
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 QUARTERLY REVIEW.

JULY, 1868.

ART I.—1. *Authorised Report of the Church Congress held at Wolverhampton*, October 1—4, 1867. London: Macmillan and Co. 1867.

2. *The Guardian Newspaper. Supplement*, Wednesday, February 12, 1868. Report of the Meeting of Convocation for the Province of York.

3. *Methodism and the Established Church.* By the Rev. WILLIAM ARTHUR, M.A. Reprinted from the *London Quarterly Review for July*, 1856, *with Additions.* 1868.

4. *Essays for the Times.* By JAMES H. RIGG, D.D. Elliot Stock. 1866.

5. *Life of Rev. Charles Wesley, M.A.* By THOMAS JACKSON. Two vols. 8vo. London: Wesleyan Conference Office. 1841.

6. *An Answer to the Question, Why are you a Wesleyan Methodist?* By THOMAS JACKSON. Sixth Edition. London: Wesleyan Conference Office. 1860.

7. *The Life of Peter Böhler.* By the Rev. J. P. LOCKWOOD. *With an Introduction on the Early Religious Life of the Wesleys.* By the Rev. THOMAS JACKSON. Wesleyan Conference Office. 1868.

8. *The Question, Are the Methodists Dissenters? Fairly Examined.* By SAMUEL BRADBURN. 1792.

9. *A Reply to a Pamphlet, entitled, "Considerations on a Separation of the Methodists from the Established Church."* By HENRY MOORE. Bristol. 1794.

10. *The Crisis of Methodism; or, Thoughts on Church Methodists and Dissenting Methodists, including Strictures on Mr. KN*X's "Considerations" and "Candid Animadversions," &c.* By JONATHAN CROWTHER, P.G. Bristol. 1795.*
11. *Primitive Methodists, in an Address from the Trustees of Broadmead and Guinea Street Chapels in Bristol to the Methodist Conference, and to all the Societies, &c.* Published by Order of the Trustees. Bristol. (Dated, July, 1795.)
12. *A Vindication of the People called Methodists, in Answer to a "Report from the Clergy of a District in the Diocese of Lincoln," in a Letter to Thomas Thompson, Esq., of Hull.* By JOSEPH BENSON, a Preacher among the Methodists. London. 1800.
13. *The Church and the Wesleyans. Their Differences shown to be Essential.* Oxford: J. H. Parker. 1843.
14. *Pastoral Advice of the Rev. John Wesley, M.A.* London: Masters and Co.
15. *The Church and Wesleyanism.* A Letter by the Rev. P. G. MEDD. London: Rivingtons. 1868.
16. *The Church and the Methodists.* By the Rev. C. HOLLAND HOOLE.
17. *History of Wesleyan Methodism.* Three Vols. By G. SMITH, LL.D. London: Longmans.
18. *History of Methodism.* By ABEL STEVENS, D.D. Three Vols. New York. London: Trübner and Co.

ONE of the very noteworthy facts of the present age is the perseverance with which attempts are made, on the part of

* P. G. stands for "Preacher of the Gospel." Occasionally the early preachers added to their names the letters "V. D. M." which were to be interpreted "Minister of the Word of God" (*the Divine Word*). Witty Samuel Bradburn is said once to have explained the initials to mean "Vile Dog of a Methodist." Mr. Bradburn's pamphlet, of which the title is given above, is a most acute and masterly compendium of the whole question. Nothing can be more skilful than the way in which, without a word wasted or the slightest colour of exaggeration, he puts his points; and nothing can be finer than the spirit in which he writes. His argument is exhaustive. He shows, amongst other things, that if the authorities of the Church of England had been willing, it might have been possible to accomplish, eighty years ago, such a union of Methodism with the Established Church as is now desired by such Churchmen as Mr. Medd and Mr. Lyttelton. We may here note that Mr. Medd has, like others before him, adopted from Mr. Alexander Knox, (the Mr. KN*X of Mr. Crowther's pamphlet), some charges as to the mutilation of Wesley's journals by the Methodist authorities which are altogether untrue. A full refutation of these may be seen in Dr. Stevens's *History of Methodism*, vol. ii. p. 450. Mr. Medd should not take all his knowledge and ideas about Wesley and Methodism from Southey's *Life*.

the Church by law established in England, to bring back the Wesleyan Methodists into communion with that Church. If, indeed, there were any possibility of such an attempt succeeding, nothing would be more natural than that it should be made. But the peculiarity of this case is, that there is no such possibility; that the reasons which prove the impossibility are clear, and absolutely decisive; that these reasons have been again and again set forth by the literary and connexional organs of Wesleyan Methodism, and by individual writers of eminence and authority; and that the overtures and attempts on the part of the Established Church appear to have been made without any encouragement whatever from the expressed sentiments of any known Wesleyan, whether in speaking or in writing. It is yet more remarkable that in the letters, the pamphlets, and the discussions in Convocation, relating to this subject, the question is never raised as to how the Wesleyans have received former overtures, or whether their authorities have ever pronounced upon this subject of reunion with the Church of England. It seems as if this were a point not worth inquiring about. The *Wesleyan Magazine*, our own *Review*, the *Watchman* newspaper, have repeatedly, during the last dozen years, discussed this subject in detail with complete frankness, with an explicitness and fulness which could leave no doubt on any point; but all this is ignored. The venerable Thomas Jackson, a Methodist of the elder school, is not less explicit in his pamphlet, *Why are You a Wesleyan Methodist?* than the Rev. W. Arthur was twelve years ago in the pages of this Journal, or than Dr. Rigg is in his *Essays for the Times*, in denying, with ample reasons assigned, that there can be for the Church of England any place for repentance in regard to its rejection of Methodism from its borders, or for Methodism itself any possibility of organic union with the Church of England. And yet Lord Lyttelton and Mr. Venables last autumn at Wolverhampton, like Earl Nelson the year before at York, could commit themselves to the publication of their vague crudities on this subject before the Church Congress, without having (as it is evident) been at the pains to make any research at all respecting the views of Methodist themselves upon the matters involved. It would seem as if every Churchman regarded it as a thing of course, that, if the Church to which he belongs can but show the way to attach Methodism to itself as a privileged dependency, Methodism will only be too happy to be absorbed. The leading ministers, it seems to be imagined, would feel it to be a

wonderful elevation and consolation to themselves, if the hands of such dignitaries as the Bishop of Exeter or of Salisbury, of St. David's or of London, could be laid on their heads; the ministerial commonalty would be content to abdicate their pastoral character, and subside into preaching laymen — constituting a kind of subdiaconate —provided only that the hope of attaining to ordination might rise before them in the distance; the people, like sequacious sheep, would *en masse* humbly follow their preachers into the Anglican fold; trustees would make no question or scruple about the deeds by which the chapels are secured to the Wesleyan Connexion, and for the ministrations of Wesleyan itinerant preachers; the Methodism of England would be more than content, for the sake of union with the territorial and decorated Church of the Queen and Parliament, to sever itself from union and communion with the Methodism of all countries besides, and thus to mar the integrity of the greatest sisterhood of evangelical churches which the world has known; nay, would be ready to isolate itself, as the Church of England is isolated, from the entire family of Reformed Christian churches; and Parliament would be forward to dispose of all legal difficulties, and to ease the way to the recommunion and the absorption desired.

All this, we repeat, is very surprising, and, on the whole, by no means flattering to the self-respect of the Wesleyan Connexion. It is as if a fashionable gentleman of noble family and extensive property had again and again sought the hand of a lady of middle rank and of country breeding, but of good looks and good property, and notwithstanding repeated and most decisive refusals, still persisted in his overtures with bland assumption, as if no denial had been given his suit, or rather continued to write letters of inquiry as to the time, the place, and all other arrangements for the marriage, as if his rejection by the lady were a thing inconceivable, as if her refusal of such a personage as himself had been a mere ignorant mistake which could never be allowed to stand.

We recommend Churchmen in general, who feel any interest in this subject, for their own sakes, to procure Mr. Jackson's and Mr. Arthur's excellent publications, of which we have given the titles at the head of this article. We are particularly glad that Mr. Arthur is republishing, in a separate form, the admirable paper which he contributed to this Journal twelve years ago, with some additions of great value, by which it is adapted to the present time. We advise

Churchmen also to weigh well the deliberate testimony of Dr. Rigg in his *Essays for the Times*. "I have no hesitation," says Dr. Rigg, writing in 1866, "in saying that there is not the remotest possibility of the Wesleyan Methodist Church ever being absorbed in the Church of England. And I doubt whether out of the many hundreds of Wesleyan ministers, and of the hundreds of thousands of Wesleyan communicants, there are altogether a score of persons who would not smile with supreme amusement if such proposal were presented to them."*

Let us not be misunderstood. Neither we, nor any of the authorities to whom we have referred, are indifferent to the question of Christian union. If the proposal were in very deed one for drawing close the bonds of union between Christians of all denominations, or for establishing, as the Dean of Canterbury seeks to establish, intercommunion on equal and fraternal terms between the Church of England and Nonconformist churches, the Wesleyan Church included, all that might be done in favour of it would be gladly done by us and by such men as Mr. Jackson and Mr. Arthur.

But what is talked of in Church Congress or Convocation, what is suggested by such clergymen as Mr. Venables, the Hon. Mr. Lyttelton, and Mr. Medd, and by such laymen as Lord Nelson and Lord Lyttelton, is not any union of churches, as such, or any fraternal recognition and intercommunion between the Episcopalian clergy and the pastors of Wesleyan or other Nonconformist churches, or anything, in a word, which would imply an acknowledgment of non-episcopal denominations as true Christian churches, or Nonconformist ministers as true ministers of Christ, but merely the reabsorption of the denominations into the Established Church, by the submission of their clergy to pass under the yoke of ecclesiastical dependence, and by the subordination of all the rules and privileges of the denominations to the clerical assumptions and prerogatives of the Episcopalian theory. The bearing of the advocates of what is called reunion towards the Greek Church is most deferential, not to say obsequious; in this case what is contemplated is a real reunion of churches on terms of honour and equality for both parties, and without disbanding or subordination on the part of either. The proposals on the part of the Church of

* *Essays, &c.* pp. 1, 2. See also a very powerful paper in the *Wesleyan Magazine* for June, 1856.

England in regard to Wesleyan Methodism, which have from time to time been brought forward, are altogether of a different character. If Wesleyans accordingly regard them with an interest which, although not unkindly, is rather critical than cordial or grateful, they must not on that account be condemned as indifferent to the question of Christian union. None long for such union more ardently than they—perhaps none are so favourably situated for realising it; if only the obstacles which arise from error and misconception as to the principles and feelings of the Methodist ministers and people can be removed.

That such obstacles should be removed is, however, of the highest importance. At present Wesleyans are apt to feel themselves affronted by the condescending overtures of Churchmen. When the latter intimate their hopes of a closer union with Wesleyans, Wesleyans themselves understand that the dissolution of their church-existence is held in view; and Wesleyan ministers who use any expression of friendly regard towards the Church of England, or even towards particular efforts and undertakings connected with that Church, are liable to be annoyed and humiliated by finding their friendliness construed into a willingness to see the way made open for their return into the "bosom of the Establishment." If we give an article in our Journal to the discussion of this question of reunion, or absorption, as it respects Wesleyans in particular, it is in the hope that we may be able to set it at rest for ever by a fundamental investigation, and to show that the aims and hopes of the well-meaning men who are perpetually raising it, rest upon a tissue of fallacies and illusions.

Why do Churchmen perpetually single out Wesleyan Methodism from among the denominations as the one to be absorbed? Its mass and unity, no doubt, attract their admiration. Congregational churches could only be annexed one by one; Congregational pastors would hardly be likely to go over in a mass. But Methodism acts collectively: and, if it could be imagined that the body, as a whole, under the leading of the Conference, could be brought back into the Church of England, of course the gain would be immense, especially in these times of schism and distraction within that Church. But, might it not naturally occur to Churchmen that the vaster the system, the more highly organised in its unity, the more complete in its manifold integrity, the more massive in the bulk of property which it holds, the

more multitudinous in its aggregate of churches and congregations, so much the more improbable it must be that it could ever be brought to consent, as a whole, to be reduced, by absorption, to the condition of a mere dependency within a church, with its pastors degraded to the rank of subdeacons, and its free, various, and independent life suppressed within the limits of a mere ecclesiastical order, privileged in its irregularity, but inferior and subordinate, subject to episcopal control, and adjusted in some way to the framework of the Established Church, with its antique and unyielding system of prescription and stereotype.

In 1856, indeed, the self-constituted committee for promoting the absorption of Methodism into the Church of England took encouragement from the fact that Methodists have never professed themselves Dissenters; and it is likely that the same consideration has still some weight with Churchmen. The reasons, however, for the intermediate position occupied by Methodism are sufficiently plain. Methodism did not originate in any active dissent, and does not now require of its members, or even its ministers, any profession of dissent from the Church of England. It grew into a separate body, almost unconsciously, and very reluctantly, by a process of separate development, the steps of which we shall presently enumerate. Neither does Methodism understand that it is any part of its duty to profess any polemic principle, or to assume any offensive or critical position in regard to the Establishment, or any other Christian communion. In the eye of the law, Methodists may be regarded as Dissenters; but they raise, as Methodists, no question of political relation, or of ritual or doctrine, as regards the Church by law established. A day may come when the connection between Church and State in this country will be at an end. The designation "Dissenters" will then be out of date and out of place)—there are no Dissenters in America)—but the positive principles of Wesleyan Methodism will still remain.

It is a fact, indeed, that, some years ago, a distinguished Methodist minister gave evidence before a Committee of the House of Lords in favour of Church-rates, and incidentally also in support of the Church of England, as an eminently valuable religious and political institution. But it must be remembered that that evidence was given on personal responsibility, and was not endorsed by the Conference. And we have other testimony that "undoubtedly the great majority of of Wesleyans are passively opposed to Church-rates; they

heartily dislike them, although few of them may have joined in any agitation against them."* Moreover, in an able and temperate paper published in the *Wesleyan Magazine* for April last, which deals with the very subject of "The Union of the Methodists with the Church of England," we find the following passage:—

"We hope it now appears that in every point of view these proposals for union are impracticable, ill-considered, and inexpedient. If those who make them would expend their time and talent in maintaining the Protestant character of the Established Church, they would do far more (though indirectly) towards accomplishing their object than by any such overtures as we have lately heard of. They would conciliate the feeling of many now grieved, beyond expression, at the unfaithfulness of those who claim to be the only authorised guides and instructors of the English people. Another method of usefulness in the same direction, is open to them. They may, in their several neighbourhoods, treat their Methodist neighbours with gentleness and consideration, and respect their legal rights and liberties. Many of the clergy appear to think a Methodist preacher a being almost beneath notice, and debarred from the courtesies of society. Union in a smaller sphere they do not contemplate, though they talk about it on a large scale. Wisdom, however, would reverse this course of proceeding, and proceed from less to more. Nothing is lost by civility; something may be gained by it."—P. 334.

There can be no greater mistake, indeed, than to suppose that there is, or ever has been, at least in the present generation, any party within Methodism, whether of ministers or among the people, who have felt the slightest concern as to union with the Church of England. Such a union has been regarded as simply out of the question. There has never been within our knowledge the faintest movement in its favour. It was a complaint of Mr. Crowther, in 1795, that the "children of Methodists, alas, too seldom grow up Methodists." It is not an uncommon complaint of Methodists to-day that their children, when they grow up, migrate into the Church of England. On the whole, however, the attachment of Methodists to their own denomination is firmer now than at any former period. And, so far as we are able to judge, the number of young persons brought up among the Congregationalist Nonconformists, who pass across into the ranks of the more fashionable and ecclesiastically open and

* *Essays, &c.* p. 7.

undisciplined State Church, is larger than of the children of Methodists. So, also, the number of ministers now in the Church of England who received their early training (in some instances as ministerial candidates) in the ranks of Congregational Dissent, is probably larger in proportion than of those who passed their early years in Methodism. And it is unquestionable that more ministers of mature age and respectable position pass over to the Church of England from the Independents and Baptists than from the Methodists. The Rev. George Venables, in his paper on Nonconformists and the Church, read before the last Church Congress, speaks, in a series of notes, of a "Dissenter of high position, who wishes to conform," to whom he is indebted for "courteous letters" on the subject; of a "Nonconformist of position and ability," to whom he had written, and "who would join the Communion of the Church at once, but by no means alone, if one or two suggested explanations were given;" of a "Nonconformist minister," with whom he has been in correspondence, "who desires to cease his Nonconformity, if only some fair opportunity were given him by the Church;" of "a very eminent Dissenting minister" (now deceased), who "told him that if he had his time over again, he would be ordained in the Church of England." This minister, it may be probably inferred from an allusion on a foregoing page of Mr. Venables' paper, was the late Rev. John Clayton; and Mr. Venables professes to be "rather intimately acquainted with Dissent" (though never connected with it), and to have been "at one time well known to a few of its eminent ministers." Now it is to be noted that we never hear of such confidential communications as these having been made by Wesleyan ministers to clergymen of the Church of England.

Apart, indeed, from the political questions involved in the connection of Church and State, we have no doubt that it is much harder to transmute a Methodist into an Episcopalian than a "Protestant Dissenter." "Speaking generally," says Dr. Rigg, "the repugnance of Wesleyan Methodists to join the Church of England is stronger than that of Dissenters. Methodism means close and lively Christian fellowship—class-meetings and prayer-meetings. These are not to be had in the Church of England. . . . Methodism is not approaching nearer to the Church of England. No real Methodist could ever find himself content and at home in the stately but cold cloisters of the Anglican Church. Methodists much prefer their own sanctuary, which, though it be less and lowlier,

has in it much more of the life and joy and fellowship which befit the communion of saints."*

We imagine, however, that that which most powerfully influences clergymen in their advances upon the Methodist Church is the consideration that John Wesley, till his death, considered himself as belonging to the Church of which he was ordained a minister, and wished and urged his people, as far as possible, to attend her services and take part in her communion. It is hence inferred that Methodists ought to be members of the Church of England, if they duly revere their founder's memory and precepts, and that there can be no insuperable difficulty in effecting their return. The inference indeed is eminently rash. The Methodists were forced by circumstances to widen the separation, already in reality organic and radical, although in appearance not very considerable, which, sorely against his will, Wesley had been obliged to make between his societies and the Church of England. Half a century ago, this separation may be said to have become almost universal and complete, and fifty years of growth since that time must needs have built up a system which cannot now be folded back within the precincts of the Church of England. "New bottles" have been provided for the "new wine;" to attempt to pour it back into the "old bottles" would be insanity. Still the fallacy we have spoken of does prevail. Mr. Wesley's principles and conduct, and the relations of Methodism to the Church of England during the later years of Wesley, are altogether misunderstood. And the chief object of this article will be to dispose, once and for all, of the assumptions and illusions of clergymen on this subject.

The most effective of the tracts by which clergymen in town and (especially) in country try to seduce Wesleyan Methodists from their allegiance to the Church in which they have been brought up, is one of the smallest, and is altogether the least original and most unpretending. It is entitled, *Pastoral Advice of the Rev. John Wesley*, and consists of a series of extracts, detached from their context, culled from Wesley's writings. No passage which could well be pressed into the service of the compiler has been neglected. The search has been thorough for whatever looked like devotion to the Church of England, or could be construed into a com-

* *Essays for the Times*, pp. 10, 11.

mendation of her claims to his people. How highly this tract is esteemed by those clergymen who make it their business to unsettle the minds of Wesleyans, may be inferred from the fact that the copy before us is advertised as one of the "sixteenth thousand." We will, therefore, in the first instance look in the face all that this tract brings forward. We shall then be sure that we have before us the strength of the case on behalf of the Anglicans who speak so urgently to Wesleyans of the propriety, not to say the imperative duty, of their return within the fold of the Established Church.

We cannot afford space to print at length all the passages quoted in this tract, which can be obtained of Messrs. Masters for a penny, but we shall give the tract-writer's summing up from the whole evidence. The following, then, is his analysis of Wesley's *Pastoral Advice* :—

"The Rev. John Wesley was a Churchman from conviction (No. 36), felt it his duty to remain in the Church (No. 4), and frequently expressed his determination to do so (Nos. 12, 39, 51, 52, 56).

"Charged the Methodists not to leave the Church (Nos. 3, 9, 31, 34, 47, 56), even though they thought their minister's life or doctrine was bad (Nos. 14, 19, 20).

"Loved the Church service and preferred it to all others (Nos. 29, 37); observed the Feasts (No. 55) and Fasts (No. 38).

"Attended Church (Nos. 28, 30, 34, 38), even when he expected an unedifying sermon (No. 28), and read the Church Service before preaching.

"Required the Society to attend Church constantly, and to receive the Holy Communion there (Nos. 1, 5, 17, 25), and urged them to do so, even if they do not esteem their minister (Nos. 14, 20, 45).

"Spoke from his own experience (No. 6) and that of another (No. 7) of the great blessing obtained in going to Church, and described the loss which he said some persons had sustained by not doing so (No. 23).

"Would not let the Methodists hold their meetings in Church hours, as he CONSIDERED THAT THIS WOULD BE 'A FORMAL SEPARATION FROM THE CHURCH' (Nos. 41, 43), showed how experience proved that the adoption of this course would not benefit the Society (No. 44), enforced his rule on this point as strictly as he could (No. 49), and was careful to follow it himself (Nos. 34, 50).

"Knew the sin of Dissent (No. 21): on principle refused to go to Dissenting meetings (Nos. 11, 25), or allow the Methodists to go to them (Nos. 17, 25, 49).

"Lost some members of his Society by his strict rules with regard to the Church Service (Nos. 11, 27).

"Disowned those who separated from the Church, as having been influenced by Dissenters, and having no connection with him

(No. 33), and implied that, for the most part, they had not been regular members of his Society (No. 31).

"Complained that these 'seceders and mongrel Methodists' did not help, but rather impeded his work (Nos. 15, 24).

"Traced the failure of Methodism in some places to disloyalty to the Church (Nos. 26, 42), and its success in other places to the adherence of the members to it (No. 16, 53).

"Declared that if his preachers administered the Sacraments, THEY WOULD, BY THAT ACT, RECANT THEIR CONNECTION WITH METHODISM, and commit the sin of Korah, Dathan, and Abiram (No. 48).

"Took steps to prevent separation from the Church (Title-page, Nos. 8, 10, 13, 18, 49).

"Reported the decisions of eight 'Conferences,' in favour of continuing in the Church (Nos. 12, 14, 32, 35, 40, 46, 53, 54), and with regard to each of them said, or implied, that the decision was unanimous.

"When he was dying, and just before he 'changed for death,' expressed strongly his wish that no change should be made in the condition of affairs; and in almost his last words, prayed for God's blessing on the Church (No. 57)."

No doubt—to begin with the beginning in reviewing this analysis—no doubt, "Wesley was a Churchman from conviction, felt it to be his duty to remain in the Church, and frequently expressed his determination to do so." All the world knows this. No doubt, also, he did, at different times, "charge the Methodists not to leave the Church, even though they thought their minister's life or doctrine was bad." But Wesley was an eminently candid man. He was strongly attached to the Church of England;* but he did not love even the Church of England more than he loved souls and the cause of God. And when glaring and extreme cases came to his knowledge, he found himself unable to maintain his injunction that his people were still to go to Church, even although the minister's life or doctrine might be bad. He was obliged to admit

* Wesley's Churchmanship during fifty years of his life amounted to this: he loved the Liturgy, he believed the doctrine of the Homilies, he desired his people, so far as they could do so, with a good conscience, to follow his own example in attending Church service and taking the Sacrament at church, except where he himself had, for special reasons, established or allowed Church service in his own preaching-houses during Church hours, and the administration of the Sacraments by himself and his brother or by their ordained coadjutors, some of whom were clergymen of the Church of England, while others were ordained by himself. But he never made attendance at Church a condition of membership in his own societies. Many Dissenters joined his societies; these both he and his brother Charles were accustomed to advise to go to the Dissenting meeting, unless the doctrine preached there was altogether Antinomian. The Methodist services were usually at hours which did not interfere with attendance at the ordinary worship, either at church or meeting.

exceptions; and as his "churches" multiplied (he himself spoke of his "societies" frequently and interchangeably as "churches"), he found himself compelled to admit of more and more numerous exceptions, until at length, to meet the case of these exceptions, he was forced to ordain ministers, from among his own preachers, to administer the Sacraments in the preaching rooms. Let us quote two passages in illustration of what we have now said. He writes to his brother Charles, "Joseph Cownley says, 'For such and such reasons I dare not hear a drunkard preach or read prayers.' I answer, I dare. But I cannot answer his reasons." And again, "The last time I was at Scarboro' I earnestly exhorted our people to go to Church; and I went myself. But the wretched minister preached such a sermon, that I could not in conscience advise them to hear him any more."* That is to say, Wesley's theory of conformity broke down under the weight of facts. It was in 1787, four years before his death, that, assisted by Messrs. Creighton and Dickenson, presbyters of the Church of England, he set apart three of his preachers, Messrs. Mather, Rankin, and Moore, to administer the Sacraments to some of the "societies" *in England*. And, for nearly fifty years before his death, not only his brother and himself, but the best of his preachers, in due course and order of appointment, on the itinerant plan, had constantly read prayers and preached *during Church hours* to the congregations gathered in the Methodist preaching-rooms or meeting-houses at London and Bristol, *in which preaching houses* also he and his brother had continually *administered the Sacraments*. It is true that what led to this complete and really organic separation between Methodism and the Church of England, from so early a period, in London and Bristol, was that the clergy drove away the brothers and their people from the Lord's Table.† Not the less, however, the result was a complete, however involuntary, separation of Methodism from the Church of England in these two mother churches of Methodism, from which separation it was to be expected that in due time a general separation of Methodism from the Established Church would follow.

The third and fourth sentences of the *Analysis* contain nothing which calls for remark; they could hardly be weaker. As to the fifth, it must be remembered that until Wesley had ordained preachers to administer the Sacraments, his

---

* *Works*, vol. xii. pp. 109, 144.
† Jackson's *Life of Charles Wesley*, vol. i. p. 231.

people had no choice but to take the Sacrament at Church, or else to live in neglect of Christ's holy ordinance. Wesley held that all Christian people were bound to take the Lord's Supper. He could very rarely be present in any given place, especially country places, to administer it himself. His itinerant preachers, at the first, were many of them men of little or no education, who would have shrunk from such a work as that of administering the Lord's Supper; and besides, even these visited the places but seldom in the course of their flying circuits, and scarcely ever were at the minor stations on the Lord's Day, their lack of preaching service, in the intervals between their visits, being supplied by the service of the local preachers. Of necessity, therefore, in most places which he visited, Wesley could not but insist that his people, as Christian believers, should repair to the parish church, to receive the Lord's Supper. It must not be forgotten, however—and indeed it is an important element in the case—that they were often cruelly and contemptuously driven away.*

The next sentence of the *Analysis* may pass without comment. And the one which follows is only an evidence of the inconsistency between Mr. Wesley's predilections and the conclusions which his judgment forced upon him. He presumes truly, that for Methodists to hold their meetings in Church hours is "a formal separation from the Church;" he was most reluctant to sanction any such arrangement. Yet he had in fact allowed such arrangements to be made, in the very instances referred to in the *Analysis*, and about which he is disturbed and grieved. And these instances themselves had arisen as a direct consequence of the system of separate services in Church hours, which he had so long maintained in the mother churches of Methodism. Brentford and Deptford had but insisted on being allowed to follow the example of City Road.

As for Wesley's "knowing the sin of Dissent," the sentence which so affirms is a pure and a very inexcusable misrepresentation. At Bradford in 1761 Wesley "found an Anabaptist teacher had perplexed and unsettled the minds of several."† Does it follow from this, or from the phrase about "Satan's devices," that Wesley regarded Dissent as a sin? There is no foundation whatever for such a wretched imputation; there is abundant evidence to the contrary. In Georgia,

* Jackson's *Charles Wesley*, i. 231; Wesley's *Works*, i. 383, 384.
† *Journal*, July 15th, 1761. *Works*, iii. 64.

indeed, and for a year or two after his return to England, Wesley did regard Dissent as a sin. But for many years he had lived far above such bigotry as this. It is true, to be sure, that, as he tells us, he never went to a Dissenting meeting. This was his rule, as a point of expediency. He did not wish to give any avoidable cause for suspicion or offence. Moreover, he could not bear the Calvinistic doctrine, or the bald service, or the slow singing, of the meeting-house. So that his tastes and sympathies combined with his prudence to keep him from the Dissenting place of worship. But, as to any point of ecclesiastical principle, Wesley was, for the best part of his life, rather agreed with the Nonconformists of the seventeenth century than with the Erastian and intolerant Episcopalianism which dictated the Acts of 1662. He traced the gross and rapid corruption of the Early Church to the establishment of Christianity by Constantine as the State religion of the Roman empire;* and he regarded the Puritans and Nonconformists of England as the "real Christians" of their age: as "venerable men," who were "driven out" of the Church by persecutors, many of whom, including even the "Protestant bishops," "had neither more religion nor humanity than the Popish bishops of Queen Mary."† But he may be forgiven if he had no great admiration for the meeting-house Dissent which he met with in England a century ago. In a few remote country towns and villages that hard and narrow sort may still be found; and there are very few now-a-days who love it or admire it very warmly. It will serve to show how far and why Wesley had a distaste for Dissent, and at the same time how altogether untrue is the statement that he regarded it as a "sin," if we quote the following passages from his tract, entitled, *Reasons Against the Separation from the Church of England*:—

"(2.) Might it not be another (at least, prudential) rule for every Methodist preacher, not to frequent any Dissenting meeting? (Though we blame none who have been always accustomed to it.) But if we do this, certainly our people will. Now this is actually separating from the Church. If, therefore, it is (at least) not expedient to separate, neither is this expedient. Indeed, we may attend our assemblies, and the Church too; because they are at

---

* *Works*, vi. 246, 292; vii. 25, 156, 264.

† Rigg's *Essays for the Times*, pp. 128—133. On the top of p. 133, however, occurs an error in regard to Charles Wesley. It was not his brother John Wesley, but his friend John Nelson, to whom Charles Wesley wrote that he would rather see him "smiling in his coffin" than "a Dissenting minister."

different hours. But we cannot attend both the meeting and the Church, because they are at the same hours.

"If it be said, 'But at the Church we are fed with chaff, whereas at the meeting we have wholesome food;' we answer, (i.) The prayers of the Church are not chaff; they are substantial food for any who are alive to God. (ii.) The Lord's Supper is not chaff, but pure and wholesome for all who receive it with upright hearts. Yea, (iii.) In almost all the sermons we hear there, we hear many great and important truths: and whoever has a spiritual discernment, may easily separate the chaff from the wheat therein. (iv.) How little is the case mended at the meeting! Either the teachers are 'new light' men, denying the Lord that bought them, and overturning His Gospel from the very foundations; or they are Predestinarians, and so preach predestination and final perseverance, more or less. Now, whatever this may be to them who were educated therein, yet to those of our brethren who have lately embraced it, repeated experience shows it is not wholesome food; rather to them it has the effect of deadly poison. In a short time it destroys all their zeal for God. They grow fond of opinions, and strife of words; they despise self-denial and the daily cross; and, to complete all, wholly separate from their brethren.

"(3.) Nor is it expedient for any Methodist preacher to imitate the Dissenters in their manner of praying; either in his tone,—all particular tones both in prayer and preaching should be avoided with the utmost care; or in his language,—all his words should be plain and simple, such as the lowest of his hearers both use and understand; or in the length of his prayer, which should not usually exceed four or five minutes,* either before or after sermon. One might add, neither should we sing like them, in a slow, drawling manner; we sing swift, both because it saves time, and because it tends to awake and enliven the soul."—*Works*, vol. xiii. pp. 217, 218.

In what spirit Wesley dealt with Dissenters when he found them among his own societies will be seen from a passage in his Journal, under date, Sunday, March 18, 1759. "I administered the Lord's Supper to near two hundred communicants. . . . As a considerable part of them were Dissenters, I desired every one to use what position he judged best. Had I required them to kneel, probably half would have sat. Now all but one kneeled down."†

Many Methodists had been brought up Dissenters; many, after joining the Methodist Society, did not cease to be Dissenters. Not even Charles Wesley regarded such as being guilty of schism, or sin, because they were Dissenters. He

* The congregation were expected to attend prayers and service at Church. Hence "four or five minutes" would be enough.

† *Works*, ii. 446.

was convinced that for *him* it would be a sin to leave the Church of England, but in visiting the societies he did not attempt to interfere with the convictions of those who were Dissenters. He says in his Journal, under date, October 31, 1756, "The Dissenters I sent to their respective meetings."* This was on Sunday morning.

So unfounded is the statement that Wesley regarded Dissent as "sin." Indeed, when it is remembered that Wesley was the friend and correspondent of Doddridge, that he visited him at Northampton, and expounded in his family, even so early as 1745, it will at once be felt how impossible it was that Wesley should regard Dissent as "sin," after he had learnt the large liberality which so eminently characterised his maturer years.

In 1745 some considerable remnants of High-Church prejudice still clung to Wesley. Nevertheless his candour had already learnt and unlearnt much. In that year he wrote his *Further Appeal to Men of Reason and Religion*, one of his most able and eloquent productions. In one part of that appeal he turns to Dissenters, and thus he writes:—

"I begin with those who are at the smallest distance from us, whether they are termed Presbyterians or Independents, of whom in general I cannot but have a widely different opinion from that I entertained some years ago, as having since then conversed with many among them 'in whom the root of the matter' is undeniably found, and who labour to keep a conscience void of offence, both toward God and toward men."—*Wesley's Works*, vol. viii. pp. 174, 175.

More than thirty years later (in 1777) he appeals again to Dissenters, in regard to the loyalty which, amid the excitement of the American war, they owed to their king. The style of his appeal is very significant, and illustrates what has been already intimated respecting his sentiments on the Puritan controversy.

"Do you imagine there are no High Churchmen left? Did they all die with Dr. Sacheverell? Alas, how little do you know of mankind! Were the present restraint taken off, you would see them swarming on every side, and gnashing upon you with their teeth . . . If other Bonners and Gardiners did not arise, other Lauds and Sheldons would, who would either rule over you with a rod of iron, or drive you out of the land."—*Wesley's Works*, vol. xi. pp. 132, 133.

* Jackson's *Charles Wesley*, ii. 128.

These are not the words of one who regarded Dissent as "sin." Wesley had left all such puerile bigotry far behind him; he had "become a man" and had "put away childish things."

We pass over the next sentence of the *Analysis* as amounting to nothing. And in regard to the one which follows, all that need be remarked is that, in the passages referred to, Wesley is distinguishing between himself with his own people, the *Wesleyan* Methodists, and such other Methodists, generally so called, as, like Ingham and Whitfield, and like Cudworth and Maxfield, who had seceded from his own society, were Dissenters in principle. His object is to show, that, if those other Methodists opposed and renounced the Church, often with bitterness and violence of language, his own people must not be confounded with them, nor he and they held to be, in violation of his principles and professions, antagonists of the Church. All this amounts to nothing more than all the world knows. What has now been said explains the sentence which follows in the *Analysis*. As to the next sentence, there can be no doubt that a spirit of hostility and bitterness towards the Church of England was very likely to cause the failure of Methodism in many places; although, at the same time, in other places, its success, as the *Analysis* and the extracts on which it is founded show, was hindered by the too strict adherence of Wesley and his preachers to the Church of England.

Of the remaining sentences in the *Analysis* none has any real significance, except that which refers to the famous "Korah, Dathan, and Abiram" sermon preached by Wesley less than two years before his death. Wesley's faculties were then at length beginning to fail, as is admitted by himself in some measure, and was much more evident to those about him. The failure of eye and hand did but indicate the decay which at last had begun to tell upon the intellectual energies of the wonderful old man. It was no marvel that some of his early predilections came back to him with passionate force. His sympathy and his taste had always attached him to the Church of England; Anglican Oxford was his *alma mater*, where he had spent, in his warm and tender adolescence and his early manhood, fifteen consecrated years; and now his calm firm judgment was enfeebled. Mr. Jonathan Crowther in his *Crisis of Methodism* intimates that he became more peremptory in his latest years. Moreover, he was indulging in a happy, sanguine, dream. He had for some years been courted and tended by many Churchmen

with wondering reverence. Laity and even clergy flocked to see and hear him. He was one of the greatest wonders of the age. Popular contempt, and the frown of dignitaries, had long passed away. Crowds thronged to ask his blessing. Magistrates and gentry vied in their attentions to him. Accomplished, thorough Churchmen, like Mr. Alexander Knox, welcomed him to their homes. Churches were now at length opened to him again; and when he gave the Sacrament, many clergymen pressed forward to assist in administering to the crowds that came to partake.* Wesley would have been more than human if this had not told upon him. He began to hope that some way might possibly be found, even after he had gone, for bringing the Methodist churches within the unity of the Church of England. He determined, if his strongest tones of authority might do it, to stay the movement among his preachers in favour of their general ordination. It was not, indeed, to be stayed. There was no reason why Mr. Moore should be ordained, and Mr. Bradburn or Mr. Thompson should not. But yet Wesley would make the attempt. Hence this sermon, in which Methodist preachers are compared to the Old Testament "prophets," and defined to be "Evangelists" in the New Testament sense, but are warned not to aspire after the "priest's" office, lest they should make themselves like to Korah and his fellows. Let us, however, not forget the note which is added to this sermon by Mr. Jackson in his edition of Wesley's works, and which is taken from Moore's *Life of Wesley*.

"Respecting this sermon the following information is given by Mr. Moore in his 'Life of Mr. Wesley,' vol. ii. p. 339:—'I was with Mr. Wesley in London when he published that sermon. He had encouraged me to be a man of *one book;* and he had repeatedly invited me to speak fully whatever objection I had to anything which He spoke or published. I thought that some things in that discourse were not to be found in THE BOOK; and I resolved to tell him so the first opportunity. It soon occurred. I respectfully observed, that I agreed with him, that the Lord had always sent by whom He would send, instruction, reproof, and correction in righteousness, to mankind; and that there was a real distinction between the prophetic and priestly office in the Old Testament, and the prophetic and pastoral office in the New (where no priesthood is mentioned but that of our Lord); but I could not think that what he had said concerning the Evangelists and the Pastors, or Bishops, was agreeable to what we read there, viz. that the latter had a right to administer the sacraments, which the former did not possess. I observed, 'Sir,

* *Works*, iv. 374, 393.

you know that the *Evangelists* Timothy and Titus were ordered by the Apostles to ordain *Bishops* in every place; and surely they could not impart to them an authority which they did not themselves possess.' He looked earnestly at me for some time, but not with displeasure. He made no reply, and soon introduced another subject. I said no more. The man of *one book* could not dispute against it. I believe he saw, his love to the Church, from which he never deviated unnecessarily, had in this instance led him a little too far.'"—*Wesley's Works*, vol. vii. pp. 261, 262.

We may now leave the *Analysis*. But it is impossible to understand truly the question of Wesley and the Church of England, or of Methodism and the Church of England at the present day, unless the principles which actuated Wesley throughout his course are definitely apprehended, and the beautiful and noble development of his opinions and views is clearly followed. It is easy to prove that Wesley was substantially consistent with himself, though certainly not with what he had been as a High Churchman, in his whole conduct as the founder of Methodism, from the time when he began to preach the doctrine of justification of faith; and that it was his adoption of that doctrine and its correlatives which compelled him to abandon his dearly beloved ground of High-Church Ritualism and exclusiveness, and to become the head of a religious community founded and organised upon the opposite principles of free religious life, of brotherly fellowship, and of sanctification by means of the truth. All Wesley's variations and irregularities as a Churchman, fundamental and numberless as these were, were forced upon him by the necessities of the great mission-work in which he had been constrained to engage. If Wesley had submitted to be a regular and tractable Churchman, that work must have been arrested and broken up. And after Wesley's death the Methodist Conference walked most strictly in their founder's steps; they separated no farther than they were compelled; they suffered the peace of the Connexion to be most seriously embroiled, and allowed many of their churches to be brought to the verge of dissolution, before they consented to permit even the gradual extension of separate services in Church hours, and of sacramental administrations by their own preachers for the members of their societies. In giving this guarded permission they still did but follow the precedent of Wesley, and act in conformity with his spirit and principles. They never, at any time, decreed a separation of Methodism from the Church of England; that separation was effected by the Society's members distributively and

individually, not at all on the suggestion, or in any way by the action or authority, of Conference. The Wesleyan Conference did not, in fact, recognise and provide for the actual condition of ecclesiastical independency into which the Connexion had been brought until that condition had long existed; and Methodist preachers abstained from using the style and title appropriate to ordained ministers, or in any way from assuming, collectively, the language of complete pastoral responsibility, until, by the universal action of the Connexion, their people had, of their own will, separated themselves from the Church of England, and forced their preachers into the full position and relations of pastors—pastors in common of a common flock, who recognised them alone as their pastors, and amongst whom they itinerated by mutual arrangement. When all this is borne in mind, and when it is also remembered, that the bishops and most of the clergy repelled, or at least declined, the overtures of the Methodists from the first; that some of them, as we have seen, insulted and drove away from the Lord's Table, and sometimes even from their churches, both preachers and people, not excepting the Wesleys themselves; that no such efforts as now, a century too late, are imagined and projected for including Methodism, with its itinerancy, and its living energy, within the pale of the Church of England, were made during Wesley's life, or were for a moment entertained, although they would have precisely coincided with Wesley's views: it will, then, be understood how ignorant, as well as how unjust a thing it is, how childish, as well as narrow and bigoted, it must appear to Wesleyans, to argue that, as true followers of John Wesley, the Methodists of to-day are bound to return to the Established Church. Such arguments can only excite the wonder and pity of manly Methodists. They may have influence with the feeble-minded and ill-informed, with a few dependent, depressed, and ignorant rustics, or with effeminate aspirants for a certain social recognition, which they have not character enough otherwise to obtain, but which, it is imagined, the passport of the clergy can confer; but they can never make an impression on the body and soul of Methodism.

Having now indicated the course of statement and argument by which the references of modern Churchmen to Mr. Wesley and his opinions are to be met, let us proceed to offer some historical elucidations of what we have said.

It is amusing to observe with what triumph a few descen-

dants of Methodists, having themselves left their ancestral church, bring forth their discoveries of "mares' nests" wherewith to confound modern Methodists. If they had only read, with care, Southey's *Life of Wesley*, they would have more wisdom; if they had also read Richard Watson's *Life of Wesley*, there would be some hope that, in ceasing to be attached to Methodism, they might still retain the credit of being well-informed, in regard to the denomination they have left. In the *Guardian* newspaper for the last week of last November there appeared a communication, containing a transcript of what seems to have been a memorandum of John Wesley. The correspondent of the *Guardian* ventures to think that this document "possesses great value and importance," and "represents John Wesley's own private opinion on the point referred to." Its purport is that Wesley "believed it a duty to observe, so far as he could—1. To baptise by immersion. 2. To use water, oblation of elements, invocation, alms, and prothesis in the Eucharist. 3. To pray for the faithful departed. 4. To pray standing on Sunday in Pentecost. 5. To abstain from blood and things strangled." It also contains some words to the effect that he thought it right "to turn to the east at the Creed." What else there is in it is immaterial. The gentleman who sent this communication to the *Guardian* seems to imagine that it may have expressed Wesley's mature opinions; intimates, in a subsequent letter to the *Watchman*, his own notion (*opinion* it can hardly be called, the word would be too dignified) that Wesley may, even in advanced life, have been a "very High Churchman," such as the extract would imply, after the modern Ritualistic type, and thinks that it is too readily assumed that Wesley's "opinions underwent a change." The most surprising thing about this gentleman's letter to the *Watchman* is, that he who could so write and so infer, professes to have "given close attention to the life and times of Wesley." We should think his close attention must have been limited to a very narrow range of reading.

Whether the memorandum in question is indeed Wesley's is a point not quite settled, as it bears no signature, and has altogether an intricate and doubtful, although a curious, and, when all is known (we happen to know more than the correspondent of the *Guardian* tells), an amusing history. What is certain is, that it was found soon after Wesley's death among a number of waste papers, which had come out of his house at City Road, and that the handwriting seems to be, or at least strongly resembles, that of Wesley. But if we assume

it to have been Wesley's, it adds nothing material to what was before known of the founder of Methodism. It can only belong to one well-defined period of his life; its date cannot be later than 1737; and it may probably be assigned to 1735—7.

Up to 1738 Wesley was a philosophical High Churchman; after 1738 he became, first, an evangelical High Churchman, and then an evangelical Low Churchman; that is to say, the evangelical light and life of which he had become a partaker, took out of him, first, his philosophy, and then his High-Church ritualism and bigotry. He tells us himself, writing in 1738, that "for many years he had been tossed about by various winds of doctrine." He read Thomas à Kempis's *Christian's Pattern*, and was deeply impressed by it. He read some "Lutheran and Calvinistic authors," and was perplexed by what they said respecting faith. He read Law's *Christian Perfection* and *Serious Call*, and for some years regarded that powerful writer as an oracle; indeed, notwithstanding some letters, distinguished by a stern and somewhat rude fidelity, which he addressed to him in after years, and notwithstanding the very serious errors, not to say heresies, into which Law advanced, Wesley seems never to have lost a sense of gratitude and respect for his early "guide, philosopher, and friend." He read Bishop Beveridge, Bishop Taylor, and Mr. Nelson, retaining still his use of Thomas à Kempis and his reverence for Law. Under the advice of Law he read *Theologia Germanica*, which has been translated into English by Miss Winckworth, and published, with a preface by Professor Kingsley. Bewildered amid the variety of doctrines and opinions, he sought for a ground of unity and continuity, and a guarantee of orthodoxy, in the Church. This brought him where it has brought multitudes besides, in former times as well as lately, "to those who showed him a sure rule for interpreting the Scriptures, *consensus veterum; quod ab omnibus, quod ubique, quod semper creditum.*" "Nor was it long," he adds, "before I bent the bow too far; by making antiquity a co-ordinate rather than sub-ordinate rule with Scripture; by admitting several doubtful writings; by extending antiquity too far; by believing more practices to have been universal in the ancient Church than ever were so; by not considering that the decrees of a provincial synod could bind only that province, and the decrees of a general synod only those provinces whose representatives met therein; that most of these decrees were adapted to particular times and occasions, and, consequently, when those occasions ceased, must cease to

bind even those provinces." From these delusions, from this dry and bigoted externalism, Wesley was, according to his own account, delivered, in part, by means of the mystical writers to whom he had not ceased to be addicted, such, no doubt, as Tauler, and the author of *Theologia Germanica*, and Madame de Bourignon. The "noble descriptions of union with God, and internal religion," which his mystic authorities gave, "made everything else appear mean, and flat, and insipid." But he found presently that they made faith and good works appear so too, giving him "a plenary dispensation from the commands of God." From these conclusions he shrank back horrified, and considered himself as having narrowly escaped from a ruinous gulf of heresy. Henceforth, to the end of his days, he seems to have regarded the mystics much as he regarded them at the time when he wrote (in 1738) the summary from which chiefly we have quoted, as "the most dangerous of all the enemies of Christianity." Hence, the startling plainness with which he soon afterwards wrote to Law, whom he had so greatly revered.*

It was after such a course of schooling as this that Wesley, under the influence of the Moravians, and especially of Peter Böhler, was brought to abandon at the same time his mystical philosophy and his doctrines of ritualistic sanctification, and to embrace the doctrine of justification by faith.

Wesley had been ordained in 1725; in 1730 he began to visit the gaols, prompted by Mr. Morgan, and to attend the weekly communion; in 1731, on the suggestion of Mr. Clayton, he and his friends of the "Godly Club" began to observe "the fasts appointed by the Church." After this they carried their fasting and austerities to a lamentable extreme, seeking in asceticism, "good works," and religious services to find rest to their souls. But it was not till Wesley left Oxford, in 1735, and went on board ship for Georgia, that his ascetic excesses and his ritualism were carried to their utmost height.

Throughout the earlier half of the period we have now under review, Wesley's doctrine may be described as ethical philosophy, limited and conditioned by the two grand postulates of distinctively Anglican orthodoxy—viz. that grace is imparted in baptism, and is nourished by the Lord's Supper. To this period belongs the earlier portion

* Southey's *Life of Wesley*, vol. i. pp. 110—112. Wesley's *Works*, vol. i. pp. 92, 93.

of his curious correspondence with the fascinating and distinguished Mrs. Pendarves (afterwards Mrs. Delany),* and some absolutely Christless sermons in MS., mere moral disquisitions, which now lie before us. During the latter portion of this period his doctrine was a strange compound of mysticism and semi-Popish asceticism; Thomas à Kempis, Law, and the Marquis de Renty, were in some way combined with the highest ritualism of the Church of England. The memorandum to which we have referred might not unfairly represent one side of Wesley's doctrine at that period. But his MS. journals more authentically and more fully represent it. Having sole ecclesiastical responsibility in Savannah, he felt bound in conscience strictly to carry out his ascetic and ecclesiastical discipline. It is well known that the strictness of his discipline and the rigid asceticism which he not only practised himself, but endeavoured to enforce to some extent in the case of communicants, brought upon him an action at law. Among the matters alleged against him, and not denied on his part, were such as these, that he admitted none to the Holy Communion who did not make a statement to him of their religious state, and submit to his requirements as to fasting and devotion: that he repelled Dissenters, or those whom he regarded as such; that he divided the morning service on Sundays, taking the Litany between 5 and 6 A.M., and omitting the Litany and some other prayers at the forenoon service; that he dipped infants; that he admitted none to be God-parents who were not communicants. One notable instance of his bigoted and ritualistic High Churchmanship he has himself commemorated in his printed Journal. On the principle that he could administer the Lord's Supper to none except such as had received baptism in the Episcopal Church, Wesley repelled John Martin Belzius, a Moravian, one of the most pious men in the colony. Long afterwards he received a letter from this good man, which he published in his eighth Journal, with this reflection, "What a truly Christian piety and simplicity breathes in these lines. And yet this very man, when I was at Savannah, did I refuse to admit to the Lord's Table, 'because he was not baptised;' *i.e.* not baptised by a minister who had been episcopally ordained. Can anyone carry High-Church zeal higher than this? and how well have I since been beaten with mine own staff."†

Such was the narrowness, the bigotry, the rigid asceticism,

* *Correspondence of Cyrus and Aspasia.* See *Wesleyan Magazine* for 1853, pp. 134, 211.

† *Works*, ii. 154. We may here add, to make the parallel between Wesley's

the ecclesiastical despotism, of Wesley in Georgia. Mr. Bennett, of Frome, is not at this day, in reality, a more determined ritualist, a more *advanced reactionary* (to use a phrase which only *sounds* paradoxical) than John Wesley was in Georgia, one hundred and thirty years ago. We repeat, Churchmen can discover nothing as to Wesley's High Churchmanship in these times which can exceed what has long been known: and they are welcome to make all they can out of the fact that before Wesley learnt the doctrine of justification by faith, he was such an *exaltado* in ecclesiastical bigotry as might suffice to entitle him to canonisation on the part of Anglican Ritualists of to-day, if unfortunately he had not, in 1738, become a Gospel believer and preacher.

But already, in Georgia, Wesley's mind was beginning to be enlightened. He had been a mere ecclesiastical moralist and formalist—a philosophical Church-ascetic: on the voyage to Georgia and in the colony he learnt something of Christ. Some impression was made on his darkness by the example, the spirit, and the conversation of the Moravians, on shipboard and on shore. He attended a Presbyterian service, at which he appears to have heard for the first time an extemporary prayer. He read the Homilies of his Church. He met with clergy of a freer spirit than himself, with less rubric and buckram, but with more evangelical feeling; and he notes in his Journal (unpublished) that, at a meeting of the clergy of the province, they had "such a conversation for several hours, on Christ our righteousness and example, with such seriousness and closeness as I never heard in England, in all the visitations I have been present at." Moreover, he attended a Moravian love-feast, and records how favourably and deeply he was impressed by it.

It was well that Wesley quitted the cloisters of Oxford for America. Had he remained at the University, he might have gone as far as Newman in one direction, or as Law in another. But his painful, practical experience in Georgia as a High-Church ecclesiastical administrator, his intercourse with German Moravians and Scottish Presbyterians, the freedom and variety of colonial life, and, above all, the introduction which he obtained, through the Moravians whom he had met with abroad, to Peter Böhler, on his return home, were the means used by Divine Providence to bring him forth from the house

---

conduct in Georgia and the proceedings of our modern High Churchmen still more striking and complete, although no charge to this effect was included in the indictment preferred against him, that he refused to bury those who had not been been baptised "at church."

of ritualistic bondage into the Canaan of free religious fellowship and life.

Already, on his voyage homeward, he was an essentially altered man, unspeakably wiser than when he had left Oxford. The review which he made of his own religious opinions, of the course through which he had passed, the changes he had known, the lessons he had learnt—from which review we gave extracts some pages back—is decisive evidence of this. He was no longer a mere High-Churchman; he had learnt how unsafe a guide is tradition; he was no longer in danger of being misled by the pretended rule of general consent, *quod semper*, &c., or by the alleged authority of councils, or by any Popish or semi-Popish ecclesiastical pretensions. He had also learnt the hollowness and deceitfulness of mysticism. He had been chastened and humbled; he returned home "a sadder and a wiser man." "He had learnt," he tells us, "in the ends of the earth, that he who went to America to convert the Indians had never been converted himself." In this state of mind, he was well prepared to receive the lessons of Peter Böhler, to whose instrumentality Methodism and the world owe a heavier debt than can be reckoned up. Wesley landed from Georgia at Deal, on February 1, 1738. Within a week afterwards he met with Peter Böhler in London. The Moravian was fresh from Germany, on his way to Georgia. He had repeated conversations with this good man, which ended in the Oxonian being completely convinced that his had been a Christianity apart from all true apprehension of Christ by faith as his righteousness and his life. Within a fortnight after John Wesley's being finally convinced by Böhler's Scriptural arguments and expositions, his brother Charles was brought to confess the truth of the new doctrine, as they had thought it, although in reality it was the old doctrine of Paul, of the Reformers, and of the Homilies. And the next day the Moravian set sail for Georgia. How remarkable are the words which Wesley wrote in his Journal that same day—"O what a work hath God begun since his (P. B.'s) coming into England! *Such an one as shall never come to an end till heaven and earth pass away.*" Wesley felt that a revolution of the profoundest character had taken place in his own mind and heart, which must affect the whole system of his opinions and all his course; which must make his preaching new, supply a new impulse to his life and a new principle to his aims and methods; he felt that boundless results to himself, and all whom he could influence, and, through them, to multitudes untold, could not fail to flow from it. He and his

brother had got hold of the apostolic lever—had been touched by the apostolic fire: how soon would Oxford and the kingdom begin to feel the spring of a new life!

Nothing can show more strikingly how absolutely Christless had been Wesley's theology during his Oxford life, than a remarkable letter which, immediately after Peter Böhler had vanquished his resistance to the evangelical doctrine of faith in Christ, Wesley addressed to Law. From this letter the following is an extract; the date is May 14, 1738:—

"For two years, more especially, I have been preaching after the model of your two practical treatises; and all that heard have allowed that the law is great, and wonderful and holy. . . . I exhorted them, and stirred up myself, to pray earnestly for the grace of God and to use all the other means" (*e.g.* attendance at public worship, private reading and meditation, fasting, self-mortification, self-examination and religious conversation, and sacramental communion) "of obtaining that grace, which the all-wise God hath appointed. But still, both they and I were more and more convinced, that this is a law by which a man cannot live. . . .

"Under this heavy yoke I might have groaned till death, had not a holy man to whom God lately directed me, upon my complaining thereof, answered at once, 'Believe, and thou shalt be saved.'

"Now, sir, suffer me to ask, How will you answer it to our common Lord, that you never gave me this advice? . . . Why did I scarce ever hear you name the name of Christ? Never, so as to ground anything upon 'faith in His blood'?"—*Wesley's Works*, vol. xii. p. 48.

What Wesley, in his theology, up to this time had received from his Church, was a ritualistic sacramentalism; what he had joined with this was a moral philosophy, elevated by the contemplation, mainly as set forth in semi-mystical books of devotion, of Christ as the Christian's pattern. As an Oxford Churchman he was a servile, but conscientious, ritualist, seeking for salvation by rites, and in sacraments, and through good works; as an individual thinker, contributing of his own intelligence and reflection to the building up of doctrine, he was, with the whole bent of his bias and to the utmost of his logical power, a philosopher. Law himself, when he was at his best, before he had developed his own mystical philosophy, had pronounced a remarkable sentence on Wesley, then his disciple, which Wesley never forgot, and which he found occasion emphatically to bring to Law's recollection in after-years. "I see where your mistake lies. You would have a philosophical religion; but there can be no such thing. So far as

you add philosophy to religion, just so far you spoil it."* And when Böhler was striving to bring Wesley to "the simplicity that is in Christ," he had to insist and exclaim, "My brother, my brother, that philosophy of thine must be purged away" (*excoquenda est istu philosophia tua*).† This tendency to philosophise remained with Wesley to the end. Some of his sermons derived from it a depth and richness of thought which amply attest the philosophic faculty and bias of the writer. Such, for instance, is that fine sermon on "The Original of the Law." And many occasional pieces, published in his *Magazine* (the *Arminian Magazine*) and elsewhere, showed how to the last the bent remained. But, as a general rule, Wesley rigidly restrained his disposition to speculate on Divine doctrines. He shunned all attempts to be wise above what is written. He was afraid to pry with eyes of human scrutiny into "the secret things which belong unto the Lord." Precisely in proportion to his own natural tendency to speculate, was the guard which he put upon himself. He looked on this side of his nature as peculiarly exposed to temptations, of which he dreaded the fascination, because he knew too well how terribly powerful it was. When he became a convert, however, to the grand doctrines of salvation by faith—involving the evangelical views of justification, regeneration, sanctification, and peace and joy in the Holy Ghost—all through faith in Christ—his whole system of opinions underwent a fundamental change. His mere philosophy was abandoned at once. He became a preacher of faith and a student of Paul. His ritualism was struck at its root with a mortal blow, and from that moment began to wither away. With his ritualism his High Churchmanship could not but also wither away. A number of old and long customary prejudices and predilections—habits of thought and feeling which had become second nature—still clave to him for a while, but these dropped off one by one, until scarcely a vestige of them was left. All the irregularities of the Methodist leader; his renunciation of Church bigotry and exclusiveness; his partial, but progressive and fundamental, separation from a church which imposed shackles on his evangelical activities, and frowned upon his converts; and the ultimate separation, in due sequence, of the church he had founded from the church in which he was nurtured; all these results were involved in this change. It is this which made the difference between Wesley and Newman. Newman renounced justification by

* *Works*, vol. ix. p. 445. † *Ibid.* i. 80.

faith, and clung to apostolical succession, therefore he went to Rome; Wesley embraced justification by faith, and renounced apostolical succession, therefore his people are a separate people from the Church of England.*

High Churchmen endeavour to strengthen themselves by an appeal to the early character and course of Wesley. The reply is, that all that made Wesley great, all that gave him evangelical power, all that enabled him to influence the nation with all its churches, to kindle the flame of the spread of which through the world he had so clear a foresight as soon as he had learnt from Böhler the true Gospel, was derived from a source altogether apart from his High Churchmanship, from a principle essentially antagonistic to all the characteristic principles and traditions of the High-Church party. His life and the life of Methodism was derived not from Oxford but from Germany, not from Anglicanism but from Moravianism. It is true, as we have seen, that he read the Homilies in Georgia; but they were set for him in a frame-work of ritualism, and even the Homilies are tinged by a traditionalism which mingled with their testimony to pure Gospel truth. At all events even the Homilies did not teach him the Gospel of grace; it was reserved for Peter Böhler to do this. And from the memorable month of April, 1738, in which Wesley came under the influence of Böhler, his High Churchmanship began to die away.†

---

* The parallel, and at the same time the contrast, between Wesley and Newman is shown by Dr. Rigg in his *Essays*, pp. 214—218.

† It was not till after the pages in the text above had been written that we received, through the courtesy of the Rev. B. Frankland, the official editor of the Wesleyan Connexion, the sheets of the excellent Introduction to Mr. Lockwood's *Life of Peter Böhler*, as they were passing through the press. The venerable Thomas Jackson, who entered the Wesleyan ministry in the year 1804, and held for nineteen years the office of Connexional editor, and afterwards for eighteen years that of theological tutor at the Richmond Wesleyan College, is the author of that Introduction. He is by far the highest living authority as to all which relates to the history of the Wesleys, and we regret every day that, besides his admirable *Life of Charles Wesley*, he has not given to the Christian world a standard life of John Wesley. Such a life must be written before long, and, it is to be feared, will now be written by some less competent hand. Meantime, this Introduction is a slight instalment towards the needful work. The following passage is so strikingly in harmony with the view we have given in the text, that we should be greatly to blame if we did not make room for its insertion in this note:—

"Within the last few years certain periodical works, conducted by Ritualistic clergymen, have expressed great respect for Mr. Wesley, and the writers have claimed him as belonging to their brotherhood, chiefly on the ground of his sayings and doings in Georgia, and before he entered upon his mission there. He then held the theory of apostolical succession; refused to administer the Lord's Supper to a Dissenter, unless he would submit to be rebaptised; and turned his face to the east when he repeated the Creed. He

The High Churchman makes salvation to be directly dependent on sacramental grace and "apostolical succession" (so called). The evangelical believer, the man who has received the doctrine of salvation by faith, as it was taught by Peter Böhler, and as it is understood by the Reformed Churches in general, learns from St. Paul that "faith cometh by hearing, and hearing by the Word of God." Hence according to his conviction the Christian salvation—justification, regeneration, and sanctification—must be realised by means of the "truth as it is in Jesus." Truth and life are by him indissolubly associated. He cannot forget the words of the Word Himself, "Sanctify them through Thy truth; Thy Word is Truth;" and again, "I am the Way, the Truth, and the Life;" nor the words of St. Paul, when he speaks of himself and his fellow-workers as "by manifestation of the truth commending themselves to every man's conscience in the sight of God." It is the truth in the sacraments, according to his view, which fills them with blessing to those who receive them with faith; they are "signs and seals," eloquent symbols and most sacred pledges, but they are not, in and of themselves, saturated with grace and life, they are *not* the only organ and vehicle through which grace flows to the members of Christ's mystical body, altogether irrespective of any Divine truth, apprehended and embraced by the mind and heart of the believer.

Wesley, up to 1738, had been a High-Church sacramentalist; all his life afterwards he taught the evangelical doctrine of salvation by faith. The grave-clothes of ritualistic superstition still hung about him for a little while, even after he had come forth from the sepulchre, and had, in his heart and soul, been set loose and free; and he only cast them off

---

most probably mixed the sacramental wine with water; prayed standing on Whit-Sunday; and certainly deemed himself a sacrificing priest. We would suggest to the gentlemen who admire John Wesley on account of these things, that a distinction should be drawn between John Wesley the Ritualist, the ascetic disciple of William Law, and John Wesley the converted evangelist; just as a distinction should be made between Saul of Tarsus and 'Paul an apostle of Jesus Christ by the will of God.' As a Ritualist and a disciple of William Law, Mr. Wesley was unhappy; his preaching was powerless, and of very little use to mankind. When he had 'put off the old man,' and was invested with a truly evangelical character, he was heartily ashamed of his former deeds; he possessed a 'peace which passeth all understanding,' and was one of the most useful men that ever lived. In reference to his ritualistic and ascetic follies, he was ever ready to say, 'When I was a child, I spake as a child, I understood as a child, I thought (reasoned) as a child; but when I became a man, I put away childish things.' The sooner his ritualistic admirers follow his example, the better it will be for themselves, their congregations, and the country at large."

gradually. But the new principle he had embraced could not but lead before long to his emancipation from all the anti-evangelical prejudices to which he had been in bondage.

If salvation is by the truth as it is in Jesus, through the influence of the Divine Spirit; if the one appointed means whereby men are to be brought to Christ, is by "the manifestation of the truth to their consciences;" it follows evidently that the truth may be savingly made known by any Christian, who has himself been made a partaker of it in its saving power. The artisan may preach Christ by the way; the peasant in his cottage; and no one either can or ought to be hindered from testifying that which has come home to himself as new light and life, in "the demonstration of the Spirit and in power." The parent must preach Christ to his child; the friend to his friend; neighbour to neighbour. The lawfulness and fitness of lay-preaching follow from this; from this, indeed, it follows that in every church laymen ought to have free opportunity to preach, under such regulations to secure order as may be needful. Laymen in the first age "went everywhere preaching the Word." It follows, further, that the accepted "pastor and teacher" of any church, "who feeds them with knowledge and understanding," cannot but be regarded by that church as the fittest person to administer ordinarily within its limits those sacraments which are the signs and seals of the Christian profession. Only on the ground of a degrading and unspiritual sacramental superstition can it be contended, that any man who is accepted by any Christian church as its ordinary spiritual guide and instructor can be unfit, for the lack of some outward circumstance or of official and ceremonial connection with some priestly caste, to administer to his flock the Sacraments of Baptism and the Lord's Supper.

A glance at the history of John Wesley after 1738 will show how the new light and life operated in his case, how complete a revolution had been wrought in his mind and soul through the instructions of Peter Böhler. Being shut out of all the churches but a very few, and being followed by more crowds than any church would hold, very early in 1739, Wesley followed Whitfield's example by beginning to preach in the open-air. The cross was very great; the reproach and ridicule were very hard to bear: but, at all hazards, the new truth must be preached to the eager crowds. "The love of Christ constrained" the preacher with a peremptory and irrepressible

power. New societies were formed — not Moravian, but Methodist — and were divided into "bands." A meeting-house was built in Bristol, and settled on trustees for Wesley's use. All this was before the autumn of 1739. In 1740, the refusal of the clergy in Bristol to administer the Lord's Supper to the Methodists had already driven Wesley and his brother Charles to administer it to their societies in their own meeting-house. The next year (1741) Wesley was constrained, after a sharp struggle, to sacrifice his deep-seated prejudices, and to authorise his schoolmaster at the Foundery, Thomas Maxfield, to preach. He was the first Methodist lay-preacher. From this time, Wesley speedily gathered lay-assistants. Class-meetings (as distinguished from the early band-meetings) were organised in Bristol in 1742.

In June, 1744, Wesley held his first Conference at the Foundery. This meeting consisted only of ordained clergymen, but the lay-assistants were called in. His second Conference, held at Bristol, in August, 1745, consisted chiefly of his lay-preachers, besides himself and his brother. This was a most important Conference, in its relations to the subject now under review; and the extract that here follows shows what a radical change Wesley's ideas as to Church government had undergone in the seven years which had elapsed since he had personally entered, through faith, into "the liberty of the children of God":—

"*ON SATURDAY, August* 3.

"*Were considered points of Discipline.*

"*Q.* 1. Can he be a spiritual governor of the church, who is not a believer, not a member of it?

"*A.* It seems not; though he may be a governor in outward things, by a power derived from the King.

"*Q.* 2. What are properly the laws of the Church of England?

"*A.* The Rubricks: and to those we submit as the ordinance of man, for the Lord's sake.

"*Q.* 3. But is not the will of our governors a law?

"*A.* No; not of any governor, temporal or spiritual. Therefore if any bishop wills that I should not preach the Gospel, his will is no law to me.

"*Q.* 4. But what if he produce a law against your preaching?

"*A.* I am to obey God rather than man.

"*Q.* 5. Is Episcopal, Presbyterian, or Independent church government most agreeable to reason?

"*A.* The plain origin of church-government seems to be this. Christ sends forth a preacher of the Gospel. Some who hear him repent and believe the Gospel. They then desire him to watch over

them, to build them up in the faith, and to guide their souls in the paths of righteousness.

"Here, then, is an *Independent* congregation; subject to no pastor but their own, neither liable to be controlled in things spiritual, by any other man, or body of men, whatsoever.

"But soon after, some from other parts, who are occasionally present while he speaks in the name of Him that sent him, beseech him to come over to help them also. Knowing it to be the will of God, he consents, yet not till he has conferred with the wisest and holiest of his congregation, and with their advice appointed one or more, who have gifts and grace, to watch over the flock till his return.

"If it please God to raise another flock in the new place, before he leaves them, he does the same thing: appointing one whom God has fitted for the work to watch over these souls also. In like manner, in every place where it pleases God to gather a little flock by His Word, he appoints one in his absence to take the oversight of the rest, and to assist them of the abilities which God giveth. These are *deacons*, or servants of the church, and look on the first pastor as their common father. And all these congregations regard him in the same light, and esteem him still as the shepherd of their souls.

"These congregations are not absolutely *independent:* they depend on one pastor, though not on each other.

"As these congregations increase, and as their deacons grow in years and grace, they need other subordinate deacons, or helpers: in respect of whom they may be called *presbyters*, or elders; as their father in the Lord may be called the *Bishop*, or Overseer of them all.

"*Q.* 6. Is mutual consent absolutely necessary between the pastor and his flock?

"*A.* No question. I cannot guide any soul unless he consent to be guided by me. Neither can any soul force me to guide him, if I consent not.

"*Q.* 7. Does the ceasing of this consent on either side dissolve that relation?

"*A.* It must, in the very nature of things. If a man no longer consent to be guided by me, I am no longer his guide; I am free. If one will not guide me any longer, I am free to seek one who will."—*Minutes*, vol. i. pp. 26, 27.

In the *Disciplinary Minutes for* 1746 it is set down that the Wesleys and their helpers (all are classed together) may "perhaps be regarded as extraordinary messengers, designed of God to provoke the others to jealousy." There is also great significance in another question and answer given at the same Conference—"Why do we not use more form and solemnity in the receiving of a new labourer? We purposely decline it. First, because there is something of stateliness in it; second, because we would not make haste. We

desire to follow Providence as it gradually opens."* In the *Disciplinary Minutes for* 1747 Wesley gives a definition and certain distinctions and conclusions in regard to "schism," which we commend to the attention of any who may imagine that he remained a High Churchman in his years of mature experience and judgment, or after he had come to be the head of the Methodist societies.† But we must quote at length one portion of these Minutes, because it is so full of instruction, and sets the question of Wesley's High Churchmanship so completely at rest:—

"*Q.* 6. Does a church in the New Testament always mean a single congregation?

"*A.* We believe it does. We do not recollect any instance to the contrary.

"*Q.* 7. What instance or ground is there, then, in the New Testament for a *National* Church?

"*A.* We know none at all. We apprehend it to be a merely political institution.

"*Q.* 8. Are the three orders of Bishops, Priests, and Deacons plainly described in the New Testament?

"*A.* We think they are; and believe they generally obtained in the churches of the apostolic age.

"*Q.* 9. But are you assured that God designed the same plan should obtain in all churches, throughout all ages?

"*A.* We are not assured of this; because we do not know that it is asserted in Holy Writ.

"*Q.* 10. If this plan were essential to a Christian church, what would become of all the foreign Reformed Churches?

"*A.* It would follow, they are no parts of the church of Christ! A consequence full of shocking absurdity.

"*Q.* 11. In what age was the Divine right of Episcopacy first asserted in England?

"*A.* About the middle of Queen Elizabeth's reign. Till then, all the Bishops and Clergy in England continually allowed and joined in the ministrations of those who were not episcopally ordained.

"*Q.* 12. Must there not be numberless accidental varieties in the government of various churches?

"*A.* There must, in the nature of things. For, as God variously dispenses His gifts of nature, providence, and grace, both the offices themselves and the officers in each ought to be varied from time to time.

"*Q.* 13. Why is it, that there is no determinate plan of church government appointed in Scripture?

"*A.* Without doubt, because the wisdom of God had a regard to this necessary variety.

* *Minutes*, vol. i. pp. 30, 31. † *Ibid.* p. 35.

"*Q.* 14. Was there any thought of uniformity in the government of all churches until the time of Constantine?

"*A.* It is certain there was not; and would not have been then had men consulted the Word of God only."—*Minutes*, p. 36.

It was, in fact, in the year 1746 that Wesley may be said to have thrown overboard finally the last of his High-Church leanings. In that year he read Lord King's *Account of the Primitive Church*, which made him virtually a Presbyterian, so far as respects the fundamental principles of church-government. The views expressed in the extract we have just given from the *Minutes* for 1747 were derived immediately from the Chancellor's treatise; and that Wesley retained these views to the end of his life is attested by abundant evidence of the most distinct and decisive character. In his "Letter to Dr. Coke, Mr. Asbury, and our Brethren in North America," dated September 10th, 1784, he expounds his views in the same manner, making specific reference to Lord King's *Account of the Primitive Church;* and he closes this letter with the following sentence:—"As our American brethren are now totally disentangled both from the State and from the English hierarchy, we dare not entangle them again, either with the one or the other. They are now at full liberty, simply to follow the Scriptures and the Primitive Church; and we judge it best that they should stand fast in that liberty wherewith God has so strangely made them free." For which reason, among others, Wesley had no desire, in 1784, that "the English bishops should ordain part of our preachers for America."* And in the following year, in reply to a letter of remonstrance from his brother Charles, he explained, with fulness as well as with characteristic precision, the principles which he had held "for forty years" without wavering. In this letter he quotes, as descriptive of the priesthood of the Church of England, a line from one of Charles's own poems—

"Heathenish priests and mitred infidels;"

in regard to which line he says, in a letter dated three weeks later, "Your verse is a sad truth. I see fifty times more of England than you do, and I find few exceptions to it." He re-affirms the substance of what is contained in the extracts we have given from the *Disciplinary Minutes* for 1745 and 1747; he declares, as to the "'uninterrupted succession,' I

* *Works*, vol. xiii. pp. 238, 239.

know it to be a fable, which no man ever did or can prove." He explains that all that he had meant from the beginning by "separating from the Church," was refusing to "go to church;" and he proceeds as follows:—

"But here another question occurs: 'What is the Church of England?' It is not all the people of England. Papists and Dissenters are no part thereof. It is not all the people of England, except Papists and Dissenters. Then we should have a glorious Church indeed! No: according to our twentieth Article, a particular church is 'a congregation of faithful people' (*cœtus credentium* are the words of our Latin edition), 'among whom the Word of God is preached, and the sacraments duly administered.' Here is a true logical definition, containing both the essence and the properties of a church. What, then, according to this definition, is the Church of England? Does it mean all the believers in England (except the Papists and Dissenters) who have the Word of God and the sacraments administered among them? I fear this does not come up to your idea of the Church of England. Well, what more do you include in the phrase? 'Why, all the believers that adhere to the doctrine and discipline established by the Convocation under Queen Elizabeth.' Nay, that discipline is well-nigh vanished away, and the doctrine both you and I adhere to.

"All those reasons against a separation from the Church in this sense, I subscribe to still: what, then, are you frighted at? I no more separate from it now than I did in the year 1758. I submit still (though sometimes with a doubting conscience) to 'mitred infidels.' I do indeed vary from them in some points of doctrine, and in some points of discipline (by preaching abroad, for instance, by praying extempore, and by forming Societies); but not a hair's breadth further than I believe to be meet, right, and my bounden duty. I walk still by the same rule I have done for between forty and fifty years. I do nothing rashly. It is not likely I should. The hey-day of my blood is over. If you will go on hand in hand with me, do. But do not hinder me, if you will not help me. However, with or without help, I creep on: and as I have been hitherto, so I trust I shall always be, "Your affectionate Friend and Brother."

—Smith's *History, &c.*, vol. i. pp. 520, 521.

For thirty years up to the date of the letter from which we have now quoted, there had been a controversy between Wesley and his brother Charles in regard to this matter of separation from the Church of England. Charles approved of lay-preaching, separate meetings, and all else that belonged to the earliest Methodism. But he resolutely contended against the administration of the sacraments by the preachers. He admitted that his brother had a scriptural right to ordain his preachers to administer, but he saw that if some were

ordained, all would claim to be sooner or later. Hence, from the first, he opposed his brother's ordaining; he opposed the ordinations for Scotland, and even for America, as well as for England. He lived in hope, sometimes sanguine, more often desperate and scarce surviving, that a bishop would be raised up to ordain the best of the preachers in succession, as they became ripe for ordination, to cures in the Church of England. He would thus have made Methodism a nursery for evangelical pastors and preachers in the Church of England, and an outwork of the Establishment. He was, however, himself practically even less of a Churchman than his brother. And his hopes of a bishop were continually disappointed. "The bishops might, if they pleased," he wrote to Mr. Latrobe, the Moravian minister, in 1785, "save the largest and soundest part of them back into the Church; perhaps to leaven the whole lump, as Archbishop Potter said to me. *But I fear, however, betwixt you and me, their lordships care for none of these things.* Still I should hope, if God raised up but one primitive bishop, and commanded the porter to open the door."*

"Yet," says Mr. Jackson, "there was a singular discrepancy between his theory of Churchmanship and his conduct. For thirty years he made more noise on the subject of the continued union of the Methodists with the Church, than any man of the age; and all this while he was, beyond comparison, the greatest practical separatist in the whole Connexion. Mr. John Wesley spent most of his time in travelling through Great Britain and Ireland, often preaching twice every day, and two or three times on the Sabbath. Rarely, however, did he preach in Church hours, except when he officiated for a brother clergyman. He so arranged his public services as to attend the church where he happened to be; and he pressed the people that heard him to accompany him thither. Many of the itinerant preachers pursued the same course. They preached to their own congregations at an early hour on the Sunday morning, at noon, and in the evening; and in the forenoon and afternoon they were present, with their people, at the service of the Church. This was the recognised plan of Methodist practice; and, though several refused to conform to it, especially where the clergy were unfriendly or immoral, yet others were even zealous for it, especially where the clergy were kind and tolerant.

"But this was not the state of things in London, under the administration of Mr. Charles Wesley. He preached twice during Church hours every Sabbath, and indulged the society with a weekly sacrament at their own places of worship; so that they had no

* Jackson's *Life of Charles Wesley*, vol. ii. p. 402.

opportunity of attending their several churches, nor any motive to attend them. He conducted Divine worship, indeed, according to the order of the Church of England, except that he used extemporary prayer, and sang his own beautiful hymns; but he and the society had otherwise no more connection with the Established Church than any Dissenting minister and congregation had. He was under no Episcopal control; the chapels in which he officiated were licensed by no bishop; and the clergy in whose parishes those chapels were situated were never consulted as to the time and manner of Divine service. The uneasiness which frequently arose in some of the country societies took its origin in part from this state of things. They wished to be upon an equality with their metropolitan brethren; and they were never satisfied, either during the life-time of the Wesleys, or after their death, till this was conceded to them."—*Jackson's Charles Wesley*, vol. ii. pp. 404, 405.*

John Wesley strove to hope, "hoping against hope," like his brother, that through the wisdom of the bishops some way might be devised for preserving Methodism in its spirit and discipline, and yet keeping the members in communion with the Church of England, and making it subsidiary to that Church—a source to it of life and power. But as years passed on, and all his intimations were rejected; as it became more and more evident that Methodism was producing little or no change within the recognised precincts of the Church itself; and that the clergy and their bishops, with scarcely an exception, were determined to frown upon Methodism; while the needs of the people of England still pressed as before, and the demands of his own society at home and abroad to have provided for them the due administration of the Holy Sacraments were continually becoming more general and more resolute;—Wesley was obliged, however reluctantly, to ordain some of his preachers. We have seen what the case of America was; that of Scotland was scarcely less clear; in parts of England, where crowds of Methodists found only profane, often insulting, clergymen, it was impossible—it would have been monstrous—continually to withstand their demand. Wesley did withstand the demands of many of his people, and the convictions of not a few of his best preachers,

* Mr. Bradburn, in his pamphlet, *Are the Methodists Dissenters?* which was published in 1792, after quoting Mr. Wesley's letter to his brother Charles, from which we have given an extract in the text, proceeds to say of Charles Wesley, "Though he hardly ever went to church, and was no more under the jurisdiction of a Bishop than I am, yet he was so attached to the *name* of a Churchman, that I heard him say, he should be afraid to meet his father's spirit in Paradise, if he left the Church! Mr. John Wesley, on the other hand, as we have seen, remained therein with a *doubting conscience*."

so long as to drive a considerable number both of the preachers and people outright into Dissent. Mr. Edwards founded an Independent church at Leeds, Titus Knight one at Halifax, John Bennet a number in Lancashire, Charles Skelton one at Southwark, and so forth. It is quite certain that, but for the sacramental ministrations of the Wesleys, of the few clergymen who assisted them, as Grimshaw, Fletcher, and Dickinson, and of the few preachers whom he ordained, the number of Independent churches formed out of Methodist churches would have been much greater. And after Wesley's death, if the preachers had not at length, after some years of turmoil and intense excitement, yielded to the reasonable demands of the people, and consented to allow the sacraments to be administered in those societies in which otherwise peace could not have been preserved, it is certain that tens of thousands of Dissenters would have been added to the ranks of those who were opposed on principle to the existence of the Established Church.

It was in 1755 that the demands of the preachers and the societies for the administration of the Lord's Supper among themselves, and by the hands of the preachers, first began to make themselves powerfully felt. Wesley had much ado to resist the importunities of his flock, which were enforced with much feeling and with the weight of strong reasons. Such men as Thomas Walsh and Joseph Cownley—that is to say, the very best of his preachers—headed this movement. For five, ten, fifteen years they had been preaching, and the societies had grown up to maturity under their pastoral care and instructions. It was no wonder that they felt that the pastoral character of those who were *de facto* the ministers of the churches ought to be completed; and it is very much to the credit of these excellent men and able preachers that considerations of Christian expediency, forcibly urged by John Wesley, prevailed with them to hold their claims in abeyance, and to labour on—in some cases for more than thirty years afterwards—as mere preaching deacons. Those who wish to understand fully all that belongs to this interesting section of Methodist history, must study the pages of Mr. Jackson, in his *Life of Charles Wesley*. It was in connection with this that the controversy began between Wesley and his brother Charles, some of the last passages in which, thirty years later, we have already referred to. Mr. Jackson says:—

"The year 1755 was a sort of crisis in Methodism, because then a controversy on these subjects began, which was not finally settled until some years after the founders of the system had ended their

life and labours. In London and Bristol the Lord's Supper was regularly administered by a clergyman; but in most other places both the preachers and the societies were expected to attend this ordinance in their several parish churches. In many instances the clergy who officiated there were not only destitute of piety, but were immoral in their lives; and doubts arose, whether such men, notwithstanding their ordination, were true ministers of Christ, and whether it was not a sin to encourage them in the performance of duties for which they were so manifestly destitute of the requisite qualifications. The clergyman at Epworth, who repelled Mr. John Wesley from the Lord's Table, and assaulted him before the whole congregation, was notoriously drunk at the time. In other cases, the doctrine which was taught in the churches was deemed not only defective, but positively erroneous; especially when justification by faith, and the work of the Holy Spirit, were peremptorily denied and opposed. Several of the clergy were directly concerned in the instigation of riotous proceedings against the Methodists, by which their property was destroyed, and their lives were endangered; and if the sufferers forgave these injuries, it was too much to expect that they would contentedly receive the memorials of the Saviour's death at the hands of men who had encouraged such outrages upon humanity and justice. If John Nelson could profitably receive the Holy Communion from the minister who, by bearing false witness against him, had succeeded in tearing him away from his family, and sending him into the army, every one had not John's meekness and strength of mind. Not a few of the clergy absolutely refused to administer the Lord's Supper to the Methodists. When these people approached the table of the Lord, they were singled out among the communicants, and denied the sacred emblems of their Redeemer's body and blood. This was the case, as we have seen, at Bristol, at Leeds, in Derbyshire, and other places; so that the Methodists were compelled either to receive the Lord's Supper at the hands of their own preachers, or in the Dissenting chapel, or to violate the command of the Lord, who has charged all His disciples to 'eat of this bread, and drink of this cup.' Great uneasiness therefore existed among the preachers, and in several of the societies."—*Jackson's Life of Charles Wesley*, vol. ii. pp. 68, 69.

In regard to what was determined upon at the Conference of 1755, Wesley wrote to his brother, as follows:—

"Do not you understand that they all promised by Thomas Walsh, not to administer, even among themselves? I think that a huge point given up; perhaps more than they could give up with a clear conscience.

"They showed an excellent spirit in this very thing. Likewise when I (not to say you) spoke once and again, spoke *satis pro imperio*, when I reflected on their answers, I admired their spirit, and was ashamed of my own.

"The practical conclusion was, not to separate from the Church. Did we not all agree in this? Surely either you or I must have been asleep, or we could not differ so widely in a matter of fact.

"Here is Charles Perronet raving, because his friends have given up all; and Charles Wesley, because they have given up nothing; and I, in the midst, staring and wondering both at one and the other.

"I do not want to do anything more, unless I could bring them over to my opinion: and I am not in haste for that.

"Cyprian is a terrible witness of the sense of the then church; for he speaks itnot as his own private sense, but an incontestable allowed rule: and by *Antistes* there, I really believe he means the minister of a parish. That pinches me. Nevertheless, I think with you, till I get more light; though I should be hard set to defend myself against a skilful adversary. When I am convinced it is my duty, I will follow Cyprian's advice. The same say you, and no more. I do not fluctuate yet; but I cannot answer the arguments on that side of the question. Joseph Cownley says, 'For such and such reasons, I dare not hear a drunkard preach, or read prayers.' I answer, I dare: but I cannot answer his reasons.

"Eight days after the date of this letter, Mr. John Wesley again wrote to his brother on the same subject. 'Wherever I have been in England,' says he, 'the societies are far more firmly and rationally attached to the Church than ever they were before. I have no fear about this matter. I only fear the preachers' or the people's leaving, not the Church, but the love of God, and inward or outward holiness. To this I press them forward continually. I dare not, in conscience, spend my time and strength on externals. If, as my Lady says, all outward Establishments are Babel, so is this Establishment. Let it stand for me. I neither set it up, nor pull it down. But let you and I build up the city of God.

"Thomas Walsh (I will declare it on the house-top) has given me all the satisfaction I desire, and all that an honest man could give. I love, admire, and honour him; and wish we had six preachers in all England of his spirit. But enough of this. Let us draw the saw no longer, but use all our talents to promote the mind that was in Christ.

"We have not one preacher who either proposed, or desires, or designs (that I know) to separate from the Church at all. Their principles in this single point of ordination I do not approve: but I pray for more and more of their spirit (in general) and practice.

"Driving may make me fluctuate; though I do not yet."—*Jackson's Life of Charles Wesley*, vol. ii. pp. 82, 84.

What has now been said is sufficient to prove that Wesley was as low a Churchman as a man well could be. He was a Presbyterian in principle;* he held that, with or without

* His "Superintendents" or Bishops were to be only *primi inter pares*.

formal ordination, one who had been the means of raising up a Christian church, and was accepted by that church as its pastor, could not but possess all the prerogatives of the ministerial office; he totally disallowed the dogma of eucharistic grace, *ex opere operati*; * he regarded the National Church as a merely political institution, and more than once seems to intimate that the alliance of Church and State was but a doubtful good;† and he grounded his objections to a separation from the Church of England on no High-Church dogmas as to the sin of schism, but exclusively on considerations of Christian expediency. He hoped in his day for some such scheme of comprehension as we have indicated—for some scheme resembling in general what is now talked about by such well-meaning men as Mr. Medd and Mr. Lyttelton, but which is now proposed a century too late.‡

Mr. Wesley was well aware that what he had done amounted to partial separation from the Church of England, and that this was very likely to spread further and further; he knew that he had done a number of things, each of which contained the principle of a complete separation, unless the Church of England should take some special means of reform, extension, and comprehension to prevent such a separation, and to gather into organic connection the churches of Methodism. His longing was that such means might be taken: and, as long as it was possible, he would, for his part, keep the door of hope for union open. His object was not division or separation, but revival and reanimation. Hence his stout and invincible opposition to all proposals for express and general separation from the Church. If separation was to

* Roman Catechism, *Works*, vol. x. pp. 109, 146.

† *Minutes*, i. 36. *Works*, xii. 110; xiii. 238.

‡ There is one short sharp test which will settle whether Wesley was a High Churchman or a Low Churchman. The High Churchman, as we have said in the text, rests upon his apostolical "orders," his "succession"; the Low Churchman relies upon the Articles, the Homilies, and the general spirit of the common worship of the Established Church. He is an illogical and spurious Low Churchman who mixes up with these things the properly High-Church dogma of the "uninterrupted succession." Now, on which side was Wesley? We have seen that he makes short work with the "succession" as a "fable which no man ever did or can prove." But yet more clearly and definitively Low-Church is the following passage, which shows Wesley to have been of all Low Churchmen the lowest. "My conclusion, which I cannot yet give up, that it is lawful to continue in the Church, stands, I know not how, without any premises that are to bear its weight. I know the original doctrines of the Church are sound; I know her worship is in the main pure and scriptural. But if the 'essence of the Church of England, considered as such, consists in her orders and laws' (many of which I myself can say nothing for), 'and not in her worship and doctrines,' those who separate from her have a far stronger plea than I was ever sensible of."—*Works*, xiii. p. 185.

ensue, he would leave the blame of it entirely on the supineness or the contempt and intolerance of the Anglican clergy. His hand, at least, should not sever the tie. He knew, however, that unless a change came over the character and policy of the clergy, a separation must come before long after his death. He knew that the very steps he had taken had shown the way to effect such a separation: and he never repented of those steps, although he saw most clearly whither they pointed. Had the Church known the day of her visitation, no separation need have ensued. If it did not, a separation was inevitable, and even desirable; and it was necessary that the way to wisely to provide against it should be indicated; besides, every one of these steps had been imperatively forced upon him by the necessities of his evangelical labours. Providence had indicated them. The work must have been brought to a stand without them. And if, through the obstinacy of the Church of England, steps thus forced upon Wesley were to prepare the way for a separation, this also must be right, and in the order of Providence.*

When Wesley organised a system of religious societies, altogether independent of the parochial clergy and of Episcopal control, but dependent absolutely on himself, he took a step towards raising up a separate communion, especially as the "rules" of his societies contained no requirement of allegiance to the Established Church. When he built meeting-houses, which were settled on trustees for his own use, and began (with his brother) to administer the sacraments in these, a further step was taken in the same direction. Calling out lay-preachers, wholly devoted to the work of preaching and visitation, was still a step in advance towards the same issue.†

---

* The following extract from Wesley's Journal, under date August 4th, 1788 (*Works*, vol. iv.), will illustrate what is said in the text. "The sum of a long conversation [at the Conference] was—1. That in a course of fifty years we had neither premeditatedly nor willingly varied in one article of doctrine or discipline. 2. That we were not yet conscious of varying from it in any one point of doctrine. 3. That we have in a course of years, out of necessity, slowly and warily varied in some points of discipline, by preaching in the fields, by extemporary prayer, by employing lay-preachers, by forming and regulating societies, and by holding yearly conferences. But we did none of these things till we were convinced we could no longer omit them, but at the peril of our souls." It must be admitted, however, that the list of "variations" is very formidable, and that it would be difficult to discover in what respect, for fifty years, Wesley had adhered, as a clergyman, to the discipline of his church. He had been constrained, in fact, to found a separate community, established on principles and informed with a spirit altogether in contrariety to the principles and spirit of the Anglican Establishment.

† When this step was challenged, he met the challenge in a style which shows how radical an anti-High Churchman was Wesley. "I do assure you,

The yearly Conferences tended obviously in the same direction. The legal constitution of the Conference in 1784, and the provision for vesting in it all the preaching-places and trust property of the Connexion, was a most important measure, giving to the union of Societies a legally corporate character, and large property rights. The ordination of ministers, even for America, necessary as it undoubtedly was, nevertheless, as Charles pointed out forcibly at the time, could hardly fail to conduct towards the result which Wesley had so long striven to avert—viz. the general ordination of his preachers in Great Britain.* If it was necessary to ordain for America, they would plead that it was highly expedient to ordain for England. The principle was conceded, the only question was one of time and fitness as to its more extended application. The ordinations for Scotland were refused by Wesley as long as he could refuse with either safety or consistency. Without them his people would, in very many cases, have been left quite without the sacraments, as the Calvinistic controversy had become embittered, and Wesley and his followers were accounted heretics by the orthodox in Scotland. Nevertheless, ordaining for Scotland could not but hasten the day when preachers must be ordained for England. It was hard to require that Mr. Taylor should administer in Scotland and hold himself forbidden and unable to administer in England. And when at length Wesley was compelled to ordain a few ministers for England, it could not but be seen that what had been done in the case of the few could not always be denied as respected their brethren at large. As little could it be expected that, while, for various good reasons, in addition to London and Bristol, more and more places were allowed to enjoy the privilege of preaching in Church hours, the concession of the same privilege to other places which might desire it could be permanently denied.†

---

this at present is my chief embarrassment. That I have not gone too far yet, I know; but whether I have gone far enough, I am extremely doubtful. . . . Soul-damning clergymen lay me under more difficulties than soul-saving lay men."—*Works*, xiii. p. 197.

* Smith's *History of Methodism*, i. 519.

† The following was Wesley's final concession at the Conference of 1788, in regard to preaching in Church hours:—"The preachers shall have a discretionary power to read the Prayer-book in the preaching hours on Sunday mornings, where they think it expedient, if the generality of the society acquiesce with it; on condition that Divine service never be performed in Church hours on the Sundays, when the sacrament is administered in the Parish Church where the preaching-house is situated, and the people be strenuously exhorted to attend the sacrament in the Parish Church on those Sundays" (Smith i. 555; *Minutes of Conference*, 1788). In London, Bristol, and a few other places, however, the

All these arrangements were compelled by the spiritual exigencies of the societies. Most of them were made immediately necessary by the character and conduct of the clergy. What the character of the clergy was may best be learned from Anglican writers. Their witness against them is much more stern and severe than that of the Wesleys or of any Methodist writers whose publications are preserved to us.* And as to their conduct towards the Methodists, the mere fact that they denounced them everywhere from their pulpits, discouraged and annoyed them in every private way, and commonly repelled them from the Lord's Table, explains and justifies the necessity which pressed on Wesley for allowing separate services, for administering the sacraments in his own preaching-rooms, and for ordaining his preachers —*i.e.* for taking some of the most serious and decisive of all the steps which he did take towards establishing a separate communion.

But the most decisive step of all towards separation which the Methodists could take, was one which was deliberately forced upon them by the Church of England itself, under the guidance of its bishops. The Methodists were pitilessly, and with callous contempt, driven by persecution most reluctantly to license their meeting-houses as "Protestant Dissenting" places of worship, or else to forego all the protection and benefits of the Toleration Act. One of Wesley's latest letters —a pathetic letter it is—refers to this subject.

It is addressed to one of the bishops, and is as follows:—

"My Lord,—It may seem strange that one who is not acquainted with your lordship, should trouble you with a letter. But I am constrained to do it: I believe it is my duty both to God and your lordship. And I must speak plain; having nothing to hope or fear in this world, which I am on the point of leaving.

"The Methodists, in general, my lord, are members of the Church of England. They hold all her doctrines, attend her service, and partake of her sacraments. They do not willingly do harm to any one, but do what good they can to all. To encourage each other herein, they frequently spend an hour together in prayer and mutual exhortation. Permit me, then, to ask, *Cui bono*? 'For what reasonable end' would your lordship drive these people out of the Church?

Methodists still, as for very many years past, received the sacrament in their own meeting-houses from Methodist ministers. There the separation from the Church of England had long been complete.

* Edward Perronet's *Mitre* was a bitter attack on the Church. But its author became the pastor of an Independent congregation, and the copies of his *Mitre* were bought up and suppressed by Mr. Wesley.

Are they not as quiet, as inoffensive, nay, as pious as any of their neighbours? except, perhaps, here and there a hair-brained man, who knows not what he is about. Do you ask, 'Who drives them out of the Church?' Your lordship does; and that in the most cruel manner; yea, and the most disingenuous manner. They desire a licence to worship God after their own conscience. Your lordship refuses it, and then punishes them for not having a licence! So your lordship leaves them only this alternative, 'Leave the Church or starve.' And is it a Christian, yea, a Protestant bishop, that so persecutes his own flock? I say, *persecutes;* for it is persecution to all intents and purposes. You do not burn them, indeed, but you starve them. And how small is the difference! And your lordship does this under colour of a vile, execrable law, not a whit better than that *De Hæretico comburendo.* So persecution, which is banished out of France, is again countenanced in England.

"O my lord, for God's sake, for Christ's sake, for pity's sake, suffer the poor people to enjoy their religious as well as civil liberty! I am on the brink of eternity! Perhaps so is your lordship too! How soon may you also be called to give an account of your stewardship to the great Shepherd and Bishop of souls! May He enable both you and me to do it with joy! So prays, my lord,

"Your Lordship's dutiful Son and Servant."

—*History of Wesleyan Methodism*, vol. i. pp. 569, 570.

The effect of the policy pursued in this case by those who represented the Church of England, was to force both preachers and people to be licensed under the Toleration Act. Thus were Methodists driven to become, in legal construction, Protestant Dissenters. After eighty years, Churchmen are now seeking to reverse what was then done, not by Methodists, but by their own predecessors.*

After Wesley's death, the preachers trod most strictly in the steps of their founder; they breathed precisely the same spirit: they "walked by the same rule;" they "minded the same thing." They took no step towards independency which was not forced upon them; they passed no resolution or law declaring or compelling separation. As many of the Methodists as chose were not only at liberty, but by the majority of the preachers were encouraged, to attend their

* Some years before, the same controversy had been raised here and there, but not by way of general pressure on the Methodists. The Bishop of London excommunicated a clergyman for preaching without licence. This was coming near Wesley himself, and he wrote respecting it, "It is probable the point will now be determined concerning the Church, for if we must either *dissent or be silent*, actum est." "Church or no church," he again wrote, "we must attend to the work of saving souls."—*Stevens' History of Methodism*, i. 398.

parish church, and to take the sacrament from the parish priest. And for many years after Wesley's death a large proportion of the Methodists continued so to do. Only by degrees, and through individual conviction and preference, were the Methodists as a community actually separated from the Church of England.*

After Wesley's death, indeed, the feeling which the venerable founder of Methodism had, for many years, experienced the greatest difficulty in repressing, and which many among his preachers, and vastly more among his people, had only suppressed out of deference to the feelings and authority of one whom they regarded as their bishop and patriarch, broke out with overwhelming force. The people demanded what they could not but regard as their evangelical right—that the sacraments should be administered to them by those who had so long been their pastors and preachers. A number of trustees—men of property, in many instances; in others, Methodists that had been, who had become Church formalists; in some cases, good, single-eyed conservative followers of "Old Methodism"—and most of the preachers, were at first opposed to the people's demands. Year by year, however, the feeling of the societies became stronger and more unanimous; the opposition of the trustees sank away; the preachers became convinced that the people's demands must either be conceded, or Methodism altogether broken up, leaving no permanent result except a multitude of scattered Dissenting congregations. The Conference and the itinerancy would have been destroyed. Dissent would have been enormously strengthened; the name of the Established Church would have been rendered intolerable to multitudes. Accordingly, after a resistance protracted for four years, it was settled at the Conference of 1795, that, where a majority of the stewards and leaders in any society, and also if the trustees of the chapel desired it, the Lord's Supper might be administered. No society was advised to ask for this; the tone of the Conference to the last was rather dissuasory: but provision was made that, society by society, where the members insisted on the sacraments being administered, they should be. This is all the separation from the Church of England which has ever taken place in Methodism. It took some twenty years to consummate the result. That result was that the ministers finally came to administer the sacrament in every circuit and every society.

* See Joseph Benson's Letter to Mr. Thompson of Hull in 1800.

This result was hastened by the continued misconduct of the clergy and their impolitic harshness to the Methodists. In 1800, according to the concurrent testimony of Churchmen themselves, the clergy at large were little, if at all, superior to what they had been fifty years before.

Now, it is the policy of Churchmen to allege that Wesley was a Churchman to the last, and that if Wesleyans were consistent they would be Churchmen too. Fifty, even thirty years ago, Churchmen took very different ground, and argued that Wesley was, throughout all his active career, a "schismatic" and no other than a Dissenter, whatever he might fancy himself to be. The facts are quite as much in favour of this view as of that now set forth by our modern Churchmen.

Truth, however, on the whole gains through these discussions. Feeling and opinion oscillate from one extreme to another; but there is progress notwithstanding towards an equitable and comprehensive settlement of the question. Churchmen now admit that the corruption and supineness of their Church in the middle of the last century were such as to justify irregularities; they admit, moreover, and lament that Wesley and his people were coarsely and often cruelly driven out from a communion in which he and his brother, most honestly and intensely, and many of his people very seriously desired to remain. Further still, they justify by the schemes and proposals which, even at the present day, they set forth for the comprehension of Methodism, notwithstanding its separate existence for fifty years past, those ideas and hopes as to the possibility of retaining Methodism within the Church, if the bishops and clergy had but been willing, which the Wesleys ventured to indulge.

All this is so far good; it is eminently satisfactory to Wesleyans; it is accompanied with many indications of Christian candour and kindliness on the part of the clergy which ought to be frankly and cordially acknowledged and reciprocated. It remains only for the clergy to learn two things—that Wesley was not a High Churchman, and that Wesleyan Methodism cannot be absorbed. The former we have, as we flatter ourselves, settled by this article; the second may be said to be a direct consequence from the first, but is, besides, rendered certain by other considerations.

We have already referred to some of the publications by Wesleyans, in which this question is settled. Whilst these are readily accessible, and also the Histories of Dr. Smith and Dr. Stevens, there is no apology for Churchmen if they continue to cultivate ignorance respecting the ecclesiastical

position of Methodism. Here all that we can do, in the space remaining to us, is to summarise the principal points involved.

Methodism, then, as we have noted, if it were to be "reconciled" to the Church of England, would have to part company with the other Christian churches and communions throughout the world. The liberty of friendship and co-operation which it now enjoys would have to be given up. From a large and wealthy place, where almost all evangelical churches can meet, it would have to retire into a very strait room.

But what we would particularly ask Churchmen to consider is, that the genius of Methodism and of Anglican Episcopacy are mutually repellent and exclusive. In the Church of England everything depends upon and descends from the minister, or, as they say, "the priest." This is not the case in Methodism. No leader can be appointed without the concurring vote of the "Leaders' Meeting," nor any local preacher be admitted on trial or into full recognition except on the resolution and by the vote of the Local Preachers' Meeting. The power of discipline is, to a large extent, in the hands of the Leaders' Meeting. No member can be censured or expelled unless he has been found guilty at a Leaders' Meeting, or by a Committee of the Quarterly Meeting. No minister can be introduced into the pulpit of a Methodist chapel who has not been recommended to the ministry by the Quarterly Meeting of the Circuit to which he belongs. All this, we apprehend, is contrary to the essential principles of the Church of England. How could these provisions be fitted into harmony with an organisation in which the sole and absolute power of the clergy, as such, to admit to communion or to repel, is, however it may be in practical abeyance, a fundamental principle, and in which the law of patronage remains supreme? Moreover, it would be impossible for the Church of England to admit all Wesleyan ministers, merely as such, to take full pastoral rank and authority in the administration of the sacraments. To do so would be to renounce the dogma of sacerdotal succession, and to admit that the validity of orders has no relation to episcopal authority. And, on the other hand, it is certain that neither the Methodist people nor their ministers would endure a word of re-ordination, or consent to the relinquishment of the right of sacramental administration.

Besides, it is just as likely that Methodism should absorb Anglican Episcopacy as that Anglican Episcopacy should absorb Methodism. Methodism has already, within the network of its own sister or daughter churches, a more wide-

spread and a more numerous connection and communion of churches—a vaster host of adherents—than Anglican Episcopacy can sum up in all its branches and correlatives. As a world-power, Methodism is much the more potent in its operation and influence. For the Church of England (so called) now to absorb Methodism would be a portentous operation. It would be more hazardous than to put new wine into old bottles.*

But surely, in all reason and decency, the Church of England should heal her own breaches before her Congresses give sittings to consider how to effect the inclusion and reconciliation of Nonconformists within her own pale. There are three parties within the Church of England—High, Broad, and Low. If the High are to reconcile Nonconformists with

* In a letter which appeared in the *Times* last September, the Rev. L. H. Wiseman furnishes the following statistics: "In the United Kingdom there are belonging to the original Wesleyan Society 356,727 recognised and registered members. Careful inquiries have shown that for every member three other persons may be added, either as regular hearers though not avowed members, or as children of members who are being brought up in the faith of their parents; thus giving a total of a million and a half of adherents. In Australia, the West Indies, Canada, and other colonies where the English language is spoken, the number calculated in the same way will be about 570,000 more. The several bodies which have separated on disciplinary grounds—none of them on any doctrinal ground—from the original society number in England and the colonies 288,000 members, or 1,152,000 adherents. It will thus be seen that in England and its dependencies considerably over three million persons are attached to the Methodist communions. If we turn to the United States a recent return places the membership of the Methodist Episcopal Church at 1,700,000; the numbers cannot be given at present with absolute exactness from some of the churches in the South. It is generally estimated, however, in the United States that this church numbers not less than seven million adherents; and there are, in addition, as is the case in England, minor bodies which have separated from the parent Church, though still holding the Methodist name and discipline, whose followers may be estimated at a million more. Putting all these members together, it will appear that the several branches of the Methodist communion number between 11 and 12 million persons in those countries where the English language is spoken. Taking the same area of comparison, what now is the number of adherents to the Anglican communion? To begin with the United Kingdom, it is well known that in Scotland and Ireland they form only a small part of the population; but in England they probably equal all the Nonconforming bodies put together.... Allowing for Ireland and Scotland, it appears a fair calculation to allow to her eight millions of adherents in the United Kingdom. As to the colonies, computation is difficult. Throughout Canada and Australia the number of Methodist clergy and places of worship greatly exceeds the number belonging to the Church of England; for example, the number of Methodist clergy in Canada last year was 1,003, and of Anglicans, 479; but let it be supposed that the number of Churchmen in the colonies is a million, or nearly double the number we have put down for the Methodists, and let the Anglicans in the United States, whose communicants have been estimated at 250,000, be put down at a million or a million and a-half more, the total number of adherents will then be ten millions or ten millions and a-half against the eleven millions and upwards belonging to the Methodists."

themselves, Nonconformists must embrace Apostolic Succession and Sacramental efficacy—in fact, embrace that which, in its essentials, is Popery. If the Nonconformists are to be reconciled on the principles of the Low Church, they must contrive to harmonise evangelical Calvinism with the Prayer-book, if not also with the fabulous hypothesis of Apostolical Succession, which, fascinating dream as it is to the strange vanity of Churchmen, is held by some even among the Low-Church clergy. If, again, Nonconformists are to be reconciled on the principles of the Broad Church, they must make up their minds to accept a latitude of faith and construction in matters of religion which will dissolve all definite theology and all distinctions between faith and unbelief, between the Church and the world, doing away at the same time with all Church discipline and with all real and earnest Christian fellowship.

We should say, however, that in good sooth there are but two theories on which the Church of England can, as a matter of principle, affect to reclaim to itself all "the Sects." These are—the High-Church theory, which demands submission from all as of right, and counts Nonconformity to be the deadly sin of schism; and the Broad-Church theory, according to which the Church is coextensive with the nation, and every Englishman, as such, is a member of Christ.

Nonconformists equally repudiate both theories. They reject the mediævalism of the one, and they detect, however disguised, the intrinsic infidelity of the other. They understand by schism an uncharitable division in a church, not a necessary separation from it. They pray themselves, on behalf of the Church of England, tainted as it is with the leprosy of Popish superstition, and distracted with incurable divisions, that God would be pleased to deliver it "from false doctrine, heresy and schism." They do not desire to see Christendom distributed into merely national Churches, which could not be truly spiritual communities, nor to see one only Church prevail, whatever may be its name, although they would not needlessly multiply denominations. They would leave the free influence of the truth, under the power of the Spirit, so to mould and adapt Churches in the midst of nations and of the world, as to exhibit the Gospel and its fellowship according to the several aspects and modes best adapted, on the whole, to bring out into living power the manifold variety and fulness of the Gospel, and to produce the highest and richest total effect upon the nations and the world at large.

ART. II.—1. *Jobi Ludolfi, alias Leut-holf dicti, Historia Æthiopica, sive Brevis et Succincta Descriptio Regni Habissinorum, quod vulgò malè Presbyteri Johannis vocatur.* Francofurti ad Mœnum. 1668.

2. *Jobi Ludolfi ad suam Historiam Æthiopicam antehâc editam Commentarius, &c.* Francofurti ad Mœnum. 1691.

ALTHOUGH Sir Robert Napier and his gallant army have, by brilliant and spotless bravery and conduct, finished the late chapter of Abyssinian history, the interest of Abyssinia for English readers cannot yet have altogether passed away. The subject of its religion especially must now remain a matter of serious inquiry and concern to all Christian Englishmen.

No work that has yet been written on Abyssinia is to be compared for originality with the two volumes of the accomplished Saxon, Count Ludolf. His facts and documents continually receive confirmation from the reports of more modern writers; and therefore, leaving the ground which may now be easily trodden under the guidance of travellers and missionaries, in order to take our readers over the less frequented field of the religious history of this very peculiar country, we accept him as our chief, yet not our only, guide.

With regard to the country itself, everyone is by this time prepared to expect that its inhabitants and their history would be distinguished from all other people ever known, and from all other history ever placed on record. Trace the geography of that African Æthiopia, and you can find nothing like it on the whole surface of the globe. From the mouths of the Nile, as it flows into the Mediterranean Sea, southward through Egypt, Upper Egypt, Nubia, Sennaar, Abyssinia, until past the innumerable sources of the Nile, deep within the Tropic, and onward to the edge of unknown deserts,—there is a system of lowland and highland, steppe, mountain, arid and burning sand, forest, field, drenching tempest, cataract, placid lake, and mountain summits capped with snow, or buried in dense cloud, with storm and thunder. Yet the snow glisters or the tempest pours exhaustless within sight of scorching deserts in such a latitude as nine or ten degrees of the equator; and hardy mountaineers, of a race unlike any of the dark savages around them, endure a tropic heat in alternation with an almost Arctic cold, holding possession of a territory within whose lofty heights none but themselves

could bear the vicissitudes of temperature, or defend their position, for thousands of years, against the forces of old Arabian, Egyptian, and Frank. The average level of their country is said to be near 8,000 feet above the sea, between the 9th and 16th degrees of north latitude, and the 36th and 40th east longitude; and on this extended area there are piled up again, to the height of some 7,000 feet more, precipitous and often inaccessible mountains, making a total elevation of near 3,000 feet above the sea; higher than highest of the Alps.

But we have now to note the bold, yet widely interrupted, traces of the land and its affairs that are imprinted on the face of history. First appears the Queen of Sheba, whom the Abyssinians claim as parent of their kings, and whose claim cannot be disproved. Sheba, the geographers tell us, was a part of Arabia the Happy, inhabited by the Hamyarites, or tribe of Hamyar, eastward of the promontory which guards the Strait of Bab-el-Mandeb on the eastern side, who also established themselves on the African coast opposite. It seems to be agreed that these same Hamyarites—a people widely differing in race from the Shemite Arabians of Asia—spread into the interior, and occupied the highlands of which we are now writing. They sometimes prevailed on one side the strait, sometimes on the other, and often on both; so that the dominions of the Queen of Sheba would be at once in Asia and in Africa, and her residence in either, and she might have travelled to Jerusalem from either the one country or the other. She might have taken the road through Egypt, bringing to Jerusalem gifts from her possessions in Arabia; or she might have travelled along the western shore of the Red Sea, from Ras Bir or Asab Bay on to Suez, as one tradition says she did. On the other hand, the historical account of a very great train, with camels bearing spices, very much gold, and precious stones, rather indicates the route usually taken by caravans from Arabia, entering Judæa from the East. There is not anything incredible in the tradition that she bore a son to Solomon, whose wives were so many, and gathered from so many nations; but, on the face of the authentic history, it is clear that, while other strange women turned away the king's heart from his God, this one differed from the rest in coming to prove him with hard questions concerning the name of the Lord, in receiving full answers to her inquiries, and in solemnly blessing the Lord his God, who loved Solomon, and set him on the throne of Israel, "because the Lord loved Israel for ever" (1 Kings x.). The visit was sufficiently prolonged for her to gain a distinct view

of the wisdom and royal state of Solomon. The occurrence of such a visit was of sufficient importance to be recorded in the Sacred History, and so memorable as to be noticed by our Lord Himself, after the lapse of more than a thousand years. Royal presents were exchanged, and the queen, with her train, went back—on which side of the Red Sea matters little—enriched with a wisdom they had not else known. As for a nearer alliance between the two sovereigns, the idea is not in the least contrary to the letter of the text, nor at variance with the licence of the times and the habits of Solomon. A Hebrew reader might almost suspect that he gave the Queen of the South the very name by which tradition calls his reputed child—*Menilek*, מִנְלֵךְ, "*from me to thee.*" Of course the descent, if such it were, could not be admitted into the genealogical record of the Kings; and, even if there were no such descent, and if the next occupant of the throne were an Ethiopian of purest blood, he might inherit his mother's wisdom, and be taught to worship the God of Israel. But it is still remarkable that Arabia leaves Abyssinia in undisputed enjoyment of the tradition.

Except the books of the Old Testament, there is not with Herodotus any history to serve us; but in these Divinely authenticated writings, we find notes, as is certainly believed, of the region which now bears the name of Abyssinia. Ambassadors came thence, by way of the sea, in the time of Isaiah (xviii. 1, 2), and the friendship of Ethiopia—then conterminous with Egypt—was valuable enough to raise the hopes of the Jews, distressed by the forces of Assyria, although it was not strong enough to satisfy them (Isa. xx.). Yet the Ethiopians would welcome fugitives from the land of Israel; and the recent descriptions of that vast mountain realm, now so familiar to us all, show that a retreat more difficult of access to a pursuing army could scarcely be found upon the face of the globe. Zephaniah, more than a century later, publishes a word of hope for the present descendants of those fugitives:—"From beyond the rivers of Ethiopia my suppliants, even the daughters of my dispersed, shall bring mine offering" (Zeph. iii. 10).

From this time, until the Macedonian conquests, the great wars which ruined Nineveh, humbled Babylon, and exalted Persia, left Egypt in comparative tranquillity, and gave a long and unbroken respite to the barbaric yet strong kingdom of the southern wilderness. There, indeed, the Israelite could no more offer the Levitical sacrifices than he could upon the banks of Chebar, or in the fields of Chaldea;

but he could freely worship God. In honour, not in captivity, he was not tempted to idolatry, nor defrauded of the Sabbath rest. Nay, the Ethiopians kept it with him. No enemy came to trouble them. As for the savages on the burning lowlands of Africa, they could scarce climb up to them, if they would; or, if they came, it was to be their servants; and if it pleased the united Ethiops and Hebrews to send out colonists to dwell among the sons of Ham, until driven back into their own fastnesses in less happy times, it was to leave some vestige of their presence that should endure even to the present day. Such traces we may soon hope to discover, even in the heart of Africa—in Sidama, for example,—as were reported to Gobat when in Gondar, by independent witnesses, who described it as a little country of Christians at three or four weeks' distance W.S.W. of Shoa, having a particular language, called Sidama, and books.

Little more than another century after Zephaniah, Cambyses, the Persian, with a characteristic excess of self-reliance, thought he would either conciliate or conquer the brave people of whom he heard some mysterious rumour, but whom he did not know. First of all, he sent to Elephantinè, or *Assouan*, for some of the people whom Herodotus called fish-eaters, and who spoke Ethiopic, to go to the king in the character of ambassadors. The king received them with hospitality, showed them his palace, and, perhaps with significance, his *prison*—the prisoners having fetters of gold; and from the prison took them to the "Table of the Sun," "a meadow in the skirts of their city full of the boiled flesh of all manner of beasts, which the magistrates are careful to store with meat every night, and where whoever likes may come and eat during the day." What this Table of the Sun might be, or whether the earth itself did not spontaneously produce the food that covered it, Herodotus knew not, or had not heard, and writers, old and new, have not explained; but Mr. Pearce exactly describes it, without any notion that the learned had ever made it a mystery, when he tell us* of an entertainment given to a portion of the army of Tigrè, when on march:—"A large *dass* built, and a platform made of clay and stones, with clay for table, about fourteen yards long, first covered with wild mint and rushes, on which bread and cooked victuals were piled in abundance: five cows were ready killed, and ten were presented to the Ras. Maize and *sowa* were also handed round in large quantities." On another

* *Life and Adventures*, i. 152, 153.

occasion, two parties vied with each other so strenuously in heaping up food on similar tables, that the Ras was obliged kindly to check their emulation. After entertaining his messengers in some such manner, the king gave a fine piece of symbolic instruction to Cambyses:—"Bear him this bow, and say, 'The King of the Ethiops thus advises the King of the Persians—when the Persians can pull a bow of this strength *thus* easily, then let him come with an army of superior strength against the long-lived Ethiopians;—till then, let him thank the gods* that they have not put into the heart of the sons of the Ethiops to covet countries which do not belong to them.' So speaking, he unstrung the bow, and gave it into the hands of the messengers." The interview probably took place in Meroë, of which we shall hear presently.

"When the spies had now seen everything, they returned back to Egypt, and made report to Cambyses, who was stirred to anger by their words. Forthwith he set out on his march against the Ethiopians, without having made any provision for the sustenance of his army, or reflecting that he was about to wage war in the uttermost parts of the earth. Like a senseless madman, as he was, no sooner did he hear the report of the Ichthyophagi than he began his march, bidding the Greeks who were with his army remain where they were, and taking only his land force with him. At Thebes, which he passed through on his way, he detached from his main body some fifty thousand men, and sent them against the Ammonians, with orders to carry the people into captivity, and burn the oracle of Jupiter. Meanwhile, he himself went on with his forces against the Ethiopians. Before, however, he had accomplished one fifth part of the distance, all that the army had in the way of provisions failed; whereupon the men began to eat the sumpter-beasts, which shortly failed also. If, then, at this time, Cambyses, seeing what was happening, had confessed himself in the wrong, and led his army back, he would have done the wisest thing possible after the mistake made at the outset; but, as it was, he took no manner of heed, but continued to march forwards. So long as the earth gave him anything, the soldiers sustained life by eating the grass and herbs; but when they came to the bare sand, a portion of them were guilty of a horrid deed: by turns they cast lots for a man, who was slain, to be the food of the others. When Cambyses heard of these doings, alarmed at such cannibalism, he gave up his attack on Ethiopia, and returning by the way he had come, reached Thebes, after he had lost vast numbers of his soldiers. From Thebes he marched down to Memphis, where he dismissed the Greeks, allowing them to sail home. And so ended the expedition against Ethiopia."—*Professor Rawlinson's Herodotus*, book iii.

* *The gods.* The Greek historian must be forgiven the use of this formula. It does not prove the King of Ethiopia a polytheist.

Our next glance towards Ethiopia is taken on "the way that goeth down from Jerusalem to Gaza" (Acts viii. 26). The Ethiopian there baptised by Philip the Evangelist was treasurer of Candace, Queen of Ethiopia, and he was a eunuch. He came to Jerusalem to worship, and on his way back was reading the Book of Isaiah the Prophet. The road he took for Ethopia showed evidently that he was going to the Ethiopia beyond Egypt, not to any other part of the world known anciently under that general designation. His coming to Jerusalem to worship shows that he was a Jew, while his reading the Book of the Prophet Isaiah proves that he understood Hebrew, unless the book had been translated into Ethiopic, a supposition which is contrary to all evidence. A common notion that he was a proselyte seems to be gratuitous, although based on a statute of the Mosaic Law that a eunuch should not enter into the house of God. For it does not follow from the enactment of a law that it will be uniformly kept; nor is it certain that no such person ever did enter; nor can it be inferred that even if the law on this point was rigidly observed in Jerusalem, it was equally honoured by the members of a "dispersion," especially in a remote and peculiar community like that of Ethiopia. It has been sought to explain away the force of the word by giving it the secondary acceptation of "chamberlain;" but it is worthy of note that the Ethiopian translator, whose renderings are often curiously adapted to peculiarities of customs as well as of language, had no such idea of the matter, but used the plain word *kházáwá*, as if unconscious of any difficulty on that account. Besides, this person had not then to *enter* into the congregation of the Lord, of which he was already a member. But even this question does not in the least weaken the continuity of evidence that there were many Jews in the Ethiopia of those times, nor impair the strength of the presumption that between the ages of Solomon and of Christ there was a paramount Hebrew influence in the country.

As for Queen Candace, the mention of her name suggests inquiry into the relations which have subsisted between Judæa and Ethiopia, between Judaism and Christianity, from the earliest period of correspondence to the present. We could wish to know, in the first place, the seat of that Queen's authority. Did she hold her court at Axum, afterwards the Christian capital,—or somewhere near the Lake of Tzana, or Dembea, or somewhere looking towards Egypt, where she might watch over the frontier most exposed to encroach-

ment or assault. Happily, we get a ray of light from Pliny, who says that persons commissioned by Nero to explore Egypt and Ethiopia, reported that a woman named Candace reigned at that time in Meroë, bearing the name that, for many years past, had been transmitted from queen to queen.* It was most probably the same queen who had sent ambassadors to Augustus at Rome.† During several years after the conquest of Egypt by that Emperor, both Romans and Greeks visited the country, some of them spending a considerable time in it, the island and great city of Meroë being of all parts of lower Ethiopia the most frequented. "Island" was the name given to the province, because it was nearly surrounded by the Nile and the Tacazze—to use modern names—at their confluence, and by a tributary of the latter river which nearly enclosed it on the southern border. Until very lately the site of the city has been uncertain. It was lost to view after the conquest of Egypt by the Romans, but, up to the time of Augustus, it flourished as the metropolis of the southern portion of Ethiopia. It may not be possible to ascertain how far the sovereignty of Queen Candace extended, and the absence of her name from the Ethiopic lists of kings confirms a persuasion that she was but subordinate to a "king of kings," enthroned at Axum, or perhaps in Gojam, somewhere near Gondar; but it is now agreed that the ruins of Meroë are to be seen about twenty-seven miles N.E. of a place called Shendy, and represent a once large and important city not far above the point where the Tacazze falls into the Nile. Pillars, obelisks, and other architectural remains with inscriptions that have yet to be examined, make it quite evident that Meroë stood firmly on the frontier of Ethiopia, in the great highway of Eastern Africa, a station for the refreshment of travellers, an emporium of commerce, a citadel of power, a seat of government, a barrier of separation between two great nations of long enduring antiquity, and therefore a centre of influence either for good or evil. Cambyses and Augustus sent their spies or their ambassadors thither, to represent the Persian or the Roman empire at the court of the far more ancient realm of African Ethiopia, and thither went the first Evangelist to plant the Cross. Be it therefore well remembered that the first Christian converts came not into a remote wilderness, nor did they bring the glad tidings from Palestine to obscure barbarians, but recited the fact of the Crucifixion, and told of

* C. Plinii Secundi, *Hist. Nat.* vi. 35. † Strabonis *Geog.* xvii.

the Divine nature of the Crucified to a nation that occupied a strong position on an outer border of the then known world. Cambyses and Nero found to their surprise men who could receive their messengers with dignity, and hear their threatenings with but slight alarm. Just as Antioch, Smyrna, Corinth, Alexandria, Philippi, and other great military and commercial stations, were chosen as the earliest fields of evangelic enterprise, so was Meroë, and for the like reason. But why an apostle did not at the first go thither to bear *his* testimony and to declare more fully the doctrines and duties of Christianity, but only a return pilgrim, is a question no more easy to answer than why in olden time a prophet was not sent to proclaim the law of Moses, instead of a heathen woman lured to Jerusalem by the fame of Solomon, and very imperfectly taught the first rudiments of revealed truth. The reason cannot be given, but the practical analogy cannot be concealed.

Yet another resemblance must be noted between the Queen of Sheba and the Treasurer of Candace. The *first*, crossing the Arabian Gulf, and ascending the heights of Abyssinia, carried back Hebrew influences or opened their way into the central region around the lake of Tzana, and amongst a people who rapidly multiplied and spread all over the adjacent provinces. The *second*, after ten centuries of years, approached the same central region by the great highway of the Nile. There, especially, the Treasurer found a people not heathen, a people weaned from the bigotry of their ancestors and his brethren in Palestine, and, for all that we know, ready to receive his message. These were the Israelites—the Falashas, we must now say—the men whom some even regard as aborigines, although they were not, but of whom Abba Gregorius confidently stated to Ludolf that they "formerly possessed many tracts of country of great extent, almost all Dembea,"—the central provinces of which we are now speaking—"besides Wojjerat, and Samen;" and that, so late as the sixteenth century, they defended themselves in the rocks of Samen, against the forces of the renegade Emperor Susneus.* Others, looking farther back than the Abyssinian doctor could see, affirm that at the time of Queen Candace, the Israelites were dominant in those parts.

Minished and brought low, a remnant of this ancient people yet lingers in the same provinces, and half a century ago Pearce found 400 of them in Gondar. They are not called Jews, nor does it seem that they ever were. Their fathers were wanderers, or immigrants, and so the people of the

* Ludolf. *Hist. Æthiop.* i. c. 14.

country called them *falashyán*, Falashas, from the verb *falásha*, "to be a stranger." They are peaceable, spirit-broken, industrious. They dislike the epithet of Jew, because that is understood to signify avowed hostility to Christians. They are proud of the name of Israelite, which their fathers bore ages before the Babylonian captives were called Jews. It was among their ancestors that a trusty son of Jacob published—for surely he could not have kept silence—the blessing he found in Syria, teaching others, as he had himself been taught, concerning the Saviour of Whom the Prophet Isaiah speaks in that prophecy which it was the labour of the Synagogue to misinterpret. How far the veil was then lifted from the legal and prophetic mysteries, there is little that would help us to conjecture, but we shall yet find how certainly the Law made way for the Gospel in all that land. The Treasurer and his company came by boat, or travelled by the river bank, or crossed the sandy plains, just where the host of Cambyses perished, or his light-footed messengers went or came, or the spies of Nero journeyed stage by stage. By that road many a messenger had already come to tell of the wars in Syria and Egypt, and now he comes to relate the wonders wrought in Jerusalem by the Prophet of Nazareth, and describe the Crucifixion, and the Pentecost.

Also from the days of the first Ptolemy onward, by way of the Red Sea, the highway of commerce between India, Egypt, and the Mediterranean, there were many messengers of like intelligence. A glance at any map or chart of the Abyssinian coast from Massowah to the Strait of Bab-el-Mandeb, significantly called "Gate of Affliction" by the old Arab seamen, shows that there are many landing-places, and some good harbours. A narrative of the historian Ruffinus*—the only one worth quoting on this occasion,—tells how those landing-places next served to let in new light upon the land.

One Meropius, a philosopher of Tyre, imitating the ambition of more eminent sages, had gone to India in search of wisdom, taking with him two pupils, relatives of his own, Greeks like himself, intent upon heathen studies. On the return voyage, he put into one of those harbours for water and other necessaries, not suspecting any danger. The two boys, Ædesius being the younger, and Frumentius the elder, had strayed away among the bushes, and were under a tree reading, when their master was attacked by the barbarians and killed. Those barbarians are now represented

* Ruffin., *Hist. Eccles.* lib. i. c. 9.

by the Hazorta and the Dancali on the same coast. The boys they caught and took to the king, the chief that would now be distinguished as Ras of Tigré, whose abode was Axum or Adulis. Ædesius was at once made cook, and Frumentius a confidential servant, rapidly to rise into a post of honour. "The king, at his death, left his wife in possession of the kingdom with a young son under her care, and gave entire liberty to the two Greek boys to do as they pleased. The queen, however, entreated them to stay with her until her child should be grown up, evidently considering that she had nothing in her kingdom to be more depended on than they, nor any one who could so well relieve her of the burden of reigning alone. Especially did she prize Frumentius, whose prudence would well suffice for governing a kingdom; for his fidelity showed him of a pure and sober mind. While they were doing as the queen desired, and Frumentius had the government of the kingdom in his hands, God was so moving his mind and temper, that he began to inquire with solicitude if any among the Roman (or European) merchants,"—for there was trade with Rome in those days,—"were Christians, and gave them the fullest permission, nay, advised them to build houses for assemblage in various places (*conventicula per loca singula*) where they might meet to pray according to the Roman rite. But much more did he himself do the same, and so exhort others, and with favours and benefits invite them, to render all help possible to give sites for buildings (*loca ædificiis*) and other things necessary, and to do all that could be done that the seed of Christians might there spring up."

By this it appears that Frumentius, usually called the apostle of Ethiopia, and spoken of as a Christian, was no more than a young Greek student of philosophy when left on the coast, but that a Divine influence moved him to inquire after Christians. What was the immediate incentive no one has related. Probably Ruffinus was not born when all this took place, but it is supposed that Ædesius, who returned alone to Tyre, told Ruffinus many years afterwards, what he knew. The tradition of the Abyssinians is entirely coincident with the view taken by the present writer of the part assigned to the Hebrew element in Ethiopian life for preparing the way of Christianity. This tradition is exhibited by Ludolf in a stanza an Ethiopic menology.* "Peace to Abrĕhá and Atsbĕhá, who sat in one kingdom, loving each

* The Ethiopic and Chaldee אוריתא, means the Pentateuch.
† Ruffin., *ut supra* iii. c. 2.

other! (Peace) to those men of old who walked in the commandment of the law of Moses. By their mouth was preached the word of the Gospel of Christ, and by their hands was also built His habitation." But the same document contains an equally express confession that the knowledge of the Mosaic precepts, even if that knowledge were heightened by never so clear a perception of the meaning of prophecy, did not suffice to dispel the "deep darkness" which overhung the land. The *Shalámá* of whom the poet sings, is Frumentius. "Peace, I say, to him with voice of gladness, while I magnify and extol him. (Peace to) *Shalámá* the gate of mercy and compassion, who lit in Ethiopia the brightness of the light of Christ, when erewhile deep darkness had been on it."* Similar language is found elsewhere, and serves our present purpose, which is to show that in the order of Divine Providence, from the time of Solomon down to that of the Tyrian boys who were shipwrecked on the very shore where our Abyssinian expedition lately landed, there was a gradual introduction of revealed truth, but at the same time we must perforce acknowledge that it also serves to exemplify the comparative worthlessness of a mere incidental scattering of truth, or portions of truth, instead of a full and life-devoting ministration of it by men who live for that alone.

After a few years, Frumentius and his brother once more embarked, intending to return to Tyre. But their views were different: Ædesius did return, and settled himself comfortably at home; Frumentius, *Deo instigante*, as before landed in Egypt, went to Alexandria, and related to Athanasius, recently made bishop of that see, all that had occurred in Ethiopia. Athanasius at once ordained him presbyter, and, thinking him to be of all persons the most proper for the work, appointed him first Bishop of Axum.

Perhaps he was the proper person until a better could be found; but the messages of righteousness and mercy delivered by the ministration of Moses and of Christ, ought to be circulated through the world with greater care, and with more scrupulous regard to every part of a work so solemn, than any we have seen given it in Abyssinia. To begin with Solomon. It does seem that the possessor of so great wisdom might have published the name and honour of his God more worthily. Two or three wise men sent back with the Queen of Sheba, each carrying at least one copy of the Law, given to be read, and certainly open to every proselyte,

* Ludolf, *Hist.* ii. c. 4.

might well have been added to his princely gifts; but he sent nothing of the kind, and such manifest negligence, added to the suspicion cast on the nature of his intercourse with the stranger queen, as if it were immoral, if not absolutely forbidden, may account for the general unwillingness of historians to allow due importance to the original narrative, while most of them reject, or, at least, pass lightly over the tradition. Yet the correspondence then opened between Jerusalem and Ethiopia, and ever since continued, is a perpetual fact of too much consequence to be overlooked either by the divine or the historian. The Israelitish eunuch was convinced of the Divinity and Messiahship of Christ, and was therefore undoubtedly entitled to receive Christian baptism on the profession of his faith. That baptism he received, and the joy which he then experienced did certainly indicate the operation of the Holy Ghost, in gracious acknowledgment of the faith he had with prompt simplicity confessed. But Philip was caught away. The evangelistic deacon was not sent on the errand of an apostle. The same power that had bidden him join "that chariot," and enabled him to do his work there, rapt him away to Ashdod. The young convert was not competent to do in his own country all that which the Lord always requires to be done. We know the extent of the instruction he received from Philip. We do not know what might have been afterwards communicated to him by the Fountain of all wisdom; but neither sacred nor secular history nor national tradition, enables us even to conjecture anything beyond the bare probability that he would recount in the great city of Meroë, and in the society of his Israelitish brethren, what he had seen, heard, and experienced in his pilgrimage to the holy city of Jerusalem. God might have instructed and sent him without any intermediate human authority, even as He sent St. Paul; but, in that case, there would surely have been more evident fruit of such a mission. Saul of Tarsus, it must also be remembered, had profited in the Jews' religion above all his equals, but the treasurer of Queen Candace, who appears to have been sincere in his way was comparatively untaught. And Frumentius? Not yet a Christian when landed on the coast of Ethiopia, but, by some unrecorded means—perhaps by intercourse with Roman merchants and seamen—converted to believe in Christianity, his first care was to assist Christian voyagers to assemble on shore for prayer. His object in visiting Athanasius was to provide a pastor for the Christian flock, then praying *in ecclesiis constructis in barbarico solo*, and for them, not so much for

the natives, the eminent Bishop of Alexandria, after consultation with his brethren, appointed their zealous advocate to undertake the charge. Eventually, if Ruffinus has not exaggerated, "so great grace was given him of God for working miracles (*virtutum gratiâ*), that he gave signs of his apostleship, and an infinite number of barbarians were converted to the faith."* The account is not satisfactory. Nations have not been converted by miracles, but by preaching and teaching; and, whatever were the qualifications of this young philosopher, he was not yet the man to feed the flock of Christ, nor to devise methods of wise discipline and sound instruction. Athanasius himself, absorbed in his glorious conflict with the Arians, and for the greater part of his time wandering among the cities of East and West, or hiding for his life in the deserts of Libya, could not possibly oversee the work, nor provide means to counteract the inevitable depravations of barbarism, and the fatal confusion of Law with Gospel which from the first took place in Abyssinia, and became inveterate there. From an incidental cause, and without the charm of a royal tradition, a similar corruption in Lesser Asia, among another half-civilised people, had called forth the energetic remonstrances of St. Paul; but no such watchman is known to have guarded evangelical purity against Judaising teachers in the court and kingdom of the reputed sons of Solomon. In short, the Christian Church in Abyssinia seems to have risen and spread very gradually, without encountering any salutary opposition, and is not reputed to have made direct aggression on the superstitions—not to say the sins—of the people. If we may judge by analogy, the natives, from the first, were complacent recipients of inoffensive novelties; for, in that light only must they have regarded truths, whereof they had no adequate expositors. Their leading converters were, first, a strong-minded, and, in her way, a sincere queen, who went on pilgrimage in search of wisdom, and came back with some apprehension of the majesty of the God of Israel, but wonder-smitten by the pomp of Solomon, and, in one respect, none the better for her communications with him. Then came fugitive Israelites, some of them idolaters, and some true worshippers, fleeing from the seats of war to take refuge in "the uttermost parts of the earth." For aught that is known to the contrary, they had no prophet, any more than the Samaritans; unlike the other "dispersions," that of Ethiopia was deprived of the conserva-

* Ruffini *Hist. Eccles.* i. 9.

tive influence of the Mosaic ritual; and, unlike the equally ancient dispersion, or colony, of Sepharad, or Spain, they had not the advantage of comparative nearness to Jerusalem, the home of prophetic power, and the centre of sacred teaching.

Then followed one fervent, yet untrained and impulsive, convert, having yet to learn the doctrine and the life of Christianity. At the same time came Roman sailors, navigating the Red Sea, men who might have caught up the new religion, just when the sudden disclosure of imperial patronage was giving it a burst of questionable acceptance in the empire. Some considerable taint of Greek philosophy, from the school of "one Metrodorus," with successive importations from Alexandria—Pharos of much pure light, but also the seat of bitterest heresy, speculation, and unsatisfying dogmatism—could scarce be avoided. Such were the antecedents, and such the channels and commencements of a nominally Christian Church in the romantic region now thrown open to our observation.

So much for the names which have served as marks to guide us over a nearly trackless wilderness, but are insufficient to satisfy the demands of history; and we must show further reason why we cannot allow to Frumentius the undivided honour of planting Christianity in Abyssinia. Had Egypt no material part in the evangelisation of that country? A few indisputable facts remain on record to justify the belief that Christianity flowed into Abyssinia by the way of Egypt, just as Judaism did in the ages before Christ. Certain it is that a Christian church was established early in Alexandria, perhaps by St. Mark, as Jerome states, but certainly in the second century, if not in the first. Certain it is that in the middle of the second century Pantænus was distinguished for his missionary zeal, that he went from Alexandria to Ethiopia, that he found Jews to whom he preached the Gospel; and it is said that he brought back with him a copy of the Gospel according to St. Matthew, in a language called Hebrew, which those Jews understood. On the missionary enterprises of Pantænus it would be premature to insist at present, but every reader of ecclesiastical history knows that Egypt was one of the first nations won to the profession of Christianity. Its presence can be traced in the "first and second Egypt," and the "first and second Thebais," or, to speak more clearly, in Lower and Upper Egypt and Nubia, beyond Assouan to a distance that cannot be defined. Versions of Holy Scripture of very high antiquity, or fragments of them, remain to attest the existence of Christianity antecedently to any written history. The Coptic served the

native Egyptian Christians who had not adopted the language of their Greek-speaking masters, and the Sahidic was read in the remote congregations between Cairo and the first Cataract, if not beyond. Of like antiquity, and also by a translator or translators utterly unknown, was the ancient Ethiopic. The boundary of Ethiopia then lay much farther northward than in later times, including Meroë itself; and if Christianity was established so early in the intermediate portions of what is now Nubia and Sennaar, the Christians would be expected to have some of the sacred books, if not the entire Bible, translated from the Septuagint, and, like other barbaric versions, those translations may have perished. But, beyond conjecture, the greater portion of the lands between Alexandria and Axum, the metropolis of Southern Ethiopia, were occupied by congregations using the Holy Scriptures in the Greek, Coptic, Sahidic, and Ethiopic languages. In the latter part of the fourth century Chrysostom declared at Constantinople that, among men of other nations which he specified, Egyptians and Ethiopians, as well as Indians and Barbarians, had learned to reason from versions of the Gospel in their own tongues.

The Abyssinia that now is, has long been isolated, and that isolation was not altogether the consequence of the conquest of Egypt by the Mohammedans. Before the conquest of Egypt by Amrou, in the seventh century, the native Egyptian Christians had separated from the Greek Church, on occasion of the Monophysite controversy, and the only mitigation of that calamity is that they retained, with the exception of the heresy of Dioscorus their Patriarch, the earlier and better form of Christianity which the Greeks have since lost. Then the African Christians made common cause, and preferring their own simpler—we do not say more correct—conception of the Person of the Saviour, to the exquisitely accurate statement of the Council of Chalcedon, their brethren in the South, having a far older tradition of revealed truths, were content to dwell apart within their own mountain-barriers, whereas, from the days of Solomon to the schism of Dioscorus in the fifth century, the highway of the Nile had been open to all travellers, and a set of itineraries made successively by men of many nations now comes into use again with ourselves, demonstrating that before Frumentius, there was nothing to check the gradual spread of Christianity, from the shore of the Mediterranean Sea to the sources of the Nile. It would spread necessarily, even as it came over to the painted Britons by unknown evangelists, while some of the Twelve Apostles were yet alive.

Historians, too, must not forget that the same Power which moved so mightily upon the men from every land that were assembled in Jerusalem, ten days after the Ascension, did also move upon other masses of mankind to whom came the report of those wondrous events, and that the ancient freedom of going everywhere and "preaching the Word," even though the preachers were fugitives fleeing for their life, produced effects to baffle the cold diligence of book-worms who think we have done little until we can head every story with a name. It is a paltry tradition that cuts out the world into twelve pieces, and tacks upon each piece the name of an Apostle. As to Abyssinia, then, we may be thankful to hear of the royal lady who came from the uttermost parts of the earth to see the wisdom of Solomon, and of Queen Candace and her treasurer, and of Frumentius and his royal patroness. It is pleasant, moreover, to have to tell of crowned ladies taking so prominent a part in the cause of God and their country; but it is good also to think of the unobtrusive zeal of persons whose names are not written in the diptychs but in heaven, persons without earthly fame who used to talk of the Son of David as they sailed up the Nile, or crossed the sandy plains to shorten the way between its meanderings, or took rest in the Oases, and made the woods resound with the morning and the evening hymn. To the honour of Old Abyssinia be it said, that we trace the work of its evangelists, although their names cannot be found; but, finding no rumour that any of them suffered persecution, we rather suspect of feebleness the aggression that provoked no perceptible resistance.

While noting the more peculiar features of this Church as it now exists, we find a strange mixture of Hebrew or Syrian, Coptic, and African-Barbaric elements. A few words concerning the Hebrew and Syrian impress apparent in the Ethiopic language, still the language of the Church, still familiar to all who read and write, whether clergy or laity, and to this day almost living in the dialect of Tigré, which appears to differ from its parent no more than Italian differs from Latin, may not be out of place. The study of Ethiopic has hitherto been a mere specialty with Oriental scholars, when they required its aid in some literary or antiquarian research. It is found to have Arabic for its base, its grammatical structure closely resembling that of Arabic, although it was evidently reduced to writing by a Western hand, moving from left to right. Hebrew and Syriac words abound; and, if our observation deceives us not, the latter are most frequent when

required to convey ideas of ecclesiastical matters. It appeared to Ludolf that some Hebrew roots are found in Ethiopic in their original signification, and that they are available in *a few* instances for the better understanding of the Hebrew text, and in this opinion we entirely agree. One peculiarity of the language appears to deserve closer investigation than we think has yet been given it; and that is, a remarkable archaic simplicity in expressing ideas which, by way of hypothesis merely, we will suppose to have been introduced about the time of the Queen of Sheba. There is but one word that we can find equivalent with "God," and that is *Amlak*. An epithet very occasionally employed, originally Hebrew, is *Kheyáwè*, "The Living One;" but, what is most remarkable, the incommunicable Hebrew word יהוה is not adopted, as neither is it literally presented in the Chaldee targums, nor by the most ancient Greek translators, nor in the New Testament. In Ethiopic, its place is supplied by a periphrasis, *Egziá-bekher*, q.d. "Lord of the lands." One may be sure that the Ethiop at Jerusalem would never have spoken that unutterable name. Like Moses, he would ask in vain, "What is His name?" But hearing Him called אדוני, *the Lord*, he would report in his own country that the God of Israel was "Lord of the lands," worthy to displace the gods of the mountain, or the plain, or the tribe, or the country, and that, in spite of what may be quoted to the contrary from Greek or Latin strangers, this Lord did indeed displace all gods previously worshipped. But we must not be tempted into speculations. Let us now survey, as briefly as convenient, the Church in Abyssinia, and be content with one example, to excite a wish for more.

Frumentius was known to the Emperor Constantius as Bishop of Axum, which is to this day regarded as the ecclesiastical metropolis of Abyssinia; and within a brief period after him there were seven bishops in the country, at the head of their several dioceses. But that increase of the episcopate wakened the jealousy of the *Patriarch*, as the Bishop of Alexandria came to be called, and a canon of a Council of Nicæa, probably spurious, is quoted to the effect that the said Patriarch of Alexandria should always appoint a Metropolitan of Ethiopia, but that the Metropolitan, bearing the title of *Abuna*, "our Father," should not be a native of the country. There were not to be any bishops, and, accordingly, the Abuna, who is always a Coptic monk from Egypt, is immediately dependent on the Coptic Patriarch, a personage as insignificant as ignorance and poverty can make him. One

of the most worthless monks is usually chosen to this dignity, but as he knows neither the language of the church nor the language of the people, his ignorance is somewhat veiled, while his tyranny is often insupportable. The kings of Abyssinia, and even the "king of kings," tremble in his presence. He supplies the lack of speech by the energy of gesture. He has been known to beat and kick brave warriors who had cast themselves at his feet to implore absolution. Mr. Pearce tells us of one who lay quiet to be kicked and beaten, and meekly let the Abuna break his cross over his shoulders; and, after the fury had spent itself, got up and thanked the chief of the Church of Ethiopia for having administered such effectual penance in token that his sins were pardoned. The same Abuna crowned outrages that would have sent their perpetrator to prison over and over in any civilised country, by declaring that he had made all the people of Tigré Mussulmans, and laid an interdict on all the churches, that there should be no prayers, nor baptisms, nor burials, nor celebration of any mysteries, until a house that he coveted was taken from its owner and given up to himself. There was great rage indeed, but the terror of his curse overpowered every other emotion. He got what he wanted. He then gave his blessing. The curse was taken away. The people were content.* This witness was for many years agent of Mr. Consul Salt, in Abyssinia, and discloses features in the Abyssinian character which the respectable native, Abba Gregorius, could not be expected to divulge to his patron, the Count Ludolf. Other sketches of character are now making English readers familiar with the degradation to which that wretched church has fallen in the person of its pontiff. Except for purposes of Coptic policy, the Abuna is nothing, and, therefore, there is in reality but one order, that of *Cahen* ("Priest") or *Kashish* ("Elder"); the former title being Hebrew, and the latter as evidently Syrian. These presbyters wear no distinctive habit, but carry a plain cross—not a crucifix. They are married, and while laymen may have as many wives as they please, according to the civil law, but only one lawful wife according to the Church, the priest is not permitted to live with more than one, and the degree of self-denial which this is supposed to involve entitles him to the praise of sanctity.

Deacons there are, and in very great numbers, since multitudes purchase ordination for the sake of carrying the cross

* *Life and Adventures of Nathaniel Pearce*, vol. ii. passim.

and enjoying the privilege of clergy. Yet many of these are deposed for grosser immoralities. The churches are numerous in proportion to the population, but small, generally built of clay, and thatched over both roof and sides to protect them from the rains. They were originally plain, but are now decorated with paintings by native artists, which attract a reverence rising to adoration, notwithstanding all that the priests can say to the contrary; for according to what is written in their books, there should be no image-worship. The churches are greatly venerated, and serve as sanctuaries; whenever there is an alarm of civil war, they become warehouses for the safe-keeping of property. We hear of spacious churches, extructed in the live rock, still as perfect as when many years ago, while Christianity was young, they were finished by the hands of the best workmen that could be hired from Egypt. It is to be hoped that the archæologist sent out with the British Expedition has found some of these among the mountains, where the old bishops of the Axumites were wont to minister, when the Arian heresy, rife in Egypt, was rigidly excluded from those dioceses. But now that the clergy have no salutary discipline, no superiors, nor any to teach them, they have sunk into a state of blank ignorance and lawless immorality; few can read their prayers in the ancient Ethiopic, and, except the priests in Tigré, fewer can understand them. Sermons in those churches there are none. People bow to the building, and the old names, *Béta Amlak*, or *Bet Makdash*, "House of God" or "Holy House," still remind us of the sacred volume whence they are taken; but the people find nothing therein to answer to the names, except forms of words, lifeless although sound. There is as little decorum as intelligence. Instead of the well-instructed choir, there is only a rude crowd making clattering noises like those made by our negroes with their tom-toms, and, instead of reverential prayer, there is the wild obstreperous dance.

Yet something good remains whereon to rest hope for brighter times. The Church of Abyssinia has the Bible. It was translated early into Ethiopic, and, leaving the critic to conjecture when the earliest translation was made, from what originals, and in how many versions, it is beyond doubt that, while the Old Testament is divided into four sections, after the custom of the synagogue, the Alexandrian error is perpetuated in the intermingling of apocryphal writings with those which were acknowledged as inspired, when the canon was closed some centuries before the birth of Christ, and other writings yet more modern. So they boast of eighty-six

books, and have yet to learn why we can offer them no more than sixty-five. Their New Testament agrees with ours; but when Ethiopia received this portion of Holy Scripture, the Book of Revelation was not yet universally admitted into the canon, for in their manuscripts—and the printing press is not yet known among them—that book is written separately, by way of appendix, and intituled, *The Vision of John Abu Kalamshish*—"Father Kalamsheesh"! so rendering the Greek word *apocalypsis*.

Time was when they could boast that the Bible was their only rule of faith, and King David declared to Alvarez, the first Romish Missioner, that if the Pope or the Abuna were to enjoin on him and his people anything beyond what the Apostles had written or permitted, neither he nor they would receive it.* Tellez confirmed the report of Alvarez, by stating that the Abyssinians were never so well pleased with the sermons of his brethren as when they produced many texts of Holy Scripture, and the more of those the better. They have not the "Apostles' Creed," which is of Latin origin, but the "Nicene Creed," which they call "The Prayer of Faith," using the word Prayer *impropriè*, much as the Talmudists use the word "Blessing," and, until inserted by the Roman editors, the Ethiopic version of the Nicene Creed did not contain the words "and from the Son." Of course that interpolation is now rejected. With regard to the person of our Lord, the Abyssinians, like the Copts, are Monophysites, and while Christianity itself is almost forgotten, the special notions of three Monophysite sects are still food for controversy; this one question being ever uppermost, the only one that, to all appearances, engages to any degree the attention of the clergy. Their documents exhibit a clear confession of the Catholic faith concerning the Ever Blessed Trinity, and it does not appear that they contain anything contrary to the Scriptural doctrine of the Atonement.

A sacrament they call *meshteer*, a name borrowed from the Greek *μυστήριον*. Their form of baptism resembles that of the Greek and Armenian churches, but a yearly festival in commemoration of the Saviour's baptism, when all Abyssinians bathe with a certain public solemnity, is quite peculiar to themselves. This festival has been mistaken for a repetition of the sacrament, but competent witnesses acquit them of the charge, and assure us that they do no more on

* Ludolf, *Hist.* iii. c. 5; Alvarez, c. 83.

that day than cast themselves into the river, as do the Christian pilgrims in Syria when they visit the Jordan.

The doctrine of the Abyssinian Church concerning the Eucharist is perfectly distinct from that of the Roman and Greek Churches, and the simplicity of administration renders it impossible to suspect them of any inordinate veneration of the elements. Besides the attestation of Protestant missionaries, and the complaints of Romish, Ludolf's commentary contains literal evidence, and enables us to lay proof before our readers. Our source of information is a collection of statutes called "Apostolic," and held in high reverence by the clergy, although the first glance shows that they are apocryphal. The twenty-first statute is "concerning the anointing of a pope of popes (chief pope or priest, which means a bishop), and the celebration of the *corban* (offering, or Eucharist)." For, although there are not any bishops in their churches, Episcopacy has not been abolished, and if the Abyssinian presbyters were supported in asserting their national independence, they could any day have bishops of their own, and the bishops could elect their metropolitan. The first sentences of the statute bear the stamp of a primitive antiquity, and are well worthy of perusal.

"Let a bishop be anointed (appointed), as we have already said, who is chosen by all the people conjointly with the presbyters (ancients) and deacons, on the day of Sabbath (Saturday). And let all the bishops come together in the congregation, and lay their hands upon him; and let all the presbyters, standing quietly, pray in silence in their hearts that the Holy Ghost may descend upon him; and so let each one of the bishops pray, and let each one standing up lay his hand upon him that is anointed bishop (Æth. *Epish-Kopos*), praying over him thus."

An excellent prayer is made for the bishop elect, having the very responses which we have in our Communion Service, with but a slight difference in the arrangement; "The Lord be with you all.—*And Himself with thy spirit.* Lift up your hearts.—*They are all lifted up to our God.* Let us give thanks to our Lord.—*That is right and just.*" They then say the Eucharistic prayer, audibly accompanying the new bishop, who, with the people and their ministers, recites the whole service as it is here translated, without abbreviation:

"We thank Thee, O Lord, through Thy beloved Son, Jesus Christ, whom in the last days Thou didst send to us to be our Saviour and Redeemer, the Angel of Thy counsel. He is the Word that cometh forth from Thee, by whom Thou hast wrought all Thy pleasure.

"And Thou didst send Him from heaven into the womb of the Virgin. He became flesh, and was carried in her bosom, and was made manifest by the Holy Spirit as Thy Son, that He might fulfil Thy will, and create a people for Thyself. Stretching forth His hands, He suffered, that He might deliver them that suffer, who put their trust in Thee. Who was delivered by His own will to pain, that He might destroy death, break the bands of Satan, tread down the realm of darkness, and lead forth the saints; that statutes might be established, and a resurrection revealed. Therefore, taking bread, He gave thanks, and said, Take, eat, this is My body, which is broken for you; and, in like manner (He took), the cup also, and said, This is My blood, which is shed for you: when ye do this, ye do it in remembrance of Me.

"Remembering, therefore, His death and resurrection, we offer Thee this bread and this cup, giving thanks to Thee that Thou hast made us worthy to stand before Thee and be priests unto Thee. Humbly we beseech Thee to send Thy Holy Spirit on the oblations of this Church. In like manner, that Thou wouldst grant holiness to all those that offer;* that they may be filled with the Holy Spirit, to the confirmation of their faith in truth; that they may celebrate and praise Thee in Thy Son, Jesus Christ; that to Thee, through Him, may be praise and power in the Holy Church, both now and for ever.—Amen.

"*He who offers oil in the Eucharist, as well as bread and wine, gives thanks in the same way; and, if he does not use the same words, he may even, at his own discretion, give thanks in other words, to the following effect:—*

"While Thou sanctifiest this oil, give (grace) to them that are anointed, and to them that offer. As Thou didst anoint priests and prophets, so do Thou strengthen them, and every one who tastes the bread and wine, and sanctify them who offer.

"*The people will say.* As it was, as it is, and as it will be to all generations, and for ever and ever. Amen.

"*The Bishop.* Again we beseech Him who possesseth all things, the Lord, the Father of our Lord and Saviour, Jesus Christ, that He will grant us in blessing to receive this holy sacrament, and that from it none of us may be condemned. May He make all worthy to take and receive the holy sacrament of the body and blood of Christ, the Almighty Lord our God.

"*The Deacon shall say.* Pray. O Lord Almighty, while we receive this holy sacrament, give us strength, and let not any of us be condemned, but bless us all in Christ, by whom, to Thee with Him, and

* In the edition of this prayer, printed in Rome, there are words inserted here which make the petition to be that the oblations may be made effectual to the sanctification of those who offer them. See Ludolf's *Commentary*, page 325, note d.

with the Holy Spirit, be praise and power, now and ever, world without end. Amen.

"*The Deacon shall say.* You who stand, bow down your heads. O Lord eternal, who knowest that which is hidden. Thy people bow down their heads to Thee. Subdue the stubbornness of their heart and body. Look Thou down from the majesty of Thy habitation, and bless them both men and women. Incline Thine ear to them, and hear their prayers. Strengthen them with the might of Thy right hand, and protect them from all evil suffering. Be Thou their keeper, both for body and for soul. In them and us increase both faith and fear. By Thy only Son, in whom, to Thee and the Holy Ghost be praise and power, for ever and for evermore. Amen.

[*Here the manuscript is illegible.*]

"One Holy Father. One Holy Son. One Holy Spirit.

"*Bishop.* The Lord be with you all.

"*People.* And with thy spirit.

"*Then they raise a hymn of praise, and the people shall come to receive the healing of their souls.* [That is to say, the bread and wine.] *A Prayer after he delivers (them).*

"O Lord Almighty, Father of our Lord and Saviour, Jesus Christ, we thank Thee because Thou hast granted us to partake of Thy holy sacrament. May it not be to us for guilt nor condemnation, but for the renewal of soul and body and spirit, through Thy only Son, in whom to Thee with Him, and with the Holy Ghost, be praise and power for ever; and He shall have it for ever and for evermore. Amen.

"*The people shall say.* Amen.

"*The Presbyter shall say.* The Lord be with you all.

"*Imposition of hands after they receive.*

"O Lord Eternal, who possessest all things, Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, bless Thy servants and Thy handmaidens. Protect, and help and succour them by the power of Thy angels. Keep and strengthen them in Thy fear by Thy majesty. Adorn them, that they may think of the things that are Thine; and grant them both to think of those things and to do them. Give them concord without sin and anger, through Thy only Son, in whom, to Thee and the Holy Spirit, be praise, both now, &c.

"*The people shall answer.* Amen.

"*The Bishop shall say.* The Lord be with you all.

"*The people.* And with thy spirit.

"*The Deacon shall say.* Go in peace.

"*And after this the Holy (Service) is finished.*'

There is nothing answering to the "words of consecration" that we can find; but before the delivery of the elements, in both kinds, there are the following prayers.

First, for the bread, "Set Thy hand upon this dish; bless it and sanctify it, and cleanse it, that with it they may minister Thy holy body." For the wine, "Set Thy hand upon this cup, and now bless it, and sanctify it, and cleanse it, that with it they may minister Thy holy blood." And before using the spoon with which they put the bread dipped in the wine into the mouths of the communicants, "Set Thy hand upon this spoon-cross (*i.e.* the spoon having its handle in the form of a cross) that they may celebrate the body and the blood of Thy only Son our Lord and our God."

More like an admission of the doctrine of transubstantiation is another form of prayer. "Change this bread that Thy body may be pure when it is joined with this cup of Thy precious blood." And another, "O, Holy Ghost, descend and come, and shine brightly on this bread that it may be the body of Christ our God, and let the taste of this cup be changed, that it may be the blood of Christ our God." To the ear of an unreasoning communicant these overwrought sentences would surely convey a notion of transubstantiation; but careful reflection would dispel the thought, and, when Ludolf pressed his Abyssinian to acknowledge that such is the meaning of the words, he answered without hesitation, and reiterated the protestation, that his countrymen did not acknowledge any such thing, neither did they trouble themselves any such thorny disputations.* It is almost to be suspected that this form crept in when the Jesuits were dominant.

The above service may be taken as a fair specimen of one of the earlier Ethiopic liturgies. It would interest the present generation if any competent editor would print with critical exactness, and with close translation of the text, at least a selection from the unpublished Ethiopic manuscripts that are treasured in public libraries in England and on the Continent of Europe; most carefully noting, and, except for a critical reason, avoiding, all that has been written by foreign scribes. Here and there Ludolf marks a Roman interpolation, and thus indicates the caution needful for recovering authentic transcripts of the symbolic writings of the Abyssinian Church, as they were when that church was separated from the Greek, and shut out from all Christendom besides.

The number of sacraments is not expressly limited to two, but no third sacred ceremonial has a sacramental character. The reception of the Eucharist is not compulsory; but, as in

* Ludolf, iii. c. 5.

these times there is little other form of worship, this only distinguishes the Christian from the heathen, and the Turk or Jew; and to withhold it from any one is an infliction of the highest ecclesiastical censure.

Many witnesses agree that the Abyssinians pray for the dead, and therefore the fact must be admitted, yet not suffered to pass without some observation. We, first of all, mention one sufficient witness—the present Bishop of Jerusalem, who spent three years in Abyssinia, and whose *Journal* was published by the Church Missionary Society in 1834. In describing the occurrences on the death of a brother missionary, for whom he would not suffer the usual ceremonies to be performed, he notes thus:—"In this country, the relations and friends of a deceased person invite, at different times, many priests and poor people, to whom they give something to eat and drink, to engage them to pray for the soul of the deceased. This they call *tescar, i.e.* 'remembrance.'" Yet we cannot find how much this means. Probably enough, they do, in their ignorance, pray *for the soul of the deceased;* and, if so, it is also probable that such praying was encouraged, if not introduced, by the Jesuits during their brief ascendancy. Beyond this, we have not even a conjecture, and can only say that the formularies of the Abyssinian Church do not afford to "Anglo-Catholics" any support of precedent. Ludolf must be our authority on the subject, and from his pages we gather—First, that one of their canons requires "singing, with prayers, at the funerals of the faithful dead;" but, as the canon is not produced, it cannot be quoted. Second, that Alvarez, the Portuguese priest, reported that they had "no funeral service, nor any songs for the dead, nor did any one even desire it." Third, that Abba Gregorius told Ludolf that "the dead were buried either in the church or near it, with hymns and prayers. Not only the beginning of the Gospel according to St. John, but some other lessons were read at the funeral. When the corpse was carried to the grave, a cross preceded, but no cross was planted on the grave. They still give alms for those who have died."* The alms, however, were given in memory of the deceased, or by his bequest, not to purchase masses, nor as a satisfaction for his sin. Our author took great pains to understand this matter, but could learn nothing more. One only sentence he found beginning with the words, "Remember, O Lord, the souls of," &c. Other prayers were simply, "Remember" such a one, and he pressed Gregorius

* *Comment.* 441.

very closely for something that would confirm the allegation that they pray for the souls of the departed, but got nothing from him but protestations that they did no such thing. It would be ridiculous, the priest said, to pray for men to be delivered from hell whom they believed in heaven: and they have no idea of a purgatory.* Commemorations of the dead are frequent, usually beginning with the formula, "Peace to" such a one, but they are not to be mistaken for the prayers, as will appear by some that we have quoted. The funeral of an Abyssinian is described by Mr. Consul Salt, whose notice of it is remarkable. "The Abyssinian priest who came down with the party," he says, "recited the psalms and prayers appointed for such occasions, which are much the same as those used by our own Church." An Englishman who attended, "particularly observed the ceremony of throwing a portion of earth into the grave, when they came to the last solemn farewell, "we here commit his body to the ground, dust to dust, and ashes to ashes, in hopes of a joyful resurrection," which seemed to make a strong impression on all who were present.

The funerals are conducted with barbaric simplicity. The corpse, washed and wrapped in a sheet over the funeral clothes, is hurried to the grave, the bearers running at full speed. When the service, which has been described, is finished, the company set up a cry which is more like a shout of gladness than a wail of grief. So when Mark, the eldest son of King Susneus, was buried, the cry was,

"Mark is dead, Hallelujah!
Dead is Mark, Hallelujah!"

And the doleful hallelujah was reiterated until the mourners were hoarse, and the Jesuit fathers who stood by knew not whether they were expected to laugh or weep. When a person of high rank has been buried, the chief mourner sits in silence for a week, the house is surrounded by a crowd of people weeping and singing to the sound of a drum, while his friends visit him daily, like Job's comforters, except that they talk less, for each one does no more than sit for a moment at his side in perfect silence, weeping if he can, and saying as he rises to depart, "The Lord comfort thee!" Whoever fails to do this is not regarded as a friend.

They pray to angels, of whom the learned count nine orders in an ascending scale of dignity; angels, archangels, lords,

* *Hist.* iii. c. 5.

rulers, thrones, powers, princes, cherubs, and seraphs, a system which may have been introduced after the Babylonian captivity by immigrants from Judæa.

They honour saints by appointing days in their memory, and have the custom of so invoking their names that they seem to pray to them, and no doubt multitudes do so pray, but it does not yet appear that such prayer is recognised by the priests as lawful. It is a superstition, a pious practice they may call it; and, as in the Church of Rome the "pious opinion" ripens into a fully-developed article of faith, so the Abuna or the Emperor may some day be induced to declare the saints worthy to receive formal adoration. They have no images in their churches, not even a crucifix, but they admit pictures, and although the books do not authorise worship of the pictures, and the priests often deny it, the people do really worship them. "The churches," says Bruce, "are full of pictures, painted on parchment, and nailed upon the walls. . . . Sometimes, for a particular church, they get a number of pictures of saints on skins of parchment, ready finished, from Cairo, in a style very superior to their own. They are placed like a frieze, and hung in the upper part of the wall." Gobat, sixty years later than Bruce, reproved the priests for having their churches full of pictures, to which they prayed, and before which they fell down. The priests confessed that the ignorant people worshipped these objects as much as the heathen worship their idols.

Auricular confession they have none. Sometimes a delinquent will come to the priest in public, crying, "I have sinned!" and when the sin is discovered by questioning, or by his own voluntary declaration, the priest will punish him, not unfrequently flogging the sinner with his own hand. But the Jesuits complained that they could never induce the penitent to enter into particulars. Anything less than theft, adultery, or murder, was not felt to be of consequence enough to be made the subject of confession, nor would the Abyssinian brook priestly interference in lesser matters. Under the age of twenty-five, persons were accounted innocent, whatever they might do, twenty-five being set down as the age of discretion and responsibility.

Fastings are extremely frequent, and gluttony is common. There are various intoxicating drinks, and, to counterbalance the ever-recurring fasts, there are correspondent eatings and drinkings to excess.

Marriage is a name rather than a reality. Monks and nuns are not married, of course, but they by no means avoid

each other's society. A priest is required to be husband of one wife, but the law in his case is not so rigidly enforced as to make him a model of morality to the flock. The Church forbids polygamy to the laity, but cannot prevent it. It prevails among the higher sort of people; and, as for the multitude, the better class marry one woman only because it is not convenient to maintain more. A comparison of what is written on the subject by residents in the country leads to the conclusion that among the mass of the people the cohabitation is only less than promiscuous by so much as natural affection may restrain the parties. Marriage, so called, is only a mutual agreement, with some little civil ceremony, between the two persons in presence of their friends. There is no sacred function. Civil sanction may be had if the man and woman are content to live together, to the exclusion of any other on either side, and appear before the *Shummergildas*, or town councillors, to signify their intention. Those gentlemen then take cognisance of their contract, and may interfere if either party complains that the other has broken it. It is then usual for them, as persons living most religiously, to go to church and partake of the communion. But few of their unions last until dissolved by death. The magistrates may order a divorce. The polygamist of either sex is excluded from participation of the Eucharist, which is equivalent to excommunication; but there are two ways of evading this penalty: either the priests may wink at the transgression, or the grandee, who wishes to be religious, may divorce his surplus wives, and appear at church freely. Divorces are made at pleasure. No law of inheritance gives value to legitimate birth, and an Abyssinian of spurious descent may take possession of the paternal estate, or the paternal crown, if able to do so, without any legal impediment. The "king of kings" does indeed boast of lineal descent from Solomon, by marriages duly enacted, but the history of his ancestors disproves the genealogy. At Gondar, as at Rome, the succession has been sadly broken.

The monachism of Abyssinia, like the Abyssinian Church in general, retains, in spite of everything, the character it bore before separation from the orthodox Greek patriarchate in the fifth century, and at this day exhibits a picture of the old communities in the Libyan deserts, allowing only for the present relaxation of primitive severity. The outline is pretty much the same, but the colours are irrecoverably flown. Each monk has, by way of cell, a small hut, standing alone. A number of these huts constitutes a monastery. Each of

them has ground enough for its occupant to cultivate: a common inclosure surrounds the establishment; and, as a mountain is usually chosen by the founder, the monastery is called a *debër*, or mountain—hence *Debra Libanosh*, *Debra Bizan*, *Debra Halleluya*, &c., are names of monasteries. The monks live by labour: a very little labour, indeed, suffices for their subsistence. They are not in good repute for morality. The nuns are not separated from them by any other inclosure than that of self-control, which is very frail. There is no such distinction of orders and habits as that which marks their brethren in other churches. Their merit consists chiefly in the slight service they render to their country by conserving the little education that exists, and by that common attachment to their ancient religion which has always made them its champions against all enemies; and, as their persons are sacred and they are exempt from contributions to the State, which would be an evil elsewhere, and must often prove an evil in Abyssinia, their order is a power in the country that often serves to turn the scale against a despotism that has none of the checks which we call constitutional. While the Church is subject to the foreign Abuna, who has little or no regard to the welfare of the country, the burden of patriotism reposes on them, and their Chief, the *Eechègué*—whatever the title may mean—balances the doubtful influence of the Abuna, and often stands in the stead of constitution.

The ignorance of the priesthood, and correspondent ignorance of the people; the wild barbarism of society, moderated however by a rude and hospitable simplicity; the scanty measure of education, just enough to become the germ of national intelligence, and to supply a key of knowledge to the few vigorous minds that can shine out amidst barbaric darkness; the strength of passion, rising often into fiendish violence, yet generally restrained by manly recollection, compensated by prompt and even heroic placability, and at all points relieved by absence of the cunning falsehood that coldly preys upon its victims; the roaming habits of a people that is not nomadic, and at the same time the wondrous persistence of a nation that has never had many "cities of habitation" within its borders; the long enduring of a succession of sovereigns on a throne that scorns the limitation of legitimacy, and yet boasts of unbroken succession from King Solomon; the persistent steadfastness of a church that, retaining its doctrinal integrity, has lost its life—these, and more than these, are paradoxes that perplex us, and will continue to perplex, until we find the solution of a mystery that

at once obscures and perpetuates the existence of the nation. Savages they may be, but they are men who have resisted on every side the inroads of savages and Christians too, whose constancy neither Turk or Pope has yet been able to subdue. We laugh at their superstition, which is profound, and we avert the eye from some of their customs, which are sickening. We go to Abyssinia to release prisoners and to maintain our own honour, and in doing this fulfil an obvious and necessary duty. Our strong battalions encamped watchfully at Senafé, while their king, a madman, a tyrant, or whatever else he might be, pursued his own policy in the distant wilderness with cool sagacity. "The captives" had lived in health year after year within the ring-fences of Debra Tabor and Magdala. We were horrified at reports of mutilation and murder perpetrated upon his own subjects. We wondered at the tantalising tyranny which kept our brethren alive, and slaughtered, as they said, his own miserable children. All was contradiction, and meanwhile the British archæologist had time to study the inscribed stones at Axum, and our naturalists had opportunity to collect specimens. The Abyssinians, however, are a very ancient people, and now that we condescend to notice them, perhaps we may glean some wisdom from their long-lost store. A few words only on the famous conflict between Rome and Gondar, which closed with triumph of the latter more than two hundred years ago. It is a morsel of history which it were well to recover from the dust that has gathered over it.

Among the wonders related by Marco Polo, on his return from Tartary and China, was a fabulous tale concerning Prester John, a mighty Christian prince reigning over a great nation in Tartary. Next, an Armenian monk, better informed, gave some account, in the year 1300, of a Christian people in Nubia "black as pitch," descendants of Indians converted by St. Thomas, dwelling on the other side of a sandy desert in Africa, haters of Mohammedans, to whose king the Pope might write, and invite him to attack the Soldan of Egypt, and so divert his forces while the crusaders should go and take Jerusalem. This gave a general idea that Prester John was to be found in Africa, and when the Portuguese navigators ventured along the western shores of that continent, a hope of getting some of the boundless wealth of Prester John stimulated their languid courage. At length, some Portuguese landed in Congo, and met a negro from the East, who gave the first probable account of a Christian king and people not far from the shores of the Indian Ocean. This gave a

sudden impulse to the spirit of discovery, and the King of Portugal sent one Covilham to Goa, there to watch for an opportunity of access to the Christian kingdom, presumed to lie on the recently-discovered eastern side of Africa. Covilham rested not until correspondence was opened with the King of Abyssinia, whose court was then in Shoa, and whom he met on an hostile expedition against a tribe of Pagans near the sea. In the year 1490, two years before Columbus found America, Covilham was in the court of Abyssinia, the guest, servant, and prisoner of King Alexander. Like Bruce in later times, he was imprisoned that he might not be lost, and made so welcome that his captivity became tolerable, if not pleasant. He married an Abyssinian, rose into power, and used his opportunity for infusing exalted ideas of Portugal into all around. It is said that he imbued with Romish doctrine a young prince who afterwards became sovereign of Abyssinia; but this is only a conjecture, now disproved by evidence. It rather appears that King David—for that was the name assumed by the young prince on his accession to the throne—remained ignorant of the religion of Europe until the first embassy from Portugal arrived in 1520, when Alvarez, its chaplain and historian, became his diligent instructor. The first lessons were on the Mass, treated emblematically, and keeping transubstantiation out of sight; and on the supremacy of the Pope over Bishops, veiling his assumption of power over kings. Alvarez found Covilham yet living comfortably in the mountain-home of the "sons of Prester John," made famous by the pen of Johnson in his tale of Rasselas. This mountain district, we cannot help noting, is either identical or conterminous with that of Magdala, Geshen, and Ambra Sel. The prayers of David for military help were urgent, and the despatch was tardy; but after David had passed away, while his successor, Claudius, was desperately struggling against the enemy of Christendom, a Portuguese contingent came upon the field and beat the Turks. A Portuguese named Bermudez, who had been sent to implore the succour, returned with the armament, and received for his reward the dignity and emolument of Abuna, already promised him by David, and during his visit to Europe the Pope professed to sanction the appointment. Claudius, however, would not consent to pay the foreigner so dear a price, but sent Bermudez out of the country. More than fifty years from the landing of Covilham had been spent in bringing matters to this pass. A more vigorous attempt was made by Pope Julius III., who despatched a party of Jesuits

in 1554, with a Jesuit "metropolitan" at their head, to reduce Abyssinia to submission. Portuguese soldiers from India, rebels from the provinces, and Turks, were associated in hostile force to drive Claudius from his throne, and they were so far successful as to slay him on the battle-field; but the nation was roused, the war continued, and another king, Adam, the son of Claudius, also fell in battle, but Abyssinia conquered. A confession of faith that was written by Claudius in defence of his Church, still remains to perpetuate his memory, and, after some years of disappointed hope, even the Pope found it necessary to recall the Jesuit patriarch and defer the enterprise.

But the crisis was not yet come. Years passed in apparent peace, but there were Jesuits disguised as Turks, or as Armenians, who privately carried on the plot, and in a time of civil war emerged from their concealment, volunteered their help to the stronger of two competitors for the throne, and after fifty-four years of treasonable perseverance, the new king, Sagued, proclaimed Romanism the religion of Abyssinia, drove the priests from their churches, and made profession of the ancient religion a crime. This was more than could be borne.

The whole multitude of the monks, with the Eechègguè at their head, roused the nation to resistance. On the other side, the king and his followers employed every engine of power at their command; and the Jesuits, now in effect the rulers of Abyssinia, rallied every element of provincial disaffection and foreign enmity, and kept up for twelve or thirteen years a sanguinary warfare, which raged with various event, as one party or the other left the field in triumph, while the vanquished fled to recruit his forces, and be conqueror in turn. At length one great battle was fought to decide the question whether Abyssinia should keep the faith of Alexandria or follow that of Rome. The slaughter was horrible on both sides, until the king and his Jesuits saw a miserable remnant of the patriot forces in full flight, and a scarcely less wretched residue of their own remaining on the field. Sagued gazed with shame upon the heaps of dead, and silently betook himself to the palace which the aliens had built for him. There the chief men presented themselves before him, as he lay sick and almost broken-hearted, and made a bold appeal to his humanity, his honour, and his *conscience*. He proposed a compromise between the two churches, and sought the consent of the Jesuit "patriarch" to issue a decree of toleration, but was bitterly disgusted when the man refused to listen, insolently threatened to excommunicate

and curse both king and people, unless the one and only true Roman Catholic Apostolic Church rode absolute over all the land, and every native were compelled, under the extremest penalties, to forswear the Alexandrian faith, and subject himself, soul and body, to the authority of Rome. From that moment the Papal standard was deserted. Thousands who had fought under it shrank away from the murderous foreigner, and the Jesuits hid their faces in dismay. Sagued, heart-broken and ashamed, repented in his last sickness, strove to make peace with God, in whose sight he had so wickedly shed his subjects' blood, and forthwith issued a proclamation to this effect:—

"Hear! hear! We formerly gave you the Roman faith, believing it to be true; but innumerable multitudes of my people having been slain on that account, we do therefore restore to you the religion of your fathers, so that your priests may take possession of your churches again, and officiate therein as formerly."

The proclamation was heard with indescribable delight. The Jesuits and their priests all hastened away to Fremona, to seek shelter within the walls of a convent, so called, but in reality a strong fortress, capable of affording protection against an army, and waited, as they hoped, the calming of the storm. But the storm never could be calmed. Hatred and exultation boiled in every bosom, and soon found utterance. An Ethiopic stanza, written by no mean hand, was sung night and day, wherever there was a voice to utter it:—

"See how the Ethiopian flock is now set free
From Western wolves by the doctrine of Mark the apostle,
And of Cyril, pillar of the Church of Alexandria.
Rejoice! Rejoice! and sing ye Hallelujah,
From the wolves of the West, Ethiopia is free!"

From generation to generation the *refrain* rang through the valleys.

"Tafashkhoo! Tafashkhoo! Wazámroo Halelnyá,
Em-takualát Gárab amshákhat Eeetyopyá."

Sagued expired at enmity with the church he had so blindly and so fatally patronised, leaving his son to finish the work he had begun, by banishing for ever from his kingdom the wolves, or, more literally, the *hyænas*, of the West, whose insatiable thirst of blood had by this time placed their own lives in peril. The *pseudo*-patriarch was sent off to Massowah in the year 1634, and two centuries of calculated silence were let pass before the Court of Rome durst make again any attempt to send emissaries openly into the country. By

1834, arrangements were completed; from that time a so-called Vicar Apostolic has been on the field, and, if all be true that is reported, a new campaign is likely soon to follow. Our business, however, is with history, and nothing more, and therefore we will not trespass on the province of a future historian, but copy a few lines from a letter recently addressed by the Minister for Foreign Affairs at Florence to the Italian Ambassador in London, and laid before the House of Commons, in translation, last November:—

"You are undoubtedly aware that for many years several Italian missionaries, belonging more especially to the ancient provinces of the kingdom, have been settled in Abyssinia, where some of them have acquired no little esteem among the populations of the country. In the number of those missionaries is included Monsignor Masasia, Bishop of the Order of Capuchins, a person of distinguished merit and uncommon prudence, who seems to possess considerable influence over the mind of King Theodore. Monsignor was in Italy for some time, when, in consequence of special information that he received, he immediately set out for his distant see, having been urgently summoned thither by the Abyssinian sovereign. It was known, in fact, a kind of pseudo-Bishop Abuna, a kind of Catholic heresiarch, who was at first a favourite with the Prince, but afterwards fell into disgrace, had been imprisoned, and put to death; and it seems that in order to replace him the sovereign had bethought himself of summoning the principal Catholic prelate, known for twenty years among the populations there, as a man anxious for nothing more than the welfare of others."

The ostensible object of this letter was to accomplish the deliverance of the European captives, "towards which the British agents have directed their efforts in vain," by the good offices of Bishop Masasia, acting under the instruction of the British Government and the sanction of the Pope. All that is at present known to the public is conveyed in a short note from the present Foreign Secretary:—"Lord Stanley presents his compliments to the Marquis d'Azeglio, and has the honour to return, with his best thanks, the accompanying note, which the Marquis d'Azeglio was so good as to communicate to him."

Politico-religious correspondence being now avowedly open between Rome and Abyssinia, we most devoutly hope that it will not lead to complications like those of ages past, but that the faith of Mark and Cyril, purified from the monophysitism of the latter, and attended by vital power, may be restored to a people that were once a portion of the charge of the venerable Athanasius.

ART. III.—1. *The Irish People and the Irish Land.* By ISAAC BUTT. Dublin: John Falconer; London: W. Ridgway, Piccadilly. 1867.

2. *The Irish Land Question: Suggestions for Legislation.* By MARCUS KEANE, Agent to the Marquis of Conyngham. Dublin: Hodges & Smith. 1868.

3. *Essays for the Times.* By J. H. RIGG, D.D. London: Elliot Stock. 1866.

4. *Irish History and Irish Character.* By GOLDWIN SMITH. Oxford and London: Parkers. 1862.

5. *England and Ireland.* By J. S. MILL. London: Longmans. 1868.

6. *A Letter to the Right Hon. Chichester Fortescue, M.P., on the State of Ireland.* By JOHN EARL RUSSELL. London: Longmans. 1868.

7. *Proposals for the Gradual Creation of a Farmer Proprietary in Ireland.* London: W. Ridgway. 1868.

8. *A few Words on the Relation of Landlord and Tenant in Ireland, &c.* By the EARL OF ROSSE. London: Murray. 1867.

9. *The Irish in America.* By J. F. MAGUIRE, M.P. London: Longmans. 1868.

10. *Principles of Political Economy.* By J. S. MILL. London: Longmans. 1867.

11. *Irish Emigration and the Tenure of Land in Ireland.* By the Right Hon. LORD DUFFERIN, K.P. 1867.

To be in a position either to express or to influence public opinion is a high and responsible calling. In the eyes of the Christian publicist who understands his mission, it has a sacerdotal character. We have never been more deeply and seriously impressed by this truth than at the present moment, when a Parliament chosen by the new enlarged constituencies of England is so soon to form decisions that will result in the weal or woe of many a generation in unhappy Ireland, and tell upon the future of the whole empire.

Our first impression upon undertaking afresh an earnest study of the wants and interests of the sister country, with which we had long considered ourselves familiar, was the fear of precipitate legislation. We said with Earl Russell, "Public opinion in this country is apt to be long quiescent

and suddenly impetuous." The Fenian crisis having been brought about by the fact that so many thousands of Irishmen had accustomed themselves to the use of arms and military discipline during the Civil War in America, we believed that, after the first few ineffectual efforts at insurrection, the accidental cause of trouble would pass away, and leave us free to treat what chronic ills remained without undue haste, or impatience to have done, at any cost, with an importunate question.

We are now convinced of our mistake. It is true the empire has nothing to fear from force, at least, immediately; a few regiments would at any time disperse a hundred thousand half-armed and undisciplined Fenians, though officered by Hiberno-Americans with revolvers of the newest pattern. Even the outrages that have been perpetrated in the streets of English cities, and startled distant colonies, are not likely to be repeated, involving, as they do, so much peril for their authors. But the conviction which has been forced upon us by closer examination is this; that the state of things in Ireland itself is such as would call for prompt, trenchant, and comprehensive legislation, even if the Fenian conspiracy and its American sympathisers had never existed, that the instincts of disaffection and hatred, national, social, agrarian, and religious, which have been always smouldering among the Catholic peasantry, have reached a term at which they must be met by wise, just, and benevolent statesmanship, or become absolutely incurable.

The Church question has been made the immediate battle-field of the great political conflict now going on. We shall not be suspected of underrating its importance; it is the just prerogative of moral and religious interests that they touch us more nearly and deeply than any other, but the land question is one of subsistence, and cannot long brook delay.

It is impossible to hide from ourselves that the Irish Church question will probably be decided in a way that we should on many grounds strongly deprecate. When the Disraeli Cabinet proposed a governmental recognition and endowment of an Ultramontane university, it did irreparable harm to the cause of the Irish Establishment, for it betrayed the consciousness that there was no alternative between levelling upwards—endowing all sects; and levelling downwards—leaving all unendowed. Even Lord Stanley's open expression of his opinion that the Establishment must go sooner or later, was not so great a blow as this tacit confession of all his col-

leagues united. Before the evident feeling of the House of Commons, Government tried to make its measure mean as little as possible, but the proposal to sanction and to pay even partially for Ultramontane education was not the less an attempt to take a second step in the direction of the recognition and endowment of Romanism as a State religion; the first step—the institution of Maynooth—having been taken long ago. The Conservative leaders have done what in them lay to teach the country that State aid to the Episcopal Church of Ireland can only be continued on conditions which, without satisfying the Roman Catholics, would wound Protestant feeling far more than simple disendowment. Without attributing to the clergy or laity of the Irish Establishment any Quixotic indifference to material interests, we quite believe—what they lose no opportunity of affirming—that they care less for pounds, shillings, and pence, than they do for the principle of State connection with Protestantism, and consequently that they are more intensely opposed to governmental recognition of Romanism than the other alternative, however cruel. It were better far to let light and darkness strive for the mastery on their own merits, than to purchase leave to own the light by contributing to the production of darkness.

But we cannot now enlarge upon this matter; it must become the subject of a future paper. The land question alone is more than enough to take up the space at our disposal, and, while we put forward our conclusions, there will unfortunately be room for a very small part of the evidence upon which they have been formed. Our readers, however, have heard so much upon the subject of late, that they will probably be able to supply many of the facts and considerations which we shall be constrained to omit.

What is it, then, that has made Ireland a land of perpetual want and misery—a source of expense, danger, and weakness without intermission, almost from the first day of our connection with it until the present hour? Why are we put to shame before the world, as though the sister island were another Poland? We have made India less unhappy than she was under native rulers; we are successfully spreading the reign of civilisation over the desert in Australia, South Africa, and Canada; we have comparatively thriving and contented subjects, speaking many languages, and professing various religions, and the submission of many of them to the British sceptre is of yesterday, while the conquest of Ireland was begun seven centuries ago, and has been nominally accom-

plished for three; why are we unable to govern a people immediately beside us, who are in every way part of ourselves, and who are helping to govern us?

There are not wanting people who will answer that the mystery consists in native, ineradicable defects of the Irish character. The Celt is incurably idle, improvident, disorderly, and vicious, ever tempted to avenge upon his betters the misery which is his own fault. This ungenerous view is generally accompanied by ignorance of Irish history, and a certain stolid narrowness of mind and harshness of character. Put in this extreme shape, the accusation is not true of any people under heaven who have passed beyond the stage of nomadic and hunter life; all sedentary nations placed in favourable circumstances learn to work, and the differences of national character are small in comparison with those elements of human nature which are common to all.

Not to speak of the Welsh and the Cornishmen, who are nearly related branches of the Celtic stock, the Highlanders of Scotland are identical with the original native Irish, speaking the same language as far as they continue to speak Gaelic, which is all but extinct in Ireland. Up to the last hundred years the Highlanders exhibited the same lawlessness and the same repugnance to hard work with which the Irishman of the present day is reproached, and, like him, they seemed sunk in hopeless poverty and dirt. We know what a transformation the abolition of feudal traditions and feudal land-tenure has wrought in the Scottish Gael within this short interval. We also know something of the industry, the energy, the enterprise, the Irish themselves exhibit in every country except their own. Not only Mr. Maguire, but every traveller testifies to their prosperity in America. The twenty millions they have sent back to the old country to help their relatives to emigrate, is a crucial proof of it. Mr. Kay, favoured with a fellowship by one of our universities for the purpose of enabling him to travel and to report upon "the social condition of the European people," writes in these terms:—

"Where the Irishman can make himself, by industry, a proprietor of land, and where he is not shackled by middle-age legislation, he becomes immediately the most energetic and conservative of colonists. He there acquires faster than any one else; and he forces his rulers to write home to England—as the Governor of South Australia did some years ago—that the Irish are *the most enterprising, orderly, and successful of all the colonists* of these distant lands."

And even in his own country, the actual occupier and tiller of the Irish soil does as much as can be expected of him when his immense disadvantages are taken into consideration. The custom of the country has ever been that the owner in letting his land makes no expenditure in putting it into order. He builds no house, provides no farm offices or agricultural appliances of any sort. It is the peasant's business to raise the roof-tree without knowing how long it may shelter his family. Is it any wonder that its architecture should be primitive, and all the arrangements of the farm wretched and slovenly? The English farmer, says Arthur Young, "pays a rent for his land in the state he finds it, which includes, not only the natural fertility of the soil, but the immense expenditure which national wealth has in the progress of time poured into it; but the Irishman finds nothing that he can afford to pay rent for but what the bounty of God has given, unaided by either wealth or industry." Mr. Wakefield calculated, in 1810, that it would take a hundred and twenty millions to make Irish farms fit to be offered to English agriculturists.

Even as they are, deprived in so great a measure of the rewards and destitute of the incentives of industry, it is essentially the poor occupiers who have given the Irish soil whatever value it presents beyond the state of nature. Proprietors, when not absentees, have built houses for themselves, made fences, and improved their demesnes, and large works of drainage have been recently executed by money borrowed by them; but the sum of many small things may far exceed the amount of a few great, and it is admitted by all competent and impartial observers that the aggregate of the occupiers' labour greatly surpasses the landlords' expenditure. It has been the patient, often silent and unnoticed, labour of the poor that has erected human dwellings, dug out rushes, increased productive power, brought waste and barren land under the dominion of the plough and the spade, and that, as Mr. Butt so truly says, though they were "cheered in their toil only by those domestic affections, which have been to the Irish people the redeeming spirit that has gone with them through the furnace."

In Arthur Young's journey there fell under his observation a district of heathy mountain, near Clonmel, upon which Sir William Osborne had allowed some twenty strolling families to settle at a time when the outrages of the levellers or Whiteboys were rife. This great authority writes in 1776,

"Their industry has no bounds, nor is the day long enough for the

revolution of their incessant labour. . . . This shows that the villany of the greatest miscreants is all situation and circumstance. Employ, don't hang them. Let it not be in the slavery of the Cottar system, in which industry never meets its reward; but, by giving property, teach the value of it; by giving them the fruit of their labour, teach them to be laborious."

Nor was this industry exceptional: he continues:—

"In the mountainous districts I saw instances of greater industry than in other parts of Ireland. Little occupiers, who can get leases of a mountain-side, make exertions in improvements which, though far enough from being complete or accurate, yet prove clearly what effects encouragement would have upon them. . . . It is, from the whole of the evidence, plain that they are, in no common degree, masters of the art of overcoming difficulties by patience and contrivance. . . . Give the farmer of twenty acres in England no other capital than his brother in Ireland, and, I will venture to say, he will be much poorer; for he will be utterly unable to go on at all."

Lord Bacon, after mentioning the many sources of wealth with which Ireland is endowed by nature, reckons as the crowning gift of all, "especially the race and generation of men—valiant, hard, and active." It is not saying too much; we believe that the Celt and the Saxon were intended by Providence to dwell together, and that the peculiarities of each race are suited to act most favourably upon the other. The English is the more masculine character of the two, the Irish the more feminine, even in its violence. The grace and taste, the inborn artistic genius, the ardent love of knowledge for its own sake, the open-heartedness, generosity, wit, the lively and emotional temperament, with a deep strain of unaffected melancholy lying below the gaiety of the surface, the impulsive sympathies of the Irishman, his nature communicative to excess, the uncalculating courage which makes him the most brilliant and reckless of soldiers, his clannishness, his respect for ancient lineage and high position, his love of excitement, capacity for religious enthusiasm and for passionate personal attachment, his loyalty, fidelity and self-devotion to those he considers his friends or natural chiefs, his prodigality of life and fortune in their service, and all the more when they are unfortunate—these are just the features of character that should be added to the coolness, the power of patient and sustained effort, the sturdy independence, the manly self-control, the self-assertion reserved but resolute, the attachment to institutions rather than personal rule, the strong sense of right securing the reign of law and liberty,

the silent but untiring action that are in the temperament of the Englishman. Our practical wisdom requires to be penetrated by their subtle and inquisitive intellect.

"What the Saxon wants in liveliness, grace, and warmth," says Professor Goldwin Smith, "the Celt can supply; what the Celt lacks in firmness, judgment, perseverance, and the more solid elements of character, the Saxon can afford. The two races blended together may well be expected to produce a great and gifted nation." The union of qualities so complementary of each other is indeed suited to form a national character of the highest order, and, as we have said, Providence seems to have so ordered it. This marriage was made in heaven. The Saxon and Celt are side by side, intermarrying, and in a thousand ways acting upon each other, through the whole length of our island: the Saxon in the east and centre from Aberdeen to Dorsetshire, the Celt in the west from Caithness to Cornwall, and on many parts of the line the fusion is complete. If in Ireland the proportion of the two races is the reverse of that which exists in Great Britain, there are not the less nearly a million and a half of Saxons living in the midst of the original population, and the latter have already appropriated the language of their conquerors, thereby removing the greatest obstacle to union. It is in English that the Irish agitator declaims, it is in English that the Fenian oath is administered. Nay, very frequently, the fanatical partisan of a separate Irish nationality will be found bearing an unmistakable Saxon name.

When we cross the Atlantic, we find millions who think that they have fled from under English rule and influences. It is an Irish blunder. In taking refuge among the children of the Puritans they have so placed themselves as to be only the more completely lost, after the second generation, in the midst of a Saxon civilisation; they become Englishmen sooner than they would have done at home! In short, wherever the Saxon is to be found, at home or abroad, throughout the length and breadth of the planet, from Coventry to San Francisco or to Sydney, there the Celt is to be found along with him, in increasing amalgamation with him. If there be any meaning in history, here are races that man may not put asunder. The stronger was once cruel to the weaker, the latter have been of late vindictive and troublesome, but they were intended to bless each other and to bless the world in their union.

Edmund Spenser in his time, three hundred years ago, heard men around him wishing the realm of Ireland "were a

sea-pool." Such being the fatal destiny of that land, they said, "whether it proceed from the very genius of the soil, or influence of the stars," that no purposes whatever which are meant for her good will prosper and take effect. This kind of speech the poet repelled with indignation, holding it "to be the manner rather of desperate men far driven, to wish the utter ruin of that which they cannot redress than of grave councillors." We, too, must altogether demur to the prejudice of any inborn incapacity of the Irish character to live in order, industry and content, under a wise and just government. Our question must be repeated, then. It was asked in substance by Bishop Berkeley long ago, "What hindereth us Irishmen from exerting ourselves, using our hands and brains, doing something or other, man, woman, or child, like all the other inhabitants of God's earth?" Or, let it be stated in Lord Dufferin's words at the present day, "Some human agency or other must be accountable for the perennial desolation of a lovely and fertile island, watered by the fairest streams, caressed by a clement atmosphere, held in the embrace of a sea whose affluence fills the richest harbours of the world, and inhabited by a race valiant, tender, generous, gifted beyond measure with the power of physical endurance, and graced with the liveliest intelligence."

All reasonable people recognise that the solution of the enigma is to be sought in Irish history, and to a certain extent they agree in their interpretation of the history.

"The original source of the calamities of Ireland," says Professor Goldwin Smith, "was the partial character of the Norman conquest, which caused the conquerors, instead of becoming an upper class, to remain a mere hostile settlement or pale. . . . The next great source of mischief was the disruption of Christendom at the period of the Reformation, and the terrible religious wars which ensued upon that disruption, and into which both nations, in common with the other nations of Europe, were drawn. Then Ireland became a victim to the attempt of Louis XIV., which was, in part, a sequel of the religious wars, to destroy the liberty and religion of England through his vassals, the House of Stuart. Finally, the French revolution breaking out into anarchy, massacre, and atheism, at the moment when the Government of England, under Pitt, had just entered on the path of reform and toleration, not only arrested political progress in this as in other cases, but involved Ireland in another civil war."

Had Ireland been much smaller, it would have been conquered without a serious struggle. Had Ireland, like Scotland, possessed extensive highlands unbroken by plains, it

could have maintained its independence. Had the whole strength of England been put forth at once under the direction of an able monarch, the conquest would have been rapid, the organisation of the conquered country comprehensive, and the assimilation of the two races would have been effected in a few generations. Unfortunately the conquest was begun by private Norman adventurers, rapacious and irresponsible, and it was only effected after a prolonged intermitting resistance—a conflict of centuries engendering equally long-lived hate.

The difference of religion began to intensify the antagonism of races, just when it might otherwise have been expected to cease, and penal laws kept up the irritation that the endless wars of former ages had created. Again, those penal laws had not yet been quite abolished when the modern antagonism of classes came into existence, and the Irish peasant, who hated his landlord as an alien and a heretic, began to hate him as a proprietor. In a word, the hostility of races must be multiplied by that of religions, and their product again multiplied by the agrarian enmity, if we would understand the relations of landlord and tenant in Ireland.

This statement is only a part of the truth, but it is so far accurate that we are constrained to admit that no legislative reforms can immediately and altogether remove the chronic disaffection of the Irish peasantry. When the causes have been at work for centuries, the hand of time is also wanting to undo the effects. But here is the question that we should ask ourselves in solemn earnestness—Are the wars, the confiscations, the religious intolerance of former days only present in their effects, and in the temper they have created, or are they continued in principle, however modified, by our present treatment of Ireland?

So far as the answer to this question concerns religious ascendancy, it has been left in abeyance for the present; but, with respect to the economical side of the question, we must confess our persuasion that rack-renting and insecurity of tenure combined, but especially the latter, have perpetuated to the present day the disturbing influences of confiscation and conquest. The conditions of tenure are such as to paralyse all tendency to industry, order, and manly self-reliance, and to make the masses feel themselves treated as a conquered and distrusted people. Driven from penal laws and legal disabilities, the instinct of absolutism in the dominant race still exhibits itself in the coercive power that lies in the legal ownership of the soil.

We once believed, as many Irish landlords, including their eloquent spokesman, Lord Dufferin, still do, that the pertinacious commercial jealousy with which, for more than two hundred years, the English Parliament stopped up every vent by which the industry of Ireland could breathe, was the main cause of her present inferiority and suffering. Of course, such a policy, and so long continued, was as injurious as it was ungenerous, tending to shut up the population to agriculture as its sole means of subsistence, making land artificially dear and man too cheap. But the injury done by this shortsighted and selfish legislation is evidently overrated by the Irish landlords, for all restrictions upon Irish trade and manufactures have ceased for nearly a century; they were removed earlier than the religious disabilities, while nearly the old poverty and more than the old discontent remains. Again, other industries, silks, tabinets, hosiery, Limerick lace, and gloves, etc., have both flourished and declined during the interval, so that their fall cannot be laid at the door of the British House of Commons.

The fact is, that the commercial wrongs inflicted by England upon Ireland, up to their suppression in 1782, were directly felt by the Protestant population only. The Roman Catholics formed no part of the nation with which history concerns itself. They were excluded from admission to any trading guilds in cities or towns, and no man could follow a handicraft in city or town who was not free of a guild. "It became a fixed principle of policy," says Mr. Cæsar Otway in a report on the condition of the hand-loom weavers issued in 1840, "to exclude the native Irish from the benefit of all the improved arts introduced by the new settlers. . . . The hand-loom weavers, the wool-combers, the clothiers, the dyers, the whitesmiths, and even the mariners, in the south of Ireland, were so exclusively Protestant that they would not allow a Roman Catholic apprentice to be received in any of their trades."

The most important of the manufactures discountenanced by the English Parliament was that of woollens, but the Act of William III. did not interfere with the right of the Irish people to manufacture woollen fabrics for themselves, it only prohibited their exportation. Had there been an independent peasantry, or wealthy middle class, the manufacture would have been maintained to a certain extent by the home demand, but the wretchedness of the people prevented the existence of a domestic market. Nay, it is even probable, as Mr. Butt suggests, that the decline of the woollen manu-

facture hindered the Irish poor from being driven altogether to despair, for in Bishop Berkeley's time the south were but too ready to depopulate their estates, and turn them into vast sheep-walks.

The linen trade was not always confined to Ulster. When Arthur Young visited Ireland the landlords of various districts in the other three provinces had exerted themselves to introduce it, and, for a time, with success. But it was vain to imagine that manufactures could permanently flourish where the mass of the people were impoverished. In Ulster itself the greater part of the capital employed in the linen manufacture has been derived from the accumulated savings of farmers with small holdings, but in which they feel they have an interest of their own. "Until the relations between landlord and occupant are altered, there can be no accumulations in the South of Ireland from agricultural industry—hence there can be no spontaneous growth of manufactures from small capitals." It was before any agitation on the subject of tenant right existed that Mr. Otway wrote these pregnant words.

Over-population is the next great explanation of all the ills given by Lord Dufferin and the class whose opinions he represents. Now, the population of Ireland was one million in 1695, and eight millions in 1841, and according to all appearances it was quite as wretched at the former period as at the latter. When misery and discontent remain the same through so great a range in the numbers of the population, their true cause must be sought elsewhere. In 1841, the population of Armagh was 387 to the square mile of arable ground; that of Down, 317; and the peasantry in both were well fed, comfortably clothed and lodged; at the same time Tipperary had but 146, and Cork 148 inhabitants to the square mile of a soil naturally far more fertile. Mr. Blackie calculated that if the whole island were cultivated and peopled like Armagh, it should contain more than 17,800,000 souls, that is to say, more than three times the present population. And yet Armagh exported pork, butter, and grain in large quantities. After the evidence of such facts, the idea of over-population, however generally entertained, must be given up as untenable. It was not over-population that made Ireland the despair of statesmen in Spenser's time, but he wrote, "The landlords there most shamefully rack their tenants." Nor was over-population the evil when Bishop Berkeley asked "whether we are not in fact the only people who may be said to starve in the midst of plenty?"

Neither can it be pretended that there was any surplus population in 1727, when Dean Swift wrote, "The rise of our rents is squeezed out of the very blood, and vitals, and clothes, and dwellings of the tenants, who live worse than English beggars." The population was only four millions in 1787, when Mr. Fitzgibbon (afterwards Lord Clare), being the Irish Attorney-General, speaking in the Irish House of Commons to Irish country gentlemen, said, "I am well acquainted with the province of Munster, and I know that it is impossible for human wretchedness to exceed that of the miserable peasantry of that province. I know that the unhappy tenantry are ground to powder by relentless landlords. . . . The poor people of Munster live in a more abject state of poverty than human nature can be supposed able to bear; their miseries are intolerable."

We are not so unjust as to forget that an immense change for the better has taken place in the feelings and habits of Irish landlords, and that Lord Clare's language, if applied to the present generation in Munster, would be a great exaggeration. We are only arguing against the mischievous fiction that a superabundant population exists in Ireland and is enough to explain its state. We contend on the contrary that in this as in every other country the condition of the agricultural population is more nearly affected by the condition of the purchase and tenure of land than by any other single cause whatever. Ulster is the most peopled part of Ireland, and Ulster is not the less contented, prosperous, and loyal. It is the one province from which the people are not emigrating in crowds. Here we are directly at issue with Lord Dufferin. His statistics, which the *Times* pronounced unanswerable, are altogether misleading, and have been triumphantly refuted by Mr. Dalton and Mr. Butt. His lordship, in making his calculation, left out of account the relative proportion of the population of Ulster to that of the rest of Ireland! We cannot transcribe the whole argument, but here are some of the most salient points:—The 1,500,000 inhabitants of Munster furnished 85,000 emigrants during the two years 1864 and 1865; the 1,900,000 inhabitants of Ulster furnished 41,000, that is to say, the emigration of Munster was nearly 6 per cent., that of Ulster a little over 2. Again, between 1851 and 1861, the population of all Ireland diminished 11½ per cent., that of Ulster but 4. These figures are rendered more striking by the fact that emigration from Ulster is essentially a healthy and natural one; that of enterprising individuals, ambitious to further themselves in

life; that of the other provinces is the departure of whole families, an exodus, the upheaval of the inhabitants from the land. Between the years 1851 and 1861 Ireland lost 76,000 families; of these but 3,600 went from Ulster, and it is to be remembered that there are large districts of Ulster inhabited by Roman Catholics, and where the custom of tenant right does not exist.

Lord Dufferin is doubtless right in his statement that a comparatively small number of emigrants have been persons recently evicted, and it is probable that no considerable percentage of the emigrants were occupiers of land up to the moment of their departure. The Irishman clings to land while he can keep possession of it. Many of the small farmers whose holdings have been swept away were turned into labourers before they thought of emigrating, and many more unable to do so are thrown as paupers on the poor-rates of the towns and cities. The passion for emigration is not confined to individual sufferers; it has seized upon all classes, because as a people they feel they have not fair play under the present land laws, and have begun to despair of a change. The confession of Lord Lifford, in his letter to Mr. Butt, notwithstanding its qualifying clause, is conclusive on this point:—

"Want of employment places those who do not emigrate entirely in the power of the landlord and landowners to make what terms the latter please as the conditions of a bare subsistence.

"The occasional misuse of that power, and the knowledge of the tenant that it exists (coupled with false notions of Irish social history, and continual tamperings in Parliament with the rights of property), perpetuate chronic civil war."

Mr. Gregory, writing in answer to a pamphlet by an Irish peer, says:—

"Many men of experience and large property in Ireland, some of them members of your House, have long felt that the real cause of discontent among the Irish peasantry has arisen, not from occasional cases of hardship proceeding from the tenant being deprived of the value conferred on land by his improvements, but by reason of the uncertain tenure which prevails in Ireland. We cannot find such a tenure to be the rule in any civilised country in the world."

Let it be remembered that to evict a tenant in Ireland is, in nine cases out of ten, to reduce him to the alternative of beggary or emigration. It is upon his own farm only, for the most part, that the Irishman of the lower order can work for

his own or his children's bread; so that the man who holds over his tenants a power of arbitrary eviction, holds in his hands their comfort, their prosperity, almost their very existence. It is not a mere abstract right, it is a cause of terror constantly hanging over the occupier, and ever present, at least as a possibility, to his mind.

Of course the bitter, crushing sense of insecurity in the minds of the occupiers, is not to be measured by the actual instances of particular injustice and oppression which occasionally happen. It is enough, as Lord Lifford intimates, that the peasant feels he is at the mercy of a power which may be misused to any extent its possessor likes. Even in slavery cases of extreme cruelty towards negroes were rare, but they were always *possible*, and it was this made the iron enter into the soul of the slave. The abuse, however, is common enough; every day sordid and unprincipled landlords seize on the property which the industry of their tenants has created. Good landlords suffer a considerable margin to exist between the actual value and the rent paid, but others lose no opportunity of forcing the rents to the highest amount that circumstances permit; Mr. Marcus Keane, himself a landlord in Clare, and agent to the Marquis of Conyngham, bears witness that, in one way or other, "the rentals of Ireland are steadily following the improvements of the tenants."

When the Irish poor-law was made in 1839, the Tory landlords protested against it as an invasion of the rights of property, and then followed evictions upon a large scale in order to avoid the danger of heavy rates. When the famine followed, and rates of from eight to fourteen shillings in the pound were staring landowners and middlemen in the face, the work of depopulation increased in a frightful proportion. Estates were cleared, as it was called, houses levelled,—hovels it may be, but they were of the poor creatures' own building. The old, the indigent, the infirm, were driven into the towns to linger out a miserable existence; the young and healthy went to England and Scotland at first; until the despair of a whole people found vent in the tide of emigration that has ever since been pouring its hundreds of thousands into America. "There were landlords," writes Mr. Butt, "ay, many landlords in Ireland, who nobly struggled to aid and support their tenantry in the sore visitation with which it pleased God to visit the land. But it is vain to deny it, there were whole districts of Ireland where extermination was the rule." In 1849 Lord Derby complained in the House of Lords that a neighbouring proprietor had evicted no less than 349

persons, who came and settled on his lordship's estate. Even the Act for the Sale of Encumbered Estates, which has confessedly wrought so much good, has been made use of to drive the people from their homes; for it is notorious that the ordinary modes by which *farmer* purchasers under the Commission succeed in getting the land into their own hands, is to induce the occupying tenants to contract for it at a large rack-rent, and then eject them for non-payment of rent, which is a readier and less expensive legal process than ejection on title. There are also cases in which a purchaser by private contract insists upon the estate being cleared of human habitations before he takes possession of it. The Tullamore Spring Assizes of March, 1865, revealed one such case, in which thirteen houses were levelled, and industrious tenants who could some of them tell of substantial improvements, and produce receipts for every gale of rent for the last twenty years, were driven into vagrancy merely to facilitate the sale of the property.

On account of the consolidation of farms which has already taken place, evictions are much less frequent than they used to be from 1845 to 1860; and yet even between 1860 and 1866, there were 37,164, representing, at the rate of five to a household, 185,000 persons of all ages and sizes, driven from their homes. When one has tried to realise the amount of human suffering suggested by these figures, it is difficult to find words to characterise the heartless flippancy of the *Saturday Review*, as it took occasion, from Lord Dufferin's statistics, to say they would henceforth remove from the mind's-eye the disagreeable picture of Irish Auburns, with their smoking ruins, "from which the extirpated peasants are picking their melancholy way, in rags and destitution, with many a melancholy look behind."

It is idle to look any further for the causes of Irish idleness, recklessness, and improvidence. We have trained them to it. "The want of security that he will enjoy the fruits of his industry is calculated to take away from the occupier every incentive to prudence and to thrift." It hinders his learning to devote his energies to the production of remote results, instead of present enjoyment. By keeping him without security for his industry and his home, we foster, says Mr. Butt, all the vices of servility and cunning, of treachery and revenge, —"the servility in which even manly spirits are compelled by hard necessity to cringe to power—the cunning by which our nature teaches weakness to evade and cheat the oppression in which might tramples upon right; the treachery and

violence by which outraged humanity often vindicates itself in the 'wild justice,' or, it may be, injustice of revenge." *

Fenianism has only manifested the feelings which had always been in the heart of people, a discontent rooted in the minds of multitudes who have never thought of becoming professed Fenians. The disturbances ever recurring in Ireland under constantly changing names, have been the several phases of an indestructible civil war maintained against the real or supposed tyranny of landlords. The *Levellers* of Tipperary in 1760 complained of the turning of arable land into sheep-walks, and of the enclosure of the commons upon which pasture for their cattle had been promised them, while they paid exorbitant rents for their holdings. They were followed by the *Whiteboys* through all the South. A little later, the *Hearts of Oak* and *Hearts of Steel* convulsed the North. This last disturbance originated in an attempt to enforce exorbitant renewal-fines on the estate of the Marquis of Donegal. It was essentially a movement of the lower class of Protestants, and it was practically successful, because neither in Antrim, nor in Dublin, when the venue was changed, could Protestant juries be induced to convict Protestant insurgents.† This is noteworthy, and, notwithstanding the enthusiastic loyalty of the Protestants of Ulster, we find competent authorities telling the Down Commission, in 1845, that any serious attempt to curtail tenant-right would endanger the peace of the country. "You would have a Tipperary in Down," said the agent of the Marquis of Londonderry. If, said Mr. Handcock, Lord Lurgan's agent, "if systematic efforts were made amongst the proprietors of Ulster to invade tenant-right, I do not believe there is a force at the disposal of the Horse Guards sufficient to keep the peace of the province."

The Right-boys of Munster, the Ribbon-men, Rockites and Terry Alts each in their turn made convulsive efforts to renew the old feud. In 1822, Lord Glenelg, then Mr. Grant, directed the attention of the House of Commons to the unvarying

* Of a peasantry shut out from all hopes of bettering themselves, Dr. Rigg exclaims—"No more cleaving curse, nor one that eats its way more deeply and ruinously into the moral stamina and character of a race than this can be conceived. A race of labourers so shut out cannot be expected to be self-reliant, and hopeful, or provident, or temperate. Such men, of course, must be pauperised."

† So much discontent, however, survived the struggle, that, according to Gordon's *History of Ireland*, many thousand Ulster Protestants emigrated to the American settlements, where they soon appeared in arms against the British Government.

character of the series of commotions which had for sixty years tormented and desolated Ireland.

"The complaints respecting the causes of these calamities are, through this long period, nearly echoes of each other. In truth, they all spring immediately from local oppressions, and were diffused and propagated by the operation of the same peculiar circumstances in the character and condition of the people of Ireland. They were all, in succession, quelled; but as yet no effort has been made by the Legislature to effect a permanent and satisfactory cure. This very fact, however—I mean the continued recurrence of such events—is itself a proof that there must be something diseased in the system. In every country local oppression may take place, and local commotions may follow; but the question that naturally suggests itself with respect to Ireland is this—How does it happen that a local commotion becomes so rapidly a general disturbance? How does it happen that the spirit, which at first discovers itself in a small district, spreads almost instantaneously over a large territory, and throws, in a very short time, nearly half a province into the most frightful convulsions? This is the peculiarity of the subject. What is the state of society that admits of such an evil?"

Forty-six years have elapsed since this speech was delivered, and no effort has yet been made by the Legislature to effect the permanent and satisfactory cure, for which Lord Glenelg appealed to it with so much good sense and true patriotism. Such a measure is really more wanted now than ever it was in 1822, though a superficial observer might not so judge. Many of the minor evils in the state of Ireland have been diminished through the effect of emigration, and of the growing intelligence of the people; the monster evil of insecurity and consequent discontent has prodigiously increased. This requires explanation.

The social and economical state of the sister island has not, during its modern history, presented exactly the monotonous dead level of misery and mendicity which the reader may suppose. The various notes in the gamut of wretchedness have been heard in turn. The barometer, constantly low, has had its oscillations, and did actually once rise to "changeable." It was in 1782, when the attitude of the armed Protestant volunteers wrung from Government the final removal of all restrictions upon Irish trade and manufactures; and the independence of the Irish Protestant Parliament. At that time the population was slightly under four millions; the promises of agricultural improvement were perhaps as great as they are now; cottier tenants were in the

state of suffering described by Lord Clare, but a considerable part of the country was held in tolerably large farms by Protestant tenants with a lease for three lives, or by Roman Catholics with a lease for thirty-one years. There was a want of sympathy between the landlord and the Catholic occupier, and a want of education in the latter, but there reigned among the better class of farmers a sort of rude abundance; bread, meat, and the best ale were their ordinary fare; while side by side with them there lived a lower class in a condition of extreme wretchedness. It was an hour of enthusiasm; several kinds of manufacture advanced for a few years with a rapidity seldom surpassed in any country; and the Irish House of Commons generously took the first step towards the political emancipation of the Catholics, by restoring to them the election franchise in 1793.

These budding hopes of fair prosperity were strangely and sadly destroyed by the very circumstances which had called them into existence. The certainty of finding a market in England for Irish produce, made the letting of land in small portions for tillage become the favourite mode of drawing the largest and easiest profits from it. The poorer Catholic peasantry, unused to comfort or independence, outbid the Protestants for these newly subdivided holdings. The landlords in their blind cupidity, says Goldwin Smith, "caught at the advance in rent, and they moreover, like the degenerate English of the Pale in former times, preferred Catholic serfs to Protestant tenants." Sir Lawrence Parsons, in the Irish House of Commons, on the 18th of February, 1793, asserted as facts with which its members were familiar, that within five or six years land had increased in value by one-fourth, and that there had been a still greater increase of tillage. "Those large farms which a few years ago were all in pasture ground, each occupied by a single Protestant farmer, are now broken into several patches, tenanted for the most part by Catholic husbandmen, so that seven or eight Catholics hold the ground at present which one Protestant held formerly." The process soon converted Ireland from a grain-importing to a grain-exporting country.

The gift of the franchise to Roman Catholics increased the evil. The creation of forty-shilling freeholders was carried to an almost incredible extent upon some estates, for the sake of political influence; while the French Revolution, the aspirations it excited, the outbreak of ninety-eight, the cruelty with which it was repressed—all contributed to estrange yet further the two races who were living in each other's presence on the

Irish soil. The enormous rise of prices during the long war with the French Empire brought about a momentary fictitious prosperity, at least for landlords and middlemen. Rent increased three-fold, and property was laden with debts and encumbrances out of all proportion with its true value, preparing all too surely pauper tenants, and bankrupt proprietors, and years of apparently hopeless distress when peace should have brought about the collapse of prices.

Such was the state of things when O'Connell's agitation wrung from an unwilling Government the withdrawal of the remaining political disabilities; and, for some years after 1829, the peasantry of the three southern provinces invariably voted with the priests and against their landlords. The result was a determination on the part of the latter to grant no more leases, in order that they might regain their political influence. Then came the poor law, the famine, and the clearing of properties. If the evils of excessive subdivision were great when connected with the exclusive cultivation of the potato, with slovenly husbandry, and with the absence of manufactures, it was too generally forgotten that this disastrous system of subdivision had been fostered by the levity or cupidity of the landlord class sixty years before. Such numbers were evicted for non-payment of rent, that holding by lease became a thing of the past, and the constituencies were found to be contemptibly small. This served as an excuse for the Act which made a £10 valuation in occupation a qualification for a vote, instead of a freehold for a life or lives as formerly. This extension of the right of voting to tenants from year to year was a new principle in British legislation. It gave political rights to men who were not in a position to exercise them independently; it was a legislative trick, mocking with the prerogatives of freemen those who were in fact given over as voting machines into their landlords' control.

Nor was this all. The ejectment code—of which Chief Justice Pennefather declared from the bench that it was a code made solely for the benefit of the landlord and against the interest of the tenant, and that judges must administer and interpret it upon this principle,—the ejectment code was improved, and the landlords acquired the new and important power of bringing ejectments for non-payment of rent against tenants from year to year. Before 1851, as is still the case in England, if the tenant had no lease he could only be dispossessed by a notice to quit and then an ejectment upon

title. That is to say, from 1851 on, things were so arranged that the landlord had the same facilities and advantages as if the tenant had a lease, without being obliged to give him one. The landlord had a vote at his disposal, a new screw expressly made to be used upon the refractory; the tenant had no security.

At the same time the Irish peasantry were educated, not merely better taught than their fathers, but better taught by far than English agricultural labourers. This made them feel their helplessness—the folly and uselessness of agrarian crime; and so, where former generations would have broken out in bloody and desperate insurrection, they now fold their arms and leave the country in sullen despair, shaking the dust from their feet, and carrying to the ends of the world an undying hatred of the English name. They hear us talk of the blessings of the British Constitution; to them it has exhibited itself as the mother of insecurity, degradation, and despair. As Mr. Mill says, it is a form of disaffection which does not demand to be better governed, which asks for no benefit, no redress of grievances, but would tell us simply, if it had the power, to take ourselves off and rid the country of our presence; and, because the disaffected have not the power, they take themselves off. The landlord and the British Crown are associated in their minds, and if the power of England were withdrawn or paralysed by any conjunction of circumstances, there would be a civil war of mutual extermination before a week was over.

Government has become mild and just as far as it has known how; every invidious distinction has been abolished; Government patronage is more liberally distributed to Roman Catholics than among Protestants. The pressure of overwhelming misery has been relieved; the civilising agency of education has been most largely and successfully introduced; and, as Mr. Gladstone says, no sooner is the sharp sting of want removed or rendered less pungent, than the Irish people by their immunity from ordinary vice and crime attract the admiration of this country. The upper classes devote themselves as they never did before to improve the condition and character of the people; they may be fairly said upon the whole to acquit themselves of all the duties of property except the most important of all—that of making the occupiers independent. Wages have risen, not indeed to the extent Lord Dufferin pretended, when in his polemical zeal he asserted that they had advanced to twelve or fifteen shillings a week. His lordship has confessed in the *Daily News* that at the

moment he made that assertion in the *Times* he was himself giving eight or nine shillings a week! But wages have really doubled within twenty years; and, notwithstanding the strangely conflicting evidence of agricultural statistics, from which pamphleteers and parliamentary orators can extract *yes* and *no* to any extent they please, it is certain that rents are rapidly rising and yet punctually paid, and that distraining is seldom resorted to.

And, with all these favourable circumstances, the mass of the Irish people are only the more discontented at the condition of dependence in which they are held by the want of title to their holdings. Mr. Gladstone gave the solution of the enigma when he said "education has taught them the significance of their political condition." It is a fearful symptom when a people's advance in prosperity and intelligence only arms them against the governing powers. Mr. Disraeli exclaimed in one of the late debates, "The Ireland of to-day is not the Ireland with respect to which the Devon Commission made recommendations,—that was before the flood." Yes, the discontent of to-day is more rooted, more intelligent, and more dangerous than that of 1845. If the Down Commission reported in favour of security of tenure then, the necessity is far more urgent and imperative to-day.

The state of the French peasantry is often appealed to as a practical evidence of the ill effects of the breaking up of a territory into small holdings. It certainly is a condition anything but desirable; yet it must be remembered that their state was worse beyond all comparison previous to the Revolution, and that the possession of property has changed a volatile people into one of the most conservative. The real plague of French agriculture is not the smallness of the holdings, but the arbitrary division of every inheritance by law, cutting them into infinitesimal parts, often at a considerable distance from each other, and from the owner's dwelling. Extensive farms enable the agriculturist to avail himself more largely of mechanical appliances, and to live through bad years with less danger of insolvency. Small holdings enable human industry to turn to the best account every hour of time and every square yard of ground; the same surface is confessedly twice as productive as it would be on the other system, and it attaches the children of toil to their country. We have seen and envied for the Irish poor the comfort, order, cleanliness, and independence of the Swiss peasant upon the little spot which he is never weary

of upturning. He frequently owes some capitalist in the neighbourhood the greater part of the purchase-money, and the interest is a rent paid to the day; but he calls the little corner nestling under the rock his own, and labours to pay off the mortgage. Flanders possesses a soil far less fertile than that of Ireland, and a climate, like the Irish, more favourable to grass and green crops than to cereals. According to M. Leonce de Lavergne, the fee simple of the uncultivated acre of sand sells for about *5l.*, and the same acre sells for *50l.* when it has been for some time under the kindly culture of an owner and his family; there is no manure like the owner's foot. In East Flanders, which is about half the size of Cork County, 750,000 acres are divided among 155,000 peasant proprietors, being an average of less than five acres to a family, while about an equal surface is distributed in larger farms, some cultivated by the owners and some by tenants. There are no manufactures in this part of Belgium, farms are much larger, and practical husbandry somewhat inferior in the manufacturing districts; but it is these small holdings of East Flanders which have demonstrated what the ownership of the land by the people can produce even upon a soil little favoured by nature.

We have not to do with the question of the comparative advantages and disadvantages of large or small farms, except in so far as it is well to resist the prevailing prejudice against the latter. We have not to speculate upon the best way of employing human labour in a new country where the population is not yet distributed. We have before us a country in certain given circumstances. Great part of the land is laid out in large grazing farms, and will remain so because of the climate, and because of the nearness of a large market for the produce of grazing and dairy farms. Another great part is in the hands of about five hundred and fifty thousand occupiers, holding farms, generally small, and comprising, with their families, three-fourths of the rural population, not a minority merely, as the *Times* sometimes takes for granted when discussing this question. These people are comparatively educated; they cannot help improving the land, and bettering their own condition to a certain extent; but, compared with what they are capable of doing, and what is done among themselves in the tenant-right district, they are living in idleness and poverty; they prefer putting their money in the savings-bank to spending it upon the land, and the feeling of discontent is bitter, ay,

deadly. We ask if there is no way to help them to become orderly, prosperous, and loyal.

Lord Dufferin, Lord Rosse, and the majority of the Irish landlords answer that there is none, that is to say, none except the agencies at present in operation. The consolidation of farms must go on until it shall be found to have reached its proper limits; emigration must, therefore, continue, though at a diminishing rate; landlords must retain their present power of eviction at will in order "to facilitate the transference of farms from the impoverished agriculturist to the man of energy and capital," and to rid themselves of either troublesome, unskilful, or insolvent tenants. "One of the landlord's most important duties," writes Lord Dufferin, "is that of insuring the consummate cultivation of his estate; and to hold him up to obloquy because he makes a point of weeding his property of men whose want of energy, or skill, or capital renders them incapable of doing their duty by their farms, and replacing them by more suitable tenants, is hardly reasonable."

The picturesque expression *weeding* would be a very happy one, if its truthfulness did not make it the most unhappy possible, for weeds are thrown over the hedge to wither and die. Was the land made for man, we ask, or man for the land? Is the banishment of another large division of the Irish people to be carried to completion, that landlords may look upon trim hedge-rows and sleek cattle? The old savage cry—"To hell or Connaught!" has been softened down to "America or starvation." But we doubt whether the modern alternative be not as exasperating to the deepest susceptibilities of a passionate people as its equivalent of old. The fact is, there are two ways possible of improving the land: it can be done *with* the people, and it can be done to a certain extent *without* the people, or rather with a minority of them. The landlords, sustained by the *Times*, maintain that the latter alternative alone is feasible, and reason as if the right and the desire of the Irish people to live upon their native soil were not to be taken into account at all. We believe, on the contrary, that the State is under obligation to adopt the former alternative. We believe that the landowners and the occupiers alike should have their interests and feelings considered by the Government which claims their allegiance; to speak with Edmund Burke, "Every man has a right to all that society, with all its combinations of skill and capital, can do in his favour."

We have included Dr. Rigg's *Essays for the Times* among

the authorities at the head of this article, because of two admirable papers, that on "Pauperism, Land-tenure, and the Clergy," and again, that on "The Origin, Causes, and Cure of Pauperism," which last appeared in the columns of this *Review* ten years ago, and attracted much attention at the time. Dr. Rigg had to do properly with English pauperism, but he took occasion to make a most graphic description (pp. 408—11) of the points of resemblance and contrast between the English agricultural labourer of the South and the Irishman. His argument, moreover, throughout both papers will be found constantly sustaining the position we take. Which, he asks—

"Is the most valuable crop to the nation, turnips or peasants? If, to cultivate land high, the peasantry, instead of being cultured, must be debased, is it worth a patriot's or a Christian's while to insist upon high-farming? The nation, and in particular the landowners, have a duty to perform—a duty of stewardship—on behalf of their fellowmen, their brethren, their countrymen. *They* are the nation's farm, and this farm should be cultivated well and highly. That this may be done, and yet the land be loaded with the very heaviest crops, I am optimist enough honestly to believe. But, doubtless, there are two ways of doing it. . . .

"We ought never to forget the principle which has already been laid down, that the labouring population of England are pre-eminently the people of England. For their benefit, more than for that of any other class—if classes are ever to be separately regarded—should the Government be carried on and the laws be made."

It is hardly necessary to say that we advocate no undue interference with the rights of property. Mr. Mill's proposal to put landlords off with a fixed rent-charge is partial confiscation, for it would arbitrarily deprive the landlord of his interest in the future management of the land, and in its future increased value. No government would be justified in venturing upon such an interference with individual rights, unless in some extremity, such as to put the very existence of the nation in peril. In the present instance it would be positively injurious; landlords changed into mere mortgagees would take no further interest in their property. Such a measure would drive out of the island all the cultivated classes, leaving behind them a body of occupiers bent upon revolution, because they would see in the British Government the only obstacle to their enjoyment of unencumbered proprietorship.

But practical fixity of tenure can be found without going to such lengths or incurring such danger. With our strong feeling of the difficulties of the Irish land question, and of

the responsibility of those who attempt to treat it, we felt really relieved upon meeting Mr. Marcus Keane's suggestions for legislation upon it. Mr. Disraeli said in Parliament twenty-four years ago, that what Ireland wanted was "the effecting by policy those changes which a revolution would effect by force." It seems to us that Mr. Keane has lit upon the political philosopher's stone; the true way of effecting this radical though peaceful revolution, to the gain of all classes and the loss of none. Such is the ingenuity, the comprehensiveness, and the fairness of the scheme, that it must be transcribed at length.

"1st. All towns, villages, and Parliamentary boroughs to be exempt from this Act; also all premises whereof the value of buildings and pleasure-grounds shall constitute one-half of the value of said premises, such being detached from any holding of the same tenant occupied under Parliamentary lease under the same landlord.

"2nd. The claim for occupation-right by every tenant who has been a resident occupier for the preceding ten years to be recognised as a legal claim, payable by the landlord or other party, on his taking possession of premises under any power of entry or re-entry; but not payable in cases of voluntary surrender.

"3rd. Such compensation to be calculated on a sliding scale—the larger proportion of compensation to be payable in the smaller class of holding, viz.—

"At or under £14 yearly rent, compensation to be equal to *five* years' rent.

"At or under £30, to be equal to *four* years' rent.

"At or under £50, to be equal to *three* years' rent.

"The sliding scale is recommended because the compensation is intended, not only to reimburse probable or assumed improvements, but also to relieve the distress of the family evicted; and it should be payable to the outgoing tenant himself, and not liable to be impounded by creditors. The tenant might claim to be assured at a less rent, if it would produce a larger amount of compensation. Thus, for example, if his rent were £16, he would come under the class of tenants at or under £30, and, as such, be entitled to only four years' rent as compensation, £64; but he might claim to be assured at £14 rent, by which he would be entitled to £70. All rent and arrears to the gale-day preceding the date of eviction to be deducted from such compensation.

"4th. All tenancies not included under exemption clause to be comprised, for the purpose of this Act, under three clauses:—

"First.—Leases in perpetuity.

"Second.—Parliamentary leases.

"Third.—Leases for a less term than a Parliamentary lease, and tenancies from year to year.

"5th. Parliamentary leases to be for *thirty* years, with the obligation on the landlord to pay all rates and taxes after the expiration of *twenty* years, if the lease be not then renewed; also to allow the legal compensation for occupation-right by a *pro ratâ* deduction from each of the last ten years' rent. For example—if the tenant's rent were £14, he would be entitled to compensation equal to five years' rent, which the landlord should allow by accepting half a year's rent as payment of each of the last ten years' rent, the premises being kept in substantial or tenantable repair; but if the landlord were willing to renew in reversion at the original rent, or at any higher rent that the tenant might propose, rates, taxes, and rents to continue as in the case of the first twenty years. Such a measure would force a new contract in reversion at the end of twenty years, or operate as a ten years' notice to quit to the tenant.

"6th. All tenancies of the third class, at any rent, to be subject to a tax payable to the State, in the form of a stamp duty of *ten per cent.* on all receipts for money payable under such contracts.

"7th. Stringent covenants might be introduced into Parliamentary leases against waste or improper usage.

"8th. Every such lease should contain covenants against sub-letting, whether by the will of the tenant, or as the result of law-proceedings for the recovery of debt. All 'middle-man' interests would thus be guarded against, and the occupying tenant would always enjoy all the benefit derivable from such lease.

"9th. Allotments for labourers employed on the premises should be permitted—suppose an acre for each.

"10th. A tenant should be permitted to sell or assign his interest accompanied with the possession; but to check such assignments, and to compensate the landlord for the loss he might sustain in the change of tenants, a penalty of *one year's rent* should be payable on each assignment.

"11th. As to rates and taxes; all such charges should be paid by the landlord on tenancies of the third class, or of terms less than a Parliamentary lease.

"12th. Half poor-rates and half county taxes to be paid by the tenant holding under a Parliamentary lease.

"13th. All rates and taxes to be borne by the tenant in cases of leases in perpetuity.

"14th. The provisions for such a bill for land improvements as was proposed by Lord Mayo (by Government lease repayable in thirty-five years) to be available either to landlords, or to tenants holding under Parliamentary leases, but not to tenants of the third class.

"15th. Authority to be given to either landlord or tenant to sever from a Parliamentary lease any portion of the premises which might be desirable for improvement, such as mill-sites or villa-sites. In every such case double the agricultural or present value should be allowed, the option of accepting and himself using such severed portion being given to the opposite party to the one naming the price. For instance,

if a tenant holding under a Parliamentary lease desired to erect a corn-mill, and for the purpose required two acres of his own farm to be separated, he might name as rent any price he pleased over double the existing agricultural value, in addition to the value of any damage sustained by severance. The landlord should be bound either to convert the two acres into a perpetuity at the increased rent, or should have the option of taking up the same from the tenant for his (the landlord's) own use, allowing the tenant the amount of such increased rent out of the rent reserved. In like manner, the landlord should have power to take land for such purposes of improvement, and to name the increased value which he might be willing to allow, giving the tenant the option of retaining it, subject, as aforesaid, to the increased rent in perpetuity."

Such a scheme as this, if carried into law, would be no measure of universal and inexorable constraint, but would simply make it the landlord's interest to grant parliamentary leases and to renew them at the expiration of twenty years. It leaves him the final control of his property. It allows him to rid himself of a tenant if his desire to do so is strong enough to determine a pecuniary sacrifice. It protects his reversionary interest, at the expiration of the lease, in that increase of value which arises from the diminished value of money in relation to land. The rent he receives is no fixed money charge; it will increase with the altered value of money. Finally, it allows him to make his own bargain with the tenant. Mr. Keane totally eschews the use of public valuations as a means of settling the relations between owner and occupier. He knows the popular pressure that would be exercised in the appointment of valuators in the first instance, and in the next upon their proceedings after appointment. Of the two evils, he prefers the *chance* of the tenant's being made to pay a rent somewhat too high to the *certainty* of the landlord's being "valued" out of the greater part of his interest in his property.

On the other hand, this scheme protects the tenant from decided rack-renting; for, the higher the rent, the higher the compensation in case of ejectment for non-payment of rent. If a landlord, for instance, wished to double the rent of a tenant who had been already in possession upon moderate terms for more than ten years, the tenant might acquiesce—not with any intention of paying, but to make himself entitled to *double* compensation. Again, the tenant might agree to pay a rent somewhat above the value, and continue to pay it during favourable years; but when a few bad seasons came round in succession, as is often the case, then the owner

himself would share with the occupier, and have the largest share of the losses following from the over-valuation of the land.

The occupier would have, to a considerable extent, the advantages of the peasant proprietor, without owing them to any legal spoliation or robbery. The fruit of his labour would certainly be his own for the term of thirty years, and probably be reaped by his family for generations. He would have a real interest in the soil, and be paid for it if forced to leave. Not only would improved cultivation and gladdened industry change the face of the country, but the disposition of classes towards each other, and of the masses towards the British Government, would be soon transformed. The combination proposed in the fifteenth suggestion would remove one great obstacle to improvement which now exists in every part of Ireland, and afford facilities for the benefit of the community, of which either landlords or tenants might avail themselves without hindrance to either from the other class.

By the absolute prohibition of subdivision, this measure would leave no room for Earl Russell's picture of the small occupier peopling his few acres with numerous "sons, sons-in-law, and brothers-in-law," the old evils and old miseries, "a wretched tenantry, low wages, ragged clothing, and precarious subsistence," reappearing in all their deformity. It does not proceed upon the supposition that the Irish people are orderly and industrious now, but it would make them so; for it is fallacious to argue from the failings of a serf, who has no fair stimulant to industry, to what would occur when he has been elevated to the position of an independent and, therefore, industrious tenant.

Mr. Keane takes nothing from recognised proprietors' rights except the power of arbitrary eviction—that is to say, nothing except what identifies them with former confiscations and conquest. Yet we are afraid his plan is not likely to be popular among Irish landlords. The reason unfortunately is, that proprietors and peasants are still in the state of chronic hostility towards each other in which conquest and confiscation left them. Individuals brought into actual contact may feel attached to each other; the really good resident landlord is loved and respected by his own tenants and neighbours; in his turn he appreciates them, and is devoted to their welfare. But even when the peasant makes an exception in favour of men personally known to him, he hates the landlord class, and the latter, as a class, fear and distrust him.

A characteristic instance of this distrust was brought to light by a petition which was presented to the House of Commons in the session of 1866. A number of tenants on an Irish estate who had long been in possession of their farms, and had expended money upon them, were served with a notice to quit, and as the condition of its abandonment were obliged to sign an agreement binding them to give up possession, if demanded, on the 7th of November in each year. If they held over after this demand, or violated any of the rules laid down in the agreement, they bound themselves for each month they did so to pay a ruinous penal rent. Mr. Lowe lately said in the House, it had never been his fate to hear a single case of grievance or ill-treatment of Irish tenants, with dates and circumstances so that it could be verified. It is to be feared the honourable gentleman's sense of hearing is not always very acute.

The Anglo-Saxon and Protestant section of the Irish population have been a garrison planted in the island to hold it on behalf of the English Crown, and the landowners have been the officers of the garrison. So far as the most indomitable vigour and courage, physical and moral, can go, they have done their duty nobly. Never have the imperial qualities of the English race been more heroically exhibited than by the defenders of Derry and the men of Enniskillen, and their like-minded kinsmen of each generation, who never counted their enemies, nor drew back from the post of danger, whatever the odds. Neither have they been a mere local militia; in proportion to their numbers they have contributed very largely to the list of the warriors, the statesmen, the orators, the men of letters who have made the English name illustrious. Almost all our great Irishmen have been of English lineage, including some whom the uninformed might suppose almost typically Celtic. Edmund Burke was a descendant of the Norman De Burgho.

However, in every country where a superior race is established as such, maintaining an arbitrary and forced ascendancy over a conquered race, all classes must suffer, though in different ways, from such an unnatural state of things. The conquerors themselves deteriorate in consequence of their contact with a degraded, reckless, poverty-stricken peasantry. Hence the extravagant and brutal habits of the Irish gentry in the eighteenth century, and the coarseness of their debauchery. "Their drunkenness, their blasphemy, their ferocious duelling left the squires of England far behind," and, as nothing is so rapacious as profusion, their very sensuality

and recklessness made them grind their poor tenants all the more to the dust.

The English garrison has so far been true to its trust that it has never allowed itself to be surprised or conquered; but it was also intended to conciliate the native Irish, to train up an orderly and loyal people, and it is in this respect that it has signally failed. Mr. Butt has established unanswerably that the present insecurity of tenure in Ireland is the result of the violation of a compact between the British Government and the planters from whom the modern landowners derive their titles—a compact always implied, and formally expressed in the case of the most important territorial distribution ever made in Ireland. And here we must say that if this great question be satisfactorily settled, the country will owe much to Mr. Butt's thorough investigation of this most important point.

In the *Orders and Conditions to be observed by the Undertakers upon the Distribution and Plantation of the Escheated Lands in Ulster*, printed in 1608, it is declared that his Majesty, "not regarding his own profit, but the public peace and welfare of this kingdom by a civil plantation of these unreformed and waste countries, is graciously pleased to distribute the said lands to such of his subjects, as well of Great Britain as of Ireland, as being of merit and ability shall seek the same with a mind not only to benefit themselves, but to do service to the Crown and Commonwealth."

The document proceeds—"The persons of the undertakers shall be of three sorts: first, English or Scotch, as well servitors as others, who are to plant their portions with English or inland Scotch inhabitants. Second, Servitors in the kingdom of Ireland, who may take more Irish, English, or inland Scottish tenants, at their choice. Third, Natives of Ireland, who are to be made freeholders."

Of the English and Scotch undertakers it is determined, "The said undertakers shall not demise any part of their lands at will only, but shall make certain estates for years, for life, in tail, or in fee simple."

Of the Irish servitors—grantees who had been in the service of the Crown, "They shall make certain estates to their tenants, and at certain rents, and forbear Irish exactions." And of the Irish natives, "They shall make certain estates for lives or years to their under-tenants, and shall take no Irish exactions." "In this manner," says Carte, in the *Life of Ormonde*, "and under these regulations were the escheated

lands in Ulster disposed of to a hundred and four English and Scotch undertakers, fifty-six servitors, and two hundred and eighty-six natives, all of which gave bond to the Government for performance of covenants; for the better assurance whereof, the King required a regular account to be sent him from the State, of the progress made by each undertaker on the plantation." Carte also expressly says the grantees were not to let their lands for a less term than twenty-one years, when they did not let them for three lives. In 1618, a royal commission was issued to one Nicholas Pynnar, directing him to visit the plantation, and report on the progress made on the several estates. His report or survey is extant in Harris's *Hibernica;* it shows that he felt the investigating the nature of the tenures granted by the landowners to be one of his principal duties.

James's grants were not confined to Ulster. They were made largely in Longford, Westmeath, Kildare, and Wicklow; and we have the authority of Sir John Davis, the then Attorney-General for Ireland, for the fact that the estates, both there and in Munster, were held on the same condition of giving fixity of tenure to the tenants. "Whereby the hearts of the people are settled not only to live in peace, but raised and encouraged to build, to plant, to give better education to their children, and to improve the commodities of their lands, whereby the yearly value thereof is already increased double of that it was within these few years, and is like daily to rise higher, till it amounts to the price of land in England."

King James's settlements were consequent upon the confiscations which had taken place in the reign of Elizabeth, and the subsequent grants of Cromwell were admittedly framed on the model of the Ulster plantation. In short, it may be safely asserted with Mr. Butt, that almost the whole island is now held under grants, which were, in fact, trusts for public purposes, for reclaiming hostile or unsettled districts to the service of the English sovereign, by placing upon them an independent and contented population. The undertakers were expressly bound not to establish the precarious tenure which has now become the rule, but to make farms in fee, and "estates" for their tenants.

There was no policy of extermination pursued towards the native Irish. Both Catholic landlords and Catholic tenants were permitted upon the greatest part of the escheated land. There was no compulsory proselytism, for the native Irish proprietors were exempted from taking the oath of supremacy.

Though a rebellion had just been quelled, the English Government provided for the right of the old inhabitants to live upon the soil. It appears, too, from Sir John Davis's account, that there was a gleam of prosperity, but it was only for a moment. Want of means on the part of the adventurers who had possessed themselves of the land first hindered them from putting their estates into order, and keeping their engagements. Then came the massacre of 1641, the civil wars and revolutions of the seventeenth century. Hitherto, the legal disabilities and grievances of the Irish Catholics had been comparatively trifling, but the danger into which they brought the empire, the proscription lists which they drew up under James II., and the spirit of retaliation provoked by the atrocities of the continental Catholic powers, drew down the penal laws upon them. This cruel code was never really enforced; the celebration of the mass and the existence of Roman Catholic schools were connived at; it was rare that the Protestant discoverer got a lease by proving that lands were let to a Papist under two-thirds of the value, and almost unheard of that a son dispossessed a Papist father of his estate by turning Protestant. Yet the very existence of such persecuting laws, and the fact that they were suspended as a perpetual menace over the people, was a badge of slavery constantly embittering the relations between the two races, and exasperating the representatives of the conquered.* Even during the first third of the present century, the words "d——d Papist," in the mouth of an Irish Protestant, were nearly equivalent to "d——d nigger," in the mouth of a Jamaica overseer. The absence of fellow-feeling between the proprietors and cultivators hindered the former from being, as in other countries, the channels of civilising influences to the classes below them, and this same lack of sympathy, together with the prevalence of a state of misery amidst which it was dreadful to dwell, increased the evil of absenteeism.

It may safely be taken for granted that the custom of tenant-right grew up in Ulster as a sort of rude way of securing the fixed tenures which the grantees were bound by their patents to give their tenantry. The obligation was

* Arthur Young in his travels complains that the remnant of the old manners and the abominable distinction of religion "still bear very heavy on the poor people, and subject them to situations more mortifying than we ever behold in England. The landlord of an Irish estate inhabited by Roman Catholics is a sort of despot, who yields obedience, in whatever concerns the poor, to no law but that of his own will."

evaded in other parts of Ireland, because the remembrances of civil war and the existence of penal laws made the old population little better than outlaws; but the Ulster peasantry belonged to the dominant race, and would not suffer themselves to be trodden down, but extorted security of tenure. In Ulster itself, Roman Catholic districts benefit very partially by this custom. There seems to be a sort of affinity between Protestantism, bleach-greens, and tenant-right; they are always to be seen together. The value of the interest possessed by the occupiers in their holdings through this tacit and traditional compact, spreading over six counties, was estimated by the Devon Commission at twenty-four millions sterling, a sum equal to two-thirds of the value of the property which has changed hands under the Encumbered Estates Act.

The fact is, the transition from the feudal state to the conditions of modern society has yet to be made in three provinces of Ireland, and in part of the fourth. Mr. Goldwin Smith rightly represents the mass of the Irish people as having been arrested at a certain stage of development, political and economical, and as having been prevented by a series of calamities from attaining a higher phase. The economical transition began in England under the Tudors, and Sir Thomas More's description of English clearances under Henry VIII. might be mistaken for a picture of the same process in Ireland during the first years of Victoria. "By one means, therefore, or other, 'either by hook or by crook, they must needs depart away; poor, silly, wretched souls; men, women, husbands, wives, fatherless children, widows, woeful mothers with their young babes, and the whole household, small in substance, but rich in numbers, as husbandry requires many hands. Away they trudge, out of their known and accustomed homes, finding no place to rest in. All the household stuff, which is very little, worth nothing, it might well abide the sale; yet, being suddenly thrust out, they be constrained to sell it as a thing of nought. And when they have wandered abroad, and that be spent, what can they do but go steal, and then, justly, perdue, be hanged; or else go about a begging, and then also be cast into prison as vagabonds."

The presence of royalty in England put a stop to these hideous scenes, at first by the statutes of Henry VIII. against depopulation, and at last by the poor law enacted in the reign of Queen Elizabeth. The Irish poor law was not made until 1839, and even then, as it did not throw the support of the

poor upon the district in which they were born, it led to the expulsion of tens of thousands from their homes. During the 250 intervening years, while the two countries were treating their poor so differently, the consolidation of farms in England was slow and gradual. It has been the almost unnoticed result of causes which brought about no violent dispossession of occupants. There has been a different state of feeling between proprietors and farmers, no legacy of oppression on one side and of revenge on the other. Our misfortune is, exclaims Mr. Butt, "that English phrases are applied to relations that bear no resemblance to the things which the words describe in the English tongue. Ireland is denied the real benefit of English justice, by the fiction that we are one country with England; and that landed property is the same thing in Ireland as it is in England, or Scotland, or Wales."

The nearest approach which has been made in Great Britain to the sort of improvement of which Lord Dufferin is the champion, was the forced expatriation of a great part of the Marquis of Stafford's Sutherland tenantry some sixty years since. The legitimacy of the proceeding was much discussed at the time; but, whether it was justifiable or not, the cases are very different. The Marquis of Stafford acted as the head of a clan, consulting in earnest for the good of the families he forced to go away, and he provided liberally for their settlement in a new country. Not one twentieth part of the soil of Sutherland was arable, so that the district was really overstocked; besides, there were no unhappy political antecedents—no traditional antagonism to bring suspicion upon the landlord's motives.

We have Lord Lifford's confession that the two classes in Ireland, on the contrary, are in a state of "chronic civil war." The Irish peasant is made to feel that his lord and master regards him as one of an inferior race. Landlords now-a-days wish to be their tenants' benefactors, but at the same time they think it their interest and duty to keep the tenants in a state of subjection to themselves. They do not understand that the proprietor who is an intelligent and benevolent dictator cannot teach the lower classes the best lesson of all—that of being able to do without his aid, cannot train them in the qualities of manliness and self-reliance, which are the sole springs of industry and enterprise. It is the weakness of every class in possession of power in any country to believe that all good must proceed from itself, but in the case of the Irish upper classes this tendency is aggravated by the more or less angry distrust with which the descendants

of the conquerors and the conquered still stand aloof from each other. We have ourselves often heard this sentiment expressed by Irish gentlemen, that it is a good sign to see the lower classes quarrelling among themselves, because it shows they are not then combining against their superiors or against the State.

Even men of high character and endowments, conscientious, intelligent and benevolent, like Lord Dufferin and the late Lord Rosse, continually argue, without perceiving it themselves, as those who reckon landlord interests to be of a higher order than those of tenants. They unconsciously treat the social compact as one between owners of property binding them to maintain its rights against those who have none. It never occurs to them that all the people who are living in a land, and bound to obey its laws, are equally entitled to have their interests and their wishes considered in any determination affecting the whole society.

We cannot blame the Irish landlords, and the Irish Protestants in general, for a sort of narrowness of view which was inevitable under the circumstances. They fell into it while fighting our battles. It is a great misfortune for any class to be so placed as in one very practical sense to have no country. They are too much under special and local influences to feel like Englishmen, they are too much aliens in an unfriendly land to feel like Irishmen. Generous minds among them wish to be Irish, and would indignantly repudiate what we are now saying, but they can only partially succeed; do what they will, a class feeling, a sectarian bias, mingles with their patriotism. Hence the Irish landlords do not only distrust their own people—they distrust the British Legislature. They are conscious that no purely English party, perhaps not even the Tories, can exactly enter into their peculiar way of looking at things. This is what Lord Lifford means by his complaint of Parliamentary tampering with the rights of property; this is the reason why Parliament was warned last year, that, if a measure of tenant compensation passed, it would be a signal throughout Ireland for one universal notice to quit. Lord Rosse confessed that landlords hesitate to give leases, sometimes even to let land at will, because they are afraid that a kind of legislation may be adopted, which would confer some rights upon the persons whom it found in the condition of tenants. "Some people," said his Lordship, "ask the question—is it not safer to farm the land for ourselves?" and again, "They think if they have to contend for their rights they had better do so with their hands untied."

Speaking of English pauperism, Dr. Rigg says, in the *Essays for the Times*:—

"So long as the gentle and high-born of this land continue to regard the present condition of the lower labouring classes, especially the peasantry, as natural and inevitable, and as one in regard to which their only duty is to alleviate it as far as may be by charity and condescending sympathies, as towards an essentially inferior and permanently degraded race, so long there is little likelihood of anything effectual being done to lift into true liberty, and into manly hopefulness and self-reliance, the poorest of the land, unless Christian philanthropy assert its power."

If this be true of the agrarian poor of England, how much more sadly is it true of Ireland!

We are sometimes told that the land market, like every other, should be left to the natural laws of demand and supply; but as applied to the relation of landlord and tenant in Ireland, this is a sophism, and a heartless one; the landlord can do without the tenant, the latter cannot live without the land. Besides, the land market has not been left, in the past centuries, to the natural laws of demand and supply; hence, in part, our present trouble. Feudal and sectarian restrictions have been largely maintained by law and order.

We are told to beware of exceptional legislation. And what has the whole history of Ireland been, from the time that the Barons of the Pale refused the native Irish the benefit of English law, down to the recent statutes reducing the work of eviction to a minimum of time, of trouble, and of cost—what has it been but one long process of exceptional legislation? It is time, by an exceptional act of justice, to undo the mischief that acts of exceptional injustice have been making for centuries. Ireland is the one country in the world in which proprietary rights are upheld by the bayonets of another country at a vast expense. Then surely England has a right to consult for the benefit of the Irish people as a whole, and to adopt the principle that the social system under which any man, without any fault of his own, is excluded from the means of living in his native land, fails in its first and most sacred obligation.

There is a wise instinct in the general disinclination of our countrymen to very large and radical measures, but we have come to a crisis which can only be met by a measure of this order. Mr. Whiteside, an Irish Protestant and an eminent Conservative, observed, as he looked upon the terraced gardens of the peasant proprietors in Tuscany—"It is not creditable

to the collective wisdom of England to attempt nothing on a bold and comprehensive scale for the social improvement of Ireland. . . . If the existence of what is called tenant-right be productive of good in Ulster, the principle should be fearlessly applied to the other provinces."

The Encumbered Estates Act was an interference with property as radical as Mr. Keane's scheme for fixity of tenure, though not so comprehensive. Even Lord Naas's Bill would have allowed a tenant holding under lease to effect improvements against his landlord's will, and charge them upon the land. However, no bill securing this right to make improvements and be paid for them, would compensate for the absence of security of tenure. As the human mind is constituted, the assurance of being paid for what you have done is not as strong an incentive to industry as the hope of enjoying its fruits yourself. "When men plant trees, the thought that rises to their mind is that they and their children will walk under their shade." Moreover, the most useful labours which small farmers undertake are not of a kind to be submitted beforehand to landlords, or surveyed by an officer of the Board of Works. What you see in the most favoured parts of Ulster, as described by Mr. Butt, "is a number of small holdings, upon each of which great and constant industry has made small improvements, upon which cultivation has been gradually carried to the hill-top, and by the patient care of many a year the cut-out bog has been trained to grow waving corn or luxuriant grass—holdings in the midst of which the white-washed cottage, with its neatly trimmed thatch, is ornamented with a little garden of flowers and fruit-trees before the door."

Such a measure as that proposed by Mr. Keane would be a gain to all parties and a loss to none. The landlords themselves would reap its fruit in the improved value of their properties, and only suffer in their self-love and their political influence; and it may be fairly asked if the whole empire is to continue its present expenditure of money and reputation, and remain under the ban of European opinion, in order that Irish landlords may have the power to force their tenants to vote against their wishes, not to say against their consciences?

After centuries of failure, it is idle to trust to the work of time. Time only serves to bring out the evil or the good involved in our acts, and its evidence in this case has been given but too conclusively. Not one of the interests intended to be sustained by the system hitherto pursued in Ireland has really prospered. Protestantism assuredly has not attained

the place in which its scriptural truth and moral superiority should have placed it. And imperial interests—have they been upheld? Why, the land that should have been at least the left arm of England's strength is our weakness and our shame. Its children have scattered over Europe the strength that should have been ours, and turned it against us, renewing under the banners of our enemies the battle they had lost at home. The Irish, says Professor Goldwin Smith, have produced generals and marshals of France, Spain, Austria, Russia, and Sardinia, magnates of the empire, and grandees of Spain. Their valour was arrayed against us at Ramillies, Almanza, and Launfeldt. We encountered it at Gibraltar and at Pondicherry. The Abbé McGeoghehan professed to have ascertained from documents in the French War-office that more than 450,000 Irish soldiers died in the service of France. The exaggeration, if it be one, is less than would appear at first sight. The Irish brigade that took service with Louis XIV. after the surrender of Limerick, was more than 14,000 strong, its numbers were more than kept up from year to year, and, after the lapse of fifty-four years, it was the Irish Brigade that turned the day against the iron steadfastness of the British infantry at Fontenoy.*

Class interests have profited as little as the imperial. Good Bishop Berkeley prophesied it would be "vain to form schemes for the welfare of this nation which do not take in all the inhabitants, and a vain attempt to project the flourishing of our Protestant gentry exclusive of the bulk of the natives." They have not flourished; the system which imparted to agrarian crime something of the dignity of national revolt has not enriched the landowners, notwithstanding apparently unparalleled advantages; a special tribunal has been instituted to sell them out!

There are various minor measures which would be advantageous to Ireland, and show the good will of the British people and Legislature. The voter might be protected by the ballot; Mr. Bright's proposal to favour the creation of peasant proprietors by Government loans might be adopted, though, as the consent of the landlord is necessary, it could only be carried out in a few cases at first. The same observation applies to the proposal advocated by Mr. Dix Hutton and other gentlemen, for the gradual creation of a farmer

* The United States are now, to Irish haters of England, what France was, up to the American War of Independence; with this difference, that the Irish soldiers of France seldom founded families, while the multitude of American immigrants bequeath their hate to posterity.

proprietary by the employment of Church property, as it falls in, to purchase estates. The remedy would be partial, and farmers whom the good-will or the distressed circumstances of their landlords enabled to profit by it, would provoke the jealousy of their fellows. We feel safer in recommending the equal distribution among the heirs of the property of persons dying intestate. But all these are secondary matters: the social regeneration of Ireland requires a measure embracing the whole country—*universal security of tenure, and requires it immediately.*

Immediate legislation is imperatively called for, because we have reached a crisis. The present state of things, though growing out of the past, is a novel one, and one that cannot last. The general insecurity of tenure, which arises from a general and combined refusal of the landowners to grant leases, is the creation of the last few years; the chronic disease has become acute. Even tenant-right, as already acquired in the north of Ireland, is in danger, for the spirit of landlord combination has spread into Ulster. Lord Dufferin does not care to conceal his hostility to tenant-right. He would wish to lend public money to landlords in order to enable them to buy out their tenants, the very counterpart of Mr. Bright's proposal! Judge Longfield gave evidence before Mr. Maguire's Committee that land-jobbers are every day purchasing Ulster properties in the Encumbered Estates Court, with the intention of making money by confiscating the interest in the farm which custom has hitherto secured to the tenant. "This is a matter of no light moment," says Mr. Butt. "What lover of Ireland would wish our country to lose that bold and manly freedom, that proud, and albeit it may be that harsh, spirit of independence; that prudent, even if it be sometimes cold and ungainly, thrift; that patient yet unconquerable energy which are the qualities that in their combination have made Ulster what it is? Take tenant-right away, and the Protestant people of Ulster—as we know and pride ourselves on that people—will not long survive its loss. Unless fixity of tenure be secured by law, the Ulster custom of tenant-right is doomed."

Delay would be unjust. Every government is under the abstract obligation to afford protection to the people, but in this instance the English Legislature is under special obligation: it must cease to connive at the violation of the conditions on which Irish property is held.

Delay is dangerous for landlords. Every year that the adjustment of the land question is postponed, prepares a

final adjustment less favourable to proprietary rights. At this moment the great mass of the Irish race, in whatever countries they are scattered, are united in one vast league against English power. As regards the Empire it is powerless for the present, but against landlords it may ere long prove itself irresistible. The hopes which have been recently awakened in the hearts of the Irish people made them receive the Prince of Wales and his gentle consort with enthusiasm, but if these hopes be once more blasted the bitterness of the disappointment will be all the greater. Under such circumstances, the natural reaction against the combination of landlords which has now spread into Ulster, would be a gigantic *tenant league* against paying rent at all, except where leases for ever were given, a combination of occupiers, Protestant as well as Catholic, since the short-sightedness of the landowners has given them a common cause. What, we ask, could be done, if the growing intelligence which has arrested isolated agrarian crime, should resolve upon this united agrarian league? Could the national army be employed to effect half a million of evictions? Formerly, if tenants could not or would not pay, middle men living on the spot were prepared to enter into possession themselves and farm the land; but this class has all but disappeared, and the landlords would now find themselves alone, with a few agents and bailiffs, in face of an exasperated multitude. It is easy to anticipate the result: after a great deal of trouble and suffering, an hour of lassitude would come in which the English Legislature would adopt Mr. Mill's scheme instead of Mr. Keane's, that is to say fixity of tenure with practical confiscation of the landlord's interest, instead of fixity of tenure with justice to all. Then the partial exodus of the Irish people would have its pendant in a total exodus of the upper classes, and the weakened country would find itself obliged to pay an enormous rent-charge to the absentee representatives of its former aristocracy. Such would be the result to Ireland of centuries of English rule, and for ourselves we could not escape the consciousness of having been unjust to every class in its turn, and of having thrown away the last opportunity of doing away with the consequences of former injustice and folly without inflicting new wrongs.

Delay is dangerous to the peace and prosperity of the empire; for if the Irish see that our legislation for them is not influenced by their wants and wishes, agitation for the repeal of the Union will become universal and uncontrollably ardent; and yet, on the other hand, repeal is not to be thought of; it

would be dismemberment, and we might as well cut short the connection with Yorkshire.

Repeal of the Union means the existence of two legislatures under nominal allegiance to the same crown, but determining independently of each other on matters of internal and foreign policy, of finance, &c. Such an arrangement is obviously untenable between two countries differing in religion and in their sympathies. It could only exist as a transition state, destined to issue in complete separation or in complete union. During the eighteen years that Ireland boasted an independent Parliament, it consisted exclusively of Protestants, and, notwithstanding this guarantee for harmonious action with Government, it could only be kept in order by the grossest corruption and intrigue. What, then, would be the attitude of an Irish Parliament, in case of a war between England and France, or America?

But if the Irish people were to gain by acts of the British Legislature that right to live in their own country which they would acquire by a revolution or repeal, then all agitation for legislative independence would drop, and they would soon learn to prize the advantages which British subjects enjoy all over the world. The Scotch have shown themselves capable of reconciling a vivacious feeling of provincial nationality with a most thorough loyalty to the Crown and country as a whole. Ireland could be brought to do the same. The so-called nationality which opposes itself to absorption in the empire is wholly artificial. It could not stand before English justice; the clouds that are only driven before the storm, melt and vanish in the sunshine.

Such Irish cities and towns as were important enough to be walled and fortified three centuries ago generally present, at one of their principal entrances, a long shabby street called "*Irishtown.*" The name is a remembrancer of the time when the native Irish were obliged to live outside the walls, and a picturesque old Gothic gate sometimes rears its turrets between this shabby suburb and the street that follows. As far as the material separation of the two races is concerned, it has been for ages a thing of the past, but it is a symbol of a separation that still subsists. Secure the Irishman his hearth and home, and he will feel himself, *within our walls at last*, a grateful denizen and loyal defender of the city of which he has been made a freeman.

If there is much that is painful in the retrospect of our dealings with the sister island, and if we cannot refrain from an anxious fear lest the present crisis be left unimproved, it is

at least encouraging to know that the evils through which Ireland suffers and makes us suffer can be explained, and more than that—can be removed. It is possible for Christian statesmanship to take a great stride towards the real and lasting union of the people of these kingdoms. This is an age in which men taken individually feel weak and troubled, but in which God is manifestly guiding the race, through all its hesitations and conflicts, to a happier future. It is possible to add a great, a priceless, though costless work of healing and reconstruction to those that this generation has already effected, or rather witnessed, in Europe and in America. The minister, under whose auspices it is accomplished, will live in the memory of three kingdoms, his name the more honoured as their concord and prosperity increase; and if the boon be indeed conferred by the first reformed Parliament, it will be our new constituencies' first use of their powers, the graceful gift of a people to a sister people, and it may be said to every English voter, "Thou hast saved thy brother!"

We have now given our views on the Land Question of Ireland. Of the Popery of the island we have said very little. That has not been our question. None know better than we what that Popery means. The dead bodies and the desolated homesteads of near kinsmen have taught the writer of this article what Popish rebels in Ireland will do. Strong Protestant feeling comes to us by inheritance. But yet large and various experience, European as well as British, and thorough investigation, have convinced us that the evil of Popery in Ireland has but aggravated, and has in turn been aggravated by, a social evil yet more fundamental. The first step towards nationalising, mitigating, de-ultramontanising the Romanism of Ireland, is to make such reforms as we have indicated. The Irish colonist in Australia and in Canada is frequently loyal, always peaceful and contented; the Irishman of the States is loyal; and yet many of those Irish are fervid Catholics. If ever Irish Catholics are to lose their bitterness, and the two islands to become one, England must persevere in the path of equitable legislation. It is not too much to say that Popery is a religion congenial to a population which is in the condition of the peasantry of Ireland, and that Protestantism can never flourish among such a population. It is certain that, in order to diffuse Protestantism throughout Ireland, the Irish population must be economically redeemed and socially elevated.

ART. IV.—1. *The Religious Condition of the Chinese, with Observations on the Prospects of Christian Conversion amongst that People.* By the Rev. JOSEPH EDKINS, B.A. London: Routledge, Warne, and Routledge. 1859.

2. *The Middle Kingdom.* By S. W. WILLIAMS. Two Vols. New York. 1853.

3. *Yu-tswán-choo-tsz-ts'iuen-shú.* "*The Complete Works of Choo Hí. By Imperial Authority.*" Compiled in 66 books, in the 52nd year of the period Káng-ke.

4. *Fah-yuen-chú-lin.* "*A Collection of Laws and Pearls.*" Compiled in 100 books, by TAOU-SHI, a Priest of the Budhist religion, who flourished in the eighth century of our era.

5. *Kiái-hwoh-peen.* "*Solution of Doubts.*" By HUNG-TSAN, a Budhist Priest.

6. *Sz-shih-rh-chang-king.* "*Book of Forty-two Sections.*" The first work translated from Sanscrit into Chinese.

7. *Sha-we-luh-yee-hien-leuh.* "*A Digest of Important Laws and Rules for the Budhist Priesthood.*" By CHOO-WANG, a Priest of the Yun-tsi Monastery, with a Commentary by the Author of "*Solution of Doubts.*"

THE great antiquity of the Chinese race; their independence of external civilisation; and their want of the Holy Scriptures; invest their religious theories and customs with peculiar interest. All that man's wisdom can do to find out God, and to throw light on the great problem of human destiny, the Chinese have had long and ample opportunity of doing. What success they have achieved is only too notorious.

The religions of China are commonly spoken of as three: Confucianism; Taouism, or Rationalism; and Budhism. The two former had their origin and development in China itself. Budhism, as is well known, entered China from India in the first century of the Christian era. Long anterior, however, to the time at which Confucius flourished, there existed in China a system of worship and sacrifice, which, because of its connection with the administration of government, has been called the State religion. About B.C. 1100, for example, it is recorded of the Duke of Chow, the younger

brother of the first emperor of the Chow dynasty, that "At the altar of the spirit of the land . . . he sacrificed a bull, a goat, and a pig."* In B.C. 1121, the founder of a new dynasty tells the officers of his army that the then emperor "does not serve God, or the spirits of heaven and earth; he neglects also the temple of his ancestors, not sacrificing in it." And he goes on to say, that as a preparation for the war against him, he has "offered special sacrifice to God, and performed the due services to the great earth."† Again, in a panegyric passed on the first emperor of the Shang dynasty, who ascended the throne B.C. 1765, we read: "He kept his eye continually on the bright requirements of Heaven, and served and obeyed the spirits of heaven and earth, of the land and grain, and of the ancestral temple; all with a reverent veneration."‡ And two hundred years earlier, an emperor, whose reign commenced B.C. 1974, addressing his soldiers on the eve of a battle, says, "And you who disobey my orders shall be put to death before the spirits of the land."‖

We learn from the above quotations, that while the Ancient Chinese had a sufficient knowledge of the true God to deem it proper and fitting that some religious homage should be made to Him, they did not worship Him alone, but other spiritual beings as well. In the Book of Rites—the Bible of the State religion—we find a considerable number of such beings or of other objects of worship enumerated; and the ceremonial to be observed in their several service is prescribed with much minuteness. This ceremonial, in its essential features and with very few modifications, has been in vogue in China from the most ancient times to our own day; and it constitutes the substance of the religion in question.

As Dr. Morrison observes of the State religion, "It does not consist of doctrines which are to be taught, learned, and believed, but of rites and ceremonies; it is entirely a bodily service, and its ritual is contained in the statistics and code of the empire." When Confucius commenced his career this religion was already in existence, and among other literary labours performed by him was that of editing the Book of Rites. By so doing he endorsed the directions it contains for the worship of heaven, earth, ancestors, gods of the land and the grain, defunct emperors and philanthropists, mountains, seas, and rivers, with many other things and beings both real and imaginary. In order to the practical carrying out of the

---

* *Book of Historical Documents*, part v. book xii.
† *Ibid.* book i. chap. v. ‡ *Ibid.* book i. chap. iv. ‖ *Ibid.* book. ii. chap. iii.

instructions of the State Scriptures, a Board of Rites is established at Peking; and that Government officers may not be wanting to the claims of the ritualistic code, they have each their own master of ceremonies appointed by authority, and paid for out of the imperial treasury.

The official duty of this class of men is to "conduct the ceremonies which the mandarins, their masters, are required by the emperor to have performed at certain temples or elsewhere at certain times of the year. . . . It is their part to read or chant the sacrificial or adulatory ode to the object of worship, to tell the mandarins when to kneel down, to knock their heads on the ground, and to arise to their feet."* The mandarins "must not presume to do anything on their own responsibility; they must abide by the intimations of those who are called *priests of the Confucian religion*, or sect of the learned."† These masters of ceremonies and their superiors the mandarins, are all learned men; the Confucian classics with the commentaries upon them are the sources of their learning; and it is by their successful study of these that their position and emoluments are attained. From this it would appear that Confucianism, or the sect or school of the learned, and the religion of the State are closely allied, if not identical.

Learned men in China consider themselves the followers of Confucius, not because he was the first sage who taught morality, but because he was the most sincere, comprehensive, and convincing. His instruction was confined to four subjects, viz. first, Polite Literature, including a knowledge of the books of poetry and of history, the rules of propriety, and music: secondly, Conduct, which comprehends virtue and benevolence: thirdly, Fidelity, the discharge of every duty, as between man and man: and fourthly, Sincerity, which is strict integrity without guile or hypocrisy. On spiritual beings and the worship due to them, it is said he did not discourse, because "it was the ancient custom fixed by law for the emperor to sacrifice to heaven and earth; the princes to the gods of the land and grain; the high officers to the tutelary duties, and the scholars and common people to their ancestors."‡ To the questions, How is man connected with the unseen world?—what is the destiny of his immaterial nature?—and how can he rise above the dominion of the passions and senses?—Confucius attempted no reply. "He

* *Social Life of the Chinese*, vol. i. p. 250. † *Ibid.*

‡ This is the reason assigned by a Chinese teacher.

did not speculate on the creation of things, or the end of them; nor was he troubled to account for the origin of man."

In the twelfth century of our era some of these questions, that on the origin of the world, for example, gave rise to much speculation among the followers of the sage; and as the theories then advanced are adopted by what is called the modern Confucian school, it will be necessary to advert to them. The chief speculator of the time was Choo Hí, who lived and taught in the vale of the White Deer on the west side of Lake Payang in the Keangsi Province. His genius has sufficed to render this spot illustrious, and pilgrimages are made to it by Chinese literati. His writings are prized by them next to their classics; and a commentator on one of his works says of it, "We confide in the *Siau Hioh* (the Juvenile Instructor) as we do in the gods; and revere it as we do our parents." In a section of his collected works devoted to the consideration of the Tae Keih (the *primum mobile* or cause of things, the ultimate immaterial principle of Chinese philosophers), of heaven and earth, of *yin* and *yang* (the male and female principles of nature), of the five elements, and of times and seasons, he says, summarising his doctrine: "Under the whole heaven there is no primary matter (ké) without the immaterial principles (lí), and no immaterial principle apart from primary matter. . . . Priority of existence can never be predicated of one or the other, and yet if their origin is demanded, we must say that the immaterial principle is first in the order of time; nevertheless it is not a separate and distinct thing; it is contained in the primary matter, so that if the latter did not exist the immaterial principle would have no place in which to abide."* Of this immaterial principle, he remarks subsequently, "it has neither will nor wish, plan nor operation . . . but if it did not exist there would be no heaven or earth, men or things."† And he goes on to state, that it has neither form nor substance . . . it depends on primary matter for its operation. . . . An accumulation of primary matter produces form, and from the union of the immaterial principle and primary matter, there result knowledge and sensation, just as flame is produced by fire being brought in contact with oily matter. . . . The immaterial principle is unchangeable, and primary matter is never at one stay. . . . .

In discoursing on the Great Extreme (Tae Keih), he says:—

"The great extreme is merely the immaterial principle . . . . If we

* *Complete Works* of Choo Hí, book xlix. † *Ibid.*

speak of heaven and earth, then they have the (or a) *taé keih;* and if of all things, then they have the *taé keih* too. . . . It is not a separate and distinct thing, it is found in the male and female principles of nature, in the five elements, and in all things; it is just the immaterial principle and nothing more. . . . If there had been no *taé keih*, heaven and earth would not have been set afloat. . . . When sages spoke of the *taé keih* they pointed to the root or origin of heaven, earth, and all things. . . . The great extreme has neither residence, nor form, nor place, which you can assign to it. . . . All things of which it may be said that they have a limit, as the south pole, north pole, and the ridge pole of a roof . . . . have all some form which may be seen, and are in some place to which you may point, but this extreme (*taé keih*) alone is without form and without place. . . . The great extreme is merely the utmost limit beyond which you cannot go; it is high, mysterious, subtle, and spiritual, and these in the highest degree."—*Complete Works*, Book xlix.

Choo Hí continues:—

"One scholar, fearing lest people should think the great extreme possessed form, spoke of it as the infinite or boundless, and the philosopher Chau, to prevent people from seeking another great extreme beyond this, spoke of it in the same way. . . . In all nature there is nothing but motion and stillness (he seems to mean nothing beyond these to account for the continuance of the world), and these are in a state of perpetual alternation; this is what is called the *yih*, or theory of permutations; but this motion and stillness must be produced by something, which something is the great extreme. . . Should it be enquired, what was the state of things before the opening up and development (of the world from chaos), less than 10,000 years ago? I should answer, Before that there was another (world) similar to the present one. Should it be further enquired, Are heaven and earth capable of being destroyed or not? the answer would be, No; only if hereafter men come to be entirely without correct principles, then the whole will be driven back again into a state of chaos, men and things will be destroyed, and after that there will be a new commencement."—*Ibid.*

This philosopher, *Choo Hí*, by the propagation of the above views and theories, has done much to expose the literati among his countrymen to the charge of atheism. He seems to have ignored the idea of a personal God altogether, though frequent allusions are made to such a Being in the oldest classics of the Confucian school. In these classics He is set forth as "ruling in heaven and on earth, the author of man's moral nature, the governor among the nations, by whom kings reign and princes decree justice, the rewarder of the good and the punisher of the bad." But *Choo Hí* appears

to have gone out of his way to combat some of these views; for he says:—

"Should any ask, with regard to those expressions—'The Supreme Ruler confers on man his moral nature, and when Heaven is about to send down a great trust or office upon men, as a protection for the people, it sets princes over them; and, 'On those who do good, Heaven sends down a hundred blessings, and on those who do evil a hundred calamities'—do these and such like expressions imply that above the azure sky there is indeed a Lord and ruler who acts thus; or is it so that Heaven has no mind, and men only reason about such things in this manner? I reply . . . that the immaterial principle of order is this: Primary matter in its evolutions hitherto after one season of fulness has experienced one of decay; and after a period of decline it has again flourished, just as if things were going on in a circle."

By reasoning thus he prepared the way for the atheism and materialism so widespread among his countrymen of the present day. And inasmuch as the current notions on these subjects are to a great extent the result of the mediæval teaching of this modern school of Confucianism, we may here give some specimens of the ideas of the common people respecting them. And we cannot do better than quote from *The Religious Condition of the Chinese.*

"With regard to creation, they know of no law but spontaneity and self-development in the construction of existing things. They consider that all things have come to be as they are of themselves. They do not conclude, from the remarks of design and contrivance which are exhibited in nature, that there must have been an intelligent contriver. Some other heathen nations have been familiar with this argument of natural theology, but the Chinese not so. All their descriptions of the origin of the world are pervaded with the idea of spontaneous production. When the Christian doctrine of creation is presented to them, and illustrations of the infinite wisdom of God in it referred to, they admit them to be reasonable, but they do not feel it to be a necessity that they should resign their own idea of the spontaneous origin of the universe. They do not speak of the *works* of nature or the *works* of God when gazing on the ever-moving panorama which that universe offers to the eye. They prefer to denominate it the 'living heaven' and the 'living earth.' 'Why,' we have often asked them, 'should you speak of those things which are dead matter fashioned from nothing by the hand of God, as living beings? Heaven and earth are surely not *persons?*' 'And why not?' they have replied. 'The sky pours down rain and sunshine. The earth produces corn and grass. We see them in

perpetual movement, and we may therefore say they are living.' . . . 'The idea of creation most familiar to the Chinese mind is that there was a monad at the beginning. This first atom separated into two. The two atoms became four, the four were changed into eight, and the eight gave origin to all things. If the Chinese are asked how this process was commenced, and continued, they answer that 'it came of itself.' Pre-occupied with this particular cosmogony, they do not feel any necessity for a creating agent, nor are they led to meditate on the wisdom of God as displayed in His works."

These illustrations of the notions held by Confucian doctors and the common people on creation and God, will suffice to show that their creed, in reference to these points, is a confused materialism.

Of the Confucian system of morality all the world has heard; and in theory it is indeed remarkably pure. We find there the Golden Rule of our Saviour, in its negative form, expressed in nearly the same words as those used by Thales. The Grecian sage said that we must "not do to others what, if done to us, we should resent." Confucius said, "What you do not want done to yourself, do not do to others." In daily use among all classes are heard fragments of familiar poetry, exhorting to virtue and warning against vice. We give the following as specimens. "Among the hundred virtues, filial piety is the chief." "Out of ten thousand crimes, adultery is the worst." "Filial piety, fidelity, chastity, and uprightness, diffuse fragrance through a hundred generations." What, then, in a few words, it may be asked, is the Confucian morality? The answer which would be given to this question by one of his followers would be, the "three relations and the five constant virtues." "The three relations, to which belong corresponding duties, are those of prince and subject, father and son, and husband and wife; the five virtues whose obligation is constant and universal are benevolence, uprightness, politeness, knowledge, and faithfulness. Politeness includes, in the Chinese meaning of the word, compliance with all social and public customs transmitted by wise men and good kings. The native term for knowledge means rather prudence gained by knowledge. The word for faithfulness means both to be trustworthy and also to trust to, and chiefly refers to friendship." "The true disciple of Confucius is the filial son, the loyal subject, and the kind and faithful husband."

While such is the purity of what may be termed their moral code, it may be interesting to ascertain their opinions concerning sin and the means of its removal. On one occasion

Confucius is represented to have said, "A good man is not mine to see," and at another time he uttered the following lament, "It is all over! I have not seen one who loves virtue as he loves beauty." But he thought that men have the power to be virtuous in themselves, and that their nature leads them to virtue. He teaches that, "by their nature they approach to goodness, but habit leads them away from it." By nature—*sing*—he meant the moral sense bestowed by God on every man. It is what we call conscience. A Confucian writer would, however, rather describe it as a bias to virtue. Mencius, who is only second in authority to Confucius himself, tried to give greater distinctness to the doctrine of his predecessor by prefixing to the sentence above quoted the words, "Men originally have a virtuous nature."

"In the moral code of the Confucian religion great stress is laid on duties to princes and parents. . . . A patient in a missionary hospital at Shanghae frequently expressed uneasiness of mind at not having fulfilled his filial duty to his deceased father. He had neglected to make provision for the customary funeral rites. It was here that his consciousness of sin was centred. . . . His wounded foot was proof to him of sin; but when asked what sin it was of which he felt the conviction, his thoughts recurred to the moral code of Confucius. He did what most of his countrymen would have done in similar circumstances. Instead of thinking of his transgression of God's law, he recollected an omission of a duty to his parent. Filial piety is the most strongly enforced of all virtues in his native country. It has over-shadowed the duty of piety towards God, and the national conscience has become in consequence comparatively insensible to sin as committed against the Supreme Governor of the World."—*Religious Condition, &c.*, p. 177.

No attempt being made on the part of the Chinese to deny that sin exists, and even Confucius himself laying no claim to perfection or exemption from sin, what direction, we may inquire, have the sage and his followers given as to the best mode of taking sin away? Confucius once said, "To have faults and not to reform them—this may be pronounced having faults." On which words *Choo Hi*—of whom, we may observe, in passing, that the writings of Confucius and Mencius are received according to his explanations of them—comments to this effect: "If one having faults can reform them, he reverts to the condition of having no faults." This quotation from Confucius is a great favourite with the Chinese. If we do virtuously, they say, all our past faults will be forgiven.

Prayer for forgiveness is quite unnecessary, for if a man seek to do virtuously, he will be forgiven on the ground of the sincerity of his repentance. We shall find, however, when we come to consider the Budhism of China, that the people have adopted from that system several modes of merit-mongering, as means of atonement for their misdeeds.

Defective as are the views propounded by Confucianism on sin and its removal, they are still more so, if possible, on the subjects of immortality and the unseen world. There were certain topics on which Confucius was slow to converse, and among these was that of spiritual beings. On one occasion a disciple questioned him about serving the spirits of the dead. The reply was: "While you are not able to serve men, how can you serve their spirits?" The disciple said, "I venture to ask about death." He was answered: "While you do not know life, how can you know about death."?* Although Confucius in this instance avoided giving any specific answers to questions respecting death and the dead, it is difficult to understand how he could have enforced the long-established custom of ancestral worship, without some definite ideas as to the state of men in the next world. This studied silence, however, on this point has resulted in a national tendency to unbelief with regard to the immortality of the soul. How this unbelief can consist with ancestral worship—a worship which may be designated, more than anything else, the religion of the Chinese—they explain by saying "that their sacrifices to the dead are but an outward form, the mode of expression which the principle of filial piety requires them to adopt, when its objects have departed this life." The founder of the Modern School of Confucianism, to whom we have so often referred, *Choo Hí*, with regard to the existence of gods and spirits, "affirmed that sufficient knowledge was not possessed to say positively that they existed, and he saw no difficulty in omitting the subject altogether. His system is also entirely silent respecting the immortality of the soul, as well as future rewards and punishments. Virtue is rewarded and vice punished in the individual, or in his posterity on earth; but of a separate state of existence he or his disciples do not speak." "Man's death is as the putting out of a lamp," is a common saying among the people. Believing, as they profess to do, that "death is nothing, and nothing is after death," we need not expect to find any theory even on a judgment to come. The Chinese adage, *Kin-puh-kih-kú* ("The moderns are

* *Confucian Analects*, book xi. chap. xi.

not equal to the ancients"), finds a forcible illustration in the history of Confucianism.

The next religion of China which we have to consider is known in that country as Taon-kia, or Sect of Reason. The acknowledged founder of this sect was born B.C. 604, in the kingdom of Tsu, now the province of Hupeh, about fifty-four years before Confucius. His followers in modern times have invented a fabulous story respecting his birth, to this effect. He was carried in the womb of his mother for nine times nine years, and when he entered the world he was an old man, toothless, with white hair and eyebrows, and shrivelled features. Books speak of him as Laoutsz, that is, the Philosopher Laou; but the words are susceptible likewise of the meaning, "old boy;" and hence the philological myth. From reliable accounts we learn that his parents were poor, but that when he reached manhood he was appointed librarian to his sovereign, and as he had thus an opportunity of studying the ancient books, he diligently applied himself to them, and so became acquainted with all the rites and histories of former times. It is said that he made a journey through Central Asia, but of what extent and duration is not recorded. The only philosophical work which he wrote was *Taon-Teh-King*, or the "Book of Reason and Virtue." In this work we find, among other things, his theory of creation, or rather emanation and development. He says, "All material visible forms are only emanations of *Taou* or Reason; this formed all beings. Before their emanation, the universe was only an indistinct confused mass, a chaos of all the elements in a state of germ or subtle essence."

Elsewhere he says, "All the visible parts of the universe, all beings composing it, the heavens and all the stellar systems, all have been formed of the first elementary matter: before the birth of heaven, there existed only an immense silence in illimitable space, an immeasurable void in endless silence. Reason alone circulated in this infinite void and silence." Of this *Taou* or Reason he declares: "Reason produced one, one produced two, two produced three, and three produced all things." Dr. Medhurst quotes from a Taouist author words expressing transcendental rapture in the contemplation of this Reason.

"What is there," says he, "superior to heaven and earth, and that from which heaven and earth sprang? Nay, what is there superior to space and that which moves in space? The great *Taou* (Reason) is the parent of space, and space is the parent of heaven and earth, and heaven and earth produced men and things. The venerable

"prince (Reason) arose prior to the great original, standing at the commencement of the mighty wonderful, and floating in the ocean of deep obscurity. He is spontaneous and self-existing, produced before the beginning, commencing prior to uncaused existences, pervading all heaven and earth, whose beginning and end no years can circumscribe."

The account here given of the origin of the world was too mystical and obscure to be popular, and therefore later authors have represented the creation of the heaven and earth as the work of the first man, Pwanku. But they must account for the origin of this human creation, and they have, for this purpose, constructed the following legend.

"The dual powers," say they, "were fixed when the primeval chaos separated. Chaos is bubbling turbid water, which enclosed and mingled with the dual powers, like a chick *in ovo;* but when their offspring, Pwanku, appeared, their distinctiveness and operations were apparent. *Pwan* means a bason, referring to the shell of the egg; *ku* means solid, to secure, intending to show how the first man, Pwanku, was hatched from the chaos of the dual powers, and then settled and exhibited the arrangement of the cause which produced him."—*The Middle Kingdom*, vol. ii. p. 196.

To Pwanku was given no less a task than that of moulding the chaos which produced him, and chiselling out the earth which was to contain him. He is represented "holding a chisel and mallet in his hands, splitting and fashioning vast masses of granite floating confusedly in space. Behind the openings made by his powerful hands are seen the sun, moon, and stars, monuments of his stupendous labours; and at his right hand, inseparable companions of his tools—their generation, however, being left in obscurity—stand the dragon, the phœnix, and the tortoise, sometimes also the unicorn, divine types and progenitors with himself of the animal creation. His labours were continued eighteen thousand years, and by small degrees he and his works increased; the heavens arose, the earth spread out and thickened, and Pwanku grew in stature, each of them six feet every day, till, those labours done, he died for the benefit of his handiwork. His head became mountains, his breath wind and clouds, and his voice thunder; his limbs were changed into the four poles, his veins into rivers, his sinews into the undulations of the earth's surface, and his flesh into fields; his beard, like Berenice's locks, was turned into stars; his skin and hair into herbs and trees; and his teeth, bones, and marrow into metals, rocks, and precious stones; his dropping sweat

increased to rain, and lastly *(nascetur ridiculus mus)*, the insects which stuck to his body were transformed into people."* The Chinese sometimes seek to identify this first man with Adam, when they hear missionaries give the true genesis of the universe.

Both the founder of Taouism, and his "Book of Reason and Virtue," together with the philosophy developed in it, have met with extravagant admiration and praise at the hands of French sinologues and other orientalists. Abel Rémusat, for instance, speaks of Laoutsz as a true philosopher, a judicious moralist, an eloquent theologian, and a subtle metaphysician. Of his philosophy, the same authority says:

"It is a system of lofty abstractions and inextricable subtleties in which his oriental imagination wanders and loses itself. It is sufficient to say that the opinions of the Chinese philosopher on the origin and constitution of the universe present no ridiculous fables or monstrous absurdities; they bear the impress of a noble and elevated mind, and, in the sublime reveries which distinguish them, they present a striking and indisputable resemblance to the doctrines professed a little later in the schools of Pythagoras and Plato. Like the Pythagoreans and Platonists, our philosopher admits, as a first cause, Reason—a being ineffable, uncreated, who is the type of the universe, but who has no type but himself. Like Pythagoras, he regards human souls as emanations from this ethereal substance, and supposes that after death they are reunited with it; he also agrees with Plato in refusing to the wicked the faculty of re-entering the bosom of this universal soul."

There are some things said of our philosopher's *Taou*, which might lead us to regard it as a pure, infinite, ethereal being or substance. And yet we may doubt whether he viewed it as a personal being at all, or even as a material or spiritual essence; it is rather an abstract principle, an eternal law, existing before all things, necessitating all existence and determining the properties and states of all beings and things as they now are; in a word, a primitive reason or rule, the abstract fitness of things, under the requirements of which the universe must exist and must develop itself. If, as we have seen, the cosmogony of our philosopher resembles that of the schools of Pythagoras and Plato, his theory of self-government and personal virtue is not unlike that of Zeno. He recommended retirement and quiet reflection, as the most effectual means of purifying the spiritual part of nature.

* *The Middle Kingdom*, vol. ii. p. 196.

"Water that is still," he would have said, "is also clear, and you may see deeply into it. Noise and passion are fatal to spiritual progress. The stars are invisible through a clouded sky. Nourish the perceptive powers of the soul in purity and rest." His own life was passed in comparatively ascetic privacy, and hence it was, that, in the only visit which Confucius is recorded to have paid to the old man, the latter upbraided the sage for his ambition in gathering so many disciples and in seeking after office; adding that such a course of conduct was more likely to nourish pride than cherish the love of virtue and wisdom. "The wise man," he said, "loves obscurity; far from being ambitious of offices, he avoids them." The preceptive part of his great work is not confined to the annihilating of the material passions of the individual, but enforces also the performance of benevolent acts. He says:—

"The holy man has not an inexorable heart:
He makes his heart like that of all men.
The virtuous man should be treated as a virtuous man,
The vicious man should likewise be treated as a virtuous man;
This is wisdom and virtue."

"The perfect man lives in the world tranquil and calm;
It is only on account of the world, for the happiness of man, that his heart experiences disquiet.
Though all men think only of pleasing their eyes and their ears,
Those who are in a state of sanctity will treat them as a father treats his children."

The followers of this "philosopher, moralist, theologian, and metaphysician," in modern times are a set of jugglers, magicians, and astrologers, seeking the elixir of life, and the means of reaching heaven through the air. They profess to have dealings with spirits, and tell many wonderful stories of what has been accomplished by their aid; but they are looked upon as ignorant cheats who are quite as willing to use their magical powers to injure their enemies as to help their friends.

The notions entertained by the Taouists respecting God and gods present a striking similarity to the mythology of many other heathen nations. Some of their gods personate those beings who are supposed to reside in the various departments of nature. And hence they speak of sea and river, and star gods, and on the sea-coast erect temples to the spirit of the sea, the king of the sea, and the god of the tide, and offer worship, burn incense, and present prayers to the ruler of thunder and the mother of lightning.

Many of the stars are worshipped as gods. Some Greek philosophers supposed the stars to be living beings and divine. The Taouists believe in a doctrine resembling this, but here, as almost everywhere else, their faith is tinged with materialism.

"The stars are regarded as the sublimated essence of things. The world, for example, is made up of five kinds of matter, which contain each of them an essence, or elementary substance. As the soul is an essence of matter, the purest form of matter in the body, so are essences belonging to other things, which, when very pure, obtain a life and individuality of their own. They constitute the souls of coarse matter. Of these there is a series of five, which correspond to the five modes of subsistence found in material nature, viz. metal, wood, water, fire, and earth. These souls of the five elements rose, when highly purified, through the air to the region of stars, and became the five planets. Mercury is the essence of water; Venus of metal; Mars of fire; Jupiter of water; and Saturn of earth. The fixed stars are also the essences or souls of matter. . . . These stars and essences became gods. They were regarded as having divine attributes. . . . It was by carrying out this way of thinking that alchemy and astrology became an important part of the Taouist religious system. They are necessarily the two favourite sciences of a materialistic religion like this. The one deals in essences, the other in stars; and they have each had an extensive influence on the formation of the Taouist system of divinities, as well as on the Taouist doctrine of immortality, and of the method of self-discipline by which immortality is to be gained. . . . In the legendary biography of the Taouist gods, it is common to say of them that a star descended, and became incarnate in the person of certain noted men, who thus obtained their divine character."

The Taouist mythology has been greatly expanded in modern times. Two elements enter into this expansion; a primitive Chinese, and a Budhistic. The ancient Chinese believed in a race of genii. They were men supposed to have obtained the honours of divinity by their virtues. "Some were fabulous, and others historical. At the time of Tsin-she-hwang, the builder of the great wall, about two centuries before Christ, many romantic stories were current of immortal men inhabiting islands in the Pacific Ocean. It was supposed that, in these imaginary islands, they found the herb of immortality growing, and that it gave them exemption from the common lot of men."* The genii of mountains, and such islands, are terrestrial genii. There is a higher

* *Religious Condition, &c.* p. 144.

class, called the celestial genii. The latter are supposed to ascend to heaven and reside there. The abodes occupied by the celestial genii are among the stars, or, higher yet, in the region of pure rest."

The highest gods among the Taouists are the San-tsing, or "three pure ones;" a modern imitation of the Budhist Trinity, the "San-she Joo-lae," the "Fathagatha of the three ages." These are intellectual gods, and their connection with the human race, like that of the Budhas, is one of benevolence and instruction. In order to provide for the control of the physical universe, they have humanised the Shang-te of the Confucian classics, giving to him a birth-day and a name. Subordinate to him in the same region of rule is a triad of divinities, called San-Kwan, the "three rulers." They preside over heaven, earth, and water. Intermediate between these chief and subordinate rulers of the physical universe are the north-pole star, the lord of the stars, some other star-gods, the ruler of thunder, the Budhist divinity Kwan-yin, and the spirits of the sun and moon. These together with the rest of the gods, have invocations addressed to them as directed in the liturgical works of the priests of Taou. In addition to the gods above-named, the Taouist books speak of medical divinities and deified hermits; a third trinity also, known as the gods of happiness, rank, and old age. But of the Taouist deities, the most popular of all is the god of wealth. Merchants and tradesmen attribute their success in business or otherwise to his interference, and their faith in him has led to the erection of multitudes of temples to his honour in Chinese towns and cities.

The State gods of China, consisting of patron deities for each city and tutelary gods of smaller towns, who were when alive brave and loyal officers of government, or men distinguished for public and private virtues, are admitted into the Taouist mythology as divinities more or less elevated in rank. They are all appointed by the State—hence their name—and Taouist priests are appointed to take charge of their temples.

The moral code of the Taouists is identical with that of Confucius, and the idea of sin is alike in both systems. Its classification of the virtues, and the account which it gives of retribution in the present life, agree in the main with what we find in Confucianism. But there is a difference; for instance, Confucius appears to make the approval of conscience the only reward one need be anxious for as the reward of virtue; while the followers of Laoutsz expect and desire longevity, riches, health, rank, and a numerous posterity.

Confucianism, as we saw just now, gets rid of sin through repentance. Taouism does this by means of rest and meditation, its salvation being relief from all sufferings of body and mind.

The Taouists believe that at death the souls of good men will go to a place of happiness, namely, to the fine ether which floats round the stars, far above the gross material world which constitutes our present abode. The souls of the wicked are supposed to die with their bodies. This doctrine springs out of materialistic views of their nature. Until the advent of Budhism into China, the common belief among both Confucianists and Taouists was that the souls of men separate into thin air at the time of their death. The general opinion now is, "that the soul is a certain small quantity of vapour capable of division into parts. The custom of calling to the soul, just after death, to come back, now prevalent among the people, is mentioned in very ancient books. It must have existed for more than 2,000 years. The friends of the deceased go to the well, to the roof of the house, to the north-west corner, with other parts of the dwelling, and call to the spirit to return. 'Death they call the breaking of the three-inch vapour.' At the moment of death this portion of vapour three inches long, separating from the organisation to which it belonged, escapes upward like a wreath of smoke, or a small light cloud, into the region of thin air."

At a very early period in the history of China, the people appear to have recognised the fact of a future state. Their knowledge of this might be conclusively argued from their sacrifices to ancestors. These sacrifices formed a part of the primitive Chinese religion, from which both Confucius and Laoutsz derived their systems.

We pass on now to the consideration of the third religion obtaining in China—viz. Budhism. The occasion and manner of the entrance of Budhism into the country are thus given in the "Solution of Doubts." In a section of this book, entitled the "Law Spreading to China," we read as follows:—

"The Emperor Ming, of the Eastern Han dynasty, when asleep in his southern palace, dreamt that he saw a good-looking man, more than eighteen feet in height, fly to the front Hall of Audience. When morning came, his Majesty asked his ministers for an interpretation, when one of them replied, 'Your servant hath heard that in the West there is a god, whose name is Budha; doubtless it is he of whom your majesty has dreamt. . . . Hereupon the emperor despatched an embassy of eighteen men to the West, in search of the sage. In the sixth year . . . from their departure they fell in with

two Budhist priests, Ma-tang and Chuh-fah-lan. After obtaining images and Sanscrit books, the words of which numbered six hundred thousand, they set their faces eastward, the two priests being with them, and in the eighth year *from when they started*, they reached Lo-yang,* *then the capital of the empire.*

"Having entered the palace, the priests presented the books and images to the emperor, who was much pleased with them. . . . Two years afterwards he commanded that a monastery should be built to the west of the capital for their accommodation, and, because the sacred books had been carried from India by a white horse, it should be called the White Horse Monastery."

From a marginal note we learn that this was the first Budhist monastery built in China. "The same year in which the monastery was erected, Tang and Lan translated the 'Book of Forty-two Sections.'" The above extract on the planting of Budhism in China suggests many points for thought and inquiry. If we regard the dreams of the Emperor as a fabrication of the priests, designed to invest the entrance of their doctrines into the Flowery Land with a supernatural character, we can hardly doubt the fact that an embassy was sent by imperial command in search of a new religion. And assuming the fact, it is natural to ask what can have prompted the Emperor to such a course. Was it a longing for some better faith than was furnished by the practically atheistic systems of his own land? Or was it the result of the Emperor's musing on that very remarkable saying of Confucius, "The people of the West have sages or a sage"? Or, yet again, is it any way possible that some indistinct tidings of the work of Christ had reached the "Land of Sinim," and originated this important though disastrous mission to the West? All this must be left in the darkness with which the silence of the records wraps the question. The early history of Budhism in China, or rather some facts in that history, are furnished by the fourth work which we place at the head of this paper. This work, in one hundred parts, contains a full account of Budhism, its rites, laws, ethics, and metaphysics, and was prepared by a priest of the religion who flourished in the eighth century of our era. Stanislas Julien speaks of this work as "La Grande Encyclopédie." We are informed by the compiler that at the close of the second century from the introduction of the new religion, there had been translated from the Sanscrit three hundred and thirty-four books, the joint production of twelve men. Fifty-four years later the monasteries numbered 1,768,

* Lo-Yang is situated in the Honam province.

† *Solution of Doubts*, p. 3.

and the priests and nuns 24,000. One of the emperors of the Sung dynasty (A.D. 420—479) chanted the Sanscrit original of one of the sacred books, and with his own hands transcribed the Chinese translation. He also supported 1,000 priests. Another emperor of the same line made a golden image of Budha more than twenty feet in height. From another source we learn, that during a part of this dynasty the influence of Budhism was felt throughout the provinces, and that its votaries had, within four centuries, become so numerous as to endanger the peace of the empire. Prohibitory edicts were, therefore, published by Wan-tí, the third ruler of this house, who also persecuted the priests. One of his princes was still more severe, and put many priests to death in the most inhuman manner. To return to our Budhist authority. A ruler of the Tsí dynasty (A.D. 480—502) is said to have made a golden image of Budha yearly on the eighth day of the fourth month (Budha's birthday), and that while he was content to transcribe some of the sacred books and to chant others, one of his successors copied all the Sutras, a division of the sacred books said to contain the immediate instructions of Budha, and made a thousand images.

One of the emperors ruling the destinies of China in the sixth century, signalised himself by copying ten volumes of the great Prajnaparamita with his own blood (the original is "pierce blood himself wrote"). A successor of his supported one thousand priests and discoursed on the Saddharmapundarika, or "The Lotus of the Good Law." Among other statistics of this religion, in A.D. 557 we find that there were 2,846 monasteries, and 82,700 priests and nuns. The author of the *Religious Condition of the Chinese* informs us, that in the sixth century "there were 3,000 Hindoos in China, helping to propagate the Budhist faith." The Budhist books in our possession say nothing about this great number of missionaries, but we do not doubt that Mr. Edkins had good reasons for his statement.

In this same century there lived an emperor who erected a monastery, and deposited in it one of Budha's nails as a relic of priceless sanctity! He made, it is said, more than 20,000 golden images of Budha, copied one of the sacred books, and converted 10,000 persons to the true faith. About this time the people themselves in different places of the empire erected upwards of 30,000 monasteries.

The same work from which we have gleaned the above statistics, contains considerable information concerning the Sanscrit literature which was translated into the Chinese language between the first and eighth centuries.

Budhist books are divided in China into three classes, viz, *King*, *Lut*, and *Lun*, corresponding to the Sanscrit words Sutra, Vinaya, and Abhidharma. The first division contains Budha's discourses, some of which were addressed to the priests and others to laics; the second division relates to discipline, and is addressed solely to the priests; the third division contains explanations of some of the more abstruse doctrines of Budha, without being addressed to any persons specifically. These divisions of the sacred books are called collectively the San Isang, that is the Three Caskets, the words being a translation of the Sanscrit term, Tripitaka. Before making further reference to the literature of the Budhists, we must observe that the adherents of this religion were early separated into two parties. To this separation Mr. Edkins refers in the following words:—

"In the study of Budhism, the distinction between the northern and southern form should always be kept in view. It is to Burnouf that we owe the first clear separation of these two chief parties into which the Budhists are divided. . . . The fundamental books of both the great Budhist parties appear to be the same, but the northern Budhists have added many important works in an ostensibly historical form, yet, in reality, fictitious. They belong to the school called the Great Development School, which is so denominated to distinguish it from the Lesser Development School, common to the north and the south. In the additions made by the northern Budhists, are included the fiction of the Western Paradise, and the fable of Amitabha and the Goddess of Mercy. These personages are exclusively northern, and are entirely unknown to the south of Nepaul. In the south, the Hindoo traditions in respect to cosmogony and mythology are adhered to more rigidly; while in the north a completely new and far more extensive universe, with divinities to correspond, is represented to exist in the books, and is believed to exist by the people."

Of the fundamental books common to both these schools, we learn from the work, "Collection of Laws, &c.," that there had been translated in the eighth century one hundred and eight volumes of the "Sutra" class, and ninety-six of them a second time; thirty-five volumes of the "Vinaya" class; and of the "Abhidharma" division, thirty-three volumes.

But of the books belonging to the Great Development School, there had been translated, at that early period, two hundred and four volumes of the first class, and seventy-four volumes of the third class. At that time there would appear to have been no translation of works belonging to the northern school

of the "Vinaya" division, which relates to discipline and belongs solely to the priesthood.

The Lesser Development Books are attributed by Burnouf to the first Budhist convocation held sixty-one days after Budha's death, and those of the other school to a council held 450 years later. The works of the former school, it is said, are doubtless the original books of Budha, for their dogmas and legends agree with the religion as it is still professed in Ceylon and by all the southern Budhists. The books of the northern school, on the other hand, are unknown there. The former class of books contains, among other things, the monastic institutions, the moral code, the ascetic life, the metempsychosis, and the Nirwana. The whole is interwoven with the fantastic notions of the Hindoos respecting geography, astronomy, and supernatural beings. The northern books embrace later developments in metaphysics and cosmogony. In a work of this school called "Prajnaparamita," the favourite dogma of extreme idealism, the non-existence of mind and matter in all their forms is reiterated to satiety.

In the year A.D. 1410, an imperial edition of the Budhist sacred books was published in 6,771 sections. A little more than three-fourths of this extensive literature consists of translations from the Sanscrit; and it has been estimated that the whole work of the Hindoo translators, together with that of Hiün Tsang, the celebrated Chinese Budhist pilgrim, amounts to about seven hundred times the size of the New Testament in Chinese form. One of these works alone, the *Prajnaparamita*, consists of one hundred and twenty volumes, and is about eighty times as large as the New Testament. Besides the above standard works there is a great number of books on Budhism by Chinese authors, consisting of commentaries, biographical works, cyclopædias, travels in Budhist countries, apologetic treatises, liturgical works, descriptions of remarkable monasteries and sacred places, and the original works of authors belonging to the various native schools of Budhism. And now we may dwell for a while on the views and theories set forth in this vast mass of literature respecting the condition of man, his relationship to a higher sphere, and his ultimate destiny. Budhism in China, as elsewhere, teaches that the world has no creator, but that in a series of revolutions it has been subject to destruction by fire, water, and wind, and no less frequently to renovation; the changes of both classes occurring wholly apart from any superintending mind or limitless power which has wrought them. And as no such mind or power was requisite in the

past eternity, so these revolutions will go on *in perpetuum* independently of any governing will. Indeed, Budhism could not consistently ascribe creation to a Divine Being, for it knows nothing of such a Being. It is professedly Atheistic. It denies the existence of an intelligent and personal deity. The gods whose existence it admits are subject to mortality like men, and are limited in their power. A class of Budha's disciples, who are considered to have made great progress towards perfection (Nirwana or Annihilation), are said to have great sympathy with man's lower wants. They are prayed to for relief from sickness, for riches, for long life, and for other desirable things pertaining to man's animal nature. They are trusted in as God by the Chinese Budhists. Divine power and benevolence are thought to reside in them. But they are not considered as supreme, nor as absolutely perfect, nor are they exempt from change, nor without the need of improvement. "When the Budhists have occasion to speak of Shang-te, or God, as He is known to the disciples of Confucius, they identify Him with Indra Shakra, one of the chief Hindoo gods, and assign to Him no higher authority or wider kingdom." "God, say they, is within the limits of the three worlds, heaven, earth, and hell; but Budha, they maintain, extends his authority beyond these boundaries." The Budhists speak of thirty-three heavens piled above each other on the mountain Maha Meru, in one of which they place Shang-te. But inasmuch as they ascribe to him a limited jurisdiction, subjection to birth and death, and subordination to Budha, the self-elevated hermit, they deprive him thereby of true deity, and are, to all intents and purposes, atheists.

With respect to moral evil, Budhism strictly enjoins the avoiding of what are called the ten sins. Three of these belong to the body, four to the mouth, and three to the mind. The sins of the body are murder or the taking of life, theft, and adultery. The sins of speech are duplicity, slander, lying, and evil communications. Those of the mind are envy, anger, and lust, or, perhaps folly, which, again, is explained to include not believing in Budha, and holding erroneous opinions. In the "Digest of Important Laws and Rules for the Priesthood," we have the following prohibitions:—"Do not destroy life; do not steal; do not be lewd; do not use guile; do not take intoxicating drinks; do not adorn the head with flowers, or perfume the body with unguents; do not sing songs, or dance, or play, and do not go to see or hear such things; do not sit on a high or wide or large couch; do not eat at improper times (in the notes we are told that "after

midday is an improper time"); do not possess . . . gold or silver, or any valuable things." The "Digest" contains no intimation as to the relative importance of these different precepts. The first five are for the observance of the laity, as well as the priests. In the first work translated from Sanscrit into Chinese—the "Book of Forty-two Selections"—Budha says, "That which causes stupidity and delusion of men is love and the desires." "A man subject to love and desire or passion, is as if, taking a flaming torch, he walked against the wind: in the latter case his hands would certainly be burnt." "If a man having many faults does not repent, but tranquillises his heart, sins will rush upon him like water to the sea, which gradually deepens and widens." The above summary of the Budhist moral code will show that there is a very good aim in much of the teaching of Gautama; and, as Mr. Edkins says, "good has resulted, doubtless, from the prominent exhibition made by Budhism of the danger and misery of vice, and the good coming from self-restraint." But much more benefit would have been derived if its system of prohibition had rested on a better basis, and been supported by a different view of the future state. The crime of killing rests on the doctrine of metempsychosis, which ascribes the same immortal soul to animals as it does to men. Faithful Budhists are told not to kill the least insect, lest in so doing they should cause death to some deceased relative or ancestor whose soul may possibly animate the insect. On this account the corresponding virtue is stated to be *fang shang*, "to save life," a term constantly applied by the Budhist priests and common people of China to the preservation of the lives of animals. The monks are vegetarians for the same reasons; they abstain from flesh, not only to bring the appetite into subjection, but just as much that they may not share in the slaughter of living beings. They construct reservoirs of water near the monasteries, in which fish, snakes, tortoises, and small shell-fish, brought by worshippers of Budha, are placed to preserve them from death."

In the commentary on the precept against lewdness in the "Digest," the case of a priest is mentioned with approbation, who in order to keep one law broke another. As the story goes, he is in circumstances of strong temptation to unchastity, but he thought, "I had better die than break the laws," and he forthwith committed suicide. Under the precept against falsehood the priests are told that they may lie without sinning for purposes of mercy and pity; and a case is supposed in which an animal pursued by hunters takes refuge in

a monastery—the creature is to be saved when inquired for by means of prevarication. There are other instances given in the book showing that casuistry, the favourite resource of Jesuits in the West, is not quite unknown to their compeers in the East.

With regard to the punishment of sin, Chinese Budhism teaches the Hindoo doctrine of the transmigration of souls. All living beings at death are divided into six classes, and enter upon as many different states of existence. Three of these are conditions of punishment, and three of reward; and according to the common notion among the Chinese of the present day, every soul at death is appointed to one of these states by Yama, the Hindoo regent of death. The punishments awarded are those of being sent to hell, of animating the bodies of animals, or of wandering about as hungry ghosts. None of these states are represented as of perpetual duration, but the period of continuance in them is determined by the amount of sin committed and of guilt incurred. So that whether or not, for example, the soul animating an insect, or bird, or beast, shall rise or fall in the scale of existence, is now being determined by its good deeds or evil deeds. But whether it rise or fall is of comparatively little importance, because should it ascend to the highest heaven, its reward there will end, and may possibly be followed by sinking into the deepest hell. Impermanence is stamped on everything in the three worlds, heaven, earth, and hell. The ruler of the highest heaven may one day wail in the miseries of the lowest hell, and the soul now suffering the deepest agony of perdition may hereafter take his place. The object aimed at by the founder of Budhism, is to deliver his disciples from this constant succession of life and death, and to transfer them to a higher sphere where there is rest from change and from misery. That sphere is Nirwana, where all sensations, and passions, and thoughts are lost, and man is in fact annihilated. But the *horror nihili* of the human breast has revolted against the cessation of existence, and Northern Budhism, as we shall see, has invented a paradise of its own for its followers.

Let us now turn to the meritorious deeds and ritual observances by which the Budhist priest proposes to reach Nirwana, and the people the paradise of the Western heaven. As to the priests, we quote the following incident from the *Religious Condition of the Chinese:*

"We once asked," says Mr. Edkins, "an aged priest at the head of a monastery if he had attained to the *true fruit?* (The result of

meditation and discipline is termed *fruit*.) He replied, that he had not. He was again asked, 'Do you, with the *Diamond Book of Transcendental Wisdom*, hold that all things having colour and form are empty and unreal, so that the objects surrounding us have no existence but in imagination?' His answer was, 'It is difficult to say. Those who have attained the true fruit see all things to be delusive; but others cannot do so.' This was an honest confession on the part of the aged monk. He did not himself believe, as his religion teaches, that matter is unreal, and that our senses are always deceiving us; but he thought that those who have risen into a state of exalted reverie are able to discern the truth of these propositions. We again asked him, 'Are you the better for submitting to the tonsure and renouncing the world?' 'No,' said he; 'it is good to be a monk, and it is also good to be a common man.' 'Then why,' he was asked, 'did you become a monk at all?' 'To keep the heart at rest,' he said, 'so that it may not be ruffled by common affairs.' 'And have you attained that stage of advancement?' 'No,' was his response; 'but there is a priest here who has done more than I have.' He led us to see him. We saw him in his monkish costume, sitting on a board in the sunshine; his face turned towards a wall. We were informed that he never spoke. He had not done so for six or seven years, and was under a vow not to break silence for the whole of his life. He constantly wore the same dress, and limited himself to the luxury of combing his long hair, which was never cut with razor or scissors, and washing his face. He ate like other priests, but scarcely ever left his apartment. He could read, but never book in hand. His only employment was to mutter the prayers of his religion in a low voice. We wrote on a piece of paper a sentence: 'Your vow not to speak is of no benefit to you.' He looked on the paper, read it, and gave a faint smile. He refused to write any reply. We said to the septuagenarian priest who had led us in, 'You can exhort men to repent of their sins, but he cannot.' 'Ah!' he replied, 'I am not so good as he is.' . . . Soon after we saw him, we subsequently heard, he was found sitting on his board in the sunshine dead. Such a poor imbecile as this is regarded by his fellow-Budhists in China as having adopted an effectual method of rescuing himself from the corrupting and deluding influence of the world, and as having found a short road to high attainments in the path of Budhist progress. . . . Philosophy has attempted many great things, but it is only in Budhism that it has attempted the salvation of the soul. In the absence of a Divine Saviour, manifested in a human form, philosophy undertook, by thought alone, to rescue men from the evils that involve them, and to frame methods of discipline and self-elevation that should harmonise with the denial of matter and of God."

But inasmuch as the majority of men, mixed up as they are with the transactions of common life, can never undertake

vows of perpetual silence, or spend their days in looking at dead walls, some other method of accumulating merit, and so of delivering the soul from the necessity of living and dying, must be invented. Among other ways by which merit may be acquired by the Budhist laity, are the following: acts of benevolence, such as providing tea to drink and fans to use in hot weather, curing a disease, distributing clothes to the poor, giving ground enough for a grave, &c.; abstinence from the taking of animal life, and from hunting and fishing; a strictly vegetable diet; and the reading and the use of repeating of Budhist prayers. Northern Budhism, however, has felt itself compelled to devise a more agreeable *ultima Thule* than is offered by Nirwana.

"The doctrine of the Nirwana," as Mr. Edkins observes, "is much too abstruse to be popular. It does not come sufficiently near to popular wants to be the object of an ordinary man's ambition. Those who constitute the mass of Budha's worshippers cannot enter into the idea of the Nirwana. They need something more gratifying to common human feelings. It was to satisfy this want that the fiction of the *Peaceful Land in the West* was framed. A Budha was imagined, distinct from the Budha of history, Gautama or Shakyamuni. He was called Amitabha, 'boundless age.' All who repeat the invocation, '*Namo Amitabha Budha*,' commonly read in China, '*Nan woo o me to fuh*" (honour to Amitabha Budha), are assured that they will be taken at death to the Paradise of this personage, situated at an enormous distance to the westward of the visible universe. The souls of such worshippers will remain there for millions of years. Their employment will be to gaze upon the countenance of Amitabha, to hear the singing of beautiful birds, and to enjoy the magnificence of the gardens and lakes which adorn his abode. Such is the heaven which is promised to the faithful Budhist."

This Elysium is represented by plates in a Chinese Budhist work lying before us. Among other features of the scenery may be mentioned rows of trees, lakes of yellow, red, and white lilies, as large as chariot-wheels, musical flowers likewise, and, chief of all, Amitabha expounding the law to a devout and admiring auditory. The following prayer of Budha's, we are told, if repeated by his disciples, insures at once the extermination of misfortune and admission at death into this paradise:—

"Nan-mo O-mí-to po-yí, to-ta-kia to-yé, to-té-yé-ta, O-mí-lí-to po-kwan, O-mí-lí-to, sieh-tan-po-kwan, O-mí-lí-to, kwan-kia-lan-ti, O-mí-lí-to, kwan-kia-lan-to; kia-mí-ní kia-kia-na chih-to-kia-lí po-po-ho."

This is as unintelligible to most Chinese Budhists as it is to the English reader, and yet this prayer and similar in-

vocations, with the name of O-me-to Fuh (Amidha Budha), are repeated thousands and myriads of times for the two-fold object named above. Immediately after the prayer, our Budhist volume goes on to say, "Amidha Budha is ever near to those who repeat this prayer, and he will not suffer them to be injured by their adversaries. In the present life they shall have quiet and security, and at death they shall have their desire, and be born in the Peaceful Land of the West. . . . In the fourth century there lived a priest (his name and place of abode are given), who was in the habit of repeating this prayer, and one day there came from a westerly direction a spiritual man (or spirits and men) bearing a silver table of the value of one hundred dollars, and addressing him, said, 'When life is ended, you shall mount this and go and dwell in the world of boundless delight. All the people heard the sound of music in the air, and for several days a wonderful fragrance was perceived.'" The same book contains several plates exhibiting a large number of open dots arranged in the shape of a pear. These dots the devotee is taught to mark off one by one with vermilion as often as he has repeated the name of Budha a hundred or a thousand times. And since all the dots will eventually be filled up, he must afterwards use some other colour. Then at death the plate must be burnt as proof of his devotion, and depending on the merit hereby acquired he will depart to the Land of Purity!

Such are some of the views which the common people of China are taught to entertain respecting the reward awaiting those who faithfully adhere to the requirements of the sacred books of Budhism. The Budhist doctors, however, do not hold the Western Paradise to be a reality, but explain it in a manner worthy of the allegorical ingenuity of Philo himself. The Western heaven, say they, means the moral nature confirmed, pure, and at rest. Amitabha means the mind clear and enlightened. The rows of trees signify the mind cultivating the virtues; the music is symbolical of the harmony of virtues in the mind; the flowers are suggestive of the mind opening to consciousness and intelligence; the beautiful birds signify the mind becoming changed and renovated. Under such a mode of explanation it is evident that the fabled paradise can no longer be presented as a future state of reward to attract men to a virtuous life; and yet the sensuous Elysium is the hope of tens of thousands of the ignorant among the Chinese people. But all this flies in the face of orthodox Budhism. Its *summum bonum* is not a paradise, but utter annihilation. Life is not worth possess-

ing, either now or hereafter. The world that now is, is cursed as the abode of illusion and misery; and the worlds which will spring up in an endless succession through interminable ages will be so too. Some Western writers have represented the highest goal of the Budhist religion and philosophy to be union and communion with God, or the ultimate absorption of the individual soul by the Divine essence. One of these, remarking on the metaphysical aspects of Budhism, observes:—"It is built upon the basis of an immaterial Pantheism; everything is but the transient manifestation of the Deity, without real or permanent existence; creation is an illusion, life is an evil, non-existence is bliss, God, the infinite and eternal, is all and in all, are the great features of Budhism. Humanity accomplishes its highest end when it . . . is fitted to be reunited with God. This is the blissful portion of the good." Our own researches into Chinese Budhism have led to an altogether different impression, and one more in accordance with the views expressed by M. Barthélémy Saint-Hilaire and the Rev. R. S. Hardy. The former of these, in his work entitled *Le Bouddha et sa Religion*, refers to the atheism, and some other features of Budhism, in these words: "A future life is refused to the yearnings of mankind, and the immortality of the soul is replaced by the immortality of works. God is dethroned, and in His place they substitute man." And, in the *Journal des Savants*, he says: "Budhism has no God; it has not even the confused and vague notion of a Universal Spirit in which the human soul, according to the orthodox doctrine of Brahmanism, and the Sankha philosophy, may be absorbed." Mr. Hardy, in his very valuable *Manual of Budhism*, writes as follows on this point: "Inasmuch as Budhism declares Karma (moral action) to be the supreme controlling power of the universe, it is an atheistic system. It ignores the existence of an intelligent and personal Deity. It acknowledges that there is a moral government of the world; but it honours the statute-book instead of the law-giver, and adores the sceptic instead of the King."

It may be inquired, what favour this philosophic atheism has met with in the land of Confucius, and what has been its influence there? Dr. Morrison says, "Budhism in China is decried by the learned, laughed at by the profligate, yet followed by all." This statement has very much the air of a paradox. How comes it to pass, that in a land where so many are the followers of Confucius and Laoutsz, all should yet be put down as Budhists?

"The religions of Confucius, Budha, and Taou," observes Mr. Edkins, "are truly national, because the mass of the people believe in them all. They are far from feeling it inconsistent to do so. . . . The majority of the inhabitants of that country comply with the worship of more than one religion, believe in more than one mythology of gods, and contribute to the support of more than one priesthood.

"What is the cause of this indifference? Do they care so little about finding out what is the truth and holding to it? Several answers may be given to this inquiry. They are superstitious, but wanting in conscientiousness. They accept legends as true without examining whether there is any good evidence for them or not. They care more to have divinities that seem to meet their wants, and can do for them what they wish to be done, than to have truth and certainty to rest upon them. This is one answer.

"Another circumstance that helps to explain how it is that the Chinese believe in three religions at once, is, that these systems are supplementary to each other.

"Confucianism speaks to the moral nature. It discourses on virtue and vice, and the duty of compliance with law and the dictates of conscience; its worship rests on this basis. The religious veneration paid to ancestors, for that is the worship of this system, is founded on the duty of filial piety.

"Taouism is *materialistic*. Its notion of the soul is of something physical, a purer form of matter. The soul it supposes to gain immortality by a physical discipline, a sort of chemical process, which transmutes it into a more ethereal essence, and prepares it for being transferred to the regions of immortality. . . .

"Budhism is different from both. It is *metaphysical*. It appeals to the imagination, and deals in subtle argument. It says that the world of the senses is altogether unreal. . . . Its gods are personified ideas. It denies matter entirely, and concerns itself only with ideas. . . .

"These three systems, occupying the three corners of a triangle; the moral, metaphysical, and materialistic; are supplemental to each other, and are able to co-exist without being mutually destructive. . . .

"It was because Confucianism 'knew God, but did not honour Him as God,' that the way was left open for Polytheism like that of the Budhists. In the old books of China, God is spoken of as the Supreme Ruler. He is represented as exercising over mankind an infinitely just and beneficent providence. But the duty of prayer is not enjoined. No worship of God by the people is permitted. It was only by the emperor acting vicariously for the people that the Deity was adored in that country. The system of Confucius, wanting this, was more a morality than a religion.

"Budhism came to fill this vacancy. In it the Chinese found objects to adore of mysterious grandeur, and richly endowed with

the attributes of wisdom and benevolence. . . . No wonder that these additions should prove welcome to the religious susceptibilities of a nation which had, hitherto, been restricted within the bounds of a system almost exclusively moral, and which discouraged the worship of God by the mass of the people."

Another reason is given by Mr. Edkins for the existence, side by side, of the three national religions of China. They

"Are all supported by the weight of authority. . . . Since the time of Confucius, men of mark in China have lent their influence to uphold his system, and it has always been the religion of the State. But, while the influential authors and the emperors of the successive dynasties have never deserted the Confucian standard, many of them have shown attachment to Budhism. Last century, the Emperor Keenlung gave the palace of his grandfather at Hang-chow to the Budhists, to be a monastery, and wrote with his own hand an inscription on a monumental tablet to be placed on its roof. The literature of that religion, in more than 1,000 volumes, is published by Government with public funds. Numberless prefaces to Budhist works have been written by emperors and authors of great repute. . . The Budhist priesthood has been and is recognised by many public acts of the Government. Budhism is supported as the national religion among the Tibetans and Mongols, and large establishments of Lamas (the Tibetan name for monks) belonging to these nations are maintained at Peking, at the imperial expense."

After what has now been advanced, we need scarcely describe in detail the various effects produced by this foreign religion on the character and social life of the Chinese. Yet there are a few points which we must not altogether pass by. When remarking on Confucianism, we referred to certain views entertained by Chu-hí, or Chu-foo-tsz, the founder of the mediæval school of that religion, and quoted the replies which he gave to a question respecting the ante-mundane condition of things. In these replies we distinctly trace the influence of Budhism on the mind of one who in many respects ranks amongst the greatest thinkers of his own or any other times. When a young man, he studied with great ardour the literature of the Budhists, and that literature left a marked impression upon him. Budhist authors dating later than the age of Chu-hí are proud to quote the following saying of his: "The teaching of the Budhists has some points of strong resemblance to that of our own orthodox system;" and they point out a great number of phrases occurring in Chu-hí's writings, which, they say, he must have gleaned from their own sacred books. Indeed, Chu-hí does speak of one of those books—a book from which Bud-

hists say he learned something of his own style, in terms of glowing admiration. The work in question contains an elaborate argument to prove that none of the objects presented to us by the senses are real; matter is not, and God is not; and having imbibed some of these views, although he was never a convert to Budhism, *Chu-foo-tsz* eliminated from the writings of Confucius all ideas of a personal God, and set forth creation as a spontaneous process, and not the effect of an Almighty agent.

"The influence of Budhism on Confucianism is seen most palpably in the mixing of its rites with the worship of ancestors. . . . The Budhist masses for the dead afforded the opportunity of showing in a palpable manner the regard felt for ancestors. The ancestral worship is simple. Simplicity marks the style of the funereal temple and the family cemetery. The common eye, not satisfied with simplicity, was pleased with the rich dresses, genuflexions, and processions of the Budhist monks, and especially with the preparation that they undertake to make for the soul of the departed in the invisible world."

The views of the future state propounded by the Budhists meet with considerable credence on the part of the Confucianists, though they have nothing in common with the teachings of the national sage.

The system of the universe as found in Budhist books is identified with modern European astronomy by a Chinese writer on that science. He yields his assent to the teachings of Copernicus, but not without an effort to show how much of it was known by his countrymen before. In particular he says that European astronomy had been anticipated by the Budhist cosmogony, and he is of opinion that the palm of sagacity should be given to the Hindoos, since they, by their own wisdom, had already discovered what the men of the West only found out by the aid of astronomical instruments. The rottenness of this position requires no demonstration. The inventors of that extended system of the universe to which our author refers—the system obtaining among the Northern Budhists—were metaphysicians who denied the existence of matter altogether: when they wrote of the numberless systems of worlds in the immensity of space they only regarded them as imaginary abodes of imaginary Budhas; and their cosmogony, so far as it can be called one, is palpably fictitious, and ought never to be treated as a reality.

The sentiments held by those who spend their days in the pursuit of pleasure, or in the transactions of business, with

regard to Budhism, are well illustrated in the following incident. The author of the *Religious Condition* was once taken to the official residence of a mandarin of the third class. The most sacred thing which the house contained was the shrine and images of Kwan-yin, goddess of mercy—a fabulous creation of Northern Budhism, and entirely unknown to the South of Nepaul—placed in the innermost apartment. On the table beside it was a copy of the Book of Prayers used in the worship of this divinity. Before the image sticks of incense were burning, which had been fresh lighted that morning. Now, in the company of his fellow-mandarins this devotee of Budhism would profess his utter disbelief in the efficacy of any such worship. Here in private, Confucianist as he is, he adores a Budhist idol and clutches at the sensual good which the Budhist Elysium provides for those who seek it.

The misfortunes of the present life are traced by the mass of the people to the sins of a former state. Chinese women believe that it was owing to their wickedness in a previous life, that they are women now and not men; they are taught that if sufficiently virtuous their souls may inhabit the bodies of men when they next enter the world; and they often pray that this may be the case.

There are certain terms familiar to all classes of the people which have their origin in Budhist teaching. For instance, the Chinese speak of *teen tang*, the heavenly mansion, and *te yuh*, earth's prison; and in teaching the Bible doctrine of retribution, Christian missionaries make use of these terms as the nearest equivalents which they can find for heaven and hell—a circumstance which has brought upon them the charge of plagiarism. Again, the forgiveness of sins as the reward of merit attaching to charitable actions, an idea widely prevalent among the Chinese, is to be traced to Budhism. "Those and similar notions obtained from Budhism prevail universally among the people of China . . . and they prove how extensively Budhism has influenced a population that is still nominally Confucian." But the influence of this foreign religion is not confined within the limits we have indicated. When it entered China the people had lost nearly all correct notions of their Creator, and in His place, as we have seen, sacrificed to the manes of their dead, rendered homage to superior and mystic powers, and worshipped genii without number. The coming of Budhism, instead of preparing the Chinese for the worship of the one living and true God, made them more idolatrous than ever. It introduced a mass of

untold absurdities; it added to their Pantheon an endless catalogue of idols; its rules of self-salvation fostered the conceit of the nation beyond all previous influences; and the result was that China became more deluded than ever, and drifted farther and farther away from truth and goodness.

The Chinese Budhists are divided into several sects. There is, for instance, the contemplative school, who say that worship in the temples, the use of idols, the wearing of particular vestments, and the practice of ceremonies are all useless. This school was founded by a celebrated Hindoo ascetic named Bodhidharma, who went to China from India early in the sixth century.

Thirty years after Bodhidharma's death (the Hindoo patriarch died in Northern China), one of his followers, not agreeing with his dissent from his master's doctrine, that all book learning should be discarded, even Budha's own words, and that the heart nurses itself into perfection by rejecting everything external and by giving itself up to an unconscious sleep-like existence, formed the outlines of another system, which he taught to multitudes of admiring disciples. He was repeatedly invited by imperial messages to the capital, but he only complied on one occasion, when he explained the sacred books of his religion to the Emperor and his court. The old man expired while sitting cross-legged in his monastery giving instruction to his followers. We have not space to describe the principles of this school, but of its special object we may say, that it intended to strike a middle path between the credulous acceptance of the sacred books as literally true, and their entire rejection by an extreme idealism. We have already had occasion to speak of the Western Paradise school, and we can only now refer in a few words to the most modern offshoot of orthodox Budhism. The sect now alluded to has grown up and spread itself during the last three centuries in the eastern provinces of China. Its members avoid the common idolatry of the country, believing it to be mischievous. There is no need of an idol, they say, for heaven and earth are the image of Budha, present always and everywhere. They are strict vegetarians. For the most part they are of humble station, possessing little mental culture, mild in manner, and decided in their religious convictions. They are regarded by the ruling classes of China as a political sect, and as such were persecuted by the last native dynasty, some of their founders being put to death by crucifixion. "The simple sincerity of the followers of this religion has attracted the attention of European missionaries. They exhibit more

depth and reality in their convictions than is common in other sects in China. This, added to their protest against idolatry, has led to their being regarded with interest by foreigners, and to some efforts to instruct them in Christianity, and some of them are numbered among the Protestant converts." The books of this sect are placed in the "Index Prohibitory of the Orthodox Budhists," as are also those of the Confucianists and Taouists.

The many points of similarity between the rites and ceremonies of Budhism and those of Popery have been pointed out in nearly every book written on the subject of China; there is the less occasion, therefore, for any reference to them in these pages. The use which the Romish Church may probably make of this resemblance, however, cannot be contemplated without concern on the part of all who desire the triumph of Scriptural Christianity through this vast region of the globe. The policy of Rome in her foreign missions, as is well known, is that of adopting into her worship and religious festivals whatever is likely to give her a claim to reverence in the minds of the people. This course has been followed by her emissaries, both in the East and West; and it may yet be followed in China.

We cannot close this paper without calling attention to the portentous fact, that the religions of China all leave it literally without God. We do not except even Confucianism; for, although allusions are made in the ancient classics of this religion to a personal God, who is to be worshipped and who governs among the nations, yet, as Confucianism is now understood by the masses of the people, it "recognises only nature self-produced, active, but will-less and unintelligent." This was not the view of Confucius himself, we apprehend, although he rarely used the name of God, preferring to speak of heaven. But the philosophers of the middle ages were led, by their contact with Budhism, to suppose that nature may subsist without God; and their views are in vogue amongst the Confucianists of the present day. Taouism knows nothing correctly of the grand division between matter and spirit, its gods being stars and genii. Of the Infinite and Eternal Spirit, therefore, it has no conception. And Budhism, as we have seen, is professedly atheistic, and distinctly and emphatically denies the being of a Personal God. We mark the fact of this universal godlessness of the Chinese nation. It is for the conscience and sympathy of Christendom to deal with it.

ART. V.—1. *Modern India; a Sketch of the System of Civil Government.* By GEORGE CAMPBELL, Esq., Bengal Civil Service. London: 1852.
2. *Regulations of the Governor-General of India.* 1793—1833.
3. *Acts of the Governor-General in Council.* 1833—1867.

IT is a frequent and well-founded subject of complaint on the part of our Indian administrators, that their labours are never sufficiently recognised and appreciated by their countrymen at home; that no pains are taken to understand what they are doing; that an Indian debate empties the House; and that among their private friends the vaguest and most incongruous notions of Indian social and political life are contentedly held. The charges are true enough; and they reflect no little discredit upon those who, as Parliamentary electors, must bear the ultimate responsibility for the good or bad government of our Indian territories. But one poor excuse for their ignorant apathy they certainly can plead,—the want of sufficient effort on the part of those who have the power, to make the routine of Indian administration intelligible to the English mind, to bring fully into view the fundamental differences between the state of Indian and English society, and the consequent difference in the Governmental work of the two countries, without entering into needless technicalities and repulsive details. The Indian civilian must speak in a dialect "understanded of the people," before he can hope to interest them, or even his immediate friends, in his work and prospects.

Mr. Campbell's book, named at the head of our article, is, to our knowledge the only successful attempt that has been made by an Indian officer of the present generation to give a clear and careful sketch of Indian official life and administration. But it is more than the bulk of men would care to read upon the subject; it is rather careful than lively, and too concise to be very agreeable reading; while so rapid has been the course of reform and change in the East, so completely has every administrative department been remodelled of late years, that a book published in 1852 may be considered as antiquated, and needs to be almost entirely re-written to fit it for the present day. It has therefore appeared to us

convenient to furnish such a brief and general sketch of the Indian system as all may read with interest, and without being repelled by the use of foreign terms or by the redundance of unnecessary detail. For the sake of simplicity we shall confine our remarks to Bengal, at once the largest, the most important, and the longest settled of our Indian provinces, which has furnished a pattern more or less closely followed in the administration of all the rest.

The province of Bengal comprises the deltas of the Ganges and Brahmaputra, and the surrounding plains; and forms, with the provinces of Behar on the as yet undivided streams of the Ganges to the north-west, and Orissa, stretching south-west along the coast of the Bay of Bengal, and, with some extensive but thinly-populated hill-tracts on all sides, the territory subject to the Lieutenant-Governor of Bengal, who resides at Calcutta. The Lieutenant-Governor, an officer selected by the Governor-General from the Civil Service, is supreme in matters of the internal administration of his territories, subject only to a general control on the part of the Supreme Government, except in three points;—important financial changes, involving increase of expenditure, require the sanction of the Governor-General in the Financial Department; the Supreme Legislative Council is competent to make laws affecting Bengal, though there is a special council by which purely local laws are made for Bengal, subject to the Governor-General's approval; and in the third place, the Subordinate Judicial Service, although the judges are appointed and removed by the Government, is under the control of the High Court at Calcutta, the members of which are appointed by her Majesty. Even with these reservations, the power of the Lieutenant-Governor is considerable; and he is the officer to whom all departments of the public service look up as their direct superior. The population under his rule is about forty millions; larger than the population of the British Isles, or that of the United States of America.

Now, if we suppose ourselves transported to the flat and fertile plains of alluvial Bengal, we shall after due search find among groves of mango-trees and bamboos, in the outskirts of some great city, the scattered residences of the Europeans, white gleaming bungalows, beneath high sheltering roofs of straw; and inquiry will show us that nearly all these habitations are tenanted by officials, servants of the Government. There are scarcely any large settlements of independent Englishmen in the interior; for the planting interest, which alone attracts gentlemen unconnected with Government away from the

Presidency towns, requires their residence in the midst of their domains, often far away from town or bazaar. Here is the judge's house, there is the collector's, and the one that towers above the rest in all the pride of a second storey, and overlooks an ampler demesne,* belongs to the commissioner. What the functions of these officers are we shall learn as we proceed. Not far from the residences, several conspicuous buildings, obviously not erected with a view to architectural effect, meet the eye: these are the *cutcherries*, or offices for public business, as might be guessed by the busy crowd which surrounds them; petty lawyers, pen behind ear, tutoring each his little crowd of raw-looking country witnesses; smart clerks in spotless white, moving from office to office; palanquins and ponies waiting under some spreading tamarind-tree. As the magistrate drives up and dismounts from his buggy, the pettifogger disappears behind the tree-trunk, the witnesses put on their stupidest country-bumpkin aspect; the clerks bow down to the ground; there is a rush into the court after the official, and the business of the day commences.

This is the Sudder station or head-quarters of a district—a tract of country of varying extent, but generally larger than Yorkshire, and containing about a million of inhabitants. The governing of this million of souls is done as well as may be, by some four or five English officers, in the court-houses just described, with the help of a police-force, a school-house, and a gaol. In these days most of the districts have been broken up into subdivisions, and each subdivision presents a miniature of the head-quarters under a single officer, who is generally a junior civilian, or a clever native of the subordinate so-called uncovenanted, service. These subdivisions afford a field to the untried officer for the first exercise of his responsibility, and they bring justice nearer the doors of the people. As it is, a man has to travel sometimes fifty miles on foot to bring his complaint or answer a summons, and the more the subdivisional system is extended, the easier and cheaper will be justice, and the more secure will be the bulk of the people from oppression.

Each district is a miniature of the State; for in each the various functions of the Government are separately represented. These functions are, the fiscal or revenue department, the judicial, both civil and criminal, the police, the educa-

* "*Campound*," from the Portuguese *compana*, a field. Many of the commonest words in use in India, as ayah, almirah, peon, are the legacy of the early Portuguese settlers.

tional, and the miscellaneous executive work of Government, which cannot be definitely classified. We shall devote a few pages to each of these departments except the educational, which cannot be adequately treated within the compass of the present article.

We commence by illustrating the working of the fiscal administration; the branch which has, until recently, obtained the main attention of Government, and been brought to the highest perfection. It would be absurd to deny that a Government ought attentively to secure the means of its own continued existence; but a Government which should confine itself to that duty, *propter vitam vivendi perdere causas*, is of very little meaning or use in the world. When justice, police, education, all the weightier matters of the law, are starved out for the sake of securing or increasing the revenue, it would be hard for the Government to point to any adequate reason for its own existence. As we shall see, the present state of things is not without exception in this respect; the Revenue Commissioner is a higher officer than the Judge; the duties of a magistrate, on the adequate performance of which more than on any other single object which the Government can effect, depend the moral and material well-being of the people, are conjointly vested in the same individual with revenue duties, which occupy the greater part of his time, and which present more tangible results; so that the officer under whom as collector the revenues suffer is more easily marked out for animadversion than if as magistrate, he perverted, the fountain head of justice, or destroyed the comfort of the population by incapacity, negligence, or wilfulness.

In order adequately to understand the duties of a collector, it is necessary to comprehend, at least in its broad general bearing, the land-revenue system of the country. The Bengal system differs in some essential respects from that which prevails in other parts of India; and we may take a future opportunity of comparing results of the several measures. At present, it will simplify the question if we confine our attention exclusively to Bengal.

On our acquisition of India, we found Mahommedan despotism so strangely mixed up and confused with Hindoo feudalism, that it was difficult to ascertain in whom was vested the actual proprietorship of the land, whether in the immediate cultivator or in his feudal superior or in the State; and in our ignorance we complicated the problem by insisting on the creation of a class corresponding to the English landlord. What we found was broadly this: The State claimed a certain

interest in the land, a certain share, that is, in the produce, which in Bengal took the form of a money-payment, estimated at short intervals by "striking the fiars" as the Scotch call it. But the rights of the cultivator were fully respected; his tenure was hereditary, and he could not be ejected as long as he paid the fixed rent,—violence of course apart. In practice, however, the Government found it impossible to deal with the individual cultivators, of whom in Bengal alone there may have been four millions; or if an equitable ruler with a genius for organisation, such as Akbar, attempted to do so, the indolence and weakness of his successors soon led the way to the system of collection by contract. The provincial governor contracted with the emperor for a fixed sum; he looked about him for persons willing to contract with him for the revenue of districts, or of *pergunnahs* or hundreds. Sometimes he found these among the old feudal chiefs, who continued to exercise, under the Afghan or Mogul rulers of the country, an authority none the less real for being unrecognised; and these chiefs or rajahs undertook the collection of rents in the districts acknowledging their influence, and the payment of a stipulated sum to the emperor's representative. Where such chiefs did not exist, or were weak, profligate, or disaffected, the collection was farmed out to speculators, or presented to the hangers-on of the Court, or to persons who had claims on the Government, such as would be remunerated out of our Civil List. These different classes of collectors were known by the name of *zemindars;** and their office was not strictly hereditary, though practically, in the case of the feudal lords, it had grown to be so. In most cases the farming system prevailed, but in some the collectors were expected to bring to the credit of Government all that they received, and remunerated themselves by a percentage.

Now, when the East India Company stepped successively into the posts, first of Chancellor of the Exchequer to the Viceroy of Bengal, and afterwards of Viceroy itself, it endeavoured to collect the dues of Government on the same system. It tried the percentage plan, but found that the revenues did not come in. Our rulers were not squeamish, but they could not make up their minds to the Mahommedan methods of dealing with defaulters,—the thumb-screw, the immersion in a noisome pool, the filthy dungeon, swarming with reptiles, and known

* A Persian term, which signifies rather the man *of* or *belonging to* the land, than the possessor of the land, or landlord, but which Lord Cornwallis misunderstood in accordance with preconceived English ideas.

in derision by the name of *Baikant*, or the Hindoo paradise, or the more merciful discipline of the whipping-post, and their resources suffered accordingly. It tried the farming system, and that failed too, or led to manifold oppression of the cultivator. The Marquis Cornwallis came out, with an amiable heart, and the ideas of an old English gentleman. He left his country prospering, as it seemed to him, under the equitable rule of country squires, and he determined to create a squirearchy for Bengal, a class of hereditary landlords, who should pay a fixed Government due, and be left in undisturbed possession of their estates. Here were the zemindars of the Mogul dynasty ready to his hand, some of them princes, but the majority mere rent-collectors; still they were the only class who at all answered the ideas of the English landlord. The old civil servants of the Company shook their heads; whatever were the rights of these zemindars, they could bear no comparison with the time-honoured privileges of the cultivator of the land. But the Marquis stood firm; the Court of Directors was only too willing to make a settlement which should relieve it of further responsibility and trouble, and in 1793 were enacted the Cornwallis Regulations, which established the perpetual settlement. By this settlement, every village became a portion of an estate and the property of a zemindar; the revenue payable by each of the zemindars was fixed for ever, and it was decreed that so long as the zemindar paid his revenue punctually, he should never be disturbed in possession, but that if any portion remained unpaid on the fixed days the estate should at once be brought to the hammer, the auction purchaser to have a good title, and to succeed to the whole interest of the defaulter. At the same time the zemindars were warned that in return for their privileges they would be expected to respect the rights of their under-tenants, and the Government pledged itself to take an early opportunity of establishing those rights on a satisfactory footing, a pledge which remained unredeemed for sixty-five years. It is no part of our present purpose to inquire how far the perpetual settlement has answered the designs of its founder; it is sufficient to say that it has insured the stability of our rule, and that, at a time when the fairest provinces of the North-West were desolated by anarchy, there was no murmur of rebellion in the permanently settled districts. The political wisdom of the principle of fixity of tenure and revenue has been established, and it is only a matter of regret that the application of that principle has begun at the wrong end of the scale; that the tenure of the actual cultivator, which the

universal opinion of the country and the evidence of history proved to be in custom inalienable, was not rendered inalienable in law; that the work of 1859 was not carried out at the commencement of our rule. The cultivators were given over, bound hand and foot, to the new-made lords of the soil; abuses, such as the power of compelling the attendance of the cultivator at the court-house of the landlord, were legally sanctioned; and the ryot, constitutionally (if we may so express ourselves) co-holder of the land with the sovereign power, was only saved by the potency of prescription and unwritten custom from sinking into the position of a mere tenant at the will of an obtrusive landlord unrecognised by the custom of the country. At length the Government, taught by time, waked up to the consciousness of its long-omitted duty, and passed the famous Act X. of 1859, which, with the interpretations put upon it by the High Court, may be regarded as the Magna Charta of the ryot.*

Before, however, proceeding to the discussion of the change, or rather "Conservative reaction," produced by this important law, we may further explain that, between the ryot and the zemindar, a vast number of intermediate tenures of various legal significance have been created in different periods. To understand all these tenures, which greatly complicate the land system of Bengal, years of local experience are necessary. We may here specify two classes of them—rent-free holdings and *putni* tenures. The old rulers were in the habit of providing pensions for their servants, military or others, and for their favourites of all classes, in the shape of holdings of land free of charge to Government. Sometimes the hereditary nature of these holdings was distinctly specified in their charter; more often, in the unsettled state of the Mahommedan government for the century preceding our rule, it was assumed through the negligence of Government; and the same permissive cause led to the assumption of lands as rent-free by persons, especially zemindars, who had absolutely no claim of any kind to them, to the great detriment of the revenues of Bengal. In the early portion of our rule, some effort, though never a very earnest one, was made to check these assumptions, and

* The use of the words *zemindar* and *ryot* may be forgiven as they have no exact English equivalents. The latter is the small farmer, who in a land where the labourer is almost unknown, puts his own hand to the plough and cultivates his tenure with the assistance of his family. The Christian *rayahs* in Turkey are a similar class; *raiyat* or ryot being strictly an Arabic plural form.

examine the claims to rent-free tenures; the revenues were somewhat increased by this process, but much that might have been realised has been sacrificed to the desire of increasing the number of those who are bound by special ties to desire the continuance of British rule. The endowments of mosques, temples, and charitable institutions, are also in the form of rent-free tenures; a condition of things which fully answers our views, as, while we are solemnly bound not to interfere with the free exercise by our subjects of their religious rites, we have, so long as the provision for these rites consists of rent-free holdings, no occasion to exercise that control and supervision over the endowments which we should be tempted to do if they were in the form of revenue-paying lands.

The *putni* tenure originated in the desire of some of the larger landholders to be free from the personal supervision of the whole of their estates. The landholder, to effect this object, makes over all his rights in a tract of country to a subholder or *putnidar*, on condition that the latter shall satisfy the Government demands for revenue, and pay also a certain proportion of the rents to the landlord as profit. The landlord thus secures a small fixed income with perfect freedom from responsibilities or expenses; but the *putnidar* is naturally anxious to make as much as possible from the under-tenant, to compensate himself for the amount he has to pay to the landlord. An example will make this clear: Let A be a zemindar deriving £1,200 per annum clear from his estate, and paying £1,000 as revenue to Government; it is clear that, if he makes over his land to B, on condition that B shall pay £1,000 annually to the collector, and £200 annually to him, A, the zemindar is as wealthy as before and more free from care; but it is also clear that B derives no profit from his interest in the land, unless he makes it pay more than A did; unless, in a word, he enhances rents, imposes cesses, and squeezes the cultivator. If, as constantly happens, B parts with his interest on similar terms to a sub-*putnidar* C, the squeezing process has to be repeated. Now these *putni* tenures, which last *in perpetuum* without relapsing, except on default, have been especially sought after by the European indigo-planters, who wished for a hold on the soil in order to coerce or induce the ryots (by practical arguments, such as the threat of enhancement) to take contracts for the cultivation of indigo, which of his own free will the farmer does not cultivate, for the simple reason that it is an unprofitable crop. The planter sought for territorial powers for the sake

of the prestige and the legal rights which are incident to such powers, and he obtained them by means of the *putni* system.

We may now return to the position of the cultivator, who was before the enactment of Act X. legally a mere tenant-at-will, though, as in Ulster, a conventional understanding secured for him a certain tenant-right. No one was very anxious to interfere with these prescriptive rights. The native landlord felt the force of the prescription too strongly, and never dreamed of exercising his full legal powers of enhancement and ejectment. The European landlord, in whose view consideration for native customs was not so binding, had set himself to cultivate indigo, and found that if he attempted to increase rents or to disturb the position of the tenant, his main object would suffer. But circumstances continually came to light which showed the advantage of legalising the ryot's tenure, and the Act was therefore passed.

Its principal provisions are as follow:—Every tenure that has been held since 1793, the year of the perpetual settlement, at fixed rates, might be held for ever at the same rates, as long as they are punctually paid; and thus, the under-tenant, or cultivator, is secured in the permanence of his holding on the same condition as the zemindar. But, as documentary evidence is preserved with difficulty in India, especially in the destructible mud or mat habitations of a poor tenantry, it was further enacted that proof of continuous holding at fixed rates for *twenty* years back, should convey a presumption of similar holding since the settlement, in the absence of proof to the contrary. Again, every tenant who could prove tenancy for *twelve* years, at fixed rates, was entitled to hold at those rates, except in certain specified cases in which enhancement was allowed; especially where the value of the produce had increased, from causes independent of the exertions or expense of the cultivator; tenants who had held for less than twelve years, were decreed to be mere tenants-at-will; and of course leases on special conditions were not interfered with; for example, even a twenty years' tenancy would confer no rights, if it could be shown to be determinable by the condition of the lease. It was further provided that written leases should be granted on demand. The Act laid down a procedure for cases of default in payment, &c. It was, like much Indian legislation, imperfect and tentative, and one important omission soon attracted attention.

The European indigo-planters had gradually, by the system of underletting which has been above described, obtained zemindari rights over a vast breadth of country, and when the

indigo business collapsed, owing to the growing disinclination of the tenantry to take contracts for the cultivation of a crop to them unprofitable, were forced in self-defence to endeavour to reimburse themselves from the rents for their failure in their more legitimate line of business. The twenty years' tenantry could not be touched, but the provision which permitted the enhancement of the rent paid by a twelve years' tenant in the case of an increased value of produce was largely resorted to, and many thousand enhancement cases were set on foot. Here a difficulty at once arose. The law provided that in case of proved increase of value (and all crops have increased largely in value of late years) an increased rent might be demanded, but was silent as to the principle on which the increased rent should be assessed. The planter-landlord maintained that if the increase were once allowed the former rent should be put out of consideration altogether, and the new rent calculated *de novo*, on the principle of granting the tenant a remuneration for his labour, and return for his capital at the current rate of interest, and making over all the remaining profits of cultivation to the landlord; and this view was warmly supported by Sir Barnes Peacock, the Chief Justice of the Appellate Court, a consummate lawyer, but imbued with thoroughly English notions of the relations between landlord and tenant. On the other hand, it was maintained with more justice by all the other judges of the Appellate Court (fourteen in number), that, as it was only by virtue of the increased value of produce that enhancement could be claimed at all, such enhancement could only be proportioned to the increase in value: thus, if the ryot's gains could be proved to be now double what they were at the date when his original rent was fixed, his rent could be now doubled and not more, and for every increase in rent a corresponding increase in the value of produce had to be proved. The decision of the majority carried the day, and it is clearly more in accordance with the original independence of the tenant and his prescriptive rights. These explanations, though somewhat dull, we have deemed it useful to give, that our readers may judge of the importance of the issues depending on a proper conception of the original position of the Indian tenant. The decision of the High Court has given a power of rising in the social scale to hundreds of thousands of cultivators whom the views of the Anglicising party would have condemned to a continuance of sordid poverty.

All suits affecting the relation of landlord and tenant are submitted to the Revenue Department, which therefore exer-

cises judicial functions of a large and important class. The organisation of the Department is as follows. The more important executive work is in the hands of the collectors of districts. The number of estates paying revenue direct to Government in each district varies from a few hundreds to twenty thousand. One man may own as zemindar half a district, or there may be a condition of peasant proprietorship, in which no man owns more than he can cultivate, and the *status* of landlord merges into that of tenant. The collector has his head-quarters in the centre of his district, and has subordinate to him a group of assistant and deputy-collectors, the latter for the most part natives, some of whom have jurisdiction over the several subdivisions of the district, while others assist the collector at his head-quarters. The collector is himself subordinate to a commissioner of revenue, whose authority extends over a province, or group of districts; and the commissioners again are controlled by a revenue board at Calcutta, which is in immediate communication with Government.

The duties of the collector are of a more miscellaneous character than would be inferred from his appellation. The actual collection of land revenue occupies him but little. The estate holders are bound to bring the share of their annual revenue due from them on or before certain fixed days of payment to the collector's treasury: and, except in accidental cases of default which may be afterwards explained, the collector, after due notice, sells by auction the defaulting estates. After deducting the dues of the Government, he makes over the balance to the defaulting proprietor, and gives a clear title to the purchaser. The collector has also to register all transfers, either by inheritance or purchase, of estates; if the joint-owners of a revenue-paying estate wish to partition it between them, he has to effect the partition; if an estate from want of a purchaser, or by escheat, falls into the hands of Government, he has to manage it as landlord, and, if necessary, to effect a complete settlement of the under-tenures; if a minor succeeds to an estate, the collector has the full powers of landlord during the minority, besides the guardianship of the minor; he conducts cases on behalf of Government in the civil courts; he furnishes supplies for troops, information to Government on all matters affecting his districts; and generally acts as a kind of upper landlord on behalf of Government.

But the land-revenue is not the only source of profit to Government. Income and licence taxes are not yet a part of the regular system of taxation; but when these occasional

imposts are laid on, it is the collector and his staff who assess and exact them. The tax upon stamps and the excise permanently require his care. He keeps and distributes stamps, and grants money-orders; with regard to the excise, it is his business to supervise the manufacture of country spirits, to grant licences for the sale of imported spirits, and for the cultivation of narcotics; and to prosecute for any infraction of the excise laws. It may be observed, by the way, that there is a considerable difference of opinion in the matter of excise; it is maintained that Government should not meddle with so degrading a traffic as that in intoxicating liquors or drugs; while on the other hand Government defends itself by pointing to the inevitable spread of drunkenness which would result from the abrogation of the duty. No doubt this is the case; but it is quite clear that, given the duty, it is to the interest of Government to increase its revenue by encouraging consumption; the collector in whose reign a large number of spirit shops are opened, gets credit for zeal and energy; and we stand out before the public as promoters and teachers of the one vice from which our subjects, both Hindoo and Mohammedan, are by habit and religious teaching exceptionally free. If, with a duty sufficiently large to make drinking an expensive luxury, and not large enough to render illicit distillation profitable, could be combined a distinct renunciation of the hope of increased profit, if the Government could be self-denying enough to visit with its displeasure all officers who endeavour to swell the revenue by promoting consumption, we should be inclined to regard the excise laws as a legitimate exercise of authority; as it is, they tend more than anything to debase us in native eyes.

We now return to the collector's duties, which we have by no means exhausted; for his judicial duties, which remain to be considered, demand more time and attention than any which have been described. All suits dealing with the relation between landlord and tenant are brought before him. If a landlord wishes to enhance rent, in any one other than in that of the tenant-at-will, whom we have mentioned above, he must file with the collector a notice of the amount and grounds of his demand; and the tenant may contest his right by a suit in the collector's court. If a tenant's rent is unpaid, the landlord may either sue for arrears or distrain; and the right of distraint is so fenced about by safeguards, so fertile in occasions for litigation, that practically he generally prefers a suit in the collector's court. There are suits for duress and extortion, suits for illegal demand of rent; suits of innumer-

able kinds, and innumerable in number; and there is a complicated appeal system, which considerably increases the amount of judicial work. As a rule, a collector makes over all original judicial work to his subordinates; one of his deputies is put in charge of the treasury, another in charge of the excise; but the appeal work, and the miscellaneous duties of which he cannot relieve himself, together with the general superintendence and responsibility, are sufficient to keep his faculties at their fullest stretch. It is necessary to observe that he employs a large number of clerks, and what are called ministerial officers—process-servers and the like. The treasury requires one batch of clerks; the account department another, a third takes charge of the revenue-roll, and so on. The scene in a collector's office, always lively, is on some occasions, such as the last day of receiving revenue payments, one that baffles description: hundreds of eager applicants for attention throng the avenues to the treasury; a Babel of sound prevails; but the patience and clearheadedness of the Bengali clerks triumph over all difficulties, and the work is got through without confusion and with a truly marvellous accuracy.

The appeal from the collector's decisions in judicial matters lies to the civil judge of the district; in other matters to the Commissioner, and then to the Board of Revenue. It is not easy to see on what theoretical grounds a Board of Revenue should stand between the Government and the executive officers, and the days of the Calcutta Board are in all probability numbered. In the gloomy days of the Orissa famine, the Board, unable to conceive of any question except in so far as it influenced the collection of revenue, refused to the last to recognise the existence of a famine, because such a recognition might give an excuse to the landholders to ask for a remission or postponement of their payments; they would not hear of the importation of grain, because that would have countenanced the delusion that a famine existed; they misled the Government, checked inquiry, and acted as men do act with only one idea and that a wrong one.

We now come to the judicial department in its two great branches of civil and criminal, and we shall have to consider, with regard to each, in as comprehensive a way as possible, the law itself and the administration of it.

The criminal law of India was, when we took the administration into our hands, the Mahommedan law. Our Government had not the instruments to carry out at once any improved system; the revenue department occupied its principal atten-

tion, and the native judicial officers were left to themselves to punish offenders according to their own law. Barbarous punishments were first abolished, the functions of magistrate and judge were gradually made over to English officers; a regular goal-delivery was organised, and laws were enacted defining the more important classes of crime; but these were strictly supplementary to the Mahommedan law of the land which prevailed in the absence of special enactments. Up till seven years ago, for instance, special laws were in existence defining the crimes of house-breaking and the like, but gambling was also punished, because punishable by the laws founded on the Koran; only the magistrate who could punish for theft on his own responsibility was obliged in each case of a conviction for gambling to obtain the written opinion of a *Moulavi* or Mahommedan doctor of laws. This confused system vanished in 1861, when the Penal Code, together with a carefully drawn-up Code of Criminal Procedure, became the law of the land over all India. Of the latter code we need only say that it is simple, intelligible and complete; the Penal Code, the work, and probably the greatest work, of the clear and judicious mind of Lord Macaulay,* merits more than a passing mention. The most remarkable features are its sound common sense, the absence of legal and antiquated phraseology, and of the metaphysical jargon into which some lawyers run when they attempt to penetrate into the region of principles, transparent clearness of definition, and the use of illustrations to elucidate whatever the definition might possibly leave doubtful. It is law for the public, as a criminal code should be, not lawyer's law; and admirably adapted for a judicial system to be worked in great part by young magistrates without a legal training, often not well-skilled in the English language, and in most cases totally destitute of the assistance of learned counsel. An example of this code will display its clearness; its completeness can only be judged of after years spent in the administration of it.

"299. Whoever causes death by doing an act with the intention of causing death, or with the intention of causing such bodily injury as is likely to cause death, or with the knowledge that by such act he is likely by such act to cause death, commits the offence of culpable homicide.

"*Illustrations.*

"(*a*) A lays sticks and turf over a pit, with the intention of there-

* It was nominally composed by a Commission presided over by Mr. Macaulay, when he was legal Member of Council at Calcutta; but it bears throughout the impress of his peculiar mode of thought and his peculiar style.

by causing death, or with the knowledge that death is likely to be thereby caused. Z, believing the ground to be firm, treads on it, falls in, and is killed. A has committed the offence of culpable homicide.

"(*b*) A knows Z to be behind a bush. B does not know it. A, intending to cause, or knowing it to be likely to cause, Z's death, induces B to fire at the bush. B fires, and kills Z. Here B may be guilty of no offence, but A has committed the offence of culpable homicide.

"(*c*) A by shooting at a fowl with intent to kill and steal it, kills B, who is behind a bush, A not knowing that he was there. Here, although A was doing an unlawful act, he was not guilty of culpable homicide, as he did not intend to kill B, or to cause death by doing an act that he knew was likely to cause death.

"*Explanation* 1.—A person who causes bodily injury to another who is labouring under a disorder, disease, or bodily infirmity, and thereby accelerates the death of that other, shall be deemed to have caused his death.

"*Explanation* 2.—Where death is caused by bodily injury, the person who causes such bodily injury shall be deemed to have caused the death, although by resorting to proper remedies and skilful treatment, the death might have been prevented.

"300. Except in the cases hereinafter excepted, culpable homicide is murder, if the act by which the death is caused, is done with the intention of causing death; or—

"2ndly.—If it is done with the intention of causing such bodily injury as the offender knows to be likely to cause the death of the person to whom the harm is caused; or—

"3rdly.—If it is done with the intention of causing bodily injury to any person, and the bodily injury intended to be inflicted is sufficient in the ordinary course of nature to cause death; or—

"4thly.—If the person committing the act knows that it is so imminently dangerous that it must in all probability cause death, or such bodily injury as is likely to cause death, and commits such act without any excuse for incurring the risk of causing death, or such injury, as aforesaid."

The code differs from the English law in some important particulars, notably in the treatment as criminal offences of petty transgressions, such as assault and defamation, for which in this country a remedy would be given in the civil courts. There are points in which a difference of opinion may be permissible, as in the punishment as a criminal offence of adultery committed by the woman, while the man may commit the same offence with impunity. But, on the whole, the code is well worth study, as the product of a highly-cultivated European mind, familiar with every form into which criminal law has been cast,* free from prejudice,

* The influence of the French Code, and the Code of Louisiana, is distinctly traceable.

and aiming rationally to combine logical accuracy, sound morality, and common sense.

The civil law, as may be expected, is not placed on so simple a basis. It is clear that the ruling power may exercise its own discretion in determining what are crimes and how they shall be punished; but it has no such discretion to fix the relative rights of individuals, the laws of inheritance, and so on. Law is in these respects the sanction of custom; and every nation has a right to its own customs, so far as they do not interfere with the public morality, or with the individual's right to his own life, health, and property. For instance, the practice of widow-burning is a time-honoured custom in India. It is not supported by the Vedas, the most ancient and authoritative religious books of the Hindoos; but, even if it were, it is clear that an enlightened legislature could not permit this practice. It is of the highest importance that no one, except the sovereign State, should be allowed to put any human being to death on any ground whatever. Therefore the extreme terrors of the criminal law have been by Indian legislation directed, and rightly, against this practice. But such a practice as the equal division of property among the children, is one which, if it has formed a part of the legal rights of a family for many ages in any country, the law has no right to touch. Even supposing a legislature convinced of the superior social advantages of primogeniture, it would not be justified in altering the law so as to create a right in the first-born; all that it could with propriety do, would be to remove hindrances, so that, if all parties were agreed, the property, or certain of the property, should descend to the eldest son. Where there are established customs, the law has only to declare and interpret, not to reform them. Of course such customs as the law can take account of must be universal, or, at least, general: the courts of a country cannot pretend to interpret a dozen systems of law; very small communities cannot claim exemption from the *lex loci*. Now, in India we found the vast Hindoo community living under a system of Hindoo law; a Mussulman community, smaller indeed than the Hindoo, but still larger than the whole population of the British Isles, whose mutual dealings were regulated by the law of the Koran and its interpreters; and a small body of Europeans, who were not prepared to acknowledge any other law than the English. The three systems accordingly flourished together: English law was administered in the supreme courts of Calcutta, Bombay, and Madras; while the Company's courts, as they

were called, with the assistance of pundits and moulavies, administered the Hindoo and Mahommedan laws in the interior. Meanwhile, a large number of mercantile and other questions arose, which the Oriental codes were incompetent to decide. The Koran was found to be of little use in deciding the mutual responsibilities of the sharers in a joint-stock company; and the Mithila school of jurists was not clear as to what constitutes an act of bankruptcy. Naturally, special enactments were required to meet these new phenomena of Western civilisation; and hence, in addition to the three bodies of law which we have enumerated, grew up a body of Company's law, based on the English model, and answering to the English statute law. To this day, therefore, a judge of the highest court may be compelled to settle different questions on the same day by reference respectively to the Hindoo jurists, the Arab commentators, the English common law, and the Regulations and Acts of the Governor-General in Council.

Within the last decade two important steps have been taken with the view of simplifying the confused mass of law and precedent which regulated the proceedings of the courts. A uniform code of civil procedure has been laid down for all courts except those established by Royal Charter, namely, the Supreme Courts of Original Jurisdiction in the presidency towns; and a code of substantive civil law is in preparation, and has been in part enacted, not to supersede the Hindoo and Mahommedan civil law, but to provide for points untouched by them, and to apply to all races and nationalities not Hindoo or Mahommedan. The Englishman resident in India, the native Christian, the Jew, Parsee, or Chinaman, comes under the authority of this code, which has been carefully prepared, not on any basis of English law, but on principles of common right and obligation independently laid down. Some of its rules are in advance of the corresponding rules of English law. For instance, the married woman, except when settlements have provided explicitly to the contrary, retains the possession of any property of which she may have been seised at the time of marriage, and any property which she may personally acquire during marriage. The eminent jurists who have prepared this code, untrammelled by convention or by English custom, have endeavoured to express in it their matured ideas as to what law should be; and it cannot be doubted that, when the time arrives for a codification of substantive law in England, those to whom that important duty may be intrusted

will find their labours lightened by the previous conclusions of the Indian Law Commission.

We have now to describe the courts and officers to whom the administration of the law is committed, and, in doing so, we shall in the first place direct the attention of our readers to the courts of the interior in which justice is administered to the vast mass of the native population.

The criminal jurisdiction of Bengal is in the hands of magistrates and sessions judges. The magistrate of a district is the same officer as the collector of the district formerly described. The work of the magistrate being mainly executive, it seems to have been thought advantageous to employ a single officer as administrative head of a district in both the criminal and the revenue departments. It results that the magistrate-collector has more work than he can attempt to manage, and more responsibility than should be placed on the shoulders of any single man. We have seen how multifarious are his duties in the revenue department, and if to this be added the management of the police and gaol, the superintendence of the roads of a district, the sanitary supervision of a town, and a hundred other executive duties, besides the general superintendence of the minor criminal courts, and a considerable amount of original criminal work, it will be seen that it requires no common assiduity and energy to enable him to conduct his duties without serious failure. There can be no doubt that a separation of the revenue department from the criminal and magisterial is imperatively required; and public opinion is so clearly tending in that direction that its realisation is probably not far distant.

Criminal cases are instituted either by application to the magistrate in person or on the reports of the police. The officers presiding in the subdivisional courts of the district receive these applications and reports, each for his own subdivision. Those for the remainder of the district are brought to the magistrate in person. His staff consists of a joint-magistrate with full magisterial powers, and assistant and deputy magistrates with full or limited powers, according to their standing and efficiency. The officer with full powers can punish by imprisonment up to two years, fine, and, in certain cases, flogging; but in the case of a definite class of offences, and wherever the code allows a higher punishment than those enumerated, if he considers that such higher punishment is necessary, he must commit the offender to the sessions. As a rule the magistrate will distribute the petty assault and theft cases among his assistants and deputies,

and make over the committal cases to his joint-magistrate, reserving only those of either class which, for their importance or otherwise, he considers it worth while to try in person. The sessions judge of the district tries all the committals, and formerly he did not share the responsibility with any jury; at present the system varies in different districts. In districts near the capital or from other circumstances supposed to contain a sufficient number of fairly educated inhabitants, the jury system has been introduced; not quite as in England, where the unanimous verdict of twelve men settles every question of fact, for in India a majority of the jury, if the judge agrees with their verdict, can carry a decision. Against unanimity the judge is powerless; but if he disagrees with the verdict of a majority, the case may be referred. In other districts the judge takes the opinion of assessors, but is not bound to follow it. It is perhaps questionable whether the natives of any part of India are as yet sufficiently advanced in political breadth of view for the introduction of a jury system. Admitting that they are sufficiently honest, they are still to a great extent led away by their feelings and prejudices.

It might be urged in their case, as it is urged by the opponents in this country of the communication of political responsibilities to the female sex, that the emancipation which they need is not emancipation from external restrictions, so much as from the mental habit of contemplating every question from a personal stand-point. Englishmen, at least those classes of Englishmen who have enjoyed the benefit of a political education, can to some extent divest themselves of the thick atmosphere of prejudice and personal feeling which refracts the rays of truth, and blurs the image presented to their minds; Bengalis cannot do so. They excuse the faults they are most prone themselves to commit, they punish the offences they most dread personally to suffer from. In a case connected with indigo-planting, their hatred of a system distorts their view of facts: for to them the planter and his assistants are always oppressors. Again, whatever may be the occasional cruelties which passion or selfishness may hurry the Bengali to commit, he is, in theory, and under the influence of his ordinary feelings, distinctly averse to taking away human life, and would esteem it a meritorious act to give a verdict (such as homicide under aggravating circumstances) which would save a culprit from the gallows. We could illustrate these views by instances which have sufficed to create in our own mind a distrust of the jury

system, except as an assistance to the judge; which should, however, be tempered by the consideration that it is by the exercise of political powers that a people learns to wield them. If in the process we are prepared to submit to numerous and grave failures of justice, we may be assured that all will be well in the result.

Crime in Bengal displays very much the same phases as in Europe. There are the crimes of passion or jealousy; there are the robberies suggested by the temptation of opportunity; but the large proportion of violent crimes are the acts of a definite criminal class, not so much a caste or a tribe, as a loose body, recruited by the bad characters of all castes who despise an honest means of livelihood. A characteristic crime of Bengal is *Dacoity*, which means housebreaking by night and with violence, in gangs of five and upwards. The dacoits conduct their operations with boldness and skill; they generally select a locality for their crime at some distance from their habitations, so as to lessen the chance of recognition, and not unfrequently disguise themselves. They are armed with a powerful club, or quarterstaff, the national weapon of all the dangerous classes in Bengal, where firearms are comparatively unknown to the mass of the people; are always prepared to exercise violence in case of resistance; and very often, if women fall into their hands, torture them by burning, or otherwise, to elicit a discovery of the place where money and valuables are secreted. This is the worst feature of Bengali crime, and is without a parallel in the criminal annals of modern England. Generally, however, the inhabitants of a house attacked seek safety in flight; the villagers are utterly defenceless, and seem to have no power of organising themselves into a body capable of resisting oppression. With all our efforts to improve the detective service, the perpetrators of these outrages generally go unpunished. The fright of the inmates, the precautions taken against recognition, and the nature of Bengali house property—brass pots and pans, and silver ornaments of a few very frequent patterns—render detection difficult; while the village police, always inefficient, are too often in collusion with the criminals. Burglary is also a very frequent crime, and is facilitated by the nature of the mud-walled cottages; a hole in the wall is made with a peculiar instrument, the possession of which is regarded as a constructive proof of guilty intentions, and punished accordingly. The practice of allowing children to go about loaded with gold and silver ornaments furnishes an opportunity for another class of crime. Many murders have

no other motive. The class of agrarian outrages, violent affrays, in which both sides are led by armed men, often by a zemindar or landlord in person, and which arise from disputes about proprietorship, gives much occupation to the criminal courts. But the prevalent crime of Bengal is undoubtedly the falsification of evidence, in its two great branches of forgery and perjury. The number of forged documents presented in every court in the country exceeds belief. The imitation of handwriting, the art of colouring a paper so as to give the appearance of age, all the tricks that make up successful forgery, are practised by numerous professors. The documents so prepared often fail of their purpose, but even when not absolutely successful, tend to confuse a judge, and to pervert the course of justice; and it is very seldom that a clear case for conviction against the culprit can be obtained. The Registration Act (1865), rendering compulsory the registration of all documents affecting landed property within a limited period of their execution, has to a great extent checked the practice of the more serious class of forgeries; but the innate tendency of the Bengali to fabricate documentary evidence has many outlets, and a higher degree of vigilance and acuteness in the judges is the only safeguard against the constant perversion of justice.

The punishments permitted under the code are fine and forfeiture of property, imprisonment with or without hard labour, and in extreme cases, death by hanging. A supplementary law has restored the punishment of flogging for disgraceful offences, such as petty theft, and this is frequently resorted to when the gaols are crowded. Imprisonment, where the labour is light, and the food better and more regularly given than is possible to a poor man, loses much of its deterrent power, especially in times of scarcity; nor has the problem yet been solved of combining a thoroughly distasteful course of prison-life with that earnest attention to the health of the prisoners which is incumbent upon a conscientious government. The prisons are, on the whole, admirably managed; the magistrates, who have the charge of them, are subordinate in this department to an inspector-general of gaols, generally a medical man of scientific acquirements and great devotion to his duties.

Civil justice is administered by a different body of officers. There is a system of county courts called Small Cause Courts, for the trial of certain cases involving a distinct money value up to a fixed amount; other cases are tried principally by judges belonging to the Uncovenanted Service, and called

moonsiffs and sudder-ameens, who are, for the most part, natives. The court judge of the district, always a member of the Civil Service, hears appeals and takes up originally certain of the more important cases, and there is a further appeal to the high courts.

The high courts of the presidency towns are variously constituted: that of Calcutta consists at present of fifteen judges, of whom five are English barristers, including the chief justice; nine have been selected from the judicial branch of the Civil Service, and one is a native pleader of distinction. The court is divided into an original and an appellate side; the original side being confined exclusively to the barrister judges. Its functions are to exercise civil jurisdiction in cases arising within the limits of the town of Calcutta, and to try criminally all persons accused of offences committed within the said limits, and all Englishmen accused of offences committed anywhere in Bengal—an invidious distinction, productive of much injustice and more ill-feeling.

The Englishman accused of a crime is brought with all the witnesses, at great expense, perhaps from a distance of many hundred miles, and too often he finds the Calcutta "jury of his countrymen" ready to listen to any plea, however absurd or trifling, in his behalf. Now that pains have been taken to improve the organisation of the district courts, which are presided over almost exclusively by trained and skilful judges, we may hope to hear no more of an anomaly which tends to foster a mischievous race-distinction, and to create the impression that courts good enough for the mass of our native fellow-subjects are not to be trusted in the case of a few Europeans. The appellate side of the court, in which all the judges take their turn to sit, forming several courts of two judges each, takes up the criminal and civil appeals from the district courts; and, in cases of great pecuniary moment, there is a further appeal to the Queen in Council.

In treating of the criminal jurisdiction, we have enumerated certain of the duties of the magistrate; but he has a number of extra-judicial functions which occupy a great portion of his time. He is the registrar of assurances, *i.e.* of title and other deeds, for his district, which involves considerable labour in a recent and not yet fully organised department. He assesses the landholders for contributions to a local postal system, of which he has the management. He superintends the gaol, and is exclusively responsible for its good order and the safety of the prisoners. He farms or manages the ferries and tolls, and superintends the expenditure of the

sums thus collected in roads and local works of improvement. He thus finds it necessary to know something of engineering, to be able to superintend the construction of roads or bridges. He is responsible for the sanitary arrangements of the towns in his district—towns which may be as populous as Leeds or Sheffield. He controls the village police; is responsible for many, and consulted in all, matters relating to the district police. It falls to him to perform all governmental work, such as the organisation of relief in time of famine, for which no special department exists. In some of these duties he is assisted by committees; others he may delegate to his subordinates; but the responsibility for all action in every department falls upon his shoulders.

The police of Bengal is of two classes: the village watchmen, and the semi-military police of Government. The former are a relic of the old system of village communities, chosen generally by the landlords or the villages; are expected to keep order in their beats, report disturbances, arrest offenders, and assist the regular police in their inquiries. Their duties are not very definite, and they have no regular subordination. They are an anomaly, a relic of antiquity, and only await reorganisation, on which the Government is just now busy. The governmental police have been of late years reorganised; and form a separate department under an inspector-general and district superintendents. The principal thing to be noted of them is, unhappily, their inefficiency. The police furnishes the one great blot and failure in our administration. A people, accustomed to be tyrannised over, and with the fear as well as the hatred of slaves for Government and its agents, throws every obstacle in the way of the detection of crime. The people corrupt the police, and the police, in turn, prey upon the people,—participate in the result of crime, or even promote and instigate it. Detection is almost impossible in the face of the tremendous *vis inertiæ* of a public which refuses to concern itself in any merely public matters; and even if a policeman is anxious to do his best, and signalise himself by the detection of a criminal, his natural bias leads him to unauthorized and atrocious modes of eliciting truth. Cases of torture by policemen, especially with the view of extorting a confession which causes them much trouble, are frequent; and their general conduct towards persons suspected of crime, or whom they choose to consider suspected, is disgraceful. Not long ago a crack inspector and three constables were sentenced to various terms of imprisonment for beating a man in the station-house,

in order to force a confession, with such violence that the man died. A wretched victim is hung up by the heels over a heap of smouldering straw, and is soon ready to confess anything, only to retract his confession when face to face with the magistrate, if his oppressors be out of sight and the tone of the official reassure him. It is so much easier than ferreting out the truth about a crime. But the corruption of the police is the greatest evil a magistrate has to contend with. He has none of the checks upon their proceeding which a jealous public spirit interposes in England. Take the case of a remote village with a non-resident landlord, inhabited only by Bengalis of the poorer classes. A crime of domestic violence is perpetrated: a jealous or impatient husband strangles his wife or pushes her into a well in a fit of rage. None of the neighbours, except to gratify a personal spite, will trouble himself to walk five or ten miles and cross a river or two to report the case at the station. Even if the facts are brought, by village gossip, to the notice of the police, the guilty man has only to offer a sufficient sum to insure their report of the case as a death by snake-bite, or at the worst a suicide; and, though the true facts may be known to fifty people, they deliberately choose not to bring upon themselves and their village the trouble, expense, and annoyance of a judicial investigation, to be dragged up to the civil station, it may be repeatedly, as witnesses, to have the police harpies quartered upon their village. If, as sometimes happens, a murmur of the matter reaches the ear of the magistrate, the corpse has probably been disposed of by burning, and every vestige of the crime has disappeared; and whatever his private convictions may be, he finds action absolutely barred. Thus earnest criminal inquiry is thwarted at every turn, and if the people, on the whole, live quietly and securely, it is not owing to the protection or the strong hand of Government, but to the prevailing decency and peacefulness of the native character. Not that we would include the whole of the police department in a sweeping condemnation; instances of good detectives, and faithful, honest servants, are to be found among them, but as a rule they are both useless and corrupt.

We have thus skimmed through the various departments of the administrative service in Bengal as represented in the districts; we have found that these departments are officered in different ways, and the distinction between the Covenanted and Uncovenanted Services has occurred more than once in the course of our narrative. We now propose to explain that distinction, and to spend a few pages in

tracing the career of the officers belonging to the Covenanted Civil Service.

In short, then, the Covenanted Service consists of those officers who have before a certain age definitely devoted themselves to the service of Government in India, and who have satisfied the conditions of test required by Government before their admission: that is to say, at present, who have passed highest in a competitive examination (the number of candidates who pass being determined by the number of vacancies in the service), and passed sufficiently well in certain after-tests of examination. To these officers, Government guarantees, in case of good behaviour, a certain scale of pay and pension, and grants them the monopoly of certain situations, forming in the mass very decidedly the majority of the good situations at its disposal. All who enter the service by any other channel, whether natives or Europeans, form the Uncovenanted Service, which is inferior to the Covenanted Service, both in pay and pension, and in the importance and responsibility of the appointments open to it. Exception may of course be made to the inflexibility of this arrangement. For instance, we have seen that the subordinate judgeships in Bengal are held by members of the Uncovenanted Service. The officers of the Covenanted Service, to whom the term *civilian* is specially applied, have, as it happens, no sort of experience in the decision of civil suits for the first fourteen or fifteen years of their service, when they are suddenly called upon to become judges in appeal in civil cases. Now, it is quite clear that, when a district judgeship or judgeship in appeal falls vacant, the ranks of the Uncovenanted Service, which contain many able men who have grown grey in the discharge of judicial duties, would be competent to supply many officers more fitted for the post—the local bars, and especially the Calcutta bar, would supply many officers more fitted for the post—than the civilian whose sole judicial training has been the committal of criminals and the trial of rent suits. Yet the system ignores absolutely the doctrine of *la carrière ouverte aux talents;* and these appointments are reserved exclusively for civilians. It would be, at first sight, admitted that we have here a great abuse of Government patronage; yet a little consideration will suffice to show that there is essentially nothing of the kind; that the existence of a privileged service tends materially to raise the standard in all departments of the administration. We must separate the accidental from the essential; that the civilian has no proper training for the high office of a judge, which is his perquisite,

is an accident, much to be deplored, but quite remediable without depriving him of his privilege. The guarantee to the class of civilians of certain privileges, of which chance or favouritism or carelessness on the part of the authorities cannot deprive them, attracts superior men into the class. The officer who has been chosen by competition, must have qualities superior to the common run of men; and if his training has been judiciously effected, will certainly be more fit for the exercise of judicial powers, than the large bulk of his possible competitors. The privilege sometimes passes over the absolutely best man for a post, in favour of an inferior one; but it secures that all who are chosen shall be fit men; it puts out of the question partiality and jobbing; while, if it were withdrawn, we should have no security for the fitness of a nominee of the Government which happened to be in power. We cannot force a government to choose the best man; we can, by judicious protection of the entries into the service, force a government to choose among good men; and it is better to aim at a certain good than at a problematical best. At the same time, we freely admit that all absolute prohibitions partake of the nature of injustice, that not only have the non-privileged class a right to expect a relaxation of strict rules in certain instances of distinct superiority, but that also the privileged class, while secure of promotion, tend to fall into inactivity and to lose zeal, while the possibility of their being passed over in favour of an able and energetic outsider would put them on their mettle, and preserve them from stagnation. In a word, so long as the entrance into the service remains free to all, at a certain age, we have no objection to the service remaining close afterwards, provided that such closeness be not absolute, and that the gate yields, under proper safeguards, to distinguished merit.

There is a prevalent opinion, especially among bigoted Anglicists, that the bar is the only suitable training for the bench, that a special judicial service does not produce judges as able and honest as our English system of selection from the body of advocates. Continentals speak of this view with contempt as one of our insular anomalies; we retort upon them with the charges of pedantry and idealism. There is clearly something of anomaly in the practice of selecting a body of judges, who are to be distinguished by their impartiality, from that profession which more than all others encourages and requires an eager partiality. If it works well in England, there must be some special and local reason, in the English

character, in the character of an English barrister, which explains its working well: but it by no means follows that the system will bear transplantation into every soil. In India we are met by the difficulty that the body of English barristers is too small for selection, that a more than proportionate number of posts of honour and emolument, including the highest judicial posts of all,—seats in the High Court,—are already open to them, and that the District Judgeships require a far more considerable knowledge of the native institutions, laws, and languages, than can be gained at the bar of the original jurisdiction side of the High Court. But, it will be said, there are the pleaders of the appellate side, the pleaders of the District Courts, among whom are men of sufficient ability and in sufficient number to make possible a prudent choice. The large majority of these pleaders consist of natives; and the question arises, Are the natives competent as yet to command to any extent the higher judicial posts? We do not believe that they are competent; or that the practice of the native bar is such as to foster in men the spirit of independence, of impartiality, of common honesty, which is requisite in our judges. We counsel patience; improvement in this respect has set in; but till there is a bar to select from, we must consent to postpone the consideration of the question, whether the best judges for India would be those selected from the bar, or those who by a gradual promotion from the subordinate to the higher posts are trained on the bench itself, for the bench, which only requires a simple modification of the present system.

There is no principle of selection for the Uncovenanted Service. A benevolent governor sometimes gives away employments to broken-down merchants, or indigo planters, to the great annoyance and perplexity of those who have to superintend their work. Clever young men educated in India, English or of mixed blood, who have not means for visiting England, to undergo the course of studies requisite to enable them to pass a competitive examination, are always acceptable. But the bulk of the service consists of natives, either the distinguished *alumni* of our educational institutions, or clever clerks in public offices. These fill the posts of deputy magistrates and collector, and the subordinate judgeships. The service is not a grateful one; the deputies have most of the drudgery of the public work thrust upon them, and under an inconsiderate superior they are in no enviable position; many years of service must pass before they can hope for a competent salary; and the posts of really high emolument

which are open to them are very few in number. Yet among their number there are many thoroughly deserving and able men; and on the whole the judicial work of the country, four-fifths of which (if we reckon cases by number and not by importance) is in their hands, bears high testimony to their ability and public virtue.

We now proceed to trace step by step the course of the civil servant from his first arrival in India. We have only to premise that such a sketch can take no account of the various special appointments in the Secretariat, the several Boards, &c., to which a civilian is eligible, and that we merely propose to consider the average career of an officer of ordinary intelligence and ordinary success.

The young civilian arrives in India at the age of twenty-three or younger, already declared qualified for the public service at a previous examination in London. How far he is so qualified may be doubted. He knows the grammar of one or two of the languages in which he may have to administer justice, and something of their vocabulary; but he can hardly make himself understood in the simplest conversation; the law he understands a little, the procedure not at all; and some weeks must elapse before he can do any really efficient work of the most ordinary kind. His appointment is that of assistant to the magistrate and collector of some district in the interior; and his powers enable him to decide criminal cases which may be adequately punished by a month's imprisonment or less. There is, however, an appeal from his decisions, in case of conviction, and as all Bengalis invariably appeal whenever the law allows it, he can do little harm. The magistrate, too, is cautious not to make over to him business of a serious character; and supervises his work very carefully till he can be trusted to go alone. If he is an active young fellow, he soon finds useful employment in visiting the gaol, or riding over a new road; and the magistrate tries his hand in drafting reports and the like. Meanwhile he is assiduously learning his work, picking up a facility in conversation, an acquaintance with Indian life and habits, while the knowledge of the intricate system of landed tenures comes to him by degrees. The salary of the unpassed assistant is £480 a-year, from which a deduction of six to eight per cent. is made for the several funds, to form a nucleus for his retiring allowance, and his widow's pension. The salary is not large for India, where a certain scale of expense is unavoidable, and where the difference between the humblest *ménage* suitable for a gentleman and the most ex-

pensive, is by no means so great as in England. Every one must spend a certain amount, while no one can spend more than a limited sum; and the establishment of a commissioner and of an assistant do not differ in any degree resembling the proportion of the difference in their salaries.

About a year after the entrance of the young civilian into the public service, he may be qualified to pass in the lower standard of the half-yearly examinations, in which he must satisfy the examiners (officers of Government of various ranks) of his knowledge of certain branches of law and procedure, and of his ability to read, write, and converse in the ordinary style of the district to which he is posted. On passing this examination, his powers are increased, and his salary also. He now begins to decide revenue cases; may perhaps have charge of the treasury; and generally is a far more important person, though still strictly subordinate to the magistrate and collector. On passing the second, or higher, standard, after a year or eighteen months further, he is invested with the full judicial powers of a magistrate and collector, and is able to relieve his superior of much important work. At this period, he is generally posted to a subdivision in the interior of a district—perhaps a new one, perhaps the one in which he has hitherto served at headquarters. Here he firsts experiences the delights of responsibility; can work his hobby, if he has one—and most young officers of any thought or energy have their hobbies. Except in judicial functions, he remains under the control of the executive head of the district; but, with a careless collector or a trustworthy assistant, the control is often merely nominal; and our officer has now ample opportunity to show what stuff he is made of. The life in a subdivision is generally dull enough; and the want of society renders this the stage at which men have the strongest inducement to marry. The days pass busily enough: the morning ride to some village where a dacoity has been committed, to supervise the proceedings of the police, or familiarise the officer with the localities of the case he will have to try,—perhaps a burst after a jackal with the dogs of a neighbouring planter, his only acquaintance within ten miles,—is followed by an hour or two in the verandah with his correspondence to read, the daily reports to hear, and yesterday's orders to revise and sign; then, after breakfast, the judicial work of the day commences, and perhaps occupies him till sunset. But the heavy, dull evenings, alone in his bungalow, are cheered by no charm of social intercourse;—too weary for study, the young magistrate

resigns himself early to slumber, to resume on the following morning the endless treadmill of his monotonous day.

After five or six years from the commencement of his service, our officer obtains his first substantial promotion, to the post of joint magistrate, which requires his return to the head-quarters of a district. Here his salary is raised to 900 rupees a month (1,080*l.* a-year), and he begins to enjoy the comforts of life; but his position is not really as independent as in the subdivision he has left. He is but a kind of head-assistant to the magistrate and collector, whose orders he is bound to obey. As a rule, the heavy criminal work is made over to him, and his duties are often exclusively judicial. Indeed, as the arrangement of offices stands, men are forced but too often to busy themselves in exactly that kind of work for which they are least suited, and which they least enjoy. The active officer, who has an eye for a country, can judge of the prospects of harvest, select a line for a new road, visit a discontented village at the shortest notice, or nip an affray in the bud, is chained to his desk by the iron hand of routine, while the clearsighted unraveller of evidence, who delights in the judge's work, is forced upon executive duties. The position of the joint magistrate is especially anomalous and unsatisfactory; the young officer, whose knowledge is now considerable, while his zeal still burns bright as ever, and his health unimpaired, wants above all opportunity; and opportunity is only given by work of an executive character, and by a position in which a man can originate plans, and not merely carry out the orders of others.

Two years of this work bring the ordinarily successful man to the post of magistrate and collector, when he finds himself suddenly possessed of immense responsibility, and in a position which, more than any other in the whole Indian service, affects the prosperity of a large body of the public. We have seen that this officer is, as collector, the agent of Government in its position of head-landlord of the district; he is literally landlord of large tracts, the property of Government or of minors; he has to execute decrees of court, to settle innumerable important matters connected with the land; he is the referee of Government wherever it requires information; he carries out taxation, superintends excise, divides or unites estates, farms out fisheries, has innumerable duties of which no clear idea could be given; add to this, a large original jurisdiction in revenue suits, and an appeal jurisdiction from the decisions of, it may be, ten or twelve deputy collectors, whose courts, too, he has to inspect and

supervise; and add, again, all the magisterial functions which we have above described, the superintendence of the gaol, of the police, of roads, appeals from the assistants, commitments to the sessions, sanitary precautions in the villages, the examination of schools, the administration of charities, even the hanging of criminals; and it will easily be imagined that many collectors complain with justice that no day ever passes on which the day's work is got through in the day; that they are forced to slur over a large portion of their duties, not less pressing than the rest, and that more is forced upon them than man can possibly do, especially in a climate where the power of exertion and endurance is narrowly limited.

The salary of the magistrate-collector is 1,800*l.* or 2,300*l.* a-year, according to his grade. He may serve in that capacity six or seven years before his promotion to a judgeship, under the style of Civil and Sessions Judge, with 3,000*l.* (deductions at the rate above explained must be made throughout), and many officers complete their service in that grade. Only the more distinguished are drafted off into the High Court, or obtain Commissionerships of Revenue.

The term of service is twenty-five to thirty-five years. An officer may resign and receive his pension after twenty-five years' service, or he may remain ten years longer. Then he must go. The rule is rigid, and even a statesman like the present Governor-General would be debarred by age from holding any of the subordinate posts of his administration. The amount of the civilian's pension depends partially on the salaries he has received, and may be 1,000*l.* a-year, or something less.

In so rapid a sketch, we have been content to overlook many points of interest; but we shall be satisfied if we have succeeded in giving a somewhat clearer conception of the system under which England governs India, and of the work of her administrators. A detailed knowledge of the subject is only of special interest, but a general sketch may be useful in clearing away misapprehensions, and exciting the interest of Englishmen at home in the duties and the life of their countrymen in the East, and in the government of so vast a population, subjected by the course of events to our rule.

ART VI.—1. *Life of Sir Walter Raleigh*, 1552—1618. By JAMES AUGUSTUS ST. JOHN. Two Vols. London: Chapman and Hall.
2. *Bacon and Raleigh*. By MARVEY NAPIER. Cambridge: Macmillan. 1853.
3. *Miscellanies*. By CHARLES KINGSLEY. London: J. W. Parker and Son. 1859.
4. *Poems*. By SIR HENRY WOTTON, SIR WALTER RALEIGH, and Others. Edited by the Rev. JOHN HANNAH, M.A. London: Pickering. 1857.
5. *Nouvelle Biographie Générale*. Paris: Firmin Didot.

THERE has scarcely been a greater man than Walter Raleigh, as there has scarcely been an age more heroic than the latter half of the sixteenth century. Shakspere, Jonson, and the glorious company of dramatists were his friends; he was Spenser's patron; he wrote Sidney's epitaph; Burleigh and Bacon were his contemporaries, though the one was by many years his senior, and the other by a few his junior. Hawkins, Frobisher, Drake, the Gilberts, were all living when he lived, and some were his own near kinsmen. And yet in the age of giants, when men of full mental stature might well have seemed dwarfs, Raleigh towers above the rest; a more complete, because a more many-sided, man than all. Soldier, statesman, poet, historian, discoverer—he was all these. Brave as Mars, beautiful and accomplished as Apollo, a veritable ἄναξ ἀνδρῶν, and yet not even for Œdipus himself was the warning more timely, "Call no man happy before his death." The age was worthy of the men. There was waging a mighty conflict between light and darkness. The combatants assumed many shapes, but the combat was always the same. Now it was fought between the North with its Queen, fair of face but doubtful of heart, and the South with its Queen, true-hearted despite all her faults. Now it was fought between the Island with its sailors, who never thought of numbers when England had to be defended, and the Peninsula with its cruel and boastful captains who named invincible the fleet that was to be overwhelmed with destruction more complete than ever before or since befell armada. Now it was the old faith contending with the new, which yet was not the new but the old. Everywhere it was a war to the knife, between free thought and thought fettered and bound; between falsehood that

poisoned the sources of moral life, and truth which elevated and ennobled that life. How small seem the events of this age compared with the events of that;—the dispute about Church-rates and compound householders, compared with the great cause of liberty of conscience *versus* Roman infallibility, a National Government and a National Church *versus* Papal supremacy in both State and Church. How insignificant are Abyssinian expeditions, entered upon with timorous reluctance, contrasted with the relentless war against the Spaniard in every sea and under every clime. How great the difference between the leaders of to-day who have made expediency the first law of statesmanship, and the leaders of three hundred years ago, who would sooner have committed suicide than have taken a leap in the dark, bearing the British institution with them into the unknown depths of the unexplored abyss.

Walter Raleigh, noblest of Englishmen, has had probably more biographers than any other Briton that has lived. This is not surprising, the man being what he was. What is surprising is that the biographies should have been so bad. His deeds were worthy to be the subject of an epic; his wisdom to be chronicled in "table-talk." Such a life might have inspired even a dullard, although Raleigh was too great for any one man to paint him as he was. But of this hero there is no record which has anything of the epic cast save as to size. Mr. Tytler's was until lately the standard life, and has good qualities. Mr. Marvey Napier's essay corrected many of Mr. Tytler's mistakes: Mr. Kingsley's article in the *North British Review*, subsequently republished in his "Miscellanies," displays the most fervent admiration, but is rather a panegyric than a biography. The lately published volumes, by Mr. James Augustus St. John, approach more nearly to the ideal work. As in so many other instances, time, which is ever removing us chronologically farther from the deeds and actors of history, is bringing us substantially nearer to them. New sources of information are constantly being discovered; doubtful points are being cleared up, false traditions swept away, and the true man becomes clearer with all his heroic virtues and heroic faults. It is not many men whose lives would stand such careful scrutiny as Raleigh's; for the many are not heroes. When the "splendid sins" as we thought them become commonplace meannesses, it is well to end our researches.

> "We have a vision of our own,
> Ah! why should we undo it?"

But for Raleigh investigation has been almost entirely gain;

and in this latest biography our great countryman is more than ever unlike that caricature which Hume has drawn. Thanks to the country which was Raleigh's implacable foe, and which he hated with such hatred as the father of Hannibal felt for Rome, we have a truer and nobler conception of him than has been current for many a generation. Seven years of loving labour has Mr. St. John devoted to the examination of all manuscripts and documents that relate to this subject—documents to be found in Spain, at Paris, at Venice, and in that inexhaustible store of historic wealth, our own Record Office. It seems scarcely likely that, after such patient industry, any new facts of importance remain for future students. Should there be such, the result of past researches gives us every reason to expect that Raleigh will profit rather than lose. Meanwhile, we tender our thanks to Mr. St. John for his careful and conscientious volumes.

The year 1552, that saw the great Duke of Somerset executed on Tower Hill, saw a greater man born in a Devonshire farmhouse. The times were sorely troubled. In Devonshire the popular feeling was all in favour of the old faith. On Whit-Sunday, 1549, the clergy, according to Edward's command, read the reformed Liturgy, greatly to the disgust of the worshippers. On the following day, the inhabitants of Sampford Courtenay forced their rector to read the service to which they had been accustomed. The news of the victory soon spread, and the example of the villagers was followed in other places. The magistrates so far sympathised with the people as to resort to no repressive measures. The Government, hearing what had taken place, sent some of the local nobles to expostulate with the rioters. These refused to listen, and prepared for the armed conflict which they saw impending. A proclamation was issued, calling upon the people to lay down their arms. They replied by laying siege to Exeter, and taking prisoner the father of Walter Raleigh—a fact which Mr. St. John, with all his industry, seems to have overlooked. Of Mr. Raleigh we learn further that he was, as Mr. Kingsley says, "a gentleman of ancient blood—none older in the land—but impoverished; he had settled down upon the wreck of his estate in that poor farmhouse." The farmhouse was not so "poor," however. Even now Hayes Barton (its name) is described by Walter White as "a solitary farmhouse—once the manor-house—built in the picturesque style of four hundred years ago, with gabled wings and portico, thatched roof and mullioned windows, and a heavy oaken door, thickly studded with iron nails, standing

at the end of a garden, partly concealed by a few old trees that rise from among the herbs and flowers." At fourteen (in 1566) he went to Oriel College, Oxford, and there he formed that friendship with Philip Sidney (two years his junior) which ended only when the younger received his mortal wound at Zutphen. Raleigh wrote his epitaph in lines that perhaps served as a model to the noblest threnody in the language.* Raleigh spent three years at Oxford. He quitted the University without a degree; but, if gossiping John Aubrey is to be believed, with another student's gown, which he borrowed and forgot to return. He made a considerable impression upon those with whom he came in contact, and he left behind him the reputation of being a good rhetorician and a good philosopher.

The gown gives place to arms. In 1569 the battle of the two faiths, which, so far as England was concerned, had virtually terminated in the triumph of the Reformation—was being fought in France with desperate energy and amid seas of blood. Raleigh repaired thither to use his sword in behalf of the cause which he devoutly believed to be the cause of truth. On March 13, he, as a Huguenot trooper, took part in his first engagement. It was a most unfortunate beginning. The Prince of Condé was taken prisoner and assassinated by order of the Duke of Anjou, the suitor for the hand of the Queen of England. Raleigh's second feat of arms was not more successful than the first. For six months the Huguenots were unable to take the field, and when they did so their army was in a state of mutiny because the arrears of pay had not been discharged. Their rout was disastrous and complete. For six years after this defeat of Montcontour there is little information respecting Raleigh. It has been generally supposed that he was at Paris during the St. Bartholomew Massacre, and took refuge at Walsingham's house; but Mr. St. John inclines to the opinion that he was in the South of France when that atrocious crime was committed. We find him at twenty-three an inmate of the Middle Temple, and writing poetry there. He did not remain among the lawyers more than a year. Another opportunity of fighting offered itself when, in 1578, Sir John Norris with a small army of English and Scots crossed to the Low

* This epitaph is not included by the Rev. John Hannah in his painstaking edition of the *Poems by Sir Henry Wotton, Sir Walter Raleigh, and Others* (Pickering, 1857). But it is ascribed confidently to Raleigh by the editor of Chambers's *Cyclopædia of Literature*, who mentions the likeness to the *In Memoriam*. The epitaph is appended to Spenser's *Astrophel;* but though it bears no signature, the internal evidence is strongly in favour of Raleigh's authorship.

Countries to oppose Don John of Austria. This time Raleigh was permitted to taste the sweets of victory. We now come to a period of Raleigh's history which has hitherto been a blank, but which has been successfully investigated by Mr. St. John. In the Record Office there is a very remarkable "Discourse," signed by Sir Humphrey Gilbert, Raleigh's half brother, but which Mr. St. John believes was really written by Raleigh himself. It was proposed that Elizabeth should fit out a fleet ostensibly for discovery alone, and to be equipped and armed conformably to its object. This fleet was at a given latitude to fall in with a more formidable armament sent out secretly, and the two expeditions having united were to fall upon the fishing boats of Spain and France off Newfoundland, and taking possession of them with their loadings, return to Europe and dispose of the whole in the ports of Holland and Zealand. The project having been favourably received, its promoters suggested that this fleet might seize upon the Spanish colonies in America, and take possession of them in behalf of the Queen of England. To hoodwink Spain, Elizabeth was to affect much indignation at these adventurers, and to denounce them as pirates or as servants of the Prince of Orange. Adopting the wretched maxim,—the end justifies the means—the writer of the *Discourse* said, "I hold it as lawful in Christian policy to prevent a mischief betimes as to revenge it too late, especially seeing that God Himself is a party in the common quarrels now afoot, and His enemies' disposition towards your highness and His Church manifestly seen, although by God's merciful providence not yet thoroughly felt." Then followed a vision of Britain ruling the seas, at that time prophetic and of the future, in our time historic and of the past; and coupled with the vision was the remark—showing how Raleigh joined the shrewdest insight to the liveliest imagination—that England's immunity from foreign invasion depended upon the condition that Ireland was "in safe keeping." Finally, the Queen was reminded that delays are dangerous. The impartial historian must condemn this project of Raleigh's, but at the same time there were extenuating circumstances. There was at that time a profound conviction of the dissimulation and treachery of Spain, and of all countries that espoused the cause of the Pope. This was not wonderful when the blood of the St. Bartholomew martyrs was still crying from the ground. There was additional reason for suspicion had Raleigh and Gilbert known it. At the very time they proposed their expedition against the fishing fleet of Spain, Philip of Spain was preparing his great Armada,

which, duly provided with thumb-screws and other theological arguments, was to effect the conquest and the conversion of heretic England.

Elizabeth was persuaded by Raleigh's eloquence; partly perhaps by her own covetousness. She sanctioned the fitting out of a fleet, and permitted two of her near relatives, Henry and Francis Knollys, to take part in the enterprise. Late in the summer of 1578 a fleet of eleven sail lay anchored under Plymouth Hoe. Misfortune attended it from the first. There was grumbling among the captains, blasphemy and rioting among the men. The crews were composed of the biggest blackguards within the four seas. They filled the whole town of Plymouth with brawl and riot, insulting the night-watch, and crowning their doings with murder. The disputes between the leaders became so fierce that it was absolutely impossible for them to act together. Henry Knollys, who seems to have been the chief offender, broke away with four ships from the admiral, and betook himself to the ocean, where he turned pirate. On November 19, the residue of the fleet, seven ships and 350 men, set sail from Plymouth under Sir Humphrey Gilbert. Raleigh was of the party. Whither they went is by no means clear; but there are indications that they sailed to the West Indies. Certain it is that they came into collision with the Spanish fleet, and were defeated with the loss of one of their principal ships and the gallant captain, Miles Morgan, who was slain in the engagement. About six months after they set out, Gilbert and Raleigh returned with the wreck of their expedition, unsuccessful; yet, in the eyes of their countrymen, not dishonoured.

Ireland was then, as now, England's difficulty. But there was not then, as there is now, patience to untie the knot. At the time that Raleigh went there, nearly the whole island was in a state of insurrection; "priests, going from castle to castle, from cabin to cabin, stimulated noble and peasant to take up arms for the Church; mountains, bogs, woods, valleys, swarmed with the fanatical acolytes of Rome; the Geraldines were at the head of large forces, while the Spaniards and Italians, making incessant forays from Del Oro and other fortresses, helped to enlarge the circle of murder and devastation." To dissolve the spell of Romish influence, and to win back the Irish to their allegiance, Burleigh sent Lord Arthur Grey, of Wilton, a stern Puritan, whose one redeeming feature was the choice of Edmund Spenser for secretary. Perhaps this was not the time for mild men and mild measures. A force of Spaniards and

Italians, some seven hundred strong, had landed near Dingle, and taken possession of the fort Del Oro. All Ireland within the pale was in a state of alarm; all Ireland without the pale was in high exultation. Saxons and Celts alike saw in this force the advanced guard of the most formidable army in Europe. This fact must be borne in mind when we read of the dark deed which, more than any other, has overshadowed Raleigh's name. The garrison of Del Oro, having been compelled to surrender, were massacred, and Raleigh was one of the two officers who (no doubt acting under orders) superintended the atrocity. Raleigh's sovereign, though a woman, approved the cruelty, and commended its perpetrators. Raleigh, now high in favour, was sent on a special mission to the Netherlands, and, having acquitted himself well, came back to be more graciously received than ever. The old story of the cloak may or may not be true, but there seems no doubt that gallantry on Raleigh's part was, *pace* Mr. Kingsley, reciprocated by coquetry on Elizabeth's. There is this to be said for Elizabeth, that she was not blinded by the flattery which was so copiously offered up to her. She knew a true man when she saw him. She talked amorous jargon with Raleigh, but she would not suffer him to degenerate into a mere courtier. She sent him down to Devonshire to try another wooing, and, as it turned out, to win the constituency of that county, which elected him to the House of Commons. There, according to Cecil, he worked like a horse. He frequently served on committees, and spoke on all great questions that came before the House, especially such as were connected with foreign policy, religious toleration, and social or commercial reform. On some of these matters he was three centuries in advance of his time. He was, for instance, a free trader nearly three hundred years before Peel. He was for repealing the famous statute of tillage, so that each man might grow what he considered best. He urged that "the Low Countrymen and the Hollanders, who never sow corn, have by their industry such plenty, that they can serve other nations, and that it is the best policy to set tillage at liberty, and have every man free, which is the desire of a true Englishman."

There was one department of public affairs in which especially Raleigh showed himself a statesman of the highest order. We should call it the colonial department now, but three hundred years ago England had no colonies. That vast empire of dependent provinces and kingdoms, on which the sun never sets and which now makes one of the smallest

of kingdoms the greatest of powers, had not then begun to be built. Raleigh was destined to lay the foundation stone. He differed from the Spaniards, inasmuch as he thought lightly of the treasures of gold supposed to be stored up in the New World. True he often spoke of them and wrote of them, but he did so because it was only in this way that he could hope to obtain the popular support for his expeditions. At the same time he did not fail to urge the higher considerations which weighed with him far more than all the mineral wealth of the "Indies" as the newly-discovered hemisphere was then called. "Raleigh," says Mr. St. John, "left out of sight scarcely any consideration that could actuate a statesman in coveting foreign possessions. In his addresses and memorials he constantly expatiates, not only on the raw materials of opulence, but on the outlet for redundant population, on the expansion and improvement of industry, on the advantages to be derived from a large carrying trade, on the increase of political power, and on the satisfaction of imparting the Christian religion and a more enlightened morality to savage races. These were the topics by which he prevailed upon the Queen, as well as upon Parliament, to favour his scheme of colonisation, which on March 25th, 1584, was shown by the famous patent granted him to search out and take possession of new lands in the western hemisphere." Having received the royal authority constituting him lord proprietor of the countries which he should annex to the British Crown, he sent out two ships under the command of Philip Amadas and Arthur Barlow, the historiographer of the voyage, who left England on April 27th. They went first to the West Indies, then went along Florida and Carolina, made friendly acquaintance with the Red Men, and returned to England in September, bringing with them two natives and a magnificent pearl which they presented to Raleigh. He laid their narrative before the Queen, who, in the enthusiasm which this discovery excited, knighted him and confirmed and enlarged his patent. She also conferred upon him that portion of the revenue which was derived from the duty on wines and the licensing of ale-houses. As each vintner had to pay one pound a year, and there were many thousand vintners, Raleigh at once came into possession of a princely income which enabled him to "appear on gala days at court, sparkling from head to foot with jewels, and to build, man, and equip ships which, formed into fleets, ploughed the ocean like those of a king."

April 9th, 1585, was a memorable day in British annals.

It witnessed the departure of the first regular colonists. A fleet of seven ships, commanded by Raleigh's cousin, Sir Richard Grenville, sailed for that part of America which in honour of the unmarried Sovereign of England was named Virginia. Grenville took out 108 settlers, with stores of cattle and seeds and fruit trees. Unfortunately the governor of the colony, Lane, was totally unfit for his post; the subordinates degenerated into a horde of adventurers seeking for gold, not over-scrupulous about the means of obtaining it, and thereby soon became involved in quarrels with the Red Man, which issued in his extirpation. Two results of this expedition were, the introduction of the potato, and the introduction of tobacco. Mr. St. John is amusingly enthusiastic about the second, and with very questionable political economy sees in the seven millions of revenue derived from the article an increase to the national wealth. Smoking was not long in becoming a national habit; and while Raleigh exhaled the "silver cloud" through a silver pipe, his rustic countrymen resorted to the device of a split walnut shell and a straw.

Raleigh met with the fate that usually befals great pioneers and inventors. Colonisation, which was to be the making of England, involved him in nothing but loss, and eventually utter ruin. For long years he persisted in the endeavour to achieve with the fortune of a subject what demanded the revenues of an emperor, and at last in despair made over his rights to a joint-stock company. Prior to this, he was to rise to a height of fame and splendour hardly reached by any other English subject. He was made Captain of the Guard, Gentleman of the Privy Chamber, Lord Warden of the Stannaries, and Lord-Lieutenant of Cornwall. It was probably only the jealousy of Walsingham and the Cecils, which prevented him from becoming officially the minister, as he was privately the adviser, of the Queen.

He gave something more than advice. When the great struggle between Spain and England, long looming in the distance, began to draw so near that every one saw a life and death struggle was inevitable, Raleigh went down to the west to see what troops he could levy for his sovereign. He gave a good account. The whole of Europe re-echoed with the rumours of Philip's preparations. Spain was then the greatest power in the world, and all her wealth and all her immense naval resources were to be directed towards the conquest of England. This in itself was a most formidable danger, but even this was not all. The partisans of the old religion were still numerous, and their foreign allies made them confident.

It was by no means certain that, when the sails of the Spanish ships hove in sight, there would not be a rising on the main land. Raleigh foresaw the danger, and particularly directed Burleigh's attention to it. At length the tidings were brought by a small Scottish bark to Dartmouth that the Armada had been making towards the Bay of Biscay. The information was forwarded to London with all possible haste, and Raleigh, rejoicing like a war-horse at the blast of the trumpet, embarked and posted himself off Dorsetshire, that he might fly at the flanks of the Armada as it passed up the Sleeve. At length, on a bright July morning the fleet was seen disposed in the form of a crescent upwards of seven miles in length, bearing up the Channel, and immediately a thousand beacon-fires flung from tower and cliff the intelligence that the enemy was at hand, and all England flew to arms, ready to fight and die for life and faith, for their country and their God. We need not repeat the story of that awful destruction by which the pride of man was laid low, and the Lord alone exalted in that day.

Raleigh received his share of the spoils, and a little later he begged and obtained from the Queen the castle and manor of Sherbourne. The new lord of Sherbourne beautified his domain with gardens and orchards, and artificial streams and exotic shrubs, and built thereon a splendid mansion. But even these delights could not detain him long from Court. There was among the royal attendants one with fine oval features, bright hair, and large blue eyes, whose beauty had more attractions for Raleigh than all the charms of his Dorsetshire estate. It is difficult now to determine if his affection for Elizabeth Throgmorton was at first anything more than passion. He wronged her most grievously, and when their joint sin could no longer be concealed he left her, as Mr. St. John says, "to face alone the scoffs of malice and the derision of the base," and on leaving he wrote a letter to Cecil, which makes Mr. St. John declare that Raleigh's connection with Elizabeth Throgmorton was "a seduction and a desertion." Mr. Kingsley's interpretation of this letter, though it involves the interpolation of a very important word, seems to us more rational as well as more charitable. Raleigh warns Cecil not to believe the "malicious report" that he had gone away "for fear of a marriage;" and he adds the very inconsequential remark, "for I protest before God there is none on the face of the earth that I would be fastened unto." Mr. Kingsley would add "rather" before the penultimate word,—a gloss that has the advantage of being at once better sense, better morality, and more in accordance

with the sequel of the sad affair. It was by no means the novelist's sequel. True they were married, true there never was a more devoted pair; but, instead of being "happy for ever afterwards," they were visited with "trouble on trouble, pain on pain," that ended only with life. Even accepting Mr. Kingsley's interpretation of Raleigh's letter, Raleigh's conduct in leaving the girl he loved and had so deeply wronged to bear the brunt of the Queen's fierce displeasure alone, cannot be palliated. Passion might excuse his first fault, but the second showed meanness that one would have supposed impossible in Walter Raleigh. He went on board with haste, knowing well the storm of anger that would rise when Elizabeth Throgmorton's condition became apparent to the Queen, as it was already apparent to the sneering courtiers. He had scarcely sailed with the expedition that he and Burleigh had organised to capture the Spanish plate-fleet, when the storm burst. A messenger was at once despatched to bring Raleigh back. He refused to obey, thinking that if successful in the adventure in which he had embarked his whole future, he would be forgiven. But a few days later came the unwelcome news that Philip, warned of the expedition, had ordered that no plate-fleet should sail that year; so, grievously disappointed and half-ruined, Raleigh gave himself up, returned to England a prisoner, and was sent to the Tower. Elizabeth Throgmorton joined him, and, so far as he could do so, he afterwards atoned to her by marrying her, and thereby obtaining the noblest and truest-hearted wife that man was ever blessed with.

For a little while after his release, Raleigh and his wife retired to their beautiful seat at Sherbourne, and there a son was born unto them. With such happiness ordinary men would have been content. Not so could Raleigh be. That irresistible desire to do something, that insatiable craving for activity which in these days exposes statesmen to the charge of ambition and greed of office, would not let him rest. To rest was to rust. Raleigh at forty-one could not consent to do that. So once more he propounded dazzling schemes, and by way of winning the world to his side, drew gorgeous pictures of the land whose mountains were of solid gold. Not but that Raleigh himself believed his own account. The conviction that in Guiana, high up on the banks of Orinoco, there existed a capital built of precious metals and stones like the City of the Apocalypse, was universal. Humboldt has shown that the conviction was not so wild a delusion as it seems to us. The islets and rocks of mica slate and talc

reflecting from their shining surface the ardent rays of the sun, might well have been taken in that age, when reality so far surpassed the dreams of a few years back, for Manoa, the gorgeous capital whose temples and houses were reputed to be overlaid with plates of gold. Shakspere has alluded to these dazzling tales again and again. He believed them no less than his great contemporary; and as for Raleigh, his unsuccessful expedition to Guiana in 1595 only confirmed his faith. It was not in the New World but in the Old that he was to win back the knightly spurs which his sovereign still withheld from him. Philip of Spain had in great measure recovered from the disaster of 1588. Once more he was collecting his forces and preparing an expedition against England. Calais had just fallen before the Archduke Albert, and the Spanish arms were firmly planted within twenty miles of the English coast. Elizabeth's ministers recognised the peril, and remembering that Drake and Raleigh had in 1587 advised that England should anticipate the designs of Spain by striking the first blow, they determined to adopt that counsel on the present occasion. A fleet of 156 ships of war, transports, and tenders, was fitted out and sailed from Plymouth on June 1, 1596, with sealed orders. St. Barnabas' Day (June 11) saw the fleet in Cadiz harbour, saw the proudest day in Raleigh's life. The battle that followed was a race among the bravest men in England for the prize of valour. The Spanish fleet was destroyed, the city captured, and an enormous booty taken. In fact the admirals, like their sailors, were for a time demoralised. They almost forsook their fleet, and thus let forty carracks laden with twelve millions sterling of treasure escape out of their hands. The numerous blunders by which this great victory was defaced were due in great measure to the vanity, self-will, and incompetence of Essex. He was so fully conscious of his mistakes that he sent on despatches to the Queen, in which he not only shifted the blame from his shoulders, but transferred Raleigh's laurels to his own brow. More accurate and impartial accounts reached Elizabeth, and she learnt from them to which of her servants it was that she owed this great victory. Raleigh was once more restored to favour. New honours were bestowed upon him, and he who by reason of his very greatness had made so many envious foes, contrived to disarm for a time the most bitter of them, and astonished the world by the sight of a triumvirate, whereof Cecil, Essex, and Raleigh were the members.

The alliance did not endure long. A new expedition was

sent against the Spaniards, with Essex for admiral, Lord Thomas Howard for vice-admiral, and Raleigh for rear-admiral. This unhappy arrangement could hardly fail to result in disaster. Arrived first at Fayal, in the Azores, Raleigh waited for his superior officer before he commenced hostilities, and, knowing well the vindictive character of the man, he suffered a rich prize to escape, in spite of the murmurs of his crew, rather than give Essex cause of offence. At length, when days had passed, and this sea-courtier still came not, Raleigh's blood was up, and, holding a council of war, it was determined to take Fayal by storm. The capture effected, Essex and his fleet hove in sight, and dire was the wrath of this Ready-to-halt. He threatened Raleigh with death for violating the instructions to the fleet; whereto Raleigh replied that he had not violated them, and, after long bickering, the meeting broke up, the two affecting to be reconciled. The rest of the expedition was a succession of failures. It was well that there was nothing worse than failure. While the English fleet was thus cruising uselessly among the Western islands, a new armada had issued from Spanish ports and had sighted the English coast, then wholly undefended. For a few hours the danger was terrible. But once more the Hand that rules seas and winds scattered the invaders by a storm—hurled them back, rent and shattered, to their own coast, never more to threaten the English shores.

When Essex and Raleigh reached England, they found that fame had preceded them, and for once had spoken the truth. Consequently, Elizabeth's reliance on the wisdom of her former oracle had revived, and Essex received so cold a welcome that he left the Court in disgust. Between him and his royal mistress things went rapidly from bad to worse. With his precipitous downfall, however, we shall not concern ourselves, except in so far as Raleigh was concerned. He had striven vainly to act as peacemaker. Essex acknowledged the service by entering into a deep-laid conspiracy, which, had it succeeded, would have overwhelmed Raleigh and higher persons than him, even the Queen herself. At length the mad *dénoiment* came. The explosion that Essex had been preparing for during the last eleven years came off, and was a failure so complete as to be ludicrous even in its very tragedy. When he and his followers rushed into the streets with drawn swords, the people, instead of rising and joining them, gazed at them as a troop of brigands on the stage. In vain Essex told them that his lifewas in danger at the hands of Raleigh and Cecil. They did not believe him, and would

not stir in his defence; and yet he was adored by the people. When in the chill grey light of that February dawn, which witnessed his execution, Ash-Wednesday, 1601, Essex wearing his "black wrought velvet gown and black satin suit," came forth to die, and it fell to Raleigh, as captain of the guard, to command the troops that surrounded the scaffold, loud were the murmurs against the latter. It was held to be unseemly that one foe should, as it was said, gloat over the death of the other. They who said this, wronged Raleigh. He was there on duty, and not by choice. Mr. St. John adds: "At the last moment the Earl expressed a wish to speak and be reconciled with Raleigh, who had retired into the armoury, whence, in an agony of tears, he saw without being seen; but no one conveyed to him the dying man's message; so that it was not until the moment of mutual forgiveness had gone for ever, that he learned the desire of his adversary to die in peace with him."

It has been said by most of the biographers, that after this execution Raleigh was profoundly dispirited, foreseeing that now Essex was removed out of the way, he himself would be an easier prey to the machinations of Cecil. Whether this be true or not, certain it is that from this time forward Raleigh's greatness declined. He had none of the astuteness of Cecil. This wily minister watched the rapid decay in Elizabeth's powers with the eyes of a lynx, and secretly prepared to make himself indispensable to Elizabeth's successor. The measure of the Queen's days was now nearly full. Worn out by strong passions rather than years, still mourning over the death of her unworthy favourite, sitting on her palace floor in hopeless dejection, refusing to be comforted by man or woman, dying at last of voluntary starvation, the great Queen of England closed her glorious career of nearly half a century with suicide. Her thoughts were all for the past; she would not cast her looks towards the future, she would not even name her successor. She passed away, and with her the old order of things, half barbarous, half heroic, and the new order was at hand in which, after years of bloodshed and civil war and two revolutions, the people at last worked out the problem of self-government. Elizabeth had no sincerer mourner than Raleigh, none who had greater cause to mourn. It was she who had founded his fortunes, and they were buried in her coffin. James hated Raleigh from the first, and hatred was begotten by fear. He dreaded the influence of this great subject. He had a special animosity against him, because Raleigh was one of those who

would have made a bargain with the new sovereign, limiting his power before admitting him to the throne. The royal funeral over, Raleigh, as captain of the guard, was for travelling northwards to meet his new master. But Cecil was determined to be first in the councils of the King, and to have no second. Raleigh of all men was to be got rid of. The first step towards that end was the issue of a warrant, which the minister had obtained in blank from the King, forbidding Raleigh to make his intended journey. He had never possessed the art of making friends, or they might have warned him of the danger that was about to gather round him. For a time they lay hid from his view. He was so powerful, he filled so large a space in the popular imagination, that it was thought best to let him down gradually. Moreover, James believed in kingcraft, especially his own, and he loved to play with the fish before he hooked it. "Raleigh was therefore not only received at Court, but encouraged to ride out and jest with his assassin; who, as he gazed at his magnificent figure, mental bearing, and countenance beaming with intellect, chuckled inwardly at his resolution to send him sooner or later to the block."

Before James came to the throne, there had been some negotiations between him and the emissaries of Rome, with the object of securing the support of Catholic Europe by seceding to the Catholic religion. He soon found that such a step would hinder rather than help him, and when on the death of Elizabeth he quietly succeeded her, he turned his back upon his fellow-conspirators and said, "Na, na, gude faith, we hae na need of the Papists now." They were not disposed to submit to this check lightly. They conspired against the King whom they had formerly conspired with. They succeeded in gaining the ear of Lord Cobham, a weak man, but the friend of Raleigh. Cecil was kept fully advised by trusty spies of all that went on. He let the plot develope itself for a while, hoping thereby the more readily to implicate Raleigh. At last the hour seemed come, and one day, as Raleigh was walking on the terrace at Windsor, Cecil said he must crave his company to the Council Chamber. Raleigh came forth from it to be lodged in the Tower. We have not space to speak of all the wicked manœuvres of the minister. Suffice it to say that Cobham was induced to write a letter implicating Raleigh in the conspiracy, acknowledged that the accusation was false when the accused remonstrated with him, and having withdrawn the charge repeated it, thereby displaying a pitiable meanness which even Raleigh's enemies

could not but despise. The trial at Winchester was a disgrace to all concerned in it except the prisoner. The Attorney-General Coke, who conducted the prosecution, overwhelmed Raleigh with foul language, calling him a "spider of hell," and other choice epithets. As for the prisoner, he made so eloquent and forcible a defence, that the people, who had hissed and groaned at him on his way to trial, cheered him and would have acquitted him afterwards. The jury basely betrayed their oaths. When Coke was told by one of his clerks that Raleigh had been found guilty of treason, he replied, "Man thou must be mistaken, I myself only accused him of misprision of treason." Nevertheless the information was true, and in defiance of all evidence the illustrious prisoner was sentenced to death. He was removed back to the Tower, and told that he had only eighteen days to live. During that interval he wrote a letter which he himself regretted subsequently. In it he craved the King for pardon and life. It was not a letter worthy of Raleigh, yet it scarcely deserves the severe description—"blasphemous extravagance"—given of it by Mr. St. John. This letter failed so far as the request for pardon was concerned. But James did not venture to put the writer to death. He and his alleged fellow-conspirators were led forth to die, but were reprieved at the block. Thenceforward the King and Cecil busied themselves in seeking for fresh information to criminate Raleigh. They beset him with spies, but to no purpose. Though they did not dare hang him, they were resolved to ruin him. They deprived him of Sherbourne Castle on the plea of some technical informality in the conveyance. Shamed, however, by remonstrances, they paid him 8,000*l.* for it—little more than one year's rent. It became clear at last to Raleigh that there was no prospect of either justice or release. He had one alleviation of his imprisonment in the presence of his wife, who bore him a second son, afterwards named Carew, and he determined to devote his enforced leisure to science and literature. He was allowed to set up a still, and his skill in pharmacy was so widespread that when Henry Prince of Wales sickened, Queen Anne applied to Raleigh for a cordial. Unhappily for him the remedy was of no avail. The young prince died, and Raleigh lost his best friend at court. In 1614, the eleventh year of his captivity, he published his *History of the World*, a marvellous work to have been written by a prisoner—so marvellous that Isaac Disraeli believes, and indeed asserts, that a large portion of the work was written by other persons. Internal and external evidence are alike against this theory.

At length the eagle—whom Prince Henry had said, no man but his father would have kept caged—was allowed to go forth, though not until he had paid heavily to certain courtiers who sued in his behalf. It was on March 19th, 1616, that Raleigh emerged from the Bloody Tower, after thirteen and a quarter years of residence in it. He was now sixty-four years of age; he had suffered from apoplexy and paralysis; his figure was tall, gaunt, and thin; his countenance emaciated; yet few faces were better calculated than his to command attention from the passers-by, or engrave themselves on the memory. During his long captivity, many important political events had occurred; but Raleigh still kept steadfast to the favourite project of happier days. He still believed in the land where there was much gold. This Western Ophir was Guiana, a country originally taken possession of by England. The English subjects had been nearly pushed out by subsequent Spanish colonists. This fact it is essential to remember. Raleigh considered, and so did James's council, that the Englishman had a better right there than the Spaniard, and that therefore there was no reason to consider Raleigh's expedition thither an act of war. James certainly would not have sanctioned the expedition if he had .so considered it; for he was then eagerly bent upon marrying his son to the Spanish Infanta. The attraction which Raleigh's scheme had for the King was the prospect of replenishing his empty coffers. But if he was covetous, he was also vindictive. He would make use of Raleigh, but he would not pardon him. Raleigh sailed with a rope round his neck. For this reason, we hold Mr. St. John's elaborate apologies to be unnecessary, Mr. Napier's strictures to be cruelly unjust, when they discuss Raleigh's negotiations for entering the service of the King of France. To James he owed absolutely nothing. James had half ruined him in fortune, half ruined him in health, and, by refusing to pardon him—refusing, that is, to give him full power over his followers—was doing his best to ruin him in reputation. On the other hand, Raleigh had in early life served in France, and now, in his later days, there was no reason why he should not serve again. We do not say that a man "carries his country with him on the soles of his boots;" but we do say that Raleigh was not only perfectly justified in providing for himself a refuge in the event of the disaster which was but too likely to overtake him, but that he would have been deficient in common prudence if he had not done so. The need of such a refuge was soon to be sadly apparent. A more complete failure than

that which attended the Guiana expedition could not have been possible. Had the whole fleet sunk in the Atlantic, the tragedy would not have been so moving. Raleigh, wasted with fever, sent a detachment up the Orinoco under the command of his most devoted adherent, Kemys, and his (Raleigh's) eldest son. Thanks to James's blabbing to Gondomar, the Spanish ambassador in London, the Spanish settlers were fully advised of Raleigh's approach, and fully resolved to frustrate his design. They attacked the pioneer force, and, though driven back at first, harassed them with constant assaults. In one encounter young Raleigh fell, and Kemys, stunned with grief, determined, though he had discovered refineries which proved the existence of gold, to retreat. It was a sore meeting between the two friends; the one had to hear, the other to tell, of woe upon woe. Raleigh, in the bitterness of his sorrow, his firstborn dead, his enterprise a failure, himself a ruined man with no other end but the block in view, reproached his trusty friend; and the gallant heart that had borne up under the anguish of failure, broke beneath the weight of the undeserved accusation. Kemys said little; only "I know not then, sir, what course to take;" and retired to his cabin, whence, a minute or two later, came the report of a pistol-shot. Raleigh sent to know what the noise was. Kemys, lying on his bed, said that he had shot the pistol because it had long been charged. A little later they entered the cabin and found the broken-hearted hero dead. The ball had only fractured a rib, but a sword had done the rest. He had stabbed himself in the left breast, and that was his appeal to a more merciful Judge than the man for whom he would have laid down his life. There was nothing more to be done. The lawless crews which Raleigh had got together saw that the game was up, and their leader had abundant reason for thinking that they would soon get rid of him if he did not do their bidding, and return to England. How sad must have been that homeward voyage, there is no need to describe. In this expedition Raleigh had embarked his whole fortune, and that of his wife. Both were gone. There was worse news in store for the anxious Elizabeth: the husband had come home alone, without their gallant son. All was ruin, utter and inconceivable. It was early in June, 1618, that Raleigh cast anchor in Plymouth Sound, whence, thirty years before, he had gone forth to do battle with the Invincible Armada. His life-long conflict with Spain was now rapidly drawing to a close. The fortune of war had changed; it was he who was now the worsted

combatant. Scarcely had Raleigh landed when James issued a proclamation denouncing his proceedings. In spite of this Raleigh set off for London, but was arrested on the way by Sir Lewis Stukeley, a man whose name we shall presently see is to be held in everlasting dishonour. Sir Judas Stukeley men called him then, and by that name let him go down to history. To this man Raleigh confided his plan of escape to France, and that man at once betrayed it to James. Stukeley accompanied Raleigh in the wherry down the Thames, and so completely deceived the fugitive, that when the well-planned plot for his arrest was carried out, and the watermen in the pursuing boat told Raleigh to surrender himself in the King's name, Raleigh did not mistrust his kinsman, but asked that he might surrender himself to him rather than to the men. To this the traitor assented, and in order to obtain substantial proofs of his captive's gratitude, hugged and embraced him with all possible show of affection; and received in payment for the kiss of treachery a present of jewels. He then threw off disguise, and had Raleigh conveyed to the Tower, as well as the faithful Captain King, whom he had vainly invited to betray his chief. Raleigh said but little; only, "Sir Lewis, these things will not redound to your credit." It is not said if the caitiff made any reply; but if there was any poor relic of conscience left in him, he must have felt that those few words consigned him to a lower depth of infamy than if he had been named by Dante among the archtraitors, ice-bound in the lowest round of the *Inferno*.

The "bird was once more caged." The man whom Philip of Spain hated most in all the world was now at Philip's mercy. The end could not now be long delayed. James, still bent upon the Spanish marriage, and so afraid of war that he dreaded the sight of a naked sword, was not likely to frustrate his favourite project, nor to run the risk of hostilities for the sake of the man who had failed to supply him with the promised gold, and whom he had always hated and feared. Gondomar knew this well. He received instructions from Spain to demand the execution of Raleigh. He did not need them, for he vied with his master in detestation of the great English captain. Against the malignity of these three men, Philip, Gondomar, and James, even Queen Anne, always, like her late son, Raleigh's sincere friend, was powerless, though she laboured in his behalf. James, with incredible baseness, conceived the idea of getting rid of his prisoner by secret assassination, and for this purpose introduced into the Tower a man named Wilson, "with the countenance, senti-

ments, and language of Abhorson." The best that can be said of him is that he bungled. James then resorted to a private practice of his—setting one of his minions to get avowals from the prisoner under promise of pardon. Raleigh, however, frankly wrote to James a statement of his arrangement with the French Government, and concluded with an appeal to the royal clemency. Royal clemency was a virtue that had no existence so far as James was concerned. On the other hand, the despatches from Madrid became more and more urgent and bloodthirsty. It was time to end this matter. The prisoner was removed to Whitehall, and knew then that he must prepare for the worst. Brought up for judgment, he made a defence of four hours, concerning which there is but a scanty record, sufficient, however, to add another to the sins by which a great reputation was tarnished. Bacon, we learn from a Spanish account of these proceedings, "censured him greatly for the injuries he had done to the vassals and territories of your majesty (Philip), and dwelt upon the manner in which he had abused the permission to put to sea granted him by the King (James), when his professed object was to discover a gold mine which he had affirmed to know where to find. In conclusion, he informed him that he must die." Raleigh was removed to the King's Bench on the day before his execution. With the certainty of death all his old sprightliness revived, and the chronicle of his last hours is full of the satires of his wit. In the farewell interview with his wife he said, in reference to the permission which had been given her to dispose of his body, "It is well, Bess, that thou shouldst have the disposal of that dead which thou hadst not always the disposing of living." On the scaffold he made a speech whose meaning has been badly preserved. Probably it was purposely misrepresented by James and his officials. But all accounts agree that Raleigh's death was worthy of his life. Suffering from ague he hastened the execution, lest the cold fit should return and people should think that he shook for fear. He gracefully bowed to the spectators, took up the axe and said, "This is a sharp but sure remedy against all diseases." Kneeling down he said a short prayer, laid his head on the block, and having repeated the agreed signal word—"Strike," the executioner performed his task in two blows. He held up the hero's head and proclaimed it in the usual style, "The head of a traitor." The world thought otherwise and could talk of nothing else but Raleigh's "perfect death."

ART. VII.—*Verses on Various Occasions.* London: Burns, Oates, and Co. 1868.

SUCH is the title of a volume published by Father Newman. His name is not on the title-page, but his initials stand at the foot of the Letter of Dedication "to Edward Badeley, Esq.," which is prefixed to the volume. Mr. Badeley is an old friend of Dr. Newman's, who has "faithfully followed, from first to last, that religious movement" of which Newman was the most powerful and advanced leader. Years ago, the barrister rendered his friend "great services" by his "legal skill and affectionate zeal, in a serious matter in which" that friend "found himself in collision with the law of the land." This volume is to be regarded as "the poor expression, long delayed, of gratitude, never intermitted."

"J. H. N." states in this letter dedicatory, "that a chief portion of the volume grew out of that religious movement." It is this fact that must constitute the main interest of the volume to us and our readers. It contains nothing of any special poetical value which is not also the expression of ecclesiastical or theological feeling; indeed, there is very little in the book which is not deeply coloured by the religious convictions of the poet-devotee, who has moulded so much of the theology of modern Anglicanism. Some, indeed, of the verses are not redeemed from insignificance even by the infusion which they contain of ecclesiastical or theological savour, and a considerable proportion of those which are free from any such savour are so poor and trifling that it raises our wonder how a man of such taste and gifts as Dr. Newman could think of publishing them at all.

Possibly, however, Dr. Newman may have a certain defined purpose in their publication. He may not think it amiss to let it be seen that even he has had his merry moods, his sportive freaks, and rigid-lined face of pale ascetic priest as his may be, that he is not disposed to reject the old Horatian maxim, "Dulce est desipere in loco." He is earnest, but not grim; a celibate, but not without sympathies for children; a devotee, who yet can smile on innocent sport, especially in the young. This may be the lesson which the Oratorian wishes these freaks of his fancy to illustrate. If so, all we have to say is, that the freaks are by no means very light or

airy; the fooling is far from exquisite; and, besides, that this is not the plea on which he has retained such pieces as these in the volume. The plea is in effect, that he found himself unable to distinguish the precious from the worthless.*

We have said that the chief interest of the contents of this volume must be derived from their relation to the religious movement with which the history of Newman is identified. Some of the pieces, indeed, are of high poetical merit; the "Dream of Gerontius" is a singular combination of philosophical speculation, of "Catholic" superstition, refined however and sublimated, and of true poetic pathos and power. Still the volume will be studied much more for the sake of its autobiographical value, and the illustration which it may be expected to contribute to Newman's own *Apologia*, than for any merit which the poetry may possess. We imagine, however, that most persons who read it with such a view as we have now indicated will be a good deal disappointed. It furnishes but scanty illustrations of the progress of the author's mind throughout his course. It adds very little to what may be learnt from the *Apologia*.

The date of the earliest piece is 1821, when the writer was twenty years of age. It is "a paraphrase of Isaiah, chapter lxvi." and shows hopeful powers. The next was addressed to his brother, Francis, as a birthday wish, Francis having that day completed his twenty-first year. He had already, at the Easter preceding, taken his degree as a Double-first, and within a few months was to be elected Fellow of Balliol, Worcester having previously been his college. The date of the poem is "Chiswick, June 27, 1826." It is full of brotherly pride and affection, and of bright anticipations for his brother's future course. It is surcharged, also, with tender memoirs of the mother whom both brothers deeply mourned. We quote two stanzas of this poem.

"Dear Frank, we both are summon'd now
As champions of the Lord;—
Enroll'd am I, and shortly thou
Must buckle on thy sword;
A high employ, not lightly given,
To serve as messengers of heaven!

* Since the text was written, we have received the Appendix which Dr. Newman has published to his volume of verse. He has been led, he says, by the favour of the public and the wish of friends, to publish the additional compositions contained in the Appendix. We confess that we can discover little reason for publishing most of these. Their quality is not by any means above mediocrity. We presume that few, if any, of these have been published before.

"Deep in my heart that gift I hide;
I change it not away,
For patriot-warrior's hours of pride,
Or statesman's tranquil sway;
For poet's fire, or pleader's skill
To pierce the soul and tame the will."—P. 6.

Such were the early relations and the mutual ties of the two brothers who have long been sundered far apart as pole from pole, at least in faith, and in the character and purpose of their lives.

In the same year, 1826, Newman wrote at Ulcombe for an album, under the title "Nature and Art," a really graceful poem. In this he intimates how much he longed for the freedom and beauty of nature while bound to his life of rule and routine at the University.

Two slight and pretty compositions, an "Introduction to the Album" (forty years ago albums were beginning to be the rage), and "Snapdragon, a Riddle for a Flower Book," and a moralising poem, entitled "The Trance of Time," bear the date 1827. In 1828 pangs of a searching sorrow gave birth to the first poem of Newman's which rises far above mediocrity. He commemorated his sister's death in two pieces, the first, "Consolations in Bereavement," dated "Oxford, April, 1828," and the second, dated "Oxford, August," of the same year. The second is entitled, "A Picture," and its motto is, "The maiden is not dead, but sleepeth." This volume contains nothing else written in that year.

There can be no doubt that these obituary strains coincide with a critical point in the development of Newman's character and opinions. In 1821 he had been an Evangelical; in 1822 and 1823 he imbibed the principles of the orthodox English High-Churchman; in 1825 he had been chosen by Whately, the principal, to be Vice-Principal of St. Alban's Hall; from 1823 to 1827, under the influence of such thinkers as Blanco White and Whately, and the circle which these represented, Newman had been annexing to his ecclesiastical and æsthetical High-Churchmanship a certain intellectual liberalism of opinion and tendency. He had used, as he tells us in the *Apologia*, "some flippant language against the Fathers in the *Encyclopædia Metropolitana*;" he "had read Middleton on the Miracles of the Early Church, and had imbibed a portion of his spirit;" he "was drifting in the direction of liberalism." But he adds, "I was rudely

awakened from my dream at the end of 1827 by two great blows—illness and bereavement." The bereavement, no doubt, was the death of his sister. From this time forth his destiny was to be taking shape, and revealing itself more and more. "Two great blows, illness and bereavement," reclaimed him from intellectual liberalism, and filled him with the spirit of a religious devotee, whose views, at no time well-balanced and liberalised (thus far), only in proportion as the spirit of an intellectual criticism had grown upon him—never by a true moral and religious largeness and breadth—were from this time forth steadily to narrow and to harden, until he found his final and congenial home in Romanism.

How long and how deeply the sorrow of his sister's loss lay living within his heart may be understood by a sweet little poem which bears date, September 29th, 1829.

"A Voice from Afar.

"Weep not for me;—
Be blithe as wont, nor tinge with gloom
The stream of love that circles home,
Light hearts and free!
Joy in the gifts Heaven's bounty lends;
Nor miss my face, dear friends!"

"I still am near;—
Watching the smiles I prized on earth,
Your converse mild, your blameless mirth;
Now too I hear
Of whisper'd sounds the tale complete,
Low prayers, and musings sweet."

"A sea before
The Throne is spread:—its pure still glass
Pictures all earth-scenes as they pass.
We on its shore,
Share, in the bosom of our rest,
God's knowledge, and are blest."—Pp. 27, 28.

The same lasting sorrow also gave inspiration to a tender and beautiful poem, entitled "Epiphany Eve. A birthday offspring," and dated January 5th, 1830. The birthday was that of the truly mourned sister.

"Birthday gifts, with the early year,
Lo! we bring thee, Mary dear!
Prayer and praise upon thy death
Twined together in a wreath,
Grief and gladness, such as may
Suit a solemn holiday."—P. 39.

So the poem begins.

Already, indeed, it seems as if the heart of Newman had taken the monastic vow. In a strain of jangling rhymes, entitled "Monks," and written for a small album, he asks :—

> "Why, dear cousin, why,
> Ask for verses when a poet's fount of song is dry?
> Or, if aught be there,
> Harsh and chill, it ill may touch the hand of lady fair.
> Who can perfumed waters bring
> From a convent spring?"

And he closes as follows :—

> "Grey his cowled vest
> Whose strong heart has pledged his service to the cloister blest;
> Duly garbed is he
> As the frostwork gems the branches of yon stately tree.
> 'Tis a danger-thwarting spell,
> And it fits me well."—Pp. 35, 38.

In March, 1831, appears the first pale tinge of distinctly Romish tendency in these poems. The verses are entitled "Kind Remembrances," and addressed to "Dear Annie." One stanza is :—

> "Can I forget, *she* to thy need,
> Her ministry supplied
> Who now, from martial duty freed,
> Serves at the Virgin's side."—P. 44.

The personal allusion is evidently to his lamented sister.

From the end of 1832, onwards, the great theme of Newman's inspiration, when now and then he put forth a strain, was the forlorn and yet majestic state, as he conceived it, of the English Church, which he continually speaks of as his "mother," his "holy mother." Most of the poems of this period here given were first published in the *British Magazine* as part of a series entitled "Lyra Apostolica." With one or two exceptions, they were written at sea. Newman had just completed his volume on the Arians, and, his health having suffered from the labour involved in its preparation, he had gone abroad with his friend Hurrell Froude, and with Froude's father.

If the poems written at this period of Newman's life are in harmony with the exaggerated and morbid intensity of a narrow and cloistered Anglican celibate's view of things ecclesiastical and political, some of them also bear distinct

traces of the increasing superstition, all tending Romeward, which was taking possession of his mind. The following lines illustrate our meaning. It will be observed how early is their date.

"THE SIGN OF THE CROSS.

"Whene'er across this sinful flesh of mine
I draw the Holy Sign,
All good thoughts stir within me, and renew
Their slumbering strength divine;
Till there springs up a courage high and true
To suffer and to do.

"And who shall say, but hateful spirits around,
For their brief hour unbound,
Shudder to see, and wail their overthrow?
While on far heathen ground
Some lonely Saint hails the fresh odour, though
Its source he cannot know.

"*Oxford, November* 25, 1832."—P. 56.

Six months later, we have the following:—

"RELICS OF SAINTS.

"'He is not the God of the dead, but of the living; for all live unto Him.'

"'The Fathers are in dust, yet live to God:'—
So says the Truth; as if the motionless clay
Still held the seeds of life beneath the sod,
Smouldering and struggling till the judgment-day.

"And hence we learn with reverence to esteem
Of these frail houses, though the grave confines;
Sophist may urge his cunning tests, and deem
That they are earth;—but they are heavenly shrines.

"*Palermo, June* 1, 1833."—P. 116.

These verses are conclusive evidence that in 1832-3, more than ten years before Newman went over explicitly to Rome, and before the series of *Tracts for the Times* was begun, or projected, so far as has yet appeared, Newman was altogether out of his place in a church professing to be reformed, and could find a true home and an honourable abode only in the Roman Communion. As yet, however, such a thought was far from his mind; and no one can wonder that for such a man to sever himself from the English Church and nation must have been a rending of the heart-strings, an uprooting of all but his very self and life.

What his feelings at this time were, with respect to the Roman Communion, is expressed in a poem, dated Palermo, June 13, 1833, and significantly entitled, "The Good Samaritan." We quote the first stanza:—

> "Oh that thy creed were sound!
> For thou dost soothe the heart, Thou Church of Rome,
> By thy unwearied watch and varied round
> Of service in thy Saviour's holy home.
> I cannot walk the city's sultry streets,
> But the wide porch invites to still retreats,
> Where passion's thirst is calm'd, and care's unthankful gloom."
> P. 131.

Throughout this voyage the conviction in Newman's mind that he had a great, stern task to perform—that his was, under God, to be the counsel and might which should bring about what he thought of as a "second Reformation," had, day by day, been growing deeper and more paramount. He felt as if he were already swimming, like a young sea-god, on the van of a great spring-tide, which, only rising then, should spread and swell into the might of a new dispensation, at least for his own land, and haply also for the whole Western Church in the first place, and then for the Church universal and the world. His guardian-angel went with him, or went before him, everywhere, of whom he rhapsodises in his poem on "Angelic Guidance."

> "Who, as I talk with men, conforms aright
> Their sympathetic words or deeds that blend
> With my hid thought; or stoops him to attend
> My doubtful-pleading griefs:—or blunts the might
> Of ill I see not;—or in dreams of night
> Figures the scope, in which what is will end."—P. 58.

On this voyage, at Rome, Newman and his companion, Froude, began for the *British Magazine* the *Lyra Apostolica*. The motto which they chose for their series of poems shows what was the temper of the poets: it was a sentence from Homer, in which Achilles, on returning to the battle, says, "You shall know the difference now I am back again."* "I began to think," says Newman himself, "that I had a mission."† The sentence always on his mind, often on his lips, sometimes spoken in soliloquy, sometimes to friends, to his servant—to strangers even, as to Monsignore Wiseman, at Rome—was, "I have a work to do in England."

---

* *Apologia*, p. 98. † *Ibid.* p. 99.

"The Bill for the Suppression of the Irish Sees," we are told in the *Apologia*, "was in progress, and filled my mind. I had fierce thoughts against the Liberals."*

It was with such thoughts and feelings that Newman wrote the piece entitled *Warfare*, in which he declares that "rough is the Holy Hand" (p. 110); and that on "Sacrilege," dated "Palermo, June 4th, 1833" (p. 121). The poem on "Liberalism," which follows this one, is in the same vein of fierce determination which at this time had possession of Newman's mind.

On his voyage home he wrote the well-known poem, "Lead, Kindly Light." When off the coast of France he penned a characteristic effusion, entitled "Apostasy." Being at this time a fanatical Tory Churchman, he held "liberal" France, with its recent revolution, in abhorrence. "It was the success," he says himself, "of the Liberal cause which fretted me inwardly. I became fierce against its instruments and its manifestations. A French vessel was at Algiers; I would not even look at the tricolour. On my return, though forced to stop a day at Paris, I kept indoors the whole time, and all I saw of that beautiful city was what I saw from the *diligence*."† What is this but the very "midsummer madness" of fanaticism? If Newman, at this time of his life, a student of history, a late vice-principal of a college, a leader and oracle among a large and growing party of the clergy, was capable of such ecclesiastico-political frenzy as this, what authority can he claim over the judgment of any man? His intellectual temper was that of a half-mad girl; he was keen-sighted, but not far-sighted; his vision was searching, and his insight subtle along a narrow line of thought, lit by a distempered glare of cloistral fanaticism; but he was utterly wanting in the tone and habits of mind which give form and law to the patient depths of philosophic inquiry, as it goes "sounding on its dim and perilous way." Newman's character has always lacked those judicial attributes which alone could entitle him to be regarded as a man of wisdom; as a safe guide for young and unsettled inquirers. Again and again the truth forces itself upon our observation that Newman's mind is feminine alike in its rare powers and in its weakness; and that what he lacked was, as we have already expressed it, hale manliness of character. His was hardly the *mens sana in corpore sano*. An infusion of "muscular Christianity," together with the ties, which he ever

* *Apologia*, p. 97. † *Ibid.*

shunned, of family and civic life, would have contributed breadth and strength to Newman's character; might possibly have redressed the balance of his feelings and faculties; would at least have made him a safer adviser, and less morbid in his zeal as a party-man.*

Mr. Newman reached England in July, 1833, joined his friends at Oxford without delay, took a leading share, as we all know, in organising the Tractarian party, and in publishing the *Tracts for the Times*, and continued at Oxford until he joined the Church of Rome, in 1845. This volume furnishes us with very scanty illustration of the process of education through which Father Newman has passed beyond the period which we have already traced. More than sixty pages are taken up with translations made from the Russian and Parisian Breviaries, chiefly of matins, lauds, and vespers. The date of these translations is 1836—38. They indicate the monastic rule which he and his Oxonian disciples observed at Littlemore. All the poems composed after his open secession from the English Church are dated from "The Oratory." They range from 1849 ("Candlemas, a Song," "The Pilgrim Queen, a Song") to "January, 1865," which is the date of "The Dream of Gerontius." Several of these productions are in praise and celebration of "St. Philip Neri," the founder of that Oratorian order to which Father Newman belongs. Several are in praise, very monkish and puerile laudation of the Virgin Mary, as, for example, the song on "The Month of Mary." One is a hymn, in its way a beautiful hymn, "for the dead," that is, for the souls in purgatory. Purgatory in Newman's verse becomes wonderfully etherealised and transfigured from the coarse and common Papal heathen conception of it. We adverted to this before, and it comes yet more fully out in the "Dream of Gerontius."

* In a very strange picture, intended by Newman as a portrait of St. Paul, but no more like the Apostle than that other Oxford painting by the master of the antagonistic school of thought,—the St. Paul of Professor Jowett—Newman has, not altogether unconsciously we think, painted himself as St. Paul. The features are heightened, Newman himself would consider the likeness flattered; but still the likeness is striking and altogether undeniable. We quote the closing lines of the sonnet on St. Paul—

> "Courteous he was and grave, so meek in mien
> It seemed untrue, or told a purpose weak;
> Yet, in the mood, he could with aptness speak,
> Or with stern force, or show of feelings keen,
> Marking deep craft, methought, or hidden pride:
> Then came a voice—'St. Paul is at thy side.'"—P. 144.

Say rather St. Gregory or Pope Hildebrand, or "as one of the" Popes. What a curious self-revelation does Newman afford in this sonnet! Here we have his Apostolic ideal so long ago as 1833.

Gerontius is very near to death, and is in the last dread agony. He cries to Jesus and to Mary for help. Around the dying man are assistants, who call upon Christ the Lord to have mercy on him, and upon Mary, the holy angels, all saints, the Apostles, the Evangelists, the innocents, all martyrs, hermits, and virgins, to pray for him. Gerontius prays again, and recites his creed. Then again the agony seizes upon him.

> "I can no more: for now it comes again,
> That sense of ruin, which is worse than pain,
> That masterful negation and collapse
> Of all that makes me man; as though I bent
> Over the dizzy brink
> Of some sheer infinite descent;
> Or worse, as though
> Down, down for ever I was falling through
> The solid framework of created things,
> And needs must sink and sink
> Into the vast abyss. And, crueller still,
> A fierce and restless fright begins to fill
> The mansion of my soul. And, worse and worse,
> Some bodily form of ill
> Floats on the wind, with many a loathsome curse
> Tainting the hallow'd air, and laughs, and flaps
> Its hideous wings,
> And makes me wild with horror and dismay.
> O Jesus, help! pray for me, Mary, pray!
> Some Angel, Jesu! such as came to Thee
> To Thine own agony. . . .
> Mary, pray for me. Joseph, pray for me. Mary, pray for me."

The assistants pray and intercede again, recounting the deliverances wrought by God for His suffering saints of old, as related in the Scriptures. Gerontius resigns his soul into the hands of God. The priest commends his spirit in a passage which begins:—

> "Proficiscere, anima Christiana, de hoc mundo."
> ("Go forth upon thy journey, Christian soul.")

Then the original part of the poem begins. The soul of Gerontius, on quitting the body, is in charge of its guardian-angel, and describes its experiences after the moment of dissolution. The guardian-angel then sings, beginning with—

> "My work is done, my task is o'er;
> And so I come, taking it home."

After this song, the soul recognises from whom the strain proceeds. Then the angel pours forth a tribute of praise, in a hymn of sweet and impressive six-line stanzas, on the wonders of human redemption and salvation. A dialogue (alas! that we must use so altogether earthly and prosaic a word) then follows between the soul and the angel.

The angel and soul next pass "a fierce hubbub," a "sour and uncouth dissonance," the "sullen howl of demons" from the "middle regions," "close on the judgment course." The grotesqueness of this conception arises in part from the character of the Romish faith or superstition, in whichever light the matter be regarded, as to the spiritual world, above, below, or around; and, in part, from the peculiarity of Newman's own mind, which had always peopled the world with angels and demons, which saw in all life and power, in all movement and organisation, angelic or demoniac presences, spiritual essences or energies. The theological poet of the Oratory, as it seems to us, would have kindred sympathies with the strange artist, Blake. The songs of the demons are yet more coarse than blasphemous; and remind us somewhat in style and spirit of those parts of *Paradise Lost* in which Milton has so far degraded his majesty, and lowered his genius as to put coarse witticisms and low slang into the mouth of the rebel angels.

The demoniac hubbub being past, the soul asked certain questions, which the angel answered. Next comes a song from the "First Choir of Angelicals," and then the angel thus proceeds:—

> "We now have pass'd the gate, and are within
> The House of Judgment; and whereas on earth
> Temples and palaces are form'd of parts
> Costly and rare, but all material,
> So in the world of spirits nought is found,
> To mould withal and form into a whole,
> But what is immaterial; and thus
> The smallest portion of this edifice,
> Cornice, or frieze, or balustrade, or stair,
> The very pavement is made up of life—
> Of holy, blessed, and immortal beings,
> Who hymn their Maker's name continually."

The second and the third "Choir of Angelicals" sing their songs. After this we have a long conversation, still between the Soul and the Angel; and then the "Angels of the second Stair," and the fourth and fifth "Choirs of Angelicals," lift up their songs.

Then follows another passage between the pair, the Angel and the Soul. After this, "the Angel of the Agony" pleads for the "souls in prison."

The "Souls in Purgatory" afterwards chant the nineteenth Psalm; and the poem finishes with this hymn of the Angel.

"*The Oratory, January*, 1865.

"Softly and gently, dearly-ransom'd soul,
In my most loving arms I now enfold thee,
And, o'er the penal waters, as they roll,
I poise thee, and I lower thee, and hold thee.

"And carefully I dip thee in the lake,
And thou, without a sob or a resistance,
Dost through the flood thy rapid passage take,
Sinking deeper, deeper, into the dim distance.

"Angels, to whom the willing task is given,
Shall tend, and nurse, and lull thee, as thou liest;
And Masses on the earth, and prayers in heaven,
Shall aid thee at the Throne of the Most Highest.

"Farewell, but not for ever! brother dear,
Be brave and patient on thy bed of sorrow;
Swiftly shall pass thy night of trial here,
And I will come and wake thee on the morrow."

It is evident that this poem is intended to present Dr. Newman's speculations respecting the intermediate state and the purgatorial fire.

It is well that we should understand the varieties of exposition by which among Romanists all tastes and intellectual tendencies are consulted. Dr. Newman's purgatory is very different from that gross, material fire, and those coarsely painted torments, which constitute the purgatory of vulgar Romanism. We have no doubt, however, that the vulgar notions are much better sustained by the authority of divines, than Dr. Newman's refinements. In sooth the Father of the Oratory may fairly be said to explain purgatory away. After all, Dr. Newman is too fine and airy a speculator, too much of a philosopher, and too much also of a poet, to be a thoroughly orthodox Romanist. Somehow, Dr. Manning has managed better in the matter of his conversion, than Newman. We confess we like Dr. Newman all the better for this volume of poems. With all his subtilty, he is at bottom a man of truth, and also, we would hope, of love.

LITERARY NOTICES.

A Memoir of Baron Bunsen. Drawn chiefly from Family Papers. By his Widow, Frances, Baroness Bunsen. In Two Vols. London: Longmans. 1868.

THERE are two busts and two portraits of Bunsen, rendered by engravings in these volumes. These likenesses perfectly image the man. In youth he was radiant with a noble beauty; the faultless symmetry of his features might have appeared to verge on effeminacy, if it had not been elevated by the grandeur of the forehead, and the masculine firmness and decision of the nose, which remarkably combined strength and delicacy, and, above all, by a frankness, truth, and earnestness of expression, which gave light and glow to the whole countenance. In age a stamp of dignity and authority, acquired by such a life-work as his, were joined to the necessary effect of years in subduing the lights and mellowing the colours of youth, and the total impression produced was that of what we must call royalty of intellectual and moral manhood, such as those who have once seen it are never likely to forget. We at least have never seen so singularly noble-looking a man as Baron Bunsen was ten years ago. And Bunsen was as true, and pure, and noble, as he looked. It is exhilarating to read a life—the life, above all, of a diplomatist and courtier, which, from first to last, is unsullied by vice, or falsehood, or intrigue; which, from first to last, was inspired and sustained by pure and noble aims, and was spent in studies and pursuits of an elevating character. As a diplomatist, Bunsen was at the same time a true patriot and a cosmopolitan philanthropist. Apart from his diplomacy, he was a devoted student in the most profound and lofty fields of thought. In family life, he was tender, true, most religiously thoughtful, altogether conscientious. As a Christian—but here, in truth, is the sorrowful part of his history. His faith in Christ was not as our faith; because his faith in God differed very far from ours. The infection of Pantheistic philosophy clave strongly to him; his thoughts were dimmed and darkened as he strove to realise the life and presence of the God and Father of Christ and of men through the speculative subtleties of German philosophy. But his errors, let it be remembered, were those of his education, his race, his country and age; the sincerity and devoutness of purpose with which he strove to work his way through

the maze of rationalistic assumptions and theories, to a firm hold of truth and goodness, in Christ, were such as, notwithstanding his errors, entitle him to the sympathy and even admiration of Christians, especially of Christian thinkers who understand something of the region of thought in which Bunsen first drew the breath of his intellectual life. Dr. McCosh has given us his testimony as to the religious condition and life of Bunsen when he visited him at Heidelberg. "Some readers," he says, "will be astonished when I add, that he once told me that 'he was not sure about allowing that God is a Being, and could not admit that God is a Person.'" Very sad, indeed, it is to read such a statement. But let the subtlety of German transcendentalism be borne in mind. The same man who uttered such a saying as this continually and fervently prayed to God, although he was not sure that He was "A Being." Moreover, no one is at liberty to quote and make the worst of the sentence we have given from Dr. McCosh, without taking in connection with it the remainder of the testimony borne by the same eminent and orthodox Christian in the same context. "I am able to say," declares Dr. McCosh, "what I believe I can say of no other with whom I had so much intercourse, that we never conversed, during those five days, for ten minutes at a time, without his returning, however far it might be off, to his Bible and his Saviour, as the objects which were evidently the dearest to him." He adds, "The last day I passed with him was a Sabbath—a Sabbath indeed, for I never in all my life spent a more profitable day. In the forenoon I sat with him in the University Church of Heidelberg, where we had the privilege of listening to a powerful Gospel sermon from Dr. Schenkel. I spent the afternoon in his house, where he read to us in German, or in English translations, out of the fine devotional works of his country, interspersing remarks of his own, evidently springing from the depths of his heart, and breathing towards heaven—whither, I firmly believe, he has now been carried." What Baroness Bunsen adds, after citing Dr. McCosh's account of his visit to her husband, must also, in all charity, in all justice, be remembered. "Dr. McCosh witnessed the oscillations of a pendulum, by which it was often borne far away from the centre of gravity, to which it returned, and in which it rested; and she who had longest watched and witnessed those oscillations, has most reason to know and to mark the fact, and the point of repose." Bunsen's speculations, both philosophical and biblical, were full of Pantheistic transcendentalism and rationalism, but his heart and conscience, notwithstanding, were powerfully influenced by Christian truth. And this, every Christian divine will be glad, as he must be bound, to acknowledge, was the real spring of that nobleness of character which so eminently distinguished Bunsen among his fellows of the courtly circle and the diplomatic world. In the utmost pressure of business and study it was his custom to read his New Testament the last thing at night, and the Old Testament as soon as he arose in the morning. Family prayer, with the reading or singing of devotional hymns, was the stedfast rule of his household.

"The history of the world," said Bunsen, in 1847, writing in reference to a speech delivered in France by De Lamartine, "shows that human reason struggles ineffectually against passion, and corruption, or the power of selfishness; and Lamartine does not propose to them any sort or kind of religion, nor any aspiration after the invisible; in short, he does not name Christianity, to subdue self and its dictates, and sublimate all energies into the love of God and man, but only that same reason, in the force of which I cannot suppose he believes, any more than do his hearers."

Bunsen was born in 1791, at Corbach, in the Principality of Waldeck. His father, himself a native of Corbach, had served in a Waldeck-Dutch regiment. He lived on the produce of a few acres of land, eked out by a small pension, and by what he made as a copyist of law documents. He was a God-fearing man, of strong and upright character, knew some Latin, read as much as he could find time to read, married a second wife in 1790, the year after he quitted the Dutch service, and, when he was forty-seven years old, had by his second wife one only child, afterwards Baron Bunsen. Bunsen was educated according to the custom of his country; passed at the fit age to the gymnasium; was confirmed at the age of fourteen; and, having had a brilliant course at the gymnasium, proceeded to the universities of Marburg and Göttingen. When about fourteen years old, he had acquired English from the pastor of a distant village; French he learnt at school. He was happily a boy who could say *No;* gay, ingenuous, social, but capable of resolutely abiding by the course he had determined upon; in short, firm and high-spirited like his father, although of a much sunnier temper than the old soldier-yeoman. He was a most tractable and diligent scholar, the pride and delight alike of his teachers and school-fellows.

In writing to one of his sons, in 1847, Bunsen said of himself, "For me, God ordained from earliest childhood a rigorous training; through poverty and distress I was compelled to fight my way through the world, bearing nothing with me but my own inward consciousness, and the firm determination to live for my ideal aim, disregarding all else as insignificant."

Bunsen left Marburg for Göttingen in 1809. At the latter university he made his first literary venture. His Latin essay (on the Athenian law of inheritance) gained the university prize, and attracted much attention. At Marburg he had been maintained by a small scholarship, requiring very frugal economy. At Göttingen he had the privilege of free commons, and was soon appointed by Heyne, then the luminary of the university, an assistant teacher. He also gave private lessons to Mr. W. B. Astor, of New York. In Easter, 1812, he was appointed first teacher of Hebrew at the university school, and second teacher of Greek. This was the year in which his prize essay was written. In 1813 the University of Jena bestowed on him the unsolicited distinction of Doctor of Philosophy.

In the same year he travelled with Mr. Astor by Frankfort and

Würtzburg to Vienna, and thence by Munich to Switzerland, and to Milan and the North-Italian Lakes. Lachmann, Lücke, and Brandis were numbered at this time among his intimate friends. At this time, also, a friendly connection was formed between himself and Frederick Perthes. And Becker, afterwards the great publisher at Gotha, was also one of his circle.

In 1814 Bunsen visited his half-sister, Christiana, in Holland, and was for the first time brought into contact with firm, definite, and vivid evangelical Christianity. He never lost the impressions thus produced upon him. In 1815 he accompanied Brandis on a visit to Copenhagen, where he formed the acquaintance, among others, of Twesten; and to Berlin, where he became a disciple and friend of Niebuhr, and where his mind came under the potent influence of Schleiermacher. From Berlin he proceeded in 1816 to Paris, to join his wealthy and warmly attached American friend and pupil, Mr. Astor. At Paris, under Silvestre de Sacy, he applied himself to the study of Persian and Arabic, working as only German students can work. From Paris, after several months thus spent, he went to Florence to meet his friend Astor, who had been some time in Italy. Mr. Astor, to whose liberality Bunsen seems to have owed much at this period, being summoned home to New York, Bunsen declined to accompany him to America. Fortunately for him, Mr. Cathcart, with whom he had met in travelling, was very anxious to secure Bunsen's services, for three hours daily, as French teacher and as companion. He was thus enabled to pursue his studies, and to see society in Florence and in Rome. Early in 1817 he was engaged to read German with "a learned young Englishman," Mr. William Clifford. While thus engaged at Rome as a student and a teacher, he made the acquaintance of Mr. and Mrs. Waddington and their family. Niebuhr and his friend Brandis were, fortunately for his position and prospects, now at Rome, the former as *chargé d'affaires*, the latter as secretary. Bunsen saw the best society and was greatly admired, although he must have been poor enough. His only pecuniary resources seem to have been what he received from Mr. Astor and from his English pupils: and he provided for his beloved sister Christiana, who was unmarried, their parents having died in 1816. Through the Waddingtons, Bunsen was introduced to the Duchess of Devonshire and other people of distinction. Unconsciously a warm attachment sprang up between Bunsen and Miss Waddington. Strange to say, the poor German student was accepted not only by the generous and susceptible young Englishwoman, but by her family. Niebuhr's high testimony as to the character, abilities, and probable prospects, of his brilliant young friend, added to his own fascinations, must account for the humbly born German student's gaining, with evident facility, the hand of a young English lady of good birth and fair fortune. Such a case, however, stands almost alone. He was married early in June, 1817. To his sister he writes in July, that Mrs. Waddington had written to Thorwaldsen to take his bust "for her to place in her house in England." "But," he adds, "I at once desired Fanny to inform

her mother that I should decidedly not consent to this; to my feelings there would be arrogance and presumption in suffering such a dignified representation of myself, when I had not yet done anything worthy of being recorded."

The young couple occupied a very modest dwelling. Niebuhr exerted all his influence at the Court of Berlin to get Bunsen appointed to a professorship at Berlin or Bonn, with permission to remain abroad for three years, before entering upon his duties, the salary, of course, to be paid from the date of the appointment. In this he failed, but, the health of Brandis giving way, Bunsen took his place as Niebuhr's secretary in December, 1817, so that, before his first child was born, he had entered upon that course of diplomatic employment in which he passed nearly all his after-life. In November he had taken apartments on the second floor in the Palazzo Caffarelli, "which proved a home" for himself and family "for twenty-two years." Here all his children were born.

We need not follow minutely the steps of Bunsen's course from this time. In 1823 he succeeded Niebuhr as *chargé d'affaires* at Rome. In this capacity he was able to obtain a wall for the Protestant burying place in that city, and also to secure transcripts for the British archives of the English State Papers in the Vatican—a great benefit this to the cause of historical truth. In 1827 he paid his first official visit to Berlin, and was received with high confidence and honour. Then began his life-long intimacy and friendship with the late King of Prussia, at that time Crown Prince. In May, 1828, he returned to Rome. Severe controversies between the Prussian King and the Roman Court on the subject of "mixed marriages" led to Bunsen's removal from Rome in 1838. The immediate consequence was his first visit to England, where he was at once welcomed into the best society, and found repose and high enjoyment in visiting the friends of his wife's family, including such superior women as Mrs. Waddington and his sister-in-law, afterwards so well known as Lady Llanover. In 1839 Bunsen was appointed Prussian minister in Switzerland, during his tenure of which office he visited England again on a special mission from King Frederick William IV. In 1841 he was appointed Prussian minister in London. Here he remained till 1854, true equally to Prussia and to Germany, to Prussia and to England. His determination to be no party to any breach with England led, in fact, to his recall from London in the last-named year, and to some official (not personal) distance between Frederick William IV. and himself. On leaving England he was made a baron; the Christian Charles Josiah Bunsen, of Corbach, became Baron von Bunsen. He settled at Charlottenberg, near Heidelberg, and gave himself up to his studies. In 1857 he visited the King at Berlin, on occasion of the visit, by the King's invitation, of the Evangelical Alliance to that city. His health began to fail after leaving England. The climate of Germany in winter was unfavourable, and his continual and close studies told upon his system. He had in fact been a hard daily student for fifty years,

from five in the morning, both in summer and winter, and had never loved or practised out-door exercise to any extent. He died at Charlottenberg, on the 28th of November, 1860, in his 70th year. To his wife and children he said in his last illness, and when he seemed to be dying, "We shall meet again, of that I am sure, in the presence of God. Love, love, we have loved each other, live in the love of God, and we shall be united again. In the love of God we shall live on, for ever and ever. Love—God is love—love eternal." "Christ is the Son of God, and we are only then His sons as the Spirit of love, which was in Christ, is also in us."

Two volumes so rich in interest as these in which the Baroness relates the story of her husband's life, we hardly know where to find. Their only parallel, so far as we can remember, is the two volumes of Archbishop Whately's *Life and Correspondence*. The light thrown upon many political questions of European importance is great; the insight given into the character of thought in the highest circles of Germany, and in part also of England, is such as could hardly be found elsewhere. Perthes, Schleiermacher, Arnold, Whately, Bunsen, —let the student of modern thought master the five pairs of volumes which illustrate the lives of these five men, throwing in along with them Newman's *Apologia*—and let him study the lines of reading to which these volumes will serve as the indices,—and it may fairly be said that the foremost and most influential thinking of this age will have been laid open to him. Our illustrations of character and thought culled from these volumes can only be very scanty.

The following passage from a letter to Mrs. Waddington, written in December, 1817, reveals an admirable feature in Bunsen's character. Young men need not be ashamed to follow such an example:—

"I wanted, therefore, and yet I want, first, time and leisure for my studies; secondly, uninterrupted direction of the mind to those objects, and what is congenial to them; thirdly, firm courage and fresh hope in doing all this. Were it only the first, that I wanted, time, I could try to gratify you: having spent the whole day in my studies, I might give the evenings to the purpose of frequenting and receiving society, English, Italian, and German circles, balls, concerts, &c., although I think I should consider myself unwise thus to deprive myself and my wife of the only opportunity of enjoying each other's company, and that of one or the other chosen friend or acquaintance. But the two other points make it impossible. I know I have it in my power to go every evening into company, pay attention to grandees and to ladies, and talk away time to the insignificant, and I have done it. I quitted University employment in 1813 on purpose to see and know the world. I have seen and known the most distinguished men in my own country, and, wherever I was, I frequented the circles of ambassadors, princes, and ministers. I was reckoned *amiable* by some of the ladies, clever by the learned, and *bon enfant* by the men. This cost me some time, but has been a great lesson to me. Almost always in these circles I was liked and valued for that which I ridiculed in myself, and I could

not go on in this way without scorning myself and my fellow-creatures too, and without losing that respect for human life and the human species which is indispensable to me; even I fear, when I consider my nature's frailty, without losing my natural horror of the custom, or rather disease, of talking without thinking and without interest.

"There are, I know very well, sometimes useful facts to be picked up in this way, sometimes even persons found that may be good acquaintances beyond the moment, but the above-mentioned rules of my life and time will not allow me to purchase them so dearly, particularly as I do not know any mortal so rich as I am in real friends and valuable acquaintances, adding to all these an excellent wife. Therefore I thank God that just now I live here, having no place in society but that of a pilgrim."

Bunsen and Mr. Gladstone were congenial spirits and became intimate at once, although Bunsen's State-Churchism differed essentially from that of Gladstone, not less than Dean Stanley's does now from that of Dr. Wordsworth, and although Bunsen's views respecting Christian grace and the sacraments differed as widely from those of Mr. Gladstone as, on the same points, Archdeacon Hare's theology differed from that of the Wilberforces. Bunsen had known Gladstone personally at Rome; when he visited England in 1838, he immediately sought his acquaintance. The future minister's book on Church and State was just out. Bunsen devoured it, and at once prognosticated the high career of the author. "It is the book of the time, a great event; far above his party and his time. Gladstone is the first man in England as to intellectual power, and he has heard higher tones than any one else in this island." "Still he walks sadly in the trammels of his Oxford friends in some points, *e.g.* the Apostolical Succession." "I wonder Gladstone should not have the feeling of moving on an *inclined plane*, or that of sitting down among ruins." "Went to Gladstone with Tom, and was delighted with the man who is some day to govern England, if his book is not in his way." So, also, no politician's eloquence charmed him so much as Gladstone's.

But Dr. McNeile impressed him as an orator more than any other man. He speaks of him "as the most powerful and graceful orator he ever heard. Having attended a great Church education meeting in 1839, at which the Liverpool Church orator had delivered the speech which called forth this eulogy, Bunsen says, "Two thousand were sitting from twelve o'clock till half-past five, in *one* state of deep emotion. . . . How did I feel, after such a day, that the English race would all run mad, did they not keep the Sabbath as they do!"

Writing to Gladstone from Berne in 1840, he says, "It has always struck me, when in England, and is constantly before my mind, how little political thought there is in most of her statesmen, in consequence of the all-absorbing party quarrels of the day. It is buying political liberty rather dear." To Mr. Hills, Bunsen writes, "It is the deficiency of the method of handling ideas in this blessed island, which makes it so difficult for your writers, political and ecclesiastical, to find the seeds

of regeneration in your own old blessed institutions, which to *preserve* you must *reconstruct*. This operation requires that the eternal *spirit* should be drawn out of the decaying or decayed *letter*, and Sir Humphry Davy did not teach you that. How wonderful that separation is between *real life* and *ideal thought*? One ought to be the image and *Abylanz* of the other; and yet we, Germans, find it so difficult to construct reality with our ideal thoughts, and you English to see your own great reality in the light of that thought, and to sublimate it *(verklären)* into that spirit which it embodies, and which to incarnate is the only good reason for its existence."

In 1848 Bunsen wrote as follows in regard to English statesmen and German prospects: "It is quite entertaining to see the stiff unbelief of the English in the future of Germany. Lord John is merely uninformed. Peel has somewhat staggered the mind of the excellent Prince by his unbelief, yet he has a statesmanlike goodwill towards the *Germanic nations*, and even for the *German nation*. Aberdeen is the greatest sinner. He believes in God and in the Emperor Nicholas.

"The present ministry is weak, but every other impossible. Peel has constantly conducted himself uprightly towards all. They all together have no comprehension of the germ of the present social movement in Europe; they consider themselves as still in the ark, and look down from their Mount Ararat with the Pharisaic satisfaction of 'I thank Thee, Lord, that I am not one of these,' or with the short-sighted congratulation of the islander in contemplating the surrounding billows. The Queen and the Prince maintain an admirable position; it is a true pleasure to me to observe how the Prince becomes more and more known for what he is. Belgium is here, too, looked upon a pattern country, and King Leopold highly honoured."

Bunsen desired to see the theatre purified and ennobled. He was a friend of Macready's, who did all in his power, although striving in vain against the evil and corrupting stream and overflow of the times, to accomplish this object. The Baroness gives the following statement of Bunsen's feelings as regards the opera. "With the opera stage, Bunsen had no patience, and though he visited it in London, in attendance on the Prince of Prussia, even Jenny Lind (although he entirely felt her power of grace as well as voice) failed to enable him to find pleasure or even amusement in that form of dramatic representation against which he peculiarly protested, as being the betrayal of a good cause, and the caricature of a kind of composition which he acknowledged to be founded in reason, and desired to see revived by a real master of combined verse and harmony. The ballet he considered a thing of unmixed evil, and its highest and most applauded efforts as the exaggeration of ungracefulness; nor could he refrain from comments in sorrow and anger on the power of fashion, which draws the modest and the pure into the multitude of spectators of a different class. Often did he wonder, in this respect, at the contradictions in English life,—no difference perceived in the tendency and effect of styles of art,—conceived in conditions of mind and with intentions and purposes

the most various—the tinkling strains, addressed to the sensual side of human consciousness, being allowed to find their way into houses, where 'whatsoever things are pure and lovely' are striven after, and every approach to evil and corruption in other respects are strenuously avoided; the inmates of which would in no case enter a theatre, and yet will suffer in the decoration of their apartments objects utterly unsuited to their habitual tone of mind and tenor of life."

Bunsen had warm and intimate friends in England among the most estimable and earnest men of all parties. Like his friends, Arnold and Hare, however—and as could not but be in the case of a German—he did not agree with any English party. "However I may agree," he says, "with the Whig party in single points, I disagree with them in the general view of things human and Divine. . . . The best are negative spirits. They are good for the purpose of keeping the Tories awake and within bounds." His theological views approximated to those of Maurice; his ecclesiastico-political principles may be fairly said to be represented at the present day in England by Dean Stanley.

Sir Robert Peel seems to have loved Bunsen. He warmed to him more than to any one else, and wished to see him just before his death. Bunsen, however, did not reach him. At Tamworth, Bunsen, Sir Robert, and others, heard the late Mr. Stowell preach with great delight. Bunsen, however, was the only one of the party who felt and saw—the only one who could be induced to believe—that Stowell's sermon was altogether extemporary.

We had intended to transcribe two of Bunsen's devout prayers to God for guidance and blessing, but our space does not allow this. The fragmentary indications we have afforded of the quality of these two volumes will, as we hope, induce our readers to study them for themselves. Here are treasures of observation and of idea; here is large correspondence with such Englishmen as Hare, Arnold, and Gladstone, and such Germans as Lepsius, and Max Müller, and Stockmar; here is the whole life of Bunsen, the politician who wrote that noble volume, *The Signs of the Times*, the versatile and accomplished ethnologist and historical critic. Let him be taken for what he was, a deeply rationalised yet devout German scholar, and the lessons of so noble and yet so incomplete and erratic a life may be most profitably read.

God in History; or, The Progress of Man's Faith in the Moral Order of the World. By C. C. J. Baron Bunsen, D.Ph., D.C.L., and D.D. Translated from the German by Susannah Winkworth. With a Preface by Arthur Penrhyn Stanley, D.D., Dean of Westminster. In Three Volumes. London: Longmans, Green & Co. 1868.

THIS work, of which only two volumes are published, is the last which its author lived to complete. It was his purpose to have followed it up by a more strictly philosophical treatise, based upon

the facts with which he deals in the volumes before us. According to his own description, the work, intended not for the learned only, but for the educated public in general, is "an attempt to place such a collection of facts before his readers as shall enable them to attain by the inductive method to a recognition of the spontaneity of the religious intuitions of mankind, and a comprehension of the stages through which these intuitions have passed in the course of the history of our race." Whatever may be the judgment of Christian students as to the theories and conclusions of the learned baron, the work itself will be valued as containing the concentrated expression of the matured views of a biblical scholar, who blended with immense learning and research a real and reverent devotion too seldom found among the profounder Continental critics. The title of the work is not happily chosen. It suggests the idea of the continuous action of God in the cause of Providence, rather than that of the gradual formation and development of the human consciousness of God. Nor are we disposed to accept the theory of spontaneous intuitions of God in the mind of man, inasmuch as all ideals of religion, which have had even the shadow of truth upon them, have been the fruit either of the direct action of God upon the human mind,—the light which lighteth every man that cometh into the world,—or of distant and fragmentary revelation. In the great religious systems of the past the Divine element appears not as the growth of progressive intuition, but as the germ of primitive revelation. But though the author's positions may be open to objection, and some of them in a grave degree, his illustrations exhibit profound and conscientious research, and furnish information as valuable as it is full and varied.

The area over which he travels is indeed vast. Devoting his first book to a general philosophical introduction, in which he explains the principles which his facts are intended to illustrate and establish, he commences with the characteristics of the religious consciousness of the Hebrews, as exhibited in their leading historical passages, their sacred writings, their political institutions, their philosophical thought, and especially their theory of Providence. He then passes to the religious consciousness of the Aryan races of Eastern Asia, as developed before the confluence of Semitic with Aryan religious thought, consequent upon the mission of Jesus of Nazareth, and the publication of His Gospel throughout the Roman empire. Here he dwells not only on the later Aryan faith, Budhism and Brahminism, but upon those ancient conceptions of God which were, so to speak, the vestibule of these faiths,—the Egyptian, Turanic, and Chinese. He next deals with the religious consciousness of the pre-Christian Aryans of Europe, the Hellenes, the Romans, and the Teutons. The fifth and sixth books, of which the English translation is not yet published, but which are to form the third volume of the edition before us, are devoted to the religious consciousness of the Christian Aryans, and to a consideration of the general results of the investigation. Each national type of religious thought is deduced not only from popular

intuitions and philosophical speculations, but from the political institutions, the art, and the literature of the people; as also from the more prominent characters of their history.

The religious consciousness of the Hebrews exhibits "two profound intuitions, to which the heart of the people clung with sublime tenacity, and which stand before us unique in the ancient world." The first of these is the consciousness of the unity of the whole human race,—a unity corresponding to the Divine unity. The second is the faith in a gradual development of the human race into a realisation of holiness, as expressed by the image of the kingdom of God upon the earth. The four leading historical representatives of Hebrew religious thought are Abraham, Moses, Elijah, and Jeremiah. The writings of the Hebrews bear witness to their intuitions as vividly as their historical representatives. The Psalms and the Proverbs are full of the idea of the unity of humanity, and the moral governance of the world by God. The same testimony is borne by their political institutions, and by their philosophical speculations, especially as exhibited in the Books of Job and Ecclesiastes.

A much wider field of study is opened out as we pass to the consideration of the religious consciousness of the Aryan races of Eastern Asia. In the Osiris worship of the Egyptians, and even in the metempsychosis and the judgment held upon the souls of the dead, there may be seen some germs of truth,—some recognition of the principle that good prevails on earth in the midst of conflict, while evil is self-annihilative; and that the enigma of existence is not to be solved in the term of a single earthly life. Even the plastic art of ancient Egypt, as well as its architecture and music, offer noble evidence of religious consciousness. The religious consciousness of the Turanians exhibits itself in a yearning after a life of enthusiasm, or of physical and mental ecstasy, as the only mode of access to a more exalted conception of God. But Turanism has its organic basis in a yet earlier stratum of religious thought; that of Semism, the religion of the Chinese,—a religion dating not from the era of Confucius, who was the mouthpiece of the comparatively modern thought of the nation, but from nearly two thousand years before Christ. The characteristic trait of the ancient religious consciousness of the Chinese is an absolute indefiniteness of the idea of God. They have a sense of the unity of the Kosmos, and of the inviolable nature of the laws which regulate human existence; but faith in God and in "the conscious mind inhabiting the universe and the soul of man" is absent. The only evidence of a faith in mind which is to be found among them is the worship of the dead. The systems of Confucius and his illustrious contemporary, Lao-tse, represent later phases of the religious thought of China. One thought continually recurs in their writings, and it is the root idea of the ancient system: "There is a law which governs the All, in nature and in man, and this one law is reasonable."

The religion of Zoroaster, which has degenerated sadly from its primitive type, was singularly pure from the errors of contemporary

faiths. Its degeneracy is the result, however, of its many cardinal defects. The religious consciousness of the peoples inhabiting the lands of the Indus and the Ganges opens out a field too wide for passing reference. There are many precious germs of truth, however, in the Vedas, and perhaps nowhere has the view of humanity gasping after God found expression so touchingly and with such sublimity as in the 121st hymn of the tenth book of the Rig-Veda, each strophe of which ends with the question: "*Who* is the God to whom we shall offer our sacrifice?" Notwithstanding the enormous errors, and the immoral tendencies and sanctions, of the various faiths which have grown and flourished in Asia, the Aryan races have achieved something of permanent benefit: "They have placed God really in the universe, and, moreover, as the conscious intelligence, which reflects itself again in the well-balanced human intellect, and is not only felt in the conscience, but also recognised by the reason, although restricted within the limits of finite forms of thought." And "though they have not, indeed, founded a free polity, they have built up piety and freedom at the domestic altar, which is the type, the beginning, and the condition of all political sanctities and liberties." Of these results the Hellenic mind availed itself with energy, applying them to actual realities; and prepared the way for the task which the Romans and the Northern Teutons accomplished.

By far the most interesting and intelligible chapters of Baron Bunsen's works are the chapters devoted to the religious consciousness of the Aryan races of Asia Minor and Europe, previous to the Christian era. The Greek Epos and Drama have an import in themselves, far beyond that of their utterances, however grand and noble. They are the earliest models, though as yet unrivalled, "of a new and advanced mode of expressing man's sense of God," or of the Divine agency in the world. They are forms of praise of the Divine order of the world; they spring from the Hellenic apprehension of God's presence in the universe; they reveal the Hellenic view of human life, and interpret the dream of our earthly existence. Homer and Hesiod reflect the belief of the Hellenic mind. Their works were to the Greeks what our Bible is to us. But even in them we discern a background of tacitly assumed beliefs. The real background is to be found in two sacred traditions, referring to the generations of the gods, and the ages of the world; the ideal background is found in two "sublime and indigenous creations, Prometheus and Nemesis,"—the representatives of the genius of humanity and the divinity of just retribution. These two conceptions contain the germ of the entire Hellenic religion.

More detailed illustrations appear in the mysteries, the oracles, the Delphic rites, the Orphics, and the early religious philosophies of Pherecydes and Pythagoras. The belief in a moral order governing the common affairs of men,—in the certain retribution awaiting crime, —in the ennobling of nature and the dignifying of humanity by the sons of the gods,—and in the high vocation of art, science, and political liberty, had other prophets besides Hesiod and Homer. Lyric poetry, as

represented by Callinus and Tyrtæus, Solon and Pindar, Alcæus and Simonides, as well as by men of lower mark,—the drama, whose brightest luminaries were Æschylus and Sophocles, Euripides and Aristophanes,—plastic and pictorial art, as represented by Phidias and Polygnotus,—historical literature, with its double-star, Herodotus and Thucydides,—philosophy, with its three luminaries, Socrates, Plato, and Aristotle, must all be regarded as prophets of Hellenic faith. To these may be added a sixth, whose witness is not less clear and conclusive,—the Hellenic Social Life.

The religion of the Romans was essentially and at all times a political institution, and as such far below the spirit of the Hellenic faith. Its chief prophets, if they may be so called, were Cicero and Tacitus. More elaborate, but more superstitious was the religious consciousness of the Teutons previous to their reception of Christianity. The appearance of Jesus Christ realised the utmost dreams and the loftiest inspirations of the ancient systems, and bound together the old world with the new.

The mention of the sacred name, however, suggests the question as to what Bunsen really believed our Lord to be. This, after all, is the test of all theological work. Despite Bunsen's spirit of reverence, and the peculiarly tender devotion with which he regarded in life and in death the name of Jesus, no one can consult his writings, and especially his great Bible-work, without deploring the results to which his researches and speculations led him. He vainly attempted a compromise between the theological criticism and the orthodox faith. Hence his Christ is at once the most perfect revelation of the Divine in humanity, and at the same time only a man of wonderful experiences. His mysterious temptation and conflicts with the enemy were no other than internal processes of discipline which He confided to the ears of His chosen disciples. His wonderful works were not miracles in the proper sense of the term: indeed, Bunsen robs some of them, and those the most rich in their symbolical meaning, of all their divinity. For instance, the feeding of the thousands is merely the glowing account of a marvellous spirit of self-sacrifice which, stimulated by the Saviour's example, contributed all for the relief of the poor. "The death of Christ," we now quote, though freely, Bunsen's words, "was a swoon in which sensibility seems to have utterly ceased, but for which an awakening or a resurrection should come." It seems almost incredible, when we remember Bunsen's strong confidence in the mediation of Jesus, that he was inclined to the opinion that our Lord went away from Judæa and died after all a natural death. It may be added that St. John is, according to Bunsen, the philosophical historian among the writers of the New Testament; and that the final form assumed by the religion of Jesus owed to him in conjunction with St. Paul its ultimate character. Whatever respect we may have expressed for this highly gifted thinker and scholar, his views of the Gospel of Jesus can have no other characterisation at our hands than that of being a combination of most discordant elements, producing a whole that can satisfy no man.

As might have been expected from his former writings and those of the school which he represents, Bunsen's divergence from orthodox views in the region of inspiration was very wide. If his judgment on the Zend-Avesta,,or the Vedas, or the system of Confucius be occasionally eccentric, it is not fatal, not even detrimental to the interests of truth. But his theory of inspiration practically excludes the Almighty from the Bible, and places the sacred books and their authors on the level merely of a higher *clairvoyance.* "The phenomena of prophecy," he admits, are not adequately explained by the hypothesis of "ordinary clairvoyance," but he asserts that the "Hebrew prophets were the earliest historical persons in whom the perceptive faculty *proper to somnambulism* was raised into a perception of spiritual things by the Spirit." His view may be more fully understood from his own words.

"Now the existence of such a faculty" (that is, as clairvoyance) "is a simple reality, as much so as the belief in it which pervades all religions and traditions. The faculty of second sight possessed by man is ordinarily the sinking of the waking consciousness in the realm of emotion. In his waking consciousness man carries on converse with the external world, and with himself by means of his senses and reason. . . . When the activity of the senses, and therefore especially of sight, is suspended, the limitations of space fall away, and in the highest degree of the slumber of the senses, also those of time. . . . Now since all that exists in nature exists also in mind, and is destined to be exalted with mind, and since man is in very deed a partaker of the Divine reason, there must be a clairvoyant condition of the human mind corresponding to its waking condition, when directed to moral or spiritual objects. . . . Hence the proper prophetic state is the moral and spiritual enfranchisement of natural clairvoyance. This is the position of Hebrew prophecy compared to that of the rest of antiquity, and more especially that of Aramaic races."

The effect of such a theory of inspiration upon himself is seen in the author's loose criticism on several passages and books of the Holy Scripture. The "ecclesiastical dogma of the Trinity," for instance, has no basis in the Old Testament, but is in the main the fruit of Hellenic and Platonic religious ideas. The Old Testament is said to give no hint either "in a metaphysical or metaphysico-historical sense" of a Divine Trinity—the spirit of God being but an attribute of the One God. The beholding of the Lord by Moses "from behind, must refer either to the reflection of Him in the Kosmos of Nature or the Kosmos of Humanity." The story of Abram, the father of many races, as contained in Genesis xv. 1—4, is assumed to be simply mythical. The Book of Job, which he calls "a Semitic drama of the time of the Captivity," is the construction out of an ancient Arab bardic recital that had grown into a popular book "of a Theodicy, or justification of ways of God to man: and this not at all in the sense of inspiration, but rather as the result of grand genius." "For," says Bunsen, "the author of our Book of Job only stood on the level of that moral apprehension, which, springing from a trust in personal sincerity and piety,

has its abiding and deepest roots in the personal relation of God to the individual." So the Book of Ecclesiastes is but "the attempt of a God-fearing Israelite to console his devoted and despairing contemporaries with that final conclusion reached by Job."

In like manner the sacred personage spoken of in the fifty-third chapter of Isaiah, though a type of Jesus Christ, was in reality the Prophet Jeremiah, between whose sufferings and those attributed to the "Man of Sorrows," a very ingenious parallel is drawn. Yet bolder is the assumption that many of the most memorable chapters of Isaiah were written as an appendix to the original prophecy by Baruch. A very imposing catalogue of names is associated with this theory. But however formidable the authority cited, it is impossible to attach any value to the assumption. The evidence of an Isaianic authorship, external and internal, is uncontrovertible. The Proverbs, again, form "a worthy pendant to the Gnomic poetry of the Greeks," without, however, their exuberance of fancy or their poetic freshness. The Book of Daniel was written "under the pseudonym of one of the ancient national heroes, who is mentioned by Ezekiel shortly before the destruction of Jerusalem, in connection with Noah, the father of our race, and the patriarch Job."

Such wild and mystical criticism as this lessens the value of those portions of the work which refer to the religious consciousness of the Hebrews as found in their sacred writings, while it shows to us how essential to all competent intelligence of the Word of God is the belief in it as a supernatural revelation of the Divine will and purpose.

Essays on Religion and Literature. Edited by Archbishop Manning. Second Series. Longmans, Green and Co. 1867.

Here are ten essays, well printed in clear type, and on good paper, pp. 508, 8vo. The subjects discussed, or rather pronounced upon, are various but related. First, we have an Inaugural by the Editor himself. Then, coming to the work of "The Academia" for the session, the reader is favoured with a laborious attempt, in two parts, to prove that intellectual excellence is no part of human perfection; that "*intellect*" is, in fact, a dangerous possession, whose chief end is to be the abject servant of "*will*." The arguments advanced in favour of this view of human perfection are four, drawn from St. Ignatius, St. Thomas, the Church's Doctrine, and the Church's Standard of Canonization. Of these four it is not necessary to say much. If, in the first, "moral" be substituted for "intellectual," St. Ignatius may, with equal truth, be made to declare that "moral excellence is no part of human perfection." In the second, the essayist claims the authority of St. Thomas, because he said something else. The third involves a hopeless confounding of fidelity with perfection. And, as to the fourth, if "Canonization" is to furnish the standard, it will be hard to tell what excellence *is* a part of human perfection. Neverthe-

less, it is admitted that intellect, when rightly governed, may be of use to the Church; but, in order to this, intelligent men must always judge by the Church's standard, serve the Church's purpose, and bow to the Church's authority.

Such an essay naturally prepares the way for a "Catholic" treatment of the subjects which follow—"The Mission and Prospects of the Catholic Church in England," "Christianity in Relation to Civil Society," "On the Philosophy of Christianity," "On Some Events Preparatory to the English Reformation," "On the Inspiration of Scripture," "Church and State," and "Certain Sacrificial Words used by St. Paul."

Space will not allow a detailed reference to these essays. The volume as a whole is remarkable, but by no means startling. It contains nothing new, something that is old, and very much that is neither new nor old. Two of the essays are by Dr. Manning himself, and all have had the benefit of his revision. Therefore it is unnecessary to say that they manifest ability, and it cannot be said that they lack authority. They have more than the *imprimatur* of him who is in this country chief emissary of the triple crown, the first and foremost of a band of political agents, who, under the guise of religion, seek the so-called conversion of England by the subversion of its liberties. The ideas and their forms, the logic and the dogma, are of the type which some persist in calling "Catholic," though, fortunately for both science and religion, it is by no means universal. Grant the premisses, ignore the fallacies, and the conclusions may be adopted. The inconsistency of the volume is in professing to argue at all. According to its teaching the highest legitimate employment of human intellect is "the *contemplation* of real or apparent truth" (p. 24). The Church alone can determine what is real truth, and all reasonings must be laid at her feet. Man was made to "know, love, and serve God" (p. 127), but practically this is all summed up in the simpler law of obedience to the priest. It is not for vain laymen to observe facts, to weigh evidence, to test theories.

> "Theirs, not to question, 'Why?'
> Theirs, not to make reply;
> Theirs, but to do—OR die."

For "the Church has the right, in virtue of her Divine commission, to require of every one to accept her doctrine; whosoever obstinately refuses, or obstinately insists upon the election out of it of what is pleasing to himself, is against her. But were the Church to tolerate such an opponent, she must tolerate another; if she tolerate one sect, she must tolerate every sect, and thereby give herself up" (p. 403).

But the peculiarity of the book after all is its audacious candour, in which the candour is more surprising than the audacity. Speaking of the charity which the present state of England requires, Dr. Manning says that "of this charity one high part is to be precise and clear in the full enunciation of Catholic truth." "The enunciation" given here of the doctrines of the Papal Church is sufficiently "precise and clear" for the information of many, and for the admonition of all.

The claims and hopes of the Romish Church are stated with a coolness that is very refreshing. Nor must any one hereafter appeal from extreme doctrines to the more enlightened views of English Catholics, or to the sense of even some Œcumenical Council. "The most ultramontane assertions among us fall within the range, and therefore under the shelter of authoritative documents, emanating from the Holy See. The attempt to distinguish between the declaration of the Holy See and the mind of the Church is the animus of heresy. If England is ever to be reunited to Christendom, it is by submission to the living authority of the Vicar of Jesus Christ. The first step of obedience must be submission to his voice, as rebellion against his authority was the first step of its departure." "It is visibly providential that at this moment the supremacy of the Crown, which is the Reformation *in concreto*, has literally come to nought. The providence of God has poured shame and confusion on the Tudor statutes. The royal supremacy has perished by the law of mortality which consumes all earthly things. And at this period of our history the supremacy of the Vicar of Jesus Christ re-enters as full of life as when Henry III. resisted Clement VII., and Elizabeth withstood S. Pius V. The undying authority of the Holy See is once more an active power in England; the shadow of Peter has fallen again upon it. What the next thirty years may bring forth, if the same forces and the same velocities continue to multiply, no one can venture to foretell" (pp. 18—20).

It has been proposed of late to recognise this "supremacy" of the Pope which "Elizabeth withstood," by repealing the Ecclesiastical Titles' Act. A Parliamentary Committee reports, "on high authority," that the Romish hierarchy claim in this country only "a kind of spiritual jurisdiction." In the volume before us, this "spiritual jurisdiction" is accurately defined. "To begin with, the State is not competent to determine of its own authority its proper range and sphere; these are shaped out for it by the action of the Church. The Church lays down the lines and the limits of its own domain, and claims the submission of the civil power to its judgment. To the spiritual power necessarily belongs, from the nature of its commission, an unlimited sway over the objects entrusted by Christ to its charge; in the pursuit of these objects it has the right to range at will over every domain unhindered. The residue only of those domains unoccupied by the Church falls to the share of the civil magistrate" (p. 455).

Nor is there more doubt as to the means by which these claims may, and, wherever possible, must be enforced. "The civil power enforces the laws of the Church; it restrains evil-doers and punishes heresy" (p. 457). "Neither the Church nor the State, whensoever they are united on the true basis of Divine right, can have any cognisance of tolerance. Not the Church, because neither true peace nor true charity recognises tolerance. Christ Himself condemns tolerance when He says: 'Who is not with Me is against Me.' "For the preservation of unity the peace of Christ calls for the sword to separate brother from brother, in order that brother might not separate brother from the

unity of the Church" (p. 403). Nor are kings and princes exempt from this compulsion. "The Pope can inflict temporal punishment on sovereigns for heresy, and deprive them of their kingdoms, and free their subjects from obedience" (p. 447). In a Christian community, if an heretical prince is elected or succeeds to the throne, the Church has a right to say, "I annul the election, or I forbid the succession;" or, again, "if a king of a Christian nation falls into heresy, . . . it is in the power of the Church to depose such a prince;" and "this right in the Church to exercise such acts of sovereign power . . . springs from the principle of that Divine sovereignty which the Church possesses in all times and over all Christian peoples" (p. 459).

Such doctrines as these were heretofore disclaimed by a large number of English Catholics, and on the faith of such disclaimer the Relief Act and the Emancipation Act were passed. Step by step Roman Catholics have been relieved from all disabilities. Little by little they have been permitted to share in the bounty of the State. They clamour still. They ask for Endowed Colleges and Universities in Ireland, and for the modification of the Coronation Oath. Their spears are already levelled against the Act of Settlement. All this has been on the ground of religious liberty and equality. At this juncture the Creed of Modern Rome is republished. And what do we learn?

Rome avows that no one can be an orthodox Catholic who does not subordinate all national questions to the teaching of the priest, and recognise the authority of the Pope as superior in every domain to that of the National Government. Either their Archbishop is false and untruthful, or else there is no Romish priest, true to his ordination vows, who is not daily seeking to subvert our national independence, and to reduce this empire to a state of vassalage to the so-called "Holy See." These political emissaries avowedly aim at the destruction of the freedom under cover of which their nefarious arts are practised. Religious toleration must be maintained, but the Toleration Act was not designed as a protection for sedition; and to endeavour to subordinate the Crown of England to that of Rome, is not a whit less treasonable than to encourage a Fenian revolt. It is time that the people of England declared, and with no faltering voice, that whilst the rights of conscience are respected, priestly conspirators against their country's liberties shall have neither national support nor national countenance.

La Physique Moderne, Essai sur l'Unité des Phénomènes Naturels. Par Emile Saigey. Paris: Baillière. 1867.

Building from the minute groundwork of some flimsy hypothesis, the ancients used to broaden out their large philosophies, superposing layer after layer to an indefinite extent; and from the tottering inverted cone thus constructed, succeeding generations sapped away the lower parts as they became obsolete, allowing such parts of the mass as were useful and durable to settle down upon a firmer base, and remain as lasting monuments. But now this is all changed, and upon the broad founda-

tions of scientific certainty, our modern *savants* erect their stable edifices, in confidence of their remaining substantially intact.

Six hundred years before the Christian era, Thales of Miletus propounded, in his praiseworthy struggle to build a theory of the universe, one of these ancient speculative hypotheses, relating to the unity of physical phenomena (viz. that water is the ultimate principle of everything); and between his idea and the modern notion of the identity of physical phenomena there is a certain fortuitous resemblance. But there is also the fundamental distinction that, whereas the hypothesis of Thales was reached by a purely subjective process of reasoning, the modern idea rests upon strong objective foundations, the results of scientific research. Laudably in love with this grand idea in its modern form, M. Saigey sets out with the view of bringing forward all the evidence he can collect from the experiences of various experimentalists in support of so useful an hypothesis, which seems fast approaching the more satisfactory state of theory. Upon the firm basis of the statical theory of the indestructibility of matter, with its resultant dynamical theory of the persistence of force,—two dogmas now generally accepted by the highest authorities—M. Saigey has constructed an admirable *resumé* of the results of recent inquiry in the several departments of physical science; and on the whole he places the matter in a very clear and fair light. With his cloud of witnesses arrayed in order before us, the tacit verdict of every dispassionate mind must be that we are not far from the demonstration of a luminous conception which will shed over the world of physics a clear unity and certainty hitherto unknown. That M. Saigey should embrace warmly an idea which may almost be called the guiding-star of modern physicists, is undoubtedly most reasonable; but the like cannot be said in regard to the minor hypothesis, whose cause he espouses with almost equal zeal—we mean the idea of an all-pervading ether, as to which authorities are seriously at variance. M. Saigey's *coup d'œil* ranges before us the great body of important modern results; but in this matter of ether there is an omission which cannot be overlooked. We should have expected that the labours of Mr. Grove and Professor Tyndall would both have found a chronicle in this work, as the contributions of two of the highest authorities on the subject in hand: but the fact is that Professor Tyndall's *Heat Considered as a Mode of Motion*—a book in which ether receives a full recognition—is referred to in terms of high praise such as it undoubtedly merits, whereas Mr. Grove's *Correlation of Physical Forces*—in which ether is not recognised—is not cited at all. Indeed, Mr. Grove's name is not mentioned throughout the book, though the Abbé Moigno, whose translation of *Heat Considered as a Mode of Motion* has been used by M. Saigey, has also done the good service of translating into French *The Correlation of Physical Forces*. This omission cannot well have been accidental; and it can hardly be interpreted otherwise than on the rational assumption that Mr. Grove's arguments against the existence of such an ether, drawn from the various branches of physics, would have been a sad stumbling-block in M. Saigey's path had he quoted the work in question.

Where eminent minds are thus at variance, time only can decide. If the existence of such an ether can be *proved*, the fact will of course be accepted, joyfully welcomed as hard-born scientific facts are welcomed. But the science of astronomy, upon which that of physics is built, has already long taken rank as a positive science without the aid of any such hypothesis: had ether been called in to do service in sidereal astronomy, it would seem to be inevitable that the results arrived at must have differed from those which have been actually reached, and which have received such complete and manifold verification. Judging, therefore, from analogy, it may not be unreasonable to hope that physics also can be constituted a positive science without the aid of an hypothesis which its parent science has done without.

M. Saigey, in the latter part of his book, encroaches rather boldly on the domain of the higher sciences of chemistry and biology, which must ever remain distinct from physics. To explain, above all, life on mechanical principles, has been found utterly impracticable, and it would seem to be in the nature of things that it should remain so. A mechanical theory of life must, in logical sequence, lead to a mechanical theory of thought—a consequence against which M. Saigey, otherwise unscrupulously materialist, throws the spiritualists a sop of unargued protestation, inconsistently recognising the violence which, from the spiritualist point of view, would thus be done to the idea of an immortal soul.

Notwithstanding this encroachment, M. Saigey's excellent little book may be safely recommended as a most useful introduction to the study of "modern physics."

The Jesus of the Evangelists: His Historical Character Vindicated; or, An Examination of the Internal Evidence for our Lord's Divine Mission, with Reference to Modern Controversy. By the Rev. C. A. Row, M.A., Author of "The Nature and Extent of Divine Inspiration," &c. Williams and Norgate. London: 1868.

This is a very able argument against such teaching as that of Renan and Strauss. The scope is to show that, if all the principles which underlie the theories of these destructive writers and their fellows be conceded, no such result as that of the concurrent and harmonious whole, the distinct and matchless unity, the idea and actual dramatisation of the Divine Man, Jesus, as he lives to view in the Gospel-narratives, could ever have been produced, within the limits of time which can be allowed for its production. He shows that, granting the premisses, the conclusion could never have agreed with the existing facts, the Four Gospels as they stand. He proves that the problem could never have been worked out so as to give us "the Jesus of the Evangelists." Nothing can be more mild, more perfectly dispassionate, more absolutely scientific, than the reasoning: the effect of the whole argument is most convincing. At the same time, in his proof that the

idea of Jesus Christ could never have grown up by the mere laws of natural development, whether in the ages before the Christian era, or in the century and a half following, or through any combination of mental or moral developments in the ages preceding and the period following, taken together and melting into each other, Mr. Row, as it seems to us, greatly underrates—not merely when employing the *argumentum ad hominem*, but when speaking evidently for himself—the actual condition of the patriarchal and Mosaic ages in regard to moral and intellectual attainment. If we must have a bias towards any school of rationalistic philosophy, we should certainly incline rather towards the school of Bunsen than that of Comte and Huxley. We do not ourselves believe in the development of the theology of the Talmud out of moral and intellectual chaos, *viâ* fetishism, polytheism, and monotheism, and we regret that Mr. Row yields too far to the assumptions of this school. We are not prepared to admit that Job had no faith in human immortality—was scarcely visited with an idea respecting it. All these assumptions we regard as radically false. Our conviction is that certain fundamental ideas of faith and morality are assumed from the beginning of Scripture, and constitute the basis and background of primary truth from which the special revelations stand out, as they come successively into view. We are aware, indeed, that on the hypothesis of the merely natural and unbroken evolution of thought, the existence of the Jesus of the Evangelists and of Christianity becomes all the more inexplicable and contradictory. But still it is, on many accounts, necessary that the truth of primary revelation should be maintained consistently, and that no concession should be made to the ignoble naturalism which is coming in on all sides like a flood.

Origin of the Four Gospels. By Constantine Tischendorf. Translated by William L. Gage. From the Fourth German Edition. Revised and greatly enlarged. London: Jackson, Walford, and Hodder. 1868.

As to the value of this small but learned volume there cannot be two opinions; and the value is all the greater because the erudite author is soundly orthodox. Some new points of great importance are brought forward by the famous Leipzig professor. It is to be lamented, at the same time, that the arrangement is obscure, the treatment by no means attractive or artistic, and the courtesy of the orthodox champion hardly greater than if he were an Ewald writing on the wrong side.

Apologetic Lectures on the Saving Truths of Christianity. Delivered in Leipsic in the Winter of 1866. By Chr. Ernest Luthardt. Translated by Sophia Taylor. Edinburgh: Clarks. 1868.

The rare beauty and power of Luthardt's Lectures on the *Fundamental Truths of Christianity* were signalised by us, when they were

published in this country in an excellent translation. This volume forms an admirable sequel, and is distinguished by the same merits as the former.

The Church and the World: Essays on Questions of the Day in 1868. Edited by the Rev. Orby Shipley. London: Longmans. 1868.

THIS is the "third series" of these Essays, which appear now to have become an annual publication. These books are to us a most painful evidence of the extent to which ultra-Romanising principles have demoralised, enslaved, dehumanised our modern English society. The men and women who write these essays are, in our judgment, notwithstanding their surface culture, more thoroughly superstitious and debased Romanists than the majority of Irish priests. Let any man of true English refinement and of true Christian morality read the detestable essay on "Defects in the Moral Training of Girls," which is said to be by "A Mother," and judge how far the poison must have gone into the social system, when so disgusting an essay can not only be written, but published. It is the foulest prurience of the most morbid purism, and is full of scandalous libels on the sex and the age: and for all the defects of which the "Mother" speaks, for all the impurity about which she expatiates, confession of girls and women to celibate priests is to be the cure!

The notorious Dr. Littledale—a Ritualistic Thersites, whom his party mistake for an Achilles—writes on "The First Report of the Ritual Commission;" Mr. Humble on "Invocation of Saints and Angels;" Mr. Vaux on "Missions and Preaching Orders;" Alfred Robert Cooke on the Divorce Court—"The Abolition of Marriage;" Mr. Pollock, of Birmingham, on "Spiritual Worship;" Mr. Carter on "Retreats;" Mr. Cheyne on "Prayers for the Dead;" and Mr. Wood (Rev. E. G. Wood, of St. Clement's, Cambridge) on "The Supernatural." These are some of the Essays. There are others on "Immoral Literature," "Ecclesiastical Literature," Anglican "Schools of Thought," "Priests and Physicians," "Church Politics," "Art and Religion," and "The Natal Scandal." Five are by laymen, two by women.

From the paper on the supernatural we quote two passages. The first shows how a mathematical High Churchman figures when he has to deal with the supernatural, and wishes to illustrate his "conception of the order of Creation":—

"Let A = creative Energy. The sum total of created Being is some function of this $= f(A)$. Suppose the natural $= \phi(A)$. The supernatural $= \psi(A)$. Then $f(A) = \phi(A) + \psi'(A)$. But $\phi(A)$ is a function of the form $A^n + m A^{n-1}$ + &c. + $\sum_{s=1}^{s=n} m A$, n being a definite, and, as far as the limit of human knowledge is concerned, a determinable number. But $\psi'(A)$ is a series of the form $\psi'_1(A) + \psi'_2(A)$, &c., being, as far as we know, indeterminable, though from being a created series, as $\psi_n'(A)$, being in form similar to $\phi(A)$."

This is indeed sublime fooling from an ultra-Ritualist mathematical sage. What, we wonder, will this hopeful divine and metaphysician attain to, if only spared a few years! In another part of his essay this prosaic and calculating genius gives a statement of the supernatural element in ritualism for which we thank him. He is an augur who believes in himself and his divinations—one of those who feel no temptation to laugh—in short, a man with no sense of absurdity. Hence he puts into bare form what Newman and Keble would have transfigured by mystical sleight-of-hand into something apparently wonderful and awful, and not evidently impossible and incredible. Men like Mr. Wood are useful for the cause of truth. They stupidly blurt out what ought to be wrapped in dazzling cloud. "In the Holy Eucharist," he says, "there is established a supernatural law—viz. that, following the recitation of certain words, and the performance of certain actions, by a certain person—a priest—what was naturally bread and wine becomes, supernaturally, the body and blood of Christ." This, he goes on to teach, is the medium through which "the life of grace" is imparted to the communicant. Such, the Anglican article against transubstantiation notwithstanding, is the doctrine held and taught by Mr. Wood, Mr. Orby Shipley (the editor of these Essays), and by all the High-Ritualist school.

A Letter from Rome, showing an Exact Conformity between Popery and Paganism; or, The Religion of the present Romans derived from that of their Heathen Ancestors. By Conyers Middleton, D.D. A New Edition. London: William Tegg. 1868.

This is a reprint for the times of a well-known tract. We cordially recommend it to those who are engaged in studying the origin and character of our modern ritualism.

The Church of the Fathers. By John Henry Newman, D.D. Fourth Edition. London: Burns, Oates, and Company. 1868.

The sketches here reprinted appeared first in the *British Magazine* in 1833 and following years. They include, to a great extent they consist of, translations from early Christian writings, frequently called the writings of "the Fathers." After the Introduction, we have Basil the Great, Trials of Basil, Labours of Basil, Basil and Gregory, Apollinaris, Antony in Conflict, Antony in Calm, Augustine and the Vandals, Conversion of Augustine, Demetrius, Martin, and Maximus. All that Newman has written needs to be read, now as much as thirty years ago, with critical caution. So read, these sections may serve, in part, as a clear and graceful introduction to the study of early Christian antiquity. The dedication of 1840 was "to my dear and much admired friend Isaac Williams, B.D.;" that of 1857 was "to a friend, who is as dear

to me now as when his name stood here, and threw light over my pages: whose heart is in God's hand, to bring into that sacred heritage, which is both the Church of the Fathers, and the home of the children." We must say that Newman makes "the loves of the angels" within his circle somewhat too public. We observe the same tendencies in the *Apologia*, the *Poems*, and in this volume. Having no family sanctuary within which the incense of his affections might be cast abroad, he wastes their fragrance somewhat too much within the general view; he takes all creation into his confidence. We are more than we could like reminded of those who offered their prayers "standing in the market-place and in the corners of the streets." The following apology for certain inevitable criticisms —criticisms which he could not avoid unless he were determined to see everything through the spectacles of monkish fanaticism—can hardly make a pleasant impression on a lay-reader of manly straightforwardness, even although he be a Romanist. Pascal would play sad havoc with its sanctimonious tortuousness. It shows how the necessities and the Jesuitical casuistry of Romanism may warp the conscience and destroy the delicate susceptibilities even of an honourable and truth-seeking mind like that of Newman.

"No alterations, however, many or few, can obliterate the polemical character of a work directed originally against Protestant ideas. And this consideration must plead for certain peculiarities which it exhibits, such as its freedom in dealing with saintly persons, the gratuitous character of some of its assertions, and the liberality of many of its concessions. It must be recollected, that, in controversy, a writer grants all that he can afford to grant, and avails himself of all that he can get granted:—in other words, if he seems to admit, it is mainly 'for argument's sake;' and if he seems to assert, it is mainly as an '*argumentum ad hominem*.' As to positive statements of his own, he commits himself to as few as he can; just as a soldier on campaign takes no more baggage than is enough, and considers the conveniences of home life as only *impedimenta* in his march.

"This being kept in view, it follows that, if the author of this volume allows the appearance of infirmity or error in St. Basil or St. Gregory or St. Martin, he allows it because he can afford to say '*transeat*' to allegations which, even though they were ever so well founded, would not at all interfere with the heroic sanctity of their lives or the doctrinal authority of their words. And if he can bear to hear St. Antony called an enthusiast without protesting, it is because that hypothesis does not even tend to destroy the force of the argument against the religion of Protestants, which is suggested by the contrast existing between their spirit and his.

"Nor is this the sole consideration, on which an author may be justified in the use of frankness, after the manner of Scripture, in speaking of the Saints: for their lingering imperfections surely make us love them more, without leading us to reverence them less, and act as a relief to the discouragement and despondency which may come over those who, in the midst of much error and sin, are striving to

imitate them;—according to the saying of St. Gregory on a graver occasion, "Plus nobis Thomæ infidelitas ad fidem, quam fides credentium discipulorum, profuit.'

"And in like manner, the dissatisfaction of Saints, of St. Basil, or again of our own St. Thomas, with the contemporary policy or conduct of the Holy See, while it is no justification of ordinary men, bishops, clergy, or laity, in feeling the same, is no reflection either on those Saints or on the Vicar of Christ. Nor is his infallibility in dogmatic decisions compromised by any personal and temporary error into which he may have fallen in his estimate, whether of a heretic such as Pelagius, or of a Doctor of the Church such as Basil. Accidents of this nature are unavoidable in the state of being which we are allotted here below."

There is this difference between Newman and Manning. The Father of the Oratory surrenders his soul, including in especial his intellect, to Papal authority with writhing reluctance, and with explanations and apologies, offered as much to his own intellectual truth and manliness as to the public; whereas Manning has made himself over body and soul, once for all, to Papal Catholicism, and is able completely to suppress and enslave his intellect. It is the sense of this difference which has secured so much sympathy from Englishmen to Newman. To which must be added that they are the more disposed to be indulgent to him, because they perceive that he is not fully trusted at Rome, and that he has missed the highest honours of Anglo-Romanism, precisely because he cannot, like the Archbishop, become the abject slave of Rome.

Parochial and Plain Sermons. By John Henry Newman, B.D., formerly Vicar of St. Mary's, Oxford. In eight volumes. Vol. I. New Edition. Rivingtons. 1868.

This is the first volume of a reprint, which for years has been longed for, of some of the most famous sermons of the age. The present volume is, and all are to be, an exact reprint. Just now Newman is regarded with undue admiration and exaggerated interest. But those who have these sermons have the best of Newman, and some of them are among the very finest sermons we know of any age.

John Wesley: Sa Vie et son Œuvre. Par Matth. Lelièvre. Ouvrage Couronné, Paris. Libraire Evangélique, 4, Rue Roquépine. 1868.

In English we have as yet no standard life of John Wesley. Those by Moore, Coke, and Whitehead, are all imcomplete and ill-proportioned, while the last is, on some points, misleading and perverse. Southey's *Life* was deformed by radical misconception. Watson's is brief, and altogether deficient. It was intended mainly to correct one or two prevailing misconceptions, and to serve at certain

points as a corrective to Southey. Here, however, we have in French a beautiful and fitly-proportioned short *Life of Wesley*. Mr. Lelièvre's is a really original work; it is of his own moulding, and the fruit of his own study. Nevertheless, a translation from this cheap and excellent epitome of Wesley's life would not be adequate as a cheap life of Wesley for English readers. Writing for France, Mr. Lelièvre has not deemed it desirable to investigate Wesley's relations with the Church of England or to trace the origin and growth of his special views as to ecclesiastical polity. Nor has he shown the *origines* of the Methodist Church, as they were successively created, within the space and time occupied by Methodism in Wesley's life-time.

Sermons on Unity, with an Essay on Religious Societies, and a Lecture on the Life and Times of Wesley. By F. C. Massingberd, M.A., Chancellor of Lincoln. Rivingtons. 1868.

THE leading thought of this little volume is the reunion of Nonconformists, and, in particular, of the followers of Wesley, with the Established Church. It came to our hand too late to be noticed in the article which we have given to this subject. Mr. Massingberd says that he has reason to believe that "a considerable number of Wesleyan ministers would accept orders from our bishops without any concession on our part." The article to which we have referred will convince Mr. Massingberd that on this point he has been misled. No conclusion could be more unwarranted. Mr. Massingberd, no doubt, knows more about Methodism and its history than most of his brethren. He seems to have even read Dr. Smith's History of Methodism. Still he has but a very dim and partial conception of what Methodism means and is. Having, however, himself been many years Rector of South Ormsby, the first parish served by the Father of the Wesleys, he has been led to take a special interest in the personal history of the Wesleys, as well as in Methodism. One prevailing error, as to the presentation of Mr. Wesley to South Ormsby by Lord Normanby, Mr. Massingberd corrects. So far even Mr. Tyerman has something to learn from the Chancellor of Lincoln. If, however, the Chancellor will consult Mr. Tyerman's life of the famous Rector of Epworth, he will find that he has himself much to learn, and some mistakes to correct, on points as to which Mr. Tyerman is by far the best authority. We respectfully refer him also to the article on Samuel Wesley, sen., which appeared in our own pages in January last. As to religious societies in the Church of England, Mr. Massingberd gives some fresh information and some suggestive hints. His lecture on Wesley and his Times is very slight indeed. Although, however, what he has to say on the subject is little and superficial, and the usual Anglican bias appears in a mild form, there is no uncharitable feeling, and no impracticable ecclesiastical assumption. In short, the spirit of the Chancellor of Lincoln is eminently candid and Christian.

John Wesley; or, The Theology of Conscience. By the Author of "The Philosophy of Evangelicism." London: Elliot Stock, 62, Paternoster Row.

We occasionally meet with men whose devotion to a favourite theory or dogma amounts to a kind of monomania. In the affairs of common life they may conduct themselves with courtesy, good temper, and good sense; but they no sooner come within the domain of their fondly cherished theory, than their minds are drawn off their true balance. Suddenly they assume a tone of authority, become imperious and dictatorial; and, if we are not prepared to approve or silently acquiesce in their oracular *dicta*, we find ourselves admonished by an impulse of self-respect to beat a hasty retreat.

The author of this lecture on "John Wesley; or, the Theology of Conscience," is evidently a man of this undesirable idiosyncrasy. The work affords clear indications of moral sincerity, logical skill and acuteness, and literary culture; and we do not doubt that, within the circle of his personal associates, the writer is as genial and reasonable as he is intelligent. But here he comes before us under the fascination of a single dominant idea; his powers warped and unsteady; not wanting in self-confidence, yet nervously apprehensive of assault; and ready to fulminate every evil at his command on any man who shall dare to dispute the strength of his position. His former book, with the high-sounding title, *The Philosophy of Evangelicism*—to which this new production "is to be regarded as an experimental sequel,"—was honoured, it seems, with a notice, "spiced with an attempt at severe censure," in the *Wesleyan Methodist Magazine;* and here the "peddling critic" is made an "example of" for the admonition of other members of his craft. In thorough Falstaff style, he is "roundly rated" as "a full-blown, pompous, arrogant priest" (p. ix.), and is visit explanation just of invective, taunt, and sarcasm, which, but for the explanation just suggested, would be more, we should suppose, than flesh and blood could bear.

Assuredly it is a hard fate which imposes upon the reviewer the necessity of giving a verdict against the evidence under so severe a penalty; and it is particularly hard upon us to have to approach this "experimental sequel," menaced by a long introduction which glistens so terribly with drawn swords and daggers. But we will not willingly provoke their use against ourselves. We have no disposition to take the ground of an assailant. There is at least an earnestness of tone about the production which entitles it to respectful treatment, and, without pointing out in detail what we believe to be fallacious, we will briefly describe the work, and leave it to produce its own impression.

The author is an admiring student of M. Comte, whose initial law of evolution he adopts as incontrovertible, and labours to construct upon it a theory of positivism in harmony with the teaching of the New Testament. The work, he states, "is intended to prove that there is no necessary antagonism between thorough-going evange-

lical orthodoxy and the favourite rationalistic dogma that a religion, to be suitable for the world, must have its intuitive root in the world's conscience." The single preliminary point to be settled is, he says, "whether the conception of an objective sacrifice for sin has, or has not, its origin in our moral instincts. If it has, the evangelical hypothesis admits of being evolved out of this primary truth with perfect scientific consistency as perfect." He adds, having recourse to the standing illustration of positivism, "as when the Newtonian system of astronomy is shown to emerge out of the principle of gravitation." How, then, is it to be ascertained that "the origin of the sacrificial idea is intuitive?" This is to be proved from Scripture, for if the doctrine of sacrifice is not "a truth brought into the world's moral constitution, how are we to account for such passages as these? 'The Lamb slain from the foundation of the world" (Rev. xiii. 8) and the like (!) And it is equally proved by "the universality of sacrifice," for "no instance is known or conceivable of the universal prevalence, throughout all ages, of any practice that is not the pure or corrupted form of something taught by man's natural or moral instincts." Here, again, some readers might demand evidence that sacrifice is universal, that it is practised by even one-half the human race. But the author is not to be diverted from his argument by considerations of this kind. It is sufficient to subjoin that "no truth that evolves itself out of the conscience in kindred association with our moral growth, can be other than an intuitive moral truth" (vi.).

Having thus re-established his theory as taught in *The Philosophy of Evangelicism*, the author proceeds to show in what manner the theology of Wesley was "evolved out of his conscience," requesting the reader to consider with special attention how healthy and well-conditioned the conscience of Wesley was. "Something, perhaps, is due to hereditary tendencies. He sprang, on both sides of the house, from a religious ancestry. His parents were high principled, especially the parent from whom hereditary tendencies are chiefly derived. But, whatever he inherited from this source, whether much, or little, or nothing, his moral powers were developed by an exceedingly strict, perhaps even severe, early training" (p. 23). This true and well disciplined conscience Wesley "brought early to the study of God's Word," which he received, "not as a theory of speculative doctrine, but as life-inspiring; and the life thus inspired, threw itself back, in sublime reaction upon the study of the Book. Thus, between the Book on the one hand, and the conscience on the other; the light without and the light within, there was kept up a system of reciprocatory influences, the effect of which was two-fold; first, the conscience became more thoroughly cultivated, more enlarged, sensitive, and authoritative; secondly, the school theology, with which the operation had begun, became thereby modified, and made more life-like" (p. 25).

All this being premised, the life of Wesley may be divided "into three periods, corresponding with three great doctrinal developments." The first ends with "that change which he speaks of as his conversion;" which, however, our philosopher has discovered was only "a

conversion from gloomy and depressing views of Christian truth to cheerful and elevating views, from a comparatively low standard of Christian morals to a high standard" (p. 31). The second period extends to the stage (somewhere between 1738 and 1791!) "when his views with respect to the witness of the Spirit, or doctrine of assurance, became thoroughly matured and settled." "That Wesley held justifying faith to be an outgoing of the conscience we cannot have the slightest doubt, his definition of it being, 'A Divine conviction that Christ loved me, and gave Himself for me.' The phrase, 'Divine conviction,' I read as synonymous with 'moral conviction,' or 'intuitive conviction'" (p. 37). Turning to the hymn-book you find proofs that faith is wrought in the conscience on almost every page. For instance,

> "Inspire the living faith,
> Which whosoe'er receives,
> The witness in himself he hath,
> And consciously believes."

"Note that expression, 'consciously believes!' It does not mean simply that we are conscious of the *act* of believing; it means that we are conscious of faith's *objects*. They become realised to our consciousness." And how? "We have said that it is by intuition, using the scientific term; and so says Wesley, except only that he uses the theological term 'inspire.' A faith inspired is an intuitive faith" (p. 47). Pity that the theology of Wesley has been so long misunderstood! Translate his theological language into the terminology of science, and how admirable a system of positivism did he propound! "In the next example, justification is used by Wesley in the same *subjective* sense that falls upon the ears of Wesleyan critics like a dreamer's mutterings."

> "For me the blood of sprinkling pleads,
> And speaks me justified."

"It speaks with an inward voice to the conscience, producing by its direct and intuitive action, a consciousness of the factors—*i.e.* 'the blood of sprinkling' and 'subjective justification' in close and indissoluble union" (p. 48).

The third and last period of development in Wesley's history was that which gave birth to the doctrine of Christian perfection. "As time rolled on, and the disciples he had gathered around him advanced in piety, some, outgrowing the rest, began to present new and deeply interesting mental phenomena, of which Wesley soon became the rapt student" (p. 77). The result being the discovery of the great doctrine of Christian perfection.

We wish we might be allowed to part good friends with the acute and persevering writer of this volume, whose devotion to a special theory we cannot but lament, more because of its influence on his own temper, than from apprehension of any serious evil which it is likely to effect in the region of theological speculation.

Memorials, Literary and Religious, of Thomas Garland, Fairland, Redruth. London: Hamilton, Adams and Co.; Simpkin, Marshall and Co. Leeds: H. W. Walker, Briggate. 1868.

In a short sketch of his father, published in the *Wesleyan Magazine* for June, 1829, the subject of these memorials writes: "The life of a Christian whose sphere of action extends but a few miles from his residence does not often supply very stirring incidents to claim the pen of a biographer; his excellence consists chiefly in the uniformity of a life hidden with Christ in God; in humility and the patient labour of love, and in the constant maturing of the graces which sustain and adorn the Christian character. The eye of friendship, as it glances over the life of such an one, sees many bright features on which it loves to repose, while in its records there may be little to arrest the attention of a stranger." However appropriate these remarks may have been to the case of the father, they apply with special force to that of the son, who, though well known and loved in his own immediate circle, and in the Church to which he consecrated his talents, was satisfied with the limited fame which his native county could afford him. In these *Memorials* the stranger will find little pleasure beyond that of a transient introduction to a man of refined taste and culture, who devoted his powers to the benefit of the neighbourhood in which he lived, and who in a wider area might have achieved a distinguished reputation. But his friends will linger with fond delight over records which vividly bring back the remembrances of one whose playful humour, whose ripe intelligence, whose gentle courtesy, and whose simple piety combined to render him the charm of the society which mourns his loss.

Thomas Garland, who was one of thirteen children, was born at the village of Cambroe, or as it is generally called Cambridge, in the county of Cornwall, in 1804. His father was a man of fair competence, the manager of a copper mine—of scanty education, but of strong common sense. He was a "local preacher" of the old, but not the less valuable, type. The educational opportunities of the son were limited, not because of the father's indifference, but because of the few facilities afforded by the district. While yet a schoolboy he became the subject of deep religious conviction, during one of the great revivals for which Cornish Methodism is somewhat famous. So deeply was he influenced by the new life on which he had entered, that he would assemble his schoolfellows during the interval of school hours for the purpose of holding meetings for prayer. Leaving school at an early age, he was transferred to the counting-house of a Cornish mine—a sphere of labour as little calculated to stimulate his mental energies as to encourage habits of physical sobriety. With but a very slender apparatus he set himself to the work of self-improvement, and ventured to send sundry poetical contributions to the local papers, and to a then popular magazine. It is only just to the reputation of the

author to say that the surviving specimens of his early muse were not much inferior to the first productions of many who rose in after life to poetical distinction. The study, however, of the greater poets led him to abandon the hope of reputation in this department, and he turned his attention to the newspapers, whose columns he enriched with valuable contributions on political topics of current interest. At the age of twenty-six, he became the editor of a new Cornish paper, published at Falmouth, entitled *The Cornubian*. Among the "answers to correspondents" in the earlier numbers of the paper are some flashes of humour which remind one of Thomas Hood. Thus, the author of "Lines written at Sea," is told "that his composition should have remained where it was written, it would not do for the dry land." The juvenile author of an "Ode to Despair," only sixteen, was told that his production created surprise at his being so old as that. The author of "Stanzas to Winter" must have had his imagination chilled by the season; was advised to wait for the thawing influences of the spring. The writer of "Moonlight Meditations" was told that his lines were not adapted for reading by day. A paper on "Tobacco," had been "given to a friend to light his pipe with." A smart hit is given in the following: "Cannot refuse to R. our cordial concurrence in the truth of his remarks on the progress of crime, and will cheerfully open our columns to him in checking its small beginnings; one of which is, perhaps, *the non-payment of postages to newspaper offices*." Some of the essays which he contributed to the *Cornubian*, and the sketches of passing events which he furnished under the signature of "Peter Pry," abounded in descriptive power, in critical ability, and in humour of the highest class.

The *Cornubian* ceased to exist, but not because of the inability of its editor or the limited nature of its circulation. The advertisements, notwithstanding the chivalrous patronage of those "gentlemen of the press universal," whose mission it is to offer to diseased humanity "pills, elixirs, paregorics, and all healing balsams," did not pay. In the meantime Mr. Garland had married, had become a member of the Wesleyan Church, despite the temporarily mischievous influence of the writings of Channing upon his mind, and had entered upon a business which promised well, and which ultimately provided him not only with personal worldly comfort, but with the opportunity of being useful to others. The exigencies of his new career necessarily lessened his literary opportunities; but up to the date of his death he was a frequent contributor to the newspapers and other serials, and often delighted audiences in his own neighbourhood with essays and lectures. As a speaker, and especially on the question of Christian missions, he attained high distinction, and during the agitation which wrought irreparable havoc in Methodism some eighteen years ago, he did great service to the Church of his choice by a series of his able letters. The functions of a local preacher he discharged with rare ability; few who ever heard his beautiful elucidations of Bible truth, and especially his expositions of the sacred narrative, will forget either the preacher or his sermon. His death was

sudden. Rising early on Sunday morning, July 29th, 1865, he complained of a sharp pain across the chest. In a few hours he was with the dead.

For further details of the life and labours of this most excellent man, we must refer our readers to the *Memorials* under review. The scanty materials at the editor's disposal have been used with great judgment and ingenuity. The book, of course, is intended mainly for the Wesleyan public. Had it been written for the general public, many of its pages might have been dispensed with, and many of its references would have been unintelligible. But while the casual reader will find much that is worth reading and remembering, especially in those chapters which furnish extracts from Mr. Garland's literary contributions, the Wesleyan will be charmed with the picture given of one who was a true ornament of his Church; and those who had the privilege of a personal acquaintance with him will feel grateful to the editor for having furnished this volume of "Memorials" of one who was so wise, so gentle, so true, and so godly a friend.

Studies in English Prose. By Joseph Payne, Editor of "Studies in English Poetry, &c." London: Virtue and Co. 1868.

Mr. Payne's "Studies" furnish us with specimens of the language in its earliest, succeeding, and latest stages. He gives us also a sketch of the history of the English language, and a concise Anglo-Saxon grammar. The specimens are well executed, and therefore, of course, interesting and valuable. The historical sketch and the concise grammar add greatly to the value of the volume. The weak part is the critical notes. Mr. Payne is a grammarian, a schoolmaster, a good English scholar, but hardly equal to the task of a literary critic, especially over so wide a field, and where the highest compression and the most suggestive discrimination are necessary. The volume, as a whole, has our strong recommendation.

Poems on Sacred, Classical, Mediæval, and Modern Subjects. By John Wesley Thomas. London: Elliot Stock. 1867.

The accomplished author of one of the best translations of Dante is a poet in his own right. He shines especially as a translator, in which capacity, let him touch what he will, he shows good scholarship and remarkable skill and taste. Nothing can be better, for instance, than his version of Luther's grand *Battle Hymn;* and that of the magnificent apostrophe in the *Prometheus Vinctus*, in which the chained hero begins by calling upon "the heavenly Æther" and the "swift-winged winds" is excellently done. But Mr. Thomas's original poems (although his sonnets are sometimes prosaic) are often inspired with true poetic thought and glow. Perhaps his powers, on the whole, appear to the greatest advantage in pieces the basis of

which is a paraphrase of Scriptural narratives. His "Vale of Siddim, *a Mystery*," is a fine composition, very well sustained. His "Bridal Week, *A Hebrew Eclogue*," whatever may be thought of its fitness, on the whole, is a remarkably rich and spirited paraphrase—often, indeed, a very close practical rendering of the Song of Songs.

Although we think the volume would be made more worthy by the omission of some prosaic compositions, not amounting altogether to many pages, we cannot doubt that on the whole it will add to Mr. Thomas's reputation.

Pax Vobiscum; or, The Bible and the Family: being a Deduction from the Scriptures of the Gospel, in its characteristically Family Aspect. By the Rev. Daniel Fraser, A.M. Edinburgh: W. P. Kennedy and T. & T. Clark. 1868.

The author of this somewhat bulky volume, which spreads over six hundred and forty-eight octavo pages, has long been impressed by a sense of the vital fallacy of the principles held by the Baptists. Protracted ponderings of the questions at issue have led him to publish this work with the twofold object of bringing the controversy to a satisfactory end, and of setting forth more fully the family promise which is the characteristic of the Gospel. Of the former result the author does not hesitate to entertain and express a very sanguine hope, his belief being "that he has been enabled to make it clearly appear that a man cannot at one and the same time hold by Baptist principles and hold his Bible; that a separate Baptist camp is no longer scripturally tenable; that Baptists themselves must be glad to escape from their unsupported and dangerous position; and that, if they are to re-form, and to continue occupying distinctive ground, it must be under another set of principles than those which their bannor has hitherto displayed." After a careful study of his arguments, we are unable to sympathise with his sanguine anticipation. They are in the main sound and solid, but they do not contribute to the controversy any points so fresh and startling as to warrant the hope of bringing the Baptists to surrender their traditions, and merge themselves among Pædo-baptist communions.

To the second object,—that of giving prominence to the teachings of Scripture as to the family character of the Gospel dispensation,—the author has devoted by far the larger portion of his work. He has treated the subject exhaustively, ranging over the Old and New Testament, and laying every available passage under contribution to the support of his theories. Some of his positions it is impossible for us to accept, as for instance that the infants and children of those who make no profession of religion are to be necessarily excluded from the ordinance of baptism. Nor does he substantiate by adequate evidence his theory of the extraordinary religious privileges of the children of the faithful. That privileges of a high order are attached to the families

of godly men is certain from the testimony of history as well as of Scripture. But these principles have a narrower limit than Mr. Fraser assigns to them. His great point, however, that the Gospel "has a peculiar respect to mankind as subsisting in families, and *primarily* addresses itself to men viewed as in a family condition," he successfully establishes. But we think that such a conclusion might have been arrived at as clearly in sixty pages as in six hundred.

On the Ventilation of Dwelling-houses and the Utilisation of Waste Heat from Open Fire-places. By Frederick Edwards, jun. London: Robert Hardwicke. 1868.

This book is full of valuable information and scientific hints. It is the work of a man who has a thorough knowledge, practical and theoretical, of the subject on which he writes. And there are few subjects of greater interest and importance to everybody. We could only wish that Mr. Edwards had ordered and arranged his materials so as to form a more clearly consecutive and evidently complete treatise.

Springdale Abbey: Extracts from the Diaries and Letters of an English Preacher. London: Longmans. 1868.

The English Preacher in this work of imagination is an Anglican clergyman, who begins life with all the absurd ignorance and prejudices respecting Dissenters which are so often found in men of his church and cloth, but who has these taken out of him in the course of his experience as a parish-clergyman. The chief instrument in making him wiser is a liberal and scholarly Congregational minister. The book is written by a clever man, but by a bungling and inexperienced artist. He makes the clergyman green and foolish, and, at the same time, scholarly and penetrating; he makes him narrow, rude, and ignorant, and yet generous and gentlemanly; he represents him, in fact, as either a sage or a fool—a gentleman or a snob, according to the particular sentiment which is to be taught or to be satirised: his identical individuality is never clearly conceived, and is nowhere tolerably sustained for many pages together. And his ignorance, at the very end of the volume, after he has been schooled and developed into a thoroughly able, manly, and liberal clergyman,—his ignorance in regard to the commonest matters of English history,—conceivable enough, no doubt, in many a clergyman fresh from college, is, under the circumstances, simply absurd and incredible. Warrington, the Congregationalist, on the other hand, is throughout a well-conceived and well-sustained character. He is evidently the picture of somebody the writer knows. The Anabaptist preacher, a fanatical Antinomian impostor, although carefully got up and worked out, is an impossible extravaganza, with his unctuous old-world dialect of High Calvinistic religionism carried into every matter of life and of business. Some of the minor characters are more true to life and reality. The Primitive Methodist convert is an exaggerated picture, but not altogether

untrue. On the whole, as a story, the book is fragmentary and eminently unsatisfactory; and, if regarded as not a story, but a series of glimpses or views, still the reappearing characters are, in several instances, made to be quite inconsistent with themselves, and in others to be altogether extravagant and impossible. Nevertheless, the writer, though, in addition to the faults we have named, he resuscitates old jokes, not always in good Christian taste, and though he makes those whom he intends to represent as gentlemen do such ungentlemanly things—not seeming himself to feel them to be ungentlemanly—is a man of talent, and may succeed better next time.

Des Premières Transformations Historiques du Christianisme. [The Earliest Transformations of Christianity.] Par A. Coquerel Fils. Baillière, Paris. 1866.

THIS is a remarkable little volume, elegantly written, and circulated very cheaply. So much the more pity that it is adapted to unsettle the faith of the young in the unity of our common faith as left by the Apostles, and in the value of the early Catholic decisions of antiquity. Such books, coming from Protestant pastors, do more harm to the interests of Christianity than the more open attacks of French philosophy.

Libres Etudes. [Free Studies]. Par A. Coquerel Fils. Baillière, Paris. 1867.

THESE are free studies indeed: being a miscellaneous collection of articles contributed by the author during the last twenty years to various periodicals. The reader of modern French literature will be attracted by it; the critics in the press being generally very full of praise. There are in it some lively strictures on England and English society; with a satirical glance at the Sabbath as kept in Edinburgh. Some things in the essays may be profitably read by the Englishman. But the pith of the volume is a fervent biography of Bunsen, and a summary of the history of later Judaism. Both of these are made the vehicle of the author's free discussions of Christianity as represented by the Creeds. They betoken a restlessness which nothing but those despised Creeds, under God's grace, will cure; and a trust in the Christian system which must ever find it hard to give a good reason of its hope. The article on the French moralists is admirable. On the whole, we wish the earnest and learned author and his French Protestantism, a surer hold on the vitals of Christianity than these writings exhibit.

FROM the *Religious Tract Society* we receive *Bible Studies for Family Reading*, by the Rev. W. B. Mackenzie, M.A., an excellent little book; and *The Mirage of Life*, with illustrations, by John Tenniel. The letterpress of *The Mirage of Life* is not new, and is well known; but these illustrations are new and in the highest style of illustrative art.

Tenniel has here put forth all his powers; nothing can be more suggestive—often pathetic—than these exquisitely finished illustrations. The *Mirage* itself, to which three illustrations are given, the last eloquently teaching the moral; the man of fashion; the man of wealth; the hero; the statesman; the orator; the artist (Haydon); the man of literature; the poet; the man of wit and humour (poor, wasted, wasteful, Hook); the man of the world; the beauty; the monarch; are all here depicted with a vividness not to be surpassed, and the lessons taught by the book are enforced with wonderful power by the artist's pencil. In most cases well-known characters and well-known facts are made to contribute towards expounding and pointing the lessons of the volume.

We may here put together five volumes published by *Messrs. Alexander Strahan and Co.* *Week-day Sermons*, by R. W. Dale, M.A., is a book full of fine sense and Christian principle, admirably expressed. Manliness, thorough honesty of view and of statement, and broad, candid, sympathetic, consideration of every case dealt with, are the leading characteristics of this book. Practical everyday duties, social circumstances and temptations, the relations between Christianity and miscellaneous life, "the perils and uses of rich men," "amusements," "summer-holidays," "Christmas parties," are among the topics of which Mr. Dale treats. Some will think him hardly strict enough; but then Mr. Dale means all he says, and means what he says to be fully carried out. We rejoice to find him enunciating the true Christian principle—that amusements are never to be indulged in for their own sake, but only as wholesome recreation directly tending to refresh and strengthen for serious duty.

Dean Alford's *How to Study the New Testament. The Epistles.* (*First Section*), needs but to be named. The Dean is doing excellent service by this cheap and popular series. From Dr. Guthrie's pen we have two volumes. *Studies of Character from the Old Testament* shows Dr. Guthrie at his best. Living humanity is here his subject, and his illustrations from the life of mere nature are not so much in excess as in some of his books. *Early Piety* is a very beautiful and persuasive little book, in which the old and staple arguments are presented in the most winning and impressive manner. *Essays from "Good Words,"* by Mr. Rogers, is a basket of fragments by the accomplished author of the *Eclipse of Faith*. The last, however, and the most important paper of the collection, was written, not for *Good Words*, but for the *Fortnightly Review*. Its subject is M. Renan's *Les Apôtres*. The chief among the others are, "Some Thoughts on Prose Composition;" "On Public Executions;" "A Dialogue on Strikes and Lock-outs;" and a paper on "Railway Accidents and the Chief Securities against them."

The *Christian Year-book*, the *Congregational Year-book*, and the *Baptist Hand-book*, for 1868, are three year-books which it would be well for every Christian gentleman to possess, who aspires to know

what are the state and prospects of Christianity for this country and for the world; but with which, also, he should take care to put the *Minutes of the Methodist Conferences* and the *Clergy List*. Churchmen, especially, would have much ignorance removed, and would be saved from many amazing mistakes, if, besides the *Clergy List*, they were to study the other year-books to which we have referred. Messrs. Jackson, Walford, and Hodder publish the first two of the volumes before us; Mr. Elliot Stock, the third. The *Christian Year-book* is in its second year of publication. It contains a "summary of Christian work and the results of missionary effort throughout the world." It is an invaluable compendium. We could wish that every writer for the newspaper press had it always at hand. No clerical orator, no "platform man," should be without it. All the three volumes, indeed, are full of interest, and are well got up. Mr. Stock's is a marvellous combination of neatness and cheapness.

Mission Life: Readings in Foreign Lands (Rivingtons), is a Church-missionary periodical, and is full of information and of interest. The volume before us is for the year 1867.

The Year of Praise: Being Hymns, with Tunes, for the Sundays and Holidays of the Year, intended for use in Canterbury Cathedral, and adapted for Cathedral and Parish Churches generally. Edited by Henry Alford, D.D., Dean of Canterbury, assisted in the Musical part by Robert Hake, M.A., Precentor, and Thomas Evance Jones, Organist, of Canterbury Cathedral. London: Alexander Strahan. 1867.

Good taste, devout feeling, Catholic Christian sympathies—apart from Romanising Ritualism—musical knowledge, cathedral experience, have combined to make this a worthy and beautiful book. It is very cheap withal.

Memorials of the Rev. A. Crichton, B.A. Edited by William G. Blaikie, D.D. London: Nisbet and Co. 1868.

Mr. Crichton was a young man of most amiable and generous character, and of high promise, both as a writer and a minister. Some years ago he contributed, at our request, to this Journal an article on "Scottish Presbyterianism in its different Varieties." This volume contains a brief memoir of Mr. Crichton, from the pen of his friend—the friend of very many—Dr. Blaikie, together with a selection from his sermons, some papers and essays from his pen, several poetical compositions, and a number of letters to friends and relations. All that is here published bespeaks the man of taste, of heart, and of Christian earnestness; and the *Memorials* cannot fail to be profitable and precious to all who knew Mr. Crichton.

Wholesome Fare; or, the Doctor and the Cook. By Edmund S. and Ellen Delamere. London: Lockwood and Co. 1868.

THIS is a capital cookery book, suitable, elegant, and full of true economy; suitable for middle-class means and tables as well as for people of wealth; modern, enlightened, and cosmopolitan, and not merely English in its prejudices and its style of *cuisine;* at the same time not foppishly or foolishly French or foreign.

A History of the Reform Bills of 1866 and 1867. By Homersham Cox, M.A., Barrister-at-Law, Author of "The Institutions of the English Government," &c. London: Longmans. 1868.

THIS is a deliberate and complete history of the wonderful Parliamentary action of the last two years respecting the reform of the representation of the people. All details are given with precision. The quotations are from Hansard. The writer, however, is undisguisedly opposed to the tactics of Mr. Disraeli. The Appendix contains an "Abstract of the Reform Act of 1867, showing the additions to and material variations from the original Bill of March, 1867, under the clauses borrowed from the Franchise Bill and Redistribution of Seats Bill of 1866;" and also "The original Reform Bill of 1867; showing the omitted and altered clauses, and the clauses borrowed from the Franchise Bill and Redistribution of Seats Bill of 1866.") A cynical philosopher may find ample food for his cynicism; a satirist, plentiful material for his satire, in this volume. Mr. Disraeli would no doubt object that the hard facts of the history here given are too hard and naked, if left to themselves; that duly supplemented by another set of facts, political and social, lying behind and around them, and by a network of reasons, they would present a very different appearance. However, they are facts, they omit no Parliamentary step taken; they, at least, present in a complete form the case which is to be explained. The volume is well written, and cannot but be very valuable.

A Vindication of the Character and Administration of Sir Thos. Rumbold, Bart., Governor of Madras in 1778—1780 from the Misrepresentations of Colonel Wilks, Mr. Mill, and other Historians of British India; including an Examination of Mr. Hastings' Relations with Sir Thomas Rumbold. By his Daughter, the late Elizabeth Anne Rumbold. London: Longmans. 1868.

SIR THOMAS RUMBOLD was an able administrator, and was nominated in 1773 by the East India Directors to succeed Hastings. He differed from Mr. Hastings in regard to many leading points of policy, and especially in regard to his relations with the Mahrattas and Hyder Ali,

out of which arose the calamitous war in the Carnatic. Mainly, as it would appear, through the influence of Mr. Hastings, the memory of Sir Thomas Rumbold has, since Colonel Wilks published his *Historical Sketches*, been loaded with obloquy. The present is a posthumous publication, and has, as the editor's preface states, "a remarkable and pathetic history." It is a daughter's vindication of the memory of her father. The late Miss Rumbold came, as we understand, a few years ago to reside at Folkestone, and there became an occasional attendant on the ministry of a Nonconformist minister. It devolved on him, by a kind of necessity, to prepare her papers for publication. Miss Rumbold herself died, at a very advanced age, not many hours after she had read Mr. Marshman's Appendix to the first volume of his *History of India*, in which he gives a summary of the chief points embraced in the vindication, the substance of which had been submitted to him in MS., and declares his judgment that Miss Rumbold had completely made good her argument, and triumphantly vindicated her father's reputation, and that the chapter of Indian history relating to the administration of Madras and the South in the years 1778—1780 would have to be written afresh. The volume contains a large amount of information respecting the affairs of Southern India in the whole period from 1770 to 1785, which has escaped all the historians, and will be found to throw new light on the origin of the war in the Carnatic, and on the history and tactics of Mr. Hastings. As a vindication of the character and administration of Sir Thomas Rumbold it must be regarded as conclusive. The name of the editor does not appear in the volume.

French Thoughts on Irish Evils. Translated from the *Revue des Deux Mondes*. With Notes. By a Son of the Soil. London: Longmans. 1868.

> "O WAD some god the giftie gie us,
> To see oursels as ithers see us."

It is often as instructive for a nation as for individuals to know what observant and well-informed neighbours think of them. To those who are studying the Irish question, accordingly, we strongly recommend a careful reading of this small volume.

The Homiletical Treasury; or, Holy Scripture Analytically Arranged for the Use of the Pulpit and the Closet. By the Rev. J. Lyth, D.D. Isaiah. London: R. D. Richardson, 92, Farringdon Street.

"THE design of this work is to develop the teaching of Holy Scripture, and suggest suitable material for pulpit ministration and private reflection. The method adopted is to give a short analysis of a whole paragraph, followed by one or more views of individual passages, according to their importance, thus forming a complete commentary on an original plan." The author has thus compressed the results of much

and various reading within very narrow limits, and produced a volume which will be welcomed, not only by "ministers and students," for whose use it is specially intended, but by intelligent Sunday-school teachers and the Christian Church generally. We heartily commend the work, and trust that Mr. Lyth will be encouraged to continue his labours "until the whole of the Bible is thus completed."

What is the Talmud? A Reply to the Article in the *Quarterly Review*. By the Rev. C. Schwartz, D.D. London: Elliot Stock, 62, Paternoster Row.

THIS pamphlet does not greatly modify the impression produced by the able article to which it is a reply. It is declamatory rather than argumentative, and contains but a small amount of information. But it is written in the spirit of an uncompromising, intelligent, and earnest Christian, and may be read with advantage.

Recollections of the Paris Exhibition of 1867. By Eugene Rimmel. London: Chapman and Hall.

THIS is an interesting general description of the Paris Exhibition, charmingly illustrated, and making an elegant drawing-room volume. It has the merit of being cheap.

The Monks of the West. From St. Benedict to St. Bernard. By the Count de Montalembert. Authorised Translation. Vols. IV. and V. Blackwood and Sons. 1867.

WE have given ample space to our notice of the preceding volumes of this admirable translation; and shall at a future time deal largely with these and their successors. We are still on English ground, and amidst scenes of undying interest to English Christians. Whatever theological scruple we have in reading these glowing pages, we are always conscious of being under the guidance of an honest man and a fascinating writer.

END OF VOL. XIX.

BEVERIDGE, PRINTER, FULLWOOD'S RENTS, (34) HOLBORN.

INDEX

TO

VOLUME XXX.