, and a considerable stir was made among the dry bones. I visited at the parish from house to house without making any difference between Churchmen and Dissenters;

and I remember disputing (in a friendly way) with the Dissenting minister about the doctrine of election, not being able to separate it from that of reprobation; but I was not violent against it, being convinced, as much as I was of my own existence, that, whatever others might do, I myself should no more have loved God if He had not first loved me, or turned to God if He had not, by His free and sovereign grace, turned me, than a cannon-ball would of itself return to the orifice from whence it had been shot out. But I soon learned that I must take the Scriptures with the simplicity of a little child, and be content to receive on God's testimony what He has revealed, whether I can unravel all the difficulties that may attend it or not; and from that day to this, I have never had a doubt respecting the truth of that doctrine, nor a wish (as far as I know) to be wise above what is written. I feel that I cannot even explain how it is that I move my finger, and therefore I am content to be ignorant of innumerable things which exceed, not only my wisdom, but the wisdom of the most learned men in the universe. For this disposition of mind, I have unbounded reason to be thankful to God; for I have not only avoided many perplexities by means of it, but actually learned much, which I should otherwise never have learned. I was not then aware that this simple exercise of faith is the only way of attaining Divine knowledge, but I now see it is so.

In October my poor brother Richard died; and as there was then no one living with my aged father, it was thought desirable that I should leave College and go and live with him. To this I acceded: everything was settled; my books, &c., were just going to be packed up; and in a fortnight I was to leave College for good.

But, behold, in that juncture, an event took place that decided the plans of my whole life. I had often, when passing Trinity Church, which stands in the heart of Cambridge, and is one of the largest churches in the town, said within myself, "How should I rejoice if God were to give me that church, that I might preach His Gospel there, and be a herald for Him in the midst of the University!" But as to the actual possession of it, I had no more prospect of attaining it, than of being exalted to the See of Canterbury. It so happened, however, that the incumbent of it (Mr. Therond) died just at this time, and that the only bishop, with whom my father had the smallest acquaintance, had recently been translated to the See of Ely. I therefore sent off instantly to my father, to desire him to make application to the bishop for the living on my behalf. This my father immediately did; and I waited in college to see the event of his application. The parishioners of Trinity were earnest to procure the living for Mr. Hammond, who had served the parish as curate for some time, and they immediately chose him lecturer, concluding that the living without the lectureship would not be worth anyone's acceptance, it being, even with the surplice fees, not worth more than forty guineas per annum. They all signed a petition to the bishop in behalf of Mr. H., informing him at the same time that they had appointed him to the lectureship. . . . . This brought me a letter from the bishop saying,

that if I chose to have the living, it was at my service; but that if I declined it, Mr. H. should not have it on any account. The bishop's words were: "The parishioners have petitioned for Mr. Hammond, and, unless gratified, insinuate their intentions of bestowing their lectureship on a different person than my curate. I do not like that mode of application, and if you do not accept it, shall certainly not license Mr. H. to it. I shall await your answer.—Nov. 9th, 1782."

How little did the parishioners think what that letter of theirs would effect! It was that which irritated the bishop, and caused him to send me such a letter as relieved me at once from all embarrassment, and fixed me in a church which I have now held for about thirty years, and which I hope to retain to my dying hour. Truly, "the judgments of God are unsearchable, and his ways past finding out."

It was at this conjuncture that the following letters were written. Mr. Simeon preached for the first time in Trinity Church, on Sunday, November 10, 1782; and three days afterwards, his affectionate friend, John Thornton, Esq., then in his sixty-third year, sent him this word of wise counsel on his entrance upon a ministry of such difficulty and responsibility. This letter, it will be observed, was written on November 13, and it is not unworthy of notice, that on November 13, fifty-four years after, Mr. Simeon entered into his blessed rest!

Clapham, 13th November, 1782.

"DEAR SIR,—I was glad to hear the books came so timely, and that the Bishop of Ely had sent you the presentation to Trinity Church; may a gracious God guide, direct, and bless all your ministrations to the Redeemer's glory, and make you a blessing to many.

Permit me to use an uncommon freedom, and I hope you will forgive me, should you not be able to join issue in sentiment with me. What I would recommend is to set off with only the usual service that has been performed, as by that means I apprehend you will gain upon the people gradually, and you can at any time increase your duty as you see occasion, and I should, on the same principle, advise against exhorting from house to house as heretofore you did.

I assure you, a subtle adversary as often obtains his end by driving too fast as too slow, and perhaps, with religious people, oftener.

Remember it is God works, and not you; and, therefore, if you run before the pillar and the cloud, you will assuredly be bewildered.

The Lord ever was, and ever will be, with the small still voice, and therefore beware of noisy professors; they are far more to be dreaded than the worldly-minded.

Watch continually over your own spirit, and do all in love; we must grow downwards in humility to soar heavenward.

I should recommend your having a watchful eye over yourself, for, generally speaking, as is the minister, so are the people. If the minister is enlightened, lively, and vigorous, his word will come with power upon many, and make them so. If he is formal, the infection will spread among his hearers; if he is lifeless, spiritual death will be

visible through the greatest part of the congregation; therefore, if you watch over your own soul, yon may depend upon it your people will keep pace with you generally, or, at least, that is the way to the blessing.

It is a sad, though too common a mistake, to be more regardful of others than ourselves, and we must begin at home; many regard watchfully the outward work, and disregard that within.

Your sermons should be written, well digested, and becoming a scholar, not over-long, but pithy, that those who seek occasion may find none, except in the matter of your God.

May the God of all grace grant unto us, and all that are dear to us, the repentance of Peter, the faith of Paul, and the love of John, and be with you at all times. and in all places, and with,

Dear Sir,

Your affectionate friend and hearty well-wisher,

JOHN THORNTON.

The Rev. Mr. Simeon.

Ten days afterwards the Rev. John Newton, then in his fifty-eighth year, who had for some time taken a very deep interest in Mr. Simeon, wrote to him as follows, with all the affectionate concern of an elder brother for the profiting of a younger one in the ministry:—

Nov. 23rd, 1782.

MY DEAR SIR,—It gave me great pleasure to hear that the Lord had relieved you from the difficulties you were under respecting Reading, by appointing you to a Church in Cambridge. I doubt not but you accept it as His appointment, and consider the immediate donor as the instrument of His will. This is the most comfortable and scriptural way of viewing things—to see them all, and all equally (even to the falling of a sparrow or of a leaf), under the direction of Him with whom we have to do, and to whom we have entrusted our concerns. This event, compared with what you told me of your situation, has appeared to me very seasonable and providential. I hope it will be productive of great good to many, and of much comfort to yourself. The Lord sees fit to fix you in a noble stand, indeed! Were I a collegian, I think I should prefer a Church in one of our Universities (and perhaps Cambridge especially) to any station in the kingdom. And yet I over-rate myself in thinking I would dare to make such a choice were it in my power, for though it would be a post of honour, and affording a great prospect of usefulness, it would be attended with peculiar difficulties, and would require very peculiar gifts and talents.

In the present instance you have not chosen for yourself, but the Lord has chosen for you, and called you to this important service; on Him, therefore, you may confidently rely for every requisite supply and support; for all that patience, fortitude, and meekness of wisdom which you will need, especially in a place where so many eyes will be upon you to scrutinize every part of your conduct; so many tongues ready to circulate every report to your prejudice, and so many ears open to receive them.

Though I have had but little personal intercourse with you, it has been sufficient to interest me in your concerns, and as you thought proper to ask my advice when you were in town, this mark of your confidence encourages me to write with freedom, as though we were old acquaintances; and if I commit to paper without reserve such thoughts as occur to me while the pen is in my hand, I shall make no other apology than my sincere regard and the cordiality of my intentions.

I had heard the outlines of your story before I saw you. The Lord has done great things for you, you have felt your obligations to Him, and His love constrains you to devote yourself to His service. He has already encouraged and owned you in your setting out, and I trust He is now opening you a scene of permanent and extensive usefulness. But you may take it for granted, dear Sir, that our Grand Adversary is aware of all this, and you may expect that he will not be an indifferent spectator, but will do everything that he is permitted to disturb and hinder you. You are engaged in the best cause; you will fight under the banner and the eye of the Captain of Salvation. You have, therefore, no just reason to be afraid of the enemy, yet it will behove you to beware of his devices. In these he is so fertile and various, that no full enumeration of them can be made, nor, indeed, can the best description of them be well understood, but in proportion, as in a course of time they are realized to us, and brought home to our experience. He is a very Proteus, continually changing his ground, his approaches, his appearance, and the manner of his assaults, so as to adapt himself with the most advantage to every change in our circumstances. Hence the Word of God describes him by very different images—a subtle serpent, a roaring lion, and as sometimes assuming the semblance of an angel of light. Your sense of the Lord's great goodness, and the strong impression you have received of the power and reality of unseen things, have inspired you with a commendable zeal. Shall I advise you to repress your zeal? Far from it. It would better become me to wish to catch fire from you, than to attempt to chill you by the cold maxims which often pass for prudence. Yet there is such a thing as true Christian prudence; and perhaps at this time Satan himself may not attempt to damp your zeal. It may answer his ends, if he can take occasion by the warmth of your desire to do good, to push you to extremes, to make you grasp at too much, and to make you throw unnecessary difficulties in your own way, and thereby preclude your usefulness. If the heart be right with God, and dependent upon His teaching, the best means for avoiding this over-doing (not that we can really do too much in the right way) is a close attention to the *whole* Scripture. Detached texts or sentences may seem to countenance what by no means will accord with the general tenor of the *whole*. Particularly the spirit and conduct of our Lord in the days of His humiliation, furnish the best model. If I had thought that all His ministers were bound and called by His example to preach on mountains or the sea-shore, I ought not to have accepted a parochial cure; but His manner, His gentleness, His patient attention to the

weakness and prejudices of those around Him (according to Isaiah xlii. 2, 3), we cannot imitate too closely.

Perhaps there are few generals who, if they were to fight a battle a second time, could not mark some mistake to avoid, which had been made in the first. Thus in our cooler moments, at least in time, we begin to be sensible that there has been some precipitancy in the honest emotions of zeal, some mixtures of our own spirit when our main end has been the Lord's service, and some of our designs better intended than conducted. When we make this discovery we are of course wiser than we were before. But it is an acquisition often attended with danger. I have known more ministers than one greatly hurt when they have been able to smile upon the well-meant indiscretions they committed when their hearts were warm and their experience but small. The enemy is ready at such a time to draw them insensibly towards the opposite extreme. He hides from them the *golden mean*, and prevails on them to think the reverse of *wrong* must be right. By degrees zeal, instead of being regulated, is extinguished. Remissness takes place and gains ground, till at length the love of the world and the fear of man prevail. Thus I have seen some frozen into mere lifeless images of their former selves, and some have not even retained a resemblance of what they once were. So many instances of this kind I have met, that I have almost by habit a fear and jealousy over those who are remarkably warm and active at their setting out. But when the heart is deeply impressed with a sense of its own wretchedness, when the law and the Gospel have combined under the influence of the Holy Spirit, to give a just and deep impression of the character of God, as a just God and a Saviour, when the Lord is pleased to give and maintain true humility, such a person will, I know, triumph over all the arts of Satan, and go on from strength to strength. These are my hopes for you. I trust and pray that He will guide you with His eye, and make you a happy instrument of winning many souls.

I have nearly filled my paper, and have left little room for an apology, if necessary. But I hope you will not expect one. I love you and wish you well, and shall be glad to hear from you whenever you are at leisure.

Believe me to be, dear Sir,

Your affectionate Friend and Servant,

JOHN NEWTON.

Hoxton, London, Nov. 23, 1782.

These wise and seasonable counsels from his affectionate and watchful friends were not lost upon Mr. Simeon. They guided and cheered him at a time of peculiar trial; and encouraged him to pursue his ministry in patience and faith amidst the severe opposition he had to encounter from his new parishioners. He thus describes these trials:—

The disappointment which the parish felt proved very unfavourable to my ministry. The people almost universally put locks on their pews, and would neither come to church themselves nor suffer others

to do so; and multitudes from time to time were forced to go out of the church for want of the necessary accommodation. I put in there a number of forms, and erected in vacant places, at my own expense, some open seats; but the churchwardens pulled them down, and cast them out of the church. To visit the parishioners in their own houses was impracticable; for they were so embittered against me, that there was scarcely one that would admit me into his house. In this state of things I saw no remedy but faith and patience. The passage of Scripture which subdued and controlled my mind was, "The servant of the Lord must not strive."

The late revered Bishop McIlvaine, of Ohio, when writing to me respecting some trials he had to endure in his diocese, and alluding to the way in which Mr. Simeon, in his early ministry, was enabled to meet his peculiar difficulties, said, that considering Simeon's naturally ardent temperament and his intense zeal in the Lord's service, he thought that the grace of God was never more conspicuous in him than in the patience and faith he exhibited when suffering so severely from the bitter opposition of his parishioners.

These letters, so full of valuable counsel from those eminent servants of Christ, John Thornton and John Newton, are now for the first time given to the public, with the earnest hope and prayer that, under the Divine blessing, they may still be profitable to young ministers when entering on new and perhaps difficult spheres of duty.

WILLIAM CARUS.

ART. VII.—THE CHURCH OF SCOTLAND.

1. *Plain Words and Simple Facts about the Church of Scotland and her Assailants.* By DEFENSOR. Edinburgh: William Blackwood & Sons. 1879.
2. *Disestablishment.* By the DUKE of ARGYLL. Reprinted from the "Contemporary Review." London: Strahan & Co. 1878.
3. *Position and Prospects of the Church of Scotland: Address delivered at the close of the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland,* June 3rd, 1878. By the Moderator, J. TULLOCH, D.D., Principal of St. Mary's College, St. Andrews. W. Blackwood & Sons. 1879.
4. *Reports on the Schemes of the Church of Scotland, and of the Committee of Christian Life and Work, to the General Assembly.* Edinburgh: W. Blackwood & Sons.

THE 18th day of May, 1843, witnessed an event unique in Church history, an event which was of more than merely provincial interest and importance. On that day four

hundred and fifty ministers of the Established Church of Scotland resigned their livings, left their comfortable manses, and cast themselves upon the voluntary support of such of their flocks as were willing to join them.

Before that catastrophe the Church of Scotland was much the most powerful establishment, in its own sphere, in the realm. With such Evangelical leaders as Andrew Thompson, Chalmers, Gordon, Welsh, Buchannan, and others, by whose influence many important parishes were supplied with able and popular ministers, it was rapidly recovering the position which it had lost during the eighteenth century.

The Evangelical party, thus led, was united and enthusiastic, and had at length obtained the majority in the General Assembly. Its one difficulty was the strong popular prejudice against patronage. That prejudice was not unreasonable.

The Duke of Argyll has shown, in his interesting article on the subject in the *Contemporary*, how alien to the spirit of the Presbyterian Church was the patronage forced upon it by the Act of Queen Anne. Both by Government and by private patrons the rights, thus obtained, had been shamefully abused, causing more than one schism during the last century. Great improvement had doubtless taken place in the exercise of these rights, but every now and then some fresh scandal created an outcry.

When it is remembered how completely in a Church, where there is no Liturgy, the people are at the mercy of the minister, not only for preaching but also for worship, and further, that a large number of the livings were in the gift of Episcopalians, who never worshipped with the people, it is no wonder that the congregations felt very impatient of, what they called, the intrusion of ministers upon them without their assent.

Dr. Chalmers and his colleagues were, for the most part, men of strong conservative instincts. They wished to retain patronage, but so to restrain it as to guard it from abuse.

This was the object of the famous "*Veto* Act." By it the General Assembly conferred upon the congregations the right, by a majority of communicants who were males and heads of families, to reject an unacceptable presentee. The power of the Assembly to pass such an Act was soon challenged in the courts of law. A long struggle between the Civil and Ecclesiastical Courts was the result. Other important issues were incidentally raised, and at length, when the courts of law had decided on every point against the Assembly, the minority with great dignity and self-sacrifice seceded from the Church.

Lord Melbourne was in power during the earlier stages of the conflict, and Sir Robert Peel at its conclusion. Had either of

these men taken a statesmanlike view of the situation, the disruption might have been averted.

It is important to note the principles upon which the newly-formed Free Church took its stand. They are well set forth by Dr. Chalmers in his eloquent introductory address, at the opening of the first Free Church Assembly:—

> The Voluntaries (he said) mistake us if they conceive us to be Voluntaries. We hold by the duty of Government to give of their resources and their means for the maintenance of a Gospel ministry in the land. . . . We hold that every part and every function of a commonwealth should be leavened with Christianity, and that every functionary, from the highest to the lowest, should, in their respective spheres, do all that in them lies to countenance and uphold it. That is to say, though we quit the Establishment, *we go out on Establishment principles;* we quit a vitiated Establishment, but would rejoice in returning to a pure one. To express it otherwise, we are the advocates for a national support of religion, and we are not Voluntaries.

These were his sentiments to the end of his life. Only three months before his death, he said to the writer of this article, "We are Voluntaries only by compulsion;" and he added, with great emphasis, "The longer I live, the more firmly persuaded I am that the voluntary principle is utterly unfit to furnish a Christian people with the means of Christian instruction."

The marvellous energy displayed by the newly-formed Free Church proved how deeply the hearts of the people were stirred. It claimed to be the Church of Scotland. It sought not merely to build a church and a manse, but also a school and a schoolmaster's house, in every parish, and to a great extent it succeeded. It sought to supplant the time-honoured Divinity Halls of the four Universities, and the Professors in its new Colleges were speedily surrounded by the very pick of the youth of Scotland who desired to give themselves to the sacred ministry.

And yet, whilst there was much to wonder at, and much to admire, there was also much to regret in the conduct of the seceding party. They indulged in the most bitter and unscrupulous attacks upon those who remained, especially such as held distinctively Evangelical views.

They constantly represented such men as actuated by the most sordid motives, so that, at that period of fanatical excitement and virulent aspersion, it required more courage for an Evangelical man to remain in the Establishment than to secede. Some, however, did remain; and the reason given by Dr. Norman M'Leod probably expresses what they felt: "The reason," he said, "why I can conscientiously remain in the Church, is simply because I believe I have spiritual liberty to obey everything in God's word. I know no verse in it which I cannot obey as well as any seceder can. This suffices me."

We presume it would be held sufficient by any clergyman of the Church of England; and much as we regret the painful misunderstandings between the Civil and Ecclesiastical Courts, and the very superficial view of the crisis which was taken by the leading statesmen of the day, we cannot but wish that the good men who left the Church had remained, and waited patiently until their principles should prevail.

The immediate result of the schism upon the Established Church was disastrous in the extreme. Nearly half of its parishes were vacant, and had at once to be supplied. Most of the foreign missionaries, amongst whom we must include the honoured names of Wilson and Duff, went with the seceders, and all its machinery for promoting the cause of the Gospel was thrown completely out of gear. For a time, a spirit of rancorous animosity was kept alive against it, by the able articles of the Free Church newspapers, and by the excited harangues which were too frequently heard from Free Church pulpits. Scotland was then a most disagreeable place of residence. The best friends were separated, and the peace of thousands of families was sorely disturbed. But it is against the nature of things that such excitement should become chronic. Slowly and surely the Establishment recovered its lost ground, whilst the Free Church began to gravitate towards Voluntaryism, and at last so completely did it depart from its *only raison d'être* that it seriously entertained a proposal to amalgamate with the United Presbyterian Church, a body which repudiates and condemns all connection between Church and State. The union, indeed, would have been effected but for the persistent opposition of a minority, who still hold by their original principles, and who threatened the majority with legal proceedings if they persevered. This phase of the controversy was very curious, for it showed that the Free Church could not escape from the control of the civil courts by quitting the Establishment. It possesses a considerable amount of property, which has been bestowed upon it, or bequeathed to it, upon the faith of its remaining true to its original principles; and if it departs from them, the civil court can and will interfere.

For a considerable time after the disruption, the Free Church scrupulously avoided joining in any crusade against the Establishment. Dr. Chalmers, in the speech from which we have already quoted, represents them as having inscribed on their flag, "We are no Voluntaries." They could not therefore consort with Liberationists and others who sought the destruction of the Establishment.

That flag, however, it has at length discarded. "We quit," said Dr. Chalmers, "a vitiated Establishment, but would rejoice in returning to a pure one." It might have been expected, there-

fore, that any action on the part of the Church they had left, in the direction of what they would consider a purer state of things, would have been hailed by them as an omen for good; and that, even if they could not yet see their way to return, any such action would lead them more patiently to wait. The abolition of patronage by the present Government, at the earnest representation of the General Assembly, would assuredly have been considered by Dr. Chalmers and his colleagues as a movement in the right direction, preparing the way for that "pure Establishment" to which they were willing to return.

This politic step has, indeed, met with the warm approval of that minority in the Free Church which still holds by its distinctive principles; but it has excited the majority to vigorous action, for the disestablishment and disendowment of the National Church. A grievance of old standing, the fruitful source of much schism, has been abolished; the Church has been rendered much more popular with the masses; hence the unworthy cry—"Down with it, down with it even to the ground!"

We believe that, even if tried by the Scottish nation, the Established Church might expect with confidence a favourable verdict. The action of the Free Church General Assembly has met with a very lukewarm response amongst the laity. The meetings which have occasionally been held in favour of disestablishment, have not been very encouraging to their promoters. But the Church of Scotland has a right to appeal to the whole nation, for she is protected in all her privileges by the Act of Union, and the question of her disestablishment is not a merely provincial question—it is of imperial importance. If the State may justly confiscate Church property on one side of the border, it may do so with equal justice on the other. The Church of England stands exactly on the same footing as the Church of Scotland, and if the latter is overthrown, then the days of the former, as an Establishment, assuredly are numbered. It becomes therefore a question of deep interest to English Churchmen, how the Church of Scotland is fulfilling her mission. There is a notion abroad, which Liberationist orators are constantly fostering, that, like the Church of Ireland, she is the Church of a mere fraction of the population. We invite our readers' attention to the following facts, which have never been disproved.

We would, first, remind them that the great bulk of the Scottish people belong either to the Established, the Free, or the United Presbyterian Churches. Episcopalians are not three per cent. of the population, and, with the exception of Roman Catholics, who are numerous in some centres of industry where there are many Irish, the other denominations are very small. The number of parishes in Scotland is 1247, and the total number of congregations, in connection with the Established

Church, is 1533. In connection with the Free Church there are 1031 congregations, and with the United Presbyterians 519. The total number of the two last is therefore 1550, leaving the National Church in a minority of only 17, as against them both. It must, however, be borne in mind that, as in England, many of the parish churches are much larger than ordinary Dissenting chapels, and therefore the number of churches does not fairly represent the amount of accommodation for the worshippers.

Presbyterian churches are generally very particular in keeping, with much exactness, the rolls of the communicants, and therefore we may gather from their own published statistics a fair estimate of their comparative strength.

In 1878, the Church of Scotland had 515,786 communicants. In May, 1877, the Free Church had 222,411, and the United Presbyterian Church 172,170. Thus a majority of 121,205 members appears on the side of the Established Church as against both the others. But both the dissenting churches confess to a decrease in membership. In the report of the Secretary of the Free Church Sustentation Fund, in December, 1875, there are these words:—"It may be assumed that our membership should have shown an increase over 1867 of 22,100. But it is shown above, on the basis of Presbyterian returns, that the increase was only 7062. There is, therefore, a deficit of 15,000, or 7½ per cent." Whilst in the United Presbyterian Church the report presented in 1877 to their Synod, after going fully into the figures supplied by their Presbyteries, concludes with the confession: "On the whole, the United Presbyterian Church may have maintained, but has not improved or strengthened, its position in relation to the total population of the country."

The returns of the Registrar-General of marriages in Scotland for 1873 are before us, and they throw important light on the question as to the comparative strength of the various denominations. It must, however, be borne in mind that since then the Church has made much progress.

The proportion of marriages performed by the various denominations in that year were—By the Established Church, 45·56 per cent.; Free Church, 21·71; United Presbyterian, 13·44; Roman Catholic, 9·16; Scotch Episcopal, 2·42; other denominations, 6·93; denominations not stated, 0·04; irregular marriages, 0·74. It is to be observed that in country districts the proportion of the Church of Scotland was 51·39 per cent.

The supporters of the National Church maintain that, from carefully compiled statistics of the whole population, it probably amounted in 1878 to 3,595,929 souls, of which the Church of Scotland numbered 1,750,000, the Free Church 805,000, the United Presbyterian Church 595,000, and all other sects 443,000.

If it is objected that these last figures must to a certain extent be mere guesswork, we can only reply that, until we can get a fair religious census, we are driven to estimates which, for want of proper *data*, must to some extent be uncertain. Both in England and Scotland the Established Churches would willingly have consented to submit to such inquiries in 1871, as would have furnished valuable information as to the relative strength of the various denominations. It was the loud outcry against such a census, raised by Liberationists, which induced Mr. Gladstone's Government to give way on that important point. Liberationists have no right to represent either of the Established Churches as supported by a minority of the population, as long as they persistently refuse to submit to the test of a religious census by the Government of the country. We consider that, as far as can be ascertained by such *data* as we possess, the Church of Scotland may justly claim to be the Church of the majority of the Scottish people; and, if Liberationists are still disposed to dispute this assertion, we would remind them that 1881 is not far distant, and that both the Established Churches earnestly desire a fair religious census. Why are Dissenters afraid to face such an ordeal?

But more is required of a National Church than that she can show her numerical strength to be satisfactory. Is the Church of Scotland true to the grand traditions of her past history?

At the beginning of this century, and for long after, Scotland was the only educated nation in the world. Each parish had its school; the stipend of the schoolmaster, like that of the parish minister, being provided out of the old ecclesiastical endowments of the country, and paid by the landlords.

This was the glory of the Church of Scotland. She could not show magnificent cathedrals, nor richly endowed colleges, but she could show, throughout the length and breadth of the land, a well-educated peasantry. The parish schoolmaster was expected to teach, not merely the three R's and the Bible and Catechism, but also the rudiments of Latin and Greek; and thus, from these country schools, youths of promise constantly found their way up to one or another of the four Universities, enabling the Universities to exercise a far more extensive influence than in England.

The population has increased far beyond the provision, which the old endowments had made, for its spiritual and educational wants. The Free Church disruption had certainly this result, that it greatly multiplied the places of worship in the land, but still in the large centres of population there has been an ever-increasing field for home mission work. Has the Established Church proved equal to her responsibilities in overtaking such work? And has she also been alive to her duty in the still

wider domain of Foreign Missions? If it can be shown that she has not been remiss in either of these particulars, a strong additional claim will be given her upon the sympathy and support of all true-hearted English Churchmen.

It is unnecessary that much should be said as regards her efforts in the cause of the primary education of the poor. The Scotch Education Act has deprived her of all control over the parish schools. Every parish has now its school-board, and, where there was any deficiency, schools have been built and are supported by rates. It is well, however, to note that before the passing of the Act, in the year 1868, the voluntary contributions of the Established Church for the education of the poor amounted to 23,444*l.* The Free Church in the same year contributed 10,069*l.*, whilst the United Presbyterian Church supported only fourteen schools in all Scotland.

Still more interesting are the statistics of Sunday-schools in Scotland. The contrast between the statistics of 1851 and 1877 are very suggestive. In the Official Report of Education in Great Britain in 1851, by Mr. Horace Mann, the number of Sunday-school scholars belonging to the three denominations, is thus given :—

Established Church.....	76,233
Free Church.....	91,328
United Presbyterian Church.....	54,324

If we compare this with the Reports on Sunday-schools given respectively to these denominations in 1877, we shall perceive a very remarkable increase in the schools of the Established Church. In that year the number of her Sunday-school scholars was 170,297, whilst in the Free Church the number was 139,926, and in the United Presbyterian Church it was 79,109. The comparative increase since 1851 was, for the Established Church 94,064, for the Free Church 48,598, and for the United Presbyterian Church 24,785. It thus appears that the increase in the Sunday-schools of the Established Church, during twenty-six years, exceeded, by 20,681, the increase of both the other denominations put together.

Her Home Mission scheme presents still more important results. That scheme originated before the disruption, and was then chiefly associated with the name of Dr. Chalmers. He threw himself into it with all the generous energy of his soul. His stirring appeals awakened a great interest in the cause of Church extension; and when the crash came, and he and so many others, who had promoted this important work, left the Church, it seemed to many that the best course would be to abandon that scheme for a time altogether. Wiser counsels, however, prevailed.

The Church of Scotland found a man equal to the occasion in the late Rev. Dr. Robertson. He not only advised the continuance of the Home Mission scheme, but two years after the disruption he originated a scheme for the endowment of the new parishes, and the following figures will show with what results:—

Before the disruption, in 1842, the income of the Home Mission scheme was 5029*l.*; the year following the disruption; it was only 2289*l.* A great effort was made, which raised it in 1844 to 4590*l.*, but it fell again in 1845 to 2782*l.* After that year the crisis of the storm had passed, the ship had righted herself, and began at last to make headway through the troubled waters. In 1873 the income of the Home Mission scheme had reached 9509*l.*, in 1875 11,857*l.*; and so it has steadily increased until 1878, that year of great commercial depression, when its income reached nearly 16,000*l.* Dr. Robertson at first proposed to endow 100 churches which had been built by the Home Mission scheme before the disruption. He and his successors have been enabled to accomplish far more than their most sanguine expectations could anticipate. They have endowed no fewer than 283 new parishes at a cost of 1,031,500*l.*, subscribed by the members and friends of the Church.

We do not wish to weary our readers with figures. We think it sufficient to add the following remarkable statistics showing the amounts contributed for various purposes by members of the Church of Scotland, from the years 1872 to 1877. The number of churches from which these returns have been made is 1286.

The total sums contributed during these six years are as follows: for congregational and charitable purposes, 567,529*l.*; to supplement the stipends of the poorer clergy, &c., 333,124*l.*; for education, 91,124*l.*; for Home Mission work, 148,689*l.*; for Church building and extension, 338,117*l.*; for endowment of new parishes, 287,732*l.*; for Foreign Missions, 165,461*l.*; making a grand total of about 1,931,779*l.*

This does not include the munificent donation by the late Mr. Baird of 500,000*l.*

Another interesting proof of the healthy condition of the Church of Scotland may be gathered from the custom, which of late years has been adopted by the General Assembly, of appointing annually a "Committee on Christian Life and Work." This Committee issues every year a series of questions to every parish minister on a great variety of subjects, social and religious, for the purpose of having a comprehensive view of the social and spiritual condition of their flocks. The following are a few of the questions, taken from the Report of 1872. They

are arranged under the following heads: I. Public worship. II. Interest in religion. III. Baptism. IV. Family life. V. Sabbath observance. VI. Ecclesiastical divisions. VII. Change of residence. VIII. Lay agency. The searching character of these inquiries may be seen from the following from II., III., and IV.:—

> What in your opinion is the state of vital godliness among those who usually attend church? Have the ministrations of the Gospel in your experience been recently followed by any perceptible result? Is it your experience that those who do not attend church are now, as a class, more or less accessible to missionary visits than they formerly were? and to what do you attribute the change, if there be any?
>
> III. Baptism.—Are there any unbaptized adults in your parish; and if so, how many? Is it your opinion that parents who are not themselves communicants obtain baptism for their children; and if so, how and through whom?
>
> IV. Family worship.—Is family worship usual, and are servants generally collected for it? Is the Assembly's manual for family devotion, or any other book of prayers, commonly used? What is your opinion of the state of domestic servants and farm labourers, as regards education and religion, and how do they stand affected towards their employers?

Verily, if Episcopacy means *oversight*, there is no lack of Episcopacy in the Presbyterian Church of Scotland! It would startle an English diocese, were the Bishop to issue a long series of such questions as these.

The reports of this Committee show that from many ministers these questions have received carefully considered answers, proving how thoroughly they are interested in the spiritual and social condition of their parishes. And this is the poor, decrepid, moribund Church which Liberationists and Free Churchmen desire to see laid low!

We believe, that had Chalmers, and some of his colleagues who have passed away, been permitted to see the remarkable changes which have taken place in the communion which they left, they would have generously acknowledged that God was blessing it, and they would have condemned the present action of the Free Church in regard to it.

In his evidence before a Committee of the House of Commons, in 1847, Dr. Chalmers most emphatically denied that the Free Church "can have anything like a hostile influence on the established institutions of the country;" and he added, "I confess to you that I should look with a sigh to the demolition of the framework, either of the Scotch or English Establishment." Before the same Committee he said, "I do not think the Free Church would consent to become the Establishment, *except on the condition of the abolition of patronage.*" Patronage is

abolished, but there is no Chalmers now at the helm of the Free Church!

The Church of England has no cause to be ashamed of the sister Establishment across the border. When the hour of its trial comes, and when Free Churchmen and United Presbyterians, combined with English Liberationists, demand its overthrow, we believe that English Churchmen will know how to act. They will have a few questions first to put, which are easier put than answered. They will want to know *the reason why*, if her destruction is decreed, and they will not accept as sufficient mere jealousy because of her increasing popularity. That, as yet, seems to be the only cause which animates her opponents to seek the confiscation of her ancient endowments, and her degradation from her time-honoured position. English Churchmen will further have a right to ask who is to be benefited by her disestablishment and disendowment? Her endowments amount only to 250,000*l.* a year, so it cannot be said that she is burdensome to the country. Her tithes are paid, not by the tenants, as in England, but by the landlords; and they are paid most cheerfully, even though many of these landlords are Episcopalians. The confiscation of her revenues, which were with such difficulty rescued by Knox, at the time of the Reformation, from the rapacity of the nobles, would be the robbing of the poor; for in Scotland, as well as in England, the National Church is the poor man's heritage, and who would be the gainers?

The Church of Scotland has shown the greatest forbearance during recent attacks. She has done what she could to heal the schisms which are the scandal of Presbyterianism. She is willing to induct into her benefices any Presbyterian minister from any other Church, who may be willing to join her and may be elected by any of her congregations. "In quietness and in confidence is her strength," and we have no fear but that she will continue to increase in influence and usefulness, and to retain her important position as one of our most useful national institutions, and one of the strongest bulwarks of Evangelical Protestantism.

WM. SCOTT-MONCRIEFF.

Art. VIII.—HEREFORD DURING THE CIVIL WAR.

Memorials of the Civil War between King Charles I. and the Parliament of England, as it affected Herefordshire and the adjacent Counties. By the late Rev. John Webb, M.A., Rector of Tretire, Herefordshire. Edited and compiled by the Rev. T. W. Webb, M.A., Vicar of Hardwick, Herefordshire. Two volumes. Longmans. 1879.

WE have been agreeably disappointed by a perusal of these volumes. It seemed to us almost impossible that a thrice-told tale like the Great Rebellion, illustrated by the pen of Clarendon, by the researches of Mr. W. Hamilton amid the State Papers, and by the industry and ability of Mr. Rawson Gardiner, the latest historian of this period, could be made to disclose any fresh matter. The authors of this work, however, by confining themselves to local traditions, and limiting the scene of action to one special district, have thrown much light upon one of the most exciting episodes of English history, and have furnished a most important contribution to the literature we already possess upon the subject. The idea was an excellent one. We have here no general history of the Civil War; but one special and distinct, showing us how the hostilities between Cavalier and Parliamentarian affected one particular district, and one class of local interests—how dwellings were rifled and ruined, fertile fields stained with blood, peaceful peasants put to the sword, and all the horrors of war let loose. It is a county history with this great difference, that instead of antiquarian details, pedigrees and accounts of family seats, we have battles, sieges, surrenders, and all the military details attending a forced occupation by the enemy.

It is evident that the sympathies of the authors are throughout on the Royalist side, yet such predilections never for one moment interfere with the soberness and impartiality of the true historian.

The volumes open with a sketch of Herefordshire during the early part of the seventeenth century, and with a brief review of the causes which led to the rupture between the King and the Parliament. These causes are not difficult to discover: arbitrary proceedings, a firm resolve to maintain the monarchial power independent of all Parliamentary control, forced loans, unjust taxes, the establishment of unconstitutional courts of law. The county of Hereford, in a lofty strain of Cavalier feeling, and in a bitter and caustic style, opposed the conduct of the Parliamentary party. At a meeting held by its principal gentry, it drew up a resolution which was printed and circulated throughout the shire. In this important document, which has escaped the attention of historians, past misgovernment was admitted, though it was

maintained that the Parliament, instead of curing, had increased the disease. It charged the opponents of the King with pursuing private ends, by means of secret combinations; it stated that the Houses were managed by men who punished freedom of speech with imprisonment; who rejected all petitions but such as favoured their own views, and who received informations and all sorts of rumours against the King and his friends. It set forth that Parliament in severing itself from the King had ceased to be a Parliament, that the Protestant religion and the Royal power had been attacked in the assaults made upon Church and State, that the King was perfectly justified in the course he had pursued, that law and liberty had been violated, and that the people of Herefordshire had no sympathy with the past proceedings, and declined to be terrified into paying heed to a Parliament whose debates were uncertain and whose ordinances were no laws.

This resolve was soon to be carried out. The Royal Standard had been raised at Nottingham, and Civil War was now to lay low the kingdom with its evil discord and fratricidal slaughter.

Before the departure of the King from York, there had arrived from the Continent two German princes, his nephews, sons of his sister Elizabeth, and of the deceased Prince Frederic of the Rhine. These princes were to occupy a conspicuous position in the contest that now ensued. Rupert, the elder of the two, was but three-and-twenty years of age, and his brother Maurice one year younger; the young men were advanced by Charles to high commands, though in most respects they were only fitted to obey. Maurice, though brave, was of a cautious and saturnine temperament, whilst Rupert was haughty and impatient of advice, and in battle all impetuosity and fire. The character of Rupert is strongly impressed upon the events of the war in Herefordshire. Flattered by the poet, the toast at military messes, and the object of the devotion of young eager Cavaliers, the Prince was at once the idol of his friends and the terror of his enemies. He was a splendid soldier, but a fatal general, for it cannot be questioned that he was the occasion of much more injury than benefit to the cause of his uncle; for, although his valour was beyond all common daring, and he achieved what few could have performed, yet his incorrigible defects, both in the council and the field, were often the cause of disasters which were irreparable. Into the details of the war, save so far as they affect Herefordshire, we cannot enter. In the South and West, with the exception of Cornwall, it was going hard with the Royal cause. At a council held by the Parliamentarians, it had been resolved, the better to cut off all communication between the Cavaliers of the South and the North, to occupy Hereford, and the Earl of Stamford was dispatched by Essex to lay siege to the ancient city. His task was not a very arduous one. Hereford was ill-fortified, it was badly supplied

with guns and ammunition, while its clergy, mindful of the havoc which the Parliamentarians created in the aisles of Worcester and Canterbury, trembled for the security of their Cathedral. After a feeble resistance Lord Stamford entered the city and established himself as its governor with control over the neighbouring districts. He imprisoned the Cavaliers, he wrecked the property of the Royalist clergy, and he essayed his utmost to carry out Napoleon's maxim, that war should be made to support war. Still his position was surrounded by danger. He and his soldiery were reduced to great straits, for it was no easy matter to feed a thousand men and more than a hundred horses. He petitioned his employers for money; they had repeatedly voted him thanks, but he could get no funds. The military chest was with Essex, and the Lord General was now out of reach; to that they should have looked; but for the last two months they had received nothing out of it; they had borrowed and exacted till they knew not in which direction to turn. Sir Robert Harley—who was almost the only member of the Herefordshire squirearchy on the side of the Parliament—had done what he could to assist them, and a loan had been raised in the city at the instigation of the mayor. The citizens, however, were not in general sufficiently pleased with the presence and behaviour of their newly imposed garrison to make sacrifices for their longer continuance, whilst the county regarded them as rebels, and held aloof. Without money, credit, and provisions, Stamford found himself powerless, and thus daily his situation became more critical. Whether he turned his eyes towards Worcester, or Shropshire, the counties of Radnor, Brecon or Monmouth, the Cavaliers prevailed. The only road open to him to retreat was to the eastward. In Gloucester he would find quarters to his heart's content, and be sure of welcome among an honest people, who, having declared for the Parliament, were left without means of defence. Accordingly he lost but little time in retiring from a city and county, the disposition of whose inhabitants, in a residence of more than ten weeks, he had ascertained to be generally hostile to him. The evacuation of Hereford was effected apparently without molestation. Arrived at Gloucester, the Parliamentarians were received with open arms, and hailed as brethren and defenders. The mayor greeted the commander at the Tolsey on entering the town and presented him with a silver-gilt bowl and cover, in testimony of the opinion entertained of his services. On the departure of the foe, the Herefordshire Royalists returned to their homes, with the satisfaction of knowing that throughout the county there was not a single enemy abroad to harm them; the peasants kindled their twelfth-eve fires without danger of exciting alarm; all was peace and quiet; no ordinance of Parliament was in force throughout Herefordshire.

This tranquillity was, however, not long to continue. The Civil War had been carried on with alternate results, victory now favouring the Cavaliers and then the Roundheads. Halls and castles had been taken and then abandoned; battles had been fought and their decision reversed in subsequent actions; negotiations had been entered into for a peace, but had fallen through. Whilst such was the state of affairs Sir William Waller, one of the ablest as well as one of the most humane of the Parliamentary generals, resolved upon consolidating his position in the West by re-capturing Hereford. The city was even worse prepared for resistance than when Stamford had appeared before its gates, and a siege was out of the question. On the approach of Waller, a parley was sounded, and a trumpeter went forward with a summons. The answer came from Sir Richard Cave, the Cavalier defender of the city. "He who held the town, held it by commission of the King; if Sir William Waller could produce a better commission from the King it should be delivered to him; otherwise he who had it by authority from the King would preserve it for the King." These brave words, however, were of little avail, and before the day had deepened into dusk the city was in the hands of Waller, and for the second time had to obey the ruling of a conqueror. The captive Cavaliers did not repine at the hard measure meted out to them. Their goods were forfeited; they were crowded together in prisons, and often so neglected that many perished. Yet they bore their sufferings with cheerfulness. If the Roundheads were sustained in the confidence that they suffered for the purity of religious doctrine and the establishment of civil liberty, the Cavaliers gloried also in being martyrs to what they held to be one of the noblest of relative duties, and strongest tests of religious obedience. The sentiment of L'Estrange inspired them all:—

> What though I cannot see my king,
> Neither in person nor in coin;
> Yet contemplation is a thing
> That renders what I have not, mine.
> My king from me what adamant can part,
> Whom I do wear engraven on my heart?

A siege, however, far more romantic than any that Herefordshire had yet seen, was now to take place. If the history of the Civil War displays equally the devotion of the Cavalier and the Roundhead to the cause they supported, it is far from being deficient in exhibiting the courage and devotion of the female sex during those troublous times. Did not Blanche, Lady Arundel, daughter of the Marquis of Worcester, defend the castle of Wardour with a few men against Sir Edmund Hungerford and Colonel Ludlow, during the absence of her husband at Oxford? Did not Lady Wintour refuse to yield to the summonses of Massey? Was not Corfe Castle defended by Lady Bankes? And above

all, did not the famous Countess of Derby baffle the assaults of Fairfax at Latham House till the siege was raised? To this list we must add the defence of Brampton Ryan Castle by the Lady Brilliana, the wife of that staunch Herefordshire Parliamentarian, Sir Robert Harley. It was to be expected that a house situated in the midst of a Cavalier county, which had been the refuge of many a runaway Roundhead, and which was owned by a man who had made himself particularly obnoxious to the Royalist cause, should be made the object of attack. The law of retaliation is ever in force during war; the Herefordshire squires—the Scudamores, the Crofts, the Rudhalls, the Coningsbys, the Brabazons—who had enrolled themselves under the banner of the King had been severely punished for their devotion; was their neighbour then, who had taken a prominent part in all the proceedings against them, to escape safe and unhurt now that it was in their power to crush him? The castle of Brampton Ryan stood alone, hemmed in by enemies on all sides; in Shropshire, Radnorshire, and in its own county, it raised its grey stone walls alone and unprotected. Sir Robert Harley was in London; the defence of his home therefore devolved upon his wife, Lady Brilliana, a woman of rare resolution, fit to command and to insure obedience. With her husband absent, her eldest son serving in a cavalry regiment under Sir Arthur Hazlerigg the fair châtelaine was sorely tired. Shut up with the rest of her children, and such retainers as were personally attached to her within the walls of her strong habitation, she lived in growing dread of opening her doors, and of suspicion of those who dwelt around her. As the Civil War progressed, intensifying party hate, she, a Roundhead in the midst of Royalists, became deserted by friend after friend. Tenants and gentry with whom she had enjoyed pleasant and cheerful intercourse now held themselves aloof, and declined to know one who had sided with the enemies of their sovereign. Her position was indeed desolate:—

> My comfort is that you are not with me (she writes to her eldest son, with the loving unselfishness of a mother), lest they should take you; but I do most dearly miss you. I wish, if it pleased God, that I were with your father. My dear Ned, I pray you advise with your father whether he thinks it best that I should put away most of the men that are in my house, and whether it be best for me to go from Brampton, or, by God's help, to stand it out. I will be willing to do what he would have me do. I never was in such sorrows as I have been since you left me; but I hope the Lord will deliver me; but they are most cruelly bent against me.

She had no alternative but "to stand it out." Her garrison was composed of about 100 men completely armed, with ammunition and provisions which would last two months. On the 26th of

July, 1643, Lord Molyneux appeared before the castle walls, at the head of several troops of horse, with foot and battery cannon. For weeks the Cavaliers lay around the walls and exhausted all their resources to reduce the little garrison to submission. But the enemy was met with corresponding vigour and address. According to Collins, the Royalists were, "after many attacks, obliged to raise the siege merely through Lady Brilliana Harley's skilful management of treaties with the adversaries, and exemplary courage which animated the defendants." The probability is, however, that the King could ill spare men at the time, and that the besiegers, finding their task more difficult than they had imagined, had been ordered to reinforce the troops then busy endeavouring to reduce Gloucester. Still the Royalists had made their presence felt in the district. They had inserted poisoned bullets in their muskets, they had poisoned a running spring which furnished the town with water at its fountain-head, they had ransacked the farms and hamlets around Brampton, they had reduced the village under the castle walls to ruins, they had laid waste the parks and warren of Sir Robert Harley, they had destroyed the rectory house and the church, and had defaced the venerable monuments against the walls. A terrible list of disasters for the Roundhead squire to con over, as he busied himself in the councils of the Parliament held in London! Shortly after the departure of her foes, Lady Brilliana fell ill of a "very greate coold," which terminated fatally a few days afterwards.

To the character of this lady (writes Mr. John Webb), whose name should never be extinct among us, not only so long as there is a Harley, but while there is a wife or mother among us to record her praise, it is difficult to do adequate justice. In whatever light many may view the bias of her religious or political sentiments, it is unquestionable that in her private life she was as exemplary as she became distinguished in the public part that she took in the local transactions of this eventful period. Her creed was that of Calvin, and, with the Puritan teachers of that school, she looked upon Episcopacy as an institution to be done away; and in this and all other matters she followed implicitly the opinions of her husband; but the severity of her principles was in all this tempered by feminine gentleness. The cause in which her family was engaged she concluded to be that before which everything must give way, considering that it was the cause of God. She was an enthusiastic admirer of all the proceedings of the legislative body in which her husband acted so conspicuous a part, pitied and prayed for the King, applauded the expulsion of the bishops from the House of Lords, and dreamed of glorious changes yet to come.

Shortly after her death Brampton Ryan was again attacked by the Cavaliers, and this time the only hold of the Parliamen-

tarians in the county sank under the power of the enemy. Its garrison were taken prisoners, its demolition was decreed and carried into effect a few weeks after the surrender. By this destruction art and literature sustained a grievous injury, for the Harleys were men of taste, and their collection of pictures, jewels, and manuscripts, were amongst the most valuable in the country.

We must now cast but a hasty glance at the events which crowd the canvas. Those who wish to peruse an unusually full account of the siege of Gloucester, to watch the movements of Massey and Thynne in the west, and to read of the reverses that attended upon the efforts of the Cavaliers, cannot do better than consult these two carefully compiled volumes. One wretched fact we learn from their pages. It has been the fashion of those whose sympathies favoured the Royal cause to attribute all the atrocities that occurred during the Civil War to the vindictiveness of the Parliamentary party. The Cavalier, it is said, was a gentleman, he willingly gave his blood for his king, but when he met his enemy he fought him like a soldier and not like a savage. The Roundhead, on the other hand, was a *canaille* who mutilated the dead, defaced monuments, and in the hour of victory disgraced the name of Englishman by the barbarities that he sanctioned. Yet, from the evidence that lies before us, neither side can afford to throw the stone at the other or to affect a superior humanity. Let us briefly examine the catalogue of offences and leave it to the reader to decide which party conducted its military operations with a less severity. We know how the Cavaliers behaved before Brampton Ryan; but their first exploit showed how little was to be expected from their generosity or humanity. "For as they passed through the street of Brampton, there met them a poor blind man, whom without provocation they murdered, and thereby merited the failure of their enterprise." Sir Michael Woodhouse, a Royalist commander, appeared before the walls of Hopton Castle, and demanded its surrender in the name of Prince Rupert. It capitulated, begging for mercy, and what was the fate of the garrison? Every mother's son was stripped, tied back to back, and put to death with circumstances of the utmost barbarity. The Cavaliers ransacked the governor's house and put all his family to the sword, sparing neither man, woman, nor child. The steward, a man of 80 years of age, "being weak and not able to stand, they were so compassionate as to put him in a chair to cut his throat." It is said that after this massacre the cause of Charles never prospered, and that whenever his soldiers craved quarter, the reply was, "We'll give you none but Hopton quarter."[1]

[1] The gloomy aspect of the ruins of Hopton Castle recalls to mind the

On the march of Langdale to aid Prince Maurice, who was being severely pressed in the north, we read that "the atrocities that his lawless troopers inflicted upon the unoffending inhabitants, and especially their ill-treatment of females, in the countries through which they swept like a desolating whirlwind, were too shocking to be recorded." A Cavalier officer, one Talbot, was seen in the streets of Worcester, his sword reeking with the blood of a poor prisoner just brought in, and exulting that a rebel had been slain by his hand. Military executions frequently took place without formality of trial. Sir Richard Grenville hanged thirteen constables in this manner, and when he had taken Saltash, he was on the point of despatching some 300 of its inhabitants, in this wholesale fashion, when expressely forbidden by the King. He was nicknamed the hangman of the West. The highlands of the Forest of Dean were severely scourged. At Drybrook a man was struck down and his eyes knocked out for refusing to give up a flitch of bacon to a foraging party. "They have plundered," we read, "much about Mansilhope, Staunton, and the adjacent parts about the Forest of Dean, and have murdered divers men, women, and children—particularly at Longhope they took away some gentlemen's children, and the like at other towns, and carried them away either to be redeemed by their parents or starved; for some of those children have died under their hands." On the arrival of some regiments of Prince Rupert's infantry into Hereford we hear that—

> They came into several houses and plundered all the money and all that was good that they could lay their hands on, and made them to fetch them in roasted mutton, veal, lamb, poultry, and I know not what; and when they had done, they having ate and drunk, while their bellies would hold, took the rest and threw it up and down the house, and let out a great deal of drink out of the barrels, and did such barbarous actions, as is most wonderful; and there is no withstanding them; for if any oppose them, it is no more but knocking them on the head, or pistolling those who speak against them.

Nor was the conduct of the Roundheads a whit less arbitrary, for as to indiscriminate wrong and robbery, the offence is evenly balanced between the two parties. Hating episcopacy and all that falls under its rule, the more violent sections of the Parliamentarians loved to wreak their narrow-minded spite upon the clergy

---

dire event. It is square (writes Mr. Webb), with many walls, its interior filled with a heap of rubbish, its exterior injured by violence as much as time. It stands in a meadow uneven in its surface; a chimney on the west side was the point of attack, and the breach is now to be seen. There is the mark of that porch which was fired—there is the depression of that moat—there is that pool in which the bodies of the murdered garrison were thrown. To those who are acquainted with these facts and shall visit Hopton Castle, no place more graphically suggests its story."

and the Cathedrals. In London Sir Robert Harley, the chief acting commissioner of the Parliament, was busy demolishing crosses and stained-glass windows wherever he found them, in church or chapel. The cross in Cheapside, cherished by the citizens in better times, where so many divines had taught the doctrines of the Reformation, was not spared, but stripped of its "gorgeously gilt-leaden coat," a military band playing all the while "most rare and melodious music." "It was done," says a Cavalier writer, "in so triumphant and brazen a manner, with sound of trumpet and noise of several instruments, as if they had obtained some remarkable victory upon the greatest enemies of the Christian faith." One morning whilst Hacket, afterwards Bishop of Lichfield, was reading prayers at St. Giles's, Holborn, a trooper presented a loaded pistol at his head, and threatened him with instant death if he did not desist. "Do you your duty, I shall do mine," was the heroic reply. At Oxford and Canterbury the devastating hand of Fanaticism is plainly visible. On the capture of Worcester, one of the first operations of the Roundheads was to repair to the Cathedral and wreak their vengeance upon the books, vestments, organ and windows. They broke into the beautiful chapter-house, scattered about and tore up the college records, brought their horses into the nave, lit fires in it, and defiled the choir in the most unseemly manner; some of the dragoons came forth in surplices, and paraded with them in derision through the streets. The cloisters of the Cathedral still show that horses have been attached there by the marks of the insertion of rings soldered in with lead between the stones. One Swift, the vicar of Goodrich, was stripped of his property, and left with his children and servants at the beginning of winter with hardly a garment to shelter them, and all who should show them mercy severely threatened. "These are our militant Evangelists," sneers a Cavalier, "whose consciences start out of the way at a white surplice, but never boggle at garments rolled in blood." Serving in the ranks of the Royalists were many Papists from the Emerald Isle; an order was issued by the Parliament that, as every Irishman in the King's service had been concerned in the murderous insurrection of the Papists in Ireland—a statement which by the way had been satisfactorily refuted—all Irishmen taken in arms should be put to death.

The commander-in-chief of the Parliamentary forces in Shropshire and Cheshire was Sir William Brereton. He was unable to control the enormities committed by his troops. "They have slain men, plundered houses, and used all the violence that may be!" cried their accusers at Shrewsbury. They robbed and spoiled without mercy or distinction of friend or foe. The destruction of cattle and sheep was enormous, and the wantonness of the robbers may be estimated from the fact that they were in

the habit of appropriating and slaughtering sheep merely for their skins. The argument, "if we leave them behind the enemy will come and take them," was too often and fatally applied. A widow who resisted had her house "fired, and all refused quarter —viz., twelve, put to the sword, nine whereof were roasted." A Committee of the House of Commons in London, listening to these grave charges, wrote to Brereton severely reprimanding him for the laxity of his discipline.

I assure your Honours (writes the Commander-in-chief), that there is nothing accompanying this service hath more afflicted me than to see these insolences that are sometimes committed by the soldiers, and not have power wholly to restrain them. I know that the soldiers' plunder is put into a bottomless bag; the State loses it; the soldier accounts it not for pay; and those who are most undeserving are most advantaged thereby. Our reputation is extremely lost hereby with the common people, who for the most part judge our cause by the demeanour of our army. . . . For my part, I know no other way to maintain order in an army but either by special interest or severe discipline. For the first it cannot be expected that I should so far prevail with the forces assigned from several parts as if they were mine own; and for the last I have not had power to hold the reins of discipline, as otherwise have been convenient, when extreme want of all necessaries have inflamed the soldiers' discontents to an un-masterable height, and in such a case I humbly appeal to your Honours' experience there how hard it is to prevent outrages.

The truth was that in the war between arbitrary misgovernment and unconstitutional resistance, the country was utterly demoralised; men, maddened by the scent of blood, forgot the better part that was within them, and, whether Cavalier or Roundhead, allowed, during the fury of the struggle, the baser elements in human nature to wield the supremacy.

Here we take leave of these interesting "memorials." The history of the Great Rebellion cannot but excite the attention of all Englishmen. It is one of those subjects which permits much to be said on both sides; there was right on each side, and yet there was also grievous wrong. The King erred perilously in resisting the demands of his first three Parliaments; the Parliament was in the wrong in waging war against its sovereign. The history of Charles is the history of personal government as opposed to constitutional government. Since the King could not obtain his ends with the assistance of Parliament, he resolved to pursue his course independent of the Legislature. For the first time in our history a monarch had ascended the throne determined upon maintaining the majesty and independence of the Prerogative. Other kings had dissolved Parliaments, imprisoned refractory members, and forced hostile votes to be rendered null; but with the exception of Charles, no English

monarch had dared for eleven long years to dispense altogether with Parliamentary aid and advice. Up to the year 1641 the conduct of the Parliament is warmly to be approved of, but after that date the Houses were not justified in the demands they laid before the King, and in the war that ensued the Parliament was clearly the aggressor. With respect to the faction that pursued Charles to death, but one opinion can now be formed. It was no friend to public liberty, for never under the most arbitrary monarch were the people of England subject to a more rigid tyranny; neither did it compose the majority of the nation, which at least latterly, had recovered its reverence for the Royal power. But it is ever so in revolutions. A few violent men take the lead—their noise and activity seem to multiply their numbers, and the great body of the people, either indolent or pusillanimous, are led in triumph at the chariot wheels of a paltry faction.

Review.

Transactions of the Society of Biblical Archæology. Vols. I.—VI. London: Longmans & Co.

THE progress of interpreting inscriptions on the Egyptian, Assyrian, and other cognate Semitic monuments, has made such rapid progress within the last half-century, and has so important a bearing on Biblical literature and archæology, as to have necessitated the formation of such an institution as the Biblical Archæological Society, which has now been in existence during the chief part of the present decade; Dr. Birch's address as President of the Society having been delivered on the 21st of March, 1871. Hitherto our knowledge of the nations surrounding the land of Canaan has been derived from the records of Holy Scripture and the early Greek historians who have handed down such portions as entered into relation with their own particular subject. Now, by means of the excavations which have brought to light a buried world, we are enabled to ascend into the remotest times of antiquity, and to examine the identical monuments which were erected in the days of Cheops and Urukh—*i.e.* within two centuries of the dispersion of mankind after their failure to build the Tower of Babel. And it is with no little satisfaction that the Biblical student is enabled to find, not only so many confirmations of the truth of the Scripture record respecting the Creation and the Fall, the Noachian Deluge, the building of Babel, the story of the Exodus, and the punishment of the Houses of Israel and Judah, but also of the harmony between the chronology of those nations, Assyria and Egypt, and that which is revealed to us in the infallible word of God. So that what Champollion wrote fifty years ago in allusion to the sceptics of his day has been amply verified by the further discoveries of our cuneiform and Egyptological scholars. "They will find in this work," said he, "an absolute reply to their calumnies, since I have proved that no Egyptian monument is really older than the year 2000 B.C. This certainly is very high antiquity, but it presents nothing contradictory to the sacred histories, and I venture to affirm that it establishes them on all points; for it is in fact, by adopting the chronology and the succession of kings given by the Egyptian monuments, that the history of Egypt accords with the sacred writings." ("Ancient Egypt," p. 56.) The recently discovered tablet at Abydos of the

reign of Seti I., B.C. 1450, seems to show that the Shera monument in the Ashmolean Museum at Oxford, which is indisputably the oldest proof of man's existence on earth, may be dated a century earlier than that named by Champollion; but this only tends to confirm the assertion, which recent discoveries in Egypt and Assyria enable us to make, that there is no nation on earth possessing authentic documents to show a higher antiquity than the Scripture date for the Flood, which, according to the Hebrew computation, may be placed in the twenty-fifth century before the Christian era.

The Biblical Archæological Society has done its work admirably by the publication of its "Transactions," which have enabled the outer world to see not only the truth of the late Dr. Arnold's remark—"These Egyptian discoveries are likely to become one of the greatest wonders of the age," but also to learn the strong confirmation which the imperishable monuments of the East afford to the truth of Holy Scripture. Our limits prevent us from attempting to show this at any length: and we must confine ourselves in the present paper to noticing the last two volumes published by the Society, and even those we are obliged to notice in a most cursory manner.

Volume V. opens with a very remarkable paper, by W. H. F. Talbot, on an inscribed Chaldæan tablet, entitled "The Fight between Bel and the Dragon, and the Flaming Sword which turned every way." This is one of the most striking narratives of Babylonian mythology, which describes the chief Creator of all things, Bel, arming himself for the contest with the Dragon, the personification of all evil. And the most curious weapon in Bel's armoury was *the Flaming Sword which turned every way*—"to the south, to the north, to the east, and to the west, so that none could escape from it," which so plainly resembles the sword of the Cherubim in Genesis which turned every way to keep the Tree of Life, that, as Mr. Talbot justly observes, "the same celestial weapon must surely be intended here." Mr. Boscawen contributes another paper of great value, entitled "The Legend of the Tower of Babel." The tablet on which this legend is incribed was discovered by the late George Smith, who gives a full translation of it in his "Chaldean Account of Genesis." The legend records the building of an immense tower by the Accadians, or early Babylonians, which appears to have offended the gods, who first manifested their anger by throwing down "in the night all that was built in the day." The builders continued their work in spite of these interruptions, until at length they were punished by being scattered abroad, their speech confounded, and the tower destroyed. There can be little doubt but that we have in this Chaldæan legend a traditionary account of what happened on the "plain of Shinar" within a century after the time when Noah came forth from the Ark.

M. Chabas' notice of an Egyptian stèle in the Turin Museum, affords a pleasing memorial of the sentiments entertained by a pious youth of the age probably of Rameses, commonly called "the Great," and within two centuries after the Israelites had quitted Egypt. It is a record of one *Beka*, deceased, who is supposed to speak from his tomb in these words, but of which we can only quote the following fragment:—"I was just, true, and free from all malice, *having placed God in my heart*, and having been taught to know His will. . . . . My sincerity, goodness, and affection was cordially manifested towards my father and mother; and never was I betrayed into manifesting the slightest disrespect towards them from my earliest youth"—an admirable lesson to many of our English youths in the present day. Another stèle from the land of Ham, now in the Louvre, which has been translated by M. Maspero, and fully six centuries older than the one just mentioned, and which the late learned Egyp-

tologist, Vicomte de Rougè, pronounced "one of the masterpieces of Egyptian sculpture," will afford us some idea of the knowledge which the ancient Egyptians had respecting religion. The stèle was erected in honour of a certain *Iritisen*, who lived in the reign of Mentuhotep, a king of the eleventh dynasty, a little before, or about the time of, Abraham's visit to Egypt. After an acknowledgment of "his true servant, who is in the inmost recess of his heart, and makes his pleasure all the day long, the devout Ra-Mentuotep, king of Egypt, unto the great god, Iritisen;" the inscription continues—"I know *the mystery of the divine Word*, the ordinances of the religious feasts, every rite with which they are endowed; I never strayed from them; I indeed am an artist skilled in his art, a man exceeding all men in his learning. Lo! there is no man excels by it but I alone, and my eldest legitimate son. God has decreed him to be most excellent in that way, and I have seen the perfections of his hands in his work as chief artist in every kind of precious stones, from gold and silver, even to ivory and ebony!" Although there is in this inscription a specimen of amphibiology, as Maspero points out, in which "Egyptian writers" delighted to indulge, it is clear that Iritisen's eldest legitimate son was as skilful a manufacturer of gold and silver, ivory and ebony idols, as the most accomplished Papal engraver of the present day.

In the sixth and last published volume of the "Transactions" we have a valuable paper on the "Babylonian Dated Tablets and the Canon of Ptolemy," by Mr. Boscawen, giving an interesting account of a great banking firm, "Egibi and Co.," the founder of which lived in the latter part of the reign of Sennacherib. It is necessary, however, to mention that Professor Oppert disputes Mr. Boscawen's conclusion of "Egibi and Son" being a Babylonian banking firm. He considers that the cuneiform records, on which Mr. Boscawen founds his opinion, show that it was not a financial but juridical firm; that Egibi was a tribal, not a personal name; and that the word rendered "witnesses" to supposed deposit notes, really meant "assessors." The great value of this paper, together with the lengthy discussion which took place on its being read before the Society, consists in the proof it affords to the correctness and accuracy of the Book of Daniel, and especially to the difficulties connected with the prophet's mention of Darius, the Mede, the son of Ahasuerus. The late Mr. Bosanquet, to whose liberality the Biblical Archæological Society is almost indebted for its existence, contended, for many years, that the Darius thus mentioned by Daniel was the same as Darius the Persian, the son of Hystaspes; and so strongly did he cling to his delusion, that he affirmed, contrary to the opinion of every scholar, whether cuneiform or otherwise, that the Egibi tablets supported his opinion in every respect. If any who are interested in this subject will turn to p. 273 of vol. vi., they will see how clearly M. Oppert, the first French cuneiform scholar of the day, has pointed out Mr. Bosanquet's fallacy. "For a long time," he says, "I have abandoned my first idea, contradicted even by the Book of Daniel, of identifying Darius, the Mede, with Darius I. of Persia. Mr. Bosanquet has ventured to assert that from B.C. 578 to 506 there were no traces of Darius' rule at Babylon. The contrary is the case, as we know at least fifty tablets dated from this period. . . . . We have not to write history suited to our own theories, but history as yielded to us by the authors, whose writings are completely and splendidly corroborated by contemporaneous documents. All this quite arbitrary destruction of history and chronology appears to have originated in a desire to obtain for the capture of Babylon under Belshazzar the date of 493 B.C., 490 years or 70 weeks before the Nativity." Had Mr. Bosanquet been a Hebrew scholar he would not have been misled in the way he appears to

have been by the imperfect rendering of Daniel v. 31, where the authorised version reads—"Darius, the Median, *took* the kingdom," in place of Darius, the Median, "*received* the kingdom" from another, as it should have been translated, that other being Cyrus, the Persian, who captured Babylon, and appointed his relative, Darius, the Median, to rule over the city and kingdom, in accordance with the prophecies which foretold that Babylon would fall before the combined forces of "the Medes and Persians." An interesting plate of the Behistan Rock accompanies the discussion. Darius Hystaspes, the king of Persia, is represented as trampling on the body of one of his prisoners, while a body of captives with ropes round their necks, and their hands tied behind their backs, are standing before the king. Each one but the last bears an inscription over his head, describing him as a rebel, who falsely assumed the name of king of one of the many provinces which owned the sway of Persia. The face of each of these prisoners is wretched in the extreme. But our interest is confined to the last one, who appears, in every respect, differing from the others. He wears a high-peaked cap, exactly like that worn by the Jewish priests, and his countenance, judging from the two copies of the Behistan Rock possessed by the writer, is of a very pronounced Hebrew type. He is not described as a rebel, but the trilingual inscription above his head merely records these words:—

"THIS IS ISKUNKA THE CHIEF OF THE SAXONS."[1]

The Greek savant D. Perides' "Notes on Cypriote Palæography" are interesting so far as they throw light on any confirmation of the truth of the Bible. And it is not a little remarkable that at the very time that Cyprus has become virtually a portion of the British empire, so much has been gathered from the antiquities of that island, the scene of the Apostle Paul's earliest mission to the heathen world. We have now before us one of the most gorgeous pictures from an Egyptian tomb of the age of Moses, where the offerings of four different nations are made to the mighty Pharaoh, who was reigning in the seventeenth century B.C., one of them being from the inhabitants of the isle of Cyprus. A thousand years later, when Assur-bani-pul, king of Assyria, son of the Scripture Esarhaddon, was on his march to punish the Egyptians who had rebelled against his authority, after he had captured Thebes, the capital of the greatest monarchy of the ancient world, no less than ten petty kings or chieftains from Cyprus are represented as paying homage to the then powerful king of Assyria.

Such are some of the many important discoveries which have been made by Egyptological, cuneiform, and other Oriental scholars within the last half-century, which have thrown such a flood of light upon the historical portions of the Old Testament, and for the knowledge of which Biblical students are not a little indebted to the admirable series of papers published in the Transactions of the Biblical Archæological Society.

---

[1] The date of the Behistan Rock is fixed by Sir Henry Rawlinson at B.C. 516; and this inscription is the earliest instance known to history of the name of "Saxon."

In the present Number we are compelled to defer some

REVIEWS, AND THE SHORT NOTICES,

And to omit any remarks on the Month.