
A table of contents for the *London Quarterly Review* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_london-quarterly-and-holborn-review_01.php

THE

LONDON REVIEW.

JULY, 1862.

ART. I.—*Histoire Générale et Système Comparé des Langues Sémitiques.* Par ERNEST RENAN. *Première Partie.—Histoire Générale des Langues Sémitiques.* Seconde Edition, revue et augmenté. Paris: à l'Imprimerie Impériale. 1858.

THE Hebraists and Biblical scholars of both hemispheres have long wished that some one would do for the Shemitic languages what Bopp has accomplished with so much genius, judgment, and learning on behalf of the 'Comparative Grammar' of the Aryan tongues. It is the aim of M. Renan—though not, we are sorry to say, out of any love for the Scriptures or Christianity—to supply this great desideratum; and in the volume above-named we have the first instalment of the work, which France seeks to set by the side of its famous German prototype. The two philological fields are very dissimilar. Bopp's is enormously larger than Renan's; and its growths present a variety in age, aspect, and organisation, such as is not to be found within the narrower borders of its neighbour. And this unlikeness naturally leads to a different mode of treatment on the part of the one writer and the other. In the nature of things, Bopp was compelled to limit himself very much to the scientific analysis and comparison of the languages which came within the sweep of his criticism. History and ethnology,—always important as guides and checks to philological induction,—while never lost sight of, must here remain, for the most part, in the background. They were too vast, too

complex, often too dim and intangible, to be successfully used and dealt with. On the other hand, the fewness, the structural sameness, and the lifelong firmness of the Shemitic tongues rendered it an easier task to combine the historical element with the logical in the discussion of them, and so could hardly fail to suggest to the comparative critic the importance of securing the advantages which would come of uniting the two. M. Renan does this; and though the part of his work, which will enable us to put him in the balance with Bopp, is as yet unpublished, this first volume of it, devoted to the history of the Hebrew, Aramæan, Arabic, and their kin, illustrates very strongly the use of the double method, and makes the reader regret continually that the German philologer was not in circumstances to adopt the like plan.

Of its kind, M. Renan's book is a prodigy. It is as graceful, erudite, brilliant, and intensely pagan a book as we ever met with. Nothing can exceed the clearness, piquancy, and general force of the author's style. His sentences flow on like a stream of music. You never doubt his meaning; and his words stand for thoughts. Where other men would be bewildered, Renan sees as by intuition; and where others would go on crutches, he often runs like a giant. His knowledge of his subject is large and accurate; and, when certain conspicuous prejudices do not interfere, his literary judgments are usually sound and sagacious. He is never at a loss for his materials; and his mind turns corners with surprising quickness. At once solid and sparkling, bold and subtle, he wields a magician's wand; and the enchantments of it are mighty. We grieve to add, that he is an utter disbeliever in Divine revelation. The Old Testament languages and literature, of course, occupy a large space in his work; yet, so far as we remember, from one end of it to the other there is not so much as a solitary hint at anything like the idea of the supernatural inspiration of either Moses or the Prophets. On the contrary, the author assumes and teaches throughout, that the entire series of phenomena, to which his thesis leads him, belongs as strictly to the sphere of natural causation, as the motions of the planets or the formation of a coral reef. A writer in the *Times* of January last—we hope not the distinguished scholar to whom the article has been assigned—speaks of M. Renan's scepticism with something like respect, because of its fearlessness of consequences. We do not share this feeling. Fearlessness of consequences may be a virtue; and it may be a vice. It is often only another name for a rampant recklessness, or a blind and portentous inconsideration. Where great interests are at stake, and, above all, such as are involved

in belief or disbelief of the historic truth of the Bible, scientific criticism is bound to be eminently regardful of consequences; and in so far as it may incline to doubt, it is only worthy of anything approaching to respect, when its reasonings are marked by the utmost caution, modesty, and devoutness. M. Renan's scepticism has none of these features: it is rash, dogmatic, and self-confident. It is a foregone conclusion with him, that the Old Testament writers did not speak as they were moved by the Holy Ghost; and he not only keeps the handkerchief tight upon his eyes, whenever the facts that meet him threaten his theory, but, as if the discernment and honesty of this province of the world of letters were concentred in himself, he makes no account of those who differ from him, and rides with the satisfaction of a conqueror through the ruin he has caused. As we proceed, we shall find illustration and proof of all this in plenty. At present we content ourselves with expressing the deep regret we feel, that a book of so much beauty, worth, and power, should be marred by an irreligiousness which strikes to the core of many of its literary principles and arguments.

In the preface to his work, after stating the circumstances under which it was originally published, M. Renan proceeds to expound and vindicate the double method which he has followed in the treatment of his subject, showing, in a few luminous and forcible sentences, how halting and dull-sighted theoretical philology must needs be without the helps which history affords her. He then calls attention to the singular fact, that, while the Shemitic tongues were the first to be brought into grammatical and lexical comparison with one another, they have been the last to come under the dissecting knife of the youthful science of comparative language. The lights which the Jewish grammarians of the tenth and eleventh centuries fetched from the Arabic and Aramæan for the illustration of the Hebrew, the polyglott labours of the great Hebraists of the seventeenth century, and even the wild and arbitrary match-making of the school of Schultens, were all so many heralds of the birth of that true inductive system, according to which languages are now judged and compared. Yet another linguistic group has hitherto enjoyed all but the lion's share in the interest of modern philologers; while the Shemitic forms of speech—forms which, because of their constancy and homogeneousness, might have been expected to be the earliest to be scrutinized—remain still, for the most part, unexplained and untouched. M. Renan accounts for this on the principle that, though the boniness of the Hebrew and its fellows renders them an admirable study in philological anatomy, they are too unelastic and inanimate to

satisfy the aspirations of science, or give full play to what are presumed to be its functions. In this very circumstance, however, our author finds a reason why the languages in question should not be neglected. Comparative philology is in danger of being intoxicated with its own successes. It needs to be kept within bounds. Here is an element that will help to steady it. If Shemitic speech is less various, less luxuriant, and less life-like than that of the Aryans, it is also more fixed, more definite, more surely reducible to order and law; and will therefore be likely to foster in the student that sober, wary, and circumspect habit of mind, which well-conducted scientific investigation so strongly calls for. Some of the critical doctrines, which M. Renan lays down in connexion with this point, are worthy of golden letters. We only wish he had shown himself more uniformly loyal to them. Indeed he is quick-sighted enough to see, that his readers will not fail to remark the chasm which divides his precepts and practice; and he deprecates their censure on the ground, that antiquity is often tangled, and that generalities are always open to criticism. How this plea can sustain the cause on behalf of which it is put in, we are at a loss to imagine. To our simple apprehensions it seems as though both the fact and the truth, of which it is made up, form the strongest possible argument in favour of the caution and reserve, which M. Renan at once commends and disregards.

The first of the five books into which the author distributes his work, is devoted to a series of discussions on the general character of the Shemites and their speech, on the primitive geographical domain of the Shemitic tongues, and on the question of the origin of dialects, viewed with special reference to the group of languages here under consideration. In all that is advanced on these subjects, there is much to admire and muse over; much also, which cannot be too little accounted of or too soon forgotten. Were it not for the flies, the apothecary's ointment would be priceless; for the hundred pages which these discussions take up are full of striking thoughts, ingenious arguments, and brilliant generalisations.

M. Renan begins by remarking, as many other writers on comparative language have done, on the unsuitableness of the term 'Shemitic' as the title of the Hebrew and the tongues allied to it. Races and languages are not always coincident. They are not in the present instance; and to apply to a number of languages a term, which is commonly understood to be the title of a race, particularly where it is demonstrable they do not fill the same area, is to open the door to confusion and error. M. Renan, however, is more embarrassed by this incongruity than his predecessors

have been; for while he allows that most of the nations, which the tenth chapter of Genesis refers to Shem as their forefather, are ethnologically related, Shem, with him, is neither an individual nor even a people; it is a designation, whatever this may mean, of 'the middle zone of the earth, without distinction of race!' This is the leader of a long string of paradoxes, which those who follow our author must be prepared to meet. Of course such a theory will only hold on the supposition that the early parts of the Pentateuch are a tissue of myths and legends, and that the writer or compiler of them had not sense enough to put his materials together without falling into the grossest absurdities and self-contradictions. M. Renan does not shrink in the least from the former of these positions. Is he equally content to take the latter? Noah's son, and Shem and Japheth's brother,—he who went into the ark with his wife,—and died at the age of six hundred years, leaving numerous 'sons and daughters' behind him,—was 'the middle zone of the earth!' We should like to hear what some historical rationalist of the sixtieth or seventieth Christian century would make of M. Renan's philological writings, explaining them on this principle. We should think him a particularly dull critic, if he did not find in them either the doctrine of the precession of the equinoxes, or a discourse on the best method of dredging for oysters. That very tenth of Genesis, which our author himself speaks of in this connexion as 'precious,' and the ethnology of which, so far as the nations bordering on Palestine are concerned, he elsewhere pronounces to be singularly accurate, contains within its own narrow limits more than one of the foregoing statements respecting Shem; and how this name can be transmuted into 'the middle zone of the earth,' without turning the whole document into a piece of literary idiocy, demands a sublimer understanding than we can boast of. M. Renan promises fuller light on this and some others of his views in his second volume. Meanwhile let reason doze and be happy.

But our author moves on from words to things, from the term 'Shemitic' to the characteristics of the race and speech so designated. And here, notwithstanding very heavy drawbacks, his genius and learning appear to great advantage. The pre-eminent glory of the Shemites is their earnest, practical recognition of the unity of God. In many respects they rank below the Indo-Europeans. They are wanting, for the most part, in the intellectual breadth and subtlety, which are the parents of philosophical and scientific research. They have no curiosity, no faculty of analysis, nothing like a severe and cumulative logic. The so-called Arab philosophy of the times of the Abbassid Kalifs was the

growth of Greece. It was written in Arabic; that was all. The poetry of the Shemites in like manner, while rich in lyrics, has always been marked by the want of that 'creative imagination,' to which the epic and dramatic compositions of India, Greece, &c., owe their birth. Its subjects are few; and the treatment of them is usually hard and monotonous. It is impossible to conceive of a Shemite Plato or Kant; and the intensely 'subjective' character of the race makes it equally impossible to imagine an Iliad or a King Lear written on the banks of the Jordan or Euphrates. On the same principle, too, we may account in part both for the love of music which the Shemites have ever shown, and for their general neglect or even dislike of sculpture, painting, and the sister arts. Speaking generally, the perception of differences is not found among the Shemitish nations. Their legislation is simple and comprehensive. Their social life has little complexity or refinement. Their history is commonly limited to the play of a few dominant passions and instincts. Rigid, grave, solitary in their feeling, they form the very opposite pole to the spring, the cheerfulness, and the energy of the sons of Japheth. Hence they have mostly held aloof from the pursuits of commerce. Their military system has lacked organization and discipline. If they have carried on wars, it has been usually by the hands of foreign mercenaries. Civilization, as we understand it, has hardly had place among them, either in ancient or modern times. Anything like the πολιτεία of the Greek states, or the absolute monarchy of Egypt or Persia, is unknown to the Shemitic annals. Even in regard to social virtue, it is difficult to trace among the Shemites, as a whole, that nice sense of honour, truth, and justice, which other races have exhibited. But, within the sphere of religion and general morality, they stand alone. 'What they did not do in the order of things external, they did in the order of things ethical; and we may assign to them, without exaggeration, at least one half of the intellectual work of mankind.' Almost wholly negative in their character, having neither philosophy, nor science, nor art, nor law, nor government, in the Indo-European sense of the terms, they are the religious race of the earth; and, avoiding alike the errors of a metaphysical pantheism and of a gross idolatry, they have known, and held by, and taken pains to spread abroad among men the doctrine of one God, the Maker, Upholder, and Ruler of all things, 'in whom we live, and move, and have our being.'

Such is in outline M. Renan's bold and striking picture of the Shemites, apart from its conspicuous distortions and blemishes. We have not been able in so few words to do justice to the

excellencies either of the idea, or of the form of it. At the same time we have rather softened than otherwise the harsher features of the drawing, and have striven to credit the author with as much judgment, candour, and faith, as a very liberal interpretation of his language would warrant. We are compelled to add, however, that there is an incautiousness in many of his statements, an appearance not unfrequently of readiness to disparage what Christians hold sacred, and an all-pervasive, and, as we take it, an utterly unphilosophical naturalism in his views, which subtracts most seriously from the value of this portion of his book. With the Old Testament records before him, how can M. Renan affirm, that a Shemite is incapable of disinterestedness and integrity? Has he never read of Abraham, Moses, and Samuel? And with what propriety or fairness can he quote the Psalms of David in illustration of the 'egoism' of the race, when nothing is more evident than that the very last notion in the mind of the inspired writer is any selfish or merely personal interest belonging to his work? Again, in contrasting the philosophical speculations of the Greeks and Hindus with such of the writings of the Shemites as have at all a metaphysical cast, he speaks of Job and Koheleth as the acme of Shemitic philosophy, and says of them, in effect, that they do but roll the stone of Sisyphus, that they never see their way out of the wood, and that the end of both is a conclusion in which nothing is concluded. We altogether decline to accept this representation. To us it is as plain as can be, that 'whom the Lord loveth He chasteneth, and scourgeth every son whom He receiveth,' is the moral of the former book; and, for the latter, we do not know what can be called a conclusion, if that is not one with which, to common eyes, it seems to terminate: 'Fear God, and keep His commandments: for this is the whole duty of man.' Does the Bhagavad Gîta, or any one of Plato's Dialogues, come to as sharp and well-defined an issue? On the subject of morals, too, while we freely admit the truth of much that M. Renan has propounded, we object to the putting of Mohammed side by side with some of the highest names of the earlier Scriptures, as a violation of historical justice; and when we read, that 'nearly all the prophets of the ancient school, Samuel and Elijah for instance, are wholly out of the reach of our rules of judgment in matters of morality,' we wipe our spectacles, and begin to doubt whether white is not black. It is the fashion now-a-days to rail at 'Bibliolaters' for their dogmatism. It would seem that they are not the only persons who are capable of substituting assertion for proof.

M. Renan's doctrine of what he terms 'Prophetism,' as obtain-

ing among the Shemites, is another example of the freedom with which he handles facts that do not square with his hypotheses. Just as Brahmanism inaugurates every new era in the revolutions of the ages by a fresh incarnation of Deity, so the Hebrews, and the rest of the race to which they belong, bring upon the stage a privileged mortal, whom God has chosen as the organ of communication with his fellows, whenever any important religious or political change is to be effected. God is so far from man, in the idea of the Shemite, that He must needs bridge over the distance by having recourse to this expedient. We ought to apologize to our readers for the violence we do their feelings in introducing them to this piece of naked naturalism. We assure them, however, that such is the account, which one of the leading philosophical scholars of his day gives of the mission of Noah, Moses, Joshua, David, and others of the great names of the sons of Israel. It is all done by machinery. A revolution is coming. We must be ready with a prophet. Now let the wheel turn. Which is the more pitiable in all this,—the folly or the profanity of it? Verily a large faith is requisite, if the supernatural is to be weeded out of the history of man. Even here, however, our author's scepticism does not culminate. We reach the hill-top in what he says as to the origin of the Monotheistic idea among the Shemites. According to Scripture this idea was originally part of the common inheritance of mankind. It was subsequently lost, or but imperfectly retained, by the various races of the earth. The Shemites, as well as others, forgot the one God, and worshipped idols; and it was only after revelation on revelation, and after centuries of painful discipline, that the leading Shemitish people was cured of its passion for divinities of wood and stone. And now let us hear M. Renan. The Shemites alone in the beginning had the knowledge of the Divine Unity. This knowledge they have never lost. At no period of their history have they been polytheists. The descendants of Abraham, in particular, have always kept themselves pure from idols. Nor is this strange. Monotheism, with the Shemite, is not a conception; it is a sense. He did not attain to it by any process of reflection or logic. 'The most imperious instincts of his mind and heart' taught it him. The 'sure and strong intuitions' of his nature unveiled to him the Deity, and from the very first put him in possession of the master truth of religion. We are sorely tempted here to 'the impolite behaviour' of which Mr. Burchell was guilty in the presence of Lady Blarney and Miss Skeggs; but we restrain ourselves. Our author must excuse us, however, if, in the absence of all proof of his doc-

trines, and with reason, history, and the Bible clean against him, we not only set down what he has stated on this subject as belonging to the stuff that dreams are made of, but also express our unfeigned grief, that a noble mind should stoop to play at marbles on ground so holy. There are other points to which we might take exception in this portion of M. Renan's work—for example, his views of the 'later angelology,' as he calls it, of the Hebrews; but we pass on to the philological and ethnological discussions, which occupy the remainder of the first book.

In treating of the genius, structure, and idiom of the Shemitic tongues, M. Renan writes worthily of himself; and we heartily subscribe to most of his opinions and principles. He forces no theory upon the facts which come before him. He interprets these facts with equal acuteness and sobriety. Keen analysis, striking comparisons, and most happy illustration go hand in hand through the entire section. Unity and simplicity, he says, distinguish the Shemite race. They are equally observable in their languages. The variety, breadth, and precision of the Aryan speech are unknown to them. There is a predominance of the physical and sensuous in their character. Even such of their roots as are used in a metaphysical sense retain, with few exceptions, their original value as expressing some state, or action, either of the human frame, or of objects belonging to the material creation. Their elemental organization, their method of word-building, their syntactical processes are all patriarchal and nature-like in their cast. They eschew logic; they love picturesqueness. Style, according to our western notion of it, hardly exists in Shemitic. It expresses thought with scarcely any subordination of parts. Ideas are set side by side like the figures in a Byzantine painting, or an Assyrian bas-relief. Propositions are seldom or ever distinguished as principal and accessory. The compound and inflected words, the manifold particles with their various shades of meaning, the nice adjustment and balance of sentences, and the hundred other modes by which the Indo-European languages body forth the most subtle, delicate, and complex workings of the human mind, are all but unknown to the Shemite. On these and similar points our author discourses at large with admirable taste and vigour. It is scarcely possible, indeed, without copious quotation, to give an adequate impression of the sparkle, life, and force of thought, which show on every page of this, as of many other parts of his book.

When he comes to deal with the question of the origin of the languages of which he writes, we find much less reason to be satisfied with his views. Not only are many of his positions

more than doubtful; but, in conjunction with abundance of what is most just and convincing, there is sometimes a looseness and airiness about his reasoning, which does not sort well either with the dignity of his topic, or with the severe simplicity of a truly philosophical induction. We entirely agree with M. Renan, that, both in reason and fact, unity is often the child and not the father of diversity; and that in seeking to track the Shemitic languages back to their beginning, we must not hope to find a primeval Hebrew, or Aramæan, or Arabic, out of which they were all developed as cognate dialects. We believe he is right in his doctrine, that there was a time when many of what are now regarded as the distinctive characteristics of the three divisions of the family were found together in a tongue that was identical with none of them, though like them all; and that this is the true key to a multitude of the otherwise inexplicable phenomena of their root-structure, and of the likenesses and unlikenesses of their grammatical forms. At the same time we see no cause, why, with our author, we should stop at this point, and deny the possibility of a still earlier linguistic epoch, at which this same original Shemitic existed as a monosyllable tongue like the Chinese. M. Renan allows that the Shemitic roots run up into significant monosyllables; and every one knows how plentiful are the formative particles, which the Hebrew, Arabic, &c., have reduced to their present slender dimensions from longer words in actual use among them. Surely, with these facts in view, it is not hard to conceive how every triliteral form may have sprung out of two biliterals, even if it be no longer practicable to determine the value of the consonant element which makes the difference between them. And how M. Renan, in presence of the Chinese, can affirm that naked monosyllables have never been used by language otherwise than as logical abstractions, and how he can argue that the passage from a Chinese-like tongue to Hebrew could only be accomplished by much reflection, we cannot understand. We do not believe that the Hebrew or any other Shemitic tongue was eliminated by a purely natural process from an older and more general type; still less do we suppose that the whole number of the head languages of the earth sprang after the same fashion from a primordial monosyllabic speech, in which they all existed potentially. History must persuade mythology to play into her hands, before we can dispense with miracle on this ground. But miracle apart, and time being no object, we have no more difficulty in bridging over the gulf between the speech of Adam and of Shem than that which divides the language of the latter from any of his descendants. Here, however, M. Renan

is writing in handcuffs; and we are not surprised that a philologer who holds that man at the first was scarcely master of himself,—these are his words,—that human reason in the early ages of the world was 'a dream-like thing,' and that our race only woke to intellectual consciousness after a long night of babyhood,—should be slow at perceiving the force of any evidence favourable to the primitive unity of mankind, and their possession in the very beginning of the full dower of their mental faculties. What does amaze us, however, is the unguardedness displayed by M. Renan in stating some of the facts and principles which he works up into his argument. When he says, for example, that there is an immense number of languages in Abyssinia and the Caucasus 'entirely distinct' from one another; and yet that this diversity is 'nothing in comparison with the differences which usually separate the Oceanic tongues;' we hardly know whether we are in the region of pure fiction, or of a rhetoric that has most rashly and unbecomingly spread its wings within the territory of the philosopher. To say the least, it is premature to assert the entire mutual distinctness of the bulk of the Caucasian and Abyssinian languages; and in respect to the other great linguistic family of which M. Renan speaks, there must surely be some misprint, which obscures his meaning; for it is notorious, that the tongues of Polynesia and the Eastern Archipelago are bound together, in the main, by ties of grammar and vocabulary, which are perfectly astonishing for their closeness. In like manner, when our author states, that comparative philology has no fixed signs by which to determine the affinities of language; that Shemitic roots are almost all made in imitation of natural sounds; and that a very sensible line of demarcation may be drawn between the older and younger Aramaisms of the Old Testament; we feel ourselves pretty much in the condition of the man, who was assured that there was no such thing as daylight, and that it must be proved to be before it could be. We are sorry to say, we have never been able to discover the parting line between the Aramaic forms of the Pentateuch and those of the later Prophets, to which M. Renan refers as so obvious. Let us comfort ourselves with the knowledge that Movers, and others not less competent to judge than he, were equally dim-eyed before us. As to the onomatopoetic character of the bulk of the Shemitic roots, we are satisfied that it is a mere theory, without any solid basis whatever. Let any one take up his Gesenius, or Castel, or Freytag, and bring this doctrine fairly to the test. Out of the domain of fancy, it will not bear the slightest scrutiny. No doubt some of the roots of these languages are formed on this principle; yet we are

satisfied M. Renan very greatly over-estimates the proportion which these bear to the whole; and we are certainly not prepared to endorse his opinion, that we must principally look towards this quarter for the correspondences between the Shemitic and Indo-European tongues. As to the first of the trio of positions on which we now remark, we leave M. Renan without any misgivings in the hands of Grimm and Max Müller; for, if any thing is certain in modern philology, this is certain—that the canons, by which these and other great names of the science judge of languages as alien or akin, are founded in the nature of things, and are, therefore, within their own boundaries, as sure as those of the entomologist or astronomer. Will M. Renan contend that botany has no fixed signs for determining the affinities of plants, because a multitude of the phenomena, which enable us to class the palms together, are wanting in the club-mosses and horse-tails?

We have spoken of the ancient geographical domain of the Shemitish languages, as one of the questions to which our author addresses himself in his first book; and a brief notice of the long and elaborate chapter, in which this subject is treated of, must conclude our already too-extended critique upon this portion of M. Renan's work. At the very threshold of his investigation the writer encounters a troop of difficult problems connected with the origin and ethnological relations of the various peoples, which from time immemorial occupied the countries lying between Armenia and Ethiopia, in one direction, and the Lesser Asia and the Indian Ocean, in the other. Speaking generally, this, it is well known, is the Shemitic region proper; and, in dealing with the problems just referred to, M. Renan seeks approximately to define its borders, and to indicate the areas occupied by the race at different periods of its history. We wish we could pass an unqualified eulogium on the manner in which he has accomplished his task. At some points he is eminently successful; at others he fails; through most of his argument precious metal and base earth cling together too closely to be sundered, and an arbitrary and pestilent scepticism vitiates what would otherwise be the good fruit of a rare penetration and learning. What are we to think of a writer who calmly, and without the slightest attempt at proof, informs us, that the early pages of Genesis contain the confused and broken 'souvenirs' of the Shemitic family of nations; and that, while many of the records of the post-diluvian periods are fictitious, those relating to the ages before the flood must be wholly excluded from the sphere of reality. Antediluvian geography is simple fable; its genealogies are made up of names

of heroes, possibly of divinities also, and there is no end to the gaps, contradictions, and clumsy patching and seaming, which they exhibit; and though Enoch and others are more real personages, they are brought in merely to give the romance in which they figure an air of truth. The traditions mend from the time of the deluge; yet you must be wary even here; for the lists of patriarchs are often nothing more than countries, mountains, towns, or even historical events, dressed up into the shape of human beings following one another in lines of natural descent; and, if the geography be generally trustworthy, you are still in a region haunted by dreams and legends, and may easily fall into a quagmire. One 'curious etymological myth' is specially marked by M. Renan. He turns it over and over with the half-interested, half-patronising look, which a mathematical father might bestow on his child's jack-in-the-box. An ingenious little plaything of the infant mind of the Shemites, that tower-of-Babel story! Even so late as the age before Terah, with whom genuine Shemitic history begins, we find the old haziness in the historical atmosphere. Nahor, who 'lived nine-and-twenty years, and begat Terah,' and who died more than a century after, was probably a town, and not a person at all! We suppose this is the language of that noble style of scepticism which speeds its way, regardless of stone walls. Let it have full credit for courage. We wish it a large increase of common sense. And if a grain or two of piety were added, it would be none the less dignified, and, in point of science, would be vastly more respectable.

Subject to the qualifications required by these and the like principles, M. Renan's opinions and judgments on the question in hand are well worthy of attention. The original home of the Shemites was the country of Arphaxad, or the Chasdim—in other words, that part of the modern Kurdistan which answers to the ancient Arrhapachitis, in the north of Assyria. Hence, long before the time of Terah, they migrated in a south-westerly direction, down the course of the Tigris and Euphrates, and spread themselves less or more widely over the region lying between the two rivers on the one side, and the Mediterranean and Arabian seas on the other. Here they encountered and destroyed the Rephaim, Zomzommim, and other scattered tribes, whose race affinities are unknown; and at the same time came into contact with the mysterious Cushites of Yemen, whose prominent place in the early history of mankind we are glad to see that our author, against the late Baron Bunsen, and in accordance with the witness of Scripture, and the recent discoveries of Rawlinson and other cuneiform scholars, distinctly maintains and vindicates. From this heathen

civilisation, of which Nimrod may be taken as the type, the Shemitish people kept aloof; and in their three branches of the Aramæans or Syrians, the Arphaxadites, including the Terahites, &c., and the Canaanites,—whom M. Renan, in opposition to the tenth of Genesis, to various testimonies of profane writers, and to his own doctrine of the persistent monotheism of the Shemites, pronounces to be of this family,—preserved both the stream of their race, and their peculiar religious and social life, pure, for the most part, from foreign admixtures. At a much later date, somewhere about B.C. 2000, the famous migration of Terah and his family took place, the starting-point of which was the so-called 'Ur of the Chaldees.' Certain recent researches among the arrow-headed inscriptions of Lower Babylonia favour, as is well known, the identification of Ur with one of the ancient city-sites of the land of Shinar. M. Renan does not accept the evidence on which this opinion rests. 'Everything,' he says, 'leads us to the belief that Ur belongs to the country of Arphaxad,' the primitive home of the Shemitish race. Of course, the causes of the migration both of Terah and Abraham, as our author represents them, are purely natural. First the Aryans about the Caucasus and the Caspian, then the Cushites on the Tigris, in all probability pressed them forward, and obliged them to seek a more westerly home. In a passage, which sorts exceedingly well with the profanity of some other parts of his book, and which we decline to put into Anglo-Saxon, M. Renan suggests that, 'La race gigantesque et impie des Nefilim, issue, selon la tradition Hébraïque, de démons incubes, et dont les crimes amenèrent le déluge,' represents, it may be, these same restless, state-mongering, and pagan Cushites, whose religion, language, and habit of life, were all alike alien to the descendants of Shem.

The philological questions which spring out of the last-named Shemitish migration, and its historical sequences, belong rather to the after sections of M. Renan's book, and are there treated in full. In dwelling on the area occupied by the Shemitic languages, however, the writer must needs travel beyond the limits which we have just indicated as their historic home. Every one is aware that, before the birth of history, properly so called, a Shemite population spread itself over various countries not included within this area. Before going further, M. Renan sets himself to determine, as far as may be, the place which this element occupied in the early ethnology of the world. On the whole, he thinks it has been greatly overestimated. Taking language as the only guide to be trusted in such inquiries, he discusses with much ability the questions of the prevalence of Shemitism, first on the side of Asia Minor and

Armenia, then on the Assyrian and Persian frontier, lastly in the direction of the basin of the Nile. Our limits will not allow us to follow him through this most interesting and valuable section of his book. We regret that they will not. It abounds with choice and well-assorted fruits of a ripe and elegant scholarship; and exact and earnest students of antiquity—only too weary as they are of the impudent plagiarism and wordy nothingness of empirics—will read and read again, with admiration and sure profit, the forty or fifty pages of masterly writing which they will here find devoted to this obscure subject. The most that we can do is to make a few jottings.

In Asia Minor, M. Renan is unable to discover the Shemites north of the Taurus. With Böttticher and Lassen, he is convinced that the Mysian, Phrygian, Lydian, Cappadocian, Pontic, Paphlagonian, and Bithynian tongues were all Indo-European, and not Shemitic. The language of Caria is more difficult to determine. Undoubtedly it contained a strong infusion of Phœnician. Still this also seems to have been structurally Aryan. South of the Taurus the footprints of the Shemite are obvious enough. The Solymi, the ancient inhabitants of Lycia, Pamphylia, and Pisidia, were very probably of this stock. Cilicia was distinctly Shemitic before its comparatively recent conquest by the Greeks. Cyprus, too, was colonized by the Phœnicians. We doubt whether our author does not under-estimate the ethnological value of the Phœnician settlements on the European shores of the Mediterranean. Some of them at least must have been much more than mere trading posts. As to Armenia, though it cradled the Shemites, it has always been an Aryan region within the historic period. There can no longer be any question as to the Aryan affinities of the Armenian language; and we are glad to see M. Renan endorsing the view of Lassen, that the ancient tongues of Armenia, Cappadocia, Phrygia, the north of Asia Minor, and Thrace, were, in all likelihood, near of kin to each other, and should be classed together as a separate type of Indo-European speech. The race to which the Philistines belonged, and the language they used, is a question which M. Renan takes up in this connexion. We believe them to have been what the tenth of Genesis makes them—Cushites, of the same stock with the Ethiopians, Yemenites, Canaanites, &c., speaking, therefore, a Hamitic language, not far remote from the tongue of the Shemites, but not identical with it. This doctrine really disposes of all the difficulties of the case, whether linguistic or other. Rejecting this clue, science is bound, we think, to acquiesce in M. Renan's conclusion, that 'all we can

affirm is, that they came from one of the islands of the Mediterranean, and, expelling the Avites, who were probably a Canaanitish people, established themselves in the corner of Palestine and the Egyptian desert.'

In regard to the eastern border of our group of languages, M. Renan finds no little difficulty in drawing his lines. Whatever he may say of Moses and the flood, it is evident, on his own showing, that Shem, Ham, and Japheth, were in wondrously close contact on the banks of the Tigris and Euphrates at the very time at which the sacred history puts them there by force of a miracle. We have already expounded some of his views as to the relations in which these three great divisions of mankind stood to one another on the geographical field in question at a very early period of antiquity. Long before the Terahites crossed the Euphrates, the Shemites had established themselves in Mesopotamia. At a time equally pre-historic, the Cushites migrated northwards from about the Persian Gulf, and founded Babylon, Nineveh, and other great cities on or near the Mesopotamian rivers. Further, at a very early epoch, the Aryan Chasdim spread themselves over Assyria Proper, and thence extended their settlements as far down as lower Babylonia. Thus Shemite, Hamite, and Japhethite—race and language too—were found together in the region which Scripture makes the second birthplace of mankind, when the God of glory appeared to Abraham, and bade him go into Canaan. For more than a thousand years after Abraham, the Old Testament Scriptures are all but silent as to what took place on the Tigris and Euphrates. Then in the eighth century B.C., the mighty Assyrian power breaks in upon us, and, some while after, that of Babylon; both, to all appearance, un-Shemitic, as their religion, their civil polity, their warlike character, their language, so far as we have any knowledge of it, seem to prove. Sennacherib, Esarhaddon, Mardokempad, Evil-Merodach, &c., are certainly not names of Shemitic origin. M. Renan thinks that both the Ninevite and Babylonian dynasties were Aryans; as were likewise the Chasdim, who, after disappearing from history for above twelve centuries, suddenly and mysteriously re-appear in connexion with Babylon and the power of Nebuchadnezzar 'the Chaldean.' The Persians who in the sixth century B.C. established themselves in Babylon on the ruins of the Chaldean empire, were, of course, members of the great Indo-European family; and, on the hypotheses just stated, simply kept up that long invasion of the Hamitic and Shemitic territory by the Aryan race and tongue, in which the original Chasdim of the land of Arphaxad led the way. All along, however, M. Renan supposes the

bulk of the Babylonian and Assyrian population to have been either Shemites proper, or their undefinable cousins the Hamitic Cushites. Towards the time of the Christian era, the limits of the Shemitish languages in the direction of Persia were nearly what they are at present; they reached, that is to say, as far as the mountains forming the eastern edge of the river basin of the Tigris and the Zab. Under the Sassanids of the third and four following centuries, Shemite and Aryan joined hands more closely than ever on the Assyrian and Persian frontier; and hence sprang the language which all but demolishes Max Müller's denial of the possibility of a mixed tongue, the so called Huzwaresh, or Pehlevi. The weft and warp, however, of this curious philological motley, though strangely broken and pieced, are now generally allowed to be Iranian; so that it properly belongs to the Indo-European rather than the Shemitish group of languages.

In the opinions above recited we agree in the main with M. Renan. At the same time we regret that his argument should be crippled more than once by his views as to the Book of Daniel, which, we need hardly say, he regards as quite unhistoric; and, notwithstanding much that we approve and admire in his polemic against the Shemitism of one class of the cuneiform inscriptions, we are still disposed to accept the opinion on this subject, which our most trustworthy labourers among the arrowheads have been led to form. On one point connected with this last topic we strongly complain of M. Renan. Throughout his volume he ignores, or makes light of, the oriental scholars of England; and we had not gone far with him before we observed, in particular, a disposition to disparage the eminent services which Sir Henry Rawlinson has rendered to the cause of cuneiform learning. In dealing with the question above named, however, this distinguished man is made the object of direct and formal attack; and while Burnouf, Lassen, and Oppert receive even more than their meed of praise, Rawlinson is held up to ridicule as a philological pretender, whose principles are as absurd as his application of them is rash and random. Has M. Renan read the writings he condemns? Does he mean to deny that Rawlinson made large and independent additions to the alphabet of the Persian cuneiform, as it was left by Burnouf and Lassen; and that he was the first to give us intelligible and continuous translations of the arrowheaded texts of this order? We contend that this double fact is a strong *à priori* authentication of his later researches; and, from what we know of these researches, they fully justify the confidence with which the literary world was so well warranted

in receiving them. Whether Sir Henry Rawlinson has been successful or not in his readings of the Assyrian and Babylonian inscriptions, there never was a more groundless allegation than that which represents him as empirical and visionary. For combined learning, sagacity, laboriousness, discretion, and candour he has no superior among those who have wrought with him in the same field of inquiry; and we wish nothing better for some who criticize him than that they may possess a tithe of his sound-mindedness, modesty, and caution. M. Renan might well have spared this most unfortunate episode in his work, and have gone without pause to the last of the three geographical quarters in which he found it necessary to define the habitations of the Shemites and their languages.

Looking towards the Isthmus of Suez, the problem of the Coptic tongue and its relations to what is commonly known as Shemitish speech immediately presents itself. The manner in which M. Renan disposes of it is every way admirable. Bating a dictum or two as to the genesis of language, which we know not how to reconcile either with his doctrine respecting the Pehlevi, or with the general facts of linguistic history, nothing can be more thorough, discriminating, symmetrical, and lucid, than his criticism on this question. It is a very choice piece of writing, and, as an example of temperate but vigorous argument, and of easy, forcible style, merits attention, where Coptic and Hebrew have no charms of their own. The conclusion which he reaches will not be grateful to extreme philologists of any school; though we do not see how the facts can warrant a different one. He holds that the ancient Egyptian is neither Indo-European nor Shemitic, though it had more of the latter element in its composition than of the former. Neither is it, strictly speaking, a mongrel, sharing the structure of both of the two families of languages. It stands apart as one of that little known but most interesting assemblage of tongues, which from time immemorial has occupied the valley of the Nile and its southern feeders, and to which, he is disposed to think, the Berber, Touareg, and other North African tongues will be ultimately found to belong. The Shemitism which marks the Coptic is accounted for by M. Renan on the principle that it was for ages in near contact with nomadic populations of the race of Shem. We doubt whether this is an adequate explanation. Add to it the original brotherhood of Shem and Ham, and we are satisfied. Our author, however, is shy of this hypothesis. On the whole, the African continent has been the scene of the widest extension that the Shemitish languages have ever

reached. Northward and eastward a formidable breastwork of Aryan and Turanian tongues prevented their advancing beyond a very short distance. For more than a thousand years before Christ, however, the vast outspread of the territory of Ham between the Mediterranean, the Red Sea, and the Niger, was subject to frequent invasions by Shemites, and was less or more widely occupied by them; and in our own days Shemitism, as represented by the Arabic language, the Koran, and the true old Musaulman spirit, is nowhere more triumphant than in this noble region.

Books II., III., and IV., of M. Renan's work, occupying together several hundred pages, are constructed on the same general plan, and treat respectively of the three great divisions of Shemitish speech, historically considered: namely, the Hebrew branch, including the Hebrew proper and the Phœnician;—the Aramæan branch, comprehending, first, the Chaldee of the Scriptures, Targums, and Talmud, with the Syro-Chaldaic and the Samaritan; secondly, the pagan Nabathæan and Tsabian; thirdly, the Syriac;—and last of all, the Arabian branch, embracing the Himyaritic, Ethiopian, and Arabic. Of this whole section of the volume, apart from certain monstrous principles and dogmas similar to those on which we have already animadverted, it becomes us to speak in terms of the highest respect. It is a wonderful product of richly gifted and cultivated mind; and we are at a loss to know whether to admire most the fine philosophical spirit, or the unobtrusive wealth of learning, or the bright, full flow of language, which the reader will find in every part of it. The keensightedness with which M. Renan perceives both the correspondences and the diversities of various types of speech, and the striking and felicitous manner in which he paints them, could hardly be exceeded by Ruskin or De Quincey. On all these accounts we deplore the more deeply the presence of so much which religion and reason must agree to condemn.

The Hebraic Branch of the Shemitish languages, comprising the Hebrew proper and the Phœnician, was the first to blossom and bear fruit along the course of the ages. From a point of early antiquity too distant to define, it flourished till the sixth century before Christ; that is to say, till its glory was eclipsed by the sudden apparition of the Aramaic in its summer freshness and vigour. Canaan must be regarded as its historic home; though Hebrew, in some form, was doubtless spoken by the whole house of Terah before its migration thither. Hebrew is pre-eminently the language of the Beni Israel; and while the tongue of the Canaanites and Phœnicians, whom we hold, in opposition to M. Renan, to have been Hamitic in race,

stands side by side with it in the sacred records of Abraham's connexion with Palestine, the former is the purest, completest, and, in respect of its literature, the oldest of the Shemite languages, and, like the Sanskrit among the Aryan tongues, serves as the key to the rest. So our author regards and ranks it; though the position he assigns it among its peers has been commonly, and, as we think, rightly, given to the Arabic, so far at least as structural entireness and originality are concerned. Hebrew certainly, in these respects, is not to the language of the Moallakat and the Koran what Sanskrit is to Latin or Greek.

For the history of the Hebrew, M. Renan distinguishes three periods: the Archaic, or that which preceded the eighth century before Christ; the Classic, formed by this century and the following one; the Chaldaic, extending from the date last named to the time when the Hebrew proper ceased to be a spoken language. The first of these periods our author fixes on the assumption, that it was not till the era of the *renaissance* which followed the reforms of Hezekiah and Josiah, that the Old-Testament Books took their present shape. Prior to this, most of them had passed through a series of changes, both as to their substance and as to the forms of the language in which they were written. Our present Pentateuch was not written by Moses. The idea of Moses being a historian is comparatively modern. The writings which pass under his name contain, indeed, authentic and contemporaneous records both of Mosaic and pre-Mosaic age. But the Pentateuch, as a connected narrative, belongs to a much later period. Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, and Numbers, are made up of materials gathered by different hands at different times, and eventually heaped togegether rather than built into a well-ordered whole; while Deuteronomy is plainly the same mass wrought up in a rhetorical way for the purposes of religious edification. This hypothesis, our author assures us, is held by 'every enlightened critic in Germany.' The so-called archaisms in the Hebrew of the Pentateuch are no archaisms. The diverse forms in which its various parts at first appeared have been reduced to a common standard. The language has been cooked, and cooked again,—'*rechauffer*' is M. Renan's word,—till almost everything has been made to square with the classical type. And the same may be said, with certain qualifications, of the other historical books of the canon down to the above-named epoch. In stating these views of our author, we designedly omit a multitude of details, which we have neither room nor inclination to specify. A writer who will quietly look the nineteenth Christian century in the face, and affirm that 'the ancient Hebrews

never dreamt of regarding their legislator as a historian,' must excuse us, if we think our 'No' as good argument as his 'Yes,' and accordingly decline to answer him when he goes on to say, that 'no doubt' the Phœnicians taught the Hebrews to write, and that 'no doubt' the most ancient pieces in the Pentateuch have been retouched, and that 'no doubt' the lists of literary works assigned to David and Solomon have been exaggerated, with much besides of the same description. We believe that Moses 'wrote' as God bade him, and as the books that go by his name declare he did; and that the Pentateuch in its existing form, both as to matter and language, was mainly his composition. No opposing theory has a tithe of the probabilities in its favour, which attach to this most ancient tradition and record. As to the one point of the language, while quite alive to certain difficulties, which spring out of the fact that the Hebrew of Moses and of Jeremiah is substantially the same, we wholly dissent from M. Renan's explanation of it. It is a mere assumption to say that the archaisms are only peculiarities of an individual writer. Strange that these should be precisely such as a large philological analogy would pronounce to be evidence of a high antiquity! And, stranger still, that they should be allowed to stand where, according to M. Renan's doctrine, an all-levelling orthographical criticism has laboured to sweep away whatever was distinctive of particular times and persons! But this apart, our author himself supplies us with facts belonging to another sphere of Shemitic literature, which will go a long way towards furnishing a satisfactory account of the phenomenon in question. Not only is the Arabic of the Koran the Arabic of the current century; but even that of the cycle of writings, known as the Moallakat, and dating before the time of Mohammed, 'differs in nothing from the written Arabic of our own days.' We conceive that in this parallel we have a strong argument to show, that such a persistency of the ancient Hebrew, as the received view of the Old-Testament Scriptures supposes, was not only not impossible, but, on the contrary, was highly probable, and indeed all but certain. If the written Arabian has remained unaltered for thirteen or fourteen hundred years, mainly, though not entirely, through the influence which the Koran has exercised over the mind and speech of the race, much more might the Hebrew, the most perfect type of its class, as M. Renan says,—the language of a Shemitish people singularly isolated and distinct from all others, —consecrated, too, in the very youth of the national life of those who spoke it as the vehicle of the oracles of God to them, —be likely, in the ages of the world before Christ, to hold fast

its original form during the same space of time. We confess we are at a loss to understand how so much difficulty should be made of this circumstance, considering at once the natural inflexibility of the Shemitish tongues, and the proof which the history of the Arabic affords, that a language of this family, so far as it is written, may transmit itself inviolate, under the safe keeping of an ancient and ruling religious literature, through decade after decade of generations.

Once fairly out of the slough of myths and legends, and landed well in the times of David and Solomon, our author moves on for a while like a man of might. We are not so confident as he appears to be, that the Book of Job makes no allusions to what he calls 'Mosaism;' nor do we see any reason why the composition of it should be referred to the age of Solomon rather than to a much earlier one. A work so intensely Shemitic is far more likely to have been written and put into the sacred canon, if not in the days of Moses, at least at a period long antecedent to those of Solomon. It is a pleasing example, however, of the critical discernment, which even the strongest prejudices of M. Renan are not always able to blind, that he finds no such philological difficulty in the way of attributing an early date to Job, Canticles, and Ecclesiastes, as should countervail the evidences of antiquity supplied by their theological and other contents. He regards all three as belonging to the Solomonic age. He cannot understand how writings marked by so much freedom, spirit, and power, could possibly be the composition of those later periods, to which they are so often assigned. The linguistic peculiarities, on which so great stress has been laid in the case of the Song of Songs and Koheleth, he explains by the close correspondence which the Hebrew, as spoken by the multitude, must always have borne to the Aramæan. From the era of David and Solomon, our author judges the language of Israel to have been 'irrevocably fixed;' and, after the lapse of a century or two, during which no addition was made to the Hebrew literature,—for Elijah and Elisha did not write,—we find ourselves in that golden age, of which Joel, Amos, Hosea, and Isaiah, were the heralds or conspicuous glories. To this period —the seventh and eighth centuries before Christ—M. Renan not only refers many of the Psalms and most of the Prophets, but also, in accordance with his conglomeration and reconstruction theory, the collecting of the Proverbs, the composing of Deuteronomy, and, as before said, the final shaping of the Pentateuch, and of most of the historical books of the Old Testament.

Towards the period of the Babylonish Captivity,—the sixth century before Christ, that is to say,—the Hebrew ceased

to be spoken as the language of Palestine. On this subject M. Renan writes with much acuteness and judgment; and scholars and divines will do well to consider, whether his views, as a whole, do not bring us as near the facts of the case as the evidence within our reach will enable us to come. He doubts whether the biblical 'Chaldee,' so called, was distinctively the language of Babylon. At any rate, he does not believe that the Jews lost their mother-tongue during their residence on the Euphrates. Some of the finest Psalms were written there. The ancient Jewish spirit, as the books of Ezra and Nehemiah sufficiently prove, maintained itself with much greater vigour among the people of the captivity, than among their fellow-countrymen at home. Moreover, from that time forward, Babylon became a new centre of Judaism, and continued to be such till the destruction of the ancient capital raised it to the position of a second Jerusalem. How can it be supposed, with facts like these before us, that Babylon was the grave of the Hebrew language? The truth is, that Palestine, and not the further East, was the scene of its dissolution. It died where it had so long lived and flourished, pressed down and stifled by the ever-increasing weight of the Aramæan, which came in upon it from all sides, and eventually killed and superseded it; the old name of Hebrew, however, still remaining as the title of the now ascendant cousin-tongue. The Hebrew proper continued to be written in Palestine almost down to the time of the Christian era. The later Old-Testament Books are in this language. Not improbably the Apocrypha was at first composed in it. As a spoken tongue, however, Hebrew, in the strict sense of the term, began to decline rapidly from the period of the exile in Babylon; and by the time of the Maccabees it was no longer the ordinary speech of Palestine. In these views of M. Renan we entirely concur. We see no objections to them that will bear to be put under the microscope. The evidence of history is strongly on their side. Moreover, they are sustained by all we know as to the manner in which languages decay and disappear under influences similar to those which obtained in Palestine at the time referred to. Students of Scripture will have further reason for thanking our author, in this connexion, because of the valuable distinctions which he draws between the older and younger forms of the Hebrew, as to orthography, the use of words, idiomatic expression, &c. We must warn them, however, that here, as elsewhere, M. Renan's philology is mixed up with historical and critical theories, which have no better foundation than the day-dreaming of a gifted but misguided mind, and that the deference due to his scholar-

ship will need to be blended with the caution, which reserves its full faith for nothing but demonstration and moral certainty.

The history of the post-biblical Hebrew our author divides into two periods. During the first of these, extending from the close of the canon of Scripture to the twelfth century of our era, the language was still written at distant intervals, but was commonly supplanted, even in religious books, by the Aramæan and Arabic. The second period begins with the date last mentioned and runs on to the present day. Throughout this space Hebrew again takes its old position as the literary language of the Jews. We regret that we cannot follow M. Renan over the ground covered by this section of his work; still less can we track his path through the formidable throng of black-gowned Talmudists, Masoretes, grammarians, and critics, whose learned labours form the last link of the chain by which the speech of Abraham is bound to the thought and science of the Gentile west in this nineteenth century. Among the many important discussions which the reader will here find, we may particularly note the passages on the linguistic contents of the Mishna and Gemaras, on the grammatical and lexicographical works of the Arabic school of Saadias in the tenth and eleventh centuries, and on the resurrection of Hebrew literature which accompanied and followed the Reformation, as containing much valuable information, woven up with the golden threads of a criticism which makes even the dullest topics sparkle.

With equal reluctance we lag behind M. Renan, while he closes his dissertation on the Hebraic branch of the Shemitish languages, with a rapid but masterly survey of the Phœnician and its cognates. We have already expressed our dissent from his views as to the race connexions of the Punic people. In the chapter before us, he makes them part of what he terms 'the great Shemitico-Cushite family,' and so identifies them in stock with the Cushites of Yemen, Babylonia, &c., before spoken of. To this we have only one objection. The theory assumes the Shemitish origin of the Cushites. There is no proof of this. As M. Renan admits, the entire character of the Phœnicians is as un-Shemitic as possible. The only difficulty is the language; and till we know much better than we now do, how far the primeval Hamitic and Shemitic agreed or disagreed, and what the early movements of the Cushites were, we are Moses's disciples, or, if our author prefers it, we adopt, as the most probable and philosophical solution of the problem in question, the statement which that curious compound of geography, mythology, and history, commonly known as the tenth of Genesis, makes in reference to the ethnic relations of Canaan. On the

structure, peculiarities, and fortunes of the Phœnician language; on the dialectic correspondences and diversities of the Carthaginian and its Asiatic parent; on the character of the ancient Numidian, which M. Renan, in opposition to Gesenius, believes to have been Berber; last of all, by way of appendix, on the influence which various Hamitic and Aryan languages, either exercised on the Shemitic, or themselves received from it, M. Renan writes with his usual exactness, vividness, and beauty; and nothing but a stern necessity could make us content ourselves with so telescopic a glance at this part of his labours as we have now taken.

The Aramaic, the second great member of the Shemitish family of languages, forms the subject of the next two hundred pages of M. Renan's volume. From pre-historic times till the sixth century B.C., Hebrew was the ruling Shemitic tongue. Thenceforward for twelve hundred years the star of Aram was in the ascendant. It was the political importance of the basin of the Tigris and Euphrates at the time just named, which lifted the Aramæan into its throne. This had always been the prevailing language of Assyria; and war and conquest now gave it a prevalence and an authority, before which the Hebrew in particular was unable to hold its ground. At present we know little of the ancient Aramæan, except through Jewish sources. What the cuneiform inscriptions may do for us by and by we cannot tell. Hitherto they have not added much, on this subject, to what we knew before. The biblical 'Chaldee' is probably the Aramæan of Western Syria rather than of Babylon. In comparison with the Hebrew, both this and the language of the Targums show to disadvantage. Their syntax is more precise and more fully developed than the Hebrew;—but they are more mixed in their vocabulary; their style is loose, dragging, and redundant; altogether, they are much less noble, animated, and picturesque. The Targums our author refers to the century immediately preceding the birth of Christ, and to the one immediately following. He doubts whether they represent the popular speech of Palestine about the time of our Lord. The relations in which the Greek and Aramæan stood to one another in the same country at this period are a question into which our author does not go at length. He believes that the vernacular was so generally known that no other medium would be needed by Christ in His ordinary preaching. At the same time he is of opinion that Greek was very generally spoken; and, while he does not pronounce against the unmeaning and most embarrassing theory of a Syro-Chaldaic 'protevangel,' he distinctly holds that the New Testament books, without any exception, were originally written in

Greek. After the downfall of Jerusalem, Babylon was the Jewish metropolis, and Aramæan was more than ever the language of the Oriental Israelites. The Mishnaite doctors, indeed, down to the third century, wrote a sort of Hebrew, though it was strongly tinctured with Aramæanisms. On the other hand, the great lights of the schools of Sora, Nehardea, &c., on to the tenth century, used the Aramaic; and this is the language of the Jerusalem and Babylonian Talmuds. The lexicography and grammar of the Talmuds are a field still open to the ambition of any who aspire to philological immortality. The prospect of a literature, whose substance and form alike are dead men's bones, worked up by the fingers of a harlequin ignorance, extravagance, and conceit, can hardly fail to be attractive to fanciers of dust and cobwebs; and for their special benefit, no doubt, M. Renan sets the door into it ajar, and gives us a glimpse of the beauties within. The Jews wrote in Aramæan till, in the tenth century, the Arabic displaced the former language, and for three hundred years held sway as the literary tongue of the people. After this they returned not so much to the language of the Masora and other Aramaic writings of the pre-Arabian period, as to the ancient Hebrew, which they endeavoured to reproduce, and adapt to the exigences of mediæval thought and culture. Still the Aramæan was sometimes employed, as in the famous Zohar, the Bible of the Cabbalists, which our author places in the thirteenth century.

A valuable episode on the Samaritan people, language, and literature forms the bridge by which M. Renan passes on to what he terms the Pagan Aramæanism,—that is to say, the ethnology and philology of the Nabathæans, Tsabians, &c. The ancient Arabian writers often speak of the Nabathæans, meaning thereby the inhabitants of Chaldæa and Irak, as a people eminently skilled in astronomy, husbandry, medicine, and magic. Making every allowance for oriental hyperbole, there can be little doubt that there was at one time an extensive literature, which constituted in part the basis of the scientific reputation of the Nabathæans. Of this literature one very curious monument has recently been brought to light in an Arabic version of the year A.D. 904,—the so-called *Nabathæan Agriculture*, already famous through Europe by the wild pretensions to antiquity which M. Chevolsohn set up on its behalf, and by the searching and destructive criticism to which his arguments have been subjected in a paper of M. Renan's. The views which this paper embodies are anticipated to some extent in the work before us; and though they deprive the new star of much of its brightness, they make it

evident that, so late as the tenth century of our era, there were still Nabathæans at Babylon unconverted to Islam, and still remains of an indigenous literature, the flourishing period of which stretches away backward into the indefinable distance of the ages. Beside this unique product of the mind of ancient Aram, there are also the better known but frivolous writings of the sect of the Tsabians, Nataoræans, Mendaites, or Christians of St. John, of whom certain modern representatives are still to be found at the head of the Persian Gulf. As to the relations which subsist between the Tsabians and Nabathæans, as to the religious opinions and practices both of the one and the other, and as to the character of the Aramæan in which the Book of Adam and other Mendaite writings are composed, M. Renan gives his readers a series of facts and opinions, which we should be only too glad to set forth in full, if our limits would allow. The topic is rich in interest; and after times will doubtless fetch light from these sources, which will illuminate many an obscure page both of the Christian and heathen history of the by-gone world.

The so-called Syriac language is much less Shemitish than some other members of its family. It is the ecclesiastical Aramæan of the schools of Edessa and Nisibis. Its literature is essentially Greek; and it is itself coloured strongly with the dye of the Aryan. We can hardly doubt that there was a native literature in Syria Proper and Northern Mesopotamia before the Christian era; though we know nothing of it. The most ancient monument of the Syriac that has come down to our times is the Peshito version of the Bible; of which, the Old Testament part was made from the Hebrew, the New Testament part from the Greek, and as to whose date, M. Renan is disposed to favour the view which fixes it earlier than the scholars of fifty years ago generally assigned to it. After the Peshito Scriptures, we have a long succession of Syriac writings extending to the thirteenth century. Between Bardesanes at one end of the line and Barhebræus at the other, a multitude of authors might be named,—translators of Scripture, sermon-writers, hymnologers, controversialists, grammarians,—whose works, in whole or part, are still extant; to say nothing of the enormous literature in the same language which time has engulfed. In the eighth and ninth centuries Syriac formed the connecting link between the culture of Greece and Arabia. Almost all the Arabic translations of Greek authors were made by Syrians from earlier translations in Syriac. The Nestorians of Chaldea, at this time, were, in point of fact, the depository of the learning of the old world, and the fountain of the learning

of the new. In the tenth century the Mussulman disciple took the chair of his master; and from the eleventh onward, the ancient glory of the language of Ephrem, though it shone again for an instant in Barhebræus, paled more and more, till it utterly disappeared. We wish we could accompany our author as he proceeds to define the characteristics of the Syriac, to discuss the question of its dialectal varieties, and to mark the reciprocal action of Shemitism and of the forces external to it, whether philological or otherwise, during the Aramæan period. Much of this ground will be new even to well-informed students of language and history; and we promise them a plentiful reward, if they will take the pains to traverse it with M. Renan as their guide. The faculty of combining minute and accurate historical detail with wide-reaching philosophical generalizations, and of evoking poetry from the unromantic materials out of which grammars and dictionaries are made, is as rare as it is admirable. M. Renan possesses this faculty; and, in dealing with the points just named, his readers will feel the spell of it upon them in many passages of wonderful grasp and pictorial impressiveness.

In his fourth book our author treats of the third and last great branch of the Shemitish tongue, which is the Arabian. This he divides into the Ishmaelitish or Arabic proper, and the Joktanid or Sabæan, including the Himyaritic and Ethiopian. No part of his work is more carefully written or more densely charged with important facts and sentiments than this. If it has special interest for the philologist, its claims on the attention of educated persons of all classes are scarcely less numerous. It is a model of philosophical history both as to the conception and the shaping of it; and it is happily free in the main from the sceptical dogmas and paradoxes which disfigure other portions of the volume. 'Never did race sleep so long and deep a sleep,' in the outset of its life, 'as did the Arabian.' Even the early Christian centuries are pre-historic to it. The sixth century is its heroic age. Down to the time of Mohammed 'it has no place either in the political, intellectual, or religious history of the world.' With the exception of a few genealogies, its ancient records are nothing but a clumsy and factitious reproduction of Jewish traditions, and of the few statements which Scripture makes concerning its first ancestors. Islam, however, was not the cause but the effect of the awakening of the race. Its slumber was broken before Mohammed. How this came to be, is a question not easy to answer. In all probability the great movements of the Roman and Christian world during the first few hundred years of our era, were the trumpet that rang through the home of Ishmael, and roused its sleepers.

We have positive evidence of the beginning of a new life in Arabia, before the times of the prophet, in the sudden appearance, in the sixth century, of a highly characteristic native poetry, written in what is substantially the Arabic of books in our own days, the language having been previously fixed, so far as we can tell, by no written monument. In speaking of the Arabian language, however, we must distinguish between the tongue of Yemen, or the Himyaritic, in its various forms and connexions, on the one hand, and that of Modhar, or the Arabic strictly so called, on the other. The Himyaritic, with which the ancient and modern Ethiopic is closely connected, was from time immemorial the language of Southern Arabia. The modern Mahri, or Ekhili, and certain other dialects allied to it, appear to be its true descendants; and it is not unlikely, strange though it be, that the ancestral tongue itself, so long lost to the world, may yet be recovered in good part from the numberless inscriptions, which those who spoke it wrote on the rocks for ever. Already we know enough of it to be able to say, that, like the Mahri and the Ethiopian, it is at once Shemitic and not Shemitic. It is difficult, indeed, to resist the belief, that in the Yemenite Arabs, both of the old world and the new, we have a branch of those same Cushites, of whom mention has several times before been made, and that, with all that is Shemitic in their language, they, and the Ethiopians, and the Canaanites, and the Phœnicians really sprang in common from a stem which, though nearly allied to that of the Shemites, was not itself Shemitish. M. Renan would distinctly exclude the Canaanites from this category; and, as we have seen, he elsewhere insists on the Shemitism of the Phœnicians. He allows that there are singular correspondences between Phœnicia and Yemen, as well in language as in the general character of their history and civilization. Still he finds the linguistic difficulty an insurmountable one, as soon as the question is raised of excluding the Phœnician altogether from the Shemitish stock. He seems to us to come very near our own explanation of the mystery, when he accounts for the peculiarities of the Mahri tongue by supposing, that, while Cushite in its texture, it has been altered by subsequent contact with the Shemitic of the north. There is no reason why this theory should not equally apply to the Phœnicians, and even to the Canaanites; and though we do not believe it embodies the whole truth of the case, we are persuaded it is one great element of it.

'Long before the discovery of the Himyaritic inscriptions, it had been perceived that the Ghez, or learned language of Abyssinia, was a living representative of the ancient Yemen

tongue.' Southern Arabia and the African Ethiopia are ethnographically and linguistically one. When the colonisation of the latter country took place we do not know. It is a fact, however, which may not improbably be found hereafter to have a significance at present little dreamt of, that the civilisation of Abyssinia was always superior to that of Yemen, and that the former, down to the age of Mohammed, claimed a kind of suzerainty over its neighbour. As to the Ethiopic language, the leading features of which M. Renan pourtrays with his own strong yet delicate pencil, it exhibits the same structural anomalies with the Mahri, and, as our author puts it, gives one the impression of 'a Shemitish speech, uttered by un-Shemitic tongue.' Contrary to the received opinion, the Ethiopic was written before the introduction of Christianity or even of the Greek letters into Abyssinia. We have no monuments of the language, however, whether rock inscriptions or other, dating further back than the Ethiopic version of the Bible, made about the fourth century. For some hundreds of years after this there seems to have been considerable literary activity in Ethiopia, and very many works were translated into Ghez from the Greek. After the thirteenth century, the Arabic or Coptic generally supplied the originals from which Ethiopic translations were made. In the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries the invasions of the Gallas and Musulmans, together with the establishment of the Jesuits in Abyssinia, caused a rapid decline of the native literature; and it is now, and has been for a long while past, defunct. The Amharic language, which, though not a direct descendant of the Ghez, has taken its place in the mouth of the people, with the Tigrè, the Saho, and other modern Abyssinian dialects, are all less or more closely connected with the ancient speech of the country; but comparative philology has not been able to practise its arts upon most of them so fully as to warrant a final judgment on their character and relations.

As to the Arabic proper, impenetrable mystery shrouds its early career. We know little more respecting it beyond the general fact, that it sprang from among the Bedouin tribes of the Hejaz and the Nejed in Central Arabia, and became the dominant dialect amongst a crowd of others that succumbed to it. It was not written earlier than a century before the Hegira. The Syrians gave it its alphabet; and, both before the rise of Islam, and long after, writing among the Arabs was almost wholly in the hands of Jews and Christians. It is true that a generation before the Prophet, Waraka is said to have attempted to write his native language in Hebrew characters, and to have

translated part of the Gospels into Arabic. 'This, however, was an isolated fact.' There is no reason, M. Renan thinks, for supposing that Mohammed himself wrote anything. The Koran is a collection of fragmentary pieces, delivered orally by the prophet at different times to his disciples,—his 'orders of the day,' M. Renan calls them,—and set down by them, in the first instance, on skins, on camel and sheep bones, on palm leaves, and on whatever else was at hand, and would answer the purpose. Subsequently, during the caliphate of Abu Bekr, the disjointed parts were put together, under the eye of Zeyd ben Thabet, the most trusty of Mohammed's secretaries. After this Othman nominated a commission, with Zeyd at its head, to fix the text according to the Koreishite dialect, and then destroyed all other copies, that there might be no trouble caused by various readings. Hence the Koran has come down to us in a text that is, in all material points, an unvarying one. We stand here by the historical cradle of the Arabic language. But the child is the man. The Koran performed the part, says M. Renan,—and we wish he had applied the same principle to the Pentateuch and the Hebrew,—'of a real grammatical legislation.' Thenceforward the literary Arabic was the Arabic, which we find in actual use through the whole Mussulman world in our own times. As to the period at which the diacritical marks and vowel points were introduced into the language,—as to the origin, history, and distinguishing characteristics of Arabic Grammar,—as to the marvellous scientific development, so utterly foreign to the genius of Shemitism, which this youngest linguistic growth of the family has attained,—as to the position which Arabic holds, in respect to its forms, its idioms, and its lexicography, among the languages to which it is akin,—as to the effects which the Mohammedan conquests have caused it to produce on the religious opinions, the civil condition, and the modes of speech of mankind in various parts of the world,—and as to the differences which obtain, whether between the spoken and written Arabic as a whole, on the one hand, or between the various dialects of the spoken language on the other,—as to these and many other questions to which M. Renan addresses himself, we can do no more than remit our readers to his charming pages, with the assurance, that they teem with instruction and interest, and that repeated readings of them will only heighten the impression, which they give at first sight, of the extraordinary literary attainments and power of their author.

Shemitish language culminates in the Arabic. Historically last of the brotherhood to which it belongs, it is first in many of those distinctive characteristics, which enable us to graduate the

scale of rank among kindred tongues. The breadth of its alphabet, the completeness of its syllabication, the loyalty which it has shown to the primitive constitution of its roots, the fulness and symmetry of its flexional system, the variety, simplicity, and expressiveness of its verbal forms, the freedom and compass of its syntax, and the exuberant wealth of its vocabulary, are all points at which it stands, like Saul among the people; and if it lacks the majesty of the Hebrew, and, unlike this latter language, has not the consecration for all ages which the tongue in which 'God at sundry times and in divers manners spake of old time to the fathers' possesses, it has yet played no mean part in the solid history of mankind, and is probably destined to be a great engine hereafter, in the hands of Divine Providence, for abolishing the very evil which it has done so much to spread and maintain.

And now we reach the concluding section of M. Renan's volume. It is worthy of its position. It well represents both the strength and the weakness which precede it. Great and little, certain and dubious, true and untrue, walk side by side. A noble philosophy joins hands with a crutched and muscleless theorising. Historical scepticism, such as will not allow a fragment of tradition to pass its lips, is seen coupled with a scientific credulity, which makes no difficulty of swallowing camels. Here, as in other parts of the book, M. Renan within the circle of profane history is one person, and M. Renan on the ground of Scripture and Revelation is another. We have not full faith in all the positions and arguments of the passages in which he treats of the general laws of the development of the Shemitic languages, and compares these with languages of other families, particularly the Indo-European. We think there is much more fancy than truth in the correspondence which he endeavours to exhibit between the geographical situation of the three great members of the Shemitish family of speech, and their several characters. Neither do we believe that within the historical period there has been any such germination and growth of the Shemitic tongues as he speaks of. 'The Hebrew,' he says, 'would unquestionably have become as rich as the Arabic, if time and other circumstances had favoured;' and in support of the assertion, he points to the Rabbinical dialect. 'The Hebrew called Rabbinical is the proof of this;' only 'the development in this case is in point of fact a chaos.' Exactly. The tendency of the Hebrew to expand and fructify appears in the circumstance that it rotted away. We fear the logic of this will bear no closer examination than the statement immediately following it, that the Hebrew possesses in embryo

nearly all the processes, which constitute the wealth of the Arabic. If anything more is meant by the term 'processes' here than what is purely syntactical, the dictum is directly contradicted by the entire history of language. M. Renan goes on to speak of the 'dual' in Hebrew, and of the fuller development of the form in Arabic, as if the latter tongue had set out with the poverty of its brother in this respect, but had traded so well with its little, that it had eventually become much. Who does not know that this flies in the face of universal analogy? Where is the historical development of the dual in Greek or Anglo-Saxon? Yet both languages had a fair field, and ought, on M. Renan's theory, to have borne a plentiful crop of the form in question. In like manner, when we hear our author roundly affirm, with the Tatar languages in sight, that nomadic tribes are eminently conservative of their modes of speech; and again, that 'the Shemitic and Coptic have nothing in common in respect of their dictionary;'—these and the like assertions torment our admiration of him, and render us less disposed than we might be to allow other and less questionable doctrines to pass without challenge. A wary reader, however, who knows where to drop the grain of salt, will derive abundant pleasure and benefit from the study of the paragraphs we speak of. Indeed, it would be hard to pass too high commendation upon them, considered as a whole. The nice philosophical perception, the clear-sighted, manly judgment, the ample and well-sorted learning, the exquisite literary taste, which show in most parts of them, are above all praise.

We wish we could use the like terms in characterizing the passage on the primitive unity of the Shemites, with which the book ends. We have no objection to M. Renan's holding, if he pleases, that the difference between Solomon and Plato may be explained by their early sires having lived, one on one side of a mountain, the other on the other, and by their having dieted respectively on barley and maize. But when he tells us, that the Aryan race in the beginning was for a long period a worshipper of its own sensations, and continued to be such till the Shemite taught it better; when he states, that intuitively the Shemitish stock 'first disengaged its personality from the external world, and then almost immediately inferred the third term, God, the Creator of the universe;' when Adam and Paradise are explained by him, in a transcendental sense, to be logical sequences of the belief of the Shemites in the Divine unity; and when the ridiculous legends of India and Persia are seriously quoted as parallels to the most ancient records of the Books of Moses, we submit that the writer entirely overlooks—

what he is bound to make the utmost account of—the grand and hitherto unshaken moral and historical argument for the literal truth of the Pentateuch and of the Scriptures in general, and that science, in speaking thus, is playing the merryandrew where she ought to take her most dignified and reverent air. We have no desire to bar or to fetter scientific investigation by force of authority. Let the physicist and the historian do their own work in the way that is proper to it. We contend, however, that the basis on which the historical truth of the Bible reposes is a scientific one, and that science is bound to pay respect to science. And the utter disregard of this principle by M. Renan, and by the school to which he belongs, we complain of as a grievous injustice done alike to religion and true knowledge.

We lay down this remarkable volume with mingled feelings of sadness and joy. Genius is not wisdom; and darkness knows how to make friends with daylight. M. Renan has done his generation and mankind a great service by what he has here written; yet his blessing has a curse in it; and we much fear in many cases the curse will eat up the blessing. Pleasure is near neighbour to pain, as Socrates said. It is so in the present instance. Scepticism has achieved its worst within the region of Old Testament history. M. Renan cannot be outdone. We know all that can be said, on this ground, against Moses and the Prophets. We record our honest conviction, when, in view of the results, we express our unaltered faith, that this ancient 'foundation of God standeth sure.'

ART. II.—*History of England from the Fall of Wolsey to the Death of Elizabeth.* By JAMES ANTHONY FROUDE, M.A. Vols. V. and VI. London: J. W. Parker. 1860.

IT is impossible to approach the study of these volumes with anything like calm, stoical indifference. The reigns of Edward VI. and Mary were fraught with consequences so overwhelming in their importance, and have exercised an influence whose power is still so directly felt by ourselves, that we cannot criticise the narrative altogether *ab extra* with the passionless discrimination of a judge. Our minds have long since been thoroughly made up as to the character and policy of the two reigns; and, in the light of the blessings which have flowed to us from the faith for which our fathers suffered at the stake, we may perhaps be a little blind to the faults of those to whom we owe so vast a debt, and perhaps a little less than just to their adversaries and ours. Let us make this admission in full at the

outset. It is with no mawkish affectation of many-sidedness that we have read Mr. Froude's history. But our convictions are not merely a blind prejudice; they are founded upon clear and assignable reasons. Whilst we admit that we have deep-rooted opinions on the main issue, we are ready to give an answer to every man who asks us for a reason of the cause which we espouse. With such feelings we were not a little curious to learn how Mr. Froude had accomplished his task. Would history gathered from the Statute Book throw much new light upon this interesting period? Could the historian who had entered upon his undertaking with the views which our author was known to entertain, and which we detailed in our notice of his first four volumes, fully appreciate the spirit of so exceptional an episode in our history? In selecting the reigns of the Tudors for his theme, Mr. Froude had deliberately chosen an epoch in which the discussion of religious dogmas largely occupied the attention of the Government. To estimate the character of many of the leading actors it would be necessary rightly to comprehend the religious motives by which they had been actuated, and for this some sympathy with their mode of thought was essential; but of such sympathy this writer is almost destitute. Whilst there are not so many incidents requiring a careful balance of authorities as in the reign of Henry VIII., it needs a full conviction (let us adopt which side we may) that the opposing parties under Edward and Mary were contending for a valuable prize, or we shall utterly misinterpret the conduct of both alike. On these points there were some grounds for anticipating that the author and his subject were unsuited to each other.

This suspicion has been partly confirmed by these two volumes of the history. We have already dwelt upon Mr. Froude's hero-worship of Henry VIII. This strange predilection has warped his decision in describing his son's reign. The father's chief object in his dying instructions was as far as possible to maintain affairs *in statu quo* until Edward should come of age. From the list of his executors, he carefully excluded those who might progress or retrograde too far. Gardiner was struck off as too violent a Papist; Lord Parr as too advanced a Protestant. The bluff King, who had ruled with such vigour in his life, desired still to govern from his tomb. He enjoined on Lord Hertford to follow out the Scottish marriage, and to continue at peace with Germany and France. He prohibited the regents and the council of regency from venturing to meddle with serious questions. He had some time before obtained an Act of Parliament 'empowering sovereigns who might succeed

to the crown while under age, to repeal, by letters patent, all measures passed in their names.' He had so arranged the regency that each side should act as a check upon the other. With such precautions he possibly persuaded himself that he had compassed his design.

It is needless to add, that he was utterly mistaken. So limited a share of power by no means coincided with the views which Hertford entertained. Ere the King's body was yet cold, he had gained over Sir William Paget, the eldest statesman of the council. The form of government during the minority was to be changed to a Protectorate. The despotism of the past reign was to be alleviated by the sweets of liberty. Above all, the enlightened convictions of the Protestant party were to take effect in further religious reform. To this programme Paget assented on condition that Hertford should be guided in all things by his advice. Their united influence was irresistible. Hertford was named Protector by the executors, and was raised to the Dukedom of Somerset; his brother was made Lord Seymour, Lord Parr became Marquis of Northampton, and Lisle and Wriothesley Earls of Warwick and Southampton.

'The next step was to show the bishops that the change of rulers had not restored their liberty. They were to regard themselves as possessed of no authority independent of the crown. They were not successors of the apostles, but were ordinary officials; and in evidence that they understood and submitted to their position, they were required to accept the renewal of their commissions. Cranmer set the willing example, in an acknowledgment that all jurisdiction, ecclesiastical as well as secular, within the realm, emanated only from the sovereign. The other prelates consented, or were content to imitate him.'—Vol. v., p. 10.

These arrangements were shortly afterwards followed by the deprivation of Wriothesley, the chancellor; and the removal of this the ablest of his opponents conferred upon Somerset the reality of power. A new commission, running in Edward's name, confirmed his authority, and for the next three years he was virtually sovereign of the realm. In most respects they were years disastrous to England. We must proceed to select some particulars of the narrative for our consideration.

In estimating the character of Somerset's administration, we should not forget the difficulties by which he was surrounded. The late King had incurred considerable debts, and the expenses of the household had been enormously increased. In the hour of Henry's necessity, recourse had been had to borrowing from Antwerp at an exorbitant rate of interest; and when a still farther pressure had arisen, a large amount was gained by debasing the currency. The avaricious passions of the courtiers

had been excited by grants of church lands, and there were still some broad acres which might be in like manner applied. True it is that Henry directed in his will that others should take care to pay the debt he had so heedlessly contracted. But as the faults of Somerset are chiefly those which we have just enumerated, it is only fair that we should remember that he was treading in the steps of his predecessor. Of course his acquittal is not to be demanded because others have committed the same errors: but that which, in Mr. Froude's judgment, was venial in Harry, becomes a deadly sin in Somerset. The situation, too, of the Protector was far more embarrassing than that of a sovereign in full. The demands of the courtiers were much harder to restrain, the popular impatience of taxation was more turbulent in its expression, the opposition more daring in its resistance to authority. It is hardly to be wondered at, then, if Somerset betook himself, in an evil hour for himself and for the country, to the expedients which had been already tried.

European complications met Somerset on the very threshold of his administration, which might have warned him to husband his resources. The Pope had called upon Charles V. to invade England; and, had Mary's life not been in jeopardy, he would probably have complied. Nor were the French more amicably disposed; they were sore at the loss of Boulogne, which they were determined to recover, and furious at the idea of the Scotch marriage, which they strained every nerve to prevent. Scotland was torn asunder between adverse French and English factions, and our own party there required the most strenuous support. To temporize, to watch for every opportunity to strengthen his position, to be prodigal of politeness and chary of expenditure, was the politic course which Paget urged upon his leader. But Somerset had neither the promptitude of Scipio nor the patience of Fabius. He dallied whilst the French besieged and stormed the garrison of St. Andrew's, which consisted of the firm allies of England. He determined on the invasion of the country when the Scottish Protestants had been thoroughly disheartened by the capture of their friends.

The result of the campaign in Scotland was rendered decisive by the victory of Pinkie Cleugh. The Scots almost doubled the English in numbers, and the fight was long and obstinate. Neither party cared to encumber itself with prisoners; and over the broken ground which formed the battle field, there were terrible hand-to-hand encounters between Scot and Saxon. The victory at first inclined to the former. No impression could be made upon their serried ranks; and the English

declined to renew the assault; they might as well charge, they said, upon a wall of steel. Their own success was fatal to the men of the north. They broke up in pursuit, and the English faced about and routed them. A panic ensued, and the flight became general.

'They flung away their arms; swords, pikes, and lances strewed the ground where they had been drawn up, as thick as rushes in a chamber. Some crept under the willow pollards into the meadows, and lay concealed like otters with their mouths above the water; some made for Edinburgh, some along the sands to Leith under the fire of the fleet, some up the river side towards Dalkeith; some lay as if dead, and let the chase pass by them. The Highlanders held together, and saved themselves with an orderly retreat, but the crowd fell unresisting victims under the sabres of the avenging cavalry. It was a massacre more than a battle; for, of the English, at most, not more than two hundred fell, and those chiefly at the first charge under the lances of the pikemen; the number of Scots killed was from ten to fourteen thousand. Two causes provoked the English, it was said, to especial vindictiveness; they resented ungenerously their own first repulse; but the chief reason was the treacherous surprise at Ancram Muir, and the death of Lord Evers, the hero of the Border-troopers. Fifteen hundred prisoners were taken, but in general no quarter was given. Gentlemen might have been spared for their ransoms; but, for some unknown cause, the noble and the peasant were dressed alike in white leather or fustian; there was little to distinguish them, and they were cut down in indiscriminate heaps along the roads and fields to the very walls of Edinburgh. Multitudes of priests, at one time it was said as many as four thousand, were among the slain. The banner of the kneeling Lady was taken amidst the scorn of the victors; and when at last the retreat was sounded, and the pursuers weary with killing gathered again into their camp, they sent up a shout which legend said was heard in Edinburgh Castle. The day was closed with one more act of barbarity. A detachment of Scots had been stationed with cannon in a small fort overlooking the field, and had given some trouble. When the battle was lost they were left behind, and unable to fly; they silenced their guns, therefore, and concealed themselves, intending to withdraw in the night. But they were discovered and surrounded; they were not offered the alternative of surrender; the place was set on fire and they were destroyed.'—Vol. v., pp. 53, 54.

There is a peculiar interest attaching to this battle as the last stricken field between England and Scotland before the union of the crowns. The victory redounded to the honour of Somerset, who commanded in person; but was singularly barren of permanent results. Its only immediate effect was to rouse the national Scotch pride against the English, and to render the marriage of Mary and Edward impossible, as the lady's friends naturally objected to so rough a mode of wooing. The Protector returned as the hero of the hour; but he did not bring

back with him the maiden Queen. A few forts dismantled, and many corpses stark upon the moor, were the only fruits reaped from so fierce a struggle.

The social state of the country at this period demands some notice at our hands. The period of transition was as yet hardly gone by, and its influences were still every where discernible. The changes consequent upon the wars of the Roses, the additional alterations following the suppression of the monasteries, the conversion of arable into pasture land, owing to the high price of wool and comparative cheapness of sheep farming,—all tended to swell the ranks of the vagrant class of the population. Mr. Froude has highly lauded Henry's social policy, but he is fain to admit that it was a failure. It missed the mark through its over severity. Whipping, branding, and hanging will not deter men from begging, if they are near starvation. It was complained that the laws failed to effect their purpose through 'foolish pity of them that should have seen them executed.' Since corporal penalties seemed to be unavailing, a law was passed reducing sturdy beggars to slavery. 'On proof of idle living, the person was to be branded on the breast with the letter "V," and adjudged to some honest neighbour as a slave for the two years then next following.' If this mildness failed, if the man ran away, or declined to work, he was to be branded on the face with an 'S,' and to become a slave for life.

The term 'slavery' grates harshly upon our ears, but no more harshly than it ought. We cannot accept Mr. Froude's dictum, that the worst part of this arrangement was its offensive name. It proved, however, unsuccessful. Perhaps the keen intelligence of our forefathers made them decline to burden themselves with such unprofitable domestics.

But in truth the lower orders had reasons for their dissatisfaction, with which the Protector sympathized, and which he laboured to remove. The creation of large parks and sheep walks had thrown out of employment a large number of the poor. The enclosure of the commons, the appropriation and hedging of public pastures, and other like encroachments of the rich, tended seriously to pauperize the labourers. Their distress was aggravated by the dearness of provisions, partly due to the agricultural changes we have mentioned, partly to the continual depreciation of the currency. In 1548 these evils reached a pitch that was intolerable. 'Leases as they fell in could not obtain renewal; the copyholder, whose farm had been held by his forefathers so long that custom seemed to have made it his own, found his rent quadrupled, or himself, without alternative, expelled. The act against the pulling down farmhouses had

been evaded, by the repair of a room which might be occupied by a shepherd; a single furrow would be driven across a meadow of a hundred acres, and prove that it was still under the plough. The great cattle owners, to escape the sheep statutes, held their stock in the name of their sons or servants; the highways and the villages were covered in consequence with forlorn and outcast families, now reduced to beggary, who had been the occupiers of comfortable holdings; and thousands of dispossessed tenants made their way to London, clamouring, in the midst of their starving children, at the doors of the courts of law for redress which they could not obtain.' *

From St. Paul's Cross the sturdy voice of Latimer was raised in rebuke of such misdeeds. Charity was waxen cold. Pity there was none. In London a man 'shall die in the streets,—he shall lie sick at the door, between stock and stock, and then perish for hunger.' With the light of the Gospel had come in selfishness, oppression, and misery. In the direct, blunt style for which his sermons are remarkable, he apostrophizes the landlords: 'You rent-raisers, I may say, you step-lords, you have for your possessions too much. That that heretofore was let for twenty or forty pounds by the year, which is an honest portion to be had gratis in one lordship of another man's sweat and labour, now is let for fifty or one hundred pounds by the year. My lords and masters, such proceedings do plainly intend to make of the yeomanry slavery. This one thing I will tell you: from whom it cometh I know, even from the devil. I know his intent in it.' With such outspoken fidelity did he deliver his own soul, and save himself from being partaker in other men's sins.

Nor were others less faithful in their ministry. Bernard Gilpin, Bradford, Lever, and others, uttered their warnings in the same strain. Mr. Froude endeavours to draw a distinction —to be presently more fully adverted to—between these men and the 'more advanced liberals,' as he terms them, who dwelt much upon 'schemes of salvation;' but the facts do not accord with this fanciful division. Prominent amongst the Genevan school was Hooper; and his sermons on Jonas, preached before the King, abound in similar expressions, as he calls on Kings, priests, nobles, lawyers, and commons, each to perform their separate duties in the state.

The evils necessarily attendant on any season of transition, were aggravated by the peculiar circumstances of the time. There were no colonies then belonging to the country, whither the unemployed might emigrate; no expanding manufactures to which they might betake themselves; none of the various open-

* Vol. v., pp. 111, 113.

ings for labour which abound in modern times. The bonds of that sympathy which so long had bound the feudal retainer to his lord were being rudely broken; hatred was taking the place of affectionate respect, and indifference succeeding to paternal care. Touched with the knowledge of their misery, and indignant at the delay of its redress, Somerset opened a court in his own house, to hear the complaints of those who could not obtain justice in the ordinary courts of law. Shortly after (June, 1548) he issued 'a commission of enclosures,' to inquire, in all counties, into the actual condition of all estates, towns, villages, and hamlets, with power to imprison any one who should attempt opposition, and to send up to himself the names of those who had broken the law.

It was the misfortune of the rulers and the ruled, at this period, to expect too much from legislation. The announcement of the commission engendered expectations which could not fail of disappointment, and were sure to involve its author in the ill-feeling that would ensue. The popularity of Somerset became prodigious. 'Never had King,' wrote one of the commissioners, 'so assured subjects, as his grace shall have.' The commission was to prove a panacea for all the many evils under which the people groaned. The iron age was drawing to a close, and a second golden era was about to dawn. Self-love and private interest were coming to an end. 'I do certainly believe,'—wrote Mr. Commissioner Hales,—'it shall go forward, and set such a stay in the body of the commonwealth, that all the members shall live in due harmony and temperament, without one having too much, and a great many nothing.'

The report of the commission was sent in, and a petition founded upon it was drawn up for presentation to Parliament. It represented that the industrious classes were in a condition of unexampled suffering. It detailed the grievances under which the people groaned, and which it ascribed to the greed of the 'nobles, knights, or gentlemen,' who, forgetful of their duty as shepherds to the people, supposed that they might live for nothing else but to enjoy themselves, and make money for themselves. It accordingly requested 'that no person of any degree, in possession of land, with more than a hundred marks a year, should farm any part of it beyond what his household required; that the great farms should be broken up; and that the act should be enforced which required persons to whom abbey lands had fallen by gift or purchase to keep an honest continual house and household on the same.' Fines of a moderate amount were to be exacted of those who should be convicted of disobedience to its injunctions.

But Parliament refused to comply with the terms of this petition, and the state of the country became more alarming. A system of peculation and extravagance prevailed throughout every department of the administration. The chantry lands which should have replenished the exchequer, disappeared into private hands. The expenses of war and new loans swelled the debt to proportions hitherto unheard of. The charges of the royal household, which in 1532 were nineteen thousand pounds, were more than a hundred thousand pounds in 1549. Corruption and trickery were shamelessly practised. Officers made false returns of the number of men under their command, receiving allowances for twice the actual force in arms, and withholding their pay from those who were employed; so that, 'it was said, by the evil report of soldiers that had come out of England, that men there were more ordered like beasts than Christians, both in the scarcity of victuals and payment.' The labourers in every branch of the arsenal and military manufactures cried in vain for their wages. The garrisons in Boulogne and Calais were all in arrears; so that the troops, discontented, mutinous, and disorderly, were driven to plunder, for the means of subsistence, on the French and Flemish frontiers. The currency had become so depreciated, through repeated tampering with its purity, that prices were fearfully augmented, and, as was inevitable, the unadulterated coin was reduced to the value of the baser portion. The credit of the country had sunk so low, that two Jews were the principal stay of the government. They charged thirteen per cent on their loans, and deducted an additional thirteen per cent on the exchange, the Protector undertaking to pay interest in 'kerseys, lead, and bell-metal.'

We are not simply adopting Mr. Froude's statements in this version of affairs. The universal testimony of contemporary writers abundantly confirms this gloomy representation. The Zurich letters, written by the Reformers to their continental friends, echo these complaints, and describe in dark colours the thickening clouds that were gathering in the political horizon. They speak unanimously in favour of the Protector, but they mourn over the calamities that desolate the land. Too often these evils were maliciously augmented by those who were opposed to Somerset's religious policy. Too often they were due to others, who, under the garb of zeal for Protestant opinions, were seeking only to obtain a share in the plunder of church lands. Through all the Protector held on his way, indulging in the widest and the wildest plans, never content if he had not more projects in embryo than one head could well devise, or one hand could safely organise. His exaltation had

made his head unsteady; his increasing difficulties only served to spoil his temper. Paget implored him to be cautious, but was 'whipped with sharp words for his pains.' 'Your Grace,' he writes to him, 'of late is grown into great cholerick fashions whensoever you are contraried in that which you have conceived in your head.' Amidst such a sea of troubles he would invade Scotland afresh; would make common cause with Charles against France; would carry out a further reformation of religion, and would issue a second commission to enforce the restoration of appropriated lands.

This last measure gave the signal for some acts of violence by the miserable peasantry. They took the redress of their wrongs upon themselves; 'filled the ditches, levelled the hedges, tore down the palings of parks, and drove the deer and killed them.' The Protector took up their cause, when the matter was brought before the Council, and said openly, 'He liked well the doings of the people.' But here the lords came into collision with him, and the boldest of them decided to act against the rioters. At this crisis an insurrection broke out in Cornwall, then a stronghold of Popish opinions; and a second in the Eastern Counties, under Anabaptist leaders. It was plain that the authority of Somerset would be seriously impaired, unless he met the danger with promptitude and success. Here is the counsel given by the ablest of his advisers.

'Sir William Paget, who was still abroad, in a clear and powerful letter, sketched a course for the Protector to follow. In Germany, he said, referring to the peasant wars, when the very like tumult to this began first, it might have been appeased with the loss of twenty men; and after that with the loss of a hundred or two hundred; but it was thought nothing. And also some spiced consciences, taking pity of the poor,—who, indeed, knew not what pity was, nor who were the poor,—thought it a sore matter to lose so many of their men Christians, saying they were simple folks, and wist not what the matter meant, and were of godly knowledge; and after this sort, and by such womanly pity and fond persuasion, suffered the matter to go so far, as it cost, ere it was appeased, they say, a hundred thousand; but I know by credible report of some that were at it, at least three score thousand men's lives. Likewise, our business may peradventure at the worst, if resistance should be made, cost a thousand or two men's lives. By St. Mary, better so than more. And therefore, Sir, go to it betimes. Send for all the council that be remaining unsent abroad; and for because there are a good many of the best absent, call to your grace to council for this matter six of the gravest and most experimented men of the realm to consider what is best to be done, and follow their advice. Send for your Almayn horsemen; send for Lord Ferrys and Sir Wm. Herbert, to bring you as many horsemen as they dare trust out of Wales. Let the

Earl of Shrewsbury bring the like out of Shropshire, Derbyshire, Nottinghamshire, Staffordshire, of his servants and keepers of forests and parks. Go yourself, accompanied with the said noblemen and their companies; and appoint the Chief Justices of England, three or four of them, to resort with commission of oyer and terminer to that good town which shall be next to the place where your Grace shall remain. Attach to the number of twenty or thirty of the rankest knaves of the shire. Let six be hanged of the ripest of them, the rest remain in prison. And thus, Sir, make a progress this hot weather, till you have perused all those shires that have offended. Your Grace may say you shall lose the hearts of the people; of the good people you shall not—of the ill it maketh no matter.'—Vol. v., pp. 181–183.

There could be no question about the soundness of this counsel, but Somerset's failing was a love of popularity. Put down the rebellion first, urged Paget, and let the engrossers smart for it afterwards; and this was the course which a true policy demanded. But the Protector hesitated. He felt that the people had just cause for complaint. His indecision was fatal to his influence, and was the presage of the downfall of his power. The council took upon themselves the responsibility of action. The lords contributed their private funds to replenish the impoverished exchequer. Lord Russell conquered the rebels in Devonshire. Dudley, Earl of Warwick, repaired the disaster in Norfolk, and his success was a stepping-stone towards his future supremacy. By the end of August the insurrection was effectually crushed, and about a month later Somerset had ceased to rule.

It is no slight plea in Somerset's behalf that the evils alleged against his administration were not alleviated by his removal. The land was as full of misery as ever. The foundation of this trouble was the burden of debt, and the condition of the currency; and these were not improved by Warwick, who shortly afterwards became Duke of Northumberland. At the close of Edward's reign all the counts in the indictment against Somerset might be recited with increased emphasis against his rival.

We turn from the state of the people to that of the Church. Mr. Froude objects to the doctrinal changes which were authorised under Somerset's supremacy. He has a strange theory that doctrine is mainly disconnected from practice, and that a clear grasp of dogmatic scriptural teaching is uninfluential upon the daily life and conduct.

'The Catholic priests,' he writes, 'in the better days which were past, as the Protestant clergy in the better days which were coming, had said, alike to rich and poor, "By your actions you shall be judged. Keep the

commandments, do justice, and love mercy, or God will damn you." The unfortunate persons who, for the sins of England, were its present teachers, said, "You cannot keep the commandments—that has been done for you; *believe a certain speculative theory*, and avoid the errors of Popery." It was a view of things convenient to men who were indulging in avarice and tyranny. *The world at all times has liked nothing better than a religion which provides it with a substitute for obedience.* But as there would have been no Reformation at all, had Reformation meant no more than a change from a superstition of ceremonies to a superstition of words and opinions, so those who were sincere and upright amongst the Reformers, men like Cranmer, Latimer, Bacon, Bradford, or Lever, to whom God and duty were of more importance than "schemes of salvation," whose opinions, indeed, followed with the stream, but who looked to life and practice for the fruit of opinions,—such men saw with sorrow and perplexity, that increase of light had not brought with it increase of probity, that as truth spread, charity and justice languished.'—Vol. v., pp. 112–114.

This passage does not stand alone. Mr. Froude misses no opportunity of expressing his contempt for all doctrinal questions. When the great mass of the people were suffering from the ignorance in which they had so long been nurtured by their Romish teachers, it might have seemed that the fairest as well as the wisest course was openly to discuss disputed questions. Surely the public universities, where the educated men who would influence the next generation were being trained, formed no unsuitable theatre for the consideration of any points of scripture truth. Men of learning and piety combined, like Bucer and Peter Martyr, men to whose ability and character many of their opponents failed not to do homage, were engaged in this task. Their labours only afford Mr. Froude occasion for a sneer. 'The Oxford and Cambridge schools,' he writes, 'rang with their unprofitable jargon, and the victory, of course, was ruled to the innovators.' 'The successors of Somerset,' he says again, 'were called upon to fight against a corruption which had infected the whole community, and amongst the rest had affected themselves. But it was easier and pleasanter to earn the title of ministers of God by patronising teachers who insisted on the worthlessness of "good works," and could distinguish correctly between imputed and infused righteousness.' (Page 274.)

As might be expected, this scorn reaches its height in his account of the vestment controversy. The character of Hooper, who stood foremost in this quarrel; the boldness with which his voice was ever raised against 'wickedness in high places;' the singular simplicity and charity of his episcopate; and the heroism with which he finally sealed the testimony which his whole life

had witnessed, might have earned for him some generous consideration, even from those who deem him to be in error. Mr. Froude knows as well as any living writer how to palliate the infirmities of a noble mind; no pen has written more powerfully than his own to excuse the failings of his favourites. But Hooper was one of the 'advanced liberals,' the most distinctive in dogmatic teaching; and for such men our author has no quarter. He thus paints and characterizes this proceeding:—

'To Hooper, the surplice was, as it were, Satan's magic robe, and enchanter's cloak of darkness—the secret of his strength and power. Alone he must fight the battle of the Lord, then. His pulpit rang, Sunday after Sunday, with invectives against disguised Popery. He became so violent at last, that he was inhibited from preaching, and commanded to confine himself to his house. His tongue being silenced, he wrote a pamphlet, in which he reflected upon the Council, and, to make an end of the matter, the Council sent him to the Fleet. Here, at last, he recovered his senses. The King excused him the oath. He himself agreed to wear the noxious garment during the few hours of consecration, if he might tear it off before it had poisoned him, and in his own diocese might wear it or not, as he pleased. So closed this child's battle, leaving us at no loss to understand how, before long, England might weary of such men, and such men's teaching.'—Vol. v., pp. 325, 326.

It might be imagined that the mind of Mr. Froude had fastened with such intensity on the great subject then debated, as to make him impatient of this squabble on an unimportant matter. His objections, however, extend not merely to minute questions about doctrine, but to all positive systematic theology, in any shape whatever. 'The doctrine of persecution,' he asserts, '*is an essential part of all dogmatic systems; and the causes which first compelled the Reformed Churches to toleration, have acted more slowly, but with equal effect, upon their rival.*' (P. 291.) Again, we are informed that the right of the Church of Rome to add to and qualify the teaching of the Bible, stands upon the same level as any articles adopted by a national Church for the instruction and guidance of her ministry. 'If,' says our authority, in speaking of the articles of religion which were promulgated in 1552, 'if it be unlawful for a Catholic council to enlarge the dogmatic system of Christianity, no more can it be permitted to a local Church to impose upon the judgment a series of intricate assertions on theological subtleties, which the most polemical divines will not call "vital," or on questions of public and private morality, where the conscience should be the only guide.' (Pp. 394, 395.) We confess ourselves utterly unable to follow the logical process by which this decision has been

reached. Because a body of men may not *add* to that which is the authoritative standard of truth, therefore another body may not declare in what sense that authoritative standard shall be interpreted by its teachers. We have turned the conclusion to the light in every direction, but we fail to see its connexion with the premises.

It is strange to mark how completely Mr. Froude has abandoned the ground he had taken in his former volumes. When the policy of Henry VIII. was impugned, he had a ready answer for all assailants. We ought, he argued, to think more humbly of our own judgment, and to have a higher estimate of the statesmen of the day. In all that seems to us so questionable, there can be no doubt that they were influenced by sound reasons,—reasons which were sufficient to satisfy all scruples, although we may be and are ignorant of their tenor. Suppose we apply against himself Mr. Froude's own line of argument. Suppose we urge on him that respectful acquiescence in doubtful cases which he then deemed so becoming in parallel cases. According to his own showing, there were many dangers involved in the onward course of religion which Somerset espoused. The mass of the people, he tells us, were hostile to innovation; there was much to be risked, and little to be gained, by neglecting the old injunction, '*Quieta non movere.*' But let it be granted for the moment that Somerset was in error; what took place when the power fell from his hands? The hopes of the retrograde party were awakened. The Papists thought they should regain their lost influence. But Northumberland and his friends, who could not be accused of prodigious enthusiasm, deliberately adopted and extended the like policy.

Yet we do not rest our case upon the *argumentum ad hominem*, which Mr. Froude has to some extent provoked. The truth is, that despite the indifference of some of the statesmen under Edward, and the contempt of his historian for all doctrinal questions, their importance was at that time fully estimated, and the risk which changes involved was calmly undertaken in the firm conviction of their vital moment. It was not the indiscretion of a band of hair-brained enthusiasts; it was the well-weighed judgment of men, learned, thoughtful, and pious, which conduced to the further reformation. They knew full well that Charles V. would be enraged, and they foresaw the evils which his anger might produce. Walton, then ambassador from England to the Court of Germany, replied in language which Mr. Froude has recorded, and which redounds greatly to his honour and that of his employers. 'The Lords of the Council, he told Charles, did well understand with what fear and danger they

made the alterations; and the greater the peril, the more were they to be praised that would rather venture land, life, and all, than not do that that God required at their hands.' In like manner, Hooper, ever foremost in the struggle for purity of doctrine, acted in full anticipation of the martyrdom which was eventually his lot. The King's life was notoriously precarious. The policy which Mary would adopt on her accession was indubitable. A selfish and time-serving spirit would have made friends of the mammon of unrighteousness against the day of trial. Alluding to Bonner's imprisonment, Hooper observes, 'Should he be again restored to his office and episcopal function, I shall, I doubt not, be restored to my country, and to my Father which is in heaven.' Even before he left Zurich to return to England, his mind had foreshadowed the issue of his labours. Taking Bullinger by the hand, as he bade him farewell, he promised to write him word of his proceedings; 'but the last news,' he added, 'I shall not be able to write: for there, where I shall take most pains, there shall you hear of me to be burnt to ashes.' For, in a spirit of such heroic and Christian resignation, with such lion hearts and childlike faith, did these men perform their duty, and incur the sneers of Mr. Froude.

Nor can we leave the statement unchallenged, that they dwelt upon theory to the disregard of practice. If they said, 'You cannot keep the commandments, that has been done for you,' their purpose was to enforce the declaration of holy writ, as to man's innate corruption and Christ's obedience for our redemption. If by the assertion that they urged upon their hearers to *believe a certain speculative theory*, it be meant that they proclaimed that righteousness of God without the law whereby men can alone be justified,—the great doctrine which St. Paul had written for their guidance under inspiration, which Luther had first tested and then taught to the regeneration of the Churches, which Wesley once again took up and sounded until new life came over England,—if this alone be meant, we are content to side with such teachers, and to bear with them this writer's scorn. But if, on the contrary, he intended to suggest that the 'advanced liberals' neglected to enforce great moral duties, or to make a holy life the only evidence of a pure creed, we at once join issue with the historian. We assert that the distinction he has drawn in this matter between Latimer and Bradford on the one hand, and those who insisted upon distinctive doctrine on the other, is altogether arbitrary. It is not supported either by the writings or the actions of the more advanced school. Ridley, who was the first to overturn the altars and set up tables in their room, effectually urged the

King to works of charity; and Christ's Hospital, St. Thomas's, and St. Bartholomew's witness to this day the efficacy of his appeal. John Knox, the future leader of the Scotch Reformation, spared neither rank nor power as he preached before the Court. Northumberland he likened to Ahithophel, and Winchester to Shebna, and so on. From the same pulpit Hooper lashed the vices of all ranks with stern impartiality. The court, the clergy, the nobles, the lawyers, the commonalty, all came in for their share of his denunciations. Amendment of life, performance of duty, constant obedience to law, human and divine,—are topics which occupy almost his entire sermons. Unless such large exceptions are made in behalf of the foremost Protestants, (and such exceptions are not even hinted at by Mr. Froude,) his accusations are utterly at variance with facts.

A single quotation may illustrate the manner in which the advocates of 'systems of theology' enforced their opinions, and may show how unfounded is the accusation that they urged mere speculative doctrines without bringing them to the test of their practical influence upon the life. Our extract is taken from the writings of Bishop Hooper, whom Mr. Froude regards as among the most fanatical of the Reformers. The prelate is treating the subject of man's conversion, one of the most 'speculative' (or, as we should term it, spiritual) of themes.

'Here,' he writes, 'it is to be noted what degrees and orders the Lord and heavenly Shepherd doth use in bringing His sheep unto the pasture of life. First, He converteth the man that has gone astray by his wicked ways and sinful manner of living. *If he were an infidel, He bringeth him first to know, feel, and hate his infidelity, and afterwards to a true faith. If he be a persecutor, He showeth him first his tyranny, and afterward how to use himself meekly. If he be a sinful man that liveth contrary to his knowledge and profession, He bringeth him first to the knowledge and hatred of his sin, and afterwards to the forgiveness of the same.* As Christ our Saviour wonderfully teacheth in St. John, where he saith, "The Holy Ghost, when He cometh, shall rebuke the world of sin, justice, and judgment." By the which words he declareth that the faithful of God cannot profit in the Gospel of Christ, neither love, nor exercise, justice and virtue, except they be taught and made to feel the burden and danger of sin, and be brought to humble themselves, as men that be of themselves nothing but sin.'—*Hooper's Later Writings. Parker Society*, pp. 204, 205.

This passage may be taken as a fair average sample of the mode in which the Reformers handled the truth of man's thorough corruption and inability to save himself. Whilst they failed not to urge these fundamental truths, they were no less careful to insist upon the fact, that amendment of life was the inevitable

result of genuine conversion; that when the Spirit convinced men of sin, it was in order to lead them to seek for grace to overcome it; that unless this were the issue, His work was incomplete; and that a true recognition of man's own corruption was invariably accompanied by heartfelt repentance, which brought men to prayer for deliverance from sin's guilt and thraldom, no less than for deliverance from its penalty. So far are the Reformed divines from being forgetful to enforce that those who believe should be careful to maintain good works, that we have often been disposed to wish that they were more widely studied as an antidote to much of the inaccurate theology of the present day.

In the course of our remarks we have not yet been led to speak of the personal character of Edward VI. His youth at the period of his accession to the throne, his feeble health during the brief years of his reign, and the engrossing interest of some other subjects involved in the history of this time, naturally throw him into comparative shade. If contemporary accounts are to be trusted, there was rare promise in his youth. No doubt a certain halo of enthusiastic loyalty surrounded the boy on whom so many hopes were centred. No doubt his early, and as men would call it premature, death kindled a deep sympathy, which his memory still keeps awake; and the tomb which closed over him before he had committed the faults of manhood has embalmed his virtues for all future time. No doubt, also, the hatred which Northumberland's misrule excited, and the bloodshed by which Mary's reign was stained, set off advantageously the bright expectations which had been formed of his government, and which the stern test of experience had not been allowed to sully. But there is evidence that when allowance is made for all such influences, there were solid qualities of piety and thought beyond his years; and in his distaste for the events of his reign, Mr. Froude has been less than just to the youthful sovereign.

Edward early showed an aptitude for business and a spirit of inquiry into its management beyond his years. He kept a private record of the various occurrences that came under his notice. He was endeavouring to gain a fuller insight into the conduct of the country than could be learned from what transpired at the council table, or Northumberland thought it convenient to tell him. Earnest in purpose and unwavering in religion, the little active interference which he could exert was always in the right direction. Mr. Froude sees nothing in his volume of Essays and Exercises beyond the ordinary ability of a clever boy; but admits that if he really wrote or dictated the two

papers termed a Discourse on the Reformation of Abuses, and a Draft of Provision for Insertion in his Will, then 'Miracle of Nature' was no exaggerated epithet. We do not know the full value of the evidence for the authenticity of these two documents. Hardly less remarkable was a Fragment on the Condition of England, which is largely quoted in these pages.

Our space does not permit us to enlarge upon many other interesting questions connected with this reign. The trial and execution of Lord Seymour, the yet more signal death of Somerset, the character of the Protector,—a subject ably handled by Mr. Froude,—the persecution of Romanists and Anabaptists, the foreign relations of the government, the increasing misery of the people and corruption of the courtiers, the plot of Northumberland to substitute Lady Jane Grey for the Princess Mary in the succession, and the closing scene of Edward's life, have each in turn received a fair share of attention. The mystery which hangs over the death of Edward remains as dark as ever. The secresy observed in the progress of his disease, the questionable treatment to which he was subjected by his female physician, and the popular hatred of Northumberland, all combined to gain credence for the report that he was poisoned. Certainly his symptoms did not correspond to those of any known malady. Eruptions came out all over his skin; his hair fell off, and then his nails, and afterwards the joints of his extremities. Mr. Froude's judgment is, that Northumberland was capable of the crime, but could have gained from it no advantage commensurate with its guilt; and that the woman to whose exclusive care the King was culpably committed, administered mineral medicines in over doses, so that Edward was poisoned in fact, though not by deliberate malice.

The dawn of Mary's reign brought with it expectations that were destined to be sadly blighted. There is little cause for wonder that the people in their ignorance attributed their sorrows to the changes in religion, and fondly expected that the restoration of the Mass would bring with it the blessing of the good old times. We need not linger over the abortive conspiracy of Northumberland. Cranmer had agreed to the scheme only at the pressing instance of the dying Edward, and his unwillingness to do wrong to Mary was requited by his being excused execution as a rebel in order that he might be burned as a heretic. The failure of his treasonable efforts fairly forfeited the life of Northumberland, and he was condemned to suffer as a traitor. Among the long list of those who died under the Tudors there were few who had not adorned their lives by the manner of their deaths; but Northumberland heaped additional

disgrace upon his name by his puaillanimity and cowardice. There was hardly a meanness to which he did not descend, hardly any spark of manliness that was struck out of him by his sorrows. Not a vestige of respect from any party in Church and State followed him to the scaffold or rests upon his memory.

Northumberland and his fellows apostatized from the Protestant profession (they had never grasped its *faith*) in their last hours. Was he disappointed that many of the Protestants had refused to join in his conspiracy, and that Hooper and others, who were deemed fanatics in their creed, were loyal to their rightful Queen? Was he deluded by the false hope that the Romish party would exult in the possession of so prominent a convert, and that he should purchase a reprieve by recantation? Who can tell what thoughts mingled in that wily heart, suggested by his desires or his fears? It is vain to speculate on such a theme. We may say of him as Latimer had said of Lord Seymour, 'He was a wicked man, and the kingdom was well rid of him.' There can, however, be no doubt that the cause of Protestantism was severely weakened by these apostasies. Who could be regarded as staunch, if the shepherds of the people set so evil an example?

'The central multitude, whose belief was undefiued, yielded to the apparent sentence of heaven upon a cause weakened by unsuccessful treason, and disavowed in his death by its champion. Edward had died on the anniversary of the execution of More. God, men said, had visited His people, and the Virgin Mary had been set upon the throne for their redemption. Dr. Watson on the 20th of August (1553) preached at St. Paul's Cross, under a guard of soldiers; on the 24th, two days after the scene on Tower Hill, so little was a guard necessary, that Mass was said in St. Paul's in Latin, with matins and vespers. The crucifix was replaced in the wood loft, the high altar was redecorated. The real presence was defended from the pulpit, and, except from the refugees not a murmur was heard. Catching this favourable opportunity, the Queen charmed the country with the announcement that the second portion of the last subsidy granted by parliament should not be collected. She gave her word that the currency at the earliest moment should be thoroughly restored; while she gained credit for the very moderate vengeance with which she appeared to be contenting herself. Ridley only, the Spanish ambassador wrote, would be executed, the others would all be pardoned. .....London streets rang again with shouts of "God save the Queen;" and Mary recovered a fresh instalment of popularity to carry her a few steps further.'—Vol. vi., pp. 75, 76.

We propose to concentrate our remarks upon two topics of Mary's reign,—the marriage of the Queen, and the sufferings of the Martyrs. On the first of these subjects some curious facts are recorded in these volumes. The exalted character which

has lately been claimed for the Queen ill accords with her behaviour in the matter of her marriage. There were many reasons which might serve to recommend an alliance with the house of Austria. The relationship of her mother to the Emperor Charles V., and the constant support which he had afforded to her in her trials, naturally inclined her to such a union. The fidelity of his race to the Romish faith had been fully tested. The influence of the Spaniards on the Continent was without its equal. The ties of kindred and the promptings of ambition equally disposed her to listen to the silver-tongued Renard. Yet nothing can excuse the childish weakness she displayed on the occasion. She was no longer young, being in her thirty-seventh year; but no maiden of sixteen, whose experience of life had been gathered from romantic fictions, could have thought or expressed herself more foolishly. She never tired of conversing with the Spanish envoy on this topic. She greedily drank in the praises which described the bridegroom as an angel rather than a man. She yearned for his coming with hysterical longing, and hastened on the needful preliminaries, lest the season of Lent should cause a postponement of her happiness. And when the cold and haughty spouse at length arrived, she saw in him all the excellencies which her fancy had portrayed, and flung herself upon him with a warmth which he neither comprehended nor returned.

'For a few months she created for herself an atmosphere of unreality. She saw in Philip the ideal of her imagination, and in Philip's feelings the reflection of her own; but the dream passed away—her love for her husband remained; but remained only to be a torture to her. With a broken spirit and bewildered understanding, she turned to heaven for comfort; and instead of heaven, she saw only the false roof of her creed painted to imitate and shut out the sky.'—Vol. vi., p. 236.

But this first disappointment of so many cherished hopes was to be followed by a yet more signal vexation. The sense of the wrongs which Anna Boleyn had inflicted upon her mother roused Mary to regard Elizabeth with the deepest aversion. Every effort had been made to inflame this enmity. Gardiner and Renard constantly whispered in Mary's ear that her sister was an enemy to her creed, and a traitor to her government. Wyatt's abortive conspiracy was made a handle for the persecution of the princess; and it was hoped that evidence might be elicited which should bring her to the scaffold. There was no sorer subject with Mary than the thought that her hated and popular rival would succeed her on the throne. But the hour of the Queen's triumph had arrived. She announced that she was pregnant. Pole, the legate, at his reception, had greeted

her Majesty in the words of the salutation to the Virgin. Scarcely had he retired to his apartments, when he was summoned by a message from the Queen. His words had been already answered: 'The babe had leapt in her womb.' All London was to ring with joyful acclamations, all churches with *Te Deums*, all pulpits with the testimony of heaven to the truth of the good news.

At length the Queen's time had come, and she withdrew to Hampton Court for quiet. Everything was in readiness to welcome the royal heir. Writs (which may be still read in abundance in the State Paper Office) were drawn out, informing the ambassadors and others of the event. Church bells were rung, salutes fired, bonfires ready piled, and tables ready laid; but all passed off without result. Still the Queen was confident. Long processions wound through the streets, from the City to the Parks; Cheapside was lighted up at midnight as the host was borne along in the glare of five hundred torches. Scoffers were whipped; Protestants burned. True Catholics prayed. The Queen vowed the restoration of church lands, the rebuilding of ruined abbeys. In vain: a more frightful, a more heart-sickening disappointment could hardly be conceived. Instead of being the mother of an heir, Mary was stricken with a mortal malady. None dared to tell her the worst; and she realized, in part, her true condition only to inquire for what fault in herself God delayed the fulfilment of her hopes. Hitherto the heretics had been smitten here and there; they should now be exterminated, root and branch, and then her desire should be gratified. 'She could not be safely and happily delivered, nor could anything succeed prosperously with her, unless all the heretics in prison were burned to a man.'

Long before the Queen had arrived at this conviction, the funeral pyres had been lighted throughout the land, and men had beheld with astonished eyes the very best of the Reformers selected as victims. Under varied pretences the leading teachers were arraigned shortly after Mary's accession. Cranmer and Ridley were accused of treason. Hooper had received his bishopric only 'during good behaviour.' Of the rest, some were married. Others were merely suspected of heretical pravity. Gardiner and Bonner would have been glad to make short work with them; but they lacked the power to deal with them as they desired. A special Bill, intended to facilitate the burning of heretics, was brought before Parliament in May, 1554. It was stoutly opposed by Paget, whose tolerant spirit was much in advance of many of his peers, and the dissolution of Parliament checked its career for a time. But, in the December

of the same year, the persecuting statutes against the Lollards were revived; and, at the same time, the bishops' courts recovered the privilege of arbitrary arrest and discretionary punishment.

All the sympathy of Mr. Froude for manly character, for the courage which will dare and endure anything rather than violate its conscience, for the grand spectacle exhibited by men who witnessed a good confession and glorified God in the fires, is awakened by the sufferings of the martyrs. We wonder that his knowledge of the deaths of these men has not corrected his estimate of their conduct under Edward VI. He remarks, indeed, that Hooper 'had shown by his conduct in his diocese that in one instance, at least, doctrinal fanaticism was compatible with the loftiest excellence.' Perhaps any one, whose prejudices had been less inveterate, would have paused to inquire whether that were rightly termed *doctrinal fanaticism*, which was thus associated with, and conduced to, so glorious a result.

In considering the general history of the persecutions, we observe that it is without a single redeeming feature. There is no instance recorded of pity or tenderness of feeling displayed by the prime actors in these ruthless and bloody murders. Every aggravation which malice could suggest, or contumely would confer, was added to the bitterness of death. The blamelessness of Hooper's life, and the fact that he had refused to acknowledge Lady Jane Grey as Queen, were not permitted even to mitigate the rigours of his prison. Nor were the most savage acts of cruelty, committed by their ignorant and brutal gaolers, without the direct authority of those in the highest station. Gardiner ordered Hooper to be confined in one of the common prisoners' wards; where, with a wicked man and a wicked woman as his companions, with a bed of straw and a rotten counterpane, the prison-sink on one side of his cell, and Fleet ditch on the other, he waited till it would please Parliament to permit him to be murdered. Gardiner refused, with a coarse taunt, the last request of Rogers, that he might take leave of wife and children ere he died. The name of Bonner has been handed down to detestation for his sanguinary cruelty; but his colleague of Winchester seems to deserve no better reputation. And the Popish prelate, so merciless to every form of heresy, could not examine any prisoner without oaths which make us shudder as we read them.

The story of the martyrdom of the chief men is so well known, that we do not deem it needful to transfer it to our pages. We, most of us, have learned in early childhood how Rogers, and Bradford, and Hooper, went to the stake as to

their bridal. We know how Latimer and Ridley, cheering one another in that final hour, played the man, and lighted such a candle in England, as by the grace of God has not yet been extinguished. We know the story of Cranmer's recantation, (told at full length by Mr. Froude, who endorses some rather questionable statements,) of his subsequent repentance,—his own stern punishment inflicted on the hand which signed the falsehood, and his soul wafted to heaven in the flames. All these are narrated with much force by Mr. Froude, and will be read again with an undying interest.

The story of William Hunter presents a striking illustration of the manner in which the persecution affected the middle class of the people. Hunter, a young apprentice, refused to attend mass when it was re-established, and was then sent by his master to Brentwood, in Essex, to keep him out of trouble. One day a priest entered Brentwood church, and found Hunter reading the Bible there. 'Could he explain the Scriptures?' asked the priest. Hunter answered, 'that he read it for his comfort; he did not take on himself to expound. The Bible taught him how to live, and how to distinguish right from wrong.' The priest replied that the boy was a heretic, and should broil for it. Hunter's friends urged him to fly; but a Catholic magistrate required his father to produce him on peril of being arrested in his stead. The lad returned and surrendered, although his father offered to suffer in his room. He was cast into prison, and, after every effort had been made to induce him to recant, he was condemned to suffer at his native village.

In this case Bonner seems to have been really anxious to save his prisoner. 'If thou wilt recant,' he said to him, 'I will make thee a freeman in the city, and give thee forty pounds in money to set up thy occupation withal; or I will make thee steward of mine house, and set thee in office, for I like thee well.' Hunter thanked him for his kindness; but it could not be; he must stand to the truth. The interval before his death was spent with his friends in the parlour of the Swan Inn. Father and mother encouraged him in his resolution. 'Mother,' said the boy, 'for my little pain which I shall suffer, which is but a short braid, Christ hath promised me a crown of joy.' As he marched to the stake, his father was at the road side. 'God be with thee, son William,' the old man said. 'God be with thee, good father, and be of good comfort,' was the reply. We are told, that when he begged those present to pray for him, the magistrate who had committed him replied, 'Pray for thee! I will no more pray for thee than I will for a dog!'

'Son of God, then shine on me,' Hunter exclaimed; and as he spoke, the sun burst through the clouds, and shone in glory on his face.

These examples entirely failed to effect their object, if it were hoped that they would serve to intimidate the Protestants. The whole spirit of the nation was aroused against such cruelty, and testified its sympathy with those who suffered. One lad, whom Bonner threatened, walked up to a burning candle, and held his hand, without flinching, in the flame. As Lawrence sat in the midst of the faggots at Colchester, the little children came about him, and cried, 'Lord, strengthen Thy servant, and keep Thy promise!' Hunter's last words were, 'I am not afraid. Lord, receive my spirit.' Cardmaker, who had retracted, stung to the quick by his own shame, recovered his courage, and marched firmly to the stake, amidst the triumphant shouts of, 'God be praised. The Lord strengthen thee, Cardmaker!'

'Every martyr's trial was a battle; every constant death was a defeat of the common enemy; and the instinctive consciousness that truth was assisting itself in suffering, converted the natural emotion of horror into admiring pride.'—Page 354.

'But martyrdom was often but a relief from more barbarous atrocities. In the sad winter months, the poor men and women, who, untried and uncondemned, were crowded into the bishops' prisons, experienced such miseries as the very dogs could hardly suffer and survive. They were beaten, they were starved, they were flung into dark, fetid dens, where rotting straw was their bed, their feet were fettered in the stocks, and their clothes were their only covering; while the wretches who died in their misery were flung out into the fields where none might bury them.

'Lollards' Tower and Bonner's coal-house were the chief scenes of barbarity; yet there were times when even Bonner loathed his work. He complained that he was troubled with matters that were none of his; the bishops in other parts of England thrust upon his hands offenders whom they durst not pardon, and would not themselves put to death; and being in London, he was under the eyes of the court, and could not himself evade the work. Against Bonner, however, the world's voice rose the loudest. His brutality was notorious and unquestionable, and a published letter was addressed to him by a lady, in which he was called "the common cut-throat and general slaughter-slave to all the bishops in England." "I am credibly informed," said this person to him, "that your lordship doth believe, and bath in secret said, that there is no hell. The very Papists themselves begin now to abhor your blood-thirstiness, and speak shame of your tyranny. Every child can call you by name, and say, Bloody Bonner is Bishop of London! and every man hath it as perfect upon his fingers' ends as his paternoster, how many you for your part have burned with fire and famished in prison this three-quarters of a year. Though your lordship believe neither heaven nor hell, neither God nor devil, you were best to surcease from this cruel

burning and murdering. Say not but a woman gave you warning. As for the obtaining your Popish purpose in suppressing of the truth, I put you out of doubt, you shall not obtain it so long as you go this way to work as you do. You have lost the hearts of twenty thousand that were rank Papists within this twelve months." '—Vol. vi., pp. 389-391.

But as the months rolled by, the persecution only increased in its severity. Every fresh cause of alarm to the court, or of disappointment to the government, was held to be a reason for renewed cruelties. The continued failure of an heir, the disaffection of the Papal court to the royal houses of Austria and England, the hostilities of France, which resulted in the loss of the last of our possessions on the European continent, the various conspiracies which were contrived in England against a rule which was becoming daily more intolerable,—each and all of these did but furnish an occasion for fresh holocausts, by which the wrath of God and man might be appeased. The early apologists inform us that under the heathen emperors the universal cry in every evil hour was, 'Persecute the Christians.' The counsellors of Mary, and the Queen herself, had but one remedy for all misfortunes,—the burning of the heretics.

In 1556, the general suffering seemed likely to be aggravated by famine. The harvest of the preceding year had failed, and prices were daily rising. The anxieties thus occasioned were enhanced by the Dudley conspiracy, and the persecution 'degenerated,' to use Mr. Froude's expression,

'into wholesale atrocity. On the 23rd of April, six men were burnt at Smithfield; on the 28th, six more were burnt at Colchester; on the 15th of May, an old lame man and a blind man were burnt at Stratford-le-Bow. In the same month three women suffered at Smithfield, and a blind boy was burnt at Gloucester. In Guernsey, a mother and her two daughters were brought to the stake. One of the latter, a married woman with child, was delivered in the midst of her torments, and the infant just rescued was tossed back into the flames. Reason, humanity, even common prudence, were cast to the winds. On the 27th of June, thirteen unfortunates, eleven men and two women, were destroyed together at Stratford-le-Bow, in the presence of twenty thousand people. A schoolmaster in Norfolk read in full an inflammatory proclamation in a church. He and three others were instantly hanged. Ferocity in the government and lawlessness in the people went hand in hand. Along the river stood rows of gibbets with bodies of pirates swinging from them in the wind. In the autumn, sixty men were sentenced to be hanged together, for what crime is unknown, at Oxford; and, as a symbol at head-quarters of the system of administration, four corpses of thieves hung as a spectacle of terror before the very gates of St. James's palace.

'On the 20th of August, twenty-three men and women were brought to London from Colchester, tied in a string with ropes, to furnish another

holocaust. A thousand people cheered them through the streets as they entered the city; and the symptoms of disorder were so significant and threatening, that Bonner wrote to Pole for instructions how he should proceed. The government was alarmed; "the council, not without good consideration," decided that it would be dangerous to go on with the executions; and Pole, checking Bonner's zeal, allowed the prisoners to escape for a time, under an easy form of submission which they could conscientiously take. They were dismissed to their homes, only, however, for several of them to be slaughtered afterwards under fresh pretexts in detail; and Pole took an occasion of reprimanding the citizens of London for their unnatural sympathy with God's enemies. That he had no objection to these large massacres, when they could be matured safely, he showed himself in the following year, when fourteen heretics of both sexes were burnt in two days at Canterbury and Maidstone.'—Page 447.

A peculiar interest attaches to the last of the noble band of martyrs who gave their solemn and unflinching testimony during the reign of Mary. 'Early in the morning of May-day, in 1558, a company of men and women, about forty in number, assembled secretly in a back close in a field by the town of Islington,' then far away from London. They were engaged in reading the Scriptures and in prayer, when the constable of Islington came upon the little flock of worshippers, and some twenty-seven were arrested. Twenty-two of them were forthwith committed to Newgate, and as they lay there for some weeks unnoticed, two of their number died in prison on the 14th of June; seven of them were brought before Bonner, were condemned to the flames, and were all burnt in Smithfield on the 27th of June; six more were then selected for prosecution, and, pending the pronunciation of their sentence on the 11th of July, were confined in Bonner's coal-house, and subsequently at his palace at Fulham. Whilst they were there, Bonner had occasion to write to Cardinal Pole upon some other business, and in his letter he thus makes allusion to his prisoners:—

'Further, may it please your Grace, concerning these obstinate heretics that do remain in my house, pestering the same and doing much hurt many ways, some order may be taken with them, and in mine opinion, as I shewed your Grace and my Lord Chancellor, it should do well to have them burnt in Hammersmith, a mile from my house hence. For then can I give sentence against them here in the parish church, very quietly and without tumult, and having the sheriff present, as I can have him, he, without business or stir, can put them to execution in the said place, where otherwise the thing will need a day in St. Paul's with more cumberance than now it needeth. And so must humbly I take my leave of your Grace, beseeching the same that I may be advertised with speed of your pleasure.—Scribbled in haste, &c.'

This letter, which is not alluded to by Mr. Froude, was first published by Mr. Bruce in the *Athenæum*, about six years ago; and we cannot refrain from adding some of the admirable comments from Mr. Bruce's pen upon so monstrous a production:—

'We have here,' he writes, 'an apt illustration of the dyer's hand taking the very colour in which it works. The long course of the hideous persecution, which had now lasted for three years, had brought the actors in that terrible iniquity to think lightly of the lives which they sacrificed. Bonner writes, "scribbles in haste," upon the subject with a listless carelessness which indicates the most supreme indifference. The consignment of half-a-dozen human beings to the most frightful torture, was a "thing" merely to be got over with as little fuss as possible. It was not worth the trouble of "a day in St. Paul's." A man of really kindly feeling would have avoided the neighbourhood of such a scene horror-struck; Bonner endeavours to bring it as near as possible to his own home. The letter reflects light, also, on the characters of Gardiner and Pole. Bonner would not have dared to write to them in a style so *nonchalant* if he had not known that the tone was familiar to them, and not disagreeable. It shows, also, the justice of the popular judgment of Bonner's character, expressed in a line to be remembered for its truth, if it cannot be admired for its elegance:

"*Carnificis nomen debetur jure Bonero.*"'

This letter of Bonner's suggests the most painful thoughts as to the fate of other victims in this frightful tragedy. The capture of so large a band as that which was assembled at Islington would not fail to be a matter of notoriety; yet even in their case the Bishop of London would venture to propose a hurried and almost secret trial. In how many instances, then, may we not believe that obscure prisoners were allowed to rot in their dungeons, in order that their persecutors might escape the odium of a public prosecution? This would be more probable as the popular disgust was more plainly expressed, and the irritation of the Romish party at their own manifest failure became aggravated. Not until the last great day, when the hidden misdeeds of mankind shall be revealed, will the full extent of the iniquity of these proceedings be exposed, and a terrible flood of light poured into the dark places full of cruelty, which were even then, however, illumined by the grace that never fails those who rejoice that they are counted worthy to suffer for the truth.

We have preferred to let Mr. Froude, as a witness whose testimony is above all suspicion of religious prejudice, tell in his own language the sickening details of the Reformers' sufferings. There is but one more feature to be noticed in the martyrdoms,

and this is their cowardice. There were in England many noblemen whose heretical opinions were notorious; earl and baron, knight and gentleman, were known to avoid attendance at mass, and to be favourers of the same dogmas as those who died. But the Council never struck at those who would dare to strike again.

'They went into the highways and hedges; they gathered up the lame, the halt, and the blind; they took the weaver from his loom, the carpenter from his workshop, the husbandman from his plough; they laid hands on maidens and boys who had never heard of any other religion than that which they were called on to abjure; old men tottering into the grave, and children whose lips could but just lisp the articles of their creed; and of these they made their burnt-offerings; with these they crowded their prisons; and when famine and filth killed them, they flung them out to rot.'—Vol. vi., pp. 532, 533.

Such a choice of victims only serves to augment the infamy of the persecutors; but for the sake of the truth it was better that it should be so. The sympathy of the masses of the people was more readily awakened, their attention was more eagerly directed to those sufferers who belonged to the same class with themselves. The reality of the Divine power of the Gospel was more fully tested when it was seen that it could enable, not men of knightly lineage and hereditary pride, to maintain an undaunted bearing, but those to whom all the worldly stimulants were lacking which support men in the hour of adversity. No more unequal contest ever was waged in any period than that of Popery with royal and material power against the Protestantism of the merchants, the yeomen, and the poor. Their truth had been tried, and not found wanting; their creed, bathed in its baptism of blood, had been washed from the foul blots with which self-interest and policy had grievously marred it; their doctrines had been proved to be fruitful of the best results, such as would fit men to live in honour, and to die in peace. The blood of the martyrs was the seed of the Church, and Protestantism sprang up like the phœnix from their ashes.

Yet, although we acknowledge thankfully that such has been the issue, we find in it no exculpation for the authors of such a tragedy. On Mary, Pole, Gardiner, and Bonner, must for ever rest the frightful responsibility of all this bloodshed. In whatever proportions the guilt may be distributed, despite any extenuating circumstances that may be alleged in favour of any one of them, the fact remains in evidence which defies all contradiction, that the burden must be borne between them. Attempts have frequently been made in recent years to vindicate the Cardinal and the Queen from their share in the business; but

all such attempts have turned out failures. No amount of special pleading has availed to disentangle their names from the network of condemning testimony. No future time will greatly soften the disgust in which their memories will be held.

In the letter from which we have already extracted a quotation, Mr. Bruce makes the following powerful remarks upon the endeavours to gloss over the atrocious behaviour of the actors in this tragedy:—'In the whole range of English historical characters, no one stands out more distinctly than Bishop Bonner. Everybody who knows anything of the period of our Reformation, and many who do not, are as intimately acquainted with his person as with his deeds. His rubicund, fat, comely, jolly-looking presence, which was the occasion of so many jokes amongst his contemporaries,—his smooth, round, florid, pleasant-looking countenance, his courtly manners, his speech, ordinarily mild and placid, but conjoined to a temper which was easily ruffled, and, when that chanced to be the case, bursting forth in words not seemly in any man, and extremely the reverse in a bishop—these are peculiarities with which we are all familiar from infancy. To his friends he probably seemed very much of a gentleman,—courteous, gentle, and pleasant-speaking in the highest degree,—probably a little over-polite; but an extremely complaisant and agreeable person. To those who judged him merely by his look and personal appearance it must have been a mystery how it came to pass that the common people held him in such utter abhorrence, and applied to him a repulsive epithet, which to this day he continues to share with his mistress, Queen Mary. It is obvious, even in the most partial accounts of the people who were brought before him on the grounds of religion, that he behaved to most of them, at first, not merely with good temper, but with a great deal of seeming kindness. He tried to smoothe down their ruffled feelings, to win upon their regard, to coax them into relinquishing their peculiar opinions. Over and over again we find him appealing to them so forcibly and kindly as to draw thanks and tears from bystanders interested in their fate. Yet this same man, with all his external kindliness and pity, was capable of perpetrating the most monstrous cruelties with absolute heedlessness and *sang froid*. An attempt was made a few years ago to show that the popular judgment respecting him was in part erroneous. The writer was a gentleman who loves truth above everything, and has done a great deal to promote the cause of historical accuracy. He proved indisputably that many things alleged in books against Bonner were exaggerated; he dwelt at length upon the pleasant features of

his character; but he was unable to remove one atom of the weight of that traditional odium which justly rests upon him as a willing minister in the perpetration of the most atrocious barbarities.'

It were hard to conceive a more painful scene than that presented by the close of Mary's life and reign. As the last days of her earthly career drew on, the shadows gathered more darkly over her spirit, and a terrible and impenetrable gloom at length lowered upon and enveloped her mind. No Sovereign, perhaps, had ever assumed the reins of government under more favourable auspices. The evils which had raged under Northumberland's misrule had disposed the English people gladly to welcome a change in the administration. The abortive attempt to deprive Mary of the succession had awakened the affectionate loyalty of the people, and had stifled the misgivings of those who feared her bigotry, but would not oppose her lawful claim. The fondest aspirations of her own heart had been gratified by her marriage with a young and royal bridegroom; whilst the power of more than half of Europe was wielded by the hand of him whom she espoused. Her own personal character had so far been unsullied, her sorrows had been deep, and in the stern school of adversity it might be hoped she would have learned to tolerate the convictions and to feel for the sufferings of others. Yet all these hopes were blasted in their blossom. She acquired the affection of her subjects only to exchange it for their bitter detestation. She obtained the husband of her choice only to suffer at his hands the last indignity that a wife can undergo. From a few months after her marriage not a victim in Bonner's coal-house whose lot was not more enviable than that of the Queen of England.

Even before her marriage she was a prey to the most miserable mental dejection.

'In vain she attempted to cheer her spirits with the revived ceremonial of Whitsuntide. She could not cast off her anxieties, or escape from the shadow of her subjects' hatred, which clung to her steps. Insolent pamphlets were dropped in her path, and in the offices of Whitehall; she trod upon them in the passages of the palace; they were placed by mysterious hands in the sanctuary of her bed-room. She would start out of her sleep at night, picturing a thousand terrors, and among them one to which all else were insignificant, that her Prince, her Philip, who had taken such possession of her imagination, had no answering feeling for herself; that with her growing years and wasted figure, she would never win him to love her.'

This wretchedness was augmented when she failed to have a son. No wonder if, with her blind adhesion to the Romish

creed, she had believed the inflated language of its prelates to be really applicable to her accession to power. No wonder if the almost blasphemous adulations of the ambassador from Christ's vicar upon earth had sounded as prophetic of blessing to the most dutiful of his children. No wonder, too, that as the legate had told her that her career was supernatural, she looked for supernatural explanations of her disappointment. And her dejection was proportionate to her exalted expectations. Passionate and restless she lingered on. With swollen body, and haggard and shrunk features, she would sit upon the floor for hours, her face hidden in her hands, and her soul clouded in an agony of doubt.

This strange apathy, broken by furious outbursts of dark passion, only gathered strength with time. We are half disposed to adopt Mr. Froude's suggestion that her mind became affected: 'Those forlorn hours when she would sit with her knees drawn to her face; those restless days and nights, when, like a ghost, she would wander about the palace galleries, rousing herself only to write tear-blotted letters to her husband; those bursts of fury over the libels dropped in her way; or the marchings in procession behind the host in the London streets,—these are all symptoms of hysterical derangement, and leave little room, as we think, for other feelings than those of pity.' So far Mr. Froude. Yet may not her example stand out as a warning against attempting to compass an end we believe to be right by means which the simplest thought might convince us must be wrong? She, herself, believed that God was against her. Was she mistaken? Let us drop the curtain over the scene.

We have only been able in the course of our remarks to advert to a few of the many lines along which Mr. Froude's narrative is directed. It is inevitable that in any review of such a work we should rather be led to enlarge upon those points wherein we differ from a writer, than to dilate upon the topics wherein we can accord with him. That there is much in these volumes which calls for hearty commendation we readily allow:—a style of unusual purity, considerable pains bestowed in the investigation of the facts, and much acuteness occasionally displayed in endeavouring to produce conviction in the mind of the reader. In his manly sympathy for energy of character Mr. Froude gives us some powerful sketches, of which, perhaps, the account of Somerset and the story of the martyrdoms are the most prominent; and throughout his history we are carried on pleasantly and lucidly to the last.

Our great objection to the two volumes now before us is founded upon the spirit in which they have been penned. The

author approaches an epoch in our history, whose crimes turn upon doctrinal changes in the creed of the Church, with a mind persuaded that such changes are altogether unimportant. From such a point of view it is, we believe, impossible to estimate the reign of Edward VI. aright; we believe it to be equally impossible to estimate aright the constancy of the Reformers in the succeeding reign. It is not for the courage only with which they yielded their lives that we treasure up the martyrs in our memories. It is also for the unhesitating submission with which they bowed before the teaching of revelation, and for the high value which they set upon the definite dogmatic truth of Jesus, from which they would not swerve one iota, be the peril what it might. It is easy to sneer at declaimers from the pulpit, or at controversialists with the pen: but whence came the spirit which braced their nerves to suffering, save from their hearts' adoption of the doctrines which they taught? The deaths of these men testify to that importance of defined dogmas which Mr. Froude so labours to discredit.

To those then who can understand the value of the truths for which they died, the martyrs of Queen Mary's reign appear in a far higher light than that of mere vindicators of liberty of conscience. It was not merely that their firm wills refused to bend at the dictation of another: the savage Indian at the stake has evinced an equal constancy, and has been seen to smile under the infliction of the most agonizing tortures. It was not merely that they looked death in the face with unblanched cheeks; for their fellow-countrymen had in the darkest ages of their history been noted for an undaunted bearing in the hour of peril. It was for truth, it was for doctrine, it was for their creed and for their Saviour, that they died. The smallest token of submission would have been welcomed gladly by their judges. The theory which Mr. Froude so often advocates,—that men should fear God and keep His commandments, regardless of minor differences upon doctrinal questions,—left to their consciences no opening through which they might escape. How could they fear God, if they let go one iota of His truth, or did not hold fast with ardent tenacity every doctrine of His word? How would they keep His commandments, if they permitted themselves to deny their Lord, or shrank from resisting unto blood, striving against sin? They would have swept aside like cobwebs the meshes of this modern sophistry, which, whilst admiring their human courage, does not recognise the grace whence all its value was derived.

Nor do we hesitate to advance a step still further. Without attempting to enter too minutely or to pry with unhallowed

curiosity into the plans of the Most High, we recognise, in its broad, large features, the marks of God's overruling providence throughout these two reigns. The more we study the history of this period, and scan the inmost characters of those who bore a leading part in them; the more we scrutinise the strangely mingled notions by which the Reformation was first originated, and afterwards sustained; the more we ponder the dark riddles of such men's lives as Henry VIII. and Somerset and Northumberland; the more insight we obtain into the rapacity of the courtiers, the hostility of the ignorant and bigoted, and the individual weakness of many of the Reformation's leaders; the more we comprehend the terrible disasters of the reign of Edward, and the yet more terrible bloodshed under his sister; the more we meditate upon all these features of the history, the more fully are we persuaded that Mr. Froude has *not* grasped the true explanation of the final issue, that he has *not* found the key by which to unlock this mystery, that it is *not* to be explained in his own terms, that, if England was still saved from the 'consequences of the incapacity of its rulers, it again owed its preservation *to fortune*.' It is hard to understand how so acute a writer should have failed to discern that no blind fortune could possibly have guided England through so intricate a maze. It is harder still to understand that any thoughtful mind, conscious of its own purposes and designs, and carrying out its own little plans, could fail to surmise, at least, that possibly some comprehensive Intelligence was weaving in large colours the pattern of these events; and that possibly that which seemed confusion to a contracted vision might have its fitting position when seen blended in a wider, all-embracing scheme. Whatever Mr. Froude may see in the whole period, to our own eyes its occurrences, in their transaction and their results, present a picture that calls for our deepest gratitude, as we remember that, despite the misconduct of those who would have fostered them under Edward, and despite the cruelties of those who would have crushed them under Mary, the great Protestant principles were permitted to prevail under Elizabeth; and have descended from that period, accompanied by countless blessings, as the most precious portion of that glorious heritage to which we have ourselves succeeded.

ART. III.—1. *A Journey to Great Salt Lake City, by Jules Rémy and Julius Brenchley, M.A., with a Sketch of the History, Religion, and Customs of the Mormons, and an Introduction on the Religious Movement in the United States.* By JULES REMY. In Two Volumes. London: Jeffs. 1861.

2. *The City of the Saints, and Across the Rocky Mountains to California.* By RICHARD F. BURTON, Author of 'A Pilgrimage to El Medinah and Mecca.' London: Longmans. 1861.

EIGHT years ago the history of Mormonism was briefly sketched in the pages of this journal. The leading events of that history, from its commencement in the imposture of Joseph Smith to the arrival of the first army of his followers in the Great Basin of Utah, and the establishment of the Salt Lake City, were detailed, and a succinct view of so much of the religion and philosophy of the sect as had then transpired, was presented. About seven years had elapsed since the arrival of the first band of refugees from inhospitable Missouri,—seven years of great trial, and repeated perils and disappointments; but seven years also of astonishing enterprise and perseverance, and, upon the whole, of wonderful success. The tragic circumstances which preceded, and the romantic and adventurous interest which surrounded, the Mormon Exodus, secured for the infant Colony at the Salt Lake a degree of attention which not even the unutterable vulgarity of the people could quite neutralize; and some of the ablest pens in England were employed in sketching the past, and speculating on the future, of this extraordinary community. Little has been known among us on the subject since then. True it is, that one principal highway from the eastern to the western coasts of America has lain through Utah; and the dazzling splendours of California have led thousands of pilgrims to traverse it. Moreover, the relations between the citizens of Utah and the Federal Government have generally been doubtful enough to give our transatlantic cousins a vivid interest in all that concerned the distant and secluded valley. In America, therefore, there have appeared during the interval several works more or less devoted to the description of the holy city and its inhabitants. These have not, however, except in an instance or two, found their way over here; and, if they had, would have been of little value. Almost all of them have been written under the influence of the strongest personal feeling and party bias, and are either unscrupulous assaults on Mormonism, or equally unscrupulous apologies for it. Accordingly, they are all but worthless for any purposes of

impartial history. A revived interest has lately been excited among European readers by the publication of the works named at the head of this article. The writers had recent and lengthened opportunities of observing the character and habits of the citizens of Utah; they profess, though in somewhat different spirit, the most perfect impartiality; they are men of education, refinement, and the large experience which only extensive travel can supply. They are, moreover, men of very different character and temperament,—the Frenchman for once appearing as a calm, philosophic, earnest thinker, and the Englishman as a mercurial, jolly, *insouciant* man of the world. And, as their representations exhibit on the whole a wonderful amount of evidently undesigned agreement, we may conclude that we have in these volumes a pretty truthful picture of the Mormons at home. It is further to be said, that, in relation to matters of fact, as distinct from opinions, Captain Burton's book is in some respects the more reliable, as containing the result of observations made five years after the sojourn of Messrs. Rémy and Brenchley in Utah.

Before, however, attempting to collect and classify the information which these volumes convey, it is necessary to modify the preceding statement by some account of the qualifications of their respective authors. These works contain opinions as well as statements of facts; and, in matters of religion and morals especially, opinion colours the light in which the facts present themselves. It is hardly possible to bring a perfectly indifferent and impartial spirit to the study of Mormon problems; and, if possible, certainly it is by no means desirable. An author who should profess to approach this singular phenomenon unembarrassed by any previous convictions as to the subjects of which he treats, would lay himself open to the suspicion of self-ignorance or insincerity, or a most criminal and dangerous laxity. Therefore it is that we must spend a few sentences in analysing the character and qualifications of our authors, before committing ourselves to their guidance.

Captain Burton is favourably known to the reading world by his very entertaining books of travel among Mussulmans and Arabs. He is a well-bred, gentlemanly man of the world, and something of a scholar. We suspect, however, that he is *too much* a man of the world, with hardly any earnestness or faith. He seems to take a perverse pleasure in defending or palliating whatever is at variance with the notions and habits of Christians and Englishmen; and his sense of the ludicrous and absurd betrays him into levity and laughter where one would expect disgust and tears. Mormon polygamy is all but defended in

his pages; or, at any rate, he lays almost as much stress as a Latter-Day Saint on the fact that the majority of mankind are in favour of this institution, and seems as if he would have small objection to run with the multitude. He appears to have little respect for one system of religion more than another, and is continually making comparisons of the most flippant and irreverent kind. We cannot gather from his work that he has any faith in Christianity; he seems to be a cosmopolitan and indifferentist of the most shallow and careless kind. He speaks of Chillingworth's famous aphorism, 'The Bible, and the Bible alone, is the religion of Protestants,' as a dogma which 'swept away ruthlessly all the cherished traditions of a past age,—the ancient observed customs of the Church; all in fact that can beautify and render venerable a faith; and substituted in their stead a bald biblioiatry which at once justifies credulity and forbids it; which tantalizes man with the signs and wonders of antiquity, and yet which, with an unwise contradictoriness, forbids him to revise or restore them.' John Wesley was 'the founder and arch-priest' of a schism, and 'followed Luther, Calvin, and other creedmongers in acting upon his own speculations and peculiar opinions.' He and Whitefield 'galvanized Christianity with a wild and feverish life. Falling among uneducated men, the doctrine, both in England and in the colonies, was received with a bewilderment of enthusiasm; and it soon produced the usual fruits of such frenzy-prophecies that fixed the end of the world for the 28th of February, 1763, miraculous discernment of angels and devils, mighty comings of the power of God, and outpourings of the Spirit, rhapsodies and prophecies, dreams and visions, accompanied by rollings, jerks, and barks, roarings and convulsions, syncope, catalepsy, and the other hysterical affections and obscure disorders of the brain, forming the characteristic symptoms of religious mania.' 'From Protestantism sprung Methodism, which restored to man the grateful exercise of his credulity,—a leading organ in the human brain,—his belief in preternatural and supernatural agencies and appearances, and his faith in miraculous communication between God and man; in fact, in that mysticism and marvel-love which are the columns and corner-stones of religion. *Mormonism thus easily arose.*' To this jumble we will add but one sentence illustrative of our author's literary competency. Speaking of Joe Smith's Lectures on Faith, he says, 'Like Wesley's Hymns, they are written for the poor and simple; consequently they were read where a higher tone of thought and style would remain unheeded.' On the special subject of his work, Captain Burton has small claim to impartiality. He

affects to present an unbiassed view of Mormonism from the lips and pens both of its advocates and its opponents; but at every turn he shows an extreme unwillingness to believe any thing that is said against it, and an equal readiness to accept every statement and apology of its promoters. He slurs over, as unworthy of the slightest attention, the story of the origin of the Book of Mormon, namely, that it was a dreary novel, written in pure weariness by one Solomon Spaulding,—though that story was attested on oath by numerous and credible witnesses. He suppresses, or endeavours to explain away, notorious misdeeds on the part of his *protégés;* and appears throughout as the partisan of his Mormon hosts. He has so overdone this part, that we instinctively refuse to trust him; and are prepared to expect, that, when his term of service as British Consul in Western Africa shall expire, this gay, rollicking, and semi-cynical cosmopolite will publish an elaborate eulogy of Fetishism, and describe, in the most charming way, the amenities of devil-worship.

M. Rémy is a very different writer. He is thoroughly in earnest. His philosophy is indeed superlatively *French;* but such as it is, he evidently entirely believes in it, and every part of his work bears the stamp of careful research, and the most industrious and conscientious accuracy. We believe his volumes to be incomparably less coloured by personal bias and inclination than that of our agreeable countryman. But his religious views, however seriously and sincerely held, disqualify him from pronouncing a satisfactory judgment on the doctrines and religious tendencies of Mormonism. We pass by his remarks on the excitement which forms so characteristic a feature of American revivalism. We make no defence for those extraordinary phenomena for which brother Jonathan has found such extraordinary names; we are even willing to admit that our Methodist and Baptist brethren in the United States have adopted methods and countenanced proceedings, especially in their camp-meeting 'exercises,' peculiarly liable to abuse, and almost tending to foster the spirit of fanaticism and superstition. In attempting to account for Mormonism, our author seems to us to lay an exaggerated stress on these things. But let that pass; for 'jerks,' swoons, convulsions, and hysterical affections, are not much to our taste in Divine worship, any more than to his own. But when he says that 'all religions, whatever may be the opinion we entertain of their intrinsic truth, are the spontaneous products of the human soul,' he lays down a maxim from which we utterly dissent and revolt; our suspicion and distrust are at once awakened; nor are they allayed by the

elaborate account which follows of the general condition of religion and of religious parties in the United States. He asserts, for instance, that 'the religious genius of the great American democracy' tends 'to break with Christianity.' 'The infinite division of its sects, their collisions, their unceasing dissensions, their meetings, their revivals,' show us 'the Gospel ground to dust, Christianity in a permanent state of crisis and decomposition.' But this process of decomposition, however startling and in some respects saddening, awakens no despair in the mind of the true philosopher. Death is the gate of life; the chaos precedes the kosmos; and out of the mouldering vegetation which results from the decay of the old growth a new and fairer form shall certainly arise. Apparently M. Rémy anticipates a constant alternation and succession of this religious growth and decadence. The destiny of religion in America is likely, according to him, to follow that of her primeval forests; and successive generations will witness the perpetual reproduction of the religious sentiment, under new forms, out of the materials furnished by the dissolution of all that have preceded.

The application of this foregone theory is as curious as the theory itself. In the overthrow or disintegration of the ancient creeds, 'we can only arrive at a new faith by the inspirations of individual reason; that is to say, by recurring to the source of all religion, or by the reform of that which exists, or by a religious system which is nothing more than the product of calculation and imposture.' In the United States, 'these three systems of religious renovation are more especially represented by three men eminent on different grounds,—Emerson, Channing, and Joseph Smith.' The first of these is 'born to be the founder of a religion.....There is in him a combination of the prophet and the seer.' Then follows an elaborate attempt to dignify the Pantheism of the great American philosopher, and invest it with the sublimity of a new and marvellous revelation. Emerson has 'a deep-seated and energetic feeling of the Infinite. .....It may be said of him as of Spinoza, that he is drunk with God;' and much more to the same effect. And if Emerson be the Moses of the new dispensation, Theodore Parker is its Aaron. He 'has been the engineer of the new faith in North America.' His religious doctrine embraces just three points: 'The infinite perfection of God; the adequacy of man for all his functions; and absolute or natural religion; that is to say, the normal development, use, discipline, enjoyment of every part of the body, and every faculty of the spirit; the direction of all natural powers to their natural purposes.' The system of Emerson and Parker is, therefore, a complete revolution. Not so with that of Chan-

ning. He is simply a reformer; but the relation between him and them, and between these two 'forms of religious renovation' and the existing Christianity of the States, is thus expressed by M. Rémy :—

'That the distant future may be reserved for Emerson's ideas, and for the religious worship of which Parker has laid the foundations, I do not dispute; but the immediate future belongs to Channing; he represents the transition from Protestantism as it actually exists, to that natural religion which looms in the future. Before the eagle, fallen from its nest, can take a wide sweep, and measure the heavens with its wings, it will, after many a vain attempt, be obliged, over and over again, to return to the paternal eyrie, and rest itself awhile on the solid rock where it was born.'—*Rémy, Introduction*, p. lxxxix.

This transcendental philosopher, this sentimental religionist, however earnest and conscientious, is necessarily unable, according to our English and Christian notions, to pronounce a correct judgment on the theology of Mormonism; and, therefore, while cheerfully acknowledging his industry and accuracy, so far as the collection and exhibition of mere facts are concerned, we must pay no attention whatever to his inferences from the facts, when they relate to matters of doctrine and religion.

M. Rémy greatly excels Captain Burton in one respect. He is not, in the slightest degree, the apologist or advocate of Mormonism. Captain Burton, finding that all was not true which he had heard against 'the saints,' and, moreover, prepared, by his oriental sympathies, to look with favour on their special institution, seems to have resolved to believe nothing to their disadvantage. He even claims for the Mormon prophet the character of a sincere enthusiast, and treats with utter contempt the notion that he was a coarse and vulgar impostor. M. Rémy has been much more true to fact and common sense. He sees far too clearly to be deceived by the success of this compound of fraud and lust. And, truly, it is wonderful that an educated Englishman should conclude that the success of a system is sufficient proof that it did not originate in hypocrisy and villany. This, however, is Captain Burton's argument; as if all history, and especially the history of religion, did not teem with instances of clever knaves, upon the one hand, numbering their disciples by thousands among ignorant and credulous dupes, upon the other. The reader of these works, as, indeed, of all that relate to the present condition and prospects of the Mormon colony, will need continually to keep in mind the origin of the system, and to remember that no lapse of time, no modification of circumstances or institutions, no ameliorations introduced, either

by astute and politic leaders, or by the necessities of civilised life, or by intercourse with the rest of the world, can ever redeem the system from the blot of its foul and infamous origin. If the territory of Utah should be filled in our day to its utmost capacity with an industrious and prosperous population; if Brigham Young and his successors should succeed in averting collision with 'the Gentiles,' and in training the people to the highest degree of physical and material development; and if the Federal Government should yield to pressure, and take the Mormon territory, with its hierarchical *régime*, and its unchristian and immoral institutions, into the closest alliance with the Union; it will remain for ever true that Mormonism was a cheat from the beginning, an attempt on the credulity of the most ignorant portions of Christendom, hatched in the fruitful brain of a youngster notorious for idleness, chicanery, money-digging, and the most vulgar arts of conjuring; and its success adds but one to the already vast multitude of proofs,

> 'That the pleasure is as great
> Of being cheated, as to cheat.'

It is time, however, that we obtain such insight as these books supply into the peculiar phase of civilization which is presented by the Mormons at home. Our travellers proceeded to Utah by opposite routes,—Captain Burton following the old emigrant track, from east to west, by Forts Leavenworth, Kearney, and Laramie; and M. Rémy travelling eastward from Sacramento city, by Carson Valley and Haw's Ranch. The captain's journey, though uncomfortable enough, contrasted most favourably with the hardships and sufferings of those heroic bands by whom the perils of the wilderness were first encountered. Mormon enterprise and foresight have provided regular stations for the rest and refreshment of travellers, where once was only a howling and inhospitable desert; and relays of animals and suitable conveyances are to be found with little difficulty. M. Rémy and his companion were much less fortunate, and, accordingly, his pages record innumerable annoyances and inconveniences, and not seldom real sufferings and perils. Captain Burton supplies much interesting and valuable information respecting the geology and the fauna of the district traversed by him; while the Frenchman minutely describes the flora of the western route. We are further indebted to Captain Burton for a very full account of the condition and habits of various tribes of Indians encountered on his way. To these portions of the volumes before us, however, we can make no further reference, but shall proceed at once to sketch the

general character and appearance of the New Jerusalem, or Salt Lake City, as described by our authors.

The site of the city is on a rolling declivity at the western base of the Wasatch Mountains, and is admirably chosen for drainage and irrigation, sloping from north to south, and also from east to west. The valley in which it stands is engirdled on all sides by mighty mountains, the highest peaks of which are from 7,000 to 8,000 feet above the level of the plain; and it presents in the dreamy haze, which so often prevails, a lovely panorama 'of green, and azure, and gold.' The city itself is from two to three English miles in diameter, extending from the base of the mountains to the right bank of the Jordan, which forms its western limit. It is from twelve to fifteen miles distant from the western range of hills, about ten from the mouth of the river, and eight or nine from the nearest point of the Great Salt Lake, from which it derives its Gentile name. The beauty and advantage of the site strike every beholder; and have been employed by the shrewd successor of the prophet to impose on the credulity of his followers, and confirm them in the belief of his inspiration and infallibility. About two miles northward is Ensign Peak, some 400 feet high, 'the big toe of the Wasatch Range.' Brigham pretended that the spirit of the martyred Joe appeared to him on this spot, and pointed out to him the position of the New Temple, around which the city is built. Looking upon it from the west, the eye commands the whole at a glance, the upper part forming a slightly rising amphitheatre. The streets, which are 130 feet wide, and supplied on both sides with a stream of clear water, adorned with a double line of arborescent willows, are perfectly rectilinear. They correspond exactly with the cardinal points; those from north to south being perpendicular to the Jordan, and intersected by those running from east to west, and parallel to the course of that river. The streets are, in fact, mere roads, not in very good repair, and are, consequently, very dusty in summer, and 'in wet weather deep with viscid mud.' The houses are generally built of adobes, or sun-dried bricks, the walls in the best class of houses resting on foundations of sandstone. Each house is surrounded by its compound, or garden, embowered in forest and fruit-trees, and maize is extensively cultivated. At a little distance, there is something oriental in these aspects, but the presence of farm-houses, with their stacks and stock, and the absence of domes and minarets, soon recalls European memories. But churches and spires are wanting, 'the magnificent steeples which are hereafter to pierce the clouds with their aerial steeples' not having yet sprung from their foundations. The city has, in

consequence of these various arrangements, an intensely suburban look, and, after weeks of desert-travel, seems a perfect paradise. Order, tranquillity, cleanliness, comfort, and industry, are the most obvious characteristics of the place to a stranger; and we are bound to say, that a closer acquaintance only serves to confirm this agreeable impression. Work is the order of the day. With the exception of, perhaps, the president,—and he is neither unable nor unwilling to lend a hand now and then,—everybody works. Masons, carpenters, blacksmiths, gardeners, reapers, furriers, herdsmen, woodcutters, woolcombers, ditchers, tailors, shoemakers, brickmakers, potters, makers of gunpowder and saltpetre, millers, surveyors, gunsmiths, turners, in a word, all sorts of labourers and handicraftsmen are found here, and all are as busy as the working bees in a hive. The very children are utilized, and taught from early years the worth and dignity of labour. The result of all this is that the infant colony supplies all its actual wants, and has attained, in spite of unheard-of difficulties and obstructions, a truly marvellous prosperity.

'Neither grog-shops, gaming-houses, nor brothels, are to be met with. There are no such resorts among the Mormons. The only places of public assembly are the temple, the schools, the drill-ground, and, from time to time, the social hall, where they have dancing and singing, where theatrical representations are given, and scientific and historical lectures are delivered. There is never any disturbance in the streets; brawling is unknown; criminal charges are also very rare, and the courts, by the admission of the Federal judges, have scarcely anything else to do, but settle disputed debts.'—*Rémy*, vol. i., p. 198.

Captain Burton's testimony fully confirms this very pleasing and creditable account; and, much as we loathe and abhor Mormonism, it would be utterly unfair and dishonest to conceal this brighter side of the social state of its disciples. There can be no doubt that, whatever in a religious point of view, and in relation to some question of morals, may be the evils of Mormonism, the New Jerusalem is a place where a poor man—especially if he be 'a saint'—may enjoy security, protection, and honour, as one of the kings of labour, and acquire in a brief time, not only comfort, but competence more ample than elsewhere would have seemed possible even in his dreams.

On the north-west of the city are two 'blocks' containing respectively the house of 'the prophet,' and the buildings appropriated to public worship. The 'prophet's block,' at the time of M. Rémy's visit, displayed an unfinished house, about ninety-eight feet long, by forty in width, built of different kinds of stone, including a magnificent granite, brought from the neighbouring mountains. It has the appearance of 'a crenel-

lated diadem,' and was intended to accommodate thirty sultanas. It had even then cost the Mormon pontiff thirty thousand dollars. He was living, with seventeen wives, in an adjacent house, surmounted by a beehive, the emblem of industry, and suggestive of the Mormon name for Utah,—*Deseret*,—the land of the honey-bee. We presume that the 'palace' has since been finished, and that the prophet and his harem have been transferred to it; for Captain Burton speaks of the contrast between its splendour and comfort and the poor provision as yet made for public worship.

The temple-block contains ten acres, and is a square of six hundred and twenty-five and a half feet on every side. It is surrounded with a wall of handsomely-dressed sandstone and stuccoed adobe, about ten or eleven feet high, and there is a gateway in each of three of the walls fifty-eight and a half feet wide. The temple itself is not yet erected, but the foundations, hidden from view, are sixteen feet deep, and composed of hard grey granite. Our gay captain is somewhat scandalized at the lukewarmness of the saints regarding this building. Considering the usual energy and devotedness of a new faith, the necessity of a temple that the dead may be baptized out of purgatory, and so on, he thinks it far from edifying that the prophet should be so comfortably lodged, while the house of the Lord has not risen above its foundations. M. Rémy was allowed to copy the plan of the temple; and he has given us an engraved view of this remarkable structure. Like the system to which it belongs, it seems to combine almost all architectural orders, the prevailing style, however, being a combination of Norman and Gothic. It is of immense height, with five tiers of windows in the front. There are six polyhedral towers, three in front, and three behind, each crowned with a rather dwarfish spire. Should it ever be finished, it will probably become a world's wonder. Till it shall be completed, its place is supplied by a huge stone and adobe house called the Tabernacle, one hundred and twenty-five and a half feet long, and sixty-four feet wide. In front of this is a kind of immense shed, covered in with planks and boughs, to accommodate those for whom there is no room in the building, and called the Bowery. These structures are in the south-west angle of Temple Block. In the north-west corner is a building called the Endowment House,—or in the euphonious jargon of the city, 'the On-dewment House.' This is the *sanctum sanctorum* of the place, from which not only 'Gentiles,' but the common herd of the saints, are rigidly excluded. Certain tried and privileged members of the sect are admitted into this place

from time to time, to receive from the prophet or the apostles the gifts of the Holy Spirit and ordination. They are invested with the sacred tunic, a long white skirt which is believed to protect its wearer from every danger. Joe Smith divested himself of this miraculous robe when called upon to meet the charge of belonging to a secret society, and his followers ascribe his assassination to this imprudent act.

We do not perceive that either of our authors throws any new or valuable light on the philosophy and theology of Mormonism. Enough was said on these subjects in our former notice of this singular system; and we need only now repeat that the Mormons are materialists of the very grossest kind, interpreting most literally every anthropomorphic phrase or passage in which the Bible alludes to the Almighty; speaking of Him as only a perfected man, assigning to Him an habitation in the planet Kolob, and regarding the Holy Spirit as nothing more than highly refined and universally diffused matter. We have not space to trace out all the singularities and absurdities of this new theosophy; nor is it quite in harmony with our design, which is simply to depict as well as we can the social life and habits of the community in their mountain-home. As we have closed our account of the place with a description of the temple block and its buildings, we will commence our sketch of the people by looking upon them as assembled for the professed worship of Almighty God. Captain Burton gives us a lively, although somewhat too irreverent, picture of a public service conducted in the 'Bowery.' This outbuilding will accommodate about three thousand souls; and those who wish to be within hearing of the discourses must go early, the Mormons attending their public services with a zeal and punctuality which may be commended to many professors of a purer faith. But Captain Burton shall describe the scene for us:—

'The congregation is accommodated upon long rows of benches, opposite the dais, rostrum, platform, or tribune, which looked like a long lane of boarding open to the north, where it faced the audience, and entered by steps from the east. Between the people and the platform was a place not unlike a Methodist "pen" at a camp-meeting; this was allotted to the orchestra, a violin, a bass, two women and four men performers, who sang the sweet songs of Zion tolerably well,—decidedly well, after a moment's reflection as to latitude and longitude, and after reminiscences of country and town chapels in that land where, it is said, had the psalmist heard his own psalms,

"In furious mood he would have tore 'em."

I was told that "profane," *i. e.*, operatic and other music is performed at

worship, as in the Italian cathedrals, where they are unwilling that Sathanas should monopolize the prettiest airs; on this occasion, however, only hymns were sung.'—*City of the Saints*, pp. 314, 315.

In another part of his volume this author gives one or two specimens of Mormon hymnology. We can only say of the one we are about to quote that either the taste of this people has amazingly improved since they settled in Utah, or the worthy captain must have selected extremely favourable specimens of their sacred poetry. The following was sung by the choir, to the air of 'The Star-spangled Banner.' The hymn itself is entitled 'The Standard of Zion.'

'O see! on the tops of the mountains unfurled,
The ensign of promise, of hope, and salvation,
From their summits how nobly it waves to the world,
And spreads its broad folds o'er the good of each nation;
A signal of light for the lovers of right,
To rally where truth will soon triumph in might.
'T is the ensign of Israel streaming abroad,
And ever shall wave o'er the people of God.

'By an angel's strong hand to the earth it was brought
From the regions of glory, where long it lay folded;
And holy ones here, for the arduous work taught
By the priesthood, unflinching and faithful uphold it;
Its crown pierces heaven, and 't will never be riven,
Till the rule of the earth will to Jesus be given.
For the ensign of Israel 's streaming abroad,
And ever shall wave o'er the people of God.

''T is the emblem of peace and goodwill to mankind,
That prophets have sung of when freed by the Spirit,
And a token which God has for Israel designed,
That their seed may the land of their fathers inherit;
Many nations will say, when they see its bright ray,
To the mountains of God let us hasten away.
For the ensign of Israel 's streaming abroad,
And ever shall wave o'er the people of God.

'Its guardians are sending their ministers forth,
To tell when the Latter Day kingdom is founded,
And invite all the lovers of truth on the earth,
Jew, Christian, and Gentile, to gather around it;
The cause will prevail, though all else may assail,
For God has decreed that His works shall not fail.
O! the ensign of Israel 's streaming abroad,
And ever shall wave o'er the people of God.'

City of the Saints, pp. 374, 375.

But to return to the captain's narrative;—

'We—the judge's son and I—took our seats on the benches of the eighth ward, where we could see the congregation flocking in, a proceeding which was not over, some coming from considerable distances, till 10.15 A.M. The people were all *endimanchés;* many a pretty face peeped from the usual sun-bonnet, with its long curtain, though the "mushroom" and the "pork-pie" had found their way over the plains, and trim figures were clad in neat stuff dresses, sometimes silk; in very few cases there was a little faded finery; gauze, feathers, and gaudy colours, such as one may see on great festivals in an old country village. The men were as decently attired; the weather being hot had caused many of them to leave their coats at home, and to open their vests; the costume, however, looked natural to working men, and there was no want of cleanliness, such as sometimes lurks behind a bulwark of tatters. The elders and dignitaries on the platform affected coats of black broadcloth, and were otherwise respectably dressed. All wore their hats till the address began, and then all uncovered. By my side was the face of a blear-eyed English servant-girl; *en revanche*, in front was a charming American mother and child; she had what I had remarked in Mormon meetings at Saville House and other places in Europe, an unusual development of the organ which phrenologists call veneration. I did not see any bloomers "displaying a serviceable pair of brogues," or "pictures of Grant Thorburn in petticoats." There were a few specimens of the "Yankee woman," formerly wondrous grim, with a shrewd thrifty grey eye, at once cold and eager, angular in body and mind, tall, bony, and square-shouldered,—now softened and humanized by transplantation and transposition to her proper place. The number of old people astonished me; half-a-dozen were sitting on the same bench; these broken-down men and decrepit crones had come to lay their bones in the holy city; their presence speaks equally well for their faith, and for the kindheartedness of those who had brought the incumbrance. I had remarked some Gentiles in the Bowery; many, however, do not care to risk what they may hear there touching themselves.

'At 10 A.M., the meeting opened with a spiritual song. Then Mr. Wallace, a civilized-looking man, lately returned from foreign travel, being called upon by the presiding elder for the day, opened the meeting with prayer, of which the two shorthand writers in the tribune proceeded to take notes (!). The matter, as is generally the case with returned missionaries delivering their budget, was good; the manner was somewhat Hibernian; the "valleys of the mountains"—a stock phrase—appeared and re-appeared like the speechifying Patlander's eternal "emerald green hills and beautiful pretty valleys." He ended by imploring a blessing upon the (Mormon) President, and all those in authority; Gentiles of course were included. The conclusion was an amen, in which all hands joined; it reminded me of the historical practice of "humming" in the seventeenth century, which caused the Universities to be called *Hum et Hissimi Auditores.*

'Next arose Bishop Abraham O. Smoot, second mayor of Zion, and successor to the late Jedediah M. Grant, who began with "brethering," and proceeded in a low and methody tone of voice, "hardly audible in the

gallery," to praise the saints, and to pitch into the apostates. His delivery was by no means fluent, even when he warmed. He made undue use of the regular Wesleyan organ—the nose;' [Captain Burton deserves credit for the discovery of this curious fact in natural history;] 'but he appeared to speak excellent sense in execrable English. He recalled past persecutions without over asperity, and promised future prosperity without over prophecy. As he was in the midst of an allusion to the president, entered Mr. Brigham Young, and all turned their faces, even the old lady,—

"*Peut-on si bien prêcher qu'elle ne dorme au sermon?*"—

who, dear soul! from Hanover Square to San Francisco, plainly reposes through the discourse.

'The prophet was dressed, as usual, in grey homespun and home-woven: he wore, like most of the elders, a tall steeple-crowned straw hat, with a broad black ribbon, and he had the rare refinement of black kid gloves. He entered the tribune covered, and sat down, apparently greeting those near him. A man in a fit was carried out pumpwards. Bishop Smoot concluded with informing us that we should live for God. Another hymn was sung. Then a great silence, which told us that something was about to happen: *that* old man held his cough; *that* old lady awoke with a start; *that* child ceased to squall. Mr. Brigham Young removed his hat, advanced to the end of the tribune, expectorated stooping over the spittoon, which was concealed from sight by the boarding, restored the balance of fluid by a glass of water from a well-filled decanter on the stand, and, leaning slightly forward on both hands propped on the green baize of the tribune, addressed his followers.

'The discourse began slowly, word crept tibulantly after word, and the opening phrases were hardly audible; but, as the orator warmed, his voice rose high and sonorous, and a fluency so remarkable succeeded falter and hesitation, that—although the phenomenon is not rare in strong speakers—the latter seemed almost to have been a work of art. The manner was pleasing and animated, and the matter fluent, impromptu, and well turned, spoken rather than preached; if it had a fault, it was rather rambling and unconnected. Of course, colloquialisms of all kinds were introduced, such as "he become," "for you and I," and so forth. The gestures were easy and rounded, not without a certain grace, though evidently untaught; one, however, must be excepted, namely, that of raising and shaking the forefinger; this is often done in the Eastern States; but the rest of the world over it is considered threatening and bullying. The address was long. God is a mechanic. Mormonism is a great fact. Religion had made him (the speaker) the happiest of men. He was ready to dance like a Shaker. At this sentence the prophet, who is a good mimic, and has much of the old New English quaint humour, raised his right arm, and gave, to the amusement of the congregation, a droll imitation of Ann Lee's followers. The Gentiles had sent an army to lay waste Zion, and what had they done? Why, hung one of their own tribe!—and that too on a Sunday.' [This was said in allusion to the execution of a 'Gentile' for murder.]—*City of the Saints*, pp. 316–318.

Captain Burton was, on the whole, greatly disappointed with the prophet's deliverance. But Brigham was followed by Heber C. Kimball, the second president. This dignitary seems to be very popular with the saints; a fact due apparently to the excessively homely style of his discourses, to his indulgence in keen thrusts at the vices and follies of his hearers, and to a tolerable spice of the buffoon in his composition. The Gentiles accuse him of being too loose in his talk. M. Rémy describes him as 'cynical and burlesque in his sermons, and he is unquestionably the most disgusting among the Mormon preachers. His grotesque physiognomy and punchy figure very much add to the comic character of his eloquence. He has been very often heard in his sermons to boast of having more wives than Brigham Young. It was Kimball who exhorted the priests sent out as missionaries "to bring to the flock as many ewe lambs as possible; but to be careful to keep their hands off until they reached the fold."' He is further charged with calling his young wives from the pulpit 'little heifers,' and other equally disgusting speech. It is fair to say that Captain Burton expresses his disbelief of these statements. On the present occasion his

'movements contrasted strongly with those of his predecessor; they consisted now of a stone-throwing gesture, delivered on tiptoe, then of a descending movement, as

"When pulpit, drum ecclesiastic,
Was beat with fist, instead of a stick."

'He began with generalizations about humility, faithfulness, obeying counsel, and not beggaring one's neighbour. Addressing the hand-cart emigrants, newly arrived from the "sectarian world," he warned them to be on the look out, or that every soul of them would be taken in and shaved. (A laugh.) Agreeing with the prophet, Mr. Kimball is said to be his echo, in a promiscuous way, concerning the morality of the saints: he felt it notwithstanding his duty to say that among them were "some of the greatest rascals in the world." (A louder laugh, and, N.B., the Mormons are never spared by their own preachers.) After a long suit of advice, *à propos de rien*, to missionaries, be bless'd, amen'd, and sat down.'—*City of the Saints*, p. 319.

After the reading of a list of persons for whom letters were lying unclaimed, and a concluding prayer and benediction, the meeting broke up. Sometimes, the communion is administered, or rather travestied, water being used instead of wine, because the latter is of Gentile manufacture. Occasionally, the service is diversified by an exhibition of the gift of unknown tongues. A story is related of a young wag, who, 'after that a woman had sprung up' and spoken in 'tongues,' as follows, 'Mela, melt,

melee,' sorely pressed by the 'gift of interpretation of tongues,' translated the sentence after a fashion that soon brought him before the Council; but he stoutly persisted that his 'interpretation' was by 'the Spirit,' and they dismissed him with admonition. After this we are not surprised to learn that the gift of tongues is now a much rarer phenomenon than formerly.

M. Rémy describes the Mormon preachers and preaching on this wise:—

'The most grotesque incoherencies swarm in their discourses, without anybody appearing to be displeased at or even aware of them. These modern Demosthenes are never at a loss. We have seen some who, motionless at first, with their hands in their pockets, expressed themselves in a cold and phlegmatic way; and who then, demeaning themselves like so many imps, indulged in the most violent contortions, and flung their arms about like madmen. It is not unusual to see some who, by violent thumps on the crown of their hats, in the fury of their inspiration, actually bonnet themselves; and who yet, in the midst of their fantastic movements, are occasionally observed to assume postures that are superb, and in the highest degree impressive. The majority of these preachers, not excepting the prophet himself at times, are not very particular about the decorum of their language, and frequently indulge in buffoonery and jests which call forth approving bursts of laughter from the congregation.'—*Rémy*, vol. ii., p. 59.

The miscellaneous character of their discourses, to use no stronger term, may be judged of by the following choice extracts. Brigham Young said from the pulpit, 'There are more devils among the Mormons than in all the world besides....The assistance given to the emigrants has brought the Church into debt to the amount of seventy thousand dollars; now you must pay this sum, otherwise I will sell up your property; and if this is not enough, I will then sell your wives and children. Make haste and get married. Let me see no more boys above sixteen and girls above fourteen unmarried....Tell the Gentiles that I am resolutely determined to cut off the head of the first man among them who attempts to seduce our girls or matrons.' Another ejaculated: 'All-powerful God, father of saints! I beseech thee, cast into damnation all the enemies of our divine religion.' Latterly, the discourses have been interspersed, naturally enough, with exultations and taunts at the troubles of their old enemies and persecutors in the United States. 'The South has seceded from the North, but the Mormons will never secede from either. I have sometimes a kind of notion that North and South will

secede from us; and if they do so, we cannot help it, and the Lord will yet make a great people of us, just as fast as we are able to bear it.' 'There is no head to the democracy; the centre of its intelligence is the belly, and the principal portion of the body is in the boots. Uncle Sam has been sadly victimised by his boys. The government has been a miserable goose for politicians to pluck;' and so on. The discourses are generally published in the *Deseret News*, after having been first carefully revised; so carefully, indeed, that those who heard them scarcely recognise them again,—a process of cooking, which, unless certain popular preachers are grievously misrepresented, is not altogether unknown among ourselves. On the whole, the accounts which our authors give us of the profane and blasphemous caricature which passes for public worship among the Mormons, produce a profound and melancholy impression of the prodigious impiety of its founder and his successors in the supreme authority.

Before passing from their religious habits and usages, it may be as well to speak of the doings in the Endowment or 'Ondewment House.' We have indeed no very reliable information, as the circumstantial account given by M. Rémy is avowedly based on the representations of John Hyde, a renegade and apostate Mormon priest. Captain Burton is scarcely just to the Frenchman, when he says, 'M. Rémy has detailed the programme with all the exactitude of an eye-witness, which he was not;' for the latter explicitly refuses to vouch for the correctness of the details, 'so utterly distasteful is it to us to place full confidence in the spiteful depositions of people who have betrayed their fellows.' Nor, with what we know of Mormon 'respectability,' can we accept Captain Burton's averment that such orgies as Hyde and others describe 'could not co-exist with the respectability which is the law of the land.' It is certain that the deepest secrecy and mystery are observed, under the sanction of the most terrible oaths. Popular opinion, among the Mormons themselves, holds that 'Elohim, Jehovah, Jesus, and Michael (Adam),' together with the devil, are represented in the ceremonies; and Judge Phelps is popularly known as 'the devil,' from the part which he is supposed to play. Washing, blessing, anointing, and clothing in mystic garments,—of which the most remarkable is a small square silk apron, ornamented with designs representing fig-leaves,—constitute, according to Hyde, the first act in this strange drama. Then follow consultations about creating and peopling the earth; the creation, the presentation of Eve to Adam, the temptation, and the fall, are then represented in action, men and women being

initiated together. The pair, cursed for the fall, can only be raised by a higher power; so God establishes the priesthood, and invests it with the requisite jurisdiction. After taking several fearful oaths, the power of the priesthood is exercised in conferring the first degree of the order of Aaron. Then comes a ceremony by which the initiated receive the benefit of full fellowship with Joseph Smith, and are admitted into the second order of Aaron. Another series of absurdities and horrors, in which he resigns himself body and soul to 'the anointed of the Lord,' (Brigham,) and to the Church, introduces the neophyte into the third degree of the order of Melchisedec; the next stage compels him to swear eternal hatred and the most fearful vengeance against the United States, (for the various sins of that government against 'the saints,') and conducts him to the second degree of the order of Melchisedec; and, finally, he is admitted within the veil, into a room representing God's kingdom in heaven. At every step in the strange process,—which is said to occupy altogether eleven or twelve hours,—the most frightful oaths are administered, the most horrible maledictions invoked and pronounced in case of apostasy. Such is Apostle Hyde's account of this extraordinary affair; and, notwithstanding the suspicion that necessarily attaches to the 'revelations' of a renegade, M. Rémy believes, from the analogy of the dogmas of the saints, and on other grounds, that in its essential parts the story is true; and the greater earnestness and more painstaking research of the Frenchman induce us to adopt his conclusion rather than that of our sceptical and scoffing countryman. There can be no question that Mormonism is a mystery of iniquity. That wicked and terrible deeds have been repeatedly done in the dark, by its chief promoters, has been too authentically testified to allow of any doubt in our minds; and such profane, shocking, and disgusting orgies as Hyde attributes to the ceremonies of endowment are only in keeping with that system of profligacy, conspiracy, and terrorism, which has distinguished the Mormons from the beginning, and affords some extenuation of the cruelties and persecutions which their indignant fellow-countrymen have frequently inflicted upon them.

We will now present our readers with a succinct and summary view of the system of government maintained among the Mormons. It will be appropriate also, under this head, to say something respecting the *personnel* of the principal men of Utah, and their relations to the government of the United States. The polity administered at the City of the Saints is strictly theocratical, and the members of the government constitute a

hierarchy. Two orders of priesthood are recognised, that of Melchisedec, and that of Aaron.

'The first was entitled, previous to the birth of the high priest from whom it has taken its name, "the priesthood according to the order of the Son of God," an appellation which was changed under the pretext of avoiding a too frequent repetition of the name of the Supreme Being. This order is superior to the other; it is to it belongs the right of presidency, and power and authority over every department of the Church in all ages of the world, for the purpose of administering spiritual things. The council of the presidency of the order of Melchisedec has the right to officiate and direct all the affairs of the Church; and it confers upon its high priests the privilege of administering the spiritual affairs within their province, and also of exercising the functions pertaining to the Levitical order.

'The second order of priesthood, the Aaronic or Levitic, thus called because it was conferred upon Aaron and his posterity, to be enjoyed by them throughout all generations, is a sort of appendix to the former, and possesses the right and power of discharging the temporal ordinances. The episcopal body constitutes the council of the presidency of this order, of which it holds the keys and the power. No one has a right to hold the keys of this body, unless he be descended from Aaron. But as a high priest of the order of Melchisedec he is privileged to officiate in every department of the Church; he may also discharge the functions of a bishop, when no descendant of Aaron can be found; but on condition, however, of his having been ordained to it by the hands of the president of the order of Melchisedec.

'The power and authority of the superior priesthood, or of the order of Melchisedec, consist in holding the keys * of all the spiritual property of the Church, in possessing the privilege of receiving the mysteries of the kingdom of heaven, in having the heavens opened, in being united in communion with the general assembly and with the Church of the first-born, and in enjoying the communion and presence of God the Father, and of Jesus, the Mediator of the new alliance. The power and authority of the Aaronitic order consist in holding the keys of the ministry of angels, in administering all temporal ordinances, the letter of the Gospel and the baptism of repentance for the remission of sins, conformably to the commandments and covenants.'—*Rémy*, vol. ii., pp. 46–48.

* The 'keys' are defined by Joseph Smith in the following very coherent and intelligible fashion:—'The keys are certain signs and words by which counterfeit spirits and personages can be distinguished from genuine, which are not to be revealed to the elders before the completion of the temple. The rich man can obtain the keys in the temple only; the poor man, like Moses, on the hill-top. The rich man cannot be saved without charity, without feeding and lodging the poor, when and how God appoints. There are signs in heaven, on earth, in hell; the elders must know them all, in order to be invested with power, and to accomplish their work and avoid error. The devil is acquainted with many signs, but he does not know the sign of the Son of Man, or Jesus. No one can truly say he knows God, until he has touched something of his hands, which cannot happen unless in the Holy of Holies.'—*Sermon by Joseph Smith, as quoted by Rémy.*

Joseph Smith was chosen, as his followers believe, 'to re-open the channel of communication with heaven by the means of revelation, and to put himself at the head of the dispensation of these latter days. Illiterate and young as he was, he was chosen because in his veins ran the pure blood of the sacerdotal race, preserved in a direct line through numerous generations.' He and Oliver Cowdery were invested with the order of Aaron by John the Baptist, who descended upon them, in a cloud of light, on the 15th of May, 1829, and shortly afterwards they were elevated to the order of Melchisedec. It is an article of faith that the apostle John is still alive on earth, in some part of North America, and that in due time he will 'manifest himself visibly, with the keys of the order of Melchisedec, which he holds by inheritance from Adam.' This order is subdivided as follows:—First, there are three high priests, chosen by the whole body, in order to constitute a quorum in the presidency of the Church. Of this body Brigham Young is president, the other two being councillors of the presidency. This threefold head is said to be in imitation of the Trinity. Secondly, there is a council of twelve apostles, whose office it is 'to officiate in the name of the Lord under the presidency of the Church; and, conformably to the rule of heaven, to build up and establish the Church, to regulate all its affairs in every part of the world, first among the Gentiles, and then among the Jews. Besides this, it is a part of the functions and obligations of the twelve, to ordain evangelical ministers in the great branches of the Church, in conformity with indications given them through an express revelation.' They form a quorum equal in authority and power to the three presidents. Thirdly, there are the seventy, whose duty is to preach the Gospel, acting in the name of the Lord under the direction of the twelve. They are to be special witnesses to the Gentiles over all the earth; and they constitute a quorum equal in authority and power to each of the previous ones. Each decision of each quorum must be unanimous, though, under special circumstances, a majority may constitute a quorum. 'In the event of a decision of any of these quorums being contrary to law and right, an appeal may be made from it to a general assembly, consisting of the various quorums which constitute the spiritual authority of the Church; and this is the only and last appeal.' Between the twelve and the seventy, there is a council of high-priests, whose functions do not seem to be clearly defined. There is also a grand patriarch, who ranks in public ceremonies immediately after the presidency, and whose chief duty is to administer blessings. The present incumbent is a nephew of Joseph Smith. The office is held for life. 'The order of Mel-

chisedec is necessarily transmitted from father to son, and belongs to the direct descendants of the chosen race, to which the Divine promises are made.' The Aaronitic order comprises bishops, elders, or priests, teachers, and deacons. The first-named functionaries are specially charged with the administration of the temporal affairs of the Church, and with the collection of tithes. They are also to inquire into the material condition of their flocks, and to report all cases of poverty among them which require assistance. Thus the office of a bishop is in a great degree secular. In the City of the Saints, each quarter has its bishop, and the other towns and villages of Utah are each under the charge of one such dignitary.

At the head of this imposing and somewhat complex organization is 'Brother Brigham, at once prophet, revealer, and seer.' This remarkable man was born at Whittingham, Vermont, on the 1st of June, 1801, and is now, therefore, just sixty-one years old. Captain Burton visited him in 1860, and found him looking not older than forty-five.

'Scarcely a grey thread appears in his hair, which is parted on the side, light coloured, rather thick, and reaches below the ears with a half curl. He formerly wore it long, after the western style; now it is cut level with the ear lobes. The forehead is somewhat narrow,' [M. Rémy says it is a wide one,] 'the eyebrows are thin, the eyes between grey and blue, with a calm, composed, and somewhat reserved expression;' ['eyes which convey an idea of *finesse*,' says M. Rémy.] 'The nose, which is fine and somewhat sharp-pointed, is bent a little to the left. The lips are close, like the New Englander's, and the teeth, especially those of the under jaw, are imperfect. The cheeks are rather fleshy, and the line between the *ala* of the nose and the mouth is broken; the chin is somewhat peaked, and the face clean shaven, except under the jaw, where the beard is allowed to grow. The hands are well made, and not disfigured by rings. The figure is somewhat large, broad-shouldered, and stooping a little when standing.'—*City of the Saints*, pp. 291, 292.

A portrait of Brigham is prefixed to M. Rémy's first volume; and as it is taken from a daguerreotype, it is, no doubt, a good likeness. The longitudinal wrinkles over the nose, and the firmly closed mouth, convey the impression both of decision and sternness, in spite of which, however, the general expression is by no means unamiable; and the bright, piercing, well-opened eye shows great native intelligence and fire. The lower part of the face, and especially the thick, clumsy neck, are indicative of sensuality,—a true index, judging by a coarse joke of Smith's respecting him, not to be quoted here,—and the *tout ensemble* has anything but a saintly aspect. His dress, it appears, is studiously plain and simple, and his manner unaffected and

natural. He looks very much like a respectable New England farmer, which, indeed, prior to his elevation to the Mormon popedom, was his calling. Placid, as a general rule, in his temper; cold, but by no means morose, in temperament; with quick perceptive faculties, carefully cultivated observation, an excellent memory, and a keen insight into character; with an indomitable will, profound secrecy and reserve, and rare powers of sarcasm and denunciation, he easily controls his weak-minded and superstitious followers, who are fascinated by the impression of power and almost superhuman sagacity which he produces, and who enthusiastically declare that there is no chief in Great Salt Lake City but 'Brigham.' His habits, both in eating and drinking, are very temperate. In common with all strict Mormons, he abstains from and discountenances spirituous liquors; and, marvellous indeed for a Yankee, he neither smokes nor chews tobacco. He is a polygamist of the boldest type. When M. Rémy saw him, his seraglio contained seventeen women, which number is said to have increased to forty by the present time. The number of children which have been born to him is unknown. In the spring of 1855 nine were born in one week. He is distinguished by his solicitude for their welfare. Captain Burton, standing near him on one occasion, inquired the designation of a building that looked like 'an English gentleman's hunting stables, with their little clock-tower,' and was answered, 'It is a private school for my children, directed by Brother E. B. Kelsey.' The prophet has been accused of innumerable acts of perfidy and cruelty, and especially of countenancing, if not planning, most of those atrocious assassinations which have made the name of Utah infamous in Christendom. There is possibly some exaggeration in this; but even Captain Burton mentions instances of what he calls 'wild, unflinching, and unerring justice, secret and sudden;' and speaks of such justice as 'the rod of iron which protects the good!' Most Englishmen will devise some other name for such an act as the following:—'Two men, named Johnston and Broom, Gentiles, who had been notoriously guilty of forgery and horse-stealing, were sauntering home one fine evening, when they both fell, with a bullet to each, accurately placed under the heart arm.' The citizens professed neither to know nor care who were the murderers; but the Gentiles declared the deed had been done by order of Brigham and his secret council, and Captain Burton fails to clear him from the suspicion. After this we are not surprised to learn that 'the prophet,' despite his strong will and high moral courage, lives in constant fear, and takes uncommon care of his own precious life. 'He has guards at his gates, and he never

appears in public unattended by friends and followers, who are of course armed.' His mansion, called the White House, after the corresponding one in Washington, has a guard-room at its eastern doorway, so arranged and surrounded that, 'in case of an assault upon head-quarters by roughs, marshals, or other officials, fifty rifles could at once be brought to bear upon the spot, and a thousand after the first hour.' Captain Burton, however, emphatically declares that he found life incomparably safer among the Mormons than among the half-civilized and miscalled Christians by whom they were surrounded. And even his enemies,—men who believe that Joseph Smith was a liar, impostor, and hypocrite,—seem to give Brigham credit for sincerity, possessing 'an earnest, obstinate, egotistic enthusiasm, fanned by persecution, and inflamed by bloodshed,' 'honestly and sincerely the dupe of sacrilegious imposture.' In this verdict both our authors substantially agree; but, whatever he may be, he is 'revered as king or kaiser, pope or pontiff, never was;' he 'unites in his own hands more power than any potentate in the world. He is the autocrat of thought and action, the omnipotent soul of this rising body, so considerable, but which is looked upon by the Americans merely in the light of a phantom, evoked by evil passions, and which they hope to lay.'

Brigham's assessors in the presidency of the church are Heber C. Kimball and Daniel H. Wells. The former is, as we have seen, the buffoon of the rostrum,—'a large, powerful man, not unlike a blacksmith,'—and appears to be extremely well-to-do. Wells is tall and bony. He became a saint on the expulsion of the Mormons from Nauvoo, and is the commander of the Nauvoo legion. Then we have the apostle George A. Smith, 'the historian and recorder of the territory, and a cousin of the first prophet; he is a walking almanack of Mormon events, and is still full of fight, strongly in favour of rubbing out 'the wretched Irishmen and Dutchmen sent from the East, to try whether the Mormons would receive Federal officers.' Mr. Wilford Woodruff, also an apostle, is a noted controversialist. Mr. Albert O. Carrington, a gentleman of liberal education, was Captain Stansbury's second assistant in the topographical survey. Judge Phelps, alias 'the devil,' is a linguist, a meteorologist, and the maker of the Mormon almanack. He tries his hand sometimes, not very successfully, at inventing philosophical instruments; and Captain Burton evidently looks upon him as slightly afflicted with monomania. The brothers Orson and Parley Pratt are—or rather were, for Parley met his death some years since at the hands of a man whose wife he had seduced—among the most noteworthy of the Mormon leaders.

Parley was one of Smith's own converts, distinguished for zeal and ardour, for his lucid expositions of the Mormon faith, and for being, as well as his brother, a graceful, accurate, and most agreeable speaker. Of Orson Pratt, Captain Burton says that he is—

'a highly, though probably a self-educated man, not, as is stated in an English work, a graduate of Trinity College, Dublin. The Usman of the new faith, writer, preacher, theologian, missionary, astronomer, philosopher, and mathematician,—especially in the higher branches,—he has thrust thought into a faith of ceremony, which is supposed to dispense with the trouble of thinking; and has intruded human learning into a scheme whose essence is the utter abrogation of the individual will. He is consequently suspected of too much learning,—of relying, in fact, rather upon books and mortal paper, than that royal road to all knowledge, inspiration from on high,—and his tendencies to let loose these pernicious doctrines often bring him into trouble, and place him below his position.'—*City of the Saints*, p. 439.

M. Rémy speaks of Orson Pratt as 'a pure and upright-minded man, whom it is impossible without regret to see plunged into the darkness of Mormonism.' Brigham and Kimball are exceedingly jealous of Pratt and his learned friend Phelps, and take a malicious pleasure now and then in publicly undervaluing a learning which they would be very sorry to see extending among the ignorant fanatics over whom they rule.

But enough, and more than enough, of these personal notices. The general affairs of the Church are regulated twice a year in the city of the saints, during April and October, by means of public Conferences, which last four days. At one of these M. Rémy 'assisted.' More than ten thousand of the faithful had responded to the call of the Great Council, and had assembled to hear and receive the word of the prophet-president, and of the other ecclesiastical leaders. They assemble twice a day in the Bowery; religious services, similar to that which we have described in detail, enter largely into the celebration. At each Conference

'all officers, from the president to the constable, are voted in by direction and counsel; (that is, of the Lord through his prophet;) consequently, re-election is the rule, unless the chief dictator determine otherwise. Every adult male has a vote, and all live under an iron sway. His poor single vote, from which even the sting of ballot has been drawn, gratifies the dignity of the man, and satisfies him with the autocracy which directs him in the way he should go. He has thus all the harmless pleasure of voting, without the danger of injuring himself by his vote. The reverse, duly carried out, frees mankind from king and kaiser, and subjects them to mobs and mobs. Mormon society is modelled upon a civilized regi-

ment; the prophet is the colonel-commanding, and the grades are nicely graduated down to the last neophyte or recruit.'—*City of the Saints*, pp. 366, 367.

One of the apostles puts the case thus:—'With the saints it is not, *Vox populi, vox Dei*, but *Vox Dei, vox populi*. The voice of God first, and the voice of the people afterwards. The Spirit dictates, and the saints sustain it.'

It follows from all this, that, with the shadow and semblance of democratic suffrage, the Mormon polity is in truth a hierarchical despotism of the most stringent kind. Brigham Young is the absolute lord of Utah, and the property, reputation, families, and very lives of his subjects are completely at his disposal. We are free to admit that the general well-being of the community affords pleasing evidence of his honesty, goodwill, and moderation in the exercise of prerogatives so exorbitant.

But there is another and a rival power in Utah; namely, that of the supreme government of the United States. On the 9th of September, 1849, President Fillmore signed the Act organizing Utah into a Territory; and on that day twelvemonth the Act became law, and Brigham Young was appointed governor. The judges, secretary of state, &c., were Gentiles. Young held his office until 1857, when Mr. Cumming was appointed to succeed him. The Federal officers consist of a governor, secretary, chief justice, with two associate judges, a district attorney, a marshal, a superintendent of Indian affairs, and a surveyor-general. During nearly all these years, misunderstandings and collisions have perpetually occurred between the Mormon authorities and those of the Federal government. How could it be otherwise? How is it possible that jurisdictions starting from such opposite points, based on such opposite principles, should ever work harmoniously together? 'The Federal, republican, and laical' element, side by side with 'the theocratic, despotic, and spiritual!' When the territorial governor was the Mormon pope, he was constantly at cross purposes with the Gentile Federal officials. The latter accused the Mormons of systematically obstructing the course of justice, by sheltering any criminal, however great his crime, and however proved his guilt, if he happened to be one of themselves, and by issuing secret orders at variance with the law of the land and the public decisions of the courts. The Mormons retorted by attacking the personal character of the officials, and complaining bitterly of the insult implied in appointing such men to rule over them. It appears, indeed, that the functionaries were at first badly chosen. One of them advised the summary suppression of polygamy, and the division of the whole land among

other territories. Moreover he executed 'a Gentile brother' on a Sunday. Another killed himself with opium; another was a drunkard; another a gambler; another had an intrigue with an Indian squaw, who demanded from him, in open court, the reward of her infamy; another seated his mistress on the bench. They were accused also of the same partiality and injustice of which they accused the Mormons. It appears all but certain that most of the charges preferred against the Mormons in 1856, and which led to the appointment of the notorious General Harney to conduct an army against them, were entirely false. We need not recapitulate the history of these years of trouble. The expeditions sent by the Federal Government failed to conquer the country; more honourable and moderate functionaries arrived, pronounced the reports on which the Government had acted false and slanderous, and succeeded in establishing comparatively amicable relations with Brigham and his people. But it is very difficult to see how Utah can be in any way incorporated with the Union; and in the event of its incorporation as a State, the common law must instantly come into collision with its most cherished prejudices and institutions. In the mean time, the military organization and discipline of the Saints are most complete and formidable. The men are trained to arms from their childhood; 'each adult has a rifle and a sabre, a revolver and a bowie knife, and he wants only practice to become a good, efficient, and well-disciplined soldier.' There are now about eight thousand citizen-soldiers in the territory, which is divided into military districts. There is, moreover, an independent battalion of Life Guards, and a corps of minute men, picked fighters, ready at a few minutes' notice to mount, and go wherever they may be ordered. The precipitous and mighty mountain-bulwarks that surround the country render it easy of defence. It could probably be held by a few thousands against a mighty host; and its inhabitants are united as one man in the determination to guard their mountain-home against all hostile approach. They are evidently preparing against all emergencies, and we should have said two years ago that the Federal Government had not the smallest chance of enforcing any unwelcome mandate. But now that she has so vast an army of fire-eaters at her disposal, who may possibly before long be in want of employment, we dare not be too sure of that. It is to be hoped, however, that the law may be upheld, and Christian social virtue restored and maintained, without recourse to the terrible arbitrament of war.

No account of life in Utah would be complete without a

special reference to its characteristic social institution, namely, polygamy,—or, as both our authors oddly call it, 'polygyny.' The 'revelation' on this subject, though bearing date 1843, was not published until the autumn of 1852, and had only just been heard of in England when our former paper on Mormonism was written. Indeed, the agents of the sect in this country continued resolutely and stoutly to deny the existence of this institution for some years after. All reserve, however, has long been cast aside. The practice is now general, and has found numerous and it must be owned able and plausible apologists. Joe Smith and his followers were accused of gross licentiousness almost from the beginning. To rebut these charges, Smith published, late in 1842, or early in 1843, the following disclaimer:—'Inasmuch as this Church of Christ has been reproached with the crime of fornication and polygamy, we declare that we believe that one man should have one wife, and one woman but one husband, except in case of death, when either is at liberty to marry again.' But on the 12th of July, in the latter year, 'Joseph Smith, the Seer, professed to have received a revelation on the subject of "celestial marriage."' This revelation was, according to Brigham Young, written down from Smith's mouth by William Clayton, from whom it found its way into the hands of Bishop Whitney, who obtained the prophet's permission to copy it. 'Sister Emma,' Smith's wife, burnt the original. The document is long, wordy, involved, outrageously ungrammatical, and in many places almost unintelligible. Smith stated that the concubinage of the patriarchs had always struck him, and that he had therefore appealed to God upon the subject; and *upon the subject* the revelation is intelligible enough:—'Do the works of Abraham.....Let mine handmaid Emma Smith receive all those that have been given unto my servant Joseph, and who are virtuous and pure before Me.....If a man espouse a virgin, and desire to espouse another, and the first give her consent; and if he espouse the second, and they are virgins, and have vowed to no other man, then is he justified; he cannot commit adultery; for they are given unto him; for he cannot commit adultery with that that belongeth unto him and to none else. And if he have ten virgins given unto him by this law, he cannot commit adultery; for they belong to him, and they are given unto him; therefore is he justified.' Hyrum Smith, the prophet's brother, was present when this revelation was pronounced, and he was ordered to go and read it at once to his sister-in-law. 'Mine handmaid Emma Smith,' however, was in no mood to obey. The prophet spent the whole of the next day in endeavouring to overcome her scruples; but she refused to look with composure on

the rivals already selected by her husband. At last, wearied with her obstinacy, he said, 'Emma, attend to your own affairs, and let the Anointed of the Lord fulfil the works for which God has raised him up.' Accordingly he soon obeyed the 'revelation,' and left several widows to bewail his death.

For nine years, though the principle was occasionally acted upon, there was no avowal of it, nor any publication of the authority on which it was supposed to rest. But, on the 29th of August, 1852, a special Conference of the elders took place in Salt Lake City. After devotional exercises, Orson Pratt proceeded to indicate the object of the new doctrine, and the grounds on which it rested. In this curious discourse, he pleads for the pre-existence of souls, for whom bodies are prepared as tabernacles. 'The Lord had ordained that spirits should come here and take tabernacles by a certain law, and that law was the law of marriage. Adam and Eve, the first married pair, were immortal beings, and were married for eternity. Redemption has re-established marriage for eternity. God promised Abraham a seed numerous as the sand on the sea-shore; and the promise was fulfilled, not by monogamy, but by polygamy. Four-fifths of the world believe in polygamy, and without it you cannot enjoy the blessings of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob. Moreover, among the spirits that have pre-existed for thousands of years, the noblest, most mighty, and most intelligent are yet waiting to enter their tabernacles in the dispensation of the fulness of time, and among the people that are most righteous on earth; and we, the Saints, are elected to the high privilege of providing these tabernacles for them. At the same time, we are not at liberty to choose our wives at random. The only man who possesses the keys concerning this matter is the president of the Church. He, and he alone, or the priesthood upon his appointment, can seal husbands and wives to each other to all eternity.' Brigham himself, in the afternoon, followed up this remarkable deliverance by giving briefly the history of the revelation; prophesying the spread and perpetuity of polygamy; quieting the people's fears as to its effect on their relations with the United States; explaining why it had not been made known previously; and authoritatively declaring that 'without the doctrine which this revelation makes known to us, no one could raise himself high enough to become a god.' After this protracted flourish of trumpets, the revelation was read *in extenso*, before the two thousand elders assembled; and the doctrine was reduced to practice as soon, and on as large a scale, as circumstances permitted.

The form of celebrating a polygamic marriage differs from

that of the first marriage. The latter differs little from what is common among Protestants; but, if a man wants another wife, he must consult the president, and obtain a revelation on the subject through him. If this be unfavourable, there is an end of the matter; but if favourable, he must next seek the consent of the parents of the fair one, if they live in Utah. If they refuse, he must proceed no further; but if they consent, he may then offer his suit to the lady. Before taking a single step, however, he must consult the wishes of his first wife, and secure her concurrence. If she refuse, she must appear before the president, and state the grounds of her refusal. If these satisfy the president, the husband cannot take another wife, either now or at any future time. But if she cannot show satisfactory cause against the gratification of the gentleman's wishes, he may proceed in spite of her, with the permission of the president. This high functionary alone,—or, under special circumstances, a leading disciple formally deputed by him,—can celebrate 'the polygynic union.' We need hardly pause to hint how well this is contrived for the aggrandisement both of the president, and of the city of the saints. When every preliminary has been agreeably settled, the bridegroom elect, accompanied by his betrothed, their parents, and friends, proceed on a fixed day to the place where the ceremony is to be performed. The president delivers an address, the bridegroom standing before him, having his wife on the left hand, and his betrothed on her left. The consent of the wife is formally signified by placing the right hand of the betrothed in that of her husband, and herself taking his left arm. The contracting parties then formally take each other for time and for eternity; the marriage is pronounced complete and legal by the president, and his blessing is given 'by authority of the priesthood, in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost. Amen.' The marriage is duly registered, and the ceremony terminates. At the end of 1858, a census was taken by the American authorities, and the number of male polygamists in Utah was found to be three thousand six hundred and seventeen, distributed as follows:—

Husbands with seven wives and upwards	387
Husbands with five wives	730
Husbands with four wives	1,100
Husbands with more than one, and less than four.....	1,400

We shall not insult the understanding, or outrage the feelings, of our readers, by entering upon any discussion of the arguments *pro* and *con* which may be found in these books. Captain Burton puts all that can be said in favour of polygamy in the strongest

light, passing over with reprehensible partiality the objections, in reason and in fact, against it; and he is, in a note, very unjust to Bishop Colenso, representing him as not only tolerating polygamy in converts, but defending it on the ground of religion and humanity. We have no sympathy with the bishop's crotchet, but he ought not to be so misrepresented. He would not allow native converts to marry more than one wife; but he pleads that converts, being polygamists at the time of their conversion, should not, for that reason only, be debarred from Church-membership. We prefer to study this question, especially in its working and results, in the company of the thoughtful, serious, and conscientious Frenchman. Without following him into the details of his elaborate philosophical argument against the system,—an argument founded on the intellectual nature of man; on the impossibility of reciprocity of good offices in the polygynic state; on the law of moral sensibility, which requires concentration in order to its proper development, and which, therefore, is forbidden by the diffusion which obtains in polygamy, to the destruction of that union of souls which is the essence of love; on the impossibility of the moral education of man where polygamy prevails,—we will confine ourselves to a few facts to which he bears testimony.

There are three forms of the polygamic household in Utah. The first is that maintained by Brigham Young, whose wives constitute a harem, living in common apart from their common husband, who resides by himself, and visits them at his pleasure. In the second,—the most usual one in Utah,—the husband lives under the same roof with all his wives, directing his attentions to each of them in rotation, and under stringent pledges to be just and impartial. In the third, the husband boards and lodges with each of his wives in succession for twenty-four hours at a time; each of the ladies living in her own separate house. They are required to look upon each other as sisters; and, to prevent as far as possible the jealousy which would be sure to arise from the indulgence of any obvious preferences or tenderness, the husband's intercourse is for the most part chill, formal, and dignified,—a fashion necessary enough in the interests of domestic justice and peace, but utterly destructive of love.

Marriages within very close degrees of affinity are common. Some men have married all the daughters by the same father and mother; others, both mother and daughter at the same time. One married his half-sister. It is said the prophet at first objected, but that the eager would-be-bridegroom insisted, pleading the example of Abraham, who 'married his half-sister, and was subsequently blessed by God.' As the girl was pretty,

Brigham cut the knot by taking her himself; but after a few weeks, handed her over to the original suitor, who very readily took her off his hands. Nor have these gentlemen any scruples about marrying the wives of living 'Gentiles.' The Mormon pope himself has more than one such in his harem:—among the rest, a lady from Boston, who embraced Mormonism for his sake, and deserted her husband to betake herself, together with an only daughter, to the Salt Lake, where she married Brigham. At the time of M. Rémy's visit, everybody was expecting him to marry the daughter too,—a very lovely young person. The following very notorious case deserves to be chronicled, as exhibiting the utter shamelessness and infamy of this phase of the institution:—

'One of the wives of Parley Pratt had previously been married to a respectable American, Mr. M'Lean, by whom she had several children. Her husband having gone to settle in California, she joined him, and there became a convert to the new faith. Soon after her conversion, she made the acquaintance of Parley Pratt, for whom she conceived so violent a passion that she deserted her husband, after ineffectually trying to deprive him of his children. She then went to the Salt Lake, and married the apostle. In 1856, having learned that her children were living with their grandfather and grandmother in Louisiana, she went with her husband to New Orleans, with the intention of carrying them off. She succeeded, by trick and falsehood, in deceiving the old people to whom they were intrusted, and triumphantly brought her children away with her to the Salt Lake. But she paid dear for her triumph; M'Lean, furious as a lioness deprived of her cubs, slew, without compunction, Parley the apostle, while engaged on a mission to Arkansas, in 1857.'—*Rémy*, vol. ii., p. 151.

The impudence which can defend an institution involving in its practical working such unnatural unions, and such outrages on the rights and feelings of others as have now been detailed, almost surpasses belief. Yet polygamy is not only acquiesced in by the women of Utah; it has found some of its most earnest and eloquent defenders among the softer sex. M. Rémy details a lengthened conversation with a highly educated and sensible woman, 'who is considered extremely ladylike among the Mormons, and would be so esteemed everywhere.' She defended polygamy with the utmost sincerity and earnestness, and with great plausibility and ingenuity; quoting the example of Abraham,—which has great weight with the Mormons in relation to this matter,—of Jacob, and of David; declaring that *Jesus Christ had Himself married three wives while on earth*; pleading the law of nature, the ends of marriage, the claims of decency, and physiological reasons, the statement of which by a woman to a

strange man is, perhaps, the most extraordinary part of the dialogue. The only thing that disturbed her self-complacency, or seemed at all to puzzle her, was the question of her interlocutor: 'But, your husband being a bishop, and even something more, is he not in contradiction with St. Paul, when this apostle says, that the bishop must be the husband of no more than one wife?' Her reply, however, was soon forthcoming. 'I know not what the apostle exactly meant to say by that. But it was he also who said, that "when we live in Rome, we must do as they do in Rome," and this, perhaps, will be the reply to your objection. Rome, in the time of Paul, governed the world; and, in spite of its gross idolatry, practised monogamy;' and so on. A fair disputant, who finds such things in the Scriptures, and seriously produces them in argument, must be particularly difficult to convince. Captain Burton publishes a letter extending over nine closely-printed pages, from Mrs. Belinda M. Pratt, the wife of Orson Pratt. It is severely and closely reasoned, but, as Captain Burton admits, displays very little heart or natural affection. Any who choose may read it in his volume, and will find it a curious example of the way in which fanaticism can blind the eyes of an unusually clever woman, and deaden the truest, purest, deepest sensibilities of the female heart. We are aghast and confounded when we find women brought up amidst the sanctities and high affections of a Christian home, and blessed with a liberal and accomplished education, coming out to defend an institution which allows a man to marry all the women of a family, nay, his own half-sister; and which sanctions such outrages as the villain Parley Pratt inflicted on poor M'Lean. We ask ourselves how such a thing can possibly be; how such advocates can plead for this iniquity as the only right state of society, and the only way to perfection. We cannot fully account for it without reference to that awful and righteous judgment which at a certain point of obstinate wickedness gives men over to 'strong delusion, that they may believe a lie.' There are reasons, however, in the Mormon creed which will help to explain this shocking and revolting phenomenon. The prophets have, as might be expected, employed all their skill for the enforcement of their doctrine on this subject; for, without the hearty co-operation of the women the institution could have no existence. It is a prime article of the saints' creed that both sexes are absolutely commanded to marry, and that a woman cannot enter the heavenly kingdom, unless introduced by a husband. For a virgin, there is nothing in prospect but absorption or annihilation. Moreover, a man's glory in that kingdom will depend, in a great degree, upon the number of

his wives. It is easy to see how a firm faith in these dogmas will influence a woman, both that she may secure heaven for herself, and increase the glory of her husband in the future state. Polygamy is held to be a positive duty, resting on a divine command, which must at all hazards be obeyed. Hence the older polygamists are considered to be emphatically holy, and Mormon girls prefer to marry these hoary sultans rather than to be united to young bachelors, for the reason that they will share the benefits resulting from the superior sanctity of their husbands. The female devotee, in Utah, as elsewhere, throws her soul into the new faith, and follows its teaching with characteristic ardour and impulsiveness. Her strong belief crushes down any doubts, extinguishes remorse, suspicion, and apprehension. Or if, after all, she feels humiliated at her position, and is haunted by compunction and fear, no sooner does she become a mother than she reconciles herself to her lot. She cannot leave her children; she cannot fly to places where her union is called concubinage, and where she would be looked upon as a prostitute; she cannot, poor and defenceless as she is, cross that frightful desert which separates her from the home and friends of her youth. Thus is her conscience pacified; thus are her feelings hardened; and we cannot wonder that she eagerly accumulates and urges all the arguments by which the system can be defended, and her own self-esteem assured.

In some respects, the material comfort of woman in Utah is greater than in Christian countries. At any rate there is less female poverty and degradation, and nothing of that frightful and brazen impurity which is the disgrace of our Christian civilization. Our authors bear unhesitating testimony to the good order of the Mormon families, and the generally moral tone of the intercourse between the sexes. Indeed, polygamy is there associated with a prudery that is as surprising as it is absurd. Probably, however, this is but a milder form of that jealousy which from time immemorial has shrouded female loveliness from vulgar gaze in the polygamic East. But real happiness there is not, and cannot be. The conjugal relation, as it is understood here, with all the real purity, sympathy, and oneness of soul which it implies, can hardly be said to exist. The woman may give all her heart to her husband; but she soon finds that she can have only a fraction, perhaps only a fortieth part, of his. Indeed, what *heart* has he to give? All the higher ends, all the pure joys of wedded life are ignored; and both parties are necessarily degraded and brutalised; and it is not possible for woman, even if she could forget

her early home, with its purity and sweetness, to be happy in such a state of things as this. As M. Rémy says,—

'Faith, or fanaticism, has then fascinated the companion of man; has robbed her of that treasure of love which God intrusted to her heart; has, in fact, thrown her into a state of servitude in which she actually hugs her chains. Thus impoverished, the female saints, whatever they may please to say, are deprived of the element on which the charm of life most essentially depends. Their happiness, if we must really believe them when they boast of possessing it, is nothing more than the negation of wretchedness, or rather in some sort an abasement of the soul produced by the abdication of its finest attribute. Moreover, there are to be seen occasionally amongst them women who, having preserved in their hearts the sacred flame of love, are a prey to horrible sufferings.' —*Rémy*, pp. 163, 164.

We will not dwell on this humiliating and disgusting subject further than to say a word or two on some of the effects of the institution. It is proved beyond a doubt that the general increase of population,—the desire of which had probably much to do with the adoption of polygamy,—is frustrated, and not promoted by it. Each of the wives of the Utah polygamists would have a more numerous family, if she had a husband all her own. And she might easily have found one among the numerous bachelors of Salt Lake City; for the gratification of one man implies there the enforced self-denial of many. The number of girls born is out of all proportion greater than that of boys,—a sure index of physiological degeneracy. And, moreover, in spite of the salubrity of the climate, the mortality is excessively great. Brigham Young, with seventeen wives in 1855, had but thirty children living; and only one of Joe Smith's descendants survived. There is some comfort in remembering that this vile institution ever tends to its own destruction. Nature vindicates her laws in the end; or rather the God of nature implants the seeds of righteous retribution in every institute and practice which contradicts His holy will. We owe our readers an apology for dwelling so long on a theme so revolting; but the revival of this element of Mohammedanism in the bosom of Christian civilization is so startling and portentous, as well as so characteristic, that we felt bound to present it as fully as delicacy would allow. We close this part of the subject with the following cogent remarks of M. Rémy:—

'Other considerations, drawn from moral grounds, do not promise a better future for polygamy. Wherever woman does not occupy the position which Providence has assigned her, society languishes and wastes

away. Holy Writ informs us that woman is a good thing; the Mormons say, in their sophistical way, that one cannot have too much of a good thing, and fancy they grow great in proportion to the number of women they take. The truth is, they deteriorate and debase this good thing by making mere animals of themselves, by casting man down from the intellectual sphere in which God has placed him, to a level with the brutes. There can be no greatness, no future, no life for societies, without the emancipation of the woman, that soul which has been given as a sister to our souls, to relieve them from the weight of isolation. If Mormonism would avoid disappearing like a phantom, after having for an instant paraded its shadows round the world, it must ask of Jehovah another revelation which shall suppress or limit that of July 12th, 1843.' —*Rémy*, vol. ii., pp. 171, 172.

We have spoken of the excessive mortality among the Mormon children. Captain Burton strives to throw doubt on M. Rémy's testimony on this point; but his mere opinion cannot stand before the Frenchman's careful and accurate investigation. On another point, also, there is a great difference between our authors. M. Rémy declares that he found the children generally godless, licentious, and immodest; that, while elsewhere such juvenile characteristics are the exception, in Utah they are the rule; that the parents themselves confess it, and rather glory in that precocious maturity which to Gentiles appears very like depravity and libertinism. 'Our boys,' they say, 'are only more advanced than other children; that is all. And how can it be otherwise, since they are of the race of Ephraim, and that the Holy Spirit has so early enlightened them? As to their language, that is not always decent; but this will mend itself hereafter.' Strange fruit of the Holy Spirit's enlightenment this! But Captain Burton says he found 'less premature depravity than in the children of European cities generally;' and concludes that a great improvement has taken place since 1855. We hope it is so; nor is it altogether unlikely, seeing that the generation of boys whom M. Rémy saw had borne all the vicissitudes, hardships, and sufferings of emigration along with their parents, and were sure to contract in such circumstances a premature knowledge of the worst side of human nature, and an exaggerated boldness, self-reliance, and love of mischief. At the same time, the worthy Captain's account of Mormon education does not inspire much confidence in his estimate of the character of Mormon youths.

'Mormon education is of course peculiar. The climate predisposes to indolence. Whilst the emigrants from the old country are the most energetic and hard-working of men, their children, like the race of back-

woodsmen in mass, are averse to any but pleasurable physical exertion. The object of the young colony is to rear a swarm of healthy working bees. The social hive has as yet no room for drones, bookworms, and gentlemen. The work is proportioned to their powers and inclinations. At fifteen a boy can use a whip, an axe, or a hoe,—he does not like the plough,—to perfection. He sits a bare-backed horse like a centaur, *handles his bowie-knife skilfully, never misses a mark with his revolver, and can probably dispose of half a bottle of whiskey.*'—*City of the Saints*, p. 514.

The italics are our own, and we leave them, without one word of comment, to make their own impression. We know pretty certainly what sort of men such boys as these *must* make. Education, in any true sense of the term, is not encouraged in Utah. Brigham Young has small faith in books and scholars. Primary schools indeed are established even in the smallest villages, and reading and writing are universally taught; but not too much of these, and very little beyond them. We know not whether the third of 'the three R's' beloved of our educational vice-president is popular in Utah. There are some learned men among the Mormons, and many who appreciate the worth of learning; but both the necessities of a new country, and the policy of Brigham, operate unfavourably for the intellectual advancement of the community. There are literary, scientific, and philosophical societies, a council of health, a public library, a theological institution, a phrenological and horticultural society, and an agricultural and manufacturing society. These are high-sounding names, and no doubt some of them are very respectable institutions. But we all know brother Jonathan's *penchant* for grandiose names, and this is much exaggerated in Utah. There is a great lack, according to English ideas of education, of correspondence between these portentous outward and visible signs and the things which they signify. Dancing and music, it must be noted, are cultivated with sedulous care, and enjoyed with a relish amounting to passion. The girls especially are badly educated. Where, under the dark shadow of polygamy, has it ever been otherwise? Brigham's doctrine on the subject betrays that want of respect for woman of which polygamy is at once an effect and a cause. He says,—

'The best education for girls consists in teaching them to sew, to knit, to garden, to cook, to be handy in the dairy, and to keep their houses perfectly clean. If you stuff them with reading, they cram themselves with romances, tales, and such-like rubbish; they neglect their duties, are obedient neither to their husbands nor their fathers.' 'Teach them to work! teach them to work!'—*Rémy*, p. 182.

Nevertheless the women are more studious than the men, and contrive to educate themselves.

To the Mormon apostle, W. W. Phelps, belongs the honour of inventing an alphabet that ought to fill Mr. Pitman and our own Phonetic school with admiration and delight. It is unutterably ugly, but not much more so than some of Mr. Pitman's characters. It consists of forty characters, and is likely to remain a curiosity for ever even in Mormonism; for nothing, it is believed, is yet published in it. The literature of this sect, like everthing belonging to it, is pervaded by a coarseness and vulgarity that make it a positive pain to read it,—a pain certainly not diminished by its subject-matter, namely, a heterogeneous mass of theological vagaries, sham philosophy, abominable ethics, and doggerel poetry. Mormonism will contribute nothing to the intellectual advancement, any more than to the moral and religious improvement, of mankind. The best that can be said for it is that, on the condition of absolute obedience to the powers that be, and plenty of hard work, it will provide for man's material welfare, and teach him how to enjoy himself while in this world. This goes far to account for its amazing success among the over-worked, under-paid, and ill-fed lower classes of the European nations.

With some notices of Mormon propagandism and success we must close these too lengthened remarks. The missionaries of the sect will bear comparison with most others in zeal, devotedness, and self-denial. They are appointed by the April session of the Grand Council, and are not consulted as to whether they will accept the appointment. An order comes to a man, signed by the president, and, whether he is fit or not,—whatever else he may be engaged in,—though he may but just have arrived from Europe, and scarcely recovered from his fatigues,—though just married,—though his wife may be in the very pains of labour,—though he knows that his family will be in abject want, his little property disappear, his very roof be dilapidated, and his fields be overgrown with briers and weeds, during his absence,—he does not hesitate a moment. Heaven speaks, and he obeys. He leaves all his property behind him; for the Church will not take care of his family. He goes forth literally without purse or scrip; partakes, while within the territory, of the frugal meal of some brother Mormon; begs a little flour and dried meat for the desert journey; works, when he reaches a seaport, to procure the means of obtaining the humblest berth on board ship; or perhaps works his way to his destination. When that is reached, no labour is too hard, no position too menial, no fare too scanty, so they may learn the language, and

propagate the faith. The missionaries are often much persecuted; but they labour with untiring assiduity and fortitude till it pleases the Grand Council to recal them. Their journey home is not less fatiguing or full of peril than the outward one; and, when restored to their families, they resume the life of industry which had been interrupted, ready to obey the next call of the Church, whithersoever it may send them. This intense conviction, this sincere and heroic faith, must occupy a prominent place in any summary of the causes of their success. It is impossible that such men should not kindle among their fellows some of the fire that glows so brightly in their own hearts. They carry with them moreover the claim to possess and exercise miraculous powers; and, as in every similar case, they can quote numerous and apparently well-authenticated instances of supernatural healing. Whatever Joe Smith was, numbers of his followers are among the most sincere believers, and the most zealous apostles that ever devoted themselves to the propagation of any faith. They have not equally succeeded everywhere, though they have missions all over the world, not excluding Oceanica. In Northern Europe and Great Britain their triumphs have been most remarkable, while, for many years past, America has supplied but few trophies. It is also observable that they succeed better in Protestant than in Popish countries. The most accurate estimate of their numbers gives for the year 1859 a total of 186,000, of whom 80,000 were found in Utah, and—startling fact!—32,000 in England and Scotland. Thirty-two years ago there were but six in all the world. It is astonishing and appalling to learn that such a system should have made such progress in so short a time, and that its principal victories should have been achieved in countries which have taken for their motto, 'The Bible, and the Bible only.'

It is well known that one principal object of Mormon propagandism is to gather converts who shall emigrate to Utah, and there assist in establishing the kingdom of Jesus Christ upon earth. The missionaries are not very scrupulous in the arguments and appeals which they employ for this purpose; but in truth the laws and usages of Christendom are so completely at variance with the full exercise and development of Mormonism, that the saints begin to prepare for emigration almost as by instinct. Doubtless they suffer much in abandoning, perhaps breaking up, the old ancestral home; but they soon conquer their feelings, and cheerfully encounter the hardships and perils of sea and land,—much modified in comparison of those of early days,—cheered by the hope of dwelling in the New

Jerusalem. For their sakes, the Church has organized a 'Perpetual Emigrating Fund,' which is one of its most flourishing institutions. By means of its resources the very poor are assisted on their protracted journey, and those who can pay their own way are helped to travel economically. The desert journey is still a very disagreeable and in some respects dangerous undertaking; but the foresight of the Church has softened down its harshest features and mitigated its worst perils; and, if the system prospers, it will become almost perfectly easy and secure. And so the bands of pilgrims proceed, cheering themselves with those 'Songs of Zion' which are so horrible to a cultivated and really Christian taste. When they reach at last the bourne of their long pilgrimage, they encamp in the great square. The president immediately visits them,

'and by a few feeling and electric words pours a balm into their hearts, which banishes from their minds all traces of the fatigues and privations of their toilsome journey. A band of music also contributes to exhilarate them by its cheerful welcome. The residents mix with the new comers; frequently they recognise one another as old acquaintances, and rush into each other's arms; then follow questions and answers about the old country, about friends and brethren who have been left behind; and, when night comes, a common prayer is offered up in the public square, thousands of voices are heard uniting in a hymn of thanksgiving, and they then separate. Next morning each of the emigrants is informed on what part of the Territory he is to locate his family.'—*Rémy*, vol. ii., pp. 218, 219.

To this let us add that, with ordinary industry and good conduct, the poorest of these emigrants may soon attain a degree of comfort and respectability which he could never have hoped to enjoy in his native land. The total number of Mormon emigrants from Europe from 1840 up to 1859 was 30,854. The troubles with the Federal government have latterly arrested the flow of immigration to Utah; but the cause has been advancing, and the apostles boast that the number of emigrants is now fast making up for any loss which these troubles occasioned.

Our space will not permit us to analyse the causes of Mormon success, neither shall we venture to speculate upon the immediate future of this extraordinary system. The former lie upon the surface, and we have ourselves been but little edified while reading suggestions which could not fail to occur to minds of only ordinary shrewdness and thoughtfulness. The system succeeds almost exclusively among the ignorant, brutalized, superstitious, and poverty-stricken classes of society. A little knowledge and a little material comfort seem to be, in general, a sufficient bulwark against its encroachments. The impious pretensions of religious

imposture have ever imposed upon uneducated men; superstition always prevails among an ignorant people; the glories of the promised land, described in glowing colours by enthusiastic missionaries fresh from the scenes which they depict, cannot fail to inflame the imaginations and excite the cupidity of those with whom life is one long unrewarded toil, one hopeless battle with poverty, squalor, disease, and death; and vicious men are attracted by the prospect of impunity in sensual indulgences, which, whatever the advocates of polygamy may say to the contrary, will always, in the minds of those without, be associated with the pet institution of the saints. And as these hints suggest in brief the causes of Mormon prosperity, so do they indicate the means of counteracting its progress, and terminating its existence. A more organized and systematic effort to elevate the lower classes,—to promote their material comfort,—to improve their sanatory condition,—to give their children a good, serviceable, and Christian education; and, above all, a determined evangelizing aggression upon the spiritual ignorance and depravity which are the bane and disgrace of the older homes of Christian civilization, would soon render it impossible for the coarse, vulgar, and blasphemous rant of Mormonism to obtain even a hearing among us. What the end of all shall be we know well. Like every other evil, this will perish at the rebuke of God's countenance; but it depends on the fidelity and zeal of the Christian Church whether, before that end arrives, Mormonism shall, or shall not, have engulfed millions of men in its whirlpool of impurity and unbelief.

ART. IV.—*Les Descendants des Albigeois et des Huguenots, ou Mémoires de la Famille de Portal.* Paris. 1860.

THIS is one of those modest but suggestive volumes which always engage the reader's heart on the author's side. Apart from the literary merits of his pages, and irrespective of his philosophical acumen, patient research, and beautiful grouping of interesting facts, the writer's dignified principle, noble temper, and fine spirit would be a sufficient recommendation to every lover of goodness and truth. We regard the author himself with peculiar interest, as the living representative, on French soil, of a family which stood identified with evangelical doctrine and spiritual piety in times when Europe at large was darkening under the sway of lifeless formalism and corrupting error; one of those rare French families which descend from the *Albigeois*,

which remain Protestant, and have proved faithful through a course of ages to the primitive principles and creed of their fathers; one, too, which, under the dispensation of the Divine Spirit, has received its baptisms of 'blood and fire.' For the truth's sake broken, scattered, peeled, crushed, yet never dishonoured; always noble in its deepest depressions, rising again above each successive flood of tribulation, and, by dint of native intelligence and genius, or its own mental and moral power, building itself afresh, in still nobler proportions, on the foundation of an ancient and untarnished name.

M. F. de Portal's collection and arrangement of family traditions serve to remind us that all the historical interests of a province sometimes appear to be gathered, as into a knot, within and around a single family. There is something in this akin to the fact, that the distinctive features of a neighbourhood often derive a mystic charm from their relationship to some centre of hallowed or interesting associations. One relic, or a solitary memorial, may confer on a wide district all the rights and privileges of reputation for beauty. In some cases, too, the student of history, in following the fortunes of an empire, finds all that seems most worthy of his attention clustering along by one distinguished ancestral line; as the pilgrim on Eastern plains enjoys the most agreeable pasture and refreshment while closely pursuing the course of some generous river. Our author has shown that the history of Languedoc, for instance, is closely interwoven with the biographies of his own house. The name of *De Portal* belongs to a truly ancient stock. Few baronial lines keep themselves so clearly and distinctly in view, back so far through changeful ages. From century to century, since the earliest historical period of Southern France, the names of this family are bound up with all that distinguishes the civil institutions, the arms, the letters, and the religion of Languedoc. Old Toulouse, especially, seems to have no stage of public life, no leading epoch, no historical turn, no significant event which is not marked by the name of *De Portal*.

Toulouse was the birth-place of the family, and for very many generations was its home, and the seat of its honour. Among the most venerable and interesting forms of European government is the *Capitoulate* of ancient Toulouse. This primitive institution, as far as we have the means of estimating it, seems to have been remarkable for its unity of principle, and the harmonious working of all its parts in the establishment and maintenance of national power. It was popular and yet compact. It satisfied the people's vanity, while it at once built up and limited the pride of the aristocracy. Under the Counts of

Toulouse, the Capitouls formed the senate of the *Langue d'oc*. The legislative power belonged to the sovereign Count, with the chapter of Capitouls; the council, composed of those who had passed the Capitoulate; and the people, assembled on all affairs of great importance, either on the field or in the church. The Capitouls exercised the judicial power too. They formed the court of the Count, and judged under his presidency, or under that of the Viscount, or *Viguier*. Military command was also in their hands. They were chiefs among nobles, and were generals of the army. On their own authority, and without even referring to the Count, they could declare war, command the troops, and sign treaties of peace. We are indebted to M. F. De Portal for a clear and interesting sketch of this antique municipal form. And we like the artist all the better because his lines are drawn with something like tender affection; for the fact is, that the oldest honours of his own lineage are inseparably one with the glory of the Capitoulate during its palmy days.

Toulouse was remarkable for the long preservation of her distinctive municipal forms under the power of her conquerors. For many ages her Counts, and even the Kings of France, were rather her patrons than her governors. Her institutions were very like those of old Venice. As in Venice the weight of the government reposed upon the Council of Ten and upon the Great Council, at Toulouse it rested on the Chapter of Capitouls and the Sworn Council, or Council of the Commune. The functions of the Capitouls were annual, like those of the Ten. There could be no re-election to office in either case, but after a certain lapse of time. No kindred ties were allowed between the members. In both republics the ancient nobility was the base of the government. The Golden Book in the one instance, and the Book of Capitouls in the other, contained all the names of the patrician houses. In all points of difference between Venice and Toulouse, the capital of Languedoc may be thought to have had the advantage. At Venice the Council of Ten was a political tribunal whose power was a usurpation. It was nearly always in opposition to the Great Council, by which it was nominated, but whose powers it really engrossed. Its bloody despotism was the terror of the nobles, who abhorred it, while they were unable to shake off its yoke. The Toulousian *Capitoulate* was a political tribunal too, although its prerogatives included the rights of civil and criminal justice as well as military power. The right of levying troops, for instance, was not held by the Counts of Toulouse, nor even, for a time, by the Kings of France. While the English held Guienne, Toulouse,

in its marked loyalty to French power, kept their frontier in check; and the army which it raised, equipped, and paid, received its orders from the Capitouls alone. They were lords of the banner. The *ban* and *arrière-ban* of the nobility fought under their colours. While, however, at Venice the Great Council elected the Ten, at Toulouse the Capitouls directly nominated their successors at first, and, at a later period, they presented each six candidates for election to the office for the following year. The Common or Sworn Council was composed of those who had filled the office of Capitoul, and who took the title of *Bourgeois* of Toulouse, holding the title in its old acceptation, that of defenders of the fortified town (*Burgum*). The ancient *Bourgeoisie* was made up of the first families of Languedoc, and the municipal functions and honours of its members were for life. No antagonism ever arose between the two great political bodies of Toulouse until the institutions themselves were violated; and the manner in which the traditions of their power were kept up show how great and all but indestructible that power had been. In republican democracies or oligarchies there must be state reasons for preventing any one family from raising itself far above others. In Athens ostracism struck down any virtue that was too great; in Venice extraordinary services entailed banishment or death. At Toulouse, however, while a brilliant action was kept secret, it was always rewarded. A single Capitoul was never allowed the entire command of the troops. Toulouse was afraid of a victorious chief's popularity, and always assigned him a colleague who might obscure his glory as well as share his burdens. His name even was not inserted in the book of Capitouls which recorded his achievements; but he was recompensed in the following year by the offer of a place in the Capitoulate for a member of his house. All the patrician families of the old town were politically equal. No chivalric or lordly title was attached to any name in the official register, unless by absolute necessity, to avoid confusion among those whose proper names and surnames were alike. The Capitoulate thus became a school of patriotism and self-denial.

The name of De Portal was of frequent occurrence in the honourable list; and is found standing among the public leaders in the earliest records extant. During the twelfth and thirteenth centuries there were few public roads in France; and those which existed were very badly kept; so that commerce had to be carried on for the most part along the course of rivers. Toulouse, seated on the Garonne, had its principal mercantile relations with Bordeaux and the country along the river banks.

The boats of the Toulouse merchants passed every day under the Chateau *D'Auvillars*, situated between Moissac and Agen, and, according to feudal custom, a toll had been paid; but on an attempt to levy a larger tax, the townsfolk resisted, their boats were pillaged, and war was the result. The Capitouls put themselves at the head of their troops, and laid siege to the Chateau. After a long struggle, the Viscount de Lomagne and D'Auvillars was obliged to submit; and on the 14th of June, 1204, a treaty was signed, by which the conquered lord bound himself to pay the expenses of the war, and promised to fix the toll for the future according to the ancient rule. The Capitouls claimed the privilege of giving their simple word of promise only, while the Viscount and his son had to be personally bound, and on oath to declare that he would henceforth act with the concurrence and on the decisions of the Capitouls. This treaty, which remains as a memorial of the power of old Toulouse, and a curious monument of its popular rights, is signed by Oldric de Portal, Capitoul. From the date of that treaty down to 1423 no less than twenty-one elections to the Capitoulate were in favour of the De Portal family; and during that period the name is found associated with some of the most remarkable transactions of the times; with every leading event, indeed, in the history of mental culture, civil regulations, chivalry, or national wars. They frequently stand out among that aristocracy of Southern France, which, during the thirteenth and fourteenth century, was so distinguished for its enlightened devotion to mental cultivation and learning; and which, trained as they were to read, write, and understand Latin, and consecrate themselves to elegant and intellectual pursuits, contrasted most honourably with the Northern lords, who esteemed nothing but brutal force. Toulouse was first and foremost in the pursuit of letters. She had her laws and customs fairly digested and issued in Latin; and in 1285 Vital, Pierre, and Raymond de Portal were distinguished among those who concurred in this design, and who accomplished the work.

The Capitoulate of Pierre de Portal is also identified in the annals of 1324 with a movement which beautifully expressed the spirit at that time animating the higher classes of Toulouse,—a movement to which the best institutions of French civilization may probably trace their origin, and for whose gentle and exalting influence entire Europe had reason to be thankful. This was the rise of the Floral Games. Toulouse felt that she had renewed her youthful sense of freedom, and gave herself up to the play of her lively and spiritual southern nature. A few troubadours made an appeal to the poets of the *Langue d'oc*. An

assembly was called, and the meeting was fixed for the month of May. The spirit of romantic poesy was to be evoked anew. The sons of song were to be called to graceful contention for prizes symbolical of happy genius, mental riches, and literary honour. Golden and silver flowers were to be presented to the most successful candidate for poetic distinction; and the first golden violet was awarded in the presence of Pierre de Portal, who, with his fellow Capitouls, decided that the costs of the elegant festival should be paid from the public purse. In the year which followed the establishment of the floral feast an association was incorporated in the form of an academy, with an elected chancellor and mace-bearer. The chancellor's office was to affix a seal to the poem which had merited the prize; and the mace-bearer was charged with its special registration. Thus to revive the love of literature was to awaken afresh the most agreeable thoughts about old times; to call up anew the deeds and achievements which formed the glory of the national traditions; and deeply to affect the hearts of the people, by pleasantly exciting their intellect.

The patronage of the Capitouls might have had a political as well as a literary object. It would not be thought wise to lose an opportunity of exciting the public imagination by renewing recollections of brave political and religious confessors, as well as gifted troubadours. The troubadours, as a writer of Toulousian biography has remarked, 'enjoyed the smile of the ruling powers; favoured as they were by the lords, and freely admitted to the courts of Castile and the provinces of Southern France, their songs were received and repeated everywhere with enthusiasm. As creators of a new style, they taught a people as yet but half civilized to understand hymns consecrated to valour and beauty. As with a war trumpet to their mouth, they called Christians to the defence of the holy places; by the successful use of satire, they showed the vices of their day, exposed the crime of ambition, the abuse of power, the hypocrisy and fanatical ignorance of the monks, the tyranny and lawlessness of the barons. With gratitude and faithfulness they kept up the conflict for their sovereigns; and when the noble house of Toulouse fell from the height which it had brightened by its courage, no troubadours were found to flatter the conquerors of afflicted *Occitanie*, or to side or sympathize with the triumphant stranger. Their voices uttered nothing but cries for vengeance, or accents of grief. When hope was lost, the minstrel's lyre was still; and the muses fled far away from regions given over to ignorance for a time, and covered with funeral piles by the Inquisition of the Faith.' The institution of the Floral Games

was originally an appeal to the national spirit. It had never been without a political purpose. For when, towards the end of the fifteenth century, most of the noble families abandoned Toulouse, the feast of the Violet and the Eglantine was given up; and though it was partially revived at a later period, the troubadours, faithful to the ancient aristocracy, sang bitter satires against the rich and upstart *bourgeois*, who now inherited the modified and subservient functions of the Capitoulate. The traditions of old Toulouse, however, show that her municipal institutions have been as remarkable for their association with military honour and chivalry, as for their patronage of elegant literature. The manners of her people, during her brightest age, differed very much from those of other provinces in France. Education among her aristocracy was grounded on polite literature, associated with the rights and the art of war. A gentleman must speak Latin, have a sound knowledge of the Roman laws, as well as the national customs, and show himself able to break a lance in honourable encounter. The noble youth went every day from the school bench to the drilling ground, and passed through a course of gymnastics somewhat different from the mechanical action of modern playgrounds, in that the exercise was intended not merely to strengthen him against disease, but to prepare him for resisting a foe. This double education, uniting the literary and the martial, necessarily produced a people ready either for argument, law, persuasion, or battle; at once reasoners in council, or heroes in the field. The history of the Albigeois and the Huguenots of Toulouse answers to their training, and shows that they were as tenderly alive to their rights as to their honour, and as ready to dispute with monks and clergy as they were to measure swords with their lay persecutors. The style of their education will account for the profound disdain with which the gentlemen of Languedoc met the northern lords, who, alas! knew no more of Virgil or Horace than about the Institutes and Pandects of Justinian; and who acted on the belief, that to fight well was the proudest distinction of a knight.

At Toulouse a preparation for the Capitoulate was the great object of education; and hence, as might be expected, her Capitouls have been prominent actors in scenes which must ever have a deep interest for the student of European history. When war was declared between France and England in 1294, the Capitouls, of their own accord, raised a large body of troops, and in many successful fields shed glory on the arms of their country; so that, at the close of the campaign, the Constable in supreme command honoured them with a written and sealed

testimony to their loyalty and generous heroism. 'Never,' says an annalist, 'did a general render a more glorious tribute than that which the Constable paid to the valour of the Toulousians. The services which they rendered were such as to merit not only the preservation of the ancient privileges of their city, but a grant of new and superior rights.' Nor was this the only time that Toulouse merited the homage which her country thus paid to the spirit of her citizens. She was always ready with her succours throughout the struggle with England. Her Capitouls always commanded in person. They maintained during the wars, not merely the prerogatives of generals, but the right of supreme civil judges over the troops; and during those calamitous and eventful times many a laurel wreath was awarded to the house of De Portal. When the gathering woes of France had seemed to mingle and overwhelm her on the field of Poitiers, when Paris and the provinces unworthily failed, Toulouse alone, persecuted, violated, disinherited, as she had been by royalty, proved herself to be the only town faithful to her French kindred and alliance. While the States General of the North, assembled at Paris, so far from granting aid to the unfortunate Dauphin, insulted him in his troubles, while Paris threatened a revolt, and town after town proved cold and heartless, the States General of Languedoc gathered at Toulouse, and by acclamation resolved to raise and maintain five thousand men-at-arms, with two horses each, a thousand mounted archers, and two thousand foot soldiers with shields. Everybody, noble and simple, wished to contribute either his person or from his purse. All armed themselves in haste; while the women came forward to offer their jewels and their wardrobes for the salvation of their country. But this was not enough for the gallant city. She would fain share the sorrows of her captive King. Neither man nor woman could wear gold or silver, or pearl, or fur, or ornaments of any sort, until John was delivered. Minstrels were to hang up their lyres, and public mirth was to be hushed. The King's ransom was fixed at three million gold crowns, and of this amount Toulouse gave two hundred and sixty thousand francs in different payments. In all these interesting transactions the family of De Portal took an active part. Pierre de Portal was elected Capitoul for the second time during the year of his sovereign's deliverance (1360), and under his Capitoulate the county of Toulouse was formally annexed to the crown of France.

A few years later, in 1365, another De Portal (Portal du Pont) was one of four hundred Toulousians who marched into Spain under the command of Bertrand du Guesclin, charged with the duty of avenging the death of Blanche de Bourbon,

sister of the French Queen, whom Peter the Cruel, her husband, had murdered. In this service the nobility of Languedoc rushed to arms. The intense excitement which carried away the *élite* of the population on this occasion has been immortalized by a troubadour, who sang :—

'Dieu ! le beau temps que c'était alors !
Les femmes qui étaient enceintes
Auraient voulu être délivrées,
Et que leurs fils fussent assez grands
Pour porter les colliers d'or,
Et les belles lances arguës.'

Among the most valiant and renowned of those whose names the poet has embalmed was Portal du Pont; whose chosen war cry and armorial device still graces the bearings of his family :—

'*Arnuel nos ullio regum.*'

With such historical associations clustering around the municipal institutions in which the names of his ancestors so brilliantly figure, who can wonder at the plaintiveness with which M. F. De Portal records the decline and fall of the Toulousian Capitoulate? Nor could we be unwilling to linger with him, when he calls us to take a last look at the fine old structure in its decay, and to mark the principle that gave it that life and power two centuries and a half of energetic foreign rule could hardly destroy. Our author reviews the venerable institution under the influence of national sympathy and family feeling, and shows that his interest in it is that of one who claims descent from those who had borne its honours; but how far soever personal affection or family principle may serve to deepen his reverence for the city of his fathers, no true Protestant, no Christian, indeed, whatsoever his name, will fail to cherish most tenderly the memory of the Toulousian Capitoulate, as an ancient embodiment of religious and political liberty. Nor can any lover of freedom and piety trace without strong feeling the history of its struggles against those violent instruments of royal and ecclesiastical despotism,—the parliament and the inquisition.

In the month of December, 1203, two legates from Innocent III. entered Toulouse to renew the work of rooting out heresy. Among their first performance during the year that followed, they took oaths from the Capitouls, one of whom was Oldric de Portal, and the chief inhabitants, pledging them to be faithful to the Romish Church; promising on their part, in the Pope's name, that the oath taken by the civic authorities should never prejudice the liberties of the city, and that all its rights and privileges should be held inviolate. The municipal dignitaries

have been charged with perjury; but M. F. De Portal fairly replies that if there was any perjury, it was the Pope who perjured himself, and not the Capitouls and nobles of Toulouse. The liberties of the town were, in fact, trampled under foot by Simon de Montfort and the kings of France at the instigation of the bishops and the Pope. The Capitouls, lords, and *bourgeois*, were, it is true, imbued with the doctrines of the *Vaudois;* but they did not wish to break with Rome. They believed that Catholicism might conform itself to primitive Christianity, and had no desire to contend about the mere forms of worship. Among the *Albigeois* there were but few who might be called separatists. The great mass remained formally Catholic; and were distinguished chiefly by the purity of their life, their charity, their truthfulness and integrity. The emissaries of the Papal legation had scented heresy, however. The cry was up. St. Dominic entered Toulouse. The Inquisitors arrested both 'quick and dead.' The bodies of the condemned were torn from their graves and dragged through the streets, preceded by a herald, whose voice fell like a token of approaching death upon the ears of the horror-stricken people. Such outrages on decency were not to be tolerated in Toulouse, the most civilized town of Europe. The public mind was in revolt; and the Capitouls took deep counsel; but the presence of the legates and of the dreadful Dominic, armed with the thunder of the Vatican, and the fires of the Inquisition, rendered it necessary to act with prudence. In a long regulation of police respecting rain water, public games, and burials, Oldric de Portal and his colleagues introduced a clause providing that 'no person, either male or female, was to be accused of heresy after death, if no charge had been preferred during life,' &c. This act of public authority began the struggle between the Capitoulate and the Inquisition. The Capitouls proceeded to issue rules which were rather favourable to the *Albigeois*, and which were evidently intended as checks on the spirit of persecution. These rules were submitted to the common council; and thus the opposition to the Inquisitors became a municipal affair, and a national question. The strife was kept up, and the *Albigeois* gathered strength and numbers, as if the controversy cherished them. The bishops seemed to have the worst of the battle for a time. They were pressed hardly by the rich Toulousians. Their country parishes could not be visited without a safe-conduct from the Lords; for nearly all the surrounding *châteaux* belonged to the *Vaudoise* nobility. Within Toulouse, the *bourg*, or citadel, was the cradle of Nonconformity or Puritanism, as we should call it; and from within the embattled enclosure the doctrines and spirit of this

early reformation flowed forth as from a guarded spring. The De Portal family, with a great number of other distinguished leaders, occupied this part of the town, and represented it in the city councils. The clergy, at length, began to gather power; the lower classes of the people were brought under their yoke; and the bishops instituted a brotherhood for the sustenance of the faith, and awarded them the distinction of a *white* badge. The *Bourg* declared itself for the *Vaudois*, and established a *black* society; and then black and white, *bourg* and *ville*, came to blows, and entered upon a succession of skirmishes in the streets of Toulouse. Alas, for the faith! and alas, indeed, for its champions, both gentle and simple! The De Portals, then numerous and powerful, threw themselves into the lists, and were the first to take up arms. The elect chief of the crusade against the *Albigeois* set up a white silver lion on his banner; the De Portals stood against it under a sable lion rampant; and in that sign perpetuated among their descendants the story of their zeal, their courage, and the mournful issue of their bold attempt.

For a time, the armed retainers of the hostile creeds swayed to and fro, and were powerful enough on both sides to hold each other in check; but at length the balance was broken, and the protesting and battling *Capitouls* and *Bourgeois* as well as Count and people were made to feel that whatever spiritual power they possessed, their carnal strength was not equal to a contest with an unscrupulous combination of 'principalities, powers, rulers of darkness, and spiritual wickedness in high places.' The ruthless Simon de Montfort had been fulfilling his dark commission through scene after scene of blood and fire; and, at length, he came down with a fell swoop upon Toulouse. The devoted city was given up to pillage, violence, and murder; but her destroyer fell amidst the destruction. His cup was full. Glutted with blood and gold, he at first withdrew in self-gratulation at having crushed, as he thought, the spirit and power of the citizens, by extorting from them thirty thousand marks, and by levelling their walls to the dust. The greatness of her sorrow, however, moved the whole city to action. She roused herself, lifted up her war-cry, and rich and poor, *Bourgeois*, nobles, and merchants, even women and children, came to the work of rearing defences. Night and day they toiled, until lines and walls, archery posts and war machines stood ready to meet the assault of the returning and infuriated foe. Then came the onset. Montfort rushed forward to inspirit his chevaliers; wounded in his side and head, he stops to lift his brother, who had fallen at his feet, and just then a stone from a

machine worked by the women of Toulouse came with a fatal crash upon his proud front, and finished his campaign. For the time, the feeling of loyalty to their old native city had overcome even religious animosity and party feeling, so far as to unite the adverse brotherhoods, both black and white, under the banner of Toulouse; for it was felt now that the crusade against the *Albigeois*, though under a religious name, was really an outbreak of barbarism, which would treat with equal cruelty both Catholic and *Vaudois*.

The fall of Montfort proved no check to the mortal strife. For twenty years the struggle for mastery over Languedoc was kept up by French royalty and Roman Churchism. The story is one of tears, devastation, and blood. One Count died excommunicated, another was forced to submit at last to a shameful treaty. Inquisitors and monks worked their way into power and influence. The Capitouls were called to share in the humiliation; and then began the emigration of the family which had so prominently identified itself with the municipal rights of Toulouse, and with the doctrines and spirit of the *Albigeois*. Raymond Gerard De Portal, not able to brook the supremacy of a French prince in the home of his fathers, sought refuge in a retreat near Nismes, and there gave existence to a branch of the family from which there afterwards sprang martyrs for the Protestant faith. The Capitoulate was doomed to fall under the dominion of the French princes. From time to time, the French court pressed its claims and widened its influence; and though, ever and anon, the Toulousians, jealous of their ancient privileges, and fondly clinging to their old forms, made efforts to hold their freedom, a parliament was, at length, formed, whose growth became prejudicial to the honour of the primitive municipality. Rome continued to manœuvre; and the Inquisition, if it ever seemed to relax, did it only that it might secure some greater advantage, and more certainly put its foot upon the necks of its opponents. Toulouse, in fact, had, by and by, drained her forces in the contest. Her wounds were many and deep. A great part of her nobility, held in contempt by the court, and harassed by the inquisitors, were a second time driven into a course of emigration; and carried off to their distant *châteaux* the property and influence which had given life to the capital of the province.

Again the De Portals were found among the pilgrims. On the 29th of May, 1420, the Parliament of Languedoc was installed at Toulouse under the presidency of an archbishop, Dominic of Florence. In the following June, a man of the city was accused before it of blasphemy against Christ and the Virgin; while the

only witness in the case, refusing to speak, was charged with the crime of silence. The blasphemer was condemned to have his goods confiscated, his tongue cut out, and his head taken off: and the silent witness was handed over to the Inquisition, to be put under a course of two months' fasting.

This was the first act of the Parliament as a criminal court; and served to mark its intrusion into the province of the old Capitoulate. The Capitouls had been from time immemorial the proper judges in cases of blasphemy. Their right was now usurped. The Parliament had begun its work of humiliating the national magistracy; and by seizing its powers of jurisdiction, by sharing the spoils with the Romish Inquisitors, and by issuing sentences which were as unreasonable as they were cruel, they consistently inaugurated a course which, in the history of Toulouse, is distinguished by traces of blood. The Capitouls bent their heads, and silently awaited the storms of clerical and monkish fury which the rival tribunal had let loose. It proved a tempest of 'blood, and fire, and vapour of smoke.' A Romish historian of the seventeenth century, a native of Toulouse, and a Dominican, has recorded its horrors in a manner which none but a Dominican could affect. With all sweetness and piety he recounts the deeds of his brethren, and shows how the blackest crimes and the most infamous cruelties can be committed with calm and sanctified complacency, under the notion that they serve the interests of heaven, that is, of the Church. He conceals no atrocity; but rather describes all with tender fondness and delight. It seems pleasant to him to think of 'the good brothers' having a joyful dinner after seeing a female heretic burnt, and of their uniting to bless God for the things which they had seen, and which had so promoted the glory of the faith and the honour of St. Dominic. He calls the list of bloody sentences, 'the book of life!' In 1423, the Inquisitors had intruded their authority so far as to sway the election of Capitouls. Pierre de Portal, the fourth of that name, felt the humiliation as *Capitoul* of the *Bourg;* and was the last of his family who undertook the office. The Capitoulate had passed under the yoke of the Inquisition and the Parliament. In 1425 it was rapidly falling into disorganisation. Not merely were its members elected at the suggestion of the Parliament and the Inquisitors; but their good and loyal services, or their acts of submission, were rewarded by a release from duty for two or three years. The venerable old forms were in fact broken up. At the same time the ancient houses of nobility could not as yet understand the signs of the times, or resign themselves to the position into which they had been driven. They con-

tinued to look back fondly, and to long for the return of times like the former; while their children were educated in the hope that the Capitoulate would at some time be re-established. But how vain are the hopes of a supplanted class! A few early privileges of the Capitouls were temporarily restored at a later period; and Jehan de Portal, who was made *Viguier* of Toulouse, in 1555, by Henry II. of France, ventured on a line of policy which was intended to bring back some, at least, of the glories of the ancient system; but the times were too hard for him, and he fell at least amidst the ruins of the institutions and the party upon which his heart had been set.

The name of Jehan de Portal may serve as a link to connect the historical interest of his family with the original liberties of Toulouse and the *Albigeois*, on the one side; and, on the other, with the Lutheran Reformation, and the Protestant martyrology of Southern France. His family had lived to see the municipal honours of their birth-place fade; and, indeed, had outlived even the existence of old Toulouse. The Capitouls, who became subject to the Parliament and the Inquisition, bitterly repented of their submission; but their repentance was too late. The original Capitoulate ceased to be represented by their persons, and the ancient city itself perished under their powerless administration. During the year 1462 a fire, which broke out in the house of a baker, spread with resistless fury, until the old feudal mass of lordly dwellings disappeared from the soil, and all its archives were devoured by the flames, which destroyed the Hotel de Ville. Pestilence and famine followed the fire, and desolation, for a time, settled on the woe-begone ruins. A curse seemed to rest upon the scene. The venerable capital could not survive its primitive institutions. The same year witnessed the overthrow of its walls and of its Capitoulate. The usurpers of its power had made it a centre of persecution, and now, perishing itself as in the flames of a monster *Auto-da-fé*, it was doomed to be forsaken by its most revered households, by its poets, and by its artists. The fire was arrested at the Portal de Matabiau, a part of the De Portal property, which remained, and still remains perhaps, a plaintive vestige of the original Toulouse. Now came a great social change. The houses of a former age were gone; and the population had passed through the fires of pestilence; and over and above all this, the old Toulousian spirit had departed, the traditions of the place had lost their freshness, and letters, arts, and science passed away in the train of the old families whom the tribulations of Languedoc had driven into exile. The four branches of the De Portal family, which were established at

Toulouse in the beginning of the thirteenth century, emigrated one after another, under the successive troubles of their times; and all moved towards the East, into the parts where the *Albigeois* and *Vaudois* found refuge. Those who fled after the fire of 1462 passed into the mountains of Rouergue. They reared 'the house of their pilgrimage' in what might be called a desert, under the name of Larzac, near the little town of La Cavalerie: by and by, their name was imposed here and there upon the hospitable soil, and they found a quiet settlement at Bagnols, in Lower Languedoc. Far away from their family birth-place, they tried to turn their thoughts from the past when it called up bitter recollections; while they endeavoured to fit themselves for their new relations by cherishing the memory of such passages in their family history as cheered them to action, and stimulated the lawful ambition of their children. Their history, like that of the early patriarchs, and, indeed, like that of many a line of Protestant confessors, affords evidence that the names given to children, and carefully transmitted, often served beautifully and certainly to indicate the political and religious spirit of a family during a particular period.

Some of the wanderers struggled into distinction under royal power, and especially in the reign of John II. Jean was the name given to the first De Portal who was born at a distance from Toulouse. Pierre was the name which had been transmitted for a long course of years in association with the Capitoulate; but when that municipal dignity was lost, the name was dropped, and never resumed till the eldest branch of the house was honourably restored to Toulouse. Jehan de Portal, who lived at Bagnols towards the end of the fifteenth and in the beginning of the sixteenth century, had three children, two sons and a daughter; the younger son, François, originated the stock from which the still existing branches of the family sprang; Jehan, the elder, found his way back to Toulouse. He at length gained possession of an old estate which had been taken from his fathers by confiscation; and there he reared a family which, for a time, seemed likely to enjoy the permanent restoration of their ancestral honours. The De Portals, who had for one entire age lost their place in Toulousian history, now re-appear within the old city in greater power than ever. Berenger De Portal had become a chevalier, lord of Pradelle, one of the royal council, and resident at Toulouse as treasurer-general of Languedoc; Antoine was bailiff of Revel; and Jehan was *Viguier* of Toulouse. How bright was his prospect! The command of the troops, the administration of the finances, everything, indeed, was in his hands. A De Portal once more seemed to represent

the old Capitoulate, the nationality of Languedoc, and the municipal power which had stood against Inquisitors and Parliament. His nomination to such a post at that time was significant. To call a representative of the old *Albigeois* to superintend public affairs at Toulouse at the moment when the Lutheran Reformation was gathering power there, was to show that the King really wished to place a check on the ultra-Romish party and the sympathizers with Spain. The power confided to the *Viguier* was very great; but De Portal seemed to know how to use it with moderation and effect. He was received with joy at the seat of his administration by the old national party and the friends of the Reformation; among whom were all the members of the ancient aristocracy inheriting the views and feelings of the primitive *Albigeois*. His aim now was twofold: that of defeating the plots of those who, by the aid of the Inquisition, were promoting the supremacy of Spanish power, and that of restoring as far as possible the rights and privileges of the Capitouls, after delivering them from the undue influence of the Parliament. With these objects before him he had to be faithful to his own religious sympathies and principles, while he honoured existing rights, and fulfilled his high trust, by guarding the lawful claims of every party in the State. Who, that has tried to realize the character of his times, can wonder at his failure? He perished amidst his noble efforts. Must not his name be put into the martyr roll? The year in which Luther burnt the Pope's Bull, and during which the doctrines of the Reformation were received into Toulouse, was the year of Jehan De Portal's birth. His birth-time was the birth-time of the Protestant faith in the city of his fathers; and the year of his death saw Toulousian Protestantism expire. The name of Jehan de Portal must ever be associated with that perfidious and bloody act of Catholic zeal which foretokened the still greater atrocities of St. Bartholomew; and the precious memory of which still kindles festival joys in the archiepiscopal heart of the present orthodox and saintly Toulouse. The influence of the Reformation deepened and widened among the most intelligent inhabitants of the old city, just as the scandals of clerical and monkish life became more apparent; and for some time there was evidently a gathering up of hostile elements, both political and religious. The slightest touch of extra excitement would be enough to bring about a fearful paroxysm. That touch came. In the month of April, 1562, just ten years before Paris witnessed the horrible transactions of St. Bartholomew's feast, a Protestant had died, and a few friends with the parents of the deceased were following the bier to the grave, when the priests of the Faubourg

St. Michel seized the corpse, and buried it according to the rites of the Romish worship. There was a struggle. The tocsin was sounded. The rabble gathered; and a massacre began. The majority of the Parliament at once took their side openly against the Protestants, and appeared in their scarlet robes publicly exciting the people to attack the Reformers in the name of the King. A white cross was adopted as the Catholic badge and standard, and the bloody strife became general. The Protestants took refuge in the Hotel de Ville, where they bravely defended themselves with some pieces of artillery. There was negociation, at length, and a treaty. The defendants were to quit the capital, and give up their arms, as the only conditions of safety and peace. To this they agreed; and during vespers on the feast of Pentecost they disarmed themselves, and sallied forth with the intention of leaving the town. But then came the frightful consummation of villany. Crowds rushed in every direction from the churches, and, falling upon the defenceless victims, murdered them in cold blood along the public streets. Then the savage Blaise de Montluc, governor of Guyenne, entered the town, with a body of royal troops, to finish the massacre; 'and,' writes he with fiendish sportiveness, 'I never saw so many heads fly as I did there. I had enough to do. Not that we were needed; for the people of the neighbourhood came running to the pillage, peasants and others, and it was not enough for them to sack the houses of the Huguenots; they fell, too, upon those of the Catholics.' What the closing scene would be under his generalship may be suspected from the fact, that, when in the course of his murderous career he had filled the wells of one fated town with the festering bodies of the slain, he chuckled at the recollection, and thought it, as he said, 'an excellent way to get rid of those naughty boys!' Four thousand perished in the butchery at Toulouse. But the judicial assassinations soon followed the carnage in the streets. There were at least two hundred capital executions during nine months of proscription. The executioners began each day of doom with a chief, and finished the hideous spectacle by the exposure of their meaner victims. On the 20th of May the Parliament condemned Jehan de Portal to the block upon the Place de Salin. As chief of the Toulouse Huguenots he had the place of honour. His head was fixed on a lance, and exposed on the tower of the Château Narbonnais, the château of which he had been the public commander. Toulouse had destroyed her best friends, dishonoured her own history, and now had the shame of seeing upon the palace wall of her ancient rulers the bleeding head of the last of her *Albigeois*.

What unsophisticated student of Christianity, as it is exhibited in the New Testament, could conceive that a tragedy, in which so much faithlessness and barbarism prevailed, should furnish the Christian Church with reasons for a feast of commemoration? Yet Rome instituted a centenary celebration of the Toulousian calamity, and called it a 'feast of deliverance.' Voltaire gave it another name, 'The procession to thank God for four thousand murders.' Such a festival Toulouse witnessed in 1762; and then the pomp of civil and ecclesiastical state proved an introduction to a year of cruel persecution, during which the wheel, and the cord, and the fire, were again called into action. A pastoral letter from the Archbishop of Toulouse reaches us but now, announcing another jubilee for 1862, in celebration of what he calls 'a glorious event which took place in Toulouse three centuries ago.' The faithful are once more called to 'renew the chain of the past.' The best and most enlightened of his countrymen scarcely understand him. 'It is hard to say,' remarks one, 'which is the most astonishing and afflicting, the intolerance and obsolete passions which inspired the archbishop's resolution, or the imprudence and temerity which characterize it. But, after all that has lately taken place, one can hardly be surprised at seeing a member of the episcopacy thus violently oppose the principles of tolerance and religious liberty, which have become the law of modern societies; what is surprising is, to see a member of the episcopacy wanting in the most simple and ordinary prudence. How is it that the Archbishop of Toulouse, who lives in the midst of our southern population, who knows the vivacity and ardour of their religious feelings, has not seen the danger of the appeal made to such melancholy reminiscences? How is it that he has not feared to revive discords hardly yet extinct? How is it that he did not hesitate before the responsibility of the calamities which might arise from those fresh struggles?' Impure zeal is always reckless; and while human nature remains unsanctified, whether in ecclesiastical or any other garb, it will be ready for any opportunity of fulfilling its purposes in its own old style, bad as that style may be. Happy is it for France, and happy for the world, too, that among 'the powers that be' there are some strong and wise, or clever enough, to bridle such creatures as the Archbishop of Toulouse, if not to saddle them for the public service.

But to return to the family of De Portal. The martyr-like death of Jehan seemed to intensify the religious feeling of his family, and to confirm them more deeply in Protestant principles. Berenger, one brother, in the spirit of the prophet,

whose confidence in the restoration of his patrimony remained unshaken amidst the darkest desolations of foreign invasion, never lost his hopes of the Reformation, even while France and the whole civilized world were in consternation at the frightful massacre of the Protestant population; but, in unwavering faith, he bequeathed a part of his property for the establishment of the Protestant worship in Paris, centre as that then was of bloodthirstiness and intolerant zeal. Another brother, Louis, of La Pradelle, lived to avenge the death of Jehan, by showing mercy to the persecutors whom his brilliant military success had placed within his power. Our sympathies and affections would fain have followed the fortunes of his branch of the family down to the time when the last of his line perished amidst the horrors of the great French Revolution, and their tragic end involved the loss of many an interesting family record. And, were it possible, we should trace the course of the other De Portal lines through the days of trial which came on in dark succession from the sack of Toulouse and the later miseries of St. Bartholomew, down to the merciless age of Louis the Fourteenth. Many a wise and holy lesson might be gathered, while it was seen how the younger shoots of the family stock secured transient fortune and honour by proving faithless to their fathers' principles, but preserved a distinct life only by returning to the confession of their ancestry: or how the elder branches kept faith with their brethren and their God amidst persecution, bloodshed, and ruin. Now the sword is upon them, their lands are ravaged, their property seized, their homes broken up, and their persons outlawed; now, scattered here and there, they bravely sustain one another by the labour of their hands; they are handicraftsmen, traders, dealers, hiding their unstained nobility under the guise of honest toil for daily bread. Here, they are on a pilgrimage to the desert for nightly worship, or privately entering into marriage contract with oppressed members of their own class, and consecrating their children to God in secret, according to the rites of Protestant baptism; there, they mutually encourage themselves in the faith, at the same time that they keep up commercial intercourse between one scene of exile and another; while now and then a De Portal passes away to join 'the noble army of martyrs' in the better land. Through all these scenes M. F. De Portal leads us with tenderness and enlightened care. He is an intelligent, able, and interesting genealogical guide. We esteem him for his discrimination in the study of family character, his ready detection of the true religious spirit, and his ingenious way of bringing into light those delicate tokens of high principle or feeling which linger here and there in the

family records, and which none but one who has the faculty of fine historical discernment would observe.

Limited as our time and space are, we must stay to dwell upon one touching story. It belongs to the period when Louis the Fourteenth was destroying the best life of his kingdom in trying to carry out his theory of, 'One King, one faith.' The feudal or military age of French Protestantism was gone; the period of its municipal strength was past, and it had entered on times when, though disarmed and weak before men, its power was greater with God; when, no longer vigorous in the use of carnal weapons, its courage rose to the height of martyrdom. Louis, in his royal pride, had said he would have no more Protestants in France. In May, 1683, the deputies of the Languedoc Protestant Churches humbly petitioned the King against the disabilities under which they were placed. The response to that petition came in the form of two regiments of dragoons, under the command of Saint Ruth. Another crusade against southern France began. The murderous storm fell first upon Dauphiny. Nearly a hundred persons, who had been found assembled for worship, near Bordeaux, were sabred, burnt, or hung; and a young gentleman called Chamier, condemned to be broken on the wheel, triumphantly bore his cruelly lengthened torture for three days. That young gentleman's great-grandmother was Antoinette de Portal, the wife of the celebrated Chamier who fell among the Huguenots at the seige of Montauban, in 1621, lamented by all who knew him, as the 'great pastor,' who, 'having been an apostle of Protestantism, was at last a martyr for it.'

The martyrdom of the younger Chamier introduced another reign of terror for the reformers of southern France. Among the fugitives who tried to escape the devouring sword was Louis de Portal, who abandoned the Château de la Portalerie, some leagues from Bordeaux, and with his wife and five children sought refuge on his possessions in the Cevennes. The barbarian troops swept along, however, not merely cutting down the men who would fain defend their homes, but strewing their course through Le Vivarais with the mutilated bodies of women and the remains of children and old people, riddled with shot, hacked to pieces, or laid open by sabre cuts. Les Cevennes witnessed still more frightful scenes. The butchers came at last upon the track of the unfortunate De Portal, and he with his wife, Jeanne de la Porte, and probably one of their little ones, breathed their last under the swords of the heartless men. They fell, perhaps, together by their own pious hearth on the banks of a mountain stream, near a mill afterwards marked as *Moulin du Portal.* Their home was burnt and levelled with the

dust. On the approach of the dragoons four of the children had been hid in a common oven outside the dwelling, and were thus saved. The desolate orphans, Henry, William, Peter, and Mary, left the scene of blood in the month of October, 1683, and began their perilous travel towards the coast. To get out of France was their one thought, their one desire. This family flight had been foreseen, it may be, by the parents, and the plan of the journey laid down; but now, alas! neither father nor mother was left to guide or guard their little flock. They directed their defenceless way to Montauban, in order to reach Bordeaux, hoping to secure a passage for Holland, where they might gain the protection of the Prince of Orange. Many perils and many bitter disappointments awaited them, however, before they reached a place of safety. Young as they were, they were outlaws, proscribed at the ports, and tracked over their native soil as if they were wild beasts. Orphans, disinherited, wandering into exile, cheered by no kind look or word, lost to encouragement, not knowing how to bring themselves to the circumstances of beggars, preferring the torture of want to the humiliation of asking for alms, weak and fainting, broken in spirit, perishing for lack of the morsel which they durst not ask for, the four young pilgrims entered Montauban. Little Pierre could go no farther. He fell exhausted and dying of hunger at the door of a baker's shop. The noble baker, whose record is on high, took up the infant, gave it a home, and cherished it at his own hearth. The elder brothers and their sister had now the sorrow of leaving the little one, and for their own sakes they pressed on to Bordeaux; from whence, in pity towards their youthful misery, they were shipped concealed in empty barrels. They were among the happy creatures who escaped before the cruel order was given to fumigate all departing vessels, so as to stifle any Protestant fugitive who might be concealed among the cargo. Well might the tender-hearted chronicler cry: 'O that for the honour of France and for the dignity of human nature this fact could be controverted!' In Holland the three young refugees found friends and foster parents; and they were soon in a position to assert the dignity of their birth. It was remarkably characteristic of their class and lineage that their first care, on finding themselves in safety, was to establish their legal claim to the rights and privileges of nobility. Marie went into Germany as governess to the Countesses of Finkenstein, and was one of the many Protestant exiles who, in the land of their refuge, devoted themselves to education. Many of these brave women belonged to the first families of their native country; in rank they were not inferior to those whom they instructed; in accomplishments and mental

culture they maintained a high superiority; and while their talents supplied them with honourable means of subsistence, they had the additional honour of giving a marked impulse to the cultivation of genuine politeness in Germany,—thanks to the careful and liberal education which the French Protestants had given to their daughters. Marie de Portal eventually married M. Lenormant, a refugee at Amsterdam. Her brothers Henry and William, after five years of sojourn in Holland, came to England in the train of the Prince of Orange. William, with a heart deeply touched and chastened by sad experience amidst the desolations, massacres, and oppressions he had witnessed, sought consolation in the hallowed employment of the Christian ministry. He took holy orders rather late in life, but was nominated tutor to Prince George, afterwards George III., and enjoyed the livings of Clowne in Derbyshire and Farnbridge in Essex. He died during the year of his royal pupil's coronation. Abraham Portal, whose poetic works were published in 1781, was his grandson. His elder brother Henry resolved by industry to re-establish his fortune, and started as a paper manufacturer near Southampton. He carried on his business in a very spirited style, gathered around him the best French and Dutch workmen, and brought his work to so high a degree of perfection that the Bank of England gave him the privilege, which still belongs to a branch of his family, of supplying their bank-note paper. He had resolved to rebuild the fortunes of his house, and he did it. The De Portals of Hampshire established themselves among the English aristocracy; and have become nobly allied to the land of their adoption. The family was replaced in the rank from which they had been driven by the tyranny of Louis XIV.; and has given to this country a distinguished line of witnesses to the truth, that God is the 'Father of the fatherless' and a faithful Guardian of His martyrs' children, and of their children's children, while they keep His covenant.

The times continued cruel; and Montauban witnessed many a heart-rending tragedy among the families of the doomed Protestants. One of the representatives of the old Toulousian nobility who had taken refuge in Montauban, and were now occupied in one or another branch of commerce or labour, was the house of Astorg. They and the De Portals had been equals in dignity, and were now companions in comparative poverty and depression. Pierre de Portal gave his heart to Isabeau D'Astorg. Both were orphans. Their union was preceded and was to be followed by many bitter trials; but they took advantage of a short interval of repose amidst the long succession of

sorrowful persecutions, and on the 8th of June, 1698, were married in the Catholic Church. This union of the most aristocratic names in the province was enough to bring fearful dangers upon the devoted couple; but the Abbé Vernède, the vicar, was pleased to shut his eyes against all temptation to suspicion, and without a question gave his blessing to his parishioners who had come to his church for the first time to seek his benediction. Their course of love had not been smooth. Their way to the altar had been long, difficult, and rugged. Their origin was to be kept secret. Pierre's case especially was beset with perils; for he had been a Protestant fugitive; his family property had been confiscated; and had he been detected, he must have suffered under the law which provided that 'arrested emigrants are condemned, the men to the gallies for life, and the women to be shorn, and sent to the cloisters for the rest of their days.' There had been a temporary relaxation of persecuting vigilance; and Pierre, passing for the son of a baker, had succeeded in taking his bride to her home. Fifteen months after their marriage, however, he and his wife were alarmed by the issue of a law declaring that judgment was now to be given, not only against all those who had been caught in the act of leaving the kingdom, but also against those who could be convicted of having unsuccessfully tried to do so, although they had not been detected at the time. This was, in fact, the crime of the poor child who had dropped half dead during his flight from the murderers of his parents; and now, if known, he must go to the gallies. His name given at his marriage before the vicar, might have led to his detection, but the vicar was silent. The priest knew enough, perhaps, or suspected enough, to condemn the young husband to the oar; but, like many of his class, his sense of honour, or his Christian spirit, was too fine to allow him to turn informer. There were many, alas! who, though in holy orders, were ready for such work; but even in those days of vindictive and merciless zeal there were men among the clergy who, like the Abbé Vernède, were too good to become the tools of bloodthirsty courts. All honour to their memory! Pierre de Portal and Isabeau d'Astorg had three sons. The first was torn from them to be trained for the ranks of the Romish priesthood; the third gave birth to the family branch of La Fumade and Haurioles, and bequeathed to his children the joy of knowing that their father and mother had been imprisoned and robbed of all earthly good for Christ's sake. Nothing more painfully shows the implacable spirit of the then ruling powers, than their vile interference with matrimonial alliances formed under Protestant regulations.

The husband, in this case, had been shut up in one prison and the wife in another, when one of the King's ministers writes to the *Intendant* of Montauban: 'I have as much suspicion as you respecting the dispositions of the persons called Portal and Marie Mazet, his pretended wife. Nevertheless, as their confinement should not be perpetual, and as their misery is extreme, I think there is reason to regard their representations; and I send you the royal order necessary for their release. At the same time it is well that you should remit their reciprocal promises, as you proposed; and it is necessary that you make them abstain from living together until their pretended marriage has been re-established.' This is one of those pages in the history of human intolerance which must always threaten to overtax the patience of the most patient generation. The second son of Pierre de Portal was Paul, who entered the army. This course was adopted in accordance with his father's wish, that the lad might find means of shelter from the importunities and machinations of Popish proselyters; and, at the same time, have an opportunity of visiting the ancient seat of the family, and be in communication with his friends, without awakening the suspicions of the police. The military profession was seemingly thought to be free from the taint of heresy, as a matter of course. In his nineteenth year the young soldier was to be found wandering about the neighbourhood of Montauban, and then at La Portalerie, indulging his family sympathies with the soil which had owned the lordship of his fathers. He succeeded at last in securing his discharge from the ranks, and set up as a cloth manufacturer at Montauban. Patient industry at that time was not merely the means of establishing a man's fortune, but, like the military profession, it often proved a safeguard against persecution. France had been nearly ruined by the emigration of her best and richest manufacturers and merchants; and now, when it was probably too late, the court felt itself pressed by the conviction that unless it could alter its course it must perish. Not willing to lose every thing, it stooped to make enticing offers to the old banished chiefs of French industry, so as to bring them back if possible; but failing in this, it tried to encourage national enterprise, and to patronise rising trade, without giving up the bad policy and cruel action by which it had already brought itself to the brink of ruin. So that there was the strange exhibition of a government chastising heretics for conscience' sake, while, from political expediency, it honoured their labour, and smiled on their commerce.

While public affairs were in this curious posture, Paul de

Portal pushed his business; and ventured, on the 19th of June, 1724, to marry Anne de Noalhac, hoping for brighter days for his Church as well as for his household. He and his family, however, must have frequently felt that 'hope deferred maketh the heart sick.' The bright days came very slowly; and darkness and tempest often set in close upon the hour of a seemingly cheerful dawn. These little Protestant groups flourished amidst the heaviest storms of the unsheltered wilderness. Their enemies found it as difficult to destroy as to convert them. They were 'troubled on every side, yet not distressed; perplexed, but not in despair; persecuted, but not forsaken; cast down, but not destroyed.' The system of intimidation had little success with the De Portals. If one was condemned, the zeal of the others was quickened. Their worship was always in the desert. At nine o'clock on Saturday evening they went forth, now in this direction, and now in that; generally choosing a spot for devotion about four or five leagues from Montauban. They left the town singly, or in very small companies, leading the children, or carrying them in their arms; and all meeting at a given point, where, according to previous arrangement, there were tilted or open carts for the conveyance of the little ones or the infirm, unless, as in some cases, necessity obliged them to make use of chairs, or the arms of the stronger members of the family. It was in this style that Paul de Portal's children were trained to attend the public services of religion; and, by turns, his five sons used to carry their little weak sister, Judith, to the meeting place on the hill side. The scene of their devotion was frequently changed, for the greater safety of the worshippers. They reached the ground usually about one or two o'clock in the morning, spent two hours in prayer and exhortation, and broke up about four o'clock, so as to reach the town about eight or nine in the morning; having travelled about eight or ten leagues, and exposed themselves all night in the open air, in order to secure the privilege of uniting in public worship. This custom was kept up weekly through winter and summer. Those mighty psalms, prayers, and intercessions have for ever consecrated the ravines and forests of Southern France. Nor will the world ever be without Christian hearts to cherish recollections of a people who never failed to meet in Christ's name, though death always hovered around their assemblies; and who received their spiritual strength under the ministry of men who never preached but in the prospect of speedy martyrdom. Amidst this Church in the desert, Paul de Portal's children were consecrated to God in baptism; and in the presence of the same Church one, at least, of his sons took the vows of matrimony. At a nightly service

in the wilderness, Pierre de Portal, afterwards known as the Lord of Pénardières, married Guillemette Delfau, the daughter of a military captain, who quitted the path to preferment, and refused the cross of St. Louis, that he might share 'the reproach of Christ.' Portal de Pénardières, like his fathers, brought his children to holy baptism before a persecuted and witnessing Church. In those days it was death by law for a Protestant pastor to administer the rite of baptism; but Francis Rochette dared, for his Master's sake, to bless the child of Pierre de Portal; and not long after, being detected in the act of baptising during a pastoral visit to a village home, he was called to suffer with two companions, and passed to his reward, singing,—

'*Le voici, l'heureuse journée.*'

Eight months after the death of this pastor, another child was born in the house of Pénardières; but it was snatched from the protesting mother, and violently hurried to the font of St. James, to be baptised as a Catholic. Three years more, and the persecuted parents were blest with a boy in whom Providence seemed to answer the prayer which, it may be, had often gone up from the 'place of weeping:' 'Comfort us again now after the time that Thou hast plagued us; and for the years wherein we have suffered adversity.' The mother had, this time, successfully evaded the meddlesome clergy by concealing herself at Albarèdes, near Montauban; and there the child was born who was to rebuild his ancestral house in still nobler proportions, and gather fresh honours around the name of De Portal. Little was it thought in that quiet circle which secretly witnessed the Protestant baptism on the day following the infant's birth, that the boy who received the name of Albarèdes would by and by, though faithful to the creed of his fathers, be honoured as Minister of Marine and of the Colonies, Minister of State, and Peer of France, under two royal descendants of that Louis whose power had been so frequently put forth to crush the old Toulousian lineage. The venerable father of Albarèdes lived to witness the final hush of that persecutive storm which had been so long beating upon the broken Protestant homes of France. Louis XVI. had restored the oppressed children of the Huguenots to their civil rights and religious freedom; and now, in his eighty-seventh year, the grandson of Pierre de Portal and Isabeau d'Astorg sat under the ancient oaks of Pénardières, surrounded by his children and children's children, and related to his sons, General de Portal, Portal of Grandchamp, and Portal of Albarèdes, how in his youth his grandfather had often told him, that his family had possessed the Château de la Portalière, that his father and mother had been massacred by the

Dragoons in Les Cevennes, that he had fled with his brothers and sister, but that, sinking, exhausted with fatigue and want, at Montauban, he had been pitied and cherished by a baker.

The little baker's great grandson, Pierre Barthélemy, known as Albarèdes, though a Protestant, secured the advantage of an education in the Jesuit College at Montauban; and then started from home with the purpose of augmenting his modest family heritage. He established himself at Bordeaux; and founded his fortune by successful efforts as a shipping merchant. A respectable alliance widened his influence; and in 1811 the Council of Commerce, of which he was a member, sent him before the Emperor to plead the interests of maritime commerce. His manner of fulfilling the mission arrested Napoleon's attention; and when he was preparing to return to Bordeaux, he found himself appointed Master of Requests, and attached to the Committee of the Interior. His intelligence, wisdom, and integrity, justified the imperial choice. On the Emperor's abdication he took the oaths of allegiance to Louis XVIII.; and kept his place in the State Council. He was again nominated Master of Requests when Napoleon returned from Elba; but declining the honour, he was favoured with an interview, and had the opportunity of explaining his motive,—that of a resolution to keep his oath to the King in favour of whom his former imperial master had abdicated. The explanation was satisfactory, and he had an honourable passport to his home. At the restoration of the Bourbons, however, he was recalled to his high position. Honours clustered around him. And, as Minister of Marine and of the Colonies, Councillor of State, Chevalier of the Legion of Honour, and Peer of France, the Baron de Portal d'Albarèdes proved himself equal to his dignified trust, fully sustained the nobility of his descent, reflected honour on his country, and shed new glories on the history of his ancient lineage. The child of confessors and martyrs had re-established his family name. Nor was it ungraceful for him to seek retirement near the town in which he had begun the new groundwork of his fortunes; especially as the chosen spot was a barony once belonging to the house of De Durfort, and in their possession in 1603, when, by the marriage of Thomas de Durfort and Jeanne de Portal, the daughter of the celebrated Captain who fought under Henry of Navarre in the wars of the League, the two old Huguenot families became allied, and cheered and strengthened one another 'in troublous times.' The elect resting place of the Baron d'Albarèdes was the Château de Breillan. There the old peer wrote his memoirs. There his son-in-law, the Marquis d'Audiffret, composed his works on finance; and

there his son, the present Pierre Paul Frédéric Baron de Portal proves himself worthy both of his ancestral inheritance and the honours which his own age has awarded him. While fulfilling his public functions in connexion with distinguished embassies, and as Councillor of State, he has shown himself a fit representative of that old family stock which was once identified with the municipal power and glory of ancient Toulouse; as the author of two deeply interesting volumes on *Symbolical Colours*, and *Egyptian Symbols, as compared with those of the Hebrews*,—which, by the by, we should be glad to see well translated for the benefit of English readers,—he fully sustains the intellectual dignity of a descendant from the cultivated aristocracy of old Languedoc; while the reverent feeling and truth-loving spirit which breathes throughout his book of family memoirs, now before us, offer agreeable evidence that the Christianity of the *Albigeois* still lives and finds a home in the quiet Château de Breillan.

ART. V.—1. *Addresses to the Candidates for Ordination, on the the Questions in the Ordination Service.* By SAMUEL, LORD BISHOP OF OXFORD. Oxford and London: J. H. and James Parker.

2. *The Quarterly Review. No. CCXXII. April*, 1862. London: Murray.

AT a certain incipient stage in the consolidation and progress of every nation, teachers of religion, professing to be divinely commissioned, have become the educators of the people, and have given the law to the national civilisation.

On this point Coleridge, in one of the most interesting of his tracts, lays down certain principles and distinctions, which, though fundamentally erroneous, so neighbour upon the truth, and represent so plausible a perversion of it, that it will well serve our purpose to quote his words. Let it be premised that he uses the word 'clerisy' as one of a wider significance than 'clergy,' and to designate, with the largest comprehensiveness, the learned and educating order of which he speaks; and that he uses the word 'Church' in a corresponding latitude of signification.

'The clerisy of the nation, or National Church,' says Coleridge, '*in its primary acceptance and original intention*, comprehended the learned of all denominations, the sages and professors of all the so-called liberal arts and sciences, the possession and application of which constitute the civilization of a country,—as well as the theological. The last was, indeed, placed

at the head of all; and of good right did it claim the precedence. But why? Because under the name of theology, or divinity, were contained the interpretation of languages, the conservation and tradition of past events, &c.; and lastly, the ground-knowledge, the *prima scientia*, as it was named, philosophy, or the doctrine and discipline of ideas.....I may be allowed, therefore, to express the final cause of the whole by the office and purpose of the greater part; and this is to form and train up the people of the country to be obedient, free, useful, organizable subjects, citizens, and patriots, living for the benefit of the State, and prepared to die for its defence. The proper object and end of the national Church is civilization with freedom, &c.....

'In relation to the national Church, Christianity, or the Church of Christ, is a blessed accident, a providential boon, a grace of God, a mighty and faithful friend, the envoy, indeed, and liege subject of another state, but which can neither administer the laws nor promote the ends of this other state, which is not of the world, without advantage, direct or indirect, to the true interests of the states, the aggregate of which we mean by the world, *i. e.*, the civilised world.'—*Church and State*, pp. 49–50, 58–60.

In contradistinction to Coleridge's theory, we hold that in the commencement of all civilisations the primary and proper function of what he designates the 'clerisy' has been purely religious. They were the authoritative religious teachers, the prophets or priests, of the people; and each kind of civilisation has been immediately determined by its characteristic religion. We agree with Coleridge, that 'because the science of theology was the root and the trunk of the knowledges that civilised man, because it gave unity and the circulating sap of life to all other sciences, because under the name "theology" were comprised all the main aids, instruments, and materials, of national education,' therefore the religion of the country became 'the *ninus formatirus* of the body politic, the shaping and informing spirit which educes or elicits the latent man in all the natives of the soil.' This principle holds good in regard to each characteristic body of religious traditions and observances in each great nation. Hence the religions of the world have moulded the respective civilisations of the world. But to say, as Coleridge says, that, on this account, the teachers of theology have had precedence over other teachers and other classes, is to invert the relations of things. They have had such precedence, not because they were recognised as the teachers of the *prima scientia*, but because of their acknowledged claims as the representatives of the Divine knowledge and will. Their utterances have been paramount, because they have been regarded as the expression of the Divine mind, and as, *therefore*, prescribing the law of morals, and exhibiting the perfection of wisdom. For this reason, they have

had authority and power to mould minds and consciences, to govern law, and custom, and ceremony, to form civilisations, and determine the limits and conditions of human progress. Perhaps in China only has there been any organisation corresponding to a 'national clerisy' which was not founded directly on a theology or mythology; and, assuredly, this phenomenon must have been a secondary refinement, not the original system and machinery of civilisation and moral control. From all this it follows that the Coleridgean theory of a learned and civilising order, as constituting the original idea and primary principle of the 'nationalty,' or 'national clerisy' or 'Church,' is founded in error. The primary idea is that of divinely-commissioned teachers,—witnesses for God.

We look upon a national Church as simply a necessary element in the life and progress of any nation which, from a condition of heathenish barbarism, is just beginning to imbibe, and is resolved to adopt, the principles of Christianity. No one can in a philosophical spirit study the civil and political history of our own Anglo-Saxondom, from its *origines* onwards, without coming to the conclusion that to welcome, and to endow with lands, the teachers of the Christian religion, was the only thing which an earnest and enlightened patriotism could, in the earliest times, have done, in order to consolidate the nation, to afford it the requisite instruction, to imbue it with Christian ideas, to lay the foundation of a Christian commonwealth. We feel persuaded that no philosophical student of history, who, for the time being, lives in the midst of the generation of which he reads, whatever may be his own ecclesiastical convictions or preferences, would dispute this. It is impossible that such a historian as Dr. Vaughan, Congregationalist though he is, should hold any other view. Had he lived in the days of Alfred, as an enlightened and patriotic man, he must have been a State-Churchman, he must have been in favour of endowing in due proportion the Christian teachers. Even at this day, in many heathen tribes, —among the Kaffirs of South Africa, and the islanders of Polynesia,—the representatives of the London (or Congregationalist) Society find themselves, under certain circumstances, compelled to accept lands from the tribes, or chieftains, in endowment of the missionary pastors. In this sense, and to this extent, all candid and thoughtful men must admit the principle of a national and endowed Church. The modern principle of the Liberation Society is one which could only have been conceived in the midst of modern conditions and ideas. To contend that in England there never ought to have been a State-Church is to contend that the times of the Heptarchy ought never to have

existed, that such a complex fact as Anglo-Saxondom ought never to have come to be, that the realm of England ought not to have taken shape, that the early conditions, the growth, the development of the nation ought to have been altogether different from what they were. It is to contend against the course of Providence and the stream of events. Given an early, aggressive, and, as yet, undivided Christianity, spreading from race to race, implanting the grand ideas of the Gospel, impressing kings and princes, claiming to regulate political aims, to reform the relations of men, to discard all olden landmarks of faith and policy, to sweep away customs, ceremonies, and mythologies; given also such conditions of social, civil, and military organization, such national traditions and superstitions, such an entire complex of life and tendency, as actually existed among the Teutonic and Saxon tribes, in the seventh and eighth centuries; and a national and nationally endowed Christian organization could not but be the result of the impact of the former upon the latter. To suppose that a system of congregational voluntaryism could by possibility have emerged out of the coalition or the conflict, out of the intercourse and the combination, in any possible variety or proportions, of such elements as have now been described, is an outrageous anachronism, into which no really intelligent student of history could fall.

But, whilst we hold this conclusion to be indisputable, except by the unintelligent, we must add that it does, not in the least follow from what has now been stated, that, in the case of a new nation being constituted, in an age of advanced thought, by the absorption and fusion of different races, and by the union of different ecclesiastical denominations under one civil compact, it would be well, even if it were possible, to constitute any one ecclesiastical organization the National Church of the country. Such a course would have been equally impossible and undesirable in the United States; and the course of legislation and of events is proving that in all the great colonies of this country no one Christian denomination will be suffered to take precedence, unless by mere courtesy, of the rest; and that no one of them will be specially endowed out the public revenues.

Neither will what we have conceded above in the least bar the inquiry whether in the case of an old country where a particular Church has, from the very beginnings of the nation itself, been endowed and regarded as the National Church, a time must not come, when the conditions of the national faith and life—its variety, its freedom, its manifoldness—will have become incompatible with the maintenance, as respects the endowed and National Church, of many of its ancient and original prescrip-

tions and precepts. What in its fundamental arrangements was adapted to a primitive age, to the conditions of an undivided Christianity, to a period of general ignorance and intellectual stagnancy, is hardly likely, notwithstanding a partial Reformation three hundred years ago, to be well adapted, as an organization, to the conditions of modern life. It seems probable, *à priori*, that administrative reforms, new economical adjustments, some disengagement from political and secular interference and control, some concession to lay advancement in Christian knowledge, some relaxation of 'priestly' exclusiveness and predominance, a more distinct recognition of the congregation of believers, as constituting the body of the Christian Church, and of the spiritual and ecclesiastical claims of the congregation, both as respects spiritual fellowship, in its various forms, and Church discipline;—that such changes as these must, in the nineteenth century, have become necessary in the case of a National Church, the fundamental conditions and organization of which were determined more than a thousand years ago, and which, during the Tudor period, was, so far as respected its organization and discipline, scarcely otherwise reformed than by being transferred from the control of the Pope and his legates, to that of the Sovereign, his ministers, and the great landowners of the country.

We are not, however, about to write an article on Church reform, but on the vocation and training of the Christian ministry. And, if we have said so much on the question of a National Church, it is to free ourselves, *in limine*, from the danger of being misconceived in our reference to the national clergy and their vocation, either by superstitiously immovable Church-of-England men, on the one hand, or by those who wish to be considered pure voluntaries, but whom we presume to consider ultra-voluntaries, on the other; and because, in an ancient and conservative country like our own, old ideas are so tenacious, and old fashions so authoritative, that it is impossible to deal intelligibly and convincingly with the general question of ministerial vocation and ministerial training until certain fallacious views on the subject, arising out of the ambiguous and somewhat anomalous position of the clergy of the Established Church, have been disposed of.

In the remarkable tract from which we have already quoted, Coleridge distinguishes between the function of the clergy of the Established Church, in so far as they constitute what he calls a 'clerisy,' and their function, so far as they constitute the spiritual pastors and teachers of the people. In the former view, they are, as he explains, appointed and paid by the commonwealth,

to do the work *of* imparting and keeping alive among the people the elements *of* a Christian civilisation. They are to be the centres of educating influence and agency throughout the country; and, regarding them as such, the State, in its political and secular character, endows and upholds them. But, at the same time, according to the theory of Coleridge, they hold a relation to the Church as a spiritual body; they do her spiritual work, and wield her spiritual authority. This, Coleridge teaches, is in virtue of a commission derived from a higher source than the State, in its political character; and this spiritual authority and work, though in coalition with State authority and control, is yet altogether independent of it. The inference is that, even when, as clergy, acting in their spiritual capacity, they are grievously defective, they may yet, as a national clerisy, be doing the State good service, and fairly earning their pecuniary recompense, and the professional consideration and influence which attach to their position.

Now, that all Christian ministers, whether belonging to the endowed and ancient Church of this kingdom, or to the modern 'denominations,' are centres of educating and civilizing influence, and, as such, are doing a most important work in the land, is an unquestionable truth. Still it is impossible for the clerical 'order' to be regarded as, co-ordinately, a clerisy, in Coleridge's sense, and as especially endowed by the State in virtue of this its co-ordinate function and character, without its subsiding into a false and inferior position. It may actually do the work of a clerisy, but there is nothing in the principles on which the order is constituted and organized, or in the forms by which individual members are introduced into it, to show that the ends of a 'clerisy' (as such) are in the least regarded as appertaining to the clergy. Their functions—their only necessary functions—are exclusively spiritual; their vows exclusively spiritual; the nature of their calling is defined, express, exclusive; theirs is entirely a spiritual calling. The solemn forms of their ordination proclaim them to be divinely moved to this spiritual work to which they are absolutely devoted by a sacro-sanct dedication and life-long separation. The '*idea*' of a clerisy, therefore, to speak as befits us when debating a point with Coleridge, will not coalesce with that of the spiritual pastorate; and although the clergy may do the work of the 'clerisy,' it is only as a fruit and consequence of their spiritual work, not at all by virtue of the strict and necessary combination, in the one order of the parochial clergy, of the two co-ordinate ideas of the clerisy and the Christian ministry.

Doubtless, however, as a matter of fact, the notion to a con-

siderable extent prevailing among the gentry of England, as to the functions of the clergy, has been rather that of the 'clerisy,' as laid down by Coleridge, than that of men absolutely devoted to the performance of apostolic work in the apostolic spirit. The latter, indeed, is the idea of the Church, as such; it is the idea expressed or implied in all the formularies. But the former has been the current conception, extensively embodied in every-day practice. To be among gentlemen a gentlemanly and, if need be, a scholarly companion; to be a kind and sympathizing friend, and an influential adviser among the poor; to do the routine work of Church duty, so far as requisite, with competent ability and decent reverence,—has been, and, to a considerable extent, still is, the summary conception of a clergyman's duty. If this had been all that he had professed and engaged to be and do, we will not contend that it might not have been a useful and honourable vocation: that is a point which just now we are not concerned to argue. But what the clergyman had vowed to do and be was something vastly higher and more spiritual than this.

How far, even at this day,—when the necessity of clerical devotion, and the sanctity of the spiritual character which belongs to the ministry, are felt so much more, among all classes, than in former times,—the idea of the 'clerisy' still prevails within the Church of England, may be understood from the tone and scope of a remarkable article on the 'Training of the Clergy,' which has recently appeared in the most popular and widely circulated of our quarterly contemporaries. 'The special function of the English clergy,' it is there laid down, 'is: first, to supply a multitude of centres dispersed and planted throughout the kingdom, round which, in every parish, the voluntary energies of the citizens may be gathered and organized for purposes of good; and, secondly, to infuse into all the operations of the empire, from the lowest to the highest, that principle of elevated conscientiousness which may render external restriction wholly unnecessary. This is the abstract theory to be kept in view both by the statesman and the churchman.' To this 'abstract theory' the Divine ordinance of the Christian pastorate is reduced. Such are the terms in which, for scientific purposes, the reviewer would, as a churchman, formulate all that is contemplated in the Divine vocation of the sacred ministry. The reminiscence of Coleridge in the sentences quoted is very evident; the forgetfulness of Christ's doctrine and St. Paul's teaching and example is equally evident. The function defined would, no doubt, constitute a high and honourable calling; but it is not that of those who 'watch for

souls, as they that must give account;' it is not that of those who are bound to profess themselves 'inwardly moved by the Holy Ghost to take upon them the office and ministry' of the Christian 'priesthood.' After such a fundamental definition, it was only to be expected that the *very first* qualification laid down by the writer of that article as necessary to a parochial clergyman should be, that he must be 'practically conversant with society and life;' inasmuch as 'his immediate, his special work is active communication with other men.' Doubtless, under any view of the ministerial calling, at least among Protestants, active communication with other men will be included as necessary; yet in many Churches this would be regarded as subordinate to the work of expounding Holy Scripture, and of presiding with Christian wisdom in meetings of the Church. Indeed, among Presbyterians and Congregationalists, many of the duties ordinarily regarded as peculiarly appertaining to the office of a parochial clergyman, are understood to be the special charge of the 'ruling elders,' or the 'deacons,' under the general direction of the 'pastor and teacher,' who is expected to be much in his study, and to devote himself peculiarly to the 'ministry of the word;' and among the various families of Methodists, the minister is, to some extent, relieved of the same class of duties by the 'leaders,' over whom, however, he presides at the 'leaders' meeting,' and through whom he is sufficiently informed as to the condition and necessities of his flock, and made aware of such cases as may require his special interposition and personal offices.

The writer of the same article further says, that 'the work of the parochial clergy is incompatible with the profound learning, and almost unearthly saintliness and withdrawal from the world, which constitute to so many minds the ideal of the minister of heaven, and without which, maintained somewhere or another in the body of the Church, the Church cannot perform its functions;' and he would point to 'our colleges, universities, cathedral bodies, as the natural localities' where 'such high qualities' might be expected 'to be found and provided.' 'Both truth and holiness,' he says, 'risk defilement,—risk at least the lowering of their tone—by too much collision with the world.' It is plain, indeed, from the whole scope of the article, that, in the judgment of the writer, a man may easily be too good for a parish priest; and that 'a very saintly tone of spiritual life' would be a serious disadvantage to a working, every-day clergyman. He hopes to see the time when 'colleges, universities, cathedrals,' shall become the retreats where 'the *prophets* of the English Church' may find 'refuges and nurseries,' in which

they may cherish their spirituality and pursue their learned studies, and where they may keep up, for the special benefit of the parochial '*priests*,' 'a reserve force of knowledge, and a most elevated standard of spiritual life,' such as these 'priests' themselves, 'the hard labourers, the rough battlers with the world,' may look up to with admiration and longing, but cannot be expected to reach or exemplify. Such is the highest ideal which the writer of the article to which we refer thinks possible. 'It may be,' he says, a few pages farther on, and in precise consistency with these sentiments, 'that for the ordinary, the daily work of the Church, coarser materials and rougher tools may be needed. It may be that minds purer than the average of human nature, with too clear a contemplation of a spiritual world,—too true a knowledge of human misery and human depravity,—too keen a horror of evil,—too acute sympathy with suffering,—too burning an aspiration for a better and a happier scene than this world offers, are unfit and unable to fight the rough battle of this life.' From which it would seem to be a direct consequence that the more a minister approaches in character, spirit, and sympathy to his blessed Master, the less fitted he may not unlikely be for doing his Master's work among men; that the pure and spiritually-minded Timothy was probably not so well fitted to be the helper of Paul as the more ordinary-minded Barnabas or Mark; and that our Saviour's prayer for His disciples must be understood in a modified sense, or as suitable for such only of His ministers as dwell in colleges, universities, or cathedral establishments: 'As Thou hast sent Me into the world, even so send I them into the world. And for their sakes I sanctify Myself, that they also might be sanctified through the truth.' Nay, it is difficult to come to any conclusion but that, in all likelihood, the great apostle of the Gentiles, than whom there has never been one who had to 'labour harder,' or do more 'rough battling' with the world, might have done his work better, if he had rested content with a less 'elevated standard of spiritual life.'

How opposed such crude and semi-worldly theorizing as the above is to facts, our readers will hardly need to be reminded. We shall not quote all the centuries in disproof of the assumptions which it involves. It will suffice to mention a few well-known modern names. The late Dr. John Brown, of Edinburgh, was a city clergyman, yet a man both of deep godliness, and of profound biblical and theological knowledge. The late John Angell James was a town pastor, laden with the cares of a very large Church and congregation; and yet he maintained for fifty years such a 'saintly' character, and exhibited such 'an

elevated standard of spiritual life,' as can scarcely be equalled among cloistered divinity professors, or ample-leisured as well as amply-dowered canons, sequestered in their cathedral closes. And, if we look to the list of writers, upon whom at this moment the work of championing the orthodoxy of the Church of England is devolved, or the more miscellaneous list of English clerical contributors to Dr. William Smith's *Dictionary of the Bible*, or the general theological authorship of the Established Church,—we shall find that comparatively little, even of that which is of the highest quality and the most lasting value, has been composed in the retirement of university life. A country rector or vicar, with an ample income, aided by a pious and efficient curate, and with his heart right towards God, is better situated, even for the prosecution of his studies, than the university resident. How can it be otherwise? The tutors at the university must give their principal attention to their pupils, and in the vacations need rest and change; the professors, if earnest men, will be specially engaged upon their lectures; and, as for the heads, are we not told of them, that 'there are college estates to be superintended, college accounts to be kept, college property to be improved; councils, and committees, and delegacies which absorb the day; hospitalities which occupy the evening?' Residence at the university will, by the opportunities of social intercourse which it affords, quicken and brighten the faculties; the abundant supply of modern books and of periodicals will enable the residents to keep abreast of modern thought; the ancient and magnificent libraries will afford the means of reading up on any particular subject; but the general tone and accompaniments of university life are not favourable to profound learning, and are still less so, we hardly need to add, to profound spirituality of mind. A man may, indeed, become as learned as he will and can, at a university; there are instruments and opportunities: but the examples and the incitements are, for the most part, wanting. So also a man may be as godly and prayerful a working Christian there as the most devoted incumbent in his parish; but, as a matter of fact, he is rather likely to become either carnal and careless, like the reverend volunteers, who smoke their short pipes, and sport their uniform among their brother riflemen; or pseudo-philosophical and innovating, like the Platonisers now at Cambridge, and the sceptical school which has its centre at Oxford; or recluse and mediæval, like some that still linger at Oxford, and others, more gifted, who once had their abode there, but who, to use the eloquent words of Bishop Wilberforce, have taken their flight 'on the wings of an unbounded scepticism into the bosom of an

unfathomed superstition.' How true are the sentences of the same eloquent prelate which are closely connected with the words we have quoted! 'They who have retired from the busy world to contemplation and a cell, have found, ere now, too often, that the Satan whom they fled from in the crowd has travelled on before them to meet them in the waste. Self-confidence, fondness for speculation, love of singularity, separation from their brethren, and then the misty visions of the darkening eye, the eager throbbings of the narrowing heart, heresy, schism, unbelief, and apostasy,—these are the special dangers of the unwatchful Christian student.' * If anything can counteract these besetments, and secure the heart in the midst of these dangers, it is that the student should have a duly proportioned share of the practical duties of the ministry, and be brought face to face with the real facts of life, and the experiences of the inquiring, the repentant, the afflicted, and the rejoicing Christian heart. Let it be observed, we are not contending that the position of a hard-working curate is that which is the most favourable to the acquisition of learning,—this would be mere folly; nor that the clergyman who thinks it to be his chief business to keep on visiting terms with all his better-class parishioners, from the lord of the manor downwards, and to enact the part of universal counsellor and referee in all litigated matters of business throughout the parish, is likely to be the most saintly minister; but we have been indicating the grounds on which we are prepared to maintain that devoted piety is a pre-eminent qualification for the work of a spiritual pastor, that competent learning and assiduous devotion to study may fitly be expected in those who have been set apart to this office; and that, among the ranks of the working clergy, whether of the Establishment or of other denominations, we may legitimately hope to find not unfrequently exemplified that union of Christian saintliness with profound learning which raises the character of the Christian minister to its highest style and type. Indeed, we should have thought that the names of Hooker, Leighton, and Baxter, in former times, and of Alford and Ellicott at the present day, would have been sufficient to settle this question.

It is evident, however, that the misconception which we have been endeavouring to expose,—and which could hardly have pervaded an article so able, so well-informed, and so thoroughly up to the modern Anglican standard of feeling and aim, as that in the *Quarterly Review*, if it had not been more or less prevalent throughout the length and breadth of orthodox and high-bred

* *Addresses to Candidates.*

English Churchism,—is founded, whether the writer may have been conscious of it or not, on that notion of the clergy as constituting primarily a class of civil officers, endowed and appointed by the State, to act strictly within the limits of their several parishes, as centres of civilising and humanising influence, which Coleridge has expressly set forth as a part of his philosophy.

It is natural, indeed, that such a notion should arise and prevail, as respects clergy in the position and circumstances of the parochial ministers of the Church of England. It might have been anticipated that those who know the members of their flock (so called) only as parishioners, who can hold with them as a spiritual congregation no truly mutual fellowship; and who, as a matter of fact, can exercise no spiritual jurisdiction or discipline, either over, or in conjunction with, the company of believers;—those who, to sum all up in one word, know no living Church except as merged and held in solution within the world; would, in many instances, come practically to regard themselves, and to be regarded by others, as little more than a professional class of state officers, appointed to maintain the rites and ceremonies of public worship for the general good of society, and to exercise a wholesome civilising influence, each of them within his particular district, upon the nation at large. Nevertheless, the influence of that revival of religious earnestness which for many years past has been spreading through all the better classes of English society, has awakened a very different sentiment, not only among the clergy in general, but among the public at large. Evidences of this abound even in the article from which we have been quoting. The immense majority of the English clergy during the last century seem to have lost sight entirely of their Divine vocation; now most of them have at least thought something about this momentous question, and many rightly apprehend and feel its supreme importance. An ancient perversion, however, is not soon altogether dislodged. Hence we find the lower view still mingling with the higher, the carnal still qualifying the spiritual interpretation of the work and calling of the Christian ministry.

Nor will the commonwealth be in any respect a loser on account of the change of sentiment to which we have referred. On the contrary, in this matter, as in that of the national education of children, the more strictly and fully the work of the Christian Church is performed, according to the purity of its spiritual purpose, the better at the same time will the work of civilisation be performed for the State. There is no teaching which so searches the soul with wholesome light, and opens it to the humble love

and welcome of all truth and duty, as the spiritual teaching of Christ's whole truth; there is no example so civilising and elevating as the example, given by Christ's own minister, of a true and devoted Christian life; there is no energy, which, with such constant force, such unswerving truth, such an unerring instinct of divinely-prompted wisdom, animates the deep heart of a nation, and determines its advancement, as the energy of Christian allegiance and devotion when rooted in the breasts of the Christian leaders of opinion and action in the land. The one business of a Christian minister, alike within and beyond the pale of the Established Church of this realm, is to preach Christ in all ways, and himself to be a 'living epistle of Christ, known and read of all men.'

Seldom has this great and primary truth been more impressively set forth than by the Bishop of Oxford in his *Addresses to Candidates for Ordination*. The writer in the *Quarterly* contemplates with evident contentment, as one of the three great classes, from which it is to be expected that the ranks of the parish clergy will be supplied, 'those whose standard has not reached beyond that of average humanity,—decent, respectable and orderly, but regarding holy orders rather as a pleasing, and safe, and gentlemanly profession, than in its profounder and more spiritual relations;' and he endeavours to suggest the best means whereby clerical neophytes of this class may be schooled into an adequate degree of earnestness and elevation for the due discharge of their office as parochial clergy. He accepts the fact as it is, lifts up no remembrance, utters no reproof, but endeavours to show the best means of utilising it. But the bishop takes altogether another tone.

'Take, for instance, the first seeking for holy orders. A young man has been destined to it by his friends, perhaps by pious friends; he is naturally of a quiet disposition, has no strong passions to lead him astray, has no very robust qualities to fit him to struggle for a high place in the rougher walks of life; he is early destined for the ministry as a profession; he finds himself so destined, and he acquiesces; he grows up a thoroughly respectable young man, with no definite religious character, no strongly marked features of inward piety, no "fire in his bones" unless he bears Christ's witness, no "woe is me if I preach not the Gospel:" but it is a mode of life which suits him; he wishes and hopes to be useful, to get his comforts round him, to take a gentleman's rank in society, and, in return for giving up the possible chance of wealth or worldly distinction, to have without much effort an ascertained place in good society, and, perhaps, if matters turn out favourably, facilities for early family life and its quiet happiness. Now all this is in itself perfectly unobjectionable. But then observe, this young man is taught to say that "he trusts that he is inwardly moved by the Holy Ghost to

undertake this office, to the glory of God." Is this true? Has he ever thought, thought deeply, earnestly, with all his soul, as a man must think who is giving up his life to such an object, about the "glory of God" in the matter? Has he ever devoted himself, on his knees, with a true searching of heart, to the high service of his God? Has the "love of Christ" ever "constrained" him? Alas! in how many cases must we say, Never! Why, then, do not such men perceive the utter unreality of what they are saying? Very much, no doubt, because the act itself appears so good that they believe they may take for granted that it is done to the glory of God. It seems to them that these words are intended to describe the whole class of which they are members; they do not dream that to make them really true of themselves there is absolute need of a personal, individual devotion of themselves to God. Thus it comes to pass that they enter on their office under a delusion; a delusion which, in too many cases, is never dispelled on this side of the judgment-day. They preach, they baptize, they visit the sick, they catechize, they celebrate the holy communion, just as other men go to the counting-house, or the court of law, or the senate, meaning to live by it, to be respected, to be able to respect themselves; but taking for granted, without a shadow of reason for their judgment, because there is a religious aspect about all the acts of their profession, that they are living for the glory of God, and are on their way to the sure reward.'—*Addresses*, pp. 26–28.

'Purity and sincerity of intention impart so much of their own blessed character to the whole conduct, that every act of the life becomes instinct with an energy and force which enables it to beat down opposition, and at the same time with a tenderness and patience which give to it a most winning persuasiveness in dealing with others. And there is no counterfeit of this great gift, which, in the whole bearing of a life, can produce at all the same effects. The light enshrined in the centre of the character pervades it all, and streams forth from every part of it with an ever-present radiance; so that, viewing our great work even on its natural side, no other power can compensate for the want of this in our endeavours to bring living souls to submit themselves to the yoke of our Lord.'—*Ibid.*, p. 23.

'Your one work is to win souls to Christ; not to produce a certain general decency and amendment in the face of society around you, but as God's instrument, and through the power of Christ's name, to work in living souls the mighty marvel of their true conversion.'—*Ibid.*, p. 18.

These are excellent and heart-stirring words, and may be taken as a setting forth that doctrine, as to the vocation and duties of the Christian ministry, which is generally recognised among orthodox and evangelical Churches. Here and henceforth, we go upon common ground, whether our readers and companions be Churchmen or Dissenters, Conformists or Nonconformists, so they be not men of extreme and singular opinions. Writing in England, in a Reformed Protestant

country, the Established Church of which is proscribed by the Church of Rome as heretical and schismatic, and with the Scottish Churches close at hand, and the Continental Protestant and Reformed Churches within our view, across the narrow Channel, we do not think it worth our while to debate with weak-minded or superstitiously blinded Churchmen the ridiculous dogma of 'apostolical succession,' as understood in the exclusive High-Church sense. Rome, and Rome alone, is consistent in holding this dogma; but even Roman divines, with all their trained subtilty, cannot redeem it from its intrinsic incredibility, or disguise the degrading as well as absurd materialism which constitutes its essence.

But we must be allowed to ask what the reviewer in the *Quarterly* can mean, if he be not, as we cannot imagine that he is, an upholder of this dogma, when he assumes that the clergy of the Established Church, and they alone, appear before their flock as commissioned and sent, and that all other ministers come before the people of England as *unauthorised intruders*.

'Whose voice,' asks our contemporary, 'is to rouse shame, and encourage hope, and promise aid, and reinforce self-respect, but that of the parochial clergyman, who comes not as an unauthorised intruder, but *because he is sent?* Few of us realise the potency of that one condition of the Christian ministry, preaching because they are sent, because it is their duty, their business, their commission; and not that officiousness, against which the English mind rebels with singular repugnance, a self-pretentious interference with the private concerns of others.'

We might have remained in doubt as to the intent of the latter of these sentences, the point of which lacks the illustration which truth and experience should have supplied, but for the appended foot-note, which, as a curiosity worthy of some investigation, a rare specimen of the *Quarterly Reviewer's* enlightenment and liberality in this present year 1862, a piece of modern mediævalism such as the middle of the nineteenth century could hardly have been expected to produce, we shall gratify our readers by subjoining, that it may be duly commemorated and preserved in our pages.

'It is often supposed that the self-instituted and self-authorised exertions of other religious bodies are more acceptable to the poor than the regular *mission* of the Church of England. We took pains some years since to substantiate and verify the following anecdote:—A clergyman, from whom we received the statement, was appointed by his bishop to act as a sort of missionary to the labourers employed in forming a railway. He interposed one day to remonstrate against some profane and blasphemous language, and was received with abuse and violence, till he told them that he was not interfering of himself, but was sent by

the bishop. "O, Sir, if you are sent by the bishop, that is another question. We are much obliged for his thinking about us. We took you for a Methodist parson." Another time he went on a Sunday into one of the huts, in which a group were gathered together, and offered to read prayers to them. All assented and knelt down but one, who rudely refused to kneel, and refused to remove his hat. As soon as the clergyman began the confession from the Prayer Book, he too knelt down, behaved with decency and attention, and, as he rose up from his knees, repeated the same observation: "O, Sir, if you are a real clergyman, that is another thing; we took you for a Methodist parson."'

The taste of this 'anecdote,' or these anecdotes,—for it seems to us that there are two,—is execrable; the cleric that penned them, (a clergyman undoubtedly he is,) may be a clever writer, and an able man in his own sphere, but his range of vision must be somewhat narrow, and his gentlemanliness, upon which no doubt he plumes himself, is evidently far from perfect. Still, however remarkable it may be that a writer for the *Quarterly* at the present day should have garnished his article with such stories as these, it is yet more extraordinary that the editor of the *Quarterly* should have suffered them to be printed in its pages. Let that, however, pass; and let us take a look at the stories themselves. They may be true, but they have not, we think, yielded their true interpretation to the relator of them. As he seems to be disposed to collect such 'anecdotes,'—first of all carefully 'verifying' them,—we wonder that in the 'several years' which have elapsed since he put these in his common-place-book, he has not been so fortunate as to meet with a few more which might have confirmed or supplemented them. Hitherto his gleanings would seem to have been somewhat scanty. At any rate, if not the stories themselves, at least their interpretation lacks confirmation. We can imagine the slyly civil sarcasm—the characteristic irony, which his comrades would appreciate more intelligently than the clergyman appears to have done—with which the 'navvy' in the first case expressed the obligation of himself and companions to the bishop for thinking of them, and the quiet 'chaff' which he put off upon the Churchman, when he told him that they had 'taken him for a Methodist parson.' And as to the second story, we confess it surprises us to hear that a navvy supposed that a 'Methodist parson' would offer to *read prayers* in a hut to his mates and himself; though we do not doubt that, as soon as the beautiful words of the Confession began to be repeated, with the reverence for such language which few navvies would withhold, he would kneel down, and behave with decency and attention.

The reviewer's stories remind us of a statement made by the

Rev. Edward Monro, incumbent of Harrow Weald, and well known as the writer of three earnest and impressive tracts, entitled, *The Church and the Million, Nos. I., II., and III.*, and also as a thoroughly resolute and devoted working clergyman. Though Mr. Monro is a decided Churchman, his calibre is considerably larger—as we presume to judge—than that of the reviewer's clergyman; and his published statement will, we fancy, weigh for much more. He thoroughly knows the class of men of whom he writes,—the same class of railway labourers to which the reviewer's stories relate.

'I had had some handbills printed,' says Mr. Monro, 'concerning the service I proposed to have for them on the following Sunday, in a shed on the line... The workshop occupants were rather more theological than those of the tap-room. They plied me with several questions as to my position. Some thought I was a Baptist, some a Wesleyan, some a Jesuit,—none took me for a clergyman of the Church of England. Their strong and main hostility, indirectly expressed, was against that latter body.

'The sheds and workshops had done as good service as the tap-room. The men were trusting me, and I was being looked upon more and more as a kind of amphibious "navvy," a cross between a Wesleyan tract-distributor and a Roman Catholic Priest. Their great horror I found on all hands to be of "a parson." I felt I might freely dispense with the title, and be anything they liked best. Anyhow, they were fish for my net, and I must catch them somehow. One man for a moment perplexed me by putting to me before a number of others very pointedly, "If, then, you are what you seem, you will not care what form a man uses, so as he truly serves JESUS CHRIST." I felt a moment's difficulty in the answer, but I floated past that rock. It was not the occasion for narrowness of view or of statement.'—*The Church and the Million, No. II.*, p. 7.

Here, now, was a man with heart and soul in his Master's work. Many such there are at present among the clergy of the Established Church; and all good men rejoice to know it. We fancy that his experience sufficiently disposes of the question raised by the reviewer as to the feeling of the labouring poor towards 'real clergymen,' in comparison with 'Methodist parsons.' We cannot refrain from adding, however, that neither the reviewer's clergyman, nor, we imagine, the reviewer himself, supposing him to be a clergyman, would have 'floated past that rock,' as Mr. Monro did. The one evidently was not prepared to dispense with his 'forms,' seeing that he went to 'read prayers' to the navvies in their 'hut;' and neither the one nor the other would be able to 'dispense with the title,' since it is the virtue of the bishop's mandate, or at least the character of a 'real clergyman,' which procures for them acceptance among navvies. No wonder that the strong, good-natured fellows

showed a sort of contemptuous indulgence to the *naïve* argument and appeal of such a weakling as the bishop's clergyman.

But now let us look for a moment at the assumptions contained in what we have quoted from the *Quarterly Review*. It seems the Church of England has a 'mission,' a 'regular mission;' but, forsooth, Methodism has, and has had, *no 'mission.'* Yet, but for Methodism, and the 'mission' of Methodism, what would now have been the condition of England and of the Church of England? The Bishop of Oxford, high Churchman as he is, would teach the reviewer, as he has before now taught the public, other doctrine than this. But, to say no more just now of 'Methodist parsons,' or the 'mission of Methodism,' let us be allowed to affirm that the city missionary has his 'mission' from Christ to the poor, no less than the parish clergyman; and that, as a rule, whether his mission be accounted 'regular' or not, he is much better received, and more immediately and heartily trusted by the poor than the 'real clergyman,' perhaps also than the 'Methodist parson' himself. At the same time, it is granted that when the parochial clergyman takes to working among the working classes and the poor, in the spirit of Mr. Monro,—or the Methodist home-missionary minister, in the spirit of several whom we have the happiness to know in London, Manchester, and elsewhere,—their full confidence is soon won, and the labour of the working ministers amply repaid.

Whether the reviewer means to claim for the Anglican clergy an exclusive authorization from Christ or from the State, to 'unlatch the door' of the poor and sinful home, 'and enter *with a right* to speak words of comfort, and calls to exertion,' is open to doubt. Probably he refers chiefly to the presumed authority of the State. His views of the ministry are in general so Erastian and utilitarian, that (as we have intimated) we can hardly suspect him of being a superstitious upholder of 'priestly' authority and the dogma of 'the apostolical succession.' Nor does he throughout his article seem in the least to recognise the 'call of Christ,' or the 'inward motion of the Holy Ghost,' as essential to the office of the Christian ministry. But the *authority* of the State, merely as such, to *commission a Christian minister*, is, in effect, a self-contradictory notion. Every man, moreover, 'has a right' to enter where he is made welcome; and assuredly the visits of the 'Methodist parson,' or leader, or sick-visitor, and of the pious town-missionary or tract-distributor, are being daily welcomed in thousands of homes, into which the 'real clergyman' never enters, not as the visits of 'unauthorised intruders,' but of the messengers of Christ. Is it come to

this, that no one 'has a right' to enter the homes of the miserable but the parochial clergy, that all else are 'unauthorised intruders,' chargeable with a 'self-pretentious interference with the private concerns of others?' Then what is to become of Christian charity? Are the parochial clergy to have the monopoly of the blessed work of 'clothing the naked,' and of visiting those that are 'sick and in prison,'—and a monopoly too of the reward annexed by our Saviour to such acts? (Matt. xxv.) Happy indeed has it been for the poor in England in past times, nay, happy is it still, that such a monopoly has not been suffered. One word more will we say on the offensive passages we have quoted. It is the very spirit which breathes through these passages which has alienated from many of the parish clergy, and to some extent from the clergy at large, the goodwill and confidence of the poor. Such a spirit cannot but beget a 'self-pretentious' temper in the clergy themselves, and lead to 'self-pretentious interferences.' Such interferences, on the part of any man or woman, whether squire or lady of the manor, whether clergyman or clergyman's wife, are felt by the poor, who are naturally extremely sensitive on this point, to be those of 'unauthorised intruders.' No 'regular mission' can prevent this consequence.

The work and vocation of the Christian ministry being such as we have seen, it follows that there is no one thing so vitally necessary for the well-being of a nation, as that its clergy should be men truly called and fully qualified to discharge the duties of their office. The tone of the nation's morality, the strain and tendency of its progress, the character of its civilisation, depend mainly upon the character of the national clergy, viewed collectively, and as embracing all denominations. It is theirs to wield the truth of God in the strength and wisdom of the Divine Spirit, theirs to be the instruments of converting energy to the souls of men; theirs to teach and enforce all the practical duties of family and social life; theirs to instruct, out of God's word, the various classes of the citizens in their relations and responsibilities towards each other, as men and as Christians; theirs to set before the money-making man a nobler and better object than that of the mere accumulation of wealth, and to teach him the right moral principles to be kept in view both in its accumulation and its distribution; theirs to infuse, directly by their doctrine, and indirectly by their example and influence, a Christian spirit into the legislation of the country, to bring our senators to understand, according to the beautiful words of Coleridge, that 'not without celestial observations can even terrestrial charts be accurately constructed,' and that 'the Bible'

should be, as to fundamental principles, 'the statesman's manual.' In a word, it is their peculiar calling to devote themselves, in the name of Christ, and with the help of His Spirit, to the grand work of diffusing through the whole intelligence and life of the nation the principles of Christian equity, brotherhood, and charity. No inquiry can be more interesting or important than that which respects the due supply and the right training of those upon whom, as a class, devolves such a charge and responsibility.

It is certain that at no former period was the standard of character and of general ability and attainment requisite for the efficient discharge of the duties of the Christian ministry, so high as at present. Whether the supply of late has, on the whole, been adequate to the demand, is another question. We believe that, more or less, in all denominations, the need is extensively felt of a more largely informed, completely trained, and broadly effective, ministry. A thoroughly disciplined energy, the union of unimpaired fervour with systematic culture, of believing simplicity and integrity with open-minded candour and fearless inquiry and research; such is the combination of qualities peculiarly called for at this time; such is the general type of ministerial character to which it is desirable that all Christian ministers should, according to their various capacities, and with due regard to their necessary differences of temperament, be conformed. It is given to but few men to exemplify such complex excellence as we have described; but all truly called ministers of Christ may approximate towards it, and the nearer they come to it will be the better qualified to serve their generation. But the cold and tame, or the merely passionate and impulsive, or the ignorantly dogmatic, or the narrowly traditional,—above all, the easy-going professional gentleman,—will find the real work of the ministry in this age unsuited to them, and certainly will altogether fail of the accomplishment of its true ends.

In the Church of England there is a great outcry just now as to the shortening supply of duly qualified candidates for 'the office of the priesthood.'* The younger son, or the aspirant after a quiet gentlemanly life, no longer regards the life of a beneficed clergyman as the easy and pleasant affair which the billiard-playing or fox-hunting country-gentlemen who (for the most part) held the comfortable livings of this country fifty years

* We use the term 'priesthood' here and elsewhere in accommodation to the language of the Prayer-Book, and the common usage of the Church of England. *Priest* so used (at least by us) should be taken as equivalent to *presbyter*, not as having any relation to sacrificial acts.

ago, knew how to make it. The civil service now takes off some of those studious youths of narrow means, who in our fathers' times might have been destined for the Church. Bold riders and crack shots find a more congenial sphere now-a-days in the army or even the navy—professions which have for a number of years past been growing in popularity—than could ever be opened to them by the assumption (save the mark!) of holy orders. And, in this critical and questioning age, an increasing number shrink from declaring their 'unfeigned assent and consent to all and every' of the forms and formularies contained in the Prayer-Book. It is to be feared that this last impediment does not merely keep away sceptics and latitudinarians, but that it bars from entrance into the Church not a few of the ablest and best of the men, who might otherwise have been devoted to her service. This is but one of the many baneful and blighting results of the Act of 1662,—an Act of tyrannous and bigoted intent, and of most calamitous operation, upon which rests the condemning brand of the noblest intellects and largest hearts within the Church of England itself, as well as of the universal Protestant Church beyond its pale. Cases which have come within our own knowledge warrant us in believing that many who now officiate without the Church of England would at this time have been ministers within her community but for that ill-omened Act.*

As respects the Presbyterian and the Nonconformist Churches of Great Britain, our observation and inquiries incline us to the conclusion that the supply of ministerial candidates is at least equal in its numerical proportion, and is superior in its absolute quality, to what it has ever been. But it may be doubted whether, in its relative quality, it is equal to the requirements of the present age. We mean to say, that a higher relative quality of general intellect and attainment is requisite now to ministerial competency in the full sense than at any former

---

* The Bishop of Oxford, in the debate, five or six weeks ago, on Lord Ebury's Bill, for relaxing the terms of subscription, stated that he had not found among the candidates for ordination any difficulty or objection arising out of the terms of subscription. Very probably not. It was not to be expected that candidates would appear before him in order to object to that which was inevitable, and which, in deciding to enter the ministry of the Church, they had already determined to undergo. But will his lordship undertake to say that many who otherwise would have come to him, and who, as orthodox and gifted men, would have been acquisitions to the Church, have not been prevented from applying to him by the 'assent and consent' required to 'all and every' the contents of the Prayer-Book, notwithstanding the incongruities which it includes, the repugnance, in particular, of many phrases, and some forms of prayer, in its services, to the essential evangelical Protestantism of its Articles, and its dread words of sweeping anathema? Does the bishop understand why Isaac Taylor never took orders, and Thomas Binney stands out as a Congregational Dissenter?

period. There has been of late years, among the community at large, a sudden overflow of notions and ideas which has filled the minds of men with questionings on all points, and especially on theology. The present is, to an unprecedented extent, an age of theological thought. The thought may not be deep, but it is busy. Real knowledge may not have greatly increased, but, through the agency of the cheap press, (itself the result conjointly of mechanical invention, of legislative reform, and of diffused elementary education,) the public mind has been put in possession of the speculations, the doubts, the conclusions, of every man whose position, or whose abilities, or whose audacity or singularity, has enabled him to attract general attention. Now those who, for themselves, know little or nothing, who have neither time nor capacity for mastering any subject on their own account, may yet be very receptive, at least in passing, of the opinions and conclusions of others; if not convinced of their truth, they may be perplexed and unsettled by them; and though their own attainments may be exceedingly slender, it may yet be necessary for their 'pastors and teachers' to be men of by no means slender attainments, in order to deliver them from their perplexities, and preserve them from error. The less profound and real a man's knowledge of the subjects about which he reads, the more subjects he will be able to read about; the superficial reader may easily, and will often, be a wide reader: but the instructor whose business it is to hold himself ready, as far as possible, to defend the truth against error, whilst he should be as widely informed respecting opinions of any importance as any of his flock, must also have mastered the real knowledge necessary to an examination of those opinions, in their grounds and tendencies. The one may do little besides take note of results and conclusions; the other must investigate processes, must scrutinise premisses, analyse arguments, and master the essential points of each subject. It is obvious, therefore, that in proportion to the superficial, and, consequently, multifarious, character of the knowledge possessed by the community at large, is likely to be the demand made upon the mind and resources of the Christian ministry. The real advancement in intelligence, in knowledge, in true culture, on the part of the people generally, may not have been great; in some important respects there may be really, as regards very many, less of sound knowledge, exact thought, and genuine intellectual cultivation than there was in the days of our fathers; nevertheless, in this age of cheap literature and diffused ideas, the Christian minister must be far in advance of the generation of his fathers, as respects both breadth and depth of thought and knowledge, or else he

will find himself unequal to the work which is required at his hands. The relative attainments of the Christian ministry at the present day need to be greatly higher than at any former period. Hence, although the supply of candidates for the ministry be not relatively inferior, in respect of general intelligence and culture, to the generation of candidates twenty or thirty years past, this will not meet the case. They must be relatively much superior. Ministerial training and culture, at this day, must be carried out much more thoroughly, and on a much broader basis, even in proportion to the general intelligence of the age, than ever before; and the culture of the Christian ministry should, as a whole, be more catholic and thorough than that of any other profession.

It follows from these considerations that it never was so desirable as at present, that the candidates for the ministry should be men of large and accurate general attainments. Three things must combine in order to a minister's being fully equal to the requirements of his office,—'the gifts and calling of God,' general culture, and biblical and theological knowledge. Without the first there is no intrinsic and personal fitness or qualification; without the second his ministry must lose all its special adaptation to the passing time, and be altogether unsuitable to any but the more ignorant of the congregation; without the third a man may be an 'exhorter,' but cannot be a 'pastor and teacher,' or do his appointed part in 'feeding the flock.' The first is, doubtless, the essential and Divine qualification. A man possessed of it ought to become a pastor after God's own heart, and there is blame or deficiency somewhere if he does not; no man can possess the requisite natural gifts and Divine grace for exercising the Christian ministry, without, at the same time, possessing superior energy and aptitude for the attainment of all the needful knowledge and intellectual discipline. Preaching and pastoral gifts imply at least an average, generally a superior, share of general readiness and ability; and there is nothing which stirs up to such an intensity of healthy action the whole inner life of a man as the force and fire of Divine faith and love. It will sometimes be the case that among the lower and more ignorant classes of our working population a gifted man shines out, evidently made to be a preacher. To furnish such a man with the needful general culture, and professional knowledge and training, will, no doubt, require a prolonged course of instruction. But, in proportion to the original disadvantages, in the midst of which his gifts made themselves known, must have been the special force and brightness of his natural talents, and the peculiar energy of the Divine baptism which called them out

into exercise and recognition. Such a man will make rapid progress when brought under systematic culture, and will abundantly repay the labour bestowed on him.

Doubtless, however, there is always a disadvantage in so late an introduction to general and special learning as is implied in cases of this class. Other things being equal, a candidate's fitness for the Christian ministry is greatly enhanced by the fact of his having enjoyed the discipline of a liberal education. The apostles, and the apostolic age, must never be pleaded in the way of precedent or example, as respects uninspired men in an age like the present. Yet, even in the case of the apostles, it must ever be borne in mind Whose instructions the twelve had enjoyed during three years' close attendance on Him; and that one of the special qualifications of St. Paul for his great mission was, undoubtedly, the systematic education which he had received, and the superior knowledge of society and the world which he possessed. Seventeen years ago, at a 'Conference of Delegates from the Committees of various Theological Colleges connected with the Independent Churches of England and Wales,' the late Dr. R. W. Hamilton, in a paper which he read bearing upon this subject, made the following remarks, which are still more appropriate at the present time than they were in 1845: 'The times which are going over us, and their immediate future, must require a form of mental power and impression which no mere rude force can supersede. Strength is wanted, but it needs to be refined. The thoroughly-educated alone can hope, with rare exceptions, to accomplish this. With the greatest weight no coarseness need be mixed.' 'Young men, having enjoyed early culture, would be exempted from that which is characteristic of a deferred education. This tardy beginning almost invariably confesses itself. It is the ὀψιμαθία of which the ancient critics spoke. Like the dark vein of the finest sculpture, it constantly re-appears, and gives a sinister expression to the whole. It is all but impossible to conceal the early neglect. Scholars from the horn-book, from the youth up, *ab ovo*, though they may be less meritorious than those who have broken away from trade and ignorance, still are better scholars.'

This consideration raises the question as to the classes from which it is desirable that the supply of candidates for the ministry should chiefly be drawn. Chiefly, we should answer, in due submission to the sovereignty of the Divine will and vocation, from the upper portion of the middle stratum of the community among whom they are to minister, but also, in properly graduated proportions, from all the other classes, both higher and lower. The education of the class we have specified will afford a

fair basis on which may afterwards be grounded a full and thorough training in general attainments and in the knowledge and discipline specially appropriate to the ministry. A body of ministers chiefly drawn from that class will be likely to command the sympathy, and will be allied with the families, of the most influential section of the congregation, or community, to which they belong. A comfortable maintenance will not be grudged to them, either because, being born to wealth and independence, they are supposed to be unbecomingly burdening the Churches, or, on the other hand, because, being born to penury, their lot is envied, and their claims are resented as excessive. The few really wealthy ministers in such a community, who have been drawn from the highest classes, will be regarded as ornaments and moral supports to their own order and the Church at large, their judicious liberality will be fully appreciated, and their cases will be felt to be altogether exceptional; while those who, from amongst the poor, have been raised to the position of pastors, will have been enabled to rise by the force of talents and of devotion, which, in the eyes of the people,—ever generous towards genuine cases of this class,—make their claim to liberal support fully equal to that of the ministers drawn from the classes above them.

The general principle which we have just laid down will, in our judgment, apply to ministers of every denomination. As respects the Church of England, indeed, the argument drawn from the question of maintenance does not apply. But, on other grounds, the same general conclusion will hold good. The parish clergyman must be a man of superior education, and of gentlemanly manners, or he is altogether unfit for his vocation. That many of the very highest class should become clergymen is not to be expected,—if only because the class itself is so small,—nor, as we conceive, to be desired; but from the ranks of 'born gentlemen' it is undoubtedly desirable that many should enter the ministry of the Church of England; nor less so, especially for the service of our large towns, that many of the sons of merchants, some from the class of tradesmen, and a few men, of transcendent energy and rare devotion, from the cottages of the poor, should fill up the ranks of the same ministry. So, again, as respects the Presbyterian, Congregationalist, Wesleyan, and various Methodist bodies, the same general canon will hold good. In the case of such a community as the 'Primitive Methodists,' so called, the candidates for the ministry drawn even from *their* 'upper middle class' will, we imagine, be very deficient in the education properly requisite for the Christian ministry. Nevertheless, in comparison with the

general attainments of their congregations, their education would, we should think, be relatively sufficient, at least, with the help of the theological institutions which, if we are not mistaken, are now about to be established among this zealous and useful *Wesleyoid* community.

Further, it seems to us that it might reasonably have been hoped that the majority of candidates for the ministry would have been derived, in the various Churches, from the families of the class we have indicated. Such families are, generally speaking, the most intimately acquainted with the condition and interests of the Church, the most actively engaged in its affairs, see the most of its ministers, and give them their daughters in marriage; and the sons of such families possess, in a superior degree, the preliminary education and culture so desirable for ministerial candidates. And, as a matter of fact, the clergy of the Church of England are, to a large extent, drawn from this class. Social considerations and the prospect of professional distinction are still strong enough, notwithstanding the drawbacks noted a while since, to attract a large number from the upper, and especially the 'upper middle,' classes of general society, into the ministry of the Church of England. The same also holds good, so far as we can learn, (though hardly to the same extent,) of the various Scottish Churches, all the ministers of which have received a university education, and have passed through a very thorough course of biblical and theological instruction. But among the Congregationalists and Wesleyan Methodists we believe that a preponderant proportion of the ministry is derived from the lower and less educated classes.

The causes of this evil—an evil we cannot doubt it to be—form an interesting and important subject of inquiry. We will touch upon some of them. It is not, we apprehend, to any serious extent, owing to the comparative scantiness of the ministerial stipend, that so few young men of the superior classes appear as ministerial candidates. The average stipend is scanty,—injuriously so,—much inferior to the income of a tradesman of the better class; but the spiritual young men of the class of which we speak would not be deterred merely by this consideration from seeking the ministry. Indeed, as a general rule, they would have personal resources which, added to the proper ministerial income, would enable them to command all the modest comforts and the intellectual aids needful for their position. Still, it must be noted that, on this account, there is, for young men of superior education and good prospects, no *inducement* to seek the ministerial office; whereas, on this same account, young men of the lower classes, in their ignorance

of the actual charges and demands which come upon Christian ministers and their families, are likely often to have a mistaken view of probable advantages which will arise to themselves. Again, as regards social status, the position of a minister seems to offer, on the whole, little or nothing to the desire of the educated and well-to-do young man. In some respects, indeed, the position of the minister might seem enviable; but, among Nonconformists, it does not, as in the Church of England, necessarily secure, by a sort of professional right and passport, a superior social standing; while there is associated with it a feeling of dependence upon voluntary public support,—of pecuniary dependence,—which is unpleasing to the natural heart of the manful young gentleman. There can scarcely be said, on the whole, to be any obvious attraction to the ministerial office for the young man of superior social position, but that of spiritual service and consecration. Whereas the attractions to other callings are numerous and powerful;—wealth, ambition, the pleasures (it may be the lawful pleasures) of society, the excitement of a stirring life, the desire or authority of a father, who seems to need his son's counsel and help in business,—all such motives as these are arrayed on the other side. Hence it is no wonder that the number of young men from the superior classes who offer themselves for the ministry is much smaller, even in proportion, than of those from the lower classes. These latter have many natural inducements to seek the promotion of the ministry, and none, we may say, to decline it; while the former have many natural inducements to shrink from it, and but few and insignificant, comparatively speaking, to seek it.

The fact, however, is one which, account for it as we may, is greatly to be deplored. A blessed day will it be for the Church and the world when, in due proportion, in the proportion which, from their education and opportunities, they are competent to furnish, the superior classes of the various denominations shall supply their quota to the Christian ministry. Not until then will the Christian army move well all together, and all classes be rightly pervaded with the Christian life and spirit. Not until then will the ministry itself attain its due position and influence.

It is certain, too, that in thus shrinking from the pastoral work and responsibility, the young men of our better families, whatever may be their own impressions to the contrary, do really lose greatly, in this world as well as for the next; and that those fathers—the class, perhaps, chiefly to blame in this matter—who never contemplate such a calling as possible for their sons, but who, if it is ever for a moment presented, discourage it with a frown, are really sinning against God, the Church, and

their own children. A truly called and gifted minister, especially if he has been brought up in the superior circles of his own Church, will exercise a much higher and more pervasive influence, will do unspeakably more good, will enjoy far rarer and more exquisite pleasures,—being at the same time liable to peculiar, but pure and blessed, and truly Christian, sorrows,—will lead altogether a higher style of life, will have more of heaven on earth, will live nearer to God, and have richer fellowship with Christ, and doubtless be far more highly blest in eternity, than could possibly have been the case, if he had yielded to carnal motives, and chosen a secular business or profession,—no matter what might in that case have been his success or attainments. Wealth can purchase many luxuries, but none comparable to the rare experiences of the gifted and faithful minister of Christ. Professional eminence can secure rank, influence, and useful activity; but it cannot place the lawyer, or even the physician, in a position equal in true, though humble, dignity, or in usefulness and beneficent influence, to that of the equally eminent minister of Christ.

We know but of one way in which the Churches can secure for their ministry a larger proportion of young men of the better classes. The character of the ministry must in every way be improved to the uttermost; all care and pains must be taken to insure that it shall be divinely called, godly and devoted, learned and diligent, wise and practical, eloquent and effective: 'by pureness, by knowledge, by long-suffering, by kindness, by the Holy Ghost, by love unfeigned, by the word of truth, by the power of God, by the armour of righteousness on the right hand and on the left.' The higher is the character of any body of Christian ministers in all these respects; the more truly and impressively Christian they are; the more powerful will be the attraction which they exert upon all ingenuous Christian minds, but especially upon Christian young men of the better classes. And it must be borne in mind that, besides the other considerations which we have noted, the presumed disinterestedness of their devotion to the ministry gives to young men of these classes a value and an authority in the Church which otherwise they could not possess.

Let it be understood, however,—we have already implied this, but we feel it to be necessary to set it down explicitly,—that we have no desire whatever that the ranks of the ministry should be filled up exclusively from the superior classes. On the contrary we would have some of all classes; if possible, down to the very lowest. One of the great benefits which we anticipate from the spread of popular education is that the gifts and

capabilities of the lowliest will be brought to light, and that, from the rustic labourer's cottage, a few, it cannot be many, will rise to eminence in every rank and calling; and assuredly the Christian ministry should receive its full share of accessions from the poorest of the people. We cannot and would not forget that Carey, the illustrious Baptist missionary, was a poor shoemaker, and that John Hunt, the gifted and noble Wealeyan missionary in Fiji, was an illiterate farm labourer. It is well for the ministry itself that it should represent all classes. It is conducive to its vigour, its breadth of sympathy, and its legitimate influence, that its ranks should be re-inforced from every grade of society, and that in its councils and assemblies the sons of the rich and the poor, of the well-born and the lowly, should meet together in the holy service of that 'Lord who is the Maker of them all.' The effects upon general society of such a mingling and harmony cannot but be most beneficial; rightly understood, too, it affords a prophecy of good things to come, for the world at large on earth, and for the Church in heaven.

We have said that we do not suppose the mere narrowness and insufficiency of the average ministerial stipend to form any appreciable element among the influences which have contributed to restrict the supply of the ministry so greatly to the lower classes. Having said this, however, we feel it to be needful to add that, in our judgment, the general standard of ministerial income is injuriously low. It ought, as a general rule, to be rather above the average income of the better class tradesmen in the same church; it is generally much below this standard. No man is at liberty to enter the ministry from mercenary motives; but every minister has a right to expect that he be enabled to live in such a way as to have domestic comfort, and the means of providing for the intellectual as well as bodily wants of himself and his family. It is not every man who is called, like the American Methodist Bishop Asbury, to forego all thoughts of family life, that he may prosecute the ministry. A minister ought, ordinarily, for the glory of God, and for his own well-being in all respects, to be a married man. But this being so, he must look at the possibilities of maintaining his wife and family. There is many a minister's wife,—the poor curate's, the country pastor's, the Methodist preacher's, in hard and poor country circuits,—who has literally worn out her strength and health, and sacrificed her life, in endeavouring, without the needful domestic help, to perform the work of her household, and to 'provide things honest in the sight of all men.' The tenderly-nurtured lady, the delicate young wife, well fitted by intelligence, manners, and piety to fill the place of a pastor's wife,

finds herself altogether lacking the robust strength which her actual position requires, and unable to cope with the daily demands upon her physical system involved in pecuniary anxiety, household toil, and family care; and after a few years of sad but brave and patient struggling against circumstances, she sinks to a premature grave. This is no fancy picture, but a painful truth of experience too often realised. Do not let it be supposed that this is only a modern complaint. In John Wesley's days, a very large proportion of his preachers were obliged to abandon the ministerial work altogether, in order that by settling in business they might obtain a maintenance for their families. Among the Methodists in America it has been from the first and is still a common practice for a minister, when he finds his family beginning to increase around him, to 'locate,' as it is called, *i. e.*, to settle on a farm, or in a business, that he may provide for those dependent upon him. It has been customary to do this in the very prime of life, just at the time when the experience and ripened powers of the minister would have made his labours of the highest value to the Church. After some years of location, it has often been the case that, having realised a competency, and settled some of his children, he has returned into the ranks of the itinerant ministry. But more often he has remained in his retirement, preaching, no doubt, and occasionally administering the sacraments, anomalous as this may seem, but really a layman and a tradesman or a farmer to the end of his days. And in the case of the poor parochial clergy of this country we know that many of them have been driven to eke out their living by school-keeping; while the poor dissenting clergy not only keep schools, but do a little farming, and invent other contrivances which need not be specified, in order to increase their scanty means. The straitened Methodist minister is in this respect alone, that he is prohibited and precluded from entering in any way, direct or indirect, into business, and that, owing to his itinerancy, he cannot, by means of a well-stocked garden, cultivated with his own hands, and the quiet and practical help and sympathy which gathers and grows around a worthy pastor, long resident in the same place, secure those compensations which might otherwise be open to him. At the same time, it should be stated that the *minimum* income of Wesleyan ministers—we speak not now of the poorly paid 'Primitive' preachers, male or female—is higher than that of other denominations.

But the maintenance in decent comfort, and so as to exempt him from that constant heart-wearing anxiety, unrelieved by hope or opportunity of bettering himself, which would

disqualify him for the performance of his ministerial duties, though it be the first necessity of a minister's outward life, does not limit and determine the extent of the provision which should be made for him. If a minister is to teach and preach, he must read; and books are as absolute a necessity for his mind and heart, as food and raiment for the bodily wants of himself and his children. This is a thought which, we fancy, never enters into the mind of many good people. And yet it is worth their pondering. The chief reason, as we are persuaded, why the preaching of many ministers is poor, dry, meagre, profitless, uninteresting and unrefreshing, good neither for mind nor heart, is, that the straitened preachers, finding it barely possible to live on their incomes, never buy a book of any value from year's end to year's end. Many such poor parsons there be. They are not wanting in sense nor in the gift of speech; but, consumed by care, and unrefreshed by communion with the thoughts of any of the good or great, the wonder is that they can preach at all—not that their preaching is sapless and spiritless.

Nor do we hold it to be enough that ministers should be able to live, with due and steady economy, in comfort and good heart, and to spare a few pounds a year for books; they ought to have, over and above this, the means of distributing to the poor, and of showing hospitality, in accordance with the apostolic injunction. What a luxury is it to deny ourselves, now and then, even of fair comforts, and often of pleasant and lawful helps or joys, in order to bestow upon others! In this there is Christian satisfaction, and the self-denial is but the fair price of the rare pleasure which it brings. But to be obliged to exercise cruel self-denial, and to be swallowed up with perpetual anxiety, in order hardly and barely to live, that is painful work indeed, to which no true minister of Christ should be condemned. Charity and hospitality are the duties of the ministry; to perform them should therefore be placed within his reach. Let us add a word as to that Christian duty of hospitality. If it were within the power of the clergy, as it ought always to be, to show this 'without grudging,' how many happy consequences might, and, in fair proportion, would, flow from this! What a pleasure, what a benefit, for the minister to be able, from time to time, to welcome to his house the very poor of his flock! On the other hand, how much good fellowship might be promoted among the better classes, how much absurd exclusiveness might be broken down, how much mischievous shyness and jealousy might be cured, what a pattern of rational, Christian, and truly refined entertainment and inter-

course might be set before the congregation, if occasionally the pastor could assemble under his own roof those who, by real intelligence and by community of principle and sympathy, are fitted to harmonise with and to improve each other, but whom accident, the want of opportunity, or the prejudices and bondage of mere caste, keep apart! The pastor ought to be the social centre of his own congregation, as well as their spiritual teacher or superintendent. It is not the right thing for him to feel, and others to feel, that it is his ever to claim and receive hospitality, but never to bestow it. His heart prompts him to 'use hospitality without grudging,' but his circumstances, as a rule, preclude it.

So, moreover, as regards public benevolence, patriotic funds, national memorials, the pastor ought to be in a position, not, indeed, to take the lead as regards the amount of his contributions; but to bear a fair and decent share, by way of evincing in his own personal practice the sympathy of the Christian Church and the Christian spirit with all that is benevolent, patriotic, and truly noble.

Let what we have now advanced be well-considered, and we cannot doubt that its truth and importance will be felt. We do not mean that the position of the minister ought to be splendid, his appointments sumptuous, his furniture rich, or the dress of himself and family either showy or costly; but he ought to have the means, with strict economy, to maintain himself and his family in credit and comfort, and to purchase the requisite books for his library; his house and surroundings ought to be such that the higher class may visit him without shame or discomfort, and the poor with confidence and friendship; and he should have something to spare for other charities. The better Dissenting Churches in England, and the superior Presbyterian charges in Scotland, have reached this standard. But the average ministerial stipend in both countries, especially in England, is much below this mark.

We have passed in review the question of the work and calling of the Christian ministry, of the classes from which the ranks of the ministry should chiefly be drawn, and of the style of maintenance which it should be the aim of the Churches to secure for it. The only other point on which we shall offer any observations, is that of the right means whereby to secure an adequate supply of properly qualified ministers. We have already stated the three particulars which go to constitute a properly qualified Christian minister, viz., the gifts and vocation of God, general culture, and biblical and theological learning; or, let us be allowed to say, as more fully and exactly expressing

our meaning, professional training and equipment. The first of these three qualifications comes from God; but it is the duty of the Church to provide, in its own organization, means for eliciting and ascertaining the gifts and testing the vocation: the second may be possessed, by candidates in favourable circumstances, in such a degree as to render any special interference or agency on the part of the Church unnecessary; but, if this is not the case, it is the duty of the Church to provide it: the third may, perhaps, in a few cases, be obtained in an adequate degree through the private diligence of the candidates themselves, making good use of superior opportunities; but in all cases the Church must strictly test this point; in all cases, moreover, it is a thing in itself highly desirable that the candidate should, if possible, have the advantage of systematic instruction, imparted by responsible public teachers appointed by the Church; and, in the great majority of cases, especially in the present day, such systematic instruction ought to be regarded as an absolute necessity.

The great defect of the Churches, speaking generally, is in regard to the first of these three particulars. With the exception of the Methodist Churches, no Church either in England or Scotland possesses, as a part of its essential organisation, the means of eliciting the preaching gifts, and fairly testing, *in limine*, (where it obviously ought to be tested,) the ministerial vocation, of the youth who aspires to be a candidate. In the Church of England a young man decides, or his friends decide for him, whether he will 'enter the Church' or not; but he has had no opportunity of exercising any gifts in public, whether of prayer or exhortation, neither has the Church any voice whatever in the matter. There is no testimony of the people, no commendation or designation exercised by the congregation of the faithful, directly or indirectly. It is much the same in the Presbyterian Churches: the subsequent examinations are strict and thorough; proof must be given of a serious spirit, soundness in doctrine, and godly life; but the determination to enter the ministry is the private resolution of the candidate himself; the Church at least has no voice in the matter. The youth goes as a student to the University; while there, he decides whether he will or will not become a minister, too often, it is to be feared, as he would decide whether or not he will become an advocate or a physician. He has given no evidence that he is 'apt to teach;' he has received from the people of the Lord no designation or commendation to the office of the Christian ministry. Nor is it much otherwise among the Congregationalist and Baptist Churches. It is true, that in the

Sunday School some fair indications of 'aptness to teach' others than mere children, may be afforded. Occasionally, too, in country congregations which have no regular minister, and are dependent upon supplies of 'students,' or the exhortations of a deacon, or, in uncommon instances, of a 'gifted brother,' a young man may possibly be called upon to address the people; but these are rare exceptions. As a rule, Congregationalist and Baptist Churches know as little of the free exercise of gifts by members of the congregation, or of lay co-operation in the work of preaching, as even the congregations of the Church of England. Neither do they make it, as we think they might well do, an indispensable condition, that candidates for the ministry shall have received the testimony of the Church with which they are associated, at least so far as respects their spirituality of mind and general weight of character. The part of the Churches in ascertaining and testing, in eliciting and cherishing, the qualifications of young men for the work of the Christian ministry, is of little significance. They may, indeed, have some voice in the matter; their testimony and recommendation, as respects certain points of experience and character, in many instances accompanies and sustains the candidate in his entrance upon his collegiate studies: so far the Churches may, and often do, exercise an appreciable, though very partial, influence in the designation of the candidate for his work, and to this extent there is an advance beyond the Church of England and the Presbyterian bodies. Moreover, it is required that each candidate shall have been a Church-member, and shall have afforded 'credible evidences of conversion and sanctification,' the testimony to this effect of at least the pastor being necessary. We entirely consent to the words of the Rev. Walter Scott, in his paper read at that 'Conference of Delegates' to which we have already made reference; that 'it is to the honour of Independents that they have ever been deeply sensible of the vast importance of genuine, and even superior, piety in the ministers of the Gospel, and have made more vigorous and systematic efforts to secure this essential qualification than any other section of the professed followers of Jesus Christ, with the exception of the Methodists.' Nevertheless, we presume that none would attempt to dispute the general truth of the statements we are about to quote from one who cannot but be well informed on the subject, and whose honesty is unimpeachable.

'The modern process which terminates in giving to a vacant Church a minister of spiritual things, and which qualifies the subject of it for taking the oversight of a Christian community, is usually after this sort.

A youth, generally from fifteen to two or three and twenty years of age, is happily, and through the mercy of God, brought into a state of sympathy with the Gospel, receives the life-giving message, and rejoices in its salvation.... He burns to consecrate his life to God, and experience has not yet instructed him that he may do so in any honourable calling. His thoughts and desires turn towards the ministry.....Events favour his wishes, and ripen them into decision. He seeks and obtains an introduction into a theological seminary, where, in company with others like-minded, he travels through a routine of study, classical, mathematical, philosophical, exegetical, and theological, exercising himself, occasionally, in delivering discourses from neighbouring pulpits, and shielded, more or less carefully, by the regulations of the place, from the numerous temptations with which society abounds. At the close of his course, extending over three, four, or five years, an invitation commonly awaits him from a destitute Church, which, having approved of his "aptness to teach," calls him to the "oversight," and receives him as an "elder.".....

'It is to be observed that, by our present method, the most important steps which can influence the character, or affect the efficiency of the future teachers of truth, are taken before the religious principle can have proved its genuineness, and before intellectual aptitude and qualifications can be determined....Our academies, founded upon an eleemosynary basis, and offering an easy ingress to an honourable and useful occupation, tend to insure, if anything can do, a large admixture of inferior influences in motives which should be kept unusually pure. .....An education, in a great measure technical, having consumed exactly that portion of life within which a choice of calling is feasible, leaves a young man, at the end of his preparatory course, even when he has discovered his original mistake, nearly precluded from altering his destination.'—*Miall's British Churches, Second Edition*, pp. 169, 170.

Such is the evidence of Mr. Miall as to the system of ministerial designation and preparation which obtains in his own body. The facts being so, the following reflections of Mr. Miall on this special point,—on many points, we need hardly say, we differ very widely from him, though we always admire his ability and his honesty,—seem to us to be most just:—

'I much doubt whether, in the method of ministerial training we now pursue, we do not invert the order which the genius of Christianity suggests as most desirable. I think it would be possible for the Churches to wait the unfolding and ripening of spiritual character in their members, before giving practical aid to those contemplating the episcopal office... Surely, if things were well ordered, and the spirit of the Gospel were sincerely cherished, those desires which young men feel in the early days of their religious life for employment in the ministry, might be fostered as desires possible to be realised at some future period; and, pursuing their several worldly callings, and devoting such leisure as they could get to intellectual improvement, exercising, too, as opportunity

offered, their "gifts," they might leave to the Churches, in whose bosom they have their home, to determine for them whether, and when, they should enter office, as teachers in Christ's kingdom.'—*Miall's British Churches, Second Edition*, pp. 171, 172.

What Mr. Miall here suggests as desirable is, in fact, the principle on which the Wesleyan Church has, from the beginning, proceeded. Their class-meetings, prayer-meetings, band-meetings; the prayer-leader's office and opportunities, naturally inviting and opening the way to occasional simple and fervent exhortations; the 'exhorter's' work, the organised multitude of 'local' or lay 'preachers,' each of whom is on the look out for promising young men, who may, by and by, be proposed at the 'local-preachers' quarterly meeting,' to be taken on the 'plan;' all these points are harmonised into a system, by means of which teaching and preaching gifts are elicited and tested, fostered and at the same time trained. Thus adequate opportunities are afforded for ascertaining a young man's aptitude and vocation for the ministry, before his decision is made to offer himself as a candidate for its work and vows. Nor is this all. Not only must he have been accepted and employed as a 'local preacher' before he can be received as a candidate for the regular ministry, but he must also have received the recommendation of the 'Quarterly Meeting' of the 'Circuit' in which he has been employed. Still further, he is required to pass a searching examination as to religious experience, doctrinal knowledge and orthodoxy, ministerial 'gifts,' and 'fruit of his labours,' before the ministerial synod of the 'District' or Province (as the word might be interpreted) in which the 'Circuit' is included; and a yet more formidable examination in London, which lasts several days, before a large Committee or Board, specially appointed by the Conference to conduct the collective examination of all the candidates for the year from all the Districts in Great Britain, prior to their cases being finally presented to the Conference for acceptance or rejection *as candidates*. It is not until after all this that the candidate enters as a student into the Theological Institutions of the Connexion, *i. e.*, if he does enter; for the weak point of the Methodist practice seems to be, that a large proportion of the candidates go at once into the itinerant work without any systematic training, and that this proportion, owing to the deficiency of accommodation in the Theological Institutions, is at present increasing in what we should almost be disposed to regard as an alarming ratio. It must be remembered, however, that these untrained young men do not go to be the sole pastors of any Churches; they are associated with senior ministers in the same circuit,

always with at least one, generally with two, occasionally with three; and also that they are still, and remain for four years, *candidates on probation*, of whose reading some oversight, of late years increasingly strict and systematic, is taken by the ministerial assemblies of the District within which they are appointed to labour.

As respects, then, the first of the three particulars included in the general duty which devolves upon the Church, of taking measures to secure an adequate supply of properly qualified ministers, viz., that it should, as a part of its essential organisation, provide the means for eliciting and ascertaining the gifts, and testing the vocation, of those who are to enter the Christian ministry, our conclusion is that, so far as we know, all the different Churches of the country, though in various degrees, are essentially defective, with the sole exception of the Methodists. Very many, there can be no doubt, are the cases in which energies of a superior class 'wither for want of scope and exercise; many more in which the germs of useful talent, always environed by a cold atmosphere of routine, and stimulated by no external process of culture, never unfold themselves, and pass away from their appointed scene of opportunity, without having so much as disclosed their presence.'

The second particular relates to the general culture which, if the candidates do not already possess it in due measure, it is the duty of the Church to provide. Now, as respects this point, the clergy of the Church of England may be presumed to be beyond criticism because of their university education, though, in good sooth, there are far more ignorant and narrowly prejudiced university men than could well be imagined. To suppose that a man must needs be learned, because he writes B.A. after his name, to suppose even that his degree implies of necessity that he must be well-read in Greek, is merely a popular fallacy. Still, university graduates, as a rule, must be men imbued with a due tincture of classical and general scholarship; and the recent improvements in the university system have done much to impart a broad and liberal character to the collegiate culture, and to insure that the graduates shall not only be well-bred gentlemen, and well-read scholars, in the narrower sense, but men who commence life with a sufficient introduction to the general scientific and economic knowledge of the age. In Scotland, too, the candidates for the ministry in the different Presbyterian Churches may be assumed to be all of them well-educated men. All of them must have passed through a full curriculum at the national universities, embracing *four* years' study of Classics, Logic, Moral and Natural Philosophy, before they can begin the study of theology; they must produce evi-

dence that they have gone through this course, before they can be received into any theological college or seminary. The United Presbyterian Church, indeed, so far relaxes this rule, as to admit students to commence their theological studies at the end of their third year at college; but this is with the distinct proviso, that they must complete their university course within one year from the commencement of their special theological studies. Graduates of the Scottish Universities, indeed, can very seldom compete with competent English University-men in classical or mathematical learning; but, on the whole, their education is broader in its basis, is better proportioned in its constituent parts, and more adapted to supply the foundation of general culture on which the professional training of a minister may rest, than that given in the English universities. As respects English Congregational and Baptist ministers, we must distinguish two classes,—those who go through no course of instruction, and those who, as students, pass through one of the various colleges of the denomination to which they belong. There are a large number of pastors of small Churches, who have received no training whatever. Some of these began by being Methodist local preachers, but have since been transformed, by a longer or shorter process, into settled Dissenting pastors. Others had grown to be deacons, chiefly in small country Churches or in very small town Churches,—especially in London, where there are many such,—which cannot afford an adequate stipend for a regularly educated and properly qualified pastor. These deacons, in due time, if men of some theological knowledge, of strict life, of talents for business, and (though last, hardly least) of some speaking power, succeed to the pastorship. In some cases, on this promotion, they give up their business; in others, they retain it. Such pastorships as these are not uncommon among the rural Independents of the southern and eastern counties; they are frequently found among High Calvinist Particular Baptists; both among Baptists and Independents, as we have intimated, they are common in London, which is a great training ground of such pastors, whence they are sometimes translated, with some *éclat*, to take the pastoral charge of a country Church, in which the words, *from London*, after the pastor's name, count for a trifle. There are thus two classes among the English Congregational Dissenters, the trained and the untrained, the gentlemanly and highly cultured and the underbred and ignorant, the men of the liberal school of modern Calvinism, and the narrow and dogmatic partisans of the harsh and acrid school. In what we are about to say, we shall speak only of the former and superior class.

For their accomplishment in all the requisite 'humanities'

which belong to the training desirable for a minister, the Congregationalists and Baptists have made noble provision in their different colleges in London, Lancashire, Yorkshire, Devonshire, Somersetshire, and elsewhere. Among their tutors or professors, also, they number, and have numbered, some men of eminence and learning, equal to any who may be found within the splendid Established Church of this country. The late Dr. Pye Smith, author of the *Scripture Testimony to the Messiah*, was theological tutor at Homerton College. Dr. Vaughan, the distinguished historian and essayist, was for many years the principal of the Lancashire Independent College. He has been succeeded by Mr. Rogers, the profound and accomplished author of the *Eclipse of Faith*, who had previously, for many years, been the classical and philosophical tutor at the Spring Hill Theological College. Dr. William Smith, the learned editor of the various classical dictionaries, and of the *Dictionary of the Bible*, who is also classical examiner at the London University, has throughout been connected, as tutor, with Dissenting colleges, and is now on the staff of the New College, near London. Dr. W. L. Alexander is the professor of theology in the Theological Hall of the Congregational Churches in Scotland. Other well-known names, such as Dr. Halley and Dr. Alliott, stand forth in the list of able and learned men who constitute the 'faculties,' as the Scotch theologians would say, of the Dissenting colleges. Of these colleges the Congregationalists have ten, the Baptists not more, we believe, than about half that number.

The course of general instruction embraced in the programme of these seminaries, includes the English language, classics, mathematics, logic, history, mental and moral philosophy, natural history and science; the student remains from three to five years,—in several of the colleges the term is five,—and continues to prosecute his studies in these branches during the whole term. The first year and a half is usually devoted exclusively to general culture, as preliminary to the theological course; and during this period the student is not allowed to preach.

This last point is, we think, a weakness in the arrangements of the Dissenting colleges. To us nothing seems more evident than that no student should enter a college, who has not given proof of his possessing the fundamental gifts of a 'preacher,' and that during the whole term of his residence these gifts should be kept in exercise, in however informal and unpretending a way. Many a young man who could talk heartily to a company of people in a plain way before he enters college, will lose entirely this fundamental qualification, will acquire a painful self-con-

sciousness, and a most embarrassing habit of self-criticism, during his first eighteen months' silent schooling and studentship; and, when again he attempts to speak, will not only have lost the faculty of plain, homely, colloquial address, but will have adopted a stiff, bookish style, exceedingly inappropriate to the work of a preacher. His mind will have effected a transmigration out of a free and easy garb of expression, which left him at liberty to use his natural faculties and to move without restraint, into a formal suit of methods and phrases, in which he moves with stiff precision, and with lamentable lack of power. The collegiate course of the Dissenters makes their ministers scholars and philosophers, and often also accomplished divines; to some men of superior gifts, especially if they had early advantages of education, it imparts a culture and finish which qualify them to take rank with the best and best-educated men of any Church; but, on the whole, it fails, in an adequate measure, to supply the pulpits of the denominations with powerful 'preachers.' Moreover, we cannot but believe that an enforced abstinence, during the first eighteen months of their college-life, from theological study, and from all practice in exhortation or preaching, must, in a number of cases, quench the lively sense of the ministerial call, which all candidates ought to feel burning within them, and exercise a very injurious influence upon their spiritual experience and life.

It would seem, too, that the protracted term and somewhat formidable character of the college course tend to keep down the number of students more than is desirable. The expense must deter not a few; there being only a very limited provision for assisting those who have no pecuniary resources of their own or through the help of friends: others who, with some training, might have become useful pastors of country Churches, shrink from a four or five years' course, and feel that their health and habits have unfitted them to pass through so strict and protracted an ordeal. We observe that, at the 'Conference of Delegates,' in 1845, the Rev. J. Frost read a paper on 'the expediency of a Seminary in which only an English Theological Education should be given, or, in addition, such acquaintance with the Original Languages of Holy Scriptures, as is attainable without previous study of the Greek and Latin Classics;' and that the 'Conference' passed a resolution favourable to the principle of such an education; but were of opinion that 'it would be more appropriately given in the homes of competent ministers receiving small numbers under their care, than in any institution formed expressly for the purpose.' We dare not impugn this decision; but, if it is not more extensively acted on in future than,

with our confessedly limited knowledge, we suppose, there will still be a serious lack in this respect.

We learn from a paper by the Rev. Professor Newth, read at the commencement of the last session of the New College, that whereas the annual demand of ministers, among the Congregationalists, to supply vacancies at home and abroad, cannot be set down at less than ninety, the yearly supply from the colleges is reckoned at fifty-one. So that the supply from the colleges is only a fraction more than fifty-six per cent., and the number of Churches supplied otherwise than with trained ministers is more than forty-three per cent.

The general conclusion at which we arrive is that, as respects the English Dissenting Churches, provision is made for affording the rising pastorate a most excellent general education, as scholars and gentlemen, in the theological colleges; but that this provision is not so *strictly* auxiliary as it should be to the paramount object of training the candidates to be preachers of the Gospel and spiritual pastors of Christ's flock.

The provision made by the Wesleyans for general culture is altogether subordinate to the great object of training in biblical and theological knowledge, and in the work of preaching. The term of residence at the Institutions was originally, and is nominally, three years; but the demands of the Connexion, during several recent years of rapid growth and extension, have reduced the term, in the majority of cases, from three to two,—a result which, though it may be unavoidable, cannot be regarded without regret. Wesleyan students have the advantage over those of other Churches, that they have all been strictly and repeatedly tested as to gifts and character, before they enter the Institution. This of necessity insures that, as a class, they are young men of superior talents and energy. Many of them, however, have possessed scarcely any educational advantages, and absolutely require all the instruction, both general and professional, which they can master during the three years' term. That the term is not prolonged to four or five years is, we think, not a matter of regret, especially when it is remembered, that, after leaving the Institution, four years must elapse for the two years' students, and three years for the three years' students, before they can be accepted and ordained as 'ministers in full connexion;' and that, in the mean time, they are under supervision as to their general, and especially their theological, reading. This last arrangement, in particular, and indeed the general position which they hold as young ministers, relieved from the direct responsibility of government, during the early part of their course, gives them a very special

advantage. One of the resolutions, adopted at the 'Conference of Congregational Delegates,' to which we have several times referred, was to the effect that 'eminent advantages would be realised by youthful brethren, were they to occupy some interval between the close of their academic course, and their entrance on full pastoral responsibilities, in further prosecution of study, and in preparatory ministerial labours.' The Wesleyan system secures this advantage for all its ministers.

In the foregoing remarks we have been led to anticipate, in some degree, so far as regards the chief English Nonconformist bodies, what properly belongs to the third particular included in the duty of the Church, with respect to making provision for a supply of properly qualified ministers. This third particular refers to the proper professional training and equipment, which belongs to ministers as such. Here, as in what relates to ascertaining spiritual qualifications and natural gifts, the Church of England, up to the present time, has been organically and absolutely defective. St. Bees, indeed, has imparted a Calvinistic theological training to its students; but this was but a small and solitary institution, whose influence did not extend far, and whose reputation has never stood high. The St. Bees clergy have been regarded as an inferior class; certainly in general knowledge they have been very inferior, not only to the body of the Anglican clergy, but to the great majority of Dissenting ministers; and although in theology they have been better trained and informed than many of their clerical brethren, who, in education and breeding, were so much their superiors, yet their theology has been of a cramped school. Now, however, in this, as in many other respects, the Church of England is manifesting admirable wisdom and energy, and institutions are rising in rapid succession, the object of which is to provide a suitable moral and theological training for university-graduates who are designed for the Christian ministry. Such institutions already exist at Wells,—this seems to take the lead in all respects,—Lichfield, Chichester, Exeter, Cuddesden; and others are likely to be established. No doubt ere long they will be distributed over the whole country. The seats of the ancient feudal civilisation, where the territorial influence of the Church of England is overwhelming, will lead the way; the northern counties, and the manufacturing districts, will follow presently. We could most heartily wish these institutions *God speed*, were it not, especially considering their locations, that we dread the priestly and exclusive spirit in which they are too likely to be constituted and conducted. We cannot take it as a good omen that an article devoted to their advocacy, and the exposition of their purpose and claims, should

be pervaded by such a spirit as that on which we have taken leave to remark in the former part of this article.

We cannot doubt that the best-accomplished divines in Great Britain, take them for all in all, are the Scottish clergy of all the great denominations. Their four years' course at the university is followed up by a four years' course of special theological instruction. Nothing can be more thorough or complete than the programme of one of these courses which lies before us. Many godly helps, too, are afforded to the students, and their spiritual condition and progress is a matter of primary care. Still the students do not preach—a vital defect; nor, as we have already remarked, have they passed through any preliminary testing as to their gifts, or received any commendation from a Church. No after-instruction can, in our judgment, compensate for the lack of such preliminary probation.

If the Wesleyans could secure for all their candidates, even the most highly educated, at least some systematic theological training; and for all who require it, the full term of three years at their Theological Institutions, their ministers would, on the whole, have superior advantages over those of any other denomination. The Presbyterians and Congregationalists would send forth a larger proportion of highly accomplished general scholars and biblical exegetes; the Church of England would still excel in the breeding, the polish, the gentlemanly culture, of its ministers; and, by means of its now rising theological institutions, would produce, in greater numbers than heretofore, eloquent and effective preachers; but for the combination of fair exegetical and theological knowledge, and competent general information and intelligence, with thorough business habits, with knowledge of men and things, and, above all, with effective and cultivated preaching faculty,—at once strong and flexible,—the Wesleyan ministry ought, if all were trained as we have described, to be, as a body, unequalled. No other community of ministers, taking their course from first to last, have equal advantages.

If, however, it be true,—as we are informed on excellent authority,—that for some years past the Wesleyan Conference has been sending forth into its home ministry more men without any tincture of regular education and training than it has sent out trained; and that, at this moment, there is accommodation in the two Theological Institutions (one at Richmond, Surrey, the other at Didsbury, Manchester) for little more than one half of the number of students required to keep up a supply of trained ministers, both in the home and the missionary departments; we think so grave a fact as this ought to compel the earnest

heed of all who have any part or interest in the management of either Connexional or Circuit affairs. Such a fact seems to us, as we have already said, to be scarcely less than alarming. If this continue, the Wesleyan ministry must fall behind the age, and lose caste and influence among the collective ministry of the English Churches: two orders of men will grow up within the Connexion, the trained and the untrained, separated from each other in culture, sympathy, and general tendencies; the inferior 'Circuits' and the inferior ministry will hang together; the superior Circuits and the superior ministry will form a sort of upper Methodism; these two parts and parties will diverge from each other more and more widely; there will be danger of sourness, distrust, jealousy, and schism. Besides which, it is a manifest injustice that, of the self-same class of men equally needing education, 'one should be taken and another left;' one sent straight away into a Circuit, perhaps because he is a year older, and another sent to the Institution for a two years' training. The evil, we believe, is beginning to be recognised in its serious magnitude; unless it be remedied, and that speedily, trouble must come of it. Whether the two Institutions, which will now accommodate about one hundred students, are to be enlarged, so as to accommodate double the number, or the smaller of them is to be enlarged, and a third added, is a question we shall not discuss. But the work presses; it must be done; somehow the requisite provision must be made. It may require a present sum of from £8,000 to £12,000, and possibly an additional annual revenue of from £3,000 to £4,500; but, whatever it may cost, the provision must be made. This is not the case of a luxury, but of a necessity. As to the money for the present outlay, there can be no difficulty in a community so trained to giving as the Wesleyan. The additional yearly income presents a very serious difficulty, and how to obtain it is a question the solution of which will require much wisdom; but still what is needed must be done. The Wesleyan Foreign Missions are generously sustained; *at home* £100,000 are raised for this object; but to educate the ministry is a nearer, more pressing, necessity. Missions and everything else must suffer if this be not done. Of late years the Home Fund, for extending the work, and establishing fixed Missions in the most destitute and demoralised districts of our thickly populated centres of industry, has been revived and enlarged, and now its income—for all purposes, it is true—is not less, we believe, than £14,000 a year; but the training of ministers is a work which comes before sending them forth on mission work, whether abroad or at home. The Wesleyan Connexion must fully rouse

itself to meet the present emergency, or its influence, now seemingly greater than ever, and still in the ascendant, must infallibly decline, and its whole style and character retrograde.

ART. VI.—*The English at Home.* By ALPHONSE ESQUIROS. Translated and Edited by LASCELLES WRAXALL. In Two Volumes. London: Chapman and Hall. 1861.

IT is most refreshing to meet with a foreign estimate of England which is neither slavishly fulsome, nor absurdly inaccurate. The English have the character of holding continental criticism in contemptuous disregard. There may be some truth in the imputation; there certainly is ample reason for the contempt. It is not that Englishmen are impatient of criticism. They rather challenge and enjoy it. They throw open the whole country to inspection. A foreigner may go anywhere and everywhere, without let or hindrance. Dockyards, factories, law-courts, mines, markets, are all patent to scrutiny. Free speech is one of the institutions of the land. A man may stand on the floor of the House, or on the more humble arena of the parish vestry, and denounce the policy of his best friend without offence. It is the glory of an Englishman to be able to give people 'a bit of his mind,' and he expects others to claim the privilege which he does not scruple to use. The Englishman is not like the American, morbidly sensitive to remark. You can never praise an American enough. Suggest an imperfection in his political or social system, and you wound him to the quick. He winces under advice. You are his sworn enemy if you hint that he expectorates somewhat too freely, or that he is not solemnly appointed by genius and destiny to 'whip creation.' The Englishman is not so thin-skinned. He is not without *amour propre*. He has a considerable conceit of his institutions. He quietly assumes that his nation infinitely transcends every other upon earth. But he is open to advice. Honest reproof does not irritate him. He is sensible of his faults; and a foreigner who should criticise those faults in a fair and manly spirit would command the respect of every honest man from John o' Groat's to the Land's End.

Such foreigners, however, are rare. Frenchmen, in particular, seem perfectly incapable of forming a common-sense estimate of England. They come over to us crammed with prejudice, and return to their native land bursting with spleen. A Frenchman rarely recovers the voyage across the Straits. He views England

under the influence of bile; his temper is not improved by a perpetual fog. Indifferent to facts, and satisfied with a most superficial study of our habits and character, he follows his predecessors in their estimate of the nation. To the French mind, the traditional Englishman is an ogre. He is a man who hates foreigners. His soul is swallowed up in the shop. He devotes his leisure to beer and beefsteaks. He eats raw meat. He garnishes every utterance with fearful expletives. He beats his wife. When tired of her, he leads her to market with a halter round her neck. He is the Bluebeard of the myth, translated into fact. The growing intercourse between England and France has done little towards modifying this traditional estimate of the English character. If our readers doubt this, let them look over the current numbers of the *Courrier du Dimanche*. The special correspondent of this paper, M. Assolant, a gentleman hitherto unknown to fame, and likely to obtain only a very unenviable notoriety, has been engaged by the proprietors to furnish a series of articles on England and the English, during the season of the International Exhibition. Disdaining the embarrassments of truth, and aiming solely at a certain epigrammatic brilliance, M. Assolant has succeeded in drawing a series of pictures which represent the Englishman of the nineteenth century as somewhere outside the pale of civilization.

A story is told of three philosophers, a German, an Englishman, and a Frenchman, who agreed severally to produce a treatise on the natural history of the camel. The German, laying in an immense stock of tobacco, retreated to his study, where, in a dense atmosphere of smoke, he proceeded to construct the ideal of a camel from the depths of his own consciousness. The Englishman, hastily packing his knapsack, journeyed forthwith to the East, to spend twelve months in the study of the animal in its native home. The Frenchman, gaily lighting his cigar, betook himself to the *Jardin des Plantes*, where half an hour's examination of the captive beast sufficed to furnish him with the materials of his treatise. It is just this intense superficiality, so characteristic of the French mind as a whole, which gives to a Frenchman's estimate of England the meagre and incorrect tone by which, in most instances, it is distinguished. The traveller reaches London in a November fog, is bullied and fleeced by a cabman, puts up at a fourth-rate hotel near Leicester Square, is driven to dyspepsia by the *cuisine*, visits that most melancholy pile, the British Museum, forms his views of our military system from an outside contemplation of the Horse Guards, and goes home, as he thinks, the master of his subject.

But, perhaps, the erroneous judgments of our foreign visitors are not to be attributed solely to the influence of prejudice, or the superficiality of their observation. Wide open as England is to the world, it is next to impossible for a foreigner to witness the real life of the people. If he be a distinguished diplomatist, or *savant*, we invite him to our *conversazioni*, or our 'receptions,'—institutions utterly un-English,—we dine him, *fête* him, lionize him, but we do not take him to our home. Our insular reserve bars all access to that inner circle in which alone our real life lies. The traveller who visits Paris, or Berlin, or Rome, sees the people. Theirs is an out-door life. He may gauge the national character by a most superficial observation. Few Englishmen spend a week in Paris without meeting with at least one Frenchman who confides to them the secret of his life, and who, at parting, lays his hand upon his heart, and swears an eternal friendship. The life of the Englishman, on the contrary, is domestic. In public he is but a functionary. If you would see him, in his true and distinctive character, you must visit him at his home. And this is precisely what a foreigner cannot do. He is perfectly welcome to pass up and down among the spheres of public life, but the Englishman's *home* is his castle; and it would be easier for the foreigner to enter the embattled keeps which guard our shores, than to penetrate the fastnesses of our inner and social life. The visitor from the continent, who wishes to study the English character, is, therefore, driven within the limits of Leicester Square. In this haunt of foreigners, this home of sharpers and adventurers, political exiles, and bankrupt spendthrifts, where continental vice may be seen without its polish, he studies the English people. Hence, whenever we take up the record of a Frenchman's travels in England, we expect unlimited fun.

The essays of M. Alphonse Esquiros are of a totally different order. This gentleman, being compelled to fly from France in consequence of the *coup d'état* of December, 1851, sought a temporary refuge in Belgium, from whence he migrated to Holland.

'In the latter country,' he says, 'I was struck by the benefits spread over a small state by a national religion that offered no resistance to the development of liberty. The intensely calm prosperity and energetic character of this handful of men, who formerly disputed with Great Britain the empire of the seas, attracted my attention to a very different branch of the Saxon race. I, therefore, resolved to study on a larger stage the political characteristics of Protestantism, the conditions of a representative Government, and the influence of certain institutions on the moral and national life of a people.'

With an outline thus broad and philosophical, M. Esquiros came over to England, and at once girded himself to his prescribed task with singular vigour and originality. He took a wider area of study than that of Leicester Square. He endeavoured to make himself one with the people. He passed from county to county, examining the geological strata and their organic remains, and instituting ingenious parallels between them and the races on the surface. He camped with gipsies in the New Forest, and by the murky light of their night fires listened to their strange and stirring legends. He fraternised with hop-pickers in Kent, and joined them in their harmless jollity. He gained a corner by the fire-side of the country inn, and mingled with rustic politicians and sages, who came to smoke their evening pipe. He won the confidence of metropolitan ballad-singers, and disarmed the habitual reserve of itinerant Punch showmen, who initiated him into the mysteries of their popular craft. He scraped acquaintance with strolling-players, conjurors, and acrobats. He made himself at home with costermongers, patterers, and fishwomen. He went upon the path of mud-larks and sewer-hunters. Shoe-blacks and chimney-sweepers became his friends. He inspected salt mines in Cheshire and steel factories in Sheffield. Note-book in hand, he visited dockyards, arsenals, camps, and forts. He gained a footing among 'regulars' at Aldershot, and 'volunteers' at Hythe. Taking root thus, as he says, in the civilisation through which other continental critics have passed only on the wings of steam, and 'heartily loving England for her institutions, her liberty, her grandeur, and the generous hospitality accorded to himself,' while, at the same time, retaining 'sufficient of the stranger in his language and tastes,' M. Esquiros was in a position to form a more original and impartial estimate of the people among whom he sojourned than many who have preceded him in this department of literature.

His essays, a few of which have been collected and very ably translated into English by Mr. Lascelles Wraxall, have appeared, and are yet appearing, from time to time, in the pages of the *Revue des Deux Mondes*. They are of a very miscellaneous character, and are entirely wanting in cohesion. They represent the aspects of English life as they passed before the author, without regard to methodical or logical arrangement. He compares himself to an amateur walking through a picture-gallery, who 'stops before each picture, or at least before those which accidentally attract his attention, reserving to himself the right of forming presently a general idea of the school of painting to which they belong.' The essays, so far, correspond exactly with

this description. It would be unfair, therefore, to make strictures upon the miscellaneous character of a series as yet unfinished. The title of the work is not very happily chosen; for the aspects of English life given by the author are all of a public and outside type. He has not, so far, afforded us any enlightenment on the mysteries of the English 'home.' This, however, may be furnished when the book is complete. Then, the author trusts, it will respond to its title, and fulfil the intentions originally proposed.

At the outset of his researches into English habits and character, M. Esquiros was struck with a peculiarity seldom noticed by continental critics,—the absence of those family traits and types which distinguish the people of other countries. The unity and uniqueness which give a certain personality to the Frenchman, the German, and even the American, do not so distinctly mark the Englishman. England is the land of contrasts. It comprehends every type of face, temperament, and character. It exhibits to the eye of the astonished foreigner 'a prodigious collection of wretchedness and wealth; a society which soars to the sky, and descends to the lowest depths.' These contrasts have been attributed ordinarily to the complex mixture of races, and the development of our political constitution. M. Esquiros goes deeper for the solution of the mystery. The secret of our national contradictions lies at a lower level. He sees a connexion between the geological system of England and its national life. Other travellers and moralists try to account for our discrepancies of character by appealing to the profundities of ethnology and political economy. M. Esquiros betakes himself to the Museum of Practical Geology.

Naturally enough, the Welsh mountains, the Alps of the great chain running westward from Cumberland to the Land's End, 'menacing heaven with the sublime sorrow of the Titans,' are the first spheres of his study. Among these 'pages of the British Genesis' he revels with all the ardour of the painter and the poet, sketching many a vivid picture of the stern but beautiful grandeur of these monarchs of the vast Silurian kingdom. In his rapturous descriptions of scenery one is led to fear that he has forgotten the function of the philosopher and the moralist. But he remembers at last that he is bound to make good his theory of geological influence, and to indicate the empire exercised by strata over the manners and morals of the people. These are his conclusions:—

'Wales, despite numerous modes of communication, and the many tourists who travel it annually, has remained, like some portions of Scotland, estranged from England in habits, traditions, and language. There

the ark of ancient customs has rested as on a promontory. It must be remarked, that a shifting population, slightly attached to those customs and institutions, which form, in a measure, the moral country, generally dwells in a flat, moving, and sandy soil; while, on the other hand, those solid rocks which abound in striking features, are inhabited by a race rooted in the ground, with granitic character and tenacious manners. The western mountains of England, which defy the skill of the railway engineer, have served to entrench a local spirit; and behind these ramparts, groups of shepherds inhabit the same districts in which their ancestors resided from time immemorial. They are all more or less closely related, and beneath the lowly roofs which hang on the sides of the mountains, like birds' nests, you will find a thousand touching pictures of family life; children rejoicing with the aged, and old people sanctifying the house. Sober, saving, economical, and hardened by fatigue, they clamber barefooted during the summer over the harsh, stern rocks; humane and hospitable, they offer a hearty welcome to the wayfarer.'

We congratulate M. Esquiros on his Welsh tour. We do not wonder that his poetry outruns his philosophy. He must have met with a generous reception among these hardy mountaineers rarely accorded to the English traveller. Tourists from England would probably subscribe to the theory that the peasantry of Wales are 'tenacious.' Some of the more indignant among them would perhaps change the word into 'rapacious.' But M. Esquiros would find very few standing by him in his estimate of the 'granitic' type of their mental and moral character. Trustworthy statistics concerning the lower classes of Welsh society do not indicate the preservation of those ancient virtues which our author describes as clinging to the population of the heights, just as 'Snowdon retains the beams of the departed planet long after the whole surrounding country has been buried in gloom.' Far be it from us to disparage the morality of the Welsh. We object only to the author's too wide and general application of his theory of geological influence. We do not regard the word 'granitic' as a correct definition of the moral and mental character of the people of Wales at large, nor indeed of mountain populations generally. Severed to a great extent from the outlying world, the inhabitants of mountain districts retain a certain simplicity of manners, allied with physical vigour and hardihood. History does not claim for them the praise of a purer life.

It is a coincidence worthy of note that the most ancient race of Great Britain dwells upon the oldest rocks. It is also interesting to learn, that the people of Brittany speak a dialect of the old Celtic tongue. Some few years ago, six of the peasantry of the ancient Armorica were brought over to the

ancient Cambria. After a little preliminary embarrassment they found that they could converse with the peasantry of Wales without serious difficulty. Wales, 'the English Brittany, is situated on the same Silurian rocks which form the basis of the French Britany, so that the mountains of the two countries, now separated by a chasm, were once the bed of the same sea.'

We cannot follow M. Esquiros through his picturesque and often eloquent *résumé* of the geology of Great Britain. Our business is rather with his illustrations of the proposition that there is a connexion existing between the geology of England and the national life of its people. It must be confessed that the theory is not substantiated by any cogent reasoning or vigorous illustration. The industrial life of a nation is doubtless modified to a great extent by the character of its geological productions. The inhabitants of a coal district will generally be colliers. Scenery exerts a certain influence upon the mind. The granite mountain range imparts some of its own sternness and solidity to the inhabitants of the heights. But surely it is going too far to attribute a moral influence to Red Sandstone, or to regard inspiration to virtue as emanating from Oolite. The theory of geological influence is sound enough when kept within its proper limits; as when M. Esquiros concludes that nations spread over an undefined space have never attained a high grade in political and social life, whereas those which have been compelled by natural barriers to draw themselves within a narrowed territory, 'have founded cities at an early date, have compelled the earth to support them, and have torn from nature those resources which the narrow geographical limits seemed to deny them.' Only thus, in the departments of political economy and historical physiology, can it be affirmed that 'the territory is the parent of human faculties.'

The essayist stands upon safer ground when he turns to the successive races which have inhabited the island, in order to discover the secret of the great contrasts of our national character. In studying the distinctive features of a by-gone generation it is necessary to take a wider range than is furnished by the domestic habits and arts of the period. The national antiquities, of which we have a splendid collection in the British Museum, do not go far enough. Hence M. Esquiros suggests the practicability of constructing a more specifically *human* archæology, 'whose oracles would be as sure, and even more instructive for the philosophy of history, than the dumb revelations of stone and bronze.' The study of skulls, 'the medals of life,' is commended as likely to prove a valuable auxiliary to ethnological research. This is an idea of Prichard's, who strongly advises

the preservation of all such human remains as might contribute to the formation of an osteological history. Out of such a collection, he thinks, much valuable information might be provided, even for the moralist, who could thus have the opportunity of studying 'the different families which, in the course of ages, have brought fresh and successive organs to British civilization.'

In the most ancient British tombs skulls have been found of an 'extremely low, flat, and pyramidal form.' It is just possible that skulls equally flat and pyramidal might be found among the remains of the present era. But M. Esquiros has so much faith in his theory of skull diagnosis, that he bases upon the contents of the ancient British graves a question of great ethnological importance:—Were the Celts, who were a comparatively superior race, really the first inhabitants of the island? The old Welsh traditions assert that they were. But ethnology does not allow itself to be embarrassed by tradition. The ancient races have always prided themselves on their autochthonic dignity, but their claims are, in most instances, open to suspicion. A comparatively new science, for which even Professor Max Müller is unable to find an adequate name, has thrown fresh light on the succession of races. The disciples of this science of language imagine that they have discovered in the English tongue 'certain sounds whose origin they can refer neither to the Celtic nor Tudesque idioms.' Our national speech contains dim hints of those Ugro-Tatar tribes which were the aborigines of various districts of Europe.

The Celtic element in the early population of Great Britain was not destroyed, though modified, by the Roman invasion. Both the Celtic and the Roman element, however, succumbed to the Anglo-Saxon, enriching, nevertheless, the absorbing nation with permanent benefit. The Danes and Normans brought no really new blood to the Celto-Saxon race; 'for they were more a connecting link than an element of the population.' The Norman victors, contrary to the analogy of history, and doubtless because of the vigour and force of the Saxon race, failed in their endeavours to introduce even the language of Normandy into the land. The conquerors were compelled to accept the language of the conquered. The Saxons are the ancestors of the English nation. The Celts were their precursors, and the Normans were absorbed. Contemplating these facts as a moralist, as well as in the character of a philosopher, M. Esquiros discerns in them the wisdom of Providence.

'Ethnology,' he says, 'contains moral instruction; for it reconciles all races in a feeling of humanity. This science teaches us, in fact, that

the human families possess different gifts and peculiar instincts, an intellect moulded in a type of special organization, external features, which all have a relative beauty, and aptitudes which respond to certain wants of the social condition. It is by shaking and mingling these elements in the sacred urn of nations, that Providence forms the living matter of history. Simple races manifest faculties equally simple and limited: on the other hand, the more races are mingled, the more does the national character abound in shades, which, by their very opposition, tend to ramify the resources of civilization.....The English is a composite nation, and hence its strength. In those parts of Great Britain where the crossing of races has been less complicated, the organization of the inhabitants offers a more uniform and, consequently, less rich instrument. In Scotland, for instance,.....the human face offers fewer individual and peculiar traits than in England.'

M. Esquiros is an ardent admirer of the Anglo-Saxon race. Spread all over England, there are yet a few localities where the Saxon type may be seen in its more definite and perfect development. One of these is Guildford in Surrey, where the Anglo-Saxon element finds its representative, not only in architecture and olden memorials, but in the muscular breadth and florid countenance of the inhabitants. 'Those, however, who wish to form a correct idea of the beauty of the Saxon type, 'must look at the female.' The description given by M. Esquiros reads like the stanza of an Oriental epithalamium. He might have been sketching a *houri*. This is his picture:—

'She is remarkable for light hair, blue eyes, coral lips, cheeks ruddy as the flower to which they are so frequently compared, a skin as white and transparent as alabaster, delicate features, arms admirably modelled, a perfect bust, and an air of flourishing health, yet bearing the stamp of birth. Who cannot recognise a true Saxon woman by her walk? *Incessus patuit dea*; you distinguish in it the movement of a haughty race, independent, mistress of itself, and all it thinks proper to subjugate.'

No wonder the gallant Frenchman found such ready access to society!

Strength and masculine energy, as well as beauty, distinguish the Saxon race. But these qualities have their drawbacks. All absolute endowments are exclusive. Elegance and delicacy of workmanship must be sacrificed to the massive and gigantic genius which conceives high-level bridges, and spans stormy straits with a tube. The Titan cannot contrive a trinket. Providence thus balances the gifts of races. Where people are colossal in their capabilities, they are seldom cunning and subtle in their handicraft. The nation that constructs the Great Eastern is not clever in fashioning the Geneva watch. Upon this basis M. Esquiros founds his theory that English

industry has its weak side. Indeed, he gracefully hints that, as a nation, we are clumsy, and even clownish. In matters of taste we are fearfully deficient. His refined sense was everywhere shocked. At the corner of every street he saw, *horribile dictu*, piles of wealth in gorgeous profusion, sacrificed and lost for want of artistic arrangement. Linendrapers have no chance of winning the popular eye, unless they secure the aid of French artistes to dress their windows. You can distinguish a French shop at a single glance, 'by the harmony of colours, that music formed to please the eye.' Everything indicates the land of the Cyclops rather than of the fairy. Use reigns at the cost of beauty.

There is some truth in all this. As a nation we are deficient in taste, heavy in design, and often coarse in execution. But we have not forgotten the lessons of 1851. In the first Exhibition we appeared at a disadvantage in the subtleties of art, when compared with our neighbours. The charge of clownishness was then appropriate. It is not so now. We have made wonderful strides in the matter of taste and subtle skill; and if M. Esquiros will visit the International Exhibition, he will find that the nation which reigns supreme in the *Annexe*, for the magnificence of its machinery, can challenge the Continent, in those courts which are devoted to more delicate workmanship, to rival its miracles of minute manipulation. Our national genius is like the Nasmyth hammer, which may be so regulated as to descend with the crushing force of tons, or the gentle fall of the snowflake.

Our author closes his estimate of the Anglo-Saxon character by running a parallel between the Englishman and the Scotchman, not very flattering to the latter. While acknowledging that the masses in Scotland are more cultivated and better educated than the peasantry in many of the English districts, he affirms that the population of Scotland, though it may never descend so low as that of England, never rises so high. Scotland, he says,—

'has certainly produced remarkable men, but she has hitherto been asked in vain for a Milton, a Shakspeare, or a Byron. Walter Scott alone, and he in an inferior style of writing, attained the first rank. The English nation, properly so called, is a human *piano-forte* of incomparable range, which contains the lowest and basest notes, but also rises to the highest known intellect.' [The reason of this comparative inferiority of the Scotch race is in the fact that Scotland] 'has been less exposed than England to invasion, and therefore less subjected to the causes of intellectual diversity which successive crossings impress, to a certain extent, on the blood of a race.'

One would scarcely expect to find in a work entitled *The English at Home*, a prominent mention of the Gipsies, who have no nationality, and who retain their individual type in every land of their wanderings. M. Esquiros, however, devotes several chapters to the Gipsies, believing that 'there is probably no spot in the world so well suited as Old England for the study of this dispersed and mysterious race.' To those who are unacquainted with the works of Hoyland and Borrow, the information afforded by M. Esquiros will prove most interesting and acceptable. He has spared no pains in acquiring a knowledge of the habits and creed of a people of whom so little is generally known, and who yet have a charm for the artist, the philosopher, and the moralist, which no other race presents.

The popular belief points to Egypt as the birth-land of this mysterious people. This tradition, which is proudly and persistently held by the Gipsies themselves, was in the first instance contrived by the mediæval theologians, to suit some theory of biblical interpretation. It has no credible basis. Nor can the theory of a Jewish origin hold good. There is no affinity between the Gipsy and the Jew. Their habits of life present a perfect contrast. 'The Jews seek towns, the centres of population, where they can trade: the Gipsies, on the contrary, spread over the country and the heaths.' The Jew is nationalized, and readily falls in with the habits and peculiarities of the people among whom he settles: the Gipsy, all the world over, is a stranger. The one is borne on the tide of civilization, the other retains the primitive barbarism. Who, and what, then, are the Gipsies?

Büttner, the philologist, was the first to throw out the hint that India was the cradle of this vagrant people. His view was subsequently confirmed by Grellman and Prichard, who discovered in the language of the Gipsies,—a language which, with slight variations, they everywhere speak,—some elements of affinity to the Sanscrit. The cause of the dispersion of the original race is involved in impenetrable obscurity. Grellman speculates on the probability of their having been driven from India by the great invasion of Tamerlane. As, however, they must have belonged to a low caste, (Grellman says, the *Sudras*,) it is not likely that a foreign invasion would lead to their dispersion. M. Esquiros supposes that certain depredations and misunderstandings with justice were the true secret of the expulsion of the Gipsies from their native land. If national characteristics be permanent, there is too much ground for assuming the truth of this suggestion.

More than three centuries ago the Gipsies made their first

appearance in England. Their reception was far from flattering. In two decrees of Henry VIII. they are represented as rogues and vagabonds, and commanded to quit the kingdom for ever. So anxious were the English to get rid of them, that they were shipped to France forthwith, at the cost of the State. They must have made their way back again very rapidly, for we hear of them in the reigns of Mary and Elizabeth. According to the statutes of the period, the Gipsy was regarded as a capital offender; and in the days of the second Charles, thirteen Gipsies were gibbeted at Norfolk, for no other crime than that of belonging to the proscribed race. The statute against the Gipsies was not repealed until the reign of George III.

There are in England five principal Gipsy tribes. The Stanleys have their head-quarters in the New Forest,—the Lovells hang on the skirts of the Metropolis,—the Coopers infest the royal demesne at Windsor,—the Hernes traverse the northern counties,—and the Smiths pitch their tents in the east of the island. Anxious to know the inner life of this strange people, M. Esquiros wandered over commons and deserted districts, with the hope of finding a Gipsy track. He was at last fortunate enough to light upon an olive-faced boy, whose countenance and colour betrayed his kindred. He induced the lad to lead him to the encampment. He describes his reception: it was certainly inferior to the hospitality which he encountered in Wales:—

'I found myself in the middle of a wild and striking scene. A naked hill, though covered here and there with tawny heath, joined the most majestic relics of the old forest; aged oaks, whose shadows fell over the slopes of the hill, proudly displayed their gnarled limbs, and their scanty but gloomy foliage. The sun was setting on the right, in the horizon of hills, whose torn flanks preserved the traces of old torrents that had disappeared. Nothing is more strange than the sight of a Gipsy camp amid this solitude and majesty of Nature. Half-a-dozen tents were arranged in a semi-circle; and I noticed they were so arranged as to receive the beams of the rising sun. The men and women were seated on the ground round a fire, which, fed with green wood, produced more smoke than flame.....No one was busied with anything. Kettles, hanging from a species of hook, under poles fixed in the ground, were singing the song of water beginning to boil. A few mangy dogs displayed their heads among the bushes, and began barking, though feebly, at the *Gorgio*. The Gipsies kept up their indifferent and motionless attitude: they are like the savages, who notice everything, while appearing to have seen nothing. Two little girls of five or six, lively, and black as demons, alone left the party, and came to ask alms of me.'

Curious to know something of the art of fortune-telling, and to learn whether it had any principle or method, M. Esquiros

withstood the charms of these lovely girls of the demon type, and was led into the presence of his guide's mother, an old woman who 'would have gladdened the heart of Rembrandt, Teniers, or David Wilkie;' but who, notwithstanding certain traces of an ancient beauty, was deplorably hideous and ugly. Either by a liberal use of those compliments which a Frenchman so well knows how to pay, or by the prospect of a more substantial benefit, our traveller succeeded in persuading the old lady to admit him to the inner circle of the camp, which contained about thirty persons. On entering the circle he was invited to take a seat on the grass, the only chair in the community being occupied by a Gipsy woman at least a hundred years old. Three old men, 'whose heads the winter had whitened,' and one of whom, wrapped in a ragged blanket, 'resembled the statue of Silence,' were warming their hands at the wretched fire. A fine fellow of forty, with an intelligent face, wearing a somewhat superior costume, as the chief of the band, and a few ill-tempered-looking women, with 'gloomy flashing eyes,' completed the picturesque circle.

The old sorceress, true to the inspirations of age, proceeded to draw a sketch of the good old times, when tents might be pitched anywhere without interference; and when donkeys and horses might always regale themselves at will on the grass-lands of the farmer. Times, however, had so wofully altered, that it was next to impossible for the Gipsies to live; and in proof of the straits to which they were reduced, the old lady asserted that they had nothing for supper but a hedgehog, which had been found on the wayside. At this point of the recital, an unhappy chicken, imprisoned in a neighbouring tent, lifted up its voice, to the dismay of the whole party, and to the special confusion of the old sorceress. Relieving her irritation by a few maledictions on the head of the offending fowl, she proceeded to explain that the bird in question was being kept for the marriage of one of the daughters of the tribe. M. Esquiros gracefully relieved the general embarrassment by the gift of a crown, with which a boy was dispatched apparently to a neighbouring farm. He soon returned bearing a fowl in his arms, the very fowl of the ill-timed cluck. This they proceeded to cook for supper, in the following fashion:—

'A square piece of turf was removed, and a hole dug in the opening, which was filled with small wood. In the meanwhile the fowl's toilette had been made: this consisted simply in removing the entrails, and rolling it, feathers and all, in a paste of clay. This done, it was laid on the sticks, arranged so as to burn easily, and the piece of grass was placed over all as a lid.'

This method of cooking, which will probably be new to all our readers, has many merits; for not only does it impart a delicious flavour to the meal, but it has the charm of concealing the culinary preparations, a very valuable quality in Gipsy life. In this very case it proved so. The farmer from whom the fowl had been stolen, came up in a rage, while the cooking was in process, to inspect the camp. He walked two or three times over the spot where the animal was secretly baking, without discovering its presence. Our traveller was puzzled, as probably our readers are, as to the mode of disposing of the feathers. The clay was broken with a hammer, the feathers came off of themselves, and the dainty was served up on a wooden dish.

The English Gipsies, like their brethren all over the world, have no definite religion. They take their children to be baptised, but rather 'as a mode of identification than as a religious practice.' They have no traditional faith, though some few dogmas of an ancient creed flit, like shadows of the past, over their imagination. The doctrine of the metempsychosis, a relic perchance of their Indian ancestry, is not altogether abandoned by them. But though without religion, they are not altogether without law. They have some recognised statutes, which, however, are few and simple.

'The first enjoins on the Gipsy to live with his brethren, to reside under a tent like a traveller, and not in a house rooted in the ground. The second is chiefly addressed to the women; it proscribes to them an absolute fidelity to their husbands. The third refers to the payment of debts.'

These debts, of course, are only those which are contracted among themselves. It is not a point of honour with the Gipsy to pay promiscuous debts. But a Gipsy who has borrowed from his brother will make any sacrifice to free himself from an obligation which he considers to be degrading.

The marriage ceremony is conducted with all the splendour they can give it, and is continued during three days, during which the tent of the Romany is open to all. Wanderers though they are, the Gipsies exhibit the deepest anxiety respecting their place of burial. With little care for the future of their souls, their one ambition is a decent coffin and a quiet grave. So great is the respect for the wishes of their dying friends on this point, that they have been known to transport a body more than a hundred miles in deference to the request of the deceased. The clothes of a dead Gipsy are burned, as well as the straw of his bed. 'His rug, snuff-box, any old silver spoon, his horse or his donkey,' are scrupulously preserved; and nothing but the greatest distress will drive them to part with these relics of the dead.

The Gipsies are not without a literature. Their language is not to be confounded with the dialect of English thieves. 'Daughter of the Sanscrit and the Zend, it has preserved traces of its noble origin.' The first book printed in the Romany idiom was the Holy Bible, translated by Mr. Borrow. Of this translation the Gipsies are very proud, not because of its moral value, but because it seems to invest their tongue with a dignity before denied to it. Songs and ballads descriptive of Gipsy life, and not remarkable for their beauty, constitute the staple of the Romany literature. The idiom, like the very existence of the tribe, is fading away. The nomad life must vanish before the march of civilization. Another generation will probably efface from England a people illustrious, at least, for their sorrows. Their present number in England is from twelve to fifteen thousand.

In the meanwhile can anything be done to ameliorate their condition? Strange to say, there have been few organizations for the benefit of these wanderers. Philanthropy has generously undertaken every other form of want and sorrow. It has almost ignored the Gipsies. The late Rev. George Crabb and others met with little encouragement in their endeavours to modify the nomadic habits of the race,—habits utterly inconsistent, of course, with civilization. A very few were induced to renounce a vagabond life; but some of these, impatient of social restraints, relapsed into their native ways. There seems 'little hope of entirely breaking the chain of habit among the adult Gipsies.' The hope lies with the children, if they can be torn, at an early age, from their perilous associations. 'Education alone, and persuasion, and gentle measures, can re-unite them to the native population, reconcile them with a home, and attach them to the soil.'

We have already indicated the miscellaneous character of the essays of M. Esquiros. Following his order, which commenced with geology, and proceeded with Gipsies, we come to beer. Disdaining, like a true philosopher, to accept superficial aspects of society, and diving into the reasons of things, our essayist concludes that one of the fundamental elements of English social life and character is beer. Modern Europe is divisible into two groups,—'the Latin races who drink wine, and the races, more or less Saxon, who drink beer.' Beverages of an alimentary class have much to do with the manners and morals of the population. Ascertain a nation's drinks, and you may form an estimate of its life.

'The impetuosity of the Latin races, their sparkling wit and warlike ardour, respond to those qualities which have been called the blood of the

grape: those nations whom nature has condemned to a sterner beverage are distinguished, for their part, by strength, patience, reflection, obstinate and encroaching toil.'

Strange to say, this northern beverage was first made in Egypt, and had for its patron the god Osiris. It has been from time immemorial 'the drink adopted in those countries where the vine refuses to grow, either through excess or deficiency of heat.' It was a mighty favourite with the Danes and Saxons, who believed that among the highest felicities of Odin's paradise was the privilege of drinking ale for ever from tall cups. Popular as the beverage was in ancient times, many generations passed away before it became a common drink. As late as the middle of the sixteenth century, the English artisan who managed to stumble on a glass of strong ale, thought himself as royally served as the lord mayor.

Believing clearly that beer has a great deal to do with the peculiarity and uniqueness of the English character, and in accordance with his determination to go back to the genesis of everything and everybody, M. Esquiros gives us the natural history of this popular beverage. In pursuing his investigations, he witnessed a vivid picture of that jubilee of vagabonds, the hop-harvest. The scene lay, of course, in Kent.

'At that period of the year, the vagabond shakes off his sloth, the wandering tinker puts out his fire, the beggar ceases to hold out his hand, the minstrel deserts his fiddle, the labourer bids farewell for a season to the plough; all proceed to the hop festival. Then come together the poor man in decent clothes, and the poor man in rags; the workman with an open face, and the adventurer with suspicious looks,—the honest man and the thief: still the latter does not steal, but works for a season. Among the women the same contrasts are visible: sordid misery and coquettish misery, youth and old age, virtue and vice; but the latter now sanctified by useful employment. All these jostle each other along the road; from station to station the parties stop to make their tea in the open air; the men, seated by the pot, smoke their pipes gaily, or sleep with their hats over their faces; while the girls ramble along the hedges, picking nuts, or unharnessing the donkey which drags in a small cart an old woman and a few household utensils.'

The native English hop, which grows wild in solitary lanes, and on the skirts of woods, and the tops of which the poorer classes boil, like asparagus, is different from the cultivated hop, which is so mixed up with the social life of our land. This was imported from the Netherlands, during the reign of Henry VIII. Its introduction was violently opposed. Petitions were laid before the King and Parliament, praying for the extirpation of

the hated weed. Happily the authorities were firm, and resisted the popular clamour.

It is a very delicate and capricious plant, requiring a peculiar soil, and very careful culture. The planting of a hop-garden costs from seventy to a hundred pounds an acre. The terrible risks of disease and failure render hop-growing a hazardous speculation. Three or four years must elapse before a plantation is ready for picking; and it wears itself out in about ten years. No man of small capital can embark safely in such a speculative business. Large capitalists, who have been able to sustain risk and contingency, have sometimes realized handsome fortunes in the growth. From thirty to fifty guineas an acre have been cleared in favourable years. But against such success there is generally an imposing set-off of failure and infertility.

Few sights are more exhilarating and picturesque than that of a Kentish hop-garden during the harvest. The work has a dash of romance about it. It allows play for the fingers of little children and old men. It occurs in the ripest and loveliest season of the year. 'Jests, songs, and bursts of laughter' attest the merriment of the pickers. They suspend their labours at nightfall, but do not leave the garden. Some sleep in barns and outhouses, some are provided with tents; while many a hardy fellow stretches himself ou the bare ground, and slumbers as soundly as though he were on a feather bed. Many are attracted by the love of adventure, and there are floating legends of titled ladies who have joined the hop-pickers in order to rid themselves of the horrors of *ennui*. Be this as it may, many romantic attachments formed in the hop-garden have issued in happy marriages. The pay of the pickers varies according to the season. It is fixed, during the harvest, at a general meeting of the hop-growers. The average pay of an industrious labourer is about two shillings a day.

Following the history of the hop from the garden to its union with barley at the brewery, M. Esquiros finally conducts it to its great emporium, the public-house. Many Englishmen are doubtless ignorant of the meaning of the word 'Entire,' which may be read on the sign-boards of most public-houses. M. Esquiros gives the history of the word:—

'Before the year 1730, the English publicans sold to the thirsty souls of their day three sorts of beer, which they drew from three different casks into the same glass, and gave to this mixture the name of half-and-half. The owner of one of these publics, (history has handed down his name,) Horwood, wishing to spare himself the trouble of performing the task so constantly during the day, hit upon brewing a beer which would

combine the qualities of all these beers. To this compound he gave the name of *entire*, which has adhered to it to this day, at least, on the sign boards.'

In the United Kingdom there are nearly one hundred thousand beer-houses,—a striking index of the tastes and tendencies of the population. The drunkenness and social disorder to which these institutions lead are noticed with kindly and generous sorrow by M. Esquiros. While faithful to his independency, he never allows himself to glide into a strain of undue severity. Nor, in estimating the various propositions which philanthropists have entertained for counteracting the terrible influence of the public-house, does he sympathise with the Teetotal movement, believing that the diffusion of education and social comfort will do more to destroy the abuse of fermented drinks, than their absolute proscription. It is our firm belief that one of the strongest reasons of the drunkenness of the lower orders lies in the wretchedness and discomfort of their homes,—a wretchedness the result not so much of poverty, for there is no necessary discomfort in poverty, as of the want of domestic education on the part of the women of the working classes. Not one mill-hand in twenty among our factory population is fit to be either a wife or a mother. If some of those ladies who are prominent in their efforts to ameliorate the position of their sisters, and who, in their enthusiasm, pursue many visionary and Utopian schemes, would give themselves to teaching factory-girls to keep their homes clean and tidy, they would serve the cause of humanity, and in time empty the public-house. An Englishman must have social life and a home. If his home be a pig-sty, as it often is, he is driven to make another elsewhere.

In M. Esquiros' estimation, beer is a question worthy of the historian.

'Regarded as a branch of trade and an inseparable element of English manners, beer no less deserves attention than the interests of state with which historians occupy themselves. Great events appear only at rare intervals in the existence of a people, while economic facts are daily renewed, embrace their whole life, engrave the principal features of the national character, and found that material comfort by the aid of which civilized nations dispute, afloat and ashore, the crown of the universe.'

'Beer and wine,' exclaimed an orator at a public meeting, 'met at Waterloo: wine, red with fury, boiling over with enthusiasm, mad with audacity, rose thrice against that hill on which stood a wall of immoveable men, the sons of beer: you have read history:—beer gained the day!'

The eccentric trades of England, though not absolutely confined to our soil, have yet a special character which renders their introduction into the study of the *English at Home* appropriate. Until Mr. Horace Mayhew published his thrilling and astonishing papers on the habits and life of these erratic classes, very little was known about them. M. Esquiros, with his wonted enterprise and perseverance, and in the belief that 'it is, before all, in the exceptional classes that the characteristics of a nation are revealed and engraved with the greatest vigour,' made himself one with street professionals, and gives us, as the result of his researches, some very valuable information.

The street musicians occupy the foreground in his picture. London is the Babel of the world. At nine o'clock in the morning 'the great army of singers and wandering minstrels advance from Spitalfields, Leather Lane, Wapping, and Clerkenwell, upon the West End.' Italian boys with hurdy-gurdies,—Scotchmen with bag-pipes,—Chinese with mandolines,—Savoyards with organs,—Swiss women with tambourines,—Ethiopians with bones and banjo,—melancholy men with sunken cheeks, whose forte is whistling,—men equally melancholy, whose forte is the clarionet,—bands whose leading spirit is a trombone, which disdains to give greater variety than that of two notes, whether to polka, march, or waltz,—blind fiddlers, who might be deaf, and must be heartless,—ogres who drag about huge machines on wheels, whose blast of concentrated shrieks and groans is the terror of quiet streets, and rises high above the din of commerce and cabs,—reduced families in clean aprons and pinafores, who wail their sorrows in common metres, with many quavers, and at funeral time,—these are the horrors which empty themselves upon the West End, day after day, the long year round. M. Esquiros, on the ground that society is based on concessions, and that the repose of the few must be sacrificed to the pleasure and profit of the many, stands forth as the apologist of our street minstrelsy, which, though 'Hades to the dilettante or the student, is Paradise to servant-girls.' The music of the streets is the poor man's concert,—open to all, and costing nothing. It ought not, therefore, to be summarily put down.

The street instrumentalists, who are mostly foreigners, are dismissed by our essayist with a very cursory notice, on the ground that they are not distinctively English. He might, however, have regarded them as an English institution; for on no other soil than that of England would they be allowed to pour forth their dismal din. The street-minstrel is more to his mind. There is a dash of poetry in his history. He is the

descendant, however unworthy, of those Norman troubadours who were ever welcome in castle hall and lady's bower, and to whom the door even of the monastery was readily opened. Romantic as was the origin of these minstrels of the streets, the revolution of years has brought about sad changes in their social status. In a penal statute of Queen Elizabeth they are classed with beggars and vagabonds. Under the Puritan Protectorate they fell even lower, until, by degrees, the descendants of the troubadours became what they now are, the denizens of the tavern and the street. In their degradation, however, they are not altogether without value. They find employment for genius. The ballad-monger lives by the ballad-singer. It must be confessed that the living is not rich. One shilling is the price ordinarily given for an original ballad. In exceptional cases, a few pence are added to this sum. The demand for compositions of this order is so lessened by the improvement of the popular taste, that the poet is reduced in many cases to supplement the muse by some more substantial resource. In the travelling tinker or seller of lucifer matches, you may see the man whose lyrics are the delight of the artisan and the servant-girl.

The singer fares better than the poet. If he be sagacious, he may realize a considerable harvest by adapting his selections to the popular taste, or to the hitting off of some mania of the day. During the excitement occasioned by the increase of the Romish episcopate in England, many a windfall crowned the singer who was bold enough to satirize Cardinal Wiseman and the Pope. A political crisis is particularly fruitful. Elections owe much of their spirit and glory to the ballad-singer; and sometimes he rises to the elevation of the moralist, and, not without a dash of cynicism, castigates popular vice. Illustrious in public, the street-singer has usually no home. His gains are too fluctuating to allow of any permanent settlement. In a low lodging-house, and sometimes under a dry arch, he takes his nightly rest.

But by far the most popular of our street institutions is the drama of 'Punch and Judy,' which M. Esquiros very justly regards as worthy of the attention of the critic and the historian. Puppet-shows have existed from time immemorial in England. 'Macbeth' was once played with wooden figures. In the reign of the 'merry Monarch' petitions were presented by the proprietors of the principal theatres, praying that a particular puppet-show might be put down, so seriously did it interfere with their receipts. Even the churches were deserted in the vicinity of these exhibitions. The direct origin of Punch cannot be traced. In the ancient Mysteries, there was generally a person called Vice, whose function it was 'to shed over the serious parts of a

drama humorous or ridiculous features.' In all probability the Punch of our street theatricals is his degenerate descendant.

In the popularity of Punch, M. Esquiros discerns features of English character. Mr. Punch himself, though withal a domestic tyrant, and sadly given to thrashing his wife,—a gentleman of violent temper and by no means amenable to authority,—personifies, nevertheless, 'a side of the English character,—strength of soul, presence of mind, and self-control.' His brutal conduct to Mrs. Judy, and the very loose and turbulent nature of his matrimonial relations, are fatal to his popularity with the fair sex, few of whom, M. Esquiros remarks, are to be found in the crowds which witness his performances. But the invincible strength with which he seems to struggle against the afflictions of life,—'the mocking energy with which he braves the horror of dungeons, and hears the death-sentence pronounced,'—the *nil desperandum* spirit which leads him to sing comic songs on the way to the scaffold which his persecutors have prepared for him,—these are the features which endear him to the English public, expressive as they are of the national temperament. 'The Punch a British public wants,' said an old gentleman who could never resist the temptation to watch the performance, 'must have a tenacious mind, fertile in expedients to triumph over material force in the shape of a huge black dog, over illness in the form of a doctor, over death in the form of a skeleton, and over all the enemies of the human race in the shape of the devil. This results from the British character, which does not like to be beaten, even when in the wrong.'

The English are essentially a grave people. They do not crowd round the street show merely to witness the fun. The drama of Punch is popular because it is national. Nor is it only popular. It has a power of influencing the masses on questions of politics and morality. M. Esquiros quotes cases in point:—

'Some years ago, during a general election, a showman placed on the stage a candidate for Westminster, who kissed Judy and her child, and then asked Mr. Punch for his vote. When the Divorce Bill, passed by the Commons, was before the House of Lords, I myself heard a showman who took advantage of Punch and Judy's conjugal disputes to support that Bill. Three years back, a certain movement took place in the public opinion against the punishment of death; and another puppet showman at once placed in Mr. Punch's mouth,—an interested party in the question,—certain words in favour of the abolition of the gallows.'

'Great Britain,' says M. Esquiros, 'is the classic ground of puffs.' He illustrates his point by the case of the so-called Aztec children, who were shown all over England as having been

obtained from the mysterious cities of Central America, where they were worshipped as idols. They were said to be the descendants of the ancient bird-men, preserved in the temples of Iximay. Their silence was quoted in proof of their sacredness, and the interest of the exhibition was enhanced by a romantic account of the dangers incurred in removing them from the temple. The two children were, in fact, deaf and dumb idiots, who were discovered in America certainly, but only in the tent of an itinerant showman, who exhibited them in company with a very tall pig!

The English nation is easily cheated, there is no doubt. We are ready to swallow any amount of wonders, whether Tom Thumbs, talking fish, singing oysters, sea-serpents, or anything else Mr. Barnum and his compatriots and imitators may concoct. An English crowd does not object to be duped,—indeed it expects to be,—but the subterfuge must be cleverly disguised. A showman is readily forgiven for cheating, if he can manage to throw some skill into the deception. Everything depends on method. The Bosjesmans, who were *bonâ fide* savages, were exhibited a few years since at Glasgow fair. The thing was done so openly and honestly, that the exhibition failed. The mob declared that they were either Irishmen or sweeps. 'Success,' said a showman, 'depends less on the object shown, than on the mode it which it is shown. The great sea-serpent itself would be nothing without an oral chronicle appealing to the imagination of the mob.'

Some of the itinerant showmen of England have achieved not only notoriety, but fortune. The celebrated Richardson commenced life as a potboy. An old man, with a peep-show on his back, came one night to the inn in which Richardson served. He was taken ill, and died. Grateful for the attention shown to him by the lad during his illness, he left him his peep-show. This was the nucleus of a future fortune. Adding one curiosity after another to his collection, he rose rapidly in popular favour, and died with the sum of fifty thousand pounds in the funds. A very interesting story has been preserved by M. Esquiros:—

'During St. Alban's fair a fire broke out in the town, and Richardson, who was then owner of a portable theatre, stopped the performance, and, at the head of his actors, struggled bravely with the flames, to try and save the life and property of the inhabitants. The loss, however, was very great; and a subscription was opened on behalf of the sufferers, the gentlemen of St. Alban's sending their one, two, and as much as five guineas. One day a man in short, black breeches, woollen stockings, and a large blue coat, walked into the office, and threw on the table one hundred guineas. "What name shall I put down?" the treasurer said;

"Say, a friend," the stranger replied, and walked out; but one of the persons present had recognised Richardson the showman, and his name figured in the list of donors.'

Another eminent showman was fortunate enough to win the notice of royalty. Wombwell, who was very clever as a veterinary surgeon, was called in one day, by the late Prince Consort, to attend a pack of hounds, whose disease had baffled the entire profession. He at once discovered that the secret of their malady lay in the water which they drank. The prince, delighted at the recovery of his hounds, asked Wombwell what his fee was. The showman, however, declined to take a fee, on the ground that he hadn't a single want in the world. As the prince insisted,—

'Wombwell said, that if his Royal Highness was determined to make him a present, he would be glad to accept a coffin made out of the wood of the *Royal George*. This demand was acceded to, and this singular article of oaken furniture figured for some time in the showman's house, and in it the wild-beast man now reposes at Kensal Green.'

From the free and romantic life of strolling players and showmen, M. Esquiros conducts us to a class of vagrant tradesmen in whose existence romance plays but a feeble part. In selecting the 'lower zones of social life,' he is guided by the principle that 'the originality of the Anglo-Saxon race is principally found in them.' The real life of a people has seldom been described by the historian. The staple of our standard histories is statecraft, with now and then a picture of regal pomp. Mr. Charles Knight has done a little towards furnishing the history of the people of England; but his work, creditable and interesting as it is, does not supply the *desideratum*. The researches of M. Esquiros, among the lower zones, have secured a great deal of valuable information which, to most Englishmen, will be quite new.

The coster-mongers, (originally *costard-mongers*, or apple-sellers,) in London alone, are estimated at upwards of forty thousand persons, men, women, and children. Some of these are stationary, and have stalls, more or less respectable. Others are nomadic. The itinerant classes are subdivided into the legitimate and the illegitimate,—the former of whom deal in fish, vegetables, and English fruits: the latter comprehending the vendors of oranges, cocoa-nuts, watercresses, sprats, and periwinkles. Between these two castes, though they seem to have so many interests in common, there is, nevertheless, the widest difference. Even costermongers have their aristocracy. A legitimate coster would not condescend to sell sprats, if he

were dying of hunger! Oranges are left, by common consent, to the Irish, while the cocoa-nut salesman is almost invariably a Jew. Having very little personal property, the costermongers have, in many cases, to buy their daily stock with borrowed money; while some have to borrow the stock itself, and hire their basket, truck, or donkey cart, and even the weights and measures. They have to pay twenty per cent. per week for this accommodation. Nor are they the only sufferers. The tax falls upon the poor, who are compelled to sustain the injury caused by this iniquitous usury.

As might have been expected, the costermongers are not highly educated and enlightened. By the age of seven, they are in business on their own account. The children of costers are about the sharpest in the world. In fact they have no childhood, but are brought up to be old men and women before they reach the age of eight. Their religion is as much neglected as their education. But they are not altogether irreligious. They have a great liking for the Gospel history. The feeding of the five thousand by our Saviour is most interesting to them. 'That proves,' they say, 'that He was a thorough Gentleman.' But while appreciating benevolence, they do not indulge in sentiment. 'I don't wish anybody any harm,' said a young girl, who had been describing the glories of the cholera time, when melons and pine-apples could be bought almost for nothing; 'but if the cholera comes back, it would be a great blessing to people of our class.'

Among the most important of the itinerant street traders, are the hawkers and the patterers. Some of the latter are men of education, who have been dragged down from a higher level of society by profligacy and the love of a vagabond life. They are the street speech-makers. Their aim is to attract popular attention to their wares by a pompous harangue. Some of them soar to the very heights of mob oratory, and would shine on the hustings. One, a very sage and 'cute man, gives a lecture on domestic economy, and then invites his audience to purchase a miraculous save-all, price one penny. During Palmer's trial, an enterprising patterer read, day by day, to the public, the record of the progress of the trial in the *Times;* and, at the close of each reading, commended to his hearers some infallible nostrum which he had for sale. The most respectable of the class are generally booksellers, who at times are literary men. One of these, with whom M. Esquiros chanced to meet, gave him the following story of Southey, which is worth preserving:—

'One day, among my hearers, I noticed Southey, whom I knew from his coming to my old master's shop.....I read in his eyes that he wanted

one of my books,—a rare old edition,—and quietly ran down even below the price the book had cost me, eighteenpence. I would have offered it to him for nothing, if I had not feared a refusal; but what was my grief when he placed in my hand a crown, and went away just as I was giving him the change! I called him back; but he said, with a shake of the head, "Keep it, the book 's worth that to me."'

There are lower levels of vagrant commercial life than these. There is the family of the 'finders,'—not precisely English in its type, for the continental cities abound in this class of industry. But London exhibits one variety of the species indigenous only to the metropolis, the 'cigar-end finder,' who frequents the neighbourhood of theatres, casinos, music halls, and clubs, to glean the cigar-ends which may have been thrown away. Precarious as such an employment may seem, it yields a very fair return for the time and energy spent over it. What is done with the cigar fragments, when found, we dare hardly guess. Perhaps the genius which converts cabbage-leaves into tobacco can construct new cigars out of the burnt relics of old ones. The 'mud-larks' are of the 'finder' family, and search for bits of coal, iron, wood, or anything else that may turn up among the mud left on the banks of the Thames by the retreating tide. They embrace all ages, but are made up mainly of little boys and decrepit old women. The lowest in this scale of 'finders' are the 'sewer-hunters,' who are found in no other city of the world.

'With old shoes on their feet, a bag on their back, a canvas apron fastened round their waist, and a long staff in their hand, they enter, no one knowing how, those horrible and forbidden places. This pole, armed with an iron hook, serves to secure their footing and sound the ground, while they have a dark lantern fastened on their chests, which throws a light some distance before them.'

The reward for this disgusting toil is seldom more than 'bones, nails, pieces of iron and copper, and dead animals,' whose skins they sell. Sometimes coins, jewels, and articles of plate are found; and it is probably the chance of finding such treasures that acts as an inducement to undergo the horrors of the sewer-hunter's life. There is, too, a dash of the Englishman's love of independency in it. 'I like this kind of life,' said one: 'I work when it is my pleasure, I rest when I like, and no one has a right to order me about.' Nor is this life unhealthy. The sewer-hunters are generally robust and jolly men, with rosy cheeks.

We are indebted to M. Esquiros for a very interesting sketch of the salt-springs and salt-mines of Cheshire, which, though a very fertile source of wealth, have seldom been honoured with the notice of the literary traveller. M. Esquiros chose the

little town of Northwich as his head-quarters of observation. Beautiful as is the locality, we should not like to live in Northwich. At the 'Angel,' where our author lodged, 'the staircase staggered like a drunken man,' and the walls of the room seemed to be on the worst of terms with the floor. This inn, however, was a substantial edifice in comparison with the majority of buildings in Northwich. On walking through some of the streets, the traveller saw 'roofs no longer resting on the houses, brick walls rent, windows that had assumed the quaintest forms, and chimneys that allowed the smoke to emerge half-way up, through yawning crevices.' The landlady of a public-house said calmly: 'Our house will fall; I only hope my son will not be in it at the moment, for I feel assured I shall finish with it.' The bed of the river has sunk so much, that a man-of-war may now tack, where but a few years back a boat could hardly make its way. The reason of this terrible dilapidation lies in the fact that—

'the town and neighbourhood rest on a soil internally traversed by abundant springs; and these subterranean water courses, formed by the rains, become saline at the expense of the solid masses of salt over which they run. The result is, that they disintegrate the rock, and the crust of superficial earth settles with the houses, the fields, and the streams.'

Northwich is doomed to perish by the very salt to which it owes its existence and trade.

The salt springs, which furnish an average of twenty-two per cent. of salt, are not of course so productive, and certainly not so romantic, as the salt mines. Unlike the gloomy home of the coal, the salt mine, with its crystallized columns, and its dry and pleasant temperature, presents a picture of positive beauty. It is difficult, says M. Esquiros,—

'not to admire this simple but grand architecture; these empty spaces, extending in the darkness like the nave of an immense subterranean church; these works, which have the shape, colour, and transparency of sugar-candy, these massive pillars, which shine in the reflection of the light you carry in your hand; and more than all this, the religious character which silence and night shed over these labours of human industry.'

The mine which he visited was worked by fifty men, who extracted a weekly average of fifteen hundred tons of raw salt, without the assistance of horses and ponies, which in some of the mines are employed to drag the blocks of salt on a tramway. The salt is conveyed from the mouth of the mine to the boiling-house; and when it has boiled for six or seven hours, it is carried to a hot room, where it is left to dry. It is then ready for the market. The annual produce is estimated at 500,000 tons; and the mines

give employment to some ten or twelve thousand men. The work of the miner is salubrious and agreeable, but the thirst resulting from it is almost intolerable. The temptation to drink is very powerful. The miners say they have a devil in their throats. From their dissipated habits it is to be feared that many gallons of drink are required to exorcise the evil spirit.

Foreigners will be more interested by the views of M. Esquiros on the military status and resources of England, than by any other portions of his work. The old and not yet exploded notion, that the English are a nation of shopkeepers, finds an elaborate refutation in his pages. His descriptions of our actual force, and our immense capabilities for meeting any possible emergency, are such as not only to astonish his countrymen, but deeply to interest many of our own, who have very limited and undefined notions of our military resources. M. Esquiros, though a lover and, as we trust he will prove, a maker of peace, is yet a Frenchman, and a man of sense. He has no faith in the Brummagem doctrine of olive leaves. His is the theory which the experience of every year strengthens and confirms, that to be prepared for war is to be assured of peace. He does not believe that there is any national desire, on the part of Frenchmen, for the invasion of England; but however that may be, he shows very clearly that such an invasion is impossible, because we have made it so. The fighting colonels across the Channel, who, we believe, do not represent the French army, would do well to study the statistics of M. Esquiros. The worst thing we can wish our enemies is, that they should invade our shores. They might possibly effect a landing, though that would be no easy matter. But even if they forced a passage through our wooden and iron walls, and through bristling ranks of regulars and volunteers, and planted their flag on the time-honoured old Tower, *what then?* There lies the pith of the whole question. Were England but half as powerful as she is, or half as patriotic, no invading army could find its way home from her shores.

Woolwich, the great emporium and work-shop of our military organization, owes this dignity to a mere accident. The Royal Foundry used to be in Moorfields. Some bronze guns, taken from the French by Marlborough, were brought here in 1716 to be recast. A large crowd of officers and people collected to see the process. A young German in the crowd, whose name was Schalch, discovered that the mould into which the metal was to be poured was damp; and rightly judging that the contact of the boiling metal with a humid surface would cause an explosion, he at once communicated his fears to the authorities. But military authorities were as slow to take advice in 1716 as they are in

this year of grace 1862; so Schalch and his friends quietly withdrew. In a few minutes there was a terrible and fatal explosion. The mould had burst and scattered its fragments in ruin. The authorities sought out Schalch, made him superintendent of a new gun-factory, and committed to him the responsibility of choosing a fresh site. He selected the ground now occupied by the government works. The natural resources of the place attest the wisdom of the selection. But the conditions of war have materially changed since the days of Schalch. Woolwich is no longer a desirable site. Looking at it from a strategical point of view, it is open to considerable peril. Our military stores ought to be beyond the reach of danger; and Government has resolved to spend nine millions of money in rendering Woolwich impregnable.

The gun-casting department, which was formerly the most attractive and important, has lost its *prestige*. The Armstrong gun is not cast, but wrought. The process is at present a secret, and the public are not admitted to view the whole of the operation. The machinery used in the construction of the new gun is massive and marvellous. The monstrous steam-hammer, which, while falling 'with a solemn gravity befitting such a mass,' at another time 'deals two or three hundred crushing blows in a minute,' seems to have fairly overpowered the philosophical Frenchman. A gigantic plane in the factory peels the iron from the block like the paring of an apple. The gun is ultimately bored by "a perforating implement, which plunges and advances in the body of its victim like the beak of a vulture." Nor is the machinery the only costly item in the production of guns. Since the year 1852, the Government has paid to private individuals for artillery experiments nearly eighty thousand pounds.

The machinery in the gun-carriage department is equally wonderful. Those beautiful specimens of carriage-work which excite the admiration of all visitors to the International Exhibition, and which are absolutely without flaw, require no ordinary apparatus for their construction. The circular saw is itself a miracle.

'A few steps had carried me to a plank platform, resembling the empty stage of a theatre, when my guide made me a sign to wait, and whispered, "She is coming." Who is she? In answer, an enormous log was thrown along the stage. A man turned an instrument, and I saw a steel disc emerge from a groove in the floor, armed with a circle of teeth, displayed one after another as the disc emerged from the ground. This metal wheel advanced, leaped on the log, walked straight through it without halting, and then, its work being completed, it returned remorselessly to

its den, like a monster which has devoured its prey. When the saw disappeared, I asked leave to visit the cave in which it lay hidden. I went down a deep staircase, where I saw in the gloom this shark-toothed thing, still warm with the results of its massacre, and which, even when calm, seemed animated by a feeling of hatred.'

Terrible as some of these machines are, and fatal as they often prove, they win the affection of the artisan. The Englishman loves his machine as the Arab loves his steed. M. Esquiros was struck with the delicate attention, 'the maternal coquetry,' with which the workman performed 'the toilet' of these saws and other dreadful implements. An artisan who had been robbed of two fingers by the steam plane, said, with a flattering look at the machine: 'It is ill-tempered at times, but it must be pardoned, for it is so beautiful!'

The catalogue of wonders is not exhausted. There are four self-acting bullet machines, which turn out three hundred thousand bullets a day. There are machines for making percussion caps, which seem to have 'a species of appetite for copper,' small pieces of which they 'greedily champ' and tear with incredible eagerness. One of these machines can turn out more than a million caps in a day. The cartridge machine is almost human, dipping its gloved fingers into pans of seething paper, and drawing them out again with a roll of paper round each. In the last war ten thousand five hundred shells were constructed at Woolwich daily. The manufacture of them is as ingenious as it is dangerous. They seem to be endowed with instinct, and know when to burst. Inflammable projectiles are conveyed from the laboratory to the magazines in gondola-shaped barges. 'The sight of the boats on the gloomy and sleepy water of the canal has something sorrowful about it.'

The Arsenal gives employment to about twelve thousand men. There is work also for boys and girls. If any lose a limb in the service of the establishment, they are not discharged; and all who have served twenty years can claim a pension. The moral and mental well-being of the workmen is carefully regarded. There are day schools for the children, and evening classes and lectures for adults. The Woolwich artisans differ from other working men mainly in the ease and quiet of their character. It is an interesting physiological fact that people who are employed in large workshops are generally taciturn. One of the officers of the Arsenal called the attention of M. Esquiros to this fact, and accounted for it on the ground that 'amid the deafening noise of the machines, which drown and defy the human voice, the mechanics end by resigning themselves to silence, and gradually contract the habit.'

British soldiers do not bear the same numerical proportion to their countrymen as the soldiers of the Continent. In France there is 1 soldier to every 95 of the population, in Russia 1 to 72, in Prussia 1 to 80, in Austria 1 to 68, in Turkey 1 to 74, whereas in England the proportion is 1 soldier to every 128. The average pay of a private is £20. 5*s.* per annum, and of a non-commissioned officer, £32. 12*s.* Rations, however, are deducted from this sum: yet, when the deduction is made, the English soldier has twice as much pocket-money as the private in the French army. Other sources of wealth lie open to our soldiers, in the shape of good-conduct money, beer money, and 'fatigue-pay,' for those who are engaged on public works. Brave as the British soldier is, he is behind the armies of the Continent in the department of social economics. He is a wretched cook, and starves in the pastures in which the Frenchman fattens. He beats the Frenchman, however, and the armies of all other military states, in personal cleanliness and clothing.

M. Esquiros is not blind to the defects of our military system. But he deals with them too gently. He would be the very man for the government to secure as chairman of a commission of investigation, moved by some turbulent member of the House, anxious to bottom a supposed irregularity. He just hints at our deplorable deficiencies in the sanitary arrangements of our barracks; but he fails to give us a comparative estimate of the death-rate in the army. Every English soldier over whom his comrades fire the 'farewell shot' represents a dead loss of one hundred pounds. As a question of economy, it is imperative that our barracks should be better ventilated and drained, and that such architectural changes should be made as the health of the soldiery demands. Free enlistment is another feature of our military system which M. Esquiros thinks open to objection. He is right in reprehending the work of the recruiting sergeant, who makes dupes of the raw lads whom his gay ribbons and rollicking eloquence attract from the plough and the forge. Our recruiting dodges are not worthy of England. But Englishmen would never stand the conscription.

The vexed question of promotion occupies a considerable share of the essayist's attention. It is about the most puzzling point of our military economy. The theory of promotion by merit is beautiful. It commends itself to our sense of justice. When carried out among continental armies, it has proved a wonderful success. The proudest names on the roll of French Marshals would have been unknown to fame, under a system of promotion by purchase. That merit should be a sufficient ground for the promotion of an officer to a higher grade, must be self-evident;

but whether promotion from the ranks would serve the interests of the British army, is a question of grave doubt. Many difficulties are involved in it. The strong class-feeling of English society is against it, and the heavy expenditure of the military mess renders it almost impossible. The junior officers of the British army cannot possibly live on their income, in the present state of military expenditure. Another very powerful reason may be urged against promotion from the ranks: the British soldier regards his officer with veneration, and will follow him anywhere. This feeling would cease if officers were chosen from among the men. One of the strongest proofs of the impropriety of promotion from the ranks in the British army was given in the Crimea, when commissions were offered on the battle-field to men who had distinguished themselves by gallantry. In most instances the honour was firmly declined.

There are now two armies in England; 'the regular army, which represents discipline, and the army of volunteers, which represents devotion.' In the very existence of the latter, M. Esquiros discerns, with a sort of enthusiasm, a proof of the majesty and strength of the English government. In no other country can such a combination be witnessed; 'a government powerful enough to rest on the support of the nation, and a nation which has sufficient confidence not to abuse the right of bearing arms.' The volunteer movement is no new thing in England. The rumour of invasion has always been enough to arm the population. National enthusiasm has risen far higher than in the present movement. In 1799 the Bishop of Winchester authorised the clergy of Hampshire to take up arms for the defence of hearth and home. In 1803 the national ardour reached its climax. The declaration of war by Bonaparte sent a thrill through the land. Chains of signals ran along the coast, and tar barrels crowned every hill. Ninety thousand pikes were served out among the labourers. Frantic mayors, oblivious of dignity, ran about the streets, beating drums, and summoning volunteers. No less than 335,807 valiant souls were enrolled before the close of the year. In London alone there were thirty-five corps.

The present movement differs from the past, as promising permanence. Anything that threatens that permanence is to be solemnly deplored. The volunteer movement must not be ephemeral. All new movements have to be tried; they have their era of evil; but if there be health and life at the root of them, they will survive their time of trial, and flourish in the future. The volunteer movement is now in such an era. It will probably have its victims. Young men without principle,

without masculine character, will be led astray, weaned from the more sombre duties of the office and the shop, and from the quieter charms of home. But in all probability such young men would, under any circumstances, drift from their moorings, and come to grief. The system is not to be blamed for their ruin, but themselves. Unquestionably, however, the popularity of the movement among steady and religious people, is sadly threatened by the dissipation encouraged in many corps. Fêtes, dinners, amateur theatricals, fancy balls, will assuredly ruin the movement, if they are not at once vigorously discountenanced and put down. It behoves all earnest and patriotic men to protest with heart and voice against those abuses which imperil the existence of one of the noblest projects of patriotism the world has ever seen.

There is in the volunteer movement an element which augurs well for the future of England,—the encouragement it gives to muscular and masculine development. There was great danger, only a few years ago, of our young men becoming effeminate,—things to be decorated by the tailor and curled by the barber; loungers on sofas, and dawdlers in the streets. Young England was fast degenerating into a woful puppyism. The traditional Englishman was dying out,—the Englishman of the days of Cromwell, who, though a very ignorant, and sometimes swinish, sort of man, was nevertheless a man, and not a dolt or a dummy. But there is hope now for the manliness of England's sons; hope that the muscle, and sinew, and hardihood, and pluck of the traditional Englishman will become the characteristic of the Englishman of the day; hope that in the consciousness of that true manhood on which she can fall back, England will for ever be what she has been in by-gone days, and what she of all nations is most fitted to be,—the terror of the tyrant, the scourge of the wrong-doer, the protectress of the weak, the deliverer of the slave, and all the world over the defender of the right.

The volunteer regiments are, in many instances, too fond of dress and display. Anything approximating to dandyism will not only threaten the dissolution of the corps on pecuniary grounds, but it will hold the thing up to contempt. The parade of soldiery, the glittering cuirass and the nodding plume, the gold lace and the scarlet coat, have a purpose to serve in the regular army which the volunteer movement does not contemplate. The dress of the volunteer should be strictly practical and inexpensive. A forage cap, a coloured blouse, and a strong leather belt, are a far more workable costume than is to be seen among any of the corps. What England wants from her volun-

teers is not display, but such solid and workmanlike efficiency as may inspire her enemies with fear, and herself with confidence. M. Esquiros puts the value of the volunteer movement in a sentence: '*In the eyes of an Englishman confidence is capital.*'

M. Esquiros deserves well of his countrymen and ours. We bid him God speed in his endeavours 'to produce a practical alliance between the two great western nations, and to dethrone King Sword in favour of King Pen.'

ART. VII.—1. *Church and State Two Hundred Years ago; being a History of Ecclesiastical Affairs from* 1660 *to* 1663. By JOHN STOUGHTON. Crown 8vo. London: Jackson and Co.

2. *Joseph Alleine: his Companions and Times. A Memorial of Black Bartholomew,* 1662. By CHARLES STANFORD. Crown 8vo. London: Jackson and Co.

3. *Troublous Times: or, Leaves from the Note Book of the Rev. Mr. John Hicks, an ejected Nonconformist Minister.* Transcribed by JANE BOWRING CRANCH. With an Introduction by the REV. CHARLES STANFORD. London: Jackson and Co. 1862.

4. *The Shepherd of Grove Hall. A Story of* 1662. London: John Snow. 1862.

5. *The Two Thousand Confessors of* 1662. By THOMAS COLEMAN. New Edition, with Additions. London: John Snow. 1861.

6. *The Case of the Ejected Ministers of* 1662. *A Speech.* By R. VAUGHAN, D.D. 12mo. London.

7. *Bi-Centenary of the Bartholomew Ejectment in* 1662. *St. James's Hall Addresses.* 8vo. London: Jackson and Co.

8. *St. Bartholomew Bi-Centenary Papers, Tracts, and Lectures.* London: Kent and Co.

9. *Conformity and Nonconformity in* 1862. By SAMUEL MARTIN. London: John Snow.

AGAIN and again our age is called the Age of Revivals; and undoubtedly it has been marked by some singular and unexpected resuscitations. We have seen an attempt to get up a tournament, and heard something about a procession of Lady Godiva. Archery is again in use; and though we have not heard of any volunteers proposing to arm themselves with the bow and arrow, we have seen a large number of 'Foresters' dressed as nearly as possible in the colour and style of Robin Hood and his merry men. Prize fights were supposed to have

been put down; but the last year or two has witnessed a revival of 'the noble art of self-defence,' and sparring matches are advertised again. The ladies have returned to a fashion of their great grandmothers; and though several lives have been lost in consequence, the manufacturers of Sheffield are said to be largely employed in supplying a metal substitute for the horse-hair which gives its name to an article we will not mention. '*Clericus hirsutus*' pleads, in the columns of the *Times*, for the liberty of Protestant clergymen to decline all tonsures; and who knows that he shall not see bishops moustached like Laud and Sheldon, or bearded like Hall and Sanderson, while the 'Dissenting Brethren' vie with Bridge and Burroughes in facial adorning? But whether their fashions return upon us or not,—and many more unlikely things have happened,—their controversies have returned, beyond all doubt, and, willing or unwilling, we find ourselves carried back two hundred years, and plunged into the whirlpool of Republican and Royalist contention. Cavalier and Roundhead, the Army and the Rump, the Westminster Assembly and the Savoy Conference, Baxter and Morley, Calamy and Sheldon, Clarendon and Manchester, and a hundred more, all are in the midst of us, asking our suffrages and claiming our sympathy. This is 'a revival' indeed; and it will be well if the bad passions of two hundred years ago do not revive with its controversies.

Against such a 'revival,' however, we must be resolutely on our guard. To commemorate the sufferings of holy men two hundred years ago, by reviling, or reflecting on, our fellow-Christians who are also our neighbours and contemporaries, is to dishonour the dead, and to injure the living; to cast behind us the lessons of the history we reproduce, and to show that, so far as we are concerned, it has been written in vain. Controversialists on all sides will do well to remember that golden saying of Hooker, 'There will come a time when three words uttered with charity and meekness shall receive a far more blessed reward than three thousand volumes written with disdainful sharpness of wit.' The discussion of the proposed celebration has already borne sad fruit in the secession, from the Bible Society, of two or three clergymen, one of whom has obtained a just reputation for his boldness for the truth, his earnestness in labour, and his catholicity of spirit. We do not wonder at this; for why should Dr. Miller inflict his presence—to use his own phrase—upon persons who pronounce him dishonest, and, in religious matters, knowingly unfaithful? But we do not the less deplore it. It is like the letting out of water, of which none can foresee the end. Nor can we wholly blame Dr. Miller. No reflection was cast on him personally, it

is true; but when all the evangelical clergy were impugned, how could he consider himself exempt, or dissociate himself from a body of which he is one of the most prominent members? A Mr. Johnson, whose language was most violent and offensive at Birmingham, has since made a kind of apology to Dr. Miller; but we have not heard that he has ever disclaimed the phraseology attributed to him, in which he stigmatized at least some of the subscribing clergy as 'liars, whom the sanctity of religion did not appal, and murderers, whom the destruction of souls did not deter.'

At Ipswich similar excesses have been committed, and the evangelical clergy have been told by some zealots, associated as a Bi-Centenary Committee, that the Act of Uniformity shuts men up to this alternative—*perjury* or *secession*. Mr. Woodhouse, the evangelical rector of St. Clement's and St. Helen's in that town, has replied to this wild assertion in a calmly-reasoned tract, which he entitles, 'Assertions and Assumptions: or, Is it true, that because Two Thousand Ministers were ejected in 1662, therefore those who conform in 1862 are dishonest and perjured Men?' And he appropriately contrasts the violence of his neighbours with the meek and gentle spirit of Philip Henry, who wrote, 'I dare not judge those who do conform; for who am I, that I should judge my brother?'

It seems strange that Dissenters should be challenged for celebrating an event to which some of their congregations trace their origin, and which all must regard with profound interest as embodying, in a palpable and impressive form, some of their principles. It is, indeed, undeniable that there are almost as many points of difference as of resemblance between the men of 1662, and those who now claim to be their successors: but on the great point of refusing subscription on the ground of conscience, they are entirely at one; and as Protestants in general may do honour to Luther without being supposed to adopt all his opinions, and even while rejecting many of them, so may the Nonconformists of to-day, with entire good faith and consistency, commemorate their predecessors of the Restoration, while they hold themselves free to dissent from them in many particulars. The old Nonconformists were most certainly not all Dissenters in the modern sense of the word; but all Dissenters are as certainly Nonconformists now. The late learned and eloquent Dr. Winter Hamilton reprobated the celebration of Bartholomew's Day; but we understand him to have spoken in his specific character as an *Independent*, and not generically as a Dissenter, when he said, 'It is no portion of our chronicle. It is robbery to keep it as our festival. It is

suicide; for it commits us to conclusions at utter variance with our profession...We feel it more consistent to begin at earlier dates, though not covered with the grandeur of national prestige and historic note.' To the same effect Dr. Vaughan, at Birmingham, replied to the objection to the celebration, on the ground of a discrepance of opinion on some points between the ancients and the moderns: 'The same things which made them Nonconformists in 1662, apart from the Established Church principle, are the things that would make us Nonconformists now, apart from that principle. So far, at least, we are on common ground.' We will not be tempted into controversy on Church government; but we can hardly suppress a smile when we find this learned man claiming for that system of Independency which he upholds, but which many of the men whose commemoration he was initiating so cordially hated, and constantly protested against as a novelty,—an apostolic, or even pre-apostolic, origin. 'We as Congregationalists are much older than 1662. We trace our descent from the time when the first proclamation went forth, that men should go and preach the Gospel.'*

The denominational prospects of the proposed celebration are certainly not the least remarkable. Most of the ejected or silenced ministers were Presbyterians; and, as Dr. Hamilton truly said, in the passage already quoted in part, 'A Presbyterian Establishment was the wish, if not the hope, of the Nonconformists.' But English Presbyterianism proper is extinct; and if any still retain the name, it is that they may the more securely teach Socinian doctrine within the walls, and by means of the endowments, founded by the godly and orthodox Nonconformists of other days. The 'adherents of the Congregational way,' who, in the Westminster Assembly of 1643, numbered five, now numbering more than twice five hundred, appear to have originated this celebration; and the princely subscription lists which have been published show that the proposal is acceptable to the intelligent and wealthy members of their Churches. As neither the Baptists, nor the representatives in England of the Scotch Presbyterians, could be expected to unite in a scheme for building Independent chapels, a mixed and general committee has been organized with the object of collecting information on the subject, and diffusing it, principally by lectures and publications. 'Their purpose and endeavour will be to present a photograph of the great occurrence to which they wish to draw attention, that the genuine significance of the picture may not be concealed or marred by an untruthful exhibition of the facts

* *Speech*, p. 12.

of which it consists.' They further state their intention 'to make immediate arrangements with a competent writer for the early preparation of an historical work, moderate in its compass, attractive in its style, perfectly authentic, and fully illustrative of the event to be commemorated.' This is indeed good news; and if the projected undertaking answers to the scheme of its projectors in only one of the four characteristics specified above, the money subscribed to 'The Central United St. Bartholomew Committee of Evangelical Nonconformists' will have been well bestowed. A *perfectly authentic* history will be a treasure beyond price. They only can estimate the worth of it who have endeavoured to sift the mass of conflicting testimony which we already possess, and to elicit the truth as to the number of persons who should be commemorated, and the degree of honour to which they are justly entitled. Most sincerely do we wish the 'competent writer,' whom the Committee propose to engage, success in his task; but we hope that, in the 'immediate arrangements' which they propose to make for 'the early preparation' of the work in question, they will not limit their author as to time. A few months more or less are of small moment where the production of a standard work is concerned; and the careful inquiry, searching analysis, and discriminating judgment, which are essential to the production of a 'perfectly authentic history,' all imply and require leisure.

The question of the number of these victims of St. Bartholomew, for instance, is one of great perplexity. For popular purposes it may suffice to speak of them, as the United Committee does in its First Tract, as 'the two thousand.' But the man who desires to write 'authentic' history must have something more than loose generalities. It might seem easy to count the lists given by Calamy and Palmer respectively; but let the reader compare the statements of Mr. Stoughton and Mr. Stanford, both able men and practised writers, but neither of them agreeing on this simple matter. The latter says:—

'About three thousand refused to subscribe; and when the terms of subscription were fully known, about two thousand of these took their final station in the ranks of Nonconformity.'—*Alleine's Life*, p. 177.

He adds in a note:—

'Baxter puts the number of the ejected and deprived as from 1,800 to 2,000. Calamy gives it as 2,400, including fellows of colleges not in orders. A catalogue in Dr. Williams's Library gives 2,257 names. A manuscript by Oliver Heywood gives 2,500.'—*Ibid.*, p. 384.

Mr. Stoughton's account is as follows:—

'The total number of ejected and silenced ministers whom Calamy mentions in his "Account," including those who were removed from seques-

tered livings upon Bartholomew's Day, is 2,188. Palmer gives a list amounting to 2,186; and mentions, in the preface to his *Nonconformists' Memorial*, a M.S. entitled, "Index eorum Theologorum aliorumque No. 2,267, qui propter Legem Uniformitatis Aug. 24, anno 1662, ab Ecclesiâ Anglicanâ secesserunt." Out of the names collected by Calamy and Palmer we reckon up 529 to which no particulars are appended, and consequently they are cases which appear uncertain, although no doubt many, if not all the names, are really those of persons ejected in 1662, or during the two previous years. Perhaps it is impossible, certainly it would be difficult now, to ascertain the exact amount of the ministers compelled to leave the Church at that time, but in round numbers the old statement of 2,000 cannot be far from the truth. It is common to speak of 2,000 ejected on Bartholomew's Day, 1662: this is incorrect. What was the proportion of those ejected on that day we do not know. Hook, in a letter to be quoted hereafter, (March 2nd, 1663,) speaks of the number as 1,600, and says, "As many had been removed before." We do not see how the latter can be true. That statement being more than doubtful, we can place no dependence on the other. If persons interested in the subject, who may be living in cathedral towns, would search the Bishops' Registers for 1660–2, much might be done towards supplying what it is so desirable to know.'—*Church and State*, p. 370.

Mr. Coleman differs from both these writers, and gives the number arranged according to counties, but does not state from what source it is drawn, nor sum up the total.

'The number of Ministers Ejected from the different Counties of England, etc.

London, Westminster, and the Borough of Southwark	113	Leicestershire	42
University of Oxford	35	Lincolnshire	54
„ Cambridge	45	Middlesex	32
Bedfordshire	16	Northamptonshire	43
Berkshire	23	Northumberland	38
Buckinghamshire	33	Nottinghamshire	30
Cambridgeshire	18	Oxfordshire	23
Cheshire	44	Rutlandshire	6
Cornwall	41	Shropshire	43
Cumberland	27	Somersetshire	99
Derbyshire	39	Staffordshire	49
Devonshire	137	Suffolk	94
Dorsetshire	54	Surrey	28
Durham	18	Sussex	76
Essex	127	Warwickshire	40
Gloucestershire	52	Westmoreland	5
Hampshire	58	Wiltshire	56
Herefordshire	17	Worcestershire	37
Hertfordshire	32	Yorkshire	126
Huntingdonshire	8	North Wales	14
Kent	78	South Wales	64
Lancashire	81	Ministers omitted	36'

All these 2,136 he calls ejected ministers, overlooking altogether the distinction which Calamy was careful to make between those cast out, and those who never had rightful possession, or were in no living at all, or were only candidates for the ministry.

If from these second-hand authorities we turn to Calamy, (Second Edition, 1713,) we find a list containing 1,240 names; or if we go to Palmer's *Nonconformists' Memorial*, which professes to correct the errors and supply the defects of Calamy, we find (vol. iii., Second Edition, 1803,) a list of 2,251. This would appear decisive; but when the book is carefully examined, the result is to show that the numbers furnished by the index are not at all to be relied on. The discrepancy between the gross number and the detail is curious enough. The total number of names given under the heading 'Bedfordshire,' for instance, is in Calamy, 14; in Palmer, 16. Let us follow the historian into particulars. The first named is Mr. Ashurst, who 'would have quitted his living, but being rather advised by some respectable friend to continue in it, *did so*, without molestation. And so, though he was legally silenced, he continued in his Church a Nonconformist.'* Of the second nothing is known but his name; and of the third nothing is stated, but that he cheerfully quitted one of the best parsonages in the county for conscience' sake. Of the fourth, Mr. Perrott, it is told how, after his ejectment, he preached for three years under the eye of Bishop Laney, and met with no molestation; and, when he finally settled in Kent, preached twice on the Lord's day, and a weekly lecture, till he died at eighty-seven. The fifth, Mr. Fairclough, had a funeral sermon preached for him by a conforming clergyman. The sixth married a rich wife, and lived comfortably in Essex till he was seventy-one. The seventh was imprisoned. Of the eighth no particulars are given. Of the ninth we read, that, like the fourth, Mr. Rolt preached for some time at Buckden, and was connived at by the bishop. No. 10, is Mr. W. Shepherd, who conformed at first, and *continued for some years in his living*, though he afterwards became a Dissenter: his son followed in his steps, held livings for some years, and then became a Dissenting minister. No. 11 is Mr. W. Blagrave, of whom we learn little more than that he was protected and favoured by the Earl of Bedford, and was, moreover, 'of so placid a temper, that he was seldom seen without a smiling countenance.' No. 12 is the notorious William Dell, who had been a chaplain in the army, was head of a college in Cambridge, and a rector in Bedfordshire; declaimed against tythes, and received them; inveighed against

* Palmer's *Nonconformists' Memorial*, vol. i., p. 281.

infant baptism, and had his own children baptised; and, according to one of Mr. Palmer's correspondents, should rather be classed among Quakers than Baptists. No. 13 has only a name and a good character. No. 14, Mr. Milburn, 'conformed in part, and yet so little, that he ought to be ranked with the Nonconformists.' No. 15 *lost no preferment*, but was kept out of it, and became chaplain to the Duke of Bedford. No. 16 is Edward Fowler, who died a Bishop.

The result may be thus stated:—

No. 1, Ashurst; No. 10, Shepherd; No. 16, Fowler; and Thornton, No. 15; were clearly neither ejected nor silenced. Four of the sixteen are, therefore, inserted in mistake. Rolt cannot be said to have been ejected; for he resigned to the former incumbent; and it is clear he was not silenced any more than Perrott. Dell is in the Cambridge List. Of four others we know nothing; so that they *may*, like Rolt, have resigned to living incumbents, at the Restoration; or *may* have been violently dispossessed and imprisoned. The same remark applies to the four remaining. We are not told whether they had been legally inducted, or when or how they gained possession of their livings; so that we know not whether to classify Fairclough, Hind, Donne, Blagrave, with the ejected, or the silenced: and we are at a loss about Mr. Milburn, whose case raises the curious question, how much or how little conformity entitles a man to be ranked among the Nonconformists. He is said to have been 'in great straits;' but whether this was owing to his conformity, or nonconformity, neither historian tells us. But even if it should be granted that the four of whom we know nothing, and the four of whom we know something, but not what we want to know, were all incumbents in rightful possession, and left their benefices vacant by their nonconformity, the whole number of sixteen, for the county of Bedford, is reduced by one half; and only one of the sixteen is recorded as having been the subject of persecution.

In the Berkshire list we count twenty-five names. One was not an incumbent; ten more are merely mentioned by name or with some note of character, but without particulars of their history; of the remaining number, five appear to have suffered persecution.

The Buckinghamshire list contains thirty-five names; of these two (Goodwin and Lockyer) are counted elsewhere. Twelve are dismissed in a sentence without any historical particulars concerning them. Luff resigned to a former incumbent; Fownes quitted the Church voluntarily before the Restoration; Hobson was a Baptist, and had been an officer in Cromwell's army;

Bennett retired at the Restoration in favour of a conforming colleague; and Dyer is reported to have turned Quaker. Of the remaining sixteen, six are said to have suffered persecution in various ways.

The Cambridgeshire list supplies eighteen names, of which five are unaccompanied by any history. Of the remaining thirteen, not one is recorded as suffering persecution; while Bradshaw preached for five years in a church by connivance, and Jephcot was offered a living by Bishop Sanderson. Kennet received kindness from Stillingfleet, and Hunt from Lightfoot. Wright was overtaken by the Act of Uniformity while carrying on a law-suit concerning his title. Wilson 'was only an occasional preacher, and probably never ordained.' It is not known from what place Binshul was ejected. Townley's name is not in the Register of Inductions, nor is that of King; so that it is doubtful whether they should be included in the list at all.

Cheshire comes next, and contains forty-six names, of which seventeen are mere names, without any particulars concerning those who bore them. Two describe preachers who, at the Restoration, gave place to the former incumbents; and three occupied parochial chapels by connivance of the parish ministers for several years. Six are said to have been more or less 'molested;' one by 'profane wits,' one by 'Quakers,' and four by magistrates and informers; one of these, however, was not ejected, but only 'prevented from' conforming and obtaining a living, and 'is therefore,' says Palmer, 'as properly entered on this list as many others.' (Vol. i., p. 331.)

Out of forty-one persons named in the Cornwall list, nine are recorded as suffering persecution. Among them is the minister whose imaginary 'Note Book' has been transcribed and published under Mr. Stanford's sanction. That gentleman has a right, if he thinks proper, to squander the reputation acquired by his 'Alleine;' and he takes the sure way to do it by patronizing *Troublous Times*. For what can the cause of Nonconformity gain by bringing into prominence a man who was so injudicious and violent, and whose course terminated so disgracefully? Eleven of Hicks's brethren, in the catalogue of Cornish Nonconformists, have only a name; six more are dismissed with a sentence; one of the forty-one was but a candidate; and three yielded up their places to former incumbents.

Cumberland supplies twenty-six names, eleven without the addition of a word, two with a sentence each added; one is that of a candidate who, with three others, suffered more or less for his nonconformity.

Eleven out of forty Derbyshire ministers have no memorial

but their names; one resigned in anticipation of coming events; one yielded his place to the former incumbent; one had no living; nine are reported as persecuted after their ejectment.

We have thus analysed the lists of those said to have been ejected in eight counties, being all that are contained in Palmer's first volume; and we cannot fail to observe how the reality of the case, even as presented by him, differs from the popular statements and impressions. The eight counties are a fifth part of all England; and the two hundred and forty-seven names registered, about a ninth part of those contained in Palmer's list of ministers ejected in England and Wales. Of eighty-one, or nearly one-third of the whole number examined, we know absolutely nothing, or little more than that some one, whom Calamy or Palmer deemed worthy of credit, reported them as having been ejected. But upon what foundation the report rests, and in what capacity, and by what authority, they officiated in the churches, we have yet to be informed. And if to these eighty-one we add the twenty-one who resigned to former incumbents, or were but candidates for the ministry, or are otherwise entered in mistake, like the four specified in the Bedfordshire list, we have a residue of 145, about whom we may be said to have credible information that they were ejected *or* silenced. If a similar process applied to the entire list should yield similar results, it is manifest that we could no longer speak of 'the two thousand' as heretofore. A deduction of 102 from every 247 in the list would reduce the 2251 to 1333; but such a reduction might perhaps scarcely be just, as the number of those of whom there is no history, is possibly larger in the eight counties than elsewhere. The total number of those whom Palmer prints in *italics*, in his index, as 'having no account,' is 508. But, on the other hand, he reckons that he has given 'an account' of a man, and he does not print his name in *italics*, when he has merely said, 'He was a good man, and much respected;' or, 'He was an antinomian,' or something equally instructive. Our readers' impressions will probably have been somewhat modified on another point. Many of these good men are recorded to have finished their days in peace, honour, and competence; and those who appear to have been in anywise troubled with legal proceedings are fewer than are commonly supposed. Of the forty whom we have noted, some were indeed 'sore vexed;' while, in the case of others, the malice of their enemies was not suffered to inflict any serious or prolonged injury.

The difficulty of arriving at the truth in reference to the sufferers for conscience' sake among the clergy is, if possible, greater than among the Nonconformists. Whether the re-

searches which are now so diligently prosecuted among our national records will bring to light the proceedings of the Committee for plundered ministers, or of the Triers, or of the several County Committees, or any of these, time only can determine. At present inquirers after the truth are baffled at every turn. Walker, who published, in 1714, 'An Attempt towards recovering an Account of the Numbers and Sufferings of the Clergy,' &c., took great pains to explore all such sources of information as may be supposed to have been accessible to a country clergyman a century and a half ago. He corresponded with persons in various parts of the land, and Calamy allows that he had assistance from 'several persons of worth and eminence;' and quotes two circular letters, asking help in collecting materials for his book, in which he charges his friends to send 'nothing but what they can get from good hands,' and have reason to believe is true. This is much in Walker's favour, and so is the circumstance that in his preface he states that some things, about which he doubts, have been inserted in his book in deference to the character of the persons from whom he received them. (Page xlii.) But Dr. Vaughan, notwithstanding this, falls upon him with great violence. The passage, in its 'disdainful sharpness,' reminds us of the style in which Carlyle is wont to deal with those from whom he differs.

'Another word I have to offer: it must be understood, once for all, that we do not take Walker's *Sufferings of the Clergy* as our great guide upon this question. Let any man turn to that huge, lumbering preface of his, extending to some fifty closely printed folio pages, let him read from the seventh page and onwards, and then, when he has considered the farrago of rabid intolerance and pitiable imbecility which he will find presented there, let him say whether a man who could write that, and send it to the printer, correct it in the proof, and give it to the world, has not put himself out of court as a calm and impartial judge upon a question of this kind. The authorities which Mr. Walker cites are, for the most part, too much like himself. Where he is statistical, we welcome what we can receive with confidence; but the men whom he cites for most of his assertions are men of the same passionate disposition with himself, incapable of a calm and candid judgment.'—*St. James's Hall Addresses*, p. 6.

This is a very wholesale method of disposing of Walker and his authorities; but before Dr. Vaughan had committed himself to it, he would have done well to weigh two considerations. First, the notorious rumour, that White, the chairman of the Committee for Scandalous Ministers, and author of the famous 'Centurie,' boasted that he and his had ejected or sequestered

eight thousand; and next, and what is of more consequence, the publication of Dr. Gauden, bearing on this question. This is entitled, 'A Petitionary Remonstrance on behalf of *many thousand* Ministers and Schoolmasters;' and was addressed to Cromwell, with the design of obtaining some mitigation of their sufferings. The author, who was unquestionably a man of ability, and would not needlessly incur the risk of contradiction from the Protector, says, 'that above half of the ministers of England and Wales had been, upon one account or other, sequestered from their livings, (which are above nine thousand,) besides fellowships or free schools; and that many others, also, had been wholly deprived of their prebendaries, deaneries, bishoprics, and highest dignities in the Church; who upon the highest figure or head could not be less than six or seven thousand persons.' Assuming that Gauden's calculations were exclusive of deceased clergy, curates, and chaplains, and candidates, (all which are reckoned by Calamy,) Walker goes on to say that these would make the total number more than White's eight thousand, and probably nearer ten. Gauden may have been 'incapable of a calm and candid judgment;' but he had at least sufficient prudence not to commit himself needlessly on such an occasion; and it appears to us, that it would have been wiser for the ex-professor of history to confute him, than to have reviled Walker. Dr. Vaughan, however, does not content himself with abuse, but produces three arguments against Walker's calculation, as follows:—

'Mr. Walker seems to think 6,000 a very moderate estimate of the number said to have been expelled from the parochial churches. Well, the majority of these were expelled, if expelled at all, when the Scottish League and Covenant was used as a test in 1643 and 1644. Suppose 6,000 to have been expelled then, or subsequently, while the parishes of England were not computed at more than 9,000, and you would then at once have had two-thirds of the parishes of England without ministers; for the men who came home from exile, and from other sources, on a sudden, would have been but a mere fraction to have been placed in that tremendous void. If the Long Parliament had left two-thirds of the parishes of England, or anything like that number, without ministers, it would have been held to be one of the most notorious crimes with which a legislative assembly could be reproached. It would have been as prominent a fact in our history as the attempt of the King to seize the five members, or as the trial and death of Strafford. But our history gives us nothing of the kind. Then, again, Mr. Walker spent some ten years in searching for information as to sequestered clergymen in the different dioceses of England. All accessible parties were put into motion to supply him with material. The utmost number of men that he could name after all is a little above 2,000 for the twenty years; and if that

were so, you can see that there never could have been 6,000 expelled. But there is a briefer way of settling this point. If 6,000 were in the condition of sequestrated clergy in 1644, or subsequently, then, according to the laws of mortality, there must have been 3,600, and more, of those men alive in 1660, and claiming to be put back into their livings. All that were so living at that time were put back, and the whole number that were so restored did not appear to have amounted to more than some five or six hundred. The point, therefore, is settled by the most certain of tests. This is a course of inquiry which I have worked out for myself. But I would not rest satisfied with my own calculations. I have obtained the opinion of two of the first actuaries and staticians in this kingdom—one of them ought to be, from his position, the very first—and this is their statement:—If there were 6,000 men alive, of 24 years of age and upwards, in 1644, there ought to have been 3,600 of those men living in 1660; and the number of ejected ministers accordingly, between the spring of 1663 and the autumn of 1662, ought to have been between 5,000 and 6,000! I do hope, therefore, that we shall hear no more about these 6,000 sequestered clergymen.'—*St. James's Hall Addresses*, pp. 6, 7.

But this admits of an easy reply. To the first argument the answer is, first, It is a mistake to suppose that the Covenant was the great means of annoying the episcopal clergy, and that the bulk of those whose complaints are now under consideration were ejected by it; those complaints reaching over the greater part of the times of the Commonwealth, and referring to the proceedings of the Triers, and others. To the second, that Walker names only about two thousand, the reply is, that Walker takes great pains to caution his readers against supposing that his lists are complete; and the third, that had six thousand been expelled, there must have been more than half of them alive sixteen years afterwards to claim their restoration, is substantially disposed of by the answer to the first. It is not alleged that 6,000 persons were expelled at once, or nearly at the same period. Walker distinguishes between *sequestrations* and *ejectments*, and professes to give an account of 'those who were sequestered, harassed, &c., in the late times of the Grand Rebellion.' All the sufferings endured during the civil wars, and during the Commonwealth, come within his range; and thus the basis of the actuarial calculation is destroyed.

The desirableness of a complete account of the sufferings of the clergy is well remarked on by Mr. Stoughton, who, at the close of the passage cited above, adds:—

'Surely it is time to look at this question of numbers without any of the prejudice of party feeling. Let the number of the clergy whose livings were sequestered under the Commonwealth, with the causes of sequestration, be looked at also, with all the impartiality of historical

justice. The *principles* of conformity and nonconformity are not at stake in the settlement of matters concerning their history.'—Page 372.

But the question of the number of sufferers, however historically important, is quite insignificant beside that of the principle involved in the case. And here, happily, all is plain and patent; there is nothing left to conjecture or dispute. The Act of Uniformity required all who would continue in the Established Church to be ordained by a bishop, to renounce the Solemn League and Covenant, and to declare their unfeigned assent and consent to all and every thing in the Book of Common Prayer. The first condition offended some; the second, others; the last, all. Even those who might have reconciled themselves to receive episcopal ordination, or who had not taken the Covenant, or might have been willing to promise to *use* the book, shrank from giving so full and precise an approbation of it as the Act required, and preferred taking the consequences of nonconformity, whatever they might be, to defiling their consciences by declaring what was not true. All honour to their fidelity! They 'dared to be true' at all costs and hazards; and it will be an evil day for England when even those who differ most widely from them in judgment fail to echo the applause which Wordsworth expresses, in the sonnet which Mr. Stoughton has so appropriately selected as the motto of his book:—

> 'Their altars they forego, their homes they quit,
> Fields which they love, and paths they daily trod,
> And cast the future upon Providence;
> As men the dictate of whose inward sense
> Outweighs the world; whom self-deceiving wit
> Lures not from what they deem the cause of God.'

One of these worthy men thus expresses himself in a soliloquy, written between the passing of the Act and the time fixed for its coming into effect:—

'It is not, O my soul, a light matter thou art now employed in; it is not thy maintenance, family, wife, or children that are the main things considerable. Forget these till thou art come to a resolution in the main business. It is, O my soul, the glory of God, the credit and advantage of religion, the good of the poor flock committed to thy keeping by the Holy Ghost, that must cast the scale and determine thy resolution. And where all cannot be at once promoted, (or, at least, seem to cross one another,) it is fit the less should give place to the greater. Thy ministry, thy people, must be singularly dear and precious to thee; incomparably above body, food, raiment, wife, children, and life itself; but when thou canst no longer continue in thy work without dishonour to God, wounding conscience, spoiling thy peace, and hazarding the loss of thy salva-

tion,—in a word, when the conditions upon which thou must continue (if thou wilt continue) in thy employment are sinful, and unwarranted by the word of God, thou mayest, yea, thou must, believe that God will turn thy very silence, suspension, deprivation, and laying aside, to His glory and the advancement of the Gospel interest. When God will not use thee in one way, He will in another. A soul that desires to serve and honour God shall never want opportunity to do it; nor must thou so limit the Holy One of Israel as to think He hath but one way to glorify Himself by thee. He can do it by thy silence as well as by thy preaching. O! put on that holy indifferency to the means, so the end be but attained, which the blessed apostle expresses, (Phil. i. 20,) that "Christ may be magnified in his body, whether by life or by death." Let God have the disposal of thee, and doubt not but He will use thee for His own glory and His Church's good, His respect to which is infinitely greater than thine can be.....What if men be Pharaoh's task-masters—impose such burdens as thou mayest ever groan under? If they be only burdens, and not sins, they must be borne, and not shaken off.

'Nothing but a necessity of sinning in the act can absolve thee from that necessity which is laid upon thee of preaching the Gospel, and shelter thee from the influence of that woe which is denounced against thee for not preaching it. The plain question, then, which lies before thee, O my soul, and in the right resolution whereof consists the comfort of suffering, or the duty of continuing at thy work, is, whether the conditions that are imposed be sinful or no. Sinful, I say, not only in the imposition of them, but in submission to them. Whether thou canst, without sinning against God, His Church, thy people, thy conscience, and soul,—all, or any of these,—submit to the present conditions of continuing in thy place and employment. Here is no room for comparing sin with sin, viz., whether it be a greater sin to leave thy ministry or perform such a sinful condition? Thou art not necessitated to sin; nor must thou do the least evil, though the greatest good might come of it. Thou wilt have little thanks if, when thou art charged with corrupting God's worship, falsifying thy vows, thou pretendest a necessity of it, in order to thy continuance in the ministry.'—*Palmer*, vol. i., pp. 396–399.

Another deals with the same question in an address to his Master and Judge. He had, it would appear, taken the covenant, and now had to consider the lawfulness of renouncing, as well as of subscribing. After specifying both difficulties, he proceeds:—

'I am, by Act of Parliament, (Thy authority over me,) *ipso facto* avoided as dead, if within the time I do not this. I am at Thy footstool; I may not do evil that good may come. I may not do this great sin against my God and the dictates of my conscience. I therefore surrender myself, my soul, my ministry, my people, my place, my wife and children, and whatsoever else is herein concerned, into Thy hand, from whom I received them. Lord, have mercy upon me, and assist me for ever to

keep faith and a good conscience!.....As for my provision, my God, I never had any considerable estate, and yet I have never wanted. I have lived well, without injury to or need of others; plentifully, by Thy gracious providence and bountiful hand. I depend on Thy promise, (Matt. vi. 24, 33,) and have reason more than others, from good experience, to trust Thee. When I come into extreme need or straits, I will, through Thine assistance, as formerly, come to acquaint Thee with it, and to devolve myself at Thy footstool for the like relief. In the mean time, I give Thee most hearty thanks for what I have, and humbly beseech Thee for grace to use it well. My God, I beg thy direction in this great business, and beseech Thee to show me what is fully pleasing to Thee, and enable me to do it; for my Lord Jesus Christ's sake, my Saviour and blessed Redeemer. Amen.'—*Palmer*, vol. iii., p. 116.

This is the true sublime, and will command increasing admiration with the increase of knowledge and goodness among men. Doubtless, similar things were thought, and felt, and said by hundreds, though not so fully recorded. The entry in Philip Henry's diary is very brief, but to the same effect:—

'August 25.—Common Prayer tendered. God knows how loath I am to go off my station; but I must not sin against my conscience.' His son adds, that he called Bartholomew Day 'the day which our sins have made one of the saddest days to England since the death of Edward VI.; but even this for good, though we know not how nor which way.'—*Life by Williams*, pp. 92, 96.

Of Joseph Alleine's thoughts and reasonings we know nothing more (notwithstanding Mr. Stanford's researches) than his wife had previously told us:—

'Before the Act came forth, my husband was very earnest, day and night, with God, that his way might be made plain to him, and that he might not desist from such advantages of saving souls with any scruple upon his spirit. He seemed so moderate, that both myself and others thought he would have conformed,—he often saying that he would not leave his work for small and dubious matters; but when he saw those claims of *assent and consent*, and *renouncing the Covenant*, he was fully satisfied.'—*Stanford's Life*, p. 199.

What passed in the mind of John Howe, we only know by the result, his private papers having been all destroyed by himself; yet we can almost think we are listening to him, in listening to his friend John Corbett, who thus prefaces a detailed examination of the question, extending over more than thirty pages:—

'In considering the terms of Conformity, now enjoined, I am not forgetful of the reverence due to rulers. I do not herein presume to judge their public acts; but I only exercise a judgment of discretion, about my

own act, in reference to their injunctions, which surely they will not disallow. To consider the lawfulness of those things, of which an unfeigned approbation is required, is an unquestionable duty. If I should profess what I believe not, or practise what I allow not, my sin were heinous and inexcusable. The reasons of my dissent are here expressed as inoffensively as can be done by me, who am to show that it is not nothing for which I have quitted the station which I formerly held in the Church.' —*A Consideration of the present State of Conformity, &c.*, p. 136.

'The true intent of this declaration is to be considered. By the form of words wherein it is expressed, it seems to signify no less than assent to an approbation of the whole, and of every thing contained and prescribed in and by the Book of Common Prayer, &c.; so that no man can make this declaration, that is not satisfied of the truth of every thing contained, and the lawfulness and allowableness of every thing prescribed in the said book. Nothing is more evident to me, than that I ought not to dissemble or lie in matters of religion; but so I do, if I declare my unfeigned assent and consent to those things contained and prescribed in the Liturgy, from which I really dissent.'—*Ibid.*, p. 137.

The Farewell Sermons, of which a specimen or two are subjoined, speak the same language, and are well deserving of a careful perusal, as illustrative both of the character of the men, and the state of religion. Whenever the preachers suffer themselves to refer to their being silenced, it is in mild and moderate language, and the ground of their Nonconformity is distinctly laid in conscience. It is a curious circumstance, that—by the diligence of reporters, whether professional or otherwise, we are not informed—so many of their prayers should have been preserved; and that the same reticence should be observable there as in the discourses.

One of the most polished and celebrated of the preachers supplies our first specimen. Mr. Stoughton describes Dr. Bates's farewell as follows:—

'Pepys, who liked to see and hear what was going on, walked to old St. Dunstan's church, at seven o'clock that summer's morning, but found the doors not open. He took a turn in the pleasant Temple Gardens till eight o'clock, when, on coming back to the church, people were crowding in at the side-door, and the Secretary of the Admiralty found the edifice already half filled, ere the public entrance was opened for general admission. Dr. Bates, minister of the church, took for his text, "Now the God of peace, that brought again from the dead our Lord Jesus, that great Shepherd of the sheep, through the blood of the everlasting covenant, make you perfect." "He made a very good sermon," Pepys says, "and very little reflections in it to anything of the times." After dinner, the gossip went to St. Dunstan's again, to hear a second sermon from Bates, on the same text. On his arrival at the church, about one o'clock, he found it thronged, and had to stand during the whole of the service. Not till the close of the afternoon discourse did the celebrated preacher

make any distinct allusion to his ejectment; and then it was in terms the most concise and temperate. "I know you expect that I should say something as to my nonconformity. I shall only say thus much: it is neither fancy, fashion, or humour, that makes me not to comply, but merely for fear of offending God. And if after the best means used for my illumination, as prayer to God, discourse, or study, I am not able to be satisfied concerning the lawfulness of what is required, if it be my unhappiness to be in error, surely men will have no reason to be angry with me in this world, and I hope God will pardon me in the next." —*Stoughton*, pp. 328, 329.

Mr. Beerman at St. Thomas's, Southwark, and Mr. Bull at Newington Green, took the same text. (Acts xx. 32.) The first, before announcing it, said,—

'Beloved, I know you are not ignorant that I am called by authority to depart from you, which for conscience' sake we must obey; and were it not for the breach of conscience, I think I could be content to undo myself to stay with you.'—*Lond. Farewell Sermons*, quarto, p. 350.

Mr. Bull, in better sense than English, concluded his discourse thus:—

'And though I take this my solemn leave of you as to this public exercise, yet if the Lord shall open the door, and take off those bands of death that the law hath laid upon my [our!] ministry in regard of conscience, who cannot conform, for which our publick ministry is suspended, I shall cheerfully and willingly return to you in this place. But now though your dying minister in respect to the exercise of his public ministry is leaving of you, yet I commend you into a safe hand. I commend you to God and to the word of His grace.'—*Ibid.*, p. 463.

The last sermon in this melancholy volume is Mr. Sclater's, and it has a stronger bearing upon the principles of his Nonconformity than most of the others. Thus, however, he concludes, with that same avowal of conscience as the ground of his proceeding which the foregoing quotations contain, and which the subsequent conduct of those who made it, so well justifies.

'And now yet one word more. I would not occasion any discomposure of spirit that is not becoming you; but this I must say, for ought I know you have the words of a dying man, and we used to say, that the words of dying men they are apt to make somewhat a deep impression; I mean a dying man, not in properness of speech according to nature; and if it should be so, I hope there would be cause of rejoicing on my part. But I speak the words of a dying man in respect of ministerial office.

'I suppose you all know, there is an Act come forth by Supream Authority, and it is not for us to quarrel at all, but to submit to it, and hold correspondency with a good conscience; and there being many injunctions, that many, besides myself, cannot comply withall, therefore we are willing to submit to the penalty inflicted.

'This I say, you have for many years had the benefit of my poor labours; I have fulfilled near up towards forty years, and have performed my service to God, Christ, and His people, and I bless His name, not without acceptance and success. My work, so far as I know, in this course, as in the weekly course, is now at an end; my desire is, that you whose hearts have been inclined to wait upon God, in the way of my ministry, may be kept faithful to God, and that you may have the blessing of the everlasting covenant coming upon your souls, and that you may have the power of this doctrine, held forth in this sermon, put forth upon your hearts; that as ye do believe that Jesus is the Christ, that Jesus is the Son of God, that as you profess these things, you may carry it suitably to your profession, that you may walk in love to God, love to Christ, and love to one another; that you may labour to manifest a noble, generous spirit in overcoming the world in errors, corruptions, false doctrines, and unwarrantable worship; that you may in all things labour to approve yourselves: and, little children, keep yourselves from idols. Amen.'

We have called this volume of Farewell Discourses a melancholy one, for it always excites such feelings in us. It seems to tell, not merely of personal, but of public, griefs; as though the preachers felt that a great experiment had failed, and that the cause of religion had not been advanced in proportion to their expectations, even by the state of things they had been so largely instrumental in bringing about. When we read the sermon preached, in the place from which he had been ejected four months before, by the elder Calamy, on occasion of the accidental failure of the preacher, and observe what he says as to the state of religion in the country, we are apt to think that his circumstances may perhaps have influenced his feelings, and led him to take somewhat gloomy views, as in the following passage:—

'Let me tell you there is not one sin for which God ever took away the ark from our people but it is to be found in England.....Are not the sins of Israel among us? The sins of Germany and the sins of all other nations round about us?.....Where are they that lay to heart the dangers of the ark? You complain of taxes and decay of trading, of this and that civil burden; but where is the man or woman that complains of this misery, the loss of the ark? Most of you are like Gallio, he cared not for these things. If it had been a civil matter, then he would have meddled with it; but for religion he cared not for that.....There is a strange knell of indifferency and lukewarmness upon most people's spirits; so they may have their trading go on, and their civil burdens removed, they care not what becomes of the ark,'.....with more to the same effect.—Pp. 371, 372.

But when we come to read the Farewell Sermon of Thomas Case, founded upon the Epistle to the Church at Ephesus, which speaks of removing the candlestick out of its place, (Rev. ii. 5,) that impression is dispelled, and with it much of the

interest with which those 'former days' were wont to be regarded as times of extraordinary piety and spiritual power. In a previous discourse from the same words, he had enumerated eleven special sins which should be repented of, among which are hypocrisy, pride,—in apparel, houses, parts, blood, birthright, yea, of grace itself,—covetousness;—never did covetousness invade the professing party as now; the more goods men get, the less good they do, &c., &c. He now enlarges the catalogue to twenty, taking care, as he tells his audience, when he had finished, not to mention one of those 'gross prophanenesses which stare heaven in the face,' but to confine himself to the sins of professors. Avoiding all mention of drunkenness, whoredom, Sabbath-breaking, &c., he specifies—'the want of mutual forbearance,—our great murmuring against Reformation and Reformers,'—the great neglect of the care of our families: 'Time was when we could not have come through the streets of London on an evening in the week, but we might hear the praises of God and singing of psalms; now it is a stranger in the city, even upon the Lord's own day,'—our indifferences * as to the matter of faith and doctrine,—our living by sense and not by faith,—want of sympathy with the bleeding, gasping, groaning churches, of Jesus Christ,—our grievous insensibleness of God's dishonour,—'that epidemical sin of self-seeking and self-pleasing.' What he has to say upon this last head is very affecting and instructive, as well as conclusive on the point that he was not irritated by the pressure of present calamity, to which indeed there is no reference from first to last.

'Oh my brethren, we may revive that complaint of the apostle: "All seek their own, not the things which are Jesus Christ's." (Phil. ii. 21.) This, this hath been the source of all our miseries. While some had power in their hands to have done great things for God, what did they do, but neglect the interest and truth in their hands, and fell a feathering their own nests, and building to themselves houses and names, that they thought would continue for ever; and to divide the spoil among

* We subjoin his words under this head, as not having quite lost their applicability, though two hundred years are passed. 'That we have not been more zealous for the truth of Christ, that great truth and deposition that hath been committed to us: we have accounted it no matter of what opinion or judgment men be of in these latter times. 'T is a universal saying, "No matter what judgment men be of, so they be saints." As if truth in the judgment did not go to the making up of a saint, as well as holiness in the will and affections. As if Christ had not come into the world to bear witness of the truth, which was his great design: as if it were no matter if God have the heart, so the devil be in the head; as if no matter that be full of darkness, so the heart be for God.' (*Farewell Sermons*, p. 38.) Case's testimony is the more important because of his early connexion with what he supposed to have been the work of reformation. He had been a member of the Assembly of Divines, and preached more than once before the Parliament.

themselves, as if their own game they hunted: and others in inferior stations began to divide, and every one began to snatch, as if the dust of the earth would not serve every one for a handful; and in the mean time a sea of error, like an inundation, hath been ready to overturn us. Yea, all men seeking to be pleased, not to please; whereas our duty is, to study to please, not to be pleased,' &c.—*Ibid.*, pp. 40, 41.

At the close of this 'head' is another sentence equally sad, and decisive on the point now under consideration.

'If we would have God repent of the evil of punishment, we had need to make haste to repent of the evil of sin. We have been a long time in sinning, we had need be a long time in repenting. I tell you, Christians, we have *been these late twenty years doing nothing else* but sinning against God; and should God let us live twenty years more, it would be too little to weep for the provocations thereof. Learn to lay these and other sins to heart, that God may never lay them to your charge.'—*Ibid.*, p. 41.

All this is very sorrowful: and it is worth noting that the same things were said by the same parties, both in the year of the Restoration, and during the palmy days of Cromwell. 'A seasonable Exhortation of sundry Ministers in London to the People of their respective Congregations,' dated 1660, and signed by Calamy and Case, with most of the other leading Presbyterians, casts some light on this subject; but those who wish to pursue it fully must read the sermons preached before the Parliament, on the 26th of May, 1647. Case could not then have expected ever to be an ejected minister, yet he utters these memorable words:—

'In a time when we had sworn ourselves to God by Covenant to extirpate Popery, Prelacy, Superstition, Heresy, Schism, Profaneness, and whatsoever shall be found contrary to sound doctrine, and the power of Godliness; alas! we run in such a contrary motion, that a man might almost think there was a word in the Covenant mis-printed, and the next *errata* should bid the reader read ESTABLISH instead of EXTIRPATE..... England was never so bad as in a time of reformation.....How much less an evil was it, think ye, to *bow* at the name of Jesus than to deny, to *blaspheme* the name of Jesus?'

Six months afterwards, Mr. Kentish bore a similar testimony in the same place:—

'The people of England once loved the saints, and honoured those that feared the Lord, but now they loathe them.....About six years since sin began to be ashamed, to creep into corners, to be out of fashion; now sin is grown brazen-faced, walks in the open streets, is come in great request again.....How are England's professors falleu from hot to cold, from better to worse! They are not like the people they were.'—*Sermon, H. C., Nov. 24th*, 1647.

Dr. Lightfoot had, nearly two years before, uttered similar complaints:—

'When reformation was first spoken of, we had orders and ordinances; but now, how is the one lost, the other slighted! We had then sacraments, full congregations, a followed ministry, and frequented churches; but now sacraments laid aside, congregations scattered, the ministry cried down, churches empty, church doors shut up, *equestres Samnitum in ipso Samnio.* If you look for reformation upon our covenanting for reformation, how little to be found, and how much clean contrary!'—*Sermon, Feb. 24th*, 1646.

Uncleanness, and excess and even wantonness of attire are reproved as prevalent sins by Case, Manton, Jenkyn, Bowles, and other preachers, in a way which would not have surprised us if the sermons had been dated as long after the Restoration as they were severally before it; and, in the year before Cromwell's death, the elder Calamy complains in the same strain, as to the prevalence of hypocrisy, perjury, Sabbath-breaking, and the like.

Well, therefore, might those holy men be grieved to lay down their ministry, which, whether it had been more or less successful hitherto, afforded, in their judgment, the most likely, not to say the divinely-appointed, means of counteracting the evils they deplored.

But why should they have laid it down? Why could not their views and wishes have been met, at least in good part? Wiser rulers would probably have kept hundreds of them within the pale of the Establishment, by proposing less stringent terms of subscription, and forbearing to insist upon episcopal ordination, except in the case of beginners! Had a promise to use the book been substituted for an unfeigned assent to every thing in it, we doubt if any but the Independents and Baptists, with a few obscure, and now forgotten, sectaries, would have refused to give it. In another generation all would have been episcopally ordained, and dissent would have been wasted to a shadow. The framers of the Act allowed the Covenanters twenty years to die out; would they had allowed a fair term for Presbytery also, and forborne the obnoxious requirement that seemed to cast a slight upon all foreign Protestants, and to reduce grave and venerable men to the rank of beginners! Even if the permission for hypothetical re-ordination had been inserted, something would have been gained. Some of the bishops approved of it, Morley among the rest; Laney practised it; the saintly Leighton did not, we may be sure, hurt his conscience, however he might have scandalized some of his brethren by submitting to it; and, had it been legalized, Howe, and Henry, and Corbett, might probably have continued to minister in those places which they afterwards willingly attended as private worshippers. The number of those who did as they did in this respect, was very considerable; and

it might melt a heart of stone to read their longings after employment in the work of the ministry, and their lamentings over those lost opportunities, which one or two small concessions might have set at rest, while their allegiance for the remainder of their days would have been secured.

But it is folly to bewail the imprudent harshness of the leading royalists. They were not in advance of their times, nor were they behind them. Religious liberty was in its infancy. The credit of having been the first to publish anything in favour of it belongs we believe to a Baptist named Busher, who published his 'Plea' in 1614. The most prominent advocates immediately following, were Milton and John Goodwin, two republicans whose violence had led to their being excepted from the Act of Indemnity. Roger Williams's argument was published in England in the same year with John Goodwin's. Taylor's 'Liberty of Prophesying' came three years after; but when his counsels might have been of service, his promotion to an Irish bishopric had removed him to another and a distant sphere.

Owen * two years after him had published an essay on Toleration; but one of Oliver's chaplains was not likely to be listened to with more attention than his Latin secretary. The Independent ministers, having mostly been zealous republicans, took no part in the Restoration of Charles, nor in the negotiations that followed. To the Presbyterians generally, toleration was 'the abomination that maketh desolate.' Pages might be filled with extracts from their sermons and other publications, demonstrating their aversion to it. Let one suffice.

'There are four things that justly deserve to be abhorred by all good Christians. (1.) An universal toleration of all religions. (2.) An universal admittance of all men to the Lord's Supper. (3.) Universal grace, that is, that Christ died equally for all, and that all men have free will to be saved. (4.) Universal allowance of all that suppose themselves gifted to preach without ordination. This last is that which we have abundantly confuted, and which we conceive to be unsufferable in a well ordered Christian commonwealth.'—*Jus. Div. Min. Anglic.*, p. 192.

* Owen's Essay contrasts strangely with his conduct in being a party to the public whipping of two Quaker women at Oxford, four or five years after its publication; and Milton, it must be remembered, expressly exempts Papists from his proposed toleration; (Prose Works, vol. i., p. 17, Bohn's Ed.;) and even so late as 1673, argues for 'taking away their idols' by force, notwithstanding any plea of conscience for the preservation of them. 'We have no warrant to regard conscience,' he says, 'which is not grounded on Scripture.' (*Ibid.*, vol. ii., p. 515.) Such being the views of two out of the three Independents who were the foremost to assert in England the doctrine of religious liberty, no wonder it was not understood by others. The Independents of New England present a striking contrast to their brethren in the old country. While seeking a refuge from the enforcement of ecclesiastical laws which they disapproved, they enacted more stringent ones, and enforced them by heavier penalties, than Laud could put into execution at home. Such is human nature even in the good.

The authors of this remarkable deliverance are the Provincial Assembly of London, in 1654; and is duly signed by the moderator, assessors, and scribes, one of whom bears the honoured name of Matthew Poole. Under such circumstances, few, if any, to suggest counsels of peace and moderation, and with no one to argue for the rights of conscience, the Act of Uniformity was passed.

It was forcibly said at the St. James's Hall Meeting that,—

'The Act of Uniformity is scarcely realised by us in its true historical character. It is not in 1862 what it was in 1662. The Act of Toleration did not grow up beside it till almost thirty years after. The Act of Uniformity without an Act of Toleration for thirty years is what we cannot practically understand, but our fathers could. The uniformity is now only for the church—uniformity within the walls—uniformity for those who do not choose to worship in any other way. So it was not at first, but quite different. It was an Act of Uniformity for the nation, the whole nation. It said to all the people of England and Wales, belted by three seas, "You must worship God publicly thus and thus, or not at all; and if you wish to meet and worship in some other way, cross one of those seas." The Act of Uniformity revived the persecuting enactments of former times, and the men turned out were doomed to silence or imprisonment.'

'And then in the train of the Act of Uniformity came Conventicle Acts and Five-mile Acts, not by any means necessary accompaniments of an Act of Uniformity for the Episcopal Church, but very legitimate consequences of an Act of Uniformity for the nation. The truth is, that Act, according to its original idea, treated the Nonconformist portion of the populatiou as un-English. It denationalized them. It counted them as folks who had forfeited their rights, as disaffected, as disloyal. Still more emphatically, the later Acts—Conventicle and Five-mile—did the same. Nonconformists were regarded as people who loved not the throne any more than the Church, the crown any more than the mitre. Persecution has ever been fond of covering her real countenance under the mask of political necessity. "These people must be crushed, they are dangerous to the State;" so again and again have rulers said—not always hard-hearted men either, but sometimes in this matter much deceived.'—*St. James's Hall Addresses*, pp. 20, 21.

The fact that the temper of the public mind made it easy to pass these Acts is not sufficiently regarded by some who write and speak about them; though others, more candid, admit that the whole nation was in a *furor* of royalist zeal and anti-Puritan indignation. The disgust felt for the former rule may be imagined when even the great Puritan county of Essex returned Royalist members by a large majority. Philips, writing to Clarendon, says, it was twenty to one.* No wonder that the first Act of such a Parliament should be such as Mr. Stoughton describes in the following extract:—

* *State Papers*, vol. iii.

'The difference between the new Commons and the old,—the change from Presbyterianism to Episcopacy,—was manifested in one of the earliest orders, *i. e.*, that the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper on the Sunday sevennight should, in the forenoon, be administered at St. Margaret's Church, according to the form prescribed in the Liturgy of the Church of England, and that no one should come into the House who did not partake of the Communion, either there publicly, or afterwards in the presence of two or more witnesses.

'Certain Commissioners were appointed to see that this was duly regarded. The Saturday before the Communion, the House did not sit, that the members might have time for religious preparation. Dr. Gunning preached in the forenoon, and Mr. Carpenter, the Chaplain, in the afternoon. A diary-keeping member present states, in one of those gossiping MSS. which are such precious waifs to the antiquary, that "the Doctor refused the bread to Mr. Prim because he did not and would not kneel; also, that Biscowen took it standing." Afterwards a report was made to the House by Sir Allen Brodrick of those who had not received the sacrament. Some were sick; others made excuses. Mr. Love's was unsatisfactory, and it was resolved that "he be suspended from sitting in this House until he shall communicate, and bring certificate thereof from the said Commissioners, according to the former order." The Solemn League and Covenant had now been displaced a year. This new Parliament resolved to brand it with fresh indignities. On the 17th May it was put to the House that the well-known symbol of Presbyterian ascendancy should be burnt by the hand of the common hangman. There were 228 "for the yeas" and 103 "for the noes." The Lords were desired to concur in the order. They did so; and on the 20th May they resolved that the Covenant should be burnt by the common hangman in the New Palace at Westminster, in Cheapside, and before the Old Exchange, on Wednesday, the 22nd May, and that all copies in churches and chapels should be taken down. The burning followed in due form, and, "the hangman," says the "Mercurius Publicus," "did his part perfectly well;" for, having kindled his fire, he tore the document into very many pieces, and first burned the preface, and then cast each parcel solemnly into the fire, lifting up his hands and eyes, not leaving the least shred, but burnt it root and branch.'—*Stoughton*, pp. 178-180.

In full accordance with the proceedings at the beginning of their Session, was their dealing with the Act of Uniformity. It was originated (no one knows by whom) in the Commons, read a first time, June 29th, 1661, and had passed through all its stages, and arrived in the Lords on the 10th of July,—just eleven days! In the Lords it met with many delays, which the Commons rebuked, and received many alterations; the effect of which, upon the whole, was to render it more severe, though some of the added provisions may be thought to have a merciful aspect. When it reached the Commons again, April 10th, 1662, 'they accepted the harsh amendments of the Peers, and made others

of their own, so as to render it more intolerable than at first.'* Our Nonconformist historian is here in full accord with Clarendon, who, in describing the passage of the Bill through the House of Commons, uses these remarkable words: 'Every man, according to his passion, thought of adding somewhat to it, which might make it more grievous to somebody whom he did not love, which made the discourses tedious, and vehement, and full of animosity.' † Elsewhere Mr. Stoughton describes the majority of the Commons as 'a mad, Royalist party, bent on making the Act as rigid as possible.' Next year, when the King would have relaxed its stringency, and the House of Lords was willing to pass an Act enabling him to do so, the Commons stepped in, and, by a full and formal statement of their objections, put a stop to the proposed measure, declaring '*that it was in no sort advisable that there should be any indulgence to Dissenters.*' ‡

While Parliament and the country was in such a temper, it is clear that any conciliatory proposals on the part of Convocation would meet with no response; and it is sad to say, that the experiment was not made. The clergy had suffered as much, if not more than others, for their King; and the Conferences at the Savoy had not tended to soften their hearts toward their differing brethren. It seems now to be generally allowed that that opportunity was sadly mismanaged, if not thrown away. Perhaps, in a rough way, Clarendon told Baxter the literal truth, when he said, 'If you had been as fat as Dr. Manton, we should all do well;' but, any how, the thin good man unquestionably embarrassed, if he did not wholly frustrate, the design he had in hand. To understand the matter correctly, we must look at him, not as he appears now to us, who read his whole history, including his grievous sufferings at the hands of Jeffreys, and his other persecutors, and calmly estimate his character and labours under the softening influence of two hundred years; but as he appeared then to the men with whom he disputed, and negotiated;—a man who had received episcopal ordination,—had taken the Covenant, but persuaded his people to refuse it, and was willing to submit to a reduced episcopacy,—yet had been a chaplain in the army,—occupied a sequestered living,—avowed that he had 'encouraged many thousands to take part in the wars,' and 'spoken much to blow the coals' of contention,—praised the government of Cromwell,—and, to add no more to this list of strange things, presented the Conference with a whole liturgy, drawn up by himself in a few days, as a substitute for that formerly in use! Can we wonder

* Stoughton, p. 268. † History, p. 1078. ‡ Stoughton, p. 396.

that he appeared to them a compound of contradictions, even before their debates began; and when they found that he had, whether by mutual agreement, or by any other means, the chief hand in the business of accommodation, it came to a stand-still? The United Committee, in one of their pamphlets, speak of his 'irritating captiousness as a sufficient pretext for displaying the insolence of power;' and Mr. Stoughton sums up the matter truly and judiciously when he speaks of the Presbyterian Commissioners as well qualified for their posts in the Conference by 'learning, devoutness, and a catholic spirit,' but 'defective in diplomatic skill, especially Baxter.' In another place he goes more fully into the subject, and concludes thus: 'An acute metaphysician, and a keen disputant, he lacked that sobriety of judgment, that patience under contradiction, and that application of means to the attainment of practicable results, founded upon common-sense acquaintance with men and things, which are essential to success in all deliberative council, when we have to deal with those whose minds are differently constituted, and whose education and habits are widely diverse from our own.' *

But had Baxter's proceedings at the Savoy Conference been as prudent as they were irritating, he and his cause would have been at great disadvantage in consequence of some recent publications of his,—the influence of which, whether avowed or not, must have been felt. In 1658 he had gone out of his way to state that Grotius was a Papist in heart, and bent on reconciling Protestants with Rome 'in a Cassandrian Popery; and added that this design had many favourites among the colder and mere ceremonial part of the Protestants;...some of whom had gone over to Rome, while others stayed in England under the name of Episcopal Divines, thinking to do that party more service.' A more extravagant and uncharitable statement has seldom been made by any controversialist; and the replies made to it show how deeply it was—in the language of that time—'resented,' by Sanderson, Bramhall, and Pierce. Next year he published his *Holy Commonwealth*,—one of the most remarkable of his many remarkable publications. It is a medley of conflicting opinions on political subjects, designed as an answer to *Harrington's Oceana*, with a vindication of himself for the part he had taken in the Civil Wars subjoined. It was so generally misunderstood, and brought him into so many disputes, that eleven years after its publication he retracted it, and begged that it might be regarded as *non scriptum*; insisting, however, all the while, that he did not revoke all the doctrines, though

* Stoughton, pp. 147, 148.

he regretted the publication of it. That, with these things fresh in their remembrance, no one can be surprised that neither Morley, Gunning, nor Pierce, manifested any strong inclination to make common cause with him, or with the party which was led by him. We may regret it deeply, but we see no reason to suppose that it would have been otherwise if any of those who now condemn the disputants on either side, had stood in their respective places.

The simple truth is, it was a struggle for life, whether in Convocation or Parliament; and as, while the Presbyterians and Republicans were in power, they did their best to prevent their being ever displaced, so did the Royalists and Episcopalians on their regaining the ascendancy. All their measures were copied more or less exactly from those of their predecessors. In 1643 the Covenant had been taken with the utmost solemnity by the two Houses; next year it was published with exhortations and arguments in favour of subscribing. One passage from that document may be a sufficient and lasting answer to those who complain that the Parliament of 1662 required the renunciation of the Covenant. 'If any ministers have taken oaths not warranted by the laws of God and the land, ought they not to repent of them?' Such was the argument, in 1643, against those who pleaded that the oath of Canonical Obedience was contradicted by the Covenant; and while we regret that the same argument should be brought into use again, we see plainly enough who were the first to use it. It is astonishing how wise and learned men, like Dr. Vaughan and Dr. M'Crie, can insist that 'no religious test was imposed upon the consciences of the prelatic clergy, dispossessed of their livings, under the Commonwealth.'* The 'Reasons against taking the Covenant,' published by authority of the University of Oxford, could not be unknown to these writers; but they must have overlooked them.

The taking of the Covenant was enjoined upon ministers presented for ordination, as well as upon ministers in parishes; and, before the year closed, the obligation to take it was extended in a remarkable way which served as a precedent for the Parliament of the Restoration. No person was to be elected into the corporation of London who had not taken it, nor was any uncovenanted citizen allowed to exercise the municipal franchise. By an ordinance of 1647, this disfranchising clause is extended to the whole kingdom, and delinquents forbidden to vote under penalty of a fine, the amount of which, however, is not specified. We believe the Parliament of Charles II. con-

* M'Crie's Lecture, p. 20.

tented themselves with excluding Nonconformists from office. In less than a month after this ordinance had passed, came another, authorising and enjoining the use of the Directory in public worship.* But as this was a simple injunction, the popularity of the Book of Common Prayer proved too powerful for it. Accordingly, about a year and a half afterwards, came forth the memorable ordinance which states that, 'in the former ordinance, there was no provision made for the speedy dispersing of the said Directory, nor any punishment set down either for the using of the said Book of Common Prayer, or for the non-using or depraving of the said Directory, by reason whereof there hath been, as yet, *little fruit of the said ordinance;*' and goes on to provide for the supply of parishes with copies of the Directory, and the reading of it the Lord's Day after it shall have been received. The next clause ordains, 'that if any person or persons whatever shall, at any time or times hereafter, use or cause the aforesaid Book of Common Prayer to be used in any church, chapel, or public place of worship, *or in any private place or family*, within the kingdom of England, or dominion of Wales, or port and town of Berwick; then every such person so offending therein shall, for the first offence, forfeit and pay the sum of five pounds, for the second offence the sum of ten pounds, and, for the third offence, shall suffer one whole year's imprisonment without bail or mainprize.'

Here we have the original draught which, slightly reduced, formed the Conventicle Act of Charles the Second. That forbade Nonconformist worship, if five persons or more were present beside the household. This made mere family worship a crime if conducted according to the time-honoured form. The date of this cruel enactment, (23rd August, 1646,) supplies the clue to the selection of the Feast of St. Bartholomew, as the day when the Act of Uniformity should come into operation; the churchmen naturally enough desiring to see their beloved Prayer Book restored to honour on the very feast, on the eve of which it had been doomed to disgrace.

The engagement to be faithful to the Commonwealth without King or House of Lords, followed in 1649, and was to be enforced by disabilities which may have suggested the Five-mile Act. Baxter's account is:—

'Without this, no man must have the benefit of suing another at law. .. ...Nor must they have Masterships in the Universities, or travel above so many miles from their houses, and more such penalties which I remember not.'—*Reliq. Bax.*, pt. i., p. 64.

* January 3rd, 1644.

To recount all the proceedings of the Independent and Republican authorities would be tedious. Their Committees for scandalous ministers, their Triers and Ejectors, their prohibition of poor ejected clergymen acting as schoolmasters, even in the families of those who were willing out of pity to give them shelter and maintenance, all point in the same direction as the proceedings of the Parliament before the Republic was proclaimed. Cromwell, it is true, abolished the engagement, talked much about liberty, and, in pursuance of his general design of playing off the several parties around him against one another, connived at some violations of his own ordinances. But they remained on the statute book to the last; while the jurisdiction of some of the several bodies who had to do with so-called 'scandalous ministers,' was clearly exercised in a very oppressive manner.*

How the pattern thus set was followed, the passage we are now about to quote will show. We do not see what answer could be given by those to whom the argument was addressed:—

'They themselves (when they were in power, though it was by usurpation only) thought it not only lawful and prudent, but necessary also for the upholding of their illegal and usurped authority, to deprive and silence all our clergy that would not take their Covenant, and submit to their Directory. And is it not as lawful, and prudent, and necessary too for us, in order to the securing of the legal, both civil and ecclesiastical, government, to deprive and silence those that will not renounce that Covenant, whereby they are obliged to ruin both; or that will not join with us in the public worship of God, as it is prescribed in the Book of Common Prayer? Certainly, if it were prudent and necessary for them, in their circumstances then to do the one, it must needs be as prudent and necessary for us, in our circumstances now, to do the other, even themselves being judges; to say nothing of the unlawfulness of what they did unto us, as being unjust in itself, and having nothing to warrant it, but an usurped power; and the lawfulness of what we do unto them, as being just in itself, and being authorized and commanded to be done by that power, which we are legally obliged to obey.'—*Bp. of Winchester's Vindication*, p. 493.

Into the question of the numbers who suffered in the Civil Wars, and under the Commonwealth, we cannot enter further with the space now at our disposal; but it may be worth while to note in

* The testimony of Owen on this point is liable to no exception. 'There are in Berkshire,' he writes, 'some few men of mean quality and condition, rash, heady enemies of tithes, who are Commissioners for the ejecting of Ministers. They alone sit and act; and are at this time casting out on slight pretences very worthy men; one especially they intend to eject next week, whose name is Pococke, a man of as unblamable a conversation as any that I know living, of repute for learning throughout the world, being a Professor of Arabic in our University. So that they do exceedingly provoke all men, and exasperate them to the height.'—*Orme's Life of Owen*, p. 154.

passing the explicit testimony of a contemporary witness. Bramhall, in his able reply to Baxter's 'Grotian Religion,' which was written in 1659, though not published till nine years after his death, which took place in 1663, speaks strongly and decisively: 'Let Mr. Baxter sum up into one catalogue all the Nonconformists throughout the kingdom of England, ever since the beginning of the Reformation, "who have been cast aside, or driven away" at any time, "because they durst not use the old ceremonies or the new," or rather because they found it advantageous to them to disuse them; I dare abate him all the rest of the kingdom, and only exhibit martyrologies of London and the two Universities, or a list of those who in these late intestine wars have been haled away to prisons,* or chased away into banishment by his own party, in these three places alone, or left to the merciless world to beg their bread, for no other crime than loyalty, and because they stood affected to the ancient rites and ceremonies of the Church of England; and they shall double them for number, and for learning, piety, industry, and the love of peace, exceed them incomparably: so as his party which he glorieth so much in, will scarcely deserve to be named the same day. And if he compare their persecutions, the sufferings of his supposed confessors will appear but flea-bitings in comparison of theirs.' †

The comparison instituted in this passage (which, though not published till 1672, was written in 1659 or 1660) is necessarily exclusive of the hardships and sorrows which resulted from the Act of Uniformity, the Conventicle Act, and the Five Mile Act; and leaves the question of proportionate suffering still open. We cannot attempt to adjust it; and would not if we had the means; yet, when we are reminded of the distinguished worth and excellence of the men who were ejected or silenced under the former, and punished for their disobedience to the latter Acts, the mind almost involuntarily reverts to the confessors of the preceding period. Some reference to each class maynot inappropriately introduce our concluding observations. Mr. Stoughton, in one of his best passages, describes the sufferers for Nonconformity, beginning of course with Baxter, of whom, after

---

* In an earlier chapter he speaks more fully of their sufferings: 'How many of them have been beggared and necessitated to turn mechanics, or day labourers; how many imprisoned or forced to forsake their native country, and seek their bread among strangers; how many have had their hearts broken, some starved, some murdered, and the spoil of their houses given for a reward to the murderer! But this is a sad subject to dwell upon. God Almighty pardon them who have had any hand in these cruel courses, and give them true repentance!'—*Ubi sup.* p. 509.

† Works. Edit. 1844, vol. iii., p. 582.

comparing him with Arnold in his desire to see a comprehensive National Church, he adds:—

'Nobody who has ever read the story of his life at Kidderminster,—how he preached the whole counsel of God, not ceasing to warn every one, night and day, with tears; and how he visited his flock, and went from house to house with apostolic zeal,—but must admit, though he conscientiously refused the see of Hereford, he was one of the truest bishops that this country ever saw, being consecrated by the holiest of all hands, even one from heaven. And we willingly leave the judgment about Baxter as a Christian teacher for all God's Churches, to those who have read his devotional treatises, and have laid open their consciences to the burning appeals of his *Now or Never*, or their sorrowing hearts to the healing touch of his *Saints' Everlasting Rest*.

'John Howe was ejected from Great Torrington, Devonshire. We are neither writing the lives, nor undertaking even to sketch the characters, of these men, or we should dwell with intense delight on the character and works of this very extraordinary person,—strangely passed over by some critics and students who, if they would only take the trouble to open his works, would find there trains of thought and occasional glows of eloquence which they could not fail to appreciate and admire. We are fully alive to the narrowness of some of the worthies of the Puritan school. Their reading was too exclusively theological. But Howe's sympathies were broad, and his reading vast. Bishop Wilkins, as we have seen, talked of his "*latitude*." No one could sneer at Howe, as not reading Aristotle, or as having no taste for Plato. His mind had more affinity to the last than the first. There is nothing of the hard, grinding, terrible logic of ultra-Calvinism in the writings of Howe. He rises into serene regions of thought,—devoutly contemplates there the mysteries of the universe, bows before the "venerable darkness" of Him who hideth Himself; and then comes down to speak, with indescribable pathos, to his fellow-sinners, of "the Redeemer's tears wept over lost souls."

'Matthew Poole was ejected from St. Michael's Quern, London. His *Synopsis*, in five goodly folios, still occupies a leading place in a critic's library, to whatever school the critic may belong; and those most familiar with Rosenmüller and Blomfield find there is not a little to be learnt from the Compilation of the Puritan annotator; and that, too, sometimes more succinctly expressed and more to the point, than can be gathered from the oft bewildering pages of his learned successors in England and Germany. As we look at Poole's *magnum opus*, we do not wonder to find that it was the author's rule to rise about three or four o'clock in the morning, and to continue his studies till the afternoon was far advanced.

'The "silver-tongued" Bates, who refused a deanery, and might have been made a bishop, had to resign St. Dunstan's-in-the-West, as already described; Thomas Manton, the Savoy Commissioner, and the celebrated commentator on the Epistle of St. James, was expelled from St. Paul's, Covent Garden; and Joseph Caryl, the patient expositor of the Book of Job, was forced to take leave of the parishioners of St. Magnus. Gale,

the learned author of *The Court of the Gentiles;* and Hill, the editor of *Schrevelius' Lexicon*, were also among the sufferers for Nonconformity. Alleine, Flavel, Brooks, and others, were also turned out of their livings in different parts of the country. They were authors and preachers, full of spiritual fervour and evangelical unction; adepts in the kind of instruction fitted for the common people, dealing in "wise saws and modern instances," and arresting the attention and fixing the memory by alliterative jingles, which, "like a sheep-bell, keep good sayings from being lost in the wilderness."

'These were all ejected by the Bartholomew Act; but there were others ejected before, who were effectually silenced by the new law. John Owen, whose voluminous theological works need be only mentioned as proofs of his learning, orthodoxy, devoutness, and zeal,—first removed from the Deanery of Christchurch before the Restoration by the Presbyterians,—was now denied the liberty of ministering in the parish pulpits, or elsewhere. Thomas Goodwin met a like fate. Though less celebrated than Owen, his great attainments in scholarship, and the range and variety of his thoughts, astonish us when we read his writings, showing how familiar he was with all forms of theological speculation, ancient and modern. He was not the man to be startled at phases of inquiry differing from his own. There has been much fun, since the days of the Spectator, about this Puritan Rabbi's "night-caps;" but those caps, few or many, whether of plain woollen or embroidered velvet, certainly covered a larger amount of brains and knowledge than some ever had, who are fond of laughing at the Congregational President of Magdalen College, Oxford. John Ray, the eminent naturalist, is to be mentioned among the ministers silenced by the Act, inasmuch as, though he remained a lay communicant in the Church of England, he refused to conform; and in 1663 quitted his fellowship, nor did he ever preach any more. Samuel Shaw's *Immanuel*, and *The Angelic Life*, and *A Welcome to the Plague*, are books not yet forgotten; the last a memorial of the singular devotedness of the author during the terrors of the plague year; and all of them specimens of pulpit teaching, faithful and earnest, such as must win the praise of all good men of every Church. He, though not first ejected, was sentenced to silence, by this Bartholomew Act. To think of silencing such a man! No severe and morose man either,—though preaching in plague years, and writing *A Farewell to Life*,—but one who, like all honest people, could laugh as well as weep; and, though "his highest excellency was in religious discourse, in prayer, and preaching, wrote comedies for schoolboys to act at Ashby-de-la-Zouch, and had quick repartees, and would droll innocently with the mixture of poetry, history, and other polite learning." There must have been something very amiable and winning in Samuel Shaw, inasmuch as, six years after the Act, he obtained licence to be master of the Free School of Ashby, and lived on good terms with the vicar, and with the bishop of the diocese. Yet, though he went every Sunday to the parish church, he was nowhere allowed to preach till the Indulgence came. Besides all these, more or less known to posterity by their books, there were the Henrys and the Heywoods, who are equally remembered and

honoured for the simple and beautiful story of their lives.'—*Church and State*, pp. 373–379.

In the numerous publications of Churchmen originated by this controversy, there are, as might be expected, very frequent references to the sufferings of their illustrious predecessors; but a testimony from one who had been himself punished for his loyalty will perhaps be preferable to any statement given at second hand. Richard Baxter thought fit to introduce, into his hasty vindication of his having charged Grotius with Popery, the subject of sequestrations, and expressed himself with great warmth on the character of some of those who had been sufferers by means of the Parliament or of Cromwell. Some of them, he said, never preached, but read the Book of Common Prayer; some preached worse than they who were never called preachers; some understood not the Catechism or Creed; many of them lived more in the alehouse than in the church, and used to lead their people in drunkenness, cursing, swearing, quarrelling, and other ungodly practices. Upon this the opponent upon whose challenge this ill-advised book had been written, rejoins as follows:—

'Whereas you say, you need not go to Mr. White's Centuries to be acquainted with the qualities of the ejected, I must shew you your errour before I go a step farther. You speak of Centuries in the plural, whereas indeed there was but one, and that so scandalous a pamphlet, that its author was ashamed to pursue his thoughts of any other. It was the boast of Mr. White (as I was told by one, who will be as likely to tell you of it) that he and his had ejected eight thousand Churchmen in four or five yeares. And if one hundred of eight thousand had been as really scandalous, as that matchless Pasquiller was pleased to make them, it had not been so strange a thing, as that one of the Twelve should be a devil; one hundred in eight-score hundred is exceedingly lesse than one in twelve. But Mr. Fuller himself, however partiall to your party, (as our excellent Dr. Heylin hath made apparent,) doth take himself up with a kind of doubt, that there might want sufficient proof to convict them of that they were accused of: and indeed there was wanting a sufficiency of proof, no witness coming in upon oath to make good the charge.'

'But now it comes to my turn to propose a few things to your consideration. First, did the men of your party cast out none but such as these? Or was it for such things as these, that any complier was ever ejected, who would but take the negative oath, the Scotish Covenant, raile against the King and bishops, cry [curse ye Meroz] or raise up good store of loan upon publick faith? But let us come to some particulars, which may put your generals out of countenance. I will but give you a specimen in several kinds. Did Bishop Hall never preach? or Bishop Duppa preach worse than they that were never called preachers? Did not Bishop Davenant understand his Catechism? nor Bishop Morton his Creed? yet how were they spoyled of their estates, and clapt up prisoners

in the Tower, whilest the most ignorant and the most scandalous had both their livelyhoods and liberties indulged to them? Of those that preached in the great city, the first occurring to my mind were Dr. Holdsworth, D. Howel, Dr. Hacket, Dr. Heywood, Dr. Westfield, Dr. Walton, Dr. Featly, and Dr. Rives; Dr. Brough, Dr. Marsh, Mr. Shute, Mr. Hall, and besides, the Rev. D. Fuller, now Dean of Durham; since the naming of whom I think of the Rev. Mr. Udall. These did not live more in the alehouse than in the Church: the fame of their piety and their learning is long since gone throughout the Churches; yet Mr. Shute was molested and vexed to death, and denied a funeral sermon to be preacht by Dr. Holdsworth as he desired. Dr. Holdsworth was cast out of his mastership at Cambridge, sequestred from his benefice in the City of London, a long time imprisoned at Ely House, and the Tower. Dr. Walton (who hath put forth the late *Biblia Polyglotta*) was not onely sequestred, but assaulted also, and plundered, and forced to flie. Dr. Rives, Dr. Howel, Dr. Hacket, and Mr. Hall, were sequestred and plundered, and forced to fly for their lives. Dr. Marsh was sequestred and made to die in remote parts. Dr. Brough was plundered as well as sequestred, his wife and children turn'd out of doors, and his wife struck dead with grief. Dr. Westfield was sequestred, abused in the streets, and forced to fly. Dr. Featly was sequestred and plundered, and died a prisoner. Dr. Fuller was sequestred and plundered, and withall imprisoned at Ely House. Mr. Udal was not onely sequestred himself, but his bed-rid wife was also cast out of doors, and inhumanly left in the open streets. Dr. Heywood was sequestred and toss'd from prison to prison, put in the Counter, Ely House, and the ships, his wife and children turn'd out of doors. Could the ejection of a few scandalous, unlearned men (supposing them really such, and regularly ejected) have made amends for such riots, as were committed upon men of so exceeding great worth? Go from the City into the countrey, and you will find the case the very same. Such venerable persons as Dr. Gillingham, Dr. Hintchman, Dr. Mason, and Dr. Rauleigh, Mr. Sudberie, Mr. Threscross, Mr. Simmons, and Mr. Farrington, and a very great multitude of the like, (whom nothing but want of time and love of brevity doth make me forbear to reckon further) were used like dunces and drunkards (by your Reformers) though powerful preachers, and pious men; men so eminent for learning, and so exemplary for life, that 't is scandalous to be safe, when such men suffer as malefactors. To let you see briefly what it was, by which they were qualified for ruine, I will tell you a story of Mr. Simmons, the most exemplary pastor of Rayn in Essex, who being sent for up to the House, of Commons by a pursevant, was told, that being an honest man, he did more prejudice to the good cause in hand then a hundred knaves, and therefore would suffer accordingly. So he did in great plenty his whole life after. And who should be sent into his place but a scandalous weaver, who cannot seemingly be nam'd? Do but read that sober and useful Book, *Anglia Ruina*, and then you will be likely to change your stile. If none had been thrown out of Oxford, but Dr. Sheldon, Dr. Mansell, Dr. Sanderson, Dr. Hammond; or none out of Cambridge, but Dr. Lany, Dr. Brownrigg, Dr. Cosins, and Dr. Collins, Mr. Thorndike, Mr. Gunning,

Dr. Oley, and Mr. Barrow, no excuse could have been made for so great a dishonour to religion. But above all, let me commend a famous passage to your remembrance. Dr. Stern, Dr. Beale, men of eminent integrity, exemplary lives, and exceeding great learning, and heads of several colledges in the University of Cambridge, were carried away captives from thence to London, there thrust up into the Tower, thence removed to another prison. They often petitioned to be heard, and brought to judgement, but could not obtain either liberty or triall. After almost a years imprisonment, they were, by order from the Houses, put all on shipboard; (it was upon Friday, Aug. 11, 1643.) No sooner came they to the ship call'd *The Prosperous Sayler*, but straight they were put under hatches, where the decks were so low, as that they could not stand upright, and yet were denied stools to sit on, yea and a burden of straw whereon to lie. There were crowded up in that little vessel no less then eighty prisoners of quality. Where that they might stifle one another, the very auger-holes and inlets of any fresh air were very carefully stopp'd up. And what became of them after I have not heard.'—*Pierce's New Discoverer*, 1659, pp. 142–145.*

Such is a short specimen of Parliamentary and Republican persecution, which, however, leaves many distinguished persons unmentioned. Dr. Vaughan excuses the sufferings of these men on the ground that they occurred during a state of civil war, when all things were in a state of confusion, and, to use his own dainty phraseology, 'when the securities which are cherished in tranquil times are sure to be put largely into abeyance;' but he forgets that, if so, the clergy must have suffered from those very soldiers to whom he gives so high a character; and further, that the sequestrations went on after the war was ended. Mr. Stoughton deals with the question in a more candid and becoming manner.

'Reverence for the sufferers of 1662 should not extinguish respect for those of their opponents who were really conscientious. Nor should condemnation of intolerance then, be connected with excuses for intolerance in earlier times. Whilst honouring the faithful Nonconformist of the Restoration, we must also honour the faithful Episcopalian of the Commonwealth. The cause makes the martyr, but we should look

* Pierce was one of the few men before whom Baxter seems to have quailed. He was fully his equal in learning, boldness, and readiness, and had the unspeakable advantage of knowing when he had made up his mind. Baxter calls him 'the strength and honour' of the cause he advocated at the Savoy, and testifies to his good moral character, as well as to his learning and logical skill; but the volume from which we quote so completely disturbed his equilibrium (if indeed he had any), that many years afterwards, when writing his Autobiography, he characterises it thus: 'A much more railing and malicious volume than the former; *the liveliest impress of Satan's image, maliguity, bloody malice, and falsehood*, covered in handsome railing rhetoric, than ever I had seen from any that called himself a Protestant.'—*Reliq. Bart.*, p. 113. The reader will now be able to judge with how large a grain of salt Baxter's epithets must be digested.

below the surface. Loyalty to Christ, according to the light received, and the judgment formed, may equally underlie the heroism of men who suffered on different sides. Strange as it may appear, they are confessors in common; and their motives, while leading to nearly opposite courses of conduct, may be alike approved by the Lord of conscience.'—*Introduction*, p. 14.

In the extract from Henry's diary inserted on p. 506, will be found these remarkable words: '*Even this for good, though we know not how.*' That is the privilege of their descendants. We do know 'how' the wonderworking providence of God has overruled 'even this,' by making the sufferings of Nonconformists contribute, in their measure, to bring about the events of that memorable Fifth of November, which delivered England a second time from Popish tyranny and arbitrary power. The liberties we now enjoy may be said to be the purchase of the Nonconformists' patience; for though nothing was further from the intentions of most of them than to procure a general toleration, the history of their times supplies a warning against intolerance which we hope it is not too much to say Englishmen will never forget. When good men are tempted to think it necessary to bind each other's consciences by penal inflictions, let them turn to the melancholy history of these days and take warning. In the multifarious writings of Baxter are many impressive passages; but scarcely any one has more affected us than that in which he recounts the successive obligations into which he and his contemporaries have been compelled to enter, and entreats that they may not be further increased. The freedom of conscience which marks our happy days appears all the more precious while we read.

'You know what changes of the government we have lately seen since things were taken into your hands: such as I never read of before. Our old constitution was King, Lords, and Commons, which we were sworn, and sworn, and sworn again, to be faithful to, and to defend. The King withdrawing, the Lords and Commons ruled alone, though they attempted not the change of the species of government. Next this we had the minor part of the House of Commons in the exercise of sovereign power, the corrupt majority, as you call them, being cast out; and by them we had the government changed, regality and a House of Lords being cast off. Next this we had nothing visible but a General and an Army. Next this we had the whole Constitution and liberties of the Commonwealth at once subverted; certain men being called by the name of a Parliament, and the sovereign power pretended to be given them, and exercised by them, that never were chosen by the people, but by we know not whom (such a fact as I never heard or read that any King in England was guilty of, since Parliaments were known.) Next this, we had a Protector governing according to an instrument, made

by God knows who. After this we had a Protector governing according to the Humble Petition, and Advice, (and sworn to both). And now we are wheeled about again.....Verily if you believe that there is such a thing as godliness and conscience, you cannot expect in such quick and frequent turns as these, all that love their souls should follow you.'—*Preface to Holy Commonwealth.*

As Nonconformists, well secured in the enjoyment of our ample liberties, we do not feel that the Bi-Centenary celebration calls upon us to demand a repeal, or even any very extensive modification, of the Act of Uniformity. So long as the Established Church refrains from persecuting or annoying her less favoured neighbours, we are not disposed to meddle with her internal arrangements, even though we are told that as contributors to her funds we have both a legal and a moral right to do so. Comprehension is now impossible. Even if the Presbyterians had not become Socinians, the Baptists are too numerous, and, with the Independents, too much opposed to all establishments,—the Methodists too many and too well satisfied with their own organization,—to render any project of comprehension feasible. No sober-minded man, unless he be lamentably deficient of information, entertains the idea. And if so, why may we not allow Churchmen to worship as they please, while they allow us the same liberty? It is ungenerous, if not inequitable, for the Nonconformist to say to the Conformist, 'First I will compel you to alter your worship to my taste because, though I do not take part in it, I contribute towards it; and when that object is accomplished, I will compel you to excuse me from contributing any longer.' And it is, as we apprehend, unnecessary too; for a party is growing up within the Establishment, favourable to a revision of the Liturgy; and if they succeed, the work will be better done than it could be by any intervention of ours. If not, it will be because they are not a majority, and therefore (as between one subscriber to the Liturgy and another) have no right to succeed. We think, too, that the Church derives, as she has long done, great advantage from the existence of powerful bodies of Christians beyond her own pale. They provoke her to jealousy, keep her vigilant, stimulate her zeal and liberality in various ways, and give weight to her testimony (whenever they can concur in it) on matters concerning the common interests of truth and goodness. The extinction of Nonconformity, were it possible, would be a sore calamity for the Established Church: meanwhile it is she that suffers, not we, by the restrictions which the Act of Uniformity imposes on her clergy, by the *cordon* drawn around her pulpits, and the stumbling-block placed in the way of pious men who would fain enter her ministry.

This very Act of Uniformity, we may add, supplies a curious instance of the defects which attach to all human laws. Any one attending various episcopal places, will find considerable diversity subsisting in the mode of worship, the substance, of course, remaining unaltered. One clergyman reads, another intones; one congregation chants even the responses, another chants the psalms and hymns only, a third reads both. Sometimes in the prayer before sermon the minister extemporizes; most use a collect; occasionally we have the bidding prayer, even in parish churches. Some commence the service with the sentences; others have gone back (unconsciously no doubt, for they are mostly Evangelicals) to the old Popish practice of an introit, which the sentences were designed to supersede, and sing a psalm or hymn at first. Some repeat the General Thanksgiving as well as the General Confession after the minister—an excellent custom, and one we could wish to see generally observed, but for which we can find no authority. Thus absolute and entire uniformity is seen to be impracticable, and will ever be, however curious and elaborate the devices by which men seek to secure it. The changes of time and circumstance which are inevitable in a dying world will modify men's practice. Even Rome feels this influence more or less; and it would be wisdom in the governors of the Established Church generally to facilitate such changes, at least, in the arrangement of the services, as would shorten the morning service, avoid needless repetitions, and adapt the whole to more extensive usefulness in different districts.

These same inevitable changes are not less curiously exemplified in Dissent than in the Established Church. Two hundred years ago, and indeed down to within the memory of living man, ministerial costume was observed: now the tendency is to set light by proprieties of this kind, lest they should foster the notion of a greater sacredness in the ministerial office than many Dissenters believe in. Gowns and bands have disappeared from many places, and from some the ceremony of ordination by laying on of hands. Meanwhile the chanting, which was such an abomination, is becoming universal; the elaborate Gothic architecture, which the Cromwellites broke to pieces, flouriahes in town and country; and organs, gilded and painted at a large expense, are used by those who claim to be descended from the men who tore them down and burnt them in the markets. Even in Scotland it has been proposed to set them up in Presbyterian congregations. And a Liturgy has in practice been found to be not only not so intolerable and antichristian as it was deemed, but to have so much to recommend

it, that its introduction into Dissenting congregations has been a subject of debate both in England and America. *O tempora! O mores!*

One of the most important practical suggestions in reference to the celebration of this season that we have met with, occurs in the Lecture delivered by Mr. Dale in London; and as there are other classes of Nonconformists besides those who are now engaged in commemorating the Confessors of St. Bartholomew, who have equal need with them to ponder it, we will transcribe the passage in which it is found; and commend it to the best attention of all whom it may concern.

'I. First of all, let me remind you that the services which these men rendered to the Church, they would have been unable to render but for their intellectual robustness and theological learning. The story of their sufferings loses half its grandeur if we forget that they were great scholars and great divines. In their memorable secession they were ruled not by a blind and ignorant fanaticism, but by convictions calmly and deliberately formed during years of studious reflection on the controversy between themselves and the rulers of the English Church, and by a conscience familiar with all the devices which casuistry can suggest for the honourable evasion of difficult and dangerous duty. Nobleness of intellect was united to nobleness of heart: they served God with the spirit, and with the understanding also.

'Now there has arisen among us of late, from causes too obvious to need more than a passing notice, a disposition to under-estimate the importance of a learned ministry. The more generous and thorough ministerial education which, after a time of unavoidable neglect, Nonconformists have been trying hard to promote, has been regarded with suspicion, if not openly protested against, as injurious to the simplicity and vigour of evangelical preaching. Strange to say, this has been coincident with a loud demand for the restoration to our pulpits of the power and fervour of the Commonwealth. Now, while there may have been a few men in that age who were effective preachers, and yet very indifferent scholars—though I can recall no man belonging to that class except John Bunyan, whose extraordinary genius made him independent of the aids which most men require from a thorough and complete intellectual discipline—the great crowd of the Puritans and of the early Nonconformists were men of an extensive and profound erudition. If learning must necessarily injure the religious life of the minister—if keen intellectual activity must quench the fervour of holy affections—if a loving familiarity with philosophical speculations and theological controversies must disqualify a preacher for addressing the common people with success—how do you account for the piety, the zeal, the transcendent power over the heart and conscience of the nation of the ejected ministers and their immediate predecessors?.....

'All who have any familiarity with the works of the ejected ministers know that they were as distinguished for their immense reading as for the

strength of their moral fibre and the depth of their spiritual life. If we are to have the noble attributes of the Puritan pulpit back again, we must have, in many a village pastorate, and in all our great cities, men who at a month's notice could occupy the chair of dogmatic theology, in the proudest of our colleges, with an efficiency which not the most accomplished of our professors could surpass; and in every county a few men at least, who, with no longer notice, could lecture on the history of intellectual and ethical philosophy with adequate acuteness and learning.

'I do not mean to say that the ejected were men whose taste was delicate and refined, or that they always carried their weight of learning with freedom and grace. Their intellectual movements were often ungainly and awkward. Their scholarship was often unwrought gold: it lay about in huge masses, and was not fashioned into forms of beauty. But this is plain, that if profound and varied studies are prejudicial to the ministry, it is a miracle they should have been such great preachers, such faithful pastors, and such good men. I am seriously afraid that there is some danger lest, in our eagerness to fill our pulpits with fervent and successful preachers, we should fail to educate a race of great divines. There are controversies still raging, for which the Church requires accomplished theologians, as well as masses of people sunk in ungodliness, for whom the Church requires impassioned evangelists. Men have to be reclaimed from error, as well as from sin. In the defence of the Divine origin of the Christian faith, in the vindication and right adjustment of its doctrines, modern Nonconformists will be unworthy of their ancestors, if they do not stand among the ablest and most learned of the champions of truth. I believe that the *Unreasonableness of Infidelity*, by Richard Baxter, was the first original treatise on the Christian evidences in the English language; so that an ejected minister stands first in that noble line of English apologists, to which belong Boyle, Clarke, Leslie, Leland, Lardner, Bishop Butler, Archdeacon Paley, Isaac Taylor, and Henry Rogers. And in the writings of the ejected you may find massive treatises on all the great doctrinal questions which were debated in their age. It would be a shame and a sin if we were to do nothing towards enriching the theological literature of our own generation; and I trust that among the many noble results of this Bi-Centenary celebration will be, the kindling in many young hearts of an ambition to attempt to rival the learning of the mightiest of the two thousand. In this good work I appeal to the sons of our wealthier laymen, as well as to our ministers. You may not have the qualifications which would make you a successful preacher; you may feel no Divine vocation to the perilous glories of the ministry; but you may still serve the Church by resolving to become great theological scholars. The leisure which your inherited wealth affords, gives you the opportunity for this, and your liberal education makes you capable of appreciating the nobleness of the attempt. It seems to be thought, too commonly, that wealthy laymen can do almost nothing for the Church, except by sitting on wearisome committees, occupying still more wearisome chairs at lectures and public meetings, and contributing their money to the support of the pastorate and the funds of our religious societies. But this is another line in

which some of you may render to the present generation and coming ages the highest service. The cultivation of Christian literature and theological learning, especially among Nonconformists, ought not to be the exclusive work of pastors, whose official labours consume nearly all their time, and exhaust nearly all their strength: laymen, with leisure and education, should feel that this responsibility rests largely upon them.

'Now, as in the age of the ejected, we require the same calmness of judgment as theirs, united with the same fervour and zeal; the same profound learning, united with the same simplicity of faith; the same power with men, united with the same power with God; and I trust that some among us will resolve that, God helping them, the necessity shall be satisfied.'—*Dale, Lecture, May 6th*, 1862, pp. 77–79.

This is good strong sense; and though in one place rather too strongly put, (for who would, or ought to, undertake to fill either of the chairs named on the last page, at a month's notice?) yet, on the whole, the deliverance is both just and seasonable.

Our references to Mr. Stoughton's volume, and citations from it, have sufficiently indicated the opinion that it takes precedence of all the publications which have yet appeared on the subject.* Had its range been more extensive, it would have been better; for it is scarcely practicable to form a just opinion of so important a period, when it is to so great an extent isolated. Still there is clearly no intention to be unfair; and notwithstanding one or two sharp phrases, the book displays a candid spirit not less worthy of praise and imitation, than the care and pains so evidently bestowed on its compilation. We have, indeed, so much confidence in the author's candour, that we will remind him that he is as much mistaken in calling D. Cawdrey an *obscure* writer, as in placing Lewes on the *coast* of Sussex; that his treatment of Sheldon throughout savours of the partisan rather than the historian, there being but a slender basis, if any, in recorded fact, or in any avowed publication, for the harsh things he says of him. In like manner he deals with Morley; in whose writings, if he had read them, we think he would have found what would have effectually prevented the sneer in which he has chosen to indulge. These things will require and repay his care in another edition.

* Mr. Stanford writes with so strong a feeling that it is not wonderful he should be betrayed into strange mistakes. Our space forbids the enumeration of them; but we must not lose this opportunity of correcting one of our own. We have spoken of Milton (p. 515) as excepted from the Act of Indemnity along with J. Goodwin, whereas it was only in the Resolutions of the House of Commons, and the Royal Proclamation, that their names were associated. Milton *was* permitted to enjoy the benefit of the Act, though Goodwin was not.

BRIEF LITERARY NOTICES.

Discussions on the Gospels. By the Rev. Alexander Roberts, M.A. London: James Nisbet and Co. 1862.

THIS volume is an expansion of a much smaller one, which Mr. Roberts published some years since, entitled 'Inquiry into the Original Language of St. Matthew's Gospel.' The aim of the author, in the later as in the earlier work, is to prove, that Greek, and not Aramæan, was the ruling language of Palestine in the days of our Lord and His apostles; that the public discourses of Christ and the first preachers of Christianity were delivered, for the most part, in Greek; that Greek was the language in which the Four Gospels, that of St. Matthew not excepted, were originally composed; and that these doctrines alone supply us with a satisfactory explanation of the forms under which the New Testament Scriptures have come down to us. Reserving for the present the question of St. Matthew's having written a Gospel in Aramæan, we do not hesitate to say, that we believe Mr. Roberts makes out his case, and that, whatever traditional prejudice may urge to the contrary, his argument, as a whole, is impregnable.

In maintaining that Greek was the dominant tongue of Southern Syria in the time of Christ, our author does not deny that Aramæan was spoken along with it. This he allows, and even contends for. No one can doubt that the Palestinian Jews understood the language allied to the Hebrew, yet not Hebrew, which for centuries had held among them the place of their forefathers' speech. But while this is certain, it is also abundantly evident, as Mr. Roberts argues, that, generally speaking, they well knew and were in the constant habit of using the then world-wide Greek; and that, in point of fact, excepting only the more familiar intercourse of life, Greek, not Aramæan, was now their national tongue. This thesis, together with the position to which it naturally leads, as to our Lord and His apostles having commonly used the Greek language in their public teaching, forms the subject of the first and larger half of Mr. Roberts's work, and is discussed through several hundred pages with much learning, pains, and argumentative skill.

After a brief introduction defining the ground he proposes to take, stating the different views that have been held on the general topic, and

pointing out the sources of evidence, the author proceeds to exhibit at large the historical proof of the prevalence of Greek in Palestine at the period in question, and in particular to show, how the New Testament itself—the chief witness in the case—shuts us up to the conclusions, to which this part of his book is designed to lead. Much of the space, which Mr. Roberts here occupies, has been crossed in all directions by preceding writers; and so far as profane testimonies are concerned, he contents himself with mustering and marshalling such of them as he deems it needful to use for the purposes of his argument. Various Greek and Latin classics, the books of Maccabees, Philo, Josephus, the Mishna, inscriptions still extant, legends on coins,—these and other well-known authorities are brought forward as proving the firm and general hold which the Greek language had on Palestine in the time of Christ. The author throws his strength, however, into the other branch of his inquiry, and, by a large and minute examination of the New Testament Scriptures, seeks to verify and corroborate the depositions of the previous witnesses. The simple fact of the New Testament's being written in Greek; the fewness and apparently exceptional character of the Aramæan expressions that occur in it; the exceeding improbability that the Sermon on the Mount, considering the circumstances of its delivery, could have been spoken in any other tongue than the Greek; the indisputable evidence we have, that the great bulk of the quotations, which the younger Canon of Scripture makes from the older, are taken either verbatim, or nearly so, from the Septuagint; the indications afforded us by the Gospel narratives, that the conversations which Christ held with the woman of Samaria, with the Greeks mentioned in the twelfth of St. John, and with the Roman governor before His passion, were conducted, not in Aramæan, but in Greek; the moral certainty that St. Peter used Greek on the day of Pentecost, and that Stephen employed the same language before the Sanhedrim; several particulars belonging to the ministry of Philip, of Peter, and of James, as recorded in the eighth, eleventh, and fifteenth chapters of the Acts; the surprise and interest which St. Paul's addressing a crowd of his fellow-countrymen, on one occasion, in Aramæan, excited among them; the internal and external evidence, supplied by the Epistle to the Hebrews, in favour of the free and habitual use of the Greek tongue by the early Jewish Christians; the general purity of the Greek in which St. James—a Hebrew of the Hebrews by origin, education, and life-long residence in Palestine—wrote his Epistle; last, not least, the very existence of the Palestinian form of the language of Homer and Plato; these and many other considerations of the same class are conclusive evidence, as Mr. Roberts judges, that, not less in language than in political status, Japheth had got the upper hand of Shem between the Jordan and the sea, when 'the glory of Israel' shone there as 'a light to the Gentiles.' We do not pledge ourselves to all the details of the author's argument. It is not at all clear to us, that if our Lord and His apostles, in their public teaching, quoted the Hebrew original of the Old Testament, the inspired reporters of their words must necessarily have reproduced such quotations, either in the *ipissima verba* of the Septuagint, or in literal translations from the Hebrew. Neither are we quite

satisfied with the ingenious theory, by which Mr. Roberts endeavours to distinguish 'Hellenist' and 'Hebrew' Jews as being pretty much what Low and High Churchmen are among ourselves. The contrast which Acts xi. 19, 20 makes between 'the Jews' on the one hand, and the 'Hellenists' on the other, seems to us to be fatal to this hypothesis. We cannot but think, too, that what Mr. Roberts says in his valuable episode on the authorship of the Epistle to the Hebrews, as to the general worth of 'the argument from style,' in discussions of this sort, is much in excess of the reality of things. Assuredly the highest criticism is becoming more and more distrustful of verdicts founded on evidence drawn from the use of words, idioms, and turns of expression in ancient documents. In regard to the particular point to which the author applies the principle in question, while we heartily endorse his opinion, that the Epistle to the Hebrews was, in substance at least, a formal letter addressed by St. Paul, at a late period of life, to his 'brethren according to the flesh,' we think there is internal evidence against the idea, that it was sent forth anonymously, as a concession to prejudice; and neither on linguistic nor dogmatic grounds are we at all so sensible, in reading it, as Mr. Roberts supposes every one must be, that we move within a sphere of thought and expression very different from that which is distinctively Pauline. At the same time, were we zealous supporters of the popular view as to the relations of the Aramæan and Greek in Palestine at the beginning of our era, and were it put to us, in face of the author's facts and logic, to champion the former as against the latter, we fear we should be compelled to substitute a flourish of fictions and sophisms for sober truth and demonstration.

The second and smaller half of Mr. Roberts's volume is devoted to the double question of the language in which St. Matthew originally wrote, and of the origin of the Gospels as a whole; the latter of the two points being handled more briefly, while the former is gone into with the fulness and minuteness, which its intrinsic interest and its bearing on the other and wider topic demand. In prosecuting this inquiry, the author begins by expounding the various opinions which have obtained as to the original language of the first Gospel, and by laying down and illustrating the principles by which, as he contends, we ought to be guided in forming a judgment on the subject. He then proceeds to discuss the evidence, both internal and external, which may be adduced in support of the proper originality of the canonical Greek of St. Matthew. Finally, he puts under his critical microscope the statements which a long series of ancient authorities make as to St. Matthew's having written in Aramæan; and, after vigorously cross-questioning Dr. Cureton's Syriac Text of the Evangelist, concludes by scrutinizing and condemning the hypothesis of a two-fold original of the Gospel as arbitrary, fanciful, and inconsistent with the facts of the case.

In regard to the principles according to which an investigation of this kind should be conducted, we agree in most respects with Mr. Roberts. We think he might have stated more cautiously the canon by which he assigns the precedence to the internal over the external evidence in the treatment of his questions. There are knots of historical criticism—take

the age of the Book of Daniel as an example,—for the disentangling of which it will surely be wise to put the two sorts of evidence into somewhat different relations to each other. We allow, of course, that acknowledged internal evidence ought to bear down the scale against questionable external authority; and that where there is a near balance of witnesses on the one side and the other, a little overweight of evidence from within may sometimes be fairly considered as settling the point at issue. At the same time it is quite conceivable, that the same internal appearances may admit of more than a single construction, and that testimony from without may render it imperative to adopt one of two or more possible interpretations rather than another. At any rate, in approaching a question where it is granted on all hands that external evidence must have great value, we doubt the policy of seeming to prejudge the conclusion by placing the one set of witnesses in front of the other.

As to the finding of Mr. Roberts on the argument, whether St. Matthew's Greek is an original work or a version, we most heartily endorse his affirmation, that it is the composition of the Evangelist himself; and we do this quite as much on the ground of external as of internal evidence. To say nothing, either of the proofs of originality, which the very contents of the document supply, or of the absurdities—often very irreverent ones—which follow from the theory of its being a translation from the Aramæan, the simple facts that history knows nothing of a Greek translation of St. Matthew, that our present Gospel is quoted by the Apostolical Fathers, and that in the earliest ages of the Church the Greek text of the Evangelist passed without question as an inspired writing, are of themselves, to our minds, decisive of the point in dispute. While we thus far follow our author, however, we are by no means so sure, as he appears to be, that the ancients were all in error in stating that St. Matthew wrote in his vernacular Aramæan. The strongest argument which he brings against their testimony is the fact, that several of the fathers make similar statements—statements now generally admitted to be incorrect—with reference to the Epistle to the Hebrews. Still Mr. Roberts must allow that the witness to the Aramæan Matthew is both older and, in virtue of circumstances, more likely to be trustworthy than that which makes St. Paul the author of an Epistle in the same language; and when we connect with this the fact, that even in the Peshito version of the Evangelists, and still more in the text of the Syriac Gospels discovered and published by Dr. Cureton, St. Matthew stands out in a marked way from the rest for the idiomatic purity of its style, and for its remarkable closeness to the Greek, it is difficult to resist the conviction, that Papias, Irenæus, Origen, Eusebius, Jerome, and others were in some sense right in what they say on this matter, and that, taken in connexion with the evidence we have that the Greek Gospel came from the pen of the Evangelist, this is one of the instances in which it becomes us to apply a favourite canon of our author's, and neither 'totally reject' the fact alleged, nor 'totally accept' it. With reference to Dr. Cureton's Syriac, we readily grant to Mr. Roberts, that, apart from the features just named as distinguishing it from its fellows,

we find nothing in it incompatible with the idea, that it is a translation from the Greek. We go further, and admit, that certain parts of it are only to be explained on the supposition that they are derived from one or more of the Greek Gospels. The point of difficulty is the positive and repeated assertion by competent ancient authorities that there was an Aramæan original of St. Matthew. Let this be got over; we go the whole length with Mr. Roberts. So long as this remains, we must believe that both the Cureton and the Peshito Syriac had the Evangelist's Aramæan as its basis, and that this is the key to the excellence which shows in the text of St. Matthew as contrasted with the other three Gospels. It was in this view that the writer of a paper on Dr. Cureton's Syriac Gospels, which appeared in a former number of this Review, maintained, that his St. Matthew could not be considered a translation; and such appears to us to be the only doctrine that can be reasonably held, until Papias and his brethren are effectually disposed of. Nor do we at all shrink from this judgment, because it lands us in some form or other of that twofold-original hypothesis, against which Mr. Roberts contends with so much earnestness and ability. We fully concur with him in his general condemnation of critical compromises. No doubt they are often nothing more than the crutches of intellectual feebleness. But such is not always the case. Mr. Roberts himself adopts a compromise with respect to the authorship of the Epistle to the Hebrews, and he may be right in doing so. A compromise is sometimes the highest exercise of the judicial functions of our reason, and the proper *via media* between the extremes of a rough-handed rashness, and of a drowsy and dull-sighted credulity. And whether the theory in question be defensible or not, it is, at least, not a whit the less worthy of acceptance, because it is a compromise.

The question of the origin of the Gospels is closely bound up, as every one will see, with that of the language which prevailed in Palestine at the time at which the facts they relate took place. On this interesting subject Mr. Roberts writes with much good sense; and his arguments are generally well-wrought and weighty. We feel some surprise that he should cling, as he does, to the idea, that the verbal correspondences of the Gospels may be explained in part by supposing, that certain fixed forms of expression came to be used by the first preachers of Christianity in narrating the facts of our Lord's life and ministry, and that some of these were transferred in common into two or more of the evangelical narratives. This seems to us to be a very artificial and improbable theory. Moreover, we doubt whether Mr. Roberts makes enough of the probability of our Lord's having sometimes spoken in Aramæan, when His words are reported in Greek, as helping to relieve some of the difficulties, which arise out of the various forms under which the sacred historians exhibit His teaching. It is demonstrable, by comparing the Gospels with one another, that the Evangelists have occasionally given us in Greek what our Lord really uttered in Aramæan; and why this may not have been the case in other instances, where they give no sign, we cannot understand. On the whole, we believe Christ used the vernacular more freely than our author seems to think likely; and in this we dis-

cover a ready and highly probable means of accounting for a class of phenomena, which are much less easily explained on the principle, that His discourses and conversations with His disciples were all but exclusively delivered in Greek. Neither here, however, nor in the chapter in which Mr. Roberts sums up and applies the argument of his book, will our limits permit us to keep abreast of him. We commend these sections of the work to all admirers of Eichhorn, and of the 'Protevangel' theory, and wish them as happy an escape as they deserve out of the hands of Mr. Roberts's logic.

We cannot close even this brief and imperfect notice of the 'Discussions on the Gospels' without expressing our strong sense of their value, as one of the best contributions, which British scholarship has made for some while past, towards the settlement of the 'vexed questions' of Biblical literature. Even those who do not accept the conclusions of the writer, will admire the learning, judgment, sagacity, and original thought, which his work exhibits. It is refreshing, too, in this age of self-important dogmatism, and of 'free handling' of holy things, to be able to add, that Mr. Roberts writes with an almost painful modesty, and that a fine tone of tender and reverent Christian feeling, worthy of himself and his subject, pervades every part of his volume.

Poems on Several Occasions. By Samuel Wesley, A.M., Jun. A New Edition; including many pieces never before published. Edited, and Illustrated with copious Notes, by the late James Nichols. With a Life of the Author by William Nichols. London: Simpkin, Marshall, and Co. 1862.

THIS volume contains six hundred and sixty pages, of which the first thirty-six are occupied with the Preface, the Life of Mr. Samuel Wesley, the Contents, Dedication, &c. With the exception of these thirty-six pages, and the last twelve, the whole volume was printed under the superintendence of the late Mr. Nichols. To us this unmodern and square-looking volume is on that account endeared. Its 18mo page, and somewhat discoloured paper, remind us that, as a labour of love, our late beloved and learned friend, whose character and habits as a man of letters, an editor, and a master-printer, take us back into by-gone generations, commenced the preparation and printing of this edition of the poems of Samuel Wesley more than twenty years ago, and that, as his son informs us, it was his 'conscientious thoroughness' which 'prevented this volume from seeing the light many years ago.'

We can imagine with what delight Mr. Nichols lingered over the work of collecting and editing the poems of the eldest brother of the Wesleys. All antiquarian literary research was a passion with him; but especially such as brought him into relation with the literary history of the Wesley family, and of those who were intimately connected with them. He was eminently fitted by his tastes and acquirements to edit the poetry of the last century. Fifty years ago, when resident in Leeds,

he edited the poetical works of Dr. Byrom, of Manchester; a man celebrated in his day, and a friend of the Wesleys. His editions of 'The Poetical Works of Thomson,' and 'The Complete Works of Dr. Young,' have gained the highest reputation for judgment, scholarship, and thoroughness. To the writings of Samuel Wesley, moreover, he was peculiarly attracted by sympathy of disposition. 'For,' as his son says in his brief Preface, 'like Samuel Wesley, though his conversation overflowed with wit and humour, generally playful, sometimes keen and caustic, no heart more tender and loving ever beat in human breast.'

The first edition of Samuel Wesley's poems was published in quarto, in 1736; was dedicated to his good friend and patron, the celebrated Harley, Earl of Oxford, and was very well received. Some Kingswood scholars may remember this fine edition, a copy of which was in the remains of Mr. John Wesley's old Kingswood library. We well recollect the quaint pleasure yielded to us by reading in this edition that rich Homeric burlesque, 'The Battle of the Frogs and Mice.' After the premature death of the author, a second edition was published in 1743, in 12mo, with some additions. The pieces contained in that volume are embodied in the present edition; together with a very large number of poems which have not been published before.

Samuel Wesley is best known to Wesleyans as the author of the beautiful hymn, 'The morning flowers display their sweets.' But, besides this, he composed the well-known favourite, 'The Lord of Sabbath let us praise;' the three fine hymns, to 'God the Father,' 'God the Son,' and 'God the Holy Ghost,' contained in the Supplement to the Wesleyan collection, and also that which begins, 'From whence these dire portents around?'

His 'Battle of the Sexes,' a poem in the Spenserian stanza, suggested by a paper in the *Guardian*, was printed originally in a separate form, without the author's knowledge, and passed at once into a second edition, of which he himself took charge. It is a poem of great spirit and even brilliancy. No one who reads this will wonder at the contemporary reputation which Mr. Wesley enjoyed, or that Pope and Addison treated him as a friend and equal. The 'Battle of the Frogs and Mice,' like the 'Battle of the Sexes,' is in the Spenserian stanza. Its poetical merits are of a superior order; and this burlesque composition might furnish some hints of value to the critics in the present controversy on Homeric translations.

In nothing perhaps did Samuel Wesley appear to better advantage as a poet than in tender lyrics. What can be prettier or sweeter than the following?

'TO A YOUNG LADY ON HER BIRTH-DAY,

BEING THE FIRST OF APRIL.

'Let others write for by designs;
I seek some moral in my lines,
Which whosoever reads must hear,
Or great, or learn'd, or young, or fair.
Permit me, then, with friendly lay,
To moralize your April day.

'Chequer'd your native month appears,
With many gleams and cloudy tears.
'T is thus the world our trust beguiles,
Its frowns as transient as its smiles;
Nor pain nor pleasure long will stay;
For life is but an April day.

'Health will not always last in bloom,
But age or sickness surely come.
Are friends beloved? Why, fate must seize
Or these from you, or you from these:
Forget not earnest in your play;
For youth is but an April day.

'When piety and fortune move
Your heart to try the bands of love,
As far as duty gives you power,
Guiltless enjoy the present hour;
"Gather your rose-buds while you may;"
For love is but an April day.

'What clouds see'er without are seen,
O may they never reach within!
But virtue's stronger fetters bind
The strongest tempest of the mind.
Calm may you shoot your setting ray,
And sunshine end your April day.'

Perhaps the richest specimen of Samuel Wesley's humorous vein is 'The Cobbler,' which, if needing some allowance on account of 'such plainness of speech as was usual to the age in which Wesley wrote,' is brimful of genuine fun, and not wanting in its lesson of instruction.

Some pieces of peculiar interest, because of the glimpses which they afford of the private life of the Wesley family at home, and of the particular characteristics of some of the writer's gifted sisters, are for the first time published in this edition.

The political and ecclesiastical satires have their value as illustrations of the party-feeling of the times, and are often caustic and clever. The batch of effusions in honour of the Earl of Oxford are, for the most part, of little value; and, to the taste and spirit of the present age, seem unworthy of the character and position of the writer. But, in the beginning of the last century, there seems to have subsisted between great men and their less powerful friends a relation somewhat resembling that between patron and client in the Roman commonwealth; and poets of undoubted honour and spirit acted, without any sense of degradation, as the laureates of the great families into whose intimacy they were admitted.

We can honestly recommend this interesting and well edited volume on account of its intrinsic merits, as well as because it contains the literary remains of a man so distinguished in various ways, as the eldest son of the gifted family which was trained by Susanna Wesley in the Epworth rectory. No collector of Wesleyan antiquities will consider his library complete without it.

Lectures on the English Language. By George P. Marsh. Edited, with additional Lectures and Notes, by William Smith, LL.D. London: Murray. 1862. [The Student's Manual of the English Language.]

Readers of Mr. Max Müller's charming Lectures on Language will have marked the respect with which he speaks of a recent American work on the English tongue. How far we are indebted to his eulogiums for the republication of the work in this country, we do not know. As matter of fact, however, Mr. Müller's praise of Mr. Marsh has been speedily followed by the appearance of New York in London; and in the volume named above—one of those black-coated, red-banded, golden-eyed, bright, sensible-looking books, which Mr. Murray every now and then puts into our hands—that indefatigable student and friend of students, Dr. William Smith, has brought the book in question within easy reach of the increasing body of Englishmen at home, to whom the history and constitution of their native language are matter of interest. From the preface we learn with satisfaction that the volume is, to all intents and purposes, a reprint of the American original. Both authors and the public have reason to complain, not unfrequently, of the injury done them by improvements in cases of this kind. Dr. Smith's editorial conscience, of course, is not so delicate as to compel him to re-produce manifest errors. In place, too, of the first and second of Mr. Marsh's lectures, he gives us—with the consent, as we judge, of the author himself,—two valuable chapters of his own, on the origin, affinities, and constituent elements of the English Language. Further he states, that he has wrought into various parts of the work certain MS. corrections and additions, which Mr. Marsh was courteous enough to send him on learning that he proposed republishing his book in this country. Otherwise, the English edition is the latest American edition over again; and in the form under which Dr. Smith and Mr. Murray have combined to send it forth, we think we may assure ourselves, that we have nothing, which the author of the original book does not virtually accept and endorse.

The chapters by the editor are an admirable digest of the facts and arguments lying within his chosen field of inquiry. The position of the English in the family of languages to which it belongs; the time of its planting in Britain; the history of our old friends, the Jutes, Saxons, and Angles, who are commonly reckoned its progenitors, and whom Dr. Smith, we are glad to find, does not deliver over to the realm of dreams; the origin of the term "English;" the series of changes, which the language has undergone from the most ancient times to our own; and the wide and often difficult question of the diverse elements, Celtic, Danish, and Latin, which have place in it—on all these points Dr. Smith writes with his usual judgment, perspicuity, and learning. The Lecture which follows brings us directly under the guidance of Mr. Marsh. It treats of that part of scientific etymology, which relates to the primitive and derivative forms and meanings of words, and discusses with much philosophical ability and force of illustration the proper functions, the

traditionary abuses, and the practical worth of this important helpmate of philology and linguistics. The writer uses strong language when, in reference to this subject, he says, that beyond the circle of Greek, Latin, French, and strictly Anglo-Saxon derivations, he knows of 'no English Dictionary worthy of the smallest confidence.' We fear, however, he speaks no more than the truth, though we do not choose to exhibit a host of dead Goths and Scandinavians making giggle and sport over our venerable lexicographers. An example or two of blundering etymologies, adduced by Mr. Marsh, show plainly how much remains to be done on this ground. From the topic now indicated, the author proceeds to consider, —first, 'the foreign helps to the knowledge of English,' including under this title the Anglo-Saxon tongue, no less than the Latin, and other members of the Indo-European stock of languages—and next, the older forms of English itself as preserved in the Ormulum, in Piers Ploughman, in Chaucer, Wycliffe, Tyndale, and in various monuments besides of that noble native literature, to the value of which, for the student of English philology, we are only just beginning to wake up. The two succeeding Lectures, on the 'Sources and Composition of English,' are full of striking facts and generalizations, the fruit of much research and thought on the part of the writer. In order to ascertain the proportions in which German, Latin, or other elements enter into our vocabulary, Mr. Marsh has not merely counted and classified the whole body of words occurring in the Ormulum, the Bible, Shakespeare, and the poetry of Milton, but has also subjected to the same scrutiny a large number of representative passages, some of them of great extent, taken from English authors of every age, beginning with Robert of Gloucester, and ending with Tennyson, Ruskin, and Macaulay. The results are very curious and interesting. When we state that ninety-six per cent. of the words of the Ormulum are found to be Anglo-Saxon, that about sixty per cent. of those employed in the authorized version of the Scriptures and in the writings of Shakespeare have the same origin, that Milton in his poetical works uses fewer than thirty-three per cent. of Anglo-Saxon words, and that the Anglo-Saxon element in the vocabulary of the best writers of the present day is considerably larger than in that of the best writers of the last century, we give samples of a cluster of facts, to which public speakers and authors, scarcely less than philologists, will do well to direct their attention. On the questions, moreover, of the causes which have led to the incorporation of foreign words in our language, of the influence which the native and exotic elements have exerted on each other, of the criteria which the various grammatical classes and forms of the English furnish as to their parentage, and of the relation in which its composite lexicon stands to its literature, this section of Mr. Marsh's work is rich in historic illustration, in striking literary sentiment, and in carefully conducted philosophical argumentation. 'The Vocabulary of the English Language' is given as the heading of the five following Lectures. After what has gone before, it is a little startling to see a title like this. We naturally expect a change of topic with a change of title. In point of fact the subject to which we advance is the subject we left behind us. That is the English vocabulary; and this is the English vocabulary like-

wise. Both here and elsewhere, we think, Mr. Marsh might improve upon the manner in which he presents the topics of his Lectures; and were a fuller and more precise analysis of the entire volume substituted for the table of 'Contents' prefixed to it in this edition, the practical value of his work would be greatly heightened. What is matter of form apart, the readers of these same five Lectures will find a world of rare information and delightful criticism packed up within the seventy pages which they occupy. The position which the Anglo-Saxon element holds in the English; the losses it has sustained, or the gains it has made, by the adoption of words from other tongues; the comparative lexical wealth of the language; the historical and scientific relations of obsolete, archaic, and colloquial terms that occur in it; the creative or plastic energy, which the demands of modern thought and inquiry have developed in our mother-speech; the theory of the derivation and classification of words, particularly as applied to the English; the extent to which our language has moulded or been moulded by our national character; the influences which have determined certain of our words to new uses, or have elevated or debased the meaning of others; lastly, the doctrine of the introduction of new words, and of the 'suspended animation' or death of old ones—form a series of subjects, which the author treats with a combined force and delicacy, that often remind us of the happiest efforts of Mr. Max Müller or M. Renan. The distinctions which Mr. Marsh draws in his next Lecture among what are commonly known as interjections, and the claim which he prefers on behalf of some of them to take rank with other 'parts of speech,' might well make Lindley Murray's hair stand on end. All honour, however, to this worthy name, though his star is setting! And honour, too, to those who have come after him, and who guide us better than the lights which he possessed enabled him to do! We agree with Mr. Marsh in his general opinions on the point referred to, and commend his stirring discourse on the Ah and Oh family to our readers' attention, as being one of the most agreeable and original portions of his work. The fourteenth Lecture, which follows, is occupied with the proper scientific notion of the noun and the verb, those redoubtable articles of standing or falling language. There is little here, of course, to suit the taste of those who can eat nothing but trifle and syllabub. Yet we cannot but admire the skill with which Mr. Marsh makes even the dry crusts of his philology soft and palatable for the mouths he cares to feed; and with his pleasant cooking of prefixes and affixes before us, we cease to wonder that words are losing their old character of hardness. The four succeeding Lectures on 'Grammatical Inflexions,' contain much which is familiar to most students of Language. Mr. Marsh deserves our best thanks, however, for the very admirable conspectus which he has given us of this broad and embarrassing subject. At present we are far from that thorough acquaintance, either with the history or the philosophy of inflexional forms, which science feels to be desirable; and if our author carries us no great distance beyond the lines that had been previously reached, he at least puts us abreast of the latest researches, and offers many important sug-

gestions for the guidance of future investigators. His views as to the design of Language in the use of inflexions, and as to the comparative merits of inflected and uninflected tongues, are marked by the same vigour of thought and felicity of illustration which distinguish his writings throughout.

We regret that our limits oblige us to follow Mr. Marsh at a distance in his remaining Lectures. They are every way equal to the earlier ones; some of them must have cost him even more labour and thought than the bulk of those which precede them. The two Lectures on 'the English Language as affected by the Art of Printing,' and the Lecture on 'Orthoepical Changes in English,' are the fruit of prodigious industry; and while they teem with facts of high historical interest, they are richly interwoven in all parts with the threads of a subtle yet strongly-fibred criticism, that gives them alike philosophical importance and literary grace. Much the same may be said of the Lectures on Rhyme, on Accentuation, on Assonance, on Synonyms and Euphemisms, and on certain other topics allied to these, which take up some sixty or seventy pages of the latter part of the book. We do not know where to point our readers for anything like so scholarly, full, and satisfying discussions of the various questions, which these terms involve and carry with them, as they may hear in this volume from the lips of Mr. Marsh. The Lectures, too, on the general subject of translation; on the character of the authorized version of the Bible, and the influence it has exerted on our mother-tongue; on the corruptions of language; and on the English spoken in America—are all characterized less or more by the excellent qualities which we have marked elsewhere. We could half suspect our author of waggery, when, in speaking of the differences between the pronunciation of English on the one side of the Atlantic and the other, he tells us he has been given to understand, that the practice of suppressing *r* where it ought to be used, and of introducing it where it ought to be absent, may be met with in England as well as in some parts of the United States. If Mr. Marsh is serious, he is evidently a stranger to the representative circles of Cockneydom; and for the orthoepical genius, which can transmute this letter into an aspirate, or something less, if he will only put himself under our guidance for a Sunday or two, we engage to take him to English churches and chapels in plenty, where even grave men in canonicals do not hesitate to lisp a meritorious liquid into nothing at all. In this brief notice of Mr. Marsh's book we have purposely avoided dwelling on what is not the least valuable element in it, the Notes and Illustrations,' appended to many of the Lectures. Taken together, they form a large mass of writing; and the information which they contain will be found to have a high interest both for philologists and general readers. The subjects of them are very various—German names in Great Britain, Celtic words in English, early English Grammars, Etymology of 'Harvest' and 'Cattle,' the Termination *-ster*, the origin of *s* as the sign of the Possessive Pronoun, the Particles 'Yea' and 'Yea,' 'Nay' and 'No,' &c.; but they are all handled in the spirit of a wide-seeing and exact science; and even where the reader may find reason for

doubting the author's conclusions,—though this will occur but seldom,—he will not fail to admire his learning, judgment, caution, fairness, and argumentative skill.

On the whole, we hail this youngest member of Dr. Smith's admirable series of students' books, as a most important addition to the helps we possess for the right understanding and use of the English tongue. Less distinctively 'linguistic' than Latham, less purely historical than Craik, less complete as a scientific grammar of the language than Angus, Mr. Marsh's work, while it does not supersede any one of these authors, comprises many of the best characteristics of them all. We strongly advise every young minister and scholar to master the contents of this instructive volume. Mr. Marsh is at present the United States' Minister at the Court of Victor Emmanuel. We venture to hope, that among his diplomatic responsibilities and labours he may still find leisure to prosecute his inquiries in English Philology.

The Providence of God, viewed in the Light of Holy Scripture. By the Rev. Thomas Jackson. London: John Mason.

It is written in the Book, 'Thou shalt rise up before the hoary head, and honour the face of the old man, and fear the Lord.' It were no marvel if, with such a task as the present, even the critic's hand should be found less firm, and his pen less pliable, than is wont. We sat down to the perusal of this book with some inward tumult; but as page after page was conned, the prudence, the thoroughness, the heart, and the holy faith which characterise it throughout, made everything give place to a grateful appreciation. The thought which occurs to the reader again and again, is, What a beautiful illustration of the words of ancient song!—'The righteous shall flourish like the palm tree: he shall grow like the cedar in Lebanon. He shall still bring forth fruit in old age.'

The question, 'How doth God know? And is there knowledge in the Most High?' has, with more or less distinctness and force, engaged the thought of the thoughtful in all ages. According to the law of fallen humanity, opinions have verged to the two extremes. Some have ignored the Lawgiver, and some have gone far towards ignoring all law. By the former, we are presented with a body without a soul; and by the latter, with a soul capriciously intruding upon the functions of the body. Yet, despite these errors of Rationalism, Materialism, or Atheism, on the one hand, and of Superstition and craven Infidelity on the other, mankind, in the main, when blessed with light, hold fast by the declarations of Revelation, and the confirmatory deductions of sober observation.

'The Lord reigneth.' Ordinary results are attained by ordinary means, and these we call *natural*. Special results are secured by the use of special means, whether the action be mediate, as in the supply of Elijah's wants, or immediate, as in the creation of all things,—and these we call supernatural. The one moving cause is in all cases the same, even He by whom, and for whom, and to whom are all things. The Supernatural is as regular as the Natural; and could we but attain unto it, the science of the unknown would doubtless present laws as beautiful,

and formulæ as simple, as does that of the known and observed. The one Lord is God over all, and order is His first law.

Mr. Jackson has restricted himself, in the treatment of his subject, to the consideration of Providence, as viewed in the light of Holy Scripture. In this we have another evidence of his 'sound wisdom and discretion.' Speculation would be easy, but, practically, all but valueless. Life and eternity are solemn realities, either pleasing or terrible. To know how far the Ruler of the universe has been, and is, wont to concern Himself with our everyday affairs, is of the highest moment both to the loving and to the disobedient. In order to this, we must have facts and not fancies. These are furnished by the Bible.

The Bible is the book of Providence; and, further, 'rightly to understand the providence of God, we must view it in its connexion with the act of creation, with the fall of man, with the redemption of the world by the death of Christ, and with a future state of rewards and punishments. When viewed apart from these subjects, the doctrine of Divine Providence is involved in difficulties which no ingenuity can unravel; and the more deeply it is studied, the more dark and perplexing those difficulties become. But of the creation, the fall, redemption, and a future state, the Holy Scriptures are the only authentic record. To their teaching, therefore, as the undoubted word of God, we surrender ourselves through the ensuing pages.' (P. 2.)

To do full justice to this excellent book is,—to read it. Every position is supported and illustrated by the facts and teachings of Scripture. Richly practical remarks are scattered throughout, making it pre-eminently what the author desired that it should be, 'a family book;'—one which will amply repay the perusal of the wise and the unlearned, the strong who know whom they have believed, and the weak who tremblingly seek to cast their burden upon the Lord. It will be a favourite book with many Sabbath readers. The aged will value it for its abounding and wise consolation, the young will devour it for the sake of its Bible histories.

Let no one, however, suppose that it is valuable for these alone. The student will find it of more than ordinary worth to him, as furnishing him with a systematic arrangement of scriptural doctrine on this all-important theme. He will find some difficult question solved to his satisfaction; as, for instance, the case of Pharaoh, in the chapter on 'Permissive Providence.' The chapter on the 'Moral Discipline of Divine Providence' will suggest, as well as give, much useful thought.

God's Two Books: or, Nature and the Bible have one Author. By T. A. G. Balfour, M.D. London: Nisbet and Co.

THIS volume is intended by the author as an introduction to his former work, 'The Typical Character of Nature.' For the apparent irregularity he apologizes. The two are meet companions in size, appearance, subject, and mode of treatment.

The design of the later publication is to supply a positive side to the argument of Butler and others; who answered objections against

revelation by the production of corresponding difficulties, as found in nature. Dr. Balfour goes to 'establish conviction of the Divine authorship of the two records;' and this he seeks to accomplish by identifying some of their chief characteristics and leading principles.

We cannot follow the writer through all his chapters, but may notice one or two. The second is occupied with the superhuman character of both Nature and the Bible, which renders it as impossible for man to have written the Scriptures, as for him to have fashioned the worlds, and the testimony of which is only strengthened and confirmed by the presence of mysteries in both; the inexhaustible resources of both nature and revelation ever unfolding to the diligent searcher knowledge which is new and useful. Both afford material for generalization, the same absence of formal and systematic arrangement being observable in each; so that as the objects in nature, observed in their mixed assemblages have to be classified and generalized, the facts and teachings of Scripture, recorded in the form of history, have to be grouped and systematized.

The fourth chapter is devoted to the universal supremacy of law, as recognised in both records. Dr. Balfour has not attempted to arrange his analogies in any logical order, otherwise this must needs have been taken earlier. The force of the argument from the exhaustless treasures of both the works and words of God lies in this: that law rules both over the truth and its discovery. Knowledge is sure, not to him who seeks, but to him who seeks aright.

Still more, if possible, does the argument from the superhuman character of the two records rest upon the supremacy of law. The unintelligible in the midst of anarchy would be so natural as not to arrest the attention, or convince the judgment of any; for the confused and the unintelligible are one, and understanding itself depends upon the prevalence of law. But the presence of the incomprehen*ded*, and to *us*, therefore, for a period longer or shorter, the incomprehen*sible*,—in the midst of evident order, and itself fitting into, and harmonizing with, the known workings of things,—mystery like this, in nature or in Scripture, compels the assent of every mind to the presence of some higher authority. And when these occur similarly in both nature and Scripture, and this without any collision or discord between the known and the unknown of the one, and the known and the unknown of the other, we have an argument for the unity of the ruling power, and, therefore, for the oneness of their origin, which is unanswerable. And it may be fairly added, that the truth above mentioned, the dependence of our power to comprehend upon the presence of known law in the facts to be comprehended, links man himself with the other two, and determines his origin as identical with that of the world and the Book.

The seventh chapter is on 'Vicarious Action.' There is undoubtedly a recognition in all nature of the principle of substitution. Its presence amidst the laws of inorganic matter, as revealed by chemistry, is not the less interesting because it could have been so little expected. But the discovery being made, we easily realize its beauty and significance. This significance, however, will be little appreciated without observation,

somewhat more extended than that furnished by the work before us. This we do not consider to be a fault of the book; for it professes to introduce, and not to exhaust.

The whole plan of redemption was present to the mind of the great Creator when the world began to be; for before its foundations were laid, the Lamb was fore-ordained. No wonder, therefore, if in the preparation of this world, destined to be the scene of a manifestation so marvellous, He whose *will* alone, which must ever accord with His nature, is the basis of all law in all departments of His kingdom, impressed from the beginning upon nature the premonitions of His grace.

The fact of a coming mystery was sufficiently declared. What but this could have been taught, as, age after age, in constant progression, this earth was seen to be fashioned, to flourish, to decay, and perish; yet ever rising up into a higher beauty and a nobler life, the work of Him 'by whom also He hath made the world?' Death in the midst of life, and life ever triumphing over death, could scarcely do otherwise than give promise to the observing mind, that the highest life should result from the latest triumph of death,—that which is perfect being come. It matters little that, *to us*, the fulfilment explains the promise.

With this view, there is additional interest in the fact, and the charge of ingenuity is greatly moderated, when we see, or seem to see, early intimations of the mode in which this mystery should be wrought out, intimations which increase in force as we rise from the first and lowest stages of creation to the latest and the highest. The subject is a large one, and we may not stay to enter into detail. Inorganic matter, capable of no suffering, of no death, presents the principle in the form of simple substitution; but the substitution is limited to congeners. When vegetable life makes its appearance, we have not only the law of types, but a further truth, that life may be by means of death. The 'grain of wheat,' falling into the ground, 'if it die, bringeth forth much fruit.' Animal life introduces the element of suffering, and this suffering is oftentimes 'vicarious' in part. The parent suffers for the offspring, and one class suffers for the benefit of another. Death for another's profit, and life at the cost of another, appears everywhere. Carnivorous propensities might be deemed very wide of the mark, were it not for subsequent and fuller information. Human existence is full of this 'vicarious action,' this vicarious suffering, rising into the higher forms of mental and moral life. The carnivorous element here appears approaching to its full expression and solution, in connexion with animal sacrifices; whilst the Spirit has taught us that 'we have an altar of which they have no right to eat who serve the sanctuary;' and He who is our life hath declared, that 'He that eateth Me shall live by Me.' The mystery is solved, and hastens to its completion. The higher form to which we are told that man points, shall be made known when 'mortality is swallowed up of life.'

The whole theme is one of profound interest and of vast extent. The mine has been worked, as yet, but little: but it will yield valuable ore. We are thankful to find men of science leading on to those higher

generalizations which *must* be possible, and which it were greater folly to declare inaccessible to the human intellect than it can be to seek to attain to them. Generalizations in individual sciences have been succeeded by laws common to many sciences. Our teachers are beginning to seek after the 'science of the sciences.' Is it a dream only that there is a kingdom of the kingdoms, and that one day the 'spirit of man,' to whom 'understanding' is given by 'the Spirit of the Lord,' shall hold the key which unlocks the world?

We are thankful to Dr. Balfour, personally, and doubt not but that much valuable service will be rendered by him in the cause which he has thus espoused. We wish him, as an author, much success.

The Progress of Religious Thought, as illustrated in the Protestant Church of France; being Essays and Reviews, bearing on the chief Religious Questions of the Day. Translated from the French; with an Introductory Essay on 'The Oxford Essays and Reviews' by the Editor, John R. Beard, D.D. London. 1861.

THE name on the title-page of this volume will indicate the school of opinion to which it belongs. It is, in fact, an attempt on the part of a distinguished Unitarian to further the ends contemplated by the English *Essays and Reviews*. Dr. Beard makes no secret of this. He had for some time intended to publish a work like the one before us. He had been hindered from doing so. At length, however, he was able to carry out his design; and in his preface, referring to the circumstance of his writing while the Oxford book was in everybody's mouth, he says, 'I congratulate myself that the volume appears in the midst of a not uncongenial religious movement, and may, with God's blessing, do something to promote it.' In pursuance of this object, he gives us a series of papers, taken, with a single exception, from the well-known *Nouvelle Revue de Théologie*, and all strongly characterized by that 'free handling,' which is supposed to be so eminent an advantage, where 'subjects peculiarly liable to suffer by the repetition of conventional language and from traditional methods of treatment are concerned.' Three of the pieces are by M. Colani, the original editor of the periodical which, by change of name, has become the *Nouvelle Revue*. Dr. A. Reville of Rotterdam contributes three other pieces; and M. Edmond Scherer of Strasburg four more. Besides these there are single essays, written respectively by Dr. Scholten of Leyden, M. Grotz of Nismes, and the great French Orientalist, M. Renan. Some brief biographical notices of the contributors, by Dr. Reville, and the 'Introductory Essay,' by the English editor, complete the programme of the volume. How far Dr. Beard's calculations may be well founded as to the service which the contents of his work are likely to do the cause he represents, it is not for us to say. Assuredly some of the pieces which compose it are not adjusted to the latitude of this country; they are too abstruse, too cloudy, too deeply baptized into the spirit of the transcendental philosophy, to be capable of producing much impression on the

average English mind. We allow that this remark does not apply to the papers of all the contributors. Several of them are as well fitted as any part of the Oxford Essays to break up the foundations of faith, and to lead unwary souls to plant their feet upon nothing. And we presume that, so far as popular effect is concerned, it will be on these portions of the work that the editor will depend for the success of his beneficent enterprise. We need say but little as to the merits of Dr. Beard's publication. Compared with the English *Essays and Reviews*, its literary qualities show to advantage. For subtlety, range, and force of thought, and for general excellence of composition, it stands on a much higher level. In what is material, however, it is one with its prototype. There is the same affectation of straightforwardness; and the same disposition to throw a slur on the honesty of the 'orthodox.' There is the same supercilliousness in refusing to look at the so-called 'evidences' of Christianity; and the same astounding misrepresentation of the logical position of those who rely upon them. There is the same sort of metaphysical jugglery, by which truth is thinned down into error, and error dressed up into truth. There is the same ringing of the changes on old objections to the received views of the atonement, of inspiration, and of the canon of Scripture. There is, even in a higher degree, the same deification of human nature, and the same empirical assertion of the supremacy of science in the realm of soul. The spirit of exaggeration and caricature which pervades the volume, in regard to what constitutes the 'Church view' of Christianity, is nowhere more triumphant than in the Introductory Essay, by the editor. We are not surprised at this. We are used to it. Unitarianism knows well enough that, if it allows Christianity to remain bound up with the Bible, it has not an inch of ground to stand upon; and it is no new thing to see it in an agony of argument to get rid of this fatal association. Dr. Beard's book is one of those baleful creations of gifted mind, on which the wisdom and goodness of future generations will look with mingled humiliation and amazement.

On Translating Homer. Last Words. A Lecture, given at Oxford. By Matthew Arnold, M.A., Professor of Poetry, &c. London. 1862.

> 'Strange, that such difference should be
> 'Twixt tweedle-dum and tweedle-dee!'

So the first opening of this little book might lead one to soliloquize. Mr. Newman has translated Homer in English ballad measure. Mr. Arnold has published some specimens of what might be a translation of Homer in English hexameters. Moreover, Mr. Arnold has criticized Mr. Newman's poetical faculty; and Mr. Newman, in turn, has criticized Mr. Arnold's scholarship. Finally, Mr. Arnold gives us a lecture, with the title named above, and, in speaking his 'last words' about 'Translating Homer,' passes some comments on Mr. Newman's comments on the views which Mr. Arnold expressed as to the ballad translation and its author.

Are we to say that the personalities here are all on one side? It is clear that, so far as expressions of irritated feeling are concerned, Mr. Newman has the ground to himself; yet Mr. Arnold's gentleness carries a terrible sting with it; and, while we do not—and hope Mr. Newman does not—doubt for a moment the reality of the respect he professes for his opponent, we see from this example, how hard blows a quiet good-nature is able to deal, and what keen thrusts of mingled pleasantry and satire may come from a tender hand. On the questions at issue, as well as on the general principles which it is the object of certain parts of the book to establish, we agree almost wholly with Mr. Arnold. To suppose, as Mr. Newman does in effect, that the language of the Homeric poems was scarcely less antiquated to Greeks of the days of Pericles than Chaucer is to ourselves, appears to us to be a violation of all probability. Who would have listened to Æschylus or Sophocles reciting his pieces at the Games, if the Iliad and Odyssey had been as foreign to the national intelligence of the Greece of their times as the Canterbury Tales are to modern Englishmen? We think, too, that Mr. Arnold is entirely right in condemning the use of our ballad metre in the translating of Homer, on the ground of its incompatibility with what he well calls the simple severity of the Homeric poetry. At the same time, we are not satisfied that the hexameter, as it now obtains among us, is at all in a condition to do justice to the sweet and graceful dignity of Homer, if even it be capable of doing it. The ratio of the consonantal to the vowel element in English is so much greater than in the epic Greek, and the combinations of letters in the former language are, on the whole, so much less musical than in the latter, that, when these disadvantages come to be combined with the difficulties created by accent and quantity, they almost put a dactylic metre out of court for the purpose of heroic verse in English, and compel us to have recourse to a severer and less flowing rhythm than that which the great father of this kind of poetry employed. Every Englishman must feel that Milton could not have written either in the metre of Longfellow or Macaulay; and, with Mr. Arnold's beautiful hexameters before us, we are still of opinion, that the coming translator of Homer, whoever he is, will be compelled to write in the iambics of Paradise Lost and Regained. The points we have touched upon are but one or two out of many, which Mr. Arnold discusses with much critical subtlety and taste. Indeed, the Lecture throughout abounds in forcible reasoning, in clear exposition of sound philosophical doctrines, and in fresh, full thoughts, which look brightly out from the author's unaffected and picturesque language. One blemish—not an inconsiderable one—marks an otherwise attractive and striking volume. Mr. Arnold is in the habit of making Holy Scripture do service in the cause of his wit. We think the practice cannot be too strongly reprobated. To write upon the fore-front of a book of this class, 'Many are my persecutors and mine enemies; yet do I not decline from [thy] testimonies;' to exclaim, 'How vain to rise up early, and to take rest late, from any zeal for proving to Mr. Newman, that he must not, in translating Homer, say *boundis* and *dances*!'—and to tell those whom he supposes to ask him mockingly, what 'the grand style' of composition is, that he has 'no answer, except to repeat to them, with compassionate

sorrow, the Gospel words: *Moriemini in peccatis vestris*,—"Ye shall die in your sins,"'—may be very smart and lively, but it is a species of profaneness, which, we trust, is rarely heard from a Professor's chair at Oxford.

Four Periods of Public Education: as Reviewed in 1832—1839, 1846—1862. In Papers by Sir James P. Kay Shuttleworth, Bart. Longmans. 1862.

THIS valuable collection of Papers is appropriately dedicated to, 'The Marquis of Lansdowne, K.G., &c., &c., and the Earl Russell, &c., &c., the Ministers of the Crown to whose sagacity, moderation, and firmness, the country owes the establishment of THE COMMITTEE OF THE PRIVY COUNCIL ON EDUCATION, and the adoption of the MINUTES OF 1846.' It is pre-eminently an authoritative publication, and, together with the same author's volume on *Public Education from* 1846 *to* 1852, *with Suggestions as to Future Policy*, will constitute the chief quarry out of which historians and statesmen, who would understand and expound the great formative period of our popular education in this country, must in the future draw their materials. In relation to the 'First Period,' there is here republished a tract on 'The Condition of the Working Classes of Manchester in 1832.' This was, if we mistake not, the author's first publication of importance. In 1832 he was known as Dr. Kay, a young physician, in practice in Manchester. The publication of this thorough-going and revolutionary pamphlet, which unsparingly exposed the actual condition of things, as Manchester was thirty years ago, and advocated the most searching reforms, both sanitary and educational, created not a little local excitement and controversy. It marked out the writer, however, to the discernment of the sagacious, as a man of such general accomplishments, intellectual energy, and moral force, that he was selected by Government as a suitable person to be engaged in the administration of the New Poor Law, in the eastern counties of England; a position which, after holding it for several years, he exchanged, in 1839, for that of the Secretary of the Privy Council for Education, which was first constituted in that year.

The tract on Manchester in 1832 is immediately followed in this volume by a Paper on 'the Progress of Manchester in Thirty years, from 1832 to 1862,' which, of course, has been prepared for this republication. In many respects,—in nearly all matters connected with civic policy and sanitary reform,—admirable and sustained progress is shown; nevertheless, the mortality of the industrial population of Manchester is scarcely less at this day than it was when, in 1832, in the midst of cholera and all manner of abounding nuisances, Dr. Kay began his raid upon long-established abuses, and his efforts in behalf of sanitary reform. Whereas the mortality of Broughton, a genteel suburb of Manchester, from which the working classes are almost excluded, is only fifteen per thousand annually, and that of Pendleton, in which there is a mixed population, is twenty-four per thousand, the number of deaths in the township of Manchester averages thirty-four per thousand annually. This enormous excess, as Sir James shows, is due, in by far the largest proportion, to the lament-

able amount of infant mortality, arising from the employment of married women as factory operatives. Next after this cause of excessive mortality comes the prevalence of intemperance, an evil which is also, to a considerable extent, the consequence of the employment in factory labour of those whose presence in the house and with their family, during the day, should be the means of securing a comfortable home for the workman when his day's work is over. 'The price paid for the cheap labour of married women is a high rate of infant mortality, and of waste in drink, fatal to health and life.' Another cause of intemperance which Sir James Shuttleworth does not notice is, undoubtedly, the want in a great town like Manchester of that wholesome and interesting class of employments for the workman's spare hours, which always accompanies the occupancy of a country-cottage with a plot of garden to it. The working man in Rossendale, or at Walkden Moor, and often also in Oldham and its neighbourhood,—wherever, in fact, a working population has been allowed to extend itself freely over ground not previously in high cultivation, or not considered as needful to be 'preserved,'—is in the habit of spending his evenings from spring to autumn very much in his garden, and in winter occupies himself a good deal in little jobs connected with his home, as he feels his cottage truly to be, or in making preparation for the cultivation of his garden when the longer days shall come. There is no influence upon the working man so strongly educational as this. It attaches him to his home and family, detaches him from the public house, makes him master of himself, establishes a habit of provident thrift. This is *the* education of country life; the same which gave a character of independence and frugality to the hand-loom weavers of Yorkshire and Lancashire sixty years ago, and which gives dignity now to the industrious lead-miners of Cumberland; in many respects for the working man a better and more effective education than that of newspapers and books, though in certain respects we attach a high value to that. The loss of the influences of such a country life, the depressing effects of residence in low, close streets and courts, and the presence of the many temptations which surround a workman in a large town, combine to transform the country immigrants who flock for work to Manchester into an altogether different and deteriorated class. In the second generation they grow up, in many cases, still further demoralized and degenerate. Boorishness has become brutishness; the illiteracy of the moors has graduated in the virulent vice of towns. The lamentable fact which comes out in Sir James Shuttleworth's paper is, that, in proportion, there is as much pauperism in Manchester now, notwithstanding shortened hours of work, and all that sanitary improvements have done, as there was thirty years ago. But for the increase of late years of those moral and educational agencies which directly tend to counteract the evils at which we have glanced, the condition of things must have been much worse. The continual immigration of the least cultivated and least moral of the moorland families, and of a large population of Irish, accumulates difficulties in precise proportion to the demands of increasing trade; difficulties which, up to this time, the application of remedial and educational means has only just availed to neutralise.

For the remedies which Sir J. Shuttleworth suggests to meet this melancholy state of things we must refer to his volume.

The papers on 'The Second Educational Period,' record 'the means adopted by the Government (in 1839,) to elevate the standard of education in elementary schools, by the first steps in the introduction of pupil teachers, and by the proposal of a National Normal Training School, the defeat of which was one reason why the Battersea Training College was established.' The chief among these documents is the official pamphlet written by Sir James Shuttleworth, (Dr. Kay) in 1839, as Secretary of the Committee of Privy Council for Education, and published with the title, 'An Explanation of the Intentions of Her Majesty's Government in the Recent Measures for the Promotion of Education in England." From this pamphlet we had occasion to quote, in our article on the Revised Code last January, some passages of the highest importance, as indicating the primary purpose of Her Majesty and Her Majesty's Government in the Establishment of the Committee of Privy Council for Education.

Next come the papers relative to the critical epoch, 1846–7, of which the most important is the pamphlet first published in 1847, by direction of the Committee of Privy Council, under the title of 'The School, in its Relations to the State, the Church, and the Congregation.' This valuable pamphlet, from which we also quoted in the article to which we have referred, passed at the time through a great number of editions.

Finally, Sir James Shuttleworth's Two Letters to Earl Granville, in 1861, of which there is no need for us to say a word, sum up what relates to the Commissioners' Report, and the Revised Code.

We need hardly add, that no library of statesman, educationist, or philanthropist, can be complete without this volume: full as it is of information, political science and suggestion, enlightened philanthropy, and intellectual force. The author of these papers, and of the companion volume to which we have referred, is surely the one man in England fully qualified to act as permanent head of the educational department of the state. As a step to his attaining that position, we could earnestly wish to see Sir James in Parliament.

Philanthropy: the Genius of Christianity. With Biographical Sketches of some of the most Eminent Philanthropists. By John Horsford, D.D. London: Simpkin, Marshall, and Co. 1862.

Dr. Horsford, with a good deal of vigour, treats of Philanthropy in its Development, Properties, Exemplifications, Necessity, Discouragements, and Rewards. Some portions of his book are addressed to Colonial readers, having been written in the West Indies, where he still resides. He has not failed to familiarise himself to a considerable extent with what is going on in the mother country, and is by no means unqualified to address English readers. But, to the Colonial origin of the book, we must ascribe some omissions, not likely to have occurred in a volume of equal range with this, if written in England. Side by side

with it on our table, are the daily reports of the Conference of the British Association for the Promotion of Social Science; and it seems strange to read a comprehensive book on Philanthropy, published in 1863, which says nothing of proceedings so variously philanthropic as those of this excellent organization. While some names not yet to be expected in such a muster-roll obtain a place in his Biographical Sketches of Eminent Philanthropists, others are missing which surely would have had a place if the writer's pen had done its work in this country instead of Trinidad. These 'Sketches,' moreover, are, as a rule, too general in their outline; they do not give sufficient prominence and distinctness to the philanthropic deeds of their subjects, and, on the whole, do not excite us to admire or imitate. That of John Williams is very little more than a notice of Dr. Campbell's memoir of that excellent missionary. Moreover, the 'Sketches' given strike us as too exclusively official and high in their range. The book would have been much more adapted for usefulness, if it had contained some stirring examples of Philanthropy exhibited by persons in the common walks of life, and such as we vouch for it, the writer's memory and ministerial observation could have supplied. Heroes and heroines are very well in their place, but what the world wants is more private and daily philanthropy,—work like Miss Nightingale's among next-door neighbours, and evangelistic zeal like Dr. Coke's, ready for service in the homes of respectable Christians, and in the lanes at the back doors of their dwellings. A few stimulating specimens of this class of benevolence might, perhaps, have led some readers of this book to amend their lives, who will feel and say that the Philanthropy of most of Dr. Horsford's typical examples is out of their reach.

Two of the chapters in the book are thrown into the form of dialogues between friends bearing the names of Anthropos and Phileo. The author puts this arrangement to some very ingenious and amusing services. He thus contrives to forestall the critics, and to declare some portions of his work 'highly interesting;' performing, in a literary way, the rather difficult manœuvre of patting his own back. He also secures and uses the chance of helping his publishers and the pockets of book-producers generally, by the following expression of opinion and advice. '1 think the plan of reading men's books by borrowing them is a very unworthy thing. Either do not read a book, or do not as a rule borrow every book that you read. It gives no encouragement to writers; and many men now, not as in olden times, are deriving a necessary remuneration from the books they write and publish. If good judges tell you a book is worth reading, purchase it, and *thus aid Philanthropy, particularly if a book is of a philanthropic tendency*, as Dr. Cumming's books are.' (The italics are ours.) Again, he speaks of 'perpetuating philanthropists,' by giving them places in the pages of his book. Oddly enough, too, the phrase quoted occurs in a 'critique' on Charles Wesley, the poet of Methodism! Good as are our wishes for the success of the book, we can scarcely anticipate for it such an immortality as this implies. Another point secured by these dialogues is, that in the conversation of the colloquists the most promiscuous subjects are introduced and pronounced upon. Throughout the book, indeed, the variety of topics brought in is

a distinguishing peculiarity; they make it a very clever piece of literary mosaic-work. The Colonial legislature and infant baptism, London daily papers and Wesley's Deed of Declaration, the *Cornhill Magazine* and a trumpery Oxford tract, Dr. Johnson at the desk and at the dinner-table, the millennium and Dr. Cumming,—these are but specimens of the multifarious matters which in turn are talked about as connected with Philanthropy. Most of the opinions advanced on these subjects display a good deal of acuteness, strong sense, and independent thought; some of them, however, are not such as we can ourselves approve; as, for instance, when the death of the late Bishop of Durham, said to have been consequent on the outcry raised against his alleged nepotism, is spoken of as one day likely to be called 'a martyrdom.'

The hearty earnestness and beneficial tendency of this volume will strike every reader, while they will make him the more regret its eccentricities and defects. But after all deductions are made for these, he will feel that an elevating influence has been exerted upon him. It is easy and pleasant reading; the writer is never at a loss, never seems to be wringing out his last thoughts for your benefit; they flow only too fast and too freely. But in his abundant sentences there is almost always something worth listening to, and we cannot fear that his labour will be in vain. No chapter in the book deserves to be more successful than that in which he pleads for evangelical effort on behalf of the immigrant Coolies of his Colony; and we trust that here and elsewhere his appeal will meet with a fitting response.

Thoughts on Holy Scripture. By Francis Bacon, Lord Chancellor of England. Compiled by John G. Hall Pastor of the Reformed Dutch Church, Fort Plain, N.Y With Preface by John Cairns, D.D. Edinburgh: Oliphant'

THIS reprint is a great boon to the universal admirers of Lord Bacon. It consists of a careful collection of passages interspersed through his writings, having a more or less marked and intended bearing upon books, doctrines, and texts of Scripture. They are brief and broken, and necessarily disjointed, but are truly ingots of thought; and not the less valuable because, not being designed for systematic commentary, but thrown off as truths and texts, gathered in graver and greater studies, and now recollected in the course of other inquiries. Such a mind directed to the study of Scripture must furnish profound and striking thoughts. The spectacle of Bacon's deep veneration for the word of God is edifying in this age of religious flippancy and superciliousness, and may well read a salutary lesson and rebuke to that intellectual licentiousness which spurns alike the restraint and guidance of revelation to human reason. We lament to see so large a portion of the rising thinkers of our age ignoring the vital truths of that Christianity to which they are altogether indebted for what is good in their morals, and true in their religion. If some of our profoundest philosophers have readily acknowledged how much they owe to revelation for their most rational and sublime religious truths, surely their testimony should have

some weight with far inferior minds when deciding questions of so great importance. It is no dishonour to tread in the steps of Bacon, when he asserts the supremacy of revelation as arbiter of truth and morals.

The style in which these 'Thoughts on Holy Scripture' are given, is characteristic of greatness. Almost all original and profound thinkers naturally fall into a style that is terse, crisp, pregnant, and antithetical. Their thoughts create their language, which is discriminating, comprehensive, and full of fire and force. We admire the majesty of Bacon's writing, whether the subject be philosophy or religion. Here we have language full of meaning, hoary with antiquity, and generally with a rhythm all its own, and every way suited to such topics. He knew well the difference between a material theology which only discovered the truth which lay concealed in the works of God, as light is said to be in the diamond; and the revealed theology which comes direct, as a stream of vitalizing light, from the sun of truth. In things beyond reason, he submitted at once, with that profound humility which distinguishes all great minds, to the teaching which the Creator has granted to man in speaking to Him on things which can only be known by a Divine teaching, and can only be understood by a docile heart. All truth is Divine, whether it is found in the works or in the word of God; it exists in the Divine mind as its original. In facts, in science, in ratiocination, it is only discovered by us,—partially, superficially, and in fragments. Every where some links are wanting; and all that is discovered was there before; and abstract or concrete, all truth to us is but a ray from the universal, uncreated sun, falling in mercy upon the dark eye-ball of the human intellect to enable man to grope his way through the difficulties of his probation. Never were the works of nature more fully studied since the days of Solomon, than by Bacon; and never did philosophy shine with greater lustre than when, discoursing on things Divine, it acknowledged a wisdom not its own. 'Thy creatures have been my book,' says he; 'Thy Scriptures much more.'

The Complete Works of Richard Sibbes, D.D. Edited, with Memoir, by the Rev. A. B. Grosart, Kinross. Vol. I. 8vo. Edinburgh: James Nichol and Co.

This is the first volume of the second year's issue of Mr. Nichol's wonderful undertaking to supply subscribers with the works of the Puritan Divines, at the rate of six volumes per annum for a guinea prepaid; a project, we believe, not to be paralleled in the history of English Literature. As we have repeatedly mentioned it before, we will say no more on the general subject than to express our admiration at the complete fulfilment of the publisher's promise for the first year; which may reasonably be supposed to be the most difficult portion of the work, and therefore affords a pledge of its successful completion.

Sibbes was not himself a voluminous author; having published no more than is contained in this volume. But such was his popularity, that his works, as published from notes of his sermons taken down by his hearers, or from his MSS. after his decease, amount to more than

twenty volumes. These are in folio, quarto, and smaller sizes, down to 24mo, and some of them have long been excessively rare.

It is calculated that they can be comprised in seven volumes of this series, and in such a form will cost less than fifty shillings! Such are the privileges of modern students.

Sibbes has always been a favourite among the readers of this old-fashioned theology. He is not a 'painful preacher,' in the subjective sense in which that word is sometimes used; but a 'comfortable' one, never tiring us with elaborate arguments, or vexing us with affected phraseology. When Thomas Goodwin was a young man at Cambridge, our author bade him, if he wished to be useful, 'preach the Gospel—preach the free grace of God in Christ Jesus;' and well and constantly did he exemplify his own rule. 'This one thing' he did; and usefulness and acceptance were granted to him in no common measure. Dying in 1635, he happily escaped the tribulations of the civil war. Very little is known of his personal history; but all that could be collected has been made available by his present editor and biographer, the Rev. Mr. Grosart of Kinross; to whom the labour has been pre-eminently a labour of love. We heartily thank him for his pains; and wish Mr. Nichol all success in his great undertaking.

Defence of the Rev. R. Williams, D.D., in the Arches Court of Canterbury. By J. F. Stephen, M.A., of the Inner Temple, &c., &c. London: Smith, Elder, and Co. 1862. Post 8vo.

A VERY bold and a very able volume, in which all that can be said on behalf of the reviewer of Bunsen, is said, and well said; with what success time will show. During the last week, it has been decided by the judge, that it is an offence against the ecclesiastical law, to deny the Scriptures to be the word of God; or to deny the doctrine of the atonement; or the doctrine of justification by faith. So far so good, and we rejoice that on these three great points, all Mr. Stephen's learning and eloquence have failed to produce the desired effect on the judge's mind. But both parties are at liberty to appeal from this decision; and as we are therefore likely to hear more of the questions at issue, we need not pursue them further at present.

INDEX TO VOLUME XVIII.

LONDON:—PRINTED BY WILLIAM NICHOLS, 25, LONDON WALL.