THE

EDINBURGH REVIEW,

JANUARY, 1853.

No. CXCVII.

ART. I. — 1. *Hippolytus and his Age; or, the Doctrine and Practice of the Church of Rome under Commodus and Alexander Severus: and Ancient and Modern Christianity and Divinity compared.* By CHRISTIAN CHARLES JOSIAS BUNSEN, D.C.L. In 4 vols. 12mo. London: 1852.

THESE volumes cannot fail to attract much attention from the public. The importance, interest, and variety of the subjects which their title-pages indicate, and the high character, reputation, and position of the author, will conspire to invite alike the inspection of those who amuse themselves with looking into the current literature of the day, and the attentive perusal of the careful inquirer into the history and antiquities of the Christian Church. Some will be desirous of knowing what a statesman and a diplomatist of more than thirty years' standing can have to say on the 'Comparison of 'Ancient and Modern Christianity and Divinity;' others will be curious to see how a foreigner, the distinguished representative of the Sovereign of a great German kingdom, shall have acquitted himself in the difficult task of writing a work of such extent in the English language. Both those who hold to the High Church party and those who belong to the Low Church party will be inquisitive to learn what so zealous and influential a member of the Evangelical Church of Germany, who for nearly twenty years was the King of Prussia's minister and plenipotentiary at Rome, and has subsequently held the same responsible office for more than twelve in London, has to

say on the subject of the 'Doctrine and Practice of the Church 'of Rome under Commodus and Alexander Severus;' while the serious and earnest inquirer after the truth will be anxious to learn what new light one who has already gained so much reputation by his historical and critical works can throw upon our hitherto obscure information respecting so early a writer as Hippolytus, and what additional knowledge he can give us touching so important a period of the history of the Church as the age in which he lived. It does not fall within the scope which we have proposed to ourselves, nor would it be suited to the limited space of our pages, to attempt to offer an opinion upon all these questions. We must refer each of our readers to the volumes themselves to satisfy his own curiosity as to that peculiar view of the subject which may best accord with his own taste or feelings. We will content ourselves with pointing out some of the leading facts and opinions in the book which have struck us as being chiefly deserving of attention, and as much as possible we will allow the author to speak in his own words, which will afford the least chance of misapprehension.

In the earlier part of the last year there appeared a work published under the auspices of the Delegates of the Clarendon Press, at Oxford, bearing the title 'Origenis Philosophumena 'sive Omnium Hæresium Refutatio. E Codice Parisino nunc 'primum edidit Emmanuel Miller.' The manuscript from which the editor transcribed and prepared this work for the press, was one of those which had been acquired for the French nation, in 1842, by Mynoides Mynas, who had been sent out at the expense of the government by M. Villemain, at that time Minister of Public Instruction, with the laudable object of searching among the monasteries of Greece for such inedited classical, or other interesting works as he could obtain; for the purpose of depositing them in the National Library, where they would be secure from the danger of being destroyed, and likewise be made accessible to the critic and scholar. This mission was attended with considerable success*: among other works which he acquired was a transcript of the long lost fables of the elegant writer Babrius†; a manuscript of

* See 'Rapport addressé à M. le Ministre de l'Instruction Publique 'par M. Mynoide Minas, chargé d'une mission en Orient,' in the 'Revue 'de Bibliographie Analytique.' An. 1844, vol. v. p. 80.

† The MS. of Babrius was found with several others in the convent of St. Laura, at Mount Athos, under a board covered with dung. The monks refused to sell it, or at least asked so high a price that Mynas made a transcript of it, from which M. Boissonade pub-

the Dialectica of Galen, and the Gymnastica of Philostratus. The well known reputation of these classical writers very naturally directed to them at once the full attention of some inquiring scholars: they were immediately examined, and the result forthwith made known to the public. Among the rest of the manuscripts thus obtained, was one unpretending volume, of which Mr. E. Miller, in 1844, gave only the following brief account: —'Manuscrit en papier de coton, du xiv^e^ siècle, con-'tenant une réfutation de toutes les hérésies. Cet ouvrage d'un 'auteur anonyme est divisé en dix livres; mais les trois pre-'miers manquent ainsi que la fin.'* Subsequently he was led to bestow more attention upon this volume; and finding it to be an authentic work of much interest and importance by a Christian writer of not later date than the first quarter of the third century: having also ascertained that it undoubtedly comprised the latter books of the same treatise as that of which the first book had been already published, with the title of Φιλοσοφούμενα, or Κατὰ πασῶν αἱρέσεων ἔλεγχος, in the editions of Origen, he came to the conclusion that he had then in his hands a considerable part of a very important work by that most learned and philosophical among all the early writers of the Christian Church. It was natural that he should feel the desire of communicating to the public his discovery of a work of such interest and value for the early history of Christianity. His proposal to the Delegates of the Clarendon Press to undertake the charge of the publication was met by that liberality on their part which they have been so often ready to show upon similar occasions.

We are fully convinced with Mr. Bunsen, and with the author of an article in the 'Ecclesiastic,' that the work is not the production of Origen; but we cannot think with this latter writer that the Delegates, in supplying the means of publishing it under that title, are either individually or collectively at all pledged to the editor's opinion, or in any way responsible for the arguments which he has advanced in his preface on that head. Mr. Miller's talents and capacity in the Greek language and literature were well known to that board, and had been favourably mentioned by Dr. Gaisford, in one of his valuable publications which, within the last few years, have issued from the Clarendon Press. They could therefore rest assured that a

---

lished an edition at Paris, 1844. Several editions have appeared subsequently on the Continent, and one in England by Mr. Cornewall Lewis.

* See 'Revue de Bibl. Analyt.'

Greek work would be creditably edited by him, and consequently they were ready to assist him in making public so large a portion of a hitherto almost unknown Christian treatise, whoever its author may be. Mr. Bunsen has the following remarks on this subject: —

'I cannot but agree with him that it would have been better that the University of Oxford should not have had the appearance of sanctioning such a mistake as the attributing this work to Origen. But I do not see how the University can fairly be made responsible for this false title. As to the Directors of the Clarendon Press, I entertain a hope, and beg to express it with sincere respect, that even if the venerable Dean of Christ Church, Dr. Gaisford, to whom ecclesiastical as well as classical philology already owes so much, should not feel himself moved to present us with a new edition, that noble institution will not hold itself pledged to the opinion of the learned editor if he should persevere in that opinion. I trust they will be glad to become instrumental in placing a new critical edition soon before the public, not only of this misnamed book, but of all the works of Hippolytus, among which I trust will be included the "Little "Labyrinth" and the "Treatise on the Substance of the Universe." Thus the University and the literary world, and St. Hippolytus himself, will receive the best satisfaction for the printing of his most instructive work at the Oxford University Press under a false title.' (Vol. i. p. 332.)

The book, as we have stated above, was published in that year which will ever be famous in the annals of the world from the Exhibition of the Industry of all Nations. This circumstance has called forth the following observation:—

'Am I not right, therefore, in saying that the publication of this work is congenial to the character of 1851: by showing the good results of international communication and friendly co-opération? The book was discovered by a Greek sent from Paris, and has been most creditably edited by a French scholar, and very liberally printed by an English university press. The publication has been accomplished by a combination of different nations, and could scarcely at this time have been brought about otherwise.' (Vol. i. p. 8.)

Mr. Bunsen's attention was first directed to this book by Mr. Tregelles. From him he learned that the venerable Dr. Routh had already perused it with much interest, and was convinced that it was undoubtedly a genuine work, and of very great importance for the history of the Church at the period when it was written. Such information was sufficient to induce Mr. Bunsen to procure a copy of the book without delay, and to study it carefully at his earliest opportunities.

The four volumes now before us are the result of that study. The first, containing 'the Critical Enquiry,' consists of Five

Letters addressed to Archdeacon Hare. In the first of these he states the conclusions at which he had already arrived:—

'*First*, that the work before us is genuine, but not by Origen.

'*Secondly*, that it is the work of Hippolytus, a person much celebrated, but very little known.

'*Thirdly*, that this celebrated Father and Martyr, Hippolytus, was a presbyter of the Church of Rome, and bishop of the harbour of Rome, *Portus*, but neither an Arab, nor an Arabian bishop, as a Frenchman imagined he might, and Cave said he must have been.

'*Fourthly*, that this book is full of valuable authentic extracts from lost writers.' (P. 10.)

To establish these conclusions is the object of the letters to Archdeacon Hare. The three remaining volumes contain the result of much diligent inquiry respecting 'the life and con-'sciousness' of the Christian Church during that early period of her existence, anterior to and contemporary with the age of Hippolytus, partly suggested by the perusal of this work against all heresies, and partly the fruit of previous research. With these are very naturally connected the writer's own views and opinions upon several important subjects of Christian faith and practice, the convictions of long study, careful thought, and earnest reflection, in a mind deeply sensible of all the personal responsibility attached to those who enjoy the great and inestimable privilege of the Christian light and Christian liberty of that Gospel which has made us free. Even those who may entertain sentiments very widely differing from his, can hardly fail, if they be honest, to acknowledge the earnest and deep 'religious 'consciousness,' to use Mr. Bunsen's own expression, which pervades the whole work, although at the same time it appears to us very probable that many who come with the prejudices of their party to the perusal, may take umbrage at the strength of his expressions upon occasions when his views are at variance with their own. Whenever it appears to him that the whole truth is disguised, or suppressed, or perverted, either from design, or from blameable ignorance, he spares neither friend nor foe, protestant nor papist, fellow-countryman nor foreigner. While, on the other hand, he is equally ready to acknowledge and approve all that appears to him to be true and right, even in those with whom he is generally widest at issue. As a specimen of this, we may quote the following passage, in which he is referring to some of the opinions of the Tübingen School, respecting the late origin of the Gospel of St. John, the infidel and highly mischievous opinions of which school he upon all occasions most earnestly combats, as tending to destroy the whole of the foundations upon which our highest hopes are

based, by reducing Christ to a mere mythical person, and the records of his life and death to forgeries of a later date.

'That this reasoning is sound the progress of our researches will easily prove. For even in the second stage of Gnosticism—the Gentile one—we find the very words of St. John evidently alluded to, long before the last quarter or third of the second century, when, according to the most unhappy of all philological conjectures, and the most untrue of all historical views, the system of Strauss and Baur, that Gospel made its appearance as the fag end of Gnosticism.

'In declaring myself so strongly against Baur's historical hypothesis, I think it is only fair to add that no one has done more for the speculative comprehension of the Gnostic systems than this eminent writer, of whose researches concerning that part of the history of philosophy those only can speak without respect who have never read them or who are incapable of understanding them. The facts now before us show that many of his acute illustrations of the very difficult and abstruse concluding chapters of Irenæus' first book, and especially his treatise on the Ophites, are wonderfully confirmed by the work before us.' (Vol. i. p. 42.)

We ought perhaps to mention here, for the information of some of our readers, that one of the last publications of Baur has been an attack upon Mr. Bunsen's edition of Ignatius, and his Letters on Ignatius.* He does not, however, for an instant attempt to disprove the arguments, which go to show that four out of the Seven epistles mentioned by Eusebius are forged, and that the Three only found in the Syriac are genuine. But rather to make it apparent that the same reasons which prove the four out of the seven to be spurious, will equally apply to the other three, and that all are false. It was essential for Baur to endeavour to establish this, because if the Three found in the Syriac were allowed to be genuine and authentic, the whole of his arguments touching the later origin of such parts of the New Testament as are evidently cited or alluded to by Ignatius must at once fall to the ground. We will quote here a passage from the preface to Mr. Cureton's Ignatius, which appears to us to be quite conclusive on this head. Archdeacon Churton has however chosen to ignore this in his preface to a new edition of Pearson's Vindiciæ, and been willing rather to call in the aid of the infidel Baur to support a tottering cause, which must necessarily be injurious to that Church which he seeks to uphold, in at least as great a degree as it recedes from the truth, which unprejudiced and candid research can alone support. Mr. Cureton's

* Die Ignatianischen Briefe und ihr neuester Kritiker. Eine Streitschrift gegen Herrn Bunsen. 8vo. Tübingen, 1848.

words are as follows:—'There is another and, in my opinion, a 'still more important aspect in which this subject may be viewed. 'In late years several attacks have been made upon the very 'charters of our holy faith, even upon the inspired books of the 'Apostles themselves, which the evidence afforded by Ignatius 'was in a great measure sufficient to refute, but which could not 'be successfully urged so long as the great admixture of spurious 'matter rendered the whole authority of the epistles attributed to 'him doubtful. I mean the citations and evident allusions to 'certain books of the New Testament which are still found in 'the genuine epistles; and which, therefore, indubitably prove 'those books to have been written before Ignatius suffered, and 'not many years later, as the theories of a certain class of 'German critics have endeavoured to establish. This is not the 'place for me to make further mention of this matter; nor should 'I have deemed it requisite now to allude to it at all, had not 'Baur, being aware that if the three Epistles of the Syriac Re-'cension were received as genuine, the grounds of his hypothesis 'must fail, felt it therefore to be necessary for him to endeavour 'to prove that they also are spurious in an answer to the 'Chevalier Bunsen, who had applied the evidence afforded by 'Ignatius to refute some of the dangerous theories of the 'Tübingen school of theology. Baur's main argument is based 'upon the assertion that these three epistles, even in their pre-'sent form, are so like the rest, that they must all have come 'from the same hand. There cannot be a more complete refu-'tation of this imagined, than that which I had already supplied 'in my Introduction, before I had any knowledge whatever of 'Baur's assertion. I have there shown that a marked difference, 'as to matter and manner, between the Three epistles in their 'present form, and the rest, was seen and pointed out by the 'ablest critics on the Ignatian question nearly two centuries 'before the Syrian Version was discovered, and proved the 'depth of their discernment, and the justice and propriety of 'their observation.' (See Preface to *Corpus Ignatianum*, p. xvi. and Introduction, p. liii.)

As the inquiry respecting the Ignatian forgeries bears very closely upon several matters discussed in these volumes before us, and is upon more than one or two occasions referred to, it may perhaps be convenient, before we proceed, to introduce here what Mr. Bunsen has to say in reply to Archdeacon Churton's strictures, who, as Mr. Bunsen quaintly observes, is one of those 'who have set their hearts upon proving, by Pearson's 'arguments, that a text with which that prelate was un-'acquainted, and which was not brought to light till nearly two 'centuries after his death, is not genuine.'

'I shall conclude this preface by saying a few words respecting the uncalled for aggressive spirit in which the editor of a reprint of Pearson's "Vindiciæ," Archdeacon Churton, has attempted to handle this question. Mr. Churton displays in his Introduction a classical Latin style, which in other times perhaps would have stood in the place of critical argument; and he employs a facetious manner well suiting a retreat from a lost cause. As a specimen I shall only allude to the advantage which he takes of a manifest misprint in order to throw ridicule on an argument which he does not even attempt to refute. Pearson had not disdained to supply the want of any solid testimony for the Greek text of Ignatius before Eusebius by some conjectures which, as he says, pleased him very much. One of these is, that Theophilus, who was a successor of Ignatius, towards the end of the second century, had alluded to the celebrated passage in the Epistle to the Ephesians (c. xix.). The testimony would be very important if it had any existence (and indeed would apply with far greater force to the Syriac than the Greek text); but it rests upon the incredible assumption of the genuineness of a commentary upon St. Matthew, bearing the name of Theophilus, under whose name there existed indeed, according to Jerome, a commentary on the Gospel. Now I had said that no honest critic could doubt (nor is there any one who maintains a contrary opinion) that the commentary preserved to us is a later imposture not even worthy of the younger Theophilus of the end of the fourth century. Bishop Fell and the Hamburg editor of Theophilus (1724) have, indeed, made it quite impossible to entertain such an opinion: but the point was already established in Pearson's time. How then could Pearson indulge in such a conjecture? This (and nothing else) I had said in a note (p. 239.), with the remark that I merely mentioned the circumstance in order to justify my not having named that Father among the testimonies of the second century. By an oversight the page (printed on the other side of the German Ocean) exhibits, instead of "Theophilus the Elder," the words "Hippolytus the Elder." Now what does Mr. Churton do? He calls upon me emphatically to show him where Pearson quotes Hippolytus as an evidence. He might have known (and doubtless did know) that Theophilus was meant. My referring to Jerome's words allowed no doubt that I alluded to Pearson's argument respecting Theophilus. But he thought it good fun to amuse his readers by so cheap a joke. I do not blame him for that; it is a matter of taste: but I do wonder how the author of an edition of the "Vindiciæ," with a preface and notes, which are to be "ad modernum controversiæ statum accommodata," could have omitted commenting upon Pearson's conjecture, and in particular upon the note which proves that he knew very well that the whole conjecture had no foundation whatever. In that note Pearson mentions the doubts of Tillemont and other learned critics respecting the commentary which impudently bears the name of Theophilus; and he adds: "Non tamen negandum est, scriptorem, quisquis fuerit, longe "Theophilo et Hieronymo juniorem, scripta priorum patrum excerp-"sisse, et Theophili fortassè inter alios." Thus Pearson himself,

whose quotation is to make Theophilus an evidence, admitted that the author of a commentary quoted by him as evidence of the second century, was not Theophilus, and was later even than Jerome. As such reasoning seems incredible, I will give the very words of Jerome. He says: "Martyr Ignatius etiam quartam addidit causam, cur a "desponsata conceptus sit (Jesus), ut partus, inquiens, ejus celaretur "diabolo, dum eum putat non de virgine, sed de uxore generatum." These words prove nothing more than that Jerome knew that celebrated passage of Ignatius' Epistle to the Ephesians which the Syriac text acknowledges, and which Origen quotes. Jerome, I am afraid, had himself never read the epistles of Ignatius; indeed Cureton has made this more than probable in his "Corpus Ignatianum" (p. lxvii.). It is, therefore, a felicitous assumption that he had transcribed this observation from an earlier commentator: but this probably was Origen, whose commentaries on the Gospel Jerome had translated. At least this commentary we know, and it contains the passage; whereas of Theophilus' commentary we know nothing. Cotelerius' opinion, therefore, that Jerome copied that remark out of Origen, is the only reasonable one; to refer it to Theophilus the Elder, because the remark is found in the commentary of an author whom Pearson himself allows to have been later than even Jerome, merely because that late writer might have read Theophilus, and Theophilus might have said such a thing, is unworthy of a serious critic. If Mr. Churton thinks differently, I am ready to give him the whole benefit of the argument; only, if he attacks my remark upon Pearson's proceeding, he must not elude the discussion by availing himself of a misprint.' (Vol. iv. *Preface*, p. xx.)

Those who take an interest in the Ignatian question will do well to read Mr. Bunsen's observations touching the Armenian version in the earlier part of the same preface. They are too long for us to insert here. But we cannot omit quoting his words respecting the opinion in Germany as to this question, which Mr. Churton, we would hope not further designedly than from the bias of prejudice, has very grossly misstated.

'Nor can I allow the learned editor to misrepresent to English readers the state of critical opinion in Germany respecting the relation which the Syriac text bears to the Greek. Mr. Churton is welcome to the obtuse argument of a reviewer who triumphantly observes that Baur has not been convinced by my arguments, but thinks the Syriac text as little authentic as the Greek. It is, indeed, very natural that he should; for he believes the Gospel of St. John, alluded to evidently in our Epistles, to have been written about seventy years after the death of Ignatius. But when Mr. Churton says that Neander, in the latter part of his life, gave up the Syriac text, it is first necessary to state that this great historian (whom Mr. Churton calls "vir "in antiquitate ecclesiastica satis spectatus") never admitted the Pearsonian text, and doubted in particular all that relates in the Seven Letters to the history of Ignatius' death and journey, on which

the whole structure of these letters is built. Now his last published words on the subject are in a note to his new edition of the History of the Christian Church (vol. i. p. 1140.) of the year 1843, and therefore anterior to Cureton's discovery. But it appears from his own and other correspondence, which lies before me, that Neander could not quite make up his mind as to the genuineness of the Syriac epistles, although he did not think them by any means so objectionable as the Greek text. Mr. Churton has, therefore, no right to quote him on the question at issue, which is this: Whether the Syriac manuscript be an extract from a genuine text, or an earlier one? As to the other German critics, not one believes the Pearsonian text to be authentic, with the exception of some Romanist writers (of whom only the Rev. Dr. Hefele merits even a mention), and perhaps of Prof. Petermann, the Armenian scholar and meritorious editor of the text and all its various readings. But the difference in the opinions of the German critics who have treated that subject, from Baur to Thiersch, is simply, that some believe with me that the Syriac text has preserved the genuine writings of Ignatius; whereas others think that even in this briefer form we have not the writings of Ignatius, but a work of fiction. It must not be forgotten, however, that the philological proofs of the authenticity of the Syriac text, most imperfectly known to those who entertained doubts on this subject, have been very much strengthened subsequently by the manuscripts recently discovered, all exhibiting the same text, and proving it to have been, at all events, not the product of an obscure extracting monk, but the acknowledged text of the early Syrian Church. Now this Church, which is that of Antioch and of Ignatius, has in other cases preserved the purer text, in opposition to Byzantine and Armenian corruptions and interpolations. When, therefore, the editor of Pearson asserts that the present state of critical opinion in Germany is best represented by what Mone, a Romanist writer on medieval antiquities, whom Mr. Churton quotes as the author of "a distinguished Treatise on Liturgies," has asserted, I beg first to refer the reader to the fourth chapter of the "Reliquiæ Liturgicæ," which treats on the Gallican Liturgy, that he may judge himself of the authority of this ultramontane antiquarian. As to the assertion that the result of modern criticism has been an entire confirmation of the authority of the Seven Epistles, it is difficult to decide which is more astonishing, that Mr. Mone should pronounce a statement so notoriously contradicted by the facts, or that the English editor of the "Vindiciæ" should bring before the public this insignificant, and in every respect unwarranted, ridiculous assertion, as representing the opinion of the critics of Germany.' (P. xxv.)

We will quote two more passages on the Ignatian question, and then return from this digression. In the second volume Mr. Bunsen has endeavoured, by the mere application of critical analysis from such resources as were within his reach, to separate the later additions from the Apostolic Constitutions, and to restore them to their more ancient and genuine form. That he

has been successful in his attempt has been proved by the discovery of a Syriac MS., which confirms the conclusions at which he had arrived; showing that in this case, as in the Epistles of Ignatius, the more ancient and genuine form of the Apostolic Constitutions had been adopted in the Syrian churches before they were amplified by interpolations in the Greek, and that they have been providentially preserved and brought to light in our day. He is giving an account of Bickell's 'Geschichte des 'Kirchenrechts:'—

'But the greatest treasure is (pp. 148—159.) the account of the Syrian MS. in the national library at Paris. This collection, examined by Dr. Zenker, bears the title Διδασκαλία τῶν ἀποστόλων, and exhibits in twenty-six chapters the original text of those first six books of the Apostolical Constitutions. Bickell considers them as extracts; but how then can one explain that on the whole they leave out exactly what I have in the second volume (printed last year) shown to be interpolations?' (Vol. iii. p. 176.)

And again: —

'I have shown the prevalence of an early systematic corruption of the ancient texts in the East by the Byzantines; exactly as such a fraud was practised later by the Romanists in the West. I have in particular shown that the text of the first six books of the Apostolic Constitutions exhibits corruptions and interpolations perfectly similar to those which, even in Eusebius' time, had made a sad twaddler out of that most energetic and original Martyr and Father, Ignatius, and a legend out of his true history. Curiously enough, the most striking instance is here also found in a Syriac text. That separation of the original contents of the first six books of the Constitutions from the later interpolations, which I had endeavoured to establish by the mere application of sound critical principles, is confirmed by a Syriac manuscript at Paris.' (Vol. iv. *Preface*, p. iv.)

But to return from this digression on the Ignatian question, which, indeed, is closely connected in many points with the subjects before us, and to which, perhaps, we are bound to allude, because both Mr. Churton's assertions and those of a writer in the 'Quarterly Review' go to impugn our own arguments which we have previously advanced on this matter.* Mr. Bunsen, as we have already observed, neglects no suitable occasion throughout his work of exposing the unhistorical, unphilosophical, and unchristian views of those among the German critics who belong to the Tübingen school. Neither does he attempt to conceal the love of the ideal rather than the real, and of the speculative rather than the practical, which is a cha-

* No. clxxxi. p. 155.

racteristic defect in the writings of many of his own countrymen. Thus, on one occasion, we find him not hesitating to declare 'That reality has no charm for the Germans.' (Vol. ii. p. 228.) And again: —

'As to the research of the Protestant critical school in Germany, the criticism upon these Constitutions is undoubtedly its weakest part, and very naturally so. What they know how to handle best is thought, the ideal part of history: what is farthest from their grasp is reality. What the Apostolical Constitutions contain of valuable is only reality: the speculative or ideal part of them is entirely insignificant. Thus alone can it be explained, that Neander has scarcely made any use of the treasures contained in the Constitutions: and that whereas the tedious novel of the Clementine fictions has been made the subject of very deep (although, I am afraid, equally premature) researches (by Schliemann, Hilgenfeld, Ritschl, and others), the Constitutions have neither been reprinted nor commented upon.' (Vol. ii. p. 239.)

While, however, the author of the volumes before us neither glosses over the defects nor conceals the failings of his countrymen; he is also ready to stand up as a champion in their defence against those who are too forward to condemn all for the faults of some, and to deny, and attempt to ignore, the abundance that is good, because there is sometimes mixed up with it a little that is evil. We can ourselves speak, from our own experience, to the fact, that German criticism and German research upon all subjects connected with theology are generally most censured and most reviled by those who are the least acquainted with them. We believe that the indiscriminate condemnation of almost all works of theological research in Germany by some professors and tutors in our universities, and perhaps, indeed, by some of the Bishops of our Church, who are unable to read a line of the original writings, and condemn only from hearsay or second-hand information, is not only highly unjust, but, in this country, has been, and is, injurious to the cause of impartial research, by which alone truth can be elucidated and upheld. The earnest cautions given by these, no doubt with the best intentions, but too often in ignorance, have deterred the young student from making use of those aids which long and diligent inquiry had already prepared to his hand. He has been thus compelled to search for himself, with the danger of being mistaken or misled, when the discovery had been already made, and been compelled to wade or swim through the river with all the risks of quicksands or currents, when there was a bridge already constructed, over which he might have easily and quickly passed. It has thus often happened that the love of inquiry

and research has been speedily quenched in an ardent and active mind; the thoughts and aspirations after knowledge and holiness have been turned in another direction; and to this we are sure we are right in attributing the cause why several of the intellectual and once promising young men in our universities, instead of being now a light and an ornament in our own Church, have deserted it, and are sunk in the bigotry of Romish superstition, whose interest it is to extinguish the torch of critical and historical research, because its errors and its vices would necessarily be exposed by it. But we will let Mr. Bunsen speak for himself on this head; and, although the extract be long, we are convinced that it merits the candid and attentive perusal of all our readers.

'If I have not entirely failed in my efforts to elicit truth out of the records of thought and out of the annals of history, which are now opened to us for the first time, I owe it to the resources of thought and learning which I have found in the standard works of modern German divinity and philology, and which I have endeavoured to apply to this subject. Deeply impressed as I am with my unworthiness to represent either, I still trust to have, by this process, and by the very important contents of the newly discovered book, sufficiently shown the real nature and the superiority of the German method of inquiry, and the satisfactory results already obtained. Now, if this be the case, I believe also that I have enabled every thinking reader to judge for himself, whether there be much wisdom in ignoring, and whether there be not great injustice and presumption in calumniating the Evangelical Churches of Germany, and in vilifying Germany and German divinity. I frankly own, that I have considered it my duty to avail myself of a subject entirely new and fresh, and belonging to the neutral domain of ancient ecclesiastical history, and of a problem which is placed at the same time before all Christian nations, in order to test the real result and worth of what each of them has hitherto done in that field of thought and research. The proofs which I have given of what has been achieved already, in this respect, by the critical and historical school of Germany, will, I trust, at all events rescue, in the eyes of intelligent and fair judges, from unqualified and unworthy insinuations and suspicions, a nation and a Church from which not only the fathers of the English Church received the Reformation, but which in the last hundred years have shown a self-sacrificing zeal for Christian truth and doctrine, and fought (alas! only too long single-handed) the good fight for intellectual and spiritual Christianity, against the overwhelming indifference of this sceptical and materialistic age. Thus much every one may easily know, and ought to have learned, if he pronounce upon German theology; that so arduous a task has not been undertaken by the noblest and purest minds of a great, although religiously divided and politically torn nation, out of levity, or for the purpose of showing ingenuity and learning, much less out of hatred against

Christianity, and that it has not been supported, and in its principle accepted, by the people at large, out of infidelity and irreligion. The revilers of German divinity might also know, and ought to appreciate, the fact, that the defects and dangers of German Church-life are chiefly attributable to the political misfortunes and sufferings of Germany, not to the individual or national want of religious spirit. The history of nearly a century proves that this attempt to place Christianity upon a more solid and really tenable basis has been undertaken out of the courageous love of truth, and that it has been carried out with sacrifices greater than any class of individuals or any nation ever made to that holy belief, that there must be truth in history as well as in reason and conscience, and that this truth exists in Christ and in Christianity. And this faith is so general, and has ever been so powerful in my Fatherland, that I boldly appeal to the impartial judgment of the world and to the infallible verdict of history, in speaking out my conviction, that there exists at present in no country so much inward, true, sincere, religious feeling and faith in Christ and Christianity, and so much hope for a better future as to religion, as in Germany, and in Protestant Germany in particular. Liberty is inseparable from abuse, and therefore from scandal: the political history of the politically freest nation in the world is the best proof of that. But men and Christians ought not to be frightened, by such abuse and such scandal, into a betrayal of the sacred cause of liberty or of truth.

'I have spoken, and I speak freely on this subject. First of all, I do so as a Christian, who feels, and has long time felt the critical state of Christianity, in this distracted and yet nobly struggling age. I have further done so as a son of my Fatherland, who feels bound to vindicate the honour of his country among a nation he respects. I, lastly, have done so as a grateful guest of England. I have wished to vindicate before Germany and the continent the character of the great body of English Protestants, as not being a party to those absurd and malicious calumnies. I know, from an experience which is deeply engraved in my inmost heart, the spirit of fairness and justice which distinguishes the nation among whom I have now lived almost twelve years. The slanderers and revilers of German religion and divinity do not speak the voice of the Protestant clergy, much less of the Christian people of England. The attacks upon Germany issue from two parties. One of them is an extreme fraction of the evangelical class in the Church of England and in some dissenting bodies: a fraction which, unconscious of its origin, has become first indifferent, then hostile, to every free thought and to all critical learning. This, however, is owing to accidental, and I hope transitory, circumstances; and especially to that unfortunate isolation from the religious life of the rest of the world, and of Germany in particular, in which English Protestants have lived these last two hundred years, with the single exception of John Wesley. But, principally and systematically these attacks upon Germany come from a party which either has joined or ought, if consistent, to join the Church of Rome; a party in which, whatever the individual earnestness and personal piety of many of its

members may be, all Christian ideas are absorbed by sacerdotal formalism unsupported by corresponding doctrine, and by catholic hierarchical pretensions unfounded in themselves, and placed in flagrant contradiction with the records of the Church of England, as well as with the feelings of the people. Those who once were their leaders now preach that historical Christianity must be given up as a fable, if an infallible authority be not acknowledged declaring it to be true. All these are necessarily the bitter enemies and detractors of German divinity, which makes inward religion, and not the form of Church government, the principal object, and which establishes its history upon a rational basis, according to the general rules of evidence. The leading men of that school know full well why they revile German Protestantism and German philosophy and doctrine. They know instinctively that their efforts to restore exclusive sacerdotal authority upon a system of superstition, delusion, and ignorance will be vain, as long as there exists a nation, bent above all things, upon conscientious investigation of Christian truth, both by free thought and by unshackled research; a nation which of all tyrannies hates none more than that of priestcraft, and of all liberties loves none so well and so uncompromisingly as that of the intellect. But the Christian public in England is not represented by that party. That great body is neither unwilling to extend the hand of brotherhood to the Evangelic Churches of the continent, nor ashamed of the name of Protestants. Nor do I think that history will acknowledge as legitimate the authority of these men to lay down the law in divinity and in religion. I at least do not see how such an authority can be founded upon any thing which they have achieved in Christian research or thought, or in the learned interpretation of Scripture, or in the field of missionary labour, or in other great national works, or, finally, in the free domain of science and literature. I do not believe, therefore, that by their achievements they have acquired such titles as are valid and available in the common conscience of mankind, to brand, by indiscriminate condemnation, as infidel rationalism the whole theology of Germany, and to vilify the most learned and profound Church of Christendom in the present day; unless they mean to claim as their titles the irrationality of their own system, and that absence of charity in which they glory when speaking of the Protestant divines of Germany and of the Protestant Churches of the continent. (Vol. i. Pref. p. xvi.)

But to come to the question of the authorship of the 'Treatise against all Heresies.' There is no evidence afforded by quotations from any ecclesiastical writer that Origen ever wrote a work with the title Κατὰ πασῶν αἱρέσεων ἔλεγχος. That the first of the ten books of this work, which was originally edited by Gronovius, in the 'Thesaurus Antiquitatum 'Græcarum,' tom. x. p. 257., was falsely ascribed to Origen, is plainly proved, as Huet*, and after him Delarue†, have shown,

* Origeniana, lib. iii. appendix xi.

† Origenis Opera, edit. Benedict. tom. i. p. 872.

by the fact that the author, almost at the commencement, speaks of himself in such terms as to leave no doubt of his having held the office of a Bishop in the Church, which was a dignity, as it is very well known, that Origen never attained to. This treatise, therefore, although printed in the Benedictine edition of Origen's works, has been very properly included among the 'Opera 'Supposita.' There are, however, several passages in the later books of this work now published for the first time by Mr. Miller, which could, under no circumstances, apply to Origen. It is, indeed, true that Origen visited Rome during the period that Zephyrinus was Bishop of that city; but Eusebius, who gives us this account, informs us that he only remained there a short time, and then returned to Alexandria: *ἔνθα οὐ πολὺ διατρίψας ἐπίνεισιν εἰς τὴν Ἀλεξάνδρειαν.** But the author of this Treatise speaks of himself as having often withstood and contended against both Zephyrinus and Callistus, who favoured the heresy of Noetus, and having forced them, although unwillingly, to acknowledge the truth.† He declares that Sabellius, when admonished by himself and others, did not show any obduratenes, but that when he was alone with Callistus (who had then succeeded Zephyrinus as Bishop of Rome) he was stirred up by him.‡ He mentions the circumstance of Callistus having a personal fear of him.§ And he also speaks of himself being officially concerned in expelling some persons from the Roman Church.‖ On this last fact Mr. Bunsen observes: 'Now only the decree of the Presbytery of the Roman Church 'could expel from its communion, and none but a member of 'the Roman Church could speak thus.'¶ There can be no doubt, therefore, that the author of the 'Refutation of all Heresies,' who speaks in such terms of himself, could not be Origen, who only visited Rome for a short time when Zephyrinus was bishop,

---

* Eccl. Hist. book vi. c. 15.

† B. ix. 7. p. 279.

‡ ix. 11. p. 285.

§ ix. 12. p. 289.

‖ P. 289.

¶ In the treatise against the heresy of Noetus, Hippolytus states that the presbyters (*οἱ μακάριοι πρεσβύτεροι*) summoned Noetus before their Church and questioned him as to his tenets, and ultimately expelled him from the Church. See Dr. Routh's Opuscula, vol. i. p. 46. On this passage the venerable President has given the following note: 'Fortasse hi fuerunt episcopi cum presbyteris juncti; etenim ostendi 'annotans ad locum, presbyterorum nomine interdum appellatos fuisse 'episcopos ab auctoribus sæculo existente secundo, qui ipsi inter 'episcopos ac presbyteros alibi aperte distinguere solent.' (*Ibid.* p. 78.)

and before the elevation of Callistus, and who had no official connexion whatever with the Roman Church.

Again, the style of this work shows that it cannot be by Origen, which, we think, will be quite evident to every one who will be at the trouble to make the comparison. But lest our readers should think that we may be prejudiced in advancing this statement, we will adduce evidence to this effect, of at least fourteen hundred years standing, from one of the most learned writers of his time. Now it is plain from the statement of Photius (xlviii.) that the author of the treatise called Λαβύρινθος, is also the author of the work Περὶ τῆς τοῦ παντὸς οὐσίας, which work the writer of the 'Treatise against all Heresies' refers to as his own. (P. 334.) It is evident, therefore, that all the three are by the same hand. Now Theodoretus having had occasion to mention that the 'Labyrinth' was attributed by some to Origen, declares that the difference of the style is of itself sufficient to refute that assertion: κατὰ τῆς τούτων αἱρέσεως ὁ σμικρὸς συνεγράφη Λαβύρινθος, ὅν τινες Ὠριγένους ὑπολαμβάνουσι ποίημα, ἀλλ' ὁ χαρακτὴρ ἐλέγχει τοὺς λέγοντας. (*Haret. Fab.* lib. ii. c. v.)

The same facts which prove that Origen could not have written this work also prove that the author of it must have been a bishop, and at the same time intimately connected with the affairs of the Church of Rome, and well acquainted, and frequently and officially brought into contact, with Zephyrinus and his successor Callistus. If, therefore, we can find in the history of the Church at that period a person to whom this description will apply, and to whom also such a work as that now before us has been attributed by competent testimony, we shall doubtless have arrived at the solution of the question, Who is the author of the work now under our consideration?

Mr. Bunsen writes thus: —

'Even they who know no more of the primitive ecclesiastical polity than what they may have learned from Bingham or Mosheim must be aware, that the six bishops of the towns and districts in the immediate neighbourhood of Rome, formed, even in the second century, part of what was then called the Church of Rome. They were integral portions of her presbytery, and took part in the election of her bishop, and in the important functions of ecclesiastical discipline and administration. One of those suburban bishops was the bishop of Portus, the new harbour of the Tiber, opposite to Ostia, formed by Trajan. Hippolytus, in almost all the ancient accounts respecting him, bears the title of Episcopus Portuensis; and we shall see later that there never was any other tradition about him. I will only say here, that his celebrated statue in the Vatican library, found in the year 1551, in the very ancient cemetery near Rome, described (about the year

400) by Prudentius as the place of the burial of Hippolytus, the bishop of Portus, near Ostia, is sufficient to prove him to have been that bishop; for he is represented sitting on the episcopal chair or cathedra, and the Paschal cycle inscribed on the chair is a western Roman one. (P. 12.)

'Eusebius, speaking of Hippolytus, the celebrated author of the "Chronological Annals," which go down to the first year of Alexander Severus (222), and of the "Paschal Cycle," which begins from the first year of that reign, mentions amongst his works that "Against "all the Heresies." Jerome does the same, which must be considered in this case as an independent testimony; for he gives the titles of some works not mentioned by Eusebius. Epiphanius (Hær. xi. c. 33.) cites the name of Hippolytus with those of Clemens of Alexandria and of Irenæus, as the principal authors who had refuted the Valentinian heresies, the treatise on which occupies so prominent a part in the book before us.

'Finally, the Letter of Peter bishop of Alexandria (who suffered martyrdom in 311), on the Paschal time,—a letter the authenticity of which, doubted even by Routh (Rel. Sac. iv.), is now proved by Mai's discoveries,—quotes a passage from the work of Hippolytus, the witness of the truth, the bishop of Portus near Rome, "Against all "the Heresies," about the heresy of the Quartodecimani; and I shall prove that this passage must have existed in our work, but that our present text gives us only an extract in this as in several other places.' (P. 15.)

These facts put together meet the condition which we have stated above, and appear to us to carry with themselves convincing proof that Hippolytus, who was Bishop of Portus, a member of the Roman Synod, a contemporary with Zephyrinus and Callistus, to whom such a book has been attributed by several competent witnesses, can alone be the author of the work before us.

But there are other facts to prove this still more strongly. Photius has the following passage in his 'Bibliotheca' (c. cxxi.):—'A little book of Hippolytus was read. Hippolytus was a 'disciple of Irenæus. It is a treatise on *Thirty-two Heresies*, 'beginning with the Dositheans and going down to Noetus and 'the Noetians. He says that Irenæus entered into a refutation 'of them in his lectures, and that he (Hippolytus) made a 'synopsis of these, and thus composed his book.' Mr. Bunsen has shown that the work under our consideration confutes *thirty-two heresies*, and that there are several passages in it taken from Irenæus; and, further, that the author of the work himself mentions the use which he has made of the Bishop of Lyons' writings. There can be no reasonable doubt, therefore, entertained but that this work, which we now have, is the one mentioned by Photius, and that in his day it was ascribed to Hippolytus.

Again, Theodoretus* says that Hippolytus, Bishop and Martyr, was one of those writers who held that Nicolaus, one of the seven deacons mentioned in the Acts of the Apostles (c. vi. 5.), was the originator of the heresy of the Nicolaitans. And Schulze, in a note upon this passage, expresses his opinion that this statement of Hippolytus would be found in the Treatise against thirty-two heresies mentioned by Photius.† Now the author of this work before us states this very thing. Πολλῆς δὲ αὐτῶν συστάσεως κακῶν αἴτιος γεγένηται Νικόλαος, εἷς τῶν ἑπτὰ εἰς διακονίαν ὑπὸ τῶν ἀποστόλων κατασταθεὶς, ὃς ἀποστὰς τῆς κατ' εὐθεῖαν διδασκαλίας, ἐδίδασκεν ἀδιαφορίαν βίου τε καὶ γνώσεως, οὗ τοὺς μαθητὰς ἐνυβρίζοντας τὸ ἅγιον πνεῦμα διὰ τῆς Ἀποκαλύψεως Ἰωάννου ἤλεγχε πορνεύοντας καὶ εἰδωλόθυτα ἐσθίοντας. (P. 258.) A comparison also of several passages in Theodoretus, with others touching the same matters in the 'Refutation of all Heresies,' shows that he must have made use of this in compiling his own work on Heresies: the conclusion, therefore, is obvious, that he knew this book to have been written by Hippolytus. Gobarus‡ also mentions this statement of Hippolytus relative to Nicolaus the Deacon.

We have already seen that Peter, Bishop of Alexandria, in a quotation from him, preserved in the Introduction to the 'Chronicon Paschale,' speaks of a 'Treatise against all Heresies' by Hippolytus, and cites a passage from that book. This passage, although not in the precise words, is also found in the work under our consideration. (See *Bunsen*, vol. i. p. 107.)

Moreover, the author of this 'Treatise against all Heresies,' mentions, as we have remarked above, another work of his own, called Περὶ τῆς τοῦ παντὸς οὐσίας. (P. 334.) There exists a portion of a Homily, first published by Hœschelius as a work falsely attributed to Josephus§, and afterwards printed by Le Moyne‖, and subsequently by Fabricius, in his edition of Hippolytus (vol. i. p. 220—222.), with this inscription: Τοῦ ἁγίου Ἱππολύτου ἐκ τοῦ πρὸς Ἕλληνας λόγου τοῦ ἐπιγεγραμμένου κατὰ Πλάτωνα περὶ τῆς τοῦ παντὸς αἰτίας. This is evidently the same treatise as that on the statue of Hippolytus, entitled Πρὸς Ἕλληνας καὶ πρὸς Πλάτωνα, ἢ καὶ περὶ τοῦ παντός. If there could be any doubt as to the identity of this work, the following passage from Photius (c. 48.) is surely sufficient to

---

* Hæret. Fab. lib. iii. c. 1.

† 'Libellus iste videtur partem Operis contra Hæreses 32 constituisse, cui ex Irenæo quædam admixta fuisse testatur. Photius,' Cod. 121.'

‡ See Photius, Cod. ccxxii.

§ In the notes to Photius, edit. 1563, p. 9.

‖ In Varia Sacra, vol. i. p. 53.

remove it:—Περὶ τοῦ παντὸς, ὃ ἐν ἄλλοις ἀνέγνων ἐπιγραφόμενον, Περὶ τῆς τοῦ παντὸς αἰτίας, ἐν ἄλλοις δὲ, Περὶ τῆς τοῦ παντος οὐσίας. It is true that Photius attributes this book to Caius, because it was plain, from the author's own words, that he was the same person as had written the 'Labyrinth' (which, indeed, is also by Hippolytus), although, as he states, in consequence of its having been left incomplete, some had ascribed it to Josephus, some to Justyn Martyr, and others to Irenæus. He did not know who its author was. We may, however, safely take his account as to the identity of the book, and that of the inscription on the statue for its authorship.

It would not be difficult to adduce many other arguments, all tending to the same end. Mr. Bunsen has compared and shown the similarity of various passages from the well-known works of Hippolytus with others from this treatise, and we ourselves have compared several others, which all lead to the same conclusion. We believe, however, that enough has been advanced to satisfy any candid inquirer that the book before us could have been written by no other person than Hippolytus, bishop of Portus and martyr. Professor Jacobi, in the 'Deutsche Zeitschrift für 'Christliche Wissenschaft und Christliches Leben,' expresses his opinion that Hippolytus is the author of the 'Treatise 'against all Heresies;' and Dr. Duncker, in the 'Göttinger 'Gelehrte Anzeigen,' pronounces that the author is Hippolytus, and promises to prove his assertion in a new edition of this work on Heresies, which he is now engaged in preparing. Both these learned men have come to their conclusion without having any knowledge of Mr. Bunsen's researches, which, however, had been printed some time before, although not published. Dr. Lomnatzch, the editor of Origen's works, in a private letter to Mr. Bunsen, has stated his conviction that the work cannot have been written by Origen, and his belief that it is from the pen of Hippolytus. Thiersch also has arrived at the same conclusion.

The first and second letters to Archdeacon Hare are chiefly employed in proving that the work is the production of Hippolytus, and in giving an analysis of its contents. We will not weary our readers by entering into any detail respecting the melancholy aberrations of the human intellect and the sad perversion of the simplicity of Christian truth which these heresies display. Much curious and interesting information, however, may be derived from them relating to the influence of Christianity upon different systems of speculative philosophy when it was first brought into contact with them, and began to act upon them. We will pass on to the third letter, in which Mr. Bunsen gives some account of the government and condition of

the Church of Rome under Zephyrinus and Callistus, A.D. 199—222. As we are here furnished with some very curious facts respecting the personal character and history of these two early Popes of Rome, of which we had no knowledge previously, we shall quote a considerable passage from this letter: —

'We know that in the latter years of the reign of the unworthy son of the philosophical and virtuous but inefficient emperor Marcus Aurelius, Commodus, his mistress Marcia played a conspicuous part in the history of the palace. She married, as a matter of course it would appear, the captain of the guards, and was believed to exercise a great influence on the emperor. When his brutal temper became unbearable, she was privy to the conspiracy which put him to death by poison and suffocation. Of this Marcia we knew already, from Dion, that she was very kind to the Christians. We learn now from Hippolytus, that she was Godloving (φιλόθεος), that is to say, that she had been converted to the Christian faith. The part she acts in the life of Callistus is peculiarly interesting. There was under Commodus, when Victor was bishop of Rome, a good Christian soul called Carpophorus, who had a Christian slave of the name of Callistus. To help him on, he gave him the administration of a bank, which he kept in that celebrated quarter of Rome called the *Piscina publica.* Many brethren and widows trusted their money to this bank, having great faith in the Christian character of Carpophorus. But Callistus turned out a rogue; he made away with the sums intrusted to him, and when the depositors wanted their money, it was gone. Their complaints came before Carpophorus: he asked for the accounts; and when the fraud could be no longer concealed, Callistus made his escape. He ran down to the harbour, Portus, some twenty miles from Rome, found a ship ready to start, and embarked. Carpophorus was not slow in following him, and found the ship moored in the middle of the harbour. He took a boat to claim the criminal Callistus seeing no escape, threw himself into the sea, and was with difficulty saved, and delivered up to his master, who, taking the matter into his own hands, gave him the domestic treadmill of the Roman slave-owners, the *pistrinum.* Some time passed, and as it is wont to happen (says Hippolytus), some brethren came to Carpophorus, and said he ought to give poor Callistus a fair chance of regaining his character, or at least his money. He pretended that he had money outstanding, and that if he could only go about, he should recover it. "Well," said good Carpophorus, "let him go and try what "he can recover: I do not care much for my own money, but I mind "that of the poor widows." So Callistus went out on a Sabbath (Saturday), pretending he had to recover some money from the Jews, but in fact having resolved to do something desperate, which might put an end to his life, or give a turn to his case. He went into a synagogue and raised a great riot there, saying he was a Christian, and interrupting their service. The Jews were of course enraged at this insult, fell upon him, beat him, and then carried him before Fuscianus the prefect of Rome. While this judge, a very severe man, was

hearing the case, somebody recognised Callistus, and ran to tell Carpophorus what was going on. Carpophorus went immediately to the Court, and said, "This fellow is no Christian, but wants to get rid of "his life, having robbed me of much money, as I will prove." The Jews, thinking this was a Christian stratagem to save Callistus, insisted upon having him punished for disturbing them in the lawful exercise of their worship. Fuscianus therefore sentenced him to be scourged, and then transported to the unwholesome parts of Sardinia, so fatal to life in summer.

'Some time after, says Hippolytus, Marcia, wishing to do a good work, sent for bishop Victor and asked what Christians had been transported to Sardinia, adding, that she would beg the Emperor to release them. The bishop made out a list of them; but being a judicious and righteous man, he omitted the name of Callistus, knowing the offence that he had committed. Marcia obtained the letter of pardon; and Hyacinthus, a eunuch (of the service of the palace undoubtedly), and a presbyter (of the Church), was despatched to the governor of the island to claim and bring back the martyrs. Hyacinthus delivered his list, and Callistus finding that his name was not upon it, began to lament and entreat, and at last moved Hyacinthus to demand his liberation also. Here the text is somewhat obscure; but thus much is clear, that his liberation was obtained by bringing the name of Marcia into play.

'When Callistus made his appearance, Victor was much vexed; the scandal had not been forgotten, and Carpophorus (his lawful master) was still alive. So he sent him off to Antium (Porto d'Anzo), and gave him a certain sum a month. Whether it was here Callistus fell in with Zephyrinus or at Rome itself, no sooner was Carpophorus dead than Zephyrinus, now become bishop of Rome, made him his coadjutor to keep the clergy in order, and gave himself up to him so entirely, that Callistus did with him what he liked. Unfortunately, says Hippolytus, Zephyrinus was not only very stupid and ignorant, but loving money very much, took bribes. Things went on in this way until Zephyrinus died, when Callistus was elected to the eminent post he had coveted all the time. He became bishop of Rome, and the theological disputes in that Church began to be envenomed.' (P. 126—131.)

We cannot be surprised that under the superintendence of a bishop of such a character as Callistus, heresy should be rife, more particularly when he was ready to adopt any opinion, sometimes on one side and sometimes on the other, which seemed most likely to tend to the support of his own personal power. He established a school, in which the doctrine of Noetus was taught; and for the satisfaction of many who had been excommunicated, and now flocked to that school, he set up the doctrine 'that he forgave the sins of all.' And in order to screen himself, he further laid down a principle: 'If a bishop commits 'sin, be it even a sin unto death, he must not be deposed for all

'that.' How much of the Romish system then must have taken its origin from this very Callistus? No wonder therefore that this account of Hippolytus, which is now for the first time, after the lapse of many ages, brought to light, should have entirely disappeared, and have been nowhere to be found in any of those countries over which that system once tyrannised. Callistus, one of the so-called successors of St. Peter, has, of course, been canonised as a saint; and his festival is celebrated on the 14th of October.

The fourth letter contains 'Hippolytus' own Confession;' but to ourselves it is far more interesting, as exhibiting Mr. Bunsen's own bold and full confession on many important subjects, which in these days most of our own countrymen would recoil from grappling with, either from timidity or ignorance. He speaks openly his own convictions on the province of reason, and the reliance to be placed upon authority in matters of faith; and he evidently is inclined to the conclusion that there is far less danger to be apprehended against the real interests of Christianity from the rationalism which is in the one extreme than from the materialism of the other. In the following sentiment we most fully concur: —

'There is no strength to be compared with that of a faith which identifies moral and intellectual conviction with religious belief, with that of an authority instituted by such a faith, and of a Christian life based upon it, and striving to Christianize this world of ours, for which Christianity was proclaimed. Let those who are sincere but timid, look into their conscience and ask themselves whether their timidity proceeds from faith, or whether it betray not rather a want of faith.' (Vol. i. p. 173.)

We will quote one more passage from this letter: —

'No Protestant in particular will ever arrive at that satisfactory result which the history of the Church and of the world presents to me, and feel his mind settled both as a philosopher and a Christian, who takes his stand on the confused and idealess formalism of that age of despair and hypocrisy, the second part of the seventeenth, and the first part of the eighteenth century. If he can read the old fathers critically, and will be consistent, he will arrive at open unbelief. Let no one search unless he be prepared to take the high ground of Christian life and liberty, and to apply historical criticism to the facts, and independent speculation to the ideas of Christianity. But above all, let him be honest and true. Whoever makes a bargain with his reason and conscience, will bruise and twist them, and lose all power of conviction and of faith. This is true, not only individually, but also nationally.

'As to those who love servitude, and fancy they can avert scepticism by authority, and to those who show their Christian charity by

priestly anathemas, their learning by ignoring facts, and their wisdom by superseding Christian wisdom with arbitrary decisions and dictates, let me say to them with Christian frankness, what Hippolytus says to the Quartodecimans. If they will take the formularies of the Councils and of the Church as a law binding upon them, let them show reason why they do not take them all — not only all the formularies, past, present, and future, but also the other ordinances which the same councils, with the same authority, have laid upon mankind. Hippolytus' argument holds good against them: if they were bound by any part of the law, as such, they are bound by the whole. As to ourselves, my dearest friend, let us thank God that we are not thus bound; and let us live, and if necessary, die for the precious liberty of the children of God.' (P. 180.)

The fifth letter, which completes the first volume, treats of Hippolytus' life and writings, and the theological and ecclesiastical character of his age. It would carry us far beyond our limits to enter into any detail respecting the various works written by or attributed to Hippolytus. We will quote one passage relating to his exposition on the Psalms: —

'The most remarkable passage is the following; because it shows how far the fathers were from that superstition which seems to have crept into the minds even of some learned and eminent men in this country, who write on the Psalms as if it were part and parcel of orthodoxy to believe that all of them are by David, and that they were composed by him, or at the utmost by him and his friends, for the use of the congregation as an official hymn-book; whereas such an opinion is nothing but a proof of ignorance, and, in divines, of a contempt for truth and learning.

'The words are these: after having said that the Jews called the Psalter Sephra Thelim (Sepher Tehillim, the book of Songs) without any name of an author, Hippolytus adds, "the reason thereof is this, that the compositions were not written by one; but Esdras collected those of several authors, as the traditions inform us, in the time after the Captivity when he united the Psalms of different writers, or rather songs in general (λόγους); for they are not all Psalms. In consequence some of them have the name of David prefixed to them, some that of Solomon, others that of Asaph. There are also some by Jedu-thun (Ἰδιθούμ), and besides some by the sons of Korah, also by Moses. Now the compositions of all these men collected together will not be called the Psalms of David alone by any one who understands the matter."' (P. 284.)

Mr. Bunsen might have added that this ignorance as to the Psalms, which leads many in the present day to look upon all those holy songs as the composition of the King of Israel, was certainly shared by one of the most eminent fathers of the fourth century — even no less a person than the golden-mouthed Patriarch of Constantinople. For Chrysostom, in his thirty-

third homily on the First Epistle to the Corinthians, has these words: — 'Especially not all things spoken by David in the 'Psalms are spoken in the person of David. For it is he him-'self who saith, "I have dwelt in the tents of Kedar, and by the '"waters of Babylon there we sat and wept." But he never saw 'Babylon nor the tents of Kedar.' There may not be sufficient grounds to determine accurately who was the author of either of these two psalms cited by Chrysostom, but there can be no doubt in the mind of any reflecting person, even although he be not skilled in the criticism of the Book of Psalms, that the 137th cannot be anterior to the captivity of Babylon.

After having endeavoured to draw the character of Hippolytus from such records as have been handed down respecting him, and from the materials supplied by his own works, Mr. Bunsen subjoins the following remarks: —

'I am fully aware that some persons will think that I have not treated Hippolytus with the respect due to a sainted father of the Latin Church. For to certain persons every such father speaks with a share of the collective infallibility of a synodical clergy; and these patristic idolaters are strongly inclined to impose such an authority upon us in matters of fact, no less than in metaphysical formularies. We are to submit to those fathers, if they assert something as a historical fact, which we have very good reasons for not giving credit to, or which we know to be untrue; and as to metaphysical theories, we are to receive their opinions with the greater respect, the more they are contrary to the reasoning power to which they appeal. When these theologians, unworthy of the name of Protestants, of thinkers, and of historians, speak of the paramount weight of their concordant interpretations, they ignore, or do not know, that on all questions of scriptural and primitive Christianity which are now doubtful to us, the ancient writers were in as much uncertainty as we are. The writers of the fourth century generally contradict those of the second, who are in part witnesses, or reported credible evidence and plausible traditions; whereas those later fathers were only critics, and most of them very indifferent and biassed ones. For they often proceed from systems, historical and doctrinal, which strongly impair their qualifications for being judges, and still more show their unfitness for being set up as infallible models of criticism. If then to criticise the fathers is to show them disrepect, these later fathers have themselves shown it to their predecessors. The much trumpeted saying, "Quod semper, quod ubique, quod ab omnibus," is a silly truism in the sense of those idolaters of the letter, and if taken in the sense in which it is true, destroys their system and their authority.' (Vol. i. p. 320.)

We are now brought to the end of the first volume, which indeed seems to embrace the whole of the writer's original intention to show that the newly-discovered 'Refutation' of all

'Heresies' is not the work of Origen, but of Hippolytus, to give some account of this remarkable book, and of its author, and also to enter into a fuller enumeration than had hitherto been made of the rest of his writings. The three succeeding volumes have grown out of the connexion of the subjects on which they treat, with a variety of matters relating to the Christian Church and Christianity suggested by this book of Hippolytus. As we have already devoted so great a portion of our space to the first volume, and given such copious extracts from it, and indeed from some of the others, we must necessarily be brief in what follows.

The second volume has reference to the philosophical history of the Church: on the title-page it is denominated 'The 'Philosophical Research.' The matter, as he himself states, Mr. Bunsen has condensed into 'Aphorisms and Fragments,' which he trusts include the most essential points. It commences with the Aphorisms. We will quote only a very few of them: —

'There never was brought forward a more crude and unphilosophical notion than that of the English and French deists of the last century respecting natural religion. Its most absolute formula is that of Diderot: "All positive religions are the heresies of natural reli-"gion." There no more exists a natural religion, than there exists a natural or abstract language in opposition to a positive or concrete language. What was called natural religion is, on the contrary, but the dross of religion, the *caput mortuum* which remains in the crucible of a godless reason after the evaporation of all life.' (Vol. ii. p. 59.)

'Prophets were wanted in the former period to pronounce the will of the divinity whose oracle was asked, and these prophets again required and had their interpreters or hypophets, who clad the obscure words of the unconscious clear-sighted seer in intelligible words. Now new prophets are needed, and this time conscious ones interpreters of their own sights. At the same time two opposite schools will arise among the prophets and among the people. Some will stick to the letter, others cling to the spirit. Both have much to say for themselves. What is the letter without the spirit in a subject essentially spiritual? and what is the spirit without the letter in a record substantially historical? But, besides, who is to decide what the letter is and means? Some say the living priestly authority — some the tradition of the learned of old — some the present consciousness of men enlightened by study, thought, and earnest life.' (Vol. ii. p. 79.)

'Is more religion or less required in such a state of things? Certainly faith is required, and faith will be manifested more than ever before. But with what dangers is the way beset which goes from the paradise lost to the paradise regained! — from the blooming land of childhood to the fruitful land of promise, through the desert of doubt and close by the abyss of infidelity! Scepticism, armed with all the powers of civilisation, comes to the market-place, and asks, Is not

inspiration frenzy? faith superstition? are not rites mummeries? histories nursery tales? Is not the much praised divine medal after all an ordinary coin or counterfeit? the tradition about it a fiction and a forgery? the artist who coined it, and perhaps the god or hero impressed upon it, an impostor or a dupe? So the philosopher asks: the learned critic is silent or nods assent; and the busy crowd round the market of life either burns the inquirer as an atheist and a disturber of public order and peace, or revenges itself upon its own credulity and submission by scorn and rebellion. A wide sea opens before poor humanity where a safe harbour had appeared as a refuge from the raging waves. The reaction is strongest where the moral or political constraint has been greatest. The most superstitious nations always end in being the most sceptical and irreligious; and thus often again, in melancholy turn, become superstitious when frightened by their own infidelity and unworthiness, and infidels when the iron rod of superstition becomes intolerable. Slaves who have broken their chains, without carrying self-government with them, are doomed by divine judgment to be crushed by despotic sway. This is the agony of religion. But where remains religion itself?' (P. 82.)

'The nations of the present age want not less religion, but more. They do not wish for less community with the apostolic times, but for more: but above all, they want their wounds healed by a Christianity showing a life-renewing vitality allied to reason and conscience, and ready and able to reform the social relations of life, beginning with the domestic and culminating with the political. They want no negations, but positive reconstruction; no conventionality, but an honest *bonâ fide* foundation; deep as the human mind, and a structure free and organic as nature. In the meantime let no national form be urged as identical with divine truth; let no dogmatic formula oppress conscience and reason; and let no corporation of priests, and no set of dogmatists sow discord and hatred in the sacred communities of domestic and national life. This aim cannot be attained without national efforts, Christian education, free institutions, and social reforms. Then no zeal will be called Christian which is not hallowed by charity—no faith Christian which is not sanctioned by reason.' (P. 115.)

The Aphorisms are followed by 'Historical Fragments on the 'Life and Consciousness of the Ancient Church and of the Age 'of Hippolytus in particular.' In these Mr. Bunsen endeavours to show what were, or indeed, rather what were *not* Hippolytus' views touching a variety of tenets maintained by different sections and denominations of Christians. We cannot enter into these at any length: we will, however, mention a few facts which are deserving of attention. So far from Hippolytus considering the Church of Rome at that time to be the Universal Church, which had the right to dictate and issue her decrees to all the world, it is shown that he puts the Church of Rome in distinct opposition to the Catholic Church. It is also

plain that in his day the services of the Church were performed even at the port of Rome, where he resided, in Greek; and that his sermons were also delivered in the same language; not because Greek was held to be a sacred tongue, even although all the books of the New Testament, with one or two exceptions, were originally written in it, but because, in the harbour of Rome, among the merchants, bankers, secretaries, and agents of all nations, which resorted thither, Greek was the language most generally used and best understood. It is plain, therefore, that at the end of the second and the beginning of the third century the Latin was not esteemed to be a sacred language even in Italy, or to be used any where in preference to the vernacular tongue in the services of the Church. The clergy, too, were certainly then not looked upon in the light of sacrificial and mediatorial priests in the sense of the later Roman pretensions after the perversion of the sacrifice of the Mass, nor were they bound to a vow of celibacy. The canon of Scripture received by Hippolytus was essentially the same as our own. Although he did not acknowledge the Epistle to the Hebrews to be St. Paul's, he quotes it as having apostolic authority; and indeed, as Mr. Bunsen observes, 'the churches which did not receive 'this epistle as St. Paul's, acknowledge both its catholicity 'and its Pauline character, and ascribed it — some to Clemens 'Romanus, who has many passages from it, but evidently gives 'them not as his own — some to St. Luke, for which there is 'no tradition either, no more than for St. Barnabas, to whom 'Tertullian thinks it might belong; in short, to friends and 'disciples of the great Apostle.' (P. 137.) It will be interesting to see what Hippolytus himself says, on the authority of the Holy Scriptures: —

'There is one God, my brethren, and Him we know only by the Holy Scriptures. For in like manner as he who wishes to learn the wisdom of this world cannot accomplish it without studying the doctrine of the philosophers; thus all those who wish to practise divine wisdom will not learn it from any other source than from the Word of God. Let us, therefore, see what the Holy Scriptures pronounce; let us understand what they teach, and let us believe as the Father wishes to be believed, and praise the Son as he wishes to be praised, and accept the Holy Spirit as he wishes to be given. Not according to our own will, nor according to our own reason, nor forcing what God has given; but let us see all this as He has willed to showed it by the Holy Scriptures.'

This passage is taken from the tract against Noetus, and the version is Mr. Bunsen's. (P. 144.) The following passage, from the same section, is well deserving of attention: —

'Here one cannot help remarking a one-sidedness of the Protestant divines of the sixteenth and particularly of the seventeenth centuries, which has been, and continues to be, the cause of endless confusion and lamentable untruth and ignorance. What relates the history of the Word of God in his humanity and in this world, and what records its teachings and warnings, and promises, was mistaken for the Word of God itself in its proper sense. By this mistake, the faith in the real Word of God, which is the only immutable and eternal standard of truth, and has its response in the Spirit within, was obscured, and is obscured to this day; and its only recipients, Reason and Conscience, have been and are violated, to the sad confusion of Christ's Church.' (P. 149.)

'The Theses on the Eucharist, which can be proved historically,' and 'the Epochs of the history of the Christian Sacrifice and the Eucharist,' are pieces which were originally written in German nearly thirty years ago; and the extract from a letter to Dr. Nott, 'on the Nature of the Christian Sacrifice,' dates as far back as Christmas Day, 1829. They relate to very interesting and important matters which have deeply occupied the writer's thoughts for a long time, and which he has now at length given to the public. It is evident that the conclusions at which he has arrived have stood the test of the long experience of many years in his own mind, and that every renewed research and additional gleam of light have strengthened his convictions. We have read them with great attention, and we believe that we may sum up the result at which he has arrived as to the nature of the Christian sacrifice in the beautiful words of the prayer of our own communion service: — 'And here we offer and present unto thee, O Lord, 'ourselves, our souls and bodies, to be a reasonable, holy, and 'lively sacrifice unto thee.'

The fact that the name of Hippolytus had been so much connected with the eighth book of the Apostolic Constitutions, and that the following title, Περὶ χαρισματων ἀποστολικὴ παράδοσις, is found on his statue, seems first to have suggested to Mr. Bunsen the idea of entering into a full investigation respecting the Apostolic Constitutions, which, from the frequent references made to them by the earliest Christian writers, appear to have had, in some form or other, much influence upon the practice and customs of the Church before the time of Constantine. The history of this highly interesting, although, in its present state, greatly amplified and interpolated collection, is involved in the obscurity of age; and great has been the diversity of opinion respecting it, varying from the view of Whiston, who maintained that these Christian laws and constitutions were delivered at Jerusalem and on Mount Sion by our

Lord to the eleven apostles there assembled in the interval between his resurrection and ascension*, to that of Archbishop Ussher, who pronounced them to be supposititious, and referred them, in their present form at least, to as late a date as the sixth century.† It seems, however, to be self-evident that in the Apostolic Churches, and in those of the ages immediately following them, there must have been laws and regulations as to a variety of matters connected with their government, discipline, customs, practice, and religious service, beyond the rule of faith, of which the only deposit is in the Holy Scriptures. Probably at first these were not committed to writing, and were included in the 'Apostolic Tradition,' to which reference is frequently made by the earlier Fathers: and it seems almost certain that they were not positively the same as to form, although concurring in spirit, in the various Churches placed under different external circumstances and separated from each other by distance, and using another language. The collection of Apostolic Constitutions, which we have now in our hands, is attributed to Clement of Rome; and we think that Mr. Bunsen has very happily illustrated and explained the cause of this: —

'The name of Clement of Rome was used as that of the author of those regulations, he having been the apostolic man who had first recorded ordinances or injunctions of the Apostles not found in Scripture, or at least had first claimed universal authority for them. His name and the names of the Apostles are used as a mythical form to express an undoubted fact, namely, the apostolicity of such injunctions as to the substance. The sense of the whole fiction is, that whatever in those ordinances is not directly the work of the Apostles must be considered as apostolic, as coming from their disciples, who, with their followers in the next generation, had continued their work in the same spirit, Clement of Rome being the first and most prominent among them. The consciousness of apostolicity in the second and third centuries justifies, or at least excuses and explains, such a fiction, which moreover could deceive nobody who reflected on the subject. St. Jerome has, in the letter to Lucian already quoted, the following very remarkable words: — "I think it right briefly to admonish thee, that apostolic traditions (particularly those which do not affect faith) ought to be observed as they have been delivered, and that the customs of some should not be destroyed by those of others. . . . . Let the people of every province stand by their own, and consider the precepts of their forefathers as apostolic laws." This advice, if well understood, is very sensible; and, at all events, highly instructive as to the view of the ancient Church.' (Vol. ii. p. 226.)

* See Primitive Christianity, vol. iii. p. 20.

† 'Diss. de Apostolicis Constitutionibus et Canonibus Clementi 'Romano tributis,' prefixed to his edition of the Letters of Polycarp and Ignatius, p. xli.

Other similar collections, such as the *Didascalia* of Ignatius, the *Didascalia* of Hippolytus, and the *Didache* of Polycarp, of which mention is made by ecclesiastical writers, seem to owe their appellations to the same cause. The opinion of Bishop Pearson*, that the Greek Apostolic Constitutions as we now possess them, have been composed of all or of several of these different codes patched up together, seems to us to be very probable. The author of this piece of patchwork can hardly be any other than the same as put forth the Ignatian Epistles in their longer and second interpolated form, as Archbishop Ussher has shown.† However this may be, it will be quite evident to any one who carefully peruses the Apostolic Constitutions, that there are passages in them which relate to the days of the early persecutions of the Christians and of Pagan emperors, and others which refer to the later times of a Christian empire. The more ancient portions of them will therefore belong to the second and third centuries, and consequently have been closely connected with, and have had much influence upon, the customs and discipline of believers in the age of Hippolytus, and are calculated to afford us much information as to the life of the Ancient Church. We thus see how the consideration of the Apostolic Constitutions falls within the compass of the design which Mr. Bunsen had proposed to himself.

We do not think he has overstated the case respecting the influence which the more ancient portions of those Apostolic Constitutions exercised over the Church before the time of Constantine in the following passage: —

'There was a book in the ante-Nicene Church, in that age which as a whole we may call the Apostolic, and of which Hippolytus, Origen, and Cyprian, represent the latter part, — there was among the Christians of those two hundred years a book called apostolic in an eminent sense, as the work of all the Apostles. It was a book more read than any one of the writings of the Fathers, and in Church matters of greater weight than any other; the book before the authority of which the bishops themselves bowed, and to which the Churches looked up for advice in doubtful cases. And this book was not the Bible. It was not even a canonical book; but as to its form a work of fiction, and pretending to have emanated from the Apostles, was excluded by most of the Fathers, as spurious, from the books of the New Testament. This book was called sometimes the "Doctrine," more generally and properly, the "Ordinances," or the "Constitutions," "of the Apostles."' (P. 220.)

* Vind. Ignat. part i. p. 4.

† See Dissertation above mentioned, cap. x. p. lxiii.

By a careful analysis of the contents of the eight books, and by a comparison of the Greek text with the Abyssinian collections, as supplied by Vansleb and Ludolf, and with the Coptic, as furnished by the work of Archdeacon Tattam, and also by reference to the Arabic and Syriac, so far as the means were open to him, Mr. Bunsen has endeavoured to separate the most ancient portions from subsequent interpolations, and to exhibit them as nearly as he could in their Ante-Nicene form. We have already remarked, when speaking above of the analogous case of the Ignatian Epistles, that the results of this critical process have been greatly confirmed by an ancient Syriac manuscript in the National Library at Paris, with the contents of which Mr. Bunsen has subsequently become acquainted. Not only in the Greek, but also in the Syriac, Arabic, and Ethiopic, we find the name of Hippolytus connected with these Constitutions, although in the two last it appears only under the corrupted form peculiar to their mode of pronunciation of *Abulides*. It was the opinion of Gale * that the Apostolic Constitutions were brought from the East to Rome by Hippolytus, and he refers to a passage of Eusebius as intimating that they were sent thither by Dionysius of Alexandria, and that Hippolytus was the bearer of them — *καὶ ἑτέρα τις ἐπιστολὴ τοῖς ἐν Ῥώμῃ τοῦ Διονυσίου φέρεται διακονικὴ διὰ Ἱππολύτου.* (Book vi. c. 46.)

We do not think that the words of the ecclesiastical historian imply quite so much, but it is extremely probable that the Constitutions in use in the Alexandrian Church might have been introduced at Rome by Hippolytus, and by him have been incorporated or subjoined to others already in existence. From the result of his comparisons and investigations, Mr. Bunsen has arrived at the following conclusions, which are very interesting:—

'*First.* The Greek text contains three distinct collections: the first six books, the seventh, and the eighth.

'*Second.* The first of these collections (Books I.—VI.) is entirely rewritten, and then interpolated.

'*Third.* The interpolations, here and in the other collections, betray themselves in most cases, not only by their contents, but also by the fact that, when they are expunged, a natural order appears in the arrangement of the ordinances, instead of the present entire want of all logical order.

'*Fourth.* The second Greek collection, or the seventh book, is, in its ordinances, entirely original, and is not reproduced in the other, not Greek, collections.

'*Fifth.* The vulgar text of the eighth book of the Greek Consti-

* Cited by Cave, Hist. Lit. par. ii. p. 27.

tutions is a corrupt and interpolated recension of the text exhibited in the Vienna and Oxford manuscripts: exactly as Grabe had maintained.

'*Sixth.* This compilation is connected with Hippolytus, both by the Introduction with which it opens, and which may be considered as substantially representing part of the lost book of Hippolytus, the "Apostolic Tradition respecting the Gifts of the Holy Spirit," and by the wording of the chapters on the Offices of the Church, and perhaps by that of others (Books III.—VI.).

'*Seventh.* The principal materials of this compilation are contained in the latter portion of the collection of Apostolical Ordinances used in Egypt (Books III.—VI.), and preserved to us in the Coptic text.

'*Eighth.* The first portion of these Ordinances (Books I. II.) of the Church of Alexandria represents the groundwork of something very like that which the first six books of the Greek Constitutions, a decidedly fraudulent imposture, the forerunner of the Pseudo-Isidorian imposture of the later canon law of the Church of Rome, exhibit in a thoroughly corrupted and comparatively worthless text.

'*Ninth.* The other collection of the Church of Alexandria, now only preserved in the Abyssinian text and its Arabic translation, bears the same primitive character in its original elements, and represents in the chapter on the admission of Catechumens parts of the eighth book of our Greek Constitutions.

'*Tenth.* The Syrian collection, or the collection of ordinances as used in the Church of Antioch and its allied Churches of the Syrian tongue, bears a similar relation to other parts of the eighth book of our Greek Constitutions; but does not coincide with either of the Alexandrian collections.' (Vol. ii. p. 252.)

The inquiry respecting the Apostolic Constitutions closes the second volume. In the third, Mr. Bunsen has endeavoured, by a reconstructive process, to show what was 'the life of the 'Ancient Church, on education, baptism, and worship in 'government and social relations.' It is divided into two parts: the first is called the 'Church and House-book and Law-book 'of the Ante-Nicene Church.' This is compiled from such parts of the Apostolic Constitutions as belong to their more ancient form, and also from materials derived from other ancient sources; as, for instance, the account of the prayers of the Church of Antioch for Catechumens as supplied by Chrysostom in his second homily on the Second Epistle to the Corinthians, and the order of baptism in the Church of Jerusalem as recorded by Cyril in his sermons to the newly-baptized. These are arranged and classified under several heads, and a reference given to the source from which they have been taken. On this part, Mr. Bunsen has made the following observations in his introduction to the third volume. We especially recommend this introduction as containing some truly noble thoughts and

sentiments embodied in powerful and energetic language, which, although uttered by a foreigner, mounts even to eloquence in English style. We have not space to quote more from it than this passage immediately relating to our present subject:—

'The Church and House-Book of the ancient Church, more especially, is a book recording that Christian wisdom and piety inspired by the Holy Ghost. It is a book composed by believing souls whose names are known to God, and sealed with the blood of the confessors of the faith. It exhibits a testimony of faith in the moral government of the world, practically tried; a testimony to the freedom of mind and to the indestructibility of the dignity of man, against the tyranny of a Nero and the administration of justice of a Trajan; a light in the midst of the darkness of despairing infidelity, and of a comfortless philosophy among the educated classes. There is nothing which makes this document more venerable than its divine simplicity and childlikeness. Let no one open its leaves who does not know how to value this simplicity. To him who will not read them, as the Bible must be read, with pure and respectful feelings, they will only give offence and be injurious; he will only wrong, without in the least understanding them.' (P. viii.)

The second part of this volume contains the interpretation and application of the first. We must rest satisfied here with merely this short indication of its contents; but we think many will be gratified to know in what terms Mr. Bunsen, when speaking of the merits or defects of the Liturgies of the reformed Churches, in general, has pronounced respecting our own:—

'The Liturgy, as a whole, is dignified throughout, although it cannot be pronounced to be organic in itself, nor adapted for general use in Christendom, still less for domestic use. We must, however, from our point of view, consider the fact, that a Book of Common Prayer has become a national institution, as more important than all defects, and even all excellences, of detail. It is of all Church ordinances, since the Reformation, the most important. It was a great and a blessed thought, this placing in the hands of a Christian nation a book impressing evangelical truths, not by abstract theological formulas, but by an act of worship and edification, and in language intelligible to the congregation. Such a book alone was capable of becoming a Church and House-Book, and such it has become. It is in itself as valuable as the Text-Book of the ancient Church, the fragments of which we have endeavoured to restore, and in many points infinitely superior to it; although, alas! less free, and breathing less of faith in that Christian Spirit which inspires the praying or teaching speaker. No Church in Christendom has yet carried out those liturgical ideas with the same dignity and completeness. The German Churches have, to this day, produced only clerical liturgies and regulations, and even the liturgical reform of Frederic William the Third has not gone beyond that. The Order

of Prayers (Agenda) is a book for the clergy, and placed only in their hands. The Hymn-books, as well as almost everything that is good since the time of Luther, the German congregations have been obliged to work out for themselves, amid bloody struggles, with all the disadvantages of isolation, and mostly under despotic forms of government.' (P. 293.)

'It must not be forgotten that the English Church and House-Book became and has remained at once the most widely circulated, and the most practically blessed book of devotion in the Christian world, and the only national one. With the exception of the Quakers, all Dissenters who speak the English language (even the Unitarians) retain a large portion, the Methodists almost the whole, without any alteration, of the contents of that Church-Book. The lamentable notion, that the service is essentially the sermon, has, by that means, been carefully guarded against by the English Church, as well as the spirit of theological quibbling which darkens the ancient, and the arbitrary license of the individual minister which disfigures the modern, German development.' (P. 327.)

'Among modern ordinances, the English Funeral Service is a model of dignity and solemnity, and beautiful in its choice of the psalms. The German Lutheran Service has, however, its own noble elements of spiritual poetry, in common with the most ancient Church. In the Marriage Ceremony both are exemplary; but here, again, by the side of the truly grand national work of the English Liturgy, the Liturgies of distracted Germany show only classical elements clumsily put together: the natural consequence of provincial dismemberment.' (P. 345.)

The mention of liturgies carries us on to the second part of the fourth and last volume of Mr. Bunsen's work, in which he has given 'The genuine Liturgies of the Ancient Church.' The whole question relating to liturgies—what was their origin — what their ancient form — what parts are common to all — what peculiar to each—how they developed themselves in various Churches—how they came to be amplified and dilated, is one of exceeding interest, but of far too great extent and magnitude for us to attempt to offer any remarks upon it in this place. We believe that Mr. Bunsen's labours have opened the way by a new and critical process, and also made considerable advances towards solving much of the doubt and difficulty involved in this inquiry. We can venture to recommend this part of his work especially to the study of all those who are able to bring sufficient knowledge and learning to bear with advantage upon this subject. It must be deeply interesting to every lover of Christian antiquity, and, indeed, to every Christian; for who can feel otherwise than interested to know how those who followed immediately in the footsteps of the Apostles, worshipped in celebrating that Holy Communion which Christ

himself instituted, and by which, as St. Paul says, we show the Lord's death till He come — and to ascertain how nearly those who came after them in each successive age down to our own time adhered to their path, or how widely they diverged from it. This is neutral ground on which all, to whatever party or set of opinions they belong, may venture, without meeting with a stumbling-block to overthrow their charity, unless, indeed, they seek it designedly.

We quote the following passage from the general introduction to the liturgies of the Ancient Church, as showing Mr. Bunsen's own sentiments on this head: —

'It is impossible to enter into the sanctuary of Christian devotion, and undertake a historical review of the sublime thought of worship through eighteen centuries, without feeling overawed by the magnitude and holiness of the subject. I approach this sacred task not without a long preparation, nor without a deep feeling of responsibility, but without fear. For I am conscious of entering into the precincts of that sanctuary with unfeigned reverence, and with no other object than that of pointing out the world-historical importance of that idea of Christian worship—the picture of which I have attempted to draw in the preceding volume. I do so, moreover, with sincere charity towards all Christian creeds. From that point of view, all party animosities appear as senseless as they are culpable. It is as untrue and as unmeaning, as it is unworthy and odious, to attempt to explain by outward circumstances, or to attribute to base personal motives, great spiritual movements and liturgical forms, which have exercised and are exercising a supreme power over millions and millions of civilised people, and which are objects of awe and respect to nations, and spiritual guides to noble and holy minds.' (Vol. iv. p. 135.)

The reader will find here printed, for the first time, some important liturgical fragments, copied from a palimpsest of great antiquity, in the Monastery of St. Gall, by Niebuhr, and by him communicated to Mr. Bunsen for publication thirty years ago; but which various causes have retarded. We are glad to see them at length brought to light. It is not without regret that we feel ourselves compelled to leave this — perhaps the most important subject of Mr. Bunsen's task — and to return to the first part of the third volume, and thus bring to a close our observations upon a work which embraces so great a variety of subjects as to constrain us to be brief upon each that we touch upon, and to pass over many points altogether without notice.

We feel it, however, to be our duty in this place to correct an error into which Mr. Bunsen has fallen, when he states (vol. iv. p. 238.), that the first edition of the Liturgy of St.

Mark, printed at Paris in 1583*, does not exist in the British Museum. Having had, ourselves, occasion to make use of this volume, we know that it does exist there, and is to be found in the Catalogue under the head of 'Liturgies.' Probably his not being well acquainted with the various plans upon which the old catalogues were made, may have been the reason why Mr. Bunsen did not find there some other works, the absence of which he regrets. A library of comparatively modern foundation, like that of the British Museum, must necessarily remain for a long period imperfect and deficient in many even important works of which almost all the copies have been long since absorbed in public libraries, and it is but rarely that any occur for sale. With the zeal and energy of the present librarian, Mr. Panizzi, we are sure that if the Treasury and the Directors of the Museum will find funds, and above all SPACE, all these deficiencies will be supplied at the earliest opportunities. What is wanted NOW, we emphatically repeat, is SPACE. We have ourselves, upon more than one occasion, pointed out to Mr. Panizzi the absence of some work requisite for our researches; and we are bound in justice to state, that he has spared no pains to endeavour to procure it. Booksellers' catalogues have been searched, and their shops ransacked, to try to obtain the volume needed; if it could be found it was purchased; if not, a note was taken to look for it at a future occasion. We believe that in this respect no especial favour has been shown to ourselves, but that this is Mr. Panizzi's general practice. We think, therefore, that it is the duty of all who use the national library, not less for the advantage of that institution than on the librarian's account, who has shown himself so anxious to make it as complete as possible, not only to communicate any deficiency first to him, that he may have an opportunity of endeavouring to supply it, but to agitate vigorously for better reading-rooms and for increased accommodation for books. We see, in a return made to an order of the House of Commons, dated June 22. 1852, that during the last fifteen years, and since Mr. Panizzi has been at the head of the Library, that the number of volumes has

* Cardinal Sirletus, in his letter to I. à S. Andrea, prefixed to this edition, states that in the same St. Mary *De lo patire*, where this Liturgy of St. Mark was found, there also existed a work of Dionysius of Alexandria against the Noetians, and the Treatise of Hippolytus against Noetus and also against Paul of Samosata. This latter heretic was indeed contemporary with Hippolytus, but his heresy does not seem to have been generally known till some years later than Hippolytus.

been more than doubled, and the average rate of increase has been 28,000 volumes yearly during the last quinquennium.

The first part of the fourth volume contains 'The Apology of 'Hippolytus addressed to the People of England.' The scope and design of this apology, which is written with much spirit, and embodies in a more popular form much of the matter discussed in the critical, historical, and philosophical parts of the work will, perhaps, be best explained in Mr. Bunsen's own words: —

'The Apology of Hippolytus rests upon the fiction, that he was come to England in order to complain of the authorship of the lately discovered book having been taken from him, and that he claims to be recognised as what he really was, bishop of the Harbour of Rome, and member of the governing presbytery of the metropolis; and, above all, as a thinking Christian and an orthodox divine, in an age which had still uncorrupted traditions, and whose heroes and innumerable martyrs lived and died for Christianity. I suppose Hippolytus to make this defence of himself before a distinguished English assembly, after some months of interviews and theological discussions with learned divines. In carrying out this fiction, I have endeavoured to follow, as closely as possible, the form of the Platonic Apology of Socrates, and humbly to imitate that mixture of irony and ethical earnestness which is inseparable from the name of Socrates.' (Pref. vol. i. p. xiii.)

Many doubtless will be interested to read what are Mr. Bunsen's own sentiments and opinions touching our Government and Institutions, which he has put into the mouth of Hippolytus. We therefore quote the following passages from this Apology: —

'What I admire most among you, is what I consider to be your great and lasting monument in the history of the world. You have created a commonwealth, where two things are united which that great pagan, Tacitus, thought irreconcilable, liberty and government. And if I search into the nature, origin, and growth of this your commonwealth, I find it to be the fruit of true Christian principles, of Christian self-government and mercy. All that striking order and energy which reign in this country, all the wisdom and zeal of your senators and areopagitic judges, the general respect for the law among the people, as well as all those great and mighty external works which people admire so much, seem to me to originate in your truly public, and, let me say, Christian spirit. For Christianity is intended to establish law and self-government, first in every individual, next in domestic life, and in public society. Christianity is to convince people of the eternal love of God, and to make them love their fellow-creatures as brethren, in order to enable them, through such love, to erect a godlike, rational, and just, and consequently a free commonwealth. Wherever, therefore, I find the forms of public

liberty, I inquire first, whether the people have the law in themselves; whether there be in them, individually, liberty, which is self-government, and charity, which is mutual faith: and where I find that to be the case, I know from history and my own experience that it is the work of Christianity. Now with you this is so, evidently. . .

. . . . . .

Here I see that you have indeed erected most wonderful factories and cotton-mills; but you do not make the poor people, men and women and children, work in them on Sundays, as the Gauls do in their country. You have, like them, labourers and mechanics, aspiring to better their condition; but yours prefer working, and quietly associating together, to the making of revolutions, and plunging others and themselves into misery. You have ragged children: but you clothe and educate them for useful work, instead of enlisting them as soldiers to kill their fellow-citizens; and they like learning to read and to work, rather than making an attempt to convulse society by their votes, and to subvert order by arms. Your metropolis is not a monumental town, like a part of theirs: but your monument is your commonwealth. I must apply to you as a nation, what you say in your great basilica on the tomb of the great architect who raised it: "*Si monumentum requiris circumspice.*" You have raised, in those three hundred years, that well-balanced commonwealth to which I have already alluded, and you have established and maintained such a sanctuary of liberty as even our fathers did not possess in the great and glorious times of the Republic. You have known how to unite freedom with order, popular rights with a national aristocracy and hereditary monarchy, which union, our great heathen prophet Cicero * said, would, if ever it could be brought to pass, form the most perfect of governments. This great monument, which you have erected, I admire more than all those outer works of civilisation of which other people think you are so proud, not only as men of your race, but as Christians, and, I am bound to add, as Protestants. You have just shown to the world the practical effect of the principle on which your social arrangements are based. People on the Continent believed (or tried to make others believe) that the gathering of so many hundreds of thousands of your working and labouring men round the spectacle of the Great Exhibition would be the signal, if not of famine and pestilence, certainly of revolution and bloodshed. But I have seen them surround their queen with respectful affection: and, far from any disturbance taking place, good-will and good-humour and plenty never have reigned more paramount any where than during these months among you. Now when I ask myself, since what time you have possessed this liberty and enjoyed this peace and tranquillity, I cannot help remarking that you owe it all to that godly reform you began to make of Christianity about three hundred years ago.' (P. 14—18.)

---

* Mr. Bunsen has added in a note the passages from Cicero's 'De Re Publica,' to which he refers, viz. lib. i. c. xxix. xxxv. xlv.

With these extracts we must close our notice of this highly interesting and remarkable book. We feel that we have failed to do full justice to it on many important points. To aver, however, that we entirely coincide in opinion and sentiment upon all the subjects and various questions which are brought before us in these pages, would be going too far. There are many matters upon which a member of the Evangelical Church of Germany must necessarily hold different views from ourselves; but upon all points of Christian charity, all truly Christian men can and ought to agree. We have sensibly felt the truth of Mr. Bunsen's remarks in the following passage; and having been aware of the treatment and misrepresentations which he has already received in certain quarters — in making these our observations upon his very learned and important work now before us, we have endeavoured, at least, to avoid their application to ourselves.

'On all these points I am prepared for misconstructions, contradictions, and attacks, from opposite quarters. Any author who in our times treats theological and ecclesiastical subjects frankly, and therefore with reference to the problems of the age, must expect to be ignored, and, if that cannot be done, abused and reviled. I shall, however, only notice such opponents as will discuss a sacred subject with an impartial love of truth, and who show themselves men of independent thought and of critical research. I shall quietly leave the others to their privileges, and by silence reply to such as enter into a philosophical discussion with the old cry, "Great is Diana of "the Ephesians!" It is impossible, in our times, to have an independent opinion on those subjects, without critical study and calm deliberate consideration; and yet everybody thinks himself entitled to pronounce judgment upon them. But the time will come when they will be again made the objects of universal interest and popular research. All tends to that, in Germany from the philosophical, in England from the practical, point of view; and, in both, from a feeling of great inward and outward necessity. Then it will be seen whether or not the way that I have indicated is the right one. Personally, it is perfectly indifferent to me whether I live to see this or not. I have neither written for my own personal gratification, nor for any party, either here or in Germany, nor for any fashion of the day. I have meditated and inquired from an earnest desire to discover truth, and to meet the wants of a confused and eventful age, which yearns after light and information; and I have said nothing which I have not thoroughly examined and tested for at least twenty-five years. Thus, while I shall not be scared by any dictatorial assertions, neither will any correction come unwelcome to me. Of the truth of the fundamental views which I have expressed, both here and throughout the work, and of the soundness of their philosophical and historical groundwork, I have as little doubt as I have of my own existence.' (Vol. iii. Introd. p. xxv.)

ART. II.—1. *History of the Island of Corfu, and of the Republic of the Ionian Islands.* By HENRY JERVIS WHITE JERVIS, Esq., Royal Artillery. London: 1852.

2. *The Ionian Islands under British Protection.* London: 1851.

THE sources of information relative to the Ionian Islands are so redundant that they perplex a writer seeking to convey an accurate notion of the affairs of that small but interesting State. Within the last three years, various political essays on this subject have appeared, adding to the knowledge we might have previously derived from Theotoky, Vaudoncourt, Mustoxidi, Goodisson, Davy, and a host of English and French travellers and yacht voyageurs.

Few of these writers, we think, have treated their argument more successfully than the author of the succinct and connected narrative now before us. Mr. Jervis, free from any political or party bias, although sometimes misled by the authorities he quotes, appears to have availed himself of every opportunity for collecting the best materials for his history that a residence on duty in the Ionian Islands could afford him. He has evidently consulted all requisite and authentic documents within his reach, and studied the characters, habits, and institutions of the Ionian population; and seems to have particularly directed his attention to the Constitution launched under our auspices in 1817.

This anomalous provisional Constitution, or the character of its administration by the Lord High Commissioner of the day, has been frequently under discussion in Parliament, and sometimes roughly and incautiously dealt with, and exposed to the unwarrantable attacks of debaters, who probably had never taken the trouble of tracing it back to the extraordinary times and circumstances which gave it birth. We hope to be able, on this occasion, to assist our readers in forming a correct opinion, not merely on the progress of improvement in the United Ionian States, after their having been partially connected with Great Britain for a period of forty-three years, and under our absolute control for thirty-four, but also on the further point, whether the period had not arrived for loosening the tightbearing rein first applied in 1817, as the least of the evils between which the Government had then to choose under the plausible but inconsistent clauses of the Treaty of Paris, and in the actual condition of the Seven Islands.

But this is a more arduous undertaking than it would at first

seem; mystified as the question has been by the advocates of political parties, averse to any modification of the constitutional charter to which we refer, or by those who, ignorant of the true state of the case, are persuaded that neither the Ionians nor their neighbours, the Greeks, are fit to be trusted with a representative Government.

To disentangle the character of a State or of an individual from the hands of calumniators and injudicious admirers, is a task of great difficulty. While we desire to give a fair summary of the proceedings, complaints, intrigues, and factions of our quasi-colonial subjects, we must not forget to do them the justice of remembering how much they have suffered from a quick succession of temporary masters, and from the effects of misfortunes by which they were overwhelmed in 1797, and which they continued to feel intensely till 1809.

The partition of the Venetian territories, and the union of the Seven Islands with the French Republic, threw them into utter confusion. The innovations of French printing presses, public libraries, and primary schools, disturbed nobles, priests, and peasantry. The combined hostilities of the Turks and Russians led to the expulsion of the French, and to the re-establishment of the former councils of the Signori. A few months later, in the year 1800, the Islands were constituted a Federal Republic, vassal and tributary to the Porte, under the immediate sway of the notables of the country. These were selected through the powerful influence of the Albanian chief, Ali Pacha, who, having his own schemes in view, favoured the ancient families. The Notabili having been re-established in ancient despotism, with no other security for its exercise than the nominal Suzerainté of the Porte, the bloodshed and disorder which followed could scarcely have been prevented.

To this tempestuous season we have been constantly referred whenever a debate on the affairs of the Ionian Isles has taken place in the House of Commons, to prove, we suppose, the unintermitted vileness of the United Ionian States since 1809, and their unfitness for a representative government half a century later. Such unwarrantable inferences are calculated to irritate and dishearten a generation educated under British superintendence. They might be supposed to have been framed for the use of the popular parties, drawn up in opposition to the Government. It is true that the Lisgaràs, Domenichinis, and Zervos*, impracticable, weak, and vindictive, may have found

* Lisgarà, the head of the annexionist party of Zante; Domenichini, of Zante, a landed proprietor; Zervo, residing at Argostoli, in Cephalonia.

access to municipal offices, and to the Parliament of 1850; but it is absurd and mischievous on this account to encourage in England the belief that Zante or any of the other islands resemble in character or conduct the lawless people of 1801, who occasioned the diplomatic mission of Neranzi to St. Petersburgh on the part of the terrified Senate. The anarchy described by Neranzi was the result of the sudden transfer of the Ionian Isles from the government and crafty policy of the Venetians to the management of three different powers in the course of three successive years. The senate, unable to govern, and protected only by the Ottoman Porte, despatched their envoy to the Emperor of Russia, to implore his interference. On this, Count Mocenigo, a native of Zante, in the Russian service, immediately appeared as High Commissioner and Plenipotentiary: his mission being, to organise a new Government, to extinguish the old institutions, and extricate the Islands from the frightful confusion into which they had been plunged by the treaties of the Allied Sovereigns.

The addresses and proclamations of Count Mocenigo and the report of Neranzi are still preserved in the archives of Corfu. These are the documents which have been used unsparingly by political writers, who have thought to find there evidence that the race described in them must be incapable of constitutional institutions. Neranzi's description of Zante in 1801 having again lately been cited in the debates of the House of Commons, we may appositely refer to the following extract of a letter written by a Greek gentleman, P. Soutzo, a subject of King Otho, inserted in Mr. Jervis's history, and copied from the Ελπις, an Athenian gazette, to show the condition of Zante in 1850. This forms a striking and remarkable contrast to the report of Neranzi, and the assassinations of 1801 in that island: — 'I write to you from Zante, which I 'reached a week ago: my object is to give you an account of 'an election to the Municipal Council of Zante, which, as you 'are aware, administrates the local affairs of this island con-'jointly with the Regent.'

He then notices the feelings of the citizens as regards a union with Greece, and the views of the extreme party: —

'Three citizens forming part of this latter class, T. Lisgarà, 'George Crenderopulos, and Demetrius Macri, lately presented 'themselves as candidates at the municipal election, and obtained 'the majority of votes. The British Government violated the 'law neither directly nor indirectly: it had recourse to no kind 'of compulsion whatsoever. If in the independent kingdom of 'Greece, a candidate for the House of Assembly had declared

'himself opposed not only to the House of Bavaria, but simply 'against the meanest of the ministry, what effusion of blood 'would have ensued! — what fabrications of bulletins! — what 'frauds! — and yet it is said we have a constitutional govern- 'ment; and we are proclaimed as unworthy of a representative 'government. Yesterday I made a long excursion into the 'country. What a delightful sight! Every where vineyards, 'orchards, golden harvest, cattle grazing, magnificent roads, 'villages full of prosperity; what security! what inviolable re- 'spect to property, both from those governing and those governed. 'Here you can proceed loaded with gold from one end of the 'island to the other, without the least fear; at home we 'cannot without the greatest danger go even from Athens to 'Kiphissie.'

This favourable description of Zante may be considered as applicable, in most respects, to the other islands also; but before adverting more particularly to the five or six tranquil years immediately preceding the revision of their constitutional charter, we must explain the circumstances which led to the peculiar and complicated form of government introduced here by Sir Thomas Maitland.

It is unnecessary for our present purpose to dwell on the disastrous scenes which occurred after the treaty of Campoformio. The intrusion of the French Republicans, and the reaction caused by the opposition between the popular party and the old aristocratic classes — the formation of the Ionian Islands into three departments — the expulsion of the French by the combined Russian and Turkish forces, and the return of the Ionians to a Republic — the Ottoman Emperor being declared Suzerain, assisted by the protection of Russia — unsettled evetything and settled nothing. So that the year 1798 found the Ionians a Federal Republic tributary to the Turks, with a government, in fact, selected by their powerful Albanian neighbour, Ali Pacha.

It was impossible such a Government could long exist; the disorders and sanguinary scenes described by Neranzi ensued; and the inhabitants naturally looked for assistance to Russia, whither many Ionians had fled. Count Mocenigo, on his arrival at Corfu, set to work so vigorously that by 1803 he had completed a new constitution; but it proved so defective that it was suspended in 1806, and just as another had been prepared, assigning the Government in perpetuity to a fixed number of families, the Treaty of Tilsit abandoned the Islands to their old masters, the French. Napoleon immediately assembled, in secrecy, 4000 soldiers on the opposite coast, at Otranto: whence,

embarked on board felluccas, they passed within a short distance of our unsuspecting cruisers, and arrived safely at Corfu. By the decree of Fontainebleau the Islands were placed under the charge of a Governor-General and an Imperial Commissioner, who carried on the government with the assistance of a nominal Senate chosen at their recommendation. Three years from this time, in 1809, most of the Southern Islands were liberated from French rule by a British fleet and army, Lord Collingwood having, at the earnest request of influential Ionians, sent ships from Malta. A British officer then took charge of the local government of each island; and with this military authority, the people appeared to have been satisfied, after all they had previously suffered; the commander-in-chief of the Southern Islands assuring them 'that he was charged 'to offer them the means to recover that political existence 'which had been snatched from them by the French, under 'the sceptre of Napoleon.' It was not, however, until February, 1814, that British troops took possession of Paxo, nor until the May of the same year that Corfu (which had been garrisoned by 14,000 men) was surrendered by the order of Louis XVIII.

At the Congress of Vienna, 1814, it was in contemplation to nominate Austria Protector of the Seven Islands; but whatever may have been the instructions of the Austrian Minister in respect to the disposal of them, no definite arrangement was proposed till the Treaty of Paris the succeeding year. An opportunity might now be supposed to have offered itself to the Emperor of Russia to compensate the Ionians for his abandonment of them at the Peace of Tilsit: Capodistria, a native of Corfu, the Russian Representative at Vienna, and a personal favourite with Alexander, laboured zealously in the cause of his compatriots. But, on its being found equally impossible to secure their national independence, or obtain the consent of Austria, France, or England to placing them in the hands of Russia, — no expedient was considered less embarrassing to the high contracting Powers, or more likely to promote the welfare and interests of the Ionians, than to declare them under the sole protection of England, whose assistance they had urgently solicited during the war. We believe, however, that at that time the British Government would rather have declined the offer, could Russia have been prevented, by any other arrangement, from bringing forward her claims. Capodistria had the merit, if it be one, of giving his support and approbation to the several clauses of the treaty, in which the terms, *free and independent* republic, appear to have been brought conspicuously on the foreground to attract the attention of the Ionian States. Sir

Thomas Maitland, appointed to carry this treaty into effect, soon became aware of the difficulties with which he would have to contend. He saw that it could not, with advantage to the parties most concerned, be executed according to its express and formal terms.

As the trust, however, had been accepted, he had only to consider the best way of extricating the protecting Government from the position in which it had been placed by Austria and Russia. The Seven Islands were declared a Republic — a single, free, and independent State: — and yet they were to be placed under the complete control of the Sovereign of Great Britain. The Ionian people, suffering from a long war, bowed down by internal commotions, and a series of complicated misfortunes affecting every department of their Government, were incapable at that time either of framing or accepting a free constitutional charter, in compliance with the treaty. No one acquainted thoroughly with their affairs could doubt this, or that the protecting Sovereign would find it necessary to assume the duties of an absolute Governor, in order to secure to the protected the due administration of justice; for unless the administrative and executive powers could be lodged with the representative of the protecting Sovereign, no other form of government appeared to be practicable.

We have understood that Sir Thomas Maitland was at first of opinion that a government might be constructed placing the Executive power directly in the hands of the protecting Sovereign, with the responsibilities usually attached to the governor of a colony. This, however, he found, on reflection, could not be accomplished; it would not have been in conformity to the Treaty of Paris; while the Senate acting by virtue of the Constitution of 1803, and necessarily consulted by him, would have protested against such a departure from the agreement; since under the circumstances they went the length of maintaining that it contemplated the reinstatement of that Constitution, and that the protecting Government had no right to interfere in executive measures. These considerations left no doubt on his mind that a direct influence could not be established, but that the tranquillity and order which he was desirous of upholding, and the influence which he was bent on obtaining and preserving, must be indirectly sustained by the hand of the Lord High Commissioner. If he had not acted on this opinion, Russia and the other Courts might have constantly required explanations, and embarrassed and obstructed his proceedings. When we look back to this crisis, and become acquainted with the careless administration of the finances which had prevailed in the Islands,

and learn their local intrigues, we cannot be surprised that the people at large submitted quietly to the new form of Government. But there were many inhabitants of weight who spoke openly against it. In framing the Constitution of 1803, the employment of a large number of the influential Venetian families, and their connexions, in public situations, was considered expedient. A similar policy appears to have been followed by the framers of the new Constitution. The number of offices created was excessive, and in order to provide for as many persons as possible, in their turn, the term of holding office was limited to five years.

The Lord High Commissioner was probably by no means averse to this policy, for it promised the power and influence required to work the Constitution he was contemplating. The system, however, had its inconvenience; for many persons who had held office, and who were not included in the list for the ensuing period, considered themselves aggrieved, and as might have been expected, could not be convinced that their former patrons had sufficiently rewarded them for past services. This happened constantly. But the direct connexion of the Islands with a vigilant Government, working with regularity, and in strong contrast with the mismanagement of former times, conduced to the satisfaction which now prevailed, and gave it the appearance of continuance. Commerce was active, and almost, it might be said, concentrated within the Islands, owing partly to the revolutionary struggle in which the Greeks were then engaged; favourable seasons, abundant crops of the staple products, oil and currants, and also high prices; a numerous garrison, and more than 20,000 refugees, consuming the produce of each isle, introduced a large capital, causing a temporary prosperity, and setting at rest all political questions.

The basis of the new Constitution, which had been declared to be only generally laid down in the Constitutional Charter, was signed on the 1st of May, 1817, and announced as the law of the land from that day. Judicious people will understand that this provisional agreement might be well suited to the actual wants of a disorganised population; and yet how very objectionable the proposed system might become at a future stage as society advanced, and as the Islands, from their experience and instruction, might be qualified to exercise a greater influence over their own affairs. This, we think, will distinctly appear by an examination of the following summary of the Constitution. Sir Thomas Maitland, it is supposed, in assembling a Primary Legislative Council to assist in constructing and arranging the clauses of the Constitutional Charter, adopted in

his first steps the course pursued by Count Mocenigo, when he superintended the formation of the Constitution in 1803.

The essential provisions of the Charter are — That the Legislative Assembly shall consist of forty members, eleven to be integral, and the other twenty-nine to be elected by the electors legally allowed by the Constitution of 1803, termed the Synclitæ.

These integral members are to be called the Primary Council, and to be composed, at the dissolution of the first Parliament, of the president and members of the Old Senate and five of the late Legislative Assembly to be selected by the Lord High Commissioner. But in usual cases, where the Parliament runs its full term of five years, five Regents instead of the five Legislators are to be selected from the Primary Council.

The Legislative Assembly elect from their body their own president, and the five Senators, the Lord High Commissioner having a veto, which he can exercise twice, and then, in case of nonagreement, he can appoint.

The Sessions of Parliament are biennial, and continue for three months.

The Lord High Commissioner convokes, adjourns, prorogues the Assembly, and dissolves it, with the consent of the Protecting Sovereign and Privy Council, regulates the internal laws of the Assembly, and approves or disapproves of new laws, and must be specially informed of any measure to be introduced; and all proceedings must daily be laid before him. If he refuses his sanction to a Bill, it cannot be brought forward again during the session.

The President of the Senate is appointed by the Protecting Sovereign for the first half of the quinquennium, on the recommendation of the Lord High Commissioner, who confirms him for the remainder of it or appoints a new one. All proceedings and acts of the Senate are laid before him. He appoints a resident to each island to represent him and control the proceedings of the Regents and the Municipalities. Neither Regents nor Municipalities can be appointed without his sanction. No Judge can be appointed or dismissed without his approbation. He is a member extraordinary of the Supreme Council of Justice, and has the casting vote in case of a parity of votes.

He appoints the Treasurer General, and approves of every new officer of that department, and determines the expenditure classed under the head of Extraordinaries. The Government General Printing Office is to be placed at the seat of Government, and no other is to be allowed. The power of High Police

is lodged with him; no vessel can depart from any port without his authority.

The election of members of the Legislative Assembly is made by the Synclitæ*, from a double list transmitted by the Primary Council. The vacancies in the Assembly, caused by the completion of the Senate, are filled up by the process of the double list, as before mentioned. The Regent of each island, or Head of the Municipality, is appointed by the Senate; and the five municipal officers are elected by the Synclitæ, subject in both cases to the veto of the Lord High Commissioner.

These provisions show that every Member of the Legislative Assembly is intended to be elected indirectly by the Lord High Commissioner. They also explain the extent of power lodged with him by means of his veto; yet this veto, which modifies the democratic and republican forms of the Constitution, is required to be exercised with caution, in order that no risk might be incurred of bringing the Lord High Commissioner into collision with his Senate or Primary Council.

The principles Sir Thomas Maitland had established were adhered to closely from 1817 to 1824, and with very little variation till the year 1832. The Senate and Legislative Assembly were compliant, and the Regents of the several Islands and their municipal officers were efficiently directed by the British residents. In Cephalonia, the Resident, Colonel Charles Napier, whose name is still remembered with gratitude, early effected many improvements, by his energy, skill, and perseverance.

Sir Thomas Maitland having throughout his administration of the Government acted with great energy, and the people, feeling advantages from his fiscal regulations and other important changes introduced by his judgment and decision, no opposition to his wishes, or none which impeded the working of the Constitution, was encountered.

Requisitions for military purposes were authorised by the Convention of 1817: these Sir Thomas Maitland did not enforce, but he informed the Legislature, in an early address, that the surplus revenue should be lodged in the Treasury and applied to useful works, and including the repair and maintenance of the fortresses. No military contribution, however, was paid under his administration; for he knew that it would be difficult

* The Synclitæ are the constituency of the Islands authorised by law to vote either in virtue of certain privileges, or a fixed amount of income, lately reduced to 18*l.* per annum in the larger islands, and a proportionable sum in the smaller.

to explain to the public the necessity of such grants, and that probably they would afford a pretext to foreigners for spreading discontent. It would have, perhaps, been more advantageous to the general interests of England, and the dependency, had the military aids or grants been still longer delayed, considering the state of the population, until the Islands had been forced forward in improvement, and until they had been supplied with those institutions which every civilised country requires.

After the decease of Sir Thomas Maitland, the payments of the military contribution were made by instalments, at intervals, and always on the supposition that the demands would be reduced when the fortifications should be completed. These separate grants were voted by the Legislative Assembly, and confirmed by the Senate; with the latter, however, the power of suspending them remained in case of unproductive seasons. The military contributions, fifteen years afterwards, became an annual charge; and, when added to the amount voted for the salaries of the British functionaries, frequently absorbed one-third of the revenue. For many years a large British force occupied the fortresses, though, by the treaty, it was only necessary to have had 3000 men. The cost to the Imperial Treasury of keeping this number of troops on the military establishment may be estimated at 120,000*l.* per annum.

The ordinary expenses of the inhabitants in the Islands were much increased by their connexion with a nation whose forms of society, and customs, were so different from their own; and this inconvenience was more particularly felt by the appointment of British functionaries to the most lucrative situations, and the occupation of the fortresses by a British garrison. At the same time, their sources of industry, from the sale of their staple products — oil and currants, were yearly diminishing, through the competition of Apulia on one side, and the Morea on the other. In the early days of the Constitution it was found an easy process to form a Parliament; for then in each island, there existed certain influential families, whose advice could be depended upon, and who were frequently consulted and held responsible for their recommendations; but this advantage was only temporary; for several causes had tended to decrease the influence of the large proprietors, and the Lord High Commissioners subsequently were deprived of such assistance. The Constitution having been framed to meet the actual circumstances of the times, would not bear strict examination except with reference to those circumstances. The concentrated power which it gave to the first Lord High Commissioner, supported by provisional arrangements at variance with

the literal construction of the clauses of the Charter, continued to be efficiently and beneficially exercised by his successor, Sir Frederic Adam. After the termination of his government in 1832, some innovations in the electoral system unauthorised by the Charter were sanctioned. This led to the abrupt dissolution of the fourth Ionian Parliament formed under the Lord High Commissioner's own immediate direction, and to the immediate election of the fifth. Lord Nugent soon afterwards resigned his appointment; and his successor, after he had been some time in office, considered it necessary to obtain authority to dissolve this Parliament also, before its second session. A sixth was then elected and convened; but either, from the intrigues of disappointed ex-senators, or from opposition of some other kind, it did not work satisfactorily, and was also dissolved. The seventh having been more carefully selected, the business of the island was at last carried on with benefit to the country. Mr. Stewart Mackenzie, who assumed the administration of the Government as Lord High Commissioner in 1842, was, however, opposed by his Senate, and the President was discontinued at the close of the half period of the quinquennium, and another appointed by him; an unusual proceeding, which having been disapproved of at home, the former President was reinstated.

We have now traced the Constitution from its novitiate, through five different proconsulships, and noticed the abrupt dissolutions of the fourth, fifth, and sixth parliaments, before the expiration of their legal terms; and the discontinuance of the President of the Senate by the Lord High Commissioner, and his reinstatement by the order of the Colonial Minister during the seventh, in consequence of collisions, either between the Legislative Assembly and Senate, or with the latter and the Lord High Commissioner. We may be permitted, therefore, to assume that the constitutional provisions which were considered as excellent in early days of British protection, and skilfully adapted to meet the circumstances of the Septinsular Republic and the articles of the Treaty of Paris, had become obstructive and embarrassing at a later period — in fact, that the Constitution had the great merit of having rendered the United Ionian States totally unfit to continue under a mode of government declared to be only provisional when it was first proposed and sanctioned. For we see that the services and duties it had performed brought on its own inaptitude for further progressive work, and demonstrated that the system required to be carefully modified and revised; meantime it had certainly redressed grievances, repealed laws of pernicious tendency, introduced an improved code, forced into order financial

departments, arranged fiscal and municipal difficulties, and promoted the welfare of the country. That the course which had been hitherto followed, in the distribution of patronage, and in selecting members for the Legislative Assembly, could not long be continued with any prospect of the results of former times, was the opinion held by persons who had invariably given their support in aid of the Constitution; and it was in some degree confirmed by the collisions to which we have alluded; but they were fully aware that the control which had always been exercised by the Lord High Commissioner could not be fairly opposed as unconstitutional under existing provisions; nor the Legislative Assembly opened to the numerous claimants qualified to be admitted by their intelligence and property; nor the Primary Council allowed to act independently, and cease to be the channel of conveyance of the wishes of the Lord High Commissioner and his double lists to the Synclitæ, without deranging the whole system, until the constitutional charter should be competently modified.

The constant necessarily indirect interference of the Lord High Commissioner in the management of senate, primary council, legislative assembly, and parliamentary elections, as well as municipal, gave to many of the provisions of the Constitution, if not to the whole system, that deceptive character which has been considered so objectionable and inconvenient, originally intended, apparently, to exempt the Lord High Commissioner from the highest responsibility, while really the whole of it rested with him. This scheme of government had seldom, we understand, been openly approved of in the Legislative Assembly, or altogether vindicated even by the party most in favour of the British connexion; but when the instances of opposition to the will of the Lord High Commissioner became more common, the tendencies of the system were censured with more method, both in the Ionian Isles and in Greece, and every opportunity of exposing them was seized by the annexionists.

We imagine that, in 1843, at the time the Lord High Commissioner, Mr. Stewart Mackenzie, was about to resign his appointment, the feeling in regard to the Ionian Constitution, which we have endeavoured generally to describe, prevailed among the intelligent and influential inhabitants. Indeed they had been almost invited to express unreservedly their political opinions and wishes for the enlargement of their electoral system by the publication of Lord John Russell's despatch of June 1840, in which the views and intentions of the British Ministry were plainly declared. The following is an extract of that document: —

'I shall not attempt to anticipate your conclusions, or to pre-
'judge the questions on which I thus solicit your free opinion
'and your aid. Yet I cannot omit to observe, that I should
'yield with much regret to the conviction, that the time is still
'unripe for conceding to the Ionian people, to at least some ex-
'tent, the advantages of greater freedom of the press, and a
'more complete system of representation. It would not be to
'the honour of this country to have occupied the Ionian States
'for so many years, without having advanced the inhabitants
'towards some qualification for institutions more liberal than
'those which were granted to them, avowedly as a mere pre-
'paration for such a change. It would be painful to acquiesce
'in the belief, that in a country placed under the immediate pro-
'tection of Her Majesty the Queen, the Government are unable
'to confide with safety to the people at large, the privilege of
'more freely discussing their own social interests, than they are
'at present enabled to do. Neither could it be otherwise than
'painful to consider that Great Britain is compelled to withhold
'a full participation of her own political freedom from a people
'to whom she looks for a large pecuniary contribution towards
'the maintenance of one of the most important of her foreign
'garrisons.' (*Downing Street, June*, 1840.)

The claims of the community to greater political freedom having thus been formally acknowledged and encouraged, the important question that remained for decision, and the only one, related to the additional process the Islands were to undergo, or what probation was required before the precise period could properly be determined on for the extension of the institutions they had been given to understand would be sanctioned, when perfectly qualified for the specified concessions. Lord John Russell, in his further correspondence, afterwards coincided with the Lord High Commissioner in thinking that the time for granting the privileges solicited had not arrived. But such recorded opinions of the Minister in 1839, 1840, when inculcated, created great expectations, although they were not immediately to be realised.

Some years after their publication, the proceedings in Greece excited an intense interest in the Ionian Islands; and it was foreseen, eventually, must have an influence on the position, policy, and prospects of the protecting power, as far as they could be affected by a successful effort, by the Greek nation, to lay the foundation of a representative government; a people of the same origin and language, and on whose territory the number of naturalised subjects from the Seven Islands had so much increased, that they preferred a claim, on the opening of the

Greek Legislature, to send their own representatives to the Assembly as a separate electoral body. A new Constitution was granted in Greece without opposition, and apparently by the unanimous voice of the nation, for not a life was lost or wound received in obtaining it. The King having ratified the change, the British Government promptly signified its approval of the introduction of the representative system; and most of the foreign ministers, on the part of their respective sovereigns, with some hesitation, concurred in the expediency of the new organisation.

We may here remark that the gazettes of Athens, and all foreign journals, had been freely admitted into the Ionian Islands, without examination, for several years before this alteration in the Greek Constitution had taken place, and that their periodical circulation had been greatly augmented in consequence of the additional opportunities afforded by the establishment of lines of steam-packets between the Ionian Islands and the ports of Greece, the Adriatic, Malta, and Naples. The elaborate and able editorial articles promulgated at Athens, and exaggerated and sarcastic statements not very complimentary, we believe, to British protection, were to be seen in the reading-room of every town in the island; therefore, to have persevered in disallowing private presses in the Ionian Islands, or to have continued the restrictions which had existed for thirty years under totally different circumstances, would, we imagine, have been as useless and nugatory as to have prohibited in England provincial newspapers, while the metropolitan journals were permitted to circulate freely. We cannot exactly comprehend why rigid and impolitic restrictions such as those we have mentioned, especially considering that they were opposed to the opinion of the loyal and well-educated, were not sooner removed.

There may have been reasons, at one period, connected with our foreign policy for the delay; but be this as it may, we find, on referring to public documents, that an act of the Ionian Government was passed in 1845, for authorising private presses, with specific details of censorship; and that in 1847, or sooner, and also early in 1848, a total discontinuance of the press regulations then in force had been submitted for further consideration, with other modifications of the Constitution, which were subsequently authorised. These other modifications altogether referred, it appears, to the marked changes taking place in society; especially to the implicit reliance in the intentions of Government, encouraged by persons worthy of confidence; and to the satisfactory sessions of the Legislature that had imme-

diately preceded the proposals for altering the articles of the Constitution. The revision accepted by the Ionian Legislature in 1849 had been conditionally sanctioned by the Protecting Government, at the earnest recommendation of the Lord High Commissioner, who incurred, we see, the whole of the great responsibility of having projected and brought forward the measure.

As the alterations had been suggested and announced at a time when the Islands were free from any questions or legislative discussion which could interrupt public business; and had reference entirely to Ionian claims and regulations, Greek progress and interests; and had been sanctioned as acts of justice, there could be no sufficient reason offered for postponing them on account of French, Italian, and German disturbances in 1848. The unfitness of the Ionian United States to be entrusted with an extension of the electoral system and a free press, was the reason commonly assigned by the advocates of the actual state of things, for continuing a Constitution which it was said by them had conferred on the Islands many benefits; but this, we suppose, may have been less the real ground of objection than the apprehension that nationality and patriotism would turn these privileges against the very Government that should confer them. We, however, look on the question from a wider point of view, and with greater confidence, being thoroughly convinced that the concessions had become by this time acts of justice; and that by anticipating the wishes of a small community, protected by a powerful State, and altogether under our absolute control, we are offering an indisputable example of the desire of the British Government to establish its own free institutions in its dependencies as soon as it is satisfied that they can be advantageously received.

A Bill repealing the articles of the Constitution relative to the press having been passed and ratified, newspapers from private presses were first issued in Corfu, Cephalonia, and Zante, in 1849. After this Act, the extension of the electoral system, and the conferring on the Legislature the right of additional control over the public expenditure, were measures which appeared indispensable. It was desirable too in this case that they should be adopted by the Ionian Legislature before the termination of the last Session of the Parliament which had approved and commenced the change in the Charter. The destruction of unpopular abuses may be reasonably expected to facilitate good government, especially by removing the most prominent grounds of discontent, and uniting in the cause of order that influential portion of the Ionian States most willing,

if treated with consideration, to give their open support to the Protecting Power, and most able to counteract or check the intrigues of the Annexionist party.

Factions will always find their way into a Colonial Parliament, and also into an Ionian Legislative Assembly, freely elected, and may occasionally be able to impede the legislative business. But, with a Constitution which will bear examination, parties coming forward with inadmissible pretensions and absurd proposals will be more easily managed and kept under, as soon as the newly organised Legislative Assembly, in addition to the weight belonging to the principles upon which it is founded, has acquired the influence which a little experience will confer.

In dissecting minutely the constitutional charter completed under the superintendence of Sir Thomas Maitland, it will be perceived that it was no easy matter to revise a Constitution which had been necessarily reconstructed on the principles of that framed in 1803 by Count Mocenigo. As a consequence, it retained its democratic form and outline, while, at the same time, it had been so moulded that the essential power of the Government was carefully and absolutely, however circuitously, placed in the hands of the Lord High Commissioner. The whole administration has been decidedly in opposition to the Treaty of Paris, but the affairs of the Ionian Islands in 1817 could not otherwise have been prudently conducted. The revisions proposed and sanctioned in 1849 were important and few, but in carrying them into effect and dispensing with the complicated functions of the Primary Council, it will be obvious that clauses in almost every chapter of the Charter required to be cautiously inspected and repealed.

Although the modifications of the Constitutional Charter were introduced in 1849, they were not ratified till 1850.

The additional articles substituted, instead of the repealed clauses, were these: —

1. The extraordinary as well as the ordinary expenditure of the United States was placed under the control of the Legislative Assembly, conjointly with the other branches of the Legislature.

2. The members of the Legislative Assembly were to be freely elected by the Synclitæ, but the five senators, who had been by the old Constitution nominated by the president and members of the Legislative Assembly, were to be chosen and appointed by the Lord High Commissioner directly.

The last article, however, was subsequently modified, by conceding to the Lord High Commissioner the power of nominating

and appointing three of the senators from the electoral body, whether they were members of the Assembly or not.

3. The five officers composing the Municipal Administrations, under the Regents, were also to be freely elected, without the intervention of the Lord High Commissioner or his residents.

We should have mentioned, that by the Constitution of 1803 and 1817, the qualifications required to entitle a person to be registered on the list of the Synclitæ, or placed on the electoral roll, were as follows: — .

1. To be born a subject (originario) of the Seven Islands.

2. To have a revenue from real property. In Corfu, of 450 dollars a year; in Cephalonia, 163; Zante, 337; Santa Maura, 135; Cerigo, 56; Ithaca, 78; Paxo, 135.

These sums were lessened on the revision of the Constitutional Charter: viz. for an elector of Corfu, the electoral qualification was a property yielding 100 or 80 dollars per annum. This arrangement, it was supposed, would give the right of voting to 1000 or 1200 proprietors in that island. The electoral qualifications were fixed in the other islands in proportion to the value of property.

We can discover no further extension of the electoral franchise with the exception of some professional rights; very far indeed, from universal suffrage, which it was industriously reported had been conceded.

These were the whole of the reforms proposed and sanctioned. They have been censured and commended as it has suited the purposes of partisans. The ballot at elections was required in a small community, to protect its voters from the interference of opulent proprietors, merchants, and contractors, whose influence on their dependants could not otherwise be controlled or prevented. A Bill was therefore passed to introduce the ballot (voto segreto); a petition, unanimously voted on the part of the Legislative Assembly was forwarded to the protecting sovereign, praying that it might be confirmed; but the measure was not to be included as an article of the revised Constitutional Charter.

A ground of complaint of late years had been brought forward; and it had been assigned as a cogent reason for the extension of the electoral system, that it would be impracticable to dispense with the high duties levied on the staple produce of the Islands, until the expensive system of Government, adopted in 1817, could be readjusted; and that this could only be accomplished by the Islands being effectually represented in their Parliament. That the United States required some relief in respect to their finances and an equalisation of official salaries, is

fully borne out by the despatch of the Lord High Commissioner, dated Corfu, June 20. 1838, published with the colonial papers of that year.

The following is an extract from it: —

'But I do not confine this appeal to a contingent remission 'or abatement of the contribution, I take the higher ground, at 'once, of most earnestly representing the vast expediency, for 'reasons above all pecuniary value, of declining to receive any-'thing like a tribute exacted out of a revenue so limited, and 'raised chiefly by excessive duties on production and industry; 'which, on the contrary, should be reduced first, and repealed 'altogether so soon as the other sources of revenue may become 'available. In my despatch of the 2nd March last, I repre-'sented that the only way of enabling these States to continue 'the payment of the contribution, and other charges on account 'of military protection, and at the same time to have a dis-'posable revenue for internal improvement, would be to increase 'taxation; but this, I am now advisably and fully convinced, is 'impracticable, and, if attempted, would occasion serious disor-'ders, aggravate, excite, and accelerate the tendencies which I 'have represented as the resultants of the present arrangements. 'Either then the contribution must be remitted or diminished, 'or this country must remain unimproved. The case in pecu-'niary terms is before every member of the House of Commons, 'by the contribution of 35,000*l.* (being a part of 766,423*l.* 'credited in the army estimates 1838-9) paid out of a limited 'and inadequate revenue as "appropriation in aid" of the Par-'liamentary estimate of 7,524,185*l.* for the military expenditure 'of the British empire. The payment of a fixed tribute, ex-'acted for the "military occupation" of an independent State, 'the people of which are admitted to no participation in the 'honours or emoluments of the service to which they are bound 'to contribute, places that State in the condition of a conquered 'and subjected country, not in the friendly relations of a pro-'tected people, taken under the generous, liberal, and paternal 'king of a great nation.

'The average amount of duties levied on the exports of oil, 'currants, and wine, during the last four years, are — Oil, '31,900*l.*; currants, 45,800*l.*; wine, 3,291*l.*; amounting toge-'ther to 79,991*l.*, which is about forty-eight per cent., or about 'half the revenue. No one who reads this statement but must 'admit the uncommon liberality of the Ionian Government and 'Parliament, in contributing so largely towards the military 'expenditure and British management of these States; and it 'cannot but be admitted that taxation is pushed to an inordi-

'nate extent to enable them to do so. These burthens are very 'unequally distributed, according to the existing finance system. 'The islands of Santa Maura, Ithaca, Cerigo, and Paxo, so far 'from contributing anything to the State, require to be assisted 'by it for the payment of their establishment. First, Santa 'Maura, to the average extent of 4462*l.* 9*s.* 11*d.*; Ithaca, '2671*l.* 0*s.* 10½*d.*; Cerigo, 2966*l.* 10*s.* 11½*d.*; Paxo, 2838*l.* 4*s.* '7½*d.* a-year; so that the larger islands are taxed to an enor- 'mous amount, not only for the expense of their own municipal 'establishments and the general government, but for the civil 'establishments of the minor islands, and the payment of the 'contribution to the protecting State.'

The introduction of the articles of the Constitution above described has now enabled the Islands to make their own financial arrangements in respect to most of these establishments; and be it observed that the Lord High Commissioner retains the control, influence, and patronage necessary to enable him to support his own authority, and to act efficaciously with the Senate. Any Lord High Commissioner appointed to carry out these modified articles of the Constitution, which his immediate predecessor had proposed and introduced, would certainly have had to encounter the many difficulties that, at first, are always inseparable in transitions from close and arbitrary electoral systems to free representative institutions. Every one who has observed the working of our Colonial Legislatures knows that opening a Parliament with a *bonâ fide* legislative assembly, having a control over the public purse, accounts, and expenditure, called on to watch the interests of the States, to decide on important measures, and destined to bear the comments of a press without a censorship, must indeed be a very different affair, when compared with the authority of the head of the Government sending forth his proposals and measures at his own convenience, or with the case of a president and legislative assembly, chosen under such circumspection and discretion as are calculated to ensure a smooth and quiet Quinquennium.

There are assuredly many difficulties incident to the reforms we have described; but they are not without their reward. The reforms will impose constant labour, we allow, on the Lord High Commissioner entrusted with the interesting duty of carrying them out. If the representatives are met with tact and decision, the successful administration of government in future will be essentially promoted by the discussions which have already taken place; the results of a change raising the Legislative Assembly into consideration and importance. We have heard it argued, on one side, that Greek *excitability* and *vivacity*

inherited by the people of the Seven Islands disqualify them for the electoral system which has been granted, or for the management of a free press; — heir-looms which, if acknowledged as impediments in the way of their enfranchisement and progress, would have deferred indefinitely the admission of their claims. At another time it is asserted that their race is tainted with Italian cunning, vice, and corruption; and that their inexperience and backward condition warrant a continuance of the control which had been exercised in the United Ionian States since 1817. Unfavourable impressions such as these may not have arisen without some foundation; but have not their follies, vices, and defects been grossly exaggerated by that class of itinerant, contemptuous censors to be found sometimes abroad among our compatriots, who collect eagerly partial facts and local rumours, — are loud in reproof of bad habits, but slow to afford assistance in correcting them by their own example; always ready to condemn the institutions of British dependencies, but unwilling to see them improved?

The cursory debates in the House of Commons, as well as the historical statements of Neranzi and Mocenigo, relating to a former generation, may have rather tended to perpetuate a false estimate of the character and qualities of the Ionians. The comparative progress of the Islands, under British protection, during the last ten years, can only be thoroughly ascertained by consulting the unprejudiced testimony of British residents officially employed, and merchants, who have been in the Islands since 1815, and whose integrity and social acquaintance with the inhabitants of all the Islands, lead us to believe them impartial and competent judges of their good qualities, and also their demerits. From these authorities we learn, that their character has been much underrated and misunderstood, that they are a most tractable, well-disposed people, and that if the advance of the rural population has not been proportionate to the improved and comfortable condition of society in the cities and towns, the fault must be partly attributed to the revenue of the Islands having been almost entirely appropriated to the maintenance of a large civil establishment, and to the difficulty of reducing it. The tenures of land by which property is held in Corfu are vexatious and perplexing to both proprietor and tenant. A landowner often possesses an estate, on which a fourth of the produce of the olive trees belongs to the tenant who has acquired rights of perpetual occupation. The constant litigation caused by the claims in such cases of both the parties is the grievance of the Island; but notwithstanding these tenures, — an evil which is increased in some districts by the

whole of the inhabitants depending on one kind of produce for their subsistence,—the population are remarkably quiet and well-disposed.

Many of the young men residing in the cities and towns, the advocates and medical practitioners, have been educated at Universities in France, Germany, and Italy, and are as capable of writing with force and energy on political subjects as any of our own accomplished and experienced editors. Among the ecclesiastics, some are persons of erudition, highly esteemed, and influential in their ministry, from their piety and learning, but the parochial clergy generally are illiterate. The ecclesiastics, however, sent out from the Greek Seminary at Corfu, since its renovation by Sir Howard Douglas, are gradually replacing inefficient pastors. The large towns and villages are provided with primary and secondary schools, and tolerable masters; and the peasantry of the whole of the Islands are a fine race. Meantime the numerous vessels constructed at Cephalonia and Ithaca are employed in carrying on a lucrative commerce with the ports of the Adriatic, the Archipelago, and the Black Sea.

One instance only of disorder, we believe, has ever occurred in Corfu since the occupation of that island by the British. It was caused by an American missionary attempting to distribute religious tracts. Santa Maura, Cephalonia, and Zante have occasionally been disturbed, from an early period of our connexion with them, by the disorderly conduct of certain villages. This apparent disposition to turbulence could not, however, be imputed to disaffection or dislike to the protecting Government, but to accidental causes, such as the system of land tenure existing in these islands; to consequent alleged oppression, and disputed rights—a subject which we have already mentioned; to clanship jealousies, or the failure of crops; which, among districts depending for subsistence on one kind of cultivation, is so liable to produce sudden distress, without any means of providing for the emergency.

At the commencement of the Greek Revolution, notwithstanding the laws were efficient and well executed, a riotous assembly of the peasants of Santa Maura occurred in May, 1821, in consequence of the imposition of a tax for the improvement of the harbour and passage to the lake, the object and necessity of which had not been properly explained. The mob fired on the soldiers, and burnt a house containing stores. They were soon dispersed, but not without measures of severity; the leader of the mob, a priest, was hanged. The same year in Zante, an inhabitant of that island, by the name of Martinengo, a man of influence, was tried and banished, having been found guilty of

exciting the people against the Government during the year of the Greek Revolution. At this period combats frequently took place between Greek and Turkish vessels in Ionian waters: the enforcement of neutrality among kindred people having been a matter of difficulty, detachments from British garrisons were often employed to restore order. In Cephalonia riotous assemblages of the peasantry have been more frequent than in any of the other islands: they occurred in the time of Sir Thomas Maitland, Lord Nugent, and of several other Lord High Commissioners. It is remarkable that the same villages have been implicated in all the disturbances which have taken place. The peasantry engaged in the riots of 1848 and 1849 were induced to assemble, it is said, and drawn together in arms with the hope of plunder, and of having an opportunity of destroying books and accounts. The instigators of these disorders were persons of desperate character and ruined circumstances residing in Argostoli, and connected with Greek agents employed to get up or encourage in the island a demonstration of discontent.

We have now referred to the serious cases of public disturbance on record since 1817. Scarcely any of them could be called political; they were always confined to four or five villages, were generally produced by local disputes, and neither encouraged nor supported by a respectable inhabitant. From undoubted authority, we learn that the annexionists in Greece, and their patrons everywhere, expressed great regret at the prospect held out in 1847 and 1848 to the Ionians, of their Constitution being revised, and at the official announcement of the alterations of 1849; and that their intriguing friends in the Islands were equally disappointed that the protecting Government had consented to the modifications carried into effect in 1850. While those who had been dissatisfied with the former scheme of Government in the Islands, but not with the British connexion, became valuable allies in carrying out the change.

The Islands having been gradually initiated in the mysteries of a partial electoral system, and in regulating the disbursements from the public purse by controlled legislators, we are of opinion that no further trial was desirable in order to render them more fit to exercise the privileges which were not intended long to be withheld from them. By the revision of the Constitution, giving a free press, a moderate extension of the elective-franchise, and a control over their expenses, the deceptive character of the Government became at once totally removed, and a great step has been made by these concessions towards detaching the classes we have enumerated, from an agitating faction. A Governor and Executive Council, without a Legislative Assembly, would

have been preferred by many to a continuance of the old Constitution; but the democratic Constitution, originally granted to a republic styled single and independent, would not have admitted of such an alteration, and a new Constitution could not have been prepared without endless embarrassment. The concessions appear to have been complete, and not to have left a pretext for further complaint.

In regard to the wishes of a party avowedly desirous of a union with Greece, we see that they have been brought into notice speedily by the extension of political freedom, and have hitherto obtained some success at elections; but this faction is now encountered by a compact and influential body of converted political opponents, resolute in earnestly counteracting their designs, and resisting their pretensions. It was apprehended by many of our friends in the Islands, that the immediate effects of the alterations introduced on the revision of the Constitution, would endanger the special interest of the protecting Power. On the contrary, however, they have served to range on the right side a most intelligent class of inhabitants, and have relieved the Government from the burden of growing discontent, open and concealed. We can imagine that any change would produce a phalanx of opposers doubtful of results. This, as in similar innovations, may have added to the perplexities to be expected from sanctioning by one act an electoral system entirely free from Government interference, and giving the control of the expenditure and financial matters to the representatives themselves. The opinions or prejudices of old and faithful servants of the Government could not be disregarded; they must have had, and still have, an influence on the whole arrangement. Individuals, who had had for thirty years an almost hereditary claim to be selected as members for the Legislature, and those who from habit or principle approved of a form of government under which the Seven Islands had prospered; and others long officially employed, whose zeal and steady support in carrying on the public business had been accepted and acknowledged by the Ionian Government for a series of years,—all disliked the changes *in toto*, or would have wished them postponed *sine die*, or, at any rate, to a more propitious period.

Reductions of salaries, and a more uncertain tenure of employment, must be the consequences of the control over the public expenditure being transferred to a Legislative Assembly, or of concessions approaching towards responsible government, and a departure from centralised authority. In watching the same process in our colonies and dependencies, it may have been observed, that instances have unfortunately occurred of

disregard to the interest of public servants, or of persons in high situations, which may be so far considered as harsh and even unjust, that colonists, who had devoted through life their energies and professional abilities to the service and cause of the Imperial Government, have been abruptly turned adrift and discarded, with ruin to their prospects, after having been encouraged and urged on by successive authorities to stand in the foremost ranks in maintaining a line of policy declared right and patriotic. Political sacrifices of this kind have probably, in some degree, been found necessary, but in such cases the combatants who have been eulogised for a quarter of a century as patterns of loyalty and usefulness, consulted and caressed, cannot be put in the wrong by the concessions of the parent State, or their claims be thrown overboard by any administration without disgrace to the Government.

In carrying into effect the revision of the Ionian Constitution, we believe, that in this republic of very small dimensions, but encumbered with a very large civil establishment, no hard or cruel cases have been the result of concession; salaries have been diminished, but no meritorious public officer, with claims of the description to which we have alluded, has been unceremoniously dismissed. *Employés* who preferred to relinquish their appointments rather than accept a reduced salary, have been enabled to retire on liberal pensions. We must advert here to the letter of Count Salamos, transmitted home for the information of the public, and the comments on it, to elucidate a part of this subject. The Count, an amiable man we have understood, and thoroughly attached to the protecting Government, approved in particular, together with some of his friends, of the scheme of administration of 1817, so far as to continue of opinion that it would still perfectly answer.

He discharged the duties of President of the Senate admirably for half the Quinquennium, relinquished his post suddenly, loving his own Zacynthus better than irritating work; and perplexed at the aspect of the future, sent in his farewell address, which was forwarded to the Colonial Department and read in the House of Commons, as a proof that the vessel is unmanageable even by a skilful pilot: but listen to the *finale*. This useful politician and opulent and industrious proprietor of vineyards, on his return to his isle, throws the whole weight of his influence into the scale against the Government to prevent Count Roma, one of a rival family, from succeeding to the honours from which he himself had voluntarily fled; and actually causes, by his own exertions, the election of a candidate for the Legislative Assembly from the factious ranks; an affair of some importance at this particular crisis.

Occurrences of the kind are not unfrequent in small communities,—the Guelphs and Ghibellines will create embarrassment and confusion in their rivalship; but fortunately, in this case of jealousy and desertion of public interests, the effect has not been disastrous. A well composed majority in the Legislative Assembly, and an influential Senate chosen from that body, appear to have transacted the business of the island satisfactorily; and it is to be presumed that the good sense of the United Ionian States will support them, and not again permit their own concerns to be neglected, and the measures of the Legislative and Executive Government to be delayed, as they were in 1850, by the absurd pertinacity and obstinacy of the *têtes exaltées* who figured in the session of that year.

The Act for revising the Constitution was ratified in 1850, after it had undergone some judicious amendments; but the first experiment of elections to the Legislative Assembly was tried in that year under the unfavourable circumstances of the Greek blockade: the entrance of Greek detained vessels into Ionian harbours, and other accidental occasions of excitement, furnished means to the annexation party and others to circulate reports which might assist their candidates, and lead to the rejection of others better qualified for the Legislative Assembly. The consequence was, that although the elections were conducted with great regularity and order, many members were returned whose factious proceedings put it out of the power of the Lord High Commissioner to act with them. A passage in Mr. Jervis's history describes so truly this first election, that we shall insert it here:—

'Owing to the tranquillity and the improved sense of justice which prevailed throughout the Islands under the auspices of British protection, the people so far improved in the social scale, that Lord Seaton, in the year 1849, thought he was justified in carrying out Sir Thomas Maitland's intention, by proposing certain changes in the Constitution of 1817, by which a more popular form would be given to the Ionian Legislature, and which would vest the control over the ordinary and extraordinary expenses of the country in the Legislative Assembly. Although the first Parliament which assembled, after these reforms (May 1850) made itself ridiculous by the unparliamentary language of its members, and notwithstanding that, entirely forgetting their position, as members of a protected State assembled to arrange internal affairs, they, with an absurd arrogance, demanded an account of the then existing negotiations between Great Britain and Greece; yet, in these irregularities at starting there is not consistent ground for discouragement, since it was not to be expected that, the first time the reins of government were loosened, a people naturally vain would not go further than they should; but it

is to be hoped that in course of time, they will acquire the discretion and sense of decorum due to themselves as members of a deliberative assembly.'

The provisions of the Treaty of Paris engrafted on the previous democratic form of the Government of the Seven Islands, did not admit of the appointment of the five senators being transferred to the protecting Sovereign. Such a departure from the Constitution of 1803, desirable as it might have been, could not have been properly sanctioned; for we must bear in mind that the United States had always exercised the undoubted right of electing legislators, and that these legislators acquired by their election the privilege of appointing the senators authorised to carry on the Executive Government. This democratic influence was intended to be counteracted in some degree by a clause in the revised Constitution, authorising the Lord High Commissioner to select and appoint from the Legislative Assembly directly the five senators,—a power which was enlarged, as we have described, before giving effect to the modifications. Democratic however in reality, as the Constitution now is, we think it is less so than the institutions of several of our colonies which at present are not within the control of the Government of the parent State; the Houses of Assembly having in their own hands virtually the appointment of Heads of Departments, and in fact of a responsible Executive Government.

Every man has his hobby, and a dangerous one it is to mount when the manufacturing of Constitutions is the object. In this age of Constitution-making, difficulties in that craft are endless, when the object is to destroy an old charter and give a Constitution with new principles. Short of this, the concessions have been so comprehensive as to be sufficient for all parties; and the circumstances under which the boon has been conferred on this occasion, reflect the highest honour on the British Government. For it is almost the only instance of ample and well considered concessions having been proposed by the Government spontaneously, and at the proper time. Objections in detail have been made to the compass and long stride of the alterations as well as to minor points; but those who have made them lose sight of the principle on which the privileges were conceded, criticising individual management, and attributing motives tending only to continue party controversy. We infer from the statement of Count Salamos that a revision of the Constitution *was* required, but that in his judgment it should have been accomplished step by step; and that the repairs, although begun before the hurricane season in a different latitude, should have been delayed by detached, gradual, probationary concessions. Unfortunately, this

mode of getting rid of positive defects is a more difficult process than the Count imagines.

With respect to our policy and existing relations, and the effect of the press we have let loose, every pretext for complaint of our political injustice has been removed but one; and that is, the question how far more strictly defined constitutional police powers may be substituted for those actually retained by the Lord High Commissioner. Now these cannot be withdrawn without great circumspection; — for this the proximity of the Greek and Albanian coasts, and the present condition of those countries, is sufficient reason. The distant prospect of an Hellenic league, as cherished in the Islands, it would be needless to discourage: it cannot embarrass any of our measures. We are not without abundant proofs that when colonial interests and prosperity draw strongly and steadily in an opposite direction, their attractions will easily overcome nationality and attachment of race. The Ionians may be satisfied with our protection and government, and yet discontented with their lot as Greeks. This is precisely the state of feeling in the Seven Islands. They see distinctly the folly of the enthusiasts who would unite them to an insignificant kingdom, with slender resources and notoriously ill governed; and at the same time are well aware of the great advantages they enjoy in the protection of the British flag, and of the support afforded them by our ambassadors and consuls over the Levant, and at the several eastern ports to which their commerce leads them, where they give much trouble and full employment to our consulate establishments.

We have heard it mentioned that even a regent of one of the Islands, three or four years ago, when a Greek national vessel of war entered an Ionian port of his municipal district, went on board, and ostentatiously embraced and kissed the Greek national flag, kneeling under it, and pouring forth an enthusiastic invocation on the occasion; but these flashes of nationality, whether on the part of Government officers or others, cannot excite surprise among a people having the language, manners, and customs of the modern Greek, occupying a portion of the soil of Hellas, and bearing the mark in every village of an homogeneous race; nor could we reasonably desire to see this admiration of Greece and its new kingdom checked or suppressed.

By applying to these isles of classic associations careful and methodical attention, based on enlarged policy and views, and looking on them as a nucleus from which the welfare and progress of the adjacent eastern peninsula might be gradually promoted, we may hope that it will have been for their good to have

been thrown under British protection. Retained with such objects, and in the conjoint political interests of the parties to the Treaty of Paris, and encouraged by beneficent treatment, we need not trouble ourselves about the question of race in dealing with people committed to our charge, or how far the race may have deteriorated by barbaric hordes, — by the descendants of the Sclavonian colonists of Acarnania and the Peloponessus, — by the Crusaders, or Venetian importations. If a prosperous Greek kingdom should be witnessed rapidly growing to maturity, under a real constitutional policy, it would, we are sure, be a matter of great rejoicing; and ardently as every Englishman may desire that British colonies should be planted in every part of the earth to which they can carry the institutions and character of their native land, the prospect is scarcely more delightful than that the islands of the Ionian Seas should form a district of Greece as soon as ever a prosperous and powerful Greek nation shall come into existence, fit and qualified to assist in maintaining the European balance of power, and in diffusing the blessings of civilisation.

Statesmen and historians expressed their regret at the dismemberment of the British Empire and at the loss of the fairest and most extensive possessions ever subjected to the rule of any nation, when its colonies, now forming the United States of America, achieved their independence; but although the disruption may have been accelerated by an evil policy, and by a series of inexcusable blunders, civil and military, no party at the present moment can have the least doubt that feelings of attachment to the mother country could not have withstood the attraction of important colonial interests drawing in an opposite current; or that a separation would not inevitably have ensued, independently of the immediate causes by which it was provoked. The vast forests of North America have given way to the axe, and are replaced by twenty-three millions of people; the events which have brought on these wonderful changes can no longer be considered as unfortunate by any citizen on either side of the Atlantic. Meantime, the necessity of the existing connexion between Great Britain and the Septinsular Islands, is as well known and recognised in the Ionian States as our determination to retain them under our protecting power, whatever signs of nationality it may suit the agitating annexionists ostentatiously to display.

We have entered at some length into the views of the framers of the original Constitution, and endeavoured to explain fully the character of the alterations which we are of opinion may be advantageously carried out. Our inquiries have convinced us that

the Government will be administered with less trouble, anxiety, and inconvenience, and with fewer accidental hindrances, than occur in the management of any of our colonies, large or small, having representative governments. Due allowance must be made for the immediate conduct of electors and legislators who have recently acquired authority and importance, flattered by a new crop of editors of newspapers, and by official documents of similar import and tendency to those from which we have made some extracts, published probably, if not *ad captandum*, yet without reference to local parties and proceedings under discussion, and in ignorance of the evils which an unseasonable publicity may kindle or inflame.

It must be confessed that some specimens of editorship which we have seen from the southern islands do little credit to the taste of Cephalonia and Zante, or rather, we may say, disgrace the tribe of writers which appear to have sprung up in the first days of a free press. But we are informed that these editors were so despicable and impracticable that the most sensitive official was not disturbed by their impertinent attacks. The most rabid newspapers of this description, we believe, already are no more, and the remainder meet with no encouragement. The Acts passed to restrain the license of the press have, we have heard, been considered insufficient, but have such laws not always been found inadequate in our colonies to prevent the publication of seditious political articles? In this matter we may be too sensitive. Whoever will take the trouble to look over political tirades, which appear occasionally in the periodical press, beginning with those of the Channel Islands, and continuing their inspection of the journals of our insular and continental colonies, will be persuaded that Attorney-Generals have either been in a trance for forty years, or have come to the conclusion that Crown prosecutions are useless. In fact, in these matters the press must be declared free, or the alternative adopted of a censorship and admonitory system, similar to that which existed latterly in France, for the regulation of political articles. A controlling law, sufficiently strong to check political attacks on the Government, is exceedingly difficult to enforce in a country where responsible editors are to be procured in abundance, at a cheap rate. The excitement of a new constitutional organisation of the Ionian Islands will subside as they become accustomed to the good effects of a free press.

When we reflect on the number of Ionian tribunals, the excessive litigation in the Islands, and an establishment of judges, on a scale, we should conceive, intended for a population of millions, although under the supervision of an excellent Court

of Appeal, composed of highly esteemed judges, we are confident that the administration of justice will derive important benefits from the vigilance of well conducted journals. The factious conduct of the Zantiot members has already been checked by the results of the Cephalonia and Corfu elections, and we may venture to predict that the advantages emanating from the integrity, perseverance, and laborious attention of Sir Thomas Maitland, and improved under the administration of his successors, will be readily acknowledged and duly appreciated by the majority of the representatives elected this year; and that they, finding themselves on the right track, will continue in it, give their cordial support to the Lord High Commissioner, and be encouraged to exertion when they calmly reflect on the progress that has been made already. Their advanced institutions comprise a system of accounts and checks, and fixed regulations, early introduced, and steadily followed, public schools for all classes, a code of laws in operation, district circuit courts by which the villager has the means of obtaining justice at his own door, public works, convenient roads and communications through every island, marshes drained, and the construction of tanks, aqueducts, moles, harbours, and canals.

We may be permitted now to offer a few observations on the new kingdom of Greece, and the continental Greeks. It has been said that the Constitution ratified in 1843 by the king has not produced the results expected from the proceedings of that year at Athens and the meeting of the Legislature.

The attempt at reform has certainly been hitherto a decided failure, but this is to be attributed to the unfortunate perseverance of incapable administrations in interfering to prevent the free course of representative institutions. These institutions had been founded on the unanimous wishes of the nation, scandalised at the squandering of the loans destined for the improvement of the country, and jealous of the number of foreigners employed. When we reflect on the enormous difficulties to be encountered in moulding a race lately rescued from the domination of the Ottomans, and in forming a new kingdom, and how these difficulties were aggravated by the grievous error committed at starting by the Allies, we cannot be surprised at what has since happened in that country, or at the state in which it now remains.

The whole affair having been mismanaged, and the results having occasioned so much disappointment, the most enthusiastic admirers of Hellas, of her cause, and of the Greeks engaged in the hard revolutionary struggle, would not desire one acre more to be added to a territory towards whose improvement so little

has yet been done. The wants of that miserable Epirus, and the wretched condition of that unhappy bordering population, must, we apprehend, be relieved by other means than extending the Greek frontier; a question which has been disposed of by treaties, and presents formidable obstacles in respect to further territorial arrangements. Nevertheless, we commiserate the fate of the Thessalians, and enter into all the feelings of the Primate of Larissa, the host of Dr. Wordsworth, who exclaimed when he looked over the waters of Peneus, still subject to the Sultan,—'Peneus has wept itself almost dry for grief, and Mount Olympus 'has grown old and hoary; for they are both exiles from their 'land.'

The conditions on which the protectorship of the Ionian Islands was undertaken by Great Britain having been fulfilled, as far as it has been practicable to comply with them, the opportunities offered of serving Greece, and a portion of the Sultan's dominions also, will be increased, and can scarcely fail to draw towards them the vigilant and enthusiastic attention of statesmen. Few there are who have not arrived at the conviction that the precarious existence and domination of the Ottoman Empire, and the probable fate of its European provinces, will soon require interposition on the part of the Allied Powers, who, by extraordinary occurrences and considerations, are compelled to support and protect a government and system at variance with the institutions and customs of every Christian country, and which have brought with them incalculable evils. The standard of an enlightened and powerful country accidentally planted within sight of an oppressed and necessitous people, and also close to the border of a race anxious and struggling for improvement, active, intelligent, easily led, propelled and flattered, raises a fearful responsibility, commensurate only with the opportunity of doing good. The thriving commercial intercourse carried on with the neighbouring Pachalics, and the daily transport of merchandise from the magazines and depôts of Corfu, and the British influence which has been obtained at Constantinople by our diplomatists, might also be made available in commencing the satisfactory and glorious career opened to England and her servants. The Ottoman Empire, destined to be overthrown, if her laws and her population cannot be improved, is a subject for much more attention than has been yet given to it.

The advantages of the Septinsular dependency to England, considered in a more limited view, have been so often enumerated, and their importance as naval, military, and commercial stations are so evident, that we shall merely add, that it is by holding such commanding points with a strong arm that we may

hope to preserve peace and extend our commerce in this quarter of the globe. The papers and despatches on this subject, received by the Colonial Office from the head of the Ionian Government, and published fourteen years ago, contain the fullest information relative to their value. As many of the opinions expressed in these able documents coincide with those we have ventured to offer, we shall lay before our readers the following extracts from them; every line of which must be perused with interest at present.

'Corfu is the key of the Adriatic; Santa Maura, lying in a commanding position near the Gulf of Arta, which, in that quarter, separates Turkey from Greece, is importantly situated with respect to both. Cephalonia is next to this island in importance, and larger in extent. It possesses, in Argostoli, one of the finest sea-ports in the Mediterranean: whilst Samas Bay, on its eastern shore, sheltered by Ithaca, and having every facility of ingress and egress through the strait which divides these two islands, forms a valuable roadstead for the resort of ships, squadrons, or fleets operating in the Adriatic or upon that coast. Zante, from its commerce, possessing a good roadstead, and a fortress placed upon an almost impregnable site, and facing the Gulf of Corinth, is a position of vast importance; and the small islands of Calamos and Meganissi add to the importance of this valuable group of islands.

'We are pledged by the treaty which placed these Islands under the immediate and exclusive protection of Her Majesty, "to employ "a peculiar solicitude with regard to the legislation and the general "administration of these States." I am at present the person invested by Her Majesty with the necessary power and authority for these important purposes, and I do not feel that I should be discharging my duty properly, did I not thus fully state the opinions and views I entertain respecting all the conditions of a trust so nearly concerning the reputation of our great country, the glory and honour of our gracious Queen, the Sovereign Protectress of these States, and the policy of Her Majesty's Ministers.'

'Were there no recorded obligation, no question of policy, no considerations connected with our own interests, binding us to the observance of a particular solicitude "for the improvement of this "country, as productive in a great degree of commercial value in "our intercourse with these islands;" yet, considering them only in the relation in which we stand as a powerful and enlightened nation, having under its protecting wing a weak, defenceless, and backward State and people, whose destinies we hold in trust for good or for evil, for our glory or to our shame; and who, rescued first by British power, and now susceptible by her influence of being reclaimed from the sad effects of centuries of mismanagement and misrule; a people not wanting in high names, and rich in historical recollections. The least enthusiastic of the many who visit these islands, imbued with vivid classical associations, may be permitted to feel that a sense of

national dignity, and all the high and noble sympathies which so peculiarly distinguish our country, unite in requiring of us to show that we are not actuated solely by selfish motives in retaining possession of these Islands; but that we recognise the moral obligation that rests with us, above all others, to dispense abundantly the blessings of internal improvement, education, and civilisation, which Great Britain has it so much in her power to confer, and which may realise to these people, and exhibit to adjoining nations, the peculiar advantages which accrue to all who have the happiness to be connected with our great country.

'Detached from political connexion with Italy,—protected from relapsing into the possession of other Powers,—shaking off by degrees the moral dependency on Italy, to which these States are still subject with respect to education,—and admirably situated for cultivating and extending relations of every kind with adjoining countries,—these Islands may become a great head of civilisation, acting under British influence towards the East, and forming with Greece a bulwark against encroachments from the North.

'I always thought that taking these Islands under our protection, in whatever views it originated, would prove in effect a vast and mighty scheme, accomplishing indirectly no less than making these Islands a great centre for effecting the moral and political emancipation and regeneration of Greece, and, in the end, of other countries, through the moral, political, and statistical improvement of these Islands.'

'The effects of improvement, order, prosperity, and contentment, if introduced into these Islands under British management and influence, must spread, and extending to the insular and continental dominions of Greece (but more immediately to the former), greatly bring that country under our influence, without intriguing to cause it to enter into the political system of these States; whilst, in certain events, which are by no means improbable, it cannot be disadvantageous to our country that a disposition should be manifested to seek our protection.'

'We must, however, be careful to raise and keep these States in advance of their continental neighbours, by promoting every wise, suitable, and rational improvement; and then matter gravitates not towards matter with greater certainty and affinity, than that the other country will become, morally, more and more subject to the influences which may be made to operate with so much reason and force here; and through the state, condition, and contentment of these Islands, upon the regeneration of Greece.'

An anonymous pamphlet appeared in February, 1851, 'The 'Ionian Islands under British Protection,' which we read with distrust and suspicion, because, from the drift and tenor of this plausible statement, it could at one glance be discerned that the remarks of the author were dictated by vindictive feeling, or interested views, although it was cleverly drawn up, and its plagiarisms artfully put together. We are informed by the

writer that his observations were intended for a review; and if they have been since transferred to the columns for which they were originally destined, it is only the more our duty to take notice of the publication.

It would seem, according to the author of the pamphlet, that the Lord High Commissioner, to whose policy he devotes his most particular attention, failed in all his efforts to promote the welfare of the Ionian Islands. 'His "unpopular regulations emptied '"the public schools of their pupils;" his "model farms" were so 'mismanaged "that every potato cost a shilling," and his succes-'sors were compelled to sell cows, ploughs, spades, shovels, and 'rakes, by auction, at a vile price. The Penitentiary at Corfu, 'built and occupied during his administration, was so ill-contrived 'that the convicts escaped from it "by dozens." The ship canal 'across the lagoons separating Santa Maura from Acarnania 'was undertaken by him "in defiance of the opinion of the '"officers of the Royal Engineers," and would neither allow of 'the passage of vessels through it when the boisterous south 'wind blew, nor attract them when northerly gales prevailed; 'and was therefore a useless and extravagant project beyond 'the means of the Ionians.' 'His municipal revisions and inno-'vations rendered the magistracy inefficient,' his acceptance of a public dinner from a literary society, of which circumstance he forgot to inform the Colonial Minister; and his invitations in 'barbarous Greek, prepared the way for disturbances in 'Cephalonia.' Yet in the enumeration of all these *delicta* and misdoings, the censor never once refers to an arrangement for which we have heard Lord Seaton was more blamed than for any other made by him during the whole course of his administration; and which we really think cannot be palliated,—we mean the imprudent step in bringing from an English University a Fellow of a College, who was personally unknown to him, to take charge of the University of Corfu, on the retirement of Professor Orioli; and giving him the respectable title of Rector. This appears to have been one of the most objectionable appointments that ever was sanctioned by a Governor or Lord High Commissioner in the wide field of his patronage; so unfit was the chosen candidate for the office and work for which he was intended, that six weeks after his arrival scarcely a difference of opinion existed on the matter. It has been said, in apology for this injudicious selection, that the Lord High Commissioner stated that he had confided entirely in the judgment and discrimination of the Heads of Houses, by whose exertions and good offices, on former occasions, eminent individuals had been sent out from Oxford and Cambridge at his request, to preside over Collegiate

Institutions in British dependencies. We cannot, however, admit this as a sufficient excuse for Lord Seaton's having persevered in the error into which he had fallen, by continuing the rector in office. If it be true that his *protégé* provoked the interference of the authorities responsible for his conduct, by his disobedience, and disgusted the Ionians by his *extravagant* and *uncontrollable* garrulity and absurdity, and thus deprived himself of the influence necessary for success in tuition; in short, if he were tried and found wanting, he should instantly have been set aside. Far better indeed would it have been for the rising generation trusted to his care, that an eastern consulship, an employment for which his great acquirements and abilities qualify him, should have been provided for him, than that the educationary current should have been checked, interrupted, and disturbed at the fountain head.

The appointment to which we have adverted became the concern of every family, and we learn, with no surprise or regret, from the reviewer, that the heathen vote by which a colossal statue had been decreed in honour of Lord Seaton, was rescinded or delayed on the first Session of a reformed House of Assembly, a measure, perhaps the only wise one, adopted by the majority of those turbulent and detestable legislators elected in wrath. Neither the good intentions of Lord Seaton, nor his 'popularity with the mass of the people,' which the reviewer says he had acquired, but which, we should think, 'was of that 'kind that followed Lord Normanby in Ireland,' could have drawn from the Assembly, justly dissatisfied in a matter of this importance, a decree for even a bust or a statuette. Having discharged the disagreeable task imposed on us of showing a proven error on the part of the Lord High Commissioner, we must, in justice to his administration, endeavour to give such explanations as we have been able to collect from official documents and private letters in reference to the allegations preferred in the pamphlet and review.

1st. It should be known that the prisoners and convicts at Corfu, and in some of the other islands, had remained for many years in a horrible and deplorable condition,—thieves, murderers, and criminals for petty offences being all confined without classification in unventilated pestiferous casemates, with no attention paid to their cleanliness; tobacco and wine allowed within and without. To alter this prison system, Lord Seaton ordered, with the concurrence of the Senate, a penitentiary on the separate system, and hospital to be constructed, on a healthy site, for the reception of 400 convicts. To this capacious and convenient building the convicts were removed, as soon as pos-

sible, and classified, and an intelligent and esteemed chaplain of the Greek Church took charge of the schools attached to the prison. Some were instructed in trades, and others employed in clearing away the *debris* of abandoned forts. The new system was commenced before the outer wall and *enceinte* were completed, and three prisoners escaped, chiefly owing to the neglect of the guard; these fugitives climbed over the iron fences of the prison courts, and four others effected their escape from the police guard, while at work in an adjoining fort. This is the substance of the reports of the police department, and civil engineer and architect who planned the penitentiary and superintended its erection.

2. We come next to the charge concerning the ship canal of Santa Maura, and having accidentally had an opportunity lately of procuring full information concerning this work, through the civil engineer employed, we insert below in answer copies of his report, and the speech of Sir H. Ward in 1850 *:—

---

* Sir H. Ward's speech to the Legislative Assembly, in 1850, *relative to the St. Maura Canal:* — 'It is satisfactory to me to be 'able to state, that as far as an unprofessional man can judge, the 'completion of this work will be less difficult than I at first anti-'cipated. The compactness of the clay through which the canal is 'cut, renders it improbable that the sides will require to be strength-'ened by piles or stone facings; the set in of the current is suffi-'ciently strong to keep the channel clear without dredging; and 'even in its present imperfect state *eighty* vessels are stated to have 'passed through it in the course of the present year, besides those 'which were loaded with salt at the salines. It is probable, there-'fore, that a considerable toll may be derived from this canal when 'completed to the depth and width originally proposed; and, under 'these circumstances, I recommend the Assembly to take measures 'for bringing the work to a close as soon as possible.'

REPORT OF THE CIVIL ENGINEER.

London, 1851.

'My Lord,—Presuming that you will be pleased to hear any news regarding the canal of Santa Maura, I feel it an imperative duty to inform your lordship, that yesterday I received a letter from Corfu, in date 21st November, wherein it states that a French steamer, directed for Alexandria, passed through the canal of Santa Maura, through stress of weather. The event was celebrated by illuminations by the islanders.' 'The letter further states, that by April the canal, in its whole breadth, will be excavated ten feet in depth; this would have taken place much earlier if it had not happened that the dredge had to undergo a thorough repair, which was a loss of eight months. The sides, as I always gave your lordship to understand, would keep their vertical, and are not in

This ship canal was cut through the Isthmus of Santa Maura to afford a safe passage, in still water, for thirty miles to the eastward of that island to vessels bound to the Corinthian Gulf and the Southern Islands, and to prevent the detention of coasters and small vessels from the Gulf of Arta, and their encountering the boisterous gales and heavy sea to the westward of the island by Capo Ducato. The opening of the canal has promoted the commerce of the Gulf of Arta, given a splendid harbour to Santa Maura, and improved the health of the town, by causing a rapid current through the lake. The channel excavated passing through an isthmus of 237 yards, and through the lagoon of about 2000, was partly effected by a steam dredging machine, and joins an old passage near Fort Constantine, formerly used in communicating with Santa Maura and Acarnania. A direct access to the extensive salt works of Santa Maura has also been secured, and the military defences have been improved by the line of the excavation intended to be seventy feet wide, and fifteen deep.*

3. The assertion that the schools were emptied by the regulations of Lord Seaton, must have been advanced in ignorance of the facts, for we observe from the papers laid before Parliament in 1846 and 1848, that 6005 pupils attended District Schools, that the number of students at the University was 78, at the College 80; whatever fluctuations there may have been, we should suspect, depended more on the qualifications of the master than the regulation of the Government. We see also

---

the least affected by the passage of boats, which is now constant. These are points on which I feel convinced your lordship will be glad to be informed upon, — and with this spirit, I have troubled you with these few lines.

'The Lexchimo road is also progressing, and will be completed, provided the estimates pass this next new Parliament, in about nine months hence.

'(Signed) J. REID.'

* We insert the following extract from the anonymous pamphlet before us in order that we may have an opportunity of stating that the Royal Engineer officers were not consulted on this occasion, and we are assured they never did express the opinions which the author has unhesitatingly ventured to attribute to them. 'So again Lord 'Seaton determined to signalise his administration by digging a ship 'canal across the lagoons which separate Santa Maura, the ancient 'Leucadia, from the coast of Acarnania. Moreover it was under-'taken in defiance of the Royal Engineer officers, who contended that 'the canal, even if completed, would be of no material advantage, and 'would not cover the annual sum necessary to keep it in repair.'

from the documents in the Blue Books of that period, that the whole of the buildings of the University, including the seminary, were enlarged and repaired, and others opened in 1844 and 1845. The school of chemistry, which had been discontinued for some years, was restored, in addition to the lecture-rooms for Civil Law and Materia Medica, and a course of lectures given to an increased number of pupils.

4. The remarks on the Model Farm require some notice. It was an institution not established, as the reviewer affects to imagine, for supplying the population with potatoes, but to secure a careful education in agricultural affairs to the sons of farmers and the peasantry, and to pupils intended to be employed as instructors in the different islands. A graduate was obtained from the agricultural establishment of the Marquis of Ridolfi, at Florence, to conduct the agricultural part of the system, and an eminent Greek ecclesiastic from the university took charge of the schools. One hundred and forty boys were under tuition, and a fixed number of boarders educated, destined to superintend similar institutions in other districts.

A reply, at some length, to the comment on invitations in Greek and the banquet, appears required, as the reviewer anxiously desires it to be understood that both were *avant couriers* of innovation and strong evidence of Democratic and Radical propensities, notwithstanding the revision of the Ionian Charter was suggested four years before any of the modifications were officially announced in 1848 and 1849. 'To show,' says the reviewer, 'how far a Tory, when once fairly started on the hobby 'of Whiggery, will ride, it may be amusing and edifying to men-'tion that during the last month of his reign Lord Seaton caused 'the cards of invitation to his balls and dinners to be printed in 'Modern Greek.' Thus speaks the reviewer. We have been more inquisitive in respect to this alleged bolt out of the Tory course than perhaps is due to it, or to the record of the historian, but we give the following information respecting the occurrence as we have received it. The experienced in the *ménages* of governors and such like functionaries, will be aware that the troublesome routine business of distributing cards of invitation devolves on aides de camp, and is, as an *affaire de routine*, regulated by that department. Probably none of these cards of invitation are seen by their Excellencies from one end of the year to the other; which, most likely, and we believe, was the fact in the instance we are now called on to explain. It had been the custom, in the early days of the Constitution, to send forth invitations in Greek on the anniversary balls of the 1st January to commemorate the completion of the Ionian

Constitution. And this was certainly the practice in 1832, if discontinued afterwards. On St. George's day the Cavalieri of St. Michael and St. George were always invited to a banquet at the Palace,—an order invented and organised by Sir Thomas Maitland, assisted by an able officer on his staff, and instituted expressly to gratify the Ionians, placed, happily for them, under British protection. It appears, then, that the officers of the invitation department, extensively and intimately acquainted with Ionian families, sent out these cards in Greek to the Cavalieri invited to the feast on St. George's day in 1848. The cards were a transcript of those used in earlier times, and those in use at Athens, *ὑπασπιστὴς* actually being the barbarous paraphrase adopted in the new Greek kingdom. The term must be tolerated, as well as the Romaic '*νέρον*' pro *ὕδωρ*, and '*κρασι*' pro *οἶνος*. We must mention, moreover, that Greek is more spoken in every Ionian family than Italian, and that an Act had passed in 1847 to enforce its use in all departments, in conformity to the articles of the Constitutional Charter of 1817.

The dinner given to Lord Seaton by the Literary Society of Corfu has undergone a strict examination. The reviewer thinks Lord Seaton was irrecoverably lost in Radicalism when he accepted the offerings of the Danai. The account given of this affair is incorrect. It is asserted that in March, 1849, Lord Seaton 'forgot to inform his official chief that when he penned 'the despatch he had himself engaged to dine, on April 4th, only 'six days after its date, at one of those public dinners, which 'he seemed to regret.' This is a great error: Lord Seaton had *not* accepted the invitation when he wrote; and he *did* acquaint Lord Grey, in a despatch of April, 'that a banquet had been 'proposed by the Literary Society of Corfu in honour of Her 'Majesty, and to show their attachment to the British nation, 'and express their thanks to the Lord High Commissioner for 'the interest which he had taken in the affairs of the Ionian 'Islands,'—the very words of the invitation, and copied verbatim from Lord Seaton's despatch,—and that he had accepted it conditionally, and that the expression of opinion on the part of the Society had produced a good effect. With respect to this dinner, which the reviewer calls 'the first outward indica-'tion of sedition,' it should be distinctly stated that he accepted it at the *earnest* and repeated request and recommendation of the two secretaries of the Senate, one of whom was Count Dusmani, a firm Conservative, and a faithful servant of the British Government; the other an esteemed and experienced British functionary. They mentioned in support of their advice

and recommendation, that as the Radicals, at the head of which Napoleon Zambelli had lately placed himself, afterwards one of the editors of the 'Patris' of 1849, were opposed to the invitation, that the impression it would produce in Greece would be advantageous to the protecting Government, at a time when Athenian agents and annexionists were at work in Cephalonia, and that it might put an end to the agitation in that island, and the false reports in circulation. The commandant of the garrison, and all the officers of the staff, were present at the dinner, as well as some of the most respectable Signori of Corfu, Count Dusmani, the Cavalieri Damaschino and Petrides, the one president and the other secretary of the Legislative Assembly, the present Procuratore Generale, Cuvcumelli, who had been one of the chief promoters of the banquet.

The toasts were three or four, which had been previously sent to the Lord High Commissioner for his approval; viz. the Queen, the Lord High Commissioner, the Ionian Islands, and the Greeks. The whole affair was quietly and most respectfully conducted. At this time, we must remind our readers that outbreaks in Greece, and the revolutions in other countries, were expected: while Metaxa Loutzo, Giovanni Metaxa Gracomato, Tipaldo Capelletto, and the intriguing factionists of Cephalonia, with their agents at Athens, were encouraged to alarm the peasantry, and to circulate reports intended to disturb the public peace, by a display of popular feeling in favour of Greece. These demonstrations had commenced early in March, 1848. Caralambo Zancarolos, of Athens, having the honorary rank of major in the Greek army, and the Mirarque of Gensdarmes Panas, also a native of the Ionian Islands, were supposed to be the Greek *intrigants* at the period referred to. The Ionian Government had every reason to believe that they were implicated; both from their frequent trips between Athens and Cephalonia, and from their communication with the Ionian Advocate General of Athens.

A Bill for the removal of restrictions on the press was passed in June, 1848, but not ratified till the end of the year. No newspaper was published in the Ionian Islands till 1849, although it was known from the acts of the Senate, and the official correspondence lodged in the public offices, that the Lord High Commissioner had, in 1844 and 1845, and in 1847, suggested that the press regulations should be modified; and that later, previously to the Parisian outbreak, he had, in reference to the increased circulation of Athenian papers and other journals, recommended the removal of the restrictions altogether. The reviewer observes, that Lord Seaton 'was content to follow

'in the steps of his predecessors, and to wield the sceptre 'which had descended to him with no less energetic grasp.' We are convinced, and we think it can be shown, that the influence or confidence obtained by Lord Seaton, and which enabled him to carry on the Government efficiently and satisfactorily, should be attributed not to the power given by the Constitution of 1817, which he exercised, but rather to the general spirit of his Government and the measures which he recommended for adoption in 1843 and 1844, during the first years of his administration; viz. the District Monthly Circuit Courts, the arrangements for separating the municipal income and accounts from the general revenue, the reform of the police establishment, by which crime and criminal prosecutions were diminished one half, and some other remedial measures, to which the following extract from the Parliamentary Reports refers:— 'Several important alterations have been made in the Judicial 'establishment. Courts of justice have been instituted in each 'district for the trial of causes of minor import, at which the 'inferior judges preside, assisted by the Epistati. These Courts 'are opened in every district, the first Monday of every month,' &c.

A few words more on the 'voto segreto,' which at one period of the Ionian Constitution, and in some elections, was the law, and we have not heard that Sir Henry Ward dislikes the system. We have already shown that the Legislative Assembly stipulated for the ballot, and forwarded a petition to the Queen, soliciting 'that the wish expressed by a large majority in the 'Assembly was that of the Ionian public, however open to 'disputes: and stating that in small countries in which in-'dividuals are closely connected, and exposed to solicitation 'and threats, without this precaution their vote would be no 'longer independent, and that many, from the intimate relations 'between families, would be disposed to resign their political 'rights, more particularly tranquil electors and haters of in-'trigue.' Most of the Judges, and persons intimately acquainted with all classes concurred in the opinion, that the influence of contractors and opulent merchants rendered the precaution of the ballot necessary. Such were the reasons assigned, so different from those imputed.

We think that it is probable that Tories or Conservatives, pertinaciously adhering to the sentiments generally attributed to them in respect to the institutions of our own country, may 'mount a Radical hobby' at Iyannina, or in any land where the laws and government are injurious to all classes, without incurring the charge of inconsistency. And, on the other hand,

we imagine, that it is possible that Radicals may change their *façon de parler* and be speedily converted and embrace Toryism in our colonies and in States, where M. P.'s are redundant, and the press scurrilous or too communicative. Such cases are known to have occurred.

The number of the Syncliteæ in the Ionian Islands, by the enlargement of the electoral franchise, was computed at about 4000; but we believe it to be overstated in that estimate. The registration returns, however, were always difficult to complete, and many irregularities were permitted. As yet we have not been able to procure a correct statement of them. The discontinuance of the interference and control of the Lord High Commissioner in municipal elections has, we are assured, been the means of correcting many abuses. The alteration alluded to by the reviewer is, that the five municipal officers are elected by the Syncliteæ, registered in the city or town lists, instead of their being nominated by the Lord High Commissioner from his double lists, and elected through the Regent. The Regent, as formerly, is appointed by the Senate, with the concurrence of the Lord High Commissioner, and is President of the Municipality; and in the administration of the municipal regulations has the casting vote; he names the days of the meetings of the Municipal Council, and calls extra meetings. The business of these officers relates chiefly to markets and the subsistence of the population, to the civil police and charitable institutions. No extra expenditure can be incurred without the previous sanction of the Senate and the Lord High Commissioner; all temporary regulations proposed are submitted for the approval of them both; and all functionaries attached to the Municipality are appointed, through the Regent, by the English Government. Those who are acquainted with the mode in which the municipal appointments are made in our borough towns will be able to judge how far the modifications adopted in the Ionian Islands were likely to be beneficial to the people and serviceable to the Government. With respect to the extension of the municipal privilege to remote districts, we see that the Lord High Commissioner, in 1849, in his address to the Assembly, recommended that 'if the revision of the municipal system should take place, district Municipalities might be instituted, under whose immediate management district schools could be brought as well as the details relative to local roads, and internal communications and matters connected with the Syncliteæ and session of Monthly Circuit Courts, as the only way of ascertaining the wants of the rural population.' Whether this suggestion was acted on or not we are not in-

formed; but we know that the rural population had been most shamefully neglected, and required protection and advice.

The framing of a repressive law to prevent abuses of the free press was one of the most difficult points to determine: any approach to a censorship was to be avoided; some of the clauses and parts of the Act passed, drawn up by the Procurator General for the sanction of the Government, it was thought, were of the nature of censorship, and not altogether applicable to the Islands, and would have been useless with a free press at Athens, encouraging the description of writing meant by the Bill to be checked; but the framing of a law sufficiently repressive, without technical defects, rested with the Procurator General and his legal associates. If the law to prevent seditious articles and scurrilous attacks is considered inadequate,—and we understand that it is,—the Legislative Assembly will soon find it for their own interests and for those of the Islands to amend it. It may be right also to define precisely the extent of the high police power vested by the Constitution in the hands of the Lord High Commissioner, but to exchange that check on sedition and disturbances for an amended law to restrain the press, would, we are of opinion, not strengthen the Executive Government.

It is a mistake to suppose that the five persons removed by the orders of Lord Seaton from Cephalonia in 1849 were apprehended by the police for their editorial offences. Two of them were editors, but the whole were accused by the Resident of Cephalonia of disturbing Argostoli by mischievous addresses, and by circulating false reports, which required immediate interference, and of an organised system of agitation in the country, and were accordingly embarked and sent to Cerigo or Paxo. Severe enactments can be as easily evaded as they are in our colonies; and probably not one of the specimens of a scurrilous abusive press would have gone beyond the narrow streets of Argostoli, where they were composed, had not the libels been forced into importance by forwarding them to England.

We have taken some pains to furnish our readers with details relative to individuals, and to attacks on their proceedings; and in bringing our story to an end have been drawn from the consideration of the real question at issue, to which we again return. One would suppose from the way in which the discontinuance of the Primary Council is mentioned, that it was an additional concession, but its abolition was the necessary result of the extension of the elective franchise. The chief duty of

the Primary Council was to examine and complete the double lists, which are no longer required.

The reviewer expresses his surprise that so many important privileges should have been granted at the same time; but we tell him that conceding by instalments is bad policy and seldom succeeds, when the proposed modifications of a Constitution are determined on, and can be with justice claimed, and are expected and desired by the intelligent and loyal; the Government, by at once anticipating their wishes, establishes confidence and respect. A different course is to be avoided. Sir Henry Ward has been, we think, unjustly and inconsiderately censured, and even harassed for his decision in dissolving a Legislative Assembly unworthy to represent the Islands; and in proroguing another, under the circumstances in which he was placed. The Colonial Department has always supported his views, and rightly. The conduct of these assemblies was injurious to the interests of the people at large, and embarrassed inferior departmental officers more than the Government. The salaries of the chief functionaries being provided for by permanent bills, and the Civil List not having been discontinued, the business of the Islands was carried on with the aid of the Senate, composed, it is said, of more able members than at any time since the Islands have been under British protection. In the last Session the influential and well-informed majority of the Legislative Assembly gave their support to the Government, except on the occasion when conditional measures were proposed to amend the Act passed to prevent libels and a seditious press, and to introduce some other regulations. The proposed measures were rejected, probably by the votes of the adherents of the *régime* of 1817, and by those of the Annexionists of course. The high police power might be more distinctly defined, but the exercise of an extensive discretionary control, with the advice of the Senate, is indispensable in islands so accessible as they are from the adjoining coasts. The Parliament has been prorogued, after a Session prolonged beyond the usual term fixed by the Constitution, and probably will not meet again till 1854. The Senate having still the power of sanctioning regulations with the force of laws during the recess — the Lord High Commissioner remains for two years in repose, undisturbed by popular legislation, — the details of the Government are administered by an excellent Senate with clockwork precision. No traces of the confusion imagined by Count Salamos, in his petulant memorandum, can be anywhere discovered. In fine, we are confident that the majority of the Legislative Assembly will give their steady support to the pro-

tecting Government; and that the intelligent and respectable majority will increase in numbers, although it may fluctuate, like all assemblies freely elected.

The revision of the Constitution has already brought into the service of Government men of talent, influence, and property, who had been for years excluded from employment, and suspected of hostility to the protecting Government. Among these we may name the family of the Romas, the Advocate Braila, at present contributing their active exertions in support of the revised system. We disagree entirely with the opinions set forth in the statement we have had under consideration, and think its predictions as unwarranted and unsound as the rest of the publication. Looking to the future prospects of the Ionian Islands, we cannot conceive a more satisfactory government for our lieutenants to administer, whether in regard to position, local advantages, or to the working of the institutions now established. A fine and compliant peasantry; free institutions; ports occupied by vessels preparing to take in their annual cargoes of oil and currants, or engaged in commerce with Odessa and the Black Sea; a delightful climate; soil fruitful in productions; magnificent scenery; sheltered roadsteads and bays; the classic land of Hellas accessible by steam in a few hours; and splendid garrisons, highly disciplined, to promote and ensure law and order; and the *Patris* defunct, without a decree having been brought forth for the erection of statues to the memory of Harmodius and Aristogeiton.

Notwithstanding the writer of the pamphlet before us observes, with *Cretan* animosity, that Englishmen are looked on in Corcyra as the Austrians are in Milan, we do not hesitate to declare that, though the Ionians have reason to remember overbearing usage in a few instances, our country is loved and our compatriots respected; and that, with the attention that ought to be bestowed on the Seven Islands, they will be prosperous, and an honour to the British name, and an attractive, agreeable, residence for Englishmen. The policy and justice of providing occasionally for the intelligent and well-educated young men of the Ionian Islands, locked up on their native soil, who are not permitted to enter our naval or military service, by nominating them for employments in the East Indies, was suggested by Sir H. Douglas, and other Lord High Commissioners; and this subject is worthy of the consideration of the protecting Government. It remains to be proved whether the Ionian Constitution of 1817, based on that of 1803, democratic in terms and form, can be worked under the present system of elective franchise, with the Synclitæ ex-

tended to 4000, or according to a calculation, though incorrect, of 6000. The local mistakes of those who proposed the revision of the charter, and the merits of those who corrected them, did not affect the Bill of 1850, which has no reference to this subject. The extent of control of which the Lord High Commissioner has been deprived may be summed up by stating that he no longer elects the Legislative Assembly; and a great loss of power it is. We are not to be discouraged by the first returns from Cephalonia, or by the imbecile who was sent from Cerigo as a legislator. The Lord High Commissioner, indeed, has gained much by being enabled to nominate and appoint a more efficient and influential Senate than ever succeeded to office under the old *régime*, and by all the elections being conducted with great regularity.

The financial matters of the Ionian States having been already referred to, little more need be said to show that the annual military contributions had been fixed at a rate disproportionate to the revenue. The payments due on this account had fallen in arrear for many years. A new agreement was assented to at the suggestion of Lord Seaton, regulating their payments in proportion to the net receipts of the Ionian treasury. One fifth of the income was the amount sanctioned, which brought down the contributions from 35,000 to an average of 24,000. The resources of the Islands could not be developed without a constant outlay; nor could the debt be reduced, or a deficit prevented, without a reduction in the establishment, or of the salaries of functionaries. These reductions unfortunately lowered the incomes of departmental officers below what was due to their services and their responsibility. Whatever profit the Islands may have received from the expenditure of British troops, and it must have been large, this could not increase or affect a revenue depending on export duties on staple produce, or alleviate the distress occasioned by a total failure in the olive crop for a series of years.

We take leave of the subject, convinced that in governing the people of the Ionian Islands *common sense* and *sincerity* are the essential requisites, and that the defensive remarks in our paper are fully justified by the ample Ionian documents and correspondence to which we have had access, from the times of Spiridione Forresti, our consul, and the contemplated occupation of Corfu, in 1801, by British troops, to the present period.

ART. III. — 1. *The Life and Epistles of St. Paul: comprising a complete Biography of the Apostle, and a Translation of his Letters, inserted in Chronological Order.* By the Rev. W. J. CONYBEARE, M. A., late Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge, and the Rev. J. S. HOWSON, M. A., Principal of the Collegiate Institution, Liverpool. With Illustrations by W. H. BARTLETT. 2 vols. 4to. London: 1850–1852.

2. *The Life and Epistles of St. Paul.* By THOMAS LEWIN, M. A., of Trinity College, Oxford. 2 vols. post 8vo. London: 1851.

3. *Der Apostel Paulus.* Von KARL SCHRADER. 6 vols. 8vo. Leipzig: 1830–1836.

4. *Pflanzung u. Leitung der Christlichen Kirche durch die Apostel.* Dritter Abschnitt: die Ausbreitung des Christenthums und Grundung der Christlichen Kirche durch die Wirksamkeit des Apostels Paulus. [*Planting and Training of the Christian Church by the Apostles.* Third Part: The Propagation of Christianity and Foundation of the Christian Church by the Agency of the Apostle Paul.] Von DR. AUGUST NEANDER. 4th edition. Pp. 134—152. Hamburg: 1847.

5. *The Voyage and Shipwreck of St. Paul, &c.* By JAMES SMITH, Esq., of Jordan Hill, F.R.S., &c. London: 1848.

WE see every reason to hail the kind of attention which is now being bestowed on the study and illustration of the New Testament Scriptures. Those fruits of collateral inquiry which the last age erroneously denominated the *evidences* of Christianity, while they are now gathered in tenfold abundance, are called by their right names, and ranged in their proper places. The more accurate philological study of the Greek language, — the light which the researches of Niebuhr and others have let in upon the contemporary and earlier history, — the multiplied facilities for travel, and the advanced intelligence of travellers, — have contributed to increase our means of confirming and illustrating the evangelic record. On the other hand, we cannot but think that a deeper insight into the character of Christianity itself has led us to give all such accessories their true importance, and no more. The stranger may gaze

with wonder at the far-stretching outworks and bastions of the fortress; but he who dwells within, knows that its strength is not only, nor chiefly, in these.

The reader who feels the force of our last remark, will have no difficulty in joining us in the assumption, with which we shall proceed to the consideration of the works mentioned at the head of this Article.

We assume, that it was the Divine intention to reveal a religion, which should suffice for the moral and intellectual elevation of ALL MANKIND; which, laying its foundations in individual convictions, should clear and exalt the conscience, purify the affections, ennoble the intellect; while, at the same time, it disclosed a hope common to all men, and capable of sustaining under every possible trial of humanity. We assume further, that *this religion was Christianity.* And we are thus led to the contemplation of definite historical facts. Christianity was introduced into the world at a certain time, and under certain circumstances. Can we, by examination of the state of mankind at the time, perceive any remarkable preparations for the assumed work which Christianity had to accomplish? Periods of this world's history may be conceived, singularly *unfitted* for the promulgation of a religion which was to take general hold on mankind. Does the period of the promulgation of Christianity present any remarkable contrast to these?

Again: if it was the intention of the Allwise to bring the whole of mankind under one bond of union, we might imagine that there would be visible in history some traces of previous preparation; that amidst the wars of states, and the conflict of opinions, we should find some advance made towards the possibility, and efficacy, of such a blending of both, as was destined hereafter to take place. Nay, we may go further than this. Excluding mere chance from any part in the arrangement of man's world, we may fairly say *à priori*, that we might expect to find some adaptations in local circumstances themselves, to the end which was to be answered. Situations might be conceived, which should be most *adverse* to the accomplishment of the end assumed. Was Christianity introduced in *those* situations, or in others of a very different character?

Again, if Christianity is to be founded in individual convictions, the weapon of its warfare, above all others, must be *persuasion;* and in order to persuasion, there must be *one able to persuade.* Do we find any provision made for such a persuader? The work will be no ordinary nor easy one. The conflicting elements of the ancient social system could never be amalga-

mated, but by one specially and unusually prepared for the task. The hierarchical prejudice of the Jew, the intellectual pride of the Greek, the political pre-eminence of the Roman, would present insuperable obstacles to any man who was not capable of entering into and dealing with each, not as extraneous to himself, but as a part of his own character and personality. And more than this. The religion of Christ was, from each of these elements, itself in danger. It might become hierarchical and Judaistic, or philosophic and Grecian, or might lose its great characteristics in the political liberalism of Rome. It would need one singularly fitted by education and temperament, to mark boldly and keenly the outlines of the faith to be preached; who, while he recognised the legitimacy of the Judaistic and Grecian elements in Christianity, and laid down the canons of civil and political conformity, might yet be under exclusive subjection to none of these, but able to wield and attemper them all.

Have we any traces of the preparation of a workman for such a work? Does any appear on the stage of the early Christian period, answering to these unusual and difficult requirements? Can we find any person able, at that time of strange complication and difficulty, *to carry out all men's religion among all men?*

Our readers will excuse us for entering somewhat into these questions, and endeavouring popularly to state the resolution of them with which Providence, in the course of history, has furnished us. They will thus be better able to appreciate the nature of the service which has been rendered to the Christian world by the authors whose works are mentioned at the head of the present Article.

Mr. Howson strikingly remarks (p. 4.), 'The city of God was 'built at the confluence of three civilisations.' The Jews, the Greeks, the Romans, had each borne their part in the preparation of the world for the Gospel. 'They were' (it is the saying of Dr. Arnold, Life, ii. 413. 2nd edition), 'the three peoples of 'God's election: two for things temporal, one for things eternal. 'Yet even in the things eternal they were allowed to minister: Greek cultivation, and Roman polity, prepared men for 'Christianity.'

The first pages of the father of history are devoted to tracing the original quarrels and reprisals between the inhabitants of the opposite coasts of Europe and Asia. And if ever two continents were designed for intercourse, these surely were. The Grecian or Asiatic fisherman could hardly sail out from the

beach of his native creek without being tempted onward by the blue islands in the distance, which, like so many stepping-stones to another land, stud the waters of the Ægæan. Adventure in the early ages was inseparable from piracy: and as villages banded into states, and states into confederacies, piracy became war, and war brought national glory. Thus the first undying song celebrates the expedition of the confederate Greeks to Troy in reprisal for the rape of Helen. Nor should the commercial element in this early intercourse be forgotten: nor the important fact, that one article of commerce was the *persons of men.* The principal trading cities were Tyre and Sidon: and we have in the prophecy of Joel (whose most probable date is as far back as the ninth century, B.C.*) a distinct charge against the Tyrians and Sidonians, that they had 'sold the children of 'Judah and Jerusalem to the sons of the Grecians†, that they 'might remove them far from their border.' Thus we have the Jew at a very early period carried into Greece, and introduced into Grecian families; and the first nucleus formed of that vast dispersion, which we witness in subsequent history. The captivities, first of Israel, then of Judah, can hardly fail to have driven westward, through Asia Minor and the Greek colonies, some scattered portions of the main bodies of captives. And doubtless the break up of the great remnant of Xerxes' army under Mardonius added considerably to the number of Jews in Greece. Mr. Howson has remarked (vol. i. p. 18.), that about the time of the battles of Salamis and Marathon, a Jew was the minister, another Jew the cupbearer, and a Jewess the consort, of the Persian monarch. Great indeed must have been the number of Jews settled throughout the East.‡ The small gleaning which returned with Ezra and Nehemiah was as nothing compared with those who remained contented in the land of exile. Asia was full of Jews. On the coasts and in the islands

---

* See the various opinions given and discussed by Winer, Realwörterbuch, sub voce.

† Joel, iii. 6. (Heb. iv. 6.) The words are לִבְנֵי הַיְוָנִים.

‡ Mr. Blackburn refers to the residence of Ezekiel in Assyria, that the mighty minister to the captive Jews settled by the river Chebar. He repeats, on the authority of Layard (*Nineveh and its Remains*), that the description by Ezekiel of the interior of the Assyrian palaces so completely corresponds with the monuments of Nimroud and Khorsabad, that there can scarcely be a doubt that Ezekiel had seen the objects which he describes,—the figures sculptured upon the wall and painted. — *Blackburn's Nineveh, its Rise and Ruin as illustrated by Ancient Scriptures and Modern Discoveries.*

of the Ægæan, along the Asiatic, European, and African sides, we find Jews and their synagogues. By trade for themselves, or by the policy of their patrons and conquerors, they had been thickly planted in the chief rising seats of civilisation and commerce. In Antioch, Alexandria, Cyrene, Corinth, Athens, Thessalonica, and many other well-known cities, we hear of Hebrew settlements more or less considerable in number.

Nor is it too much to say, that the influence of these widely dispersed Jews must have been every where felt. In the case of the Jew alone was religion bound to a law of moral purity. The Jew only had a conscience, in the better and higher sense.* Everywhere a mystery to the surrounding heathen, despised by the cultivated and learned, he yet found his way into the bosom of households, and laid hold on those feelings after purity and truth, or even those weaknesses and pronenesses to superstition, which are common to the tender in age, or sex, or bodily constitution. We find, in some of the most renowned cities of the East, that a large proportion of the female inhabitants had embraced Judaism.† And allowing for every admixture of superstition and misunderstanding, there can be no doubt that better convictions, and a yearning after something more solid than Paganism, must be conceded to have operated widely on the proselyte class. Where such feelings existed, the way was being admirably prepared for a religion, which, founded on all that was true and permanent in Judaism, should yet winnow off the effete and temporary, and embody in itself, with yet loftier sanctions, all that was pure and good in it before.

But this was not always the character of the world-wide Judaism of the day. Regarding the conscientious 'God-fearing' proselyte as the mean, we have for our two extremes, Pharisaism and Hellenism.

The Pharisaic society formed a hierarchico-political combination only equalled in efficiency and influence by that of the Ulemas in Turkey or the Jesuits in modern times, and forming to this last, in some respects, a remarkable parallel. Schrader‡ has vividly depicted the zeal, aims, and practices of the Phari-

* 'Treffend und schön bezeichnet De Wette als die auszeichnende Eigenthumlichkeit des Hebräischen Volkes, dass in ihm von Anfang an das Gewissen rege ist.'—*Neander*, Pfl. u. Leit. p. 91.

† Josephus, Bell. Jud. ii. 20. 2., says of the women of Damascus, that they were ἁπάσας πλὴν ὀλίγων ὑπηγμένας τῇ Ἰουδαικῇ θρησκείᾳ. See also Acts xiii. 50.; xvii. 4. 12.

‡ Vol. ii. ch. 4.

sees. By their stern theocratic exclusiveness, their minute literal observances, their proselytising zeal, they formed the inner stronghold of Judaism,—the conservative power which kept inviolate the letter long after the spirit had departed. At the same time that the gross materialism of their expected messianic kingdom attracted the lower and selfish multitude, the apparent earnestness and perfection of their legal obedience acted as a lure for better and loftier spirits. In comparison with the importance of collections for the temple, the first moral duties were set aside by them: weighed against the advancement of hierarchical Judaism, justice and mercy were light altogether. Their history, like that of the body to whom we have compared them, is one of intrigue, turbulence, and bloodshed. We find them in the courts of princes, and in the houses of widows: praying apart in the holy places at Jerusalem, and mingling with the great concourse at Rome; the stirrers up of the people to sedition and tumult, the secret organisers of conspiracies and subverters of thrones.

From this compact and organised body it was to be expected that Christianity would meet with the most determined opposition. They had been the bitterest enemies of its Divine Founder. His teaching was the negation of all their views: its success would be death to their dearest hopes. Moral purity was by Him upheld at the expense of ceremonial correctness: all hierarchical system was abolished by a religion whose foundations were laid in individual conviction: the messianic pomp of the expected kingdom was apparently resolved into some spiritual renovation, to them unintelligible, or, if understood, unwelcome.

Such was one, and that the prevailing element in the Judaism of the time; prevailing, not because numerically the greatest, but because in it was concentrated all the fire and zeal of the system; because it had the only organisation, the only perfect unity of mutual understanding and action. The other, the Hellenistic element, embraced all those Jews who had become mingled with Grecians, used their language, and had learned their habits of thought. To them, for the most part, the sacred tongue was unknown. They had their own version of the Scriptures, made in their great metropolis, Alexandria. They formed a widely spread and motley combination of various grades of opinion and practice. For the most part, Hellenism was a fruitless attempt to unite principles essentially discordant. Its philosophico-allegoric speculations on Scripture may have amused some ingenious minds like that of Philo; while, on the

other hand, the refuge which its purer creed offered at small cost from the utter abandonment and hopelessness of heathenism, attracted many of the conscientious and upright; but we can hardly imagine in the Hellenist either logical consistency, or very fervent zeal.

As regarded Christianity, Hellenistic Judaism was a most important preparation. By it the essential truths of the Old Testament had long ago been clothed in the language of philosophic thought. At Alexandria, at Antioch, at Ephesus, the weapons had been prepared, with which the warfare of persuasion was to be carried on. It was the link between the schools of Athens and the schools of the Rabbis: the form in which, if at all, the truths of Christianity must be presented to the Grecian mind. The processes of dialectic argument, unknown to Eastern composition, were eminently suited to a religion whose hearers were to prove all things, in order to hold fast that which is good. And it was now no new thing, to have sacred truth propounded in these dialectic forms.

We have thus been gradually led to the *second* great element in the social system at the Christian era — the intellectual culture of Greece. If humanity is to be gained for the highest purposes, the reason of man must be satisfied, and his intellect ennobled: nor can that be the religion under which man's highest state is to be realised, which is not prepared to enlist and consecrate every lawful use of his powers and faculties; to work in the lump until the whole is leavened. At the same time, let it be granted that this is to be done, not by unaided human power, but by a revelation from above,—and it is manifest that a very important part of the preparation for receiving such a gift would be, the demonstration of the insufficiency of man himself to attain to this ennoblement of his powers. And this is the work which, in the designs of Providence, was accomplished by that wonderful development of the human intellect witnessed in ancient Greece. That a height of intellectual excellence should there have been reached which has never since been attained,—that in philosophy, in art, and in poesy, the patterns for the world should there have been set once for all, will surprise only those who do not bear this purpose in mind.

But while the failure of Greek philosophy to regenerate mankind was thus in progress of demonstration, these highest exercises of man's intellect were but preparing the way for Him who was to come. The *language* of the Greeks is itself a wonderful monument of the culminating intellectual period of our race. In no other tongue under heaven, can the minutest

shiftings and distinctions of the mental feelings be expressed with so much precision. In no other are there so many varieties of construction and arrangement, by each of which some minute distinction of meaning or emphasis is given. In no other language have we so many apparently insignificant particles, by which the exact reference of secondary clauses to the main subject, and to one another, can be marked off and determined. In that language, every term relating to things human or divine had already been discussed, and its meaning laboured out with marvellous patience and accuracy.

Nor was Providence, which was thus preparing a garb for Christianity, wanting in making it generally known and used. The dispersion of Greeks is hardly less wonderful than that of Jews. In early times, their colonies had spread along the coasts of Italy and Sicily, of Africa and Asia Minor. Their hostile intercourse or intrigues with Persia had gradually carried them further East; till finally the conquests of Alexander distributed the Greek tongue and influence over the whole of his vast but fleeting empire. Amidst the struggles and confusion incident on his death, this one effect alone of his conquests remained undisturbed and increasing. All the dynasties which sprang from his grave were Greek, and tended to consolidate the Grecian element which his victories had first introduced. Greek letters and arts became every where cultivated; the language usurped the place of the indigenous tongues in all polite intercourse. Nor was Judæa exempt from this influence. Lying between the contending kingdoms, and ever involved in their quarrels, it too received, although slowly and reluctantly, the unhallowed boon of Grecian culture.

There yet wanted a political power which might adjust to equilibrium these disturbing forces. Had the world been seething in tumult, as it was under the successors of Alexander, the propagation of Christianity would have been, humanly speaking, impossible.

And we must here express our opinion, that there are few things more instructive in history, than the relation of the Roman Empire to the spread of Christianity. Whether we regard it in its rise, at its height, or in its decline, we see in it a vast instrument to subserve the purposes of Providence with regard to the religion of Christ. In its rise, with which we are here more immediately concerned, by a rapid succession of conquests and annexations, it reduced to political unity and security the various conflicting powers whose struggles had hitherto distracted the world. Crushing and afflicting as was the

character of its rule over its provinces, it was every where the government of order, and the friend of commercial intercourse. Among its works conducive to safe transit by sea and land, we may reckon, for the first, the extinction of piracy in the Mediterranean; for the second, the admirable roads with which every part of its vast territory was intersected. It was through these seas, and along these roads, that 'the noble army of 'martyrs,' as well as the armies of Rome, advanced to the conquest of the world. In times of restricted intercourse, and unsafe transit, these missionary journeys would have been impracticable.

The Roman policy with regard to religion was entirely consistent with the other parts of the system. Every existing religion of nation or tribe was sanctioned by law; but no countenance was given to the introduction of new tenets or modes of worship. Thus Christianity, for many years after its promulgation, grew up undistinguished from Judaism, and under the shelter of this *religio licita* as one of its sects. It was not till the inhabitants of whole districts flocked to baptism amidst the indignation of surrounding Jews and Pagans, that we find systematic persecution enjoined; and by that time Christianity was strong enough in numbers to be aided, rather than crushed, by such hostility.

During and for some time after the reigns of the first twelve Cæsars, the citizen of Rome was endowed with considerable privileges. Among these, exemption from corporal punishment, and the power of appealing to the people, were the chief and best known. It is true, that this last had now merged into an appeal to him who wielded, by his concentration of offices, the power of the *populus* and the *plebs* alike; but it had not, on that account, lost its value as a means of rescue from arbitrary decisions, and from the warping of justice by the venality of provincial judges.*

The foregoing sketch of the state of the world shortly after the Christian era, will enable us to lay down *à priori* the necessary and desirable qualifications of the man who is to be the main agent in propagating the Christian faith.

First. It is absolutely necessary, that he be a JEW. Founded as Christianity is on the ancient covenant and promises, its appeal to the world was mainly through Judaism; addressing

* The bearings on Christianity of these various characteristics of the time are admirably treated in the first chapter of Conybeare and Howson's work.

itself 'to the Jew first, and also to the Gentile.' It is to the Jews that the preacher must look for his earliest and his most able converts: men, who having been reasoned with out of the law and the prophets, were thereby convinced, and prepared to convince others, that Jesus was the Christ. And none but a Jew would gain access to that exclusive and prejudiced people. The synagogues would be forbidden ground to a Gentile teacher: the ears of the Jews would be absolutely closed against him.

For the same reason, the Apostle of the world must be not a Hellenist, but of pure Hebrew descent. It is of the utmost importance that he should be able to speak and cite in the sacred language of the law and prophets. The Hellenists were looked on by the purer Jews with disparagement and contempt. They had their own synagogues, in which the sacred tongue was never heard, and to enter which would have been pollution to the scrupulous and rigid Pharisee. Thus a Hellenist would have acted at a great disadvantage, in leaving the central fortress of Judaism untouched, because to him inaccessible.

This last consideration will at once bring before us another requisite. None but the straitest sect of Judaism will furnish the man who shall be sufficient for this work. The pretended mysteries of the Rabbinical teaching must be in his grasp to deal with and set aside. None must be able to say of him, 'This man, 'who knoweth not the law, is cursed.' In one point at least his message to the Jews should be without fault: all should be compelled to look up to him as one trained to teach, and thoroughly capable of doing it. If the question, 'Whence hath 'this man letters?' was for other and wise purposes permitted to be asked respecting Him who came to be rejected and suffer and die, it would have been, as far as we can judge, a serious obstacle to the work of one who must be to the Jews as a Jew, in order to persuade and gain them.

But yet another reason existed (and this is ably brought out by Schrader* and Neander†), why the great apostle of Christianity should be a Pharisee. Of all the opposition offered to Jesus of Nazareth, that of the Pharisees was the most consistent and entire. They saw in his teaching the abnegation of hierarchical Judaism. If He were a teacher from God, the ceremonial law had passed away, the barrier between Jew and

* Vol. ii. ch. 6. 'Bildung des Apostels Paulus in der Schule der 'Pharisäer.'

† P. 183.

Gentile was broken down, and Judaism became an empty husk henceforward. None thoroughly understood this but the bigoted Pharisee. "The lapse of years, and the warning of heavenly visions had not kept the greatest of the chosen Twelve from vacillating on this vital point; and there is every reason to believe that the Church at Jerusalem remained to the end practically prejudiced against the free admission of the union of mankind in Christ. Amidst all the difficulties and inconsistencies on this matter, he only would be sure never to go wrong, who having during his life of Pharisaic zeal keenly stigmatised as an abomination the anti-exclusive spirit of the religion of Jesus, had thus gained the clearest view of its universality, and in his conversion adopted this view as his own to the full.

But Jew and Pharisee as he must be, other elements must be mingled in him, which few who were Jews and Pharisees united in themselves. A Jew born in Palestine, and receiving a purely Jewish education, could have been a missionary for the most part to pure Jews only. It is plainly necessary that he be, though not a Hellenist himself, yet from youth accustomed to the use of the Hellenistic version of the Scriptures, together with the Hebrew original, — nay more, from youth accustomed to the habits of thought and expression of the more cultivated Greeks, — no stranger to the literature and rhetorical usage of that language which had been prepared for the work which Christianity had to do. The advantage of a boyhood spent in the haunts of Greek literary culture would be great, even if he himself did not frequent the schools for instruction. A certain pride in the place of his birth would lead a youth of genius to some acquaintance at least with the Greek writers who had sprung from it, or were connected with the studies there pursued; and the first remembrances of his early days would be bound up with his taste, however brief, of the sweets of profane literature. All this would eminently fit him to address a Grecian audience; to know the peculiar stumblingblocks which the hearers must be taught cautiously to approach, and gently to step over; and skilfully to avoid incurring those charges, which might exaggerate in the Greek mind the repulsiveness of himself and his message. At the same time, no extraneous culture could educate a Pharisee. In the Holy City alone, and in the schools of the Jerusalem rabbis, was the fountain head of Judaism to be drawn from.

Thus we have arrived at the complicated, and we may conceive not often united requirements, of pure Judaic extraction,

with birth and early education among Hellenists and Grecians, and subsequent training in the rabbinical schools of Jerusalem. If however we rested here, one important advantage would be wanting. The great Apostle is sure to incur the deadliest hatred of the Pharisaic party, which he has deserted to pass over to Christianity. That hatred will be unrelenting, and will pursue him wherever his message is delivered. No calumny will be spared, no attempt withheld, to make him odious to the local magistracies. Should he be found in Judæa itself, the jealousy of the Roman procurators, ever ready to awake against turbulence and sedition, will be aroused to effect his ruin. One safeguard, and one only, humanly speaking, would obviate the danger of his career being cut short by conspiracy on the part of his enemies, or the tyranny of an unprincipled governor. If he possessed the privileges of a Roman citizen, his person would be safe from punishment at the hands of the officers of Rome: and an escape would be always open to him from conspiracy or apprehended injustice, in an appeal to the supreme power in the great metropolis.

We have said nothing of personal characteristics. That the Apostle of the world should be full of earnestness and self-forgetting zeal, is too obvious to be insisted on. That a great persuader should, besides convincing men's minds, be able to win and keep their hearts, — that he who wishes others to weep must weep himself — has long ago passed into an axiom. But we prefer filling in this part of the sketch *à posteriori*, from the facts themselves.

That the person so required *was found* — that so many and unusual attributes were combined in one individual — is known to us all. But it seems to have been reserved for our own age of biography and minute research, fully to trace all the qualifications of Saul of Tarsus for his great mission, and to point out their examples in his extraordinary career.

There is no work extant in which this is more laboriously and completely done than in Conybeare and Howson's 'Life and Epistles of St. Paul.' The names of the authors are vouchers for their ability to perform their task; and no one will consult their book without being convinced of the diligent research and careful accuracy with which it has been accomplished. No pains have been spared to gather information on every point of the Apostle's life and sayings; and the abundance and excellence of maps, and illustrations by landscapes and coins, make the book a complete manual of all that relates to the subject. The authorities referred to are given *at length* in the foot-notes, which greatly increases the value of the work to the scholar.

On the whole, we doubt if any modern literature possesses a treatise more complete or satisfactory in its design and execution.

Perhaps there is a little too much of imaginative minuteness in some of the descriptions of the journeys of the Apostle; and we confess an objection to the frequent and sometimes bewildering illustration by reference to modern state relations or local circumstances. These however, to which might be added an occasional want of condensation, and exuberance of style, are but slight faults, compared with the essential service which these authors have rendered to English biblical literature by their elaborate researches, and to English society by the pleasing and attractive garb in which they have clothed the results.

Into the important portion of the work which Mr. Conybeare has contributed — the translation of the Epistles — it is not our intention to enter critically. In such a wide field of controversy, philological and doctrinal, there will be much for every scholar to question. At the same time we have found much to approve; and we hail every independent scholarlike attempt to render the sacred text in our language, in hopes that it may lead at some time to the judicious removal of some of the acknowledged blots on our otherwise excellent authorised version.

Mr. Lewin's work, though published since the first volume of Conybeare and Howson, is an original contribution to the same subject, from a candid and diligent layman. While there is much in it that is really valuable, it is to be regretted that Mr. Lewin has not enriched and in some places rectified his book by the admirable and copious treatises which have of late years been published in Germany, and of which the authors of the former work have largely and most properly taken advantage. This fact tends to place Mr. Lewin's book altogether on lower ground than it should have occupied; while the unfortunate inaccuracy of its printing is continually confusing the reader.* At the same time, Mr. Lewin's useful historical memoirs, his plans of the principal towns, with geographical authorities cited at length†, and the justice and good feeling which he shows in

* The Greek is printed *without accents*, a practice against which every scholar should protest, and about as rational as it would be to print an English work without crossing the *t*'s or dotting the *i*'s. The punctuation of the text is in some places in utter confusion. Take an example: — 'but, at night he escaped from his guard, and got on board, and reached, Alexandria.' (P. 84.) Such abound throughout.

† His geographical notices are not always accurate: *e.g.* where in

his remarks, will prevent his work from being laid aside, and cause it to be retained as accessory to, or a cheaper substitute for, the more important and costly volumes of Conybeare and Howson.*

We have placed two well-known German works on our list, because our neighbours have in this, as in most of the departments of biblical literature and research, the credit of having led the way, and suggested to ourselves the reproduction or expansion of their labours; and because there is something so well fitted in the German mind for treating subjects of this kind, that after all acknowledged defects are allowed for, and evident excrescences pared away, we always have left, in the work of an intelligent German, abundant suggestive matter that is truly valuable, and nowhere else to be found.

Schrader's treatise spread its publication over the years 1830—1836: and considering the time, we cannot help ranking it as the most remarkable work on the subject. Its plan is that of a biography, with the chronology and doctrine treated of in separate volumes, and followed by a translation of the Epistles, with a commentary. For really sound research into the necessities and inner proprieties of St. Paul's preparation for his work, we know of no book which approaches Schrader's in value. We might perhaps be disposed to find a little fault with Mr. Howson for not having more abundantly transferred to his pages the interesting speculations of this author. We might think that some pruning of graphic description would have been more than compensated by giving us the substance of some of Schrader's valuable chapters in his second volume on the personal character and training of the Apostle.

At the same time, there is one part of Schrader's work which disfigures it in common with many of the best German treatises on matters connected with historical Christianity. We mean its perfectly gratuitous rationalism. If Saul was in reality, as Schrader and we are sorry to say Neander also would have us believe, merely *struck with lightning* on the way to Damascus,—not only were the solemn words then related to have been spoken to him, and on which he distinctly grounds his apostleship, the offspring of his excited imagination,—but he

---

speaking of Myra, he makes it the metropolis of Lycia in the apostolic times, on the authority of the Synecdemus of Hierocles, a work of the sixth century; and in the same notice makes the distinct rivers Limyrus and Andriaki into one.

* Mr. L. gives the Epistles in the authorised version, with a few departures, and those not always for the better.

must himself be charged with deliberate falsehood and imposture; for in neither of the narratives of his conversion which we possess from his own lips is there the slightest intimation of a storm having overtaken the party, but an evident intention to imply that in the brightness of the noonday sun, a light brighter still was shed around him, and a supernatural voice plainly heard, answered, and heard again, the speaker being all the while distinctly seen.*

Neander's work is well known in this country by translations, as one of the most valuable contributions to an intelligent appreciation of the mind and mission of the various great Apostles, and the conflicts and character of the first Christian age. Tinged strongly with the peculiarities of the German school, it yet exhibits so thorough an understanding of the position, wants, and divisions of the nascent Church, and so admirable a spirit of Christian faith and charity, as to have become an indispensable element in the study of the Apostolic history.

We shall proceed now, with the aid of the works which we have characterised, in some measure to fill in *à posteriori* the outlines given above. To do this continuously would be out of the question. We must necessarily select a few salient points of the history as examples of the rest.

The destined Apostle of the Gentiles was born of pure Jewish descent, 'a Hebrew of Hebrews,' at Tarsus, the capital of the province of Cilicia, a few years probably after our era. With

* If, to take another instance, (and here we must include Mr. Lewin in our reprehension, and even complain somewhat of the guarded and ambiguous language of Mr. Howson,) the pythoness at Philippi was not really possessed by a spirit, but only (we quote Mr. Lewin) 'subject to ravings, and at the present day would merely be 'committed to the charge of a keeper,'—how on the one hand can we account for those ravings taking daily the form of vehement recognition of the divine mission of the Apostle, and how on the other can we give any consistent account of her *cure*, which both these authors believe to have followed on St. Paul's words? Far better and deeper in this instance Neander, who, though he supposes the case need not imply possession by a personal evil spirit, yet distinctly recognises the agency of the chief spirit of evil, and the maiden's liberation from it by the Apostle. See the whole matter very satisfactorily treated in the recent work of Baumgarten, 'Die Apostel-'geschichte, oder der Entwickelungsgang der Kirche von Jerusalem 'bis Rom,' vol. ii. § 26. There is a sensible and able refutation of the rationalistic views of Saul's conversion in Hemsen's 'Apostel Paulus,' p. 12. ff.

his birth he inherited the citizenship of Rome.* His native place, characterised by himself as 'no mean city,' was one of the most celebrated seats of Greek learning. Two eminent Stoics, Athenodorus the tutor of Augustus, and Nestor of Tiberius, were taken from the school of Tarsus. Strabo gives it the preference over Athens and Alexandria, and every other academy of the time. No city could be imagined more fitting for the birthplace of an apostle of the Gentiles. Free from the warping influences which would have beset a childhood in Athens, Alexandria, or Rome, the Hebrew youth might here stray without danger into the pleasant paths of Grecian literature.† We know that his main education was Jewish. In all probability, both the Hebrew text of the Scriptures and the Septuagint version were familiar to him from childhood. The former would be sure to be known and read in a pure Hebrew family; and the familiarity with which he cites the latter from memory, can hardly be accounted for except by early habitude. Mr. Howson traces, with that graphic minuteness which, while it is sometimes his temptations, is undoubtedly also his excellence, the illustrious recollections connected with the tribe of Benjamin, and with his own royal name, which would stir the spirit of the eager Hebrew boy,—and the fine emotions with which one capable of the feelings which we find expressed in his writings, would wander by the clear cold stream of the Cydnus, and gaze on the snowy heights of Taurus.

But other and more exciting scenes soon rose upon his view. We can hardly conceive the burst of enthusiasm with which such a Jewish youth, educated in exile, first beheld the spot where Jehovah had placed His name. We may well conceive that from the time of the youthful Saul entering the Holy City, his previous intercourse with Hellenism was dropped, and he devoted himself zealously to the study of the law and traditions of his fathers. He himself appeals to the fact many years after: 'My manner of life from my youth, which was at the first 'among mine own nation at Jerusalem, know all the Jews;

* This fact is as certain as its explanation is obscure. It was formerly assumed (by Tillemont and Cave, see C. and H. vol. i. p. 49.) that the privilege belonged to natives of Tarsus; but more accurate knowledge has precluded this. The probable account is that which Mr. Howson has adopted, that Saul's father had gained the citizenship as the reward of services rendered during the civil wars to some influential Roman.

† We find him quoting Aratus (a Cilician poet), Epimenides, and Euripides, or Menander. Where did he read these authors, if not in his early youth at Tarsus?

'which knew me from the beginning, if they would testify, that 'after the most straitest sect of our religion I lived a Pharisee.' (Acts xxvi. 4, 5.)

'Having a foundation of excellent natural talents, gifted 'with creative profundity, and a rare clearness and energy of 'thought, he made his own the whole cycle of Rabbinical Scripture-lore, its jurisprudence and its theology, the different 'exegeses of the Bible, its allegory, typology, and tradition, as 'his Epistles sufficiently show. By this theoretical education, 'he was enabled, in after times so powerfully and convincingly 'to refute Pharisaical errors, and to unfold the most profoundly 'and amply of all the Apostles the intrinsic doctrines of Christianity. By nature an ardent and decided character, armed 'with the choleric and melancholic temperament found among 'Reformers, he embraced whatever he once held to be right 'with all his soul, and was thus inclined to a rude straightforwardness and action in extremes. Thus he became a Pharisee 'of the strongest kind, and a blind zealot for the law of his 'fathers (Phil. iii. 6., Gal. i. 13, 14.).'*

Saul was never a hypocrite. He hated the name and followers of Jesus from his innermost soul. In this he nobly differed from many of his elders and compeers, who in hypocrisy carried on an opposition to a teaching which in their hearts they approved, but saw to be the certain ruin of their worldly hopes. Schrader (ii. 47. ff.) brings out well this difference, and speculates on its probable effects. It was no small thing for Pharisaism to possess a partisan of an earnest and thorough spirit—one too, who was not, like the Palestine Jews, confined to a narrow Judaistic circle of experience, but had from childhood known Gentile persons and practices. Is it not certain that they who compassed sea and land to make one proselyte, would be carefully training such an one for a missionary of their own and promising themselves by his co-operation a rich accession of Gentile converts? If so, Pharisaism was eventually pierced to death by a shaft winged with its own feather.

We must quote Schrader for the further usefulness to Saul of his Pharisaic education: —

---

* Schaff, Geschichte der Christlichen Kirche von ihrer Gründung bis auf die Gegenwart, vol. i. p. 163. This work, of which the first volume was last year published in America (Mercersburg, Pa.), promises to be one of the best compendiums extant of Church history. Its spirit is thoroughly Christian, its arrangement clear, its style lively and attractive; and it contains notices of the most recent German and other opinions on every question as it arises.

'In order to defend themselves against the attacks of Jesus, and retain their own influence, the Pharisees not only availed themselves of excommunication and persecution of those who would not implicitly obey them, but sought even more eagerly to fill their partisans with inexpiable hate of Him. This was the easier, because to those who reckoned Pharisaism as a thing from God, Jesus could only appear as God's enemy. It required no perversion of truth to prove this. They need only say that He was the greatest foe of the patriarchal traditions, did not keep the sabbath, did not fast, nor pray as other men, neglected the necessary washings, held converse with Samaritans and Gentiles, placed them on a level with Jews, nay required and yielded obedience to the Gentile government, gave himself out for the Messiah, &c., and they were sure to render their fanatical scholars His irreconcilable enemies. But to Paul, all this was of the utmost value. He thus learnt to apprehend in many respects the plan and intentions of Jesus more correctly than even His own friends and disciples. To these last it appeared impossible, in their deep reverence for their Master, that He should in any way have impugned or rejected that which was to them above all things precious and sacred. And hence it was that they so seldom understood His sentiments, which deviated from the established maxims, and so often defended him against the charge of transgressing or rejecting the Mosaic law. The Pharisees, on the contrary, veiled nothing; to them it was a delight to lay hold of, and disseminate among their partisans, such acts and sayings of Jesus as contradicted that which had usually been esteemed true and divine. . . . As the foe of the ancient traditions and precepts, and of Pharisaism, as the abrogator of the law of Moses and of Judaism, as the friend and enfranchiser of Gentiles and sinners, — thus was the image of Jesus vividly present in the heart of the Pharisee Saul. And as it often happens to those among us who advance far before their age, that their views are rightly apprehended, and therefore decried by their opponents, but misunderstood by their friends, and by way of justification attempted to be reconciled with doctrines previously held, thus it was also in the case of our Lord; His friends and worshippers were blind, and His enemies only had eyes to see His intentions.' (Vol. ii. p. 82. ff.)

With such an impression of Jesus, and with his earnest character and fiery temper, Saul could not but be a persecutor. To extinguish the hated name, — to prevent the obnoxious sect from spreading in or out of Jerusalem, — would be an exertion worthy of all his energies. To this accordingly we find him devoting himself, when the sacred narrative first introduces him to our notice.

The question, whether he had seen our Lord in the flesh, is wrapped in obscurity. The probable answer is in the negative. Had he taken any part in the acts of the Pharisees during the eventful period of the ministry of Jesus, he would hardly have

passed it over in silence in those passages where he speaks so freely of his state and acts as a persecutor; and that he should have been present, and have taken *no* part, is inconceivable. Why he was absent from Jerusalem during those three years, it is impossible to say. It may have been just the interval between the completion of his Rabbinical training and his maturity as a member of the Sanhedrim, which we afterwards find him. He may have been at Tarsus, or on travel. That he should not yet have arrived as a youthful scholar, is chronologically improbable. However it was, such seems to have been the fact; and his first hostile efforts were brought to bear on the Church about eight years after the Ascension.

We refer to Mr. Howson for the complete detail of the trial and execution of Stephen, and for some able remarks on the influence, in after times, which the apology of the martyr seems to have had on the mind of his chief persecutor. It has been assumed by recent writers (Schrader, Olshausen, Neander,) that a deep immediate impression was made on Saul's mind by the circumstances of the death of Stephen, and that he was in a remorseful state of self-questioning when he undertook his errand to Damascus. But this idea, intimately bound up as it is with the rationalistic interpretation of the narrative of his conversion, is entirely opposed to the history (Acts ix. 1.), and to his own assertion: 'Being exceedingly mad against them, I 'persecuted them even unto strange cities.' We have no reason whatever to suppose that any change had taken place in his sentiments towards Christianity. Nay, we quite agree with Baumgarten in placing here the culminating point of his zeal, and seeing, in this sudden arrest and turning of his course by the working of Divine wisdom and power, a fitness for the occasion and for the character and temperament of the man. As Bengel strikingly remarks, 'in summo fervore peccandi ereptus 'et conversus est.'*

Of all that has been written on the mind and feelings of Saul consequent on his conversion, we have read with the greatest interest the remarks of Baumgarten, vol. i. pp. 198—223. On one point only we entirely differ from him. He spends some pages in tracing during this period the inner experience detailed by the Apostle, Rom. vii. 7—25. We believe the greater part of that weighty passage to belong to an earlier and totally different portion of his life; and it seems to us strange that a

* Such too was the view of Chrysostom: *καθάπερ ἰατρὸς ἄριστος, ἀκμάζοντος ἔτι τοῦ πυρετοῦ, τὸ βοήθημα αὐτῷ ἐπήγαγεν ὁ Χριστός.* C. & H. i. p. 108.

writer who has taken so just a psychological view of his subject should have adopted a theory which tends completely to confuse it, and destroy its unity. This is not the place to discuss and appropriate that description; it may suffice to say that, while we distinctly recognise its autobiographical character, we see in it a reference to a process much more frequent in the human mind, and better calculated to be a general pattern for us all, than that by which the zeal of the persecutor became transformed into the zeal of the apostle.

Some degree of mystery has always rested on the *visit to Arabia**; but almost all writers are agreed in connecting it with an immediate reception of the Gospel from Christ himself. Mr. Howson indeed gives the alternative, that perhaps he went to preach 'in the synagogues of that singular capital which was 'built amidst the exiles of Edom, whence "Arabians" came to 'the festivals at Jerusalem (Acts, ii. 11.);' but we must own the other alternative seems to us more probable; and that, whether the rationalistic or the supernatural view be taken. The former is given by Schrader (ii. p. 147.): —

'He cared not, previously to the public opening of his ministry, to obtain information from other men in a matter which was accessible to him by his own reason (?), but preferred shortly after his baptism to retire apart from all human society to the solitude of the Arabian wilderness; with this view beyond doubt, undistractedly to prepare himself for the work of the promulgation of Christianity, to meditate on his present circumstances, to think of that which lay before him, to make powerful resolutions, or rather to confirm himself in the resolution already made, and to take counsel of God and of himself, or of that which was become a divine or living principle within him. In this he acted as other men of great and independent character have done, and even as Jesus himself, who also immediately after His baptism withdrew Himself for a similar purpose into the same wilderness.'

But sensible as this view is as far as it goes, none can fail to see how entirely inadequate it is to satisfy the requisitions of the historical facts resulting, or the assertions of the Apostle himself. In a passage (2 Cor. xii. 1. ff.) where he is undoubtedly describing his own experience, and referring to a period not far removed from this, he speaks of 'abundance of' visions and 'revelations' being granted to him, and recounts in mysterious words the nature of some of these. We should therefore be much more disposed to agree with Baumgarten, when he says (vol. i. p. 223.),—

* Gal. i. 17.

'Those will take the right view of this sojourn of Saul in 'Arabia who regard it as a still retirement, in which he lived in 'communion in the spirit with the Lord in Heaven, as the 'original Apostles had conversed with the Lord on earth.'

Another difficulty belongs to this period, which has been very variously dealt with. The facts are simply these. Some physical weakness, of a conspicuous and distressing kind, resulted from the exaltation of the spirit at the expense of the body. Perhaps his own words—'when I could not see for the glory of 'that light,'—may furnish some clue to its origin. Feebleness of sight, connected probably with some nervous infirmity, may have constituted the thorn in the flesh, concerning which he prayed thrice that it might depart from him: which made his 'bodily presence weak, and his speech contemptible;'* and of which he could say to the Galatians, 'My temptation which was 'in my flesh ye despised not, nor rejected. . . . I bear you 'record, that if it had been possible, ye would have *plucked out* '*your own eyes, and have given them to me.*'† But even this, whatever it was, served him as an argument for the divine character of his mission. It precluded any imputation that he had won his converts by the charms of graceful rhetoric; he was among them 'in weakness, and fear, and much trembling.' So does every circumstance in the life of this remarkable man fit into its place, and bear its part in the work prepared for him.

Five years at least elapsed after his conversion, before we find him actively engaged in ministerial labour. He certainly was not idle, but his proper vocation had not begun. There had apparently been nothing more than fragmentary testimonies in the synagogues. At Damascus and at Jerusalem he had been exposed to the fury of those Jews, whom he had now through life for his implacable enemies. At both places he was rescued by the brethren; who yet, not knowing in what department to employ the zeal of the new convert, sent him back to his native town, to wait a special call of Providence.

A great question soon began to be agitated in the Church. Was Christianity to be preached to the Gentiles? That they were eventually to share in its blessings, no believing Jew doubted; but *how* this was to be brought about, was yet unknown. The first step towards a solution seems to have been taken at Antioch, by certain Cyprian and African Hellenists, who had fled on the persecution which arose about Stephen, having *spoken to Gentiles*‡ in that city. This new step aroused

* 2 Cor. x. 10. † Gal. iv. 14, 15.

‡ The reading Ἕλληνας, for the Ἑλληνιστάς of the received text,

the attention of the mother-church at Jerusalem. Barnabas, himself a Cyprian, was sent to report on the movement, or perhaps to restrain what was deemed an excess of zeal. By what he saw, he was convinced, and sympathised. But joy was not his only feeling at seeing the Gentile converts. The time for action was obviously come. There was one in retirement, to whom it had been said, 'I will send thee far hence unto the 'Gentiles.' He went to Tarsus to seek Saul. For a year they taught at Antioch, which became the second historical capital of Christendom, the great centre of activity during the transition-state from Judaism, and most appropriately the birthplace of that name, by which those who were neither Jew nor Greek, barbarian nor Scythian, were in future to be called. After a journey to Jerusalem for a special eleemosynary purpose, the two friends depart, by Divine command, on their first great missionary journey.

The whole process of this, as of the other journeys, is admirably narrated, discussed, and illustrated by Conybeare and Howson. We have every accessory which could be desired. Recent surveys and soundings have furnished accurate maps of almost every country and coast; while Mr. Bartlett's beautiful drawings give reality to the scenery of the most remarkable spots. There can hardly be more pleasant reading for the lover of travel and adventure, than the pages of this work which trace the Apostle through Cyprus, or Asia Minor, or Greece, or afterwards on his perilous voyage by Malta to Rome. And it is no small merit of the work that, while it extracts information from every source, an admirable spirit of Christian faith, accompanied by a manly love of truth and soundness of judgment, characterise it throughout. While its hand is in every German treatise, its heart is thoroughly English; and its effect will everywhere be, to confirm those great central truths, round which it has grouped the accessory and subordinate matter.

The first eminent fruit of this journey was the conversion of the proconsul of Cyprus, Sergius Paulus. From this time Saul becomes known by the Hellenistic name of Paul. The coin-

---

is now almost universally adopted. The received reading would stultify the whole narrative. There was and could be no difficulty about preaching to *Hellenists*.

We do not in the text forget, nor depreciate the importance of the special mission of Peter to Cornelius; but regard *this* incident as necessarily prior in point of time, and *that*, as intended more to give solemn sanction in the sight of those who would be most difficult to persuade, than to precede all efforts of the kind.

cidence is at least remarkable, and may not have been altogether fortuitous. But that the Apostle, as Jerome and Augustine believed, took the name from his convert, we may with safety deny. Such a piece of secular conceit was wholly alien from his character, and could only pass current when that character was, as a whole, very imperfectly studied. It is far more probable that the change marks the transition from his earlier memoirs, when from the still Jewish character of the Church his Hebrew name prevailed, to those recording his preaching among Gentiles. The bearing of two names, the original Oriental appellation, and the same græcised or romanised, in sound or meaning, was very common.*

During this journey we have striking instances of the fitness of the Great Apostle for becoming all things to all men, that he might by all means win some. At Antioch in Pisidia, we have his first recorded discourse. It was delivered to Jews, and besides its historical detail, so suitable to his hearers, contains, as Mr. Howson justly observes, the kernel of that great argument which he afterwards unfolded in the Epistle to the Romans. At Lystra we find him dissuading the heathen multitude from sacrificing to his companion and himself, in words of singular skill and beauty, founded on an argument from natural theology, far too expansive for any mere Pharisee to have propounded.

On the commencement of the next journey a personal dispute separated from him the former companion of his toils and dangers. He is henceforth either alone, or accompanied by a group of which he is unquestionably the centre; thus bringing his apostolic agency more plainly into relief, and removing all possibility of actual rivalry, or, which was more to be apprehended, the setting up of one against another in the minds of converts.

It is on this journey that the most remarkable instances of that which we are illustrating are presented to us. It originated in that affectionate yearning after converts once gained, which we see so often expressed in his Epistles. This directed his way to Derbe, Lystra, and Iconium. His course lay through his native province and city: and Mr. Howson is justified in raising on the well known character of the Apostle the following supposition: —

'One other city must certainly have been visited. If there were churches anywhere in Cilicia, there must have been one at Tarsus.'

* See Grotius's note *in loc.*; and Conybeare and Howson, vol. i. p. 164.

It was the metropolis of the province; Paul had resided there, perhaps for some years, since the time of his conversion; and if he loved his native place well enough to speak of it with something like pride to the Roman officer at Jerusalem, he could not be indifferent to its religious welfare. Among the "Gentiles of Cilicia," to whom the letter which he carried was addressed, the Gentiles of Tarsus had no mean place in his affections. And his heart must have overflowed with thankfulness, if, as he passed through the streets which had been familiar to him since his childhood, he knew that many households were around him where the Gospel had come, "not in word "only but in power," and the relations between husband and wife, parent and child, master and slave, had been purified and sanctified by Christian love. No doubt the city still retained all the aspect of the cities of that day, where art and amusement were consecrated to a false religion. The symbols of idolatry remained in the public places, — statues, temples and altars, — and the various "objects of "devotion," which in all Greek towns, as well as in Athens (Acts xvii. 23.), were conspicuous on every side. But the silent revolution was begun. Some families had already turned "from idols to serve "the living and true God." The "dumb idols" to which, as Gentiles, they had been "carried away even as they were led," had been recognised as "nothing in the world," and been "cast to the moles "and to the bats." The homes which had once been decorated with the emblems of a vain mythology, were now bright with the better ornaments of faith, hope, and love.'

We leave in the able hands of our authors the description of the journey itself, and select one or two points for our especial purpose.*

At Neapolis, the port of Philippi, the missionary band, now augmented by the youthful Timotheus, and Luke 'the beloved 'physician,' first set foot in Europe. From the high grounds above that town, they gazed on the plains where the world was lost and won: arrived at the walls of the now flourishing colony, they entered a miniature of that great capital in which the Apostle had already resolved to bear witness to Christ. Here, amidst the insignia of Roman power, in a Greek city, they sought out the few Jews who assembled by the river brink outside the gate for the purpose of prayer. The combination is singular, and more remarkable, as we reflect how many ages had been spent in bringing it about, how many and jarring influences had converged. Here we have the first record of

* We cannot withhold our praise from the minute and very satisfactory manner in which the contemporary geography of Asia Minor is discussed and illustrated in this chapter. Certainly the sacred chronicle has never before had such diligent and loving labour bestowed on it.

the Roman citizenship having procured for the Apostle and his companion an honourable dismissal, and doubtless for the cause which he preached respect and protection, after illegal treatment during a tumultuary outbreak.

But before he had been many weeks in Macedonia, the enmity of the resident Jews had been thoroughly aroused, and they were acting in concert against him. They drove him first from Thessalonica, then from Berœa. It became necessary to take measures for his safety. As at Damascus, the brethren sent him away by night. His destination was a distant part of Greece, where the enmity of the Thessalonian Jews might for a time be baffled. He went by sea to Athens.

And here we have every thing present, which can kindle enthusiasm in the breast of the Christian scholar. For those who have tasted deeply the sweets of art, poetry, or philosophy, there is an indescribable charm in all that is connected with Athens. It is the metropolis of the human intellect; the holy city of the nether world, as Jerusalem is of the upper. And when, as in this case, the two are linked together, — when we see the man prepared by Jewish birth and training, united with Grecian culture, standing on the Areopagus and preaching God's revelation, we feel, if ever we do, the unity and harmony in the divine counsels of all that is holy and beautiful and great in man; that ours is not a nature of bright fragments, disjointed and helpless, but that there is a power able to unite and hallow all that is good, or seeking after good, amongst us. His *ἄνδρες Ἀθηναῖοι* comes on us with its familiar sound, as we have heard it from Pericles and Demosthenes and the illustrious masters of persuasion, like a well known strain grafted into some loftier harmony. In the stately periods of this second and nobler Areopagitica, we read an indubitable proof that the speaker had drunk no shallow draughts at the fountains of Grecian learning. Perhaps there does not exist a more perfect specimen than this speech affords us of cautious prudence and consummate skill. It might well be so, when such a man had been so prepared; when a mind of the highest order was enlightened and directed by the special suggestions of superhuman wisdom. The authors at the head of our Article have vied with one another in its praise. An able analysis is besides given in Hemsen, Der Apostel Paulus, pp. 148, 149.

But Athens was not destined to be noted in the annals of the Apostolic Church. We know nothing of any permanent fruit of the Apostle's residence there. It was not from the stronghold of the human intellect that the Gospel was to win its most numerous or brightest trophies.

'It is a serious and instructive fact, that the mercantile population of Thessalonica and Corinth received the message of God with greater readiness than the highly educated and polished Athenians. Two letters to the Thessalonians, and two to the Corinthians, remain to attest the flourishing state of those Churches. But we possess no letter written by St. Paul to the Athenians; and we do not read that he was ever in Athens again. (Vol. i. p. 409.)

The next visit was to the capital of the province, the rich and dissolute Corinth.

'The reasons which determined St. Paul to come to Corinth (over and above the discouragement he seems to have met with in Athens) were, probably, twofold. In the first place, it was a large mercantile city, in immediate connection with Rome and the West of the Mediterranean, with Thessalonica and Ephesus in the Ægean, and with Antioch and Alexandria in the East. The Gospel once established in Corinth, would rapidly spread everywhere. And, again, from the very nature of the city, the Jews established there were numerous. Communities of scattered Israelites were found in various parts of the province of Achaia, — in Athens, as we have recently seen, — in Argos, as we learn from Philo, — in Bœotia and Eubœa. But their chief settlement must necessarily have been in that city, which not only gave opportunities of trade by land along the Isthmus between the Morea and the Continent, but received in its two harbours the ships of the Eastern and Western seas. A religion which was first to be planted in the Synagogue, and was thence intended to scatter its seeds over all parts of the earth, could nowhere find a more favourable soil than among the Hebrew families at Corinth.' (Ib. p. 410.)

Into the many points of interest which now gather round us, we must forbear to enter at any length. At Corinth, St. Paul wrote his first extant Epistle to his Thessalonian converts. There commenced that invaluable series of letters in which, while every matter relating to the faith is determined once for all with demonstration of the spirit and power, and every circumstance requiring counsel at the time, so handled as to furnish precepts for all time, the whole heart of this wonderful man is poured out and laid open. Sometimes he pleads, and reminds, and conjures, in the most earnest strain of fatherly love: sometimes playfully rallies his converts on their vanities and infirmities: sometimes, with deep and bitter irony, concedes that he may refute, and praises where he means to blame. The course of the mountain torrent is not more majestic nor varied. We have the deep still pool, the often returning eddies, the intervals of calm and steady advance, the plunging and foaming rapids, and the thunder of the headlong cataract. By turns fervid and calm, argumentative and impassioned, he wields familiarly and irresistibly the varied weapons of which Providence had taught

him the use. With the Jew he reasons by Scripture citation, with the Gentile by natural analogies: with both, by the testimony of conscience to the justice and holiness of God. Were not the Epistles of Paul among the most eminent of inspired writings, they would long ago have been ranked as the most wonderful of uninspired.

It is not to be supposed, that we now possess all or nearly all the letters written by the Apostle. If we take into account his fervid and affectionate spirit, and the frequency of communication between the principal cities of the Roman world and along the great roads, we may safely say, that many Epistles of guidance, warning, and encouragement were addressed by him to the numerous churches. Of these he mentions* one to Laodicea, now not extant; and it is necessary, unless we do almost more than commentators' violence to the natural construction of words, to suppose a lost Epistle to have been sent to Corinth. The interesting letter to Philemon was doubtless one of a large class addressed to individuals.

And not only have Epistles been lost, but voyages and visits to churches remain unrecorded. The phenomena of the Epistles to the Corinthians are not satisfied by the history in the Acts. If there be plain meaning in plain words, the visit which he was about to pay them when he sent the Second Epistle, would be the *third*.† But the History informs us of only *one* previously paid. It becomes necessary then to interpolate a voyage to Corinth during the 'three years' stay at Ephesus of Acts xix.; for this is the only admissible time. And this has accordingly been done by almost all modern critics. Mr. Howson devotes some space to an able description of the probability and nature of this visit. We cannot, however, agree with Wieseler in uniting with it the sojourn to Crete implied in the Epistle to Titus, nor in placing that letter itself, or any of the so-called Pastoral Epistles, at this period; seeming to us as they do to bear unquestionable evidence of a much later date.

We pass on to the return from the third visit to Corinth. For many years now had the hostility of his own countrymen pursued the Apostle. Bitter and unrelenting, it met him at

---

* Col. iv. 16.

† We are well aware of the ingenuity with which the τρίτον ἑτοίμως ἔχω ἐλθεῖν of ch. xii. 14., and the τριτον τουτο ἔρχομαι of ch. xiii. 1., have been twisted different ways by commentators to escape this third visit. But we hope an age of biblical exegesis is dawning, when we shall inquire no longer what words *may* mean, but what they *do* mean.

every station of his apostolic work. As an omen of this journey, a conspiracy awaits him as he is about to set sail for Syria. But it is defeated by a change of plan. The old route is retraced. The Egnatian Way is once more traversed to Philippi. His heart at this time seems to have been unusually full — his words more than ever impassioned and earnest. What outpourings of affection would there be to the Thessalonians, 'his 'glory and his joy,' — to the Philippians, 'his brethren dearly 'beloved and longed for, his joy and his crown!' But we are not left to conjecture. We hear of a whole night's discourse at Alexandria Troas. We have the tone of his spirit feelingly struck in the short hint that he sent the ship round Cape Lectum to Assos — 'for thus had he arranged, intending himself to 'go afoot.'*

'He hastened, therefore, through the southern gate, past the hot springs, and through the oak woods, — then in full foliage, — which cover all that shore with greenness and shade, and across the wild water-courses on the western side of Ida. Such is the scenery which now surrounds the traveller on his way from Troas to Assos. The great difference then was, that there was a good Roman road, which made St. Paul's solitary journey both more safe and more rapid than it could have been now. We have seldom had occasion to think of the Apostle in the hours of his solitude. But such hours must have been sought and cherished by one whose whole strength was drawn from communion with God, and especially at a time when, as on this present journey, he was deeply conscious of his weakness, and filled with foreboding fears. There may have been other reasons why he lingered at Troas after his companions: but the desire for solitude was doubtless one reason among others. The discomfort of a crowded ship is unfavourable for devotion: and prayer and meditation are necessary for maintaining the religious life even of an Apostle. That Saviour to whose service he was devoted had often prayed in solitude on the mountain, and crossed the brook Kedron to kneel under the olives of Gethsemane. And strength and peace were surely sought and obtained by the Apostle from the Redeemer, as he pursued his lonely road that Sunday afternoon in spring, among the oak woods and the streams of Ida.' (*Conybeare and Howson*, vol. ii. p. 214.)

He had a strong presentiment that this would be his last apostolic journey. He had determinedly set his face toward Jerusalem. Like his Master, he had a baptism to be baptized with, and was straitened till it was accomplished. He dared not trust himself at Ephesus, the scene of his former labours and dangers. He might be involved in the one or the other anew,

* Acts xx. 13.

and thus his object be foiled. But the ship tarried a short day or two at Miletus. He sent for the Ephesian elders — he spoke to them his second great discourse — the noblest extant effusion of love, as that at Athens of wisdom.

Then pass rapidly before us the great crises of his course. His apprehension at Jerusalem — his rescue from the conspiracy of the Jews — his detention at Cæsarea — till hastened on the fulfilment of the divine announcement, 'As thou hast borne 'witness at Jerusalem, so thou must bear witness at Rome.' We laid great stress at the outset on the importance of his Roman citizenship. It was this which prevented his life falling a sacrifice to the caprice or corruption of the procurators of Judæa. It was this which rescued him from the conspiracies of his fellow-countrymen. It was this again which secured his transmission to the metropolis.

But we may just turn aside to remark, in the two apologies delivered by him during this interval, new proofs of exquisite tact and skill. The narrative of his conversion is common to both. The *first* is made before the infuriated Jewish multitude in their native tongue. He probably foresaw that he should hardly be heard to its termination. But at all events, it was an opportunity for them to hear from his own lips, unvitiated by the misrepresentations of his enemies, the account of the momentous change which befell him. Accordingly, he uses all possible caution in his narration. Every word is carefully chosen. To the Jews he speaks as a Jew. The Christian faith is 'this way'; the Jews at Damascus are 'the brethren.' The hated Name is avoided throughout, — used but once, and that in the speech of another. Ananias is 'a devout man, according to 'the law, having a good report of all the Jews who dwelt 'there;' not a word is breathed of his being 'a disciple' (Acts ix. 10.). In the *second* apology, all the circumstances are changed. He is speaking under the safeguard of his civil privileges, before the Roman procurator, the Jewish king, and an assemblage of the high officers of both. The detail, so useful in the other case, but likely to be wearisome here, is altogether dropped. Ananias does not appear. The 'heavenly vision' is represented as embracing the whole command given in fact through Ananias, and all the weight is laid on the paramount duty of yielding obedience to it. Thus we have two distinct treatments of the same occurrence, both strictly within the limits of truth, both admitting of illustration and justification by the ordinary methods of speaking among men, adapted with exquisite skill to the different trying circumstances under which the orator was placed.

We come now to that voyage to Italy, so full of incident and adventure, so rich in materials for the research of the geographer, the sailor, and let us add, the psychologist. The duties of the two former have been admirably fulfilled by an English gentleman, whose work concludes the list at the head of our article. After the labours of Mr. Smith, there can be no doubt left on any reasonable mind as to the direction of the Apostle's course, or the accurate trustworthiness of the history. The idea that St. Paul was shipwrecked not on Malta, but on Melita or Meleda, high up in the gulf of Venice, was preposterous enough at any time, when compared with the requirements of the narrative; but has now, by an abundance of circumstantial evidence of the plainest and most satisfactory kind, been fairly scouted out of the field. We cannot follow Mr. Smith through the various interesting steps of the identification of the scene of the shipwreck with St. Paul's Bay at Malta, but recommend our readers to study them in the book itself, believing that they will find them, as we have done, irrefragable. Mr. Smith has also done excellent service by bringing his naval experience and reading to bear on the various nautical incidents recorded. He has shown that the course adopted under each trying circumstance was precisely that which good seamanship dictated; that the very shiftings and characteristics of the wind were such as are well known to and expected by sailors in the Levant at that time of the year. He has elicited some curious results respecting the character of St. Luke's naval knowledge; showing that he was not a sailor, but a landsman well accustomed to the sea. This point he illustrates by the journals of others similarly situated, and by comparison with the Evangelist's own account of the storm in the Lake of Gennesaret. The book is full of solid proof and valuable suggestion; and we may safely say, that a more valuable original contribution to biblical knowledge has not been made by any countryman of ours during the present century.

But *psychologically* this voyage is hardly less interesting. The influence acquired by a prisoner in chains over the motley assemblage congregated in the huge Alexandrian corn-ship, would of itself testify to his being no ordinary character. But when we combine this with our previous knowledge of the man and his mission, we hardly could have testimony more satisfactory to the consistency of a truthful narrative than this, that one so described antecedently should have so done and spoken and influenced those about him. The following beautiful description is from Schrader, whose unworthy rationalism here

completely disappears, and gives place to an enthusiasm far more genial to him:—

'Amidst the many dangers which Paul, well accustomed to perils by sea, had clearly foreseen, he was the adviser, he was the comforter of all; like a genius from a higher world, he stood among the men of this earth, carried onward by the persuasion that he should proclaim the Gospel in this world's metropolis, and before its rulers; that he should gain for it a new and noble victory; that in chains and weakness, not in freedom and strength, he was to work its work. So lofty was his purpose, so visibly was his God pleased to glorify Himself in him through his captivity, that at midnight it was bright day about him: the angels of God hovered round: waking and sleeping, in thoughts and dreams, they whispered consolation; they pronounced his purpose so blessed, so knit into the divine counsel, that God would, in its pursuance, defend both himself and all that were with him in the ship.' (Vol. ii. p. 363. f.)

We have now brought the great Apostle to Rome. And here the shades of evening close over him, and the apostolic history withdraws its guidance. We only know that for two years, he continued in custody, but in his own lodging, privately preaching the Gospel. We cannot doubt that some of his Epistles date from this imprisonment. Hence he wrote to the Colossians, to the Ephesians (for we still believe, notwithstanding the arguments of Conybeare and Howson, and so many able critics, that it was veritably addressed to *them*), to Philemon, and the affecting letter to the Philippians; the latter in the apparent prospect of death. The evidence supplied by each of these has been well collected and applied by many able writers, and seems unobjectionable and convincing.

From this time the shade becomes deeper and more impenetrable. We have yet remaining (to say nothing of the much-questioned Epistle to the Hebrews) three letters, two to Timotheus and one to Titus, commonly known as the Pastoral Epistles. These, in style and diction, are so completely distinct from the others, that while they bear indubitable marks of the mind and hand of Paul, we must refuse to insert them anywhere in the existing series, but regard them as subsequent, and in a later manner. If this were once established, the important question of a *second imprisonment* would be also decided; for journeys are spoken of, and events alluded to, which make it impossible that two of them should have been written in captivity. We cannot pretend here to follow out this matter: we will only cursorily notice two points connected with the question:—

1. The statement in 2 Tim. iv. 20., 'Trophimus have I left

'at Miletus sick,' has never received any satisfactory explanation on the hypothesis of *one* imprisonment. Those who wish to see to what shifts the advocates of that theory are reduced by those words may refer to Schaff's Kirchengeschichte, p. 273 *b*, or Davidson's useful introduction to the N. T. vol. iii. p. 53.

2. There is between the remarkable doxology at the end of the Epistle to the Romans, and the Pastoral Epistles, a curious affinity in style and diction. Might it not well have been that the Apostle, reviewing his Epistle in later days at Rome, subjoined this fervid ascription of praise (for the Epistle was manifestly complete without it), — and so may it not be synchronous with the Pastoral Epistles?

Of the death of St. Paul, we know next to nothing. All that tradition tells us, is no more than might be inferred from his own notices, and therefore probable: but on this very account, of little independent weight. Gathering the evidence for ourselves, we may safely assume that he died by martyrdom, and possibly at Rome.

However this may have been, we know that he regarded his COURSE as FINISHED. The end for which he was raised up had been answered. A man had been found, who by birth, by training, by privilege, by character, united in himself the many requirements for an Apostle of the nations. By this man's living word, the principal churches in the world were founded. By his written testimony, the principal disputes of Christendom were anticipated. To this armoury went Augustine: to this, Luther. From this, future champions of God's truth and man's right may yet equip themselves.

We regard it as a sign for good, that just now attention should be directed to the biography and character of St. Paul. No study could prove so effectual an antidote to the assumptions of hierarchical pretension; — none will afford a more grateful relief from the tinsel of that frippery Christianity which is now so ostentatiously imported among us. He is above all others the Apostle of individual religion: of those things which are true, and honest, and just, and pure, and lovely, and of good report. His course was a life-long and single-hearted striving after one glorious purpose, with no side-aims nor reservation.

The more such a character is known and appreciated, the better Protestants shall we be, and the better Christians.

ART. IV. — 1. *Mein Leben und Wirken in Ungarn in den Jahren* 1848 *und* 1849. Von ARTHUR GÖRGEY. 2 vols. 8vo. Leipzig: 1852.

2. *Der Nationalkrieg in Ungarn und Siebenbürgen in den Jahren* 1848 *und* 1849. Von GEORG KLAPKA. 2 vols. 8vo. Leipzig: 1851.

3. *The Fortress of Komárom* (*Comorn*) *during the War of Independence in Hungary in* 1848 *and* 1849. By Colonel SIGISMUND THALY, late Director of Fortifications in Komárom. 1 vol. 8vo. London: 1852.

GREAT historical events, like large pictures, should be viewed from a distance. If too near, we can only perceive a portion of them, and form no correct idea of the whole. The more imposing they are, the greater should be the distance which separates us from them. The generation, therefore, which witnesses an historical event is seldom a competent tribunal to decide upon it. A correct judgment is reserved for future ages, free from the passions and prejudices to which the actors and spectators of an historical drama are necessarily subjected.

The actors themselves can only narrate that part which they performed; for the time is passed when *one* individual embodied in his person a whole period, and when historical events were transacted, or at least written in the style, which is exhibited on the propylon of the temple of Thebes, where *one* gigantic warrior trampled down whole hosts of pygmy foes. The nearer we approach our own times the more clearly we find all great events accomplished by a combination of individuals animated by the same idea. Colossal characters, which united the king, legislator, and prophet in their sole persons, and obtained oftentimes a seat among national divinities, have disappeared. The consequence is, that in our degenerate or, perhaps after all, only our more inquisitive age, the historian, finding no legendary heroes large enough to fill up the whole frame of his picture, has to group together the principal individuals of his age, and arrange them in a proper light.

We are, therefore, glad to have the opportunity of collecting some of the various autobiographies which illustrate a contemporary period, and of drawing from them the soul of future history; for the individuality of an author and his age shines through his descriptions sometimes against his will, and in no

case more distinctly than in several of the publications enumerated at the head of this Article.

The vindication of the rights of individuality in the person, and those of nationality in the world, have constituted the most interesting objects in the struggles of modern Europe; and although often oppressed and seemingly extinguished, the ardent desire after these imperishable rights still glows in the European heart, only to be put an end to by the annihilation of the race itself. The spring of 1848 kindled to new life this everlasting flame, and bore it over the western continent; but the breeze died away, and before another spring the sacred fire was quenched in blood. In the eastern corner of Europe alone the flame still blazed mightier than ever, and grew into a triumphant and consuming fire. The astonished nations of the West ran for their maps, and found the name Hungary on this field of warfare. Many had heard, but few recollected anything about that people which, among the strange and convulsive migrations that took place in the beginning of our era, had been thrown from Asia into the very heart of Europe, and there had lived as an isolated colony, retaining an eastern nature and eastern ideas, which for centuries had formed the noble and valiant barrier against the barbarism of the East, and had insured the development of western civilisation by keeping at bay the followers of Mohammed.

It was not unreasonable that political imaginations, agitated by the February revolution of France, should have viewed at first the two events in connexion. They thought the Hungarian war was a continuation of the galvanic convulsion by which France had been surprised and shaken; and when they began at last to understand the struggle which the united strength of two mighty empires, aided by internal disunion and treachery, could only just subdue, sympathy came too late; and an opportunity was lost for regulating, under favourable circumstances, the entangled affairs of the East of Europe.

By a reference to the map of the Austrian empire we can form an idea of its history. We see a heterogeneous compound of nations differing in race, language, religion, habits, and customs. The centre of all is occupied by an Eastern people, the Hungarians. In adopting western civilisation the Hungarian did not lose his oriental character; he only modified it sufficiently to receive the benefits of western ideas. His nature is therefore a mixture of the oriental and occidental element. The excitable blood which he inherited from his ancestors, who roamed over the table-lands of Asia as herdsmen and warriors, has not been subdued by the more calculating spirit of the West.

He is as susceptible as ever, and breaks out readily into the wildest enthusiasm. He is swayed by impulse, but his impetuous temperament is mitigated by a chivalric spirit, which pervades the whole nation from the highest to the lowest, and which renders it as a race capable of everything grand and heroic.

The poetry of this people is almost identical with its history — both tell us, that isolated betwixt diametrically opposite races, it carried on for centuries a continual war for its existence. Far from all its kindred tribes of Asia, and growing in the heart of Europe, like the hardy exotic which shelters the place of its adoption from the sun as well as from the storm, the Magyar race formed the boundary between the East and the West. From the West it was exposed to the overpowering influence of the superior German civilisation which threatened to absorb it; and in the East it had to repel first the encroachments of the cunning monarchs of Byzantium, and afterwards the brutal invasions of the Mongols and Turks. These continual and glorious struggles imparted such a strength to the national feeling, that nationality became the ruling sentiment of the Magyar; and differences of class and even of religion vanished altogether whenever they endangered the safety of this most highly prized possession.

To have a real appreciation of that hereditary love for nation and family which animates all nomadic and patriarchal races, we must behold the Bedouin in his waste and the Tartar on his barren steppes. This spirit is not lost by migration to a land more rich and beautiful. Historical recollections add their charm to the innate love with which the Magyar is inspired for his country's very soil, where the ashes of his fathers lie beneath his feet, and where the names of the places around him, with their wild euphonious sound, recall to his mind the deeds of his ancestors. We may say of him, that he is first an Hungarian, and then a man.

The detached parts of four different nationalities — the German, the Italian, the North-western Sclave, and the South-eastern Sclave — group themselves around this foreign people. Separated from their original stock and kindred, they are here united under one head, and bear the name of the Austrian empire.

It would be impossible to find stranger ingredients for a popular compound than these five nationalities. Western civilisation is common to the German and Italian people, notwithstanding their contrarieties in all other respects. On the other hand, the Hungarian and Sclave exercised no influence on the development of occidental civilisation: they have only accepted and modified some of its results, a course which has tended to

create a civilisation of their own. This civilisation, though still in its infancy, has a distinctive character, one of its peculiar marks being the predominance of feeling over reason, and of impulse over calculation. These two latter races represent in some degree the youth of Europe — their manhood has yet to come; while the two former, the German and Italian, have passed their youth, and are now in their manhood, if not advancing towards old age.

In addition to the well-known differences between the German and Italian people, which have disfigured the book of modern history with many a bloody page, there is also a remarkable contrast between the Hungarian and Sclave: the one, though fiery and impassioned, has always been stationary and unyielding. Oriental like, the tendency of its character is conservative and aristocratic; whilst the other, being the most numerous family in Europe, is distinguished by a longing for expansion and a decisive democratic feeling.

The last distinction, and not least, in this chaos of nationalities, divides the North-western Sclave from the South-eastern. The former, to whose family the Poles, Czecks (Bohemians), and Sclovacs belong, with flaxen hair, blue eyes, and pale complexions, represents not only in body but also in mind the northern element; while the latter, with dark eyes, hair, and complexions, have all the moral idiosyncrasies of a southern people; so that, notwithstanding the unity in race, there is an invincible opposition in character, which has shown itself in the life and death struggle between the Poles and the Russians, the latter of whom belong to the South-eastern family. It is remarkable that the difference in language is too great for these two cognate branches of the same race to understand each other; and when in the early days of the popular movement in 1848, an universal Sclave congress was attempted at Prague, after many attempts at compromise, they were obliged to keep their records in the German language.

We naturally inquire what power has collected under one head all these opposing elements? and what bond of union keeps them together as an Austrian empire? Common interest it could not be, for such would have separated the heterogeneous elements, and drawn each of them to an union with its own kindred. Conquest has not incorporated the several provinces, for there is no numerical predominancy of any one of the various nationalities. On the contrary, that section which has given its name to the whole State, forms only one-twentieth part of the empire. Finding no bond of union in the people, we must look for one in the government; and it would appear that to the luck

and clever management of the rulers is the existence of the Austrian empire to be attributed — that 'Felix Austria' which the capricious goddess has constantly overwhelmed with her favours. The story of the Austrian empire is comprised in the family annals of the House of Hapsburg-Lothringen.

Favoured by a remarkable coincidence of circumstances, this family, though it never produced one great man, became the centre of heterogeneous possessions, only allied under a common sovereignty. All these territorial fiefs, mostly acquired centuries ago, at successive periods and under different conditions, were considered as patrimonial inheritances, to each of which, both in law and custom, the prince stood in a peculiar relation. How much this was the case appears from the circumstance that prior to 1804 there was no name to designate the union of all in one State; for the successive sovereigns attached to their titles all the names of their possessions, as if accident, not combination, had made the same prince the head of several independent Governments. The titles ran 'Romanorum Imperator,' 'Germaniæ, Hungariæ, Bohemiæ, Rex,' &c. &c. It was only after Napoleon terminated the holy Roman Empire by the Confederation of the Rhine, that Francis II. thought of including the different possessions of his House under one common name. Then the empire of Austria was born into the world. The infant's birth was inaugurated by the baptism of blood on the fearful field of Austerlitz, which cost its parent a considerable portion of his newly constituted empire.

But the old luck of the Hapsburg-Lothringen dukes and emperors was handed down to the new firm, and at the Congress of Vienna, by relinquishing some antiquated claims to former successions, the House of Austria obtained several very convenient and extensive possessions in Italy and Gallicia. It thenceforward prosecuted more earnestly than before its intention of uniting the various races under its sway into one people, by consolidating the laws and empire into one.

The tendency of every dynasty which sprang from the chaos of the Middle Ages, to sovereign rule, was to overpower its former equals, and to establish absolute dominion. The House of Hapsburg was no exception in this respect. It employed the system which was used by all the dynasties of Europe aiming at the same end. These were, the assistance of the Church, a standing army, the animosities of the different classes, and last, but not least, the jealousies of the different nationalities. The House of Hapsburg has always been one of the staunchest supporters of the Romish See, and the grateful Church has frequently and generously repaid her faithful ser-

vant and useful protector, not, however, forgetting to exact fresh surrenders from the Emperor when her aid was especially needed. Generally the interests of the two Powers have been the same: Rudolph I. was raised by the influence of the Romish clergy to the Imperial throne, and the priests possessed themselves of the education of the youth,—the most powerful means to preserve the darkness so favourable to their purposes, as well as to maintain the subjection of the people to the despotism of civil authority.

But the Reformation dawned, and the new light was so piercing that even the blind felt it. It spread with the quickness of lightning over the northern part of Europe, and, before one generation had passed, it was deeply rooted in England, the Netherlands, Scandinavia, Germany, and Hungary. Alarmed at its threatening aspect, the Church of Rome looked with anxiety towards her most powerful defender—the House of Hapsburg. Charles V. was too great a politician not to wait for the consequences of this new movement. It seemed at first a very appropriate means to curb the intruding influence which the Romish Church had exercised over the clergy of his dominions. Therefore, notwithstanding the urgent entreaties of the Pope, he was tardy in stopping this alarming heresy. But he soon found that the spirit of Protestantism is analogous to that of freedom, and that those who perceived the abuses in the Church were not likely to be indifferent to the imperfections in the Government. After his retirement both branches of the House of Hapsburg began an implacable war against this new and most formidable enemy..

The ample contributions which flowed from the Catholic League for the defence of despotism, both in the mitre and the crown, furnished the means of raising out of the Condottieri bands, which infested Europe during that dissolute epoch, those powerful armies which suppressed Protestantism in all the hereditary dominions of *Austria* except Hungary, and which were also employed to annihilate the civil rights of the people, in order that, with the suppression of Protestantism, the last spark of constitutional liberty might be for ever extinguished. Many of the regiments formed at this era still exist, and under the names given to them when first enrolled. The chief care of the rulers has been to maintain them as an isolated body, torn from all connexion with the people, and therefore subservient to all Government designs. The internal regulations adopted in the army have been based on the differences—we might almost say the hostility—of the several nationalities which composed it. The troops were enrolled by conscription, and firmly held to-

gether by an iron discipline. To counteract all national feeling it was a rule to give to the troops of one nationality officers of another, who were frequently ignorant of the language of their subordinates. Moreover, the regiments were seldom stationed among the people out of whom they were constituted. Finally, to bind together these unharmonious parts by a tie which should also separate them from the community of their fellow subjects, they were made independent of the civil law, and only responsible to military discipline, codes, and tribunals.

The attempts of Governments to set one class of the population against the other, and which were so successful in other continental countries, proved in the Austrian dominions generally fruitless. We must except the fearful contest in Gallicia in 1846, when the peasantry were instigated to destroy the so-called rebel nobility, by the publicly offered bribe of five florins for every head they brought in, dead or alive, to the Government officers. Unable to wield this unholy instrument of rule in Hungary, the parental rulers of Austria, with a Machiavelian policy that became the then ministry, resumed the ancient system of fostering national animosities, in order to pursue their absolutist schemes for engrossing all government at Vienna.

Many circumstances had combined to consolidate and unite Hungarian feeling in this struggle against the absolutist desires of the kings of the House of Austria. Hungary had to fight for life from her first existence as a nation in Europe. She had a dynasty of her own. The virtues of her model king, St. Stephen, like those of our own Alfred, are heart and household Lares—the subjects of her poetry and her legends: and it was only when her native dynasty was extinguished in the year 1527, that—unlike the other territories of Austria which had been acquired partly by inheritance and partly by treaty—Hungary of her own free will elected her king from the House of Hapsburg, upon the condition that he should preserve inviolate her rights as a nation. The new dynasty could at first do little to extend its regal prerogatives, as part of the country remained under Turkish sway, and the other provinces had still the power of counteracting the influence of the rulers. Several attempts made by the Government, principally against the fast-spreading Protestant religion, were vigorously repelled by the people; and Rudolph II. and Matthias II. were compelled to sign the pacifications of Vienna and Linz, which guaranteed perfect religious freedom to the Protestants, and confirmed the liberties of the people of Hungary. But after the final expulsion of the Turks, and after reducing the power of the estates in her other territories, the

House of Austria recommenced her manœuvres for the subjection of Hungarian independence.

Let us now see what was the character of that independence, and the nature of those rights, for whose defence Hungarians have so long struggled, and which they yet hope and seek to recover. As in all other feudal monarchies, so in Hungary, the nobility and the deputies of the freemen possessed from the earliest times great power of control over the king. Thus they succeeded so early as the 13th century (only a few years later than ourselves) in obtaining a charter (Bulla aurea) granting the same rights as our own Magna Charta. The similarity between the two is most remarkable. The Diet in which the nobility and deputies sat together granted taxes, raised troops, and made laws. Jealous to an extreme of all his rights, the Hungarian was chiefly anxious to retain those which he possessed. Besides, the continual wars in which he was engaged left him little time to develop from these rights a constitutional form of government in our sense of the word.

In the most advanced countries of the West the boundary line between the legislative bodies and the executive power was not accurately drawn, until a comparatively late period; it is not, therefore, wonderful that the princes of the House of Austria succeeded in partially withdrawing *a portion* of the executive from the control of the Diet before the new constitutional ideas had taken root in the mind of the nation. If the nation did not early develop the germ of its constitution by the establishment of a truly limited monarchy with responsible ministers, it nevertheless retained that indirect controlling power which the Diet had always exercised from the first existence of the State. Having the right to levy taxes and raise troops, it possessed an all-powerful check on the Government in general, though for the redress of particular grievances it had no other means but that old feudal right of petitioning the king, which, as our own history shows, was far from unavailing in an armed community. Besides the Plebiscité of the Diet, the municipalities in counties and towns possessed extensive rights and privileges, which likewise greatly controlled the exercise of the executive power. The counties were in their internal administration altogether autonomic; they chose their own magistrates every third year, sent their deputies, instructed how to vote, to the Diet; and opposed every illegal decree of the Government, by first protesting against it at the Quarterly Sessions, and then making it a grievance at the next Diet.

When the sympathies and apprehensions of the 18th century influenced the feeble-minded Austrian dynasty, it is not

surprising that, under the advice of designing statesmen, and with the example of despotic sovereigns at hand, it should have sought to consolidate and re-construct the whole empire on the principles of Absolutism and Centralisation. But the Diet and municipal institutions of Hungary presented an invincible impediment to the realisation of this idea. It was necessary, in the first instance, to abolish or to weaken these; strong, therefore, in the holy Alliance of Princes, Francis, Emperor of Austria, and King of Hungary, allowed year to follow year, after the peace, without convoking the Diet. He was mistaken in his plans; the spirit of independence was not quenched by the wars of Napoleon; on the contrary, the people having been roused to defend their country against foreign power, the reins had been loosened, and free action had imparted new might.

The dissatisfaction manifested throughout the nation by the postponement of parliamentary action proved that Hungary had not even tacitly surrendered its liberties, and the Government, after repaying the devotion of the people during the recent wars, by an attempt to suppress their liberties, was at last compelled to assemble the Diet in the year 1825. This Diet is the beginning of the new constitutional history of Hungary. The constitution of that country, like our own, had been a work of time, never systematically developed, but adapted to, and growing out of, the necessities of the moment. The chief care of the nation had always been to *preserve* rather than extend; for the people preferred enduring some imperfections rather than risking the loss of all, by seeking to change a part, knowing that their rulers, who should have been their protectors, were ever warily watching to take their privileges away. The Diet of 1825 opened a new series of what might be called the Reforming Parliaments.

The object of the reforms was simply to adapt the ancient constitution of Hungary to the wants of the times, to abolish the abuses by which the Government had made the executive power nearly independent of the legislative assembly, and to establish a real Representative Government. This is the most brilliant epoch of the parliamentary history of Hungary. A new spirit animated the whole nation, and gave elasticity to all its faculties. This activity was not confined to its political life, it spread itself throughout its literary, scientific, and industrial spheres. Associations were formed to encourage all the different branches of national industry, and steam-boats, manufactories, railroads, with agricultural and scientific institutions, were originated with wonderful rapidity. It seemed as if, notwithstanding manifold obstacles, Hungary was prepared to stride on with

gigantic steps, to regain lost time, and to rival the most advanced nations of the West.

The Viennese Government anxiously sought to counteract this new spirit, and employed all the resources which an actual possession of the executive power can give, in order to obstruct its progress. So enthusiastic was the unity and the will of the nation, however, that the greatest exertions of the Government only gave it a bare preponderance in the Upper House. But with this it was able materially to impede the projected reforms. Feeling its weakness, the Government sought and found an ally influenced by national jealousy. The spirit which had penetrated all Hungary had also spread to Croatia. This territory had been connected with Hungary from the 11th century, and enjoyed the same laws and privileges. Her deputies met in the same Diet, and were treated altogether on equal terms. The people—a branch of the South-eastern Sclavonic race—had begun to imitate and emulate the Hungarians. To turn the activity of these two nationalities against each other, and to foment the animosity of both, was now the game at Vienna, and so cleverly was it played, that during several years preceding 1848 the Croatians were thrown into extraordinary commotion, and every thing was prepared for an outbreak.

The Diet was sitting in Presburg when the news arrived of the French Revolution of February. The members were at that juncture in the greatest excitement, having been roused by new encroachments on the part of the Government, and Kossuth's proposal to appoint a deputation to ask the King to govern Hungary, according to her ancient laws, as an independent country, and by responsible ministers, was at once and unanimously adopted. Nor was this demand unreasonable or rebellious; on the contrary, it was strictly in accordance with the laws of the empire, and craven would have been the spirit, and cold the heart, that, with the living recollections of Hungary's independence, could have shrunk from the duty which the Diet was ready to perform. On ascending the Hungarian throne, the House of Hapsburg had sworn to govern according to ancient law, to maintain inviolable the nationality of the people, to preserve the independence of the country, its liberties and its constitution, and not to absorb the nation into the common mass of its imperial dominions.

Hungary was to be to Austria as to laws what Hanover was to Great Britain. Previous to the year 1687, Hungary had been an elective monarchy. In that year the throne of Hungary was declared hereditary in the House of Hapsburg, but on the condition that before being crowned, each prince should take

the oath to defend the constitution, and to maintain the nationality inviolate. How literally this was understood appears from the circumstance, that all the acts of Joseph II., who had not been crowned king, were abrogated and declared null by the succeeding king.

The late king, Ferdinand V., after swearing the oath that his forefathers had dared to break,—but never with impunity,—received with all solemnity the separate crown of Hungary in the Dóm of St. Martin at Presburg. So important was the ceremony of the Hungarian coronation considered, that on his marriage six years afterwards he brought his queen to Presburg to be crowned with the same solemnity Queen of Hungary. His declaration of title, the coins of the realm, every communication to foreign courts, every patent, and every decree, while it declared Ferdinand to be Emperor of Austria, declared him also to be only King of Hungary, and affirmed Hungary to be a kingdom.*

The deputation sent to Vienna, in accordance with Kossuth's proposal, was successful, and brought back the assenting promise of the sovereign to the exulting population. The Diet set to work, and in less than a month all the reforms of the liberal party passed into law by common consent, and the improved constitution of the kingdom was established. Instead of the Aulic Chancery a responsible Ministry for Hungary was instituted. The censorship of the press was abolished. The National Guard was established. A general taxation was introduced. The mode of election was improved. Instead of county delegation, representative districts were created. The

* It is worthy of remark that the Crown invariably used at the coronation of the Kings of Hungary, was that of St. Stephen. The ancient regalia were modelled after the Byzantine fashion. The Diet appointed custodes to keep them in safety at Buda, under a guard selected for the purpose. Although the elective power of the people had ceased, the adoption or rejection of the Sovereign seemed still to linger with them as a matter of choice, or at least was subject to conditions, for the coronation could only take place while the Diet was sitting. The two custodes, Magyar magnates, required an order from that body to bring up the Crown, and deliver it for the use of the archbishops during the coronation at Presburg, and after the ceremonial to take it again under their charge.

It may also here be noticed, that the inscription on the Austrian coinage ran as follows:—'Ferdinandus I., D. G. Austriæ Imperator. 'Hungariæ Bohemiæ Rex, Hoc nomine quintus.' Clearly designating a separate regal union to Hungary as the fifth Ferdinand, while to Austria he was only the first Ferdinand.

peasantry were made free proprietors of the land which they possessed formerly as hereditary tenants,—not as serfs, as was commonly believed with us, for they had freedom of person, but were obliged to give as rent for their lands the ninth of its produce, and also fifty-two days' work with cattle, or 100 handwork days. They could leave the land whenever they chose, but they could not be sent away by the landlords. Lastly, the union of Transylvania with Hungary was decreed. The King came down, and on the 11th of April, 1848, gave his sanction to all these laws. The enthusiasm which prevailed was general, and the nation, almost without exception, hailed these events as the opening of a new era. The letter of the law was at last realised, and Hungary, instead of remaining *de facto* a province of Austria, had now regained her independence. This feeling overpowered every other sentiment, and the whole nation abandoned itself to the intoxication of success. All differences seemed to be forgotten, and, perhaps for the first time in history, a people offered to the world the spectacle of perfect union among all its classes. Nobody seemed to recollect that liberty never comes as a free gift, all forgot that it must be bought with the heart's blood of the people.

These events had passed so quickly and unexpectedly, that perhaps no one soberly appreciated the true position of the country; certainly no one appeared to doubt that the Hungarian Ministry would at once restore the golden age.

There were two ways for the Ministry to act at this conjuncture, according as they believed or disbelieved in the readiness of the power at Vienna to respect the recent laws. On the first assumption conciliatory, on the second, energetic, measures were necessary. But in either case a wavering course was most impolitic. Unfortunately this last was pursued by the first Hungarian Ministry.

The idea prevalent upon the formation of the Ministry was undoubtedly that of conciliation, for it was composed of all parties. The chief advantage of such a combination of parties would have been, that it should comprehend persons whose names were known all over the country. But, most strangely, with the best intentions, this universal conciliatory idea was in the end practically forgotten. Not one of the Croatian leaders was included in the Ministry. This alone would have served to quench the movement which had begun in Croatia in union with that of Hungary. Another blunder was, that when the Austrian Exchequer, overwhelmed by the enormity of its burden, proposed that the Hungarian Exchequer, now separated from it, should take a portion (about 200,000,000 florins) of the

debts contracted before the separation, the Conciliatory Ministry indignantly refused the proposition. No doubt the right to refuse rested with the Ministry, because the Diet had never been concerned in the expenditure of the Austrian finances; but it was not consistent with a conciliatory policy to drive the Austrian Government to extremity, instead of trying to alleviate its difficulties as far as was compatible with the security of the Hungarian finances.

Again, the proposal of the Ministry to supply Hungarian troops for the Italian campaign, which was revoked by Kossuth himself in the open Diet within a few days of its being made, indicated that want of a decided straightforward policy, which in the end proved their ruin. Pursuing half-measures, the precious time was lost which was necessary to regulate the affairs of the nation, under its peculiar circumstances, and for putting the country into a state of defence against the aggression which it was impossible not to apprehend.

Even when the tactics of the Court of Vienna were no longer concealed,—when, carrying out their ancient policy of exciting the enmity of races, the Austrian Ministry stimulated the Servians in Hungary to rebel against the Government, supplying to these insurgent troops regular Austrian artillerymen,—the Hungarian Ministry pursued the same undecided course. Many persons may view with charitable approval the unwillingness of a people to believe in the treasonable policy of its rulers,—for a ruler may be as much a traitor to his people as a subject to his king,—but when the success of the Hungarian armies, officered by Austrian generals, was sacrificed by the evident treachery of these generals, then ought the Ministry and the people to have listened to the opposition, headed by Perczel, and changed their irresolution into a decisive action worthy of the nation.

Perhaps the greatest error committed by the new Government was in raising only ten battalions of volunteers against the Servians instead of fifty, because the arms could more easily have been raised at the time than at a later period, and a determined course at this time might have induced the Austrian Government to think it dangerous to attack the liberties of a nation so energetically preparing for its defence.

To understand the subsequent events, we must contemplate, for one moment, the position of the Imperial Government in March 1848, when the first revolution broke out in Vienna, falling upon the astonished Court like a thunderbolt from a cloudless sky. Confusion and consternation arrested at once the whole machinery of the State. Nor was it surprising. The whole system of administration had been based on an elaborate

bureaucratic system which ascended pyramid-like to one head. The apex, and we may say the foundation also, was the Prince Metternich. Whatever may be our opinion of his measures, no one can deny that the manner of his rule was almost absolute. In every emergency he was consulted, and he decided.

The popular mind understood the system, and the first movement was against *him*. The first day of the March revolution ended with his removal. The want of his directing spirit was manifest as soon as he fell. The pyramid was without its head and without its base. The Collegiate or Corporate system (as we might translate the idea), by giving the mutual dependence of a corporation to the bureaucratic councils, which had prevailed throughout the whole administration, had taught every officer of State to identify himself with his colleagues as a body, and to shun all personal responsibility. This was carried so far that each person feared to take an independent resolution. All were blind tools, only daring to pronounce their opinion when interrogated upon matters of secondary moment. Generally they had no acquaintance with the higher principles by which statesmen are guided, and were equally ignorant of the action and influence of the different elements in a State.

Constitutions they had always heard of as dangerous and abominable things, which entitled the people to find fault even with the actions of that sublime being, a Minister of the Crown. Such an idea seemed blasphemous in Austria. At the first moment all these gentlemen hearing of an actual revolution at home, thought only of the French Revolution of 1789 and—of themselves. If the revolution had been the very abyss they feared, it could not more quickly or completely have swallowed up the faithful Counsellors of His Majesty. They disappeared as by magic. His Majesty must indeed have imagined some strange fate had attended his flatterers and advisers, when on the second day there was not one of them to be found who could draw up a proclamation to the people. One of the popular leaders was therefore called upon to do it. But with the illuminations and processions which followed the promise of the new constitution to Austria, which the Emperor spontaneously volunteered on this occasion, these cautious gentlemen crept out of their holes, having first provided magnificent popular rosettes to be looped on to their buttons. They were grafted on to the branches of the constitutional administration, and those who were formerly called Presidents were now converted into Ministers, and the Aulic Counsellors were baptized Chiefs of Sections. All endeavoured to ape the gait and figure of constitutional statesmen according to M.

Hecker's 'Staats Lexicon.' But accustomed to the tight uniform of bureaucracy, when no longer buttoned up, and when their actions and shape were left to their natural play, they only roused the laughter and contempt of the bystanders by their cowardly and hypocritical awkwardness.

It was not from such automata, however useful in the machinery of an absolute State, that the dynasty of Austria could expect its salvation in these perilous times. Meantime, this bewildered dynasty never stood more in need of a clear-sighted honest statesman. It required a man, who, understanding the character of the people and the tendency of their ideas, could behold with prophetic eye the direction which the yearning impulses of his countrymen were ready to take, and without coldly repelling their fervid energy, would have controlled and moulded it, and thus led them on to create a new life and existence for the ancient empire. It was, perhaps, the most decisive moment in the history of the House of Austria. The almost instantaneous crash with which the old edifice crumbled down, was a sufficient proof of its rottenness; and the unanimous rising of the whole empire, excepting Moravia, Illyria, and the Tyrol, should have convinced the Imperial Monarch that the people had ceased to be children, and that the prestige of paternal authority was irrevocably broken.

The renewal of the bond of union in its old form was now impossible. Through all changes of the dynasty the people had preserved an awe and respect for prerogative; and though sometimes experiencing that there were bayonets behind the paternal throne, they always wished to regard the throne with the reverence that exists towards the head of an old hereditary house. In the new position of affairs the resumption of this feeling could not be expected; but the Government should have resolved that the children having arrived at maturity, it was necessary to expand the institutions of the country to meet the development of their faculties. Instead of this course, the despotic policy of the Court was, first to gain time by amusing the population with a so-called Constitution, while it fostered jealousies between the different nationalities; and then to make the Government power feared and respected, by placing the bayonets before the throne and governing by military power alone. Acting on the absolutist view of divine right, the Court concluded that all measures were lawful by which the supremacy of the throne could be secured against and before all popular claims. In the nineteenth century there can be no other apology than the right divine to govern wrong for

those savage cruelties, which were perpetrated under this plea, and which must prove the eternal shame of our age.

A mock Assembly was convened at Vienna. There it was impressed on the deputies from the other States, that Hungary only desired a separate government in order that it might supplant the other nationalities of the empire,—'a project which it 'was the special object of the paternal government to prevent.' This assembly, having fulfilled its purpose of deluding the people with false hopes, was dissolved, its acts and the decree constituting it abolished, and Viennese absolute decrees now govern the once free and independent States of the empire. The operations of this intriguing policy commenced immediately after the outbreak at Vienna in March, and its influence, fostered by the priests of the Romish and Greek churches, soon penetrated the various ruder nationalities. The Sclave and Wallachian races were infected with the Court fanaticism against Hungary, and perpetrated atrocities in civil warfare, which the historian will blush to record, and which the actors themselves now lament — perceiving as they do, that after all, they have a common interest with Hungary in the maintenance of popular freedom.

The chief hopes of the Government from the first rested on the Sclave races. These had been led to believe that if the independence of Hungary were destroyed, and the Austrian provinces rendered one consolidated family, they, as forming a majority of the population, would shortly realise the idea of a vast Sclavonic Empire. Their contiguity to brotherhoods of the same race in Russia and Turkey, rendered this a favourite notion. Vainly some of the Polish leaders tried to remove this delusion, showing their fellow Sclaves that, by refusing to unite with the Hungarians and the Germans for the purpose of obtaining the establishment of a reasonable federalism under the family of Hapsburg, in which the rights of all should be sustained, they were only running after a shadow of greatness and seconding absolutist views which must ultimately crush them. How correct such advice was, time has already shown, to them and the world.

But at that period, fired by delusive expectations, stimulated by the hope of plunder, and encouraged by their Greek and Romish priests in Viennese pay, who willingly preached a crusade which bore upon the Protestantism and independent Constitution of Hungary, — Croats, Servians, and Wallachians assembled to defend the Emperor and their religion, both of which, they were assured, were threatened by the rebellious and heretical Hungarians.

Of all these nationalities the Croatian was the best prepared for seconding the Austrian wishes. During the persecutions of the Christians in Turkey, in the eighteenth century, many fugitives found refuge in Croatia, and were organised on the frontiers as military colonies. The assumed object of such establishments was to erect a military cordon upon the Turkish frontier. Similar colonies were organised all along the southern frontier. They were divided into seventeen regiments, and the regiment into four battalions, numbering 1500 men each. Every male inhabitant of these colonies was a destined soldier from his birth, and was drilled from his childhood. The administration of this district lay in the War Department at Vienna, which sent down Austrian officers to command these regiments. The officers were never chosen from the colonists themselves. Separated from their equals, they took root among their troops, and not only superintended their military duties, but regulated their minutest affairs. All the regiments on the Croatian frontier were under the command of the Ban of Croatia.

This was the secret of the 40,000 men whom Jellachich, the convenient instrument of the Court, led against Hungary. It has been supposed that the acts of this army manifested the enthusiasm of the Croatians. The reverse was the fact. These almost servile frontier regiments are assembled for exercise each September. When on duty as usual in September 1848 they were ordered, greatly to their surprise, to proceed to the borders of Hungary; and after the victories in Italy had placed more forces at the disposal of the Government, Jellachich threw off the mask, which his countrymen alone had been too blind to penetrate, and set forward towards Buda by orders from Vienna. In vain did the Hungarian Diet repeatedly send deputations to the Monarch, calling upon him to use his authority, to maintain the integrity of the Hungarian Crown, and to order the Ban of Croatia to desist from hostilities, in order that all matters between Hungary and Croatia might be settled by a congress at Vienna. Evasive answers only were brought back, and the Viennese Constitutional Assembly, to whom they at last appealed, refused to hear the Hungarian deputies.

Thus involved on all sides, the Hungarian nation saw no hope save in her own energy. She retained the right of self-defence. A painful hesitation and pause occurred before the irrevocable step was taken — it was the dead silence before the thunderstorm; and then all attempts at pacification failing, the nation rushed to arms.

But the people required a leader in this emergency, one to bear the banner of Hungary in this strife of life and death.

Public opinion had for some time singled out one man. It was Kossuth. His heart-stirring eloquence had been always ready to revive the sinking spirit, and his energy had communicated itself to the most desponding of his countrymen. Every day thousands surrounded the house where the representatives sat, and an anxious people in the country waited on the roads to hear what their favourite, Kossuth, had said. The nation had faith in him because he had faith in the nation, the cause, and himself. Faith and hope were the charms which subdued all spirits, and gave him the position which first elevated him above all competitors.

It was the duty of the Palatine, the Archduke Stephen, the appointed representative of the King, his Alter Ego in fact, as supreme captain of all troops in Hungary, to lead the army against Jellachich. He proceeded to the neighbourhood of the lake Balaton, there reviewed the troops, and then fled to Vienna, without communicating with the Parliament. In this position the Hungarian Ministry felt themselves dissolved; and the Diet at once appointed a Committee for National Defence. This body was composed of members of both Houses, including two late Ministers, and Kossuth as president. Its object was the defence of the rights of the nation embodied in the laws of 1848. It accomplished its aim; for when it was constituted, the hostile army was a few miles from the capital; and when its power was superseded by the Provisional Government, the whole country, with scarcely an exception, was free from the enemy. This was the most brilliant effort of Kossuth's genius.

The first care of the Committee was the army. By the laws of 1848, all Hungarian regiments employed elsewhere were to return home, and be subjected to the Hungarian War Ministry. To the reiterated demands of the Hungarian Ministry evasive answers were returned from Vienna, alleging the impossibility of the recall of the Hungarian troops, as they were employed in the campaign in Italy. But the Viennese War Department authorised the Hungarian Ministry to employ in the meantime such foreign troops as were then stationed in the country. These troops accordingly took the oaths to the Constitution. The Ministry employed these forces against the Servians and Wallachians, but in vain; for the Austrian officers were traitors to their ostensible cause, and instead of subduing the insurgents, allowed the insurgents to fortify themselves, and to devastate Hungary by their inroads. At the entry of Jellachich, all the foreign troops began to act openly against Hungary; but the greatest part of the Hungarian troops remained faithful. Even those who had been formed under

Austrian rule, and had officers of different nationalities, who had no interest in the cause, maintained their allegiance to their oath; and Jellachich was defeated and driven over the frontier. Viennese troops were now ordered to his rescue, but the people of the capital opposed their departure, and the October revolution broke out. The unwillingness of the Austrian officers who had remained in the Hungarian army to cross the frontier and follow Jellachich into Austria Proper, delayed the advance of the army. When this difficulty was at last overcome, Vienna had fallen; and instead of finding a demoralised and fugitive enemy, the Hungarians were met by well-appointed forces; and on the 30th of October the unfortunate battle of Schwehat induced them to withdraw into their own territory.

The die being now cast and the lists opened, every one felt that it was no longer safe to employ Austrian officers, on whom no reliance could be placed. Kossuth, therefore, sought to separate all Austrian elements from the constitution of the army, and to make it truly Hungarian. Hence Moga, an old Austrian general, was removed, and Görgey appointed Commander-in-chief. Görgey had to organise the army. Nor was his task less arduous because the army he had been called upon to organise consisted chiefly of enthusiastic recruits. This made it the more difficult to implant in their minds the necessity of a systematic discipline. His previous life seemed hardly of a kind to fit him for the duties to which he was summoned. Though trained in the Royal Hungarian 'Noble Guard,' he had relinquished the army, and applied himself to chemical studies. Few would have thought that at thirty years of age the young lecturer was qualified to head an army. But those who reasoned thus must have been ignorant of the intensity of his character, and his powers of rapid and keen perception. Kossuth understood his capabilities; and had the Statesman and the General worked afterwards truly and heartily in unison, neither the armies of Austria nor the weight of the Russian alliance could have crushed the Hungarian independence.

When the State was in danger, Rome used to create a dictator. Extraordinary events require extraordinary means. In that deadly struggle on which the Hungarian nation had entered, unity of action was an indispensable condition of success. How much the nation felt this, was shown by the noble confidence with which it singled out Kossuth to lead her in the approaching trial. So long as the task was to arouse the people and to inspire them with his own energy, Kossuth had brilliantly responded to the confidence of the nation; but the forces now

organised had to be employed, and employed on the field of battle, and he was no general. Educated for a legal and political career, he had not studied the art of war. He, therefore, found himself compelled to commit that most important responsibility to other hands. In this juncture he might have transported the seat of Government to the head-quarters of the main army; but then he could not have superintended the organisation of new troops, or he might have confided the army to a general possessing his entire confidence, both in respect of his skill and his patriotism. Kossuth apparently chose the latter, but he did not carry it through by giving the general his full confidence.

As it would have been ridiculous to attempt to control all military movements from the seat of the Government, Görgey was invested with the command of the main army; but several smaller armies were in the field, and these professed to communicate with the Government, or rather with Kossuth alone. An attempt to secure union of action among the generals was made by professing to subordinate all the troops to the Minister of War, who was also a member of the Defence Committee; but his authority was so little maintained, that several independent commanders, Bem especially, scarcely ever condescended to correspond with the War Department, but sent their despatches directly to Kossuth. So long as the new commanders felt Kossuth's influence to be absolute, this was of comparatively small importance; but when, with the progress of the war, they assumed a more independent action, the subordination of the military power to the Central Government was so far relaxed, that at last the orders of the Minister of War lost even the shadow of authority. This was the consequence of that personal influence on which Kossuth based his authority, instead of fortifying it by a subordinate, but effective organisation, of which he would have been the head.

After the submission of Italy to the troops of Radetzky, and after the suppression of the popular movement in Vienna, the Imperial family proceeded more energetically to carry out its absolutist projects. Some future student, turning over the archives of the House of Hapsburg, will perhaps be able to discover the secret of the Court revolution which occurred at Olmutz in the beginning of December 1848. An unexpected proclamation announced to the inhabitants of the Austrian empire, that Ferdinand the Good had abdicated in favour of his youthful nephew, Francis Joseph.

Was this abdication voluntary or not? is the question which first suggests itself to the mind. Did the Emperor, weak in

mind and body, harassed by the violent commotions which shook his thrown to its foundations, throw down the heavy sceptre which fatigued his arm? or was he indignant that his courtiers and his family insisted upon the necessity of his breaking that oath which he had sworn to his people? Time only will disclose the causes of this change, and how far his confessors and his family took part in it. But one thing was gained — the new Emperor had never sworn fidelity to the contract made by the House of Hapsburg with the people, and therefore had no oath to break. The proclamation which announced this important event to the Hungarian nation was answered by a declaration of its Diet — that no change could take place in the throne of Hungary without the consent of the Diet, as long as the former King lived; and that no King could be recognised, according to ancient law, until he had been crowned, after having first taken the oath to the Constitution. The response of the Diet was unheeded, and the proclamation of the new Emperor was backed by a powerful army, which at once entered Hungary from all sides.

To the combined forces of the empire, numbering about 150,000 men, exclusive of the Servian and Wallachian insurgents, Hungary could only oppose at that time about one third the number. Moreover, the greatest part of these were new levies. As it would have been impossible to contend against such disproportionate forces, the chief object of the Hungarians was to occupy the invading hosts until the national army could be increased and efficiently organised. This could be best effected in a position little exposed to the enemy, and which at the same time offered facilities for accomplishing the purpose. Such a position existed in the heart of Hungary.

Inclosed by the river Tisza (Theiss), the sacred river of the Hungarian, by the Maros and by the mountains of Transylvania, lies the large Hungarian plain, an European savannah, containing 3000 or 4000 square miles of country, almost exclusively inhabited by the Magyar race, living as agriculturists and herdsmen, which occupations render them extremely hardy. In former days they furnished soldiers in the insurrections of Boiskay and Rakoczy, as well as in other struggles for national independence. They still bear many traces in their customs and character of their long relinquished, but not forgotten nomadic life. Both rivers run a very rapid and irregular course, between low banks, which are liable to great inundations, forming extensive marshes, that extend for miles inland, so that all the year round — but principally in spring and autumn — the transit of an army and its train is a matter of the greatest diffi-

culty, and nearly impossible. The mountains of Transylvania protect the eastern side of this plain, and offer but few passes practicable for troops. This protected position includes the most fertile part of the country, one peculiarly rich in grain, cattle, and especially horses; so that it affords all the requisites necessary for forming and victualling an army, and for recruiting and mounting cavalry.

Görgey proposed, even before the invasion of the Austrian army, to transfer the seat of government and the military depôts to the left bank of the Theiss. Kossuth, however, objected, apprehending that if the Government retreated before the enemy had crossed the frontier, the nation would be too much discouraged. His hopes in regard of the then efficiency of the Hungarian troops were also more sanguine than those of Görgey. This difference of opinion had its origin in the difference, nay contrast, which existed between these two leaders, and which is to be traced in all their actions. So long as they did not meet in antagonism, but only modified the opposite extremes to which both were inclined, success attended their common enterprises; but when this sort of tacit compromise was broken, both manifested in excess their peculiar tendencies, and the cause suffered in proportion.

Kossuth, the enthusiastic patriot, had embraced his country's cause because the honour and independence of his fatherland had been to him an all-absorbing idea, to which he had dedicated his hopes and his life. Görgey defended his country because he thought the cause a just one, and one for which he had sworn to fight. Kossuth, the tribune of the people and the orator, hoped to save the nation by the energy of the people. Görgey calculated only on the army. Kossuth desired to elevate his country, and to make it free and independent. Görgey's aim was to maintain unimpaired the Constitution of 1848. Kossuth's plans expanded with success. Görgey's success was the fruit and consequence of his plans.

It was very natural that the opinion of each respecting the mode of repelling the Austrian invasion should also be different. Kossuth relied chiefly on enthusiasm. Görgey exclusively, or nearly so, on discipline. Therefore Kossuth's chief object was to keep up the former; Görgey's to establish the latter. The difficulty was to combine the two in one. Both plans were attempted. The military depôts were transferred to the left bank of the Theiss, but the army remained on the frontiers, and the Government at Pesth.

The difficulty in unexpected casualties is not so much to find the means to escape, as to use the means at the proper moment.

So the retreat of the Government behind the Theiss was a measure demanded on the most superficial survey of the circumstances; but the difficulty was the time. Too early or too late was equally objectionable; as in both cases the confidence of the nation in the Government would be shaken, because the first would show that it had lost its courage, the second, that it had lost its head. The Government being anxious to avoid the former, fell into the latter error.

The astonishing celerity with which the Austrian main army, without striking a blow, had followed Görgey's retreat upon the capital, had a stunning effect on all minds, including the Diet and Government. A deputation to Prince Windischgratz to try pacification once more, received the easily foreseen answer: 'We don't negotiate with rebels.' The resolution was then instantly taken, to transfer the Diet and Government to Debreczin, and the order was given to Görgey to risk a decisive battle before the capital. This was, however, recalled by a council of war, and he was directed to the left bank of the Danube, in order to divert the attention of the enemy from the pursuit of the Government, and to enable them to raise new forces and to collect those scattered in the country.

The halo of authority must constantly surround the rulers of a people. Once penetrated, it is useless to disguise it any more. It then loses its power to awe. The Government migration had been more like a flight than like a well-arranged removal. The commanded battle was more like a measure to secure an Hegira than to benefit the country. The army was left to arrange its own course; and having felt the want of energy in the civil rulers, it began to act independently. Hence ensued subsequent catastrophes.

The first act showed what was to be expected. Görgey published a proclamation from Waitzen in the name of the army, in which he declared that the army fought *only* for the Constitution sanctioned by the King Ferdinand V., to which it had sworn fidelity; and that its mission was to defend the Constitution both against the public enemy from without, and republican movements at home. This went the whole length of pronouncing the precise conditions which the army was to obey; and amounted to a renunciation of implicit obedience to the decrees of the Diet and the National Defence Committee, provided they should undertake any thing inimical to the Constitution.

With the retreat of the Government to Debreczin, and the occupation of the capital by the Austrians, the year 1848 and the first year of the Hungarian war of independence ended.

In the beginning of that year the nation had vindicated its ancient liberties, in a lawful form, through the Diet, and under the sanction of the King. The year ended with an invading army, in the heart of the country, bent upon depriving Hungary of its rights. Nevertheless, the nation was not cast down: it had decided to resist; and notwithstanding the unfavourable turn of affairs, it believed in final success. Austria had to attribute much of the energy of this resistance to her own duplicity, which had disgusted and exasperated many of her staunchest supporters.

Though the successful opening of a campaign generally acts favourably upon the spirit of soldiery, it also may produce an unwarranted feeling of contempt for the enemy which subsequent campaigns painfully dispel. Such was the case with the Austrian army. Notwithstanding their confidence in their experience, and their low opinion of their adversaries, they had not anticipated so successful and rapid a march on the capital. Their good opinion of themselves became an absurdity, and induced them to despise the supposed cowardice of the constantly retreating enemy, who refused to furnish them with one opportunity for the display of their valour. An overweening confidence naturally led them into the trap laid for them by the retreating army of Görgey. This army contained a large portion of the old soldiers who had been drilled under the Austrian discipline, and those hussars about whom alone the Austrians professed any uneasiness. It was, therefore, their main object to capture these troops, after whom they detached a large portion of their forces, depriving themselves of the means of actively pursuing the Diet and the Government, which continued to be the rallying point of the nation.

Notwithstanding this seeming respite, the position of the Government and the Diet at Debreczin was by no means satisfactory. Other Austrian armies were advancing towards that place. But at this juncture Kossuth proved that he deserved the confidence which the nation had placed in him. He was the first to recover from the disheartening effects of the opening of the campaign. He inspired the Diet and the different branches of the Government with spirit and energy, and he worked marvels with the nation at large. He manifested what one man can make of a people which trusts him. The recruits of the levy granted by the Diet were organised; and tailors, shoemakers, and sadlers went energetically to work to fit out the troops for the spring. The national tendency to indolence disappeared. Kossuth was well seconded by the people, and armies arose as if by enchantment.

Perhaps, after all, the most difficult task that Kossuth had to accomplish in the winter of 1848-9 was to keep up the members of the Diet to the proper degree of enthusiasm. Like all the other assemblies chosen to represent the interests of the people in the various continental States during the popular movement of 1848, this Diet was behind the emergency of the case. True, it consisted of all the men of note in Hungary, whether political or literary,—of the members of the former opposition as well as of the Conservative party. Many members of the aristocracy took their seats in it. But it was a deliberative, not an executive body. Different degrees of opinion were unfortunately represented in it, and an undecided and wavering policy was often advocated there by men who, with the best intentions, were not equal to the crisis. In the end, its spirit, instead of being elevated to the height of circumstances, admitted too readily the possibility of failure, and proved that in political revolutions, a body that discusses and hesitates, though composed of the best men, is inadequate to the management of affairs, and that power, on such occasions, demands to be concentrated in a few hands.

Despite the difficulties he encountered, Kossuth found his reward in February, 1849. An Hungarian force of 40,000 men, including Görgey's, Klapka's, and the Southern army, was ready to advance from the plains of the Theiss. But nothing is so pernicious to the authority of a government as to attempt measures which it cannot carry out. Such a proceeding was the nomination, at this moment, of Dembinsky as commander-in-chief.

The Government had not forgotten Görgey's proclamation from Waitzen, and was anxious to regain the influence which it had lost by its precipitate retreat in the winter. It therefore named a commander for the united main army, who should implicitly obey all its orders, and, as commander-in-chief, hold the other generals in hand, and connect them with the War Office. Kossuth also believed that the military renown of the Polish General would excite the confidence of the army, and probably thought that, as a foreigner, he would not join an opposition party. This was keen calculation; but he, who should have been the last to do so, forgot on this occasion the Hungarian character. He omitted the fact that this was one of those national wars wherein the admixture of foreign elements never answers; and that a nationality so jealous as that of the Hungarian would not long tolerate the idea that its army needed a foreign commander.

The moment the news was received of Dembinsky's appointment, Görgey's army commenced a demonstration against the

new commander. This produced no effect until after his unsuccessful operations on the right bank of the Theiss. Then, upon the loss of the battle of Kápolna, the army declared its want of confidence in him, and required the commissary of the Government, Szemere, to appoint another commander *ad interim*. Szemere complied, and nominated Görgey. Dembinsky refused to relinquish the command; but Görgey ordered him to be placed under arrest. At this conjuncture Kossuth arrived; a council of war was held, and the result of the investigation was Dembinsky's removal, and the nomination of Vetter, the former commander of the South army, as commander-in-chief.

These events struck another deadly blow at the civil authority. The army had rejected the commander whom the Government had (unadvisedly, it is true,) appointed. His removal was necessary; and how could the Government punish the movers in this opposition, after it had acknowledged they were right? This independent conduct of the army, therefore, remained unpunished; the authority of the Government fell; and when Vetter was disabled by illness, unable longer to resist the wish of the army, the Government was obliged to appoint as commander-in-chief that general who was most formidable to its power, and who had shown the greatest unwillingness to submit to its authority. But the splendid successes which followed this appointment of Görgey soothed, in some degree, the bitterness of the necessity. Victory followed victory, and in less than four weeks, and before the middle of April, the Austrian army was driven to the frontiers, and, with little exception, the Hungarian territory was free from invaders.

Now was the time to restate to the powers at Vienna the object for which Hungary fought, and to obtain a guarantee for the Constitution of 1848. But prosperity stimulated larger hopes, and Kossuth availed himself of this period of success to make a proposal to the Diet which, while we acknowledge it to have been provoked by the conduct of Austria, entirely changed the character of the war. This proposal was the deposition of the House of Hapsburgh from the kingdom of Hungary. After three days' discussion with closed doors, and one day in open session, it was accepted, and on the 14th of April, 1849, Hungary was proclaimed independent of the rulers of Austria, Kossuth appointed Governor of the Kingdom, and a cabinet was selected to aid the executive in conducting the affairs of the State.

In extraordinary crises, when the reasons for or against a decisive measure are nearly balanced, success must certainly pronounce upon the policy of the steps, because it proves

whether the calculations are right or wrong. To determine the propriety of this declaration of independence, we must consider it from two points of view—justice and policy.

The justice of the step raises that old, and some will say undecided question,—when has the people the right to resist the oppression of its rulers? This problem has been practically solved on several occasions by ourselves. The House of Austria certainly held Hungary upon ancient and well-known conditions. It had violated these by armed force, and had sought to deprive the people of their guaranteed rights. It appears therefore that, in the light of justice, the war was simply one of self-defence. What might have been the result had not events been precipitated by this declaration it is impossible now to determine. Granted, then, that the nation had a clear justification for armed defence, was the declaration of independence equally justifiable, and, if so, was it expedient? The main argument by which Kossuth stimulated the Diet so hastily to adopt this declaration, was the promulgation on the 4th of March of the constitution decreed for the whole Austrian Empire. This was made public immediately after the Hungarian army was checked in the battle of Kápolna. Imagining that opposition was then subdued, the Viennese Court availed itself of the opportunity to proclaim the unity and indivisibility of the empire,—the existence of separate, but, of course, powerless, provincial diets,—and the establishment of one central Chamber at Vienna, by which the affairs of the Empire were to be regulated.

It is needless to enter further into the working of this mock constitution, because, like all other semblances of liberty in Austria, it has been wholly abrogated. But it was clearly intended that the nationality of Hungary should be extinguished, and that kingdom be reduced to the condition of a mere province of the Austrian empire. The Hungarians felt this, and Kossuth urged that this decree should be responded to by a like act declaring the dethronement of the House of Hapsburg. But even *if* this act of the Hungarian Diet was defensible on the grounds of justice, we have a strong opinion that, at the moment, the measure was contrary to sound policy.

After a six months' war, justified by the infraction of the National Hungarian Constitution, the publication of this new Austrian Constitution in no wise altered the position of affairs. The nation was at war for their own Constitution, and had nothing to do with that which Francis Joseph published as Emperor of Austria. The *casus belli* had been as patent to the world upon the entrance of the Austrian army into Hungary

as at any subsequent period; and if dethronement was the just reward of the House of Hapsburg for outraging the Hungarian Constitution, this step should have been taken at the commencement of the war, and thus the nation would have known from the first for what it was fighting. Therefore, if judged by the mere justice of the case, the declaration came too late, and, if viewed in the light of expediency, too early.

For it was a crowning provocation offered to the House of Hapsburg. There was no medium now between separation or subjugation. It was easy to foresee that Austria would accept the offers of her mighty ally, Russia, rather than descend from her position as a first-rate Power in Europe, which would have been the inevitable consequence of the loss of Hungary. Russia had abundant reason to seize the first opportunity to humble her rival, and to crush, at the same time, that dangerous movement in Hungary which served as an example for the Poles. Moreover, Russia had nothing to apprehend from any other foreign intervention, as the popular party was everywhere subdued, and there was no reason to anticipate that England or America would interpose in favour of the dethronement since, having no diplomatic relations with Hungary, and — at that time like the rest of the world — being very ignorant of the merits of the case, they were not in the position to take the question in hand.

A division in the army was another evil likely to follow the declaration of independence. As before stated, many of the officers in Görgey's army had been in the Austrian service. They fought in obedience to the oath they had sworn to the Constitution, but were by no means disposed to partake in a war against the dynasty of Austria. The battle for the Constitution had united the whole nation and the army: the dethronement was the apple of discord which ruined the hopes of Hungary.

We see no advantage connected with it. It had no inspiring effect on the nation. It did not enlarge the means of defence: on the contrary, it diminished them. It increased the number and the hostility of the enemies of Hungary, and there is no evidence that it gained one additional friend to the cause. Nor are there any traces of any wish in the nation for such a measure. The disadvantages of this measure were greatly increased by the establishment of the Provisional Government, with a responsible Governor, and, under him, a responsible Ministry in the constitutional style. At that moment, the nation, to realise the idea which was expressed in the declaration of independence, had need of all its concentrated energy. But the same act surrounded the executive power with those forms which, however salutary — nay, necessary — in ordinary times, must needs have

a pernicious effect under circumstances which require rapidity of decision and unhampered energy. In the abrogated National Defence Committee, Kossuth had been, if not in name, at least in reality, dictator; and now the power was split and weakened by the collegiate forms of a cabinet.

At the period of the Declaration of Independence, the Hungarian movement had reached its height. From that moment it began to decline. It had overshot its mark. The second era of the Hungarian war furnishes a brilliant chronicle of heroic deeds, of union, and concord; which testify that the Hungarian race, though long silent in the history of nations, is not dead. It has opened for itself a glorious position in the modern annals of the people of Europe. Nationality and liberty fed the fire and animated the patience of the people. So long as these intelligible barriers had to be defended, the nation was victorious. But when theories were set before it, the nation lost its basis. The movement had ceased to be national.

In the life of nations, as in that of individuals, there are moments which decide their fate for years. To use that moment is success; to lose it, is ruin. Such a moment presented itself to Hungary in the beginning of May, 1849. The Declaration of Independence had irrevocably broken up all hopes of a compromise with the dynasty, and there was therefore no hope but in its utter defeat and abolition. Even for this extreme measure the moment was favourable. The Austrian troops flying and disorganised,—the Hungarian army, flushed with victory, at their heels,—Vienna trembled. Then Kossuth himself might have gloried in the probable realisation of his wildest schemes: for, having passed the Rubicon, and severed himself from Austria, he might have attempted to confer on the other nationalities of the empire the like independence he expected to gain for Hungary. As he had now thrown the dice, such was the surest way to preserve his stakes. But at that decisive moment, the army went back to besiege Buda, in which a small garrison had been left by the retreating Austrians.

The Government either did not perceive the greatness of the moment, or did not dare to enforce the necessary orders. Görgey received instructions to follow the enemy with the bulk of his army, and to direct a few thousand men upon Buda. But he sent a small force to follow the enemy, and marched with the greatest part of the troops to besiege Buda. After a month's siege Buda fell before a splendid assault. But in the mean time the enemy's forces were reorganised, and a Russian army had assembled on the frontier. The second moment for a *coup de main* on Vienna passed away like the first.

The fall of Buda was the last gleam of the sun of Hungary. Buda, the old capital which overlooks the field of Rákos, where, in bygone times, her proud nobles assembled to discuss the affairs of their country in the sight of heaven;—Buda, the town of Matthias Corvinus, who made the Hungarian name resound from the Baltic to the Adriatic;—Buda, the scene of the most heroic events in the national history, — the sacred Palladium of the Hungarian,—was again in the hands of the nation. Never, during the whole war, had there been so much bravery, and so much contempt of death displayed. It was as if the meanest soldier had been an inspired hero. Görgey became the pride of Hungary, as Kossuth had been her love.

But in this brilliant display few observed that the star which had guided the nation up to this moment, and which had pointed out the way for her leaders, had become extinguished. That star was *faith*. Faith in the justice of the cause — faith in her own virgin strength, had elevated the nation to that sublime height which attracted the gaze of the world. Faith had been the pillar of fire, going before her, and sustaining her courage in the dark night of trouble and misfortune. Faith had hardened the bare-footed Honvéd against cold and hunger, and prompted the Magyar woman, peasant and princess alike, to submit to the severest privations. But when the nation awoke from that intoxication into which her many victories, crowned by the fall of Buda, had thrown her, the star was gone, and the sky grew darker and heavier day by day. The pathway was obscured; the nation lost herself; she had begun an undertaking or had been led to attempt one, which she had no longer faith to accomplish. A negative idea, the dethronement of her Royal House, had been put before her as the reward of her exertions. This excited no enthusiasm, and when the pompous proclamations intended to rouse her soul to fresh exertions were published, they spread panic instead of encouragement.

If at this moment a new and energetic arm had seized the reins, an arm guided by a clear head and by a firm conviction, would all then have been lost? Probably not; for the nation feeling the imminence of the storm was more willing than ever to be led in the right direction. But the leaders ceased to confide in themselves: losing the purity and singleness of their early love, they lost their faith, their head, and their hope.

The success of the spring campaign had soothed for a moment the animosity existing between the head of the Government and Görgey. The proclamation of Waitzen and the deposition of Dembinsky by the army seemed to be forgotten, but the declaration of independence, and a lull which came over the mili-

tary successes, reopened the breach and made the gap wider than ever.

The individual who seizes an idea and is intent on carrying it through, imperceptibly identifies his person and his passions with the idea itself, and generally concludes that the impulses of his own personal feeling emanate from his leading idea. With the two rival leaders in the Hungarian war, the guiding idea was, we believe, the welfare of their country. But each connected his person and himself so closely with the cause that he sometimes failed in keeping the two interests separate: nay, very often mixed his own individuality with the interests of his country, of course always to the disadvantage of the latter.

Previous to this time, Kossuth and Görgey, though on different roads had striven in the same direction. Now their paths separated. Kossuth thought that the declaration of independence would alone save the country. Görgey believed that this document contained the seeds of its destruction. Both felt that they could no longer work together, and each felt it necessary to displace the other in order to save the State. Neither of them had the moral courage to do this openly, because neither felt confidence in the possibility of realising his own scheme. Otherwise both would have been ready to risk even the danger of a division in the nation,—an uncertain evil,—rather than longer endure that latent discord, which paralysed all the actions of the executive power. Under these circumstances both thought it better to feign, and believed that this falsehood was a policy justifiable by the object. They ultimately destroyed each other, but their country perished in their fall.

There was one difference, however, between the two. Kossuth only feigned confidence in Görgey's *person*. Görgey appeared to approve,—nay, in his appeal to the army dated Comorn, 29th April, 1849, *openly* approved, the declaration of independence, and proclaimed a *conviction* which he did not feel. He therefore descended to direct treachery, like those Austrian officers who accepted the commissions of the Hungarian Ministry intending to betray it; and his was not the less treachery, because his object was to save his country.

This alone explains that fatal irresolution which marked the actions of both leaders after the declaration of independence. Neither of them saw his way to the end. As if their policy had sunk to the level of *ouvriers*, they lived from day to day, making schemes which were never executed, until the approach of the allied armies of the enemy reminded them of the fatal *trop tard*.

The errors which overwhelmed Hungary in quick succes-

sion during this third period,—the period of her decline,—were consequences of this irresolution. The siege of Buda instead of a vigorous pursuit of the enemy,—Dembinsky's lingering on the frontiers of Gallicia, instead of carrying the war into that country, and seeking there allies among the people ready to join him,—the incredible hesitation which prevented the adoption of one determined plan of defence,—and, finally, the fatal indecision in selecting a Commander-in-chief in place of Görgey, are the results of one and the same cause. All pointed in a natural direction to the surrender of Világos.

So ended the Hungarian war of independence. The sword was laid down and the work of the executioner's axe begun. It has been an elevating but distressing vision. A nation, strong in her right, driven to extremes, defends herself, and at first humbles her aggressor. Hurried into extremes herself, she falls.

Of the two men who had her destiny in their hands, one is under surveillance, and if not a prisoner is certainly a pensioner of the enemy. The other is wandering in distant countries seeking help for his down-trodden fatherland. One has hitherto been the object of the execration of his nation and of mankind. The other has received the homage of the two greatest people in the world. One had too low an opinion of the cause he defended; the other estimated it too highly. Görgey judged *first* as a soldier and *then* as an Hungarian; Kossuth *first* as a cosmopolite and *then* as an Hungarian. One was too near, the other too far, for the mark.

This mark was NATIONALITY, the dearly bought jewel for which the Hungarian has so often shed his best blood; the oriflamme which will at this moment alone inspire him, and which he will follow so long as his name exists. It is his religion, his history, his literature, his country, the very atmosphere he breathes.

But the struggle in another light cannot be considered as a mere national affair. It was one of principle:—Hungary, the isolated and constitutional, against the absorbing centralisation and absolutism of Austria. Such a struggle, in order to yield a decisive verdict, ought to have been left to itself; but Austria did not conquer by the vitality of her institutions or the energy of her forces. She was obliged to have recourse to foreign aid. Such victory is a defeat as it respects the settlement of the two principles involved, and likewise as it regards the future greatness of Austria. Three years have elapsed since Hungary was crushed before the Czar, and placed at the foot of the Emperor of Austria. But has Austria made one step in the fulfilment of her centralising schemes? It is still the state of siege which

maintains her tranquillity. Her reluctant subjects, deprived of the last shadow of a representative system, are held in subservience by terror, not by love.

Austria is a hollow name: we meet with Hungarians, Bohemians, Germans, Italians, Poles, but no Austrians. A native of the province of Ducal Austria Proper, who ought to be the most proud of his name, will say, I am a Viennese, or speak of some other town or district as his place of birth, but he will never boast of his great Austrian fatherland. Despotism may exist if based on nationality. The proud *civis romanus sum* was the link which kept together the empire of the Cæsars. The autocracy of Russia stands on this foundation; but what has Austria given wherewith to inspire her subjects? bombardments, massacres, and executions!

It is not difficult to foresee what will be the future of that tendency to centre all government in the rulers alone which is now creeping over the Continent. Least of all does mystery hang over the fate of Austria. Its doom is written in language as clear as that which flashed in fire through the banqueting hall of Babylon. We see an image of gold, iron, and clay; but the gold has been corrupted and the iron weakened, and what now remains of either is but a scale to hide rather than adorn the earth of which the image consists: — and it is but an image after all, for where is the life? The House of Austria must now stand alone. The last golden link which bound Hungary to its rulers, and to which age had imparted the reverence due to antiquity, has been melted in the fire kindled to burn up a nation's liberties, and to forge, not chains of love, but the fetters of servitude and humiliation. This unhappy House, deceived by its successes, may think it has quenched the spirit of freedom, but the world's records are a proof that the strongest arguments of despotism so lavishly used by imperial oppressors — the hangman, the axe, and the prison,— are inadequate instruments for suppressing the breath of a nation which pants for liberty.

Were the millions of voices which cry, 'Haza és Szabadság,' (country and freedom) in the Magyar tongue, silenced by the Austrian executioner; or were the millions of hearts which animate those tongues impaled in a death-struggle on the bayonets of a mercenary Austro-Russian host — Hungary would not be dead. The destined avenger will yet arise.

ART. V. — 1. *A Bill to enable Her Majesty further to regulate the Duties of Ecclesiastical Persons, and to make better provision for the Management and Distribution of Episcopal and Capitular Revenues.* Prepared and brought in by the Marquis of BLANDFORD and Lord ROBERT GROSVENOR. Ordered by the House of Commons to be printed. 1852.

2. *Cathedral Trusts and their Fulfilment.* By the Rev. ROBERT WHISTON, M.A., Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge, and Head Master of the Cathedral Grammar School, Rochester. London: 1849.

3. *The Choral Service of the United Church of England and Ireland.* By the Rev. JOHN JEBB, M.A., Rector of Peterstow, Herefordshire; late Prebendary of Limerick. London: 1843.

4. *An Attempt to investigate the true Principles of Cathedral Reform.* By the Rev. WILLIAM SELWYN, M.A., Canon of Ely and Rector of Branstone. Cambridge: 1839.
The Same. Part II. Cambridge: 1840.

5. *Thoughts on the Renovation of Cathedral Institutions.* By HENRY BOOTHBY BARRY, M.A., Michel Fellow of Queen's College, Oxford, and Domestic Chaplain to the Earl of Yarborough. London: 1852.

THE time seems to have come for an effectual reform of the Cathedral Establishments of England. The chapters have scarcely recovered from their surprise at the debate of last summer on Lord Blandford's motion for leave to bring in a Bill, by which deans were to be totally abolished. This debate exhibited the strange scene of Lord Blandford and Mr. Hume, Mr. Horsman, Mr. Sidney Herbert, Mr. Secretary Walpole, and, if we mistake not, Mr. Gladstone, all shaking hands, and exhorting each other to the pious work of demolition. The deans seemed to be selected as the especial objects of vituperation. They were regarded as public enemies; no voice but that of Sir Robert Inglis was uplifted in their defence; and the advocacy of the venerable champion seemed perversely to be looked upon, by an overwhelming majority of the House of Commons, as in itself a sufficient *primâ facie* evidence, that the dignitaries thus defended were an abuse and ought to be put down. And now the issuing of the Cathedral Commission has followed the debate.

No one would have supposed, on reading that debate, that amongst the twenty-nine clergymen thus quietly set aside, as

persons with whose existence the Church and nation could so easily dispense, are to be found the first Greek scholar in Britain, if not in Europe; the only two really able ecclesiastical historians in our Church (one of the two also a poet of no slight merit as well as an historian); the greatest mathematician of Cambridge; two of the most eminent geologists of this or any other country; while there are at least a dozen of others in the number, who, by their writings or their preaching, their efforts in the cause of education among rich and poor, or their laborious care of parishes in their earlier years, have won their way deservedly to the leisure and dignity to which the favour of their Sovereign has promoted them. We doubt much, whether any other twenty-nine appointments in the Church of England, taken at random, will be found to be so well filled as the twenty-nine deaneries.

We are, therefore, justified in concluding, that the leaders of the assault selected this office for attack as being the strongest point in the intrenched camp of the cathedral army, thinking that when they had carried this point by storm, no head could be made against them elsewhere. Doubtless Mr. Hume and Mr. Horsman saw at a glance, that if they could get the whole world to acknowledge, on the safe authority of Lord Blandford, that there was no possible use of a learned clergyman, selected by the Prime Minister out of the whole body of the clergy, residing for eight months of each year in his cathedral town, making the cathedral close his home, and therefore necessarily the centre of his charities and his activity, *à fortiori*, there must be a universal agreement that canons were worse than useless: for canons certainly are usually selected from a much narrower circle than deans; under the present system, they reside each year only for three months, during which they are kept at a distance from important duties calling for their presence elsewhere; and they can do no real work in the cathedral town while they are in residence, from knowing that any business they may undertake is so soon to be interrupted by nine long months of absence. Doubtless some of the new allies had made a careful note of the following passage from Mr. Sidney Herbert's* Letter to the Dean of Salisbury (p. 35.), and were ready to produce it the moment deans were disposed of, in order to show that the uselessness of deans implies the more than uselessness of canons.

* Proposals for the better Application of Cathedral Institutions to their intended Uses, in a Letter to the Very Rev. the Dean of Salisbury. By the Right. Hon. Sidney Herbert. (For private circulation.) 1849.

'Zealous and active parish priests,' says Mr. Sidney Herbert, 'promoted to a canonry, come up to their residences' (in the cathedral close) 'only too anxious to devote their three months' 'leisure to some good work or another, and find all their efforts 'rejected. They find that they can only interfere with, not 'discharge, any man's business. At the end of three months' 'residence they must withdraw from whatever they have under-'taken. By the time they have learned their business they 'must give it up; by the time some one else has forgotten his, 'he must recommence it. Their assistance, not being per-'manent or continuous, is valueless; and, with every dis-'position to work, the members of the chapters are forced into a 'state of unsettled idleness. They saunter about their cathe-'dral closes, a spectacle which delights the eyes of every enemy 'to the Church, and affords a point and an epigram for every 'attack on her discipline.'

There can indeed be little doubt that, in sound logic, the abolition of deans implies the abolition of canons also. The strength of the argument, as we have now stated it, depends, it is true, on the fact that canons, according to the present system, reside at their cathedrals only for three months of the year, while deans reside eight. And Lord Blandford certainly intended to save some few canons, by forbidding them to be non-resident. But, if the canons were thus to escape the argument *à fortiori*, that *à pari* was still fatal to them. If a resident dean must be useless, how could two resident canons be useful? Doubtless if Lord Blandford's Bill appears in the House again, its several clauses will be made more logically consecutive before it passes into an Act.

Meanwhile, the best friends of the chapters see, and their assailants see also, that, since the Bill has been so favourably entertained by the House, some great change must come; that the time for the maintenance of mere sinecure offices in the Church, such as deaneries and canonries have so long been, has gone by; that cathedral offices must either be all abolished, or all thoroughly reformed, so as to be mere sinecures no longer.

We confess we do not see the wisdom of the main feature in Lord Blandford's Bill—his project for the suppression of deans. If all that was wanted was to raise money for the extension of the Episcopate, we do not see why the deaneries should be especially selected for confiscation.* Taken at the very worst,

* It is right to call attention to the very great sacrifice of Royal patronage made on the occasion of the last retrenchment of the cathedral members and revenues. Considering the paramount im-

the deans are twenty-nine sinecurists, all appointed by the Crown. A very considerable proportion of canons are appointed by the bishops. If cathedral offices, hitherto sinecures, can have some regular duty assigned to them, the Crown is quite capable of selecting proper persons to fill those in its gift. If they are to continue mere sinecures, it may be reasonably doubted whether bishops may be more safely trusted to appoint sinecurists than the Prime Minister. This may be a favourite view with the Episcopal Bench*: we doubt whether it is in favour with any other class of Her Majesty's subjects. We hope Lord Blandford was not indebted to any of the bishops for suggesting that part of his Bill which abolishes the deans. Some of their lordships are supposed to have no great love or respect for the decanal office. Some of them may even prefer that the officers of the Church should be divided into themselves, on the one hand, seated on a lofty eminence, and on the other a world of poor incumbents and curates who look up to them with awe. One magnate of the bench is reported to have said, when asked, what is the use of deans? that he knew no use for them except to give dinners to the chapter. Another is said to have once expressed to the plain-spoken Vicar of Leeds his conviction that they were of no use at all. The vicar is reported to have answered, that he thought their chief use was to keep bishops in order. We incline to believe that there is some truth in the vicar's view. Besides, the bishops, whether they like it or no, ought not to stand, like the monarchy of Louis Philippe, face to face with a hungry democracy; there ought to be men below them who have some sort

---

portance of maintaining the influence of the Crown in the National Church, Crown patronage ought never to be surrendered without an equivalent. Sidney Smith wrote in his Second Letter to Archdeacon Singleton (*Works*, London: 1851, p. 625.), 'One of the most 'foolish circumstances attending the destruction of Cathedral property 'is the great sacrifice of the patronage of the Crown. The Crown 'gives up eight prebends of Westminster; two at Worcester; 1500*l.* 'per annum at St. Paul's; two prebends at Bristol, and a great deal 'of other preferment all over the kingdom.' Lord Blandford would now have the Crown give up twenty-nine deaneries at a blow, in the hope of being able occasionally to found a new bishopric.

* It is curious to observe how long the names of episcopal families remain connected with some cathedrals. An old lady at Lincoln, of the name of Reynolds, descendant of the bishop, used to boast that it had taken a hundred years to get the Reynoldses out of the church of Lincoln. It is too soon to predict when the lease to the Pretymans may be likely to expire.

of claim to be looked upon as their equals. In the gradation of ranks is the best defence of monarchy. Lord Blandford, we are sure, would have done better service to the Church and nation, if he had proposed not to abolish deans; but while he retained them with their present very moderate emoluments and dignity, to assign them some definite and important duties as heads of the cathedral bodies.*

If the House of Commons and the public agreed with Lord Blandford in the hard thoughts he seemed to entertain of deans, it was because a strong feeling exists against offices supposed to be mere sinecures. It is not as deans, but as deans without duties, that these dignitaries are unpopular. The Bill contemplated that some distinct duties were to be assigned to the two canons, whom Lord Blandford proposed to retain: we do not see why this principle should not have been carried further, and why fitting duties should not be assigned to all the existing cathedral offices. Provided the performance of distinct duties be imposed on them, we believe the Church and nation have need of all the members of the cathedral staff: if they continue mere sinecurists, the opinion has become general, and cannot be resisted, that there is no need of any of them.

The present strong feeling against all sinecures in the Church may be an exaggerated sentiment. There may be a great deal to be said in favour of offices without any very definite duties, affording abundant time for learned leisure; and it may be owing to the existence of such offices in past times that the clergy of the Church of England have been able to do so much both for theological and for general literature. We may doubt, with the inimitable canon of St. Paul's, (reiterating the doubts of Burke) whether the property even of the wealthiest cathedral have not done more good to the nation, even when administered with all the worst evils of the old system, than it could have done had it been the private property of families. We may think that there was much reason in his question, when, in his Second Letter to Archdeacon Singleton, he asked: —

'What harm does a prebend do in a politico-economical point 'of view? . . . . A long series of elected clergymen is rather 'more likely to produce valuable members of the community than 'a long series of begotten squires. Take, for instance, the 'Cathedral of Bristol, the whole estates of which are about

* It seems partial and unjust, and indicative of a foregone conclusion, that Lord Derby should have thought of issuing a Commission of Inquiry, in which his four bishops and three canons were not counterbalanced by the presence even of a single dean.

'equal to keeping a pack of fox-hounds. If this had been in 'the hands of a country gentleman, instead of precentor, suc- 'centor, dean and canons, and sexton, you would have had 'huntsman, whipper-in, dog feeders, stoppers of earths; the old 'squire full of foolish opinions and fermented liquids, and a 'young gentleman of gloves, waistcoats, and pantaloons: and 'how many generations might it be before the fortuitous con- 'course of noodles could produce such a man as Professor Lee, 'one of the prebendaries of Bristol and by far the most eminent 'Oriental scholar in Europe? The same argument might be 'applied to every cathedral in England. How many hundred 'coveys of squires would it take to supply as much knowledge 'as is condensed in the heads of Dr. Coplestone or Mr. Tate 'of St. Paul's?'*

We may think too that no good answer to this argument is found in pointing to a great number of foolish prebendaries and useless deans: that in preferment, as in nature, there is always great apparent waste, and if you have one really good appointment in six to offices, whether sinecures or laborious, this is almost as many as any system of patronage can secure you, as long as the human nature shared in common both by patrons and presentees is what it is.

But whatever may be the force of the arguments in favour of the old system, the time for urging them has gone by. And, moreover, we candidly confess our own belief, that the argument in favour of mere sinecures in the Church is not good. We believe the offices in question will be more likely to be filled by worthy and able men, if they have some definite duties attached to them. And, if these duties are not too laborious, abundant time will be left for learned leisure. Indeed, a literary man will do his literary work not one whit the less efficiently from having some practical business conjoined with it. At present every right-minded clergyman, residing at his cathedral without any very definite practical duties assigned to his office, considers it a point of conscience to seek such duties for himself; and a good deal of time and energy is usually lost in the search. Probably both his time and his power of working would be economised by some judicious arrangement by which he should know distinctly what it is that is expected of him. But, whether the argument for sinecures be good or bad, it is fairly exploded, *i. e.* hissed off the stage, and the nation will endure no more of them. They are gone in the State, and they will soon disappear in the Church also. Whether Lord Blandford's Bill of last summer were wise

* Sidney Smith's Works. London: 1851. P. 623.

or foolish, it will be found impossible now not to entertain some of its leading propositions. A thorough reform of cathedrals has become inevitable. The House of Commons is resolved on it; even the late Ministry, the chosen friend of the Church, the bulwark against democracy—by appointing a Commission, indicated its approbation of Lord Blandford's principles; the admirers of things as they are can hardly hope to be successful with such an array of Tories, Whigs and Radicals, high-churchmen, low-churchmen, and nochurchmen, all eager for innovation. The very Queen's speech has pronounced sentence against the present system. Deans and chapters may take breath for a month or two: they can scarcely have a longer breathing time. The alliance of last summer may break up, and Mr. Hume and Lord Blandford be ranged on hostile sides, but the matter has gone too far to be dropped now, and the cathedrals must have a root and branch reform.

Meanwhile, it will be the best policy of those who are alive to the importance of maintaining a learned and dignified clergy in the Church, to be considering what duties may be well assigned to cathedral officers — duties real and important, but not so laborious as to monopolise the time of all of them. The bishops in the present day are far too much occupied with the practical business of their office, to have much time for the quiet pursuit of learning. The parochial clergy are overwhelmed with continual calls of work. It will fare ill with the nation if anything be done to diminish the few quiet places now reserved for learned men: and the defence of truth against Romanism on the one hand and infidelity on the other, cannot with safety be left now-a-days to bishops and parish priests.

Not considering how large a sum of corporate property is at stake, how vast the amount of good, which we believe this property might do to the Church and nation, and the very small quantity of sense or practical acquaintance with the questions in hand, which is usually brought to bear on the discussions which arise on this subject, we confess we look to this promised reform, desirable as it is in itself, with no small degree of apprehension. Every quack has his nostrum by which cathedrals are to be doctored. One man wants more bishops, and must needs pay them out of the confiscated salaries of the deans. Another, impressed with the necessity of removing all temptations of riches from the clergy, would collect the whole cathedral revenues into one fund, and dole it out in parcels of 150*l.* a year to necessitous perpetual curates. Another sees the remedy for all the evils under which England groans in an indefinite multiplication of archdeacons, and supplying them each with a comfortable house,

which he may occasionally inhabit when it suits his convenience, in the cathedral city, and an income of 600*l.* a year. The imagination of another, who is a crack-brained medievalist, is fired with the hopes of reviving a *bonâ fide* monastery in the centre of each diocese. Another would turn each cathedral into a hospital for decayed parish priests. No sooner has a man a pet philanthropic project for which he wants public money, then he turns to the cathedrals as an inexhaustible mine of unappropriated wealth.

Now, this great diversity of opinion as to the best way of reforming cathedrals, and the proper duties to assign to them, suggests several thoughts. Certainly there must be something very wrong in the present system, if no one can tell, either what cathedrals are now doing for the public good, or what they ought to do. They cannot be doing much in this age of ours if no one can say what they are doing — if Mr. Horsman can assert that he has asked Sir Robert Inglis, for eight years, to tell him, and Sir Robert Inglis, even when thus pressed, remains inexorably silent. Again, the great diversity of opinion seems to show that there is no one ideal of all cathedrals which admits a very obvious or easy adaptation to the wants of the present age. And moreover, while reformers are thus at variance one with another, it is difficult to answer those who urge that the country is not quite ripe for legislation on a subject on which opinions are so various. No one seems to have any distinct principles on which to legislate. Perhaps this view of the matter justifies what has been considered a serious fault in the dealings of the Ecclesiastical Commission with the question. The late Archbishop of Canterbury and the Bishop of London, when they reformed the chapters, did not assign duties to the various members, perhaps for the obvious reason that they did not see distinctly what duties to assign. Therefore they contented themselves with the easier task of taking possession of a portion of their revenues, and left the settlement of their duties to wiser heads.

Meanwhile, the questions involved in such reform as is now demanded, are certainly better understood than they were ten years ago. It has been in the hope of extracting from them some principles which may make legislation safer that we have turned to the several publications, the names of which are prefixed to this Article. Each sets forth some important truths, though in most of them there is much also which we cannot recommend. Mr. Barry's sensible 'Thoughts on the Renovation 'of Cathedral Institutions,' have been published since the introduction of Lord Blandford's Bill, and therefore bear distinctly

on the particular questions now at issue. We may be doing good service if we try now to sketch out the principles on which we think cathedrals ought to be reformed.

And first of all we will state plainly that we do not think the process of nibbling or paring away the revenues of the cathedrals can be called Reform. The incomes of some cathedral dignitaries were certainly under the old system far too large; but they are so no longer. The deanery of Durham is indeed still to be retained with an income of 3000*l.* a year; the deaneries of St. Paul's and Westminster have 2000*l.*, but these are the great deaneries; the others probably average below 1400*l.* None of them, except two of the Welsh deaneries, can be less than 1000*l.* a year; none except Christ Church more than 2000*l.* Several are simply 1000*l.* Compared with the incomes of other professions this will not be thought too much. A dean, if the office is to be retained at all, ought to have as much to live on as a county court judge. Or, to take an example from their own profession, there is no reason why deans, if they will do as much duty, should not be as liberally paid as Oxford Heads of Houses. Again, no canonry under the present reformed system (unless it be the canonries of Christ Church, Oxford) is above 1000*l.* a year; none in England below 500*l.*; few, we believe, exceed 600*l.* We cannot suppose that any reasonable man will grudge such incomes, provided those who receive them have real and important duties to perform. The great sin of deans and of the whole cathedral race, in the eyes of the public, is that they are sinecurists. As sinecurists they are clamoured against. If they continue mere sinecurists they will be destroyed. But if they have important duties assigned to them, and perform those duties, the public would not grudge them their very moderate emoluments. Mr. Sidney Herbert (Letter to the Dean of Salisbury, p. 16.) fairly expresses the common feeling on this subject in the following passage: —

'The Act of 1840 was drawn by persons who either ignored 'the fact of there being special duties to be performed by 'cathedral bodies, or who were quite insensible to their value 'and importance if performed. They found these bodies in an 'inert state, and their duties in abeyance. They should either 'have insisted on the duties being performed, or they should 'have abolished the office. They did neither. They accepted 'the non-performance of the duties, recognised and established 'the neglect, and merely reduced the numbers and the income. 'But a non-performance of duty is as much overpaid by 500*l.* 'as by 800*l.* a year.'*

* When a cathedral dignitary under the present system is anxious

The nation in its present mood will not tolerate the enjoyment of any incomes at all by deans and canons, if they appear to do nothing for them. Whereas, if they have an intelligible sphere of action assigned to them, and honestly do what is thus required of them, no one will grudge them what they at present enjoy. It is but reasonable, then, to leave to future deans and canons their present incomes on the condition that they undertake such duties. A sinecure, in the legal and technical sense of the word, is simply an ecclesiastical office without cure of souls. It is not, of course, against sinecures in this sense that a protest is raised. No one ought to wish that all cathedral offices should have cure of souls attached to them. There are many great duties to be performed in the Church besides those of parish ministers. Some of such duties are best performed in the universities, many others naturally fall to the cathedrals.

The true idea of a cathedral seems to be this—that in the centre of every diocese there ought to be an Ecclesiastical Establishment, intimately connected with the bishop, which shall be at once a model place of worship and a model place of education for the whole diocese, and shall have attached to it a model almshouse for a certain number of aged persons reduced to undeserved poverty, and that the whole institution shall be placed under the superintendence of a body of learned clergy, enjoying sufficient means and sufficient leisure to enable them to follow undisturbed such duties as may make them the bishop's best advisers, and the most potent champions of religion and morality in the neighbourhood.

Other duties were contemplated as very important in a ruder age. When the monasteries suddenly disappeared, the charitable hospitality which they had exercised to rich and poor was sought to be kept alive in their modern representatives. Hence the Cathedral Statutes dwell very forcibly on the duty of hospitality.

---

to undertake some regular duty, and seeks to have it attached to his office, he is likely to be met with this objection: It may be well for you to undertake such duties while in health and vigour, but what is to become of them when you are old and infirm? It may be right, in answer to this plea, to call attention to the 43rd Canon of 1603, which insists on the duty of deans and prebendaries to be assiduous in preaching, and provides, that 'in case they shall be sick or lawfully 'absent, they shall substitute such licensed preachers to supply their 'turns as by the bishop of the diocese shall be thought meet to 'preach in cathedral churches.' This seems to recognise the principle, that in case of old age, or other incapacity, deans and canons are bound to find (and of course adequately to remunerate) competent substitutes approved of by the bishop, to perform their duties.

We are by no means disposed to think lightly of this virtue, even when shown towards the rich, if it be exercised as a Christian grace, not made a mere occasion of fostering worldliness and vanity. The common hospitalities of a cathedral close, if they were only carried out in a right Christian spirit, might do much to raise the tone of society in the cathedral town and neighbourhood, and to keep alive good feeling among men of different social positions, and might thus assist in counteracting that heartless exclusiveness, which is the bane of English society. It is miserable to think how often the conventional follies established in cathedral precincts, binding even good men by rules which they have not the courage to break, have countenanced this very worldliness which is so opposed to true Christian hospitality. To exercise even towards the rich that hospitality of which the old statutes speak, is by no means unbecoming in Christian ministers even in our own days, while no grace more becomes them than that truer hospitality which extends its acts of kindliness to the poor. A cathedral close, where dean and canons were to act up to the spirit of their statutes, would always be looked to by all the poor who live within sight of the cathedral tower, as a place where, however the heartless and busy world may pass them by, they are sure to find sympathy and friends. There is something very touching in the simplicity of those injunctions by which the Cathedral Statutes urge upon the dean and canons the maintenance of such kindly intercourse with all ranks. There need be no omission of duties like these,—the natural overflowings of kindliness, by which the presence of a Christian household makes itself felt amongst its neighbours,—because the attention of the cathedral members is sought to be more distinctly directed, as their great business, to the other offices of their mission.

The purposes for which Henry VIII. endowed the cathedrals of the new foundation on the suppression of the monasteries are thus summed up in his own words:—'That where ignorance 'and superstition once reigned the pure worship of God may 'flourish; that the holy Gospel of Christ may be zealously and 'piously preached; that, moreover, for the increase of Christian 'piety, the youth of our kingdom may be trained in sound 'learning, and the poor may be for ever relieved.'*

* The cathedrals of the new foundation are Canterbury, Durham, and Winchester, having by their original constitution twelve canons each; Ely and Oxford having eight; Worcester, Bristol, Chester, Gloucester, Norwich, Peterborough, and Rochester having six: Carlisle four. They are said (see Jebb's Choral Service, p. 74.) to have

In Mr. Jebb's work (pp. 38, 39, 40.) a clear account is given of the original officers of the cathedrals of the old foundation: 1. The Dean at the head. 2. The Precentor, to whom belonged the superintendence of the principal part of the Church Service. 3. The Chancellor (quite a distinct officer from the Chancellor of the Diocese), who was the secretary of the chapter, and had the custody of the library and the superintendence of the schools in connexion with the cathedral. In some instances he is said to have had the superinten lence of all the schools in the city. In Exeter Cathedral a lectureship was attached to the chancellor's office, and the importance of such lectureships, when not attached to the chancellorship, was distinctly recognised elsewhere. Divinity lectures were established after the Reformation, at Lichfield and Hereford, to be read on Wednesdays and Fridays by persons chosen by the chapter. The divinity lecture was read daily at St. Paul's* in Grindal's time, and all members of the Church were required to attend. In the Convocation of 1562, it was recommended that all members of chapters who do not preach should contribute to two preachers, and especially that the chancellor of the church do give the greatest portion, for that dignity is given for that office and end.† 4. The fourth officer was the Treasurer of the Church, who was not, as his name might seem to denote, the bursar of the chapter, but rather the sacrist, having duties assigned to him in the cathedral somewhat similar to those which churchwardens exercise in a parish church. 5. The Archdeacons, though superior in diocesan rank, seem to have held generally in the old cathedrals a place inferior to the officers mentioned above. These five were the chief dignitaries of the old cathedrals. They stood at the head of the whole body of prebendaries, whose number varied in the several English cathedrals of the old foundation from fifty downwards.‡ Of these dignitaries and

been modelled on St. George's Chapel at Windsor, founded about 200 years before. Recent legislation, as is well known, has reduced the chapters of all the cathedrals, with rare exceptions, to a dean and four canons.

* See the references to the original authorities in Mr. Jebb's book, pp. 64, 65.

† See as above, p. 41.

‡ 'The superior ministry of the more ancient cathedrals consisted of a dean and a large number of canons, who had the chief 'charge of the celebration of divine worship. The number of 'canons varied in different places: in some there were thirty, in 'others forty and even fifty (St. Paul's, Lincoln, Salisbury).' At the head of these canons stood the five dignitaries. All canons

prebendaries, the residentiaries, who have long been regarded as the sole members of the governing body of each cathedral, seem to have been originally but the delegates.*

In the constitution of cathedrals on the new foundation the distinct assignment of such duties as were anciently performed by the precentor, chancellor, and treasurer of the old Foundation, were not overlooked. We have a precentor, a schoolmaster, and a sacrist. These offices were, however, assigned, not to the members of the chapter, but to officers of the rank of minor canons. Yet the full performance of the duties was placed under the guardianship of the highest authority. The dean, besides his general superintendence of the whole body, is urged to see that Divine Service be duly celebrated, that sermons be preached, and the young profitably instructed, as well as that alms be distributed to the poor. Both dean and canons are urged to be 'instant in season and out of season' in preaching the Word of God.†

We are not departing, then, from the spirit in which cathedrals, both of the old and of the new foundation, were instituted, when we say, that they ought to be each a model to its diocese, in public worship and preaching, in their instruction of the young, and in their care of the poor. We fear it cannot be maintained, that they have generally come up either to the

---

were originally bound to residence. But gradually a system was introduced by which residence devolved on a limited number only, and these residentiaries in time became the governing body. Rev. W. Selwyn on Cathedral Reform, part ii. p. 36. See also Jebb, p. 44.

* See the proofs of this, Jebb, pp. 45, 46. Also Selwyn as above, pp. 45, 46.

† It may be well to point out here the legal difficulties in which the obligation to obey the statutes given by King Henry VIII. to cathedrals of the new foundation is involved. The Act, 6 Anne, c. 21., sets forth, that 'several doubts and questions have arisen and may 'hereafter arise in relation to the validity and force of the statutes of 'divers cathedrals and collegiate churches, founded by King Henry 'VIII. of famous memory,' and proceeds in consequence to enact, that in all such cathedral and collegiate churches, 'such statutes as 'have been usually received and practised in the government of the 'same respectively, since the late happy restoration of king Charles 'II., and to the observance whereof the deans and prebendaries, and 'other members of the said churches, have used to be sworn at their 'instalments or admissions, shall be and shall be taken and adjudged 'to be the statutes of the said churches respectively,' &c. &c. A reference to Burn's Ecclesiastical Law will show that this Act leaves it very uncertain what the obligation to obey the original statutes is. The present statutes of Canterbury are of Charles I.'s reign.

intentions of their founders, or to what the Church and nation has a right to expect from them. Things are somewhat improved of late compared with what they were twenty years ago, but there is still very great room for improvement. We have heard of an ardent admirer of the Church of England from America, who had long desired in his own land to be present at the service of one of our magnificent cathedrals, hurrying the very morning after he reached England to be present at the cathedral service. We can imagine such an one, full of the great ideal which he had conceived from what he had heard of the ancient Statutes, approaching with reverence the consecrated ground, surprised when he sees the dreary look of deserted prebendal houses and their smokeless chimneys, which give no signs of daily hospitality, — still thinking himself sure to find the church filled with devout churchmen, but chilled as he enters, even on a Sunday, by the coldness at once of the place, of the scanty congregation, and of the preacher. We can see him coming out disappointed and disheartened, inquiring as he comes out for the cathedral school, which he has pleased himself with supposing to be the centre of a sound Church education to all the diocese, and shocked to find it huddled into some obscure corner with a very few boys, receiving very second-rate instruction from a very inferior schoolmaster. But, 'at all events,' he says to himself, 'these cathedrals, if they have ceased to be any thing else, 'are places of leisure for learned men;' and he turns from the desolation in all other quarters to inquire for the chapter library. Despair, however, soon takes entire possession of him, when, after groping his way through ruinous passages, he comes to a dusty closet, where some few hundreds of worm-eaten folios, which look as if they had never been touched since the Reformation, divide with the cobwebs the possession of the rotten shelves.*

* There are some cases in which cathedral libraries are real libraries and of use. The library of Durham is said to be worthy of the place. But we cannot resist giving publicity to what has reached us as having happened in one of the richest and best cared for of the cathedrals within the past year, a cathedral too in which the library is not allowed to be useless. A minor canon is said to have observed that the jackdaws flying over his garden at times carried in their beaks what seemed like rolls of paper. On one occasion he was fortunate enough to have one of these rolls dropped at his feet. He took it up, and was surprised when on examination it proved to be an ancient Anglo-Saxon MS. Inquiry was made as to the favourite haunts of the jackdaws; and it was found that they had obtained undisputed possession of a muniment room, in which sundry old

Such is the picture which very many of our cathedrals would have exhibited a few years ago: such, we fear, is the picture which some of them exhibit even now. Shame to cathedral dignitaries if anywhere such a state of things still lingers. The deadness of a former age has passed away from our parish churches: shame indeed if it still clings to the mouldering walls of these great establishments which ought to be each the model of its diocese; and shame still if all the zeal which has of late shown itself in cathedral bodies has gone no further than stone and lime, and painted windows, and ornaments of woodwork or of architecture, or has extended, at the best, but to improved organs and good singing;—if the real gold of zealous worship and faithful preaching, and careful instruction of the young, and overflowing deeds of charity has been neglected, while all men's zeal has been expended on what, beside these, is but wood, hay, stubble.

It is vain, however, to find fault with evils unless we can point out their remedy. Among members of cathedral bodies have been many of the most earnest ministers of the Church of England. They have often laboured assiduously in other spheres; what is it that has chilled their zeal where it was so much wanted? Many causes have contributed to this evil result. Some of the chief it is well here to note. An attention to the following points must form part of any effectual reform.

I. In the first place, corporations are very difficult to move. In all boards there is a wonderful *vis inertiæ*. Any one member of a board is almost omnipotent for obstruction; if there be several zealous members who wish for change, the chances are that they will not quite agree in what they want; and the dead weight of the indolent, thrown into the scale alternately of each who wishes to restrain the particular movement advocated by another, will be able to prevent all movement whatever. Reading the Cathedral Statutes, one would suppose that deans were omnipotent: looking at the working of the statutes, as hemmed in and modified on every side by the law of the land, we shall find the dean, like his brethren of the chapter, powerless for movement, and only powerful to retard. No reform of the cathedrals will be effectual which does not transfer much of

---

MSS. were preserved, and had got into the expensive habit of using these MSS. to line their nests. The Greek monks mentioned by Mr. Curzon were wiser than the canons of this cathedral, for they employed their MSS. for their own convenience and did not give them to the jackdaws, but used them instead of hassocks to defend their feet and knees from the damp stones.

responsibility from the corporation in chapter assembled to individuals, and give to each zealous dean and canon a distinct sphere in which he is free to act.

2. Again, it is a melancholy but certain truth, that great improvements cannot be effected without a liberal command of funds; and no scheme could be more unfavourable to public improvements than that so commonly adopted in cathedrals, by which it is made the pecuniary interest of every individual of the body to resist improvement. There can be no worse scheme of management than that by which the dean and canons are constituted the residuary legatees of the cathedral exchequer; so that whatever is not spent on public purposes goes, directly or indirectly, to augment their private incomes. We grant freely that great sums have been spent most liberally on public purposes by deans and chapters, in spite of this premium on illiberality. The dean and canons of Canterbury, *e. g.*, are said to have spent, within the last twenty years, on the restoration of their cathedral, upwards of 70,000*l.*, which they might, without any one being entitled legally to censure them, have divided among themselves. But it will not do to legislate as if men were perfect. It is impossible to suppose that, in a mixed body, where there is often diversity of opinion as to the propriety of adopting some proposed change, the scale will not often be turned in favour of inactivity by the knowledge that to be active will diminish the year's dividend. No reform of the cathedrals, then, will be of much real use which does not insist upon a marked distinction being established between the private income of the dean and canons and the money they are to spend on public purposes. Each cathedral must be bound to have a public fund, of which the chapter act, indeed, as the trustees, but in the residuum of which they have no personal interest. Ample funds must be reserved for schools, libraries, and repairs of the fabric, as well as for all purposes of charity of which the statutes speak.

3. The question next arises, Whence are these ample funds to be derived? In many cathedrals, according to the system on which the property is at present managed, there is only a bare remainder for public purposes, after the moderate incomes, secured by Act of Parliament to the dean and canons, have been paid. In the charges brought by Mr. Whiston against the several chapters, while he calls indignantly for a division of all the funds among the inferior officers of the cathedrals as well as the dean and canons, according to the improved value of money, the scantiness of the aggregate revenues, and their inadequacy, under such a change as he proposes, to meet the very reasonable requirements of the Act 3 & 4 Vict. c. 13., is over-

looked. The property of the cathedrals must be managed so as to produce a larger aggregate income, if it is, in the present state of society, to supply sufficient funds for all the great purposes contemplated by the founders.

Happily an Act was passed in 1851 which makes this better management now possible. The condition and tenure of cathedral property may now be entirely changed by the joint consent of the chapter, the lessees, and the Church Estates' Commissioners. This Act is in process of being made very extensively effective; and the result of the full working of the Act would be to realise large sums applicable to the wants of the Church. Let us suppose, for example, a cathedral of which the whole annual income, under the present system of management, is 8000*l.* After due regard has been had to the rights and reasonable expectations of lessees, according to the recommendations of the House of Lords' Committee on the subject, the full working of the Bill would probably raise the annual income derivable from the property of such cathedral by the church to 16,000*l.* As the Church Estates' Commissioners at present understand their duty, the 8000*l.* a-year thus gained would all be applied to the general fund of the Ecclesiastical Commission: but we can hardly think that, when a real Cathedral Reform is taken in hand, such an arrangement will be continued. Whoever undertakes to reform cathedrals ought to insist that the first application of this surplus of cathedral property be to further those objects for which the founders gave their estates, which objects are quite as important now, and quite as much called for, as they were when the cathedrals were founded. The first lien on the property ought certainly to be the adequate maintenance, not only of the church services and fabrics, but also of the schools and almsmen, according to the founder's wish. When all such parts of the institution are liberally cared for and improved, there will still be a considerable surplus for the Ecclesiastical Commissioners to appropriate.

4. When ample public funds are thus secured, many great and useful changes may at once be introduced, which, without such funds, seem impossible. The first purpose of a cathedral doubtless is, to be a great place of worship. Now, by all means let choral services and all the adjuncts of a splendid worship have their full sway; but let no one suppose, when these have been all arranged with consummate art, that a real devout worship, acceptable to God, has been secured. Without something deeper than these, the noblest cathedral service will be but theatrical display. For our own parts, we are decidedly of opinion that public worship must always be somewhat cold,

unless the sympathy of some permanent connexion be established between those who minister and the people. We should protest loudly against any scheme to make cathedrals mere parish churches; but we are firmly convinced that, without some parochial bond, uniting the cathedral congregation and those who minister in it, cathedrals never can be real places of devout, hearty worship. So long as a cathedral congregation consists mainly of stray officers from the neighbouring garrison, and strangers who are passing a vacant Sunday at the principal inn, and the few musical amateurs of the town, whom probably none of the cathedral body except the organist know even to speak to, and a few old ladies, whose families have once had some official connexion with the close, added to a body of unruly school children, who are brought to the cathedral only because it is difficult to find room for them in any other church—and so long as all these fortuitously assembled worshippers have no personal religious intercourse with any of the clergy who officiate, we cannot have in our cathedrals such real, hearty worship as we find in a parish church. Let there be some one of the cathedral dignitaries who stands to a portion of the cathedral town in the relation of its pastor. Let the inhabitants of this district look to the cathedral as their especial church. By a little arrangement there will be room enough within its ample walls for the whole congregation of such habitual worshippers, as well as for the present fluctuating body.* Let the inhabitants of this district know that they have a right to send for the dignitary we have spoken of, in order to cheer them in sickness, to baptize their children, to minister at their dying beds. Let this pastor-canon (call him by the old title of Precentor, from his connexion with the public worship, or by what name you please,) be, in fact, responsible for the cure of the souls of a large portion of those whose devotions it is his part to lead. Let him in this work have one of the minor canons as his curate. Let him preach to his people habitually, though assisted, according to some fixed cycle, by his brethren of the chapter. Let him, in fact, have the same interest and responsibility in the cathedral congregation which he would have elsewhere in a parish, and we shall soon have a change. It is an incidental advantage that such an arrangement, by attaching a district to the cathedral, will, in many cases, relieve the overburdened parochial ministers of a thickly-peopled town. The point now to be in-

* The various parts of the cathedral might surely be made of more use than at present. In the buildings attached to some of our greater cathedrals there is space enough to hold many thousands.

sisted on is, that, with such an arrangement, the cathedral may soon become what it ought to be — the model place of worship for the diocese. If this plan be adopted, both the pastor and his curate must, of course, be fairly remunerated for their laborious duties out of the cathedral funds.*

5. Let the cathedral school be thoroughly cared for and extended. Let one of the canons (call him by the ancient name of Chancellor, or by what name you please,) become responsible for its proper management.

We owe thanks to Mr. Whiston for drawing attention to the very important place which the school occupied in the original constitution of the cathedrals of the new foundation. There are charges mixed up with his wide argument, to which his own experience as a governing member of an ancient corporation — a Senior Fellow of Trinity, Cambridge, — must now tell him other establishments of the same antiquity are as much exposed as deans and chapters. Fellows of colleges, as our Article on University Reform last July† intimated, are certainly in the condition of persons living in glass-houses, when they throw stones at deans and canons because they augment their statutable salaries by the contrivance of a dividend. But still it is well that Mr. Whiston has drawn so much attention to the cathedral schools. The condition and improvement of these schools must be fully considered in any good reform. They must be all supplied with proper buildings, with proper salaries for their masters, and proper exhibitions to deserving boys.

There are few more pressing wants in this day than that of

* Connected with the present too common deadness of cathedral worship are many important questions of liturgical reform, into which we forbear to enter. We would only notice the beneficial effects which seem to have followed from the division of the present accumulated services of the Prayer Book, and their restoration to their ancient proportions as sanctioned by the Bishop of Worcester in Birmingham. We would also ask how it is that in colleges and cathedrals those very unsatisfactory state services for the 5th of November, King Charles the Martyr, &c. are still upheld, when the universal voice of all intelligent members of the Church of England unhesitatingly condemns them. The Cathedral Commission would do well to call the attention of Parliament to the fact, that it is by State authority that the services are maintained, and that an abrogation of them by Parliament would be welcomed as a deliverance by the Church.

† See Oxford University Commissioners' Report. — The account of the Colleges, *passim*. See also the remarks in the Cambridge University Commissioners' Report, p. 48., on the 40*l.* paid to the Regius Professors by Trinity College.

good schools for the middle class. Every cathedral ought to have such a school, thoroughly efficient and a model for the diocese. With this ought to be combined a training school for teachers, with its practising schools of children, extending education from the middle classes to the poor. These need in no way interfere with the full efficiency of the ancient classical grammar-school for the children of the upper classes. It is an extension, not any fundamental alteration, of the ancient cathedral grammar-schools, that is required. All these departments may well be worked harmoniously together under the same general superintendence. Each chorister might then be made sure of a good education, suited to his particular capacity, in the arrangements of these several schools; and an easy access might be opened for the promising children of the poorest to rise in life as high as their talents and industry entitle them. The cathedral schools might thus be the means of affording a continual supply of promising youths from the lower and middle classes to recruit the learned professions; and the cathedrals would thus justly become endeared to ranks from which they are now too much estranged. That most amiable man, as well as charming artist, the late Sir Augustus Calcott, retained through life a deep sense of the injustice done to choristers in cathedrals, the body to which in Westminster he once belonged.

And what more appropriate employment for a learned clergyman than to watch over such schools? The drudgery of daily teaching would devolve on others. Let the schoolmasters be the lieutenants to the canon who presides over education as his minor canon curate is to the pastor canon. The labours of such superintendence need not be more oppressive than those of an active Head of a House in the university, and may certainly leave ample leisure for a learned life.

6. Pastoral superintendence and general education thus provided for by two of the canons, there remain sufficient occupations for their brethren. We grant the full force of all that has lately been urged against a great multiplication of clerical colleges, where the young clergy of each diocese are to receive a distinctly professional education.* We see the danger which may arise lest the Church be split up by such institutions into narrow cliques. It requires a very superior man indeed to gain possession of a great university, and lead all the rising generation of academics in his own track. There is always a free circu-

* See, *e. g.*, Mr. Barry's 'Thoughts on the Renovation of Cathedral 'Institutions,' p. 20. Cf. our own Article on the Report of the Oxford University Commission in July, p. 276.

lation of opinions in a great university — one able man is met by another who is his match. But it will not require a prodigy either of learning, or ability, or zeal, to become the pope of a cathedral close. Again, an exclusively professional education for clergymen is rightly considered to be the worst education they can receive. The Church and nation may well exclaim, Save us from a clergy educated by common-place teachers in a small priestly seminary! But still, granting and strongly maintaining the full force of such objections, we admit that places of distinctly professional training for the clergy will be wanted here and there. Young men who have received a good education elsewhere may often, with great benefit, spend a year before ordination under the tuition of some able divine or experienced parish minister at a distance from the temptations or interests of old scenes, and in an atmosphere less exclusively intellectual than that which prevails amongst the ablest students at a university. A cathedral town obviously affords a convenient site for such pastoral training. When such a college is instituted, let no one be admitted to it who does not give satisfactory proof that he has previously completed a good general education; and let the college be placed under the direct superintendence of the dean, who, being a great officer of the Church, appointed by the Prime Minister, may be supposed generally to be a person of some eminence, and will, on the whole, be less likely than any other, to represent the views of any narrow sect. In some cases, let one of the canons, if it is thought desirable, assist the dean in the instruction of such candidates for ordination, being appointed to the ancient cathedral office of theological lecturer. And under the safeguards we have indicated, we grant the establishment here and there of such colleges may be of great use.

7. The dean then would in some few cathedrals have regular duties as the head of such a pastoral college. In some others, where there is to be no pastoral college, it may be thought right that, instead of one of the canons, the dean himself, properly assisted, should undertake the direct superintendence of the Department of General Education. Nor will very important duties fail to devolve on him elsewhere. To him, in each cathedral will necessarily belong the whole superintendence of all parts of the complicated machine. He ought to have distinct functions assigned to him in preaching and lecturing. It would be well also that he should have some diocesan authority, and he might thus afford valuable assistance to the bishop. It is notorious how much the time of an active bishop is engrossed by matters which might as well be arranged by others. There is no reason why some portion of such duties should not be vested

in the dean. From the wants of the diocese, of the cathedral town, and the institution of which he is head, regular employment ought to be assigned to the dean, such as becomes his place, and still leaves him time for studious pursuits.*

8. Mr. Selwyn writes (Part II. p. 52.): —

'In the city where the Bishop holds his residence, the religion of our Lord and the ministrations of his Church should be manifested in their full vigour. The cathedral city should be "a city set upon an hill," a centre of godliness, of light and learning, diffusing its beams on all the surrounding neighbourhood. I need not take any pains to prove that this description is in many cases far from a true picture of the present state of our cathedral cities. In many of them, the population has been suffered silently to outgrow the ministrations of the Church . . . A large portion of the inhabitants have grown up and are content to live without any religion at all, presenting the strange and awful spectacle of a heathen people in a Christian land. That such a state of things should exist in the immediate neighbourhood of the Bishop and his cathedral clergy is an anomaly productive of the worst consequences. That a large religious establishment with many members should be so powerless, or, to speak more gently, so weakly effective, for the spiritual welfare of those who dwell under its shade, is a most glaring offence both to the friends and enemies of the Church . . . . We cannot wonder, that where our religion is seen under such an aspect of weakness and inefficiency, many are led to doubt and to dis-

* Cranmer and Burnet (*Hist. of Reformation*, A. D. 1540) regretted that further advantage had not been taken of the foundation of the new bishoprics. Cranmer's 'Design was quite disappointed. 'For he had projected, that in every cathedral there should be pro-'vision made for Readers of Divinity and of Greek and Hebrew, and 'a great number of students to be exercised in the daily worship of 'God, and trained up in study and devotion; whom the bishop might 'transplant out of this nursery into all parts of his diocese; and thus 'every bishop should have had a college of clergymen under his eye, 'to be preferred according to their merit; he saw great disorders 'among some prebendaries, and in a long letter—the original of 'which I have seen—he expressed his regret that these endowments 'went in such a channel. Yet now his power was not great at Court, 'and the other party ran down all his motions. But those who 'observed things narrowly, judged that a good mixture of preben-'daries and of young clerks, bred up about cathedrals under the 'bishop's eye, and the conduct and direction of the dean and preben-'daries, had been one of the greatest blessings that could have befallen 'the Church, which, not being sufficiently provided of houses for the 'forming of the minds and manners of those who are to be received 'into Orders, has since felt the ill-effects of it very sensibly.' (Vol. i. part. i. p. 602. ed. Oxford, 1829.) What a satire is this last sentence on our universities and their ecclesiastical pretensions!

believe its divine power.' And 'again,' Mr. Selwyn asks, p. 54., 'how can we (the members of the chapter) devote ourselves in peace of mind to prayer and study,—to thoughts and counsels for the general welfare of the Church, when we know that close at home, almost at our doors, the sick and dying are in need of our ministrations, the parochial ministry not being competent to the cure of one half the souls who are nominally committed to them?'

Till this evil is remedied, the cathedrals must be despised. A partial remedy will be found in the proposal made above to annex a district to each cathedral. It may be found desirable also, in some cathedral towns, to attach another stall to the incumbency of some poorly endowed city parish. This, however, ought to be done very sparingly. The superfluity of the improved cathedral property under the Act of 1851 will afford a much more suitable means for increasing the value of such incumbencies than can be found in the annexation of stalls. And here we would urge very strongly the claim of justice which such incumbencies in the gift of the cathedral bodies may advance to be considered first, before the funds derived from the improved cathedral property are scattered over the whole kingdom. The Ecclesiastical Commissioners have acted wisely in pledging themselves, when tithes fall into their hands, to consider, before all other claims, the wants of the parishes from which the tithes arise. They will act still more wisely, and greatly conciliate good feeling towards the cathedrals, if they bind themselves in all cases, not of tithes only, but of other property also, to consider the wants of parishes in the cathedral towns and otherwise connected with the cathedrals, before they appropriate the surplus of the cathedral revenues to their general fund.*

9. It will be most proper that, where stalls in any cathedral are in the gift of the bishop, one or two of them should be appropriated to archdeacons. The Crown indeed ought never to be called upon to surrender any of its stalls into the Bishops' hands without an equivalent. But arrangements for such an exchange of patronage between the Crown and the Bishops might easily be made, if the scheme much talked of lately be carried into effect, for a re-adjustment of all episcopal patronage by a general agreement among the members of the Bench. It will

* It ought to be generally known that the Ecclesiastical Commissioners annually distribute above 70.000*l.* in salaries to the incumbents of small livings. The Commission has so often of late been represented as a mere machine for building bishops' palaces, that this fact ought not to be overlooked.

be very right that the archdeacon should generally be a member of the chapter. There seems, however, no reason for his being a residentiary. In some respects he will better fulfil his duty if he has a parish in the country, and there resides. Unless, therefore, he be pastor of the cathedral district, or superintendent of the cathedral education, or divinity lecturer, we do not see why the rule of habitual residence, which ought to bind the canons generally, need apply to him. And as he will thus hold a living on which he is resident, he certainly ought not to receive from the chapter property equal payment with those canons who reside at the cathedral, and there work. He may well receive from his canonry 500*l.* a year, simply and directly as his archidiaconal salary, the present salaries of most archdeacons being far too small. The other canons who reside ought to have higher payments as the salary of their respective offices, since the nature of the duties proposed to be assigned to them, and their habitual residence at the cathedral, will preclude other sources of income. The duties of his office ought not to occupy the whole of an archdeacon's time; and it is more important for the right discharge of these duties, that he should keep up his practical acquaintance with parochial matters than that he should follow a learned life. By all means, then, let the archdeacon usually have care of a parish, and in it let him reside.

We have thus seen already that ample occupation may be found for all the members of each chapter, according to the particular circumstances of their several cathedrals, by annexing a district with cure of souls to each cathedral church; by requiring grammar-school, training school, middle school, and schools for the poor to be thoroughly organised in connexion with each cathedral, and superintended; by establishing in some few cases a College of Pastoral Theology; by occasionally annexing a city living to a stall, and by making the archdeacon a member of the chapter. In most cathedrals, it will be remembered, there are only a dean and four canons, among whom all these various duties have to be apportioned according to the particular wants of each cathedral town.

10. It is taken for granted that the rule of residence which now binds the deans, will apply in future to all canons who have duties assigned them in the cathedral. Others who have duties elsewhere, as archdeacons, or heads of colleges, or professors at Oxford or Cambridge*, as we have already hinted, had

* We cannot but think it strange that the Greek Professorship at Cambridge should so recently have had a stall at Ely attached to it; and that thus all laymen are excluded from holding the post.

better be entirely released from the necessity of residence at the cathedral. Let them receive a portion of the cathedral dividend simply as their pay for duties elsewhere performed. Their houses, not wanted any longer for residence, will be of great use for some of the various educational or other purposes, which a thorough cathedral reform must promote. Let them take their turns in preaching, if this is thought desirable, in order to keep up their connexion with the cathedral; but otherwise, unless they are to work in it, let them not reside. They will only bring discredit on the whole body by continuing any particle of the old system of selecting the cathedral close as the place in which to pass their idle months. Henceforward let the rule be, that those canons who have distinct work assigned them in the cathedral, shall be habitually resident as the deans are at present; and that none shall be required to be resident but those who have such work. The habitually resident canons with the dean and minor canons will be amply sufficient to provide for the daily worship.

11. But if the working canons are thus to be resident like the deans, their salaries must be made sufficient to maintain a clergyman holding an important station without any other professional source of income. This may be done in part, as we have seen, by paying smaller salaries to the archdeacon canons, and other members of the chapter, whose work is at a distance, and a part of whose emolument is derived from some other source. Thus a portion of the corporate income may be set aside to increase the payments made to those who make the cathedral their home and their place of work. Lord Blandford, in his Bill (s. 39.), wisely assigned to his canons residentiary an annual income of 700*l.* The under-masters of a great public school usually receive not less than 1500*l.* a-year. But these men, it may be said, have very laborious and incessant work. The unmarried tutors of Oxford, from fellowship and tutorship, receive some 500*l.* or 600*l.* a-year: those of Cambridge much more. Canons, usually married men, who are to give all their time to their cathedral, and who ought to look upon their work in connexion with it as the business of their lives, should not be placed in a position in which they will have to struggle with continual pecuniary embarrassments. It is not the manner of Englishmen to expect work to be done and to refuse to pay for it.

12. The common belief is, that at present a cathedral sermon is often—we might say generally—a very dull one. Arrangements ought to be made (the Bishops have it in their power to make them at once by the appointment of honorary canons,

preachers and the like) for enlisting the best preachers in the diocese in the service of the cathedral. In large towns there ought to be three sermons in the cathedral every Sunday. The pastor canon, assisted by his minor-canon curate, would preach habitually once in the day to his own people. The other residentiaries, including the dean, would preach according to a cycle, as at present; but to this established body the Bishops may at once add a large infusion of new blood from the whole diocese. Strange to say, at the very time when men began to think that books had superseded oral teaching, the desire of hearing sermons, as of lectures in matters of secular learning, has become greater than ever. Public speaking has become the most effectual engine of influencing men for good. To these sermons might well be added, on week-days, lectures as in old times, to strengthen men's minds in the great struggle likely soon to arise between Christianity and Infidelity. These the dean, canons, and others appointed by the bishop, would deliver.

13. With regard to minor canons, we find in Mr. Jebb's work the following indignant protest (p. 112.): —

'As the offices are no longer to be regarded as in any way diaconal as preparative to higher places in the Church . . . they (the minor canons) are permitted to struggle with all the hardships of married poverty; or, if they do obtain a competence, it is found in the accumulation of duties, which are in their nature incompatible. Indeed (for the truth must be spoken, and it is spoken with an indignant conviction of the fact) the vicars choral (minor canons) are looked upon as the drudges of the chapter, as an order of men inferior in caste, though really their equals in ecclesiastical order; for they are priests as much as the prebendaries, and are frequently their superiors in years, learning, piety, and accomplishments. The very offices they hold, so honourable and holy in themselves, subject them to be treated with a slight which ought not to be shown to the humblest door-keepers of God's house. Of course to this statement there are exceptions; but I appeal to general experience whether it is not just: and I further appeal to the charity of the English Church, whether such unchristian contumely, such meanness of secular pride, ought not to be put to open shame.'

We trust that this statement was somewhat of an exaggeration, even when it was written; and we trust that a better feeling has been at work since. But still there is no denying that the position of minor canons is a somewhat anomalous one. Recent legislation has secured them a salary of 150*l.* a-year at least. But 150*l.* a-year is small pay. We believe that its due position will best be secured to the office by regarding it, as much as possible, as a curacy; and adding to its present duties in the choir others in the cathedral district or in the several

educational institutions enumerated above. A curate is not supposed to be ill-treated by his rector if he receives 100*l.* a-year. But a curate is usually a young man, learning his profession, looking forward to a higher sphere. It will be well that a minor canonry also be regarded as but a temporary office for a young man. Recent legislation secures for minor canons, after they have served for a certain number of years, some claim on cathedral livings. This principle might well be carried further. Under a reformed cathedral system minor canons might have far better opportunities than in an ordinary curacy to prepare themselves for the duties of a higher sphere. They ought always, if possible, to have rooms within the cathedral precincts.

14. It is not necessary to speak further of the schoolmaster of the grammar-school, whose emoluments, we have already intimated, ought to be increased, and whose position would rise with the rising importance of the school.

15. With regard to the cathedral library. We have already spoken of the necessity for appropriating a sufficient fund to the purchase of books, in order that each cathedral may soon become possessed of a good collection. It is enough here to extract the following passage from Mr. Barry (p. 18.) :—

'Regulations should be made allowing the free use of books to the clergy and perhaps to the laity of the diocese. The formation of such libraries in every cathedral town would be a great boon to the clergy. None but men of large means can afford to buy all the books useful if not necessary to be read. Many an active mind has grown torpid from the want of the occasional use of works of information or reference. Access to a library is one great difference between living in London or at the Universities, and residing in the country.'

We may add, that a catalogue of each cathedral library should be printed and circulated.

16. Of the lay clerks, choristers, and almsmen, we would say a few words. The choristers are, we hope, now, in general, properly educated. It ought to be the especial business of the dean, or of one of the canons, to see that they are well taught, and that they receive such advice and guidance as the peculiar temptations of their enforced attendance on Divine Service make very requisite. It would be well if they could always be boarded under due superintendence within the precincts. They might well be boarders in the training school.

The singing-men are now usually well paid. In well regulated cathedrals they are not allowed to eke out their salaries by frequenting balls and concerts. They are usually teachers of music, or follow some useful trade. Under a reformed system,

it would be well if they could be always persons among whom the pastor-canon might find his Scripture-readers and Sunday-school teachers, and the agents of his charities in the town.

The almsmen ought, according to the intention of the founder, always to receive what is enough to be of real use to them, instead of the yearly dole of shillings which, in many cases, has remained unchanged amid all the changes in the value of money for centuries. A body of almsmen may be held in abhorrence by political economists; but, good as political economy is, there are exceptions to its rules. We do not think that the sternest political economist could grudge a maintenance to King Henry the Eighth's poor bedesmen — 'men borne down by poverty, or 'overwhelmed by want, broken down and mutilated in the wars, 'or worn out by old age, or otherwise debilitated and reduced to 'want and misery; whose duty it shall be, as far as their infir-'mities allow, to be present daily in church at the time of 'Divine Service,' and to help in lighting and putting out the lamps, ringing the bells, and doing other useful duties connected with the Church. There is a touching respect shown to these old men in the founders' institution. It would be well that they should always have houses found for them near the cathedral. Their presence, with that of the children of the choir and school, makes the whole cathedral establishment, as described in the Statutes, resemble a large Christian family, with its head and members, including children servants, and its old dependents.

Truly, it is no romance or excited sentiment which makes us pronounce that our cathedrals might be a great blessing — a living protest for Christianity in its most comprehensive form, in each of our cathedral towns.

17. We subjoin one further extract from Mr. Barry (p. 16.):—

'Every cathedral in the kingdom should be as accessible to the public as the British Museum or the National Gallery.* The poorest person, free of any charge whatever, should be permitted to inspect and admire every part of the building. Whatever there may be of elevation and solemnity in the internal architecture of these noble structures ought to be the common privilege of all. A national Church should throw open the doors of its cathedrals to the nation at large. The public will defend and appreciate what they enjoy

* It is well to remark here that there ought to be some central control for the preservation of the monuments and other antiquities in cathedrals. The fabrics will probably never again be allowed to go to ruin: public opinion may secure this, but there is absolutely no guarantee for the preservation of the smaller historical or archæological curiosities with which our cathedrals abound.

freely and as a matter of right. The more frequent the visit of the stranger or the influx of the neighbourhood, the more necessary does such liberality become. It is not surely too much to require that the servants of the Church should be entirely supported from the funds of the establishment, and not also by the fees of casual visitors. It is not unreasonable to expect from them the civility of a railway porter, or of the attendants of the British Museum. The very reverse of this liberality and civility has generally been the case. It would not be easy to calculate the damage done to the Church in the opinion of the masses by the long-delayed and incomplete opening of St. Paul's, and by the frequent rudeness of vergers generally. These may appear small things, but they are important, as they give the Church itself a repulsive instead of an inviting aspect. They are not so much the fault of persons as the system itself. The harmless loitering on Sunday and the stolen glance are regarded by the attendants as so much deducted from their means of livelihood. There is some tendency to improvement in this respect, but it proceeds but slowly, and only in few places. Any effectual change must be imperative and universal. Cathedrals, like other public places, should be thrown open by Act of Parliament.'

18. A very serious point remains. Much of what is said in the Report of the Oxford University Commission* against oaths of obedience to college statutes applies with full force to the oaths taken in cathedrals. These oaths are solemn promises of obedience to rules, many of which are completely obsolete and of such a nature that it would be highly inexpedient to revive them, while the binding force of the whole code of the Founders' Statutes has been greatly modified by changed circumstances in the course of centuries, or by the injunctions of some conflicting authority, and many provisions are now even distinctly contrary to the law of the land. A cathedral dignitary, who considers the matter seriously, will probably say, that his oath to obey the Founders' Statutes means, that he binds himself to obey them so far as they have not been modified by direct Act of Parliament†, by the canons of the church, or by allowed and notorious practice—a practice which has long suffered many rules to go into such complete desuetude that it is now out of the power of the cathedral body to revive them without contravening the authoritative decisions of judges, or even Acts of Parliament passed on the tacit supposition that such rules had altogether ceased to be binding. Thus he who has taken the oath has great difficulty in saying whether it is to the letter or the spirit, or both or neither, that he considers himself bound. Meanwhile the words of the oath remain unaltered, simply

* Pp. 146, 147.

† Cf. here note, p. 164. above.

promising obedience to the statutes as they stand written in the book. This is a great evil. Surely, as these many important limitations on the promise of obedience to the cathedral statutes are certainly implied in the oath, the oath ought either to be simply abolished or the limitations openly and distinctly expressed. The Church and Religion must suffer by the State maintaining in sacred places a system so likely to give reasonable scandal and so difficult satisfactorily to explain.

These then are the principal heads of alteration in the present system of our cathedrals, to which we think a wise reform ought to have respect. There are two warnings which ought to be given to the Commission and the Legislature as to the mode of effecting such reforms.

1. It will never do to leave the settlement of such reforms as we have pointed out to the several corporations to arrange for themselves. From some unfortunate idiosyncrasy, corporations are powerless for self-reform. Legislation for cathedrals has hitherto been confined too much to legislation on the subject of their revenues. There must now be definite legislation on their duties. We do not pretend to say how this may best be effected. The House of Commons is certainly not very well qualified for a patient and calm investigation of the various questions which such a reform implies. But Parliament must, of course, determine whether great changes are required, and must settle what is the best mode in which a new scheme for the regulation of cathedrals is to be put in force. There must be a definitive settlement now by some authority from without as to what the duties are which each cathedral is henceforward to perform. We trust the Commission which Lord Derby issued will do its work faithfully, and present to the nation a well-considered scheme for regulating duties as well as revenues.

2. It would be most unwise to insist that, in the reform now contemplated, all cathedrals should be squared alike. Each will be found on calm inquiry to have its own peculiar duties according to the circumstances of the town and diocese in which it is placed. A calm and wise consideration of all these peculiar circumstances will be required before we can legislate aright. St. Paul's and Westminster Abbey are in the centre of the teeming capital. Their business is obvious: by preaching, by schools, by encouraging every good institution, to labour that they may christianise the dense masses of heathenism that darken the approaches to their precincts. Christ Church and Ely are appendages to Oxford and Cambridge. Durham has already struck out for itself its proper sphere as the university of the north. We see not why new universities of the same kind

should not be added, as, for example, at Canterbury, where there is already a Missionary College. Wells has already gained some reputation for its School of Pastoral Theology. Many cathedrals in quiet country towns, like Lichfield, are simply to be looked upon as the centres of their respective dioceses, while others must have additional busy work, since a hard manufacturing people is springing up around them. A distinct sphere will certainly be found for the activity of each. Each must in its own peculiar way be made a centre of Christian teaching; and all, we trust, will be made places in which we may be sure to find learned men.

That cathedrals ought to be places for learned men will not, we trust, be forgotten in any reform which is attempted. There is a great rage among persons zealous in religion to multiply a hard-worked parochial clergy. This is all well. But we must urge once more, in conclusion, that a parochial clergy without learning will not reform the age.

We must renew our protest;—certainly this age wants quiet places for learned men. It certainly wants in every district what the cathedrals may supply—something to counteract its absorbing, money making, bustling interests. The quiet cultivation of sacred learning may do much to regenerate the age. If it be true that infidelity stalks abroad throughout the land, this evil, we repeat, can never be met, either among rich or poor, by an over-worked parochial clergy. No dislike of sinecures must lead us to forget this. According to the suggestions given above, in each of the twenty-nine cathedrals the dean and one canon, at least, might have ample time secured for learned leisure; and, whatever duties are laid on chapters, this important point ought studiously to be kept in view.

It may be true that those who have held the patronage of stalls hitherto have made many bad appointments, but we trust a better spirit is arising. Our parochial clergy were, a few years ago, as inefficient as our cathedral sinecurists; but they have awakened. Let distinct duties be required of cathedral dignitaries, and they will awaken too. Bishops and Prime Ministers will not dare to appoint persons utterly unfit to perform these duties. If after a fair trial it be found that there is no improvement, experience will seem then to warrant that sentence of annihilation may be pronounced. But we hope better things, and are sanguine enough to look for ages of fresh exertion from what is now certainly the most dead and useless portion of the Church.

ART. VI.—1. *A Letter to the Marquess of Tweeddale.* By Major-General BRIGGS, Madras Army. 1842.

2. *The War in Affghanistan.* By JOHN WILLIAM KAYE. 2 vols. 1851.

3. *History of General Sir Charles Napier's Administration of Scinde.* By Lieutenant General Sir WILLIAM NAPIER, K.C.B. 1851.

4. *Remarks on the Affairs of India.* By JOHN SULLIVAN, Esq. 1852.

5. *Report from the Select Committee on our Indian Territories.* 1852.

WE have no intention of criticising the merits, literary or otherwise, of the works which, in their titles, stand at the head of this Article. They are full of interest, every one of them; not more on account of the importance of the subjects to which they refer, than because they are suggestive to such as read them attentively of very grave reflections. Who can doubt that for the last twelve or thirteen years the existence of the British empire in the East has been hanging continually in the balance? Who can flatter himself that the scales have even now subsided into their proper places, and that all danger is past? Had the native powers better understood one another, and the disaffected within our own provinces been more energetic in their councils, the disasters in Affghanistan might have lighted up a blaze from one end of India to another, which we should have found it difficult if not impossible to extinguish. Had Burmah been ready and the Punjab further advanced, the march of Lord Gough upon Gwalior would have been the signal for an inburst through Arracan, and across the Sutlej, and so onwards to Delhi and Calcutta. Had the Sikhs been aware that our cavalry were fleeing from the field, how many of the gallant men who stood to their arms amid heaps of dead outside the lines of Ferozeshur would have survived to speak of their escapes and their daring? And then, with Hardinge and Gough and their stout army annihilated, what was there to prevent a general rising of the whole Asiatic population, and the consequent expulsion of the English from their land? Nor are other and scarcely less alarming truths forced upon our notice by these publications. It is impossible to deny that we are indebted for the continuance of our supremacy in the East, quite as much to

the favours of fortune as to the skill of our leaders and the bravery of our troops. Was not the advance of the enemy upon Moodkee made known to us only by the falling of their round shot about our ears? Does it not appear that, in the judgment of Sir Charles Napier at least, the famous flank-movement from Loodianah, which is supposed to have averted defeat, was an operation contrary to all the laws of strategics, and perfectly impracticable except in the face of a very rude enemy? How came 30,000 Sikhs to lie idly in their encampment within a few hours' march of Ferozeshur all the time that the battle was raging? And earlier still, when the Sikhs were beginning to threaten, and the whole army of Scinde had been prostrated with sickness,—when Napier himself lay exhausted at Suckur, and his disputes with the Bombay government were at the bitterest, — what was it that stopped the hill hordes from pouring down into the plain and taking vengeance for the defeats of Meeanee and Hyderabad? Far be it from us to undervalue that of which Sir William Napier is justly proud — the terror of his brother's name. We believe that it was as potent as a naturally partial historian represents it to have been; and we know as well as he does how potent is such a spell among the tribes of central Asia. But even the terror of a name cannot altogether account for a state of rest so opportune among a people proverbially prone to indulge the passion of revenge, and singularly expert in obtaining information. No; we must unquestionably refer our deliverances, for such they were, to some influence beyond the compass of human ability. For, speak of the affair as we will, we were on fifty different occasions at the mercy of our enemies. Where were the proofs of attachment to our cause when 40,000 men were enabled to arrive within cannon shot of our outposts without one native out of all whom we professed to take under our protection coming in to tell us of their advance? Nor is this all. When the day of trial arrives, we do not find, as in former years, that every part of our army is to be trusted. The official despatches which describe recent great battles, with the lists of killed and wounded that accompany them, tell a tale as alarming as it is novel. We miss the forwardness in strife which used to characterise the Sepoys of other days, and cannot discover that they any where paid the penalty of their daring. The English regiments go to their work with a will; and the face of the plain is covered with their dead; but their dark-complexioned comrades appear to fall off from them; for though their slain be comparatively few, whole battalions seem to dis-

solve themselves. And worse still; our Sepoys have taken to stipulate for terms when operations against an enemy are projected, and refuse to march forward unless their propositions be agreed to. Now all these are features absolutely new in Anglo-Indian history; and therefore, perhaps, as well as because of their immense importance, we cannot but give to them the chief share of our attention. How are they to be accounted for?

It appears to us that among the many subjects connected with Indian administration which must occupy ere long the attention of the Legislature, there is not one which calls for more prompt and searching inquiry than the state, as regards its discipline, organisation, and general efficiency of Her Majesty's native army. We express ourselves thus, because, without meaning to deny that British rule has proved, upon the whole, advantageous to the agricultural population of the empire, it would be ridiculous to pretend that even they are so keenly alive to the fact as honestly and in a fervent spirit to desire the continuance of our presence among them. They may be thankful,—we dare say they are,—for the protection from external violence and plunder which is afforded to them. They cannot but contrast favourably, if they consider and contrast at all, their own condition in this respect with that of the Ryots in the best governed of the native States with which they happen to be acquainted. And in regard to the administration of law and justice, the machine, though still far from what it ought to be, is more smooth and regular in its movements than it was forty or fifty years ago. Still the utmost that can be predicated even of the Ryots, considered as subjects of the English Crown, is that they seldom, if ever, trouble themselves with discussing the merits of the system under which they live; being content to do as their fathers did before them, and satisfied so long as life and property are safe. But it is not so with any of the classes above the mere cultivators: quite otherwise. They see in the English Government a power which, however evenly it may profess to hold the scales between man and man, entertains no sympathy for them or for the traditions of their ancestry. They may acquire fortunes by trade; they may build ships and obtain the honour of knighthood; and whatever they earn by honest industry they feel that they will be permitted to keep: but all beyond this is a blank; and they are fully alive to its dreariness. There are no such avenues to advancement opened to them as stirred the ambition and stimulated the exertions of their forefathers. They cannot attain in the civil service of the State to a station more elevated than that of an ill-paid rural

magistrate, or a clerk in one of the public offices. Even the status of a practising attorney in the Courts of Law seems to be denied to them, though the decision of the judge who settled the question was manifestly delivered under a painful sense of its iniquity. And as to the army, we shall have occasion presently to explain, that it offers no prizes for which it would be worth while for a native gentleman to strive. Now people so circumstanced cannot be loyal in any sense of the term. They may submit to their fate with more or less of resignation; either because they see no chance of escape from it, or through the influence of that fatalism which enters largely into the faith of all the religionists of the East. But it is impossible that they can nourish the slightest feeling of love for the government which thus grinds them down, far less be prepared to make sacrifices of any kind in defence of it. Nor do they. By the native gentry of India,—and it is a great mistake to suppose that India has not its gentry of ancient lineage and proud reminiscences,—the rule of the English is regarded not only without favour, but with settled detestation. There is not one among them all but would rejoice to see it overthrown to-morrow.

Again, the complete antagonism which exists in manners, customs, and religion; the differences in their domestic habits, in their speech, in their very costume, interpose between the British rulers and their Asiatic subjects a gulf of severance, which neither time nor the degree of intimacy which here and there arises out of it, will ever be able to bridge over. We may be as ostentatiously tender as we will of Hindoo and Mahomedan prejudices; we may be ready to hear the complaints of outraged individuals, and prompt to give redress where we believe them to be well-grounded, but we can never hope to reconcile either the one class of persons or the other to the daily contemplation of scenes which utterly revolt them.

What Brahmin can look, except with horror, on persons who habitually slaughter and devour the flesh of the sacred cow? What Mahomedan but must regard with scorn the free intermixture of the sexes in the social life of their Christian masters? The Hindoo, religious even to the grossest superstition; the Mussulman, devout and decorous in his very crimes, alike turn away with horror from men, who live, according to their notions, without God in the world, and glory in their shame. In a word, it is idle to talk of the contentment of the *people* of British India with the particular form of government which we have established among them. They submit to it, because they cannot help themselves,—the masses with the same degree of apathy which caused

their co-religionists to submit to the government of the Ameers in Scinde, and to that of the Sikh Sirdars in the Punjab. But no living soul entertains the slightest predilection for us or for our government, while all who may be crossed by it in their schemes of personal or family ambition execrate, while they endure, what they feel to be the wrong.

That we are taking no prejudiced view of this important matter, nor broaching opinions that lack authority on which to rest, a very little research on the part of our readers will enable them to ascertain. The statements adduced here have been held and promulgated by almost every man of note who has made India and its institutions the subject of his inquiries. Open Mountstuart's Elphinstone's able History, and you will find the same tone pervading every page. He speaks of the people whom we thus slight and keep down as having attained to a high degree of civilisation and prosperity before the march of Alexander across the Oxus. He describes them as retaining these advantages in the midst of endless wars, revolutions, and schemes of conquest, till we arrived upon the stage. And he attributes the circumstance to their admirable municipal institutions, which survived every change of dynasty except the last. 'Dynasty upon dynasty,' he says, quoting from Sir Charles Metcalfe, 'tumbles down; revolution succeeds revolu-'tion,—Hindoo, Pagan, Moghul, Mahratta, Sikh, English, are 'all masters in turn; but the village community remains the 'same. This union of the village communities, each one forming 'a separate little state in itself, has contributed more than any 'other cause to the preservation of the people of India through 'all the changes and revolutions they have suffered; and is 'in a high degree conducive to their happiness and to their en-'joyment of a great portion of freedom and independence.' Again: 'The main evil of our system is, the degraded state in 'which we hold the natives. We suppose them to be superstiti-'ous, ignorant, prone to falsehood, and corrupt. In our well-'meaning zeal for their welfare, we shudder at the idea of com-'mitting to men so depraved any share in the administration of 'their own country. We exclude them from every situation of 'trust and emolument; we confine them to the lowest offices, 'with scarcely a bare subsistence; and even these are left in their 'hands from necessity, because Europeans are utterly incapable 'of filling them. We treat them as an inferior race of beings. 'Men, who under a native government might have held the 'first dignities of the State, who, but for us, might have been 'governors of provinces, are regarded as little better than menial

'servants, are often no better paid, and scarcely permitted to sit 'in our presence. We reduce them to this abject state, and then 'look upon them with disdain as men unworthy of high station. 'Under most of the Mahomedan princes of India, the Hindoos 'were eligible to all the civil offices of Government, and they fre- 'quently possessed a more important share in them than their 'conquerors.'

The above passage Mr. Elphinstone quotes from a paper by the late Sir Thomas Munro. The following sentiment is his own, and it occurs in his well-known letter to Mr. Villiers: — 'Under a native government, independent of the mutual adapta- 'tion of the institutions and the people, there is a connect- 'ing chain throughout society, and a free communication be- 'tween its different parts. Notwithstanding the distinctions of 'caste, there is no country where men rise with more ease from 'the lowest rank to the highest. The first nabob of Oude was 'a petty merchant; the first Peishwa, a village accountant; the 'ancestors of Holkar were goatherds; and those of Scindiah, 'slaves. All these and many other instances took place within 'the last century. Promotion from among the common people 'to all the ranks of civil and military employment, short of 'sovereignty, are of daily occurrence under native states; and 'this keeps up the spirit of the people, and, in that respect, 'partially supplies the place of popular institutions. The free 'intercourse of different ranks, also, keeps up a sort of circula- 'tion and diffusion of such knowledge and such sentiments as 'exist in society. Under us, on the contrary, the community 'is divided into two perfectly distinct and definite bodies, of 'which the one is torpid and inactive, while all the power seems 'concentrated in the other.'

That these sentiments were put on record many years ago, and that some slight improvement has been effected since in the arrangements of our civil service, we are quite ready to admit. The continued remonstrances of such statesmen as Munro, Elphinstone, and Malcolm, could not be disregarded for ever; and in Lord William Bentinck India at last found a Governor-General able and willing to act upon the principles which they recommended. But even he soon discovered that there was a countervailing weight elsewhere, which neither his vigour nor his perseverance could overcome; and hence the reforms which he introduced scarcely went farther than to make more glaring than ever the iniquity of the system against which they were directed. It appears that throughout the provinces of Bengal, comprising a population of forty millions and upwards, there

are, at this moment, but 105 natives employed under Government at salaries which do not fall short of 30*l.* a month; whereas of Europeans, salaried through all the various stages, from 600*l.* up to 10,000*l.* a-year, there are in public employment, within the same limits, not fewer than 626. Was ever people so governed satisfied with their rulers? Nor is this all. While the working of our system has had the obvious tendency to produce the very vices which are assumed to be the causes of it, an influence more overwhelming than either prejudice or greed has forced us to transact almost all our real business through the people whom we affect to distrust. The natives do the work on miserable wages, the Europeans draw large salaries and monopolise the credit. Hear Lord Metcalfe — too early lost to his country — on this subject: — 'The difficulties of procuring 'effectual European superintendence, whether originating in 'climate, difference of habits, language, and other circumstances, 'are so numerous and overwhelming, that it is worth while 'to consider whether there is not a fair prospect of the duty 'being done by other means, not only cheaper, but more effectually. It is well known that in some districts almost the 'whole business has been done by natives, though their European employers have enjoyed the credit; and it is absurd to 'suppose that the former should be less able to do well when 'working on their own responsibility. The deplorable system 'under which the advantages are reaped by one, while the 'labour is performed by another, has been too long the bane of 'the country. It is the cause of the inefficiency of the European, and the corruption of the native; and, so long as it is 'upheld, there can be but little amendment in either party.'

The time has not yet come for dealing as fully as the case deserves with the important questions involved in these statements. The whole machinery of Anglo-Indian government is once more upon its trial; and the evidence as yet collected, though in some respects of considerable value, is not sufficient to warrant a verdict, either of condemnation or acquittal. More, we presume, will soon follow; but, in the meanwhile, enough has been elicited to prove that matters cannot be permitted to go on exactly as they do now. Whence does it come to pass that, in direct opposition to an Act of Parliament, the Company is still able to draw so broad a line of distinction between its own covenanted servants and the rest of the Indian community? The statute which renewed the charter in 1833 contains a clause to provide that no man shall be debarred from office on account of his colour or his religion. And the ablest

judges of the intentions of the Legislature have declared that every post, under the highest,—collectorships, magistracies, even seats in the Supreme Council itself,—were thereby thrown open for competition to *all* the Queen's subjects in Asia, from whatever stock descended. 'India,' said Lord William Bentinck, fifteen years ago, 'in order to become an attached de-'pendency of the British Crown, must be governed for her own 'sake, and not for the sake of the 800 or 1000 individuals who 'go there to make their fortunes.' But how stand the facts of the case? The execution of the law was left to the Court of Directors, and they ruled, in the very teeth of this enactment, that none except covenanted servants of the Company, nominated by themselves, should be competent to hold certain offices; and the consequence is, to use the words of Lord William Bentinck, in his evidence before the committee of 1837, that, 'not 'only is the civil administration of India entirely in the hands 'of foreigners, but that the holders of this monopoly, the patrons 'of these foreign agents, are those who exercise the directing 'power at home; that this directing power is exclusively paid 'by patronage; that the value of this patronage depends exactly 'upon the degree in which both the honours and emoluments of 'the State are engrossed by their clients, to the exclusion of 'the natives. There exists,' he continues, 'in consequence, on 'the part of the home authorities, an interest in the administra-'tion precisely similar to what formerly prevailed as to com-'merce; that is, directly opposed to the welfare of India.'

Whatever may be the conclusion to which we shall be driven by the force of evidence as yet to be adduced, in regard to the wisdom of retaining, either modified or otherwise, both a Court of Directors in Leadenhall Street, and a Board of Control in Cannon Row, no impartial man can doubt that such an exercise of power by the former of these bodies as is here described and condemned, is not more at variance with the letter of the statute law, than it is in contradiction to the principles of moral right and public justice. It may keep open, for a few more years, the avenues to wealth for a limited number of Englishmen in a distant land; but it does so in defiance of an Act of the Imperial Legislature, and at the expense of crying wrong to the native population of India. 'There is one great question 'to which we should look,' says Sir Thomas Munro, 'in all our 'arrangements. What is to be the final result on the character 'of the people? Is it to be raised, or is it to be lowered? Are 'we to be satisfied with merely securing our power, and pro-'tecting the inhabitants, leaving them to sink gradually in cha-

'racter lower than at present? Or are we to endeavour to 'raise their character? It ought undoubtedly to be our aim to 'raise the minds of the natives, and to take care that whenever 'our connexion with India ceases, it do not appear that the only 'fruit of our dominion had been to leave the people more abject 'and less able to govern themselves than when we found them. 'It would certainly be more desirable that we should be expelled 'from the country altogether, than that the result of our system 'of government should be such an abasement of a whole people. 'In proportion as we exclude them from the higher offices, and a 'share in the management of public affairs, we lessen their inte-'rest in the concerns of the community, and degrade their cha-'racter. If we make a summary comparison of the advantages 'and disadvantages which have accrued to the natives from our 'government, the result, I fear, will hardly be so much in our 'favour as it ought to have been. They are more secure from 'the calamities both of foreign war and internal commotions; 'their persons and property are more secure from violence; they 'cannot be wantonly punished, or their property seized, by per-'sons in power; and their taxation is, on the whole, lighter. 'But, on the other hand, they have no share in making laws for 'themselves, little in administering them, except in very sub-'ordinate offices; they can rise to no high station, civil or mili-'tary; they are everywhere regarded as an inferior race, and 'often rather as vassals or servants than as the ancient owners 'and masters of the country. It is not enough that we confer 'upon the natives the benefits of just laws and moderate tax-'ation, unless we endeavour to raise their character; but, un-'der a foreign government, there are so many causes which 'tend to depress it, that it is not easy to prevent it from sink-'ing. It is an old observation, that he who loses his liberty, 'loses half his virtue. This is true of nations as well as of indi-'viduals. To have no property scarcely degrades more in one 'case, than in the other to have property at the disposal of a 'foreign government in which we have no share. The enslaved 'nation loses the privileges of a nation, as the slave does that of 'a free man. It loses the privilege of taxing itself, of making 'its own laws, of having any share in their administration, or in 'the general government of the country. British India has none 'of these privileges: it has not that of being ruled by a despot 'of its own; for, to a nation which has lost its liberty, it is still 'a privilege to have its countrymen, and not foreigners, as its 'rulers. Nations always take a part with their government, 'whether free or despotic, against foreigners. Against an in-

'vasion of foreigners, the national character is always engaged, 'and in such a cause the people often contend as strenuously in 'the defence of a despotic as of a free government. It is not 'the arbitrary power of a national sovereign, but subjugation to 'a foreign one, that destroys national character, and extinguishes 'national spirit. When a people cease to have a national cha- 'racter to maintain, they lose the mainspring of whatever is 'laudable, both in public and in private life, and the private 'sinks with the public character. This is true of every nation, 'as well as of India. It is true of our own. Let Britain be 'subjugated by a foreign power to-morrow; let the people be 'excluded from all share in the government, from public honours, 'from every office of high trust and emolument, let them, in 'every situation, be considered as unworthy of trust, and all 'their knowledge, and all their literature, sacred and profane, 'will not save them from becoming, in another century or two, 'a low-minded, deceitful, and dishonest race.'

These are words of wisdom, put upon record by one who, better, perhaps, than any servant of the Company, understood the subject which he was discussing. Nor was he, while thus reasoning, blind to the well-nigh universal degradation of the people whose cause he pleaded. No one knew better than he that 'the inhabitants of the Company's dominions are the most abject 'race in India;' no one was more keenly and bitterly aware of the causes which had produced such a result. For even the wretched satisfaction of seeing the strangers who seek their shores for the purpose of growing rich at the public expense, settle down, and become, by degrees, one of themselves, is denied them. Other conquerors had overrun their territories before, assumed supreme power, and dispensed patronage; but they did so upon the spot, and excluded no man, of whatever race descended, from a share in it. We send out our youth by shoals from England to amass wealth and exercise power for a season; each batch returning to England, when it has satisfied its own wishes, only that it may be succeeded by another. What bond of good feeling can exist between the hundred and twenty millions whom we thus govern and the few thousands of white-faced men whom we appoint to plunder while they profess to govern and protect them.

It was the knowledge of facts like these,—it was the natural dread of stretching too far a system of management so thoroughly rotten,—which led all our ablest Indian statesmen, from the days of Clive downwards, to deprecate the extension, under any circumstances whatever, of British empire in the East. It was the constant pressure from without,—the continual

arrival of young men from England, for whom employment in the civil or military service must be found,—which forced them, one after another, into the adoption of a policy which all equally condemned. No doubt occasions arose, when, being driven to defend ourselves against foreign aggression, we could not otherwise cover the expenses of the war than by appropriating the whole or a portion of the enemy's territories. But it is too much to assume, as popular writers are in the habit of doing, that *all* our wars in India have been defensive in the first instance, or that each addition made to our territorial empire there has been made upon compulsion. There is no end to the instances in which our allies have been compelled or cajoled, in times of prosperity and peace, into ceding to us tracts of country which we should have done better, perhaps, to leave in their hands. Such was the transaction in 1800, between Lord Wellesley and the Nizam, when the latter made over to the Company provinces producing an annual income of 650,000*l.* in lieu of a subsidy for troops, the cost of maintaining which was calculated at 400,000*l.* Such was the nature of his lordship's dealing, in 1801, with the Nabob of Oude, who was glad to yield up the half of his dominions, after being threatened with a seizure of the whole. So also, in 1802, the Nabob of Arcot, being *an infant*, was forced to surrender the whole of his territory, in consideration of an annual pension. And in the same year, and by a similar process, the petty principalities of Tanjore, Surat, and Furrukabad, passed under our rule, yet Lord Wellesley, though a more enterprising Governor than any that had preceded him since Hastings, was no friend, any more than his illustrious brother, to the policy of excessive aggrandisement. Nor have either our proceedings, or the theory which they controvert, undergone any material change in the progress of time. In 1831, we possessed ourselves, without scruple, of the dominions of our ally the Rajah of Mysore, and have kept them ever since. Between 1840 and 1847, we confiscated to our own use the principalities of Sattara, Coleba, and Mandavie, upon the plea that the thrones were vacant, the last incumbents having died without lawful heirs. And finally, in 1848, we took possession of the territories and treasures of our *infant* ally and ward, Dhuleeb Singh of Lahore, — in consequence of an insurrection which occurred in his country, while we were exercising uncontrolled authority there, and to which the child neither was, nor could be, an assenting party. These acts may have been, in themselves, politic. That they were forced upon us by circumstances over which we had no control, is a convenient, but it is by no means a self-evident,

theory. Indeed, the very author of the latest wrong, if wrong it shall prove to be, does not so much as pretend to shelter himself under any plea of the sort. He speaks out like a man. What to him are the declarations of Parliament, uttered long ago, and never recalled. It may still be, in the opinion of the House of Commons, as it was sixty years ago, 'repugnant to 'the interests and honour of England' to pursue schemes of territorial aggrandisement in the East. Lord Dalhousie thinks otherwise; and not only seizes upon the Punjab, but avows his determination to extend the dominions of England, whenever and wherever a convenient opportunity of doing so shall offer. 'I take this fitting opportunity,' he says, 'of recording my 'strong and deliberate opinion, that in the exercise of a wise 'and sound policy, the British Government is bound not to 'put aside or neglect such rightful opportunities of acquiring 'territory or revenue, as may from time to time present them-'selves.'

If this reasoning be sound,—and we ourselves cannot detect a flaw in it,—the reader, we think, will agree with us in the opinion, that year by year, as we become masters of a wider extent of territory in the East, we are year by year reducing the nature of our hold upon the empire to that of mere force. Wherever our authority reaches, all the established institutions of the country, all the influence of the native princes and governments, their legitimate occupations and places in society, crumble to pieces under it. We repress feuds, it is true—we take away the power of doing arbitrary acts from individuals—we equalise taxation, and proclaim the supremacy of law, but we do not increase thereby the loyalty, far less the gratitude or the affection, of a single class,—we had almost said, of a solitary individual. 'I am decidedly of opinion,' says Sir John Malcolm, 'that the tranquillity, not to say the security, of our vast 'oriental possessions is involved in the preservation of the 'native principalities which are dependent upon us for pro-'tection. I am further convinced, that though our revenue 'may increase, the permanence of our power will be hazarded 'in proportion as the territories of native princes and chiefs fall 'under our direct rule. . . . . Every means should be used to 'avert what I should consider as one of the greatest calamities, 'in a political point of view, that could arise to our empire; 'viz. the whole of India becoming subject to our direct rule.' 'It 'appears to me,' says Mr. Elphinstone, 'to be our interest, as 'well as our duty, to use every means to preserve the allied 'governments. The period of our downfall in India will pro-'bably be hastened by every increase of our territory and

'subjects.' 'I consider the extinction of a native state,' says Sir Henry Russell, 'as a nail driven into our own coffin.' Does any body distrust the wisdom of these vaticinations? Let him consider for a moment what follows immediately on the deposition of a native prince, in the single matter of employment for large and important sections of the community! We do not tolerate feudal rights, nor any thing akin to them, within the limits of our empire. We have no desire to increase our army more than may be absolutely necessary for the occasions of the moment. No sooner, therefore, is a cession effected, than down goes the state of scores of insubordinate chieftains, down comes the royal establishment, with all its paraphernalia of wuzzeers, dewans, guards, and soldiery. What is to become of these people? We open no doors of exertion to their energies. 'They cannot dig, to beg they are 'ashamed.' They either pass into other principalities still nominally independent, carrying with them feelings of implacable rancour towards us, or they wander about the provinces, sometimes in bands, when they become robbers, or singly, when they not unfrequently perish. It was calculated, that after the overthrow of Tippoo Saib and the Mahrattas, not fewer than 500,000 persons, belonging to the military classes alone, became vagabonds and plunderers. And we need not tell such of our readers as concern themselves with the aspect of public affairs in the Punjab, that the whole face of that province is covered, at this moment, with men who, having no settled occupation, are ripe for any thing that may occur; more especially, for any project of hostility towards ourselves.

It is clear, then, whatever we may have accustomed ourselves to fancy, that we retain no hold upon India except by the sword. Our government is the government of the stranger, and nothing more. It is so designated by the people who submit to it; and unless thoroughly recast, it must continue to deserve the appellation to the end of time. Indeed, we may go further. The whole bent of our legislation, even where it most professes to seek the good of the people of the country, pursues with the greatest earnestness objects which have no value whatever in their eyes. 'We might 'read,' says Mr. Sullivan, 'all the Acts of Parliament which 'relate to India,' without knowing from them that such a 'people exist. Take as examples the three last 'Charter 'Acts. The Act passed in 1793 provides that a proportion of 'the estimated surplus of the revenue shall be appropriated 'towards the payment of the national debt of England; and 'another proportion of the assumed surplus be applied to in-

'crease the dividends of the proprietors of East India Stock. 'The Act of 1813 provides for the support of Anglican bishops 'and archdeacons out of the Indian revenues, and for giving 'additional allowances to governors and other English function-'aries. The Act of 1833 adds to the number of bishops and 'archdeacons, and to the number of European members of 'Council. It provides for the appointment of a law commis-'sion, composed of Europeans, involving an additional charge 'in the aggregate of at least 50,000*l.* a year for European 'agents, and it throws all the debts and liabilities of the East 'India Company, including an annuity of 660,000*l.* a year to 'the proprietors of that Company, on the revenue of India. 'The only allusion to the people of India to be found in these 'Acts, and that inferentially, is confined to two clauses; one 'of which enacts, that whenever India shall have a surplus 'revenue, 10,000*l.* a year shall be set apart for native collegiate 'establishments; the other, that no man shall be debarred from 'office by reason of his caste and religion.' Now we do not object to the appointment of bishops and archdeacons, or the adoption of any other course which shall hold out some sure prospect of extending to the people of India, by legitimate means, the pure faith of the Gospel. Neither is the policy of necessity wrong which provides for the appointment of a law commission, even though it be composed exclusively of Europeans. But it is surely not to 'govern India for its own 'sake,' or 'to render her an attached dependency of Great 'Britain,' that any portion of the debt of England should be saddled upon her, or her people taxed, beyond what they are able to bear, in order that the dividends of the proprietors of East India Stock may be increased. The people of India are proverbially patient under taxation, up to a certain point. But undoubtedly they would bear the burden with greater cheerfulness if they saw the funds thence arising applied, even in part, to the development of the resources of their own country, and still more if members of their own body, bone of their own bone, and flesh of their own flesh, were allowed in the spirit of the law, as it stands, to have some voice, as well in the imposition of the taxes, as in the control and general management of the revenues when collected.

The growth of our Indian empire, looking first to the period when it may be said to have taken root, and next to the enormous extent of territory and population which it now comprises, may indeed be said to constitute one of the wonders of the world. In 1757, not quite a hundred years ago, England, besides being mistress of a few factories on the coasts of Malabar

and Coromandel, exercised sovereignty over 4882 square miles of territory which she had acquired from the Nabob of Bengal. In 1793, the date of Lord Cornwallis's permanent settlement, upwards of 200,000 square miles of territory, with a population little short of 40,000,000, acknowledged her supremacy. The former had grown in 1813, when the Charter was renewed, to about 320,000 square miles, the latter to 60,000,000, which again were increased, in 1833, to 462,000 square miles, peopled by at least 100,000,000 of natives. At this day, the surface extent of land, actually contributing to the Indian treasury, and managed by covenanted servants of the Company, falls little short of 600,000 square miles; while the population will be placed under rather than above the mark, if we assume that it reaches 120,000,000. But this is not all. Between Cape Comorin and the Himalaya Mountains, and from Bombay to Arracan, there is not a principality, state, or province, but is more or less connected with the British empire by treaties admissive of the superiority of the stranger. Thus, northward of the peninsula, and extending to the centre, we find Cashmere, Cis-Sutledge, Nepaul, — the north-east frontier states, Rajpootana, Oude, Bundelcund, — the south-west frontier states, Berar, Sangoor, Malwa and Hyderabad, with other less important principalities; to the south lie Mysore, the Orissa Jaghires, Travancore, &c., and to the west, Cutch, Guzzerat, and various petty chieftainships besides. All these, presenting a surface extent of upwards of 690,000 square miles, and comprising a population which has been taken at 52,000,000 of souls, are, for every practical purpose, at the absolute disposal of the British Government. Some of them are connected with it by subsidiary treaties; that is to say, they supply funds for the maintenance of a given number of troops, which the British Government disciplines and officers; others pay tribute, and undertake, in case of war, to swell our armies with contingents, of which the strength is fixed; while the residue accepting our protection hold themselves bound, when called upon, to co-operate with us in any contest into which we may enter. In a word, we have become, far more extensively than could be predicated of the most powerful Mahomedan emperors, lords paramount of India, having vassals under us, whose aggregate military establishments show a muster-roll, in round numbers, of about 400,000 armed men.

It would be idle to lament over a contingency which, however fraught with danger, is complete, and cannot be reversed. It would be equally so to persuade ourselves that this growth in the extent of our territorial dominions indicates a corresponding

growth of power, accepting the latter term in the only sense which a wise statesman would apply to it. Were the kingdoms which we have overrun and annexed inhabited by races cognate with ourselves, we might hope, in the course of time, to become one with them. It is true that this is not the work of a day. The French population of Lower Canada, though for well nigh a hundred years bound by ties of allegiance to the British Crown, are still a distinct people in their habits, tastes, and creed, from their English conquerors. And in spite of the legislative union of the two provinces, we cannot say that as yet tokens of a different order of things are rife. But the national characteristics which stand between them and us are the merest bagatelles, when compared with the insurmountable barriers that present themselves to anything like an amalgamation of Englishmen with the Hindoo and Mohammedan natives of British India. Moreover, as has elsewhere been shown, it is, and always has been, the bent and object of our policy to prevent the natives of India from acquiring an interest in the well-being of the government under which they live. What then is each enlargement of the area and population of our eastern empire, except an extension of sources of anxiety and a serious addition made to the difficulties, already numerous enough, that stand in the way of the maintenance of our superiority? Are we richer than we were sixty years ago? Speaking comparatively, the case is otherwise; in 1792 the public debt of India amounted to no more than one year's purchase of the public revenue; whereas now it exceeds two years' purchase. Are we more at our ease as regards either foreign war or domestic trouble? Surely not. Our frontiers now touch, wherever they touch any neighbours at all, upon tribes fiercer, more warlike, and more jealous of our encroachments than any with whom we have as yet had to deal; while within ourselves, though there may seem to be tranquillity, it is but the tranquillity of the ocean during a calm. Look back upon the events of the last eighteen years, and say whether in these you can discover any tokens either of indemnity for the past or of security against the future.

In the year 1835 the advanced frontier of British India towards the north, rested upon the Sutlej, one of the branches or tributaries to the mighty Indus. Over the navigation of that great river we asserted no claim. Anxious, indeed, many of our Governors-General had been to obtain, through that channel, access to the trade of central Asia; but none of them had aimed at more than the establishment of commercial treaties with the native chiefs, who owned the soil on each of its banks. The Sikhs, under Runjeet Singh, were undisturbed

lords of the Punjab, and the Ameers governed Scinde according to their own sense of propriety; and it was considered good policy to keep them there, because they stood between us and the advance, if such an enterprise should ever be seriously contemplated, of either Russian or French troops, through Persia, upon our dominions. Moreover, India was supposed to be, and doubtless was, in an unusually flourishing condition. 'The 'country,' says Mr. Kaye, 'was in a state of profound tranquil- 'lity — the treasury was overflowing — the quietest ruler was 'likely to be the best — there was abundant work to be done, 'but it was all of a pacific character.' It was under such circumstances that the late Lord Auckland acceded to the chief management of affairs. What was the disposition of that nobleman? — what were his qualifications for so important a post? We shall quote again from Mr. Kaye, partly because his statements appear to be perfectly just — much more because they are of value, as coming from one who has not shown himself particularly sparing of censure on the general policy of the man whom he thus delineates: — 'In entrusting that work to Lord 'Auckland, the Ministry thought that they entrusted it to safe 'hands. The new Governor-General had every thing to learn; 'but he was a man of methodical habits of business, apt in the 'acquisition of knowledge, with no overweening confidence in 'himself, and no arrogant contempt of others. His ambition 'was all of the most laudable kind — it was an ambition to do 'good. When he declared at the farewell banquet given to him 'by the Directors of the East India Company, that "he looked '"with exultation to the new prospects opening out before '"him, affording him an opportunity of doing good to his fellow '"creatures — of promoting education and knowledge — of im- '"proving the administration of justice in India — of extending '"the blessings of good government and happiness to millions '"in India" — it was felt by all who knew him that the words 'were uttered in grave sincerity, and expressed the genuine 'aspirations of the man.'

It has long been the practice — and probably it will long continue — to commit the government of the Indian empire to men who, whatever may be their qualifications in other respects, cannot but carry out to their important post the most profound ignorance on every subject of which a knowledge seems to be necessary for the right discharge of its duties. Lord Auckland was not in this respect one whit less qualified than others to bear the burden which his friends in office laid upon him. And according to the measure of the ability which God had given him, he is described as bearing it well. 'The early days of

'his government,' says Mr. Kaye, 'did not disappoint the ex-
'pectations of those who had looked for a pains-taking, labour-
'ious administrator — zealous in the prosecution of measures
'calculated to develop the resources of the country and to ad-
'vance the happiness of the people. It appeared, indeed, that
'with something less of the uncompromising energy of Lord
'William Bentinck, but with an equal purity of benevolence,
'he was treading in the footsteps of his predecessor. The pro-
'motion of native education and the expansion of the industrial
'resources of the country, were pursuits far more congenial to
'his nature than the assembling of armies and the invasion of
'empires. He had no taste for the din and confusion of the
'camp — no appetite for foreign conquest. Quiet and unobtru-
'sive in his manners, of a somewhat cold and impassive tem-
'perament, and altogether of a reserved and retiring nature, he
'was not one to court excitement or to desire notoriety. He
'would fain have passed his allotted years of office in the prose-
'cution of those small measures of domestic reform which indi-
'vidually attract little attention, but in the aggregate affect
'mightily the happiness of the people. He belonged, indeed,
'to that respectable class of Governors whose merits are not
'sufficiently prominent to demand ample recognition by their
'contemporaries, but whose noiseless, unapplauded achievements
'entitle them to the praise of the historian and the gratitude of
'after ages.'

Such a man assuming at such a crisis the chief management of affairs in a country of which 'the treasury was overflowing,' and where 'tranquillity was profound,' was very little likely, in the common course of things, to plunge into wars. But what actually took place? Reports came in of ambitious movements through Persia by the Russians, in districts far beyond the utmost limits of our most distant political intercourse. A Persian army was laying siege to Herat, and Persians and Russians were expected, on the fall of that place, to march across the Hindoo Coosh, and to break through Affghanistan and the Punjab, into the fertile plains of Agra. Was this probable? and if it were, what ground of alarm could there be to us, secure, as popular authorities pronounced that we were, in the devoted attachment of our immediate subjects, and in the alliance of the states that were mixed up with them? A government which is supported by a strong and well-disciplined army, and which knows that every civilian capable of bearing arms is ready to support the regular troops if need arise, can afford to laugh at threats of danger, especially if they be uttered at a distance of many hundred miles from the frontier, with chains of inhospitable

mountains between. Was this the feeling of Lord Auckland and his advisers, or could it be? Quite otherwise. British India shook at once from one extremity to the other. 'The 'remoteness of the countries,' says Mr. Kaye, 'in which these 'incidents were passing, might have reconciled an Anglo-Indian 'statesman to dangers of a character so vague and an origin so 'distant; but the result of all these distracting rumours was 'an after-growth of new perils springing up almost at our very 'doors. The native states on our own borders were beginning 'to evince signs of feverish unrest. From the hills of Nepaul 'and the jungles of Burmah came mutterings of threatened 'invasion, which compelled the British Government to look 'well to their lines of frontier. Even in our own provinces 'these rumours of mighty movements in the countries of the 'north-west disquieted the native mind; there was an uneasy, 'restless feeling among all classes, scarcely amounting to actual 'disaffection, and perhaps best to be described as a state of 'ignorant expectancy — a looking outwards in the belief of 'some coming change, the nature of which no one clearly un- 'derstood. Among our Mussulman subjects, the feeling was 'somewhat akin to that which had unsettled their minds at the 'time when the rumoured advent of Zemaun Shah made them 'look for the speedy restoration of Mahomedan supremacy in 'Hindostan. In their eyes, indeed, the movement beyond the 'Affghan frontier took the shape of a Mahomedan invasion, and 'it was believed that countless thousands of true believers were 'about to pour themselves over the plains of the Punjab and 'Hindostan, and to wrest all the country between the Indus and 'the sea from the hands of the infidel usurpers. The Maho- 'medan journals teemed, at this time, with utterances of undis- 'guised sedition. There was a decline in the value of public 'securities; and it went openly from mouth to mouth, in the 'streets and the bazaars, that the Company's Raj was nearly at 'an end.'

Contrast this state of feeling with the spirit which prevailed at that critical period in the History of the World, when the Turks, masters of Eastern Europe and of Central Asia, poured their swarms into the Punjab, and prepared to strike for the Mogul Empire in like manner. Then every nabob, raja, and poligar, from one extremity of India to another, mustered his troops, at the emperor's bidding, and prepared to take the field. There was no backwardness on the part of the chiefs; there was every readiness among the people, to be marched against the common enemy: for, however prone each subordinate ruler might be to withhold tribute and service in time of peace, he was

quite as much interested as the head of the empire in repelling a foreign invader. But where are the chiefs — where their followers, to whom, under like circumstances, we could apply? They are swept from the face of the earth; and in their room has sprung up a population either perfectly indifferent or, where the Mahomedan element prevails, eagerly desirous of change, let it come from what quarter it may. In a word, we have made ourselves masters of the largest and most populous empire in the world, — China, perhaps, excepted, — and we maintain ourselves by the weight of a large regular army, and by that alone. How is this army composed?

According to the latest returns, there are now serving in India, — of Queen's troops, officers included, 29,480; of European troops in the service of the Company, 19,928; of native troops, 240,121. This gives us a grand total of 289,529 regular soldiers; of whom 2569 are engineers, 16,440 artillery, 34,984 cavalry, 229,406 infantry, and the residue medical men, warrant officers, and veterans. To this must be added the contingents of certain native states, which, being commanded by British officers, are available, under treaties, for British purposes. Of these the united strength appears to be 32,311 men. Thus we keep our hold upon the provinces through the respect that is paid to the swords, musketry, and cannon of upwards of three hundred thousand disciplined troops, supported by corps of irregulars, which increase or diminish according to the exigencies of the moment.

It will be seen from this abstract that, large as the Indian army is, the proportion of soldiers to the peaceful population of our eastern empire is far below that of the most favoured of the great military Powers in Europe. In France the regular army, exclusive of troops in Algeria, amounts to about 300,000 men; the population does not exceed 37,000,000. In Prussia we have 200,000 soldiers to 15,000,000 inhabitants. Austria exhibits, inclusive of her frontier regiments, 400,000 troops, with a population of 35,000,000. Russia, with her 50,000,000 of people, supports about 600,000 soldiers. The population of British India cannot be taken at less than 120,000,000, and the army little, if at all, exceeds 300,000 men.

Again, the composition of the Anglo-Indian army presents to the eye of the philosophical inquirer one of the most extraordinary spectacles on which it can any where rest. Out of the entire disciplined force which we keep on foot and trust, not quite a sixth part consists of Europeans; — all the rest are natives of India of every caste and from every province, Hindoos and Mahomedans taken indiscriminately, and governed by our

articles of war. In other words, we make India enslave herself, and rivet the yoke when she has put it on; for we arm a small percentage of the population in each district when we have subdued it, and keep thereby the large majority in subjection. Now it is very obvious that such an experiment must, under the most favourable circumstances, be attended with some risk; and so keenly alive are many thoughtful men to the extent of the danger, that they can think of no other means of meeting it than by making a large addition to the European portion of the army. But this is clearly out of the question. A European soldier is too costly a machine to be multiplied in India unnecessarily; and the remoteness of the sources whence the Indian Government must fetch him, renders a supply of the material in the time of need both tedious and uncertain. The experiment may be perilous therefore, but it is unavoidable, unless we be prepared to withdraw from the country altogether; and it becomes much more than perilous if we fail to connect the native soldier with ourselves by the strong tie of personal interest. Is it quite certain that we have succeeded in so attaching him? That he loved our service and was proud of our uniform sixty years ago, no reader of history can doubt. For him there was no loyalty except to the Government which paid him his wages, and treated him in other respects well. We did both, and he was ready to fight for us against his own father; but can we assert the same thing of him now, and to the same extent? Why then do we hear of whole regiments turning their backs in the day of battle? How is it that mutinies—events never known till the present century came in—are now so frequent? And in what sense shall we read the general orders of a late commander-in-chief, which seem to describe the army of Bengal, at least, as in a state of almost total disorganisation? These are very alarming signs of the times, to say the least of them; for if the native army be indeed disaffected, nay more, if the *esprit de corps* in any of its portions be destroyed or seriously weakened, it is not too much to say, that unless a remedy be applied, the days of our Indian Empire are numbered. Does any body imagine that it is by the 50,000 English soldiers now in India that we retain military occupation of the country? By no means. Were the native regiments merely to disband themselves and return to their homes, our hold upon the country would not continue three months. And this once lost, not all the available resources of England, were they turned exclusively to that one object, would suffice to recover it. Let us see then what the changes may be which are supposed to have operated not without ill effect upon the *morale*

of the Indian army, and then we shall be better able to suggest a remedy, if, indeed, a remedy be needed.

We learn from Orme, the faithful though diffuse chronicler of our early wars in India, that in 1746, at the siege of Cuddalore, the French brought into the field, for the first time, a body of native troops armed and drilled after the manner of Europeans. The English felt the weight of this battalion, and resolved to raise one in like manner, which they did towards the close of the same year. And so important were the services rendered by the Sepoy corps in the military operations which terminated in the capture of Madras, that others speedily followed. These, led on by Clive and his contemporaries, proved themselves equal to every emergency. The defence of Arcot, the action at Volconda, with other affairs too numerous to mention, established for them a character such as left their commanders nothing to desire, and placed an inexhaustible depôt for recruiting at the disposal of the Company. Nor was the example thus set at Madras slow in being followed elsewhere. After the recovery of Calcutta, Sepoy battalions were embodied both in Bengal and Bombay, and side by side with their Madras and European comrades they won the battle of Plassey, and laid the foundations of that power which is now paramount in India.

The constitution of the native army at the period of which we now write was very different from that which it has since assumed. It consisted then exclusively of infantry, who, though drilled after the European fashion, worked both in peace and war under chiefs connected with the men by ties of consanguinity and clientship. Occasionally, indeed, though not always, there was attached to a battalion a European officer, well versed in the native languages, and capable of appreciating the native character. But his duties were rather those of a commissioner or field-deputy than of a commandant; he explained to the native chief the orders of the general, but took no part at all in the arrangements necessary for carrying them into effect. The services performed by Sepoy battalions so managed have been described in the official records of the day as most effective; and the names of Mahommed Yusuf, Jemal Sahib, and others, fill a page in history scarcely less memorable than that which sets forth the exploits of our own Ford, Calliaud, and Coote.

The first marked change in the organisation of the native army occurred in the year 1766, when all the battalions were raised to a uniform strength of a thousand men a-piece, and had permanently attached to each of them one European captain, with two European lieutenants.

The duties of these gentlemen, however, scarcely, if at all, interfered with those of the native officers. The captain became to his battalion what the brigadier used to be to his brigade; he gave orders, through his European adjutants in the field and in quarters, which the native commandant carried into effect. But with respect to the internal economy of the battalion, that was still conducted under the native commandant, by one subadar, or native captain, with three jemadars, or native lieutenants, in each company. Hence, though European superintendence might be more widely diffused, it was no where exercised so as to lower the position or wound the feelings of the native officers. They still felt that their rank in society was an elevated one, and were still regarded by the non-commissioned officers and men as their natural superiors. It was about this time, or rather two years subsequently, that a corps of cavalry, divided into troops, was first raised at Madras. It consisted of horsemen, who had originally served in the army of the Nabob of Arcot, and amounted in 1780, when the war with Hyder Ali broke out, to 2000 sabres. 'Sir John Malcolm' (we quote from a letter to the Marquess of Tweeddale, by Lieutenant-General Briggs) 'has passed a very high and merited eulogium on 'this excellent body of troops, and has given examples of the 'distinguished character of many of the native officers, all of 'whom had entered the service of the Nabob, and were in it 'when the corps was transferred to the Company. The native 'officers were gentlemen of family and education, and realised 'the expectation which might be formed of persons of that class. 'It is at this period the late Sir John Malcolm seems to think 'that the native army of Madras had attained its highest state of 'efficiency. The chivalrous conduct of its native officers, the 'attachment of the men to their leaders, their patience under 'fatigue and hunger, their devotion to their European officers 'and their fidelity to the state when imprisoned and cruelly 'treated by the ruler of Mysore,—all tend to throw a lustre 'over the character of these faithful soldiers.' Nor was the case different in the other presidencies. Bombay in 1780 brought fifteen battalions into the field, raised, organised, and officered like those at Madras, while Bengal advanced from nineteen to twenty-one, adding them to the six troops of native cavalry, six battalions of European infantry, and six companies of European artillery, which she had previously embodied.

It is worthy of remark, that so long as the native armies retained this constitution the battalions got their officers from the native gentry of the provinces, all of whom entered the service as privates, though they rarely continued in that grade more

than two or three years at the most. These brought with them their retainers,—every man born and reared on their own lands,—and not unfrequently filled their ranks with Pariars and persons of the lowest caste. Nor did the slightest inconvenience arise from this. Off duty, the Brahmin or Rajpoot could not come into contact with the Sudra, far less touch the Pariar, or eat of food which he had dressed; on duty, they rubbed shoulders freely, and were honestly attached to one another. In fact, to use the words of General Briggs, the native army 'consisted then of two classes, of which all armies to be effective must be and have been composed,—one class derived from 'the better order of society, accustomed to command the services 'of domestics and underlings, and the other class drawn from 'the lowest grades, who are from infancy habituated to obedience, and taught to respect the upper class on whom they are 'dependent.' Meanwhile all young gentlemen sent out as cadets from England joined the European regiments. With these they served till, by the acquisition of the native languages, and by other marks of general intelligence, they attracted the notice of the Government, when one by one they were drafted off into native corps, none being permitted to join a Sepoy battalion until there was good reason to believe that he had qualified himself for the new class of duties thence arising.

It was about 1784 that this wise practice began to be broken in upon. Heretofore promotion went on through the whole line, now it was thought necessary, by way of putting the King's and the Company's services more upon a footing of equality, that promotion up to a certain point should be regimental. In 1781 the rank of major had been introduced, and battalions were divided so as to form two respectively. Hence while each continued to have a captain at its head, the whole, under the designation of a regiment, fell to the charge of a major. But this half measure was not found to answer, and in 1783 it was abandoned. There came in, moreover, an innovation whereby to each company a European subaltern was allotted in command; a serious matter even when guarded by all the checks of which it was susceptible. For though the subalterns thus disposed of were carefully selected, and the feelings of the subadars spared as much as possible, the native gentleman could no longer disguise from himself or from his men that his shadow was growing less. He supported himself, however, tolerably well till the tide which had begun to set in against him acquired greater force. In 1790, and again in 1796, the European element became still stronger, and then, and not till then, the spirit of the native sank within him. Sir John Mal-

colm in his Political History of India, speaking of the native army during the war with Tippoo from 1790 to 1793, says, 'Though improved in discipline, it had become in some degree 'a secondary one, and the pride of those who composed it was 'lowered.' Worse effects followed upon the changes which ensued in 1796. Then 'the whole form of the army was changed. 'Instead of a single battalion commanded by a captain who 'was selected from the Company's European regiments, and a 'subaltern to each company, regiments were formed of two 'battalions, to which officers were appointed of the same rank 'and nearly of the same number, as to one battalion in the service of His Majesty.'

Many and great evils followed this change, not the least telling of which lay here: that it was no longer possible to *select* European officers for Sepoy commands; but that as vacancies occurred, raw lads fresh from England, with all their inexperience and inborn prejudices in full flower, were brought forward to supply them. Such boys could hardly avoid coming into constant and painful collision with the native officers, whom they affected to look down upon because their complexions were dark, and did not understand, because they were ignorant of every language spoken among men except their own. But, defective as it was, the duplex arrangement had so far the advantage over that which now prevails, that it was competent to the authorities to select from *both* battalions, for the battalion about to be employed in war, the European officers who were known to be best acquainted with the native character and habits. And such selections—imperfect of course when compared with those which they superseded — were continually made. But in 1824 battalions were again re-united, without any increase to the numbers of European officers, nor any distinction drawn between the wants of the several arms of the service. Hence a regiment of infantry, with its ten companies, retained its colonel, lieutenant-colonel, major, five captains, eight lieutenants, and five ensigns. A regiment of cavalry, with its six troops, was equally well supplied; and a battalion of artillery, which consists of only four companies, did not fall short in its complement. It too showed a muster-roll of one colonel, one lieutenant-colonel, one major, five captains, eight lieutenants, and five ensigns, all being Englishmen by birth.

The effect produced by these changes upon the native officers, and ultimately upon the service at large, has been deplorable. The former losing all influence and authority in their corps, soon began to degenerate; indeed, the race may be said to have changed its nature altogether. Formerly you had the *élite* of

the native gentry in your ranks; now no native gentleman ever thinks of putting on the uniform of the regular army. It would be marvellous if he did; for length of service furnishes, and has long furnished, the only claim for advancement to a commission; and it takes a soldier from twenty to thirty years to earn his subadar's epaulets. Formerly every native officer was an educated gentleman. He could keep his company's accounts, write out orders and despatches, and not unfrequently acted as interpreter, where his European comrades would have been otherwise at fault. All this is changed now. The soldiers of India are the most unlettered men in the country, and the officers, taken from the same class, do not, in this respect, go ahead of the privates.

'In the year 1831,' says General Briggs, 'the Commander-in-Chief of Madras was induced to call for a return of the education in the native army; and the following result of that inquiry shows how much it is neglected, and from how low an origin the native army is derived—a conclusion, however, which should not excite our astonishment, when we reflect on the small pay which the Sepoy receives. Education is very general among the people of India; all those forming the middle classes are early instructed to read and write; and few even of the personal domestics of Europeans are so uninstructed as not to be able to keep an account.

'An abstract of the return exhibits the following state of the educated:—

Cavalry and Horse Artillery	726	can read at all	out of	4,966
Foot Artillery and Infantry -	7,226	„	„	39,988
Sepoy Recruit Establishment	280	„	„	4,321

'The original return exhibits two very remarkable circumstances which merit notice. These are, first, that in one regiment of cavalry, and in the horse brigade of the artillery, there is not a single native officer or havildar-major (serjeant-major) who can read; and the same occurs in the case of all the subadars of two other regiments of cavalry; so that out of eight regiments of cavalry and two of horse artillery, there are four corps in which no subadar, or native captain, can read. The second, is the very small portion of the Sepoy recruits that can read, and for whose education regimental schools exist. These admirable institutions consist of thirty sons of deceased Sepoys above seven, and forty above twelve years of age, in each regiment, who receive half-pay, and are trained till of an age to enter the army.'

General Briggs speaks here of the Madras army as it was in 1831, with which a service of forty years made him thoroughly acquainted. We beg to assure him that his estimate, *mutatis mutandis*, will serve quite as well for the armies of Bengal and Bombay, and for the Madras army in 1852. We doubt,

indeed, whether, in the former force at least, the standard be not even lower than he has put it, though the following facts convey but a melancholy impression of the *morale*, not less than of the intellectual state of the service to which he belongs:—

'From a review of the native courts martial I find that between the years 1800 and 1830, there were 331 native officers of the Madras army brought to trial on the following charges:—

Drunkenness on duty	137
Insubordination	29
Mutiny and sedition, with the intention of murdering the officers	46
Robbery, usury, peculation	26
Perjury and subornation of evidence	5
Absent without leave	3
Robbery, burglary, theft	16
Assaults and frays	12'

Considering that this estimate covers a space of thirty years we should not be startled by the conclusion to which it leads, were we dealing with the non-commissioned officers and privates of any army in the world. One per cent. of criminals is not a large average, but the reverse, in a general armed force. Nor are the crimes here specified different from those which we might expect to find brought home to the individuals composing it. But when one per cent. in a body of officers is proved to have committed atrocities like these, we naturally ask ourselves, can they be taken from the class in society whom previous habits have qualified for situations of trust? 'In con-'sidering this part of the subject,' continues the General, 'we 'can arrive but at one conclusion; namely, that the race of 'native officers who so distinguished themselves under Clive 'and Lawrence, under Coote and Cornwallis, under Harris and 'Wellington, no longer remain in our regular army.'

We perfectly agree with the General. The native veterans on whom the blow first fell struggled, as they best could, against outraged self-respect. It was very bitter for them to find, that even the practice of selection ceased to be observed; and that, covered it might be with honourable wounds, they were subjected to the caprices of striplings from England, many of whom had not been born when they entered the service. They endured the wrong, as became them; but they took care, instead of inviting their sons, or younger brothers, or nephews, to enlist, to warn them against it. Hence the native officers, at all the Presidencies, as compared with their predecessors, have dwindled into a low and degenerate race, in no degree superior, as respects intellect, conduct, or education, to the

havildars or serjeants, from among whom they are taken. And to add to the catalogue of their faults, they are in nine cases out of ten inefficient through age; and incapable, were they ever so much disposed, to support the position of gentlemen through poverty. The pay of a sepoy is, we believe, five pence half-penny a day, out of which he is obliged to find his linen and the materials for keeping his arms and accoutrements in order. It takes him, on an average, from five to seven years to become a naeg or corporal, about ten more to reach the grade of havildar or serjeant, and twenty, or it may be thirty, in all, to earn his first commission, when his pay is raised to one shilling and four pence a day. In his turn he becomes a subadar or captain, with pay at the rate of half a crown per diem; and, finally, if he live, and his constitution does not fail altogether, he may become subadar major, with five shillings a day. The average age of the native subalterns in the Company's service has been taken, we believe, at forty-five, of the captains at fifty-five, and of the majors at sixty-five, or from that to seventy.

A consideration of these facts leads to one of two conclusions; first, that if the Indian Government did well in throwing so large a portion of the European element into their Sepoy regiments, they erred in not making that element larger; next, that if it was right to deprive the native officer of all real authority and patronage, it was wrong to continue the class of native commissioned officers at all. As the case now stands, the whole of these persons, from the subadar major down to the junior jemadar, are positively in the way. The most exalted of them all—the black-faced major—cannot take command of the battalion as long as there is a white-faced ensign or serjeant-major, or, we suspect, a white-faced serjeant on the ground. And as to his influence in quarters nobody, we presume, would pretend to say that it is greater than that of a havildar or a naeg. Hence the inability of these people to repress the mutinous spirit which has too often shown itself of late in our Sepoy regiments; and of which, previously to the reorganisation of the army in 1796, there is not one instance upon record. Hence, too, the comparative good or bad behaviour of Sepoy corps, in the enemy's presence, according as they are led into the field by an adequate or inadequate number of European officers. Observe that we do not charge the native officers, as a body, with promoting a spirit of insubordination or with setting an example of misconduct in battle. The Hindoo portion of them, at least, have never, we believe, been known to join in a mutiny; of the Mahomedans we cannot say as much. And in regard to courage, or its opposite, both classes stand

pretty much upon a level with the non-commissioned officers — certainly not a hair's breadth above them. But in the present case it does not appear, either that their authority is of weight enough to extinguish a flame, or that in any recent instance they have been able to give the European commandant notice of the mischief that was brewing. The only fair inference to be drawn, therefore, is, that the commissioned rank just raises them to a sufficient height above their former comrades to deprive them of the hail-fellow-well-met confidence which private soldiers repose in one another, without creating for them in the class from which they have been taken the deference which leads a tenant to make a confidant of his landlord, or a poor man to seek advice, when in difficulties, from a gentleman whom he knows and respects.

It was a great mistake when we took to officering our Sepoy battalions and companies with Europeans, to retain any native as a commissioned officer at all. His nominal position is an insult to him. It brings with it neither power nor pecuniary gain; it has ceased to be an object of ambition to the class of persons whose services could be of any value; and forasmuch as the rules of the profession render the prize, such as it is, unattainable, except in the decline of life, it is no sooner won than the fortunate individual takes steps to retire upon a pension. Nor is this all. Except for the mockery of the native commission, Government would admit the necessity of giving to the Indian army an adequate strength of officers; which, under existing circumstances, it certainly has not. Will any body pretend to say that an English battalion, eight hundred strong, has, upon our present peace establishment, too many officers attached to it? And if eight hundred Englishmen, speaking the same language with their officers, and standing towards them in the relation which General Briggs has so well described, cannot be made effective, as a regiment, with fewer than thirty-three battalion officers, exclusive of the staff, how can it be supposed that eight hundred Sepoys, a mixed mass of Hindoos and Mohamedans, speaking different languages, trained up to different habits, and altogether aliens, in customs and in thought, on every important subject, are to be rightly managed by twenty-two officers? But are there really twenty battalion officers present with any native regiment in India? By no means. Such is the demand for European service on the general staff of the army, and so trying the effect of an Indian climate on European constitutions, that not only is this not the case, even in a solitary instance, but that, in a vast variety of instances, less than one half of the regimental officers in the Company's

service ever do duty with their corps. Nor is it to be forgotten that even as regards regimental duty, no provision is made in the Company's service for staff employment. The adjutant, the quartermaster, and the paymaster, are all selected from among the battalion officers, thus leaving available for Company duty, supposing all to be present, barely fifteen. Even fifteen, however, is far above the mark. We have not at hand the latest official returns explanatory of the strength and distribution of European officers belonging to the armies of India; but an article in an early number of the 'Calcutta Review' sets forth the details of the service as they stood in 1844: and as nothing has occurred since to alter the principle on which the army works, we do not see why we should refuse to make use of our contemporary's tables here. It appears, then, that nine years ago, the Company's regular native army,—cavalry, infantry, and artillery,—consisted of 212,500 men; that to these were nominally attached 4,481 officers; that the general staff and the command of irregular corps, absorbed not fewer than 2229; leaving exactly 2253 officers to take charge, in field and in quarters, of 212,000 men. This will give an average of something less than 1 officer to every 93 men; a proportion which all who are conversant with the subject will pronounce to be wholly inadequate, and which, as we learn, drew from Marshal Soult, when he was here, on the occasion of Her Majesty's coronation, expressions of astonishment that discipline could be preserved in the Indian army at all.

Again: inadequate as this complement is, the experience of the last eight years has shown that the progress of war, even for a few months, renders it far more so. We have heard of regiments, both in Affghanistan and the Punjab, going into action without being able to show so much as one European officer at the head of each company. We believe that there were occasions when three or four Europeans at the most took their places in the line. Can we expect, looking to the class of natives now dignified with the title of commissioned officers, that regiments composed like those of our Indian army, and so commanded, should behave otherwise than ill? We should not like to see the best regiment under the Crown led into action without having at least one officer per company to show the way. And yet there is affectation of surprise and regret when a Sepoy battalion, under the command of a lieutenant, becomes unmanageable and insubordinate.

Again: there has sprung up, within the last twenty or thirty years, particularly in Bengal, a notion that men of high caste make better soldiers than men of low caste; and that it will not

do to parade together persons who in common life cannot hold familiar intercourse with one another. More or less the same prejudice prevails elsewhere; but we believe it to be as mistaken as it is mischievous. The high caste man is the slave of a thousand scruples, which do not affect the mind of the low caste man. He cannot eat this, and he will not drink that; to pass the sea in ships is contrary to his religion, and as to working in the trenches, it was shown, at the siege of Mooltan, that to so deep a degradation he never will submit. The Pariar is oppressed with no such weaknesses. He will go wherever he is ordered, and do whatever he is desired; and, under fire, exhibits as much coolness and courage as the proudest Raj-put of them all. And in the older and, we must be permitted to say, the better times of the native army, a very large proportion of its regiments belonged to this order.

'The Sepoys,' says General Briggs, 'who fought the battles of Clive and Coote, who contributed to the humiliation of Tippoo in 1792 and to his downfall in 1799, and who gained laurels under the Duke of Wellington in the campaign of 1803–4, were, like the Bombay army, of a mixed class. The infantry was composed of Pariars, Pullers, and other low cultivators of the Carnatic, and of the Northern Circars, with some few Mahomedans. The cavalry were wholly Mahomedan. In the year 1806, the epoch of the Vellore Mutiny, Government, on what ground does not appear, forbade any recruit to be enlisted for the Madras army of the low caste tribes, and advantage was taken of that order to discharge all those for which such excuse could be found. An old Raj-put Subadar, whose company I commanded for some years, and for whom I entertained great esteem, considered the measure highly impolitic. "These men," he said, "have ever been faithful, obedient, and brave; and the day will "come when you will confess how much higher qualities they pos- "sess, as good soldiers, than the Mahomedans, whom it is now the "fashion to bring forward."'

The day predicted by General Briggs' friend has come. Of all the troops in the Company's service, there are none so little to be depended upon as the regular cavalry, and it is composed exclusively of Mahomedans. The best regiments in the service are the Madras Pioneers, recently converted into Sappers and Miners, the Bombay Native Infantry, and the Gourkas. They are all recruited mainly from among low caste tribes, and, when properly led, will go any where and do any thing.

Again: we have too much got into the practice of raising an army suddenly when war occurs, or appears to threaten, and as suddenly reducing it when the danger blows over. It is a most unwise proceeding; for he takes but a short-sighted view of the moral uses of the native army who supposes that it operates

solely upon the fears of the people of British India to keep them in subjection. Of the 250,000 men composing our Sepoy force, there are probably not 10,000 unmarried. Most of them have families; and all these, as well as the followers of our camps, and hangers-on about cantonments, are interested in the welfare of the government on which they depend for subsistence. Indeed, it is from these persons, scattered over the whole surface of the empire, that our Government receives all its information of plots and conspiracies as soon as they are formed; they act as a sort of detective police, and may at all times be depended upon. But if, in the prosecution of a short-sighted economy, we take to enlisting men, and by-and-by discharging them without pensions or other provision against want, we shall not only lose the support of them and of their relatives, but we shall convert every one of them into a conspirator. Let the reader call to mind how fatally the absence of such motives of attachment on the part of the people of Affghanistan told against us. A whole nation conspired for the destruction of the force which had conquered it. Yet the leaders of the force knew nothing of the matter, till the blow fell. The Government of India will act judiciously if it avoid giving an opportunity, by a too frequent discharge of its native soldiers unpensioned, for the formation of similar plots against its continuance in districts nearer home.

We have not half exhausted this part of our subject, to deal fairly by which would, indeed, require more than double the space now at our disposal; and there are various points besides, more or less connected with it, on which we cannot pretend to touch at all. There is the commissariat of India, for example, which, especially as it affects the means of transport for our armies, appears to us to be as defective as any thing can well be. There is also the armament of our native troops, their clothing, and their equipment, especially of the horse. See how unsuited it is, as well to the physical strength of the men as to the nature of the climate. What is it which renders the regular cavalry of British India in so marked a degree inefficient? Because you mount the trooper on an English saddle, impede his movements with your tight-fitting English uniform, and put into his hands a sabre so heavy that he is unable properly to wield it. And look at your Sepoy or infantry man,—buttoned up to the throat in a woollen jacket of brick-dust hue, and expected to make play with a musket, fabricated in Birmingham, after the model of such weapons as a stalwart grenadier of the 87th Irish Fusiliers is just able to manage. All these things require looking into; and we strongly advise when the Com-

mittee on Indian Affairs come to this part of their subject, that they fail not to examine Sir Charles Napier, having first of all carefully read and digested his pamphlet on the 'Baggage of an 'Indian Army.' But we are constrained, for the present, to pass them by; for it will never do to bring forward a bill of indictment against either an individual or an institution without making, at least, some suggestions for the amelioration of the evils complained of; and even these — not being forgetful that of all subjects that of Indian administration is, to the majority of Englishmen, the most distasteful — we must endeavour to make as brief as shall be consistent with perspicuity.

The points which we have established against the military administration of British India seem to be three: —

First. That the comparative inefficiency of the native army of India is attributable mainly to the want of an adequate corps of officers, who shall command and obtain the confidence of their men.

Second. That the general condition of the native commissioned officers, their false position in the corps, and the low state of their education, renders them all but useless, if not positively inconvenient, to the service.

Third. That if we desire to retain India, upon which our only real hold is through the native army, steps must be taken without delay to correct those evils.

As to the other subjects, glanced at rather than discussed, — such as the wisdom of recruiting from classes different from those in which we now seek our soldiers, the providing a better-organised baggage-train, and general commissariat, — these involve questions which, though not without their importance, may safely be left to answer themselves. It will be enough for our present purpose if we deal with points more salient.

It appears to us then, that there are two courses open to the Indian Government, by following either of which the armed force of the country may be placed on such a footing as shall render it at all times trustworthy in quarters, and perfectly efficient in the day of battle. Either they may go back to the state of things which prevailed prior to the regulations of 1796, or they must raise the strength of their European regimental officers to the same level with that of the Queen's service. In point of economy the former course holds out many and very obvious advantages, for it is the pay of the European officers, regimental as well as staff, which renders the maintenance of the native army so costly: and though Government must be prepared, if it expect native gentlemen to serve in the ranks, to remunerate them on a scale considerably above that which has

been fixed for the present race of subadars and jemadars, still the total outlay on their account would be more than met by the diminution of expense which would attend the reduction of European officers. But before this course be either recommended or adopted, one or two grave questions must be answered. In the first place, are there left within the Company's provinces, native gentlemen of sufficient standing and education to undertake so important a charge; and in the next place, assuming that such persons exist, should we be justified, looking to the altered state of the empire, in trusting them? Our own honest belief is, that such persons are still to be found; and we see no reason to assume that they might not be trusted. Look at the irregular corps. They are by far the most efficient, whether as horse or foot, in the native army. Yet they have seldom more than two, and sometimes only one, European officer attached to each. And as to courage, there never was a greater libel upon human nature, than that which assumes that the people of India are naturally cowards. They were no cowards who met us at Assaye, at Dieg, at Mehedpoor, Sitabaldy, Maharajpoor, the battles of the Sutlej, and at Chillianwallah. We defeated them, on each occasion, no doubt, because of our superior discipline; but it was at a sacrifice of life quite as great, in proportion to the numbers engaged, as occurred at any of the fiercest European battles during the late war. Compare the slaughter which occurred at every one of them, with the loss sustained by the victors at Waterloo, and it will be found to stand thus:—At Waterloo, the Duke lost in the proportion of 1 to 6. The Indian returns show the following ratios:—

	British Loss.
1803. Assaye. - - - -	1 to 3
1804. Dieg - - - -	1 to 4½
1817. Mehedpoor - - -	1 to 6
1817. Sitabaldy - - - -	1 to 4½
1818. Korygaum - - - -	1 to 3½
1845. Maharajpoor - - -	1 to 6
1846. Battles of the Sutlej - -	1 to 5
1848. Chillianwallah - - -	1 to 7

Here is no proof of cowardice on the part of the defeated, whose loss, in every affair, except perhaps the last, greatly exceeded our own. Why should we assume that because they serve the Queen of England, Indian gentlemen will not lead, and Indian soldiers follow, as gallantly as when both are in arms against her. Are not the exploits of Skinner's Horse fresh in the memory of every reader of history? Have the terms in which

Sir Harry Smith spoke of the Sermore and Gourka battalions been forgotten? And did not Sir Charles Napier convert the robber population of Upper Scinde into as effective a corps of irregulars as ever took the field? We cannot say that either the style or the matter of Sir William Napier's 'Administration 'of Scinde' greatly delights us. The accomplished author has contrived to disfigure a not uninstructive narrative, by a more than ordinary indulgence in the luxury of vituperation and hard names. Yet he has done no more than justice to his brother in the following passage, which we quote as strongly confirming the opinions expressed throughout this paper.

'While the regeneration of the poorer classes was thus urged forward, the just claims of the high-born people of the land were not overlooked. Though a conquered race, Sir Charles Napier regarded them only as English subjects; and resolved to open for them all places of trust and dignity, without objection to colour or religion, demanding only qualification. Mohamed Tora, one of the greatest serdars who fought at Meanee, was made a magistrate at his own request, the appointment being justified thus: — "The nobles of "Scinde must have the road of ambition opened to them, or they "will not have their rights, in the honourable sense of my procla-"mation; that is, if they qualify themselves for the offices demanded. "But in questions of general interest like this, even qualifications "should not be required before enjoyment, — we must give first, we "must turn out afterwards for incapacity. The class-right will be "thus acknowledged, while the man is removed; and if one Beloo-"chee gentleman becomes a magistrate, many will qualify them-'selves. I want to go beyond this, if the Indian system will allow 'me; but that system—a rotten fabric of expedients for the support-'ing of robbery,—is equally destitute of humanity and knowledge of 'human nature, and will, I suppose, certainly debar the Scindian 'gentleman of the rights possessed by Englishmen. I will, however, 'give them all I can. The Beloochee gentleman may likely enough 'abuse his power for ten years to come; but we who have conquered 'the country can surely keep half a dozen such persons in order; "and the great men of the land must have a door open for their "ambition, their virtues, and their industry, or they will become "rebellious or vile; I know not which is worst; but the govern-"ment which produces either is a detestable tyranny."'

There is sound philosophy in this, albeit the sentiment be strongly worded; and it is in the spirit of the same philosophy that we certainly should not object to the attempt, judiciously made, to introduce to public employment, both military and civil, Indian gentlemen, wherever they might show themselves qualified. Why should we hesitate to place more Mahomed Yufs, or Bhavany Sings, at the head of our battalions if we can find them, — subject, of course, to the general

control of European officers, carefully selected? Are they more likely to betray their trust than the chiefs whom we employ with our irregular corps; or gentlemen like Mohun Lal, who in the civil department of the army proved himself so useful and so trustworthy in Affghanistan? General Briggs, at least, and the late General Caulfield seem to apprehend no danger; indeed the former goes somewhat further than in the present stage of the business we feel quite disposed to go with him; for he sketches his plan in detail, and recommends it for adoption. But in the summing up of his argument we acquiesce heartily. 'In 'such case young men of family might be received into the 'army as volunteers, with an understanding, that according to 'their merits and standing they should succeed to commissions. 'No volunteer should be eligible to his commission before he 'had served at least two years as a private, one as a corporal 'or naeg, and one as a serjeant-major or havildar-major of his 'company.'

It is not our business to go into the details of a plan, of the principle of which alone we are ready to express our approval. Should the Indian Government judge it expedient to revert in whole or in part to the military organisation of 1780, ways and means of doing so, without inflicting wrong upon any one, can easily be found. Should the prejudice against placing natives in offices of trust, prevail to bar the door to their advancement in the army, there is no alternative left except largely to increase the number of European officers. For apart from the evils that every where follow the attempt to preserve discipline in armed bodies with inadequate means, there is this special drawback to the Indian system, that none except the least intelligent officers in the service remain with their regiments. Indeed, employment on the staff becomes an object of ambition to every well-disposed cadet from the hour of his landing in the country; and he seldom fails, with ordinary diligence and talent to qualify himself after a few years, and to win the prize. Meanwhile the idle, the stupid, the dissolute, and the ignorant remain with their colours; and even of these the numbers become, through casualties of various kinds, often so small, that the regiment cannot show, upon a peaceful parade, one European officer per company. This is a state of things which must at any cost be put a stop to; and every day, while it diffuses the native army over a wider space of territory, renders the application of some remedy to so fatal an error more urgent.

The expense of rightly supplying the army of India with European officers, will be in the end very great. There is no disputing that fact. And another measure, not wholly free

from risk, must keep pace with it, namely, the abolition of the class of commissioned native officers; but this latter step need not, any more than the former, be taken precipitately; and a slight degree of caution will suffice, in our own opinion, to rob it of all its terrors. For the position of a jemadar or subadar is not coveted by any natives of India above the humblest in point of birth and station; and even these seek it much more on account of the pension which it secures, than because it opens a door of advancement for them in the world. The discharged subadar, when he goes back to his village, relapses into the social place from which by enlistment he had escaped. He sits down in his unfurnished hut, a ryot,—better to do in the world than some of his neighbours, but still only a ryot. The havildar, who on the retirement of the subadar, expected to succeed to the epaulettes, will be quite satisfied if you give him in the meanwhile the pay, and assure him of a jemadar's pension by-and-by. Thus in time, and after no very great lapse of time, the race will die out. Nor need you push on your increase of Europeans one whit more rapidly than space shall by these means be found for them. We will engage to say that such a measure as this would give offence to no class of our Indian subjects. It might and probably would establish the custom of recruiting from low-caste tribes exclusively; for the low-caste man, as he does not in civil life indulge in ambitious longings, so he enlists for the sake of the pay, and with little or no view to promotion. And he is, for this as well as for other reasons, better suited than the high-caste man to serve in such an army as ours. But it would attract no attention whatever in circles which would be likely to make a bad use of their knowledge, for against them the military service of their rulers is already barred. The measure therefore would be at least safe, though we confess that it could not be made economical or generous.

Again: care must be taken under such a change of circumstances to attach officers permanently to the corps which they first enter. The native soldier is susceptible of strong attachment to his officer, provided the latter understand him, and deal liberally with his prejudices. But the native soldier, under the present order of things, has no time to become acquainted with any except the refuse of his European officers. All the rest are taken away from him for service on the staff, or to fill civil offices which would be far more effectively filled by the native gentry of the district. This state of things must be altered. The Indian officer must learn to look again, as he looked fifty years ago, to his regiment as his home; and he will then think

it worth his while to become personally acquainted with the characters of his men, and to conciliate their good will by fair dealing. Meanwhile such a corps as that of the Etat Major in the French service may be formed; for admission into which all shall be allowed to compete; but from which, and from no other source, candidates for staff employment shall be chosen. This will still, to a certain extent, deprive the line of the *élite* of its officers; but at least it will render staff situations even more than they are now the rewards of transcendent merit, while it leaves with regiments enough both of *personnel* and of talent to manage them adequately in the field or in quarters. And finally, care must be taken to render superannuation, both in the Company's and in the Queen's service, compulsory. All the improvements in minor matters, which the wit of man can devise, will not render an army effective which has only worn-out old men at its head. And the days are not, we fear, distant, when the importance of this truth will be forced upon us.

We have completed the task which we had set for ourselves. It is for the Indian Government, and the general public, to judge of the manner of its performance. For in respect to the groundwork on which our argument rests, we defy the whole body of Proprietors, with the Court of Directors and the Board of Control at their back, to controvert it. We have won an enormous empire with the sword, which is growing continually larger. We have established a system of civil administration there which protects the peasant, and disgusts all the classes above him. If we could exterminate these classes, or stop education, and reduce 120,000,000 of people to the social condition of cultivators of the soil, then with our army even weaker in point of numbers than it is, we might be safe; for it is not among the peasant classes in any country that seditions and rebellions originate. But this we cannot do; and with a large body of discontented gentry everywhere, and whole clusters of native princes and chiefs interspersed through our dominions, it is idle to say that the continuance of our sovereignty depends, from one day to another, on anything except the army. Now the army is admitted by all competent judges to be very far in many respects from what it ought to be. We too are of this opinion. We have pointed out where some of the gravest defects lie, and suggested a remedy. Others must act as to them shall appear expedient in the matter.

ART. VII.—1. *Des Intérêts Catholiques au XIX^e^ Siècle.* Par le Comte de MONTALEMBERT. 2d edit. Paris: 1852.

2. *De la Liberté et de l'Avenir de la République Française.* Par M. RENDU, Evêque d'Auvergne. Paris: 1849.

MOST of M. de Montalembert's writings and speeches are superior to the Essay before us in liveliness and richness of expression and in originality of thought and illustration. A certain tone of apology chills the fervour of his rhetoric, and his impetuous nature is restrained by a consciousness that the truths he is uttering are unwelcome to those before whom he has prostrated his remarkable mind, and to whose service he has devoted the fairest years of his political life. It is not indeed the young enthusiast, who in the 'Ami de la Réligion' preached a theocracy founded on republicanism, that appears once more on the scene, but it is the mature politician still instinct with some sense of the worth of civil liberty, and confirmed by experience in his views of the danger and degradation incident to the cause of religion when it becomes the servile acolyte of the civil power. Such a protest at such a moment of French history deserves some notice for its own sake, and for us the interest is increased, when its author is in the first rank of the orators whom the constitutional government of France has brought forth, and the son of an English mother.

The immediate provocation to the work has doubtless been the adulation with which the Church in France has hailed the destruction of political liberty. Of that event we will not now speak further than to say, that the reception which it has met with from the press and public feeling of this country, is one of which no man has a right to complain. We are constitutionalists, or, to use the new French slang, parliamentarists, not by choice of opinion, but by historical necessity; we connect this matter in our minds with the gravest questions of human progress and moral responsibility: we recognise in such institutions something above material prosperity, or private security, or public order: we have won and sustained them by the sacrifice of a national dynasty, by revolution and civil war, and by the continual and contented submission of every separate class or interest to the will of the majority, after fair fight and honourable surrender. It is thus that the capability of enjoying representative institutions enters so largely into the calculation of the amount of respect we bear to foreign nations, and the consideration we attach to them; it is thus the abandonment of

such privileges, whether forced or voluntary, on the part of the most advanced and powerful nation of continental Europe, has inevitably struck us with dismay. No Frenchman, who knows our way of thinking on these points, can owe us any grudge for appreciating his liberties more than he seems to do himself, and refusing to listen to justifications which in our own case we should disdain to acknowledge. M. de Montalembert says well, that in treating such a political question as the establishment of despotic authority, the character of the person who happens at any particular moment to wield it, is hardly a legitimate incident in the discussion; and when the Russian emperor Alexander called himself a 'lucky accident,' he pronounced the severest condemnation of the system of which he formed a part.

In alluding to the conduct of the Gallican Church in the late establishment of absolute power in France, we ought perhaps to specify the hierarchy, for there is no evidence that the suppression of liberty has been acceptable to the lower ranks of the clergy. The *curés*, who as a body were regarded with much suspicion even by the government of Louis Philippe, have taken no prominent part in the affair; and it is not improbable that the consequences of their repugnance to the servility of their superiors may form a portion of M. de Montalembert's anxiety on the subject. If an honest *curé* has any Jacobinism latent in him, the sycophancy of his superiors would naturally tend to excite it. 'The Elect of God,' 'The Messiah of the 2d of 'December,' 'The Star from the East,' are phrases which every man of true piety would reject with disgust; and the civil power, addressing the father of France, to 'give us our daily bread 'and forgive our trespasses' against him, might well provoke the minister of religion even more than the citizen. If it has failed to do so, M. de Montalembert's protest is indeed uttered in vain.

The connexion of the royal and sacerdotal powers in France is an interesting chapter in history; and it is undeniable that the sovereigns have always had the best of it. All the advantages and independence, won at the council of Basle for the Gallican Church, were sacrificed by Francis I. for the immense accession of ecclesiastical patronage conferred on the Crown, and the Gallican liberties became nothing more than the substitution of the authority of the State for that of Rome. The Prince de Condé's well-known assertion, that 'if Louis XIV. would 'only declare himself Protestant, all the French clergy would 'follow him,' and measures like the excommunications of actors and actresses for the purpose of preventing the Grand Monarque

from exhibiting himself on the stage, are but specimens of the relation of the State to the Church in the days of Bossuet and Fénélon. These two names, indeed, typify both the dominant sentiment and the honourable exception; and while in the conduct of many prelates of to-day we recognise the natural successors of the great bishop and orator who pronounced all attempts to check absolute power to be 'un vain tourment,' and who abruptly closes his 'universal history' at the moment when the Church participates in the triumph of Charlemagne, so in the pages before us we would hope to welcome the wiser judgment and larger heart of the author of Telemachus — a work now too exclusively confined to the school-room, and whose influence over political opinions in France has seldom been justly appreciated. Those who derided the 'Telemacomanie' and its effects probably understood them far better than we do. But that the supporters of these purer theories were always a minority among the French clergy, is indeed too manifest; and how little the tone of the government in its relations to the Church was changed even by the events of the Revolution and the Empire, is strongly illustrated by the extract which M. de Montalembert candidly cites from the official dispatch of the Duc de Laval-Montmorency, Ambassador at Rome, on the subject of the French cardinals who were about to take part in the conclave of 1823.

'The French Cardinals should be sent, without communication with any one whatever, without recommendations, one might venture to say without individual consciences, as far as that word implies a vanity occupied with personal considerations rather than with the interests of the King. Each of them, deeply penetrated with the sense of the duty he owes to his Sovereign, should consent to err with him, if he should chance to err, and should use every effort to bring about such objects as the King may desire, objects which appeal to their conscientious feelings, in their character of prelates placed in the conclave by the King, and who would not have been there without the King.'*

Surely, no language more derogatory to the independence of the Church could have been devised; and yet its author was a most devout Catholic, and the sovereign he represented a man of strong religious sentiments and of higher views than the brothers of his race.

To a Protestant accustomed to attach spiritual ideas to spiritual things, the principle asserted and defended by M. de Montalembert, that a moderate and well-ordered liberty is fa-

* Artaud, Histoire de Leon XII. tom. i. p. 145, 146.

vourable to the religious development of a nation, seems almost a truism, and beyond discussion. Indeed, the inference would rather be, that the form of religion which required such unholy aid, and which could exist with such a base alliance, was itself essentially defective. The transition from this aspect of the question into the general controversy against the principles of Roman Catholicism is so easy, that we are content with merely pointing to it; but there is another principle involved in the argument, which is almost equally self-evident, and which does not provoke this objection. In all forms and shapes of the Christian religion, certain moral and intellectual developments are required to make a man susceptible of the sense of its requirements and obligations. The Roman Catholic system, in its wonderful adaptation to the inferior faculties and desires of mankind, can exist, and even flourish, with a far less expansion of these powers than is elsewhere necessary; but it is, on the face of it, paradoxical to assert that even this can be aided and encouraged by the extraneous pressure of a wilful and merely human authority. The worst teachers of passive obedience do not predicate that kings are infallible, and, of all religious influences, a power that assumes itself to be infallible can, with the least consistency, inculcate implicit submission to a fallible rule. M. de Montalembert is therefore both philosophically and historically right in defining the doctrine of the excellence of absolute power as having been both a sign and a consequence of the decline of the influence of the Church. To those who appeal to mediæval history in contradiction of this view, M. de Montalembert effectively replies:—

'I strongly suspect our present admirers of the feudal system and the middle ages of understanding them very little, for I remark that they eulogise them with about as little discrimination as distinguished the criticism of a former period. They seem to look on the kings of these times as having been in general men of a saintly character, devoted to good works, surrounded with respectful and obedient subjects, whose eagerness to execute faithfully their commands was only equalled by their docility. Nothing is less like the truth. Through the whole of the middle ages the struggle between good and evil was continual and fierce. Two powers, essentially inimical, fill with their strife the annals of the middle ages, like the opposing currents which unite under the walls of Constantinople from the north and south, and in their collision and confusion fill the Bosphorus with the struggles and dangers of the navigation. Too soon the strength of evil predominated, and the pure and sacred stream of vitality which flowed from the Roman catacombs, and which, during many ages, had covered the face of Europe with the flood of Christian genius and enthusiasm, was infected and driven back towards its

source. But by the side of the moral spirit which governed the middle ages till their very end, and which was nothing more nor less than Catholicism, there was a political spirit very distinct in character, which, under an aristocratic form, constituted a vast system of guaranties and restrictions imposed on hereditary or elective sovereigns. The clergy, the feudal nobility, the commercial, municipal, and rural corporations, the numberless traditional usages and privileges, kept the supreme authority enlaced in inextricable bonds. The abuses of power no doubt were frequent; but the notion of the confiscation of all powers by one, the personification of all the rights of society in one man, the abdication of all individual will for the advantage of one dominant will—this was indeed unknown, and would have been deemed impossible.'

How, then, are we to reconcile the pretensions of the Roman Church with its general leanings, in more modern times, to despotic power? May not some solution be found in the weakness of that Church, which compels it to look for protection to powers it once itself limited and defied; and still more in the close analogy of those mental conditions which incline a portion of mankind to a contented submission to irresponsible authority? Rare indeed is that temper which on the one hand leans to spiritual despotism, and on the other asserts its right to freedom,—which, in the path of civil life, demands neither crutch nor barrier, and, in the higher walks of moral being, cannot advance a step without support and direction. And this natural connexion of ideas is of course confirmed by the political action of the Church itself. In those countries where the Church of Rome exercises political sovereignty, has the slightest amount of political liberty been allowed to exist? Does any one now believe that the liberal designs of Pio Nono ever embraced anything better than a just and benevolent absolutism? and do not all the organs of the Papacy, even in this country, insist on the essential incompatibility of the temporal power of the Pope and constitutional forms of government? We are by no means sure, that in the rarefied air of the Roman Church, this book itself may not have a scent of heresy: we should not be astonished to see the pages we are reviewing in the Index.

But it may be said that we are enlarging the conclusions of M. de Montalembert beyond his intentions, and that the limitations of the benefits of constitutional government here expressed and implied, are at least as important as the admissions. 'We 'only defend representative government,' says he, 'we only 'desire it, we only respect it, there where it has succeeded, 'where it has lasted, where it has consistently and honourably 'maintained itself;'—a concession of which the antagonists of

M. de Montalembert will take due advantage. They may not unjustly decline to take him as the judge of these results in almost every country of Continental Europe. To those who have faith in representative institutions as the main element in the education of a people, as the safe outlet of disturbing influences, as the guardian of the political, and thus of the moral conscience of a nation, the difficulties incident to their establishment and continuance are necessary conditions of their vitality, and often evidences of their public usefulness. But the faint and tepid excuses of M. de Montalembert for the faults of parliaments, even within his own narrow bounds, would hardly resist the logic that would argue from the duty of spiritual submission to the sinfulness of temporal resistance. The violence and perfidies of absolute sovereigns against the Church are, in themselves, no proof that parliaments might not be equally unscrupulous. If the absolute Kings of Spain and Portugal expelled the Jesuits, the constitutional Queen of Spain sanctioned the appropriation to the State of something like a fourth of the whole land of Spain, the property of the Church, and the abolition of the 'religious' life as a legal *status* in the community; while the constitutional sovereign of Portugal has done much the same. M. de Montalembert would get off, on the ground that the Peninsula is not one of the countries where the constitutional system has succeeded, but others might point to these very acts as proofs of its success.

And this avoidance of the real difficulties of the argument will, we fear, induce most readers to believe that, after all, the question with M. de Montalembert is, not whether constitutional government is in itself a good to mankind and liberty a benefit to religion, but whether, by adroit management, the Roman Church may not get more out of a parliamentary than out of an absolute authority. If he believes that in a condition of religious equality and free discussion the Roman Catholic religion will ultimately triumph, he has a full right to demand, even for that special object, a system of political and religious liberty, and no consistent Protestant can demur to his desire. But if he only prefers limited to absolute government, because the latter has been a frequent and successful rival of the powers and pretensions of the Church, while the former leaves, or may, a fuller play to spiritual usurpation and moral despotism, then his commendations of liberty are a snare and a delusion. The Roman Church has always claimed for herself the right of drawing the line between secular and religious affairs, and the pretensions of its ideal theocracy always remain unhumbled amid the repulses and degradations of centuries. It is therefore to be

justly inferred, that if she regards a constitutional government as a rival, she will strive to injure and embarrass it to the advantage of her own supremacy; but if, on the contrary, she is willing to abdicate political claims, and to confine her influence within moral limits, then, in truth, she is a gainer by liberty, inasmuch as she accepts a just position, which no fair opponent can refuse her. In the United States, separated from the political and historical associations, which fill so large a space of modern European history, surrounded by influences that check individual and corporate assumptions, the Roman Church takes its due place among the teachers of the community, and receives, in turn, a cordial acceptance from other religious bodies and from the State in general, which it has not yet obtained in any Protestant country of the old world. The truth is, that in America the Papacy is really a spiritual institution, a centre of unity in faith, but not an intruder into political or domestic life; and while a great example has there been given to mankind that the Roman Catholic religion does not only exist, but flourish, without that intermixture of temporal and political interests, which in Europe contaminate its moral power, it becomes more than ever certain that its adaptation to liberal institutions can only be sincere where its exclusion from political action is complete, and where it is contained by public opinion within the proper sphere of religious action.

'I know well,' says our writer, 'that in these days, unlike former times, political liberty everywhere draws religious liberty along with it; but I would fain persuade myself that Catholicism has as little to fear from the one as the other. I have no hesitation in saying that if the liberty of error and evil could be suppressed, it would be a duty to suppress it. But experience proves that in our modern society this cannot be thoroughly effected without equally smothering the liberty of good, without confiding absolute power to governments that may be incapable or unworthy of the task. Liberty of conscience, that principle so long invoked by the enemies of religion, now turns to its advantage. Of course it would be extravagant (*insensé*) to announce it in countries where it does not exist, and where no one claims it; but where it once exists, where it has once been registered in the laws, let us beware how we efface it, for it becomes the defender of the faith and the rampart of the Church.'

The author proceeds to prove that Protestants have persecuted as well as Catholics, and deduces that the Reformation only triumphed in England, in Holland, and in Germany by means of fierce oppression and cruel penalties. We would desire to refer him to the temperate and merciful methods by which Protestantism was successfully crushed in Spain, or Bohemia

reclaimed to the faith. He regards it as a 'marvellous secret of 'divine mercy, that in these days *le libre examen* only turns to 'the advantage of the truth,'—a proposition in which a Protestant would conceive the wonder to be the other way; but when he goes on to speak of 'heresy sheltering herself under 'severe legal restrictions or the terrors of revolutionary vio-'lence,' we can only point to the Madiais pining in the prisons of the Grand Duke of Florence, to the exile of Count Guicciardini, to the refusal of the government of Spain to allow the funeral service to be read over a Protestant grave, and, above all, to the lamentable violences by which a portion of the Roman Catholic clergy of Ireland are trying the sympathy and interests of the Liberal party in this country, and in inducing the largest-minded men to feel somewhat like a friend of ours, who says, 'that he lives in continual dread of waking some morning with 'the conviction that, after all, Lord Eldon was in the right.'

The restriction of the right of liberty of conscience to places where it exists already, is of a piece with the limitation of constitutional governments to nations where they have worked well; nor do the Catholic authorities, whom the writer cites in support of his principles, do much more. In a letter to the Bishop of Orleans (dated July 1852), the Bishop of Moulins writes: 'I will simply (*naïvement*) own, *even though I may* 'pass for the owner of ideas already exploded, that I do love 'liberty; I love it too much when it supports, not to endure it 'when it opposes me.' '*Nobles paroles*,' says M. de Montalembert: but we rather accede to the *naïveté* of the venerable prelate, and conceive that the sentence would run just as well if 'absolutism' were substituted for 'liberty.'

Very different is the tone of the discourse of M. Rendu, Bishop of Auvergne, a work of honest purpose and hearty faith. He makes no apologies for liberty, but accepts it as the only field in which religious truth can worthily assert itself, and, pointing, as we have done, across the Atlantic, with no unjust pride, asks whether his religion cannot coexist with free institutions. We should be glad to see this specimen of sound controversy translated into every tongue in which the Roman doctrine is taught, if only to show that a Catholic Bishop can vindicate the principle of 'religious liberty,' defining religious liberty to comprehend 'the liberty of conscience, the liberty of worship, and *the 'liberty of proselytising*;' and demanding full liberty of instruction, 'by the 'pen and the press, by preaching and 'example.' Would that those liberties were more enjoyed in countries where the Roman Catholic Church is dominant, and would that the clergy would accept and act up to these defi-

nitions, both as for and against themselves, wherever religious toleration is the principle of the law, and where they might make it the principle of society!

There is another aspect of M. de Montalembert's character which is so prominent in his political life, that it must enter into any estimate of his real love of freedom. He is a lover of minorities, an implacable enemy of triumphant causes of all kinds, and finding constitutional government very low in estimation in France at this moment, he comes forward as its advocate. There was no politician in France who less valued constitutional liberty when France had it than himself: to no administration in the time of Louis Philippe did he ever give his cordial adhesion, but always contented himself with that amount of support which enabled him to exercise considerable influence in ecclesiastical appointments, especially under M. Guizot, who highly appreciated his oratorical faculty. At the same time he directed his fiercest eloquence against the policy of Lord Palmerston, which was then, as always, founded on the extension of constitutional principles, and which has never ceased to identify English interests with the reasonable and well-ordered freedom of all other nations. But when the Republic became the established order of things, the men and forms of the preceding system rose in his esteem to a high elevation, and he was proportionally unmerciful and unjust to what succeeded them. His position at that moment was one of much responsibility, for his parliamentary experience gave him high rank among so many new men. The moment was now come when the principles which he had maintained in his youth, and which had brought him as a criminal before the bar of the Chamber of Peers, might be put into practice, and when he might consistently advocate at once the liberties of the Church and of mankind. But the same Assembly which contained as representative of Paris the ancient preceptor of the young enthusiast, M. de Lamennais, witnessed the unceasing attempts of M. de Montalembert to vilify the Republic and, through the Republic, the people who endured it: no speaker more assisted the anti-socialist panic, and thus more played into the hands of those who have used it so sagaciously for their own purposes. And when that odious political contradiction, the imposition of a detested temporal government on the Roman people by a French republican army, had succeeded in alienating from the rulers of France the sympathy of all liberal-minded men, he called for 'un expédition de Rome à l'intérieur,' which could mean nothing more than an abrogation of the first principles of national independence, and an utter abasement of all popular

rights. He perhaps hardly anticipated how much of his prayer would be speedily granted, although, when it did come, he was still sufficiently under the influence of the same opinions to incur the unhappy notoriety of being the one distinguished orator of the old Chamber of Deputies who consented to transfer his services to the Legislative Chamber of the then approaching and now consummated Empire.

But no sooner do we find him there, than the same disturbing elements which had made this able man so useless, or worse, in former deliberative assemblies, again drove him into opposition; and now this essay not only isolates him again from a political system, but from a large portion of the fellow-religionists, whose homage has hitherto surrounded him, and who looked on him as their uncompromising and even unscrupulous advocate.

M. de Montalembert permits himself to indulge in the hope, that the remnant of the forms of constitutional government preserved under the Empire, will be the nucleus of further liberties, and instances periods in English history when parliamentary institutions had as little internal vitality. Such analogies really mean nothing in the face of altered circumstances and the progress of mankind. But where a power has not in its origin trusted itself to popular discussion and criticism, every hour of its existence increases the difficulty of the experiment. Whether, however, some such result occurs or no, it is equally true that if there is a nation on the globe which requires this comparatively safe outlet for popular excitement, for nervous impatience, for all the oscillations of hope and fear, it is the people of France; and Europe cannot feel herself secure from some outburst of the moment, now that these forces are merely repressed by that authority, which may be compelled, in its own defence, to direct upon others the violence and passion that would otherwise threaten its own existence.

ART. VIII. — *Legends of the Madonna, as represented in the Fine Arts. Forming the Third Series of Sacred and Legendary Art.* By Mrs. JAMESON. London: 1852.

THE recent sale of Marshal Soult's collection of paintings has familiarised most of our readers, at least by name, with the celebrated picture by Murillo, called 'Our Lady of the Immaculate Conception.' The title, however, conveys to the English reader but little information as to the subject represented by the painting. Nor is the meaning more intelligible to the generality of those persons who have seen either the

painting itself or an engraving after it. It represents a female figure with 'grave sweet eyes and golden hair,' and beautiful features. Her hands are crossed on her bosom as if in prayer. She is supported on clouds. From her head, as from a sun, radiate streams of light, under her feet are visible the horns of the crescent moon. Beneath the clouds is seen the outline of the globe, on the surface of which a serpent is gliding along. To those conversant with the mysteries of religious art the picture has a meaning which the uninitiated cannot penetrate. The Virgin is here represented not only as 'Maria 'purisima sin pecado concepida,' but as the second Eve, whose seed was to bruise the head of the serpent. The painter has endowed her with the attributes of the woman of the Apocalypse, 'clothed with the sun, having the moon under her feet, 'and on her head a crown of twelve stars.'

Could we in all cases read the thoughts which lie beneath the surface of pictures, veiled in the emblematical and allegorical language of the old painters, how much greater would be the interest felt in Italian Art! What deep significance would be found attached to accessories which the idle spectator ascribes to the fancy or imagination of the painter! Even the situation in which the picture is placed 'can a tale unfold.' In the Madonnas set up at the corners of streets, over the doors of houses, or gates of gardens, or in the colossal figures of the Virgin, whose ample robe, supported on either side, throws its protecting shade round men, women, and children, the student of religious art sees 'Our Lady of Succour,' 'Notre dame de 'bon secours,' 'La Madonna di Misericordia.' The Virgin is here in the character of Protectress. In the Virgin reading he sees the Mater Sapientiæ, the Virgo Sapientissima. In the coronation of the Virgin, he beholds the type of the Church triumphant. When she wears the crown or holds the sceptre, she is adored as Regina Cœli; when attended by adoring angels, as Regina Angelorum. 'When she is merely veiled, with folded 'hands, and in her features all the beauty, maiden purity, and 'sweetness which the artist could render, she is simply the 'Blessed Virgin, the Madonna, the *Santa Maria Vergine.*'

But how is the English visitor in Italy to understand these symbolical meanings and the traditionary legends of the old painters? Mrs. Jameson will inform us; and our best thanks are due to her for another beautiful volume elucidating religious art, which forms the third series of 'Sacred and Legendary 'Art.' The subject of the new work is 'The Legends of the 'Madonna;' and it is impossible that they could have found a better interpreter than Mrs. Jameson. The work is divided into

two parts, namely, Devotional and Historical subjects, and is preceded by a long introduction, which contains an account of the rise and progress of the worship of the Madonna. In this the authoress traces the first worship of the Virgin to at least the very commencement of the fifth century; she shows that the earliest effigies and pictures of her were considered as symbols of faith, and not as mere representations. She notices the fury of the Iconoclasts under Leo the Isaurian and his successors, which resulted in the final triumph of image worship; the Nestorian heresy, which denied to the Virgin the title of 'Theotokos' (Mother of God); the introduction, after the Crusades, of the Apocryphal gospels; the compilation of the Golden Legend, the influence of Dante, the Council of Constance, and the Condemnation of Huss, all of which contributed to the establishment of the worship of the Virgin.

The real cause of the prevalence of worship of the Madonna for more than ten centuries is a question which has seldom been fairly discussed. The one party is strongly prejudiced in its favour; the other is as strongly opposed to it. We give Mrs. Jameson much credit for the able and novel manner which she has treated this subject of contention. Although considered chiefly in an artistical point of view, she remarks upon the softening influence which the worship of the Madonna exercised over the Christian world. Everywhere, she tells us, the Art-treasures of the Middle Ages suggest one prevalent idea — 'it is that of an impersonation in the feminine 'character of beneficence, purity, and power, standing between 'an offended Deity and poor, sinning, suffering humanity, and 'clothed in the visible form of Mary, the Mother of our Lord.' Even through the obscure myths of antiquity she finds dimly shadowed forth this prevalent idea of 'a mother-goddess, chaste, 'beautiful, and benign.'

'As in the oldest Hebrew rites and Pagan superstitions men traced the promise of a coming Messiah, — as the deliverers and kings of the Old Testament, and even the demigods of heathendom, became accepted types of the person of Christ, — so the Eve of the Mosaic history, the Astarte of the Assyrians, —

'"The mooned Ashtaroth, queen and mother both,' —

the Isis, nursing Horus of the Egyptians, the Demeter and Aphrodite of the Greeks, the Scythian Freya, have been considered by some writers as types of a Divine maternity, foreshadowing the Virgin Mother of Christ. Others will have it that these scattered, dim, mistaken, often gross and perverted, ideas which were afterwards gathered into the pure, dignified, tender image of the Madonna, were but as the voice of a mighty prophecy, sounded through all the gene-

rations of men, even from the beginning of time, of the coming moral regeneration and complete and harmonious development of the whole human race, by the establishment on a higher basis of what has been called 'the feminine element' in society. And let me speak for myself. In the perpetual iteration of that beautiful image of THE WOMAN highly blessed, — *there*, where others only saw pictures or statues, I have seen this great hope standing like a spirit beside the visible form; in the fervent worship once universally given to that gracious presence, I have beheld an acknowledgment of a higher as well as gentler power than that of the strong hand and the might that makes the right, and in every earnest votary one who, as he knelt, was in this sense pious beyond the reach of his own thought, and "devout beyond the meaning of his will."' (Pp. 19, 20.)

Mrs. Jameson then shows how, in the early ages of the Christianity, the Virgin was endowed with the attributes of Ceres and of the Diana of the Ephesians; and how, with Christianity, new ideas of the moral and religious responsibility of Woman entered the world.

'With Christianity came the want of a new type of womanly perfection, combining all the attributes of the ancient female divinities with others altogether new. Christ, as the model-man, united the virtues of the two sexes, till the idea that there are essentially masculine and feminine virtues intruded itself on the higher Christian conception, and seems to have necessitated the female type.' (P. 21.)

To the reverence felt towards the mother-goddess, chivalry added fresh honours. The title of 'Our Lady' was given to the Virgin because 'she was the lady of all hearts, whose 'colours all were proud to wear.' The great religious communities enrolled themselves as her votaries. The 'Serviti,' or 'Esclaves de Marie,' we learn from Mrs. Jameson, devoted themselves in her name, as 'Our Lady of Mercy,' to acts of charity. The Cistercians, she tells us, 'wore white in honour 'of her purity, the Servi, black, in respect for her sorrows.' The Franciscans were the champions of the Immaculate Conception, and the Dominicans introduced the 'Rosary.' It may be necessary to explain that by the 'Rosary,' is understood a cycle of devotional subjects consisting of fifteen mysteries, for a complete explanation of which we must refer our readers to Mrs. Jameson's book, p. lxi.

The Apocryphal Gospels and the Golden Legend, by introducing new traditions concerning the Virgin, gave not only a fresh impulse to the general veneration for her, but supplied new themes for artists. Dante also lent his powerful influence to promote the honour of her whom he apostrophises as 'En-'nobler of thy Nature!' and the enthusiasm and religious vene-

ration for the Madonna continually increased, until it reached its culminating point about the time of Raphael.

Mrs. Jameson then tells us how art maintained its spiritual character until the revival of classical literature in the fifteenth century infused into it a new element, — the love of the beautiful; and the traditional features of the Madonna, expressive of 'that divine and contemplative grace which theologians and 'poets had associated with the queenly, the maternal, and the 'bridal character of Mary,' gave place to portraits of living persons, frequently of those whose reputation was not equal to their rank, and whose worldly beauty was but a poor substitute for the lofty yet tender expression given to the portraits of the Virgin by the painters who flourished during the religious era of Art. It was for preaching against these impieties that Savonarola lost his life. 'He exclaimed,' observes Mrs. Jameson, 'against the profaneness of those who represented the meek 'mother of Christ in gorgeous apparel, with the head unveiled, 'and under the features of women too well and too publicly 'known. He emphatically declared that if the painters knew, 'as well as he did, the influence of such pictures in perverting 'simple minds, they would hold their own works in horror and 'detestation. Savonarola yielded to none in orthodox reverence 'for the Madonna; but he desired that she should be repre-'sented in an orthodox manner. He perished at the stake, but 'not till after he had made a bonfire of the offensive effigies; 'he perished — persecuted to death by the Borgia family.'

The good seed sown by Savonarola did not, however, fall on barren ground; his influence is apparent in the works of the greatest Florentine painters of the day, and Raphael gave him a place in his grand fresco of the 'Teologia' among the doctors and teachers of the Church.

In the sixteenth century the reign of faith was superseded by the reign of taste, and the mythological personages of antiquity occupied conjointly with the mysteries of religion the pencils of the artists. Spiritual art became extinct, and theological art arose in its stead, while the 'Naturalisti' still perpetuated the profaneness against which Savonarola had inveighed, and which Salvator Rosa rebuked in vain in his satires. The Madonnas of the time were nearly all portraits. The handsome wives of Rubens and Albano appear constantly in their pictures, Domenichino painted his daughter, while Allori and Vandyck gave to the pure and spotless Madonna the features of their mistresses.

While, on the one hand, the representations of the Madonna degenerated into mere portraits of living persons; on the other

they assumed the characteristics of an idol. Instead of the orthodox red and blue drapery and veil, the Virgin was decked with worldly ornaments, and her embroidered robes, which partook of the fashion of the day, suggested constantly the supreme power of the Church, and of its papal head, if they failed to raise the thoughts to heaven. The full-length Madonnas of the Spanish school of the Louvre, with their enormous fardingales decorated like a jewelled mitre, which they resembled in shape, could only have originated in a country where religious pictures were under the direction and guardianship of the Church, and where a familiar of the Inquisition might be said to be master of the robes to the Virgin.

From her sketch of the influences which modified in a general way the pictures of the Madonna, Mrs. Jameson turns to consider the personal attributes which have been given to the Virgin by the different schools of painting. 'We have,' she says, 'the stern awful quietude of the old mosaics; the hard 'lifelessness of the degenerate Greek; the pensive sentiment of 'the Siena, and stately elegance of the Florentine Madonnas; 'the intellectual Milanese, with their large foreheads, and 'thoughtful eyes, the tender refined mysticism of the Umbrian; 'the sumptuous loveliness of the Venetian; the quaint cha-'racteristic simplicity of the early German, so stamped with 'their nationality, that I never looked round me in a room full 'of German girls without thinking of Albert Durer's Virgins; 'the intense life-like feeling of the Spanish; the prosaic, 'portrait-like nature of the Flemish schools.' These diversities suggest the question whether there was no common type from which the varieties originated. The old tradition that St. Luke the Evangelist was a painter, and that the earliest portrait of the Virgin was ascribed to him, is then discussed, and Mrs. Jameson urges that as his gospel is the authority for the few authentic particulars respecting the life of the Virgin, 'so he may, in the figurative sense, be said to have *painted* that 'portrait of her which has since been received as the perfect type 'of womanhood.'

With regard to the personal appearance of the Virgin, there is some difficulty in reconciling traditional descriptions with existing representations, we do not say *portraits*, because we speak of pictures which were executed at different periods, in various countries, and by many artists; nor do we think that Mrs. Jameson's own account is exactly consistent with the evidence she produces or with tradition. Making every allowance for the variety of dispositions in the artists who portrayed the Madonna, each of whom had of course his own peculiar impres-

sions respecting her personal appearance — and for the different circumstances and different characters in which she was represented, whether as Queen of Heaven, Mother of God, the Madonna of Mercy, or any of the other forms under which she was adored, and which might give rise to peculiar pictorial treatment, still there are certain general characteristics, derived from tradition, which we should expect to find observed by painters. We shall transcribe Mrs. Jameson's description of the person of the Virgin, extracted from the history of Nicephorus Callistus, on the authority of Epiphanius, who himself had derived it from more ancient authority. 'She was of middle stature; her face 'oval, her eyes brilliant, and of an olive tint, her eyebrows arched 'and black, her hair was of a pale brown, her complexion fair as 'wheat. She spoke little, but she spoke freely and affably; she 'was not troubled in her speech, but grave, courteous, tranquil. 'Her dress was without ornament, and in her deportment was 'nothing lax or feeble.' Mrs. Jameson mentions the general belief, in which she apparently concurs, that the Saviour resembled his Mother in person; for, she observes, 'it is argued, 'Christ had no earthly father, therefore, he could only have de-'rived his earthly lineaments from his mother. All the legends 'assume that the resemblance between the son and the mother 'must have been perfect. Dante alludes to this belief:—

'Riguarda ormai nella faccia ch' a Cristo
Più s' assomiglia.'

'Now raise thy view
Unto the visage most resembling Christ.'

Let us now see how far this description of the Virgin agrees with the traditional account of the person of the Saviour. Kugler, in his Handbook of Italian Painting (edited by Sir C. L. Eastlake) gives two descriptions; the first is from the letter of Lentulus to the Roman Senate, originally written about the end of the third century, but not found until the eleventh; the second, by John of Damascus, dates from the eighth century. In the former Christ is described a 'man of stately 'form, dignified in appearance, with a countenance that inspired 'veneration, and which those who look upon it may love as well 'as fear. His hair curling, rather dark and glossy, flows down 'upon his shoulders, and is parted in the middle after the 'manner of the Nazarenes. The forehead is smooth and very 'serene; the countenance without line or spot, of a pleasant 'complexion, moderately ruddy. The nose and mouth faultless, 'the beard thick and reddish like the hair, not long, but divided, 'the eyes bright and of varying colour.' John of Damascus

describes Jesus as 'of stately growth, with eyebrows joined 'together; beautiful eyes, large nose, curling hair; somewhat 'stooped; in the bloom of life; his beard black; his complexion 'olive, like that of his mother, with long fingers,' &c.

On comparing these two descriptions, it is easy to see that the one is European in character, while the other is decidedly Asiatic. Eyebrows joined together are considered by the Persians as a great beauty, while the large nose, the olive complexion, and the dark hair and beard, remind one of the oriental stock whence the Saviour derived his descent. And here it may be observed that Humboldt considers the inhabitants of that part of Asia which the Scripture teaches us was the cradle of the human race, as the most perfect in the world, as well with regard to their physical as to their mental endowment. It was from this stock that the Saviour was descended through his mother. The auburn hair and beard, and the ruddy complexion mentioned by Lentulus, are of the European, and we think we may say, of the Greek type. The account by Epiphanius of the person of the Virgin is also European in its character. It tallies better with that contained in the letter of Lentulus than with that of John of Damascus. If, however, the description of Epiphanius be correct, how comes it that the most ancient effigies of the Madonna, as well Italian as Byzantine, are invariably dark in colour? Much of this dark colour, we know, is to be attributed to the effect of time; but we also know that Cimabue's fair Madonnas were, when they first appeared, considered as innovations. And Cimabue's Madonnas, and Giotto's* also, are fair still; while that painted long after by Squarcione (of which Mrs. Jameson gives a woodcut, p. 129.) in the Lazara palace at Padua, is as dark in colour as the others are fair. Whether this dark colour be the effect of time or of design, we cannot determine. Mrs. Jameson evidently favours the fair type; for this she has certainly the sanction of the great masters of art, and she expresses her dissent from those who, because some of the Greek pictures and carved images had become black through extreme age, agreed that the Virgin herself must have been of a very dark complexion, and who in favour of this idea quotes the text from the Canticles: 'I am black, but 'comely, O ye daughters of Jerusalem.' Whether, however, they acquired their black tint by age, or whether the dark colour was originally given by the painter, there is no doubt that as Mrs. Jameson says, the Madonnas of the old Byzantine type were held in peculiar veneration.

* See also Handbook of Painting (Italy), edited by Eastlake, p. 45. n. first edition.

'This arose,' she observes, 'from the fact, always to be borne in mind, that the most ancient artistic figure of the Madonna was a purely theological symbol; apparently the moral type was too nearly allied to the human and the real to satisfy faith. It is the ugly dark-favoured ancient Greek Madonnas such as this, which had all along the credit of being miraculous; "And to this day," says Kugler, "the "Neapolitan lemonade-seller will allow no other than a formal Greek "Madonna with olive-green complexion and veiled head, to be set up "in his booth." It is the same in Russia. Such pictures, in which there is no attempt at representation, real or ideal, and which surely have a sort of imaginary sanctity and power, are not so much idols as mere *fetishes*. The most lovely Madonna by Raphael or Titian would not have the same effect. Guido, who himself painted lovely Virgins, went every Saturday to pray before the little black "Madonna della "Guardia," and as we are assured, held this old eastern relic in devout veneration.' (P. xxxvi.)

On looking over the account of the attributes and accessories introduced into the pictures of the 'Virgin and Child,' we find it mentioned, that in a painting by Baroccio the infant Saviour is made to hold up a bird before a cat; upon which Mrs. Jameson observes, 'so completely were the original symbolism and all 'the religious proprieties of art at this time set aside.' What would our authoress have said if she had seen the 'Annunciation 'of Aliense' in the Seminario at Venice, in which Moschini (History of Painting in Padua) says a cat is introduced in the act of making a spring at the Holy Spirit, which is represented under the form of a dove! Where could have been the religious feeling which ought to have guided the hand of the artist, or which permitted the exhibition of so irreverent and material a treatment of this subject? The difficulty of distinguishing the symbol from the object of veneration, and the tendency of the one to degenerate into the other, has been felt at all times. It was the consciousness of this danger which led to the destruction of works of art by the Iconoclasts, and which at a later period determined the rigid Protestants to exclude pictures and sculpture from their places of worship. Our incapacity to express what is immaterial by what is material—as, for example, the imperfect representation of the descent of the Holy Spirit in the visible and tangible form of a dove,—leads in some cases to image worship, in others to infidelity.

It is curious to trace in this work the progress of Mariolatry. Mrs. Jameson has considered the subject purely in an artistic point of view, and has contented herself with stating facts, without making any comments on this subject of dispute between Roman Catholic and Protestant. We do not, however, consider ourselves precluded from making a few remarks which occur to us from the perusal of the work, and especially we would call

the attention of the reader to the manner in which the attributes of the Saviour are given by the Roman Catholics to the Virgin. The Saviour, during the Middle Ages, was invested with a stern character, and was supposed to be animated by a sentiment of vengeance. 'Christ himself,' says Mrs. Jameson, speaking of this period, 'is less a judge than an avenger,' while the office of Mediator, which the New Testament assigns to the Saviour, is given by her worshippers to the Virgin:—'Maria filio suo pro 'Ecclesia supplicat.' Again, she is styled 'The Star of Jacob,' 'The Root of Jesse,'—terms which are considered by Protestants as applicable to the Saviour only. The words 'I am the 'door, by me if any man enter in he shall be saved,' are also applied to her. She is, moreover, the 'Spouse' of the Canticles, the 'King's Daughter,' of the Psalms, 'all glorious within, 'whose clothing is of wrought gold.' She is 'the woman 'clothed with the sun,' described in the Apocalypse, 'having the 'moon beneath her feet, and upon her head a crown of twelve 'stars.' She is also invested with the character of Heavenly Wisdom, and to her have been applied the magnificent passages of the Book of Proverbs, 'The Lord possessed me in the beginning 'of His way, before His works of old. I was set up from ever-'lasting, or ever the earth was. . . . Then I was by Him as 'one brought up with Him, and I was daily his delight, 'rejoicing alway before him.'

The historical subjects occupy the latter half of the book; the New Testament furnishes the only authentic notices of the Life of the Virgin — the traditionary and legendary scenes are derived from the Apocryphal gospels current in the Middle Ages, and from a Greek legendary poem once, Mrs. Jameson says, attributed to St. John the Evangelist, but supposed to be the work of a certain Greek named Meliton, who lived in the ninth century, and who 'has merely dressed up in a more fan-'ciful form ancient traditions of the Church.' Some knowledge of these legends is absolutely essential to the student of Italian Art. The work is illustrated by reference to the most celebrated pictures, by numerous woodcuts, and by upwards of sixty etchings, the latter by the hand of Mrs. Jameson. We recommend this beautiful and instructive volume to the perusal of our readers.

ART. IX.—1. *The Morality of Public Men: A Letter to the Right Hon. the Earl of Derby.* London: 1852. Pp. 48.

2. *How should an Income Tax be levied?* Considered in a Letter to the Right Hon. B. Disraeli, M. P., Chancellor of the Exchequer. By J. G. HUBBARD, Esq. London: 1852. Pp. 55.

THE meeting of the new Parliament took place on the 4th of November last, and on the 11th, after the usual delay necessary for the swearing in of members, the Queen's Speech was delivered. It had been announced by Lord Derby in the previous Session, that the new Parliament would be assembled before the end of the year, in order that the principles to be adopted for our future commercial and financial policy might be discussed and decided, when the results of the elections would be known, and the prevailing opinion of the country would have been expressed through its representatives. The question of Free Trade occupied the largest share of attention at the elections, and, more than any other, decided the choice of candidates. By yielding to the Free-trade current in the towns, and by blowing up the embers of Protectionist agitation in the counties, the Government contrived to swell their minority until it amounted to nearly half the House of Commons; but the means by which this result was obtained were fatal to the integrity of their party. The Derbyite ranks thus recruited contained many Free Traders; and it was evident that when Parliament met, all real struggle about the practical recognition of the Free-trade principle was at an end.* The national jury had heard the evidence and the

* In his speech on Mr. Villiers's motion, Nov. 23., Mr. Disraeli said, 'I have shown the House that, acting on these two principles, 'first, that we should not disturb that legislation unless the working 'classes were permanently suffering; secondly, that we would by re-'medial legislation alleviate and mitigate as much as possible any just 'claims for relief placed before us,—claims which I have shown that the 'leaders of almost all parties have attempted to alleviate, we came to 'a dissolution of Parliament. The dissolution took place in July. 'The moment the elections were terminated, it was the duty of Her 'Majesty's Government to form a definitive and conclusive opinion with 'respect to the feeling of the people on this question, of attempting to 'abrogate the repeal of the laws of 1846 and 1849, which admitted the 'importation of corn, the importation of sugar, and the free navigation 'of the country. There could be, and there was, no question in the 'minds of Her Majesty's Ministers with respect to the result of that 'election. There was no doubt that there was not only not a prepon-

arguments of counsel on both sides; they had received the judge's charge; they had retired to deliberate; and they had agreed upon their verdict. All that now remained to be done was that the verdict should be delivered in open court, and that judgment should be given accordingly. This was, in fact, the process for which Parliament met in November last, and for which Lord Derby and his colleagues had to prepare themselves, however little agreeable it might be to their feelings, after the circuitous, insincere, and indefensible course which they had held.*

Before the meeting of Parliament, Lord Derby's Cabinet had decided to abandon altogether the system of protective duties, and, in the measures which they were about to propose, to adopt those principles, both commercial and financial, which are considered as characteristic of the Free-trade system. Having formed this decision, their proper course clearly was to embody it in the Queen's Speech. This was the most solemn and authentic manner in which the intentions of the Government could be announced; and though it might not be usual to make confessions of faith in royal speeches, yet such occasions as the present, fortunately, are of rare occurrence. There had been a new party created, and a parliamentary opposition maintained for six years, upon the single principle of Protection. A Government of Protectionists had been formed; Parliament had been dissolved in order that the question should be decided by the country; and a new Parliament had met in order to deliver their verdict upon it. In these circumstances, a plain and unequivocal declaration, through the Queen's Speech, of the intentions of the Government, such as we have since ascertained them to have been, would have removed all uncertainty, and precluded all debate on the subject. If, however, the Government did not think fit to announce their change of policy, and to read their

'derating majority in favour of a change in the laws passed in those 'years, or even of modifying them in any degree; but that there was 'a decisive opinion on the part of the country that that settlement 'should not be disturbed.' (*Times'* Report.)

* Mr. Disraeli occupied a considerable portion of his speech on Mr. Villiers's motion, by an argument intended to prove that the Protectionists had never been Protectionists. It is true, that more far-sighted or less sincere than the rest of his party, he abstained from the extreme language which they held; but if any body doubts that Lord Derby was, in the fullest sense of the word, a Protectionist, we advise him to read the pamphlet first named at the head of our Article, equally distinguished by the accuracy of its facts, the force and pungency of its style, and the elevation of its moral tone.

recantation, in the Queen's Speech, then the next best course was that the Queen's Speech should have been wholly silent on the subject, and that Lord Derby in one House of Parliament, and Mr. Disraeli in the other, should each, on the first night of the Session, have made, in concert, an authentic and complete declaration of the policy of the Government; similar to that which was actually made by Lord Derby in the House of Lords. The Government, however, did not adopt either of these straightforward, and (as we should have thought) obvious courses. They preferred a third and more tortuous line, which consisted in introducing into the Queen's Speech the following paragraph: —

'It gives me pleasure to be enabled, by the blessing of Pro-'vidence, to congratulate you on the generally improved condi-'tion of the country, and especially of the industrious classes. 'If you should be of opinion that recent legislation, in contri-'buting, *with other causes*, to this happy result, has at the same 'time *inflicted unavoidable injury* on certain important interests, 'I recommend you dispassionately to consider how far it may be 'practicable, equitably, *to mitigate that injury*, and to enable the 'industry of the country *to meet successfully* that unrestricted 'competition to which Parliament, in its wisdom, has decided 'that it should be subjected.'

Nobody, acquainted with the actual position of affairs, who reads this paragraph, can doubt that its ambiguity is studied. It was as much intended to have a double handle, one for each side of the House, as the ancient oracles were intended to have a double construction, in order to suit either a lucky or an unlucky event. This design of a double adaptation was indeed candidly admitted in debate by Mr. Walpole. The paragraph affirms nothing, except the general improvement of the country. Its principal member is put in a hypothetical form; which expresses no opinion, and refers the decision to Parliament; but refers it in an unintelligible and unpractical manner. As Mr. Sidney Herbert remarked, it is equivalent to saying: 'If you 'think that Free Trade has done mischief, which you don't, you 'will adopt certain measures, which you won't.' To insert such a paragraph in the Queen's Speech, on such a question, at such a moment, after a long series of autumn cabinets, was, in our opinion, trifling with public business, with Parliament, and with the country. Moreover, as we shall see presently, the course which this paragraph recommends, or rather indicates, was not that which Ministers subsequently pursued in proposing their Budget.

This equivocal passage could not be expected to satisfy the

Free-trade party as to the intentions of the Government; and, accordingly, on the first night of the Session, Mr. C. Villiers, the long-tried advocate of Corn-law repeal,—who had, in former Sessions, fought an uphill fight against Protection, when that policy was still maintained by a large majority of the House,—gave notice that he should, on a future day, move a resolution affirmative of the benefits produced by the recent Free-trade legislation. This notice having been given, the Address on the Queen's Speech was agreed to without a division; and the main question which Parliament had met to decide was reserved for ulterior discussion.

The proposal of a distinct declaration on the subject of Free Trade having thus been forced on the Opposition by the equivocal language of the Queen's Speech, Mr. Villiers, on the 23rd of November, moved a resolution in which the good effects of the Free-trade measures were affirmed, and which pledged the House to the adoption of that policy. This motion was debated for three nights with great ability, particularly on the opposition side of the House: but the debate was protracted beyond its natural length by the objection of the Government to certain words in the resolution, and by their declaration that if it was carried in the proposed form, they would resign. This announcement gave rise to the interposition of Lord Palmerston, who, as an intermediate course, proposed a resolution which had been prepared by Sir James Graham in concert with Lord John Russell, and had been assented to by Mr. Gladstone, but which was substantially identical with that moved by Mr. Villiers. To this resolution the Government did not object; and indeed Lord Derby had previously advised his friends to accept it, at a meeting of them summoned by him in Downing Street. The division took place upon the choice between the two resolutions proposed respectively by Mr. Villiers and Lord Palmerston: their effect, as affirmative of the Free-trade policy, being similar; but the former contained words to which the Ministers objected, and which entailed their resignation, whereas the latter did not. The result was that 256 voted for Mr. Villiers's resolution, and 336 against it; whereupon the House divided upon Lord Palmerston's amendment, which was adopted by the overwhelming majority of 468 to 53. In the first division the Peelite party, with Sir James Graham and several Liberals, voted in the majority; a course which certainly indicated no eagerness to turn the Ministers out of office, and afforded no evidence of an 'unprincipled coalition' for the purpose of defeating the Government. That party which had proposed and carried the Repeal of the Corn Law in 1846, were surely the last persons who

could be charged with faction in affirming that it was 'wise, 'just, and beneficial.' They might, with perfect propriety, have supported these 'odious epithets,' as they were called by Mr. Disraeli. If, therefore, they abstained from voting for Mr. Villiers's resolution, it could only have been from a desire to avoid a course which the Government treated as hostile and harsh. If any 'coalition' or 'combination' existed on this occasion, it was rather in favour of the Government than against it. And although Lord Derby, after he had resigned office, complained of not being supported by the Peelite party, that party had nevertheless been considered by him as distinct from his own, and its junction with the Derbyites on this division was, for the moment, a 'coalition' of independent sections of the House. We presume, that when Lord Derby's Secretary of the Treasury stood against Mr. Cardwell at Liverpool, when Derbyite candidates opposed Mr. Gladstone, Sir G. Clerk, and Lord Mahon, the Government did not treat the Peelites as their friends, or seek to obtain their political support.

The following are the words of Lord Palmerston's resolution, carried by 468 to 53 votes,— which will show that the system of Free Trade, as opposed to Protection, was unequivocally adopted by the House of Commons, and acquiesced in by the Protectionist Government.

'That it is the opinion of this House that the improved con-
'dition of the country, and especially of the industrious classes,
'is mainly the result of recent legislation, which has established
'the principle of unrestricted competition, has abolished taxes
'imposed for the purposes of Protection, and has thereby dimin-
'ished the cost and increased the abundance of the principal
'articles of the food of the people.

'That it is the opinion of this House, that this policy, firmly
'maintained and prudently extended, will, without inflicting
'injury on any important interest, best enable the industry of
'the country to bear its burthens, and will thereby most surely
'promote the welfare and contentment of the people.

'That this House will be ready to take into consideration
'any measures, consistent with these principles, which, in pur-
'suance of Her Majesty's gracious Speech and recommendation,
'may be laid before it.'

This resolution, it will be observed, recognises in the amplest manner the success of the Free-trade policy with respect to the past, and looks forward to its extension with respect to the future. Moreover, by expressing the readiness of the House to take into consideration measures in accordance with the principles of Free Trade, it implicitly signifies the unwillingness of

the House to take into consideration measures not in accordance with these principles.

With this division terminated the first act of the sessional drama; with the second act, on which we now enter, Lord Derby's Ministry comes to a conclusion.

On the first night of the Session Mr. Disraeli announced that the financial plan of the Government was prepared, and that he would bring it forward on an early day. Much anxiety was expressed by the Government to be permitted to produce their financial measures, and the motion of Mr. Villiers was treated by them as factious and obstructive, because it retarded the advent of the Budget, and, even for a few days, withheld this great boon from the expectant public.* The House, however, who remembered that the Government had declared that their financial measures would depend on the event of the elections, —that they had no fixed principles, but that their policy was a sliding-scale, which would fluctuate according to the votes of the new House,—that if there was a majority for Free Trade, they would propose a Free-trade Budget, but if there was a majority for Protection they would propose a Protectionist Budget;—the House, we say, remembering that the policy of Ministers was to be governed, not by their own opinions, but by the comparative numbers of the newly-elected House, thought it wise and necessary that the House should authentically declare its adoption of a certain policy, and that the Government should subscribe to it, before the financial measures were introduced. As soon, therefore, as Mr. Villiers's motion was disposed of, the moment so ardently desired by Ministers had arrived, and

* In his speech on Mr. Villiers's motion (Nov. 23.), Mr. Disraeli said, 'We pledged ourselves that there should be an autumn meeting, 'in order that the House might have an opportunity of ascertaining 'the policy of the Government. The Parliament is now assembled 'for that purpose. I pledged myself, if an opportunity offered, to 'bring forward measures which I think the altered circumstances of 'the country require. Previous to my election I communicated frankly 'my views to my constituents, by telling them, as I always did, that 'the assimilation of our financial to our commercial system, would 'ultimately prove the policy by which general contentment would be 'given to the country. *I am ready to fulfil this last pledge;* and the 'measures which the Government has prepared would have been 'brought forward but for this—I must call it—vexatious motion. 'These measures are founded on the assumption that Unrestricted 'Competition, or, to use the more popular phrase, Free Trade, is the 'principle of our commercial system.' See some similar remarks in Lord Derby's speech in the House of Lords on Nov. 22.

the all-important Budget was opened. The debate upon this motion terminated on the 26th of November: on the 3rd of December Mr. Disraeli made his financial statement to the House. This statement was elaborate, wide-ranging, and diffuse in expression: its delivery occupied no less than five hours and a quarter. The matter and thought, however, bore no proportion to the quantity of words: as a speech, it was inferior to his financial statement of the previous Session, which was lucid, concise, and full of interesting facts. His object, in making this verbose oration, seems to have been to magnify the importance of his Budget, by a long-continued flourish of trumpets; and at the same time to effect a retreat from his Protectionist position, under cover of the dust of his own cavalry and the smoke of his own guns.

This speech may be considered as the finishing scene of the long drama which had begun in 1846, and as the settlement of the Protectionist agitation. In the introductory part, Mr. Disraeli disposed of the claims of the three great interests which had been affected by the repeal of the corn law, and of the navigation laws, and by the alteration of the sugar duties. For the relief of the shipping interest, he recommended several changes of the law, and a remission of 100,000*l.* a year now paid by ships as light-dues; which sum would have to be made good to the Trinity House, from the public exchequer. For the relief of the West India interest he proposed to permit the refining of sugar in bond; the other remedies which had been suggested, and particularly the arresting of the equalisation of the duties on colonial and foreign sugar, he rejected. With respect to the agricultural interest, he divided the principal burdens upon land into the highway rate, the county rate, and the poor's rate —(a division which, we would observe, is only applicable to England); and for the former rate he announced a measure for the reform of the management of highways in England, which had been prepared by Sir W. Jolliffe, the Under Secretary of State for the Home Department. As to the county-rate and poor-rate, he proposed no change—the grounds for making a transfer of expenditure from the poor-rates to the exchequer, had, he stated, been weakened by the diminution in the cost of the relief of the poor since he had brought forward motions on the subject. We are not disposed to scrutinise too narrowly the reasons which induced Mr. Disraeli and his colleagues to arrive at this sound conclusion. Considering the expectations which their former arguments had raised, we owe much to their forbearance in not disturbing the present system of local taxation. It cannot be denied that the relief of the poor, the maintenance

of highways, and the punishment of crime, are national objects, and that those charges are now defrayed by taxes which are levied on real, exclusively of personal, property. Nevertheless, the system, taken as a whole, is justifiable on grounds of enlarged expediency; and even the owners of real property, upon whom it seems to press unfairly, profit by it in the long run. Probably the decision of the Government was assisted by the further consideration of the difficulty of meeting new charges on the exchequer, and of the dissatisfaction which would be created among their own party by replacing the powers of magistrates and other local unpaid functionaries by paid servants of the central government, an inevitable consequence of this change of system.

The way having been thus cleared by the formal abandonment of protective duties, and of relief from local burdens on land, Mr. Disraeli proceeded to set forth the substantial contents of his Budget. These, though ushered in with a great parade of words, were not of very extensive operation, and admit of a brief statement. His main propositions were five in number, and affected the duties on malt, hops, and tea, the house tax, and the income tax. We will take these propositions in their order.

1. The duty on malt to be reduced from 2*s.* 7½*d.* and 5 per cent. to 1*s.* 3½*d.* and 5 per cent. on the bushel. This duty to be levied uniformly on all malt made from barley, and bere or bigg; the discrimination in favour of bere or bigg being abolished. The drawback allowed to spirits distilled from malt in Scotland to be likewise repealed. The loss to the revenue from this reduction is estimated at 2,500,000*l.* Instead of the absolute prohibition of the importation of malt, imposed by the existing law, foreign malt to be admitted at a duty of 1*s.* 8*d.* and 5 per cent. upon a bushel.

2. The excise duty on native hops to be reduced from 2*d.* and 5 per cent. to 1*d.* and 5 per cent. per lb.: the custom's duty on foreign hops to be reduced from 2*l.* 5*s.* to 1*l.* 2*s.* 6*d.* per cwt.; or from nearly 4*d.* to nearly 2*d.* per lb. The loss of revenue by this reduction is estimated at 120,000*l.*

3. The duty on tea to be reduced from its present rate of 2*s.* 2½*d.* per lb. according to the following scale: —

Year.	Duty. s. d.	Year.	Duty. s. d.
1853 - -	1 10	1856 - -	1 4
1854 - -	1 8	1857 - -	1 2
1855 - -	1 6	1858 and the following years -	1 0

The reduction being 4¼*d.* in 1853, and 2*d.* in each of the next five years, when the duty would remain fixed at 1*s.* The tea duty in 1851 produced a revenue of 5,900,624*l.*, charged upon 54,000,000 lbs., from which sum the effects of the proposed scale can be estimated.

4. The tax on inhabited houses, being for shops, public houses, and farm houses, 6*d.* in the pound, and for all other houses, 9*d.* in the pound, on the annual value, to be increased respectively to 1*s.* and 1*s.* 6*d.* in the pound, and to be extended from houses worth the annual rent of 20*l.* or upwards, to houses worth the annual rent of 10*l.* or upwards. The tax so augmented is estimated to produce 1,723,000*l.* a year.

5. With respect to the income tax, the tax on farmers' profits, Schedule B., to be reduced from 3½*d.* to 1¾*d.* in the pound in England, and from 2½*d.* to 1¼*d.* in the pound in Scotland.

The tax on Schedules D. and E. (trades, professions, and offices), to be reduced from 7*d.* to 5¼*d.* in the pound.

The duties in Schedules C. and E. (funds and public offices), to be extended to Ireland.

In Schedules A. and C. (land and funds) the minimum to be reduced from incomes of 150*l.* to incomes of 50*l.* a year; in Schedules B. D. and E. (farmers' profits, trades, professions, and offices), the minimum to be reduced from incomes of 150*l.* to incomes of 100*l.* a year.

The income tax so modified is estimated to produce 5,421,000*l.*; nearly the same as its present amount.

Such being the main propositions of Mr. Disraeli's Budget, it remains for us to examine how far they accord with the expectations of its contents held out to the country, and how far the adoption of them would have been likely to improve our financial system.

When Mr. Disraeli, in his written and oral addresses to his constituents before and during the late general election, announced the abandonment of Protection, he coupled this announcement with a declaration that the claims of the agriculturists, West Indians, and shipowners, which could not be satisfied by a restoration of Protection, would be adequately met by a general and systematic revision of taxation, founded on novel principles, more just and beneficial than those which had hitherto been its basis. He stated that the Government would, as soon as it was in their power, bring forward measures framed in this spirit; he considered the times as favourable for the undertaking, and he anticipated that these measures would not only, by adjustments and reductions of taxes, greatly relieve

the burdens of the community, but that they would receive the sympathy and approbation and support of all the various classes of the country.*

Now, on comparing the ideal plan of finance announced in the summer with the real and positive plan produced in December, can it be said that the execution at all corresponds with the design, or that any attempt was made to fulfil the promises, voluntarily tendered to the public by the Government, and indeed almost forced upon its acceptance? Who can pretend to discover in this Budget the results of a general revision of taxation, systematic or unsystematic? Does it contain any novel principles; does it manifest ingenuity, resource, or invention? Is there a single proposition in it which has not been repeatedly under the consideration of Parliament, and with which financiers are not perfectly familiar? The reduction of the malt tax and hop tax may be considered, if not annual, at least periodical motions in the House of Commons; the reduction of the tea duty has been often pressed upon Parliament, and an association has, we believe, been formed for promoting the question; and the extension of the house tax has been frequently suggested for adoption, and it is strongly recommended as a good source of revenue by Mr. M'Culloch, in the new edition of his work on taxation.† The discrimination between permanent and precarious incomes in the assessment of the income tax has been more than once supported by elaborate arguments; the introduction of this principle of graduation may be said to have been the main object of Mr. Hume's Income-tax Committee of 1851, and a motion was made in that Committee by Mr. Sotheron that the tax on Schedule D. should be three-fourths of the tax on the other Schedules, which is exactly the proportion adopted by Mr. Disraeli.

The *diminution of the cost of production* was the cardinal principle laid down by Mr. Disraeli last summer, for the guidance of the Legislature; and to this end all his financial reforms were to be directed.‡ But who can maintain that this principle has presided over the formation of the late Budget?

---

* These declarations will be found in Mr. Disraeli's address and speeches, cited in the last Number of this Journal, No. 196. p. 530. 533-5.

† See his 'Treatise on Taxation and the Funding System,' p. 67. ed. 2. Mr. M'Culloch here indicates the policy of extending the house tax to houses of 10*l.* a-year.

‡ See the quotations in the last Number of this Journal, p. 530. and 534.

'The means (said Mr. Disraeli to the Buckinghamshire farmers) 'by which you may obtain redress is not to increase prices, in 'order that you may have a fair remuneration for your toil, but 'it is to reduce the cost of production. That is the sound ad- 'vice which the agricultural interest must act upon. . . . 'I say (he added), in accordance with the spirit of the age, and 'with the temper of the country, let your produce now be 'raised upon the cheapest possible principles. But then it 'follows you must not allow your native produce to be shackled 'by laws which hinder the producer from competing with foreign 'countries. *It follows that, in the new principle of justice, the 'cultivators of the soil shall no longer remain the only class inca- 'pable of receiving a fair profit for their industry.*' Now, will any one venture to affirm that the late Budget contains a single measure which diminishes the cost of production for agricultural produce? Is there anything in it which enables the farmer to grow corn or green crops, and to breed or feed live stock, at a cheaper rate? The reduction of the malt tax and hop tax might possibly somewhat increase the demand for barley and hops; but it certainly would not diminish the cost of producing either of these articles. The promise to relieve the agricultural interest, by diminishing the cost of production for their native produce, has remained absolutely without fulfilment. As to the shipping interest, the various measures indicated by Mr. Disraeli may, in a slight degree, tend to diminish the cost of navigating ships; but the refining of sugar in bond, the only concession made to the West India interest, cannot diminish the cost of producing sugar in the West Indies.

The promise moreover of a brighter financial day, the first streaks of which were said to be visible in the horizon; and of a reduction of the burdens of the people, by a readjustment of taxation, has remained equally unperformed. To the extent to which there was a legitimate surplus of income over expenditure, Mr. Disraeli, like every other Chancellor of the Exchequer who has preceded him, and like every Chancellor of the Exchequer who will come after him, might safely reduce taxation. But can any one truly say that this Budget would have lightened the burdens of the people by a readjustment of taxation? That the commutation of half the malt tax into an increased and extended house tax did not give great satisfaction to the country, was shown in a very significant manner. Even in the income tax, the changes which were popular were countervailed by other changes which were at least equally unpopular. If the introduction of the principle of graduation between permanent and precarious incomes was acceptable to the mercantile and pro-

fessional classes, there was a large set-off in the extension of Schedules A. and C. to incomes of 50*l.*, in the extension of Schedules B., D., and E. to incomes of 100*l.*, and in the extension of Schedules C. and E. to Ireland.

It cannot be even said that the Budget, as proposed, accords with the more recent indication of the intentions of the Government afforded in the Queen's Speech. So far as that enigmatic passage can be construed, it affirms that the Free-trade policy has inflicted injury on certain important interests, and recommends Parliament to take measures for mitigating that injury, and for enabling the industry of the country to meet successfully the unrestricted competition to which it is now subjected. But how does the Budget enable the 'suffering interests' to wage a more successful war against the competition of the foreign producer? Some slight palliatives are indeed tendered to the West India and shipping interests; but to the landed interest, which we suppose we may consider, without fear of contradiction, to have been the main object of solicitude to the Government, no relief whatever is afforded, which can diminish the cost of production. The sum remitted to the farmers of England and Scotland by the change in Schedule B. of the income tax is estimated by Mr. Disraeli at 156,000*l.*; a saving which would not, we presume, greatly facilitate the operations of agriculture. As to the reduction of the malt tax, it certainly could not diminish the cost of producing barley; and if for the present prohibition of foreign malt, a customs' duty of 1*s.* 8*d.* per bushel were substituted, the competition, which is now very effectually 'restricted,' would be conducted on nearly equal terms.

Substantially, however, it may be said, the budget was framed in fulfilment of the promises made by the Government before and during the elections. Fiscal relief of some kind was promised to the agriculturists; and the reduction of the malt and hop duties was intended as the fulfilment of this promise. In order to supply the deficit thus created, the increase of the house tax was proposed, and, as a compensation to the occupiers of houses and to the mercantile classes for the remission of the duties on agricultural produce, and for the increase of the house tax, the Government tendered a reduction of the tea duty, and the discrimination between permanent and precarious incomes in the income tax. Thus all the characteristic points in the Budget may be traced to an attempt to fulfil the original promise of the Government, to give relief to the agricultural interest by changes of taxation.

Mr. Disraeli proposed the reduction of the *Malt tax* on the

ground that it is a tax on beer, an article of prime necessity, which enters largely into the sustenance of the people. He considered it a consumer's tax; but 'he had always told his 'friends that though it was certainly the interest of the con- 'sumer that the malt tax should be dealt with, still it was his 'opinion that there was no tax with which they could deal, *which,* '*if properly dealt with, would more benefit the agricultural interest.*' Unfortunately for the Government, however, neither the consumer nor the agricultural interest anticipated any sensible relief from the remission of half the malt tax. Upon a calculation of the reduction to be expected from the brewers and publicans, the gain to the consumer seemed to amount to a possible chance of a farthing in a quart of beer—a gain which could hardly arouse the enthusiasm of the most inveterate beer-drinkers. As to the farmers, whose gain Mr. Disraeli considered, though incidental, yet certain, they showed equal indifference to the boon proffered to them by their long-trusted, if not trustworthy, friends and leaders. Not a county meeting was convened to petition for a repeal of half the malt duty; although time was found for numerous petitions against the increase of the house tax. The mistake of the Government in tendering half the malt tax to the landed interest as an equivalent for the lost duties on imported corn, arose from their taking this interest in the gross, and not discriminating between different sorts of grain and different qualities of soil. The great change produced by the repeal of the corn laws has been the reduction in the price of *wheat:* those who have suffered temporary loss by that measure have been the owners and occupiers of lands principally devoted to the growth of wheat. Barley, however, has not sustained a proportionate decline of price since the opening of the trade, and those interested in barley land have little to complain of. On comparing the prices of British wheat and barley for the fifty-two years from 1790 to 1842, it will be seen that the price of barley was then in general about half, or less than half, the price of wheat. The following years may serve as specimens:—

[See Table in next page.]

Now, on coming down to the period since the repeal of the corn law, we find that the average prices of wheat and barley stand thus in the last two years:—

	Wheat.		Barley.	
	s.	*d.*	*s.*	*d.*
1851 - -	38	6	24	9
1852 - -	40	9	28	6

Year.	Average Prices per Imperial Quarter.	
	Wheat.	Barley.
	s. *d.*	*s.* *d.*
1820 - -	67 10	33 10
1821 - -	56 1	26 0
1822 - -	44 7	21 10
1840 - -	66 4	36 5
1841 - -	64 4	32 10
1842 - -	57 3	27 6

Instead, therefore, of barley being only about *half* the price of wheat (as it was in general before the repeal of the corn law), it has, during the last two years, been nearly *three quarters* of that price. Mr. Tooke, we observe, in his History of Prices, similarly points out that in 1835, when the price of wheat was low, the price of barley was relatively high; whereas in 1838, when the price of wheat had risen considerably, barley had undergone a very slight increase, and the ordinary ratio was restored. The following are the numbers for these years: —

	Wheat.	Barley.
	s. *d.*	*s.* *d.*
1835 - -	39 4	29 11
1838 - -	64 7	31 5*

If, therefore, any wound has been made by the repeal of the corn laws, the reduction of the malt tax would put the plaister in the wrong place. If a reduction of the malt tax would benefit any portion of the agricultural interest, it would be the growers of barley; whereas it is the growers of wheat who need the relief. But, it may be said, if there is an increased demand for barley, barley will be substituted for wheat, and this substitution will benefit the farmer. To a certain extent, no doubt, this substitution might be effected; but it could not be made with profit on a large scale. The soil which is best fitted for wheat, is not well fitted for barley; and it would be more profitable to grow wheat upon it, even at its present reduced prices, than to use it for growing inferior barley. All the argument, however, as to relief to agriculture from a reduction of the malt tax proceeds upon the assumption that there would be an increased demand

* See Tooke's History of Prices in 1838 and 1839, p. 19. Compare his History of Prices from 1793 to 1837, vol. ii. p. 230-3.

for barley in consequence of the diminished price of beer; whereas the diminution in the retail price of beer, produced by a repeal of half the malt tax, would be nearly insensible. Besides which, an increased demand for barley would now (as we showed in our last Number) lead, not to higher prices of native barley, but to larger importations of foreign barley.

The malt tax produces, in round numbers, 5,000,000*l.* a-year. A reduction in the tax would leave all the excise inspection and the machinery of collection unchanged, and would maintain them for the sake of a smaller revenue. We agree with Mr. M'Culloch, in considering it as a tax which, in the present state of our finances, it is inexpedient to reduce, and impossible to repeal.* The malt tax is now in reality a beer tax. Beer and spirits are to the middle and working classes, what wine is to the wealthier classes. Without some tax on beer, it is scarcely possible to raise a large revenue in this country. The revenue now levied on beer, by means of the malt tax, is, notwithstanding the great increase of wealth and population, considerably less than the revenue obtained from the same article, by the malt and beer duties, in the years between 1815 and 1830.† Besides, if beer is wholly untaxed, the present high duties on British spirits, and the corresponding high duties on foreign spirits, together producing 8,500,000*l.* a-year, and, therefore, one of the main stays of the Exchequer, could not be maintained.

---

* 'The malt tax is, in truth, not only one of the very best of 'existing taxes, but it is one of those which, should any considerable 'increase of revenue be required, may be most advantageously raised. We do not mean by this to undervalue its sinister influence over 'agriculture; but where is the tax, fitted to produce between five and 'six millions a year, against which some weighty objections may not be 'urged ?'—Treatise on Taxation, p. 246 ed. 2. Mr. M'Culloch proceeds to suggest the imposition of a protecting duty of 2*s.* or 2*s.* 6*d.* a quarter on foreign barley, in order to countervail the malt tax. But all such import-duty levied on barley *not* intended for malting would be unjust: and as foreign barley used for malting pays the malt tax as well as native barley, we do not see the need of a countervailing duty.

† The beer duty was repealed in 1830: in the four previous years its produce was as follows:

	£		£
1826 - -	3,492,779	1828 - -	3,128,047
1827 - -	3,265,441	1829 - -	3,217,812

In 1829 the produce of the malt duty was 3,026,133. Between the peace and 1830, the income obtained from malt and beer was between six and seven millions a year.

The argument of relief to agriculture applies as much to the duty on spirits as to that on malt: for if malt is made of barley, British spirits are likewise made from barley and oats.

The *hop duty* is variable in its amount, on account of the uncertainty of the crop, and of the cultivation being carried on under the shelter of a protective duty, which excludes foreign competition. In 1849 the net receipt was 205,936*l.*: in 1851 it was 426,028*l.* Mr. Disraeli appears to take its average produce at only 240,000*l.* a year: inasmuch as he estimates the loss from the reduction of the duty to a half at 120,000*l.* It seems to us that the hop duty is not worth maintaining at all, unless it produces something like its present amount. It is not reasonable to subject the entire hop cultivation of England to an excise inspection, in order to raise a revenue of 120,000*l.* a year. The cost of hops is so small an ingredient in the price of beer, that a reduction of the duty would be wholly insensible to the consumer.* In ordinary years, the grower adds the entire duty to the price of the article which he sells; and the probability is, that the 120,000*l.* of revenue abandoned by Mr. Disraeli would be shared between the dealer and the brewer. If the entire excise duty on hops were repealed, the protective duty on foreign hops must go with it: a change which would probably be beneficial to the consumer, but would, we suspect, be at first, of doubtful advantage to the grower.

The reductions of the malt and hop duties having been proposed, ostensibly for the benefit of the consumer, but in reality for the satisfaction of the agricultural interest, Mr. Disraeli seems to have bethought himself that something must be done to please the towns; and with this view the reduction of the *tea duty* appears to have been brought forward. It would undoubtedly be a great advantage to diminish the duty on tea, whenever the state of our finances will bear the reduction; but the arguments against a change are not weak. The tea duty now produces nearly 6,000,000*l.* a year! tea is an article which spoils with wet, and cannot be easily smuggled: a great reduction in its price was produced by the opening of the China trade, and even with the present high duty, the consumption is large and increasing. Coffee and cocoa, substitutes for tea, are

* In introducing the proposition for the reduction of the hop duty, Mr. Disraeli says, 'We are unwilling to make this effort *to give cheap 'beer to the people* without dealing with one of the important ingre-'dients of that beverage.' We believe it to be impossible to prove that a reduction of the hop duty from 2*d.* to 1*d.* per pound, would make any reduction in the retail price of beer.

cheap, and the duties on them are moderate: sugar, which is mixed with tea, has been cheapened by the free-trade measure of 1846. The duty on tea is now 2*s.* 2½*d.* per lb.: no sensible relief would be afforded to the consumer, and no large extension of consumption would be produced, by any reduction short of a duty of 1*s.* per lb.; and a reduction to that extent implies a considerable sacrifice of revenue; though we do not doubt that, as in the cases of coffee and cocoa, a sensible diminution of the duty would be followed by a large increase of consumption. We may here remark, that there seems now to be a belief that indirect taxes, such as the malt duty and the tea duty, are inconsistent with freedom of trade. It may perhaps be desirable to substitute direct for indirect taxation: into that question we do not now enter; but indirect taxes are perfectly compatible with freedom of trade. By *freedom of trade* we understand an abstinence from all duties of a protective nature; from all duties intended to intercept and obstruct a certain trade, and to give an artificial advantage to one set of products over another. If tea was grown in England as well as in China, and there was a duty on foreign but not on native tea, the import duty would then become a protective duty, and would violate the freedom of trade. But in the present circumstances of the production of tea, this duty is quite consistent with free-trade principles.

The alterations in the *income tax* proposed by Mr. Disraeli open a wide field for comment, upon which we can now scarcely enter. The extension of Schedules C. and E. (funds and public offices) to Ireland, without the other Schedules, and particularly Schedule A., seems to us wholly indefensible, on the grounds both of equity and expediency, and never, in our opinion, could have been carried. Moreover, the extension of Schedules A. and C. to incomes of 50*l.*, when Schedules D. and E. were reduced only to 100*l.*, was a change bearing hardly upon persons deriving small incomes from land and the funds, and would have put the endurance of this class of persons to a severe trial. But the main feature of Mr. Disraeli's propositions respecting the income tax is the introduction, for the first time, of a graduation between different classes of incomes. He leaves Schedules A. and C. (land and the funds) at 7*d.* in the pound; but reduces Schedules D. and E. (trades, professions, and public offices) to 5¼*d.* in the pound. This discrimination was proposed upon equitable grounds; but it was shown in the debate, and would appear more clearly upon further analysis, that this attempt to apportion the tax according to the ability of the taxpayer is itself full of injustice. In the first place, it puts trades and professions on the same level: a merchant trading on a large

capital, or a sleeping partner of an old-established bank, would pay the same rate as a barrister or a physician, whose income is exclusively the remuneration for his labour. Besides, the proposed graduation only makes allowance for one distinction of incomes; viz. the distinction between permanent or life incomes and precarious incomes for less than the person's life; but there are other circumstances by which the ability of the taxpayer may be properly measured; such, for instance, as the number of his children. The most important, however, of these is the *amount of the income:* and it seems to us impossible to say that if a person in a bank or a mercantile house, or a public officer holding a permanent office, entitled to a superannuation allowance, is to be taxed at a lower rate than a person having a life interest in land or government stock of equal annual amount, there ought not, by parity of reasoning, to be a distinction between a person deriving 5000*l.* a-year and upwards from trades, professions, and public offices, and a person deriving an income of 100*l.* to 200*l.* from land or the funds, in favour of the latter. If once the principle of graduation is introduced into the income tax, it cannot stop at the point indicated by Mr. Disraeli. Now this is a serious consideration for those on whom the responsibility for our financial management rests; for although an income tax in time of peace may not be permanently necessary to our revenue, and might in a few years be discontinued; yet peace might unhappily be interrupted; new phenomena have arisen on the Continent, to which nothing since 1815 affords a parallel; and it is a matter of grave consideration whether a heavy war income tax could be levied upon a system of graduation, developed out of Mr. Disraeli's principles, without pressing so severely upon realised property as to be almost intolerable, and to become an oppressive restraint upon both consumption and productive industry. The taxation of the funds at the highest rate is likewise a measure of very doubtful propriety; and the chances are that, before long, Schedule A., the schedule of landed property, in its various forms, would alone bear the burden of the high rate.

The income tax, as modified by Mr. Disraeli, was calculated by him to produce nearly the same revenue as the tax in its present shape. This part of his Budget therefore did not affect his balance sheet: but the reductions of the duties on malt, hops, and tea created a deficit which it was necessary for him to fill up. This object he attempted to effect in part by proposing to appropriate the repayments to the Public Works Loan Fund Commission, as part of the current revenue of the year. It was shown during the debate that this was not a legitimate process, inasmuch as it implied the absorption of a fund applicable to the

redemption of debt; and although Mr. Disraeli quoted some instances of grants under the form of loans having been charged by Act of Parliament upon this fund, he did not succeed in proving that the fund had been mal-administered by the Commissioners. But his main expedient for supplying the deficiency which he had himself created, was the extension of the area of the house tax, and the doubling of its rate. With respect to the former part of this proposition, he made the following statement: —'I think we ought to increase the basis of the tax, and 'that it would be a moderate proposition if I suggest that its 'present basis should be extended to houses of 10*l.* a year. 'I don't mean that the House should for ever stop at 10*l.* I do 'not lay that down as a final proposition: *but it is an advance 'in the right direction, and it is all I can venture at this moment 'to recommend.*'

The proposition for the enlargement of the area of the house tax was therefore presented to the House only as the first step in an intended progress: a further extension of the tax, so as to comprehend houses of less value than 10*l.*, was reserved for some subsequent budget.

Without discussing the merits of this enlargement of the house tax, the prospect of which was held out by Mr. Disraeli, we may say of the proposition which he actually made, that perhaps no better measure could be suggested for an increase of taxation, if an increase of taxation were really necessary. But the necessity was factitious, and was created by himself. Moreover, the relief afforded by the repeal of half the malt tax was imaginary; whereas the burden imposed by the duplication and enlargement of the house tax was real. In order to make the scheme consistent, the burden and the relief should have been equally imaginary, like the proposal to execute a forged release as a satisfaction to a forged bond; but unluckily the occupiers of houses, who were the losers, resented this equitable adjustment of taxation, while the farmers and consumers of beer, who were to be the gainers, were indifferent and silent. Hence the House of Commons and the public refused to ratify the bargain which Mr. Disraeli proposed to strike between these two parties. If a real deficit had existed, or if any new and important branch of expense were to be incurred, we do not doubt that the feeling of the public, and the decision of the House, would have been wholly different. The people of this country have never shown any reluctance to make sacrifices for purposes of taxation, when solid national interests were at stake. If Hannibal was at our gates, we do not doubt that a Government might have asked successfully for much more than Mr. Disraeli's augmented house

tax. But it was a very different matter for a Government to demand an increase of the house tax, because it pleased them to abandon half the malt tax; this measure being merely an expedient for fulfilling their promises to their agricultural supporters, and a proffered equivalent for the previous policy of Protection. How could a Chancellor of the Exchequer reasonably expect that he would succeed in persuading the House of Commons to double the house tax, and enlarge its basis, simply in order to enable him to pay the bad political debts of the Government? How could he anticipate that the occupiers of houses would patriotically submit to increased taxation, when the classes who were to be relieved at their expense repudiated the worthless bounty of the Finance Minister?

Having thus proposed their financial plan, the Government announced that they staked their existence upon its leading principles. They selected the resolution on the house tax as the question upon which the first division should be taken, but invited a discussion upon the entire Budget, as containing the deliberate views and matured policy of Ministers. The challenge was given on the ground chosen by themselves; they insisted on being finally concluded by their entire plan, as opened to the House; they rejected with scorn, and in no courteous terms, the proposal of Sir C. Wood, that they should withdraw it for reconsideration, and reproduce it in an amended form. Not only, therefore, is it quite fair to judge the Government by their late Budget; but it would be unfair not to judge them by it. They invited and courted the judgment of the country upon this scheme, and they did, what they would not do with their Protectionist policy,—they staked the existence of the Government upon the result.

When a budget is proposed with merely financial views, much inconvenience would arise, if every resolution in Committee of Ways and Means were made by the Government a vital question: many persons might think it a less evil to support a bad tax, than to bring on a change of ministry, and would therefore vote under constraint. Without going into the merits of Sir C. Wood's budgets (to whom, as a finance minister, justice, in our own opinion, has never been done), we think that he was fully justified, both by precedent and policy, in reconsidering propositions from which the House dissented. But the late Budget was not an ordinary scheme of finance; it was the settlement of the long Protectionist agitation; it contained the measures which the Government tendered to the agriculturists and the other once protected interests,

as the equivalents and substitutes for Protection. For Protectionists to abandon Protection, was difficult, though possible; but after having abandoned Protection and promised a substitute, then to abandon the substitute was next to impossible; at the same time, it is hard to say what course a Government so practised in equivocation might not have resorted to, if they had not expected that the threat of resignation would be successful, and if they had foreseen that the country would not be captivated by their Budget. Whatever may have been the motives for the decision of the Government to stand or fall by their Budget, the course is inconvenient, and ought not to be drawn into a precedent. The real settling day for the Protectionist speculation of the Government was not at the elections, when they virtually threw Protection overboard; nor on Mr. Villiers' motion, when they formally took the Free-trade test; but on the 16th of December, when the House of Commons divided upon the first resolution of the Budget, and rejected it by 305 to 286 votes.* This division was the last link of a chain, of which the first links were forged in 1846.

* The following analysis of this division shows the comparative strength of the two parties in the counties and boroughs.

Majority.— Tellers included.			*Minority.—Tellers included.*		
COUNTY MEMBERS.			COUNTY MEMBERS.		
England	29		England	113	
Scotland	14		Scotland	12	
Ireland	35		Ireland	24	
		78			149
BOROUGH MEMBERS.			BOROUGH MEMBERS		
England	187		England	119	
Scotland	21		Scotland	1	
Ireland	21		Ireland	19	
	229			139	
		307			288

It appears, therefore, that on a question particularly interesting the towns, 78 county members voted in the majority, and 149 in the minority: whereas 229 borough members voted in the majority, and only 139 in the minority. Of the English county members, 29 voted in the majority, to 113 in the minority. Only one member for a Scottish borough voted in the minority; viz. Mr. James Baird, member for the Falkirk burghs.

Beginning with the separation from Sir R. Peel, and the creation of a new Protectionist party, it next passed through a long series of Protectionist agitation. Then came the accession of Lord Derby to office; the virtual abandonment of Protection, with the promise of a revision of taxation and of fiscal relief; the attempt at a fulfilment of this promise in the Budget; and finally the rejection of the Budget by Parliament on the first division.

The Budget was not a straightforward *bonâ fide* proposition for the improvement of the finances — it was an intricate compromise, intended, not to benefit the country, but to relieve the Government from their political embarrassments. It was framed for the purpose of providing political ways and means to the Ministry, not pecuniary ways and means to the nation. As a financial plan, it was defective and inadmissible; and the adverse decision of the House of Commons will, we are satisfied, be confirmed by the deliberate opinion of the country, when its several propositions have been further scrutinised and considered. Lord Derby could find no mode of accounting for this decision but by the hypothesis of a factious coalition. But the coalition (if a united vote can be so called) was forced upon the Opposition by the perverse and suicidal ingenuity of the Government. The occasion was not sought by the Opposition, but was created by the Government; and even the *locus pœnitentiæ* which was offered to the Government was contemptuously rejected. If it suited their tactics to treat a vote for a tax in Committee of Ways and Means as a vote of confidence in the Ministry, they could not justly complain if those who disapproved of the tax voted against the resolution.

The division of the House of Commons upon the Budget took place on the night of Thursday, the 16th of December. On Monday, the 20th, Lord Derby announced in the House of Lords the resignations of the Ministers and their acceptance by Her Majesty. A similar announcement was made in the House of Commons by Mr. Disraeli. Thus ended, in about ten months from its formation, the Ministry of Lord Derby.

We have never expressed any confidence in Lord Derby's administration; we have given our reasons for disapproving of his Budget; we rejoice at its summary rejection by the House of Commons; and we view his resignation without regret. At the same time, we trust that these feelings will not prevent us from forming an impartial judgment upon the course of his policy while he was in his office. Now, whoever deliberately reviews the conduct of his administration, from its beginning to

February, 1852, to its close in December, cannot, we think, fail to come to the conclusion that if Lord Derby wished to preserve his political character untarnished, his proper course was to announce without delay his intention of proposing a moderate import duty on corn, with some protection to colonial sugar; and of standing or falling by the decision of the newly-elected House of Commons, after a dissolution of Parliament. We do not doubt that the country would have decided against him, and he would have met Parliament in the autumn, as the Whigs met it in 1841, in order to receive his death blow. But his resignation would only have occurred in October, or November, instead of December; and he would have left office admired for his courage under difficulties, and for his honest and consistent adherence to his principles. He would have been sincerely regretted by his party, and respected by his opponents; and when he had resigned office, he might, with perfect propriety, and without any suspicion of interested motives, have proclaimed his conversion to the policy of Free Trade, and thus have cut the millstone of Protection from his neck. If he had no convictions on the subject of Protection, or if he did not feel that he would be justified in convulsing the country by a struggle, of which the result could not be uncertain; then he ought, in our opinion, to have lost no time in formally announcing his abandonment of the Protectionist and his adoption of the Free-trade policy. He ought to have anticipated by eight months the declarations which he made in November last. This course would, probably, have been, in no long time, fatal to his Ministry; he would have alienated his own party, without effectually conciliating his opponents. Still, it would have saved him from the insincerity and vacillation of an ambiguous policy; and when he fell, he would at least have fallen without discredit, and, probably, with the regrets of many. By the course which he actually adopted, he abandoned Protection, not immediately, or distinctly, but in the end effectually; and thus lost the benefit of his best party-cry. He sacrificed his prominent political principle, and his character for consistency; and, notwithstanding all these concessions to the opinions of his opponents, he could not keep his Administration alive for a year, but fell in the first real trial of strength which had occurred since he came into office, upon a motion voluntarily treated by himself as a vote of confidence. He has fallen without the cordial regret of his friends, and without the respect or admiration of his adversaries. If by first equivocating about Protection, then abandoning it, and afterwards proposing a budget of set-offs, in-

tended to please every body, he had been able to strengthen his own party, to divide his opponents, and thus to consolidate his power, and retain office, he might have offered some solid consolation to his followers for his tortuous and discreditable course. In politics, as in other departments of practical life, success covers a multitude of sins. But to be discredited as politicians, and to be defeated in the first division on the first Government measure proposed after the elections, is a combination of afflictions which Lord Derby's followers must summon up all their fortitude to bear with equanimity.

Lord Derby and Mr. Disraeli both appear, from their management of the late Administration, to be men of words, rather than men of action or of business. Lord Derby is an impassioned, impressive, and powerful speaker; he is eminent in all styles of oratory — in statement and in reply, in the solemn or in the playful vein. Mr. Disraeli's chief excellence is in the vituperative style; in his speaking, he deals not so much with measures, as with men. He is more successful in damaging an antagonist, than in supporting his own proposition. His last speech on the Budget debate was a vehement philippic; even on the Treasury Bench he seems to emulate the fame of a Cleon. But, however brilliant such displays of invective may be, they do not harmonise with the feelings of a Ministerial party in the House of Commons, and those who are prepared to support him with their vote feel relieved when he sits down. It is impossible that the business of a Government should be permanently conducted in the style of Mr. Disraeli's recent exhibitions on the stage of St. Stephen's.

Since the resignation of the Ministry, however, the conduct of the late Chancellor of the Exchequer has contrasted favourably with that of his chief. Mr. Disraeli has sustained his reverse of fortune with dignity and good temper; Lord Derby, on the other hand, first at a meeting of his party in Downing Street, and since in the House of Lords, has been indulging in a series of querulous outbreaks of ill-humour, which are quite unworthy of his character for manly vigour. His refusal to move the adjournment of the House, for the short time requested by his successor, was a singular ebullition of splenetic disappointment. The defeat on the Budget was, in truth, the Nemesis for the dishonest manner in which Protection had been abandoned by his Government. He brought this reverse upon himself; let him bear it with decent fortitude. If he is mortified at the early shipwreck of his Ministry, let him remember that his hand guided the helm, and that, in fair weather,

and in broad daylight, he steered the vessel against a rock visible above the water, and lying out of his straight course. If ever another Tory Ministry should be formed, we wish it no worse fate than to be directed by the counsels of Lord Derby and Mr. Disraeli. We have the utmost confidence in their advocacy for ruining any cause which they may undertake to promote.

As soon as the resignations of Lord Derby and his colleagues had been accepted by the Queen, Her Majesty sent for Lord Aberdeen and Lord Lansdowne, in order to consult them upon the formation of a new Ministry. Lord Lansdowne having been prevented by indisposition from making the journey to the Isle of Wight, Lord Aberdeen was subsequently summoned to Osborne alone, and undertook the task of forming an Administration. That task he has since fulfilled, and a combined Ministry has been formed of the political friends of Lord Aberdeen and Lord John Russell, including Lord Lansdowne and Lord Palmerston as members of the Cabinet. In forming this combination, many personal sacrifices were indispensable; but the ready acquiescence of Lord John Russell in an arrangement which necessarily assigned the post of First Minister to another, is a truly gratifying proof of the manner in which some of the leading statesmen of this country prefer the public interests to private ambition. The Ministry has been described as a Coalition Ministry; and references have been made to the Talents Ministry of 1806, when the party of Lord Grenville was joined by Mr. Fox and his friends; and when the House of Lords was led by Lord Grenville, as Prime Minister, while the House of Commons was led, first by Mr. Fox, and afterwards by Lord Howick. The cases are in many respects parallel; but the present Ministry is a coalition Ministry in form, rather than in substance. The administration of Sir. R. Peel from 1841 to 1846 was conducted on enlarged and liberal principles, often distasteful to the bulk of its supporters. Since 1846, Sir R. Peel's followers maintained their separateness, and sat on the opposition side of the House; but their opinions approximated closely to those of Lord John Russell's Government; while they were, on most important subjects, diametrically opposed to those of the Protectionist party. If a Coalition Ministry implies sacrifices of opinion, in order to arrange a compromise, we doubt whether any mutual concessions beyond those required in the formation of all governments, were required in the formation of the present Government, in order to bring about a general agreement of principles. It is our belief that Lord Aberdeen's Administration will study to pursue a progres-

sive and liberal policy, showing, at the same time, a due respect to the existing institutions of the country, to the acquired rights of property, and to the prevalent opinions, practices, and habits of the people.

Whatever policy the present Ministry may adopt, it will not, from incapacity, be unable to carry into effect. A greater amount of ability, for purposes both of debate and administration, was probably never included in any government: to say that, in this respect, the present Ministers are superior to their predecessors, would indeed be a compliment of no great value: but they may be safely considered as *pares negotiis* at a time when weighty questions both of foreign and domestic policy may be expected soon to occupy the attention of Parliament.

The great alteration in the state of public affairs which has been produced by the admission of the Protectionists to power is, that it has extinguished Protection as a practical question, and has finally crushed the barren and obstinate controversy carried on against the Free-trade policy. In other respects, the state of the country is essentially the same as that in which it was left by Lord John Russell's Ministry. Lord Derby's Government passed a Militia Bill, and some useful measures of Law Reform, founded on reports of previous commissions, in the preparation of which, however, the country derived much important service from the practical ability and profound legal knowledge of Lord St. Leonard's. Their only financial measure, so far as we know, was their Treasury Minute on Chicory. But if Lord Derby's Government have left no important marks on the legislation or administration of the country, they can say with truth that the national interests have not suffered under their stewardship. The revenue is prosperous; agriculture, trade, and manufactures are in a thriving condition; our relations with foreign states are pacific; India and the colonies, with the exception of the Cape, are tranquil; and in the latter settlement the Kaffir war begins to wear a more promising aspect.

The changes which the late Government actually made in the finances of the country were insignificant. But the changes proposed in their Budget were important; and financial propositions, deliberately made by a government, sometimes bear fruit afterwards, though rejected at the moment. The only principle of the late Budget which Lord Derby is likely to bequeath to his successors is that of a *graduated income tax*. The principle of graduation introduced by Mr. Disraeli — viz., a discrimination founded on the sources of income—appears to be approved by a large portion of the public; it is intended to favour the

mercantile and professional classes; and as it was proposed by a Government which was considered to represent the landed interest, it apparently enlists the support of the chief portion of the country. How far the principle of graduation ought to be adopted in the income tax, and whether, when once admitted, it can be limited to the distinction singled out by Mr, Disraeli, are questions which will probably engage the early attention of Lord Aberdeen's Government.

The amendment of our representative system, which was recommended to the deliberations of Parliament in the Queen's Speech of February, 1852, must, at its proper time, be carefully considered by the Ministry, and form the subject of a government measure. Upon this question, we cannot do better than quote the words of Lord John Russell's recent address to his constituents. Referring to his address of the 22nd of May last, he says: 'I then stated that the progress of the working classes 'in knowledge and in intelligence ought to be accompanied by an 'increased share of political power, while I was aware how diffi- 'cult a task it is to adjust, in any plan of representation, the 'respect due to ancient prescription with the claims of advancing 'trade, increased population, and growing intelligence. To 'this task the ministry of the Earl of Aberdeen will anxiously 'apply themselves. A matter of so much importance requires 'from the Government the most deliberate consideration before 'any measures are submitted to Parliament.'

To what extent the measures to be proposed by Lord Aberdeen's Administration may meet with support from the present House of Commons, it is impossible now to foresee. Lord Derby has, since his resignation, shown great anxiety to keep together a party in opposition, which shall restore him and Mr. Disraeli to office. In this course (which, if practised by an opponent, he would have called factious, and have made the subject of much criminatory complaint) we can see nothing to condemn. If Lord Derby and his followers oppose the present Government by fair motions and arguments, this will be a legitimate and constitutional course. We trust that the Government may not, on any vital question, find itself in a minority in the House of Commons during the present session. But we cannot contemplate that the goodness of its measures will be any preservative against Lord Derby's vindictiveness; and if it should incur any ministerial defeat, we hope that it will not consider such a reverse as final, or as necessitating an immediate resignation. The present House of Commons was elected under the auspices of the late Government, of a Government in which Major

Beresford held a prominent position. To the verdict of this House Lord Aberdeen is not bound to submit, if public opinion should be in his favour; and it would be a manifest abandonment of the cause which he has undertaken to support if, under such circumstances, he hesitated to make a new appeal to the people, in order that by the votes of a House of Commons freely and fairly elected, the unfavourable verdict of its predecessor might be reversed.

No. CXCVIII. will be published in April.