

## The Effects of Contempt for International Law.

*"Justitia non nostra constitutio, sed divina lex, et vinculum societatis humanæ. In hac non est quod aestimemus quid expediat, expedit tibi quicquid illa dictaverit. Quisquis ergo hanc sectari desideras, Deum time prius et ama, ut ameris a Deo. Amabilis eris Deo, si in hoc illum imitaberis, ut velis omnibus prodesse et nulli nocere."*—SENECA.

IN the middle ages the name of Religion served as the plea and justification of aggression upon weaker nations; it led to their spoliation and enslavement. The Pope, then the head of all Christendom, partitioned Asia and America amongst the Christian Princes. Spain took the lead in these expeditions, so contrary to all the principles of justice and international law; and members of the Spanish Government were also the first to protest against the acts of tyranny and injustice into which the Colonists were led by natural steps, deriving from their unlawful invasion of unoffending countries.\*

The nineteenth century, which professes to have discarded fanaticism, has substituted the advance of civilisation for the extension of Christianity as its pass-word. Humanity has not gained by the change; aggressions continue as before, in defiance of international law: the motive in the present time is more undisguisedly selfish, since modern aggressions are made under the pretext of commerce, by which the aggressors hope to enrich themselves: the absence of a religious element, however mistaken it may have been, makes itself felt, since there is now no one to plead for the vanquished. The exception to this in modern times is in New Zealand, where deserving members of the Church of England have interested themselves in the fate of the New Zealanders, and have not ceased to protest against the spoliation and extermination going on in that unhappy land.

Japan has been subjected to the two forms under which European aggression has presented itself, in the sixteenth century and in our days. Let comparison be made between these two periods of intercourse with Japan. In the sixteenth century, the Europeans made numerous proselytes, and gained a great influence over the councils of that State; their abuse of that influence led to their expulsion. In the nineteenth century, the Europeans have no sooner arrived than they excite universal hostility on the part of the Japanese, and the desire to be rid of the unwelcome intruders. Yet it is said, with much show of reason, that Japan has remained comparatively stationary since the first visit of Europeans, whilst Europe has greatly advanced. But such superior civilisation should more readily obtain admi-

\* "In 1542 the Bishop Las Casas presented a memorial to Charles V., remonstrating against enslaving the Peruvians. He maintained that if the Indians, as it was pretended, would not labour unless compelled, the white man would still find it for his interest to cultivate the soil; and that if he should not be able to do so, that circumstance would give him no right over the Indian, since God does not allow evil that good may come of it. This lofty morality, it will be remembered, was from the lips of a Dominican in the sixteenth century."—Prescott's "Conquest of Peru," book iv. chap. vii.

ration and a favourable reception, than that of the sixteenth century. Why is it not so? Perhaps the improvement of the nineteenth century is only material, and there is a falling off in the respect felt for legality and the rights of others. Certainly, among the British visitors to Japan in the nineteenth century, there have not been many persons so respectable as Mr. W. Adams, the English pilot, or master, in the beginning of the sixteenth century.\*

But the people of the present time cannot justify themselves by what took place in the sixteenth century, with respect to their conduct towards other nations; for since then the duties of nations towards their neighbour have been codified, and form international law, which has become fixed; but is not on that account more regarded: and as these laws are the expression of justice and order, the disregard of them is the cause of many of the evils from which we suffer.

In the sixteenth century Europe was a prey to wars of religion, which had been made the pretext for wars of aggrandisement and rapine. This state of disorder caused Suarez, and after him Grotius, Vattel, and others, to write those works which have become international law. These writings did not become law from any authority of the authors, neither were they subsequently formally accepted as such: but their weight and authority consist in this, that their authors sought out and laid down the first principles of right and justice, which stand and recommend themselves by their truth alone; they then examined what had been done by men in international transactions, from the earliest times on record, though they did not accept or approve everything that had been done as a precedent, but adopted as precedents and examples to be followed, only such acts or modes of transacting international business as agreed with the eternal principles of truth and justice, which they took as the point of departure for ascertaining what international law was, or should be: they also related various wrongful transactions, as examples to be avoided.

In the nineteenth century "Civilisation" has taken the place of "Religion" as a watchword, and as a pretext for aggression. The modern term, like the former one of difference of religion, is used to proscribe those who differ from the persons who utter it, and to deprive them of those rights which all

\* "The lowly-born William Adams, when cast in wretchedness on the shores of Japan, was not indeed received as a prince; yet this man, commencing life in the capacity of "apprentice to Master Nicolas Diggines, of Limehouse," eventually attained rank and acquired possession in the Empire equal to those of a prince. With no claims to consideration but talent and good conduct, he became the esteemed councillor of the sagacious and powerful Monarch by whom the land that had afforded him shelter was ruled."—Rundall's "Memorials of Japan," Preface, p. iv.

men possess in common, and to get rid of those obligations which all members of the family of mankind owe to one another. The modern term is more vague, more elastic, more unjust; and it serves to deprive the Chinese of the rights of international law and its mutual obligations, equally with the Feejee Islanders, or other cannibals.\* The application of the word "Civilisation" is very much like that of "Orthodoxy;" it claims pre-eminence for the speaker who uses it. The possession of civilisation cannot alter right or wrong, remove obligations, or lessen the necessity of observing good faith with the uncivilised, any more than a difference of religion can do any of these things. Yet people now-a-days reason, and certainly governments act, as if this were the case. On the contrary, the claim to a higher civilisation, so far from freeing those who make it from their obligations to those whom they term uncivilised, imposes upon them the duty and the necessity of making good their claim, by superior respect to what is lawful, just, and true.

Since civilisation confers no rights over the uncivilised, it is not strictly necessary to inquire what is civilisation, or by what it is tested. M. de Maistre limited it to those nations which study Latin. M. Escayrac de Lauture claims civilisation for all those countries which possess fire-arms and the printing-press. Mr. Cobden would assign the highest civilisation to the country possessing the greatest number of miles of electric telegraph and the largest quantity of daily newspapers. The Chinese might point to respect for the law, and the most ancient annals; and the Japanese might put forward absence of pauperism as tests of civilisation, worth at least as much as the others: they could, at any rate, maintain that civilisations differ like religions, but that there is no foundation for the claim of Europeans to be the sole possessors of the former.

The use of unmeaning terms has superseded the

\* The following passage from a controversy between Las Casas, Bishop of Chiapa, and Dr. Gines de Sepulveda, Chronicler of the Emperor, at Valladolid, in 1550, lays down the obligations of civilised nations towards cannibals, and those whom they consider as such. The former says:—

"The fourth argument of Dr. Sepulveda is founded on the injury which the Indians inflict upon the innocent; killing them to sacrifice or eat them. To which the Rev. Bishop, although in the sixth case he had conceded that it was incumbent upon the Church to defend the innocent, answered that it was not, however, a convenient or suitable thing to defend them by wars. This he based upon three or four grounds. The first has already been touched upon, that of two evils we ought to choose the lesser; and that the Indians should kill a few innocent people to eat them, which is even more revolting than sacrificing them, is without comparison a lesser evil than those which come of war, from the excesses of which many more innocent persons are killed than the number of innocent persons whom it is proposed to liberate. In addition to this, by these wars the faith is brought into ill repute and made odious to the unbelievers, which is even a still greater evil. The second argument was because we have a negative precept, 'Thou shalt not kill;' and most particularly, '*insanctam et innocentem non occides*;' (Exod. xxiii.), which is more rigid than the affirmative one to defend the innocent. And on this account, when it is not possible to accomplish this second precept without going against the first, the second ought rather to be broken than the first. And since in the fights of nations in a just war, where there are cities of the enemy, several innocent people may be killed accidentally, not knowing them, and without any such intention; yet when war is undertaken to chastise some delinquents, if it is to be presumed that the innocent persons are in greater number, and that it is not possible to distinguish between the two, it is a sounder counsel to omit to inflict such chastisement, conformably with the evangelical precept of Jesus Christ, who did not permit the plucking out of the tares from the wheat, lest instead the wheat should be plucked out at the same time, but He rather chose that it should be deferred till the harvest, which is the day of judgment, when it will be possible without risk to discern the good and the bad, and to chastise these without prejudice to the others."

sense of law; and that superiority of civilisation should have been put forward as a justification for international acts, which would not have been tolerated, or even attempted between European nations, shows how much the study of international law has been neglected of late, and how much its first principles have been set aside and contemned. The confusion arising from this contempt of international law, begun in Asia, is now spreading to Europe; and the evil must increase, unless some great writer should arise, with power to recall and enforce upon the present generation the forgotten lessons and the high morality of Grotius, and the other writers who followed him.

Meantime, it may be well to reiterate some of the principles laid down by those great men; especially those, the neglect and transgression of which have led to disorders and wars, to the demoralisation of states, and, subsequently, of individuals.

One of the first principles of international law is, that all nations are equal, without regard to their size or importance, or to the form of their government; since the duties of nations towards each other are the same as those of individual men towards their fellow-men, and a dwarf is as much a man as a giant.\* It follows from this, that nations are bound to assist in the preservation of other nations; to assist them in cases of famine and calamity; to contribute towards their improvement, but not by forcible means, or against their will; to cultivate the friendship of other nations; to take care of their honour; the differences of religion should not prevent one nation from rendering to another services of humanity, no nation should do anything to injure another, and the intercourse between nations should be mutually beneficial. Yet what is the practice, and, apart from positive aggressions, how is it that public morality in England has sanctioned the enforced introduction of opium into China, in spite of the laws of the country, and whilst opium is an unmitigated evil, a means of debauchery, admitting of no palliation?

It is equally well established, that no nation has the right to interfere in the internal affairs of another.† Yet of late it has been assumed that two or three nations could, by joining together, acquire a right against a third which they did not possess separately. This practice has been protested against under the name of Non-intervention, and this has been made a principle and a virtue. But we do not talk of non-robbery or non-piracy, so that this term shows the demoralisation of opinion; for it leads to the supposition that intervention and non-intervention are different policies, instead of the true notion that intervention is wrong and cannot, in any manner, be justified. Wheaton, after referring to the refusal of England to join in the measures of interference taken by the Congress of Verona, in 1822, seeks to justify the intervention of France, England, and Russia, in 1827, in the affairs of the Morea.‡ It was open to any of those countries to have sent an ultimatum and a declaration of war to the Ottoman Porte, but the conduct which led to Navarino, and warlike operations in the midst of peace, was a distinct violation of law, and a crime.§

Partly owing to this setting aside of the principle

\* Vattel, "Preliminaries," book ii. chap. i. sect. 18.

† Ibid. sect. 7.

‡ Wheaton, vol. i. part ii. chap. i. sect. 9.

§ The case of Mexico is so recent that it is enough to name it.

of equality amongst nations, by fanciful divisions of civilised and uncivilised; partly owing to interventions, by which hostile acts are committed against nations with whom those who intervene are not at war, great abuses, irregularities, and violations of the law have taken place in the manner of carrying on war. To make war lawful or just, it is necessary that one nation should have a cause of complaint against the other; it is necessary that a remedy should first be sought for the injury complained of, that, if redress is refused, an ultimatum, threatening war, should be sent to the State causing the injury; and lastly, that war should be formally declared, and the causes of it proclaimed, by the sovereign of the state which complains of the injury. Such is the law of nations.\* The law of England is the same; and it requires that a declaration of war shall have been made by the sovereign, without which no acts of war are lawful, and they are in nowise distinguished from piracy.†

Vattel's words upon the necessity of a declaration of war, and of avoiding its calamities if possible, should be ever present to those who think so lightly of undertaking military operations. He says:—

“The right of making war only belongs to nations as a remedy against injustice: it is the fruit of an unfortunate necessity. This remedy is so terrible in its effects, so fatal to humanity, so vexatious even to him that makes use of it, that natural law doubtless permits it only at the last extremity; at this, when every other is of no avail for upholding justice. It has been proved in the preceding chapter, that in order to be authorised to take up arms it must be, 1stly, that we have a just subject of complaint; 2dly, that we have been refused a reasonable satisfaction; 3dly, we have also observed that the ruler of a nation must take into mature consideration whether it is for the good of the State to pursue its rights by force of arms. This is still not enough, as it is possible that the imminent fear of our arms may make an impression upon the mind of our adversary, and oblige him to render us justice. We owe yet this concession to humanity, and, above all, to the blood and repose of the subjects, to declare to this unjust nation, or to its ruler, that we are going to have recourse to the last remedy, and to employ open force to bring it to reason. This is what is called to *declare war*. All this is comprehended in the manner of proceeding of the Romans . . . It is surprising to find amongst the Romans conduct so just, so moderate, and so wise, at a time when it would seem that nothing but valour and ferocity was to be expected of them. A people which treated war in so religious a manner, established very solid foundations for its future greatness.”‡

Vattel then states, that the declaration of war should recite the subject of complaint for which arms have been taken up; and explains that war should not be carried on if, after it has been declared, the enemy should offer equitable conditions of peace.§

\* Vattel, Book ii. chap. xviii. §§ 334, 354, 378; Grotius, book iii.

† This has been proved by a decision in the case of *Evans v. Hutton*, in 1842, given by the Chief-Justice Tindal, and the judges Colman, Erskine, and Maule. This case was an action for breach of contract. The defendant had contracted to land the plaintiff's goods at Canton during the year 1839, but was prevented from doing so by Captain Elliot, the Superintendent of Trade, and Captain Smith, of Her Majesty's ship *Volage*. The decision was for the plaintiff. The judges unanimously held, that no orders in council having been alleged, the proper authority which Captain Elliot possessed among British subjects in China, as Superintendent of Trade, had not been made out. They further held, that no declaration of war having been alleged, it could not be pretended that what he did was in exercise of the Queen's undoubted prerogative.—*Report of the East India Committee of the Colonial Society, on the Causes and Consequences of the Military Operations in China*, p. 39. London, 1857.

‡ Vattel, Book iii. chap. iv. sect. 51.

§ *Ibid.* Book iii. chap. iv. sect. 54. Grotius, liv. ii. chap. xxiv. sect. 1; liv. iii. chap. iii.

Let us inquire into a few recent instances of war-like operations, and see how far they were undertaken in contempt of these canons of international law.

In the Afghan war there was neither declaration of war nor just cause of it, since the motive assigned was the desire to meet and anticipate Russian influence. The China war was undertaken without a declaration, or a just cause of war, since it arose from the attempt to enforce the introduction of opium, a prohibited article, into China. This and the Afghan war have been so much written about, that it is sufficient here to allude to them.

In 1858 an infuriated crowd attacked the British Consul at Jiddah, and killed him, and then proceeded to murder the French Consul and some Greeks who were in the town. As soon as the news was received, the Sultan sent assurances to the British and French Embassies that the matter should be inquired into, and the guilty punished: his Imperial Majesty, at the same time, sent a sum of money from his privy purse to be distributed amongst the relatives of the victims. Here, so far from there being any disposition to refuse redress for an injury, the State in which the injury was done anticipated any demand for it, so that no cause of war could arise. If the State injured was not satisfied with the redress offered, it was open to it to withdraw its ambassador, and declare war. Notwithstanding this, the British Government, at the same time that it was receiving assurances of redress, sent telegraphic orders to Captain Pullen, of H. M. ship *Cyclops*, to bombard Jiddah, which orders he executed. This precipitation is entirely contrary to the deliberation which should precede war, according to all writers on international law: an act of war without a declaration of war was committed, and that whilst negotiation was going on. The guilty in Jiddah deserved punishment, but it was for their sovereign to punish them, and a foreign State had no right except to call upon him to do justice. Such an event could not have occurred, but for the utter disregard and disrepute into which international law has fallen.

The same disregard for law, and preference of might to right, was shown in the bombardment of Kagosima. Satisfaction for the death of Mr. Richardson had already been given by the Japanese Government, in the shape of an indemnity of one hundred thousand pounds; and by asking for, and accepting that indemnity, the British Government had precluded itself from further action.

In 1852 a French fleet appeared before Tripoli in the west, and made a demand, the justice of which was doubtful. On the demand being refused, the French, instead of treating the matter at Constantinople, threatened to bombard the town; and the Governor was compelled to yield to save it from bombardment.

The evils of these departures from law and usage multiply themselves and increase. Cabinets issue instructions to carry out acts of war without a previous declaration of war in the name of the Sovereign, and now subordinate governors improve upon this practice, and carry on military operations without even the sanction of instructions from home. Recently, in 1862, the Governor of Singapore sent to the Sultan of Tringganu, who is entirely independent of the British Government, to demand the expulsion from his city of the Sultan of Lingga, nephew of the ruler of Tringganu. The ground for this demand was the allegation that the Sultan of

Lingga abetted disturbances in the neighbouring state of Pahang—also an independent state. But as the Sultan of Tringganu is tributary to Siam, the Governor of Singapore also wrote to Bangkok, to complain of the presence of the Sultan of Lingga at Tringganu, and to ask for his removal. The Governor of Singapore did not, however, wait for an answer to this application to Bangkok, but sent a peremptory demand, backed by a naval force, to Tringganu, for the expulsion of the Sultan of Lingga. As the ruler of Tringganu had no orders to receive from the Governor of Singapore, he naturally refused to violate the duties of hospitality by compliance with this ultimatum; the consequence of which was, that the naval force sent from Singapore bombarded Tringganu. This act of war, besides being unlawful and unjust, was gratuitous and useless; for, almost at the same time that the bombardment was going on, the Siamese answer to the Governor's application was being sent to Singapore, to the effect that the Siamese Government would send a steamer to Tringganu and recall the Sultan of Lingga. The Siamese Government naturally protested against this unlawful and unnecessary violence; but, apparently, without any beneficial result. The conduct of the Governor of Singapore was disapproved of,\* but in terms such as leave it to be supposed, that whilst the injudiciousness of his policy was apparent, its violation of international law had passed unperceived; and the door was not closed, as it should have been, upon the possible future commission of similar unlawful acts.

After this came the Ashanti war, the existence of which was only known to the nation after its fruitlessness and disastrous consequences had become public. Here, again, no declaration of war had been made; and in this instance the value of such a declaration, as concerning the interests of the nation commencing war, as laid down by Vattel, became apparent: for if the facts which became public in the course of the debate in the House of Commons had been known at the outset, it is probable that the same result, of refusing to sanction these hostile operations, would have been arrived at without the loss of life and expenditure which occurred. If it is objected that the formalities of a declaration of war were superfluous with the Ashanti kingdom, it may be answered that international law makes no distinction with regard to States: that law and right are to be observed, for the sake of fulfilling a duty by the person that observes them, on their own account, and irrespective of other considerations. And, lastly, as it appears we had an extradition treaty with Ashanti, if the kingdom of Ashanti was thought worthy of international stipulations, other international usages should have been complied with.

Besides, disregard of right in dealings with one country serves as an example for a similar disregard in another; the evil extends and increases, till the habitual mixing up of war and peace in China has confused the public mind to such an extent that public approbation was given to the expedition of Garibaldi to Sicily, which in no respects differed from the attempt of the Savoyards to seize upon Geneva, in 1602, by escalade. The Savoyards failed in their attempt, and all their prisoners were hanged. Vattel quotes this as an instance of brigandage

rather than of war,\* and says of the execution of the prisoners, that "Geneva was not blamed for an action which would have been detested in a formal war."

In explaining that no nation has a right to meddle with the government of another, and that no sovereign can set himself up as a judge of the conduct of another, Vattel † blames the conduct of the Spaniards who brought the Inca Athahualpa to trial: he says, "If this prince had violated the law of nations with respect to them, they would have had the right to punish him. But they accused him of having put to death some of his subjects, of having had several wives, &c.—things of which he had no account to give them. And what crowns their extravagant injustice, they condemned him by the laws of Spain." Two similar instances of violation of international law have recently occurred, which it is well to mention as examples to be avoided. When the Siamese conquered Keddah, assisted by some British gunboats, which blockaded that port, one of them commanded by Captain Sherard Osborne, the Sultan of Keddah was driven out, but continued to wage war upon the Siamese. For this he was subsequently brought to trial in a British court of law in the Straits Settlements, on a charge of piracy: the decision was an acquittal, on the ground that he had not been engaged in piracy, but in lawful war. But the court had no right of jurisdiction, and the prosecution should not have been entertained. Its institution was a continuation of the injustice which had been done to the Sultan of Keddah by the Straits Government in blockading Keddah and assisting the Siamese, whilst the stipulations of the treaty with Keddah, under which England holds Pulo Penang and Province Wellesley, especially provide that England should *defend* Keddah from any enemy coming by sea. ‡

The motive for this action of the British Government, so much in opposition to the treaty engagements, was the desire to obtain a commercial treaty with Siam: this policy, nevertheless, entirely failed in its object, and a commercial treaty was not negotiated with Siam till many years later. Still more recently a similar abuse of jurisdiction took place at Singapore. An action was brought into court there against the ruler of Johore, for acts of his in Johore complained of by a Chinaman. Judgment was given against the ruler of Johore: this decision was, however, reversed at Calcutta, where it was ruled that the court had no jurisdiction in the matter.

A most flagrant violation of international rights was committed in the summer of 1864, by the French Consul at Tunis, who "warned off," and attempted to prevent the landing of, the Ottoman Commissioner; that is, an officer of the sovereign of the country. The relations of France with Tunis (those of a neighbour) would not have justified the French Consul with interfering with a public officer deputed by any other State, much less then with an officer sent by the sovereign. It was said at the time that the French Government disapproved his conduct, but the disapproval was not, as

\* Vattel, Book iii. chap. iv. sect. 68.

† Book ii. chap. iv. sect. 55.

‡ An additional illegality was perpetrated against this ruler of Keddah, for after this trial and acquittal, instead of being released, Tunku Mahomed Said was detained a prisoner for many years; which imprisonment was wholly illegal.

\* Parliamentary papers relative to bombardment of Tringganu, 1864.

it should have been, public as the offence. The consequence of this act remaining unpunished and unnoticed, has been a repetition of the offence a few months later in an aggravated form, as narrated in the following letter given in the "Times," as received by its Malta correspondent from an authentic source in Tunis, and dated Nov. 17:—

"A singular incident has just occurred here. From time immemorial it has been customary for the Sultans to send Commissioners to Tunis, and for the Beys to depute Envoys to Constantinople, either to compliment the Sultans on their accession to the throne, or to solicit their own firman of investiture, or on other matters connected with the affairs of the two countries. At the breaking out of the revolt, the Sultan despatched an Imperial Commissioner to Tunis to report on the state of affairs; and, in return, the Bey had formed a resolution of sending an Envoy to thank his Imperial Majesty for the interest he had evinced in passing events. According to custom, he announced his intention to the foreign representatives, in order to obtain from them letters of introduction for his Envoy to the Ambassadors at Constantinople; but the French Consul, upon being made aware of the Bey's intention, proceeded immediately to his Highness, and remonstrated in the strongest possible terms against an envoy being sent to the Sultan without the previous sanction of the French Government. He insisted that it was an Anglo-Turkish intrigue, which he would not tolerate. In vain did the Bey endeavour to explain that it was customary both to receive and to send envoys; and that, in the present instance, it was an act of courtesy towards the Sultan, who was the head of all Mussulman nations; and that nothing more was either meant or intended. The Consul would accept no explanation; said that the Envoy could not leave without his permission, but that he would despatch an *aviso* to Cagliari with a telegram to Paris; and that until he received a reply the departure of the Envoy must be postponed. His Highness having, however, replied to his peremptory language, that he was at liberty to send for instructions, but that he did not intend to alter his resolution of showing respect to the Sultan, by deputing General Khairaddin to convey to him his grateful thanks; the French Consul rose, evinced much impatience, and left the room, after crying out 'No! no! no!' when he refused to take the hand which the Bey had offered to him. This unfortunate incident, coupled with a previous threat of sinking the Sultan's Commissioner, when he arrived in May last, in case he should attempt to land, determined the Bey, with a view to avoid further embarrassment, to hasten the departure of his Envoy, who was therefore directed to proceed on his journey on the 14th, instead of the 17th inst. General Khairaddin, consequently, embarked on board the Tunisian steamer *Bechir*, about half-past six in the evening; but a French officer was sent to him on the part of the commandant of the ironclad, *Invincible*, stationed at the *Goletta*, to dissuade him from proceeding on his journey; and when he was told that he was bound to execute his orders, the officer announced to him that, in that case, he would be prevented. General Khairaddin then said that he should follow instructions, and would only yield to superior force, as he was not authorised to lose the steamer and sacrifice the lives of the crew. He gave the officer sufficient time to carry his answer to the Captain of the *Invincible*, which was all this time firing rockets and burning blue lights, when he weighed anchor, and at half-steam passed the ironclad. When about 1000 yards ahead of her, the *Invincible* chased the Tunisian steamer, which put on full steam, and kept ahead of her pursuer, until they both neared the Island of *Zembri*, at the entrance of the bay, when the Tunisian steamer boldly passed through the Straits between the island and the mainland. It being perilous for a large vessel to attempt the passage at night, the *Invincible* had no other alternative but either to make the circuit of the island or return to her anchorage. She preferred the latter course, and the Tunisian steamer and Envoy thus escaped being captured in Tunisian waters by the vessel of a foreign and a friendly Power. This affair, which is attributed to the political intemperance of the French representative, has created a very painful sensation in Tunis. It has utterly disgusted the Tunisian authorities; and it has humbled the Europeans to think that so open a violation of every principle of public right and international law should be perpetrated by the agent of a great and powerful nation against a weak government, which it pretends to protect against the encroachments of others."\*

\* This Consul has been removed in consequence.

Another fruit of the aggression on China has been a similar aggression on Cochin-China. France had no just cause of war in Cochin-China, for if any of her Missionaries were killed in that country the fault was theirs, and their going there and preaching in defiance of the Government was in itself an aggression.\* France, however, did not carry war into Cochin-China only for the sake of avenging a few Missionaries; they may have been the pretext: but the motive was to seize upon the country for the sake of establishing a colonial empire, and following the example of England. England, however, was more to blame than for her example only; for had she not invited the co-operation of France in China, and so occasioned the despatch of twelve thousand troops to China, it is doubtful if France would have sanctioned the sending of those troops to Cochin-China only for the problematic establishment of a colony: but the French nation imagined, when these troops were sent to China, that they were sent for our assistance, and in return for concessions to be made by us in their Italian policy, and much bitterness was felt and expressed by them when they found these hopes disappointed. A treaty has just been concluded by France with Cochin-China, restoring part of the conquered territory and retaining a "protectorate" over another part, with an indemnity of a hundred millions of francs to be paid to France.† It was not to be expected that the example set in China should not be followed, especially since bad examples are more readily followed than good ones. When neighbouring nations quarrelled and fought there usually was some excuse, if not in the amount of injury of which one or other had to complain, at least in the mutual animosity and strife fomented by long years of rivalry; but in the case of these distant nations beyond the seas, those excuses are wanting: feelings of hostility do not exist, and these wars, so lightly undertaken, have a strong similarity to brigandage. They have another base feature, in that they are all waged by the powerful against the weak, and so can boast of none of those acts of valour and daring which give a relief to wars amongst equals, and which ennoble the career of the soldier fighting for his country in a just cause. For the justice of the war not only adds to the fame of the soldier, but it augments his valour. Grotius insists much upon this point, and condemns mercenaries,‡ and soldiers who, fighting for pay or plunder, make a trade of war. It is on this point that Vattel falls below Grotius, for, being a Swiss, and seeing what the Swiss practice was, he accepted in this respect what existed, without examining whether it was right, and he attempts to defend mercenaries on grounds of utility and advantage.§ That Grotius is right and Vattel wrong is proved by the fact, that whilst formerly soldiers trading in wars just or unjust, in the service of foreign princes, were called, and called themselves, "mercenaries," this name has now become a term of reproach, and such troops are now designated as "foreign legions." On this point the opinion of an eminent author may be cited:—

"It is one very awful form of the operation of wealth in Europe, that it is entirely capitalists' wealth which supports

\* Vattel, Book ii. chap. i. sect. 7.

† This treaty has not been ratified, and France retains the conquered provinces.

‡ Grotius, liv. iii. chap. xxv. sect. 9.

§ Vattel, Book iii. chap. ii. sect. 13.

unjust wars. Just wars do not need so much money to support them; for most of the men who wage such, wage them gratis: but for an unjust war, men's bodies and souls have both to be bought; and the best tools of war for them besides, which makes such war costly to the maximum. . . . And all unjust war being supportable, if not by pillage of the enemy, only by loans from capitalists, these loans are repaid by subsequent taxation of the people, who appear to have no will in the matter; the capitalists' will being the primary root of the war: but its real root is the covetousness of the whole nation, rendering it incapable of faith, frankness, or justice, and bringing about therefore, in due time, his own separate loss and punishment to each person.\*

To conclude, there is no mystery in international law; and though every one may not study it, each man may understand what are international rights and duties, by becoming convinced of that which forms the basis of international right; and that consists in the consideration of nations as individuals, and in the fact that there is no separate standard between States and individuals: for as individuals compose a nation, so nations compose humanity; and the rights of nations and their obligations to each other in no wise differ from those which exist between individuals; and as the law, whether criminal, civil, or poor law, recognises no difference between men of different classes or religions, learned or unlearned, in the same manner international law, which depends upon right and wrong, which are immutable, cannot vary between

\* Ruskin's Essays, "Unto this Last," p. 154. London, 1862.

nations, however different their position in the world may be. And the key-stone of international as of individual duty is the Divine command, to "do unto others as you would they should do unto you."\* All the false notions which now obtain with regard to international obligations have come in under cover of the phrase, "Religion has nothing to do with politics."

By means of this phrase, such words as policy, expediency, and other ambiguous terms, invented to cover a dubious transaction, have led men to approve of in public matters what they would condemn in private matters. Religion means a sense of accountability in a future state, and so religion has to do with every act that men can do in this world; and if an account has to be given for every idle word, surely public acts affecting a large number of fellow-creatures must be still more a subject of account than private acts affecting the happiness only of a few.

\* "What is permitted to one nation is permitted to every other, and what is forbidden to one nation is equally forbidden to every other."—Vattel, "Preliminaries," sect. 19.

"The seat of judicial authority is indeed locally here in the belligerent country, according to the known law and practice of nations, but the law itself has no locality. It is the duty of the person who sits here to determine the question exactly as he would determine it sitting at Stockholm; to assert no pretension on the part of Great Britain which he would not allow to Sweden in the same circumstances, and to impose no duties on Sweden as a neutral country, which he would not admit to belong to Great Britain in the same character."—Lord Stowell.

## Islam as a Political System.

(WRITTEN IN 1833.)

"Never in the course of their history have Mahometans been brought into contact with any form of Christianity that was not too degenerate in its rites, its doctrines, and its effects, to be worthy of their esteem."—Smith and Dwight's "Missionary Researches," vol. ii. p. 334.

DURING that distracted period which followed the Greek war, I happened to be present at the sack of a Greek village by Albanians. After the seizure or destruction of the little it contained they turned their eyes to a chapel which stood at some distance, and made a rush in that direction, either with the view of scouring, or of destroying and insulting, the remnants of its service and the symbols of its worship. As they reached its threshold a Mussulman Dervish suddenly presented himself, and grasping with extended arms both posts of the door exclaimed, "You can only enter here over my body." At the time I believed the contest to be religious and right on the side of the Christians, because of the fanaticism of the Turks. Words cannot render my astonishment: I saw that I was wholly in error, and I applied myself to inquire. It is with a profound consciousness of incapacity that I approach this subject. It is to a future age that it will remain to analyse that portion of the history of man, our general ignorance of which is summed up in the word "Mahometanism."

Islam is divided into two portions—Imân (Faith), and Dîn, which I will render, Practice. It comes nearer to the French term *culle*. It is not the dogmatic, but the practical portion of Islam which has influenced the moral, social, legal, and political ideas and circumstances of its professors. This,

then, is the branch to which I will apply myself. The hold it has over man we naturally refer to its dogmas, because such is the only hold that religion has over us. Our religion is neither the rule of the courts of law, nor does it decide upon the policy of the State. We, therefore, hold religion and policy different things, and do not, even in expression, so much as conceive a connexion between religion and jurisprudence. What, then, are to us religion, institutions, and honour—powerful as motives, but distinct in their application, and sometimes opposed—is for them all contained in that one word, "Islam." It is patriotism, legality, tradition, constitution, right.

While I separate dogma from practice, referring the constitution of Eastern society to the latter, still the dogma has materially affected this state of the East, in consequence of the influence of Christian feelings on the policy of Eastern Governments. However contrary such impulses may be to that charity which is the essential character of true Christianity, and to those interests which it is the avowed purpose of that policy to sustain, I am, therefore, induced to say something on this head, convinced, that the Christian who knows their belief will cease to revile; and when he observes the influence of their devotional feelings on their lives, will deem them worthy of sympathy, if not of imitation.

The unity and the immateriality of the Deity is the grand doctrine. The contemplation of the greatness, power, and goodness of God, is the devotional exercise. The five cardinal points are,—the Profession of the Faith; Prayer, called by Mahomet the pillar of religion and the key of Paradise; the Fast of Ramazan; Almsgiving, which is a practical regulation of the charity inculcated towards their fellow-men. The Pilgrimage to Mecca was but a regulation, in accordance with previous habits, to maintain the unity of doctrine, and to refresh the zeal and ardour of its professors. The injunction regarding washing and cleanliness is an accessory to prayer. Sale, in his "Preliminary Dissertation," p. 139, says:—

"That his followers might be more punctual in this duty, Mohammed is said to have declared that the practice of religion is founded on cleanliness, which is the one half of the faith, and the key of prayer, without which it will not be heard by God. That these expressions may be the better understood, Al Ghazali reckons four degrees of purification; of which the first is the cleansing of the body from all pollution, filth, and excrement; the second, the cleansing of the members of the body from all wickedness and unjust actions; the third, the cleansing of the heart from all blameable inclinations and odious vices; and the fourth, the purging a man's secret thoughts from all affections which may divert their attendance on God; adding, that the body is but the outward shell with respect to the heart, which is as the kernel. And for this reason he highly complains of those who are superstitiously solicitous in exterior purifications, avoiding those persons as unclean who are not so scrupulously nice as themselves, and at the same time have their minds lying waste and overrun with pride, ignorance, and hypocrisy. Whence it plainly appears, with how little foundation the Mahometans have been charged by some writers with teaching or imagining that these formal washings alone cleanse them from their sins."

The Mussulmans believe with the Christians in an Omnipotent God, Creator of all things; in the immortality of the soul; in the resurrection of the body; in the recompense and punishments of a future life. In respect to the remission of sins and justification, the Mussulman comes much nearer to the Calvinist than some other sects of Christianity (and they compose by far the greatest portion) who admit of works as justification. They believe with the Unitarians, Socinians, Arminians, and other sects, in the prophetic character of Christ.\* They believe with the Lutherans, Calvinists, &c., in justification by faith, and not by works, and with the latter sect in predestination. While subordinate to those distinctions they concur with Protestantism in the grounds of its separation from the Church of Rome. Very possibly I may surprise the reader when I state that the Mussulmans believe in the inspired writings, at least in the Pentateuch, the Psalms of David, and the Gospels. A Mussulman may differ from a Christian in the interpretation of a passage, but he does not deny the "Law and the Testimony." The sects of Christianity with which the

\* "I have, I think, put the parallel between Mahometanism and Socinianism in a pretty clear light. I could carry it farther to the disadvantage of our Unitarians, who are at a greater distance from the truth than the Mussulmans in the articles of the Creation, of the knowledge of God, of providence, of predestination, and of the state of human souls after death."—*Catholic Tract, quoted by Mr. Forster*, vol. ii. p. 500.

"Jesus Christ is revered by all the doctors as the greatest of the Prophets before the Arabian Legislator; as the Messiah of nations and the Spirit of God. The Saviour is regarded as predestined to return in the plenitude of ages, to reassemble all men in unity of one belief."—*D'Ohsson*, vol. i. p. 427.

"The Christian heretics all verge towards Unitarianism, that is, Mahometanism."—*Mahometanism Unveiled*, vol. i. p. 305.

Mussulmans have come into contact can scarcely be said to have had the Bible.

The character of Mahomet is, perhaps, the point which has produced the most unfavourable impression on Christians. But, in fact, we have erred in this matter. He himself disclaims the power of working miracles, does not pretend to salvation out of good works, nor is he designated by his followers by any other title save that which is common to Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, and which is used to one another at the present day by friends in familiar discourse. Anything more would be inconsistent with their all-absorbing idea of the Deity. Mahomet is not ranked so high by the Mussulmans as are the saints in the Romish Church. But a large portion of the Mussulmans, the Wahabees, had rejected even the use of that name by which we chose to know the body. In the formula of their faith they have substituted, in the place of *La illahá il'Alláh Muhammad resul Illah* (There is no Deity but God, and Mahomet is the apostle of God), *La illahá il'Allah malik yaum eddin* (There is no Deity but God, the Lord of the day of judgment). Now the doctrines of the Wahabees were admitted by so many of the Ulemah, in every portion of the Empire, to be in strict conformity with the original principles of their faith, that the suppression of that sect was felt to be the only means by which a political division of the Ottoman Empire could be prevented; and the Western Mussulmans lent themselves to the purposes of the State on this occasion, through the apprehension of the consequence of the hostility of Christendom in the event of any division taking place between the Mussulmans. The Wahabee reformation would have brought Islam into the closest resemblance with Protestantism; and it is curious to remark, that while the use made of the prejudices of Christians has prevented this consummation, millions of Christians\* have apostatised through the violence of a European power, who has acquired this means of indirectly propagating Islam from the support it obtains from Christian fanaticism.

At the time of the Reformation, the Mussulmans were considered as religious allies.† To say nothing of Lollards and other sectarians, fellowship with them was admitted by Cromwell, and unambiguously expressed by Queen Elizabeth, in a letter to Sultan Murad. If, as Iconoclasts, the Catholics conceive that they ought religiously to be made war upon, and expelled from Europe, it might have been imagined that the Protestants, in parity of reasoning, would have taken the opposite view of the question.‡ The fact is, that the intercourse of latter times between the East and the West has consisted in a reverberation of prejudice and an exchange of wrong.

The following extracts from the orthodox creed will not be read without interest:—

\* The Circassians, the Lesghis, &c. See "Progress of Russia in the East," by Sir John McNeill.

† There are, in Count Maillette's "History of Hungary," some curious facts respecting the mutual good will of the Turks and the Protestants, which the author had difficulty in reconciling with the received notions, and therefore represented the Turks as disposed to abandon Islam, because, where they had no mosques, they frequented Protestant churches.

‡ "The Mussulmans are Christians, if Locke reasons justly, because they firmly believe the immaculate conception, divine character, and miracles of the Messiah."—*Sir William Jones, "Asiat. Resear."* vol. i. p. 275.

"Praise be to God, the Creator and Restorer of all things, Who does whatsoever He pleases, Who is Master of the glorious throne and mighty force, and directs His sincere servants into the right way and the straight path; Who favoureth them after their having borne testimony to the Unity, with the preservation of their confessions from the darkneses of doubt and hesitation;\* Who directs them to follow His chosen Apostle, upon whom be the blessing and the peace of God! Who maketh known to them, as touching His essence, He is One and hath no partner; Singular, and hath no like; Unique, having no contrary; Separate, having no equal. That He is Ancient, having no first; Eternal, having no beginning; Everlasting, having no end; to be described by glorious attributes; subject to no decree; determined by no limits or times; but is the First and the Last, and is within and without.

"Neither doth He exist in anything; neither doth anything exist in Him; neither is there anything besides Himself in His essence; nor is His essence in any other beside Him. And that as to the attributes of His perfection, He wants no additional perfection. And He is known to exist by the apprehension of the understanding, and is seen, as by ocular intuition, out of His mercy and grace, by the holy in the eternal Mansion, completing their joy by the vision of His glorious presence.

"And that He (praised be His name!) is living, powerful, mighty, omnipotent; not liable to any defect, or impotence; Who neither slumbers nor sleeps, nor is obnoxious to decay nor death. To Whom belongs the kingdom, and the power, and the might. His is the dominion and the excellency, and the creation and the command thereof; the Heavens are folded up in His right hand, and all the creatures are couched within His grasp. His Excellency consists in His creating and producing; and His Unity in communicating existence, and Original. He created men and their works, and measured out their maintenance and their determined times. Nothing can escape His grasp that is possible; nor the vicissitudes of things get out of the reach of His power. The effects of His power are innumerable, and the objects of His knowledge infinite.

"Now He produced creatures anew for the manifestation of His power and His precedent will, and the confirmation of His word, which was true from all eternity; not that He stood in need of them, or wanted them; and that He manifestly declared His glory in creating, and producing, and commanding, without being under any obligation; not out of necessity, since loving-kindness, and showing favour, and grace, and beneficence belong to Him; whereas it is in His power to pour forth upon men variety of torments, and afflict them with various kinds of sorrows and diseases; which, if He should do, it would be justice in Him; not reproachful, nor injustice. And that He rewards those that worship Him for their obedience upon the account of His promise and beneficence, not of their merit, nor of necessity; since there is nothing which He can be tied to perform, nor can any injustice be feigned in Him, nor can He be under any obligation to any person whatsoever.

*"But that the creatures are obliged to serve Him ariseth from His having declared, by the tongues of the Prophets, that it was due to Him from them; not by the simple dictates of the understanding, but that He sent them Messengers, whose veracity He had proved by manifest miracles,† who brought down from Him to men commands, and promises, and threats.*

"Furthermore, that He doth speak, command, forbid, promise, and threaten by an eternal ancient Word, subsisting in His essence. . . . And that the Koran, the Pentateuch, the Psalms of David, and the Gospels, are books sent down by Him to His Apostles."

The foregoing will suffice to show that their belief warrants the conclusion to which I have been led by experience, that the Mussulmans entertain no antipathy to the Christians on religious grounds. I shall now address myself to the civil and political branches of the system.

Islam is regarded in Europe as a "religion of

\* The difference between the Sheeites and the Soonees is one, according to our ideas, of a political rather than of a religious character. It is, indeed, considered religious by themselves, because with them everything is religion.

† This does not refer to Mohammed, who disclaimed the power of working miracles.

blood," and as having extended itself by the sword. Whatever, or however favourable may be the opinions of any person in reference to Oriental manners and Turkish character, this anti-social maxim is held to be a fundamental portion of their belief and their institutions. If it be erroneous, great is the wrong we do, and how universal!

The small beginnings of the system render it difficult, if not impossible, to conceive how it could progress by physical means, and through the violation of law and policy. Here no numerous race adopted suddenly a principle of intolerance; here no antiquated system became inquisitorial and fanatic, and used the authority acquired, and the power realised, by the virtues of ancestors, to trample on the outraged feelings of man or the laws of nature. Islam, so wonderfully successful as a system as to reach almost to its full growth in its earlier infancy, could only progress through superiority over coeval systems.\*

Mahomet was the only founder of a religion who was at the same time a temporal prince and a warrior. Their power lay exclusively in restraining violence and ambition; his temptation was ambition, and the sword was at his disposal. It is therefore to be expected, that making religion a means to temporal power, and having obtained that sway over the minds of his followers, by which they accepted as law and right whatever he chose to promulgate, his code should be found at variance with all others, and even in opposition to those dictates of justice which are implanted in the breasts of all men. If, then, we find that it is not so—if we find him establishing maxims of right in international dealings, of clemency in the use of victory, moderation in that of power, above all, of toleration in religion, we must acknowledge that, amongst men who have run a distinguished course, he possesses peculiar claims to the admiration of his fellow-creatures. The Arabs were a people of rapine. His followers implicitly believed, and this was all his world. There were no nations around whose feelings he had to respect, admiration to win, or censure to dread: his conduct is therefore referable solely to his own internal instincts, and to that obedience to the whisper of conscience which must be a condition of all greatness, and in which may truly be said to reside the character of man; the germ of which, though born with each of us, has on this populous earth, during the ages of its existence, so seldom ripened to maturity.

A private man made himself to be looked upon as a prophet by his own family. A simple Arab united the distracted, "the scanty, naked, and hungry tribes of Arabia," into one compact and obedient body, and presented them with new attributes and a new character among the people of the earth. In less than thirty years this system defeated the Em-

\* One of the courtiers of Heraclius thus explained, in a council at Antioch, the cause of the astonishing and alarming progress of the Arabs:—

"The victories of the Arabs are to be ascribed solely to the perfection of those institutions and of that religion by which they were restrained from evil and stimulated to the performance of virtue. From this alone, and from no other circumstance, they derived those irresistible energies which, as men and as soldiers, gave them a decided superiority over all that had been employed against them."—Price's "Mahometanism," vol. i. p. 71.

After several chapters, in which the Arabs are only mentioned as fanatics, spreading their creed by the sword, Major Price slips in the following observation:—"It may be once for all observed, that in the early stage of their progress towards foreign dominion the disciples of Mahommed were seldom, if ever, known to be extremely urgent for a change in point of faith."—P. 93.



peror of Constantinople, overthrew the Kings of Persia, subdued Syria, Mesopotamia, Egypt, and extended its conquests from the Atlantic to the Caspian and the Oxus; from which limits, during twelve centuries, its political sway has never receded, while the faith has continued to extend, and is at this hour extending in Northern Asia, in Central Africa, on the Caspian, and the Adriatic.

A combination so extraordinary, and events of such magnitude, flowing from the ideas patiently developed during fifteen years by a solitary Arab, friendless, unknown, and dwelling in the desert or the cave, are not to be explained by phrases, whether employed by the vulgar or the philosopher. These changes were not effected by the outpouring of nomade hordes, by the progress of military aggression, or the gradual extension of diplomatic dominion; they were brought about within a single lifetime by men's thoughts, and have endured through forty generations, not through prescription, but by attachment.

Islam has never interfered with the dogmas of any faith, never persecuted, never established an Inquisition, never aimed at proselytism. It offered its religion, but never enforced it; and the acceptance of that religion conferred co-equal *rights* with the conquering body, and emancipated the vanquished States from the conditions which every conqueror, since the world existed up to the period of Mahomet, has invariably imposed. For its proselytes there was no obligation of denial and revilement of their former creed; the repetition of a single phrase was the only form required or pledge exacted.\*

The two great faiths with which it stood in opposition, Judaism and the Greek Church, were declared to be the models, and their "Book," or Bible, the fountain of the faith of Islam; at the same time it swept away the power and taxes usurped by the Church, which at that period oppressed the Christians of the East not less than the political despotism under which they groaned, while it also diminished a very large proportion of the religious observances, penances, and superstitions previously in force in both religions; preserving in this respect a happy medium between the conservation of prejudices deeply rooted and the destruction of practices associated with them which had become too onerous to bear.

It is not at the present day that we can judge of the effect of a conqueror preaching to his subjects and a general praying with his men. It is not at the present day that we can estimate the awe and respect imposed upon mankind, the enthusiasm and devotion animating the people, or the phalanx who proclaimed the majesty of God, and the necessity of His worship through the observance of good faith between man and man; who exhibited examples of love in the household, devotion in the temple, union in the camp, valour in the field: who associated with themselves at once the loftiest conceptions of natural devotion and the most trivial observances of personal cleanliness.

The faiths with which it stood in competition were Christianity, chiefly as represented by the Greek Church; Judaism, then possessed great of political and military power; and Fire-worship. With the latter we have little to do, although it is

also associated with Islam in reference to all the doctrines which it holds in common with Christianity; as, for instance, that most remarkable of all, the resurrection of the body, re-promulgated on the banks of the Oxus 600 years before the Christian era. As regards Judaism and Christianity, Islam adopted them as its models; they were the sources of its faith. The same revered personages were alike prophets and teachers for all three; there was blood alliance.

Islam did not rise under any persecution from these creeds. There could be no bitterness, even of circumstances. In Arabia its first persecution was by, as its subsequent wars were carried on with, the local idolatry, and in the course of this period the Jews and the Christians in Arabia seem to have been considered its allies: it was impossible that there could be rancour against either, and unless such a passion had existed in the highest degree, it was impossible to make religion the ground of a war of invasion. These considerations appear to me to supersede all argument, and to put aside all testimony; the thing was impossible.

How the reverse should be stated by the Mussulman and Christian writers of early times, and, consequently, thereafter believed, is easily explained. To the Mussulman the word Religion stands in lieu of State. Where we would say, "There was a meeting of the people," they would say, "There was a meeting of believers." Every act is referred to God; all authority thence derived. War was with them a judicial matter, so that they would speak of religion commanding a war as we would speak of religion commanding charity, or love, yet without the one being more an act of fanaticism than the other. This is a general habit of mind and form of expression, but there then comes a purposed misapplication, to prove its claims to Divine favour. The Mussulman would speak of his religion as being propagated by the sword;\* which words, indeed, would strictly signify that his side had triumphed. The Christian writers in the same spirit would assert the same thing, as charging violence and injustice on their antagonists. Besides, to Christians a difference of religion was, indeed, a ground of war, and that not merely in dark times and by fanatics. The great restorer of international law in Europe, Grotius himself, formally excepts the Mussulmans from all participation in the community of rights which he lays down, and the permanent piracy of Malta was sustained by the chivalry of Europe, and into it were periodically drafted the scions of its noble, princely, and regal houses. I may further add, that throughout the Mussulman world the belief that the sword is the weapon of Christianity is quite as common as in Christendom that counter-belief which we are examining.

The expansion of Islam is, therefore, to be looked for in its own inherent character, in the genius of its founder, in the qualifications of its earliest apostles, the system of its political administration, the condition of rival creeds, and the circumstances of surrounding nations: and if it be a rule of philosophy to content ourselves with sufficient causes for any effect, and to abstain from introducing hy-

\* Gibbon says, "The repetition of a phrase and the loss of a foreskin," was all that Islam required: but circumcision is not obligatory.

\* Amongst them the sword does not represent the idea of violence; and so the succession of the Caliphate was by Mahomet remitted to the sword. It conveyed the sense of an appeal to the God of Battles—a judicial duel.

pothetical ones, we will be dispensed in this case from admitting the argument of religious compulsion, which would not only be superfluous as an hypothetical cause, but destructive of the practical ones which account for the result.

At the time that the Mussulmans crossed Arabia Petræa, and showed themselves in Syria, the two great empires of the East, the Greek and the Persian, and the two religions which prevailed in these States, were alike corrupt and tottering, oppressive to the nations by hopeless burdens and intolerable observances; revolt and schism were the common characters of both, and the appearance on their respective thrones of princes of extraordinary spirit and capacity had only the effect of adding hatred, invasion and war, to the sum of the calamities of each, severally incapable of reconstruction. The Christians in their internal schisms sought support from the Parsee Monarch, and on the metaphysical points of Unitarianism and Dualism, as bearing on the nature of Christ. The warlike inhabitants of the mountain ranges, extending from the Euxine down to the borders of Egypt, having taken the side opposed to that then espoused by Heraclius, these countries, on religious grounds, were more favourably disposed to the Persian than to the Christian monarch. Religious animosity being thus fervidly excited at home, was in abeyance as between Christian and Parsee. The power of the two states was equally in abeyance. The history of time will therefore not afford a conjuncture more favourable for the interposition between them of a new system, at once religious and political, respectfully observing the creed of each, and employing the sanction of its new faith to establish beneficial maxims of civil and political freedom. These were the two conditions of respect for religious feelings, subversion of governing system, so as to induce the people to make a sacrifice in regard to the first in order to secure the benefits of the latter. This is precisely what was done. The Unitarian doctrine of Islam, in the sense of the Godhead, fell in with the Unitarian doctrines of the Monophysites and Monothelites, with respect to Christ; indeed, the same terms were used for both; and that hitherto unobserved coincidence of Islam with the Mazdasnians might seduce the Persians into the belief that they had but modified the forms of their Church without abandoning its profession.\* Islam put an end to infanticide, then prevalent in the surrounding countries. Christianity might be equally opposed, but was not equally successful. It put an end to slavery, the adscription to the soil.† It gave equality of political rights, and administered even-handed justice,‡ not only to those who professed its religion, but to those who were conquered by its arms. It reduced taxation; the sole tribute to the

State consisting of the tenth. It freed commerce from all charges and impediments; it freed the professors of other faiths of all forced contribution to their Church or their clergy, and of all religious contribution whatever to the dominant creed. It communicated all the privileges of the conquering class to those of the conquered who conformed to its religion, and all the protection of citizenship to those who did not. It secured property, abolished usury, and the private revenge of blood.\* It inculcated cleanliness and sobriety: it did not inculcate them only, but it produced and established them. It put an end to licentiousness, and associated with charity to the poor the forms of respect for all. Success in either of those points was enough for the triumph of any system.

Such were the offensive weapons of Islam. Conversions with these wings flew so rapidly in the rear of the Black Eagle of the Saracens, that future ages, seeing nothing but victories, have accounted for the inexplicable fact by an impossible theory.†

Instead of Islam having introduced a bloodthirsty spirit amongst the Arabs, it had precisely the contrary effect. Mahomet, from reasons which the event justified, refused to appoint his successor, notwithstanding his own anxious desire that a certain man should succeed him. He did everything to induce the people to select Ali, though he would not nominate him. He went even so far as to place him on the Minbar above himself. Ali, though invariably regarded as the first of the Mussulmans, was passed over on three elections. It was not that he was judged to be deficient in any of the qualities requisite for a chief, but because he was a man injured to bloodshed. Speaking of the election of Abu Beker, Major Price says,—"But this was only the first of three successors in which the pretensions of the distinguished chieftain Ali were baffled or overlooked, with no other exception to his choice than that (*among a nation of homicides*) he was alleged to be a man of blood. Not less decisive are the epithets of those preferred to him—Abu Beker, the *just*; Omar, the *patriarchal*; Othman, the *pacific*."

Having thus shown, on general grounds, the unlikelihood of the existence at the basis of this system of so anti-social a principle, I must now proceed to the proof of my proposition, which is to be found in their law; and I assert that in that volume, which by common consent is held to contain, not merely the maxim but the injunction of propagating religion by the sword, there is not one line at variance with the common instincts of humanity, or with the

\* I can do no more than here indicate the importance of the language then employed with reference to the terms. Throughout the mountains, from the Taurus downwards, the Syriac was then in use. The Armenians had adopted the Chaldaic and Syriac characters and religious literature, so that their religious shibboleths consisted, as against the Greek and the doctrines of Constantinople, in those very identical terms by which Islam appears in the present day to place itself in opposition to Christianity.

† Slavery in the East is not the slavery of Europe, as this single incident will show. Othman, to appease the tumult in which he perished, offered freedom to the slaves who would lay down their arms.

‡ In reporting a case between an Arab and one of the princes of the tribe, the Caliph Omar says,—"I told him (the Prince) that that was no matter, for they were both Mussulmans, and therefore equal."

\* On the occasion of the last pilgrimage that the Prophet of the Arabs conducted to Mecca, he is represented "pronouncing as he went along a discourse of singular sublimity and eloquence, in which he solemnly declared the property of his followers, as well as their persons, reciprocally sacred and inviolable to one another, in the same degree as they held the solemnities in which they were mutually engaged that day, in the same sacred place." "Know," said he, "that I have brought under foot the institutes and usages of ignorance and infidelity. The homicide, therefore, which previously occurred among you, I also absolve from revenge; and the blood for which I shall first pronounce absolution is that of my cousin Rebbiah, the son of Mareth. In the same manner, and with the same solemnity, have I abolished the usurious practices of the period of reprobation; and the contracts of usury which I shall first prescribe and annul are those of my uncle Abbas, the son of Abdul Mutaleb, in order that revenge for blood and claims for usury may be first abrogated in my own family."—Price's "Mahometanism," vol. i. p. 608.

† "On one day, no less than 20,000 Christians, Jews, and Magians, embraced the Mahometan faith."—Sale, "Preliminary Discourse," p. 209.

law of nations, as laid down by our first writers, however disregarded in our present practice. I might content myself with this declaration, and throw upon my antagonists the burden of disproof; I might ask them to produce their counter-authorities, and as they can produce not one, the case is closed. But I will go further. I will disprove them out of their own mouths. I select their highest authority, Sale. He says:—

“Under the head of Civil Laws may be comprehended the injunction of warring against Infidels, which is repeated in several passages of the Koran, and declared to be of high merit in the sight of God: those who are slain, fighting *in defence* of the faith, being reckoned martyrs, and promised immediate admission to Paradise.”

Will it be believed that there is not a single passage in the Koran to justify this assertion? He refers, in a foot-note, to a variety of texts: there is not one of those texts which does not controvert him, as will be seen presently when I cite them from his own translation. He was misled by the expression, “Fight for religion,” which is constantly used, and which, as I have above shown, implies the same as with us would be implied by the words, “Fight for your rights,” “Fight for your country.”\* Sale being considered a partisan of the Mussulmans, his opinion has been considered conclusive; and who would venture to question a maxim for which a score of references are given to the Koran itself? and these words of Mahomet, applied to his small band of persecuted followers, to encourage them to resist attack, are received to-day as a command laid on 150,000,000 of men to assail all other creeds. Now, here are the passages referred to in the note:—

“And fight for the religion of God against those who fight against you; but transgress not by attacking them first: for God loveth not the transgressors.”—*Koran*, chap. ii.

“If they (the true believers) ask assistance of you on account of religion, it belongeth unto you to give them assistance; except against a people between whom and yourselves there shall be a league subsisting; and God seeth that which ye do.”—Chap. viii.

“God hath purchased of the true believers their souls and their substance; promising them the enjoyment of Paradise, on condition that they fight for the cause of God. Whether they slay or be slain, the promise is assuredly due by the Law (of Moses), the Gospel, and the Koran.”—Chap. ix.

But who are the unbelievers? those “who have violated their oaths.” . . . “Will ye not fight against those who have violated their oaths, and have conspired to expel the Apostle of God, and who of their own accord assaulted you?” Sale adds the following note:—“As indeed the Koreish, in assisting the tribe of Beer against those of Kozaah, had laid a design to ruin Mahomet without any just provocation.” †

“If God did not repel the violence of some men by others, verily monasteries, and churches, and synagogues, and the temples of the Moslems, wherein the name of God is frequently commemorated, would be entirely demolished.” Sale’s note to this passage is:—

“This was the first passage of the Koran which allowed Mahomet and his followers to defend themselves against their enemies by force, and was revealed a little before the flight to Medina; till which time the Prophet had exhorted his Moslems to suffer the injuries offered them with patience: which is also commanded in above seventy different places of the Koran.” ‡

I need not multiply instances.

What a contrast have we not here with the then practice of the world, and even with its maxims! At the period of Mahomet’s rise, a state of public law, if the term can be so used, had been superinduced by the connexion of the schisms of the Eastern Church with state policy, whether as regards internal revolution or conflict with Persia, similar to that which arose out of the Reformation, when a difference of religion became, on the one side, the basis of an alliance, and on the other, grounds of war. Amongst us the rectification took place through the labours of juriconsults, in which the Jesuit Suarez and the Reformer Grotius took the lead; and gradually Europe was brought back to see that rights were not contingent upon faith. It was the founder of a new religion, himself chief of the State and leader of its armies, who, in the seventh century, proclaimed this truth, and specially asserted it for the benefit of the professors of other faiths. Islam may, therefore, be said to owe its extension to its assertion of international law.

As to the systems from which Mahomet copied, of course he found in Christianity the purest and most benevolent of maxims; but he was liable to interpret the Gospel by the acts of its followers, or would have been so, had he not been gifted with that intuitive perception of the means of influencing mankind which involves all practically important truths. The same thing may be said in reference to the religion of Jemshid, known by the name of its reformer, Zoroaster; for the majesty of its ancient principles had likewise been obscured. The third system, however, Judaism, did give a religious sanction to aggression; not with a view of conversion, but of extirpation. The Jews were cursed for sparing. Mahomet quotes both Moses and David to justify war, but applies the example to defensive ones.

But we must look at conduct as well as maxims.\* Perchance in this case, as in many others, the one may belie the other. The first wars of Mahomet in Arabia were defensive. The war with the Greek Empire arose out of the assassination of an envoy. The career once entered upon, they were placed in just warfare with the whole of the then world. It was impossible that aggressive war should not take place; but I confine myself to the original code, and the early period by which its character was formed and its principles fixed. The spirit of aggression never breathed itself into that code which formally incorporated the law of nations as a portion of the faith, and the Mussulmans, in the hour of triumph, were always ready to say, “Accept our faith, and you will cease to be even tributary; you will enter into full fellowship with the conquering people.” It is this, which was a generosity then undreamt of, which became the ground of the charge in practice of propagating religion by the sword. As these charges rest principally upon the events of the first and great war—that of Syria, I cannot avoid referring to them, as given by Alwakidi, vehemently disposed to make every war a religious one, and every victory a sign from Heaven. Here is the instruction of the Caliph on the first foreign expedition:—

“When you make any covenant or article stand to it, and be as good as your word. As you go on, you will find some religious persons that live retired in monasteries, who propose to themselves to serve God in that way.”

\* See note at the end of the Essay.

† Chap. ix.

‡ Chap. xxii.

\* See note at the end of the Essay.

The following is the account of the capture of Tyre:—"Youkinna, the governor of Aleppo, had turned Mussulman, and had introduced himself into Tyre with 900 followers, also converts to Islam. His design and character being discovered, he and his men, on the approach of a Saracen force, against whom the governor had sallied forth, were confined in the Castle. A Christian named Basil, holding some place of trust in the Castle, released these men while the two armies were engaged without the walls."

"This Basil, upon information of the great success of the followers of the Prophet, was abundantly convinced of the truth of his mission. This inclined him, having so fair an opportunity offered, to release Youkinna and his men, who, sending word to the ships, the rest of their forces landed and joined them. In the mean time, a messenger in disguise was sent to acquaint Yezid (the Saracen leader) with what was done. As soon as he returned, Youkinna was for falling upon the townsmen upon the wall; but Basil said, perhaps God might lead some of them into the right way, and persuaded him rather to place the men so that their coming down from the wall might be prevented. This done, they cried out, '*La illahé!*' &c. The people perceiving themselves betrayed, and the prisoners at liberty, were in the utmost confusion; none of them being able to stir a step, or lift up a hand. Those in the camp hearing a noise in the city, knew what was the occasion of it, and Youkinna opened the gates and let them in. Those that were in the city fled, some one way and some another, and were pursued by the Saracens and put to the sword. Those upon the wall cried quarter. Yezid told them, that since the city was taken by force they were all slaves. 'However,' said he, 'we, of our own accord, *set you free, upon condition you pay tribute; and if any of you has a mind to change his religion he shall fare as well as we do.*' The greatest part of them turned Mahometans."

"When Constantine heard of the loss of Tripoli and Tyre his heart failed him; and, taking shipping with his family and wealth, he departed for Constantinople. All this while Amrou Ebn ul Aâs lay before Cæsarea. In the morning, when the people came to inquire after Constantine, and could hear no tidings of him nor his family, they advised together, and with one consent surrendered the city to Amrou; paying down for their security 2000 pieces of silver, and delivering into his hands whatsoever belonged to Constantine that he had not carried away with him. Thus was Cæsarea lost in the 17th year of the Hejrah, and the fifth of Omar's reign; upon which those other places in Syria which as yet held out, namely, Ranihah, Accah, Joppa, Ascalou, Gaza, Sichein (or Nabolos), and Tiberias, surrendered; and in a little time after the people of Beirout, Sidon, Jabalah, and Laodicea, followed their example: so that there remained nothing more to be done in Syria, but all was entirely subdued by the Saracens, who had not spent above six years in subduing that large, wealthy, and populous country."\*

From Syria the arms of the Arabs were turned against Persia, and the deputies of Omar offered to Yesdegird terms by which war might be avoided—the profession of Islam and *the reform of political abuses*; all taxes to be reduced, save the tenths, and 2½ per cent of every man's means for the poor, the distribution of which was left to himself; justice to be administered by the code of Mahomet; and all men, without distinction of grade or office, to be subject to it. Such terms did no more agree with the dispositions of Yesdegird than with those of any other monarch; and he, his nobles, and the chiefs of the priesthood, were cut off in the desperate stand they made amidst millions of indifferent subjects.†

The communication made by the Saracen General to the Governor of Egypt is also equally decisive:—

"Abadah (the emissary of Amr) coming into Makouka's presence, he bade him sit down, and asked him what they

(meaning the Arabs) meant, and what they would have. Abadah gave them the same answer as the Saracens always used to do, to all that asked them that question; telling him that he had three things to propose to him by the command of Amr, who had received the same order from his master, Omar the Caliph, viz. that they should either change their religion and become Mahometans, and so have a right and title to all privileges in common with them, or else pay perpetual tribute yearly, and so come under their protection; or else they must fight it out, till the sword decided the controversy (not of faith, but dominion) between them."

On this Ockley remarks:—"These, as we have observed before, were the conditions which they proposed to all the people where they came; the propagating their religion being to them a just occasion of making war upon any nation whatsoever."

The propagating their religion could not have been the occasion of their making war, as it was not the object of the war, nor the consequence of triumph. Ockley's supposition would be incorrect, even if they had proposed conversion or tribute, for they were already at war with the Empire to which Egypt belonged.

A spirit the very reverse of this is evinced in every page of the history of Islam, in every country to which it has extended; so that in Palestine a Christian poet\* has exclaimed, twelve centuries after the events to which we are referring,—“The Mahometans are the only tolerant people on the face of the earth;” and an English traveller† reproaches them with being too tolerant.

The results produced by Islam seem too vast, too profound, too permanent, to allow us to believe that the human mind could anticipate them, far less adjust the scheme; thence the disposition to take refuge in chance, or providential design, instead of applying to it the process of reasoning, by which we estimate the effects of the laws of Solon, or the triumphs of Timoleon. Nevertheless, this scheme was framed by a single man, who filled with his own spirit those who were in immediate contact with him, and impressed a whole people with the profoundest veneration of which man ever was the object. The system of laws and morals which he formed agreed equally with the highest development as with the lowest level of society, which, during ten centuries, passing from race to race, made every people by whom it was received superior to, and triumphant over, the nations and empires with which they came in contact.

By the same process that Islam subdued Arabian idolatry, so did it subdue fire-worship. After conquering the Arabs it conquered the Persian Turks, Mongol Tartars, Berebers, and a large portion of the Greek and other populations. At this day that faith is spread where the hostile banners of its professors never flew. Missionary labours have extended it to the eastern confines of India. Moorcroft found it in Ladak, triumphing over Buddhism; and the Landers found it on the banks of the Niger, putting an end to human sacrifice, where its sway is established with regal pomp and despotic power. No one ever heard of inquisition into man's faith, or conversion by force; and where the title of High Priest and Successor of Mahomet is placed above that of emperor and of king, no follower of a different creed contributes from his substance to the maintenance of the Church. Whilst Turkey was an aggressive Power, it might have been politic in the nations she attacked to raise the cry of religion, but as against an unaggressive state it is as insane as it is

\* Ockley's "History of the Saracens."

† Price's "Retrospect of Mahometanism," vol i. p. 105.

\* Lamartine.

† Slade.

immoral. The present fomentation of revolt amongst its Christian subjects is undertaken out of the same regard for the propagation of Christianity as the fomentation of internal discord, or the military survey of the frontiers of India for the propagation of Islam—for the dupes in the one case are the victims in the other.

To the mind of the Mussulman, no idea of anti-thesis is conveyed by the designation of his faith with that of Moses or of Christ. He holds these to be stages of progression, and thence the expression, "A Jew must become a Christian before he can be a Mussulman." He calls Abraham and the Patriarchs Mussulmans. He says all men are born Mussulmans. Islam means "resignation." They do not call us Christians, but followers of Hazret Isa, the blessed Jesus; the reviling of whom is blasphemy, and is punished with death.

In the time of Mahomed IV., a Christian priest had made profession of Islam, and, to prove his zeal, reviled our Saviour, applying to him the epithet "impostor," which he had been accustomed to apply to Mahomet. The Mussulmans, shocked at the outrage, carried him before the Divan, and he was ordered for immediate execution.\*

This chapter having been translated to a party of Mussulman doctors at Constantinople, one of them inquired, at its conclusion, why I had taken so much trouble to write down these things. I explained what were the prevailing ideas in Europe. He then retorted, "In that case you have not said half enough," and said that I should refer to every war which had occurred during the last 150 years, every one of which had arisen out of the religious animosity of Christians. "When," said he, "has Turkey violated a treaty, or undertaken a war, save in self-defence? And what, on the other hand, has been the conduct pursued towards us? The violation of every moral and religious feeling; not only treaties violated, and aggressive and unjust wars undertaken, but treaties falsely interpreted, and the agents of all powers, and even our own, turned against us. Then, our subjects, urged to insurrection on the grounds of religion, and ourselves attacked by the three greatest Powers of Europe, in profound peace. Now you accuse us of being the aggressors, and attribute to our religion the hostility of yours. After the battle of Navarino, what was it that saved your lives and your property but our respect for the precepts of our religion? Ask the Greek inhabitants of Arnout-Keuy to whom they owed their salvation from inevitable destruction?" I inquired, What were the circumstances to which he alluded? He told me, that on the breaking out of the Greek revolution some thousand Asiatic troops were embarked at Constantinople, to be sent to Galatz, but the wind proving unfavourable, the vessels cast anchor in the Bosphorus, at that village. Infuriated against the Greeks, these troops determined on burning the village, which was exclusively inhabited by Greeks. They were on the point of carrying their design into execution, when the Greeks sent information of it to one of the body of the Ulema, who resided in the neighbourhood.

\* "Mahomet was the wilful prey of his own unbridled passions; Christ, the perfect pattern of all virtue. The only comparison open to us is one of contrast, and the only appropriate contrast, that between 'the swine wallowing in the mire and the Lamb without blemish and without spot.'"—Forster, vol. ii. p. 479.

This from a "Christian philosopher;" what might be expected from an illiterate monk?

He immediately assembled as many of the Ulema as were within reach, and as no time was to be lost, they hastened to the beach, carrying with them all the money they could collect. "What," said my informant, "were the arguments they used? Were they not the words of the Prophet? and why did they venture themselves on so perilous a service, but because they were his servants and the guardians of the honour of the Mussulmans?"\* "But," said he, "so strongly impressed on every true Mussulman is the obligation of having right on his side before he has recourse to arms, that if the Russian fleet were to sail down the Bosphorus not a gun would be fired until the signal for hostilities was given by the invaders themselves. Ask the Russians if they have not, at the commencement of every war, taken cruel advantage of this conscientiousness on our part, even when dealing with men who have never used to us the words 'faith' or 'honour' but for purposes of fraud and deceit?"

The foregoing pages were returned to me by a friend, to whom I had submitted them, with this remark,—“This is all very well, and I will take your word for it, but this is only one half of the question; let me now see the defects of Mahometanism; for like the moon, its emblem, it must have its dark side.”

I confess I was startled with the observation, because I had only been struck with the good parts, and had only thought of these. I had at the time to deliver myself from a most inveterate censure, an implacable hatred; and consequently, as I gradually came to admit what was good, I dropped my own previous opinions as to the bad: and in fact, in all inquiries, it is the good alone that links on, connects thought, or strikes root. In this case, moreover, it was the branch of the subject which presented novelty. But, desirous to yield to my friend's wishes, I looked up the subject in travellers' and other books, and made a catalogue of the evils of Islam. I found to my surprise, that there was not one of these which I could not show to be a misprision, or a calumny. Of course it will be understood that I am speaking of it as a political system, and considering it simply as a code of laws. I set down face to face the allegations, with my remarks:—

1. IMPOSTURE IN RELIGION.

With this I have nothing to do.

2. SENSUAL PARADISE.

This is also a religious point; but it is to be observed that the descriptions of the Koran are spiritually explained and understood, as is by us the Song of Solomon.

3. NO SOULS ALLOWED TO WOMEN.

An ignorant mistake.†

4. SENSUALITY.

They bring that charge against us. Napoleon observes that Mahomet was the only Eastern legislator who *restricted* the number of legitimate wives. I refer the reader on this head to the chapter entitled "The Life of the Harem," in "The Spirit of the East."

\* This fact has been confirmed to me by the inhabitants of Arnout-Keuy.

† See note at the end of the Essay.

5. RELIGIOUS  
SCHISM.

The schisms of Islam are not doctrinal; not even that between the Sunnys and the Shiahs.\* It is remarked by Sylvester de Sacy, in his "History of the Druzes," that the early spirit of Mahometanism was devotional, but not doctrinal. The metaphysical spirit was a subsequent importation from the Greeks and Persians.

A mistake.

6. EXTENSION OF  
RELIGION BY THE  
SWORD.7. PERSECUTION  
OF OTHER CREEDS.

Ditto.

## 8. INTOLERANCE.

The reverse of the truth.

9. ENMITY TO  
SCIENCE AND  
LETTERS.

Islam has outstripped the enlightenment of our age by making instruction a fundamental law.† Every child must be put to school in its fifth year. It is the duty of the State to instruct the citizen, that he may understand the laws he has to obey, and of the family to teach the child the means by which he may acquire his livelihood. Every Sultan is instructed in a handicraft, and some of them have earned thereby their subsistence. There have been, however, no educational heart-burnings, because each community had to teach its children for and by itself. It was from the Mussulmans that Europe received science and letters.

10. BURNING OF  
THE LIBRARY OF  
ALEXANDRIA.

This event, however it may have occurred,‡ was followed seventy years after by the reign of Mostassem Billah; and if the event is a charge, that reign might be a redemption. Speaking of it with Mustafa Pasha, of Skodra, he said, "It was a crime of self-defence; the faith was young." The present Mussulmans, indeed, say, all science is to be found in the Koran, but they did not burn Ulug Beg. The present scientific darkness of the East has as much to do with Islam as that of the eleventh century in the West with Christianity.

\* See note at the end of the Essay.

† At Constantinople, when a quarter is burned down, the inhabitants are obliged to rebuild the school, but the mosque is not rebuilt until provided for by its own endowments, or by some pious person.—*Note of Editor.*

‡ It is most doubtful that this event ever did occur, since it is not related by contemporary Arab historians, and the wilful burning of a library would have been contrary to the precept of Mahomed,—“Seek for science, even though it be in China;” and the saying of Abu Hanifah,—“Thank the Greeks for paper, for which you are indebted to them.” However, the burning of all the Arab works on history, medicine, and agriculture, by Cardinal Ximenes, on the ground that they were Alkorans, is historical.—*Note of Editor.*

11. PUNISHING  
OF APOSTATES WITH  
DEATH.

I am not going to defend this law, but I nevertheless enumerate it in the list of unjust charges, for it is one which Christians have no right to make, and which, in a practical point of view, is utterly insignificant. If we are contrasting two systems of long duration, to judge of their character from their conduct, we must not take the opinions of a certain period of the one as the test by which we shall rate the whole course of the other. Let us go back three centuries, when rival fires were being lighted by Christians to burn the bodies of other Christians, and who would have dreamt of bringing this law as a charge against Islam? I have already said that religion includes country, consequently this law is the law of treason. As to its abolition having any effect in influencing religious opinion, I utterly deny it. If there was a disposition towards conversion, it would be thereby increased, and almost without exception; the instances, rare as they are, of its application, have been those of Christians who first apostatised and then relapsed. However, this law, by what I must call a most cowardly, as well as ill-judged, violence on the part of the British Embassy, has been now, so to say, superseded. We will see whether conversions will be the result. Any one acquainted with the people will be of a very different opinion. It opens the door to apostasy, because it withdraws that which has been hitherto the great obstacle, the impossibility of returning thereafter to their original faith. Death is very different for a Mussulman and for a Christian. Besides, the tide of conversion is running the other way. No one has ever heard of a Mussulman becoming a Christian, but millions of Christians throughout the Ottoman Empire have, in the course of the last century and a-half, become Mussulmans.

12. SEPARATION  
OF THE SEXES.

This, like the former, is indefensible in itself. That women should veil up their faces, and be separated in society from men, no natural law commands, and no necessity will justify; but if we estimate an institution by its effects, that is to say, if we compare its effects with those of other

12. SEPARATION  
OF THE SEXES.

institutions, I do not think that we shall have grounds for condemning this one. I believe that in the East domestic happiness is realised in a greater degree than in Europe: at all events, there is no compulsion. The people like their way of life, and compulsion would be required to alter it. This, however, like the former point, was not a new law introduced by Mahomet, but an institution existing from the earliest times.

## 13. SLAVERY.

Again a mistake, resulting from the false application of our own terms. When an anti-slavery despatch was sent to Lord Ponsonby, he refused to communicate it to the Turkish Government, and in his reply asked with what face he could deplore the miserable condition of the slave to a Reis Effendi or a Grand Vizier, who was himself a slave.

14. IMMUTABILITY  
OF LAW ARRESTING  
PROGRESS.

This is an opinion, and not a charge. There are those, even amongst ourselves, who side with the Mussulmans. The value of this objection, says Richardson, regarding the Institutes of Menu, depends upon the character of the law, and it is clear that laws that are not good cannot be immutable. It is clearly as desirable to keep good laws as to change bad ones, and so in fact we may both be right. In any system where the laws are immutable there must be simplicity in the machinery, and facility of the adaptation to practice; as, on the other hand, where the principle of change is admitted, the best of laws must lose half their value. It will scarcely be denied that amongst us legislation is but the tool of party, and the expression of the despotism of a temporary majority with the effect of complication and multiplicity, which imply badness of law.

15. VENALITY OF  
JUDGES.

Throughout the history of Islam this has been the great cause of commotion and the butt of satire; yet, perhaps in no country is less injury suffered from legal proceedings. There are no lawyers; proceedings are immediately brought to a close. Judicial authority is, moreover, recognised in all municipal and elective officers; all corporations, religious communities and commercial guilds, administer justice through their

15. VENALITY OF  
JUDGES.

own officers, without interference from the tribunal; their civil awards are enforced by their own authority; their penal decision (death excepted) by the Turkish authorities.

## 16. DESPOTISM.

Turkey is the only government in the world which is not struggling with its people to wrench from them their privileges. It is, on the contrary, engaged in an attempt to confer them. A Sultan can impose no tax, make no law, declare no war, contract no debt. If the constitution of Islam were translated and applied to any country in Europe, it would be considered a beautiful, but impracticable, theory of Utopian freedom.

## 16. DESPOTISM.

17. ABUSES OF  
ADMINISTRATION.

This, it will be observed, is a practical, and not a theoretic point.\* The Turks established themselves by conquest, which exposes a people and a system to temptations which almost inevitably end by its ruin. Two questions then arise: first, whether the abuses have their root in the system? the second, whether they be capable of remedy? I answer negatively to the first, and affirmatively to the second; and I but repeat the opinion, and, at that time, the prophecy of the first authority on the subject, D'Ohsson,† who at the very darkest period of Turkish history asserted that those abuses were capable of easy rectification, because not in the system, and because they were violations of positive canon law.

## 18. FATALISM.

I know not how to answer a charge conveyed by a word which has no meaning. They do not believe in Fate, and cannot, therefore, believe in an abstraction of Fate. They do assert man's free-will; they hold him responsible for his acts before God and man; they do not believe only, but trust in Providence. Their dispositions differ from ours in many respects, but not as the result of vain speculation. They are content when they have no grounds for being dissatisfied, and are, consequently, inert where Europeans would be busy. They are resigned to the decrees of Providence, and, consequently, quiet where the

\* See note at the end of the Essay.

† "Tous les maux politiques qui affligent les peuples Musulmans dérivent de leurs préjugés, de leurs fausses opinions, des vices du gouvernement, mais non des vrais principes de la religion et de la loi."—*Mouradgia D'Ohsson*.

18. FATALISM. European would be dissatisfied. They do not believe in the contagion of the plague, and, consequently, attend the sick-bed of a relative when a European would be touching him with a pair of tongs, or flying into the country. And they are in the habit of saying on all occasions "God is great," and so leaving the morrow to take care of itself. A Turk could not deny that he was a fatalist, for the best of reasons—that he has no such extravagance in his brain, or such a term in his language.

Such is the catalogue of evils, as I find them in European writers. I may be considered partial in this statement, yet no one has the experience of the evils of Turkey that I have had, because my work in that country has consisted in a struggle for their rectification. My support in this has been always the Koran, and in so far as I have succeeded, it has been from this cause. If I have spoken commendatorily of them, it is not to themselves. With them, the theme has ever been their wrongful judgments and abusive acts; but so conscious are they of their own departure in this respect from the original type, that instead of being looked on, in consequence, as an enemy of Islam, my crusade, if I may so call it, has gained me the designation of "Threefold Mussulman." However, other Europeans have come to the same conclusion. I have already stated that of D'Ohsson; I will add that of a powerful French writer who had every opportunity of knowing them,— "Islam is neither the enemy of progress nor the friend of violence and abuse."

This search after faults has led me to the observation of two points, in which Islam is superior to all other systems. The decrepitude of all beliefs is the putting the creature in the place of the Creator. Islam is old enough to have experienced this change; yet alone has it remained free from idolatry and superstition. In regard to the second point, the contrast is rather with Christianity than with Buddhism or Brahminism; it has reference to international law; it deals with the acts of the community, as our courts of justice with the acts of the individual. No doubt the Christian religion, and more specifically the Old Testament, forbids alike crime in the community and crime in the individual; but Christianity established no court for the enforcement of that law; and having gradually emerged from a condition of obscurity and persecution, there was never formed a system of administration which, so to say, should apply and implement the faith. It is true that the Church exerted itself to control, through the consciences of men, the lawlessness of princes and the passions of people; and we find it interposing, denouncing, and excommunicating, with the effect of diminishing the frequency, mitigating the savageness, and limiting the duration of wars, and thus establishing a rule and code of right and honour, out of which came the chivalry of the middle ages, which is of scholastic and monastic parentage. But in all this the Church was an *opposition*, not an institution—a petitioner for justice rather than the judge dispensing it from the bench.

The feebleness of this organisation is exhibited at later times, when the Church was reformed; when, instead of supplying the fundamental deficiency, or strengthening the power it still retained, the Reformation purposely ruptured the connexion between the Church and the aggregate conscience, saying to it, "You shall be spiritual only; you shall be little children, and yet preach to grown-up men; but all that regards justice and judgment, that is, 'policy,' is no matter of yours." In the end it has happened, that the nations of Christendom have lost and entirely forgotten, to the very tradition, the meaning of *war*, beyond the mere material facts connected with it; so that the perpetration of a national murder, entailing the loss of tens or hundreds of thousands of lives on the parts of those whom we assail, or in retribution for our own act, can be effected without so much as the formalities requisite for cutting a road or building a bridge. Justice in its highest sense has disappeared from Christendom; with it, Religion, in its social and binding power; and it would require a very fine distinction—so very fine that I am unable to perceive it—to admit of the possibility of the existence of faith, in the abstract sense, amongst a people on whom judicial blindness has fallen. A man who has committed a murder may be a Christian, but no one will say that that man is a Christian who is ready daily to commit murder. There is no difference in regard to morality between a collective and an individual murder; and if a community continues to remain aware, in its private dealings, of the distinction between murder and self-defence, while it has lost that perception as regards its aggregate acts, surely that people is blind in respect to justice and to judgment; and, so far from being the repositories of the truth and the faith, it is to them that religion has to be preached: and happy would it be if they could be converted, I will not say to Christianity, but to any religion whatever.

Dr. Goodall, the now venerable head of the American Missionaries in the East, once addressed, in my hearing, some young fellow-labourers, who had just arrived from the other side of the Atlantic, and one of whom had just preached to us a sermon, fervid with prophecy and proselytism, in these terms,— "My dear young friends, you have come here to see practised those virtues we hear of in Christendom." Before then, it had occurred to myself that the nations of Europe required first to become Mussulmans before they really could be Christians; and in fact, the Christian faith is Oriental, and though the faith be circumscribed to no region, yet its manners and habits are not those of the West. The two social features with which we are acquainted are private charity and international justice. It is to the method adopted practically to maintain both that I attribute more especially the sudden expansion of Islam, its permanency, and the preservation to the present hour of its early simplicity of mind and institutions. I shall now mention the means adopted in respect to the latter.

A special organisation is only intelligible by a due appreciation of the relative functions of the other portions of a State; we must, therefore, first consider in the Mussulman system the regal prerogative, the executive power, and the popular will.

The Prince is the mere executor of the law, but is not possessed of any portion of legislative power, nor of judicial functions. The first he cannot pos-



ness, because it is not in exercise at all; the code is immutable, and royal ordinances (the *Urf*) a mere regulation. As to the second, he is regarded in no other light than as a private individual; he is liable to pursuit before the courts of justice, and there are sultans who have stood to plead their own cause before the tribunal of a *cadi*. The executive authority is in his hands, but it is limited in every respect as our governments are in some respects—they are most strictly controlled in home matters by Act of Parliament. A Mussulman executive is equally limited by the law in foreign matters. But the law which limits our Governments is a changeable one: they are members of the legislative assemblies, and dispose of the powers of the monarch in his legislative functions; they dispose equally of the influence of Government as of the party which has raised them to power in enacting or in abrogating laws; in obtaining acts of indemnity, or in dispensing even with that protection in cases of their violation of positive law. A Mussulman Government has no such hold, and possesses no such power.

In the West, the opinion of the people constitutes itself a strength and an authority; its will becomes law, and the exercise of that will is called freedom. In the East there is no such thing as opinion; the process of teaching of the whole people corresponds with that which we give to lawyers, and consequently, when commotions break out, it is not with the view of changing institutions, or introducing reforms, but of resisting violence and wrong, and maintaining the law: it therefore ends with the deposition of a sovereign, or the execution of a minister of state; and so, instead of shaking the stability of the throne or of the institutions, serves to maintain them. Consequently the abuses of Government, even in the worst times, though they may prostrate the well-being of a nation, never destroy its common sense, its just appreciation of right and wrong, or its faculty of restoration; for it suffers only from the temporary violence of man, not from the disembodied and undying perversions of legislation.

In the centre of an Administration so simple and patriarchal, is placed the body into whose hands is exclusively remitted the right of judgment on such cases as involve the drawing of the sword. It is, so to say, the Church to which alone this power is intrusted. I use the word "Church," as it is the nearest approach which our language affords; but it also includes the "Bench." Islam is without a priesthood. The doctors of the law are the doctors of divinity, because the law is the Koran: but they are not supported by tithes; their functions are not sacerdotal, but judicial; yet are they a corporation by affiliation, succession, cohesion, wealth, dignity, connexions, and influence—no less authoritative than the Church in England; with this difference, that there is no dissent. Their wealth is derived neither from church property, nor from tithes, nor from state pensions. They are supported by judicial fees on litigated cases, amounting to  $2\frac{1}{2}$  per cent, and by the revenues of lands appropriated to the mosques; in the same manner that, amongst the Greeks, lands were attached to the temples. This property is, in consequence, discharged from taxes to the State, and secure against confiscation; consequently, in the political uncertainty of the last two centuries, a large proportion of the property of the Ottoman Empire has been placed in this

condition, a portion of the proceeds being secured to the families of the original owners, the remainder entering the treasury of the *Efkaf Naziry*. The Christians profit by this allocation even as much as the Mussulmans, and at the present moment almost the whole of the property of the city of Constantinople belongs either in this form, or positively by having fallen in, to the body of the Ulema, and pays no taxes to the State. This body, although connected with the aristocracy of the land, and filling the highest administrative offices, has, nevertheless, its roots in the people—resembling, in this respect, the Church of Rome. It is looked up to by the nation, in times of difficulty and danger, as its protector and representative. Every commotion has been led by it, and none has succeeded, except where it has pronounced itself decidedly in its favour.

Those who desire to become acquainted with the details of its constitution will find them elaborately expounded in D'Ohsson; I confine myself to the general outline.

The chief of the body is the Sheik ul Islam, or Grand Mufti. He is nominated by the Sultan, but he can only choose one of the three highest functionaries: these, again, are nominated by the Sultan, but under a similar restriction; and so progressively downwards, the Sultan always nominating, but only from the eligible persons determined and presented by the hierarchal progression of the body itself. It finally rests upon the students in the different colleges who are raised the first two steps by collegiate degrees.

The Grand Mufti, the *Cazaskiers* of Anatoly and Roumelly, the three *Cadis* of the first cities, and some other dignitaries, form the supreme council of Ulema, or learned men. Their ordinary functions have reference to their own corporation, but in all extraordinary or doubtful occasions they are consulted by the Government; they are not invited to join the *Divan*, but the case is submitted to them. Thus, for instance, before the measures against Mehemet Ali were adopted they were appealed to, and it was on their *fetva* itself, rehearsed in the *firman*, that he was declared an outlaw, or, according to their expression, a "*Firmanli*." The case is not presented to them in the form of documents to examine, but as a solicitor prepares a case for submission to counsel. It is said, "M. or N. has done so and so. Is his act lawful or unlawful; and if so, what is the penalty?" This is the form in which cases with foreign Powers are submitted.

It may be said that this is a very inadequate process for arriving at the truth; that they have before them but an *ex-parte* statement; and that even upon it a purely judicial view will not be taken by persons so intimately connected with the Government. These objections are, doubtless, valid; but we must consider how much there is gained, *ceteris paribus*, on the other side. The Ulema are not merely a body of lawyers, they are a representative one, and a popular one; they will not confine themselves to the case as presented by the Government; their opinions and habits are distinct from those of the Administration; they are not compromised by its anterior steps; they will, consequently, in a case of manifest injustice—and this is the important matter—refuse their *fetva*, and, of course, the Executive is at once stopped. Of what importance is it in the case of any quarrel to have an uncompromised

friend, even to consult with? and the quarrels of nations, even more than those of individuals, arise out of intemperance and irritated self-love. What a restraint upon a Government to know that, after it has made a quarrel, it cannot shelter itself under pending negotiations or royal prerogative! and what a support for the morals and the honour of a people that it has only to draw the sword upon a judicial sentence!

But the functions of the Ulema do not cease, in case of war, with the rendering of a fetva. So soon as the frontiers are crossed a representative of the body is sent to the camp, not only to administer justice in the army, but to watch and report on the proceedings of the general, to prevent his overstepping the limits of legality, to take cognizance of his proceedings with the opposite party, and to sign with him armistices or other documents, which, in fact, without such signature, have no validity. The rare cases in which the Turks have broken faith, have arisen out of the ignorance of their enemies of their constitution. They have never, indeed, presented a *forged treaty* to deceive native princes in India, and to avoid parliamentary pursuit at home; but they have been guilty of delivering invalid documents, as in the case of Rhodes—that is to say, uncounter-signed by the representative of the Mufti—and then felt themselves at liberty to violate them. But this aberration is the strongest proof of the value of this legal restraint, showing that it was exercised to repress the worst passions, and directly connecting with the institutions of Islam the high character of honour which is never to be found save acting as a moderator. There is but one instance in which ambition induced the Turkish Government to violate an engagement. The voice of religion was then loudly raised against the outrage, and in the subsequent triumphant progress of the Ottoman forces through Hungary to Vienna, which lay exposed and defenceless, when every temptation of easy victory might have led on with eagle's flight the unresisted squadrons, the troops, discouraged by the denunciations of the Ulemas, and the chiefs paralysed by the same cause, exhibited in their insubordination an example of respect for the moral dictates of religion which is perhaps unparalleled in the military history of Europe. The disasters of the campaign, attributed, of course, to other sources by biographers of the Western heroes, let loose the suppressed indignation of the population of Constantinople; and Mahomed IV., after having occupied the throne for more than forty years, was sent to the Seven Towers, to expiate with his life the resumption of hostilities before the expiration of a truce.

To come to later times:—

When in 1812, by the intercession of England, hostilities were put an end to between Russia and Turkey, it became a matter of astonishment to all Europe that Turkey should forego the prospect or the certainty held out to her by the invasion of Napoleon, of obtaining those ends for which she was in arms at that very moment, and for retaking from Russia the immense tracts of country which Russia had possessed herself of during the previous forty years. It was a conviction of the manifest interests of Turkey on this occasion that probably rendered Napoleon indifferent to the negotiations of England at Constantinople, and which proved successful beyond all belief, in consequence, no doubt, of the

coincidence of English and Russian intention.\* Scarcely was the treaty signed, when, as at that of Carlovitz, Turkey perceived her error; but, her agent having appended his signature, no representations and no advantages could induce her to break her faith. When the news of this Treaty reached Brussels, Prince Lieven was there in company with a German diplomatist (Baron Ompteda), actually a representative of a foreign State at the British court. On hearing the Treaty had been signed, Prince Lieven gave vent to his satisfaction in terms so strong as to surprise those present. The German Minister above referred to observed to him that his rejoicing was rather premature, as a hundred thousand treaties could never prevent even a Christian State from seizing the moment of the entrance of the French on Russian soil for repossessing itself of its lost territory; that, consequently, the Treaty could only be a feint to deceive the Russians. Prince Lieven, in the unguarded exultation of the moment, exclaimed, "Little do you know the Turks; the ink of that deed is worth more to us than a hundred thousand men."† In proof that the Turkish Government has always maintained the respect for law, still inherent in the breast of its people, and that inoffensiveness which at once renders it worthy of the esteem of foreign Powers and the victim of their intrigues, I select a few passages from different periods of their history.

On their first settlement in Europe they restored the Morea, after capturing it, to the Byzantine Emperor, as lawful possessor. They retained Thessalonica only after its capture for the third time, and then on the grounds of a correspondence intercepted, by which the Emperor had disposed of it to the Genoese. At the Treaty of Belgrade, the Grand Vizier justified his refusal to assent to a proposition of the plenipotentiaries as follows:—"You mistake the nature of the Turkish Government. It is not in its power to do things which that of Vienna can do of its own pleasure. It has to consult its people, and it is guarded by a law which it cannot infringe. It partakes of the nature of a republic, and does not wield despotic power."

Sitting with some soldiers at a bivouac fire, one of them was recounting how, at the opening of the campaign of 1828, the perfidious Muscovites had established themselves on the Turkish territory, and were pushing their works up to a small fort where he was in garrison. On which I asked how they could be such fools as not to attack and drive them back. He answered, "War had not been declared." I laughed. Upon this, he leaped up and ran for his musket. I thought he was going to use it against me, but he kissed the stock and said,—“God puts this in my hand, and I will not use it save with His blessing.”

It was a similar feeling which led to the destruction of the Turkish fleet at Navarino. They might have annihilated that of the allies as it entered, but they allowed them to take up their positions, waiting till they had fired the first shot.

\* That at the moment of such peril Russia should obtain the accessions of territory by the Treaty of Bukarest, that England in saving Russia should not have regulated with some idea of justice, or some glimpse of future events, the boundaries between Russia and Turkey, is what might have been incredible, but for the more recent experience. It was in the same year (1812) that England secretly arranged with Russia the dismemberment of Denmark, Norway being given to Sweden, that Sweden might not, at the general peace, reclaim Finland.

† This incident I had from Baron Ompteda.

The classical scholar will no doubt have already been reminded of Rome. There the Ulema was the Feecial College. The Consuls, the Senate, and the People could declare no war; that matter was remitted to the Feecials; and the very negotiations with a foreign State were remitted to the legal body, which drew up the *petitio rerum*, transmitted the *ultimatum*, and sent their heralds to the capital of the foreign State to *denounce* the war, remaining thirty days on the frontier before the *ultima ratio* was appealed to and the legions suffered to cross. They threw open the temple of Janus to publish at home the event, so that every precaution should precede, every form of law accompany, and every publicity declare the solemn event. Thus it was that in a Roman the characters of soldier and of citizen were combined, and that discipline and honour were not divorced. Thus it was that the Republic became mistress of the world, and that *Roman* will be a title of honour to the latest generations.

I have contrasted, as antithetical, the legal character of Islam and of the British Constitution. I spoke, however, in respect to the last, not of its ancient principles, but of its present practice. England adopts the law of Rome, and in it the law of nations. It has the Feecial code: *petitio rerum*, *ultimatum*, *denunciatio belli*, are still terms of her jurisprudence,—are still legal documents requisite in every such transaction. The Chancellor of England is the great Feecial. The proclamation of war is made in Chancery; it is not a matter settled in a Cabinet Council, for England's law knows neither Cabinet Council nor Secretary of State. England's law knows no more of diplomacy than did the law of Rome; it no more entered into the conceptions of the founders of the one State than of the other to settle such matters by whispers, to maintain normal intrigues amongst other nations, or to suffer them amongst themselves. When a case did arise, then was it judiciously decided upon at home; and then was an ambassador expedited to the adverse party *pro hac vice*.

The founder of experimental philosophy has left us, in regard to politics, a legacy which has long lain dormant. His rule for the rectification of errors in this branch is,—“Stand upon the ancient ways.” If this had not been the ancient way, what discovery so great as its invention?

The practical value of the knowledge of other people is the rectification of errors or abuses at home: if we find sound principles and useful habits in a system which we despise, and amongst a people to whom we consider ourselves superior, our pride and prejudice afford additional arguments for such an adoption. This motive has influenced me in the foregoing sketch. I have hoped that the contrast would not be unavailing to open the eyes of my countrymen to this fatal perversion of modern times, which, if not rectified before it be too late, must, according to my judgment, end in the extinction of this Empire, after inflicting incalculable woes on the human race.

P. 12.—From the following extract from Condé's “History of the Arabs in Spain,” it would appear that Islam was offered as an alternative by which war might be avoided. In 963, the King Alhakem declared the obligations of the Muslims when they go on the jihad, or in maintaining frontiers, in this order of the day (given at Toledo):—“It is the duty of every good Muslim to go to the jihad, or war against unbelievers, enemies of our law: the enemies shall be invited to Islam, except when they, as on this occasion, begin the invasion: in the other case it shall be proposed to them either to become Muslims or to pay the established tribute, which the unbelievers under our government have to pay. If in the strife the enemies of our law should not be twice as many as the Muslims, the Muslim who should fly from battle would be vile, and sins against the law and our honour. In entering the enemies' country, kill no women and children, nor the old men without strength, nor the monks of secluded lives, except if they should do you an injury. Neither kill nor take prisoner him to whom you have given a safe-conduct, nor break the conditions and agreements made with them. The safe-conduct which any leader has given, *let all maintain it* . . . . The leaders shall use their discretion in recompensing those who serve with the army, though not fighting men, or *though of another faith* . . . . Let none come to the army or to the frontier who have father and mother, without the permission of both of them, unless in case of sudden necessity, when the chief duty is to hasten to the defence of the land, and at the call of the frontier governors.”—Chap. 89.

“Some of the Christians of Galicia solicited the king to declare war against other Christians, and many of the Vizirs of the Council and frontier governors desired an occasion for a rupture, knowing that the Christians were carrying on war amongst one another: but the King Alhakem answered them with those words of God's Book,—‘Be faithful in keeping your agreements, for God will require an account of them from you.’”—Chap. 90.

P. 13.—It is difficult to account for the origin of this mistake; the “Arabian Nights” are full of contradictions of it, and many Arabic books on religion end with a statement that they are for the benefit of the Muslims and the Muslimahs. Besides, travellers must have observed women going to the mosques.

P. 14.—The differences between the Sunnys and Shiachs are almost entirely political and national: what religious differences there are between the two rites are not the cause of their hostility. The Shiachs are Persians, for there are no Shiachs except in Persia, or where Persians have been. The hatred of the Persians to the Khalif Omer, and their habit of cursing his name alone of the three Khalifs whom they reject, is a remnant of Gheber feeling, or national irritation against the Arab general-in-chief, whose armies subdued their country. This national feeling might have died out if it had not been revived for political objects by Shah Ismail into a national feeling against the Turks. About the year 1200 Persia was overrun by those Turkish bands, from fear of whom the poet Saady “left his home and fled away;” and to this day the greater part of the Shah's subjects speak Turkish rather than Persian. Shah Ismail saw the progress of the Ottoman Turks, and that, on account of the majority of his subjects being Turks, Persia was likely to merge into the Ottoman Empire. He therefore set up the Shiah rite as a device to give a Persian nationality to the Turks within his frontiers; and by making religious distinctions between them and the other Mussulmans, he prevented their looking upon the Ottoman Sultan as the Commander of the Faithful. There were rafizys, or rejectors of the first three Khalifs, before his time, but they differed less from the other Mussulmans; they were few in number, and have disappeared from places where they formerly existed.

The Shiachs in India are descendants of Persians, and there are some others who were brought over to the Mussulman faith by Persians. It is hardly necessary to say that there is no schism in the four Sunny rites, which are equally orthodox, and only differ in the interpretation of small legal points.

P. 14.—It is surprising that writers should continue to charge the Arabs with the destruction of the *Library of the Ptolemies*, when it is well known that it was burned, with its four or seven hundred thousand volumes, during a military operation of Julius Cæsar. It is the more surprising, since Gibbon has thrown doubt on the story, on account of its own improbability and the absence of contemporary authority for it, either Christian or Mussulman; and has said that, even “if ‘the ponderous mass of Arian and Monophysite controversy were indeed consumed in the public baths, a philosopher may allow with a smile that it was ultimately devoted to the benefit of mankind.” The statement that the library was burned by the Arabs was never made till 600 years after the khalifate of Omer, when the Jacobite Christian, Gregory Abulfaraj of Malatia, revived the old story, and transferred it from the time of Julius Cæsar to that of the Arab conquest. Whilst Abulfaraj, in his history of the Sixth Dynasty, speaks less concisely than is usual to him of Cæsar and Cleopatra, and dwells on her love of science, and on the labours of Photinus, the arithmetician and geometrician, who adorned the end of the reign of the Ptolemies, he excludes all mention of the destruction of the library at that time, in order to transfer the story in such a manner as to gratify his feelings against the Arabs. He had also a bias in favour of his own sect, and mentions other Jacobites; and in his story of the library seems to have been desirous of giving prominence to Johannes Gramma-

---

#### NOTES OF THE EDITOR TO THE FOREGOING ESSAY.

THIS Essay was written in 1833; some additions were made to it in the few succeeding years, so that it has not been revised since some twenty years ago.

ticus, also a Jacobite, whom he represents as having asked Amr Ibn ul As for the books in the *Royal Library*. Moreover, the words attributed to the Khalif Omer only stand upon the authority of Abulfaraj, who quotes no testimony in support of them; and they seem like a recollection and travesty of the words of Seneca with regard to this event.

“Onerat discentem turba, non instruit: multoque satius est paucis te auctoribus tradere quam errare per multos. Quadringenta millia librorum Alexandria arserunt . . . . Non fuit elegantia illud aut cura, sed studiosa luxuria . . . . Vitiosum est ubique, quod nimium est.” Cæsar only says,—“Eodemque tempore, quæ consueverunt navigia per pontes ad incendia onerarium emittere, ad molem constituerunt.” And further on,—“Regem cohortatus ut parceret patriæ . . . . quæ turpissimis incendiis et ruinis deformata esset.” This is a case in which it is necessary to “Render to Cæsar.”

But supposing it to be true that the Saracens did burn the Alexandrian Library, how can this be made a charge by those who evinced no indignation at the burning of the Summer Palace, and the far greater loss sustained by that destruction of ancient monuments and uninterrupted records of the Chinese Empire?

P. 14.—“The Arabs showed the same tolerance, or still greater, in the other countries under their rule. They had allowed the Sicilians the free exercise of the Christian religion; they even permitted them to make public processions.” (Johannes de Johanne. *Codex diplom. Siciliae*, quoted by M. Libri.)—*Viardot*, vol. ii. p. 21.

In how many Protestant countries are Catholic processions permitted?

P. 15.—That the abuses of administration are capable of remedy, has been proved by their having been remedied by Sultan Murad IV., in consequence of the memorials addressed to him by Kutchy Bey, remonstrating against the abuses of the administration, particularly with respect to the disposal of the Timariots and Spahiliks to unfit persons, and the great increase of the palace officials and servants. The good effect of Sultan Murad's reforms lasted for some time. One of Kutchy Bey's maxims in his remonstrance against bribery and corruption deserves mention, as being in advance of the age, which seems to favour an opposite idea:—“Cursed is he that gives as well as he that takes a bribe.” As most of Kutchy Bey's writings would apply to the present time, and might again do good service, they were printed lately as a pamphlet, from one of the rare manuscript copies, and are now in general circulation at Constantinople.

The following extract contains an answer to another charge frequently made:—“Reprocher à l'Islam, à la doctrine de Mahomet, la décadence, peut-être irremédiable, où sont tombées les nations qui la pratiquent aujourd'hui, serait une injustice souveraine. La religion d'un peuple n'a pas avec sa puissance politique de relation directe, absolue et forcée. Autrement en lisant l'histoire des Romains, il faudrait donner la préférence au paganisme, qui vit s'élever la fortune et la grandeur de Rome, sur le Christianisme qui vit sans les empêcher sa chute et sa ruine. Le Koran, au contraire, a donné l'impulsion des conquêtes et de la civilisation à des races indolentes, vieilles dans une immobilité séculaire, qu'il fallait retremper et rajeunir.”—*Viardot*, “*Histoire des Arabes d'Espagne*.” Paris, 1851. Vol. i. p. 49.

## The Greek and the Russian Churches.

(WRITTEN IN 1852.)

ANY description of these bodies would no more represent the use to which they are applied, than a sketch of the figure of a chess-board convey the interest of a game. I can only pretend to give the naked outlines, from which the utmost benefit that can accrue may be the dispelling of some vulgar errors, and the indication of some of the obstructions presented to Russia from a quarter which is supposed to afford her only facilities and instruments.

If a Seminole philosopher were detected teaching his fellow-countrymen that Louis Napoleon had great chance of subjugating the Highlands of Scotland because he was the intimate friend of the Pope, who was the head of the Christians, and that the Highlanders were the most religious people belonging to that community, he would be but conveying to the Red Men of the New World a species of instruction very analogous to that which the White Men of the Old World receive respecting Russia, her designs and her instruments. There never was a more gross imposition than the representation of the Emperor of Russia as being Head of, or even in communion with, the Church of the East. The Church—if I can so prostitute the word—of Russia stands, in reference to the Church of Constantinople, as the English Reformation does to the Church of Rome; or would do if, in addition to denying the spiritual authority of the Pope, it substituted for High Priest, or for God, the King or Queen of England for the time being. Supposing such to have been the character of the Reformation in England, what would have been said of the Queen of England interfering to protect the Protestants of France? And supposing that England should, by any extraneous circumstances, grasp at the dominion of Europe, would not the danger arising from her ambition be infinitely greater for the communities of Protestants, from whom she would require the surrender of their faith, than for Catholics, from whom she could only wrest political supremacy?

This hypothesis is the state of the case in reference to Russia and the Greek Church. The proposition strikes directly at every received opinion. I boldly enunciate it, with the view of provoking inquiry and criticism in regard to the proofs I shall adduce. I speak with certain and perfect knowledge of the dispositions of every Christian community in the East, and in what I shall have to state I express their sentiments. I do not mean to say that such will be the answer they will give to a traveller's inquiry, but such they will avow when there is no reason for distrust and no opportunity for deception.

The Church of Constantinople separated itself from that of Rome under Photius. The metropolitan church of Kiof, the daughter of Constantinople, became the primate and mother of the churches of Russia; but, from the ninth century, Constantinople became the Rome of the East, and its spiritual authority remained undivided. The endeavours of the Popes never ceased to reunite Constantinople; and when the Byzantine emperors were endangered by the progress of the Turks, they sought, by reconciliation with Rome, to purchase the military support of the Western Christians. But the Greeks detested the Azymites more than they dreaded the Mussulmans; and the fall of Constantinople may, in a great measure, be referred to these weak endeavours to coerce the consciences of the people. The Greeks of the present day do not hesitate to acknowledge this truth, and even hold the Turkish conquest to have been a special interposition of Providence for the maintenance of the true faith.

At the time that Kiof became the religious metropolis of Russia, it was in like manner the political metropolis. The line of its princes was that which succeeded ultimately in uniting the dukedoms; and as they proceeded to incorporate and to extend their power, their seat was successively transferred to Vladimir and Moscow, in the centre of the proper Muscovite race.

The geographical structure of this region facilitates, to a degree unknown and inconceivable elsewhere, the institution of slavery. Mountains are, in our minds, always associated with freedom; but the contrary idea is not connected with plains, because the Kirghis and the Bedouin, the freest of tribes, live on plains, or wander over steppes: but those plains in the centre of which are placed Vladimir and Moscow, differ from the others in soil and in climate. The wastes of Arabia and the steppes of the Kirghis are not fitted for tillage; they present a scanty subsistence for flocks and herds; there are no cities, and no fixed habitations; the people roam and circulate rather than dwell; they are hardy and enterprising, and rendered by nature bold and free. The products are not such as to render despotism profitable, and the children of the soil are not such as to render it possible. A people of tents is a people of nature; institutions are simple, and men sharp-witted. They can no more be overreached than over-awed by a governing system.

The plains of Muscovy are a rich alluvial soil; the people is, consequently, essentially agricultural and fixed. The dead level of the land is paralleled by an equally deadening uniformity of circumstances; the body is inured to toil, and the mind immersed in torpor. The productiveness of the soil facilitates the accumulation of riches, and the governing power is unrestrained in its action by physical impediments: insurrection finds no protection in mountain gorges—patriotism no immunity in impassable wastes.

Beyond this there is the long duration of winter; the people, shut up at home, are exposed to the visits of the executive force, travelling by snow almost as easily as by the railway. For their hibernation, preparation has to be made by storing the abundant harvest, that ripens with extraordinary rapidity during the summer months. The granaries are the pledges of the people's fidelity. The Russians have never known the art of secreting grain by burying it in the soil; that unobserved protection of the independence of man under all the great systems of antiquity, and in the East at present. Thus it is that the plains of Muscovy afford a peculiar and natural basis for the erection of despotic power. Of this edifice we have seen the plan laid as a diagram, attempted as an experiment, and obtained as a result. There, the people have neither means of resistance nor opportunity of flight. Like the Egyptians under Joseph, they dispose of birthright against food on a tacit contract renewed every twelvemonth. Elsewhere, the throne of despotism balances on a sword; here, it reposes on the buttresses of hunger and cold. One support alone remained to popular rights—the Church. That support too vanished, when the centre was transferred to this cradle of subjection from amongst the pastoral and patriarchal tribes of the South, ennobled and humanised by association with the friendly horse and the dutiful camel. Amongst populations themselves reduced to the condition of beasts of burden, and inured to unvarying and cheerless toil, servitude must be religious no less than political. The Church so transplanted has lost its franchises and its rights—its faculty of defending the people or itself. In the early contests between Rome and Constantinople, Kiof had endeavoured to escape from the supremacy of either; and in like manner the new Church of Moscow endeavoured to escape from the supremacy of Kiof. These dissensions were comparatively insignificant

whilst the Tartar yoke weighed on the land. The Church was then held in the highest reverence by the Grand Dukes, because it was held in respect by the Tartars; and in fact it served as the protection of the people, and finally became the chief instrument for their emancipation. It consequently rose to a position of the greatest influence and authority. As the power of the Tartars was broken, that of the Church took its place, and the Grand Dukes had no sooner relieved themselves from the former than they applied themselves to undermine the latter; and with this view supported the usurpations of the Church of Moscow.

The first prelate who entitled himself "Metropolitan of Moscow" was Theognost, in 1330, but without denying the supremacy of Kiof. In 1462 the title was first assumed of "Metropolitan of all Russia," on the ground that Kiof had a distinct metropolitan subject to Lithuania.\* Under the Grand Duke Basil the Blind, Moscow was erected into a Patriarchate,† on the plea that Kiof and Constantinople had both yielded to Rome.‡ Religious dissensions now became embittered, both by these internal measures and by the reaction of the feuds of the East and of Europe, when a new element was thrown in, in the form of a translation of the Scriptures by the Patriarch Nikon, in which passages bearing upon church government were translated to suit the purposes of the Court, and became the basis of the new system of servile theology. The priesthood, not of Kiof only, but of all Russia, was indignant; many refused to use the volume or permit it to be used: its adoption was enforced by penal laws. This was the first religious persecution in Russia, and the recusants holding to the old faith against the new interpolations were called *Starorivtze*, or "old believers."

Shortly afterwards, Ivan the Third, on the capture of Casan, took the title of "Czar of all the Russias;" a title not of new invention, but of common use from the earliest times, and implying a sacerdotal no less than a religious supremacy. It was under this prince that the seed of the present Russia was sown, and, indeed, that the germ expanded itself. By his marriage with the Princess Sophia, and although she had brothers, he assumed to be legitimate successor to the Empire of Constantine, and quartered its arms. She was given to him by the Pope, whom he encouraged in the belief of effecting a reunion with the Eastern Church. He excited Germany by the prospect of the decay of the Ottoman Power, offering himself as a providential instrument for the accomplishment of its destruction. By the expulsion of the Golden Horde he likewise pretended to the inheritance of the Tartars in the East; and under his successor we find communications opened with India and China. On the fall of Constantinople he gathered in the remnants of that State, and pretended to the headship, for Russia, of the Christians of the East, presenting her to them as their future deliverer.

Under his successor, Ivan the Fourth, great strides were made in the same direction. He extended the limits of Russia by the capture of Astrakan and the subjugation of the Nogai Tartars. He finally extinguished the rights of the free cities,

\* Mouravief, "History of the Russian Church," p. 80.

† See note at the end of the Essay.

‡ Isidore, patriarch of Kiof, had attended the Council of Florence.

sacking the last of them, Pskof. He reduced the nobles to the lowest condition of servitude, and in his reign, appropriately designated one of terror, every vestige of internal independence was swept away.

Under Theodore, the deposed Patriarch of Constantinople, Jeremiah came to Moscow. He lent himself to an inauguration of the Patriarch of Moscow, and declared his independence of that of Constantinople. This occurred in 1588. Jeremiah received a large sum of money for this service.

Peter having left this Patriarchate vacant (as, of course, to the Czars belonged the filling up of an office they had created), was at last called upon by the chief dignitaries of the Church to fill it. It was then he rose, and striking his forehead with his fist, uttered the memorable words, "It is here that there is for you a Master, a Patriarch, and a God." On this he himself officiated at the altar.

Thus by a sacrilege was effected the fusion of temporal and spiritual power, and another, Jeremiah, patriarch of Constantinople, was found to give to it such sanction as the venal adhesion of a displaced prelate could afford. These measures affected solely the Church of Moscow, which henceforward came to be designated as Antichrist by a large proportion of the nation that would not conform, including nearly the whole of the populations of the south dependent on Kiof: the distinction was drawn between the *Official Church* and the *True Church*. From that hour the Russian State contained in its breast an immedicable wound; the knowledge of the sufferings endured and the blood shed has, by the system of government, been concealed from the eyes of the rest of the world: but the facts connected with the revolt of Pougatcheff could not be concealed, however much its causes may have been misunderstood. It was a Starovirtze insurrection, and with the slightest conduct on the part of its leader it must have upset the throne of the Czars.

The Church property was now confiscated; the clergy received pay from the State; a military organisation was given to it; the priests took army rank and received decorations; and the Holy Synod was instituted to discharge functions of the Patriarch under the directions of a general officer. Its duties were now restricted to the inculcation of abject obedience. The Czar, not in his quality of Patriarch, but of Prince, was declared the Vicegerent of God upon earth; his name was printed in the same form as that of God the Father and of Christ, and his subjects were taught that virtue and religion consisted in the sacrifice of their substance and their lives to the fulfilment of his decrees. The oath administered to the army was not, as with the rest of the world, to obey lawful orders and to *defend* the frontiers, but to obey every order and to *extend* the frontiers. This superstition was not, as in similar cases (if there be a similar case) of human corruption, engendered by oppression, but based on imposture; it was proposed and accepted as a means of advancing the pretensions put forward by Ivan the Third to the succession of Rome in the West, and of the Tartars in the East. The Russian Church is not Erastian, in the sense of sanctioning acts of government; it invests the governing power with the ecclesiastical attributes, transferring to the chief of the State even those of the Lord of the Universe. It does not trouble itself with psychological disputations respecting emanations of the Divine Essence and its manifestations in the flesh. A Czar is not a

living Buddha, adored on account of a supposed spiritual abstraction; but the Czar, as a monarch, and because reigning, is the centre of faith and the object of worship; believed in for what he *does*, worshipped by executing his decrees.\*

This is not the first time that such blasphemy has been witnessed. The Assyrian monarchs so seated themselves upon the altar, and required the prostrate nations to worship them, not as one of the humble array of gods amongst whom the Cæsars were enrolled, but as God upon earth. No wonder that the Slaavs should claim affinity with this same people, and that the Russian language should afford this very interpretation of that monarch's name.†

Nor are these pretensions advanced under the secrecy of priestly instruction and of the confessional; they are loudly asserted and ostentatiously proclaimed in the face of Europe, in a work published at St. Petersburg in 1840, and entitled "Civilisation and Russia:"‡—

"The will of the Emperor is the most literal expression of Divine Order transmitted to the earth, whose Imperial person is recognised as the living head of the State and of the Church, and whose decision no written word of the past can bind."

It might be supposed that a people thus deprived of all incentives would sink into a political sea of mud, and that there would result a condition utterly unresisting, but capable of nothing. However, that wonderful thing, the human mind, is always working out for itself unanticipated results, and, placed in new circumstances, ever develops new features. Political prostration has, by discipline, become military strength; and religious prostration, through fanaticism, is transmuted to ambition. Thus has the Muscovite race, by the deprivation of all the objects which brace the arm of nations, or their spirit to heroic deeds, been filled with an unparalleled energy, and a desire to assert their lordship over the human race. "The Muscovite," says a remarkable writer, "pays himself for his present degradation by the hopes of his future supremacy."

The chief occasion is afforded by the existence of co-religionaries in neighbouring empires, subject, in the one, to the rule of the Mussulman, and in the other to that of the still more detested Catholic. These populations do not know that the Church of Moscow has denied God and put the Czar in His place. They look, besides, to the Czar as their *political* protector, and are glad to find that he has the support of a Church which they imagine to be identical with their own. What the Russians apply to him as Head of the Church they understand as Head of the Christians; and to them Russia is identified with faith, as in Russia faith is identified with the Czar. The Russian *Church* is announced to them as the Oriental Church, and by it is to be conferred political emancipation. The writer who speaks to the Russians of the will of the Emperor in the words I have quoted, thus addresses himself to the Oriental Church beyond the frontiers of Russia:—

"In the East, as in the West, for the whole communion of the Greeks (*subjects of foreign powers*), for the Serb, for the Armenian, for the Montenegrin, for the Georgian, Russia is the Spiritual Life, the Image of God in her Church,—the Social Life, bringing Emancipation, Regeneration, and

\* From Russian Catechism.

† Nebuchadnezzar—Ne Bugh na da Tzar—*There is no God but the Czar.*

‡ By Count Gurowski.

Perfection. In the bosom of the Russian Church, Faith has endured united and pure, and it will sustain and re-temper the faculties of humanity. That Church alone, amongst all others, has remained in harmony with Order, Hierarchy, and Government; alone has it preserved its Unity, while all others have lost it.\*

Here Russia is presented to them as the personification of the Church; she is there personified as their Church. There the Emperor is visible head of State and Church; that Church and its law are called in to give authority to the living and reigning head, or itself instantly annihilated, for his decisions are not to stand upon any law, or to be bound by any. For the *Greeks*, Russia is to be truth in this world and salvation in the next; all other professions as heretical or infidel. The thousand emissaries of Russia are always repeating the same thing. The Mussulmans are the "Empire of Hagar;" the Catholics profess a "dog's faith." But on the borders of the White Sea (the Mediterranean), where England is chiefly apprehended, the art is peculiarly observable. There there is no rancour of contending creeds: the object is effected by epithets. I have often heard the expression at Constantinople, "Are you Christian or English?" which may equally be interpreted, "Are you Christian or *infidel*?" or, "Are you Russian or English?"

If there were subjects of the Russian Crown who abhorred and repudiated this blasphemy, there were those also who equally detested and abjured the external ferocity and internal prostration with which it was associated. We find both characters in the Starovirtze, adherents of the original faith. They are reformers of the public immorality; they combat the general corruption by their life and conversation. If an exile is succoured on his path, if a prisoner is relieved in his want, if an accused person is aided in his defence, the helping hand is sure to be that of a Starovirtz. With them have taken refuge freedom and charity, expelled elsewhere from the land; and the apparently triumphant progress of the system furnishes daily increasing occasions for the trial of their faith and the exercise of their benevolence.

They have also their partisans, for they have many favourable who do not belong to their body. These partisans are to be found amongst the burghers of all the cities; amongst the merchants of every class; in all the branches of industry, and even in the army: they are not wanting in the general administration, and they have had a representative in the supreme government. From the comprehensive nature of their tenets, every class and every department may at one time or another be reduced to seek their support, and by the total dissimilarity of their ideas from the opinions of the West, that support has no character of conspiracy. Opposing the present union of Church and State, they are in turn the allies of each of the bodies whom that union may oppress; seeking the restoration of the ancient rights of the Boyars and of the prelates, being opposed to the serfdom of the people, objecting to foreign conquest, they are, so to say, the born protectors of each class as it is oppressed, and a living protest against every violence as it is committed. Being destitute of all character of confederacy, and of all organisation for action, it cannot be compromised into acts which would enable the Government to extinguish it in blood.

There being nothing similar in Europe—there being, indeed, nothing similar to the government, by antagonism to which it subsists—it is but natural that it should have escaped observation. It is equally so that the Russian Cabinet should have taken every care to conceal this its great secret. One of the methods which it has most successfully employed to that end is the publication of works hostile to itself, where every other possible charge is brought save this. I take, for instance, the work of Turghenief, where, through three volumes of vituperation, not a word is said respecting the Starovirtze, and the whole question of religion is excluded, except in the last paragraph, where the truth is entirely perverted.

Russia has also taken care to stock the reading public with materials. There is the work of Mouravief—a general officer in active service—on the Church! This book is a careful adjustment of the circumstances, so as to prevent the past facts from being understood. What I have stated I have learned from refugees in Turkey, not one of whom was acquainted with a European language. From them I have also learnt that the Starovirtze of Southern Russia had prepared a petition to the Czar, praying to be allowed to emigrate into Turkey if not permitted to follow in peace their religion at home.

The Greek Christians of Turkey are indeed themselves Starovirtze; they are under the Patriarchate of Constantinople, and not under that of Kiof: but if the Russian sway were established at Constantinople the position of both would be identical: they actually have become identified by a most extraordinary revolution that has occurred in the last few years, and which has rendered Constantinople the metropolis of the dissidents of Russia.

In treating of the Cossacks, I have shown how they had met the attempts of the Russian Cabinet to assimilate their political administration with that of the remainder of the Empire. This population is the stronghold of the Starovirtze: it was the extinction of that sect that the Government had chiefly in view, and while it showed itself disposed and able to resist administrative innovation, it was judged to be more vulnerable in matters of religion. Between the official and the old Church there was no dogmatic difference; a new profession of faith was not required, and if the one priesthood could be substituted for the other the assimilation was complete. This was then the scheme adopted, and it apparently presented great facilities for execution. Hitherto it had been a constant practice to impose one of the official priests upon a parish, but the result was that the Church became instantly deserted.\* It was now resolved to convert the siege into a blockade, and to starve them out by the denial of the offices and consolations of religion. The priesthood of Malo-Russia is recruited from the monasteries of the interior; the Government seized and deported the monks and bishops, especially those of Saratov and Kramenchuk, and enrolling them as a regiment sent them to die in the marshes of Lankeran on the Caspian. As the priests died off the parishes re-

\* The Emperor looks strictly into these matters. On the occasion of one of his visits he went into a church, which he found crowded, but which on a former visit he had found deserted. On inquiry, he discovered that not one of the congregation belonged to the parish. It having been found impossible to constrain the parishioners, who were Starovirtze, to attend, a congregation was brought for the occasion from a distance.

\* Count Gurowski's "Civilisation and Russia."

mained without the means of baptism, confirmation, marriage, confession, extreme unction, and burial, and were placed irrevocably between the alternatives of absolute infidelity or submission.

Such was the plight in which I found a Cossack settlement in Turkey, where I first became acquainted with these circumstances. They were exceedingly devout, but had no priest; and when I inquired the reason, they broke out into most vehement abuse of all priests, saying they would as soon see the Emperor himself as a priest in their village.

There were, however, Cossacks high placed in the Turkish Government, who cast about for a remedy. In the first instance, their views extended no further than to the Cossack colonies in Turkey; but circumstances soon gave to them an unexpected development. The Porte entered into their views, and communicated upon the subject with Vienna, which was at that moment very cordial towards Turkey, and where the Porte knew, though the Austrians did not, that this sect existed.

At the same time (1771) that the Kalmuks, the followers of the Dalai Lama, fled to the Yellow Sea, a body of Starovirtze had penetrated into Galicia, where, under the name of Ruthenians, they remained undisturbed and unnoticed till the year 1845, when the discovery of them was made by the Archduke Ferdinand in the centre of his government, with as much surprise as if they had been Red Indians. Troops were sent to drive them out, but, bribing the officers, they gained time to appeal to Vienna. One of their priests, Milaradoff, found access to Prince Metternich, and explained to him the real circumstances of the case. Just at this time the communication above referred to took place with Constantinople, the object of which was the establishment of a Starovirtze Bishopric in the Austrian dominions, as Turkey would not venture on so bold a measure herself. The Austrian Arch-chancellor felt all its importance, and did not refuse his concert, but on the condition that the Porte would find an already consecrated Bishop of the Constantinople Church, who would conform in all points to the Starovirtze faith: in such case the Galician district would be converted into a Bishopric and the Prelate inducted. Such a Bishop was found for the consideration of 200,000 ducats; he was despatched to Vienna, received the Imperial *exequatur*, repaired to his new diocese, and in the month of June, 1846, laid hands on eight priests, consecrating them as bishops, and on three hundred laymen, who had repaired from all parts to await their consecration as priests. The Russian Government was no sooner informed of the step than it addressed indignant remonstrances to Vienna, but it was too late. She demanded the extradition of the refugees; but the new Bishops had repaired to Constantinople, and she was constrained to be satisfied with the abolition of the Bishopric (the Bishop was sent in September, under surveillance, to Cylli, in Styria), and the engagement was taken to permit the entrance of no more Ruthenians, and several who have since passed the frontier have been seized and given up.

At the period of the conquest of Constantinople by the Turks, the dependence of the Church of Russia on that of Constantinople was considered by both parties as affording powerful means of action to the Sultan in Russia. What I have before stated would suffice to show, that at that period there was no religious jealousy between Mussulmans and Christ-

ians. The Church at Constantinople, far from suffering by the Mussulman conquest, acquired prerogatives and authority such as it had never known under the Christian Emperors. It was interfered with neither in dogma nor in ceremony, and, moreover, power was vested directly in its hands. The priests everywhere became municipal officers; the prelates became judges in many civil and in all ecclesiastical cases; and the Patriarchate was erected into a supreme court for its nation, the sentence of which was executed without pretence to revision, except in capital cases, by the Turkish authorities. It had, moreover, administrative functions, and apportioned the taxes between the provinces. To actual power was added dignity and respect. The conqueror Mahomed II. himself held the stirrup of the Patriarch when he came to visit him. Nothing then was more natural than an alliance of the Church with the Mussulman Government, and the Russian Czar had justly to apprehend the political action of the priesthood sent from Constantinople throughout his dominions. In applying himself to ward off this danger was commenced that system of cajolery, and framed that scheme of perfidy and corruption, which in aftertimes succeeded in reversing upon Turkey those very dangers. But the system has been worked to excess and pushed beyond endurance, so that now the wheel has completely gone round; and the fourth century, at present completed, brings us back exactly to the position of 1453, when the Churches of Russia are supplied from Constantinople with priests whose sympathies are with the Sultan and against the Czar. This is one of the necessities which force Russia into action, and which render the destruction of the Ottoman Empire a condition of her own existence.

The revolution to which I have referred affects indeed but a most insignificant portion of the subjects of Turkey, but circumstances of another kind have alienated from Russia each of the other populations professing the Greek faith. These I shall now pass rapidly in review.

The creation of the official Church in Russia might be conducive to the ends of internal despotism, but that very despotism had itself its end in foreign conquest. The official Church was therefore an instrument forged for the conquest of the Byzantine Empire. By bringing Church and Government into one line, adhesion to the faith became equivalent to allegiance to the Prince. The Patriarch of Moscow was to be substituted for that of Constantinople (possessed by infidels); and when the Patriarch was merged in the Czar, the sovereign of Russia was the legitimate sovereign of the professors of the Greek Church, subject to the usurpation of the Mussulman Sultan. So long as the administration of Russia did not touch those provinces, the suppression of the Church by the State was not observed, and in the disorders of Turkey the Christians naturally turned to a foreign prince, who, in claiming their spiritual allegiance, offered them political protection. Under this illusion the whole country was opened to the propagandism of the priesthood. The Patriarchate of Constantinople fell into the absolute dependence of the Russian Embassy. The Greeks, insignificant indeed by numbers, but of real importance by intrigue, apparent importance, and volubility, invaded all its offices and filled its prelacy. They appeared everywhere as Russian agents and creatures. The 12,000,000 of the Greek Church in



European Turkey, of Turkish, Roumain, and Slaav blood, detested the Greeks as a race; so that the association alienated those populations from Russia.\* This explains the simultaneous and unremitting endeavours made during the last thirty years by Wallachia, Bulgaria, and Serbia, to emancipate themselves not from the Patriarchate of Constantinople, but from the Greek Prelacy, and to substitute natives for these adventurers. This was effected in Serbia soon after they had acquired their independence. A similar change was made in Bulgaria, as one of the reparatory measures of 1851.† It has also been one of the reforms most urgently demanded on the north of the Danube. A change in the constitution of the Patriarchate has ensued, as may have been gathered from the recent declaration in favour of the Sultan against the professed protection of the Emperor of Russia. What a contrast with the parallel case of 1821, when the Patriarch was the first victim of a similar declaration, and was hanged as a malefactor before his own door!

But it may be supposed, that if the other populations were alienated by this preference of the Greeks, the Greeks themselves must have been conciliated. The Greeks are far too astute to work for Russia, save for their own individual benefit. No population knows Russia so well; none detest her so thoroughly; none would suffer more by the triumph of the Russians or the fall of the Turks. Their services have been indeed of immense value, but it is only as practising on others: she can use them as local agents, as dragomans at Constantinople, and as Turkish ambassadors in London and Paris, but they are of no service to her whatever as a people; and for this reason, that they do not exist as one: they did so, indeed, in the Morea and the islands, but these are no longer included in the Turkish dominions, and we shall presently see how they stand affected. There is in Thessaly a Greek population, which amounts to about half a million; that is the only one, and even that one did not take part in the Greek insurrection, when every chance was open to it. Elsewhere the Greeks are but shopkeepers, or brokers, or priests. They have no country, they have no cities, they have no mountains, they do not bear arms, they are mere pedagogues or huxters.

I cannot better illustrate the universal defection, in a religious sense, from Russia, than by the Church measures adopted by independent Greece, so soon as that State was constituted on its own basis. Russia, of course, expected to establish there her official Church; it was impossible that it should remain dependent on Constantinople; an independent Church of the Morea was a pretension too visionary for a moment to be admitted; she consequently despatched from Odessa by a frigate, through the Dardanelles, a model sacerdotal establishment, to be set up in the Russian Embassy. The Greeks had, from the very commencement of the War of Independence, been especially jealous of her interference; their first appeal to Europe, through England, was for protection against that interference: they declared through the then minister, Rhodios, that they would rather perish to a man than submit to any

conditions dictated by her; they said that they knew her purposes and her perfidy, and preferred to her protection the despotism of the Turks. The same opinions were energetically expressed by Mavrocordato in an anonymous letter, published at the time, in the "Courier de Smyrne." England, however, as usual, forced that protection upon them, enabled the Russian faction to establish itself, and sanctioned for Europe the belief that Russia commanded the affections of the Greeks. With this knowledge there will remain nothing enigmatic in the fact, that the Greeks should resolve to anticipate the plan of uniting them to the official Church by instituting an independent Synod of their own. King Otho had not yet arrived, but his place was occupied by a Regency of four members, one of whom only (Armansperg) was Russian; the majority, struck by the representations made to them, hastened to pass a law for the creation of the Synod. The exasperation of Russia knew no bounds; the majority of this Regency, constituted by a European Treaty, was expelled by violence, troops being landed from the Russian squadron to enforce the decree in case they had offered resistance. As usual, the order came from London, and the pretext that was employed was, that they were "Russians."\*

Having thus, I trust, effectually disposed of the revolutionary element afforded in Turkey by religion, in so far as it can be handled by Russia, I now come to the condition of the dissidents internally.

A revolution may be made without any reason, but the religious constitution of Islam never could afford a reason for the revolt of its subjects of another faith. They are, indeed, rayahs; but the condition of rayah is not one of disqualification or dishonour, as I have elsewhere shown. In point of social etiquette there is a great distinction, but this is one belonging to the habits of the people, and you might as well attempt to attack caste in India. The Mussulmans are a superior caste: they have become so practically, not having been so by the original constitution, for to this day those social distinctions do not exist between Arabs of different creeds. The Christians, as Churches, possess in Turkey privileges unknown to any Church in Europe, whilst in religious matters the congregation is in possession of rights of which they have been deprived in Christendom. Here alone is to be seen to-day the constitution of the Apostolic times; here the flock elects the pastor, and the Sultan confirms invariably the election: no monarch has ever usurped, from either the consistency or laity, the nomination to bishoprics; and no King or Pope by Concordat has disposed of them to each other. The Christians may, in evil times, have been subject to misrule and to oppression, but it is not as Christians that they have suffered; when animosity has been aroused against them by acts of foreign Powers, or their connexion with them, again they have suffered as traitors, not as Christians.†

\* At the Revolution in 1844 the Greek Church was re-united to the Patriarchate of Constantinople.—*Editor.*

The details of these transactions will be found in the history of the Regency, published by Messrs. Abel and Maurer, two of its members, with the concurrence of General Heideck. Further and confirmatory details will be found in the work on Greece of Professor Thiersch, tutor to King Otho, sent to Greece before him, and whose return to that country was prevented by the order of the English Minister.

† An Instruction of the Propaganda, in 1849, to the Lebanon, explained for the guidance of priests in the confessional that acts which would be criminal against a Christian King are not less so against a Mussulman Sultan.

\* The Bulgarians, amounting to about 5,000,000, are of Turkish origin. They were the original Tartars of the Volga, whence they have derived their name.

† The Bulgarian Church has recently joined the Church of Rome.—*Editor.*

Men are not by nature informed and wise, and it does not follow that a people should be content because it has reason to be so. Men may enjoy benefits without knowing them, and, still more, be ignorant of contrasts which would make them doubly dear. The Christians of Turkey are not aware that they enjoy the benefits of toleration, because they have never belonged to a European Government; they do not know that they have the benefit of being free from taxation to a dominant Church, nor that they have the enjoyment of any privilege in the fact of electing their pastors: the clergy are not aware that they are in possession of singular power in their judicial and administrative functions; but how is it that Europeans do not see those things? How is it that they do not enlighten them regarding these contrasts? However, there are those who are neither caught by such fallacies nor backward to expose them. In a controversial work against the Church of Rome, published at Constantinople in 1850, the most learned of the modern Greeks writes as follows:—

“In reference to the charge brought against us of our being subject to the august descendants of Osman, ‘whose political influence,’ according to M. Villereau, ‘has entirely swallowed up the ecclesiastical power,’ we may remark that the Ottoman Government does not in the least degree prejudice our religion; neither has it, indeed, at any time up to the present day, in any way injured it. Every nation is under the obligation of submitting, after God, to a temporal power.

\* \* \* \*

“Our Government grants us freedom of worship and the public performance of our rites, and secures to us the enjoyment of these privileges through the political authority with which it has invested the Patriarchs and Archbishops.

“The internal administration of the Church has at no period been interfered with, the election of the four Patriarchs and of their bishops having ever been freely made by their own synods. The career of religious instruction lies open to the holy ministers, and even the schools for public instruction enjoy the patronage of Government. If at times, and in some places, far from the centre of administration, or in the midst of troubles, unruly men have raised their barbarous hands upon churches and schools, the Government, as soon as apprised of such occurrences, has remedied the evil and punished the guilty.

“The celebration of divine worship in our holy temples is performed with so much pomp, that a Carmelite monk, nearly two hundred years ago, after being present at one of our ceremonies, expressed his admiration as follows:—‘On the 4th of January, 1679, I was present, in the name of Mr. De Nointel, during the celebration of mass by the Patriarch Dionysius at Constantinople. I cannot imagine that anything more imposing and magnificent could have been exhibited on this day, even in the most flourishing times of the Greek Church.’

“Were we to be so presumptuous as to pry into the wonderful and inscrutable decrees of Divine Providence, we might discover that the preservation of the Orthodox and Catholic Church was secured through the downfall itself of the Roman Empire. For who does not at once perceive that ultimately the Orthodox remnant would have been rent in twain by those unfortunate sovereigns who, listening to the suggestions of the Pope and other European Governments, saw no hope of preserving their power save by apostasy, and by abjuring the orthodox, the catholic, and the apostolic faith of their forefathers; they contrived to maintain themselves for a short time by gradually corrupting that Church, and by the appointment of Patriarchs, such as the fraudulently elected Beccos, and Gregory the pseudo-Gennadius? Who does not see that this must have continued, whichever of the Western Powers had obtained the ascendancy? Were it not that the narrative would cast ignominy on the name of Christian, and had I paper to waste and time to spare, I might, from the materials of Frank historians themselves, revive the recollection of the many and furious persecutions, the coercive measures, exiles, imprisonments, tortures, martyrdoms, which our immortal forefathers had to endure, whenever the Papal rule under the cloak of a Michael or a Beccos, or the Frank Crusaders, especially in Syria, Cyprus, Crete, and even at Constantinople

under Cardinal Pelagius, prevailed; and thus point out the tyrannical violence with which the Pope’s blessing hand was used for the destruction of Orthodoxy.

\* \* \* \*

“Shortly before the fall of Constantinople the Pope’s emissary assured the distracted Constantine, who had employed his aid, that this would be granted on condition of his receiving again Gregory Mummus, whom he had expelled for professing Latin doctrines. At this critical emergency, when both the Emperor and his people, reduced to the last extremity, were on the verge of renouncing their faith, the interposition of the sharp-edged sword of the invincible Ottomans was evidently providential. It cut asunder at one blow, and for ever, the chain which impiety had cast around the neck of the Church professing orthodoxy—the Church which on this occasion washed off by her martyrs’ blood, whatever stains or defilements had polluted her in her contact with the temptations of heresy; and now rejoices in presenting herself before God, ‘purified, holy, immaculate, having neither spot nor wrinkle.’

“The throne of Constantinople had become by heresy a snare unto the feet of religion: how, then, should not every one of the faithful exclaim with the Psalmist, ‘The snare is broken asunder and we are delivered. Our help is in the name of the Lord!’ For this it is we do praise, and must ever praise, with thanksgivings, the Almighty, who has provided us with, not as M. Villereau would have it, ‘a scourge,’ but in reality with a severe master, but a faithful guardian—the Ottoman Government, which proved instrumental in cutting off every connexion between us and the nations of the West, and thus effectually preventing the corruption which threatened our immaculate religion.”—*Παπιστηριών Ἑλέγχων*, tom. i. p. 245.

The same writer, speaking of the constitution of the Church, thus proceeds:—

“The Conqueror and his illustrious successors, down to the present Sovereign, have invariably invested the persons of the Patriarchs with plenipotentiary dignity whenever the constitution interferes with religion, or even religion with the constitution. Likewise legislators and expounders of the law are of opinion, that the *Sheriat-i-Sheriff* in sundry cases, such as matrimony, affinity by marriage, inheritance, when it decides differently from the law of the Christians and the precepts of the Gospel, or the maxims of the Apostles, shall not be enforced, in order not to wound the consciences of the Christian subjects, whose liberty of worship is declared inviolable; and they therefore invested their spiritual pastors, such as Patriarchs and Bishops, with the power of pronouncing judgment, and so punishing the disobedient and unruly.”

I have now to point out a recent infraction of those ancient and venerable institutions; but the incident, however it may affect the future fate of Turkey, confirms what I have said respecting its character. It has deviated from its rules, but it is a rule from which it has deviated; the deviation has sprung neither from pride nor from pretension, but from weakness, and the crime has been imposed by the Powers of the West. What I am about to relate ought to be easily apprehended by Englishmen, since it is no other than a similar act to that which was designated a Papal *Aggression*, by which this great Empire was for the space of a year agitated, distracted, and convulsed.

A Papal rescript, similar to that of 1850 for England, partitioned the Catholic Armenians into six Bishoprics, appointing Bishops thereto. Turkey, like England, submitted, but only in consequence of the coercion applied to it by the French Government: but observe the difference of sense of the people; the usurpation of the Pope was not denounced by the Mussulman as an attack upon the sovereignty of the Sultan, and it was not received as a boon by the Armenians. The Sultan resisted it as an oppression of his Catholic subjects, and the Armenians resisted it as an usurpation on their own rights. There was no animosity between Christian and Mussulman; no Grand Vizier published inflammatory letters; no

ministry was displaced; no absurd or inoperative bill was carried for a prerogative that never was touched, and the injured party was not left at once unprotected and vituperated; no greater triumph was given to the Pope, beyond all his other triumphs, in a triumph over the mind and the Divan of Turkey.\* The difference of this common sense resulted from the natural position in which the Christian Churches in Turkey stood, and from their possession and exercise of ancient and immemorial rights. No man could there be deceived with reference to the nature of the Pope's rescript; it was clearly the abrogation of the right of the community to nominate its own religious officers, and the subversion of their corporate authority. Who, then, could have imagined that a regulation touching titles could affect the wrong, or touch the matter in any way at all? Who could be so insane as to suppose that the Sultan's authority was compromised therein, except in so far as that a particular class of his subjects might be injured?

A Roman Catholic Bishop in Turkey does not stand in the same position as one in England; he is not a nominee of a foreign priest whom the Government does not choose to recognise, but being the elected of the people and their administrator he becomes thereby a functionary of the Crown. The Porte has no Concordat, and no treaty with the Pope, but it does not say—"Do what you like with your spiritual subjects for I do not profess your faith;" but it says to its subjects—"Write to the Pope what letters you like, and read, if you are disposed, what letters he sends; but no prelate is to rule you, except when he has received my firman of investiture, and that firman is granted only on your own election." Consequently, the rescript of the Pope fell just as dead a letter as if it had constituted so many pashalics or nominated so many pashas. But when the French Government was known to press the matter, and it was apprehended that the Porte would yield, the Armenians interposed by petition, praying that the firman might not be granted. France, however, persevered. Simultaneously a fictitious quarrel was got up between her and Russia, on the subject of the Holy Sepulchre; the instruction to M. Lavalette, received from the Pope himself, was to yield on the latter question and to press the former. The Russian Government, who certainly had as much interest in the one as in the other, dropped the one and pressed the other. England then, in the midst of the full frenzy of its "Papal Aggression Bill," recommends a "temporising policy;" that is, submission; or, in other words, the granting of a firman, which would have been equivalent to the inducting by Royal ordinance of Cardinal Wiseman as Archbishop of Westminster. But all this would not have sufficed unless an Armenian Primate (Artim Bey), to whom that people had entrusted its care, and who belonged to the hollow system of Egypt, had at the last moment turned round, misleading the Porte by that very authority entrusted to him to oppose the measure. Thus was extorted this fatal concession, not by infatuation and fanaticism, but by art and intrigue, in which Russia nowhere appears, having her work done for her, as usual, by her miserable tools. Turkey may arouse the fanaticism of her Christian subjects, but it is only in so far as she yields to the threats and counsels of her European protectors, or degenerates into a resemblance with

them of character and infatuation. The following letter from a Roman Catholic Ecclesiastic, often referred to in the discussions on the Papal Bill, cannot fail to be read with interest:—

"Lavalette came, before going to Constantinople, to receive his instructions from His Holiness, and though there were the two questions, that of the Bishops and that of the Holy Places at Jerusalem, the first was considered the one of importance. His means of carrying it were at that time Artim Bey, the very man upon whom the adversaries of the Bishops relied!

"The clergy will now see the avenues of preferment closed against them, and will be reduced to dependence on a distant court, and from it solicit all favours through the French Ambassador or Archbishop. If this were but a solitary phenomenon it would be deplorable; but how much more so when it is one of a series of measures tending to destroy throughout the world, in the Catholic clergy, all freedom of action and all spirit of independence, placing them under the direct management and direct nomination of the Propaganda!

"To Turkey this is peculiarly dangerous, as she has no representatives to watch the manœuvres of the Powers who direct the movements of Rome. It has hitherto been the policy of the Porte to prevent its Catholic subjects from being subject to foreign interference; and who could have dared to press it against so triumphant a reason for its refusal as this,—'We only give firmans for Bishops on the solicitation of their future flocks?' For a whole year the Armenians rejected the solicitations of the Pope to ask for this firman, and now comes an Ambassador, not from the Pope but from France, and the firmans are delivered. It might prevent much evil if all correspondence with Rome were carried on through a member of the Divan—the great majority of Catholic prelates would hail such a decision. The Catholic Patriarch of Antioch was only prevented from making such a proposal last year by apprehensions of the vengeance of the Propaganda. Any Power that now wishes to use that population of the Turkish Empire has only to purchase the Secretary of the Propaganda, and venality in that quarter is not unheard of.

"The Porte may retrace its steps—it may, for the future, insist upon the Pope's respecting the ancient privileges of the Armenian nation in the election of their own Bishops. When it consented at the Pope's request, more than twenty years ago, to withdraw a large number of the Armenians from the authority of the Primate of Constantinople, it could not mean to establish over them an absolute master and a foreign head, who might be but a puppet in the hands of enemies. The Pope has a right to confirm the election of a Catholic Primate; but here his ancient jurisdiction, except in appeal, ceases. Let the Porte secure to the national clergy and people the liberty of canonical election, which up to the present time they have always enjoyed, and it will not only ensure the unbounded devotion to the Sultan of the Catholic Armenians, but it will ere long see them joined by large numbers of the religious subjects of the Russian Catholics of Uthmiadzin."

This measure was followed by a Papal rescript to the Papal legate of Antoura, in the Lebanon, which is the stronghold of Catholicism in the East; the effect of which would have been to transfer into the hands of the Roman authorities the complete control of the conventual and other religious funds, in a country where a very large proportion of the public property belongs to the convents, which may be considered rather in the light of industrial associations than of ascetics. Here, however, the resistance of the people was successful, and France did not interfere. There are sufficient local grounds to prevent her from attempting it; the ill-will of the Catholic Armenians was to her a matter of no importance: not so the ill-will of the Maronites, which she must have thereby incurred. The Lebanon has always been for her a source of trouble and vexation; it is termed, in the Paris Foreign-Office slang, *la Bouteille d'Encre*. To avoid the recurrence of similar troubles and dangers, the consulate of Beyrout had been removed from the list

\* Words of Lord John Russell altered to the case.

of political consulates and placed on the commercial, and the *personnel* had been changed to give effect to this alteration. Had the matter been pushed in the same way as that of the Bishops, the Catholic body would have been simultaneously convulsed in every portion of the Ottoman dominions. At the same time the Maronites were exasperated by the measures taken for pushing Protestant proselytism, through the instrumentality of the American missionaries. In the North, the Armenian Catholics threatened to relapse to the old Armenian Church, or to join the Greek; the old Armenian Church is now under the patronage of Russia, and the Greek Church is of course her church.

The Pope, in the plenitude of his power in ancient times, and in the religious freedom of action which he retained till the late revolutions, never attempted such measures as these. In later times the direction of its policy was quite the reverse, and Europe was astonished to behold a Legate of the Pope at Constantinople and an Ambassador of the Sultan at Rome. I have the best reason for knowing that this was no matter of caprice, but based upon a mutual appreciation and a necessity of common defence: in fact, matters had gone so far that it was a question of instituting a diplomatic college at Rome, and directing the studies of one of the most powerful of the religious corporations to the mastering of the policy of Russia, and to the means of upsetting it; and Rome possessed for this end opportunities, not only immense, but seductive. It might have made itself the director of the Catholic governments; it might have created in both Houses of Parliament in England a body of protectors of English rights and of public honour; and while securing itself against the deadly blows levelled at the faith of Poland, and securing its own station as a Church in opposition to the Greek Church, might have given to itself a claim to the respect and veneration of mankind. The power of Rome would have been revived in a new fashion, a moral character conferred upon its action, and an intellectual aim given to its pursuits. No greater danger has menaced Russia in this or in any former age; but then came the revolutions of 1848.

Shortly after these events I met an influential person in the counsels of Rome, who had been one of the most active in promoting the plan above indicated. His first words were these,—“Circumstances are now completely altered; *we owe everything to the Czar*. In the moment of our distress, with unheard-of generosity, he came forward, and placed his treasury and his army at our disposal. Of course, that kind of succour was out of the question; *but we owe to him the presence of the French*.” On expressing my surprise that he had not perceived the escape that Russia had had, and that he should mistake an insolent triumph for a benevolent act, he answered,—“Oh, we are not deceived; we know that it is out of no love for us: but we are upon the same line—*that of order*.”\*

The startling circumstances thus revealed are fully borne out by documents that have been made public. So early as the month of February, 1848, the Cabinet of St. Petersburg thus addressed itself to the Court of Rome:—

\* Mazzini having been once asked how he could reconcile to himself the pecuniary assistance afforded by Russia to his party, answered,—“There is no love lost between us; we merely happen to be on the same line—*that of disorder*.”

“It is beyond doubt that the Holy Father will find in his Majesty the Emperor a loyal supporter in effecting the restitution to him of temporal and spiritual power, and that the Russian Government will apply itself to all the measures that may contribute to this end, seeing that it nourishes in respect to the court of Rome no sentiment of rivalry and no religious animosity.”\*

The Papal rescripts for England and Turkey have therefore to be referred to the influence which had now gained the ascendancy at Rome; and in consequence of the revolutionary movements which England had fomented: indeed, during the discussions on the Papal Bill, it was on all hands admitted that the aggressions sprang from a political and not from a religious source. The English Prime Minister spoke of a conspiracy acting from Rome and threatening Europe. This was after all the religious topics had been exhausted.† The conspiracy that ruled at Rome was not France, but Russia. She it was who had an object in setting Protestants and Catholics by the ears; she it was who had to convulse Turkey by a religious hatred, and to make the Catholics, no less than the Greeks, turn to her as their sole hope and protection. France’s object in protecting the Catholics was to gain influence. Was it to be secured by openly forcing their own Sultan to oppress them? The Pope sought to extend his flock by proselytism. Could he have devised an innovation, the unmistakable effect of which was apostasy?

This leads me to a matter as yet unopened, but which ere long may attain, as all others with which we are mixed up, a painful and noxious importance, and that is the union of the Greek and Latin Churches. This, indeed, is an old story, and forgotten in our times; but circumstances have now assumed that shape in which it may one day suddenly be realised.

Whenever the Czars have had a point to carry with the Pope they have flattered him with the hope of conformity—a hope utterly vain, because then the Greek Church would have become Catholic. The altered position of the Pope and Czar would now make the Catholic Church and the Catholic body Russian; the Roman Catholics would no longer then be filled with abhorrence of the chanting of the first Greek mass in St. Sophia, but would be the first to sing hallelujahs or pœans on the event.

If such an idea does exist in the thoughts of the Russian Cabinet, we will doubtless observe traces of it in their conduct, and preparations for its execution. Such symptoms are to be observed, and they are of a nature to render any other explanation difficult.

So soon as the Russian Cabinet had taken its measures to render a revolution in Italy inevitable, the Emperor repaired thither to lay the seeds for the after-game. It was a dramatic performance: he, the “head of the Greek Church,” knelt to the Pope for his benediction; he kissed his hand and ring; he then repaired to St. Peter’s, and laid him-

\* “Egli è fuor di dubbio che il S. Padre troverà in S. M. l’Imperatore un leale aiuto per farlo ristabilire nel suo potere temporale e spirituale, e che il Governo Russo si associerà francamente a tutti provvedimenti che potranno condurre a questa fine, che esso non nutre verso la Corte di Roma verun sentimento di rivalità ne veruna animosità religiosa.”—*Farina*, “*Stato Romano*,” vol. iii. p. 215.

† Lord Shaftesbury, in his spoken speech, had already taken the same view. He spoke of the rescript having been dictated by the “bayonets from which the Church of Rome drew its breath;” but all this was cut out of the speech in Hansard, where nothing but “Catholic” and “Protestant” is to be found.

self at full length upon the tomb. Meanwhile, his Minister narrated to the public the circumstances of the interview; promised the Papal Government every concession in respect to Poland, and used every means, social and diplomatic, to make the Romans believe that the Muscovites were their only friends on earth. One of the avowed organs of Russia meanwhile, following one of her religious-military authorities, pointed out the necessity of a union of Rome and St. Petersburg to combat immorality, infidelity, and Protestantism.

The question of mixed marriages had hitherto been one of the great differences between Rome and Russia, as it had also been with the Protestants. From the month of March, 1848, the Greek Popes abstained from requiring in such marriages the conditions, hitherto rigorously enforced, respecting bringing up the children in the Greek faith. The form in which they expressed themselves was that of deferring the settlement for a year, sometimes remarking, to the surprise of their auditors,—“In a short time we shall all be of one church.”

From the same period all persecution has ceased against the Catholics in Russia, and the prelates of that Church have been treated with the greatest consideration and distinction.\*

The most significant incident, however, has been the publication of a ukase on the subject of Purgatory, assimilating in that respect the doctrines of the Greek to that of the Roman Church.

To judge of the possibility of such a union, we must turn to those doctrinal points upon which the project has hitherto been apparently shipwrecked, and which have consequently been supposed to present insuperable obstacles: they will be found to be exceedingly tractable.

The first point is the procession of the Holy Ghost. A solemn anathema had been denounced against whoever should add or take away from the Creed. The Pope added the “Filioque,” and the Greek Patriarch, not denying the doctrine, denied the authority, and declared that the Pope had incurred the anathema. The authority that has prostrated the ancient Russian Church, submitted the prelacy to military discipline, and made a layman chief priest—the Czar to-day—will find no difficulty in introducing the “Filioque” and in raising the anathema.

As regards Purgatory, the objection is rather for the ignorant than the learned. The Greeks admit prayers for the dead, and thereby recognise a place of duration for the soul. The Latin Church has used the word as expressing St. James’s idea of the purifying of fire, which separates the good metal from the dross; while, as the body is not exposed to it, the fire must be metaphorical; and such, in fact, was the declaration registered in the Council of Florence, under Eugenius IV. The recent ukase disposes of the abstraction.

The only other point not purely one of discipline is the Supremacy of the Pope; but all the Pope pretends to over the Patriarch of the East is the appellate jurisdiction, the presidency in general councils, and the right of calling them. The Patriarch of Constantinople yields to him the place of honour, holding him *primus inter pares*; the Patriarch of Moscow, who may be recreated for the nonce, will question neither.

Every other distinction in discipline has already been conceded by the Church of Rome to the members of the Eastern Church who have entered her communion under the name of *United Greeks*, just in the same way as she has adopted the national peculiarities and the original liturgies of the Copts, Jacobites, Maronites, and Armenians. The clergy of the United Greeks are married; the Eucharist is consecrated in leavened bread; the Greek, and not the Latin language, is used in the liturgy; sculpture is excluded from the churches. On the other hand, in the Greek Church, the names of the Popes canonised previous to the separation are venerated as saints, and spoken of as successors of St. Peter; and a Catholic at the hour of death would have no difficulty in sending for a Greek confessor, if a Catholic one was not at hand.

Thus, then, the difficulties of every kind, in so far as doctrine and discipline are concerned, are smoothed down; the advisability of the measure will depend solely upon political considerations. The objection which hitherto prevailed in the independence of the Pope has disappeared, and the union of the Churches would seem to be the recompense of the supremacy achieved at Rome and Vienna. It would be the application to the West of a similar process of disorganisation to that which has been so long employed in the East; it would be of the most essential importance in the assimilation of Poland, for in the negotiation mutual concessions would be made, and it would be easy thus to obtain the substitution of a Greek for a Roman hierarchy, and of the Greek for the Latin tongue.

The point, however, which we have chiefly to consider is the effect on Turkey; I speak not at present of indirect effects produced through Europe, but of her direct relations with the two creeds. Passing by the period of diplomatic action from a distance, during which the professors of the Eastern Church appear to be, and act, as her partisans, and coming to that of actual possession—a possession which in the first instance would be confined to European Turkey, and which would be accompanied by the retreat into Asia of the Mussulman Turks—let us see in what predicament Russia would then find herself. The suppression of the Mussulman government, the retreat of the Mussulman population, at once sweep away all the grounds of favour which she can possess at the present moment, and every means of conciliation and association which she can use. Down on the native population, taught by herself, filled with the most extravagant sense of its importance and exultation in its triumph, would come the crushing weight and the exasperating features of the Russian administration; instantly the religious question will appear; she would find herself placed between two organisations—the one Catholic, her bitter foe from olden time; the other *Greek*. Here let us pause.

At the period of the Treaty of Kainardji, in 1774, M. de Thugut, then Internuncio of Austria at the Porte, addressed to his Government a Memoir reviewing the Treaty and its effects, anticipating, under misapprehensions then universal, the downfall of the Ottoman Empire, in consequence of the religious adherence of the Greek Church to Russia, but, with a discrimination seldom equalled, showing to the Austrian Government that it could compensate for those acquisitions by none on its own part, and that the neighbouring fragments of Turkey which it might

\* See note at the end of the Essay.

incorporate could only hasten its own final subjugation. "Such aggrandisement," he says, "of the Austrian territory would not excite the jealousy of Russia, for those provinces (Bosnia and Serbia) are inhabited almost entirely by Mahomedans and *schismatic Christians*: the former would not be tolerated as residents there; the latter, considering the close vicinage of the Oriental Russian Empire, would not delay in emigrating thither; or if they remained, their faithlessness to Austrian power would occasion continued troubles; and thus an extension of territory without intrinsic strength, so far from augmenting the power of his Imperial Majesty, would only serve to weaken it."

This statement applies to Russia herself: those Christians, "schismatic" to Austria, would be no less schismatic to Russia. If, as the price of their having expelled "the accursed Empire of Hagar," according to the terms of the publication of the Holy Synod of Moscow, they were required to receive the Emperor as Vicegerent of God upon earth, and to acknowledge as Patriarch a General Officer and his colleagues, they would very soon remember not only that the Mussulman Caliph had imposed neither serfage nor conscription, but that he respected the name of Christ and honoured His people, their priests and prelates. With the fickleness which we must admit as the cause of the event which we contemplate, they would soon invite a Sultan from Broussa or Iconium, as they had invited a Czar from Moscow or St. Petersburg: in this invitation they would be earnestly joined by the Latins;\* the 14,000,000 or 15,000,000 of Eastern Christians, suddenly become Starovirtze, would make common cause with the 8,000,000 Starovirtze of the Russian Empire,† with the 14,000,000 of Latins in Poland and Turkey, and all these would look to the descendant of Osman as their protector.

In prospect, therefore, of a practical occupation of Turkey, some means must be devised for changing the present religious arrangements of the Russian Empire. The Czar cannot reveal himself to the new subjects he expects to acquire under an aspect which, in their eyes, will at once stamp him with the character of Antichrist; and he is placed in the alternative of surrendering a power which himself and his predecessors have laboured during five centuries to obtain, or by some such compact or composition as that to which I refer to break the concert of religious opposition, which otherwise infallibly will be directed against him the moment he assumes the direct administration of the Ottoman Empire. That Empire the Ottomans acquired, because they were not Christians; that neutrality which they have maintained in matters of religion and absolute toleration,‡ they have taught as a habit to their subjects. Russia has promised them something better; they will forget neither lesson. If the power of Turkey fall of itself, its European dominions will present a frightful scene of rage and persecution; but if the head of the official Church of Russia presume to replace it, then will be opened an era from the contemplation of which imagination shrinks; the darkest scenes of the most barbarous ages will

be re-enacted; English, French, and German blood will now be mingled with that of Russian, Turk, Slaav, and Greek, in the Danube and the Euxine. We shall be called to that field, not as protectors but as gladiators; and Russia, if she does not in the end acquire a second empire, will, at all events, acquire the best thing next to it—she will leave a desert.

#### NOTES OF THE EDITOR TO THE FOREGOING ESSAY.

ON the 15th of February, 1865, a Report of a Committee was read before the Lower House of Convocation on the subject of communications with a Committee of the American clergy relative to "Intercommunion with the Russo-Greek Church." It appears from this Report that "an Association has been formed in England, called 'The Eastern Church Association,' which already numbers amongst its patrons the Most Rev. the Archbishop of Belgrade, the Most Rev. the Archbishop of Dublin, with several English Bishops, the principal objects of which are to inform the English public as to the state of the Eastern Churches, and to make known the doctrines of the Anglican Church to the Christians of the East. The Committee has been favoured at their last meeting with the presence of the Very Rev. Archpriests Popoff and Wassilieff, chaplains of the Imperial Embassies of Russia in London and Paris, from both of whom they have received the most cordial assurances of personal co-operation."

Of course they have; this being merely the repetition of the traditional action of the Russian Government, which has repeatedly made overtures of union to the Pope whenever it wanted to make use of him, especially in the time of the Russian struggles with the Order of the Teutonic Knights.

This scheme has originated with Russia, which has taken advantage of the presence of a small party of innovators in the English Church, who have been foiled in their attempt to draw closer to Rome, and who seem to forget that, with the exception of celibacy of the clergy, the Russian Church possesses in a higher degree than the Latin Church what some have chosen to call "the mummeries of superstition." Union, therefore, is impossible. Russia, however, would gain her end by letting herself appear disposed to such an union, by which she would gain some sympathy, and to that extent indifference to her oppression, perhaps extermination, of the Catholics in Poland.

All Russian history is there to show that the Church in Russia has been a political instrument, subject to the objects of State aggrandisement; the religion has become Russian, rather than that Russia has been converted to the religion. Vladimir, the first Christian Prince, would not at once be baptized, but went with an army to Constantinople, as Karamsine says, "to conquer for himself his religion."

At the time of the Crimean war Western Europe was startled by the mention of the God of Russia, and wondered what deity they possessed peculiar to themselves, circumscribed to their country. Karamsine first mentions this divinity in 1380, after the battle of Koulikoff, and mistakenly attributes the words of the conquerors—"The God of the Russians is powerful!"—to the defeated Mamai, khan of the Tatars; a speech which it was impossible for him, who was a Mussulman, to have made, or for his historians to have written.

This phrase gives the measure of their notions of spiritual things, and the way in which they are made to subvert national pride and aggrandisement. The phrase is, however, a remnant of the old paganism as much as a sign of national vanity.

Whilst some in England are imagining that intercommunion with Russia would be intercommunion with the Oriental Church, they would do well to remember that the Moscow Synod is separated from the Patriarch of Constantinople, or head of the Oriental Church, by the usurpations of the Russian Emperors, and that pious and scrupulous Russians, on coming to Constantinople, have to make their peace with the Patriarch, to purge their schism on their own account.

At this moment, too, Prince Couza has commenced a separation of the Church in Wallachia and Moldavia from the Greek Church, by arrogating to himself the nomination of the metropolitans and bishops in those two principalities.

P. 21.—These statements are verified on reference to Karamsine, from whose history it appears that Russia, having been for eight years deprived of a Metropolitan by the imprisonment of the Metropolitan Isidore by the great Prince Vasili, on account of the part taken by him at the Council of Florence. Four bishops, as Karamsine says, "in conformity with the desire of the Sovereign, consecrated Jonas as Metropolitan, authorised thereto by the blessing of the Patriarch given to that bishop in 1437. But in the circulars sent to all the bishops of Russian Lithuania, Jonas maintains that he had been elected by the bishops of Russia, according to the institutions of the Apostles, and bitterly reproaches the Greeks with respect to their conduct at the Council of Florence.

\* There is a remarkable tendency amongst them at present towards Rome, but it is prompted by the desire to escape from Russian influence through the Church, in the same way as the Christians in Circassia became Mussulmans.

† The number is not known, but in any movement they would unite the Malo-Russians and the Cossacks, estimated at 10,000,000.

‡ Passage from "Russia and Turkey."

*It is at least dating from this period that we commenced no longer to depend upon the Church of Constantinople, which reflects the highest honour on Vasili. The spiritual tutelage of the Greeks cost us very dear. During five centuries, that is to say, since St. Vladimir until Vasili the Blind, we only meet with six Russian metropolitans. Without reckoning the presents which were sent to the Emperors and Patriarchs, the foreign metropolitans, always ready to leave our country, heaped up treasures to send them to Greece. They could not bring a very sincere zeal to the interests of Russia, and their respect for our princes could not be as profound as that of our countrymen. These truths were evident; nevertheless, the fear of touching religious matters, by scandalising the people by an innovation in its ancient usages, had not hitherto allowed the great princes to withdraw themselves from the supreme authority of the clergy of Constantinople. The disunion of that clergy, on the occasion of the Council of Florence, rendered easy to Vasili the means of doing that which several of his predecessors had abstained from executing from timidity.*—KARAMSINE, vol. v. chap. 3, section "Sage administration de Vasili."

P. 29.—It must be remembered that this was written before the commencement of the measures which have led to the crushing of Poland, ending with the persecution of the clergy, and suppression of the Polish convents; which latter measure has been approved of by some in England, as good government.



#### REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE OF CONVOCATION ON INTERCOMMUNION WITH THE RUSSO-GREEK CHURCH.

THAT as the limited power conferred upon your Committee, by the terms of their appointment, did not authorize them to enter into direct intercourse with the authorities of the Eastern Church, the report of their proceedings will be mainly occupied with the account of their communications with the Committee of the Convention of the Church in the United States on the same subject. The action of Convocation in appointing this Committee was hailed with great satisfaction by the American Church, and the intercourse between the members of the two Committees has been of the most friendly and cordial character. Your Committee were favoured by the Hon. Mr. Ruggles, a distinguished statesman, and eminent member of the American Committee of Convention, with some particulars of his visit to Russia. And at their first meeting they had the advantage of personal communication with the Rev. J. F. Young, the secretary of the Committee of the American Convention, and whom, in compliance with the terms of their commission, they had invited to attend their meeting. But your Committee, not being required by the terms of their commission to report at the next Session, were induced, in consideration of the extreme delicacy of the questions involved, to defer their report until the present time. They now proceed to record the progress that has been made. Mr. Young and Mr. Ruggles were both received in the most cordial manner by the Metropolitans of Moscow and St. Petersburg, and other members of the Holy Governing Synod, who expressed their earnest interest in the question, and their desire to co-operate in any measures having

for their object the restoration of unity. The Committee of the American Convention have begun to issue a series of papers with the object of recording their own proceedings, and giving information as to the principles and practices of the Eastern Church. It is an instance of the increasing interest that is taken in this question at home that your Committee are enabled to state to the House that there has been formed in England an association called "The Eastern Church Association," which already numbers among its patrons the Most Rev. the Archbishop of Belgrade, the Most Rev. the Archbishop of Dublin, with several more of our English bishops, the principal objects of which are to inform the English public as to the state of the Eastern Churches, and to make known the doctrines and principles of the Anglican Church to the Christians of the East. Your Committee have been favoured, at their last meeting, with the presence of the Very Rev. Archpriests Popoff and Wassilieff, chaplains to the Imperial Embassies of Russia at London and Paris, from both of whom they have received the most cordial assurances of personal co-operation. It would be premature to lay down any principles or conditions on which it may seem to your Committee that such intercommunion as is contemplated may be brought about; further than this,—to establish such relations between the two communions as shall enable the laity and clergy of either to join in the sacraments and offices of the other without forfeiting the communion of their own Church. That any overtures towards such an object should be made, if possible, in co-operation with those Churches with which the Church of England is in communion; and that such overtures, whenever made, should be extended to the other Eastern Patriarchates, and not confined to the Russo-Greek Church. With this view your Committee ask leave to sit again, and suggest that, if the Convocation of York should think fit to delegate any of its members to sit with them they should be authorized to confer with them, and also to co-operate with any Committees of other branches of the Anglican Communion. Your Committee, citing the words of the Venerable Patriarch and Synod of Constantinople, that "the Orthodox Church of the East has never ceased to offer with tears fervent prayers to her God and Saviour, Who maketh of two One, breaking down the middle wall of separation between them, that He may bring all Churches into one unity, giving them sameness of faith and communion of the Holy Ghost," conclude with the words of the prayer familiar to us all, "That as there is but one body, and one spirit, and one hope of our calling, one Lord, one faith, one baptism, one God and Father of us all," so we may henceforth be all of one heart and one soul, united in one holy bond of truth and peace, of faith and charity, and may with one mind and one mouth glorify God, through Jesus Christ our Lord.



3 0112 077597950