SERMONS

ON THE OCCASION OF THE DEATH OF

NORMAN MACLEOD, D.D.,

MINISTER OF THE BARONY PARISH, GLASGOW;
DEAN OF THE ORDER OF THE THISTLE; AND ONE OF HER MAJESTY'S CHAPLAINS FOR SCOTLAND,

PREACHED ON THE 23RD JUNE, 1872,

IN THE BARONY PARISH CHURCH,

AND IN BARONY CHAPEL, PARLIAMENTARY ROAD.

Published by request.

GLASGOW:
JAMES MACLEHOSE, PUBLISHER TO THE UNIVERSITY.
EDINBURGH: EDMONSTON AND DOUGLAS. LONDON: HAMILTON ADAMS AND CO.
1872.

In Memory of

NORMAN MACLEOD, D.D.

WORDS SPOKEN TO THE

CONGREGATIONS OF BARONY PARISH CHURCH AND BARONY CHAPEL,

ON THE SUNDAY AFTER HIS FUNERAL.

In the Barony Parish Church.

In the Barony Chapel.

"REMEMBER THEM WHO HAVE THE RULE OVER YOU, WHO HAVE SPOKEN UNTO YOU THE WORD OF GOD, WHOSE FAITH FOLLOW."

REMEMBRANCES OF OUR PASTOR AND FRIEND.

Forenoon Service, Barony Parish Church.—Rev. Dr. Watson.

I have never had so sad a task to perform as that which is set before me this day. It is a day of sorrow. It is a day on which we are allowed to indulge our sorrow. When you assembled here last Sunday morning you thought of your minister, and you prayed for him, and trusted that you would soon hear his voice again; and to-day you mourn over his loss, and your mourning is not less but greater when you remember that this loss of yours has stirred the hearts of tens of thousands in this country, in India, in America, and over the world. His ministry was for you, but you did not grudge to share this privilege with others, and all who ever heard his voice or sought instruction or pleasure in his writings, now share with you in the sacred privilege of grief; and the universal expression of regret which has been drawn forth within these few days, serves but to confirm you in the consciousness that your sorrow is neither slight nor to be soon healed. On this the first service which is held here after the death of my dear friend, your minister, I do not even make a pretence to preach a sermon to you. I have come rather to give utterance to our common affliction, and to speak to you

as his friend, who knew much that was in his heart, and who will be received this day by you as one who can talk about him in a spirit of kindred sympathy, who needs consolation as much, perhaps, as you, and who can only find that consolation in reflecting on his great and good and loving spirit. I am to-day thinking your thoughts, sorrowing with your sorrow, uttering your bitter regrets that I have profited so little by his teaching and his life; and to-day I am also the spokesman of your unfeigned attachment to his memory, of your reverence for his noble and high character, and of your love for his person—a love which is deep and unchanging, and which makes us better men the deeper and stronger it is. There is but one feeling amongst us this day, one common subject for our meditations. I ask no other, and knowing well how he himself set aside all conventionalisms when some great duty lay before him, so I, in that spirit, seek to dwell with you for a little on his character and life. Let the man himself be to us for a time our living epistle, that we may read in him what he has taught us by his example and his words.

No one could know Dr. Macleod for even a short time without discovering his large-heartedness and intense power of sympathy. His capacity of entering into every form and shade of human life and feeling was boundless. It was this large-heartedness which struck you when you first came to know him, and the longer you knew him the more were you struck with it; it seemed to grow upon you. You could not hear him speak for many minutes without discovering it, and as year by year you listened to him and lived with him, you came to think that you had never rightly appreciated it. It was the first and last thing in his character which impressed you—indeed, there were people who, though they could not resist the force of this intense sympathy, yet could hardly believe what they saw and felt, and they sought the solution of their doubts in trying to account for this manifold power by supposing that it could not be all real. It is impossible, they thought, that any one man can enter into so many phases of

human life with a fellow-feeling at once so comprehensive and true. This sympathy was seen in every aspect of his character: in social life, in his friendship, in his reading, in his appreciation of men who differed widely in politics, in theology, in temperament, and in habit. Everywhere he was at home. With the young, with the poor, with the simple, with the weak, he was as one who understood them and who liked them; and in all ranks and classes throughout the kingdom, and in other countries, there are hundreds who can recall his presence and remember how he mingled in their society, and was never reckoned an alien to their tastes or a stranger to their ways of thinking. In sorrow and joy—in your homes, when the dark cloud of adversity or bereavement broke over you—at your wedding feasts, when your hearts were glad—be your circumstances what they might, you found him united with you and with your interests, ready to counsel, comfort, rejoice, and aid you as if, for the time, that were the only centre of his life, and the only way in which it was worth spending his time. I never knew a man bound to humanity at so many points; I never knew a man who found in humanity so much to interest him. To him the most common-place man or woman yielded up some contribution of individuality; everywhere he saw something worth looking at and studying, and you were tempted to wonder which of all the various moods through which he passed was the one most congenial to him, and some might be tempted to doubt whether it was possible to be really genuine and true in any of them at all. How is it possible to disabuse their minds of such doubts and suspicions? It is not in human nature, in even its noblest forms, to preserve every impression in its original force for ever. A nature like his—open on all sides, and keenly susceptible of impressions, must seem to others less deep—nay, it must at times be less retentive, and there will be an appearance of transitoriness about the emotions which are stirred up. But you never cherished a thought of his want of sympathy with you; you could not.

It was given to him—not indeed to him alone, but to him pre-eminently, and as a type of many others—to commend the Gospel to the hearts of men by bringing truths into prominence which had been kept in the background. No one whose memory can range over thirty years can overlook the fact, that during that time a great change has passed over the general tone and style of preaching in Scotland. This change has not arisen from the discovery of any new truth in theology or in the human heart. We have the same Scriptures, with the same divine truths embedded in their pages; we have the same human nature, with its deep cravings and necessities; and hardly one of the facts of religion or of human life which at the present day form the main subjects of pulpit teaching was doubted or suppressed in the previous generation; but there can be no question that the modes of thought, and the proportion which religious truths bear to one another, have undergone an alteration in religious discourses during the lives of many of us; and the change has been in many cases so marked that a cry has arisen that a new Gospel is preached, and a new theology has superseded the old. In one sense this is true. You hear much more now than in other days that religion is a life; that salvation means the state of the heart towards God and towards His will; that to be like Christ is heaven, and to be turned away from His Spirit is death; much more now than in other times is the great truth pressed on your attention that the only way in which divine truth can benefit men is when it is admitted into the soul, and when it shines there by its own light, constraining the soul to say out of its deep convictions, "This is what I need, and feel to be true;" much more now also do we hear, and in directer terms, of the Fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man; much more stress is laid on the fact that life is a sphere for education and training, and not for probation merely; but none of these things were ever doubted or disbelieved; only their place was different, and their power was different. Other truths, or truths stated in other forms, used to be far more prominent,

and the effect of the change, it must be admitted, has been in many cases very much as if a new Gospel had been preached, and a new theology. The thoughts of men have been turned to facts in human life and in divine truth which used to count for little; and by degrees aspects of religious questions which assumed great importance in former times have been eclipsed or suffered to pass away. What ultimate effect this may have upon the religious character of the country, it is not possible at this moment to say; what effect it is working out now is even a matter of dispute; what effect it is intended to accomplish we need not doubt. The direct object of preaching such forms of truth is to make the Christian life a worthier and better thing, and to bring men more closely into the fellowship of God.

You know well what was the general bent of Dr. Macleod's teaching from this place; you know what truth or want of truth there was in those charges and insinuations which were made in reference to his theology—"that it was doubtful," "that it was dangerous," "that it was broad." Wherein was it doubtful? and what did it make anybody doubt? Did it ever make you doubt anything that was worth believing? The love of God? the grandeur and glory of the character of Christ? the mighty power of the Spirit of God? Did it ever make you doubt that? On the contrary, did you ever feel so much ashamed of your doubts of God and of God's faithfulness as when he taught you of that divine gift which God gave in His Son? And wherein was such teaching dangerous? Did it tend to rob men of any truth which is dear to the heart? did it imperil any holy purpose? did it bring into danger the value of any true or religious conviction? On the contrary, is it not the case that you never valued with half so much sincerity the precious gifts of God to you as when he made you feel how much richer the world was in God's goodness than you had supposed? And wherein was his teaching broad? His last speech in the General Assembly —a speech that cost him great thought, that expressed the deepest convictions of his heart, and which was uttered with a

profound sense of his responsibility for what he said, and with a profound belief that it would not be understood or received —that speech contained words which form a memorable reply to the charge of broadness in his teaching, when he said, "I desire to be broad as the charity of Almighty God, and narrow as His eternal righteousness." This was one of those sayings of his which lay hold of the popular mind, and which touch the most thoughtful. And it expresses in a few words the two poles of his theology. These two facts both strengthened each other, and modified the effects which the thought of each by itself might have produced. The love of God was to dwell side by side with the righteousness of God; and rightly understood, the love and the righteousness were not opposed, but intertwined; and in his teaching and in his religious life these two mighty truths were his guide and mainstay. All through his teaching you must have traced them, and all through his teaching you may have observed a progress towards his fuller faith in them. What he preached to you was what he had first preached to himself. He preached because he believed, and his faith was grounded not in man but in God. Who that ever listened to him or talked with him could doubt the personal trust he had in God—the loving, brotherly, loyal devotion of his soul to Jesus Christ. In the presence of such a true living faith and love, which of us did not regard our own religion as a thing comparatively meagre and shallow?

In cases of sudden and unexpected death, one goes back on words and phrases with eagerness as if we could read in them an intimation that the event which has happened was not quite unexpected. Probably we lay too much stress upon such words, but on the other hand it is quite as likely that we underrated this force when we read them, and only came to learn what they meant afterwards. The present sad occasion has suggested to many of us similar thoughts. Perhaps he felt more than we can know the approach of his end. And though that feeling was not a prevailing one, we can call to mind sundry hints in his words and acts that it was a feeling which rose up in his

mind and found expression. One instance of this I mention, which struck me at the time, and I could not help wondering what it meant. It was in a letter, the last but one which he wrote to me, and is dated the 3rd June, his sixtieth birthday. At the close of the letter he says—"God bless you! We part, but shall meet somewhere and some time, to part no more." We have not met since that parting. May the closing words come true, and be as full of comfort as the bitter words "we part" have brought a sorrow, and are fulfilled in a way which I little dreamt of when I first read them. That he was often thinking of the hour when all labour and life should be ended, we know from other sources than mere hints and stray expressions. Yes, all his plans and acts were carried on with the close of life full in view. Again and again have I heard expressions which brought home to my mind the contrast between his anticipations and the prospects which are before many men. For, whilst the common goal of life to many is an age of ease or rest, his resting-point was in departing from work and life together. But this tone of thinking never darkened life; it did not cast a cloud over his wit or bounding spirits; he knew well that tears and laughter are for a day, and that the great God who laid upon man his burden to carry did not design man to be a beast of burden, but gave him also his powers of enjoyment, and he claimed the right to indulge these powers, not reckoning imagination or humour to be stolen treasures, but gifts of God. And so he could pass from the profoundest questions in human life to topics of the lightest order, with no sense of incongruity or inconsistency, any more than you have a sense of doing something profane when you step for a few seconds out of the dark oak forest into the greensward covered with the daisy and the blue-bell. In the sure prospect of a time when all life's tasks and cares would be ended, he talked and planned, he mingled words of sympathy and kindness, words of solemn weight and warning, with words that woke up mirth in the dullest and most prosaic mind. All life was sacred to him; not prayer only,

not worship only, not religious work only, but music, and story and song, and art—they were not mere recreations fitting him for something else, they were part of life, of the life God gave him; and I believe that, had circumstances so ordered it, and had his lot been from early years cast elsewhere, he might have earned for himself a name and a place in other fields. All things that he enjoyed, as well as all things he did, were regarded by him as sacred, and the thought of coming death, the certainty of its approach, without knowing how near it might be, did not affect either his enjoyment of life or his earnestness in living.

It was to all of us a matter of amazement where he found time for all his work, and how he could set his face to tasks, new and laborious, as if he had nothing else on hand. Year by year he added to his burdens and cares fresh duties, any one of which would have been, to an ordinary man, sufficient labour. And how he was able to overtake all his occupations few could understand. Alas! the secret has come out; and it was no secret to those who knew him well; no secret to those who saw him at his desk, and who saw with alarm how for him the day had no night, and the week no pause or rest. It was almost useless to persuade him to seek rest. He carried within him the spirit of unending toil; and, place him where you might, he found occupation: amongst the hills, on the monotonous sea voyage, everywhere the instinct of work was true to itself; and if shut out from one labour, he found another. And so it happened, that the work which could not be said to belong to any fixed individual fell to him; his power to do it, and his willingness to undertake it, decided the choice; and, between midnight and morning, I have known him again and again finish tasks which any ordinary man would regard as labour enough for days.

He used to say on occasions when men praised him in public, "I like flattery." The words were spoken half in jest and half in earnest. He liked to be understood and appreciated, above all things to be loved; and to be spoken well

of by those who really loved him and admired him, was, to his warm and loving heart, a source of unfeigned pleasure. But no man ever penetrated deeper into the nature and motive of fair words than he. And when he was loaded with compliments of every sort, and when it was supposed that he was accepting the incense which was offered, his keen sense of truth detected the false from the genuine, and he despised it in his heart. Like all public men whose voice and writings could bring any individual whom he named into prominence, he was exposed to many arts which spring out of self-love and cunning. And none could discern with so sure a glance the mere tricks of the flatterer who was bent on his own personal ends whilst pretending to be offering homage. Wherever he went he might have secured any amount of attention, and he never treated lightly or undervalued the kindness of any human being; but his soul turned away from the artificial and self-interested attempts of those who were only courting notoriety or profit under the colour of flattery and generosity. At the root of all his social and sympathetic gifts was the satisfaction and joy he had in being really loved, and that spirit was itself the outcome of his own power to love. He had a great tenderness of heart. Men who saw him only in public associated his name with public business, with eloquence, with open, manly strength, and with hearty, unrestrained exuberance of spirits; but they little suspected the far more deep nature which couched beneath, which lay quiet and still, only waiting for the dispersion of the throng and the silence, to come forth and assert its supremacy. No one could have imagined the tenderness of heart which he manifested, and it was accompanied with a thoughtfulness so careful and full. When a friend was sick, he was as minute and sedulous in his attentions as if he had entered into all the details of the disease, and his kindness was as gentle as any woman's. It was impossible that, with such a spirit, he could hurt or offend the feelings or the prejudices of others; and if at any time he ran counter to the wishes of others, whether friends or foes, nothing but

a strong sense of duty and righteousness could explain his course.

It has been truly said that he was too great a man to be limited to any single Church. He was too catholic-minded to be an ecclesiastic, in the narrow sense of the word; but he was, with all this, truly devoted to the Church of Scotland. His attachment to her interests was something chivalrous. A comparison which he often used, and which every one who heard him on the platform advocating her Home or Foreign Missions may remember, was this,—the Church universal was the army, and his own Church was his regiment. He never forgot the one or the other; he never put the one in the place of the other; nor did he ever forget that the Church was for the nation, and that greater was the whole than the part. But whilst he kept in view the great end of every Church, he was a true and loyal son of the Church of his fathers. He vindicated her place, he rejoiced in her growth, he consecrated his strength and his gifts to her honour. For himself, he was willing to take the humblest room, but as a representative of the Church of Scotland, he would not for an hour give place to any one. His services to the Church have been appreciated by many, but by many more they have never been valued. For years and years in his earlier ministry, he spoke, and preached, and worked for her Schemes, but he was always kept outside. He was allowed to take a rope or an oar in the ship, but he was not called into the councils of the officers, or to put his hand one moment to the rudder. For long years, especially, he thought and wrote on behalf of the Foreign Mission of the Church, without a word or act of recognition. And it was only late in his career that even a nominal place was given to him in that department of church work which is now to thousands, who know nothing of the Church of Scotland, associated with his name. How he served his Church—how he was jealous for her—how he, by word and influence, warded off injuries, direct and indirect, we may come to learn, and perhaps learn too late. But there can be nothing more sure than this,—that his personal

influence, which he might have wielded for interested ends, was exerted in ways which the people and the clergy could little know to secure her welfare. And all this was done, not as a mere Churchman, but as a patriot. He had no wish to see the Church, as an organised society, separate herself and her interests from the people. He had no desire to see her thrive apart from the well-being of the people. He believed that Scotland really wished the Church of Scotland to be strong, and he as really believed that she could do a work for the people which could not be done by any other Church; and it was this capacity for usefulness and for good which endeared her to his heart, and made him willing and ready to serve her.

The influence which Dr. Macleod exerted on the Church and on society was very great; and it will not pass away with his life. That influence it is difficult to measure, for it was both direct and indirect, and it touched men on all sides. Moreover, it is not easy to separate each man's specific work from the great mass. The great river of life is swollen by a thousand different rills and streams, no one of which can be traced to its source. He lived in an age when many new influences in politics and theology, no less than in science and discovery, arose to recast the forms of human thought and action; and his warm and generous nature responded to these new forces. His sagacity and insight helped him to forecast much that was coming. Long before the heavens were black with rain he predicted the storm, and his constant desire was to have all things in readiness. He never was taken unawares. Whether it was in small things or in great, he was always ready,—he never was late for any journey or engagement; and that forethought in minor matters was but the symbol of his readiness in those great matters which form the duty of the Christian and the patriot in the affairs of human life. His influence was felt when it was not acknowledged. It acted upon human society, and in turn it responded to the movements and forces which were at work in the world. His presence gave men courage, and hundreds fought under the shield of his name

who would not otherwise have ventured into the battle of life. Most truly did his career show that none of us liveth to himself. Ay, when the narrow-minded and the jealous could not comprehend him, and when his generous efforts were received with hesitation, as if it were impossible there could be a generosity so great as his acts, he was most surely laying the foundation of future blessings to the world and the Church. And his influence shall long survive him. For many years his wide and generous spirit will reprove the petty attempts of men to measure all things by their own miserable notions, and for many years the memory of his life shall stimulate and elevate the thoughts of his brethren.

And now all these gifts and powers are taken from us, and he whom we loved so well, and whom we held in so high honour, has ceased to cheer us with his presence and to teach us. We cannot yet believe that he is gone; there was so much living force in him, so much light and warmth, that we cannot believe that it is all dark and cold. As when we shut our eyes after looking on some great orb of light, the image is still before us, so I seem to see him and hear him, and to be influenced by him, as if he were amongst us. One had the impression that, whoever should fail, he would abide—that no mists could gather round that active everworking brain—that nothing could stop the movement of that great heart. In his presence I had a sense of being under the shade of some wide-spreading tree which could not wither or fade; and although I often had fears—dark fears—as I observed symptoms of pressure on brain and heart, I always thought that a little rest, a little change, a little breathing of the mountain air, so congenial to his life, would refresh him and restore him. Now, when I read over the tidings that I received, I wonder why I did not take alarm. I felt we needed him—that we could not do without him—that he was a man for our time and for our work—and that he above all others could awaken the torpid, and urge on the lagging, and sustain the hearts of the faithful; and knowing all this, I felt as if our needs would be the

measure of our gifts—as if God would spare us what we could not part with. I believe that this extraordinary impression one had of his innate life and inexhaustible resources of mind made one less careful to treasure up his sayings and to record them. If you forgot anything he said, you could ask him again—if you misunderstood anything, you could learn it some other time. It no more occurred to me to transcribe his words and thoughts than one thinks of forming a pool beside a vast river. One lost all sense of needing to store up and preserve his wonderful memories and observations. I felt with him, as a man feels in the broad sunlight, that every new day will bring again the same marvellous floods of light, and I little thought that such a sun would go down so early. But his day had its twelve hours, and during all these hours he was busy, and his work is done. Yes, so far as mere work is concerned, he has more than accomplished his share; he has served his generation before falling asleep. He has all but finished what was dear to his heart. And he has been taken away, not in an hour when he was arranging for the plan of life, but when its purpose was nearly completed. A few years earlier, and how much would his death have lost us. One month earlier, his removal had been even a greater loss to us. To himself personally the desire to vindicate his great convictions on India and on his work in India in the face of his Church, in her supreme Court, was a desire which he longed to have fulfilled. For two years, and especially during the last year, it has been a burden to his mind; and God gave him his desire. Other desires and yearnings he had, which God withheld. But he bowed meekly to the will of his Father; and he saw in the Divine Hand a wisdom and goodness which filled his heart with gratitude and humility. So in one of his latest letters, when numbering up some of his blessings, he said, "How solemn are God's mercies."

I have spoken feebly—I feel it—of some points in the life and character of our beloved friend. I have spoken with some sense of restraint, too, for I have felt that the spot where

Dr. Macleod was known and loved, as nowhere else he could be known and loved, was at home. But into that inner sanctuary no stranger's foot shall at this moment pass. It is enough for us to know that there his presence was a glory and a light, now dimmed for ever—a joy and a power which few men can equal. Let us not part with empty regrets. We shall best honour him for whom our bitter tears are shed by taking up the words and lessons of his life; nay, we shall honour him when we have learned to say over his grave, "Even so, Father." "Not what we will, but what Thou wilt." And knowing as we do that no man dieth to himself, and that our beloved friend and father counted all events in the light of their fruits to God, let us comfort ourselves with words which were a favourite theme of his own—"Except a corn of wheat fall into the ground and die, it abideth alone; but if it die, it bringeth forth much fruit."

THE LIFE IN CHRIST OUR HOPE AND CONSOLATION.

Afternoon Service, Barony Church.—Rev. Dr. Taylor.

John xi. 19-25.

"And many of the Jews came to Martha and Mary, to comfort them concerning their brother. Then Martha, as soon as she heard that Jesus was coming, went and met him: but Mary sat still in the house. Then said Martha unto Jesus, Lord, if thou hadst been here, my brother had not died. But I know, that even now, whatsoever thou wilt ask of God, God will give it thee. Jesus saith unto her, Thy brother shall rise again. Martha saith unto him, I know that he shall rise again in the resurrection at the last day. Jesus said unto her, I am the resurrection, and the life."

Before the journey to the house of mourning was begun, or Bethany was reached, the conversation was equally of life and of death. It taught that our life is ever safe in the path of truth and right, and it spoke of the natural termination of such a life as sleep; that, walking in the light, whether we call that light faith, or know it as duty or as the love of truth, a man is safe; and that when it comes to dying, as come it must, safe still,—he but retires to rest and falls on sleep. He passes into a world or state into which we cannot enter, although, indeed, it be there beside us—as near to us as when a mother bends over her sleeping child when blessing and parting for the night. It taught that in that world he lives, conscious to himself of what transpires within it, although, verily, never a thought may be exchanged between us; that the slight but strong partition shall be removed, the separation ended, and the unity of the circle from

which the sleeper had retired be restored; inasmuch as the very phrase itself—*sleep*—pregnantly suggests *a waking*. The immediate context, therefore, was equally a preparation for courageous living and for hopeful, if there cannot be such a thing as joyful, dying.

But this does not exhaust the sequence of the thought any more than it meets all the necessities of our experience or of life. As we do not grasp the full import of "God's ordinance of death" till we look from the dead and all they suffered to the living that bewail them—from death as touching one on whom it is passing or has passed, to death as touching others with its after-sorrow—so the thought of the text moves from sickness on to dying, and from dying on to mourning. And, as we may have known the dying await the end in peace; or seen them calm, collected and resigned, when around them every heart was breaking; or heard them speak words of wise direction, words of comfort even, to others whose silent tears, or whose more impetuous grief declared them comfortless; just such a case is met by the thought and consolation of the text. Their friend had already entered upon sleep—the sleep that is so full of awe. His, therefore, was not now that trial of the soul that needed help, whether of man or God, on this side the grave. It was that of those who were left behind. And we miss more than one element in their distress if we do not feel that they and he were bound up each to each by the most endearing ties, and by the very strongest bands of life. It is the head of the house; it is the bearer of the family name; it is the protector to whom they clung—the strong staff of their life—on whom the stroke fell. Nor fell it lighter because of the friendship that existed between the mighty One of Nazareth, their brother and themselves. They had trusted to Him for deliverance from the worst, but his help had tarried while that which they feared came. Death had indeed come and now possessed their home and world. Everything around them suggested it, and not alone the stiffened limbs or the

features that were rigid as the sculptured stone or the closed and heavy lids. The vacant chair was as full of it as the laden bier; the garments that he wore when living as the wrappings required for the grave; for they who have had a life inexpressibly dear to them wrenched from its living place and hold, feel in the first moments of their loss as if the whole world were void, and altogether desolate.

It is at times like that, when the heads of the strong bow them as the bulrush before the rising flood—and when such as are of gentler mould are like a bruised reed, that there is need of every kindly office that can be rendered by the heart and hand. Nor is it the least of the facts that graciously affect our life and tend to soften the hardness of its lines, that when needed, these are freely offered; that it is to-day, as it was when friends and relatives and neighbours of the little town in which they dwelt, and others from the neighbouring city came to Martha and Mary, *to comfort them concerning their brother.*

Nor let us say,—as if one-half of the world were cynics and the other half were hypocrites,—that, even at such a time as that, few feel with a true heart, or seek to enter lovingly into the sorrows of others, or to share their burden, in the spirit of a loving sympathy, as best they may. Whether there, at Bethany, or here, we may be certain that most are not sad of countenance or grave of speech for the sake of custom or appearance. Very probably, every such time is one when silence says more than speech, and the pressure of a loving hand is more than cogency of argument. But it cannot be too heartily, or too gratefully acknowledged, that in the day of trouble the sympathy of loving friends is very dear.

Indeed, we do not recognise the true place of sorrow in the discipline of life, or in the economy of the kingdom of God, until we see its connection with joy on the one hand, and its power to elicit sympathy on the other. There have been systems of thought, no doubt,—and some of the thought now current runs in the same direction,—for which it has only the significance of an alien element of our life, in

which it is the equivalent of weakness, and of weakness only, and of which one great object is to restrain it or repress it. But to try to stamp out our natural griefs is to strike at the roots of all human feeling. It is not to weed out the bad in order that the good may grow. It is to trample indifferently on all; for it is one and the same heart that rejoices with them that rejoice and weeps with them that weep. To get rid of the possibility of being pained is to get rid of the capacity for joy. So to steel the heart as not to feel the darkness of the day of mourning, is also to steel it so as not to know how broad and sweet may be the light in the day of our rejoicing. If we are to be able, without distress, to see our friends depart, and to have farewells without feeling, we must also content us with formal and callous welcomes.

The sorrow that springs from loss is evidently an essential part and genuine element of life; but it is more,—it is also a mighty power for good in it. It makes instant demand on the sympathy of other hearts, and through the power of a common suffering it washes out our selfishness. It destroys our isolation. It lifts us out of the region of private or personal cares and concernments. It draws us in the bonds of our common nature closer together, and, as a consequence, when our thoughts and feelings are made thus to rally round the centres of our own life, we are inevitably drawn nearer to Him who is fount and centre of all life. Illustrations of a truth so manifest are barely needed, but if they were, they are ever near. Each of us can recall times in which once and again it received impressive confirmation even in events of national, and more than national importance. Within the year in which we stand, we have seen a mighty empire under the shadow of a great awe, and, through fear of that which seemed to be coming upon it, stirred to its depths of better feeling, till as with one heart it throbbed to the beat of a common pain, into which the chastened thoughts and sanctified desires of men and nations were gathered, and through which they were caught up toward heaven and laid before

God. And nearer still we found it—and in a way we would not—when the past week gave us its first, memorable day of outward rest and inward travail of the soul; and what we looked not for came on us suddenly, and we knew that One who was as a tower of strength in the midst of us was fallen. None requires stronger confirmation of it, who felt the shock or shared in what was really the consternation of that day, or witnessed the great sorrow that sprang from our great loss, spreading from heart to heart, and from home to home in all the land. None will ask for it who saw how it fell on all ranks and touched all estates of men without distinction, till laying one hand on the poor and lowly, it laid the other—a hand as strong as it was gentle—on the tender and courageous heart of her who rules us, and clasped sacredly in one embrace the whole nation's life. A force of nature that can do so much must have its place permanently for good in it. Let us thank God for it.

But there are hours when no human help avails, and when all our efforts will not prove us sons of consolation. There are times when neither the wine nor the oil will tell upon the wound. It was thus, on that day at Bethany; for this was Martha's greeting, and it is also Mary's: *Lord, if thou hadst been here, my brother had not died;* greetings that disclose how it was with them, at once. Their hearts were lingering by the withered hopes lying on a brother's grave; the consolations of friends had not imparted the grace of resignation. Now, this thought of their's, and their position at the time, were so like to those of many more that I may ask you to observe the parallel. It is this *if* that plagues us still. We repeat, as they could and did, that our dead shall rise. We know it as they knew it, in that lifeless way in which we are often able to run over an accepted formula of belief, although it may have struck no root either in the heart or mind. But then, this is what the living heart within them was saying all the while: *if thou hadst been here*—and in the same way the hearts of men to

this day keep brooding over living yearnings which no dead beliefs can help; yearnings that keep striking a like chord—if —if only this had been done, or so much left undone, it were not as it is! But I do not read this scripture rightly, if it is not designed to vivify beliefs that are often held by us in such a way as to be worthless—and to make us strong to suffer the will of God through help of the certainties that are in Christ himself, even more than in any of His works.

Further on in the narrative, no doubt a great work of Christ is recorded that is not only a great work in itself, but is of three such works the crowning work. There is the raising of Jairus' daughter from the couch on which she had expired; then there is the raising of the widow's son from the bier midway between the grave and his mother's house; then there is the raising of Lazarus from the grave itself—and this last precedes but by a very little space his own Resurrection. These works do indeed emphatically declare that Death and the Grave were made subject to His power —and even if these works were all—perhaps too often they are counted all—that is given us to light up the darkness that descends upon the tomb—it were still enough to give wings to hope with which to outstrip the watches of the longest night we know of, and to anticipate the dawn.

But we are led up to a higher standing-ground of faith than that on which even these great works can place us. We are led to Christ himself as more than any word of power He uttered, or any deed He wrought, that in the fulness of the life that is in Him, we may find the possibility, the certainty of a continuance of the life that is in us. Here as elsewhere, He simply takes the troubled heart near to His own heart that it may find all its rest—rest even from its fruitless strivings after light—there. It is always so with Him. He is the way to the place whither Himself would go, to Thomas. He is the revelation of the Father, to Philip. He is the resurrection and the life, to Martha and Mary. In the same way, He himself is the light of all:

He is the bread unto life for all; the living root whose sap is in every living branch. It is, in short, the full-orbed life that is in Him that carries conviction to the heart that the life of God has come into the world and touched the life of man, and that brings life and immortality to light. To have felt the power of that life of his, and then to think of Him as altogether dead, as having dropped out of the universe, is simply an impossibility. The mind starts back from the very thought, as well it may, seeing that the truest knowledge of ourselves comes to us chiefly through Him who knew what was in man, and that the knowledge that draws us to God also comes to us through Him who hath showed us the Father. Are all such thoughts of God, as well as His highest name of Love, not to fade away from the hearts and consciences of men? Are we to believe that He has not given us this revelation of Himself in love to be forthwith withdrawn in mockery? Then Christ liveth, and through Him we know that the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ will not willingly let us die. He liveth as God liveth, an endless and a quickening life in one—*at once the Life and the Resurrection.* The one implies the other. Are the leaves swept from the trees, and their fruit fallen to the ground, and the sap returned into its roots; see again the swelling of the leafless branch, and the return of life to every spray. Have all the generations but one passed away, there is, nevertheless, a growing intensity of life—an increasing breadth of light in the life of men. We do not know, indeed, of a time when there was not this conflict between life and death,—when death gleaned not its victims in the wake of life; but neither do we know of a time in which life came not forth anew, triumphant in the resurrection of itself. Whether we think of life as sustaining nature, or as inspiring the soul, *the life* cannot be the prey of death, or death had already seized on all. The life secures the resurrection—under new forms, it may be, when the old are marred; but it provides for the continuance of itself. It takes to itself, moreover in due

course and time, its proper body; for the law of life would seem to be, not that the outward form chooses for itself a life to dwell in it, but that the life moulds the form. It would follow that when Christ is the life of men, or when there is in them even the beginning of the new life that is begotten through faith in Him, even then there is within them the beginning of the resurrection. And when men are being raised by Him out of the grave of spiritual death,—when the eye is being opened, and the deaf ear unstopped, and the swathed and bandaged limbs set free,—they may well leave the rest to Him who has already done so much, confident that the life which is begun in them will find in due time its own spiritual body.

Let us take our stand, then, there, where the certainties that are to be found in Christ Himself are felt by us most forcibly —where we know that His life encircles ours, sustaining and enriching it. Then, as He lives in us, and we in Him, the conviction will grow in strength, not that well-nigh endless night stretches over the valley of graves, but that those who have gone before, and we who remain behind, are equally alive in Him; that on one side of the world He holds *us* with the one hand, while on the other He holds *them* with the other hand; that where He is present there is really no death, and that if He is present no man dies. This seems to be the central thought of the passage—the thought to which it leads us up, and by which it would have us rest; for here is God's well-spring of comfort in the day of separation. It is in Christ, and through His Spirit, that we have fellowship with departed friends. But as He liveth, and we live unto God by Him, we know that they live also, Wherefore let us not say,—any longer hopelessly, any longer fretfully,—"*Lord, if thou hadst been here,*" but rather let us say meekly, out of the quiet and calm of chastened and obedient hearts,—if it were possible we would say it joyfully this very day of *him who was as friend, and father, and brother, —Lord, Thou hast been here; Thou art here; he is not dead.* For just as it is when men lay the head in contrition and in

loving trust on the Saviour's breast, that they know most convincingly their sin and fear to have fallen away from them, so also it is there they feel that they are safe, and that even death cannot touch them where there is so much of the strength, and peace, and clear broad light of the eternal day.

God assuredly is helping us to realise this when He raises up from among the children of men even, those whose lives are larger than that of others, whose souls are touched with greatness from the womb, and whose natural gifts are lighted up with the love of God and the mind of Christ. There is in the lives of such men a power to affect us similarly, and it is a measure or reflection of the power that is in Christ. Such lives are nothing short of a revelation of the things that are eternal, loving and true. They help us to know Christ, to know the Father; whom to know is life eternal. There is so much of a large, real, God-like, and Christ-like nature in them, that a virtue goes out from them into the crowd upon whosoever touches them. Out of their fulness the poorer, weaker natures round them are enriched, quickened, and made strong; helped on besides to know something of a peace that may live in the very centre of the storm. While such men are with us we feel that life has been given them more abundantly, and when they are gone it is hardly possible for the mind to think them dead, except as having died to sense and nature, and as having paid a lawful tribute, in order that their souls might find release. On a lower plane of moral conviction, no doubt, and in a less degree, this is the great lesson of their lives. Their lives affect us as Christ's does. They make known what possibilities of a divine life are in men; and while they are shedding light and warmth on others from a higher heaven, they are bridging the void between the visible and invisible, the temporal and eternal, and the souls that are separate through death. When God gives us such to dwell with us—great souls who are fired by his own love—He sends us great gifts.

You will have caught the reference in these remarks, for one

such man we all knew, and we are to-day by so much the poorer, our life is by so much the darker, and is grown by so much the less that he is gone. His country, of which he was not the least gifted or least distinguished son, the whole nation has given public expression to its sense of the great loss which it has suffered, and has freely acknowledged his greatness and his worth—a worth and a greatness known to none so well, excepting personal friends, as to you his fellow-citizens of Glasgow and the members of his flock connected with this church. It could not be otherwise; for thousands far away knew him who never saw him, and who cannot now recall, as we can, to our joy, the impressions which even his bodily form and countenance made on all who ever looked on him—the stalwartness of the frame; the character and power in every line and furrow of the face. Men, too, in all lands had read what he gave to the world through the press who never heard him address an audience from the pulpit or the platform, and who knew nothing of the pathos in his voice or the fire and tenderness of his speech, or the spell with which presence and voice and the torrent-like flood, force and freedom of the higher moments of his eloquence held his hearers. The insight into a man's thought and inner life that is given by books and by the incidents that mark the chief points and stages in the activity and career of public men—that alone was theirs. And yet they felt that there dwelt among us here in this old land of ours, one of nature's own nobility, a truly great man. They felt that his must have been a strong loving heart, in full sympathy with the good in man and nature, to whom even mirth and laughter were excellent, but to whom truth and righteousness were sacred. They knew him as one who was great enough to be simple as a child, natural and true; to acknowledge even that he himself had his unsolved problems, and that he could not make all things clear either to himself or others; but as one whose faith was anchored firm and fast in the love of God, and whose teaching was that men, whether in sunshine or in darkness, in doubt or certainty, should "trust in

God and do the right." Men in all lands knew him thus: but only they who know that he was a man who was already charged with such pastoral cares and burdened with such professional and public toils as would have exhausted the strength of most, and that it was in the bye hours of his life that he made such large room for himself, and grasped so worthy a renown among men of action and of letters, that can appreciate the marvellous combination of qualities that met in him—his rounded strength and massiveness of life.

The truth is, the immense variety of the work in which his hand was ever busy in conjunction with a multiplicity of engagements unknown to most men, tended to obscure, if not actually to diminish, the full height of his stature. But you who can understand something of all this, know, that while we admire a greater than the great man whom the world knew him to be, we have a greater loss to bear. Not only this, but such personal friends as may be present will bear out the statement that he was greater than anything he said or did, that it was only when the restraints of public life were laid aside, and when the springs of life flowed freely in the circle of family and friends, that the secret of his strength became apparent, and you felt that the personality of the man was the greatest thing of all. Then there came to light a simplicity, a lovableness, a force of attraction, and an inexhaustible power of sympathy that made one feel that his life was above all things in its character dynamic. It inspired, quickened, and gave impetus, and this not through mere incisiveness of intellect or direct moral stimulus, but because a large, plastic, tender nature seemed to flow softly round you, as completely as the waters around an islet of the sea. This deeply sympathetic element of his life ought to be taken into account, whether men approve or disapprove of the ends which he sought, or of the way in which he approached them; and on both points there will doubtless be difference of opinion. Speaking for myself, I cannot but think that this was of the first importance in a time of transition such as our time, in much, admittedly

is; when new thoughts are filling the old forms, and there is a tendency to move away from the past. It was something that there should be a man in the Church, in the land, of his genius, influence and position, who could not lightly give up what had even the flavour of an old association, and yet who could never close his heart or mind to new ideas and impressions.

In the best sense a great teacher, to whom thousands owed the best gifts that a teacher can bestow, because they caught from him a spirit that was even better than knowledge, he carried with him to the end the receptive nature and humility of a true disciple. He delighted to give and to receive, to bless and to be blessed—while he constantly acknowledged the good he had received from others, as if he himself had never made any debtors. It followed from this large-hearted tenderness of nature, to which a certain continuity of intellectual and social life was sacred and essential, that while his insight into the wants of his time was great, it could be said of him truly and emphatically that throughout a public career of incessant activity and in all his movements *he felt his way.* If at any time his views were in advance of current teaching and practice, he had to wait till his heart assimilated whatever truth he knew regarding the points at issue. He could not move till he moved altogether. But when he felt that he had got hold of a living truth, and felt that that truth was being concealed from men, and that they were the worse for it, then the fire kindled within him, and the hour of his courage was come, and his manner was—not to confer with flesh and blood, but — forthwith to speak and liberate his soul. No doubt a keener dialectic or a narrower nature, or both, would have proceeded otherwise, but just where both would have failed he succeeded. Where both would have repelled, his honest, open, hearty sympathy and enthusiasm took the heart by storm. It is incalculable what a power for good there was for himself and others in this side of his being!

It is this that must account in part for his apparently limitless capacity for work, and the seeming ease with which he made his way through tasks and labours that would have been a toil to others. Not to speak of the cares which every father must know, arise in connection with one's own family, or of a private correspondence with men in all quarters of the world; think of the time, anxiety and thought demanded by parochial work alone; by an organisation of schools, churches, missions, and agencies of every kind that was always on the increase in an over-grown, enormous parish such as this. If to this be added the necessary preparation for his pulpit, his India-mission work and endowment work, his editorial and literary work—who could have confronted them but himself. And even he would have found it impossible to guide them with so strong a hand had there not been this freshness of heart—had it not been that the moment a task was laid aside, there came to his help a mirth and cheerfulness which seemed to brace him like breezes from the hills, and refresh him as if he sat by a woodland spring. Under all his burdens, this helped him to do what the shepherd does when he shapes a staff, or hollows out a boat for his boys at home, while he is watching the flocks that are scattered on the slopes and in the corries of the mountains; or what the boatman does when he sings his song and bends lustily to his oars. Without this side of his life, he might perhaps have filled those pews, and drawn men to him week after week for more than twenty years of his life, —so he drew them, as to a living and refreshing stream,—but without it, his dead body would not have brought men and women—a vast sympathetic concourse of people—to witness its removal from the city, not one of whom but felt that he had lost a friend. To this he owed it, that he was at once great as a man, and great as a Churchman,—that he was a Churchman for the sake of humanity, and a man for the sake of the Church. It was this that made it possible for a simple presbyter to be the representative man he was,—a Scotsman of the Scots,—a man in whom the poorest in the city found a

brother, and whom the highest in the land called a friend. Yet some few there were, no doubt, whom a width of life somehow repelled that touched the springs of life in all others. Throughout the whole of it there was no trace of lines that sharply divided the secular from the sacred; but rather a blending of both in a profoundly reverential and altogether genial spirit. Those who knew not how inseparably both these sides of his nature were united did not quite understand him. He, for his part, knew this, and was content to have it so; while of them it may be said, that they at least forgot that the same light that falls so evenly on level fields, has other glories when it springs from sunlit clouds above the hills.

Alas! that such a life should have passed away so soon, that its strong support and brightness should have been withdrawn; that the tide of his encircling strength and love should have so ebbed away from us, and that his sun should have gone down while it was yet day—before the eyes of the strong man were dim or his natural force abated. But, if we cannot but lament that a life was not prolonged which was so rooted in the love of God, and so endowed with excellent gifts for men, and was so quickened by the spirit of Christ, that it was itself in turn not only as a living soul among us, but also as a quickening spirit—let us bless God that he was spared at least till any bitterness or misunderstanding that ever separated him from men whom he loved and respected had disappeared, and the strife of tongues had altogether ceased, and his work and usefulness in the Church and nation had rounded them to a strange completeness. Let us know, too, that since it pleased God not to leave him with us longer, there was mercy in the very suddenness of his decease. To a mind such as his, that loved the concrete rather than the abstract, and that had, in addition, a power of realising to itself its own conceptions with so intense a vividness as seemed to give them colour, form, everything but reality, and whose soul could feel to the core the grandeur and solemnity of

things, we can well imagine how appalling it would be to be conscious to the latest respiration, and at the last to know that now *the moment* had come. This actually was one of those things that he spoke of with peculiar solemnity and awe —nay, one of those things that might be, from which he even shrank. Knowing this, I can ask you rather to rejoice with me that this great conflict of the spirit was spared him, and that the message that summoned him into the presence of the King of Kings was, so to speak, informal, and took him gently by surprise. He knew, indeed, that at any hour he might be called away, and he had been speaking calmly and preparedly of his decease, but his belief was that the end was not yet.

It was but two hours after, while he thus waited on the God of his salvation, and was having, as he said, much spiritual insight and peace through Christ,—while ready to depart, and yet free from all perturbation of the spirit that might have attended so solemn an announcement, that the messenger came and called him. Without a struggle *he left all and followed;* and—while you were joining in the services of an earthly Sabbath in the lower sanctuary—for him the endless Sabbath of the Lord had already dawned, and he had heard the songs that rise in the land that is very far off. To the close, the majesty of nature in him was so graciously sustained by living trust in the forgiving and redeeming love of God, that you may be asked to *comfort yourselves together,* even while you mourn in him an irreparable loss. And that the power of his life may abide with those for whose welfare and highest interests it was so freely offered—with you, his children, his friends, his flock—*grow in grace and in the knowledge of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. To him be glory both now and for ever. Amen.*

WHAT THE MAN OF WORK HERE HOPES FOR IN THE BLESSEDNESS OF THE HEREAFTER.

Forenoon Service, Barony Chapel.—Rev. Charles M. Grant.

Rev. xiv. 13.

"And I heard a voice from heaven saying unto me, Write, Blessed are the dead which die in the Lord from henceforth; Yea, saith the Spirit, that they may rest from their labours, and their works do follow them."

Thank God that it was a voice from heaven that spoke these words! No doubting, stammering voice of earth, expressing a hope, an opinion, or even a strong human conviction; but a full, clear voice from heaven, sounding out an assurance as certain as is the Unchangeable Himself.

I. Death seems so terrible—so terribly cutting-off in its character—so painfully negative; it seems to be the taking away of so much, of light, warmth, activity, and the giving in their stead only that which is negative, darkness, chill, cessation of activity; at best it seems to be so like a doubtful leap into the dark, that it is one of the most difficult things to which we are called to believe that, under any circumstances,—no matter with what limitations stated,—it is a real truth, "Blessed are the dead." Certainly it *cannot* always be said, for it cannot always be true. Standing by the deathbed, or by the grave, of the man who has struggled in his "labours" not to resist evil, but to give it full swing and play, whose "works" were of such a kind, that if they followed him they would be his curse—who has sought life in himself, and not in the Lord, and whose death could not be, in any true sense, in the Lord

either,—the words would freeze on our lips, and we would feel that their utterance would be nothing short of mockery. God is loving, and more than loving—He is Love itself; but because He is so, all the more terrible is the death of the man who dies in himself,—in the power of a self, or of a world-worship, and not in the hold of the Lord.

And not only are there those of whom it cannot, it dare not be said, but there is at least one point of view in which it is difficult to believe—even admitting that the death has been "in the Lord"—that there is a deeper blessedness possible for the soul in heaven than there is possible for it on earth. Suppose that an objector—taking up the popular thought concerning heaven—were to say: Take your Christian conception of heaven,—of the state of those who die in Christ,—and place it alongside of your Christian conception of life on earth, and tell me which implies the deeper blessedness. Place your undoubtedly lofty and true conception of life here, as consecration, devotion, battle against wrong, honourable wounds and scars, and honourable victories too, for God and in God's cause; place your conception of such a life as Jesus Christ lived, in its glory of suffering, beside your popular conceptions of heaven as the place of passive enjoyment,—of inactive, unsacrificing, almost lazy basking in the sunshine, and amid the flowers of an existence that seems unfitted to call out, or give play to, the divine capacities for suffering and self-sacrifice that Christ taught us to believe were the points of our closest connection with God, who is the Ever-giving, and which life on earth is fitted to call out, and then say, Is not man on earth, with all his trials and sorrows, his temptations and buffetings, and with his opportunities of achieving the same greatness which the Son of God achieved on earth, as much more truly blessed as is the patriot in the field more than he in the drawing-room, or the noble nurse in the hospital, sacrificing self, all for Christ's dear sake, than the lady of the ball-room? Pursuing questionings of this kind, we necessarily fall into deep confusion. We would not like to conceive, and we refuse to conceive, of those who

have gone from us as in circumstances less calculated to make them great and good,—to call out from within them all of that Christ-like energy which they possess, and which if divine and the testimony of our greatness *here* will surely be the same *there*,—we would not, and, in the face of the hopes and assurances of Scripture, we dare not, conceive of them as less "blessed" in this aspect, than when on this earth they were allowed to *work*, and *fight*, and *suffer* for God, and achieved their glory in and through their working, fighting, suffering, and not through the ease, the sunshine, or the flowers of life. And so it would seem that the way to meet such an objection is by enlarging our conception of what will be possible to us in heaven, rather than by narrowing our thought of what is possible to us on earth. Whatever *fancies* may imply, we must believe that anything in our views of life in heaven which makes it less "blessed," in the deepest sense than life on earth ever can be—less pronounced in service towards God—less developing throughout eternity of the divine riches within us —must be wrong. To whatever conclusion this position leads us, we must follow it. The future life *must* be more full, more complete, more freely active, more consciously great, more rich in service, than the present one. Heaven *must* be a place where not one of the possible avenues towards greatness—as Christ taught us the meaning of the word—which are now open will be closed—where not one of the channels, whether of worship or of work, which now float out the wealth of God within us, will be dried up.

II. Let me ask your attention to the beautiful and most suggestive way in which the corroboration of the assurance, as given by the words of the Spirit, seems to be in harmony with this general position—in their negative and positive description of this "blessed" state—"They rest from their labours," and "their works do follow them"—(1) "They rest from their labours." The word "labours," expressing that from which they "rest," is very different from the word "works" expressing that which "follows" them, and has its meaning brought out by such words

as struggles, travails, perplexities. This is the negative limb of the description. From their sufferings caused by triumphant wrong, from their struggles with themselves, the buffettings by a rebellious will, untrained understanding, undisciplined affections—from these they rest. The life that was spent on earth under the cloud of the misunderstanding and the reproach of fellow-man, now emerges into the light of God where its truthfulness is recognised and the detracting tongue for ever silenced; the will that here knew only struggle, rebellion, doubtful victory and undoubted defeat, now passes into the triumphant rest of complete conformity to God; the affections that here swayed to and fro, uncertain of their centres, and in their movements caused jarring and dispeace, now remain fixed on one unfailing centre—the soul rests from its travails. But (2) it does not rest from its "works." "Yea, saith the Spirit, their works do follow them." What does that mean? One thing it certainly does not mean. It does not mean that they leave them behind as something cast off for ever, of which they are to hear no more: it does not, it cannot, mean that the life of the future is so dissevered in its kind from the life of the past that the one has no lines connecting it with the other. Neither can it mean as its *whole* meaning, though doubtless it forms a part, that the *reward* of their past works follows them and blesses them with a blessing outside of themselves, in the heaven to which they go, for we are told that the works (themselves), and not merely the rewards of the works, follow them. What, then, does it mean? I do not attempt to exhaust the meaning of the suggestive words; they open up long but hazy vistas before the mind's eye; they suggest what one does not feel is sufficiently clearly stated for him to venture to put it in words. But there are some things that are very clearly implied by the words; they imply that there is a close connection between the life and the work of the past and the life and the work of the future; that if we have begun to carry out God's gracious purposes here we shall not be denied the same hereafter; that if we have drawn glory to ourselves and enriched our natures by the

Master's life of sacrifice for our fellows here, we shall not be debarred from the glory of like work in the heaven to which we go. How far, to what an extent, the ideas thus suggested may be carried, who can tell? whether those of us who are faithful now—who are Missionaries for God now—may not in God's infinite kingdom be used as faithful Missionaries still, in the endless Missionary work which God must carry on till all things are put under Christ's feet, and all that belong to God are brought back to God—whether it be that we are only in one stage of an endless educational movement in which the faithful are being trained to be His ministering Angels in other spheres of existence—whether all this, and far more than this, yea more than the deepest and broadest of us have yet begun to conceive of, be meant or not, I do not know, but I do know that these words "their works do follow them" bring before me the ennobling conception of a heaven where there is work to be done for God; where there is enlarging self-sacrifice, without which I would not feel my worship to be complete, to be entered into for God; where, although the worry and travail of a soul in which God is not supreme, and evil is still strong, have forever ceased and left me in the deep peace of utter consecration, yet along with that peace and in harmony with it there is still possible to me the dignity of being a "fellow-labourer" together with God. Those of us who know that the crown of our humanity is that we can work with God, will not readily give up the belief which God's Word has caused to grow large within us, that the work and struggle for Him which we begin here we may be allowed to carry on hereafter in ever increasing completeness. We want, and the Word teaches us to look for, no heaven of laziness, but it is our precious and blessed belief that God will need us there, and that work—real, active, soul-quickening and soul-enlarging, will be permitted there to the dead who here have lived and here have died "in the Lord." Our work will follow us there—there we will catch again the broken thread, there we will again take up the interrupted service, and carry it on till the end come, "when all

things shall be subdued unto Him and the Son Himself shall be subject unto Him that put all things under Him, that God may be all in all."

III. Why have I chosen these words to speak from, and these thoughts to throw out, this day? Because this is a subject, and these are thoughts, which, during the last nine months at least of his life, bulked large in the mind of the great father in Israel whose departure we all deplore. I now well remember how he was wont to recur in conversation to the thoughts that were moving and burning within him concerning the future life and the glory which he believed God had in store for those who, faithful on earth, were to be glorified by becoming, in a fuller and completer way, faithful workers in the manifold realms of God. I now well remember how he was wont to return to the subject again and again, to open out his heart and give wing to his aspirations, with a persistency that then appeared almost painful, but which now appears inspired, most prophetically anticipative.

Bear with me for a few minutes longer, whilst I speak of him as he was known by, and dear to, all of us. And give me your sympathy and forbearance, for it is not easy to attempt to measure such a man as he was,—it is not easy for the pupil to speak of the master, and still less easy for the man who owed and loved much to speak of him to whom he owed and whom he loved. My claim to speak, is not that I have either "words or worth, action or utterance," but that, through his own revelation of himself to me in rich tenderness and abounding sympathy, I knew him well and loved him reverently—loved him as the man who first taught me to think and led me on in my thinking, who first kindled the flame within me and fed it from his own great fire, who showed me in his own heart and life that there might be breadth without coldness, intensity without narrowness, and zeal without intolerance.

And, in addition, there are two respects in which it is

not unfitting that I should speak to-day. I have had connection with two countries in both of which he was deeply interested, and with which, to a considerable degree, he was identified—with Canada in the West, and India in the East. He visited Canada in 1846, and never forgot the heartiness of Canadian hospitality; the interest in the Colonies then awakened in his heart never died out, and never a Colonial student in Glasgow University but found in him a friend, and more than a friend. Pardon me referring to his connection with our Colonial students, for it is a matter, though small in itself, which shows, in one aspect, what manner of man he was. Nearly nineteen years ago, four young men arrived in Glasgow from Nova Scotia, to study for the ministry of the Church of Scotland. One of them was my own brother, and all of them were strange to the ways and the temptations of city life. He, who was ever the stranger's friend, was their friend from the first hour of their arrival. Instead of waiting to see whether they could make themselves and then taking them by the hand, he took them to his heart at once, and often have I heard them speak of the influence he exerted for good in them and for them. A small matter, you say, this connection with four young men! Yes, but it reveals the man—the man who had a heart large enough for every true man that needed him. And, as the years went on and others joined the first four, and a colony of Colonials became formed at Glasgow, "the Doctor" knew, and was known and loved by all, and to each and all he was a friend. And, as one of these, it is not unfitting for me to be here to-day to speak in their name and express what all felt and now feel. The day after I arrived in Scotland, nearly thirteen years ago, I was introduced to him in the Barony vestry, and from that day onwards till the end, till the Wednesday before he died, when I saw him for the last time, and when he raised himself in his pain that he might bless me as we parted, he was the same, a man great and good, a friend true and thoughtful.

And still, for another reason, it is not unfitting. Having had the desire kindled by himself I entered on that work that lay so near to his own heart, and went as a missionary to India. Then I came into more intimate relations with him, for he was not the formal Convener of the Committee, but the friend, the brother, the father of each one of the missionaries. He was a man wide enough to take in East and West, North and South, into the range of his interest and sympathies. He reached from Canada on the one side to India on the other. With unceasing interest he watched the course of his exiled fellow-countrymen in the Dominion—their upbuilding of a new and mighty Empire, and their development of institutions in which he had confidence. With a mind and vision strong enough to see and to understand the mighty revolution going on in our Eastern Empire, and with a sympathy wide enough to go round the struggles, the risings and fallings, the aspirations and longings of every Hindoo man who loved the past and yet reached on to the future, he watched, and waited, and prayed for, and believed in with a great faith the coming of Christ into that land. And as a Canadian who has heard his name spoken of in Canadian homes with a reverence with which I have heard the name of almost no other living man spoken of, as the "Stranger's Friend;" and still more, as an India Missionary who has heard missionaries of other denominations pray God to raise up men in their churches to love and sympathise with them as he loved and sympathised with us, and who has heard educated native gentlemen speak of him as almost the only European who understood them—as the Canadian and as the India Missionary I stand here this day to say to you, his countrymen, that Canada and India knew and loved him, thank God for his coming, and mourn his taking away.

In every way in which you can view him he was a great man—a man complete, full-rounded; his humanity flowed in no narrow, shallow, or sluggish stream, but rolled broad, deep, and swift. Seen from whatever point we look at him he was

a man notable, but he stands out most conspicuously as the man of *Work*, and the man of *Sympathy*.—

(1.) As the man of Work. You who are members of this congregation, to whom he was so deeply attached and who owe so much to him, need not be told of what he was as a worker. His work was overwhelming. I remember that once on a Friday night he took out his pocket-book and read a list of engagements already formed for the next week, and it seemed a marvel how he could overtake these alone, far less have in addition time for pulpit preparation and purely literary work. And I remember that in one of his letters to me he apologised for its brevity by saying, "it is the thirty-second I have written to-day." The only thing impossible for him was to be doing nothing; he was a fountain that could not but give forth its waters. How significantly this necessity of his character is illustrated by the fact I have already mentioned, and which suggested my text for me. As his thoughts turned more and more upon heaven, and the future life, it was as a place and as a state where God would have a *Work* for him to do, where he might be, as he once expressed it, "a Missionary of the future," that he chiefly delighted to regard it.

It would be in vain for me to attempt to describe the various outlets which the ever-flowing activities within him sought and found. As the Parish Worker you knew him better than I did; as the Preacher, who, out of the fulness of his knowledge of human nature, spoke with a directness and power, I, for one, never heard equalled, you knew him as well as I did; as the author who does not know him? and who has not recognised that intuitive power with which he went directly into the core of a truth rather than argued up to it by logical processes? as the man of Home Mission work, to whom Glasgow owes so much, and the Church of Scotland so much more, you also knew him as well as I did. But as the man of Foreign Mission zeal I can speak of him, for again and again I have heard him pour out his soul concerning it,

speaking when we were alone as he never could speak in public; I know what time and thought, study and anxiety, he bestowed upon that land for which he was willing to die, and did die. He was profoundly convinced that in India there is given to the Christian Church the mightiest battle to fight which God has ever called her to; that He has given her all the preceding ages to prepare herself up to this call, so that she might go to it with all the aids of experience and knowledge as well as of zeal; and that there is already initiated and being carried out in India a revolution of thought and social life on a vaster scale, and more radical, than has ever elsewhere been witnessed, involving a gigantic overthrow and a long-continued and laborious reconstruction. And, I believe, that on this question of missionary labour in India and the Church's call thereto, he has touched the Church's heart as never it has been touched in this land, and that in the days to come, looking down from the heaven to which he has gone, upon the struggling Church below, in an aroused community, in a Church conscious of, and rising to her call, and in an increased missionary zeal everywhere—in these, with all reverence I apply the words, "he shall see of the travail of his soul and shall be satisfied."

(2.) As the man of Sympathy. This was the glory of his character; this gave him his many-sidedness; it gave him that power which he possessed of speaking to the heart of the Queen and of the peasant with equal success. This made it possible for him to be at once the most genial and the most terribly earnest man I ever met. This sympathy running through all the departments of his nature—appearing in all his activities—gave to all the cast and character of genius, aye, of inspiration. In this power,—a power possible only to the man in whom Christ is formed—of taking up the burdens of others, he was—again with reverence I say the words—the highest interpretation to me of Jesus Christ that God ever gave me; and as Christ was and is the only "way" up to the Father, so he was the "way" to many up to Christ. You do

not know the secret of his greatness unless you know this. It was something far more and deeper than mere kindliness; it was an ever and Christ-like flowing out to and in to others, by which he identified himself with them, felt as they felt, necessarily sorrowed with their sorrow, and joyed with their joy. Hence, his wonderful felicity on all occasions; he never jarred; he never made a great mistake; as I heard it expressed the other day, "wherever he was, he was the right man in the right place." Those of you who knew him personally, know how deep and true his power of sympathy was; the more intimately you knew him, the better you knew it. Well may I speak of it with tears, for he spoke to and dealt with me as other man never did, and as I never expect to find another man able to do. I have knelt with him in prayer when no eye save God's saw us, and I have heard from him the words that I needed to hear.

And now he has gone, but he has left a completed life behind him, and his works do follow him. We cannot sorrow as if his life had been a failure, or mutilated in any of its parts. It was grand all throughout, but it was grandest at its close. He set, not as the sun sets in these latitudes, gradually paling away, day only gradually passing into night, but as it sets in tropical climes, where it rushes in its full light and glory into darkness.

> No pale gradations quench his ray,
> No twilight dews his light allay,
> With disc like battle-target red,
> He rushes to his crimson bed,
> Dyes the blue wave with heavenly light,
> Then sinks at once—and all is night.

But the night is only for us, and not for him; he carries his light along with him, and shall shine for ever and ever in the Kingdom of God. Amen.

CONCLUDING REMARKS.

Afternoon Service, Barony Chapel.—Rev. David Morrison.

After sermon on 2 Sam. i. 25 (first clause), Mr. Morrison said—

When I was requested, by telegram, on Friday last, to preach a funeral sermon here to-day, I shrank from the duty, and declined to undertake it. I would rather not have attempted to put in words my idea of my friend, but would have preferred to stand aside with those who felt that a very dear friend had been lost to them, and a great light had gone out of their lives, and to have mourned with such in silent sympathy. But the request was repeated, and I felt that I could not again refuse. I can only crave your forbearance, and ask you to remember how difficult and trying is the duty I have undertaken.

It is not necessary for me to enter into any minute analysis of Dr. Macleod's character. This is not the time, nor this pulpit the place for such. Nor do I wish to pronounce any formal eulogy upon his character;—that also is uncalled for. The manner in which the heart of this nation was stirred last Monday morning, and that funeral procession,—the like of which, I venture to say, was never seen in Glasgow,—and those countless crowds, in which the faces seemed far more those of sorrowing friends than of curious spectators, in which ever and anon there were eyes red with weeping and faces gloomed over with sorrow;—these are a better eulogy than any one could pronounce. All I would wish to do is to tell you some of the impressions which I formed of Dr. Macleod

during an intimate friendship of eight years,—speaking to you in the manner in which friends do when they meet together for the first time after the loved remains have been laid in the grave. For I am well assured you are all his friends, and that we mourn together a great common loss.

Every personality is in great degree a thing indescribable;—Dr. Macleod's peculiarly so. It will be told what he said, and what he did, and what he wrote; but the man himself, to a degree that holds truer of him than of almost any one else, will remain undescribed. His large heart, his eloquence, his humour, his pathos, his power over men,—all these will appear; but there was something beyond definition or description,—a charm and a power which words cannot convey.

That which I think all will agree was greatest about him, was his big human nature. God gave to him a very large portion of what is strong, and beautiful, and loving in our human nature. His nature was full and radiant of the best feelings in our humanity,—its desires, and hopes, and charities, full of tender sympathies and human likings—capable of much enjoyment and healthy laughter—capable also of deep grief and divine tears. He was at home, delighting and blessing men, in every company. In the society of the learned and cultivated,—on the fore and the quarter-deck,—among literary men and men of the world,—in the homes of the poorest and humblest,—everywhere he was welcomed as a brother; and, though he might have been silent and apparently as undistinguished as any, when he rose and spoke in any company, those who composed it felt that he understood them, and acknowledged his power. It was very much the wide sympathies of his nature that enabled him to do this. In him childhood's mirth and manhood's strength were mixed together as in few other men. No period of life seemed to have been left behind or forgotten by him. He mingled in his children's games with all their zest,—wrought hard that he might return to a second game,—was as keen to be victor as any of them. He was as fond of dreaming and making plans as a boy. But

a few months back, alas! I remember twitting him with tantalizing us with the enterprises and tours which he projected, but which, for want of time, were never carried into effect. Especially he had a large brotherly-kindness. It was this which gave him that pleasure in dealing with working-men which he had, and which pervaded all his missionary efforts. Religious motives of course mainly influenced him, but he wrought also, all unconsciously, through the large sense of brotherhood which God had implanted in him. When he came back from India, perhaps the most striking passage in all the wonderful speech which he delivered before the Assembly, was that where he pictured the burning of the Suttee, by the side of the Ganges, and what made it so affecting was the thoughts which that sad sight suggested regarding his own aged mother at home, and the contrast-picture which he drew of what her death and burial would be. It was this wealth of humanity which caused him to be regarded as the personal friend of the people. Norman Macleod was looked upon by the people as their friend; and what caused him to be so, more, I feel sure, than his eloquence and more than his services, was his broad, joyous, human heart. In all those "stories" which he loved to tell, a loving humanity was conspicuous. Cynicism or bitterness had no place in them. Some few, I daresay, did not understand him, and would have liked him better if he had had less of this large nature. and given it less play. We shape our little conceptions of what a man should be, and especially of what a Christian minister should be, and we leave out and prune away much of Nature's nobility. But this was not his idea. He was the man before the minister or anything else. Tears and laughter he seemed to think were very near each other, pathos and humour very closely allied in God's arrangement, and so he let them come and go on his own soul, as light and shadow sweep over grass fields, and moved others to them in quick transition. Amid much that would have narrowed a smaller man he remained fearlessly true and natural. Church-

manship, nor false ideas of the religious life and character, nor moving among the highest in the land, nor Church honours, none of all these spoiled him or professionalized him, as most of us clergy are apt to become professionalized. To the end he was the same; the man in Scotland whom the people felt and acknowledged to have the largest amount of human brotherhood and fellowship and understanding in him.

His religious views and beliefs were just what you would have expected from his nature. This same large-heartedness you see in them. His nature would not let him be a sectarian or a fanatic. He could not pronounce a shibboleth or join in party-tactics or utter party-cries. Neither could he take narrow or gloomy views of God and His feelings and institutions and dealings. His large heart "rose up" and protested against such. God his Father, in and through Jesus Christ, —that was the beginning and end of his religious faith. You must have noticed in his prayers how often the word Father occurred. His whole tone was that of a son speaking to a father, with utmost reverence, yet with utmost confidence. In his confessions—the dominant idea was the deploring of unchildlike distrust, and neglect of his Father, and unlikeness to Him; in his thanksgivings—it was that Christ had brought men to know God as their Father; in his petitions—it was that he might be a true son, that he might be conscious of his sonship, and, chiefly, that the Father might be glorified in him,—that is to say, that what God is—God's love, and righteousness, and holiness — might be wrought out in his character, and life, and work. "My Father, I thank Thee for the proof of Thy fatherliness Thou hast given to me in and through Thy Son: I deplore all my neglect of Thee, and all my poor thoughts of Thee, and my poor love to Thee, and my forgetfulness of Thee, and my unlikeness to Thee; I pray that I may know Thee better, and more truly rest in Thee, knowing Thee as my Father, and more truly reveal the glory of Thy fatherhood,"—that was like the tenor of his prayers. His favourite Chapter was, I think, the 17th

Chapter of St. John's Gospel. All his theology was there. To grasp the idea that God is our Father, no matter how deeply we may have sinned against Him — to know and feel God's Fatherhood — to show it forth and make it known—that, to him, was religion. Consciousness of sonship was peace in believing. Being a son in spirit and in life—that was the highest and greatest thing in the Christian life. This was something like Dr. Macleod's religious belief. And we can easily see why it was so. It was his large human heart going forth toward God. The larger the capacity of brotherhood, the deeper the desire and the larger the capacity for Divine sonship. The more human love and sympathy, the more, and larger, and more loving do we need God to be. "He prayeth best who loveth best."

I cannot refrain from speaking here of the blessed consciousness of sonship which Dr. Macleod attained to, and all the peace and rest which it brought him. How many a trying hour it carried him through! What strength and fortitude it brought him! When he went to India—a trial greater than many knew, and undertaken through a deep sense of duty; when he was under bodily pain and hindered in his work; when, especially, he went through that martyrdom,—for to him it was nothing else—of the discussion of the Sabbath Question—in what perfect peace it kept him! I should like to refer to this last subject as a mere illustration of my meaning and nothing more. It has been insinuated in one of the obituary notices, that he went into that Sabbath Controversy without counting the cost, and that when he saw the storm that arose, he allowed the matter, through his kindliness and aversion to disputation and giving offence, to be hushed up. No;—as one beside him during the angry heat of that time, and living in the house with him for part of it, I can testify, and will always be glad to testify, that he went into that battle deliberately—counting the cost—putting on his armour — weighing his words, and, also, that he never consciously resiled a hairsbreadth from the

position which he took up, nor did his courage misgive him. But what was the secret of his boldness and of his peace? He suffered keenly; bitterly he felt the agony of grieving those whom he loved, and of turning those whom, in truth, he regarded as equally earnest men with himself into keen opposition. I shall never forget the awe and sorrow which filled him when he told me that he had been hooted in this city on his way to the Presbytery at night. But there was a joy deeper than any care, in the strength of which, I most sincerely believe, he would have calmly met deposition, and that was this confidence in his heavenly Father—his peace in believing. But it was this alone and no human pride which sustained him. For, humanly speaking, he was stung to the quick. The best commentary on his feeling of peace and calm trust through all that time was his own hymn—"Courage Brother!" That was his own heart cheering itself and giving voice to the secret of its own perfect calm. This deep trust and confidence in God, this Son-heart has been vividly brought to view by his death. Many of those who loved him must have felt the impossibility of realising that he is gone. Part of the reason of this, I feel sure, is not the ordinary feeling of the impossibility of realising the loss of a friend, but the intense confidence in God which we associate with him, and which will not allow us to think of him as holden of death. When we laid him in his grave beneath his dearly-loved Campsie hills we felt that we could not realise that he was in reality away, to be "always away," and we asked ourselves, why, when our loss and the loss of the land was so great, this was so? and the answer which seemed to be the true one was this,—that we could not believe that that calm faith and rest in God were brought to nought, but only in brighter exercise somewhere, and we felt that he himself was consoling us, and strengthening us, as of yore, though he was removed from our sight.

Along with this large humanity God gave him another gift intimately associated with it, that of eloquent speech.

His eloquence was of the truest kind—that of a large spirit moved to its depths by the truth which he saw. It was no rhetorical manufacture with tricks of voice, and attitude, and clerical stage-properties. No one despised such more than he did, though none could imitate them more happily. His speech was impassioned because his thought was the same. Hence, he was as eloquent in his common talk in his own room, in a railway carriage, or on the door-step of his house, as in the pulpit, or on the platform. Of him can be said what cannot be said of many of our eloquent men, that almost as many will remember his private conversation as will remember his public utterances. Hence, also, his eloquence did not merely evoke admiration of power, or art, but moved men to the depths of their capacity of being moved, quickened their vision of higher things, stirred feelings they could not utter, and best of all, perhaps, made them love the man.

Alas, that this great heart should have ceased to beat, and this eloquent voice been stilled! As with many great men, we shall only begin to understand what he was when he is away, and to see what he was doing when he is no longer here to do it. What a blank his removal has made! How many places will remain unfilled! Where shall we find a man to occupy even one of the many positions which he occupied? Where is the man who will take this city into a heart so large as his, and care for it, and speak wholesome truths to its rich and its poor as he did? Churches and ministers will work, but where is the man who, with his own arm, and by leading on others, will beat back the wave of godlessness which is surging round its walls? Where is he whose presence at every meeting will be so heartily welcomed—diffusing an aroma of kindliness on the platform and through the hall, affording perfect guarantee that the people's cause will be eloquently advocated, that large-hearted thoughts will be uttered, that nothing like intolerance or a tortuous policy will find place? Where is he who will stand between the poor and the rich as he did—I might say

even, so far as Scotland is concerned, at least,—between the people and the Throne? Where is he whose voice will stir men of all classes and all degrees of culture and no-culture—

> "With soul of seal and lips of flame,
> A royal-hearted Athanase!"

Where is he who will do battle as he did with that evil which, like a canker, is eating away the heart of our religious life—our religious selfishness? Where is he who will draw the hearts of the people after him, and be at once the teacher and the friend of the people? How cold and dreary does the church in which he ministered look without him—even in many ways the Church of which he was a member; how large a part of her soul and life has gone with him; how sad the thought that his voice will ring no more in her Assemblies, nor his name be associated with her to her honour! Yet, let us not be unthankful. While we mourn his loss let us recall how much work he did which lives after him: his labours for working-men—his Mission work—his conception of a cheap Magazine of the best literary food for the people—the churches he built—the impulses he gave to our religious life and work—the larger ideas and kindlier views which he disseminated—the name he leaves behind him, which, while he lived, was the symbol of a broad and yet earnest, a strongly-convinced yet loving nature, and, now that he is gone, will become more so than ever—and much more good work which cannot perish.

And where shall some of us find such a friend? I scarcely dare trust myself to speak of his friendship, though to speak of it would seem the most natural thing of all at this time. How kind and unselfish and full of tender consideration he was! How grateful for any service rendered to him—how accessible—how loving—how unexacting! At such a time as this our thoughts go back naturally to early acquaintance and early impressions and I find many memories of his kindness presenting themselves at every turn. When I came to him as his Assistant I was quite unacquainted

with him personally, and came with considerable fear and diffidence—not being able to get quit of the idea of the great man. All my fears soon vanished before his simple ways, his naturalness and human kindness. The first time I preached he was in church, and—while it may seem a small matter, yet, I am sure, very few would have done it—before the congregation dismissed he came up to the pulpit and spoke generous and assuring words both to myself and to the congregation, for which I was deeply grateful. This simple incident illustrates his uniform treatment of his assistants. He laid an injunction on me, though his life was so very valuable, that I was not to visit any case of infectious disease but to report it to him for his own visitation. His assistants and missionaries were more his friends than bound to him by ties of service. His house was free to us; his councils, his books were at our disposal—above all his heart was open to us. He took us with him in the one walk that the week could spare in those busy days, generally on Saturday afternoon, almost always to the harbour and the ships, with their associations with early Campbeltown days and foreign lands, and as bringing him nearest to the sea which he loved more than any man I ever knew, and whose breadth and freshness and glory seem a more natural metaphor to connect with his large nature than any other. How could we help loving him and wishing to do him loyal service! None that I ever knew, that really knew him, but did so. And some of us felt and proved that in him we had one deeply interested in all that concerned us, who mourned with us in our sorrow and joyed with us in our success, whose charity could take us into its wide embrace, no matter in what circumstances we might be, who would always be ready to stand by us, to whom we could go, even if we had erred, knowing that he would not turn us away. I know that some misunderstood him. His very warmth of heart led some to count too much on what he could do for them.

I trust his Memoir will speak freely on all his relations with

his fellow-men—on his relations with the great and the rich—his relations as a Churchman (if I may use this word of him), and as a literary man. If all the truth can be told it will be seen how singularly brave he was and how ready to risk position and name for the sake of truth and well-doing—how free from "policy and cunning"—how devoid of clerical caballing—how very unselfish and generous—how little spoiled by greatness.

It was your privilege to know this man to whom all thoughts are turned this day in sadness, to hear him and keep company with him and love him. God the heavenly Father has come near to you in this privilege; Christ has fulfilled in very signal manner His promise to be with us to the end of the world. It is an idea in vogue with some of the teachers of our time that God incarnates Himself in humanity—especially in its enthusiasm, and love, and sincerity, and thrilling speech. How near, then, has God come to us in this man, whose enthusiasm has been pervading this city like an atmosphere, and his voice sounding in its pulpits, and his love flooding the homes of the people rich and poor. How great has God's gift been to us—how near to His face has He been lifting us His children!

Our Father, we thank Thee for Thy goodness in giving Thy servant to us, and for all that he was to us, and taught us, and did that Thou mightest be glorified in the hearts and lives of Thy children. We beg that Thou wouldest cherish and comfort those on whom his removal has fallen most heavily, in ways known to Thine infinite love and wisdom, and deeper than we can tell to Thee. And do Thou help us so to live that when we pass into Thy presence we may meet again Thy creature whom we found so fair on earth, and abide with him in the full fruition of Thy glory. Amen.

EXPLANATIONS

RELATIVE TO

THE TRAINING OF

EDUCATED NATIVE MINISTERS

IN CONNEXION WITH

THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY'S MISSION:

A LETTER

ADDRESSED TO

THE CHAIRMAN OF THE CORRESPONDING BOARD

OF

The Church of Scotland's Calcutta Mission

BY

THE SUPERINTENDING MISSIONARY.

Calcutta:

G. C. HAY AND CO., ESPLANADE ROW.

1867.

been entirely abandoned. Believing that the training of a Native Ministry constitutes one of the fundamental objects for which the Mission was originally appointed, the Committee are earnestly desirous that the greatest prominence be given to such training, and they hold it of the highest importance that this should form part of the work done by the Missionaries, in whose zeal and ability they have every confidence. They, therefore, regret that the Superintendent regards it as impracticable that this object should be carried into effect at present; but as Mr. Ogilvie proposes to set forth hereafter in detail the various efforts that have been employed in the hope of producing results intimately connected with this training, the Committee abstain from entering more minutely on this part of the letter."

To the Board, this minute was the occasion of surprise, disappointment, and perplexity. And more strange still did they consider certain remarks relative to this subject that were made at last General Assembly.

The truth is, that by no Mission was the training of a Native Ministry *more* earnestly attended to than by this Mission of ours. And, certainly, by no one that was ever engaged in this work, were such pains taken as by us, in endeavouring to make the whole matter plain. Statement after statement was written on the subject. In a word, so ample and so precise had been the information conveyed, that all of us here felt quite sure that, for all practical purposes, those supporters of the Mission in Scotland who really took an interest in its proceedings, could hardly fail to know every thing of any particular importance rela-

tive to the question of raising Native Ministers ;—in fact, that they could hardly fail to know nearly as much about this question as do the supporters of the Mission in this country.

But this minute completely undeceived us as to that point ; and (I may add) as to several other points also.

The Board very naturally requested me to reply to that portion of the minute that relates to the training of Native Ministers ; the more especially, as I myself had expressed an intention of furnishing some details on this subject. This proposal of mine is noticed also by the Acting Committee.

It is proper, however, to state here that I afterwards regretted my having made any such proposal. My reason was, the way in which the statement on *Affiliation* was received by *some* of the supporters of the Mission in Scotland—so very different from the way in which it was received by *all* of them in this country.

Such a statement had been repeatedly called for by the Board. They were of opinion, that the time had now come when the supporters of the Mission *must* determine whether the measures that had been adopted were to be allowed to be continued, or not. But the questions involved in these measures were so numerous, that several of the members had great difficulty in making up their own minds, so as to be able to express a decided opinion on the subject.

The explanations given in the statement, however, served to remove those doubts and scruples they had formerly entertained. Having carefully considered these explanations, they expressed their entire ap-

proval of the steps that had been taken, as well as of the manner in which our operations had all along been conducted. The statement was also read with interest by a good many persons not members of our Church ; and there is reason to believe that it was of service in various ways.

The Board expected that the statement would be as acceptable in Scotland as it had been here. But such was not the fact. The explanations called for rendered it imperative on us to mention several very important matters,—well-known indeed to every one here that has given much attention to the subject of Missions, but seldom or never adverted to in such accounts as are published for the information of the supporters of Missions at home. For this, and perhaps some other reasons, these explanations seemed to disturb people's equanimity, and, somehow or other, to put them a good deal about. All this I regretted much to perceive.

The manner, then, in which this statement was received, determined me to lay aside all thoughts of furnishing details on the subject of Native Ministers ;—at all events, in the way I originally intended. The only object I had in view, when I expressed this intention, was simply to convey to others some information that I thought very much wanted. Certain remarks that I had, from time to time, observed in the *Missionary Record of the Church of Scotland,* led me to think that the subject of raising up Native Ministers was one that was far from being clearly understood ; or rather, that it was one that seemed to be a good deal *mis*-understood. In particular, in the

Record for *July*, 1865 (page 82), there appeared from the pen of "an Elder," an article on the general subject of the India Mission. The "Elder" strongly advocates the propriety of changing the administration of the Mission. He remarks that "he sees no occasion for our Church wasting its limited means on elementary education." His proposal is "to convert our three Colleges into seminaries for the training of educated native christian youths for the ministry."

My attention was particularly called to this proposal; and I was asked to state what I thought of it. All that I thought of it was simply, that the writer of the proposal really seemed to be in great want of having some accurate information as to facts. But, so far as the wants of the Calcutta Mission were concerned, there was no need for our entering on the question. We had no need whatever for any thing in the shape of Bursaries. It was long since our work of training converts for the ministry had been accomplished;—long since our Divinity-Students had completed their Literary and Theological courses;—long since they had presented themselves before the Presbytery of Calcutta.

It is plain, then, that the Mission here had nothing to gain by our writing statements about Native Ministers. And for the reason I have just mentioned, I considered, that I was quite free from any sort of obligation I might have thought myself under to carry out the proposal I had made.

But certain events have lately occurred in connexion with this Mission that have compelled us to re-consider our determination.

Three Native gentlemen, who have long been connected with our Church and with our Mission, have forwarded to the Calcutta Presbytery applications to be taken on trials, with a view to their being ordained as Ministers of the Church of Scotland.—Two of them have long been desirous of being set apart to the work of the ministry; and it may be proper to state here that what induced them to forward their applications to the Presbytery *on the present occasion*, was a conviction they had been led to form, that there existed on the part of a large number of the supporters of the Mission in Scotland, a very earnest desire to have a Body of Native Ministers.

The Presbytery have long and intimately known these gentlemen; and as they feel assured that many years may yet elapse before more suitable persons will be found, they have consented to receive their applications.

But, before taking a single step towards their Ordination, the Presbytery will require an assurance that their salaries shall be paid by the supporters of the Mission in Scotland. The supporters of the Mission in this country do indeed contribute with great liberality; but there is one thing that the Presbytery do not feel themselves justified in calling on the people of this country to do; and that is, to become in any way responsible for the payment of the salaries of ordained Native Ministers.

The funds, therefore, that may be requisite for that purpose, must, *for the present at least*, be all raised in Scotland.

The Presbytery, however, do not wish to call on the Church to undertake the payment of the Salaries of

these men without having, in the first instance, carefully considered the whole matter. The Church is entitled to receive full information on the whole subject; so that no hasty measures may be formed, no pecuniary burden undertaken that might hereafter prove the occasion either of disappointment or regret.

But, apart altogether from these and such like considerations, both the Corresponding Board and the Calcutta Presbytery feel very strongly, that the time has *now* come, when a sense of what they owe to themselves renders it incumbent on them to lay before the people of Scotland, some account of the nature of those efforts that have been put forth both by this Mission and by this Presbytery, with the view of raising up native ministers.

These reasons, then, have induced me to comply with the request that has been made to me, namely, to draw up a truthful narrative of facts,—in short to present a faithful account of the various efforts that have been put forth here, in the hope of raising up a native ministry.

All Christians will at once acknowledge (unhappily, however, the thought is one that is neither so earnestly nor so habitually dwelt upon, as it unquestionably ought to be) that the Religion we are striving to propagate among these people is distinguished from the various other religious systems around us—as in many other particulars, so especially in this, that it emphatically claims to be a *True* Religion.

Truth—That is its essential, its distinguishing characteristic.—It plainly follows from this, that any communication professing to give to Christians at a

distance, a faithful account of the progress of their Religion among a heathen people—any account, in short, that is at all worth the name of an *instructive* account must have this quality, also, as its distinguishing characteristic.

If there be any circumstance that is of importance in enabling people to form a correct judgment on any question that may be submitted to them, that circumstance ought not to be withheld merely on the ground that it may not be considered encouraging.

Were my object, on the present occasion, merely to endeavour to induce people to undertake the payment of the salaries of these three Candidates, perhaps I might hope to succeed best in that, by dwelling at large on the great importance of raising up native ministers, the happy results that might reasonably be anticipated from the labours of these men, and such like topics. In other words, I should endeavour to give great prominence to one class of facts, and as carefully endeavour to withdraw attention from another class of facts. By adopting such a course I might perhaps produce an *effective* statement. But then, my statement would, in no sense of the word, be an *instructive* one. It would be the very opposite of that. It could only tend to distort people's views, and to lead them to draw erroneous inferences. What I said might indeed be all true ; still I should be telling merely a portion, in fact, a small portion, of the *whole* truth.

In all departments of Missionary labour here, the discouragements far outnumber the encouragements. An account, therefore, of Missionary effort that should dwell merely on " encouraging circumstances," might

indeed be most eloquently set forth, and so succeed for a time in arousing people's emotions ; but it could contain no *instruction* ;—it could never tend to make men any wiser on the subject of Missions ; and could hardly fail, in the long run, to prove injurious to that very cause it professed to advocate.

There is a well-known proverb that *half* the truth may virtually amount to a falsehood.

To raise up a Body of well-educated Native Ministers—this was what, at one time, we considered as constituting the *primary* and *leading* object of our Mission. But now, instead of viewing that as our primary object, we regard it as no object at all. For the raising up of a Native Ministry forms no part of the work in which we are now engaged. This, for the present at least, has been entirely abandoned.

And how has such a change of purpose been produced ? Why is it, in a word, that this object has, for the present at least, been entirely abandoned ?

This is the very point I am now so desirous to explain. But the task is not an easy one. I cannot effectually set forth the reason of all our proceedings without touching on a good many details. For the subject before me is one that extends over a considerable period of time ; it is one also that embraces a variety of transactions.

I trust, however, that all candid and intelligent supporters of the Mission will be quite satisfied, if I can succeed in furnishing them with full and precise information with regard to the following questions :—

I. What success has attended the labours of the Missionaries of our Church in training *Native Ministers?*

II. What success has attended the efforts made by the Presbytery of Calcutta to ordain *Native Ministers?*

III. What particular class of Native converts alone ought to receive any encouragement whatever to prepare themselves for becoming candidates for the Ministry?

The answers to these questions will, I think, comprehend every remark that needs to be offered. And, for these answers, I will rely mainly on certain facts that I shall adduce from *four* Reports that have, at different times, been given in to the General Assembly.

I propose then to set forth—

I. The success that has attended the labours of the Missionaries of our Church in training *Native Ministers.*

In order to do this, it is necssary (1) to call special attention to the *fact* that we *have* trained Native converts for the office of the Ministry; and (2) to point out the *manner* in which we did train them.

With the view then, of convincing you of the *fact* that we have trained Native converts, I have to request that you will consult the following document, namely—

Report by the Committee for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts, to the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland, given in by James Macfarlane, D. D. Convener—22nd May, 1856.

(Reproduced in the *Home and Foreign Missionary Record of the Church of Scotland, August,* 1856, *p.* 196, *et seq.)*

For myself this document possesses a more than ordinary interest. By its perusal several matters have been most vividly suggested to me. In considering it, therefore, I shall not confine myself entirely to the question now in hand, but shall also offer a few remarks on some of those other points that have been so forcibly brought before me.

Of course, however, what I am principally concerned with is the establishment of the fact, that we have trained Native Converts. To that, therefore, I shall at once proceed after having made one preliminary remark.

From the Report, then, of the Committee for the propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts, that was presented to the General Assembly of last year (1866), I learn that, of the members composing the Committee by whom this Report of 1856 was drawn up, four at least were members of the "original Committee of ten," that is, of the very first Committee that had ever been connected with the Mission. They had been associated with the founder himself. As a matter of course, then, they must have had a personal knowledge of the more important proceedings of the Mission from its very commencement. On that very ground, therefore, any statement made by them must be deserving of great consideration.

Let me ask you now to turn to the following passage*—"Agreeably to the remit of the Acting-Committee, of date 22nd February, 1856, the Sub-Committee had under consideration the present con-

* Original Report of 1856, page 12. Missionary Record, August, 1856, page. 199.

dition and future prospects of their Missionary operations in India, and after several meetings on the subject, and the most ample deliberation, they are at one in the opinion that the time has now come when a change in the mode of conducting the Mission is not only advisable but necessary."

And what is the nature of the change that they are thus at one in so earnestly recommending ?

The change is indeed a most thorough one ; amounting to no less than a complete abandonment of all Educational operations, the entire discontinuance of the schools in the several Presidencies within a period more or less remote, and, finally, the disposing of all the buildings connected with them.

Now, the question which it is of importance to consider with reference to the point before us is—Why is it that the Committee recommend, with such earnestness, so very sweeping a change as this ? Strong reasons they must have had ; for they pronounce the change to be not only advisable but even necessary.

Do they, then, express any dissatisfaction with the manner in which the mission was then conducted ? Do they say (what some recent speeches and statements do certainly more than insinuate) that there had been a failure in carrying out any one of the schemes of the Mission *after* it had come into the hands of those who were then conducting its operations ?

That was a point on which the Committee were well competent to judge ; for, as I have remarked, they were acquainted with the proceedings of the Mission from its commencement.

Do they, then, utter a single word that would lead one to infer that the Committee had any sort of notion, that the Mission was now conducted with less zeal, with less diligence, with less ability than it had formerly been ?

The precise opposite of any thing like this is the fact. I purposely forbear referring to any of the *private* communications that were received from this Committee, in all of which there was only an expression of approval in regard to the manner in which all our operations were conducted.

Let me, however, call your attention to the words employed at the beginnig of this Report—" In Calcutta your Missionaries have been labouring with their wonted fidelity and zeal ; and, we are thankful to add, not without some measure of success. It is our pleasing duty to report that three pupils of the Institution have, during the year, been admitted by baptism into the Christian Church."

It is manifest, then, that the Committee could have had no such idea in their minds as that the Mission was accomplishing less now, than it had done at some former period of its history.

The reasons that operated with them are briefly set forth : and these reasons—they state—" constrained them to consider the propriety of their adapting themselves to the altered circumstances in which they were placed."

Now, there is *One* of "these altered circumstances' that stands forth very prominent. The Committee remark that "the *raising up* of Native Converts to preach the Gospel to their brethren, was one of the

great objects of the Missionary School in its original programme."

Let me ask you to notice what follows—

"That object has in a great degree been attained." What object is this? It is no other than the great object contemplated by the founder; for (as the Report goes on to state) "at Calcutta, there are not less than fifteen converts of this class—converts, namely, who after the necessary preparation might be able as well as willing to devote themselves to the service of Christ among their countrymen."

This is a remarkable declaration.

What the Committee urge as *one* at least of the reasons for now wishing to change the mode of their Christian operations is not any thing like a *failure* of the Mission; on the contrary, it is its complete *success.*

One would almost infer that the founder of the mission had never intended that educational operations should be carried on any longer than might be found necessary to impart an adequate literary and theological training to a certain number of Converts. But the training of these Converts was now completed. The special object, then, for which the educational portion of the scheme had been established, was now accomplished. In respect of its *training* operations, the Mission had done all that the founder ever expected of it. It had been crowned with complete success. The Institution had done its work; and so effectually had it done that work, that there was no purpose to be served in upholding it any longer.

With respect, therefore, to the first point that it seemed necessary to set forth, there is no need that I should

add another word. For, that we *have* trained Native Converts for the office of the ministry—this is what no one now can for a moment doubt.

[Before proceeding to consider the next point, I wish to offer a few remarks regarding those "altered circumstances" to which the Committee refer. Some account of these will serve to explain various matters that seem to have exercised considerable influence over the working of the Mission. The circumstances in question are enumerated in the sketch the Committee give of the history of the Mission—a sketch remarkable, at once, for its conciseness and for its simplicity.

The Mission—they inform us—had been established about twenty-five years before. At that time the means of education from other sources, for the Native youth, were of the most meagre description. Accordingly, the erection of Missionary Schools in the several Presidencies recommended itself, as one of the most likely methods, under the blessing of God, of obtaining access unto, and of extensively leavening, the heathen mind with the knowledge of the truth, as it is in Jesus. And the Committee do not forget the large measure of good which had thus been accomplished, not only in the conversion of many to the faith and obedience of the Gospel, but in the extensive diffusion of Christian truth among men of every caste—among Hindoos and Mahomedans alike, with many of whom it might yet come to an abundant harvest.

But, as the Committee observe, matters then were very different from what they had been twenty-five years before; a great change had passed over the face of society in India. The means of education among all classes of the community had been greatly increased; and, above all, there was the recent introduction of a national system much more palatable to the heathen than any school system where religion is taught.

These, then, were the changes, in consequence of which the Committee felt themselves constrained so earnestly to recommend the discontinuance of all educational operations in connexion with their Missions. In this recommendation, many of the supporters of the Mission here entirely concurred; and there was a very general impression among us, that the wishes of the Committee would have been carried into effect.

With respect to our own views in this matter, I may observe, that a consideration of those circumstances which are here stated by the Committee, forced us to come to a conclusion precisely the opposite of theirs.

It was by means of education that all the changes mentioned by them, had been mainly produced. All the other means hitherto adopted, had been found to be of small or no avail. But a change had now passed over the face of society in India, greater perhaps than any change that had been effected in the course of many previous centuries. It appeared to us, then, that this was about one of the very clearest indications that could well have been given, that it

was the will of the Almighty that the *commencement* of the renovation of these people—which we knew must be a very slow and a very gradual process—should mainly be brought about by means of the education of the young.

Accordingly, when it was decided that the Institution was to be continued, we did not consider it to be our duty to follow the advice of some friends who earnestly recommended us to abandon it; we thought it right to abide by it, at any rate for some time longer; we resolved to do what we could to increase its efficiency; and we hoped that we might be able, by proceeding cautiously and gradually, to carry it on at a much less cost to its supporters than it had hitherto been found possible to do. All this, I may mention by the way, has been most effectually and most thoroughly accomplished now.

But there was *one* altered circumstance that we did not seem to have at all reflected upon. Had we done so, our resolution to carry on the Institution would, no doubt, have been different from what it was. For the consequence of this altered circumstance was that, in the course of three or four years after this Report had been given in, we ourselves were brought to precisely the same conclusion as that of the Committee, although for a very different reason. Indeed, the harassing questions and endless distractions that now arose, were such, that we rejoiced to think that the time could not be far distant, when we might say, with a good conscience, that the Institution *ought* to be discontinued; that this was a measure that was now not only "desirable, but even necessary."

The circumstance I am now referring to, is the very great change of sentiment that seemed to have taken place in the minds of not a few of the supporters with respect to the value, in a Missionary point of view, of all the operations conducted by the Mission.—The natural consequence of this was that they completely failed to appreciate the nature of those difficult questions which now began to arise. They did not contribute so liberally as before; in short, they seemed to manifest but little sympathy with the efforts we were endeavouring to put forth.

And how are we to account for such a complete change of feeling as seems to be implied in all this? The explanation is quite easy.

The Mission had now been established upwards of twenty-five years. The truth is, then, that it had by this time lost all the attractions of novelty. When Missions to the heathen were first established, every thing relating to them was new, and wonderful, and strange, and mysterious. To the labours of some of the first Missionaries an extraordinary measure of success would appear (at all events was believed) to have been granted; the accounts of that success seem to have been set forth in a very striking manner. The consequence was that people's feelings were greatly excited, and the most powerful emotions were produced. Men of fervid imaginations were, thereby, led to form vast anticipations (having, of course, not the slightest foundation in the Word of God) of the wonderful changes that might be expected to be produced, in an incredibly short space of time, over the whole heathen world, by the diffusion

among the people of the knowledge of Christianity.

To give you some idea of the nature of those anticipations as well as of the language in which they were set forth, I will quote a passage from a well-known popular work.* After giving an account of the success of modern Missionary enterprise among the Chinese and among some of the races of Africa, the writer sums up his argument with these words :—

"May it be permitted to say that a voice from heaven, full of meaning, is heard in the particular character of the successes—how limited soever they may be—which have crowned the incipient attempts to convert the heathen ? The veriest reprobates of civilization and social order have been the first to be brought in to grace the triumphs of the Gospel in its recent attempts at foreign conquest ; as if at once to solve all doubts, and to refute all cavils relating to the practicability and promise of the enterprise. If it had been thought or affirmed that the stupefaction and induration of heart produced upon a race by ages of uncorrected ferocity and sensuality must repel for ever the attempts of Christian zeal, it is shown, in the instance of the extremest specimens that could have been selected, that a few years only of beneficent skill and patience are enough to transform the fierce and voluptuous savage into a being of pure, and gentle, and noble sentiments ;—that within a few years all the domestic virtues, and even the public virtues—graced with the decencies of rising

* *Natural History of Enthusiasm.*,—*p.* 294, *Third Edition, London*: 1830.

industry, may occupy the very spots that were reeking with human blood, and the filthiness of every abomination which the sun blushes to behold."

This is indeed to invest the subject of heathenism with 'a grandeur and a glory' quite dazzling, and, by consequence, quite misleading.

It is very plain, that it must have been from these and such like stirring representations that men were led, at the outset, to form all their ideas about Missions, and to build up all their sanguine anticipations as to what might confidently be expected as the result of earnest and devoted Missionary effort.

Most deeply is it to be regretted that such should have been the case;—most deeply to be regretted that they should have overlooked the very different lessons on the subject of heathenism that they might so easily have learnt from the writings of the Apostle Paul.

For, although this may have given a great impetus to Missionary enterprise at the beginning; yet it has only led to the greater disappointment and dissatisfaction when the real facts became known at a later period.

But as yet there was no real, that is, no experimental, knowledge of the nature of the heathen mind. Notwithstanding this, men laid down systems and formed anticipations, and proceeded to act on these with the utmost confidence: just as if the heathen could not fail to adapt themselves to their systems, or as if the mental constitution of the heathen had been in all respects similar to their own.

Respecting several of the notions that appear to have been formed not long after the commencement

of Missions, and to which men seem to have adhered ever since, I shall have occasion to say a few words. What I wish to notice at present is the particular kind of Missionary communications that appears to have been alone considered as worth any attention. They were such only as gave accounts, if not of some special success, at all events of something that was thought to be striking. And when Missions were *new*, it was of course possible for men to say many things, in a very attractive and a very striking way; and also to hold out great anticipations as to the results that might be expected from the carrying on of certain systems, which, however, had yet to be worked out.

But *we* found ourselves in quite "altered circumstances." The heathen mind was now known—*experimentally* known. The people we had to deal with were not "fierce and voluptuous savages," ready to make a profession of Christianity, or anything else, according to the whim of the moment, or as it might happen to suit their worldly interests. It was with a very different class of heathen we had to deal—a class respecting whom we soon learnt that the process of real transformation, must be a very slow and a very gradual one—so slow and so gradual as to be nearly imperceptible. With them, therefore, we had no hope of ever succeeding, except by patient and assiduous labour, endeavouring according to our ability to impart "line upon line, and precept upon precept; here a little and there a little." As for exciting subjects, they had been well-nigh exhausted. With our utmost efforts, we could find but very few; and these few were soon told.

It is curious to observe that, even by the time that this Report was given in, the lack of something interesting to write about, seems to have been severely felt. If you look at page 5 of the Report, you will find that, after giving a brief account of the operations of the year, I used these words—

"I wish it were in my power—more especially at the close of one Session, or at the commencement of another—to communicate to you some accounts which might be regarded as somewhat more interesting and encouraging than the often-repeated statements as to the number of pupils, proficiency in knowledge, and other details of that description."

Details of that description were not striking, not encouraging. On that ground they were considered dry and uninteresting; people seem to have got quite wearied of them, and probably at last ceased to pay any attention to them.

But details of that description, that is to say, details setting forth some of the difficulties we have in dealing with the heathen; details in which attempts are made to explain the real nature of heathenism, its frightfully darkening and degrading effects on the soul,—effects which leave a permanent impression long after it has been professedly renounced; details giving an account of the gradual spread of knowledge among these people, the moral and intellectual improvement, that is taking place among them ;—these are the very details that impart knowledge, communicate instruction, and suggest subjects for profitable reflection.

As for stirring accounts about encouraging circumstances, fervid appeals and the like—these may

indeed excite, in some minds, a transient feeling of interest; but their effects must be very temporary. To us here who are engaged in the work, statements of the kind now mentioned are *dis*-couraging beyond all others. Indeed, were it not that we are perfectly aware of their precise value, they would lead us into utter despondency.

It has frequently been remarked that when people are induced to engage in *any* system of well-doing, not so much from a strong sense of DUTY as from the novelty of the thing, or from having their emotions aroused by powerful appeals to their feelings,—the result will, in all probability, be that when the novelty is over, or when discouragements arise, all their ardour will gradually cool down, their first emotions will insensibly subside, and that subsidence will be followed by a powerful reaction, terminating at last in something like complete indifference.

Of the truth of this remark, a very apt illustration may be found in certain facts connected with this Calcutta Mission. At one period of its history, the Mission was certainly a celebrated one—a very celebrated one; and called forth a most powerful interest. But like everything else, it ceased at last to be new. Not long after this Report, of 1856, was given in, a good many of its former supporters must have withdrawn their attention from it altogether, and ceased to take any interest in it.

How little is known of its later proceedings was clearly brought out at the last General Assembly.

One of the members of that Assembly who at one time appeared to have taken some interest in the

Mission, rose to express his entire disapproval of the steps that had lately been taken. This of course he was perfectly entitled to do. He then took up the subject of training Native Ministers (of all things); he did not know anything of the facts of the case, but he spoke with as much confidence as if he had been perfectly familiar with all of them; he charged us with having abandoned Dr. Inglis's great scheme, and spoke of us in such a manner, that, had it not been for the generous remarks of the corresponding member for Calcutta, he might have succeeded in making such an impression on the Venerable House as "to secure a verdict against us for having abandoned the object they had in view when they entered upon this scheme."

Very painful and very mortifying no doubt it is to be made so fully aware of all this want of interest in our work; on the other hand, however, it is consoling to reflect that the estimation in which the Mission is held by many others who really *know* about it, is quite different from all this. Above all, it is consoling to think that, whatever failure there may have latterly been in exciting people's interest, there may have been no failure at all with regard to what surely ought to be considered as the *true* object of any Mission; but that, during all these years, this Mission may have been continuing to accomplish quite as good a work as ever it had done; that it may have been privileged to sow in the hearts of many, the incorruptible seed;—to cast that bread upon the waters which may yet be found, even though it should be after many days.

But I must now dismiss this Report of 1856, so interesting to myself. The remarks now offered have

of course no particular reference to the subject now before us, namely, the training of Native Ministers. But they have an important bearing on certain of the proceedings of the Mission. They cannot, therefore, be considered as out of place.]

To proceed now with the question more immediately before us :—I remarked that, under the head of *success*, there were two points to be noticed. It is not enough merely to call attention to the fact (1) that we have trained our converts for the office of the ministry. It is much more important (2) to give a description of the *manner* in which we did so train them.

I have to request, then, that you will now turn to another document, namely—

Report by the Committee for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts, to the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland, given in by James Craik, D. D. Convener. 1857.

The portion of this Report, having a special reference to our subject, is contained in the form of an appendix entitled—*Statement relative to the General Assembly's Mission, drawn up at the request of the Corresponding Board.* (Reproduced in the *Home and Foreign Missionary Record, January* 1858, p. 8, et seq.)

It may be proper to state here the circumstances that gave rise to this document. From what has been now mentioned, it will be easily seen what a diversity of opinion there now existed respecting the mode in which Missionary operations ought to be conducted.

The Foreign Mission Committee had given it as their deliberate judgment, that the Institution *must* be dis-

continued. This proposal, however, was not acquiesced in by the Church ; a majority being of opinion, that the Institution ought to be maintained. The Foreign Mission Committee at once resigned ; and a new Committee was appointed. But many of the former supporters of the Institution both here and in Scotland, were now bitterly opposed to it. And it was thought by some that the difficulties of conducting it would, year by year, increase. In these circumstances, no one here considered it as at all probable, hardly even possible, that it could be carried on very much longer—not beyond three or four years at farthest.

The new Foreign Mission Committee were placed in circumstances of peculiar difficulty. They called on the Calcutta Board to express their sentiments on the whole subject of the Mission. The Committee were desirous of having full information to guide them in their future proceedings. Accordingly, the Board met very often to deliberate on all matters relating to the Mission. But these matters were, many of them, of a very perplexing nature. Before venturing, therefore, to express their final decision, the Board requested to be furnished with a statement which should enter, with great minuteness, into all particulars connected with the working of the Mission for the previous ten years.

It was in compliance with this request, then, that this document was drawn up. On all points that the Board considered to be of importance, the object was to convey very accurate and very precise information.

Now, one point that the Board considered as of the very highest importance, was this very question relative to the training of native Ministers.

Accordingly, I endeavoured to give a particularly full answer to this question,—to note down, in a plain way, not merely all the most important Facts, but such inferences and reflections also as the experience we had hitherto gained, seemed to authorize us to make.

It would occupy far too much space to insert the whole statement here; but as longer experience has only tended the more and more to confirm our belief in the correctness of every thing that is there mentioned, I have thought it advisable to subjoin, in the form of an appendix to this letter, the portion of the statement relative to the training of Native Ministers.*

[Before, proceeding, however, to enter on the subject of the training of these converts, I deem it needful to call your attention to the principles that have guided us with reference to our admitting candidates for Baptism to live within the Mission Premises, and to our mode of dealing with converts generally. These are points that some have not clearly understood. They call, therefore, for special explanation.

You are probably aware of the fact, that the class of people we have mainly to deal with, consists of persons that are not in circumstances to maintain themselves: they depend for their support on their parents or relatives.

Formerly, when any one of them came to us professing a desire to embrace Christianity, if we had

---

* See Appendix A.

reason to be satisfied as to his character and acquirements, he was at once admitted into the Mission Premises. This was a step that he required to take altogether without the knowledge of his relatives. Any thing of this kind they very naturally considered as a grievous calamity ; and, accordingly, every effort that could be thought of, was at once employed to induce the candidate for Baptism to return to his family. If, however, he continued to adhere to his purpose, he was entirely disowned not merely by his relatives, but by the whole Native Community.

The very circumstance, then, of his having embraced Christianity rendered him completely dependent on the Mission.

Many persons will, no doubt, be of opinion, that a mode of dealing with converts such as all this implies, is exceedingly undesirable. Some, indeed, there are who consider it as having very much the appearance of holding out a bounty on conversions, and, therefore, as being quite wrong in principle. There is no need, however, that I should at all enter on the consideration of that question. The system was not one of our seeking : we had no choice in the matter. The alternative before us was simply this:—

Either you must be prepared to support and educate your converts, or else you must make up your minds to have no converts at all. We adopted the former course. Accordingly, the great majority of our converts were supported and educated by us ; and that too, at a considerable expense and for several years.

You are to observe that we were not singular in adopting this practice of supporting converts. The

truth is, that *all* those Missions whose operations are in any respect similar to ours, have had precisely the same alternative before them as we had. All of them, accordingly, have supported and educated their converts ; some of them, indeed, have carried the system considerably farther than ever we thought it advisable to do.

The special object of our Mission was somewhat different from that of several other Missions in India. Our special object was to train converts respecting whom there might be some ground to hope that they would hereafter be employed, in some capacity or other, in connexion with the Mission. We did not, therefore, proceed to baptize all at once such persons as were admitted into the Mission Premises. As we had to support and educate them, so we thought it our duty to keep them for a time—some weeks perhaps—in a state of probation. And several of those who were admitted did not like this mode of proceeding ; they wanted to be baptized at once. And because we would not consent to do this, some of them told us, after a few days, that they had changed their minds about Christianity ; they were not quite sure about its truth ; and for the present at least, they had no wish to be baptized.

Others, again, there were who, before the time of their probation was over, gave such indications as left us at no loss to ascertain what sort of motives *they* were influenced by. We could not, therefore, but feel thankful that the principle we had adopted had prevented us from baptizing *them*.

I might tell you, also, of the very trying and very distressing scenes that we not unfrequently had with

their parents and relatives. The truth is, that there were times when, in consequence of these distressing scenes, we had very grave doubts indeed as to how far we were justifiable in some of our proceedings.

But it would be tedious to enumerate all the circumstances that induced us at last to wish earnestly that we could make some change in our mode of dealing with converts. I will, therefore, merely state that, after much deliberation, and in consequence of what appeared to us to be good reasons, we resolved no longer to permit candidates for Baptism to live within the Mission Premises; we resolved also, that, if we were to give them any support at all, it would only be for a short time; we would no longer hold out any promise to give them support for a period of years.

The result of this determination was that for several years we had no Baptisms at all. To other Missions circumstanced as ours is, precisely the same result would ensue, were they to adopt the course we did.

It is proper to mention here that several of those whom we have educated during these years went elsewhere, and were baptized. To this we had no objection. If these persons were really believers in Christianity, their being baptized and supported by this Mission or by that, seemed to us to be matters of comparatively small importance.

Those whom we have *recently* baptized were in circumstances to support themselves.

It is a *heathen* people we have to deal with—a people brought up in all the perverted ways of thinking that heathenism inculcates. With respect to religious

matters, then, you need not wonder that we should have found it needful to exercise a considerable degree of vigilant caution in dealing with them. Whether our Baptisms were to be many, or whether they were to be few—that was not the point that we kept mainly before us. Our great object was simply to adopt such measures as we trusted might prove effectual in guarding against any one being baptized by us who might hereafter, either by apostasy or by some other way, prove a scorn and a reproach to the Christian name.

What I have now mentioned will at once explain to you the reason of our not having had quite so many Baptisms as there have been at some other Missions. You will perceive clearly *now* that it is not (as some have very thoughtlessly alleged) in any special Divine blessing granted to them and withheld from us, that you are to seek for the reason of this. Baptisms from heathenism are not unfrequently announced in a very loose and a very indiscriminating way. The employment, in *any* subject, of loose and indiscriminating language can hardly fail to mislead. The idea that you are to estimate the success of a Mission by the *mere number* of Baptisms, cannot perhaps be said to be altogether a modern idea: certainly, however, it is one that receives no countenance from the Apostle Paul* (1 Cor. i. 14—17). And it does not appear to be at all favoured by the practice of the ancient Church.†

Nor, so far as I can judge, are you to seek for the reason of the fact just mentioned in the circumstance that we have not had quite so many Missionaries as there may have been at some other stations. For

* See Appendix B. † See Appendix C.

supposing that there had been a Missionary for *every class in the Institution,* and supposing that all these Missionaries had agreed to act *on our principles,* my opinion is that, so far at least as regards the mere number of Baptisms, the results must have been very much the same.

But our principles were somewhat different from those adopted by certain others. Whether we were right in our principles—that is not the question I have been now considering ;—I have been merely trying to point out to you what our principles really were.]

I will now proceed to give you some explanations regarding the manner in which we endeavoured to train our Converts for the office of the ministry.

For full details on this subject, I beg to refer you to the document now under consideration—appendix A.

You will observe that an account is there given of the way in which we trained our first two Converts ; it being thought that a statement of our proceedings with them would be considered quite sufficient.

It is remarked that these Converts had been pupils of the Senior Class, and that they were persons of considerable ability and respectable acquirements.

But, in order that you may know more precisely what sort of persons we had to deal with, I think it of great importance that you should have some additional information respecting them.

I wish you, then, to notice particularly that they were Converts *quite fresh from heathenism* ; and that, at one period, they were about the very last persons that we should have imagined would ever

apply for Christian Baptism. Not long before this, indeed, one of them had repeatedly used somewhat violent measures to interrupt the preaching of the Gospel. They applied, however, for Baptism, and were admitted into the Mission Premises. They were not, however, baptized all at once; during the time of their probation, strenuous efforts were employed to remove them. One of them indeed formed the subject of an expensive law-process.

But they remained steadfast to their purpose; resisting all the endeavours that were made to induce them to withdraw from the Mission. Of their conviction, then, of the truth of Christianity, there could hardly be any room for doubt.

You are to bear in mind, however, these important facts respecting them;—that only a very short time had elapsed since they might have been described with truth as "unbelieving heathen"; that they had been trained from their earliest years in heathenism, and, consequently, that they could not but bring with them many of the superstitious notions inculcated by Hindooism; that they could not but be familiar with many of its degrading practices. From the very limited knowledge, however, that we then had of the effects of Hindooism on the mind, we of course concluded that as they had now been baptized, and (so to say) *rescued* from heathenism, so a complete revolution must have been, all at once, effected on their moral and spiritual nature.

Such, then, is an account of the persons we were now to set about training to be educated Native Ministers;—superior persons in many respects, un-

doubtedly they were ; very much so, when compared with the generality of Native Converts.

To give you as clear an idea as possible of our mode of proceeding with them, I will transcribe a few sentences from the statement. It is remarked that our instructions in general terms were—" to give them a theological training, corresponding as closely as circumstances would permit to what is prescribed to candidates for the ministry by the Scottish Church at home." In accordance with these instructions, the two converts studied various works in Mental and Moral Philosophy, Logic, Theology, and Christian Evidences. They had also attained some proficiency in Greek—having read portions of the New Testament and of Xenophon's Anabasis. One of them also had read in Latin a part of Cæsar, of Sallust, and of Calvin's Institutes.

This course of study occupied about *four* years ; during which time, they were liberally supported by the Mission. They prosecuted their studies with assiduity and success. Every thing was satisfactory ; the only exception mentioned is, that we had occasionally to find fault with them for their reluctance to attend the services in the Bengalee Chapel, or to assist in the Institution. " We have so many different subjects to master," they used to tell us, " we have no time to lose ; we are preparing for the ministry."

And so, at length, for the ministry they were prepared :—if all that is meant by such preparation simply be, that they were prepared to pass such examinations, in Literature and Theology, as the Presbytery might have required of them.

Thus far, then, all matters seemed hopeful enough. The Divinity Students had been successfully instructed ;—quite as successfully as they could have been in any Theological Hall in the world.

My object at present being to show the *success* of our operations, it would not at all serve my purpose to quote any more of the details that are contained in this Appendix.

Those, however, who take an *intelligent* interest in the subject of Missions, will find in these details such information as can hardly fail to lead them to reflect on the pernicious effects that heathenism produces on the soul,—effects which (as I have already remarked) leave a permanent impression, that continues long after heathenism has been professedly renounced.

And those, again, who frame systems for the guidance of such as may be employed in endeavouring to convert the heathen will, I am confident, find in these details a great deal of practical instruction.

There seems to be a very general notion, that any man is competent to give directions on this subject, if only he have sufficient learning, and, above all, an adequate knowledge of doctrinal or systematic Theology. The notion is a most erroneous one. Men of learning may, indeed, construct systems having, at first sight, a very plausible appearance ; but if they have no knowledge but what is to be obtained from the study of books on systematic Theology, and the like,—if they have had no *familiar* intercourse with any classes of men except such as are of the same faith with themselves,—if they have no correct ac-

quaintance with Human Nature generally,—above all, if they have no accurate knowledge of the peculiar habits of thought and of the mental constitution of the particular class of persons to be instructed ;— their systems, however admirably framed, will not be found to be of any real practical service.

From the Acting Committee of the Foreign Mission of the Church of Scotland, there has just been received a communication, of date January 18, intended for the consideration of the Corresponding Board. In this communication it is remarked that " there is a pretty strong feeling in Scotland that our Mission is not making much way ;" which feeling, it is stated, found a *certain expression* in some disparaging remarks respecting ourselves that were made at last General Assembly. We are all here deeply concerned to learn that such is the prevalent feeling. None can be more conscious than we are of the slow progress that Christianity is making through the instrumentality of our Mission ; and, I may add, through the instrumentality of all other Missions here ; slow, that is, when compared with the anticipations that were entertained of the progress Christianity would make when these Missions were first established. The reasons of this slow progress we have often endeavoured to explain. And, after all these explanations, it is very disheartening to have the fact so prominently brought before us by others.

But what I wish you particularly to notice is the system, that is recommended with the view of enabling our Mission to make more way. It is to

establish Bursaries for aiding and encouraging Native Converts who might be desirous of studying for the Christian Ministry.

We were greatly consoled when we read this proposal. We thought that after all, perhaps, the main reason why people were so much dissatisfied with our Mission in particular was, that they were not at all aware of the progress we have really made. They propose to establish Bursaries. But we are far—very far beyond that stage. The truth is that what we want now, and have wanted for several years back, to enable us to complete our system, is not the establishing of Bursaries for Students, but of salaries for Ministers. This circumstance alone ought to show people what an amount of way we have long since made.

The Committee enquire "what would be the probable effect of the institution of such Bursaries?" If they will read the statement of which I am now speaking, they will be able to form some idea of what the probable effects would be. They are effects that hardly any one, I think, would consider to be very desirable.

Of course the statement in question has been already before the Church; for it was printed in one of the Reports. I fancy, however, that most people may have overlooked it, on the ground probably that it was not considered very encouraging. Indeed, in a Report* that was presented some years ago to the General Assembly, our "pictures of Native Converts to our creed," were pronounced to fall very far short of

* Report of the Committee on Indian Churches, May 1862, page 16.

those that had been drawn by others. But, if they did fall thus short, they certainly had one advantage ;— they were no fancy-pictures ; they were no pictures of the imagination ; they were natural pictures ; in short, they were sketched from life. It is plain then, that if they were not pictures of the BEAUTIFUL, at all events, they must have been pictures of the TRUE. And if people turn away from the sight of our pictures, what must be the feelings of those who have to deal with the living realities !

What a close resemblance there is between our pictures of converts from heathenism and those drawn by St. Paul, I will afterwards point out.

I will now conclude this account of our training operations with a few remarks which may serve to throw additional light on the matter.

I called your particular attention to the fact that the persons we were required to train for the ministry had not been born of Christian parents, nor brought up in the Christian Faith ; on the contrary, they had been brought up from their earliest years in all the habits of heathenism. It was confidently believed, that if these persons were to receive a very careful training in Literature and Theology, they would hereafter become useful Missionaries to their countrymen. Now, the question I wish to ask is—Had ever any one before attempted a work of exactly this description ? If so—that was quite unknown to us. For we had before us no experience from which we could draw any conclusion as to how all this training might turn out.

It is plain, then, that we were in the position of per-

sons who were going to make an *Experiment*. Now, for the complete success of that experiment, it is evident that two things were required. It was required (1) to impart to our converts all needful literary and theological training :—it was required (2) that the converts when thus trained and educated should be prepared to abandon all thought of rising in the world;—that they should be willing to devote themselves to the most laborious, and most self-denying, of occupations ; and all this, for salaries not amounting, perhaps, to more than one third of what they could readily obtain at other employments. In other words, it was required that they should be Christians of the most exlated order.

With regard to the first requisite, namely, the literary and theological training—in that, as you have already seen, we were perfecty successful.

And, as for the second requisite—it is a remarkable circumstance, but it is, nevertheless, perfectly true that, for a long time, that requisite never seems to have cost us a thought. The truth is, that we took it for granted, that that requisite would come of itself; that if we were only careful and diligent in the training, all other things would follow of themselves as mere matters of course.

But, was not this to assume a great deal ? Undoubtedly it was. And yet, the founders of our Mission must have assumed the same thing. Of course they did not do so, in so many express words ; nor did we. But *tacitly* they must have assumed it. There can be no doubt of that. For no one would consider it a very important work merely to *train* converts to

be Missionaries, if he had not the fullest confidence, that they would ultimately *become* Missionaries.

Now, had the persons we were training been born of *Christian* parents, had they been brought up in the *Christian* faith, we should hardly, I think, have concluded so confidently respecting them.

The question, then, is—how comes it to pass that in a case where converts from *heathenism* were concerned, we should have been prepared to make so very large assumptions. These assumptions are plainly not intuitive, or self-evident truths. It must, then, have been by some process of reasoning that men arrived at them. I will explain to you how *we* arrived at them. When we commenced the work, we had of course some knowledge of systematic Theology; but we had so very little knowledge of Human Nature that, as I have already remarked, we concluded that, as the persons with whom we had to deal had now made a solemn profession of their faith in Christianity, so a complete revolution must have taken place in their whole moral and spiritual nature; and we reasoned in this way:—By means of this Mission these converts have been rescued from heathenism, and brought into the liberty of the children of God. They are now most liberally supported by us; they are receiving from us every kindness, we have it in our power to bestow. Does it not follow then, as a plain matter of course, that they will be prompted by what certainly are the highest of all motives, even those of *Christian gratitude* and *Christian love*,—that they will be prompted by these which surely *ought* to be the most influential of all considerations, to do all that

in them lies to communicate to others the blessings they themselves enjoy? And does it not also follow, that they will regard all matters relating to salary as of very inferior importance?

To those who have had little or no personal intercourse except with such as are of their own Faith, this reasoning may appear (as it did to us) perfectly unexceptionable. But when you come to have intercourse with the "unbelieving heathen," or even with *converts* from heathenism, you find yourself compelled to take a very different view of things. The Facts, as they appear before your eyes, are so very different from what they ought to be according to your system, that if you are determined to uphold your system as in all respects in accordance with Scripture, you will, by and by, find yourself involved in utter perplexity.

Sad experience will teach you the need of modifying your system—the need, in a word, of making many and great allowances. You are gradually led to take a more enlarged view; you will probably proceed to consider the case of *another* class of Divinity Students brought up (not as ours were in habits of heathenism, but) in the nurture and admonition of the Lord. You ask yourself— what change is produced in *them* by their training in Literature and Theology? When they have finished their theological course, are they willing to abandon all thought of rising in the world? Supposing them to be well educated men, would they be willing to spend all their lives as teachers, or as preachers, among the very lowest and most degraded of the population? If they were called to a position yielding them five or six times

their present emoluments, and requiring an incomparably smaller amount of laborious exertion, how many are there that would feel themselves bound to reject such a call ?

Ah ! but (says the mere systematic Theologian) *your* divinity students were *rescued* from heathenism ; they were brands plucked from the burning. In regard to *them*, therefore, it might reasonably be expected that they would manifest a degree of zeal, and of love, and of self-denial, and of deadness to the world, and of all the other Christian graces far higher than what ought to be looked for in the case of Divinity Students who have been *born* Christians, and so have never been *rescued* from heathenism. To whomsoever much hath been forgiven, the same loveth much.

This, then, is the inevitable conclusion to which our system brings us at last, namely, that, had it been our fate to be born of *heathen* parents, and brought up in all the darkness of heathen ignorance, error, and superstition, and then brought to make a profession of Christianity when we grew up,—in that case, it might have been natural to expect that we should have been far better Christians than what we now are. But is it not the fact that the generality of people consider it (and well indeed may they so consider it) as a matter calling for devout thankfulness, that they have been born of *Christian* parents, and taught from their *earliest* years to know Him who is the Way and the Truth and the Life ?

That a notion, which unavoidably lands you in conclusions such as these, must be an unsound one, and, by consequence, a pernicious one—this is what

most people will be prepared to admit. It is quite possible, however, that it may not have been till your own Faith sustained a severe shock that you were able to discover exactly where the unsoundness lay.

Thus far, then, respecting the kind of persons whom we had to prepare for the ministry, and also respecting the manner in which we endeavoured to prepare them. The explanations now given will, it is hoped, enable people to understand something of the nature of our work. They will now perceive that it is a work involving a good many intricate questions,—a good many points of difficulty.

As for the work of training, or imparting instruction (which is all that Divinity-Halls contemplate) I have said enough to show that there was no failure there. Our Divinity Students were quite prepared to pass such examinations as might have been required of them.

And this leads me to consider the next point that I proposed to notice, namely—

II. The success that has attended the efforts made by the Presbytery of Calcutta to ordain *Native Ministers.*

Our Divinity Students having now completed their Literary and Theological courses, the next step was to introduce them to the Presbytery.

From the minutes of the Presbytery of Calcutta, it appears that so far back as the year 1858, three of the Converts connected with the Mission had forwarded applications to be taken on trials with a view to their ordination. And others were making in-

quiries as to the time when they would be required to pass their examinations.

The applications were of course considered. But there arose now a great variety of questions that nobody ever seemed to have thought of before.

In the event of these candidates being ordained, where are suitable spheres of labour to be found for them? How are Churches to be built for them? And supposing the Churches built, where are congregations to be got for them? But above and beyond all, how are adequate salaries to be procured for them?

These were matters that our system appears never to have contemplated;—at all events, it had made no provision for them. It is probable that, just as in the case of the *second* requisite above mentioned, so also in respect of these other matters, it had been taken for granted that, if only the needful Theological qualifications could be imparted, all other things would come of themselves—they would follow, in short, as matters of course.

But sad experience taugh t the Presbytery that not one of these things followed as a matter of course, and, though they held meeting after meeting, they could see no way of surmounting their difficulties.

In the mean time, some of the candidates for ordination were beginning to get very much dissatisfied. Most earnest endeavours were made to induce them to remain as Christian Teachers in the Institution; or (if they preferred it) to engage in the work of preaching in the Native Chapels and Bazaars. But this was what the Converts would not hear of. They

had been educated, they said, to serve the Mission in the capacity of regularly Ordained Ministers, and now they began to take the alarm that our object was to make them spend their lives as mere teachers or preachers; and all this, for salaries that would furnish them with little more than the bare necessaries of life or (as some of them alleged) hardly even these. They insisted on it, therefore, that the Presbytery should proceed to draw up what they called a "graduated scale of salaries;" and take such other steps as might convince them that we really meant to ordain them. The Presbytery could not, at once, comply with all their wishes. On this ground, the Converts imagined, that we were breaking faith with them: accordingly, some of them resolved to give up all thoughts of the ministry, and to leave the Mission as soon as they could. They were persons of good education, and being also Christians, they had no difficulty in procuring far more lucrative employments.

To the Acting Committee of the Foreign Mission of the Church of Scotland, communications were, from time to time, forwarded containing ample details of all these matters. The proceedings of our own Converts were fully reported. The proceedings also of some of the Converts belonging to other Missions were sufficiently dwelt upon; to certain of their *published* writings the attention of the Committee was most earnestly directed.

It was hoped that from the variety of facts thus set before them, the Committee would have no difficulty in drawing their own inferences as to the future working of the scheme. It was thought that the knowledge of these facts would lead them to concur

with the Presbytery in the opinion, that, *for the present at least,* there did not seem to be any very cheering prospects that we should be able to carry the system very much further than we had already done.

But, I will now proceed to point out how a way was at length opened up, by which the Presbytery hoped to be able to overcome all their difficulties;—so far at any rate, as to make a beginning in the work of ordaining Native Ministers. For some account of that way, I have to request you to consult another document, namely—

Christian Progress and Prospects in India, under the General Assembly's Foreign Mission Committee; being Report of the Committee on Indian Churches, given in by the Rev. James Bryce, D. D. Convener:— May, 1861.

(I regret to find that this document did not appear in the *Missionary Record*: it may not, therefore, be so accessible as the others.)

About the beginning of the year 1861, the Committee on Indian Churches addressed to the Presbytery of Calcutta a variety of communications, in which they dwelt with the utmost earnestness on the vast importance, with a view to the conversion of India, of raising up, with the least possible delay, a body of highly-educated Native Ministers. And, as what appeared to them the readiest way of accomplishing that great object, they most earnestly urged on the Presbytery, the necessity of losing no time in proceeding to establish Literary and Theological Classes, for the purpose of preparing young Converts from heathenism (of whom the Committee

seemed to have a notion that there must be a large number) to become candidates for the office of the Christian ministry.

With the view of encouraging the Presbytery to open these classes, the Committee expressed their readiness to do all in their power to secure Bursaries for the Students : again and again did they assure the Presbytery, that, if they would only set about opening the classes in the Divinity Hall, they need be under no apprehensions of there being any lack of Bursaries.

For a time the Presbytery were quite at a loss to know what to make of all this. To the earnest appeals of the Committee, however, they were by and by, able most fully to respond. They were able to point out a more ready and "a more excellent way" of raising up Native Ministers than that proposed by the Committee. What that way was I will now explain. The Presbytery had lately received certain communications from the first convert of the Mission, Baboo Tarini Churn Mittre. This convert was again a candidate for Ordination. He had long been a Divinity Student ; but upwards of five years had elapsed since he had left the Mission. During that period, he had been employed in various situations of considerable trust and emolument. He had thus enjoyed opportunities of gaining some experience and a knowledge of the world. For some time, the Presbytery had no opportunity of holding any personal intercourse with him. But the letters he now addressed to several members of the Presbytery, showed him in a very different light, from that in which he had appeared when a mere Divinity Student, five or

six years before. He had evidently reflected seriously on the nature of the office to which he was now aspiring. He was a man of cultivated mind, well-versed in Literature and Theology. With regard to his knowledge of these subjects and his attainments generally, it is certainly not going beyond the truth to say of him, that he did not at all fall below the average of persons that present themselves for ordination before Presbyteries in Scotland.

Some information respecting this Convert, and also an able statement written by him, were forwarded at once to the Committee on Indian Churches. The object was to ascertain if the Committee were prepared to guarantee not a Bursary, but such an amount of salary as the Presbytery, after the fullest deliberation, considered to be fair and proper. For, unless this were done, the Presbytery did not consider themselves in a position to take a single step in the way of ordaining him.

The Committee appeared to enter into the matter with much interest. Both the Presbytery and the Candidate were led to believe that their hopes would soon be realized.

[In the Report now under consideration, there are several matters to which I wish to call attention :—

(1.) Is it desirable to establish Bursaries for the maintenance, during their Theological training, of such Converts as may offer themselves for the ministry ? I have neither time nor space to transcribe the answer which is given to this question ; but those who take any *real* interest in Missionary proceedings will not grudge the trouble of turning to page 32 of this

* See Appendix page xvii. ***

Report, where they will find the subject clearly and fully discussed. They will perceive the thoughtful care that we bestowed on all these matters, as well as our anxiety to make every thing as intelligible as possible.

(2.) I have also to request attention to the statement (page 42) in which the candidate explains the manner in which he meant to conduct Missionary operations. The statement in question I consider an able one, well-worth the attention of Theologians. The writer is a thoughtful man, and has had large personal intercourse with various classes of his countrymen. He is, therefore, quite competent to express an opinion on the subject.]

As I have remarked, both the Presbytery and the candidate were led to believe, that their hopes would soon be realized. How far these hopes were well founded will afterwards appear. Will you be pleased then to turn to another document, namely—

Report of the Committee on Indian Churches: Given in by the Rev. James Bryce, D.D., Convener, May, 1862.

To understand fully the references in this document, it may be proper to mention, that the communications of the Presbytery relative to the candidate for ordination, had been despatched to the Committee on Indian Churches in the early part of the year 1861.—It is proper, also, to state that, at this time, the candidate was in Government employment, at a place some hundreds of miles from Calcutta. As has been already remarked, then, the Presbytery had hitherto had no opportunity of communicating with him except by written correspondence.

In the month of December, 1861, however, he obtained leave of absence; and in order to follow out the object he had in view, he came to Calcutta. He was requested to attend a meeting of Presbytery which was held on December 6, 1861.

The following extract from the minutes will show the result of that meeting:—

"The Presbytery having been informed that Baboo Tarini Churn Mittre was now in attendance, invited him to appear before them. The Presbytery conversed with him on various points; and in particular, on the views that he entertained relative to the mode of conducting evangelistic operations in this land, and on his own wish to resign his present employment and to devote himself to the work of a Missionary. Being satisfied with his views on these matters—

Resolved (1)—To encourage the candidate to prepare and send in to them an application to be taken on trials with a view to his ordination as a Missionary to his countrymen. (2) — To prepare a full statement, in which a special endeavour should be made to point out to the Committee on Indian Churches, what appeared to the Presbytery to be the only way by which useful Native Missionaries could be obtained."

Accordingly, a full statement was prepared for the Meeting of Presbytery, held on March 7, 1862. It is to this statement that reference is made at page 16 of the Report now before you. The main object of the statement was to give the Committee some information as to the character of young Converts, and also to call their particular attention to the fact that the class of Converts from which they could obtain use-

ful Missionaries was as yet but a very small one. The Committee were informed that the candidate for whom they were asked to provide a salary was one of this exceedingly small class. After giving a brief account of the candidate, the statement concludes with these words :—

"The Presbytery, therefore, beg now to inform the General Assembly's Committee on Indian Churches that if means can be devised that shall effectually relieve them of all responsibility as to the matter of salary, they should feel disposed to venture on the step of taking the present candidate on trials ; and (if found duly qualified) to ordain him to the office of Missionary to his countrymen. But until something definite be settled as to that point, they should not feel themselves authorized to take any further proceedings. With these explanations, the Presbytery have much satisfaction in leaving this whole subject in the hands of the Committee on Indian Churches ; assured that they will do all that in them lies to make a commencement, in the work of raising up a Native Ministry in connexion with the Church of Scotland."

This minute of the Presbytery's seems to have taken the Committee on Indian Churches somewhat by surprise. They were not at all pleased with *our* pictures of Converts. For an account of their views, however, as well as of the manner in which they proposed to find a salary for the candidate, I must refer you to the Report itself.

The following extract will show you how the Presbytery were obliged at last to bring the matter to a close :—"December 5, 1862. A communication was

received from Gopal Chunder Laha, in which he requested to be informed, if the Presbytery were disposed to receive an application from him to be taken on trials, with a view to his ordination as a Missionary to his countrymen. The Presbytery, taking into consideration the fact that they had now two qualified candidates, and that one of them had been kept in a state of suspense for nearly two years—Resolved—That it was highly desirable, that the Committee on Indian Churches should be informed of these circumstances, and also that the Committee should be requested to state whether there were any prospects of such provision being made for the support of these Candidates, as should authorize the Presbytery to proceed at once to adopt such measures as were requisite for their ordination."

The reply of the Committee was to this effect—that what their scheme contemplated was the raising of Bursaries for the maintenance of Theological Students, while they were prosecuting their studies at the Divinity Hall. As for providing salaries for Ministers, they had no funds at their command : they regretted, therefore, that they had it not in their power to do any thing towards the promotion of that object. They, however, earnestly recommended the Presbytery to lose no time in bringing the case before the Acting Committee of the Foreign Mission of the Church of Scotland.

Here then ends the account of the correspondence of the Presbytery with the Committee on Indian Churches.

Of the subsequent transactions connected with this case, there is no *published* record.

These transactions were very few: they will be sufficiently understood from the following extracts, from the minutes of the Presbytery of Calcutta—

"September 4, 1863— The Presbytery were informed, that the Committee on Indian Churches had handed over the subject of Baboo Tarini Churn Mittre's ordination to the Foreign Mission Committee, and that a letter had been received from the Convener of that Committee requesting information as to the qualifications of the candidate, and the amount of salary he was worth—Resolved—(1) To furnish the Committee with full information as to all these points. (2)—To take no steps in the matter of the ordination till the Committee should decide as to whether they were prepared to accede to his terms."

The decision of the Committee was at length received. In the minutes of the Presbytery the decision itself is recorded, but no reasons are there mentioned—

"March 4, 1864— The Presbytery were informed that the Foreign Mission Committee had declined to accede to the terms proposed by Baboo Tarini Churn Mittre, and approved by the Presbytery: and consequently, that the Committee had declined altogether to accept of his services."

Such then is the history of this remarkable attempt to raise up *one* educated Native Minister in connexion with the Mission of the Church of Scotland.

* See Appendix E.

Various and important were some of the results, that ensued in consequence of the decision that had been so deliberately pronounced respecting this candidate for ordination.

One result I wish particularly to mention. It cannot have escaped notice what a difficulty we had in knowing how to deal with our Converts in the matter of salary. That difficulty was greatly increased by certain notions they had been led to form, from the way in which they saw themselves not unfrequently spoken of, in some of the Missionary publications. That there *could* be any difficulty in procuring salaries for persons whose importance was so frequently and so strongly set forth—this to our Converts was perfectly inconceivable. The notion they formed was this—that it was we, the Missionaries, who "stood between them and the people of Scotland; that, but for us, the people of Scotland would be quite willing to give them ample salaries." The consequence of this notion was that they began to entertain feelings of great bitterness towards us, feelings which they entertained for a long time, and which they did not fail to express in a variety of ways. There is nothing to be wondered at in what I have now stated. Our Converts had indeed a large amount of book-knowledge; but they had no experience whatever, and not the slightest knowledge of the world. People, therefore, can easily understand that the picture I have now given of them is not only a true one, but, in the circumstances of the case, a perfectly natural one.

Now, the proceedings I have just narrated were watched with great interest by *all* the Converts. And

when the decision was received, they seemed to understand at last how the matter stood. They now knew who it was that took a *real* interest in their welfare; they had now got rid of this most pernicious sentimentalism as to their "great importance," more distressing to us than any heathen superstition could possibly have been; they had now gained most valuable knowledge; in a word they became quite changed men. Here then is one encouraging circumstance; and I have much pleasure in now recording it.

Another result was, the resolution the Presbytery were led to form in regard to their future proceedings. The result of this candidate's case was considered as perfectly decisive in regard to all others; accordingly, they were informed that, *for the present at least,* no more applications would be received; that, *for the present at least,* the Presbytery were not prepared to take a single step towards the licensing or ordaining of any one.

And what was the consequence of all this in regard to our own proceedings? Simply this:—in the case of all *future* Converts, we resolved that, while we should, of course, be as desirous as ever to instruct them in Literature and Theology, we certainly would no longer permit them to continue studying for four or five years under the plea, that they were preparing for the Christian Ministry.

And was not this a most proper resolution to come to? At a considerable cost to the Mission, and with an amount of trouble to ourselves that I should not wish to dwell upon, we had already done what we could to train Fifteen;—with the unsatisfactory results that have been just set forth.

After all this, then, should we have been dealing honestly with the supporters of the Mission, if we had made a profession that we were continuing to follow out our former scheme in all its integrity, and allowed the supporters to continue incurring a large expenditure, under the conviction that we were training Converts for the ministry, when we ourselves knew perfectly that we were training them for no such object ?

Some have charged us with having abandoned what they call the 'great scheme.' We were brought face to face with it. We had the most ample experience of it. We worked it out from beginning to end.—A scheme whose most striking feature seemed to be that it ended in raising up ministers for whom there were no congregations and no stipends—we thought it wise to abandon it.

And what is the scheme we have substituted in its stead ? It is this ;—to teach our converts and all others literature and theology, as far as we are able ; but, *as for making ordained Ministers of any of them,* we hold out to them no hope of anything of that kind ;—in fact, we never speak of such a subject.

Let me now express my earnest hope that all these explanations may serve sufficiently to clear up the meaning of the sentence in the statement on *Affiliation,* which seems to have given rise to such perplexity ; namely, "the raising of a Native Ministry forms no part of the work in which the Missionaries are now engaged. This for the present at least has been entirely abandoned."

From the remarks that have now been offered, it must not be supposed that any blame whatever is meant to be attached to the Committee for declining to accept this candidate's services. The very contrary is the fact. True indeed it is, that, from the manner in which we have been publicly spoken of with reference to this matter, it has been considered by all here that we have been placed on our defence ; and, therefore, that it is our imperative duty to give the fullest explanations. But we must not be, thereby, understood as meaning to reflect upon any party whatever. The truth is, that after the matter had been fully decided, I took occasion indeed to state my views to the Committee ; but these views were expressive of any thing but regret. I went over the whole scheme ; and I stated that, from the large experience the Committee had now had of its working, I felt quite sure they must all perceive that it was premature ; and that, for the present at least, nothing more could be made out of it.

That was the view that appeared to be taken by all the more thoughtful of the supporters of the Mission here. They approved of our proceedings ; and we were under the conviction that the same view could hardly fail to be taken by all thoughtful supporters of the Mission elsewhere. We believed that they also were quite satisfied with the manner in which our operations were conducted. But we have now learnt that such is very far from being the case ; for a strong feeling prevails that our Mission is not making much way.

Here, then, a question arises which we *must* con-

sider. Is it thought that the Mission is not making much way *absolutely* ? Or is it merely thought that the Mission is making less way than some of the other Missions in this part of the world ?

Now, certainly, it is most true that, in the matter of *ordaining* Native Ministers, our Mission has *not* made so much way as some of the other Missions here.

For instance, in respect of *ordaining* Native Ministers, our Misson is behind the other Scottish Mission here,—I mean the Mission conducted by our brethren of the Free Church.

Our friends in Scotland are perfectly aware of the fact that, in a pecuniary point of view, that Mission possesses very much larger resources than ours has. Accordingly, twelve years ago, the Free Church Presbytery of Calcutta ordained three Native gentlemen.

Our friends in Scotland, however, must not overlook the fact that these three are the only ones that have as yet been ordained by the Free Church Presbytery of Calcutta ; and also that twelve years have now elapsed since that event took place. They may conclude from this that there must be considerable difficulty in finding suitable persons to ordain.

Perhaps our friends would wish to be informed how these three ministers are employed. One of them is pastor of a congregation here, which, in many respects, resembles the congregation presided over by the agent of St. Andrew's Missionary Association. The Free Church congregation is of considerably longer standing than ours ; its members worship in an excellent Church ; they are in more affluent cir-

cumstances than the generality of Native Christians here. This is evident from the fact that, for the last two years, they have contributed liberally to the support of their Pastor : for many years, however, the whole of his salary was paid by the Mission, which of course is still responsible for it.

Another of these Ministers is employed not as a Pastor, but as a Missionary, in connexion with the Institution at Chinsurah. The third is also a Missionary. He is at a station in the Mofussil. His work very much resembles that which is carried on at Ghospara by the agent of St. Stephen's Congregation, Edinburgh. The former indeed is an ordained Minister ; the latter is not, though he has for several years been a candidate for ordination. With respect to the two last mentioned clergymen, it may be almost superfluous to state, that the whole of their salaries has, as a matter of course, to be defrayed by the Mission.

Again, our Mission is behind the London (Congregational) Mission in Calcutta. About five years ago, three of the Converts of that Mission were set apart to the office of the Ministry. They are employed much in the same way as those other three Ministers, whose work I have just described.

The Missions of the Church of England not being in all respects circumstanced as ours is, I have not thought it necessary to refer to them. I may, however, just mention, by the way, that, in connexion with the Missions of the Church Missionary Society here, there is one educated Native Minister.

I cannot exactly say how the case stands with respect to the Baptist Missions. I was on the point of

making inquiries, but it occurred to me, that there was no need for doing so. For what I have already mentioned is quite sufficient to show that, in the matter of *ordaining* Native Ministers, our Mission has not made so much way as several of the others.

Last year I ventured to throw out an opinion that, when I considered all circumstances, I could hardly regard it as a matter of great regret that, we had not, as yet, any highly educated Native Minister. The reasons that led me to form this opinion, there is no need for mentioning. I may have been quite wrong in entertaining that opinion, and still more wrong in giving expression to it.

For, there are many who *do* consider this a matter of regret; they are anxious to have ordained Native Ministers in connexion with their Missions. They have now, then, a favourable opportunity of having their wishes carried into effect. The Presbytery are willing to do what they can to forward their views; and have, accordingly, transmitted to Scotland, the applications for ordination of three candidates. There is nothing, therefore, to prevent our having, in a very short time, quite as many ordained Native Ministers, as any of the other Missions now mentioned. And this brings me to the last point that I proposed to notice, namely—

III. The particular class of converts to whom any encouragement ought to be held out to offer themselves as candidates for the ministry.

With respect to the particular question now before us, Converts may be arranged under two heads (1) Recent Converts, such, for instance, as those of whom

I have been lately speaking; and (2) Converts of longer standing.

As for the first class, then, the important practical question is this: Is it advisable (either by Bursaries, or in any other way) to hold out any encouragement to *them* to qualify themselves, by means of a four or five years' course of Literature and Theology, to become candidates for the office of the ministry?

We instruct them in Literature and Theology, so far as we can find opportunity. We should not, however, think now of maintaining them, for four or five years, while prosecuting these studies. Indeed, we have completely abandoned all thoughts of training any of *this* class for the ministry.

But many of the supporters in Scotland regret much to hear this announcement. They believe that the training of these converts for the ministry, is a work of the highest importance; and they are earnestly desirous that the greatest prominence should be given to such training.

Is the question one on which *Scripture* gives us no instruction? If such were the fact, it would be a strange circumstance. It appears to me, however, that an attentive consideration of what the Apostle Paul teaches us with reference to this very subject, would enable any one to form a pretty decided opinion on the question.

In the First Epistle to Timothy, iii. 2—7, the Apostle enumerates a variety of qualifications which he considers as of essential importance for any one who would aspire to the office of a bishop; which term

he uses as equivalent to *overseer, presbyter, pastor;* as equivalent, in short, to *ordained minister.*

Now, among other qualifications which the Apostle lays down as essential for the office, he mentions, in particular, that—*A bishop must not be a novice, lest being lifted up with pride he fall into the condemnation of the devil.*

The question which it is of the utmost importance for us to determine here is—What class of persons does the Apostle mean to include under the term 'novice'?

In the margin of our Bibles, the word is translated "one newly come to the faith."

Most instructive are the comments on this passage that are made by that profound Theologian, J. A. Bengel:—

μὴ νεόφυτον) *non recens* ab ethnicismo *conversum*; that is to say, the person whom you are to endeavour to qualify for the office of a bishop must *not* be one that is *quite fresh* from heathenism.

Now, you cannot but have noticed, that that was exactly the kind of persons whom we endeavoured so to qualify. They were (as I have already pointed out) *quite fresh* from heathenism.

Bengel remarks that the term *neophyte* is opposed to *antiquus discipulus.* For an example of this opposite, he refers us to Acts xxi. 16, where we read of "one Mnason of Cyprus," who is described as being ἀρχαῖος μαθητής (*antiquus discipulus*), rendered in our version, "an old disciple":—by which, however, we are not to understand that he was an *aged man.* He was

old, not *as a man*, but *as a disciple*. He was an early convert—having in all probability embraced Christianity about the time of Pentecost, possibly even before it.

Let it be carefully observed, then, that neither the term *neophyte* nor its opposite has any reference to mere *age*: The former simply denotes one who has been *recently* converted;—the latter, one of *longer standing*; and, by implication, one whose Christian character has been *tried* for a sufficient time, and who is therefore, *known* and *approved*. For example, at the time when this Epistle was addressed to Timothy, he might have been described (in the implied sense of the expression) as an *antiquus discipulus*; for though young in years, he was old in Christian experience,—having been trained, from a child, in the knowledge of the Holy Scriptures by a pious mother and grandmother.

Nothing, it appears to me, could be more explicit, or more clearly defined, than the classification of converts which is here laid down.

There is, first of all, the class of converts *newly come to the faith*; raw, thoughtless, inexperienced, wayward, conceited persons. Like our converts, they may indeed have a considerable knowledge of books; but then (from the very nature of the case, as being youths quite fresh from heathenism) they have no knowledge of the world, and no experience whatever of the trials and difficulties of life. They are full of ideas of their own importance; they are self-willed and obstinate; and, by consequence, they are utterly impatient of all reproof: they have no steadiness of view, no fixedness of purpose, and *not the slightest experience of the Christian life*. It is

not to persons of *this* class (the Apostle instructs you) that you are to hold out encouragements to qualify themselves, by a course of training in literature and theology, for becoming candidates for the Christian Ministry.—Literature and Theology you may indeed teach them to any extent you choose; but, if you will listen to the teaching of the Apostle, you will look for some other qualifications before you ever think of proposing to them the subject of the Christian Ministry.

The Apostle had large experience of Converts of all classes; in this matter, therefore, he may be considered quite a safe guide for all times. Now, he plainly informs you that, if you wish to have *ordained ministers*, you must turn your attention to the other class of Converts; those, namely, of some standing; those who, as he expresses it, have *first been proved*; that is, who have given sufficient proofs of the steadfastness of their Christian character, and respecting whom you have good grounds for believing that they really do possess *some* at least of those qualifications that are requisite to fit them for the office to which you would raise them.

Particularly instructive are the remarks of this commentator (Bengel) on what the Apostle assigns as the reason why you are not to attempt to qualify *neophytes* for the office of bishop:—

τυφωθεὶς) *elatus*:—τυφοῦσθαι dicuntur, quos *opinio scientiae* et *fastus* impotes sui facit, et vertigine implet:—From a conceit of their own knowledge and their contempt of others, they are unable to control themselves; in fact, their heads become quite turned.

Again: *recens conversus* cruce nondum maceratus est:—a *recent convert* has not yet been softened by trials.

On the inexpediency of elevating young and inexperienced persons to *any* high office, Bengel has the following admirable note—

"In omni vitae genere observare licet, eos, qui a summo statim fastigio ordiuntur, difficulter sibi consulere, ad inferiores vix descendere, afflictorum sorte non moveri, seque ipsos regere et modum in rebus tenere non posse. Maxime vero omnium in episcopi munus haec omnia conveniunt":—the import of which is—That in *every* department of life, inexperienced persons who have been all at once elevated to a very high position are not well able to act prudently for themselves; that they cannot associate and sympathize with the lowly; that they cannot feel for those that are in distress; and that they cannot exercise self-control, or observe moderation. Now, all these remarks apply especially to the office of a *bishop*.

Such, then, is the exposition of this passage which is given by one who was a great Theologian, and—what is more—a profound observer of Human Nature.

Let any one compare the foregoing descriptions of converts newly come to the faith, with the details which I have given respecting such converts, and which were derived, not from any knowledge of Human Nature, but entirely from experience,—he cannot fail to be struck with their agreement.

Well worth consideration, also, is an incidental remark of Lord Bacon's,* in a speech which he de-

* The Works of Lord Bacon, Vol III. p. 314, London: 1803.

livered "in the lower house of Parliament, by occasion of a motion concerning the Union of Laws." He thus observes—"*Nemo subito fingitur:* the conversions of minds are not so swift as the conversions of times. Nay in effects of grace, which exceed farther the effects of nature, we see St. Paul makes a difference between those he calls Neophytes, that is, newly grafted into Christianity, and those that are brought up in the faith."

I have ventured, thus earnestly, to call attention to this passage from the Apostle's writings, because it appears to me that, by a careful consideration of it, those supporters of the Mission who are at a distance might be able, in some measure at least, to form for themselves a judgment as to the matter now in hand. Those supporters have of course no means of obtaining a personal acquaintance with young converts; and some of them may, perhaps, think that our descriptions of converts do not quite come up to the descriptions they have heard from others. But, in a question like that now before us, is there any need that they should depend entirely on the views of any man in particular? What inference would the supporters themselves deduce from an attentive consideration of the Apostle's language? There seems no particular ground for supposing that the converts from heathenism with whom we have to deal, are *better* Christians than were those with whom the Apostle had to deal.

The question, then, is—Does the Apostle's language afford us much encouragement to hope for any special success in our efforts to raise up useful and efficient ministers out of this first class of converts—I mean,

"Converts who have newly come to the faith?" And, let it be observed that, at an Institution like ours, it is with Converts of *this class*, that we have exclusively to deal; and, certainly, it is for Converts of this class *alone* that Bursaries can be of any service.

For my own part, I consider the passage that has been now referred to, as perfectly decisive of the question.

To all that I have now stated, it may indeed be answered, that it would be only reasonable to expect that great changes would be effected in young converts, by a long course of training in Literature and Theology.

In reply to this, I need only remind you that the success of the Mission, considered as a mere Divinity Hall was all that could have been expected. It was complete. But the changes I am now speaking of are manifestly such as no amount of training in a Divinity Hall will ever produce.

With reference to this point, I will cite the opinion expressed by the Presbytery a few years ago. And I think it of importance to state that this opinion was not formed from any consideration of the teaching of the Apostle; for, at that time, the attention of the Presbytery had not been at all directed to the passage.

The opinion was entirely the result of their own experience.

The presbytery observe—

"As for Literary and Theological studies—young converts may prosecute these with sufficient diligence, but rarely indeed have such converts been found to manifest, so long at all events as they continue to be

mere students, any thing whatever of that zeal, and patience, and earnestness, and devotedness, without which it were vain even to expect that they could be useful labourers in any department of the vineyard of the Lord.

That, in the case of young Converts from Heathenism, there should be such a marked deficiency in the higher graces of the Christian character; and that Time, among other things, should be requisite for the development of these graces,—this is what can appear wonderful only to those who have never considered carefully, nor reflected attentively.

The Presbytery, accordingly, desired to express it as their decided and deliberate conviction—a conviction which is entirely the result of experience—that it would afford far higher hopes of ultimate success in the work of raising up a body of qualified native Pastors and Missionaries, if (instead of holding out encouragements to mere youths, it may be fresh from Heathenism—to qualify themselves by a course of Literature and Theology for entering on the office of the ministry) endeavours were rather made, as opportunities might present themselves in God's providence, to obtain the services of Converts who are already in some measure *prepared* for their work—who have attained some maturity of thought—who have enjoyed opportunities of gaining some experience and knowledge of the world—who have given some proofs of the steadfastness of their Christian character; and above all, of Converts regarding whom there should be at least *some* grounds for believing that they had reflected frequently and earnestly on the solemn and

responsible nature of the office to which they would aspire."

Such were the views set forth by the Presbytery. Accordingly, it was to this latter class of Converts alone, that they were of opinion that any encouragement whatever should be given to offer themselves as candidates for the Christian ministry.

But then, throughout the whole of Bengal, few indeed are those who have as yet reached anything like the standard which is here laid down. And let me remind you particularly that those few are all far beyond the stage of mere Divinity students; they are already somewhat advanced in life; they are all of them in the enjoyment of considerable salaries; and if any of them are expected to become Missionaries, they must receive adequate remuneration.

The Presbytery are of opinion that the three candidates, whose applications have lately been transmitted to the Acting Committee, possess several at least of the qualifications which have just been mentioned.

From the Presbytery's minute, I will extract such information respecting these candidates, as it seems desirable that the Church should be put in possession of.

The Presbytery observe—

"That they have long and intimately known these three gentlemen; that one of them, Baboo Bipro Churn Chuckerbutty, has been for many years one of the agents of St. Andrew's Missionary Associa-

tion. His name must be well known to the Church. It would be superfluous, therefore, to say anything more here regarding him. Another of them, Baboo Tara Churun Banerjea, was long employed at the Ghospara Mission, being one of the agents of St. Stephen's Congregation, Edinburgh. For some years past, he has been employed in connexion with the Missions of the Church of England; but he has all along continued a member and a communicant of the Church of Scotland. He adheres, *on principle*, to the Presbyterian form of worship and of Church Government: for this reason, he has declined to apply for ordination in connexion with the Church of England. At present, he is employed as Assistant Professor of Literature in the Cathedral Mission College on a salary of Rupees 120 (£12), a month.—These two Candidates have had more than twenty years' experience in Missionary labour; they are very able men, and have a high reputation as preachers.

The remaining candidate, Baboo Gopal Chunder Laha, has not had so much experience in the work of Missions as the others, having for a good many years back been in the service of Government. At present his salary from Government is Rupees 130 (£13), a month. He is a Convert of the Mission, and was for some years in the employment of the Mission. He is a Christian of long standing, having been baptized about 20 years ago. For many years past, he has maintained a consistent Christian character. He has frequently addressed the Native Congregation; and his addresses have been listened to with great acceptance. He also, as well as the others, is a man of great ability. His

application sufficiently shows how desirous he is to devote himself to the work of the ministry."

The Presbytery furthermore observe—

"That so far as regards ability, attainments, and character, these three Candidates are not surpassed by any Native Missionaries that are at present in connexion with any of the Missions in this part of the world; and the Presbytery feel assured that many years may yet elapse, before more suitable persons will be found. The earnest desire, therefore, of the Supporters of the Mission, to have a body of Native Ministers in connexion with their Missions in Bengal, may now be satisfied under singularly favourable conditions."

With respect to the spheres of labour to be assigned to these ministers, the Presbytery state—

"That this will receive their anxious consideration; that, in the mean time, it may be sufficient to say that they are of opinion that Bipro should be ordained minister of the Native Congregation in Calcutta, the nucleus of which is already under his charge, and that, at least one of the others should, if possible, be stationed in the Mofussil."

I have now set before you a somewhat detailed narrative of our proceedings in attempting to carry out the primary and leading object of our Mission,— I mean the raising up of an educated Native Ministry. I have also set before you, in passing, those inferences which seemed to be suggested by the facts which I was narrating.

Some may think my statement to be a very tedious one;—but this very circumstance should only convince them of the earnestness, the care and the patience, with which we have sought to bring the experiment to a successful issue. The statement should also show them that the subject of Missions is not one that can be understood by any mere appeal to the feelings; but, on the contrary, that it requires attentive thought and a close observation of facts; and that from these facts the inferences must be drawn with the greatest care.

Some of the notions which have been generally entertained on the subject of Missions hitherto, are certainly not found to be confirmed by the *facts* which I have had to narrate; and, consequently, these notions, we may presume, are not in accordance with *Scripture*, as I have also attempted to show, in more than one instance. Missions have now been carried on for a considerable period, and much experimental knowledge has been acquired regarding heathenism, and the changes which Christianity is calculated to produce on it. The last half-century has been distinguished by the progress which has been made in all departments of knowledge: and surely there ought to be something like a corresponding advance in the knowledge of all that relates to heathenism, in other words, in the knowledge of the true theory of Missions.

It seems to me, therefore, that it is our incumbent duty to dismiss now those *a priori* notions which seemed plausible indeed before experience, when our Indian Missions were first established, but which have

been found to be at variance with facts that are now well-established. And it is our duty to carry on Missions in that manner which is suggested by the declarations of the Apostle Paul, as they are interpreted by the aid of experience.—Experience ought to be considered by us, as affording an indication of the will of God as to the manner in which He designs the regeneration of this people to be accomplished.

The very great changes that have been produced in Hindoo and Mahomedan Society during the last half-century, have been chiefly produced by means of education.—Our Mission has been instrumental, under the blessing of God, in accomplishing its full share of these changes. It is very true, these changes are not such as were at first anticipated, nor are they such as to satisfy the wishes of many of the supporters *at a distance*, who think that the Mission is not making much way. But if there is discouragement in these circumstances, who is it that ought to feel the disappointment most? Is it those at a distance who have merely contributed (it may be very liberally) to the support of the Mission, or is it those who, after devoting their best energies to the carrying out of a plausible indeed, but certainly a superficial scheme, have at last been brought face to face with the disappointment?

With regard to 'encouraging circumstances' generally, I would have people to remember that, DUTY is a fixed and an absolute thing, altogether independent of *circumstances*; and that when they have made up their minds, by a careful consideration of *all* the light

that God puts in their way, as to what *is* their duty, they ought to endeavour steadfastly to pursue that course, leaving all results in the hands of Him with whom alone are the issues of events.

For, it is the very law of the Christian life to "walk by FAITH, not by sight."

I remain,

DEAR MR. CHAPMAN,

Yours very faithfully,

JAMES OGILVIE.

APPENDIX A.

Extract from "Statement relative to the General Assembly's Mission, drawn up at the request of the Corresponding Board, March, 1857."

* * * *

3. *Of the fourteen persons who have been baptized, how many are now qualified and prepared to go forth as Missionaries to preach the Gospel to their own countrymen in their vernacular tongue?*

This is a very important question; it is especially so at the present moment, from the fact that while among those who have hitherto supported the Mission, there is *now* a great diversity of sentiment as to the best mode of conducting their Missionary operations—some being favourable to "Grants in Aid;" others as bitterly opposed to them—some advocating the teaching system; others being very doubtful of the propriety of this system. I say, while there is such a diversity of sentiment as to these and various other points, men of all opinions, and of all shades of opinion, seem unanimously to concur in this—that henceforth, a far greater degree of time and of attention than heretofore must be devoted to the direct and public preaching of the Word, and that "chiefly through the agency of heathen converts trained to be preachers."

Yet important as this question is, there is no one which it is so difficult to answer in a satisfactory manner.

In replying to it, I can do nothing more than endeavour to describe as concisely as I can the way in which we proceeded to discharge this part of our work.

Our two first converts were baptized so long ago as the year 1847—the one in the month of January, the other in the month of September. Both of them were pupils of our senior class; they were persons of good conduct, of considerable ability, and respectable acquirements. Very soon after their baptism, they expressed an earnest desire "to devote themselves to the work of preaching the Gospel to their countrymen; and they wished that measures should be taken to impart to them all that knowledge and all those qualifications which they believed to be necessary fully to prepare them for such an arduous work. We were of course delighted to hear this; and as we had already, in some measure at least, succeeded in accomplishing the first object contemplated by the founders of the Mission, so we trusted that we were now fairly in the way of fulfilling the second one also. We had now two heathen converts to prepare for the ministry; and how did we proceed?

Our instructions in general terms were—"To give them a theological training, corresponding as closely as circumstances would permit to that which is prescribed to candidates for the ministry

by the Scottish Church at home." In accordance with these instructions, the two converts studied various works in mental and moral philosophy, logic, theology, and Christian Evidences. They had also attained some proficiency in Greek—having read portions of the New Testament, and of Xenophon's Anabasis. One of them also had read in Latin a part of Cæsar, of Sallust, and of Calvin's Institutes.

This course of study occupied about *four* years, during which time they were liberally supported by the Mission—their allowances being, besides a house, fourteen, sixteen, and not unfrequently eighteen rupees a month each. And so long as they were thus engaged—with the exception that we had occasionally to find fault with them for their reluctance to study the Bengalee language, and to attend the services in the Bengalee chapel, or to assist in the Institution—with these exceptions, we had no reason whatever to complain.

They conducted themselves in a satisfactory way, and prosecuted their studies with assiduity and success. By the end of the four years, they were nearly prepared to pass such examinations as might have been required of them. But supposing they had passed all these examinations, and been formally appointed to the office of "Ordained Ministers," the great and perplexing question was—*What kind of work shall we set them to?* This was a question which we really did not know how to answer. We had no English preaching for them; we had no Mofussil station to send them to, and no prospect of ever having any such station. We did not require their services in the Bengalee chapel—the catechist, Bipro, being quite able to do all the work there; and as for carrying on any kind of Mission work about Calcutta by means of the "direct preaching of the Word," the Board are aware of the insuperable difficulties of doing anything in that way. I am of opinion that going about preaching in the bazaars and streets of Calcutta is not a very hopeful sort of work; and, besides, it is what can be done only in the morning or in the evening; and, therefore, not sufficient to occupy anything like the whole of a man's time. Then what work could the two candidates for the ministry engage in? The question now became a most pressing one—not with reference to these two only, but with reference to others also who had by this time become converts, and who professed to be preparing themselves for the ministry. Had there been only *one*, perhaps suitable employment might have been found for him, but the object contemplated by the founders of the Mission was to raise up not *one*, but a *body;* for, as it is expressed in the Report of the Indian Committee for last year (1856)—"The raising up of native converts to preach the Gospel to their brethren, was one of the great objects of the Missionary school in its original programme."

Supposing such a body had been raised up, what were they to do.

In the Institution, indeed, in which we ourselves had so much to do, there would, of course, have been abundant work for large

numbers of converts; and as it was now absolutely necessary that the young men should set about doing work of some kind or other, so we at last found we had no alternative but to inform them that they must take a part in conducting the classes in the Institution.

It was now that we perceived something of the real difficulties of the Missionary enterprise. *All the trials which we had hitherto experienced were as nothing compared with what we were now subjected to.*

Perhaps it may be proper here to give a distinct statement of the real nature and the cause of those difficulties. The Board, then, are well aware that we have always had a very large number of pupils to instruct, and that it has ever been our desire to employ, with the utmost economy, such means as were at our disposal. Accordingly, a considerable portion of the Institution work had hitherto been carried on through the agency of "heathen" teachers; that is to say, persons for the most part trained by ourselves, but who, though well acquainted with Scripture, are not convinced of the truth of Christianity. These we have of course employed to teach only such subjects as history, geography, etc., in the junior classes.

Now, however, the converts were called on to become teachers in the Institution. Our difficulty with them, I will endeavour very briefly to explain. Suppose, then, two teachers—the one a Christian, the other a Heathen—conducting classes in the same room. The two men are very nearly of equal attainments, and discharge their duties with, we shall suppose, equal assiduity.

The question now is: How shall we adjust their salaries? We first arrange with the Heathen, and fix his salary at 20 rupees, with which he is satisfied in the meantime; but this we know will not do with the Christian, so, in consideration of his greater expenses, we tell him he will get 30 rupees with a house. But does this satisfy the Christian? Very far from it. He appeals to the Corresponding Board—he declares that this salary is not at all adequate to his necessities. He has now learnt "the manners and customs." He tells us of this, that, and the other expense; in short, he cannot live like a Heathen—he must have an "increase." The Board recommend him to get 5 rupees more. Well; is he satisfied now? For a short time, perhaps, he says little about the matter; but in the course of six or eight months, we have another application craving a further "increase." The Board will no doubt remember well the continual complaints about salaries, and the heart-burnings and ill-will excited towards myself in particular, when these converts were required to teach in the Institution.

The question again is: Shall we increase the convert's salary? The Heathen has 20 rupees, and he says nothing; the Christian has 35 with a house, and he is not satisfied. Then, shall we increase his salary? On what ground? Does he teach better than the Heathen? No. Is he more diligent? Decidedly not. Then, on what ground shall we increase his salary? *Because he is a Christian?*

but he has already, on that ground, 15 rupees together with a house more than the Heathen.

Though I have frequently been *compelled* to increase the Christian's salary, I could never bring myself to see the fairness of so doing. It did not appear to me that such a proceeding was calculated to give to the Heathen a very exalted sense of Christian justice; and besides, here were we endeavouring to do all that we could to destroy the system of caste, *and at the same time raising up another caste no less dangerous than any of those which we professed to hold in abhorrence.*

Accordingly, we at last refused to give them any further increase. Their salaries were already considerably higher than those allowed to convert teachers by the Missionaries of any other society in Calcutta, with one single exception. Our converts, therefore, seeing that they had no bright prospects in a pecuniary way in connexion with our mission, applied for, and soon obtained other appointments.

These are incidents connected with missionary work; but they are not exactly the kind of incidents that people like to hear about. There is therefore no need to dwell on them; the more especially as I am now convinced that some, at least, of the troubles to which we were then subjected, were to be attributed partly to my being but little acquainted at that time with that very particular phase of human nature, which is presented to us in the Bengali character, and partly also to my having completely over-estimated the greatness of the change that ought to have been produced in the views, the motives, and the conduct of a Hindoo who had a sincere belief in Christianity.

I have no doubt that the generality of persons would peruse a statement like that which I have now given, if not with absolute incredulity, at all events with feelings of the utmost astonishment. What! they will exclaim, is it possible that Christians can be so difficult to deal with? Is it possible that in the mere matter of salary they should be so much more troublesome than the very heathen? Then, where is their faith, where is their zeal, where is their love, and where is their self-denial? And the conclusion which they will draw will no doubt be something like this:—Then these so-called Christians are after all but mere *pretenders*—they are not sincere in their professions—they have embraced Christianity through some sinister motive.

The truth is, some of ourselves had at one time almost come to a conclusion of this kind; and yet I could not but feel that it was a conclusion in which we could not acquiesce. And why? I had seen these converts renounce their ancestral faith, and embrace Christianity under circumstances of peculiar trial and difficulty. As to the *sincerity* of their belief, therefore, I could not doubt; and this latter conclusion has been amply confirmed by their subsequent good conduct.

How then, it will be asked, can we account for the difficulties we have experienced in the management of the converts?

Were I to attempt to answer this question fully and properly, I should require to enter on the consideration of the following very difficult subject:—

What change are we authorised by Scripture, and by reason, and by experience, to expect will be produced (in the first instance, at all events) on the moral character and condition of one who has been trained from his earliest years in a system like Hindooism, and who in mature age renounces that system and embraces Christianity?

So far as I am aware, this is a question which has never yet been raised; and yet I know not of any question connected with missionary operations which is more important and more interesting. I have long thought that if this question were fully developed and thoroughly discussed in all its bearings by any man qualified for the task by feelings of deep piety—by a profound knowledge of Scripture—by an enlarged acquaintance with human nature in all its various phases—by a sound, philosophical, and discriminating judgment, and especially by a freedom from all bias in favour of certain theological dogmas—such a man would confer on the cause of missions a boon of inestimable value.

I do not pretend to be able to discuss the question; nor will my limits permit me to express all my views here. But I will venture to throw out one or two brief considerations which ought to be borne in mind, by any one who wishes to arrive at a correct conclusion respecting this deeply-important subject.

Let it be observed, then, that Hindooism and Christianity differ from each other, as in innumerable other particulars, so especially in this: that the former lays down the most minute and the most precise rules—the most exact directions regarding every action which it is possible for a man to perform. There is no single act, however insignificant, but what has its specific regulations. Hence the common paradox, "*The Hindoos are the most religious people in the world; they eat religiously, they drink religiously, they dress religiously, they sleep religiously, and they sin religiously.*" Of course there is nothing of what *we* call religion in the whole matter—nothing beyond the merest mechanical observances performed sometimes with extraordinary rapidity, but with no more thought than what a man would exercise in counting his fingers.

What a prodigious contrast does Christianity present to all this? Instead of laying down precise rules for every case that may occur, Christianity, on the contrary, strives to regulate men's conduct *by implanting in them Christian* PRINCIPLES, and by leading them to *cultivate Christian* DISPOSITIONS. Instead, for instance, of giving a number of specific rules (like Hindooism) as to how men are to conduct themselves in the ordinary affairs of life, it endeavours to impress on them this great general principle: "Whether, therefore, ye eat or drink, or whatsoever ye do, *do all to the glory of God.*" And so in all other cases. As for the *application* of these principles, however, Christians are in a great measure left to their own judgment and their own discretion.

Now, then, when a person, long trained under such a system as Hindooism, becomes a Christian, he feels that in a certain sense he is "made free,"—he is now "under a perfect law of liberty;" which sentences I have frequently heard converts quote, though in a very different meaning from that of the apostles; and they exult in their liberty, and are sometimes apt to run riot in their liberty. It is, indeed, with very great difficulty that these converts can apply the *principle*s of Christianity to the regulation of their conduct. Their former habits and their former modes of thought are apt continually to return. I have long lived amongst them; and from the circumstances in which I was placed, I required to associate with them, and to have intercourse with them on all occasions, and to converse with them on almost every subject.

I have thus had opportunities of becoming acquainted with them, such as few (if any) Missionaries ever had before. I feel, therefore, that I can state my opinions regarding them with the utmost confidence. I have often been struck by observing with what tenacity the feeling of caste and the pride of high birth continue to cling to them; and, again, their sensitiveness to reproof of any kind, and the obstinacy with which they hold to their own views. Of all this I could relate innumerable instances. Not long ago, for example, I had occasion to remonstrate with a Brahmin convert, for manifesting a spirit of scorn and contempt towards some of his inferiors. He acknowledged his fault, but pleaded that he could not help it, "as his Brahminical feelings were upon him." On a former occasion, this same man was proceeding to take revenge on some person for an injury that he imagined had been inflicted on him; but (as he told me afterwards) he was stopped in the way "by the thought suddenly occurring to him that he was a Christian."

As for the difficulty in the salary matter, that is to be accounted for in this way:—They see that Missionaries labour very anxiously among them, and they fancy that by becoming Christians, they lay the Missionaries under obligations to them such as can never be repaid. This feeling is greatly fostered by the well-meant, but certainly not very judicious terms in which they are spoken of in many of the English and Scotch Missionary periodicals. These periodicals our converts are always desirous to get hold of. "See" (they have frequently said to me, pointing to some passage in these publications in which they find themselves designated—"Precious Converts"—"Brands snatched from the burning"—"Inestimable Jewels," etc.)—"See how the Christians of England and of Scotland love us. They care nothing whatever for the heathen, but for us the converts. They would never think of putting us on an equality in point of salary with the heathen. It is you that stand between us and the Christians, and prevent them from increasing our salaries. Show us any passage of Scripture which proves that our salaries should not be higher than those of the heathen."

From these illustrations, I hope the Board will understand what I mean by saying that Hindoo converts have great difficulty in applying to their conduct the *principles* of Christianity.

Again, in estimating the change likely to be produced on Hindoo converts, we should ever remember "the rock whence they are hewn, and the hole of the pit whence they are digged." An eminent and a pious writer* remarks (and to this remark I beg to call the special attention of the Board), "that censures have been passed on the endeavours to enlighten the Roman Catholics, on the ground that many of them had become atheists, and many the wildest of fanatics." He admits the fact as being highly probable, which he accounts for in this way: He says "that it is a natural result of the pernicious effects on the mind of the Roman Catholic system, or of any system of blind, uninquiring acquiescence."

Such a system, he adds, *is an Evil Spirit which we must expect will cruelly rend and mangle the patient as it comes out of him, and will leave him half dead at its departure.*

Are such the dreadful effects on the mind of a comparatively pure system like Romanism? Then what shall we say of such an unspeakably horrible system as Hindooism? What can we expect of Hindoo converts who (as has been justly remarked) are descended from a race steeped for generations in the foulest faith man ever yet invented—a faith to which Greek worship was refined, and Fetichism is pure!

I am well aware that it is the opinion of many—perhaps of most theologians—that such is the transforming power of Christianity, that it may fairly be expected of a Hindoo convert, if he be a *sincere* believer, that he will manifest the same zeal—the same love—the same self-denial—the same purity of motive; in short, that he will bring forth all the fruits of the Spirit to the same degree (I have even heard some say to a *greater* degree) as one would be warranted to look for in persons born in Christian countries, and carefully educated by pious parents. At one time I had some such notion of the power of Christianity; but long experience, and many a bitter disappointment, made me first question the notion, and then reject it altogether. I do not mean to discuss the point. The dogma is one which I believe to be contrary to Scripture, and contrary to reason, and which I *know* to be contrary to experience.

I trust then I shall be pardoned if I venture to express my belief, that it would be well for ministers, in their eloquent descriptions of the power of Christianity over the life and conduct, to take care that their representations be in accordance with Scripture—and with Scripture, too, as interpreted by that most important of all kinds of knowledge (though in these days apparently almost an universally neglected study) *the knowledge of human na-*

---

* *Essays on some of the Difficulties of the Writings of St. Paul, by R. Whately, D. D. Archbishop of Dublin*, p. 44—*Third Edition, London:* 1833.

ture. I say it would be well for ministers to take care not to give an *overcharged* statement. It is certainly incumbent on every one to place the most exalted model before him, and to strive after Christian perfection; but to Missionaries especially, there is a danger (and I can certify that the danger is no imaginary one) that when they find the views and motives of their converts falling far short of the description which they have been accustomed to associate in their minds with the idea of a *true* Christian, I say there is a danger of their going, by a sort of reaction, to the opposite extreme, and of fancying that Christianity has produced no change at all on their converts;—*it may be even of fancying that if any change has been produced, it is a change for the worse.*

I hope and trust that no one will imagine that I am undervaluing the power of Christianity. Nothing could be farther from my thoughts. Vast indeed are the pretensions of Christianity, and I believe that it does bring with it the only sovereign remedy for all the diseases of our moral nature; but I do *not* believe that it pretends to produce any so great changes as the above-mentioned dogma plainly implies, which, in reality, would be nothing short of saying that it pretended to raise fallen man, even in this life, almost to the condition of a sinless angel. I can assure those who attribute such effects to it, that, however beautiful and pleasing may be the pictures they draw, they are doing more mischief than they are aware of. As Dr. Paley expresses it, with reference, I think, to the doctrine of transubstantiation, they are "laying a weight on Christianity sufficient to sink it altogether."

I remember to have seen it stated in some Missionary publication or other, that "the Gospel could not be making much progress in this land." And how did the writer attain this knowledge? He inferred it from the fact that Indian Missionaries are not persecuted; it being his opinion, that, in every heathen nation in which the Gospel is advancing, the hostility of the people must needs be excited, and therefore there must needs be persecution. Now, whence did he deduce this last-mentioned assertion? From the fact that the *apostles* were persecuted.

Now, I quite concur in the statement, that *Christianity is not making much progress in this land.* Unhappily that is a plain statement of a matter of fact; but I cannot see that the *mere absence* of persecution proves anything either the one way or the other.

Indeed, it is a very remarkable fact, that the only heathen people among whom Christianity has made any great progress in modern times have not only not persecuted the Missionaries, but have treated them at all times in a manner precisely the reverse. I refer to the Karens—a people most unlike to the Hindoos indeed, but still a *heathen* people. "Amongst the Karens," says one, "a most wide and effectual door is opened. The people not only cry out for the bread of life, but make most vigorous efforts to obtain it; and no sooner does a man obtain peace in believing himself, than he exerts himself to bring others to the same state."

This fact alone (to which several others might easily be added) is quite sufficient to prove the utter fallacy of the above-mentioned assertion, viz., "that modern Missionaries must needs be persecuted, because, forsooth, the apostles were persecuted."

But not only is this theological dogma utterly erroneous in theory, it is also most mischievous in practice. Did my limits permit, I could point out a variety of evils which have arisen from the belief of this notion. I have no doubt that it is to some such notion as this (viz., *the necessity of imitating the apostles in their sufferings)* that we are to trace the origin of the practice of self-torturing, penances, pilgrimages, etc, etc.

But waiving all these points—If Missionaries in this land have not to undergo direct persecution, the Board will concur with me in thinking that they are subjected to trials, discouragements, and mental distress, such as hardly any other class of men are subjected to.

Year after year do they endeavour to instruct thousands of their fellow-creatures; every day are they shocked by having to listen to all the objections that European infidels have set forth, and to many others which these infidels never dreamt of.

They see that, in regard to vast numbers, their preaching seems to be altogether in vain; Christianity, in their case, seems to be utterly powerless; they appear to be altogether incapable of perceiving its truth. Then, again, with regard to those who do become converts, how insignificant are the effects produced, compared with what had been anticipated!

If any man were to consult me about becoming a Missionary to India, and if I were to tell him the truth frankly and candidly, instead of dwelling on the "grandeur of the Missionary enterprise," and the glories of the same, I should tell him that there is no enterprise in which he can engage, in which (so far at least as this world is concerned) he will have less glory; no enterprise in which he will meet with so many discouragements and disappointments of every kind—no enterprise, in short, in which his own faith will be put to so severe a trial.

The Board will not, I trust, regard all that I have now stated as a needless digression. I have had various reasons for dwelling so earnestly on this subject; in particular, I hope that what I have mentioned will serve as a warning and as a caution to the Board, in any new mode of conducting operations which they may recommend, to be careful not to excite hopes which they know can never be realised. The Board will of course endeavour to set forth as clearly as they can, what they believe to be the incumbent duty of Christians in this matter; but they will not, I trust, by any representations, of theirs, lead people to indulge in vain and fanciful anticipations, as if any *one* plan, or *all* plans put together could, in the meantime, at any rate, be followed by a large measure of success. The representations which are occasionally put forth may have the effect of exciting people for a time, perhaps even of in-

ducing them to contribute large sums of money, but, sooner or later, they are sure to be followed by disappointment, perhaps even hopeless despondency.

Could any better proof of this be adduced than the dissatisfaction that seems at present to prevail among the people of Scotland in regard to this same ill-fated General Assembly's Institution?

But the remarks which I have ventured to offer cannot be considered in the light of a digression. As will just now appear, they are quite relevant to the subject in hand. Among other things I have endeavoured to convey to the Board some notion of the sort of *material*, out of which it is expected that we shall raise up native converts to preach the Gospel to their brethren.

The results of our efforts in that way are now before the Board; and from a consideration of these results, they will perhaps be in a condition to form some opinion in regard to the following most important question:—

I have already mentioned that the instructions of the founders of the Mission were to raise up a native ministry, by "giving them a theological training, corresponding to that which is prescribed to candidates for the ministry by the Scottish Church at home." Now, the question is—How far is such a system of training calculated to attain the object which the founders had in view? This of course is not the place nor the time to enter on the full consideration of so important a question; at present, therefore, I shall only make a few observations which may serve as hints on this subject.

It is my conviction, then, that a theological and literary training of this kind would be well calculated to raise up a native ministry, *were the special work of that ministry simply to discharge the office of* PASTOR.

For instance—suppose that this country were in some measure Christianised—that there were native congregations able and willing to support their own pastors in a respectable way, in that case, I think that our plan would raise up a body of well-qualified *pastors*.

Again:—From the Report of the Committee on Indian Churches, it appears they are "striving to obtain an increase in the number of chaplains of the Scotch Church in India," Suppose, now, that the Court of Directors were to appoint an order of *sub-assistant chaplains* (according to a plan of the Bishop of Calcutta's), in that case, I think our method of training would be an admirable one for raising up a body of men to fill such appointments.

The Board must not imagine that I am expressing any opinion as to the fitness of these Hindoo converts to hold any such situations; and yet *some* of them can expound Scripture readily and fluently, and I have heard them make "eloquent" speeches; and they are *all* of them largely possessed of the gift of prayer.

But what I mean to say is this—supposing our object were to raise up such a body of men, our plan would be an excellent one. For is not our plan to give them "a high theological training," resembling as closely as possible the training given to Scotch mi-

nisters at home? and, of course, also the training which has been given to Scotch chaplains abroad?

But I take it for granted that the object contemplated by the founders was something different from all this. They meant, I suppose, that the ministers so raised should discharge the office, not of *pastors* or of *chaplains*, but of missionaries, strictly so called. And by a missionary, I suppose they meant one who should regard the matter of salary as but of very secondary consideration—one who should be prepared to endure a good deal of labor and fatigue in the prosecution of his work—one who should be willing to go forth among the thousands of his ignorant and degraded countrymen, and sympathise with them—not keeping aloof from them, as if he were better than they, but sitting down among them, and endeavouring, by every means in his power, to communicate to them the blessings of which he himself has been made a partaker.

In this point of view, I fear that experience has now taught us that our plan is liable to several objections of a very serious nature For example: -

1st, Has not the long course of study, which our method of training requires, a tendency to lead such a people as the Bengalees to contract sedentary habits and a dislike to active exertion? Does it not also tend to *enervate* them, and to induce a feebleness of body, so as to render them *physically* incapable of undergoing much fatigue—such as, walking in the sun, itinerating, etc.

2nd, Is it the opinion of the Board that a "high training" in *English* literature and *English* theology is the best mode of qualifying them for the special work for which they are designed -supposing that work to be to preach the Gospel to ignorant people in the Bengali language?

3rd, Is it reasonable to expect that, after such a training in English literature and English theology, converts should be able (even though they were quite willing) fully to sympathise with, and sit down among, the poor, ignorant, miserable, and deeply-degraded Ryots in the Mofussil, among whom it is proposed that they should labour?

4th, Above all—Is it not most unreasonable to expect that persons who have gone through a literary and theological training, and who have read many books, and have long associated with Europeans, and who, as a matter of necessity, must needs have contracted some habits of refinement and of literary taste—I say is it not most unreasonable to expect that such persons should be able to live contentedly and happily on the very inadequate allowance which is usually thought sufficient for them—on the salary, for example, which was lately proposed in the circular put forth by the Calcutta Conference?

To this, the reply of the majority of European Christians would, undoubtedly, be something like this:—"Of course, if these converts have any faith, and any zeal, and any love, and any devo-

tion to the cause;—in short, if they are *sincere* Christians, they will not only be willing, but even supremely desirous to follow the example of the apostles, and to go wherever they may be sent, and deny themselves, and labour for whatever may be allowed to them." Now, I beg to inform the Board that we have at present two candidates for the ministry; and that as they and I could not agree on the subject of salary, I rejoiced when the Conference issued their circular, and I took the earliest opportunity of placing it before the converts, hoping that all differences between us would now be brought to an end. I said a great deal to them on the matter; I enlarged on the self-denial of the apostles, and I endeavoured to teach them, as I thought, to apply the great principles of Christianity.

I received a reply which completely silenced me, and which it never would have occurred to me to employ, had it not been suggested to me on the occasion above adverted to.

The Argument which they employed was what is called the *argumentum ad hominem*—a mode of reasoning of which some Hindoos are thorough masters.

The *principle* of the argument was this, "All things whatsoever ye would that men should do unto you, do ye even so to them;" and in applying this argument, the train of thought which was suggested to us was this: How would *we ourselves* like to be treated in this way? Suppose, for instance, a Scotch preacher possessing considerable talents and literary attainments, were sent to some remote district to teach a parish school, with a paltry allowance of say £60 or even £70 a-year, would he be willing to spend all his life in such an appointment? Would he not, on the contrary, strive by every means in his power to improve his condition? first perhaps by endeavouring to procure some parish church, and afterwards, if he were possessed of popular talents, to be appointed a city minister?

But you would never for all that brand the Scotch preacher with a want of zeal, or with hypocrisy? Yet the Scotchman belongs to a people who have long been supposed to be the most religious on the face of the whole earth.

And then I was led to ask myself this question, Why is it, in the name of common sense, that people universally are so utterly inconsiderate as to expect from the Bengali a degree of self denial, and of devotedness, which they never would look for in a Scotchman?

How is this strange mode of thinking and of speaking to be accounted for? Is it not to be attributed partly at least to the *overcharged* statements which we often hear from the pulpit, and which we read in popular theological works, as to the greatness of the change, which will take place in every man who is a *sincere* believer in Christianity? I know not how otherwise to account for it.

We are under no obligations whatever to give Hindoo converts such a "high theological training;" and some people question very

much the propriety and expediency of so doing; nor, again, is there any necessity for retaining them in our service, unless we are so disposed. But if we *do* give them all this training, and if we *do* wish to retain them in our service, my decided opinion *now* is, that we ought to take all things into account, and give them an adequate salary.

I intended to make some remarks on various other points, such as the propriety of giving these men the status of "ordained ministers," when there are no congregations over which they are to be ordained; but to dwell longer on these points would be unsuitable to the object of this Statement.

APPENDIX B.

I Corinthians i. 14—17.

I thank God that I baptized none of you, but Crispus and Gaius; lest any should say that I had baptized in mine own name. And I baptized also the household of Stephanas: besides, I know not whether I baptized any other. For Christ sent me not to baptize, but to preach the Gospel.

Paul was not appointed a baptist among the Gentiles, as John was a baptist among the Jews: nor was the office of the one and the other, alike. The Jews, even from their cradles, were instructed in the doctrine of the Messias, and in the articles of religion, so that John had no need to spend much pains to prepare them for baptism in the name of the Messias now to come, and for the reception of the faith of the Gospel. But how much pains must Paul take among the Gentiles, who had not so much as ever heard, either of Christ, or of the true God? He preached therefore daily; and, as it were drop by drop instils into them the doctrine of religion; and it was no small labour, leisurely to lead them to a *baptizable* measure of knowledge, if I may have leave so to express it. He baptized Gaius, Crispus, Stephanas, that were Jews, who were, presently and with little labour, instructed in the doctrine of the Gospel: but others who did ripen more slowly to the knowledge of it, he committed to other ministers to be baptized, when they should find them fitted for it.

Works of the Rev. John Lightfoot, D. D. Vol. XII. page 459, London: 1823.

APPENDIX C.

With respect to the practice adopted by the ancient Church, with reference to Candidates for Baptism, I subjoin the following passage from a valuable little work:—

"An anxious wish to increase their number must be felt by all true Christians equally, because they desire to extend as widely as

possible those privileges of which they personally feel the value. But it is extraordinary that those of whom we are speaking took measures with regard to the admission of members which would seem likely to deter proselytes, rather than allure them. The candidates for baptism underwent a long and strict probation, under the title of catechumens. It was not enough to profess themselves convinced of the truth of the Christian doctrine; they were required to pledge themselves to live according to its precepts; they were directed to perform a solemn exercise of prayer and fasting for the forgiveness of past sins; and their lives and behaviour, during the time that they had been subject to Christian instruction, were closely inquired into.* Before the ceremony was performed, they publicly renounced sin, and all the pomps and pleasures of the world. This was the conduct of men who were in earnest as to the value of what they professed, but not of men who wanted proselytes for the sake of a party. In fact, they absolutely refused baptism, not only to the members of scandalous vocations, but to those who were exposed by their callings to visible danger of temptation.† And further, they excluded from their society, and from the pale of the church, those who were guilty of any known offence against the Christian law; and thus rendered the conditions of remaining within the church no less strict, than those of admission into it."

The Evidence of Christianity, by John Bird Sumner, Archbishop of Canterbury, New Edition, page 275, *London:* 1861.

---

* Justin Martyr, Apol. i. p. 70.—Origen, contr. Cels. l. iii. p. 50.—Ambr. de Sacram. l. i. c. 2.

† See Apostol. Constit. l. viii. c. 32, &c. Bingham's Antiqu. xi. 5.

CALCUTTA:
PRINTED BY G. C. HAY & Co., ESPLANADE ROW.

APPENDIX D.

The following Extracts from their minutes are printed by order of the Corresponding Board.

R. Henderson,
Secretary.

Calcutta: *April* 13, 1867.

Calcutta: *February* 7, 1867.

At a Meeting of the Corresponding Board held this day—

Inter alia —

There was read an extract from the minutes of the General Assembly's Committee on Foreign Missions conveying their views on Mr. Ogilvie's letter on *Affiliation;* and on the minutes of this Board (of April 19, 1866) regarding that letter.

The Board consider it very important that an account of what has been done towards raising up a Native Ministry in connexion with the Mission should be prepared and printed for the information of the Committee on Foreign Missions and of the Church generally; as, notwithstanding all that has been written from Calcutta on the subject, there seems to be so much misconception *at home* on this matter; and they request Mr. Ogilvie kindly to prepare a full statement on the subject to be laid before the Board at a special Meeting to be held as soon as it may be ready.

2. The Secretary reported that the Institution had maintained in the University Examinations of this year the high place which it had reached in those of last year. The Board expressed their great satisfaction with this result; and warmly congratulated Mr. Ogilvie and Mr. Wilson on the brilliant success which has attended their labours during the past year. They feel that the Church is more than ever indebted to them for the able, earnest, and successful way in which they have conducted the work of the Mission; and they *again* earnestly urge on the Church the necessity of strengthening their hands, if the Institution is to maintain its high place.

Calcutta: *April* 13, 1867.

At a special Meeting of the Corresponding Board held this day, Mr. Ogilvie laid on the table his "Explanations relative to the Training of Native Ministers," prepared in compliance with the request of the Board.

There was also read a minute of the Acting Committee on Foreign Missions of date 15th January 1867, and a letter from Mr. Cook of

date 18th January, on the subject of Bursaries for Theological Students.

The Board having carefully considered these documents, expressed their great obligations to Mr. Ogilvie for his able and valuable paper with the statements of which they all substantially agree ; and they unanimously resolve—

1. That being deeply sensible of the importance of having a properly qualified and earnest Native Ministry, they have much satisfaction in learning that three Converts of the Mission, who seem so fit for the office, are Candidates for ordination ; and they heartily recommend that the necessary guarantee for their salary should be given without delay ; in order that the Presbytery may be able to take them on trial and if found qualified to ordain them ; the want of such a guarantee from the Church at home having been the *only reason* why Native Ministers have not hitherto been ordained in connexion with the Mission. The Presbytery consider that at least Rs. 120 a month must be guaranteed for each of the three Candidates who have applied for ordination.

2. That this Board are ready to give Bursaries for the support of Students for the Ministry whenever suitable Candidates present themselves, *on condition* that the Church at home undertake to provide adequate salaries for the support of such of them as may be ordained ; for it must be borne in mind that there is at present no other way of providing for the maintenance of a Native Ministry ; there being no Congregations here, able to support their own pastors.

3. That the Board again very strongly draw the attention of the Committee to the following paras. of their resolutions of 19th April 1866—

"That as the class of men who are educated in such institutions, and can scarcely in any other way be brought under Christian influences, have exercised, and must continue to exercise, the greatest influence in every sphere of life, giving indirectly a tone to Native society at large, and promoting such remarkable movements as those which, in the present day, are opening the Zenanas to missionary enterprise, the Board desire to record their opinion that the General Assembly's Institution is a field to which the highest energies of the Church ought to be devoted."

"That they therefore most earnestly urge upon the Church the duty of strengthening the staff of the Institution, as the present high place which it has taken can be maintained only in this way ; and they most emphatically state their conviction that only a man who combines with piety and missionary zeal a gentlemanly bearing and high attainments, can do satisfactorily the work to be done. Such a man, whether he be a clergyman or a layman, can find no higher sphere of Christian labor than the Institution presents ; and the Board trusts that at least one highly-educated man may be sent without delay, and if possible, or as soon as possible, two."

"That whatever differences of opinion there may have been from time to time among the members of this Board as to the mode of carrying on missionary work, there have been none as to Mr. Ogilvie's great claims on the Church, and no feeling but one of the highest respect and esteem for him; and in congratulating him and the Church on the high place which the Institution now holds, they feel it but right to say that this is mainly due to his high character, great attainments, accurate scholarship, and able and devoted discharge of the duties to which he has been called."

4. That the Board earnestly entreat the prayers of the Church that the Holy Spirit, who alone disposes the hearts of men to believe in Christ and to give themselves to the work of the ministry, may be poured out abundantly upon the Mission, that, the hand of the Lord being with us, a great number may believe and turn to the Lord.

True Extracts.

R. HENDERSON,

Secretary, Corresponding Board.

*** *In the preceding letter, page* 48 *para.* (1), *reference is made to a minute in one of the Reports,* as containing a full and clear answer to the question regarding the desirableness of establishing Bursaries. That minute is reprinted below as it so excellently supports and supplements the minute of the Meeting of to-day*:—

"At a Meeting held on Tuesday, 26th March 1861, at 9 A. M., in the Vestry of St. Andrew's Church,—*Present*—The Rev. J. C. Herdman, in the Chair; the Rev. J. Ogilvie; Mr. G. Adie, Treasurer to the General Assembly's Mission; Mr. J. J. L. Hoff; Mr. D. H. Lee; and Mr. R. S. Moncrieff,—Elders in St. Andrew's Church,—

A letter, to the address of the Rev. J. C. Herdman, was submitted from the Rev. Dr. Bryce, Convener of the Indian Churches' Committee, dated Edinburgh, 23rd January 1861, in which the friends of the Church of Scotland at this Presidency are invited to express their views on certain questions therein brought forward, having an important bearing on the status of the Church in India, and on the progress of its Missions among the heathen.

This letter, with several other communications from Dr. Bryce, had been previously circulated by Mr. Herdman among the gentlemen whom he invited to meet Mr. Ogilvie and himself on this occasion; and, as some of the points in question were for the consideration of the senior Chaplain, or of the Presbytery alone, the attention of the Meeting was especially directed to the question on

* Report of the General Assembly's Committee on Indian Churches—given in by the Rev. James Bryce D. D., 1861.

which, as warmly interested in the Church of Scotland's Missions in Bengal, it seemed to those present that an expression of their views was invited in the letters of Dr. Bryce; namely—

The desirableness of establishing bursaries for the maintenance, during their theological training, of such converts as may offer themselves for the ministry.

But, before stating their views on this point, it seemed to the Meeting indispensable to consider and to declare their sentiments on another preliminary question, viz. :—The amount of encouragement afforded to the supporters of the Mission in their hopes of seeing a Christian Pastorate raised from among the converts trained in the General Assembly's Institution.

After a very careful discussion of these questions for some hours by those present at the Meeting, with the single desire, it is hoped, of gaining ground for the Gospel cause, it was found that they were agreed in the following deliverance thereon :—

"*First*, That to the eye of sense, the prospects of seeing a Native Ministry raised from among the converts in the General Assembly's Institution are most discouraging, and that this is a fact which ought not to be concealed from the supporters of the Mission at large. Indeed, the experience which has now been obtained is calculated to raise serious doubts whether the system of training converts in English institutions, and requiring such as may offer themselves for the ministry to go through a long course of Theological training similar to that prescribed for students of Divinity in Scotland, is the system best adapted to qualify them to be efficient preachers of the Gospel to their countrymen.

"*Second*, That while, as at present, the converts are so few, and not one of them gives evidence of the inward call to the public proclamation of the Gospel, without which it would be simple presumption to hope for a blessing on his ministry, the certain effect of holding out to them the prospect of the secular advantages to accrue to them on offering themselves as candidates for the ministry—by a system of bursaries—would be to encourage motives to come forward which the Mission cannot too scrupulously discountenance; and, therefore, the Meeting is of opinion that the time has not yet arrived for the establishment of such a system, however valuable it may eventually prove for the furthe rance of the great object in view."

While this Meeting regret their inability at present to encourage the bursary system, they feel deeply the earnestness with which Dr. Bryce has urged its consideration, and they have been led by this discussion on his papers, to recommend strongly a scheme of a somewhat analogous character, as more suitable to existing circumstances.

Fully concurring in the conviction of their friends at home, that, humanly speaking, it is mainly by indigenous agency that the truth as it is in Jesus can be expected to prevail among the masses of India,

they would rejoice were the means provided for employing such native labourers as God may call; they believe that great benefit may flow from a "Native Pastorate Fund,"—to be applied in supporting, wholly or in part, native Christian ministers, either as itinerating evangelists, or as pastors at fixed stations. The nucleus for such a fund already exists. The Meeting have ground for hoping that employment for it may be found at no distant period. They cannot doubt that the Lord is calling out men of His own choosing, and that He will do so in large measure, the more the subject is made matter of really earnest prayer and expectation on the part of the friends of the Missionary cause.

In conclusion—lest any of the views here recorded lead to the supposition that those present at this Meeting undervalue the General Assembly's Institution as a means of spreading the knowledge of the truth—they would here beg to state it as their opinion that, considering the present position of the great Educational question in Bengal, there never was a time when it was more important that Christian Churches, having Missions in this Presidency, should exert themselves in the endeavour to maintain and to spread the *Christian Element* in the education of the people.

Looking, then, to the wide-spread influence for good which the General Assembly's Institution has long exercised, and still continues to exercise, it would give to one and all present at this Meeting sincere satisfaction to learn that the members of the Church of Scotland had resolved to extend to the Institution their cordial confidence, and to uphold it in that state of efficiency in which, according to the judgment of this Meeting, it well deserves to be upheld."

APPENDIX E.

The following minute shows what were *latterly* Baboo Tarini Churn Mittre's terms, and also the opinion of the Corresponding Board regarding him:—

"An extraordinary Meeting of the Corresponding Board was held on the 15th October, 1863—Henry Dundas Esq. in the Chair.

After prayer—Read the minute of the August Meeting relative to Tarini Churn Mittre. Read also a letter of 14th October from the Baboo; explaining the pecuniary conditions on which he was willing to become a Missionary of the Church of Scotland, and the kind of work in which he should wish to be engaged. A conversation ensued with him personally on these matters.

It appears that, in addition to a Salary of Rs. 100 per month, he would require "accomodation," or in lieu Rs. 35 per month and "conveyance" or an equivalent of Rs, 25. Also that he desires to

reside in Calcutta—at least he holds it indispensable, for the sake of his family, to be stationed where there is a European Doctor.

Further, he is not favourable to public "Preaching" to the heathen —as ordinarily understood. He is not of opinion that this is the most effectual method of reaching the consciences of his countrymen, and it is doubtful if he would heartily engage in such labour: he would prefer to spend his time in the instruction of the young, the visiting of people in their own houses, and the meeting with young men who have been brought up in Government Seminaries.

In these circumstances, the Board feel a difficulty in offering any recommendation. On the one hand, Tarini is in many ways a deserving person: from his desire to engage in Missionary work he is prepared to resign a respectable Government appointment; for upwards of two years he has been in communication with the Presbytery as a Candidate for ordination, and hopes have been held out to him that his services might be accepted.

On the other hand, however, it is evident to the Board that his habits of thought and his acquirements (while they might render him a very useful labourer in several departments of Missionary work) are not such as to specially fit him for that *particular* department in which it is the express wish of the Foreign Mission Committee that he should engage, and above all, the allowances which he expects—and which in his case may not be at all unreasonable—are beyond what as a general rule Missionary Societies could be expected to afford. But there is little doubt that, whatever allowances may be granted to him will be considered as a sort of standard by all future candidates for ordination; at least by all in connexion with our Mission."

It would seem that the Committee were not prepared to accept the responsibility of acceding to the candidate's terms (and considering the many difficulties of the question, this is not to be wondered at); for, in the minute of the usual Meeting of the Board of date July 11, 1864, it is simply recorded that the Secretary read a letter from Dr. Robertson, dated February 3, 1864, forwarding extract minute from the Committee on Foreign Missions of date February 2, declining to engage Baboo Tarini Churn Mittre as one of their agents.

Had they consented to guarantee the Salary, the Presbytery would have at once ordained him.

CALCUTTA:
PRINTED BY G. C. HAY & CO.

VARIETY OF METHOD IN MISSION WORK.*

In the morning sow thy seed, and in the evening withhold not thine hand : for thou knowest not whether shall prosper, either this or that, or whether they both shall be alike good.—Ecclesiastes xi. 6.

This text may serve as a motto that may be appropriately prefixed to a few remarks on the legitimate adoption of a variety of methods in missionary agency. It is often asserted, very positively, both by worldly people and by many sincere believers, that vernacular preaching is the only legitimate agency that should be adopted in carrying on mission work. It must be acknowledged that preaching, and (generally speaking) vernacular preaching, was the method adopted by the apostles. Yet even in that age a considerable diversity of operation may be noticed. On his great itinerating tours the apostle Paul made it a rule, when he came to a city in which there was a Jewish synagogue, to go to the meeting assembled there on the Sabbath-day, and availing himself of his privileges as a Jewish rabbi, to address to his hearers a discourse, in many cases apparently followed by lively discussion.

* Being the substance of an address delivered at the monthly missionary prayer-meeting, Calcutta, May 1st, 1876.

But those persons who were awakened under such a discourse, were usually conversed with in private during the week. The church at Thessalonica was one fruit of this method ; and it is probable that Luke was converted during the apostle's brief sojourn at Antioch in Pisidia. But in most cases this mode of proceeding was cut short, after two or three weeks, by violent persecution, which compelled the apostle to flee to some other city. At Corinth and at Ephesus, however, he continued to labour on, after his connection with the Jewish synagogue had come to an end. In the former place he obtained (perhaps for hire) the use of a room in the house of a Gentile proselyte, named Justus, whose house adjoined the synagogue—a circumtance apparently so unfavourable as to cause the apostle no little anxiety, until the Lord by a vision assured him of his presence and of ultimate success. At Ephesus, in like manner, he obtained the use of the lecture hall of one Tyrannus, of whom it is uncertain whether he was a Jew or a Greek. It would appear that in those two cities the apostle spent the greater part of the day in working at his tailor-like trade of a journeyman tent-maker. At Ephesus in particular he thereby secured the means of supporting not himself alone, but also his companions. In the evening he would resort to the room or hall, and address the hearers who assembled there.

At Lystra and Derbe there were no synagogues, and we may therefore conclude, that in those two cities his preaching closely resembled that now carried on in India. He would resort to the streets or squares, and address such audiences as he found there. We know that, among others, Timothy, then a lad, as well as his mother and grandmother, were converted during his stay in those parts.

At Athens he had an opportunity of delivering, on Mars-hill, that master-piece of a missionary discourse which is recorded in the 17th chapter of Acts. It is an instructive fact that his success there was small, not through any fault of his,—and yet success was not wholly wanting, for Dionysius the Areopagite, and a woman named Damaris, and some others were converted during his stay at Athens.

But the apostle's method was not uniformly the same. The address delivered after midnight in the courtyard of the jail

at Philippi must have been a very brief and informal discourse, but it was followed by the conversion and baptism, then and there, of the jailor and his household. In the same city, a few days earlier, he resorted to the place near the river side, where prayer was wont to be made, and where, owing to the absence of a Jewish population, only a few women had assembled. To these he made known the gospel by conversation only ; and the Lord was pleased to open the heart of Lydia, so that she attended to the things that were spoken, and became a believer in Christ.

In this last case, then, we have an instance of plain *conversation* being employed as a means of making known the gospel. The same means had been used more extensively, years before, by those who were scattered by the persecution which broke out on the day of Stephen's martyrdom : they went abroad, even as far as Antioch, and there spoke to heathen Greeks, and thus were made instrumental in the establishment of the first church which was largely composed of Gentile believers.

It may also be mentioned here, in passing, that preaching, in the days of the Apostles, was not always conducted in the vernacular. Both Stephen and Paul employed the Greek language at Jerusalem ; Paul also at Damascus and Antioch, where it no more was the vernacular tongue than English is here. So at Lystra and Derbe, Paul and Barnabas did not preach in the Lycaonian vernacular, but in Greek. There is no evidence to show that Paul preached to the Galatians in Welsh, which was their mother-tongue, but he undoubtedly spoke to them in Greek. A consideration of these facts will show that it is quite legitimate for missionaries in many parts of India, to employ the English language in preaching the gospel to natives.

Our information regarding the method of propagating the gospel adopted by the other apostles is too limited to enable us to draw a comparison between them and Paul. But in his case we see a man clearly called by the Lord to the work, and endowed with special qualifications. His ready command of the Greek language, and his training as a rabbi in the school of Gamaliel, enabled him to adopt the method of combining preaching and controversial discussion with the Jews. The

peculiarity of his method manifests itself in his epistles, by the references to Rebecca, to Hagar, and to Melchisedec.* Is it too much to say that this method could not have been adopted, for instance, by the apostle John, whose mental constitution differed essentially from that of Paul ? And are we not justified in concluding that the Lord, in calling to the work of evangelizing men endowed by gifts so widely different, intended each of them to make use of his special gift, and of the method best suited to that gift, in carrying on his work ?

Now, this is a consideration which may serve as a bridge over the great gulf of eighteen centuries, and lead us to the contemplation of mission work at the present day, and in this country, nay, in this city of Calcutta. We may at once cite, as examples, two men whose names are well known here, Dr. Duff and the late Mr. Lacroix of the London Mission. No one acquainted with the facts relating to them, will doubt that both of them had received their call from the Lord. But they were endowed with very different gifts. Dr. Duff's special talent lay in his eminent qualifications as an educator of youth : Mr. Lacroix was the prince of vernacular preachers. The circumstances in which they were placed, through the interposition of Divine Providence, were favourable to the utilization of their special gifts. There is no need of entering into details on facts patent to every one here. But suppose now, these two men of God had been compelled, by some human authority, to exchange places : is it at all likely that either of them would have been so useful as we know them to have been ? And were they not justified in adopting, each of them, that particular method of labour, which was best suited to his special gift ? And did not the Lord manifest His approbation of the course they pursued, by causing His blessing to rest upon it ?

Now what has been said of these two distinguished men, is applicable to all missionaries who have been called to their work by the Lord. Each of them has his special gift, and is

---

* The writer takes it for granted that the subject matter of the epistle to the Hebrews must be attributed to Paul, even if he should not be the actual penman of that epistle.

justified in utilizing that special gift, as far as Divine Providence permits, by adopting that method of operation which best accords with it. Whatever judgment may be formed by man, the Lord who gave him the gift, will not withhold his blessing from the use he will thus make of it, provided his aim be always to make known the gospel.

As a matter of fact, various methods of carrying on mission work have been adopted and are now in operation in this country, and it is not too much to affirm that the Lord has owned and does own all of them, by causing His blessing to attend them.

1. *Vernacular preaching to the masses*, though unquestionably the most direct and a scriptural way of spreading the gospel, is the method which, strange to say, is regarded as the least successful of all. Even Mr. Lacroix, who excelled in it above all his contemporaries in Bengal, was repeatedly heard to say that he knew of no conversions that had resulted directly from such preaching. In this desponding estimate of the work he was mistaken. The awakening near Rammakalchoke, twelve miles south of Calcutta, a place with which he was for many years connected as pastor, was the result of bazar preaching at the Chitla market, about four miles south of the city. It may be true that none of the Rammakalchoke people were actually converted at this market, but it was there they received those impressions which afterwards issued in the conversion of many. Again, nearly fifty years ago, some persons who had come from Khari and other villages, forty or fifty miles south of Calcutta, were in like manner awakened by bazar preaching at a place called Banstollah, four miles east of Calcutta. This awakening led to the establishment of churches in those villages : but here again actual conversion was probably the result of subsequent instruction at home rather than of the preaching in that distant market.

But examples of direct conversion resulting from street preaching, have come to the knowledge of the writer. In the rainy season of 1862 a Muhammadan youth, named Abdool Rashid, came from Sylhet to Calcutta in charge of the cargo of a boat. Whilst the boat was lying in the Baliaghatta canal, a mile eastward of the city, he had an opportunity of hearing

the gospel preached on the bank by some native brethren, who resorted to that place on certain days in the week as one of their preaching stations. His heart was opened, so that he attended to the things that were spoken. He found what his soul needed, the pearl of great price, and with very little delay avowed himself a believer in Christ, and was baptized at Intally by the Rev. G. Pearce. His course was brief, but consistent. Though he went to reside at Serampore, he usually paid a visit to his distant native village in the cold season, mainly with the object of making known the gospel to his aged father and the other members of his family. He died in that distant part of the country in November 1873.*

At the same place, and under very similar circumstances, a young Brahmin from eastern Bengal received impressions which led to his conversion and that of his wife, about the year 1869. This man is now the pastor of a village church.

Examples like these two which came under the writer's own observation, must have occurred elsewhere : these are mentioned here, simply to show that street preaching sometimes does prove the direct means of conversion. The writer believes that the conversion, about the year 1824, of the late revered Shujaat Ali (who died in October 1865,) can also be shown to have been the direct result of bazar preaching at or near Howrah.

2. *Instruction given in Schools* has also in numerous instances been owned by the Lord and blessed as a means of conversion. It is hardly necessary to cite examples. The writer would name two, the late Baboo Ganga Narayan Sil, who died in 1843, and the Rev. Ramkrishna Kobiraj, who still survives ; these were both converted about the year 1836, in an English School at Sibpore, under the charge of the Rev. G. Pearce.

Missionaries are often blamed for devoting much of their time to secular teaching in English institutions. There was a distinguished servant of God who for many years held and openly maintained the conviction that it was unscriptural and therefore wrong for missionaries to be so engaged : but in the

---

* A fuller account of this young man was given in the *Christian Spectator* for April, 1874.

early part of 1851, when a number of conversions took place, in rapid succession, among the senior pupils of the Bhowanipore Institution, the good man's feelings underwent a change, so that he determined no longer to persist in his declared opposition to such institutions. He candidly expressed himself to this effect, that although he could not see that his arguments against them were erroneous, yet he saw that the Lord owned this educational agency as a means of conversion, and that consequently it would not be right in him to oppose it any longer. It may perhaps be interesting to some readers to know the view which the late Rev. Dr. Ewart* took of this matter. He said, in the writer's hearing, it would certainly be pleasant for missionaries, if they could hand over the secular branches of instruction to other teachers, and engage solely in religious teaching; but by adopting this course, so congenial to their own feelings, they would lose an important vantage ground. "When these youths and their parents see that we devote much time and strength and labour to their advancement in those studies which are conducive to their temporal success, they give us credit for a genuine personal interest in their welfare; and the confidence and gratitude which result from this conviction, predispose them to receive with attention, candour, and respectfulness that religious instruction to which they see that we attribute the highest importance." These words, if not exactly the same which he used, express faithfully the sentiments he uttered, and on that ground deserve the fullest attention. Their force would perhaps be most readily perceived, if they were applied to the case of a medical missionary, whose personal diligence and skill and self-denial in the discharge of his medical duties must add great weight to his spiritual instructions.

A very suggestive and encouraging illustration of the value of ordinary mission schools is supplied in the brief account of a young woman, named Badam, which appeared in the *Christian Spectator* for January 1874, but which it will not be deemed improper to advert to here. Her husband, Kanai Lal, had

* Is it vain to hope that a biographical sketch of this good and great man will ever see the light? His record is on high.

been instructed in a school (probably the one situated in Amherst Street) connected with the Church Missionary Society. "He there learnt something of Christianity, but after leaving school forgot all about it. Yet the seed sown was not lost ; it was destined to spring up." He set up a pawnbroker's shop, in a place near which the gospel was occasionally preached by the wayside. He heard some preaching, "and the question soon came to his heart, 'What must I do to be saved ?' What he had learnt of Christianity, led him to wish to seek the way of salvation in the Bible. To this end he bought a copy of the Bible for Rs. 2-8. He read that at home, and followed the native preacher (who came to the neighbourhood) everywhere for three years, before he said anything to him about his seeking after the truth. And he did not read the Bible alone. He taught his young wife—she could have been only sixteen —to read, and together they read the Holy Book. Slowly the light broke in upon them." Some time after this, and after the birth of a little girl, to whom (to the astonishment of their Hindu relatives) they gave the scriptural name Esther, "Mrs. Sale, having heard from the native preacher, that Kanai had been conversing with him about Christianity, thought she would call and see the wife." Shortly after this, both husband and wife were baptized, about the year 1864. Both maintained their Christian character to the end, the wife's piety apparently being even of a higher type than the husband's. She was taken to glory in September 1867, and her husband followed about two years later.

3. *The preparation and distribution of Scriptures and Tracts.* In this country few conversions can be distinctly traced to one agency alone. In most cases a variety of means are employed, in succession, by the Lord for the purpose of drawing souls to Himself ; but each link in the chain of love is valuable and important.

Full fifty years have elapsed since Mr. Lacroix prepared a Bengali tract or school book on the Miracles of Christ. Perhaps he never heard of its being blessed to a single soul as the means of conversion. Yet not many years ago the first leaf of a torn copy of this tract, lying on the ground in an orchard, was espied by a Bengali girl (for though married, she

was but a girl as to age) who had just conquered the difficulties of the spelling book. She picked it up, to see whether her skill in reading would prove equal to the task of perusing this leaf: to her delight she found that she could not only read it, but also to some extent understand it. This incident was the first step of the way,—a thorny, yet blessed way—which in the course of a few years led her to the Saviour.

Thirty-five years ago the writer received a visit from a young man of the Kayastha caste, who had come a distance of fifty miles or more in search of a missionary. On conversing with him, it was found that he was acquainted with the fundamental truths of the gospel, which he professed himself willing to embrace: he then stated that his knowledge was mainly derived from a careful perusal of a tract called "the True Refuge." After the lapse of a little time he was baptized, and shortly afterwards encouraged to preach the gospel to his countrymen—a work in which he is still engaged, though his strength is now impaired by long service.

That same tract has been blessed as the means of conversion to many other persons, not merely in its original Bengali form, but also in various other languages into which it has been translated. The writer has a strong impression, based upon information which his memory now fails to reproduce, that the awakening among the lower classes in and around Delhi, which has led to large and very gratifying results, had its origin in the perusal of some copies of the Hindi translation of this very tract, which were scattered during the mutiny. Its author, the late Rev. W. H. Pearce (who died in 1840), is no doubt now rejoicing in the society of many who were brought to Jesus through this tract.

An extensive awakening in Orissa had its origin in the perusal of a copy of the gospel by Mark, brought to the village by a cartman, from a market where he had received it.

A pleasing illustration of the blessing which may attach to the perusal of the Word of God, is supplied by an occurrence that took place in the Backergunj district about twenty years ago. Christianity had found its way into a village named Baropakhya: most of its adherents were merely nominal, but a

few were real Christians. In one house at least there was a copy of the entire Bible, as printed in 1852. The zemindar was determined that Christianity should not take root on his estate. Under certain pretexts he harassed the Christians, seized many of them, and removed them to distant places where they were kept in durance for weeks, without having the means of communicating to their friends where they had been taken to. Their houses were levelled with the ground, the materials of them removed, the ground where they had stood was ploughed up, and planted over with vegetables, &c. so that a stranger would have been unable to perceive that a village had ever existed there. The goods and chattels of the poor people were annexed by the tenants from a distance who had helped in the work of destruction. The Bible referred to came into the possession of one of these, who, when his children wanted to have a paper kite, tore out some of the leaves to make one. A young man from a neighbouring village, a carpenter, happening to visit him, noticed the large book, and was sorry to see it undergoing this process of gradual destruction. He begged that he might be allowed to have it, and his request was granted—possibly for a consideration He took it home, and with his father began to read it, and continued doing so for months. Both were impressed ; and at length the old man thought it was time to come to a decision. Consequently he invited the brahmans of his acquaintance to spend an evening with him for the purpose of religious discussion. Many came, and the discussion over the book was prolonged till near day-break, when the old man told his friends, that their arguments had confirmed rather than shaken his conviction that they were wrong and the book right,—and that therefore his mind was made up to have done with Hinduism. After a while both father and son sought Christian instruction, and ultimately were baptized. The precious volume was read and re-read, and then sent to Calcutta to be bound, with instructions that the owners would greatly prefer receiving back the identical copy, though incomplete, to having a new one substituted for it, with which the old association of ideas and feelings could have no intimate connection. Both maintained a Christian course for years. The son died in the faith some time ago ;

regarding the father the writer has no information, but he has no doubt of the genuineness of his conversion also.

Having thus been led to refer to the Backergunj district, he may be permitted to speak of it a little longer.

It is not impossible that the Lord may occasionally, for wise purposes, use *extraordinary means* for bringing about the conversion of particular individuals. Are we authorized to limit Him, or to restrict Him to the use of our instrumentalities? How then could we account for the conversion of Cornelius? Thoughts like these have often led him to check himself, when inclined to reject, as utterly undeserving of credit, the account of the way in which a man, named Kangali, steadily professed himself to have been brought to a knowledge of the gospel. He has heard the narrative from Kangali's own lips, and has no reason to doubt the man's sincerity or veracity, whatever may be thought of the faithfulness of his memory or the completeness of the view he took of his mental impressions.

From a period somewhat anterior to the year 1840, there existed among the Nomo-sudras (nick-named Chandals by the Brahmans) of the northern part of Backergunj, a sect who appear to have borne the name of *Karta-bhoja* (worshippers of the Creator), a name which has been assumed by various Bengali sects in various localities. Their great principle was the rejection of idolatry and of subjection to the Brahmans, and the worship of the Being whom they called *Karta*, or Creator (or Lord). In refusing subjection to the Brahmins, however, they trespassed on political ground; for all their landed proprietors were Brahmans who treated them tyrannically, and by refusing to be any longer subject to them, they intended, if possible, to deliver themselves not only from their tyranny, but also from the obligation to pay rent, or at least any exactions over and above the legal rent. The men were thoroughly in earnest in their opposition to idolatry, caste and priestcraft, and in the observance of a very simple and withal very defective form of worship. Kangali, whose name has been mentioned, was their recognised head, a tall fine looking man of considerable energy, but ignorant and apparently destitute of mental superiority, though he kept the whole band in strict obedience to himself. The account he gave of the way in which he was

led to a knowledge of Christ, is substantially as follows. He had a very severe illness—probably typhoid fever—which resisted all the appliances within his reach, so that he began to despair of recovery. One night, as he was lying awake, he saw a shining person who approached him and said, "Pray in the name of *Rishu Khrist*, and you will get well." In the morning, feeling no better, he thought he might as well follow the advice that had been given him; he prayed to *Rishu Khrist*, to make him well, and from that moment he began decidedly to improve, and after a time was restored to health. He now began to wonder who Rishu Khrist might be: one day, as he was walking along, he met a man with a tract in his hand. On his inquiring what book it was, he was told it was an account of the life of Rishu Khrist—the vulgar pronunciation of the Saviour's name then current in those parts—he had just received it at a weekly market, having simply, in taking it, followed the example of others who asked and got such books from a preacher, but now he had got it, he hardly knew what to do with it, as he could not read. Kangali himself was no reader, but some of his disciples were: so being very anxious to know more of Rishu Khrist, he prevailed upon the man to give the tract to him. He took it to the rendez-vous of his disciples, and a good part of that night was spent in hearing the tract read out aloud at their meeting. Kangali having received an impression that other tracts might be obtained occasionally at markets, issued instructions to his disciples to collect as many different tracts as they could get. That part of the district was then but rarely visited by preachers: however, about a dozen different tracts were obtained; the scribes connected with the band—not very skilful ones—were ordered to copy them out, and then they were circulated among the men. The writer has seen a manuscript book containing such copies of more than ten tracts. In this way a knowledge of gospel truth was diffused among these people; and about the year 1842 they cautiously began to seek out and converse with native preachers. At first a small company was baptized, about the end of 1844; and a larger number, one hundred and ten, were baptized about July 1845. This was the origin of the movement in the Backergunj district, where the body of Chris-

tians now numbers about a thousand families, including nearly a thousand communicants,

At the end of February 1847, the writer accompanied the Rev. G. Pearce on a tour of inspection, in the course of which it was ascertained that some of the people, especially those at Digalia, had suffered heavy persecution from their Brahman landlords, and that there were among them a fair number of apparently sincere believers, although their notions on the questions connected with land and rent constituted a source of great perplexity.

At the close of the same year Mr. Pearce and the writer visited the people once more, spending nearly six weeks among them, and on that occasion both were deeply impressed with the importance of another means of spreading the gospel, to which their attention had not been specially directed before.

4. *The singing of Christian hymns* was discovered to be the principal instrumentality by which a knowledge of the gospel had been and was being diffused by and around these new converts. The means of regular instruction with which they had been supplied were very scanty and very imperfect, owing to the sudden manifestation and rapid expansion of the movement, which called for more numerous and better qualified preachers then were found to be available. But the people had learnt from those preachers that were sent, and from other brethren who found their way among them, a number of Bengali hymns, with the tunes of which—being mostly tunes that were in use among the Vaishnavas or other Hindus—it was easy for them to become familiar. At one place in particular (Koligaon) the deputation witnessed one of these gatherings for singing. The number of Christians in that village was very small ; but all were eager to be present, and they sung not merely at the top of their voices, but, what was far better, from their hearts. The writer especially remembers one hymn being sung there, with the author of which he was personally acquainted, and which he had read before, without ever being specially impressed by it. It is the one beginning with the words, " Jisu paramdhan, Táre jatna kara ámár man," *i. e.*, " Jesus is the chief treasure, pay Him assiduous attention, O my soul." It was impossible not to be struck with the depth of feeling ex-

pressed in every countenance, and with the eager interest manifested by the crowd of their heathen neighbours that surrounded the gathering. Never to his dying day will the writer forget the emotion which he experienced in that hour, when this touching hymn was sung in that remote corner of swampy Backergunj. Such meetings for singing were at that time common among those people, and were frequently, as was most meet and desirable, connected with prayer. It may be remarked here, that a very large proportion of our older Bengali hymns embody a simple but impressive statement of the leading facts of gospel history, and thereby are well adapted to the purpose of conveying instruction to enquirers; whilst an equally large proportion contain direct appeals to the unconverted, urging them to seek the salvation of their souls, by believing in Christ without delay.

5. In the course of the same tour of inspection an occasion also occurred which showed the impressiveness of *a convert's oral statement of his experience.* Near a large village—or township —called Kotwalipara, beyond which Calcutta boats were not well able to proceed, there was to be held a meeting for the purpose of ascertaining, as far as practicable, the knowledge and character of the new converts. An awning was made of the sails of two or three boats, to shelter the company from the sun, and partially also from the gaze of the heathen population. The Christians of the surrounding villages, which were nearly all of them several miles off, were invited to come to this "tent" at a particular time. It was not expected that very many would have the courage to come, considering the violent character of their Brahman neighbours. However, about ninety men and a score of women made their appearance, and the tent (such as it was) was surrounded by a numerous crowd of Hindus. After the preliminary devotional exercises were concluded, the writer, in accordance with a previous arrangement, commenced the examination of the converts by calling upon a venerable and prepossessing looking old man of about sixty, to state what he knew of the gospel. The questions were put as kindly and as simply as possible: still the old man, evidently very timid, and possibly not quite able to make out a foreigner's accent, maintained a long silence. At

length, when he saw that he was not going to be let off, he said, " Sir, I am an ignorant old man, I never learnt to read, and I do not think I can answer your questions." On being asked, how his Christian knowledge and character could then be ascertained, he replied, " Sir, I can pray ; if you like, I will offer a prayer." On being encouraged to do so, he fell flat on the ground, and in this humble position offered up a most affecting prayer, evidently extemporised, but expressed in most appropriate language, with the deepest feeling, and containing ample proof that he not only knew, but trusted and loved the Saviour whom he professed. The impression produced by that prayer was most profound, at least upon the Christians who were present. and who spoke of it for years afterwards. Whether it also produced a salutary impression upon the still more numerous heathen bystanders, will be seen on the last great day. The good old man lived a consistent Christian life for a few years longer, until he was called away. In his dying moments he firmly believed he could hear the music of angels that were deputed to convey his soul to his beloved Master, into whose presence he was about to enter.

J. W.

Preaching = heralding without explanation = the Jews were prepared to receive a heraldic announcement - the Greeks not.

Did the Jewish synagogues answer the same purpose that missionary institutions now do? And were they a preparation for Paul's preaching?

THE BRAHMO SOMAJ.

PAPER BY THE REV. R. JARDINE, B. D., SC. D.

Church of Scotland Mission, Calcutta.

IN presenting before this Conference some account of this well known religious movement in India, I shall begin by mentioning some important events connected with its history, especially during the last ten years. Every one is quite familiar with the name of the famous Rajah Ram Mohan Roy as connected with the beginning of this important movement. It was about the year 1830, just three years before the death of this eminent man, that the Somaj was first established. About one decade after its establishment, or in the year 1841, Baboo Debendra Nath Tagore became a leader of the Somaj, and under his leadership considerable progress was made towards separation from orthodox Hinduism. The work of Rajah Ram Mohan Roy, although in some respects perhaps more valuable than that of any of his successors, appears to have been chiefly *destructive* with reference to existing Hindu religious customs and beliefs. He did not form a *sect;* he did not establish a system or mode of worship. This work was accomplished by Baboo Debendra Nath Tagore, and in him we have consequently the immediate founder of the Somaj as an organized body with a peculiar form of public worship.

REV. DR. JARDINE.

Rajah Ram Mohan Roy.

Debendra Nath Tagore.

Only a few years before the beginning of the decade which is now terminating, about the year 1857, the Somaj was joined by a young man who has since occupied a prominent position as a leader of the movement. Baboo Keshub Chunder Sen, for it was he, continued for a few years in connection with the Somaj of which Baboo Debendra Nath Tagore was the leader. But about the beginning of the now-expiring decade, influences were at work which finally led to a separation. The Brahmo Somaj, in its entirety, may be looked upon as a development of Hinduism, brought about chiefly by the influence of the contact with minds of another race and another religion. Now as in every society of man, so in this Somaj, there arose a party who wished to advance more rapidly than others were willing to follow. The young men of the Somaj were not

Baboo Keshub Chunder Sen.

Progressives and Conservatives.

satisfied with the amount of the separation which as a body they had effected from orthodox Hinduism ; the old men, being naturally more conservative, thought that enough had been done for the present, and that time should be allowed to accomplish those changes which they foresaw must ultimately take place, and which the younger members of the Somaj wished to bring about at once. Matters were brought to a crisis in the year 1865.

Three propositions.

In that year, Baboo Keshub Chunder Sen presented to Baboo Debendra Nath Tagore, three propositions with reference to the management of the Somaj, signifying that unless these were complied with, he and those who agreed with him should feel themselves necessitated to separate from the existing Somaj and form one for themselves. These propositions were :—

1. That the external signs of caste distinction—such as the brahminical thread—should be no longer used.

2. That none but Brahmos of sufficient ability and good moral character who lived consistently with their profession, should be allowed to conduct the services of the Somaj.

3. That nothing should be said in the Somaj expressive of hatred or contempt for other religions.

Brahminical thread.

The first of these propositions was too radical and progressive for the conservative party of which Debendra Baboo was the leader, and consequently was rejected. The result was a separation in that same year between the two parties, and the formation of the Brahmo Somaj of India of which Baboo Keshub Chunder Sen has since its commencement been the acknowledged leader.

Sources.

With reference to the *sources* from which these three leaders of Brahmoism appear to have received this inspiration, there is a striking difference. Rajah Ram Mohan Roy by the publication of the "Precepts of Jesus" plainly indicates that he looked upon the teachings of our blessed Lord and Master as being the supreme guide to life eternal. Baboo Debendra Nath Tagore appears never to have advanced beyond the national scripture of the Hindus, and his followers still wish to identify themselves with Hinduism. Baboo Keshub Chunder Sen has proclaimed eclecticism to be the principle of his search after truth, professing his willingness to accept truth from whatever source it may be obtained. Thus, of these three leaders of the movement, the first approached most nearly to Christianity, the second is most national and consequently most exclusive, the third is, in a sense, the most comprehensive.

The Adi Somaj, under the leadership of Baboo Debendra Nath Tagore, has recently exhibited a tendency to retreat even from the very moderately advanced position which they formerly held. There is manifestly a desire to be considered Hindus in religion as well as nationality, and yet to present to the world a somewhat reasonable religious faith. Hence we have had defences of what is called Hinduism, but of a Hinduism "developed," modified into a somewhat defensible form, not of what would be recognized as Hinduism either by the great mass of the ignorant people or by the great mass of the learned brahmins of India. Considering this position which they have taken, we should say that the influence of the Adi Somaj, as a religious movement, is about exhausted. Adi Somaj.

In the history of the progressive Brahmo Somaj and especially of its leader, there are a few salient historical points to which I shall refer. On the 5th May, 1866, Baboo Keshub Chunder Sen delivered a lecture in Calcutta upon "Jesus Christ: Europe and Asia," which approaches perhaps more nearly than any other of his published utterances to the faith of his great predecessor Rajah Ram Mohan Roy. From this lecture one would suppose that he was almost a Christian. But, as if startled by his boldness, and perhaps made to feel by his fellow countrymen the difficulty of moral courage, he appeared desirous of retreating from his position, for in a lecture upon "Great Men," delivered on the 28th September of the same year, we find him advocating a theory which implicitly places Christ upon the same level with other benefactors of their race. Progressive Brahmo Somaj. Lectures.

His visit to Europe in 1870, has no doubt produced a very considerable influence upon the position of the Somaj, and as we are now chiefly interested in the present position and prospects of this religious movement, I shall devote the remainder of my paper to their consideration. Visit to Europe.

I have said that the principle by which the Progressive Brahmos at first professed to be guided was eclecticism, and although the same may be said of them now, it must be with a qualification. The principle of eclecticism implies that no single scripture is *authoritative*, but that the individual who is in search of truth must choose from all sources what is true and good. To do this implies a power in the individual to discriminate between the true and the false, the good and the bad. But if an individual is possessed of this power, it seems a very natural and easy inference for him to make, that he may himself have an intuitive knowledge of truth and goodness. In fact the claim to this intuitive Eclecticism.

knowledge is a necessary condition of eclecticism. Hence there is a probability that a system of eclecticism will very soon transform itself into one in which individual intuition is considered the great source of religious knowledge. Such appears to have been the case with the Brahmo Somaj, and perhaps this result has been hastened by the intercourse between the leader of the movement and the theists of England. There appears to be a tendency to separate themselves farther than ever from every historical religious leader and religious record, and to place greater importance upon that inward mystical intuition which at various periods and places of the world has been a prevalent religious phenomenon. How much of this tendency is the result of moral cowardice, and how much of national prejudice, and how much of sincere conviction, it would be difficult to say.

Religious intuition.

The bringing forward of individual intuition as the great source of religious knowledge and life has the same effect and the same tendency in India as elsewhere. Religious intuition is unquestionably an important principle in human nature, but when not corrected by something more stable, it is simply identical with the uncontrolled religious imagination of the individual. Hence mystics have nearly alway sbeen wild, unreasonable enthusiasts, under the control of whatever freak of religious fancy happened to predominate. And the mystics of India, for the theists of the Brahmo Somaj are such, appear to show very much the same tendency.

That the eclecticism of Progressive Brahmos has passed into mysticism and that this mysticism seeks to disconnect itself from every historical stand-point, appears from certain events which have occurred during the present year.

Rev. C. H. Dall.

The Rev. C. H. Dall, a Unitarian Missionary of Calcutta, being, without doubt, desirous of bringing the Brahmo body nearer to Christ, became himself a member of the Somaj, calling himself, as indeed he always had a right to be called, a Christian theist. From his position, however, the leader of the Somaj decidedly shrunk, and wished it to be distinctly understood that he was not a *Christian* theist but a *pure* theist, thus denying the connection of what he believes to be the true principles of religion with the person and life of Christ. The prominent members of the Somaj appear to have endorsed the action of the leader, and thus shrink, not only from Christianity, but from the position of their great leader Rajah Rammohan Roy. What may be the final issue of affairs, time only can tell.

For the information of those who are not acquainted with the special doctrines of Brahmoism, the following extracts from Brahmo publications will be useful: Doctrines of Brahmoism.

1. "Whether we look up to the heavens, or whether we look round to the various objects lying scattered in the amplitudes of nature, every object tells us that the Creator of the Universe is one; all historic life, all creation tells us that He who guides the Universe and the destinies of nations is One and Infinite. (K. C. Sen's English Visit, p. 552.) Unity of God.

2. "To believe in the Fatherhood of God is to believe in the brotherhood of man; and whoever, therefore, in his own heart, and in his own house worships the true God daily, must learn to recognize all his fellow-countrymen as brethren... Declare a crusade against idolatry and...the very sight of that will drive caste to desperation." (Lectures and Tracts by K. C. Sen, p. 211). Brotherhood of man.

3. "If every individual were to realize this great fact, and feel that God is near to him as *his* Father, while as the Universal Father He looks to the grand purpose of the universe as a whole,—then, but not till then, would religion be a source of comfort on the one hand, and of purity on the other." (English Visit, p. 164.) The Universal Father.

4. "There is something in the Bible which has staggered many who stand outside the pale of orthodox Christianity, and made them inimical to Christ: I mean his sublime egotism and self-assertion. It is true, Christ says, 'Love God and love man and ye shall inherit everlasting life;' but does he not also say, '*I* am the way, *I* am the light of the world;' does he not say, 'Come unto *me* all ye that are weary and heavy laden and *I* will give you rest?' He who said that the only way to eternal life is the love of God and the love of man, also says '*I* am the way.' Jesus Christ, then, truly analyzed, means, love of God and love of man." (*Ibid*, p. 240.) Claims of Christ

5. "It would be an insult to the majesty of God's throne—it would be a blasphemy against Divine mercy to say that He will wrathfully condemn any sinner to eternal perdition." (*Ibid.*, p. 175.) Eternal Punishment.

6. "If we pray in a humble spirit, if we kneel down and open up the depths of our hearts, our longings, our sorrows, our afflictions, unto the One Living God, He who is plenteous in mercy will hear us, and grant our prayers." (*Ibid*, p. 68.) Prayer.

7. "In the religion of the world man is his own guide, and, to a great extent, his own saviour. He depends upon his own faculties and powers for the attainment of truth, and for deliverance from sin. Its prayer is—that man's will may be done on earth in the name of God. (In the religion of heaven) God's will is absolute and immutable law, and His judgment final and irreversible." (Lectures and Tracts, p. 100.) Salvation.

8. "True penitence humbles man to the dust, and makes him put his entire trust in the Lord for the purpose of salvation. As such repentance is essential to faith; for not till man's proud Repentance.

head is humbled down under an overpowering sense of his own unworthiness, would he cling to God's feet—not till he distrusts himself would he trust the redeeming and all-sufficient grace of God. Repentance begins the good work of conversion, which faith and prayer carry on. By opening the eyes of the sinner to his iniquities, it fosters a longing for deliverance; faith and prayer act as guides, and safely lead the penitent sinner into the kingdom of heaven, where he is regenerated by divine grace." (Lectures and Tracts, p. 116.)

Number of Brahmos.

With reference to the number of Brahmos in India, it would be difficult to form an estimate. Two years ago the number of Somajes throughout India was put down at 85. At the present time the number is probably over one hundred. The meaning of this simply is that in places where Somajes are said to be established there is some person or persons, more or less imbued with Brahmo principles, making attempts to extend those principles amongst others. But this gives us little indication as to how far the principles of Brahmoism have penetrated, or how thoroughly they have been received even by those who profess them. And there is great reason to fear that the number of those who have entirely given up idolatrous practices in consequence of their acceptance of Brahmoism is very small indeed.

Position to be taken.

I wish now to make some remarks with reference to the position which the Christian Church should assume in looking at and judging of this movement. There is undoubtedly much in it which we can approve and for which we ought to be thankful. It appears to be to a very great extent the result of the influence of Christianity upon Hinduism. It may not be such a result as we could wish to see. But if it be such a result as God in his wisdom has seen fit to permit, are we not bound to recognize it as being in its time and place good? It has taken a firm stand against idolatry, and in this we may heartily wish it success. It has proclaimed the abolition of caste distinctions as one of its leading aims, and in this we may sincerely concur. It has recently directed its energies to the amelioration of certain social evils involved in Hindu marriage customs, and we have all rejoiced at the measure of success which has crowned its efforts. It has exerted all its influence against the tendency to materialism and positivism which in some places has prevailed, and every Christian may surely be thankful that there is in India a body of men exerting such an influence. It has proclaimed as its great principles the universal Fatherhood of God and Brotherhood of Man, and we may heartily recognize the value of

Good effects of Brahmoism.

these principles since they occupy such a prominent position in the teachings of our own great Master. As far as concerns all these features in the character of this movement, I think that we are bound, as followers of our Master, to stretch out the right hand of fellowship and encouragement and wish it God speed.

Unfavourable view.

But there is also unfortunately a dark and unfavourable view of it which we cannot but take, and to this let me now call your attention. The essential point of this lies in the relation between Brahmoism and—not Christianity—but Christ. We have seen already that even the Progressive Brahmos have manifested a most decided shrinking from Christ, at the same time accepting many of the truths which originated with Christ, or which have been established in the world by Christ. While making this statement we must acknowledge the many, eloquent, and grateful admissions which have been made by some leading Brahmos of the immense obligations under which the world lies to Christ. They have admitted that he is well entitled to be called our elder brother, the most glorious Son of God. But while acknowledging that some leading Brahmos have made such admissions regarding Christ, we cannot be blind to the fact that they have never accorded to Christ that position with reference to human salvation which we believe he occupies. Christ said, "Come unto *me* all ye that are weary and heavy laden, and *I* will give you rest." I have never seen the plain meaning of this passage acknowledged as a truth by any Brahmo. Christ said—"*I* am the Way, the Truth, and the Life!" but no Brahmo has ever accepted that statement as true in any sense in which it is accepted as true by a Christian. But this and other similar statements regarding the connection between the *Person* of Christ and human salvation, contain *the essential point* of Christian faith. And as long as we accept the gospels of the evangelists and the epistles of the Apostles, as containing a faithful account of the principles of Christianity, we must look upon Brahmoism, in its present form, as being wanting in that central, essential element which has been the life of the Christian church from the beginning. While therefore we may gladly rejoice that a large body of people in India have accepted so much that is true and good, we cannot but deeply lament that they continue resolutely to maintain their position of separation from Him who was, is, and continues to be, the Light and the Life of men.

With refereuce to the future of this religious movement

Future of Brahmoism.

we should not perhaps speak very decidedly. But yet, judging from the analogy of history, there are some general statements which I think we may safely venture upon regarding the future prospects of Brahmoism. If we inquire what it is that has preserved Christianity in its unity and life during its long and chequered history, we shall find, I think, that it is its connection with an historical person. Speaking upon ordinary human principles without reference to any high religious meaning, such a connection appears to be essential to the preservation of the life of any religious system. All the great religions of the world have been connected with some historical person, with whose name they have been specially associated. But Brahmoism professes to repudiate all such connection—its leaders wish to be called *pure* theists. There is, therefore, no bond of union amongst them except a set of ever-varying metaphysical and moral doctrines—true and good, some or all of them may be, but still they depend upon that continually changing religious imagination of individuals called intuition. Now such being the case, there appears to be a two-fold tendency and a two-fold danger connected with the future of this movement. In the first place, there is a

Individualism.

danger that it will split upon the rock of individualism—each one asserting his own so-called intuitions to be the whole truth which should be accepted. If this tendency prevail, the whole body will soon fall to pieces, in consequence of the discordance occasioned by the self-assertion of individuals, and gradually sink into the great mass of Hinduism from which it has sprung. There is a second danger to which the movement is liable, which is suggested by the

Hero-worship.

name hero-worship. Every great body of men must have some leader—the majority of men are incapable of thinking or judging for themselves in matters of importance and especially in religion. And consequently if Brahmoism is to comprehend a great number of the Hindoo people, there is almost a certainty of its being degraded into the worship of some leader of the movement. In this case it will sink into the position of an insignificant sect such as that which was founded by Choitonya. These, I believe, are the two leading forms in one or other of which Brahmoism is likely to degenerate, unless it advances from the position which it now holds.

Transition state.

But I think that there is a more hopeful view of it which we may entertain. We must remember that Brahmoism, as it at present exists, is simply the superficial out-come of a

very wide-spread and radical change which has been going on in the Hindu community for the last half century. Western influences and western education have not been exerted in vain upon the minds and lives of our Hindu brethren. Great changes have taken place in their social customs, intellectual condition and religious beliefs. An attempt to enumerate these changes is needless; we are all more or less familiar with them. The influences which produced these changes are still being exerted, and will continue to be exerted as long as British enterprise and Christian philanthrophy continue to be what they now are. We are consequently bound to believe that the great series of changes and movements, intellectual, social and religious, which have had a temporary efflorescence in Brahmoism, will continue to go on and produce fruit—let us hope better and truer than what has yet been produced. And what is more, I think we have good ground for believing that in future the progress of this movement, if it progresses at all, must be more and more towards the Christian position. I have already pointed out the two-fold danger which besets it—a Sylla and Charybdis which can only be avoided by a closer connection with Him who is the Light that lighteth every man that cometh into the world. There are already some few signs of a tendency in this direction, and the leaders of the movement will, before very long, be compelled to go either one way or another; either to approach—I do not say Christianity, for that is a very indefinite term in the present day but—Christ, or to recede from Him as the Adi Somaj have already done. If they take the former course, let us hope and pray that they may be wisely guided in the way of life. If they take the latter course, they are bound to sink into the obscurity of Hinduism from which they have sprung, and others will be chosen to carry on the great work for which they have proved themselves incompetent.

Two alternatives.

The Chairman then invited remarks.

Dr. Wilson said, he had listened with much interest to the able paper of Dr. Jardine, which had presented a clear and intelligible view of the Brahma Samáj in its present position. That Samáj or "Church" was certainly entitled to attention and respect, though the designation (temporary it might only be) which it had assumed was too much in accordance with the manifest cowardice of most of the attempts at religious reform which had been made in India in past ages. Of a want of courage, he accused some of the authors of the Aranyakas and Upanishads,

Rev. Dr. Wilson.

in which the dawn of Indian philosophy first appears, and the great Kapila, who is said to have claimed the authority of the Vedas at the time that he was deliberately and expressly subverting them. Of the same weakness he accused Shákya Muni and his adherents, who had not only impugned the doctrines of the Vedas, but destroyed their institutes and overturned the fabric of Brahmanism, and established Buddhism, at the very time that they professed to be guided by the Vedas and to be seeking only to do them justice. Of this cowardice he accused most of the Indian teachers of reform and change of whom he had any knowledge, whether they wrote in the Sanskrit or Prakrit languages. The Brahmists, however, for whom, on other grounds, he had a very great respect, may have clung to the title which they have assumed from want of due consideration. To the designation of Brahma Samáj, its members, as they appeared at present, had no recognizable right, whatever they may have had in the days of their original founder, the celebrated Ráma Mohana Ráya. The word *Brahma* is used in the Hindu literature, distinctively, only in three senses. It is used to denote the *Brahma* Vedic ceremony of the ancient Indians, instituted for the sake of "increase" (the word coming from the root *brih* to increase). It is used to denote the *Brahma* priesthood viewed collectively. It is used to denote the *Brahma* doctrine (*Brahma* or *Brahman* in the neuter), used in the Hindu pantheistic philosophy to denote the deity viewed as the Sole Existence. The ceremony denoted by the first sense of the word, is wholly repudiated and disused by those now calling themselves the Brahma Samáj. To the second sense the members of the Samáj lay no claim. The Brahma pantheistic (or *advaita* non-dualistic) doctrine is also rejected by them, though he feared it was, at one time at least, held by Ráma Mohana Ráya, as is apparent in his tracts in which he quotes from the Upanishads and other Vedantic writings such passages as the following:—"A wise man knowing God, as perspicuously residing in all creatures, forsakes all idea of duality; being convinced there is only one real existence which is God." "The Veda [Vedánta] says all that exists is indeed God." "The soul is a portion of the supreme ruler; the relation is not that of master and servant,—ruler and ruled,—but is that of whole and part." Are the members of the advanced Brahma Samáj prepared to stand by these dogmas and these legitimate consequences? They certainly are not. Then why do they continue to use their present designation? Missionaries are not the only persons who put this question. The orthodox Hindus do the same, as he (Dr. W.) had heard the orthodox learned Pandits doing even at Calcutta, when inquiring at them why they objected to the native marriage law introduced into Council by Mr. Maine, (to whom India is so greatly indebted for help in its improved legislation). Let them hoist a distinctive flag for themselves, like Christians and Muhammadans, and, not leave it to be inferred that they are bearing the flag of Hinduism, while

Designation questionable.

actually fighting against Hinduism. This advice he had given to his highly valued friend Keshab Chandra Sena at a large meeting ably addressed by him in Manchester; who had received it with regard, adding that he was not wedded to the name Brahma Samáj, which (much to the satisfaction of the meeting) he had declared to be Theistic and not Pantheistic. He and his followers have accepted the new marriage bill, considerably changed from the form in which it was originally drawn, and when using it distinctly aver, according to the requisition of the Act, that they are not following the Hindu ritual. This leads to the hope that the New Samáj will take another title than that of "Brahma Samáj." He cordially rejoiced in its abandonment of polytheism, abandonment of idolatry, abandonment of caste, abandonment of many evil social practices, and above all, in its abandonment of the fearful system of pantheism, which leaves no God for the soul, while it converts everything into God, and even makes Deity, as conceived by it, the sinner and the sufferer, and the changing and erring one. Mr. Keshab Chandra Sena deserved the thanks of all for what he had done; and fervent prayers should be offered up to God in his behalf and that of his associates, that they may make advances on the path of truth; that they may accept the divine Revelation which is given in the Bible; and that they may look to the great Saviour who has been there revealed from the beginning, and who is the centre of history and the hope of the world. In conclusion, he would say that there is nothing novel in spirit or character in what is called the Brahma Samáj, looked at from a general point of view. When the first propagation of Christianity was advancing, the votaries of gentilism, and gentile philosophy, influenced to a not inconsiderable extent by its doctrines and indications and external reforms, tried to accommodate to it their own beliefs, and religious systems and practices, so as to modify or mitigate its high demands for absolute faith and obedience, and at the same time conserve the essentialities of their own systems. Hence the movements produced by the Neo-Platonists, Gnostics, Manicheans, etc. etc., which have passed away, as will every system of thought and practice continuously declining to receive the accredited revelation of Heaven, and looking to man himself for judicial justification before God, and for the restoration by the same means of that nature of man, which is obviously fallen, to prevailing obedience to the law of God and the enjoyment of God as the supreme good of the soul. But better things were yet to be hoped of the Samáj, which comprehends, it is believed, sincere inquirers seeking after God, if haply they may find him, and also effecting important changes in certain important sections of the Native Community, and who should be treated with all due regard and sympathy.

Progress of Samaj.

Better things hoped of.

The Rev. T. Evans, B. M. S., Allahabad, said:—No doubt many Brahmos hold Jesus Christ in very high esteem. This was clearly shown in the case of Keshub Chunder Sen in the startling

Rev. T. Evans.

Lecture which he delivered in Calcutta, some years ago, on "Jesus Christ: Europe and Asia," in which he described the Saviour as the "Son of God"—the "Way," and the "Door" to the "Father." But the Brahmos are in a dilemma. They speak of Christ as the great and good teacher, and yet they impugn the doctrine of his divinity. Keshub Chunder Sen felt that he had gone too far in his lecture on "Jesus Christ," &c., and modified his former views by a second lecture, on "Great Men," in which he put Christ in the same category as all other Reformers—at the same time essaying to show that *all* "Great" men were, in some sense, "inspired," or "divine." But as Jesus Christ assumes an infinitely higher status than any other Reformer, yea, says Himself, "I and the Father are *one*," the Brahmos must accept him as equal with God, or else, impeach him as a false teacher and an impostor. This is a dilemma out of which the Brahmos will find it difficult to extricate themselves.

Dilemma of the Brahmos.

Rev. W. McMordie.

The Rev. W. McMordie, I. P. M., Ahmedabad, wished to know what had been done by Missionaries in Calcutta with reference to the Brahmo Somaj. What views of sin, the immortality of the soul, the relativity of truth, &c., were held by its members?

Information asked.

Rev. Dr. M. Mitchell.

The Rev. Dr. Murray Mitchell, F. C. M., Calcutta, said that Dr. Jardine's paper was a very fair and temperate statement of the character and position of the Brahmo Somaj. The Somaj was in some points doing very important service. It contended earnestly against Polytheism and caste. It contended no less earnestly against a system that was morally more ruinous even than Polytheism, namely Pantheism, a dreadful creed that had eaten out the heart and soul of India. The Brahmos also strove against Comtism with all their might. He never could forget the sadness with which the distinguished leader of the Progressive Somaj said some time ago, when speaking of the spread of Positivism, "This alone was wanting to complete the miseries of my country." Then, the social reforms which the Somaj was straggling for were of the greatest consequence. As a matter of simple justice let all these things be frankly acknowledged, and heartily commended. Some seemed to think that because the Somaj was so grievously far wrong in regard to the divinity of the Lord Jesus Christ, they should not be praised for any thing they did. With that view Dr. M. said he had no sympathy. And assuredly the coldness, or severity often, with which they were treated had repelled them from Missionaries and Christian influence.

Services of Brahmoism.

Original Somaj.

But in speaking of the Somaj a distinction must be made. The original Somaj, though presided over by a most respectable gentleman, Babu Debendernath Tagore, seemed steadily retracing its steps towards Hinduism. On the other hand the Progressive

Somaj, or the Brahmo Somaj of India, as it called itself, was firm in its attachment to theistic principles: and its leading men had testified with honest indignation against the backsliding of the Adi Somaj. It was truly lamentable that the Society founded by the great Ram Mohan Roy—for he really deserved that epithet—founded as a strictly Monotheistic Society, and drawing its principles largely from the Christian Scriptures, should depart so far from its original character. Its leading minister had lately given a public lecture, proving Hinduism to be the best of all religions! His arguments were as singular as his conclusion; but they need not be stated here. Apparently the Adi Somaj would furnish but another instance of a reformation of Hinduism going on hopefully for a time, and then entirely losing its character. Over and over again this had happened in India. There seemed to be some fatal gravitation downwards, by the force of which the highest wave of religious thought in India fell back, by and by, into the *magnum mare* of Hinduism.

Progressive Somaj.

But what of the Progressive Somaj? It could hardly go back; its eminent leader had burnt his ships, and retreat was impossible. Would the Progressive Somaj advance till it blended with the Christian Church? He believed that many of its members would do so; but perhaps not soon. He could trace a remarkable resemblance between the Somaj and some of the heresies of the early Christian centuries, and in particular, Marcionism. That system passed away—though not speedily; and so would the Somaj.

Treatment of Brahmos.

Meantime, how shall we treat the Brahmos? He would repeat it—let us treat them kindly. Some time ago he had met four Brahmo Missionaries and had been a good deal moved by a request they made, that he would help them to come in contact with Christians. Between the Brahmos and the Hindus there was little sympathy, and the little was becoming less; but if we showed a deep affectionate interest in them, they would be drawn nearer and nearer to the truth. He had rather a thousand times be blamed for showing too much sympathy with all, however far astray, who acted up to the light they had, than treat them with suspicion or coldness. One need not lower his colours one inch, in dealingly kindly with the Brahmos. He believed he never met a Brahmo without frankly telling him how deeply he lamented the gulf of separation between them and Christians; but when this was done, it created no bad feeling whatever.

Rev. J. Bhattacharjya.

The Rev. J. Bhattacharjya, F. C. M., Bengal, thought that Brahmoism could not stand long. Christianity has the Bible; Muhammadanism, the Koran; all other religions have some thing to rest upon; but Brahmoism has nothing. Its doctrines can never satisfy the longings of the soul. Still, it was doing some good in opposing caste and idolatry. Some of its members he thought would embrace Christianity; while others would go back to Hinduism.

Insufficency of Brahmoism.

Rev. W. Stephen. The Rev. W. Stephen, F. C. M., Bombay, said that what struck him most about the Somaj was its early organization into a Theistic Church. Church. Theism in India, it appeared, claimed to be a church, and as such to be animated by a Missionary spirit. This was a claim which all Christians would repudiate. The idea of a church implied a divine founder and also a divine commission in view of its proper work—and both these essentials were wanting in the case of the Somaj. He allowed that the Somaj had protested against many errors, and hoped that its members might yet come to embrace the truth as it is in Jesus.

Rev. S. Dyson. The Rev. S. Dyson, C. M. S., Calcutta, said:—I very gladly, but perhaps unnecessarily, bear testimony to the accuracy and trustworthiness of Dr. Jardine's account of the Brahmo Movement. There is no doubt, I think, that its influence is now declining, especially with that portion of the community, the educated youth of Bengal, over whom, at the commencement of the movement, its influence was greatest and most conspicuous. State of the movement. A very small percentage of the *alumni* of our Colleges avow themselves to be distinctively Brahmos. On the contrary, within the last few months, a strong reactionary movement, under the control and guidance of the leaders of Hindu Society, has set in, in favour of the national superstition, viewed simply as a bond of society. Certainly the Brahmic movement has now issued in a complete severance from the prevalent idolatry, and this is a real step in advance and a very hopeful fact. This has been clearly shown in the line of action followed by Keshub Baboo's paper—the *Indian Mirror*, on the occurrence recently of a gross scandal in their community, viz., the marriage with idolatrous rites of a young Bengali Civilian with the daughter of a leading member of the Brahmo Somaj. The paper at once and boldly denounced the whole transaction, and cleared itself of all complicity in the disgraceful business. I gladly testify to this fact.

Now with reference to the three questions proposed.

(1) Their views as to the origin of sin.

Origin of sin. They cannot but acknowledge the existence of sin as a fact, perhaps the universality of the fact; they certainly do not realize the importance of the fact. I am not aware that they have ever attempted to speculate in any way as to the mode of its origin. They do not attempt generally to explain the origin of anything which goes to make up their creed. Usually, they practically ignore the existence of history and of course its lessons. They deny the existence of any innate sinful tendency in human nature most vigorously, and, when pressed with the alternative difficulty that if sin does not originate in the creature, it must originate in the imperfect intention or defective power of the Creator, they refuse to discuss the subject. They are satisfied with their present position. They say, they want no dogmas and controversy is not edifying. They hold that repent-

ance is an adequate atonement for sin. Sin and punishment are causally connected so intimately that forgiveness is not possible. Punishment exactly proportioned is an effect of which the sin is the cause, and, beyond this, somehow or other, either in this life or the next, this exact punishment is sufficient to secure and in every case does secure the adequate repentance of every sinner. The salvation of every human being is simply a question of time.

References.

On this point I may draw the attention of Conference to Keshub Baboo's Tract on *Atonement and Salvation*; also to an excellent Lecture by the Rev. J. Welland in the *First* Series of the Cathedral Lectures, and to incidental remarks in my Tract on *The True Revelation*.

Immortality.

(2.) With reference to their doctrine of immortality, they avow that they see it in the eye of Intuition. All discussion is thus precluded. They do not enter into the doctrine of the Immortality of *Human Nature*. They mean only the Immortality of the Soul. When pressed with the difficulty, that learned philosophers of ancient times in India and Greece had no clear and settled views on this important point, no reply to this obvious difficulty is made, nor as far as I know, ever attempted to be made. The immortality predicated of the soul, is, again, exclusively one of happiness. Sin, they allege, can only be finite, therefore infinite punishment is plainly unjust, and opposed to God's merciful character. When it was pointed out that continuous sin beyond this life would entail continuous punishment and that endlessly continuous sin, from all we see in this world, is probable, they again decline discussion. They have never made any attempt to vindicate their statements.

Relativity of truth.

(3.) It was enquired whether they held the doctrine of the relativity of truth. As I understand it, that which is true to some beings but which is false to others, is relative truth. Absolute truth is that which is true to all intelligences at all places and times. The Brahmos have never entered into this question, but I think they would repudiate with some indignation the charge of perceiving only relative truth.

Dogmas,

No recent tracts on Brahmoism have been published, because I think discussion has been declined by the Brahmos. They fervently denounced all dogmas and urged exclusively religious emotions. Now there can be no argumentation about emotions, and no appeals to the emotions except through the understanding. But religion, they say, is not an affair of the understanding. Brahmoism has become something like a vapour, and we could no more discuss with them than we could tie up vapour with a piece of string. Of course a religion without emotions is barren and dead, but emotion without truths and dogmas is baseless and unfixed. Keshub Baboo, both in India and in England, has been constantly with much fervency and unctuousness preaching

"Dead dogmas."

against "dead dogmas." But who wants "*dead* dogmas?" We should remember that dogmas may be dead and yet true, and may be utterly false and yet living. A poor Hindu woman worships a piece of stone, daubed with red paint, believing that the *Rakoshi Shosthee* will be propitious. Her belief is false and vital. A man may believe the true Brahmo dogma of the Fatherhood of God and the Brotherhood of Man, or, for the matter of that, *all* the revealed doctrines of the New Testament, and yet the dogmas may be dead. And in the vast majority of Brahmos, these true dogmas are dead.

BERKELEY AND MODERN PHILOSOPHY.

THE WORKS OF GEORGE BERKELEY, D.D., *formerly Bishop of Cloyne: including many of his writings hitherto unpublished. With Prefaces, Annotations, His Life and Letters and an account of his Philosophy.* By ALEXANDER CAMPBELL FRASER, M.A., Professor of Logic and Metaphysics in the University of Edinburgh. In four Volumes. Oxford: Clarendon Press. 1871.

THE four handsome volumes which form this edition of the writings of a justly celebrated philo opher of Britain, exhibit marks of great labour and care on the part of the learned Editor. It has been well known for some years past that Professor Fraser was engaged in collecting and annotating for the sake of republishing the various writings of the great English Idealist; and now that the result has been given to the world, we have every reason to be satisfied with the opportunity offered to us of becoming thoroughly acquainted with Berkeley and Berkeleianism. Several writings of considerable importance hitherto unpublished are here presented; and in some of them the enthusiastic admirer of Berkeley may see some interesting stages in his mental history. The whole is so copiously annotated that the most unlearned reader can have no difficulty in tracing obscure allusions, or understanding the bearing of particular passages upon modern philosophical theories. Perhaps much of the life of Berkeley and many of his letters here published will fail to interest those readers to whom the name of Berkeley is simply symbolical of a particular set of philosophical doctrines. This is to be expected, and would probably be the case with reference to any philosopher who has become truly historical. The interests of the individual life have become secondary to that of the permanent treasure of thought which is the result of that life. To bring out clearly what this result is, has been the principal endeavour of the learned Professor in the work before us. And it shall be our endeavour in the present article to present, in brief, an account of Berkeleianism, to show its relations to other modes of thought now current, and to estimate its value from a historical and philosophical point of view.

At the outset we notice a mode of expression which, we think, has been one of the leading causes, not only of a great deal of misunderstanding regarding Berkeley's philosophy, but also of a great deal of confusion in modern psychology generally. We allude to the manner in which Berkeley and others have spoken of the word *mind* and of the *ideas* said to be *contained in the*

mind. As if the mind were a sort of hidden chamber, portioned off into different compartments called faculties, and containing a variety of possessions called sensations or ideas. Many have made use of this form of expression who have had a clear conception of what they meant by it ; but many more, we believe, have been led by it into conceptions utterly false and absurd, and been unable to reconcile Berkeley's psychology with common sense. We are glad to see that Professor Fraser attempts to correct and explain almost every expression of this kind which is likely to mislead.

The leading problem which Berkeley set himself to work out was psychological—he strove to explain the elements of which that acquired power called perception is composed and the manner in which it is acquired. But in doing so he was brought face to face with very important ontological problems, and his deliverance with reference to one of them—the existence of matter—is that by which he is now popularly known. We shall give our attention first to the psychological doctrines with which Berkeley's name is associated, but which he did not explicate as completely or defend as satisfactorily as could be wished. Indeed such explication and defence could not be expected until a variety of attacks rendered them necessary.

Perception, in the common signification of the term, is a very complex power, although to practical men it appears very simple. The practical man takes in at a glance all the circumstances and qualities which constitute his knowledge of an external object—its distance, colour, shape, and a variety of other things. This glance he calls perception ; and he never asks whether it is simple or complex, original or acquired. Philosophers, however, endeavour to analyse and explain this wonderful power. Long before the time of Berkeley attempts had been made to solve the problem ; but Berkeley thought these attempts unsatisfactory. In short he obtained an insight into the origin and character of perception, which had escaped the most acute of his predecessors. To explain. Those organs which we call senses, each give us the knowledge of some particular quality. Sight presents us with colour ; hearing gives us sound ; touch makes known hardness or softness ; through taste and smell we know the peculiar qualities of these senses. Now all these sensations are different ; they are different in kind ; they come to us through different senses ; and we can see no reason *a priori* why they should be constantly associated together.

By many previous philosophers, these sensations or qualities, as they were called, were divided into primary and secondary ; the former being believed to be objective, to be essential to the existence of external objects ; the latter subjective, being only affections

of the mind, occasioned, it is true, by some external cause, but still as sensations purely subjective. It was maintained, moreover, that there was a necessary connection between visible expansive colour and tangible extension, inasmuch as the former was always associated with the latter.

Berkeley's attempt with reference to these doctrines was twofold; he showed, in the first place, that those qualities called primary and supposed to be objective, are just as truly subjective sensations as those usually recognized to be subjective; he showed further that there is no necessary connection in the nature of things between visible phenomena and tangible phenomena. It is true that *visibilia* always suggest *tangibilia*, that visible extension is always connected with tangible extension. But this connection is solely the result of experience and association—experience and association which undeniably follow from the constitution of our organism, but still to be distinguished from a necessity in the nature of things. To a person born blind tangible extension would be suggested by some other sensation than colour—sound, it may be, or smell. What Berkeley made out is, that any one sensation may be the sign of any other sensation, that this constant association of different sensations is the result of experience acquired long before the time of life when the mind is able to analyse its experience, and that perception as exercised by the mature mind is an acquired power, the original elements of which are sensations, all of them simply and equally subjective in their character, that is, all of them nothing more than sense-given phenomena. Here some questions arise. What is the ground or principle of that experience by virtue of which we come to associate together sensations, and think of them as being qualities of external things? And what is the meaning of that externality and reality which we attribute to things? In attempting to answer these questions, while professing to accord generally with Berkeley's system, we shall take advantage of the subsequent history of philosophy for the purpose of expressing ourselves in more careful and less equivocal language.

All experience has reference to some minds, and Berkeley accounted for the unity or constant association of ideas by their being contained in the same mind. Modern supporters of the psychology which Berkeley attempted to establish, have found reason to express themselves more carefully.

Before the consciousness of every individual there passes a great variety of sense-phenomena. These may be contemporaneous—all witnessed in the same moment by consciousness; they may be successive. But, whether contemporaneous or successive, they must constitute a *diversity* whereby they may be distinguished from one another. They are composed of such well-known sensations as colours, sounds, tactual feelings, smells, muscular sensations, &c.

But in the midst of this diversity consciousness perceives a unity, or rather consciousness *constitutes* a unity.

All these sensations are *mine*, and therefore they are constantly associated together. Thus the diversity of sensations derive their unity, in the first place, from their mutual relation to that permanent unifying principle which philosophers generally have agreed to recognize by the name of the conscious subject or *ego*.

Having advanced thus far, we may look at our position. If Berkeley maintained that this relation of sensations to the ego is the only unity which they possess, the only bond of association by which they are linked together, he is in truth what he has been very generally supposed to be, a subjective idealist ; but we maintain that this is not the only unity which he attributed to sensations, and that he is not a subjective idealist.

Berkeley maintained that all *things* are collections of perceived or perceivable *ideas* ; or, in other words, that all objects in nature are insensible phenomena. An object can have no existence unless it is related to a percipient mind. But then each conscious-self is aware that the series of sensations which constitutes the elements of his knowledge, is not entirely under his own control. A person cannot refuse to perceive a sweet smell or a beautiful colour ; nor yet can he produce these sensations at his will. This independence of sensible phenomena upon the individual mind was fully recognized by Berkeley. He acknowledged that in all our conscious sensations or ideas there is involved a *foreign* element—something which the individual-self did not create and cannot control. The ego in its conscious activity recognizes its sensations and ideas as *its own*, and thus gives them a subjective unity ; but the ego also recognizes an objective foreign power as involved in all its states and activities, and in doing so acknowledges an objective unity in the transient series of sense-given phenomena. It is in this objective unity that the reality of *things* consists ; and the conscious-self is able to understand no objective unity which does not resemble that which exists in its own subjective series. This at least is the position which Berkeley holds ; and this appears to be what he means when he says that sensible objects cannot exist unless they are perceived by some mind.

Let us see what explanation has been given of the objective unity and reality of things by other philosophers. According to that system which Berkeley endeavoured to overthrow, external objects owe this reality to some insensible substance in which they are supposed to inhere. This inert noumenal matter underlies all sense-given phenomena, and is their hiuden cause ; but, from the nature of the case, can never itself become an object of sense. It has an existence independent of every percipient mind, so that

even the conceived possibility of its being an object of perception would render impossible its existence. Probably the hypothesis of this inconceivable matter took its rise in the relative permanence of tangible as compared with visual phenomena, so that the former came to the looked upon as possessing greater reality than the latter. And probably it gradually grew into shape by the efforts of the conscious-self to explain that objective unity, after the sensible phenomena had, by an illegitimate but natural process of abstraction, been completely objectified or separated from the mind to which in part they owed their very existence.

This hypothetical matter, Berkeley makes every possible effort to overthrow; and the philosophical tyro cannot obtain a more enjoyable philosophical and literary repast than by reading the three dialogues between Hylas and Philonous, in which the enthusiastic and acute spiritualist sweeps that inconceivable absurdity called matter entirely out of existence, or rather shows that it never had any existence except as a baseless figment of the metaphysician's brain. If then the hypothesis of the materialists be an inconceivable and contradictory explanation of the objective unity and reality of things, we are brought back to Berkeley's own attempt to solve the problem.

The solution which Berkeley gives may be very briefly expressed in his own form of language. The existence and reality of things consist in their being perceived—nothing can exist which is not perceived. But objects are not always perceived by my mind, and many objects can never be perceived by any human mind; still their *esse* is *percipi*, and therefore there must be some omnipresent percipient mind in continual relation to them, in order to account for their existence.*

We believe that this explanation is substantially at the bottom of all the religious beliefs of the human race. We see it in the fetichism of the savage, in the more intelligent monotheism of rational men, and in the profound thinking of the most transcendental metaphysician. But in the time of Berkeley, psychology was not so perfect either in its phraseology or its analysis as it has since

* Philonous to Hylas—"I deny that I agree with you in those notions that lead to scepticism. You, indeed, said the *reality* of sensible things consisted in an *absolute existence* out of the mind of spirits, or distinct from their being perceived....But I neither said nor thought the reality of sensible things was to be defined after that manner. To me it is evident, for the reasons you allow of, that sensible ings cannot exist otherwise than in a mind or spirit, whence I conclude not that they have no real existence,' but that, seeing they depend not on my thought, and have an existence distinct from being perceived by me, *there must be some other mind in which they exist.* As sure therefore as the sensible world really exists, so sure is there an infinite omnipresent spirit who contains and supports it."—(Sec. Dia. p. 303.)

become ; and there is unquestionably much in Berkeley's manner of expression which is likely to shock and prejudice the practical mind. We shall try to conceive his principal ontological doctrine in a form which is not inconsistent with our ordinary manner of speaking and thinking.

We saw before that the conscious-self or ego is the unifying principle of the diversity of subjective states and activities. We saw too that this conscious-self in the midst of its sense-given phenomena necessarily recognizes a foreign element which it does not originate and cannot control. The presence of this foreign element is the occasion by virtue of which the conscious-subject objectifies its own sensations, and thinks of them as phenomena of something other than self. In short the diverse series of sensations, recognized as partially foreign in origin, has an ego of its own attributed to it as an explanation of its perceived unity, and this becomes relatively to the subject a non-ego, a real thing. In the childhood of the individual as of the world, every permanent collection of phenomena is looked upon as a living *alter ego*—a fetich invested with life and personality. Experience gradually corrects this conception, but no matter how much experience is acquired the complexity of phenomena can be unified and harmonized in no other way than by the attribution to it of that unity of which we are first conscious in the midst of those subjective phenomena which go to make up what we call our mind.

This attribution of subjective unity to the diversity of objectified phenomena is, we say, the principle by virtue of which we affirm the existence of sensible objects. We give especial unity to each more or less closely associated collection of phenomena, but as experience advances we observe connections to exist between phenomena which formerly appeared distinct. As these connections are observed and verified, we form other and more general unities, but upon exactly the same principle as we learned first to speak of individual things. These higher unities are expressed in various ways—it may be by general names applicable to a great variety of objects; it may be by the statement of a general law by which phenomena are conceived to be bound together. As soon as the individual's experience has become sufficiently extensive, he thinks of all actual or possible objects as being bound together in one great unity, and as constituting the *cosmos*—the universe of things, all related to the universal non-ego and governed harmoniously by the laws of Divine Intelligence. This is monotheism, and although this does not constitute our whole conception of God, we maintain that it is essentially the same principle that leads the child to think of its spoon or its rattle as a *thing* different from itself, and the matured man to look upon the universe as a harmonious whole which receives its existence and its harmony from one all-knowing, all-powerful God.

Thus, according to Berkeley, the whole sensible universe is a language—the language by which God speaks to men. The finite individual-self first puts a meaning and harmony into this language by attributing to it the unity andh armony of which it is conscious in its own subjective cosmos. But as time advances and experience becomes more extensive, the finite person recognizes in the laws of nature a unity and harmony in the universe of things which is independent of his finite consciousness, but which he must still explain by the only analogy within his reach.*

Positive science is the result of man's investigation into the laws of phenomena. Wherever sensible phenomena exist, they form legitimate objects of scientific investigation. The philosophical explanation which Berkeley gives as to the nature of objective reality, does not in the slightest degree invade the domain of the scientific enquirer. The divine ideas which constitute the universe are, according to Berkeley, under the control of the laws of the Divine Intelligence. That means, in ordinary language, that all the objects and changes in the universe have their order of co-existence and succession determined for them by the Governor of nature in accordance with uniform laws. Berkeley, the philosopher, therefore, might, consistently with his philosophy, have become a precise and accurate scientific investigator. That he did not do so, cannot be brought as a reproach against himself, as he had other duties to occupyhis life. But he has left a place in his system for a complete body of positive science, and no positive science can ever touch the found ation of his philosophy. The essential distinction between philosophy and positive science is, that in the former all sensible phenomena are studied in their necessary relation to the conscious subject by which they are known ; while, in the latter, sensible phenomena are, by a logical abstraction, separated from the conscious-self, and studied as if they had an independent existence. Now it so happens that all

* "The only conceivable and practical, and for us the only possible, substantiality in the material world is—permanence of co-existence or aggregation among sensations ; and the only conceivable and practical, and for us the only possible, causality among phenomena is—permanence or invariableness among their successions. . . . . The substantiality and causality of matter thus resolve into a universal sense-symbolism, the interpretation of which is the office of physical science. The material world is a system of interpretable signs, dependent for its actual existence in sense upon the mind of the interpreter ; but significant of guaranteed pains and pleasures, and the guaranteed means of avoiding and attaining pains and pleasures ; significant too of other minds, and their thoughts, feelings, and volitions ; and significant, above all, of supreme mind through whose activity the signs are sustained and whose archetypal ideas are the order of those universal or invariable relations of theirs which made them both practically and scientifically significant or objective." (Editor, vol. iv. p. 375.)

men naturally make this logical abstraction in the affairs of every-day-life, and it requires an effort to bring together again the two essential elements of all existence, which, by the laws of our nature, have been separated. Thus it is much easier to become a scientific man than a philosopher ; much easier to study the laws of those phenomena which to ordinary practical minds appear abstracted from the intelligence by virtue of which they exist, than to bring together in their original synthesis of existence those elements which, by the laws of our nature, have been abstracted.

But if the philosopher thus willingly acknowledges the right of the scientific man to apply his most vigorous canons of induction to all sensible phenomena, whether past, present or future ; the scientific man as such has no right to intrude on the domain of the philosopher or to refuse to acknowledge his sphere. There is a system much in vogue in the present day, miscalled philosophical, which goes by the name of Positivism. In so far as it is positive science, it is legitimate, as the whole universe of phenomena is spread out before us for the purpose of being studied ; and every effort should be made to ascertain the laws of those phenomena, independently altogether of any ontological explanation which may be given of them. It matters not to what conclusions a strict adherence to scientific truth may lead us ; it matters not what we may discover regarding the origin and past history of the globe upon which we tread, or of the physical organism which we call our bodies, or of the moral and religious beliefs which constitute our mosts acred mental treasures. All these subjects come legitimately within the sphere of phenomenal science, and although scientific men pursue these subjects to their utmost limit, philosophers have no right to complain, nay they ought to assist their fellow-searchers after truth in arriving at the goal towards which they both profess to be striving.

But Positivism is not contented with the sphere of legitimate positive science. Positivism professes to be a system of universal knowledge, and to comprehend within its sphere all the objects and all the instruments of knowledge which may be studied or employed by the human mind. And yet Positivism excludes as an instrument of knowledge that which is the chief instrument of philosophy—consciousness. And it attempts to explain all the problems of psychology by a physical examination of the brain, by a study of different parts of the organism, by examining the relations which the individual sustains to society. If the Positivist instrument of knowledge be the only one, if consciousness be not an independent source of knowledge whose sphere can never be invaded by the microscope or the dissecting knife, then Positivism is the only legitimate science, and all men's notions about the universe receiving its existence and its explanation from

some all-knowing mind are mere dreams and delusions. But we maintain that as long as human nature is constituted as it is, consciousness must be accepted as an independent authority, and the Positivist cannot even employ language without assuming truths and facts which could never be known without that instrument of knowledge which he discards.*

But if we are bound to protect philosophy from the sweeping exclusiveness of Positivism, no less necessary is it to guard positive science from the encroachments of philosophy. In order to understand the danger to be guarded against, let us study the development of which Berkeleianism is capable.

According to the system which Berkeley chiefly opposed, mind was regarded as one thing, matter as another and a different thing; they were believed to exist independently of one another, to be separated from one another, as has been said, "by the whole diameter of being," to exist under different conditions and to be governed by different laws. But this was shown to be a false contradictory way of thinking. The existence of matter as an insensible substratum of phenomena was shown to be impossible. The existence of mind, independent of its own phenomena, is also inconceivable. The essential characteristic of mind is that conscious unifying principle which gives consistence and harmony to the variety of sense-given phenomena. But the conscious subject recognizes these sense-given phenomena as having a relation also to a true non-ego—that non-ego being necessarily constituted by the same unity as that of the subjective ego. The particular non-ego becomes, by an inductive process, the universal non-ego, or rather the non-ego of the universe. But still the individual subject is bound to attribute to this higher non-ego, the same unity which constitutes itself. And the subjective universe is

* Mr. J. S. Mill has criticised M. Comte severely for his rejection of consciousness as an instrument of philosophy. "He gives no place," says Mill, "in his series of the sciences to psychology, and always speaks of it with contempt. The study of mental phenomena, or, as he expresses it, of moral and intellectual functions, has a place in his scheme under the head of Biology, but only as a branch of physiology. Our knowledge of the human mind must, he thinks, be acquired by observing other people. How we are to observe other people's mental operations, or how interpret the signs of them without having learnt what the signs mean by knowledge of ourselves, he does not state. But it is clear to him that we can learn very little about the feelings, and nothing at all about the intellect, by self-observation." (Mill's *Pos. Phil. of Comte*, p. 59.) Mr. G. H. Lewes in his *Review of Positivism* gives a more important position to psychology, but still it is *comparative* psychology, the result of comparing the functions of the human brain with those of brutes. How we could ever get a knowledge of any sensation or thought without consciousness, is to us inconceivable. All scientific knowledge, no matter of what kind it may be, is capable of being analysed into elements originally given in consciousness and consciousness alone.

recognized as governed by laws; that is, the laws of co-existence and succession of the phenomenal universe correspond to those of the subjective phenomena of the individual mind. In short the laws of subjective knowing and the laws of objective being are the same, because knowing and being are but different sides of the same indivisible absolute existence. This identification of knowing and being, of the subjective and the objective, leads necessarily to the complete supersession of positive science by philosophy, or rather indicates a method by which all the problems of positive science may be solved by philosophy. Knowing and being are one; the laws of knowing are the laws of being also; the laws of the individual mind which regulate the *form* or *order* of thought, are the laws of thought generally, that is, are the laws of that objective being which is the thought of God. Consequently, if we can arrive at a true science of the laws of thought, we have attained a science of the universe of things. Logic is thus the universal organon of science.

Berkeley, certainly, did not attempt to reduce his principles to such a systematic form, as we have here indicated; probably he never conceived the notion of making such an application of his principles. But we believe that if he had turned his mind to natural science and history, if he had endeavoured to systematize all knowledge and establish a method of investigation, he would probably have hit upon something similar to what long afterwards appeared in Germany. We say "something similar," because we think that neither Berkeley's mode of expression nor his psychological analysis could ever have enabled himself personally to reach that wonderful formulating of the laws of thought and being which was accomplished by Hegel. And we think, too, that the employment of the Hegelian organon can never be of much practical use, can never be more than a splendid theory, understood by few and employed by none. Still within the sphere of its influence it must have an injurious effect upon positive science, and, therefore, we wish to show wherein we think it transgresses its legitimate bounds.

Hegel's ontology, like every system of ontology, is founded upon a psychology,—the psychology of the finite subjective process of thought. And it assumes as a *sine quâ non* that the analysis of the subjective process of thought in the individual mind must give, as its result, the essential and necessary process of the world-idea. This assumption Berkeley would never have reached, in consequence of the element of freedom which he implicitly attributed both to the human and the divine will.* But granting that this

* "By a diligent observation of the phenomena within our view, we may discover the general laws of nature, and from them deduce the other

assumption is, within proper limits, the fundamental principle of all ontology, we may still doubt the ability of any so perfectly to formulate the finite subjective process of thought as to make it the basis of transcendental ontology. Astronomers would come to very imperfect conclusions regarding the magnitudes, motions, and distances of the fixed stars, or even the other bodies of the solar system, if they had no basis of calculation more extensive than that afforded by the daily revolution of the earth. So we fear that the analysis of the process of thought in the individual human mind can scarcely be so perfectly freed from the erroneous and the contingent as to make it a thoroughly reliable basis, whereon to construct a theory of the universe. Hegel and his followers profess that such an analysis does exist in the Hegelian philosophy, and if we could understand that analysis, or had any means of verifying it except its own inconceivable ideas, we might confess that the secret of the universe has been laid here. But before we make this confession, we must be assured in the first place that the finite mind is a full and perfect measure of the infinite, so that an accurate analysis of the subjective process of thought must necessarily constitute a complete analysis of the process of the absolute idea; and in the second place that such an analysis has been attained. But unless we are to believe mere assertions, we have no satisfactory assurance of either the one position or the other.

The denial of the first of these positions does not involve the destruction of ontology. We have already endeavoured to point out in this paper that the basis of all ontology as well as of all belief in the reality of external objects is to be found in that law of our nature by which we attribute the unity of subjective thought to objective things. God would never be found in the universe, unless the subjective reason put into objective phenomena the elements out of which it constructs the idea of God. But the mind observes in the objective phenomena a unity and harmony which are not of finite subjective origin, and we have no right to assert that there can be no principles involved in the world-harmony which are not found in the process of finite thought.

With reference to the actual analysis of thought which Hegel has made, it would be presumption to criticise it, particularly as we are not sure that we understand it. But it appears to us that there may be some doubt as to the ground from which the analysis begins. Is pure abstract Being that element of con-

phenomena; I do not say *demonstrate*, for all deductions of that kind depend on a supposition that the Author of nature always operates uniformly; and on a constant observance of those rules we take for principles which we cannot evidently know." (*Prin. of Human Knowledge*, sec. 107).

sciousness which is primary and which underlies all others? No consciousness can exist without activity; all sensations are the resultant, as it were, of the interaction of opposing forces, the ego on the one hand, and the variety of powers which we call the non-ego on the other. Thus, from an analysis of consciousness, we should be inclined to place as *the first* not abstract being, but some dynamical principle—call it volition, force, or by whatever other name it may be best indicated.

The chief use of ontology appears to us to be not the *a priori* explanation of the universe, but the furnishing of an ideal cause or hypothesis for the explanation of observed facts. And consequently we say that philosophy ought to be prevented from intruding within the domains of positive science. The proper method of studying the universe, whether physical, social or mental, is the careful observation of facts. The mind must, in the first place, supply hypothesis for the provisional explanation of the facts; and ultimately the careful and continued observation of the facts will serve to correct the hypothesis. So that the study of things may even be made useful as a psychological instrument for correcting the analysis of thoughts. The study of the laws of nature and the laws of history aud society has already been instrumental in correcting numberless ontological errors in morals, metaphysics, and theology, but it is surely a grand mistake to suppose that positive science will ever be able to dispense with the aid of philosophy. As long as men are born into the world with the same nature which we possess, they must continue to attribute their own conscious personal reality to objective phenomena. And this attribution, with the different principles which it implies, constitutes the basis of all ontology.

We shall now endeavour to point out some erroneous modes of thought which Berkeleianism, if fairly followed out to its consequences, must serve to correct. And first we shall refer to certain views upon theological subjects which have prevailed in the religious world for many centuries, and which still continue to prevail. The philosophical doctrine which lies at the basis of all mediæval theology is dualism — its essential tenet being the independent existence of matter and mind. According to this doctrine, matter and mind are different entities entirely distinct from one another—perfectly opposed in nature and mode of existence. Philosophical dualism has existed in the world in all ages; it is the natural result of that primitive act of abstraction to which we have referred, whereby the conscious-self objectifies its sense-given phenomena, and, by a natural process, thinks of them as constituting an independent thing.* To the practical man this natural process of

* "It is indeed an opinion strangely prevailing amongst men that

abstraction is invaluable; but to man as a thinker, it is most pernicious. And the history of philosophy and religion shows how difficult it is for men when they aspire to become thinkers to divest themselves of these ordinary modes of conception which result from the natural abstraction and association of practical life. Philosophical dualism, or the doctrine of the independent existence of matter and mind, has been held from the earliest times. It existed in Plato and Aristotle; it existed in mediæval times; it was retained by Descartes and through him came into modern philosophy. Berkeley was one of the first in modern times to point out the inconceivableness and impossibility of ontological dualism.

The theological application of this doctrine might almost be anticipated. If matter is one thing and mind another, each of them independent of the other, then, manifestly, God must have an existence entirely separate from and independent of the universe of matter, and in the same way matter must have an existence independent of God. The eternity, independence, and co-existence of God and matter, or good and evil, was, therefore, a prevailing doctrine of heathen antiquity, both Grecian and Oriental. In the Judaic cosmogony, however, this antithesis does not appear "in the beginning," for we are told that "God created the heavens and the earth." But it may be questioned whether the idea of the absolute origination of matter is consciously continued in the Jewish account of creation. However this may be, subsequent Jewish theology presents the most violent antithesis between God and his creation. Jehovah is represented as seated in the heavens with an out-stretched arm, ruling from without over the powers of nature, giving audible or visible directions to his chosen people, and following with dire vengeance the enemies of his heritage. Of course a great deal of this language is highly figurative, and must have been uttered by the Jewish leaders and prophets with the distinct consciousness that it is so. Such language must have been the natural way by which the Jewish people expressed their religious thoughts and feelings; probably they saw the figurative character of the

---

houses and mountains, rivers, and in a word, all sensible objects, have an existence, natural or real, distinct from their being perceived by the understanding.....If we thoroughly examine this tenet, it will, perhaps, be found at bottom to depend on the doctrine of *abstract ideas*. For can there be a nicer strain of abstraction than to distinguish the existence of sensible objects from their being perceived, so as to conceive them existing unperceived? Light and colours, heat and cold, extension and figure—in a word, the things we see and feel—what are they but so many sensations, notions, ideas or impressions on the sense? And is it possible to separate, even in thought, any one of these from perception?..... In truth the object and the sensation are the same thing, and cannot, therefore, be abstracted from one another." (*Prin. of Human Knowledge*, secs. 4-5.)

expressions which they used; but these expressions must have been inherited from a time when they were really understood in their literal sense. At any rate, from the prevalence amongst the Jewish people of such descriptions of God as we have referred to, we are led to the conclusion that a most distinct form of dualism prevailed amongst them. They looked upon God as ruling his universe from without, as having his spiritual throne somewhere within the regions of space apart from material things, which latter had an existence also apart from Him.

This Jewish conception of God's existence and mode of government has played an important part in modern Christian theology. It has received a name in the word personality, which word is at the present moment by many sectaries made use of as one of the shibboleths of orthodoxy. The Jewish conception of personality, however, was combined with other elements in the early Christian theology. The wonderful individual to whom the Christian system owes its rise, spoke of himself truly as the Son of God, and he, in his human nature, was unquestionably a person. He promised to send the Comforter to his disciples after he had departed, and the language employed with reference to him led the Christians to ascribe personality to him also. The problem then arose how to reconcile this three-fold personality with monotheism. Every one who knows anything of the history of Christian theology, is aware of the innumerable controversies and struggles which took place in early times and which have continued to agitate Christendom for many centuries. The doctrine of the Trinity was the central point about which these controversies clustered, but many other questions were necessarily involved.

Now the particular conception which rendered these controversies possible was, we say, that which is usually expressed by the word personality. And we maintain that this conception was not philosophically accurate. The meaning of *person* in the ordinary language of practical life comprehends the whole complexity of mental and organic faculties which constitute a man or woman. And this conception of the word, divested of some material elements peculiarly human, was retained in its theological application. In other words, the higher and more spiritual faculties of man were magnified and attributed to God, and He was thus regarded as comprising that complexity of mental and moral powers which constitute a man's mind, only in an infinitely greater degree. This infinite Person was thought of as existing and acting outside of the laws of nature, as it were, in something the same way as each man is aware that he exists and acts upon that small portion of nature with which he comes into contact. The discussions of the early Christians regarding the nature of Christ, no doubt served to render still more distinct this

conception of God which regarded Him as a very great man. Christ was human, endowed with that complexity of human powers and faculties which constitute what we usually call a human person. Since Christ, therefore, was believed to be the Son of God, a Person like his Father, men were naturally confirmed by their religious discussions in regarding the Deity as resembling in all essential respects the mind of a human being, and as existing outside of his own universe, ruling it pretty much as a man directs the movements of some machine. Hence arose long discussions as to the manner in which God ruled his universe, comprising the much agitated questions as to the divine decrees, the introduction of sin, the covenant or bargain made between the Father and the Son regarding the human race, and a great many other subjects of a similar character.

With reference to the legitimacy of discussions of this kind, it must be defended either on the ground of revelation or of philosophy. If the contending parties refer to revelation, we reply that the scriptures are essentially practical in their character, and do not afford a ground for such an elaborate analysis of the divine nature and government as constitutes mediæval theology. If, on the other hand, they wish to defend their position on philosophical grounds, we maintain that they are equally destitute of any sanction for their contests. Philosophy does not recognize the legitimacy of that conception of the divine person which must be entertained in order to render the controversies in question possible. Philosophy does not take the side of the Athanasians against the Arians, or of the Calvinists against the Arminians, or *vice versa*; but she sweeps the ground from beneath the feet of both parties by destroying the false conception regarding the divine nature upon which they take their stand. Anthropomorphism, in some form or other, is at the foundation of all the doctrines regarding God's nature, and His relations to man which have taken their rise in the theology of the middle ages; and the great work of philosophy in the present day is to purify theology from the gross and incongruous elements of which it is so largely composed.

This function of philosophy must depend for its success upon an accurate psychology, and we have endeavoured to indicate briefly in this paper some of the results of a true psychological analysis. We have tried to point out, with the aid of Berkeley and other thinkers, the absurdity of regarding matter and mind as two independent entities existing by themselves; we have attempted to express what we mean by personality—a conscious-self in the midst of states and activities resulting from the relation of that self to various foreign powers, which may be collectively called the not-self. But this self is simply the unifying, harmonizing principle of these states and

activities ; and the existence of a self independent of its phenomena is inconceivable. And when we objectify this self and think of the person who gives unity and harmony to the universe of things, it is equally impossible for us to think of the universe as existing and running on its course apart from Him, or of Him existing and acting like some human mechanic, or governor, or judge, outside of the universe.

This result of the application of philosophy to theological problems, however, does not in any degree lessen the importance of the religious history of our race. The great utility of all religion is of a moral nature to free man from moral imperfection, to make him better fitted to perform the various duties of his existence. But as the universe itself has a unity, so the history of religion, if we thoroughly understand it, would present the same unity and harmony which characterize the whole of God's universe. That we are, in our present state of existence, capable of fully understanding it, we do not by any means maintain ; but every honest unprejudiced thinker must acknowledge the propriety of attempting to bring within the domain of law the religious as well as the social and physical facts of human history. If there are facts which cannot be accounted for upon rational principles, they must be referred to the transcendent character of the great problem which surpasses the ability of the finite mind to solve. But we must also believe that if we were acquainted with all the facts, and were in a position from which we could observe the hidden principles of things, we should be able to perceive a truly divine and harmonious law governing that wonderful complexity of physical, social, and religious facts which constitute the history of the universe.

DEGRADATION OR DEVELOPMENT.

Primitive Culture. By Edward B. Tylor. 2 vols. London. John Murray, 1871.

THE author of "Researches into the early History of Mankind" has given to the world a very valuable addition to the particular department of ethnology which he cultivates, in these volumes. He has made himself, by an enormous amount of labour and care, one of the most reliable authorities regarding the primeval customs and beliefs of mankind. The book before us contains a vast amount of materials which are partially digested into general theories, and which afford a foundation for a great deal of thought regarding most important subjects connected with the history of man. We shall make it our object in the present paper to study carefully the two opposite ethnological theories with which Mr. Tylor is occupied in this work, and which he has called the *degradation* and the *development* theory respectively.

It has been a widely prevalent belief in many parts of the world that the present race of men is composed of sadly degenerated descendants of primitive ancestors who were greatly superior to any present representatives of the human race. We need not now enquire into the origin of this belief; the fact of its existence and widespread prevalence is sufficient for our purpose. We can trace it in the worship of ancestors which is the characteristic religion of China and which prevails throughout the whole of the East; we can see its operation in all the legends of a golden age, when mortals were considered fit companions of the gods, and when exploits of wonder and deeds of daring were performed by men upon whom the favour of heaven had rested. The same belief has resulted in the modern theological doctrine of a primeval Paradise and a subsequent Fall, which lies at the foundation of a large part of mediæval theological speculation. In this doctrine, it is assumed that the first pair of the human race were created in a state of moral and intellectual perfection; that a full revelation was made to them of God's nature and laws; and that all the faculties and capacities of human nature were found in them in a state of perfection. It is assumed that they continued in this state of moral and intellectual perfection until, by the seduction of an evil spirit, they broke a certain apparently arbitrary commandment; that then they fell from their perfection and their purity, were driven from paradise and the presence of God, and became subject for the first time to death and "all the ills which flesh is heir to." It is assumed that after this, wickedness multiplied; that from henceforth the vast majority of men were cut off from all knowledge of God

except the traditions and relics of that original revelation which was made to man in his condition of perfection and happiness, which traditions and relics, however, were not sufficient for their moral and spiritual guidance ; and that to a very small minority, a chosen section of the human race, a gradual revelation was made which should, after many centuries had elapsed, be made known to the whole world for its enlightenment and salvation. Thus this theory maintains an absolute degeneration of the whole of the human race with reference to the original condition of our first ancestors ; while at the same time it admits of a certain relative progress, brought about by supernatural means, in a small section of the race, as compared with the vast majority who continued to sink, by the working of natural causes, into deeper and more hopeless degradation.

There are many, however, who hold a theory of degeneration of a much less extreme and more philosophical form, but not differing essentially from that now described. "It has practically resolved itself into two assumptions. First, that the history of culture began with the appearance on earth of a semi-civilized race of men ; and second, that from this stage culture has proceeded in two ways, backward to produce savages, and forward to produce civilized men." *

This degeneration theory has received many rude shocks in recent times from a great many different quarters. Geologists tell us that the earliest relics of human life upon the earth indicate that man's first condition was one of savagery, that he had nothing but rude stone implements, that he was ignorant of the use of fire, and that he advanced gradually through the stone, bronze, and iron ages to his present state of culture. Philologists give us a kind of evidence, limited in extent, which leads to a similar conclusion. History fails to establish the theory of degradation because it does not begin till comparatively recent times. Many of those who look upon the Bible as containing the oldest true account of man's existence, do not admit that it supports a doctrine of a primitive state of advancement and a subsequent decline. And finally, ethnology has collected an enormous mass of evidence bearing upon the question, which every careful and unprejudiced student must admit to have great influence in overturning that view of human degradation which has so long and in so many countries borne sway over the human mind.

The general thesis which Mr. Tylor endeavours to maintain in the two volumes before us, is thus stated in his own words :— "That the savage state in some measure represents an early condition of mankind, out of which the higher culture has gradually

* Ty. I, 31.

been developed or evolved, by processes still in regular operation as of old, the result showing that, on the whole, progress has prevailed over relapse." In making a brief review of the attempt to maintain this thesis, we find the work naturally dividing itself into four great portions. In the first of these evidence is collected from relics of primitive arts, such evidence as has been rendered familiar to modern readers by the science of Prehistoric Archæology. To this must be added the facts for the knowledge of which we are indebted to the study of language. This portion of the work is manifestly only preparatory to that which follows in the second part, and which is really the most important of them all, inasmuch as it furnishes the key by which the author explains all the psychological and other difficulties that meet him afterwards, namely, the doctrine of souls, or Animism. In the third great portion the doctrine of souls is merged into the more extensive and complicated doctrines of Spirits and Deities, leading us more immediately to a study of various systems of religion. Finally, we have a long and interesting chapter on religious cultus, being an account of important religious ceremonies, with their meaning and bearing upon the general subject of discussion. We shall give our attention successively to these four great classes of subjects.

I. In dealing with the great and various mass of facts which constitute the history of general human culture, the author appears to set out with two leading hypotheses which it is his object to establish. These hypotheses may be thus briefly stated : First, that there is amongst men a power of developing culture from the rudest beginnings ; and second, that culture thus developed has an invariable tendency to survive through succeeding generations. With reference to the first of these two propositions the author admits that a people may degenerate from a comparatively high state of culture, and also that elevation from a low state of culture is frequently the result of contact with more civilized races. Thus the out-lying offshoots of a great tribe or race are frequently placed in unfavourable circumstances, and, consequently, of necessity degenerate from the condition of their brethren who are more favourably situated. Thus also when a more civilized race comes into close contact with a less civilized one, a transmission of culture takes place by which the latter is elevated ; unless, indeed, the difference in culture between the two be so great that the latter is corrupted and ruined by acquiring the more artificial habits and inclinations of their powerful neighbours. But independently of these two occasional results of peculiar circumstances, there is amongst men a certain power—an inventive faculty—by which an instrument, an art, an ability is developed into something better. " Throughout the various topics of Prehistoric Archæology, the force and convergence of its testimony

upon the development of culture are overpowering. The relics discovered in gravel beds, caves, shell-mounds, terramares, lake-dwellings, earthworks, the results of an exploration of the superficial soil in many countries, the comparison of geological evidence, of historical documents, of modern savage life, corroborate and explain one another. The megalithic structures, menhirs, cromlechs, dolmens, and the like, only known to England, France Algeria, as the work of races of the mysterious past, have been kept up as matters of modern construction and recognized purpose among the ruder indigenous tribes of India. The series of ancient lake-settlements which must represent so many centuries of successive population fringing the shores of the Swiss lakes, have their surviving representatives among rude tribes of the East Indies, Africa, and South America. Outlying savages are still heaping up shell-mounds like those of far-past Scandinavian antiquity. The burial-mounds still to be seen in civilized countries have served at once as museums of early culture and as proofs of its savage or barbaric type. It is enough, without entering further here into subjects fully discussed in modern special works, to claim the general support given to the development theory of culture by Prehistoric Archæology." *

But the facts of Prehistoric Archæology are not, according to our author, the only ones which tend to establish the proposition in question. The history and antiquities of the useful arts attest the existence of a natural power of invention and development amongst all races of men. The appearance of any art in a particular locality, where it cannot be shown to be foreign in its origin, is a *primâ facie* evidence that it is indigenous amongst the people with whom it is found. And if its history could be traced, the probability is that it could be shown to be the result of a development from a still simpler and ruder original. The researches of philologists lead to a similar conclusion. Language grows, which means that men have a power of multiplying and rendering more expressive the signs of their feelings and thoughts. Those products of the imagination which we call myths also grow ; they are developed in accordance with natural laws which have already been partially discovered, but which still remain a subject of interesting scientific enquiry.

The second proposition which Mr. Tylor endeavours to establish is, that any element of culture once developed amongst a people has an invariable tendency to survive, even long after its meaning has been forgotten, and the general culture of the people has advanced far beyond it. There is certainly nothing very recondite in this proposition, nothing which would seem to a casual observer

* Primitive Culture I., 55.

to be at all striking. Yet its very simplicity and obviousness is an evidence of its scientific truth, and the number of facts and illustrations which the author has brought to bear upon it renders the discussion one of extreme interest. It is only a particular way of stating that principle of connection which binds together different generations of men into a harmonious unity. The fathers give to their children that knowledge and those habits which they have themselves inherited or developed. The children receive this inheritance with filial reverence, preserve it in some respects unchanged, develop it in some of its elements to suit their advancing civilization or changed circumstances. Frequently a particular ancestral custom or notion continues amongst a people long after the general condition of civilization has advanced far beyond that in which it originated. Such a custom or notion is called by our author a "survival;" it is a relic of the past, a fossilized product of a time and a people long gone by. As a survival it cannot be understood except through a knowledge of its history. A knowledge of its history furnishes likewise an important element towards the study of the past history and condition of the people.

These two principles which we have thus briefly examined furnish the key to the whole of the work before us. The author makes use especially of what, by a happy invention, he calls survivals for the purpose of solving many of the difficult problems with which he grapples. It would be impossible in the course of a brief article to do any justice to the wonderful variety of fact and circumstance which are made use of in the elaboration and support of his theory. All that we can do is to refer to some of the important results which he has reached and some of the consequences which follow from them. Carrying with us then the leading principles which he has unfolded in what we have called the first part of his work, we shall advance to the consideration of the second which comprehends the doctrine of Souls.

II. In this doctrine the author sees the essential element of religion. A people may not hold any clear belief regarding a Supreme Being, or future retribution, or any of the other great doctrines which constitute the religious belief of a higher civilization; but if they possess a simple belief in the existence of Spiritual Beings, either human or not human, they cannot be described as non-religious. This belief is the root-element of all religion; it appears to be almost universal in its prevalence; it is the original trunk upon which all the other elements of the higher religions are grafted. "The conception of a personal soul or spirit among the lower races may be defined as follows:—It is a thin, unsubstantial human image, in its nature a sort of vapour, film, or shadow; the cause of life and thought in the individual

it animates; independently possessing the personal consciousness and volition of its corporeal owner, past or present; capable of leaving the body far behind to flash swiftly from place to place; mostly impalpable and invisible, yet also manifesting physical power, and especially appearing to men waking or asleep as a phantasm separate from the body of which it bears the likeness; able to enter into, possess, and act in the bodies of other men, of animals, and even of things."*

How this conception of the soul has been attained may perhaps be inferred from the language used by savage and other races in describing it. It is frequently spoken of as a *shade* or shadow similar to that unsubstantial image caused by our bodies intercepting the light of the sun. It is spoken of as breath or air, thus being likened to that essential condition of life, the vital air which we breathe. It may be suggested by dreams and visions, by the passing of the breath from the body at death, and by many other similar phenomena of human life.

However this conception of the soul may have been acquired, it manifestly contains within itself elements which only require a little development and elaboration in order to produce some of the most important elements of the world's great religious systems. The soul, according to savage conceptions, is capable of departing from the body even during life, as for example, in dreams when the person fancies himself far away from the place where his body lies. At death, it is absolutely certain, that the soul does leave the body, but amongst few, if any, savage peoples is it believed to cease to exist. Various views are entertained regarding what becomes of it after it has left the body, and from the nature of these views we can draw important conclusions regarding the religious and moral condition of those who hold them. The highest moral conceptions of a people will undoubtedly exhibit themselves in connection with this belief regarding the future condition of the souls of their deceased friends or enemies. And Mr. Tylor has placed in the hands of moral philosophers, most important materials for supporting, or modifying, or over-throwing current ethical doctrines. Professor Calderwood, writing in the *Contemporary Review* of January 1872, thinks that "recent investigations of savage life are tending towards a confirmation of an intuitional philosophy, and what is now required to make this more manifest, is a rigid scrutiny of the vast mass of evidence now at command such as would make it possible to throw off the accidental, and clearly mark out the constant and uniform testimony of the several stages of life on the highway towards civilization." Probably this writer is somewhat biassed by his desire to support a

* Primitive Culture I. 387.

pet theory, and we think it is a pity that formidable names such as "intuitional," "development," and many others should exercise such a power over men whose sole object should be to reach the truth. We shall examine as thoroughly as we can in this brief article the ethical elements which show themselves in the vast mass of facts which Mr. Tylor has collected from the records of savage nations regarding the soul.

The leading essential fact connected with the soul's existence which is of world-wide distribution is, of course, that it continues to exist separte from the body which it leaves at death. Now in this continuity of existence, the soul may either be connected with some other physical organism, or may have a separate spiritual existence. "The one is the theory of the Transmigration of Souls, which has indeed risen from its lower stages to establish itself among the huge religious communities of Asia, great in history, enormous even in present mass, yet arrested and, as it seems, henceforth, unprogressive in its development; but the more highly educated world has rejected the ancient belief, and it now only survives in Europe in dwindling remnants. Far different has been the history of the other doctrine, that of the independent existence of the personal soul after the death of the body in a Future Life. Passing onward through change after change in the condition of the human race, modified and renewed in its long ethnic course, this great belief may be traced from its crude and primitive manifestations among savage races to its establishment in the heart of Christianity, where the faith in a future existence forms at once an inducement to goodness, a sustaining hope through suffering and across the fear of death, and an answer to the perplexed problem of the allotment of happiness and misery in this present world by the expectation of another world to set this right." *

With reference to the special ethical question which we wish to discuss, it makes very little difference to us whether we are dealing with beliefs regarding transmigration or continued independent spiritual existence. We find ethical notions prevailing amongst the one class of belief as well as the other. The character of an individual in his life in one body determines his condition in subsequent births as frequently as in the case of separate future existence. Now if we examine the notions of savages or barbarians regarding the state of the soul after death, we may arrange them apparently into three different classes. First, we have those notions in which the soul is represented as enjoying a mere continuance of its existence in the present life without any material change except that of being separated from the body, or joined to another similar body. Secondly, we have another class of notions in which certain qualities or conditions not properly ethical, such as bravery, rank, endurance,

* II., 2.

determine the future state of the disembodied or transmigrated soul. And finally, we see amongst many peoples, especially those approaching the higher culture, a distinct recognition of moral retribution in a future life, the good being rewarded and the evil punished. Let us see what we can learn from this analysis.

A glance at these classes of notions regarding a future life discovers a transition to a distinct ethical consciousness; but in the first and simplest theories there appears to be no element which we now recognize as ethical. A study of the illustrations which Mr. Tylor has collected bearing upon the simple continuance theory will lead us to the conclusion, however, that there are certain primary elements which form, as it were, the ground-work upon which moral principles may afterwards be based. Wild Indian tribes look forward to a land where they shall engage in labours and enjoy pleasures similar to those of the present life. They collect together in their imagination all that is good, all that they take pleasure in; they form with this a conception of an ideal existence better than the reality which is around them; they project this ideal image into the future life and believe firmly that they will one day realize it.

Now there is not much here that *we* would consider ethical; but there appear to be the same principles in operation which in a higher culture produce true ethical doctrines. There is the formation of an ideal conception of life—something to be aimed at, and to be hoped for. There is a gathering up in the mind of all that is thought to be best and happiest in human life, and a distinct hope of attaining to it. Now what is the highest aim of a moral life, as we understand it, but the striving after an ideal? And if our ideal be higher, more complex, and more perfect than that of a wild Indian, still the mental principles involved appear to be essentially the same.

We now ascend a step higher and observe a second class of notions regarding a future life in which there is an important element added to that which we have been considering. The life which now is continues beyond the grave; there is here also a projected ideal of that which is most esteemed in the present life. But in addition to this there is a distinct recognition of a causal connection between present character and future condition. Those who have been brave in battle, who have shown fortitude in suffering, who have occupied an exalted rank, are rewarded by a life in every way desirable in the spirit land. Thus the enjoyment of the ideal life is considered the appropriate reward of the most estimable character. And thus there is a distinct recognition of a better and a worse in human character, of something considered noble which we should seek after, and of something considered unworthy which we should shun. We do not find here any

such abstract ideas as right or wrong, the good or virtue. But we do find certain qualities and conditions which are considered worthy of approbation, and deserving of reward. And undoubtedly this conception of the worthiness of these qualities and conditions must practically operate as a rule of life; and therefore with reference to the mode of its operation it is essentially moral.

We cannot, therefore, agree with Mr. Tylor when he says that "on the whole the evidence tends toward the opinion that the genuine savage doctrine of the future life either involves no moral retribution, or accepts it only at a rudimentary stage." * On the contrary, we think that the principles which we have seen in operation are essentially moral. The ethical standard—the ideal life—of the savage is not that of the more cultured man. But still there is an ideal life either as a present object of approbation or projected into the future; and the very existence of this ideal object of approbation and desire constitutes a moral aim in life.

Undoubtedly the moral elements of such doctrines are rudimentary; that is to say, the moral standard has not been developed, the idea of abstract good or virtue has not been elaborated, the notion of duty, as distinguished from particular actions which one should do and a particular character which is deserving of approbation, has not been conceived. But there is very distinctly exhibited a sort of frame or setting into which these developed ethical products may be fitted as soon as they are formed. As knowledge increases and experience is gained, the idea of a worthy life may be modified; but still as an ideal it must always occupy the same position. The abstract ideas of right and wrong, the good and evil, are, in the higher culture, distinctly seen, whereas in the lower they are not; but the principles in accordance with which these ideas are formed appear to be at work in the lowest culture, and the mode in which these ideas influence the life finds a close analogy in the lowest culture. The ethical elements, therefore, which we would vindicate for savages do not consist in those developed abstract ideas of right and wrong with which we are familiar. They consist rather in certain modes of thought—what Kant would call Forms—certain ways of looking at life and the aim of life; the matter of these forms being supplied by an ever varying and continually accumulating experience. The most primitive and therefore most essential of these modes or forms of ethical thought is the formation of an ideal life, an actually unrealized life in spirit-land. Perhaps this ideal is first formed in projection, as it were, into the future, and afterwards recalled into the present

* II., 83.

and applied to certain qualities and conditions of actual life. However this may be, the next important form of ethical thought appears to be the connection of the ideal life as a consequence with the actual life as realized. And the only other step necessary to the completion of ethical doctrine is the formation of certain moral ideas as right and wrong, which constitute the matter that experience supplies to fit in to those primitive forms which we have been considering. These abstract moral ideas, however, are found only in religious systems of peoples who have advanced considerably on the high road to civilization. Amongst the ancient Egyptians, the well-known "Book of the Dead" is the record of the existence of an idea of virtue and a belief in future retribution. In the hymns of the Rig-veda abstract moral ideas are continually appearing, showing that the writers of those hymns had advanced to tolerably matured ethical conceptions. As to the manner in which these moral ideas are formed, the historical study which we are conducting does not inform us. They appear more or less clearly expressed in various systems of higher culture. They apparently take the place of other cruder and more concrete conceptions which form the ideal ethical life of more primitive peoples. They are not, therefore, essential elements of universal ethical doctrine. That which is essential must be formal, and we have endeavoured to indicate briefly and crudely what we think are the important formal principles.

It is with regret that we leave the discussion of this part of the subject, as we think that historical analysis alone can decide some of the disputed questions in morals. The old battle-field between the theory of intuition and others opposed to it appears to be shifted ; and moralists would be much better occupied in endeavouring to make an accurate investigation and analysis of the ethical phenomena of history, than in engaging in never-ending speculative discussions about questions which mere discussion can never decide. We now advance to a study of the doctrine of spirits.

III. We have collected in this third part most important elements for the study of what has been called the natural history of religions. In old days when the adherents of every great religious system made an exhaustive division of religions into the absolutely true and the absolutely false, viewing his own religious system as the sole representative of the former class, there was not believed to be that community of principles and origin between different religious systems which scientific investigation is now demonstrating. But careful and unbiassed enquiry is gradually leading men to the conviction that religious systems are not isolated phenomena, that there is not one of them which is not intimately connected at many points with all the others which have preceded it or co-exist with it. This conviction is at the foundation of the various modern

attempts to construct a science of religions. No science of any series of phenomena can be constructed unless those phenomena are recognized as governed by laws and connected together upon some rational and discoverable principles. The work before us cannot claim to be a science of religions ; but it contains a great and varied collection of facts systematically arranged, which must be most valuable to the professed student of theology. The general principle in subordination to which the facts are arranged is expressed in the following sentence :—"It seems as though the conception of a human soul, when once attained to by man, served as a type or model on which he framed not only his ideas of other souls of lower grade, but also his ideas of spiritual beings in general, from the tiniest elf that sports in the long grass up to the Heavenly Creator and Ruler of the world, the Great Spirit !" * The facts which are adduced appear, in a general way, to bear out the truth of this theory.

The most direct and immediate employment of the conception of the human soul in religion is, of course, manes-worship or the worship of the souls of deceased ancestors. In this case the objects of worship are actual human souls, existing separately from any material embodiment. But in the great majority of lower religious forms the spirit is supposed capable of becoming embodied, of connecting itself more or less permanently with some material object. Thence arises the theory of possession, of spirits, usually malign, taking up their abode in human or animal bodies and speaking and acting through them. Thence arises Fetishism, in which spiritual beings, good or evil, are supposed to be embodied in particular objects, to act through them, to communicate by them. Thence arises the worship of "stocks and stones," believed to be an embodiment of some spiritual agent. From this origin, by a little development, springs the practice of idolatry, which involves essentially two ideas ; that of the idol being, in a sense, a representation of the unseen spirit, and also its embodiment or abode. The various forms of nature-worship are but different manifestations of the same ground-conception. The great powers of nature are personified, considered to be exhibitions of the power of some spiritual beings analogous to the human soul ; and these occupy a ruling position in the great hierarchy of polytheism. From this point, the exercise of the generalising power leads either to a religious dualism of good and evil as amongst the Persians, or to a kind of monotheism in which some one of the great deities is elevated to a supreme position, the others being degraded to the rank of lower deities, or angels or demons. Into any criticism of the details

* II., 100.

which are brought to support these positions we cannot at present enter, but shall make some general observations which occur to us regarding their influence upon current theological beliefs.

1. If the facts contained in these volumes be true, and the inferences naturally following from them consequently well founded, the hard and fast line of demarcation which has been supposed to separate Christianity from other and lower forms of religion must, to a great extent, be obliterated. Many modern Christians have been accustomed to look upon Christianity as the only divine religion, all others being so-called human religions, as the only absolutely true religion, all others being absolutely false, or if true at all containing only so much truth as has been received by tradition from some primeval revelation, or as has been excogitated by the natural reason of man. Such, however, is not the conception of the relations of Christianity to other religious systems which we should form from the book before us. We find that there are innumerable beliefs connected with religion which appear to take their rise in their crudest form amongst savages or barbarians, which reappear more or less purified amongst people of higher stages of civilization, until finally they are incorporated in the Christian system. The mass of evidence at our disposal appears to lead to the conclusion that there is an actual historical connection between lower and higher systems of religious beliefs, that the former have formed as it were the stepping-stones by which the minds of men have risen to the latter, and that all religious conceptions have advanced and become purified, from our human point of view of course, by keeping pace with the progress made amongst the other mental and moral elements of our constitution. The strangely complicated character of human life and human history forbids us to isolate any one element as the religious, and fancy that it can be implanted and make progress independently of all the others ; it forbids us also to isolate any historical period or people and fancy that they drew their religious beliefs from a source entirely different from that which is the common origin of all religious belief. We may maintain strenuously that Christianity is the best and truest and purest form of religious life that the world has ever seen, and also maintain just as strenuously that the most essential elements of Christian belief are found more or less crudely exhibited amongst peoples whom we look upon as heathens.

2. As another conclusion from this investigation, we point out that the distinction usually drawn between natural and revealed religion is untenable. "The distinction beween natural and revealed religion, as commonly understood, does not mean simply that there are truths which are peculiar to revelation ; or that Christianity has communicated to us what we could not have learnt from

any other source of knowledge, and has exerted on the human spirit a divine and holy influence unattained and unattainable by any other moral agency; for, so understood, the distinction does not seem to admit of question. But the notion generally attached to the phrase 'natural religion' is that there are certain religious ideas, principles, doctrines, which are within the province of human reason, and have actually been evolved by it, as distinguished from certain other ideas and doctrines which lie altogether beyond that province, and which can be known only by a special authoritative communication from heaven. Examining the contents of our religious belief, it is supposed that we can discern in it certain elements which are not exclusively Christian, which the human mind is capable of excogitating from its own resources without supernatural aid, which were actually recognized by thoughtful men before Christianity, and are still believed by many who do not accept the peculiar or characteristic doctrines of the gospel." In this distinction thus eloquently stated in a recent lecture by Dr. Caird for the purpose of condemning it, we have a position which cannot be maintained consistently with the facts and conclusions contained in the volumes under review. All religion is in a sense "natural," as all religion may be in another sense revealed. All religion is relative to the faculties of our human nature and is the expression of our most deeply felt spiritual wants and longings, and is therefore in that sense natural. All true religion, likewise, should have reference to something out of ourselves, to something higher and better than ourselves, should be to our minds an interpretation of the highest meaning of things around us, and of our own lives in relation to them, and in this sense should be a true revelation in our hearts of the divine. Hence, if we would wish to understand one religion in its fulness we must study others which have prepared for and led up to it. And in making this study it will not do to abstract certain elements supposed to be natural, rational, or the reverse, and arrange them in different bundles and call them by different names. This will be doing violence to the facts of history, to our own nature, and to truth. We must take the elements of our human nature to constitute one whole, and the religious facts of history to be a great harmonious unity, if we would wish to understand the nature, the powers, and the complex life which we possess.

3. The history of religions is of something essentially subjective, a history of the subjective notions and beliefs which have borne sway over the minds of men. It matters not whether we turn our attention to the lowest or the highest form of religious belief, this is true. The external material facts of the universe are everywhere and at all times pretty much the same. The exter-

nal events of man's life have varied greatly, it is true, at different times and in different countries of the world; but the variation has been chiefly in accidental circumstances. Religious history and progress are essentially subjective, although expressing themselves in objective forms. This applies to all religion, whether so-called natural or revealed, as well as to revelation, the source from which religion is excited and advanced. Revelation is an inward light in the heart of man, enabling man to interpret the meaning of external nature, or to put a meaning upon otherwise, to him, meaningless phenomena. The language of any so-called book-revelation is but the expression recorded for the use of after times of the religious light and life which were glowing and throbbing in the hearts of those by whom it was spoken. Indeed a so-called revelation which is simply external, a series of words uttered and heard, an object presented to the senses, an event taking place must be entirely meaningless and useless, unless they serve to call forth a response from the heart, unless they are caught hold of and interpreted and invested with meaning and life by the mind of the individual to whom they appear.

IV. In the study of the history of religious cultus we must carry with us the results which we have already reached. We have had certain materials laid before us from which we may learn something as to the *kind* of experience which first gave rise to the conceptions of the human soul, of the future existence of that soul, and of the ideal life in the future or in the present which is the object of ethical consciousness. We have seen that this conception of the soul furnishes the type upon which the conception of the more extensive world of spirits is based, a conception which rises finally to a spirit supreme over all. There remains to be considered the doctrines and customs which have arisen out of the relation believed to exist, and the intercourse held to be carried on between the human soul and other spiritual beings. The most important elements of this religious cultus are prayer and sacrifice.

There is nothing in the conceptions of either prayer or sacrifice which could not naturally arise out of the belief that men are related to other spiritual beings in something the same way as they are related to one another. The prayers which rude barbarous tribes present to their deities are pretty much the same as the requests which they make to persons in authority amongst themselves; that is, they are formed after the same model, conceived in the same spirit, although of course the objects after which they seek are different. We should naturally expect therefore that prayer, being the expression of the most deeply felt wants of men, would vary greatly amongst different peoples according to the nature of the ideas which pre-

dominate in their minds and their general state of culture. Where the minds of the people have not arisen above utilitarian conceptions we need not expect anything higher in their prayers. Where there have been formed distinctly ethical ideas of right and wrong we may certainly expect to find these, if any where, in the petitions presented to the deity. The few specimens of prayers collected by Mr. Tylor are sufficient to bear out the general theory which he wishes to support. But we think that a much more extended study of the prayers of different peoples might result in important discoveries in the history of religious and moral thought. The examination of this field of research still requires to be performed, and when it is thoroughly carried out by a competent scholar we have no doubt but a great deal of light may be thrown upon obscure questions connected with the history of humanity.

The custom of presenting sacrifices follows just as naturally as prayer from the general conception of the relation between man and higher spirits. And the meaning of the sacrifice, that which it is designed to express, must of course vary according to the idea in the worshipper's mind of his relations to the deity. We have many instances in which the sacrifice presented is considered to be only a gift designed for the use of the deity with a view of pleasing him or securing his favour. We have other cases in which, besides this, there is involved the idea of rendering homage to him as superior. And finally when moral ideas, and the conception of God as supreme have arisen, the meaning of sacrifice becomes much more complicated. It involves the idea of propitiation, of giving up to God something valuable to the worshipper as an expiation of sin committed. Thence arises the sacrifice of children, the cutting off of members of the person's own body, and the presentation of other things valuable to the sacrificer. In this is involved also the idea of substitution, that the sacrifice presented is a substitute for the life of the sacrificer which has been in truth forfeited by the commission of sin, but that a merciful deity is willing to accept some other offering as a substitute or as a symbol of the life which ought to be sacrificed.

All these and other ideas involved in religious cultus are abundantly illustrated in the chapter before us. Many of these ideas have found their way up into Christianity ; many of them are still incorporated in the theological systems of Christian churches ; some of them have been rejected, some of them are now being rejected by the increasing enlightenment of the modern world. Let us see what conclusions we can draw from this progress of religious history.

1. No single phase of religious thought appears to be final. Every religious conception is a successor more or less purified and

developed to some one that preceded it ; and is itself a stepping-stone to some higher and, it may be, truer conception which is to follow it. Every religious system must contain in it materials taken from other religious systems out of which it may have sprung ; and is liable, nay, judging from the history of religions, certain to become developed or purified or, it may be, corrupted into something else. The doctrine of the development of religious belief is now a firmly established scientific principle, whatever view we may take as to the manner in which that development is brought about, or as to the standard by which it should be judged.

2. Consequently it is not proper for the adherents of any system of religion to rest in that system as absolute truth. As far as the human mind is concerned there appears to be no such thing as absolute truth, or at least to human faculties in our present state of existence the knowledge of absolute truth is unattainable. It is right that men should seek to know what is true and good ; it is right that they should reject what will not stand the test of examination, and that they should receive as an article of belief what their intellect and conscience approve. But to rest in any system of religious beliefs and to cease searching after something still better and higher is a sign not of the culminating point of a religious character, but rather of religious death.

3. Religious beliefs appear to be valuable chiefly from their influence upon moral character. Almost as soon as moral ideas began to be formed they were connected with religion. And the beliefs of religion affording, as they do, a sanction and a powerful motive to the practice of that which has been regarded as virtue, have exercised a very powerful influence in the formation of morals. We say this of all religious beliefs whether we regard them as being true or not. The argument that the good moral results of a religious faith prove the truth of the principles of the religion is a false one. Granting that correct moral ideas have been once formed, the presence of a strong religious belief will have a powerful effect in stamping as it were those moral ideas upon the character. But this is true of all religious beliefs, unless there be involved in them elements essentially immoral.

But we must leave the subject with the reader. The book must be read in order to be appreciated, and deserves to be carefully read. And it should be particularly interesting to people in India who have so many opportunities of becoming acquainted with the customs and beliefs of tribes comparatively low in the ranks of civilization and of adding to the amount of available knowledge regarding the subjects we have been discussing.

ART. VII.—THE BRAHMA SAMAJ. *(Independent Section.)*

1.—*Brahmic Intuition.* By the Rev. S. Dyson : 1866.

2.—*The Brahma Samaj Vindicated.* 2nd Edition : 1868.

3.—*The Brahma Samaj of India : A Lecture delivered at Dehra Doon :* 1870.

4.—*Deism and Theism ; or, Rationalism and Faith :* 1869.

5.—*Essential Principles of Brahma Dharma :* 1873.

6.—*The Unreasonableness of Brahmaism.* By B. L. Chandra, 2nd Edition : 1873.

7.—*Brahmic Dogmas, in five Parts.* By the Rev. S. Dyson : 1874.

THE writings, whose titles we place at the head of this article, extend over a period of several years, and form important stepping-stones along the recent history of the Brahma Samáj in India. We do not propose to enter into a detailed criticism of any of these writings, but shall devote some attention to the subject with which they all profess to deal. The Brahma Samáj is, in some respects, the most important, indigenous, religous movement in India, and its future history must be a matter of considerable interest to all reflecting minds. All friends of progress and of truth would like to see the supporters of this movement taking a position in their native land worthy of those who profess to be seekers after and promoters of the truth. It is admitted on all hands that if the millions of India are to be civilized, it must be through the influence of reformers who have sprung up from amongst themselves. The influence of foreigners may do much in the way of stimulating and directing the efforts of the people of India ; but it is only the efforts of the people themselves which can be effectual in bringing about such a change as can deserve to be called a national regeneration. We propose to direct our reader's attention to the present condition of the Samáj, and to offer some reflections which may enable those who have not paid much attention to the subject to get an intelligent view of the Brâhmic position, and may, perhaps, be of some service to the Brahmists themselves.

When the Brahma movement was first brought prominently before the public, a great deal of hope was entertained as to its future advance on the road towards truth ; but now the novelty of the movement has departed, public interest in it has flagged and people are not so sanguine as to the good which it is destined to accomplish. A great deal of work, however, has yet to be done

in India, and the Brahma Samáj has it in its power to do a large share of that work if it only has the sincerity and the honesty and the life which are necessary to the accomplishment of anything truly great.

The permanence and vitality of any movement depends to a great extent upon the *truth* intellectual and moral involved in it. For notwithstanding the widespread depravity of human nature, there is in the human mind an inherent love of truth; and any system will naturally continue amongst men in proportion to the amount of truth contained in it. It is a matter of importance therefore to the supporters of any system or movement that they should examine carefully the nature of their foundations, to see whether they have a basis which is really capable of supporting their superstructure.

The most vigorous attack against the Brahma system which has been made has been conducted by the Rev. S. Dyson, and is to be found in the various pamphlets of which he is the author. That learned and able writer has examined both the basis upon which Brahmaism rests, and the superstructure of dogma which has been erected upon it. There is a nervous vigour and sharpness in Mr. Dyson's style of writing which is not likely to conciliate those whom he attacks, and which also renders it difficult for them to return a satisfactory answer. He has carefully studied the principles of Brahmaism, and brings to his criticism of those principles an accurate knowledge of European philosophy and theology, a firm but reasonable belief in Christian doctrine, and an earnest desire to forward the interests of what he believes to be the truth in opposition to what he believes to be error. Consequently those, whose principles he is criticising, need not expect, and do not obtain, any quarter in the attack which he conducts. Whether this attack will cause any modification of their principles remains to be seen; if it leads them to examine more carefully into the foundations of their faith, good service, we hope, will be done to them, to India, and to the cause of truth.

The stand-point from which Mr. Dyson criticises the Brâhmic basis and dogmas is that of a moderate Christian orthodoxy. Assuming, as nearly as possible, his point of view, we propose to examine the principles of the Brahma Samáj, referring where necessary to recent publications concerning them. And we shall find it convenient to divide our examination into two parts, in the first of which we shall examine the foundation on which Brahmaism professes to rest, and in the second we shall consider the superstructure of intellectual or ethical doctrine which has been erected upon that foundation.

In "Essential Principles of Brahma Dharma," published in 1873 under the authority of the Brahma Samáj, the source of the

Brahmic principles is thus described: "The true scriptures writen by the hand of God are two—the volume of nature, and the natural ideas inplanted in the mind. The wisdom, power, and mercy of the Creator are written in golden letters on the universe. We know Him by studying His works. Secondly, all the fundamental truths about God, immortality, and morality, are established in the constitution of men, as primitive and self-evident convictions. Intuitive faith is the root of Brahmaism." This statement of the basis of Brahmaism is but slightly different from that which has appeared in their previous publications. The works of God in the universe are added to the intuitions of the human mind as the revealers of the nature and will of God. But it is admitted by everyone, whose opinion is worthy of consideration, that the objects and wonderful contrivances, and laws of nature speak to us of God *only after* we have imposed upon them conceptions of God taken from our own minds. No human being ever saw God in the universe, until his own imagination put his conceptions of God into the universe. This addition, then, of the works of the universe as the basis of Brahmaism does not extend that basis in the slightest degree. And we are thus free from the necessity of bestowing any further consideration upon this extension of the Bráhmic foundation.

The principal basis upon which Bráhmists attempt to establish this faith, called by them intuition, has been ably and thoroughly examined by Mr. Dyson in his pamphlet upon "Brahmic Intuition," and we shall not attempt in our short space to discuss the subject as fully as he has done. There are few words of the vocabulary of philosophy which have been so much abused as this favourite of the Brahmists, intuition. Almost every philosopher and theologian will admit that we have certain amount of intuitive or immediate knowledge. Certain objects and certain relations are known to us immediately, and our knowledge of them is our only guarantee of their existence and character. But it requires the greatest care joined with a considerable degree of critical ability to enable one to distinguish between that knowledge which is intuitive and that which is inferred, derived or complex. The uncritical common sense of the older writers of the Scottish school, as Reid and Stewart, included amongst the "original principles of our constitution," many elements which have no more right to be called original than our present belief in the sphericity of the earth. That eloquent Frenchman Victor Cousin, who has written more nonsense about spontaneous convictions, original principles, *et cetera*, than any other modern European writer, declares to be intuitively known to him, what Sir W. Hamilton, who is by no means behind hand in the number of his primary intuitions, does not admit to be known at all. But we must confess that we

have seen nowhere else such utterly reckless statements regarding the alleged contents of our intuitions as are to be found in the Brâhmic writings. . . . "All the fundamental truths about God, immortality and morality are established in the constitution of men as primitive and self-evident convictions." (Essential Principles, p. 2.) Really this is more than might have been expected even from an exuberant oriental imagination. Surely, if all this is given to us in "primitive and self-evident convictions," we ought to expect as little difference of opinion amongst men regarding "God, immortality, and morality" as we actually find amongst them regarding the principles of geometry. But we should say that not even a Brahmist with all his oriental extravagance would venture upon the assertion that there is as little difference. We may, perhaps, have misread the Brahmic "Essential Principles." We observe the statement is made regarding *fundamental* truths. And possibly the truths regarding God immortality and morality which are *fundamental*, are very few in number and simple in their character. But this statement is taken from a little pamphlet entitled "*Essential* Principles of Brahma Dharma" and we naturally conclude that the principles contained in it are intended to be included in the class of "primitive and self-evident convictions." On the first page of this pamphlet we find: "God is the first cause of the universe. There was nothing before. By His will and creative power He created all objects and beings, and He upholds them as their primary power and life. He is spirit not matter. He is perfect, infinite and eternal. He is omnipresent, omnipotent, omniscient, all-merciful, all-blissful, and holy. He is our Father, Preserver, Master, King, and Saviour. He is one without a second." The next paragraph gives us the Brahmists, "primitive and self-evident convictions" regarding immortality. "The soul is immortal. Death is only the dissolution of the body; the soul lives everlastingly in God. There is no new birth after death; the life hereafter is only the continuation and development of the present life. Each soul departs from this world with its virtues and sins; and gradually advances in the path of eternal progress while realizing their effects."

Now we are not at present concerned with the consideration of the *value* of these opinions regarding God and immortality, or their coincidence or difference with the corresponding doctrines of other religious systems. What we wish to point out is, that if all these "convictions" are given amongst the intuitions of the Brâhmic consciousness, either they must mean something different by the word intuition than is meant by it in the philosophical writings of the present day, or their minds must be differently constituted from those of the rest of mankind, or they are so loose and inaccurate in their reasonings or their language, that it is a waste of time

to engage in discussion with them. As far as our present argument is concerned, it makes little difference how the generally received doctrines regarding God and immortality originated. No one, whose opinion is worthy of consideration, believes that such doctrines as those quoted above from "Essential Principles" are "primitive and self-evident convictions" of the human mind. Christians believe that the doctrines which they hold regarding God and immortality" have been *revealed* at different times and in various manners during the past religious history of the world. Many who do not adopt the orthodox Christian view, and have given much attention to the history of religious opinions, believe that the current doctrines regarding God and immortality have gradually *grown up* out of cruder and more primitive beliefs in accordance with the ordinary laws of human mental and social progress. Amongst European philosophers and theologians there are many who place great importance upon intuition as a source of knowledge. But we know of none who, adopting such a crude uncritical method as that of the Brahmists, heap together in delightful confusion such a number of doctrines currently received amongst civilized people, and stamp them all with the common brand of "Bráhmic dogmas"—"primitive and self-evident convictions."

There can be no doubt but intuition is a most important source of knowledge, and a system of philosophy or theology which ignores it must be essentially defective. But those who claim more for intuition then can be maintained, only injure the cause which they are endeavouring to advance. And we would counsel the Brahmas, if they think our counsel worth listening to, to examine more carefully and critically the basis of their belief, and not to bring contempt upon such an important source of knowledge as intuition by crediting it with such a multiplicity of reilgious beliefs as they have collected together in their "Essential Principles."

II.—In proceeding briefly to review some of the "Bráhmic dogmas" we first give Mr. Dyson's classification which evidences a thorough and careful study of Bráhmic writings. "The doctrines of Brahmism thus comprised within the range of our enquiry will be classified as follows:—

I.—Doctrines of Brahmism distinctive *in themselves.*

II.—Doctrines of Brahmism distinctive *indirectly, in regard of the warrant on which they are professedly accepted.*

III.—Doctrines of Brahmism which are *verbal caricatures* of supernatural facts and doctrines of Christianity.

I.—Belonging to the first class we have, among others, the following dogmas, professing to be as Brahmic principles, statements of (1) *facts* and (2) *facts which are "primitive and self-evident convictions."*

1. The supernatural altogether is *an impossibility.* This

sweeps away at one stroke both the facts and evidences of Christianity.

2. Prayer for spiritual blessings is efficacious, but prayer for physical blessings is *not.*

3. Forgiveness of man's sins by God is an impossibility.

. . . . . .

5. Repentance is the punishment of sin, and no other is possible.

6. No sinner can be punished till he is conscious of his sin, and this consciousness depends upon his own free will.

. . . . . .

8. Repentance which brings us back to God is the only atonement.

. . . . . .

10. Hence, as every sinner must be adequately punished, *i.e.*, every sinner must adequately repent, therefore, every sinner must be saved. Punishment, repentance, and salvation are all the same process regarded from different points of view.

II.—Under the second head there are :—

1. The Unity, Personality and Perfections of God.
2. The Fatherhood of God and the Brotherhood of man.
3. Man's immortality.
4. The Christian doctrine of creation.

III.—Under the third head we have :—

1. Bráhmic "Unity in Trinity."
2. Bráhmic "Incarnation ;" Bráhmic "Revelation," Bráhmic "Scripture," Bráhmic "Inspiration," Bráhmic "Kingdom of God," "Gospel," "Regeneration," "Redemption," "Atonement," &c.

These various doctrines are collected by Mr. Dyson chiefly from the lectures and addresses of Babu K. C. Sen delivered in England and in India. The most astounding fact connected with them is that they are all held to be self-evident and intuitive convictions of the human mind. And in consequence of the Brahmists holding this perfectly insane position, Mr. Dyson obtains an easy victory over them. The position of the Brahmist appears to be something like the following. They have been awakened from the darkness and superstition of Hinduism by coming into contact with Western intelligence and life. They belong to a proud and sensitive nation, and are unwilling to acknowledge the intellectual and religious benefits which have been communicated to them from without. They are especially unwilling to acknowledge in Christianity the source of the moral and religious enlightenment by which they are being influenced. They consequently wish to establish for themselves an independent basis on which to build the intellectual, moral and religious truths and principles which they have succeeded in imbibing.

They have read some of the popular European philosophers, such as Cousin, and are fascinated with their eloquent declamations about eternal truths and self-evident convictions. They have read some of the popular free-thinking theologians and are delighted with the assistance which they give them in their attacks upon orthodox Christianity, and in building up something which will be distinctive of themselves. Familiar as we are with the loose inconsequent thinking and the declamatory tendencies of young Bengal, we can easily understand how, out of these elements, there should proceed the incongruous medley of "dogmas" which Mr. Dyson so severely criticises.

Without entering into a detailed review of Mr. Dyson's criticism of the Bráhmic positive dogmas, we propose to refer briefly to the Bráhmic doctrines regarding (1) The Supernatural, (2) Prayer, and (3) Divine forgiveness.

1. The Brahmists are by no means alone in denying the possibility of the supernatural. Various classes of thinkers have made the same denial for various reasons. Spinoza and the pantheists have denied the possibility of the supernatural upon the ground that God is immersed, as it were, in the universe, forming an essential element of it, working in all its forces in accordance with its laws, and consequently incapable of interfering with it *ab extra*. This position we can understand, and are able to put ourselves intellectually into the stand-point of those who maintain it. But this is not the position of the Brahmists. They profess to believe in a personal God, the Creator and the Governor of the world.

There are others again who do not exactly deny the possibility of the supernatural, but who affirm their disbelief in it upon the ground that the uniform experience of mankind has led to such a strong belief in the uniformity of law, that the human testimony adduced in favour of the supernatural fails to shake the opposing belief. This is the position of many modern scientists whose minds have been engrossed with the study of physical phenomena, where law is seen most clearly to prevail. But it cannot for a moment be pretended that the Brahmists ground their denial of the supernatural on this basis, since they belong to a race notoriously inexpert at physical sciences, and, moreover, they profess to ground all their doctrines upon the self-evident principles of the human constitution. We do not at present express any opinion as to the possibility or impossibility of the supernatural; we simply point out that we do not see any reason why the Brahmists should deny its possibility. They profess to base their doctrines upon the principles of the human constitution, and we do not know of any of these principles which, apart from experience and reasoning, could possibly be the foundation of such a denial.

Moreover, they believe in the existence of a personal God, not immersed in the universe, but the Creator and Governor of the universe; and we find ourselves incapable of understanding the mental constitution of those who, from this stand point, conclude that the supernatural is impossible. We should recommend the Brahmists to seek for greater consistency in their system of doctrines.

2. The Brahmists deny the efficacy of prayer for physical blessings, but admit its efficacy for spiritual blessings. They base this denial and this admission upon the self-evident convictions of the human mind. At the same time with this denial and this admission there is held the existence of a personal God who loves the rational beings whom He has created.

Now, in the first place, we fail to see how they can consistently deny the one and admit the other. We are not aware of any self-evident conviction which makes such a distinction between the physical and the spiritual. In fact these two elements of our nature are so intimately connected that even in our advanced period of the world's history we sometimes find it difficult to distinguish between them. And certainly in more primitive conditions of human society we find no trace of the presence of the self-evident convictions of the Brahmists. Primitive man seeks chiefly after the physical, and has not the slightest doubt but his deity hears and can answer his prayers. And as we trace the history of man and reach more cultivated and enlightened times, we find certainly changes in human conceptions of God's nature, but we do not see the working of those intuitions to which the Brahmists appeal. As long as men continue to believe in the existence of a personal God, who is the Father of His rational creatures and the Governor of His universe, there appears no sufficient reason why they should limit His power or His goodness in the way in which the Brahmists do in their doctrine of prayer.

And as a matter of fact those who deny the efficacy of prayer, implicitly deny the existence of a personal God and Father. If there exist a being independent of the universe who holds to men a relation something analogous to that of a father to his children, there appears nothing in the nature of the case or in our mental constitution to forbid us asking Him for any blessings, physical or spiritual, which may be for our good. If the Brahmists, therefore, wish to be consistent, they must modify *either* their doctrine of a personal God *or* their doctrine of prayer.

3. According to the Brâhmic writings, divine forgiveness of human sin is impossible. This also is based upon the fundamental convictions of the human mind. But the connection between the basis and the super-imposed doctrine we fail to see. The Brahmists, in imitation of some western writers, are fond of inveighing

against the opinions, supposed to be held by Christians regarding divine anger and divine forgiveness, as being anthropomorphic and unworthy of God. Anthropomorphism is the bugbear of many who wish to differ from ordinary received conceptions of God's nature. But those who ridicule anthropomorphism should ask themselves the question whether it is possible in any other way to form conceptions of God at all. God is not directly known to us, and we can only form conceptions of that which is not immediately known by clothing it with forms taken from the known. Our own human nature is the highest and noblest nature with which we are directly acquainted ; and when we attempt to think of the Creator and Governor of the universe, it appears to us that we can do so most worthily by forming our conceptions after the model of the highest order of beings with which we are acquainted. We may and ought to be ready to admit that our conceptions thus formed are imperfect and inadequate ; but if we try to think of a personal God at all we can do so in no other way than in that way which is stigmatised as anthropomorphic. A purified and reasonable anthropomorphism is not only the highest and best form in which we can conceive God, but it is the *only* way in which we can conceive *God as a personal Creator and Father*. If, then, we are to retain our belief in a personal God we cannot give up anthropomorphism in some shape or other. Nor are the Brahmists free from anthropomorphism in the conceptions of the deity which they present in their writings. They represent God as a *personal Being* who is filled with *love* to all the creatures of His hand. Now, here is unquestionably a *human* feeling attributed to God ; but with a strange inconsistency the correlative feeling which gives to love its meaning is denied to Him. God is capable of loving, but is incapable of being angry. Upon what self-evident conviction this distinction rests we are not aware. We have been taught that there are certain relative terms which have a meaning only with reference to one another ; and that there are certain relative feelings which similarly depend upon one another. And we feel ourselves incapable of understanding the meaning of the word love or of the thing either, without comparing it with its correlative.

We are perfectly willing to admit the difficulties in which we may be involved by anthropomorphism, but the very essence of our conception of God *as a personal Creator and Father* involves anthropomorphism of some kind or other, and if we retain the one we must retain the other also.

These considerations show the inconsistency of the Brahmists in denying the possibility of divine forgiveness of human sins. And we would seriously and candidly repeat our counsel to them to seek both for truth and for consistency, We are ready to

acknowledge the advance which they have made upon the currently received opinions of their orthodox Hindu brethren; and if they are really sincere and earnest in seeking after truth we wish them every success. But unfortunately there is too manifest in their writings that inflated self-conceit and self-assertion which is the characteristic of shallow and superficially educated young men, and which is the most effective bar to all real progress.

We have now completed all that we intend to say regarding the Brahmic movement and Mr. Dyson's controversy with its promoters. There are many details of this controversy to which we have not alluded, and for which we must refer the reader to Mr. Dyson's pamphlets and the various Brahmic productions. We have brought out what appears to be the most salient points in dispute between the Brahmists and their critic, and given our own view regarding them. We conclude by expressing our hope that the young men of Bengal, who are being rapidly introduced to western thought and culture, will seek after truth with sincerity and earnestness, and will embrace it when found; and especially that they will cultivate that humility and teachableness of spirit which is, perhaps, the most essential requisite for the attainment of both truth and goodness.

J.

Art. X.—THE PHILOSOPHY OF MODERN SCIENCE.

Address delivered before the British Association assembled at Belfast in 1874. By John Tyndall, F.R.S., President. Longmans, Green & Co. 1874.

THE Address delivered by Professor Tyndall before the British Association last year is one of considerable importance,—an importance which attaches to it upon various accounts. It was delivered before an Association composed of the most eminent scientific men of Great Britain. It is the production of a man who, although not standing in the first rank of scientists, has a fair claim to be considered a representative man, and whose clear and interesting style of exposition fits him for bringing down to the level of men of ordinary intelligence the somewhat abstruse doctrines of modern science. The Address is important also from the fact that its author goes beyond the range of simple science and offers hints toward the construction of a philosophy of science. Considering that the tendency of scientists for some time has been to depreciate and despise everything pertaining to philosophy, we have in this address a practical and valuable acknowledgment of the necessity of a philosophy of some kind or other to the mind of even the man of science. And although the temporary occasion of the delivery of the Address has become a thing of the past, the subject of the Address itself is of permanent value, and the particular views expressed in it have not ceased to be representative. In India a great stimulus has of late been given to the study of physical science ; and, although this may be a step in the right direction, yet there is unquestionably a strong tendency in the human mind to take a superficial view of things which the exclusive study of physical science encourages. And it may therefore be of importance to turn the attention of students of physical science to some underlying problems which science as such cannot touch, but which are the proper object-matter of philosophy. Taking Tyndall's Address as our text, we purpose to undertake this task.

We shall begin by pointing out the relations between science and philosophy, and the proper object-matter of each. Science is conversant only with what is or may be directly known by sense or consciousness. For the sake of clearness we shall call anything that is or may be directly known a phenomenon. The universe, as we know it, is then made up of phenomena ; and by phenomena we mean to indicate both those objects of knowledge which we perceive by sense and those which are given to us in consciousness. The fact however that we are not able ourselves to perceive certain

phenomena, does not exclude them from the sphere of science. Anything which has been perceived at any past time, or which might have been perceived provided any percipient beings were brought into relation with it, or which might now or at any future time be perceived by the senses of any percipient beings, is properly the subject of phenomenal science. To determine the relations and laws of phenomena is avowedly the great and exclusive aim of modern science.

But by some powerful and universal impulse the human mind is driven to infer the existence of something else which is not and can never be a phenomenon, that is, an object of direct knowledge. Whenever any voluntary conscious effort of ours is met by resistance, we know directly the power which we ourselves put forth; but we infer the existence of a power which resists ours. When we feel any sensation, as of smell, colour or sound, we know directly the phenomenon, but we infer some power outside of us as existing and acting antecedently to the phenomenon and causing the phenomenon. Rays of light and heat, we say, come from the sun; but they are not phenomena until they come into relation with our sentient organism. Thus, underlying or behind this universe of phenomena, we are driven to infer the existence of some things or powers not phenomenal as the objective cause of the things which we know. Now it is with this underlying or, as it has been called, real world that philosophy deals, and it is with this that a considerable part of Tyndall's Address is concerned. We have therefore in this Address a doctrine of philosophy propounded by a man of science, and perhaps the same remark may be made with reference to him which he in this Address (p. 13) has made with reference to Aristotle. "When the human mind has achieved greatness and given evidence of extraordinary power in any domain, there is a tendency to credit it with similar power in all other domains. Thus theologians have found comfort and assurance in the thought that Newton dealt with the question of revelation, forgetful of the fact that the very devotion of his powers, through all the best years of his life, to a totally different class of ideas, not to speak of any natural disqualification, tended to render him less instead of more competent to deal with theological and historic questions." And thus, too, a man, who has devoted his life to the study of phenomenal science, is not likely to be thereby more but rather less fitted to pronounce upon problems of philosophy.

The greater part of the Address is taken up with a historical review of the progress of scientific speculation or discovery. In this review prominence is given, as was to be expected, to those whose discoveries or speculations have borne chiefly upon our knowledge of physical nature. The majority of

philosophical thinkers will, probably, scarcely agree with Tyndall, in according such an eminent position to Democritus and his followers as compared with Plato and Aristotle. Indeed, a candid reader of the history of philosophy can scarcely understand the elevation of Democritus except upon the theory that the President of the British Association, by his predilection for the atomic theory, has been influenced in his judgment of these ancient philosophers so as to pronounce unduly in favour of the inferior. The doctrine of atoms, as held by its various successive exponents, is that which has chiefly taken hold of Tyndall's mind in his study of the history of thought, and this doctrine we shall now examine historically and critically.

After the bright period of Greek and Roman enlightenment there followed a long dreary night of darkness and confusion, when thought was bound and the human mind appeared to be resting itself preparatory to making a greater effort. When the revival came, the doctrine of atoms found a new exponent in "a contemporary and friend of Hobbes of Malmesbury, the orthodox Catholic provost of Digne, Gassendi."

"God who created earth and water, plants and animals, produced in the first place a definite number of atoms, which constituted the seeds of all things. Then began that series of combinations and decompositions which goes on at present, and which will continue in future. The principle of every change resides in matter. In artificial productions the moving principle is different from the material worked upon; but in nature the agent works within, being the most active and mobile part of the material itself." Such, according to Tyndall, was the doctrine of Gassendi.

The philosophy of Gassendi is thus seen to be of a mixed kind. Insensate atoms contain within themselves the principle of all the phenomenal changes of the material world; but these atoms are themselves produced and prepared by an omnipotent spiritual Being. Here we have a dualism which is unsatisfactory to the philosophic mind, which has a strong tendency to seek after unity of knowledge as well as existence. Gassendi on the one hand presents us with a spiritual Being as the originating cause of all things; and on the other hand with material atoms created and prepared by that Being so that without any farther interference or government they of themselves develope into the myriad forms of inorganic and organic life. To this explanation of the universe many objections offer themselves. The genuine theist is not satisfied with a Deity who is introduced simply to bring into existence the atomic materials of the future universe, and is then relegated into obscurity as being of no further use. The genuine materialist, if indeed there is such a person in existence, is not satisfied with a system which begins with spirit and gives to

matter only a subordinate position. The seeker after a unity of knowledge is not satisfied, because he must still ask how material atoms are endowed with such powers and principles of action as to produce the complex phenomena of our knowledge, and how such an all-powerful Being as the creator of the universe of atoms should be introduced simply for a temporary purpose.

Tyndall himself is not satisfied with the divine element in Gassendi's system, nor does he think that in any way human reason can legitimately advance from a foundation of material atoms to the existence of God. And assuming Lucretius to be the purest representative of the old atomic system, he brings that philosopher into conflict with Bishop Butler, who, as is well known, was a staunch advocate of the doctrine of an intelligent creator and governor of the universe. Butler takes his stand upon the spirituality and possible independence of the mind or percipient and reflecting powers of man, and holds that we temporarily inhabit our physical body and use its various organs as the instruments of thought and action. He denies that any part of our present organism constitutes an essential part of ourselves. Let us see now what arguments against this view Tyndall puts into the mouth of Lucretius. "Subjected to the test of mental presentation *(vorstellung)*, your views, most honoured prelate, would present to many minds a great, if not an insuperable, difficulty. You speak of 'living power,' 'percipient or perceiving powers,' and 'ourselves'; but can you form a mental picture of any one of these apart from the organism through which it is supposed to act? Test yourself honestly, and see whether you possess any faculty that would enable you to form such a conception. The true self has a local habitation in each of us; thus localized, must it not possess a form? If so, what form? Have you ever for a moment realized it? When a leg is amputated, the body is divided into two parts; is the true self in both of them, or in one? Thomas Aquinas might say in both; but not you, for you appeal to the consciousness associated with one of the two parts to prove that the other is foreign matter. Is consciousness then a necessary element of the true self? If so, what do you say to the case of the whole body being deprived of consciousness? If not, then on what grounds do you deny any portion of the true self to the severed limb? Another consideration, which you may consider slight, presses upon me with some force. The brain may change from health to disease, and through such a change the most exemplary man may be converted into a debauchee and a murderer . . . . . Can the brain or can it not act in this distempered way without the intervention of the immortal reason? If it can, then it is

a prime mover which requires only healthy regulation to render it reasonably self-acting, and there is no apparent need of your immortal reason at all. If it cannot, then the immortal reason, by its mischievous activity in operating upon a brother instrument, must have the credit of committing every imaginable extravagance and crime."

So argues Tyndall, by the mouth of Lucretius, against the belief that we have within us an immortal spirit. Bishop Butler is now represented as being "thoughtful after hearing this argument," and after "having strengthened himself by that honest contemplation of the facts which was habitual with him," he proceeds as follows:—

"You will remember that in the 'Analogy of Religion' of which you have so kindly spoken, I did not profess to prove anything absolutely; and that I over and over again acknowledged and insisted on the smallness of our knowledge or rather the depth of our ignorance, as regards the whole system of the universe. My object was to show my deistical friends, who set forth so eloquently the beauty and beneficence of Nature and the Ruler thereof, while they had nothing but scorn for the so-called absurdities of the Christian scheme, that they were in no better condition than we were, and that for every difficulty found upon our side, quite as great a difficulty was to be found upon theirs." And then Butler proceeds with objections against the atomic theory. Thus Tyndall appears to think that the defender of man's spiritual nature has been completely floored by his arguments, so that even such a strong thinker as Butler acknowledges in a most imbecile manner that he is incapable of meeting them. It is always unfortunate for any thinker to have arguments put into his mouth by a professed opponent, and therefore, instead of admitting the complete capitulation of the fortress of our immortal spirit of which Butler is supposed to be capable, we shall endeavour to put words into Butler's mouth somewhat more like what we believe he would have spoken to Tyndall's Lucretius.

"Most worthy Lucretius, I beg you to remember that the test of mental presentation of which you speak, is not, without examination, to be admitted as a test of truth. It may be impossible to form a conception of 'percipient powers' apart from a physical organism, but this impossibility of conception does not by any means imply an impossibility of existence; nor yet even does it imply an incapability of belief. There may be many things in whose existence I firmly believe, but of which I am incapable of forming what I myself think to be a true conception. And it is to me quite plain that my inability to form a conception of 'percipient powers,' apart from some physical organs, arises from my want of experience, and may not arise from any inherent

impossibility of existence. I myself have never had a conscious existence apart from my body, and as all my mental conceptions are formed upon my own past experience, it is quite plain that this want of experience is amply sufficient to account for my present inability to form a conception of myself existing and acting apart from my body. Moreover, it is not quite correct that I cannot conceive myself as acting apart from my body. A great part of my mental activity is conducted without any conscious employment of any part of my physical organism. And it is certainly possible for me to conceive of this kind of conscious activity as being carried on independently of material organs. I do not affirm that this possibility of conception affords any demonstration of the fact, but neither is it legitimate for you to affirm that your alleged impossibility of conception proves the impossibility of existence.

"Again, you assume that, since the true self is localized in our bodies, it must possess some form. This assumption I cannot for a moment admit. Permit me to show you the reason why it is impossible for me to admit this point. The 'true self,' you must remember, according to my doctrine, is not a phenomenon of any kind. My body consists of phenomenal qualities, some of which in my life-time I am able to examine by my senses, and all of which may be a subject of study by the anatomist after my death. But even you will scarcely maintain that this collection of physical organs constitutes my true self, since you must surely look upon that which controls these organs as the true self. And at any rate, as you are now discussing my theory, you must allow me to deny self-hood to any of my organs which can be perceived by my own or other people's senses. But in addition to the organic parts which can be preceived by the unassisted or assisted senses, there are other phenomena which I become aware of by consciousness. These phenomena, called mental, have *form*, that is, they are distinguished from one another as being of different kinds, as, *e.g.*, sensations, emotions, fancies, and so on; and they exist in certain relations, as successive or simultaneous. But I must deny that any of these phenomena, or all of them together, constitute my true self. For these phenomena are the *objects* of consciousness, they are *known*; but they do not *know*. Consider. When you say 'I feel a smell,' does that mean that one of your mental phenomena, such as a thought or a perception, is conscious of the smell? The very statement of the question reveals its absurdity. Or does it mean that the whole collection of your mental phenomena is conscious of one of themselves? This, too, is equally absurd. Or does it mean that any abstract idea which has been derived from the aggregate of phenomena, such as abstract Feeling or abstract Thought, is conscious of

one of the concrete? No power can be in the abstraction which was not exerted in the original concretes. Now I am not aware of any other mental entity possessing *form* except single mental phenomena, or the aggregate of phenomena, or some abstraction from phenomena, and we see that none of these can be supposed capable of *knowing* without absurdity. Their essential character consists in *being known.* But the true self is that which knows. And the true self cannot be a phenomenon, cannot place itself as known over against itself as knowing, cannot annihilate its own essential nature by assuming *form* and thus becoming capable of being known.

"Perhaps you may object that I am now speaking of something which can neither be known nor conceived, which cannot therefore be the object of scientific thought, which is purely a hypothetical attempt to explain certain features of conscious life, and which is an hypothesis which cannot be verified. To all this I answer briefly that I have never assumed the *ego* to be an object of scientific thought, that out of the phenomena which are the object-matter of science, there arise problems which philosophy discusses, but which cannot be scientifically examined, that the hypothesis is one to which I have been driven by an intellectual necessity, and that such an hypothesis as this may be legitimately held, although it is incapable of phenomenal verification.

"I trust that you, although apparently unaccustomed to philosophical thought, have succeeded in comprehending, to some extent at least, this my main position. If you have done so, you will see that the other questions which you ask are vain and foolish. Your remarks about the division of the body and the total or partial removal of the brain go no farther than to show that in our present condition of existence our *phenomenal* conscious life has a more or less intimate connection with, and dependence upon, our physical organism; and this no person in his senses ever for a moment doubted.

"Again, you speak of the influence of disease upon the brain, and you appear to think that you have fastened me with one or other of the horns of a dilemma. You ask, 'Can the brain or can it not act in this distempered way without the intervention of the immortal reason?' If it can, then it is a prime mover which requires only healthy regulation to render it reasonably self-acting, and there is no apparent need of your immortal reason at all. If it cannot, then the immortal reason, by its mischievous activity in operating upon a broken instrument, must have the credit of committing every imaginable extravagance and crime.'

"Now I hope you will excuse me for suggesting that this must be a specimen of the product of a self-acting brain 'without the intervention of the immortal reason,' as I can scarcely under-

stand how a reasonable mind could be satisfied with such loose thinking. In the first place it is simply impossible for me to understand how the material particles of the brain can automatically produce any of the effects to which you refer. I have not yet seen anything to convince me that mental activity is only transmuted electric or magnetic or vital force. Nor do I believe that force of any kind is the product of material particles. I must therefore try the second horn of your dilemma. In this you present as the only alternative that 'the immortal reason by its mischievous activity in operating upon a broken instrument, must have the credit of committing every imaginable extravagance and crime.' Really you astonish me. Is the 'broken instrument' to have none of the credit? If a first-class musician plays upon a broken piano and produces execrable music, do you blame the musician or the instrument? I fear, most sage Lucretius, that your brain has not been cerebrating very satisfactorily of late."

It is but justice to Tyndall to point out that, although crediting Butler with so weakly acknowledging the force of the rubbish that he has put into the mouth of Lucretius, he yet permits the worthy prelate to conquer at last. The atoms of Lucretius are dead insensate things, as atoms ought to be, and Tyndall admits the position of Butler that out of such atoms the phenomena of consciousness cannot arise. Passing by Tyndall's discussion of Darwinism and evolution and other things of a kindred nature, we reach (p. 54) the essential point of his philosophy of science. "Two courses," he says, "and two only, are possible. Either let us open our doors freely to the conception of creative acts, or, abandoning them, let us radically change our notions of matter. If we look at matter as pictured by Democritus, and as defined for generations in our scientific text-book, the notion of any form of life whatever coming out of it is utterly unimaginable. The argument placed in the mouth of Bishop Butler suffices in my opinion to crush all such materialism as this. But those who framed these definitions of matter were not biologists, but mathematicians whose labours referred only to such accidents and properties of matter as could be expressed in their formulæ. The very intentness with which they pursued mechanical science, turned their thoughts aside from the science of life. May not their imperfect definitions be the real cause of our present dread? Divorced from matter, where is life to be found? Whatever our *faith* may say, our *knowledge* shows them to be indissolubly joined. Every meal we eat and every cup we drink illustrates the mysterious control of mind by matter.

"Trace the line of life backwards, and see it approaching more and more to what we call the purely physical condition. We come at length to those organisms which I have compared to

drops of oil suspended in a mixture of alcohol and water. We reach the *protogenes* of Haeckel, in which we have "a type distinguishable from a fragment of albumen only by its finely granular character." Can we pause here? We break a magnet and find two poles in each of its fragments. We continue the process of breaking; but, however small the parts, each carries with it, though enfeebled, the polarity of the whole. And when we can break no longer, we prolong the intellectual vision to the polar molecule. Are we not urged to do *something* similar in the case of life? . . Believing as I do in the continuity of nature, I cannot stop abruptly where our microscopes cease to be of use. Here the vision of the mind authoritatively supplements the vision of the eye. By an intellectual necessity I cross the boundary of the experimental evidence, and discern in that matter which we, in our ignorance of its latent powers and notwithstanding our professed reverence for its Creator, have hitherto covered with opprobrium, the promise and potency of all terrestrial life."

In this statement of Tyndall's philosophy it is satisfactory to observe his admission, that there is an important sphere of thought which extends far beyond the reach of experimental evidence. It is all the more satisfactory to observe this in a man of science, as we have recently had an example of one professing a more liberal culture, insisting upon the restriction of even theological thought within the sphere of what we may not inaccurately call experimental evidence. The author of "Literature and Dogma" appears to have utterly failed to interpret the wants of our nature, when he thinks that we are satisfied wtth such a conception of God as can be verified, or that we can conscientiously and sincerely worship such an intellectual abstraction as "the eternal not ourselves which works for righteousness." And it is pleasing to turn from such phenomenalism in theology as this to the utterances of a purely scientific man who willingly acknowledges the "intellectual necessity" of going far beyond the boundary of experimental evidence in search of an explanation of the things that be.

At the same time, we fail to see that "clearness and thoroughness," which the author of the Address professes to desiderate. He appears in the first part of our quotation to abandon entirely the "conception of creative acts," while at the close of the quotation he speaks of the "Creator" of matter. We can scarcely charge such a generally clear writer with inconsistency here, and therefore we must seek for a reconciliation of the apparently incongruous ideas. Does he mean that a Creator must be admitted to account for the first existence of the matter which has in it "the promise and potency of all terrestrial life;" but that, this matter having been introduced into being, we can dispense with

all future creative acts and all divine government? Although the admission of an original Creator of matter is made in the most incidental way, and indeed appears to be reluctantly thrown in as a concession to those who are unreasonable enough to insist upon it, yet we presume that the author, if questioned, would not deny the "intellectual necessity" of assuming a Creator for his matter. We have then as the essential elements of Tyndall's philosophy: (1) a Creator whose function it is to bring into existence the material foundation of the universe; (2) matter which contains or is the support of certain powers; and (3) the development of this matter into all the forms and phenomena of "terrestrial life."

As the author of the Address does not profess to be a theologian, he tells us nothing about the nature of the Creator or of His work in the production of the matter; in fact he does little more than merely abstain from denying His existence altogether. The philosophy of Tyndall does not include any doctrine of the Creator or creation; if God's existence is to be admitted at all, He is required only to account for the existence of matter, and then He is to be excluded from the system which He has brought into being as of no further use. This mode of treating the Deity is by no means peculiar to the late President of the British Association. Throughout the greater part of the speculations of modern science there is to be found a similar exclusion of the Divine Being from the developed universe; the sphere of the known is the region of science; in that sphere there is to be found no God; the Creator is pushed out into the surrounding sphere of darkness and ignorance; and consequently as the sphere enlightened by human knowledge is gradually extended outward, the enclosing sphere of ignorance and blind faith retreats farther and farther. Such is the theology of ignorance which has grown up in connection with modern science, and which, if not contained in the Address, is at least not inconsistent with it, and is probably the only theology professed by its author.

We can understand the intellectual stand-point of those who take this view of things. They are chiefly men who are accustomed to confine their attention to physical phenomena, or who make the study of physical phenomena the basis of their enquiries regarding life and mind. Beginning with the objects of the senses, they include within the sphere of science nothing but what the senses can verify or at least nothing but what is directly inferred from sensible phenomena. Consequently they cannot see in the universe the presence and operation of the Higher Power whom men worship as God; and He is simply banished from the sphere which science believes it has fully explored. This position we say we can understand, but we do not at

all sympathize with it. Accustomed as we are to believe that God not only has created the universe, but also governs it, and that in no indirect way, we are incapable of accepting a philosophy of the universe which drives Him into the region of the unknown. And if there be an "intellectual necessity," which compels the scientific man to postulate the existence of powers and principles which the methods of science can never verify, we profess to be subject to the same "intellectual necessity" of postulating an all-pervading and intelligent Power who not only has operated at the beginning, but continues to operate throughout the whole progress of the universe in which we live.

There is, however, another view of the sphere of religion hinted at in this Address, with which we find it equally impossible to sympathize. "There is also," says Tyndall, "that deep-set feeling which, since the earliest dawn of history and probably for ages prior to all history, incorporated itself in the religions of the world. You who have escaped from these religions into the high-and-dry light of the intellect, may deride them; but in so doing you deride accidents of form merely, and fail to touch the immovable basis of the religious sentiment in the nature of man. To yield this sentiment reasonable satisfaction is the problem of problems at the present hour. And grotesque in relation to scientific culture as many of the religions of the world have been and are, dangerous—nay, destructive to the dearest privileges of freemen as some of them undoubtedly have been and would, if they could, be again, it will be wise to recognize them as the forms of a force, mischievous if permitted to intrude on the region of *knowledge* over which it holds no command, but capable of being guided to noble issues in the region of *emotion*, which is its proper and elevated sphere."

Now, whatever others may think, there appears to us to be implied in these words a *fundamental misconception* of the nature and relations of our religious principles. All our emotions must have some object of the intellect with which they are connected and from which they arise. We are incapable of comprehending emotions which spring out of nothing; we believe that all strong emotions of the human heart arise from some objects or facts which the human mind can conceive or know. We believe, therefore, that there must be an intellectual basis for the religious sentiment which Tyndall acknowledges to be immovably established in the nature of man. Now, what intellectual basis does the philosophy of Tyndall and others of his class offer to the religious sentiment of the human heart? A Deity who once acted in the production of matter, but who is now of no further use in the universe which He was temporarily called forth to create. Surely, such a basis as this is an insult equally to the intellect which

it is supposed to satisfy, and the emotions of which it is offered as the foundation. We can sympathize with Professor Tyndall when he protests against the control of science by an ecclesiastical organization, banded together for the purpose or at least with the effect of preventing the progress of knowledge and of perpetuating scientific error. We have no sympathy with those who dread the progress of scientific discovery, lest some of their favourite inherited beliefs should be shown to be baseless. But we protest against a science superficial and one-sided, which ignores the better-half of the phenomena which it professes to study; we protest against a science which cuts away the foundation from the highest, the noblest and the most powerful emotions which have appeared amongst men and for better or worse have so mightily influenced human history; we protest against a science which, calling itself science, passes beyond the region of phenomena, and applying the methods of science to the objects of faith, virtually drives out from the universe its own Author and Governor.

Having seen the unsatisfactoriness of the foundation afforded to the religious sentiment by the philosophy which modern scientists profess, we proceed now to examine the matter which Tyndall places at the foundation of terrestrial life. It is admitted by all, Tyndall as well as others, that matter in its metaphysical sense transcends the bounds of experience. But there are different ways of getting at the conception of this matter, and it may help us in our criticism to examine them. Tyndall has, in his Address, illustrated one of these ways, which we shall call the mechanical. If you break a magnet, you find two poles in each of the fragments. Continue the process of breaking until you reach the smallest fragments which you are able to manipulate; you can imagine, or perhaps directly perceive, that each of the fragments possesses powers similar in kind to those of the original magnet. So any material body may be broken into most minute parts until you get to the limits of microscopic vision, and each of these parts possesses the properties of the original lump. Now, scientific men borrowing a philosophical method, carry the process of division and sub-division in imagination far beyond the sphere of human experience, until they reach an *atom*, which is supposed to be the smallest particle into which the body under manipulation is capable of being broken. Each atom of any material simple element is, as a matter of course, endowed with all the properties found in the original body. And out of these atoms the constructive minds of the scientific world proceed to fabricate the universe, or rather to show how, by atomic forces and laws, the universe is evolved. Now let us examine this mechanical method of reaching the ground of the universe and its result.

The mechanical process of analyzing or breaking up any compound or simple material body so as to reach its primary elements or smallest parts, belongs essentially to the method of science. The complex body subjected to the method, as well as the atoms which are the results of it, are phenomena, that is, *objects of knowledge*. It may be objected to this statement that the atoms are not objects of knowledge inasmuch as they are too minute to be perceived by any of our senses, even when aided by the most powerful artificial appliances. But notwithstanding this objection, we adhere to our statement. The atoms of modern science are essentially *phenomenal*. They may transcend our experience, but they are *of the same nature* as the objects which we know, only more minute. And if we conceive a race of intelligent demons with faculties of perception correspondingly subtle, the atoms would be perceptible to them in the same way as physical phenomena are now to us. It is simply impossible for mechanical or chemical analysis to arrive at anything which is not a phenomenon or conceived of as a phenomenon. And in the atoms of modern science we have minute phenomenal objects, which, although ultra-experimental and unverifiable, are of such a nature that we could perceive them if our senses were sufficiently microscopic. Now, what is the meaning of saying that we could perceive them, that they are phenomena?

When we perceive any object, our senses are affected in some special way. The retinæ of our eyes are impressed by something objective which we call a ray of light. The impression, the sensation, the colour, is the phenomenon which we know; the objective thing which we denominate a ray of light is inferred, but it is unknown. The points of our fingers are impressed by some object, and our muscular force is resisted; these tactual and muscular sensations we know; but by a process which we need not now explain we transfer them in imagination outside of us, and believe in the hardness and other tactual qualities of something which we call body. But this body is unknown, except through its qualities, that is through our sensations objectified. What body is apart from our knowledge of it we cannot tell, but we think of it as having, or rather being, certain powers which affect us in certain ways. All phenomena are composed of sensations or affections of the organism, transferred outwards and supposed to have independent existence. But there is an intellectual necessity which compels us to account for phenomena by something objective, which is neither a phenomenon nor of the nature of one. We see a colour; we are compelled to infer a ray of light as the cause of it. We hear a sound; we must conclude some objective force which has struck us from without. Our muscular force is resisted; we are compelled to infer an objective force which

resists. Every sensation by which the objective world becomes known to us must be accounted for by something objective,—not a sensation, but a power which, coming into contact with us, contributes to the production of sensation. Thus psychological analysis reduces all phenomena into sensations and some objective inferred powers which have contributed to their formation. And it matters not how minute phenomena are ; if they are phenomena, that is, objects of knowledge or possible knowledge, they must be accounted for by something behind and beyond themselves which is not an object of knowledge. This is true of the atoms of science. They are conceived of as phenomena, and as such they demand to be accounted for by something beyond and behind themselves. They may be satisfactory to the man of science who, as such, does not pretend to seek for any non-phenomenal explanation of things. They certainly are the only explanation of phenomena which the methods of science are capable of reaching. But to the philosopher acquainted with the use of philosophical methods of study, the atomic theory of the universe must appear altogether inadequate.

Thus if we adopt the philosophical instead of the mechanical method of analyzing phenomena, we reach as the ground of the phenomenal universe, not material atoms, but active forces. In fact, the objects with which we come into contact in our daily experience appear to be composed entirely of various localized and permanently active powers. The whole universe, inorganic as well as organic, appears instinct with life and power. And if we are able to analyze the objects of our knowledge into sensations and their forms, and account for them by postulating objective powers, the question arises, where is the intellectual necessity of atoms at all? The scientist may require them as a phenomenal explanation of complex objects, and he does not need to look beyond them nor does his method enable him to go beyond them. The philosopher or the man of thought *must* pass beyond them, as we have shown, and having got beyond them, he cannot see the need of retaining them in his philosophical system at all. It may be said that some matter is required to form a *locus standi*, as it were, for objective powers. Tyndall asks, "Divorced from matter, where is life to be found?" And he would perhaps ask the same question regarding all natural forces. "There is need of clearness and thoroughness here." What is the nature of the matter with which life and all the forces that we know of are connected? It is phenomenal matter, matter as an object of our senses. And we have already seen that all such objects must be regarded as themselves constituted by a variety of combined powers which, coming into contact with our sensibility, give rise to the qualities that we perceive. And hence when we say that a power of any kind acts upon or is connected with matter, we mean simply that

a power which affects us in a certain way is connected with other powers which affect us in other ways. All material bodies as we know them are partly the creation of our own conscious life, and partly of an objective activity, whether conscious or unconscious. It is proper for science to consider these objects as independently existing apart from the mind; and it may be proper for science to hold that no force can be exerted apart from matter. But when the scientific man tries to impose this principle upon philosophy, he is going beyond his sphere; and the philosopher has a right to stop him with, "Thus far shalt thou go but no farther." We must protest against the transference of principles of scientific reasoning into a sphere which transcends science. And hence, although in our experience all force may appear to be connected with things which we call material, yet these very things are themselves but manifestations of other forces, and we have no warrant to carry what we call matter beyond the sphere of known or knowable phenomena at all. It we do so, it can only be to help us to conceive a state of things which transcends our experience, and a conception thus assisted must be admitted incorrect.

Again, there is another question connected with this subject to which we must turn our attention. The exponents of modern science exert all their endeavours to show how, without admitting the activity of an intelligent first cause, all the phenomena of life and mind may be evolved from the atomic ground assumed to explain the universe.

It cannot be denied, that Darwin, Wallace and others, have brought to light many interesting and important facts bearing upon the history of natural species; and there is no reasonable man who has the slightest interest in undervaluing any of their discoveries. The theory, however, which they would wish to establish, is as yet only hypothetical. They cannot be said to have demonstrated the origin of species by natural selection; still less can it be said that organisms possessing life have been shown to be capable of origination from material elements not possessed of life. This latter is admitted by Tyndall. But supposing that either or both of these positions were established, what then? Do they remove the "intellectual necessity" of postulating an intelligent designing cause? Most assuredly not. We have already seen the necessity of inferring some power acting behind or beneath every phenomenal quality or body, in order to account for the existence of that quality or body. And we must carry the same principle with us in studying the more complex phenomenal qualities and activities which are found in living beings. The theory of material atoms having in themselves the "promise and potency of all forms of terrestrial life" is purely hypothetical; and such atoms melt into useless fictions when subjected to careful

philosophical analysis. Laying them aside, therefore, we may examine some possible explanations of the origin of the successively higher forms and activities of organized beings. We may trace out in a rough way three great stages of cosmical progress. We have in the first place, the material foundation consisting of what are called inorganic elements, which are subjected to the ordinary forces and laws with which we are familiar in mechanics and chemistry. In the second place, we observe a higher class of bodies possessing an organized structure, and exhibiting the operation of a new power and higher laws—the power and the laws of life. In the third place there are some organized beings who manifest an activity of a still higher kind which is subject to different laws, the activity, namely, displayed in consciousness which is subject to the laws of mind. Now the problems which have to be solved, refer to the nature and relations of these three kinds of forces or activities and laws. Are the forces or activities of a mechanical or chemical kind ; of a vital kind and of a mental kind, essentially identical or essentially different? If life and mind are essentially different from mechanical or chemical forces, how have they originated ?

There are those who hold that these three classes of forces and laws are essentially the same, that amidst all the external phenomenal diversities there is an internal essential identity. This doctrine is partly an assumption and partly the result of certain observed correlations of different phenomena. If we take a subjective stand-point and observe different classes of phenomena in relation to consciousness and its laws, we observe that the phenomena and laws of consciousness have a certain correspondence with those of external things; that there is a reason in things answering to the reason which constitutes our conscious life. And, assuming that this correspondence between the subjective and the objective is universal and complete, that the laws of thought are also the laws of things, that, in short, things are nothing but thoughts rendered objective, the Hegelian, taking the laws of thought as his basis, applies them to the evolution of the cosmos. If, again, we turn our attention to the objects and forces of the external universe, we may observe a certain correlation between them. Light and heat, electricity and magnetism, are capable of transmutation ; that is, under certain circumstances, the one passes into the other. Life also is supported apparently by consuming forces or materials of a mechanical or chemical kind. And the phenomena of mind appear to have in some cases a correlation with phenomena of a physical kind. Assuming that there is a complete correlation and essential identity between these different kinds of forces and activities, the modern evolutionist endeavours to express the

higher phenomena and laws of life and mind in terms of those of mechanical and chemical dynamics. Thus, upon the assumption of the identity of mechanical, vital and mental forces, we have two philosophical systems: the one begins from the subjective and works outwards to the objective; the other begins from the objective and works inwards towards the subjective; both begin from lower and more universal forms, and work upwards to higher and more special; both work out their evolution or development independent of any exterior or anterior designing power.

Now there can be no doubt but both of these philosophical theories have been wrought out with wonderful ingenuity and ability, and that by their means the relations of many different phenomena have been successfully explained. A wonderful knowledge of facts and great genius have been brought to the aid of both; and it is not to be wondered at that two such ambitious and ably supported systems of philosophy should find many supporters and defenders. But, notwithstanding the greatness and learning of those who have originated and defended them, we must decline to admit either as resting upon a sufficient foundation. The assumption that the human mind is the measure of the universe, that the phenomena and laws of mind are not essentially different from objective things and their laws, which lies at the foundation of idealism, is *only* an assumption which is evidently dictated by the desire of an ambitious mind to discover some central principle by which all problems may be solved. The other assumption that the phenomena and laws of mind are only a higher manifestation of the forces and activities of the inorganic and organic objective world, is also *only* an assumption originating in the same way. And although there may be many facts which appear to support both of these assumptions, we think that such sweeping generalizations are unworthy of that caution and modesty which should characterize men of science; and after studying carefully the relation of our own finite mind to the great universe, we have come to the conclusion that we are incapable of discovering the essential nature and laws of that universe, and that a philosophy of the cosmos is, in our present condition, at least unattainable. By the evolutionist it is indeed admitted, and Tyndall does not deny it, that at present there are many unsolved problems, many difficulties in the process of development which have yet to be explained, many gaps yet to be filled up. But, notwithstanding this admission, there is still the underlying assumption that by some further advances in knowledge the gaps *may* be filled up and the problems solved. And there appears to be a rapidly spreading opinion that the process of evolution *sine Deo may* be shown to be a sufficient explanation of all things. Let us examine the grounds of these expectations.

Whatever we may hold regarding the essential identity of mechanical forces and vital forces, we must admit that the manifestations of the latter are different from and higher than those of the former. We are quite on our guard against personifying those peculiar phenomena which constitute what we call life; we are quite aware that life, *as it is known to us*, is simply a name for certain phenomenal conditions and actions. But at the same time the relations between vital phenomena and those of inorganic nature are of such a kind that we, for our part, are under an "intellectual necessity" of inferring a power underlying the phenomena of life higher in kind than what is to be observed in lower nature. Vital phenomena rise up out of those of inorganic nature; the hidden power which gives rise to life, seems to make use of and control the mechanical and chemical forces around it. We find ourselves incapable of conceiving how lower powers can of themselves elevate themselves to the rank of higher and then turn round and interfere with and control those from which they sprang. We have not been able so far to think ourselves into the position of an evolutionist as to conceive gravitation or electricity potentiating themselves up into the organizing power which converts oxygen, hydrogen, nitrogen, and carbon into living vegetables or animals. Consequently we do not see how any scientific discoveries which *could* be made, would be sufficient to establish the fundamental position of evolutionism.

Our inability to accept the principle of evolution is greatly increased when we compare the phenomena of *consciousness* with those of organic life and inorganic matter. Although it were established that many of the phenomena of our conscious life occur in correlation with others of a physical kind, yet we find it impossible to conceive that the former are simply modifications of the latter. We cannot understand how consciousness can of itself spring out of unconsciousness. And especially when we see conscious effort *governing and guiding* unconscious organic force, we cannot see how the former should be simply a higher potency of the latter. Thus, it will be seen that we decline to accept the doctrine of evolution, not because it yet lacks a sufficient amount of evidence to establish it, but because no amount of phenomenal knowledge could possibly establish it. It is essentially an ultra-experimental speculation, and we have seen that it is not adequate to the explanation of the relations of different orders of phenomena to one another.

Professor Tyndall remarks:—"The strength of the doctrine of evolution consists, not in an experimental demonstration (for the subject is hardly accessible to this mode of proof) but in its general harmony with scientific thought." What this means,

scarcely appears clear to us. The doctrine of evolution is, we presume, the result of the application of minds trained in science to philosophical questions, that is, the result of what we may call scientific thought. Does this mean anything more than simply that the conclusions of scientific men regarding philosophical problems harmonize with their conclusions regarding phenomenal problems, and that this harmony is the chief strength of their doctrine? We should say that such a harmony as this would not furnish to unprejudiced thinkers a very satisfactory ground for accepting such an extensive system as that of evolution. And if no positive evidence stronger than "general harmony with scientific thought" be submitted, we must fall back upon the inconceivability of the principal assumptions of the evolution doctrine as a sufficient ground for rejecting it.

Professor Tyndall further observes:—"From contrast, moreover, it derives enormous relative strength. On the one side we have a theory (if it could with any propriety be so called) derived . . . not from the study of nature but from the observation of men—a theory which converts the Power whose garment is seen in the visible universe into an artificer, fashioned after the human model and acting by broken efforts as man is seen to act. On the other side we have the conception that all we see around us and all we feel within us—the phenomena of physical nature as well as those of the human mind—have their unsearchable roots in a cosmical life, if I dare apply the term, an infinitesimal span of which is offered to the investigation of man."

What the theory is to which Professor Tyndall refers in the first part of this extract, we do not know. We are not aware of any theory of God's nature or government which represents Him as "an artificer fashioned after the human model and acting by broken efforts, as man is seen to act." There may be and doubtless are many absurd popular conceptions of God's nature and mode of acting, but those who seek after and hold a *reasonable* belief in a Creator and Ruler of the universe do not wish to be credited with the absurdities of unreasoning men. And it is unworthy of scientific men that, when they contrast their own views with those of the religious world, they should select for their unfavourable comparisons crude popular conceptions instead of carefully thought out doctrines. But there is one feature in the theory described and contemptuously dismissed by Tyndall which we have no hesitation in defending, after it has been subjected to a certain qualification. If, instead of "a theory derived, not from the study of nature but from the observation of men," Tyndall had referred to "a theory derived not only from the study of nature but also and chiefly from the observation of men," we should gladly adopt such a theory as our own. We believe

that the whole universe is a manifestation of God's power and wisdom; but surely our human nature is a higher manifestation of His attributes than can be found elsewhere. If, therefore, we are to form a conception of the unseen Power, which Tyndall admits, from the study of those phenomena of which that Power is the inferred cause, surely we ought to base our conception upon the highest instead of the lowest manifestation of the Power. If reason and goodness appear as the crowning qualities of the highest beings known to us, surely it is not unreasonable to attribute these qualities in their perfection to Him who is believed in as the source and centre from which all phenomena derive their being and nature. We feel ourselves compelled by an "intellectual necessity" to think that there is as much in the cause as there is in the effect; and if there is that in conscious activity which is not in mere organic life, if there is that in organic life which is not in inorganic matter, we feel ourselves compelled to go backwards to a more remote beginning, and infer a cause which contains in itself the Power of producing the highest form of manifested being. And we cannot imagine any Power capable of producing intelligence except one possessing intelligence; we cannot imagine any Power capable of producing virtuous beings except one possessing virtue.

There is one passage more in the Address to which we shall refer before closing our review. "The 'materialism' here professed may be vastly different from what you suppose, and I therefore crave your gracious patience to the end. 'The question of an external world,' says Mr. J. S. Mill, 'is the great battle-ground of metaphysics.' Mr. Mill himself reduces external phenomena to 'possibilities of sensation.' Kant, as we have seen, made time and space forms of our own intuitions. Fichte, having first by the inexorable logic of his understanding proved himself to be a mere link in that chain of eternal causation which holds so rigidly in nature, violently broke the chain by making nature, and all that it inherits, an apparition of his own mind. And it is by no means easy to combat such notions. For when I say, I see you, and that I have not the least doubt about it, the reply is that what I am really conscious of is an affection of my own retina. And if I urge that I can check my sight of you by touching you, the retort would be that I am equally transgressing the limits of fact; for what I am really conscious of is, not that you are there, but that the nerves of my hand have undergone a change. All we hear and see and touch and taste and smell, are, it would be urged, mere variations of our own condition, beyond which, even to the extent of a hair's breadth, we cannot go. That anything answering to our impressions exists outside of ourselves is not a *fact* but an *inference*, to which

all validity would be denied by an idealist like Berkeley, or by a sceptic like Hume. Mr. Spencer takes another line. With him, as with the uneducated man, there is no doubt or question as to the existence of an external world. But he differs from the uneducated, who thinks that the world really *is* what consciousness represents it to be. Our states of consciousness are mere *symbols* of an outside entity which produces them and determines the order of their succession, but the real nature of which we can never know. In fact the whole process of evolution is the manifestation of a Power absolutely inscrutable to the intellect of man. As little in our day as in the day of Job can man by searching find this Power out. Considered fundamentally, then, it is by the operation of an insoluble mystery that life on earth is evolved, species differentiated, and mind unfolded from their preponent elements in the immeasurable past. There is, you will observe, no very rank materialism here." (pp. 56—58)

It is somewhat amusing to see such names as Mill, Kant, Fichte, Berkeley, Hume and Spencer, brought into such close juxtaposition, and represented as all testifying to the inscrutableness of that Power which produces and determines all things. Surely, the man of science is here transgressing his sphere and speaking about unfamiliar subjects. What would the pious Bishop Berkeley, who believed that he enjoyed a very direct and intimate knowledge of the unseen Power or mind of the universe, think if he saw his name placed in such company as that of J. S. Mill and Hume! Passing by, however, the incongruity of the names, we offer a few remarks upon the admission here contained.

The doctrine of evolution, of which Professor Tyndall speaks so highly, may, perhaps, be viewed in two lights. As a doctrine of *science* it should be concerned only with phenomena, because scientific men do not profess an ability to study anything but phenomena. If it be concerned only with phenomena, it will have, however, a very restricted sphere for its operation. Phenomena, having certain relations of resemblance and difference, succeed one another; lower and more simple kinds of phenomena precede higher and more complex; the lower are composed of organs which in the higher assume more complex and perfect forms. This progress in the order of phenomena is the result of certain laws which are called laws of evolution. Now the question is, are these laws of evolution laws of the relations of phenomena only? Scientific men must answer in the affirmative, because the establishment of a law implies that the objects controlled by the law are known. It follows then that the higher orders of phenomena are evolved from the lower; objects of a simpler kind evolve themselves into objects

of a more complex. But every object which we know is an individual thing; every plant or animal is a single object which has a temporary existence, and from which is produced the germ of a new object of a similar kind. Now, what is it that is transmitted from the parent to the offspring? Is it the phenomenal material of which the offspring is composed? Or is it not rather the organizing power which enables the offspring to take in materials from external sources and build up its own organism similar to that of its parent? It appears then that species are perpetuated by the transmission of an organizing power from parents to offspring; and it is only by assuming this transmission that we can see any real connection between preceding and succeeding resembling objects. Thus evolution, if it is concerned only with phenomena, certainly assumes some underlying causal link between succeeding phenomena which is itself not phenomenal. And this underlying power which manifests itself, now in a lower order of phenomena, now in a higher, is absolutely essential to the very idea of evolution. Individual objects which begin to exist and then die, cannot with any decree of propriety be spoken of as evolving themselves into higher forms. That which evolves itself has, from the nature of our conception of evolution, a *continuity* of existence quite inconsistent with the transient character of phenomenal objects. Thus when we come to investigate into the nature of evolution, we find that it is concerned with a continuously acting power, not itself phenomenal but manifesting its activity in the production of various forms of phenomenal existence; and the laws of evolution cannot therefore be simply phenomenal laws. But in determining the laws by which anything is governed, it is implied that we know a good deal about that thing. How then does Professor Tyndall say that "the whole process of evolution is the manifestation of a Power absolutely inscrutable to the intellect of man?" If the philosophy of evolution is not conversant with a continuously existing Power underlying phenomena, it must be restricted to the relations of more or less closely resembling objects of knowledge, and, thus restricted, it appears to us meaningless and useless. If it is conversant with an underlying Power manifested in phenomenal objects, it assumes a knowledge of that Power, which by Professor Tyndall is here utterly repudiated.

There is much need of a more clearly defined line of demarcation between science on the one hand and philosophy and theology on the other. It doubtless has been prejudicial to the interest of truth that ecclesiastical organizations have intruded within the domain of science and prescribed upon authority what men should believe regarding subjects which ought to be freely investigated by reason. But it is equally prejudicial to the

interest of truth when science transgresses its sphere, and assuming a knowledge of that which is only an object of inference or faith, dictates to philosophy and theology the methods which they are to pursue and the results which they may reach; or, denying all knowledge of what is not phenomenal, saps the foundation of all thought regarding the object of our philosophical or religious faith. There is a great deal of *phenomenal knowledge* with which science deals; this may be a source of interest and pleasure to all, and should be pursued solely by the methods of science. There are important *inferences* which the thoughtful man must draw regarding hidden powers of nature and mind, but these are not verifiable upon scientific methods, and the scientific man, as such, should leave them to the philosopher, or acknowledge that in dealing with them he is transgressing the bounds of science. There are also higher and more sublime *mysteries*, the objects of faith to the religious man, and which the Christian theologian believes to be not discoverable by reason but communicated by revelation; both science and philosophy should acknowledge their inability to deal with these, but neither science nor philosophy have any right to sit in judgment upon these objects of faith and deny their truth because they are incapable of being known or conceived. The theologian, the philosopher and the scientist, have each an important sphere of labour, and it would surely be for the interest of truth and the good of mankind if each, instead of trying to jostle the other out of existence, should endeavour to bring the results of the other's labours into harmony with his own, and where this cannot be done, honestly acknowledge that there may be a multitude of things in this great universe of ours which we cannot reduce to a harmonious system, but which nevertheless it is necessary for us to believe.

J.

Art. IV.—PROTESTANT MISSIONS IN INDIA.

The History of Protestant Missions in India. By the Rev. M. A. Sherring, M.A., L L B. : Benares. Trübner & Co., 1875.

"THE aim of this work is to show historically what Protestant Missions have accomplished in India since their commencement in the beginning of the last century. In pursuance of this object, I have collected together all the important events of these missions, and have presented them in a succinct and consecutive narrative, thus striving to give a complete view, as in a panorama, of their operations and achievements."

Such is the brief and appropriate account which Mr. Sherring, in his preface, gives of the aim and nature of this very interesting book. It consists of successive panoramic views of the efforts and successes or failures of those who, from different Protestant countries, came to India for the purpose of supplanting her ancient idolatry by the faith and the worship of Christ. To all who feel any interest in the welfare of India, the history of these efforts, written by such a candid, painstaking and competent man as Mr. Sherring, must appear of importance. And whatever view one may take of the value of Christian missions, a perusal of this book will at least leave no doubt in the mind of the reader, that they have accomplished a work of great magnitude. There are those who estimate the value of missionary labour by the amount of money which is expended in supporting it; and such persons usually conclude that the results of the labour are not at all proportionate to the pecuniary expenditure. At the outset we wish to repudiate this mercantile mode of thought as altogether absurd and unfair when applied to moral or spiritual problems; and in estimating the value of the efforts described in this book we shall adopt another standard.

The task which we propose to ourselves may be best accomplished by first passing in review some of the most striking series of events chronicled in this interesting history.

Denmark was the country whence the first Protestant Missionaries came; Bartholomew Ziegenbalg and Henry Plutschau were their names. In A. D. 1705 these two pioneers of Protestant missionary effort went forth to endeavour to plant reformed Christianity upon the shores of Tranquebar. In spite of persecution and sickness and loss, these two brave men and others sent to assist them, persevered in their self-denying labours. "Three years and a half after the arrival of the first missionaries the native Christian community numbered one hundred and sixty

persons, an amount of success truly astonishing, considering the gigantic obstacles against which they had to contend."

To learn how the Christian cause in Tranquebar, Madras and Tanjore progressed; how one distinguished man after another devoted himself to the self-denying labours involved at that time in mission work; how, especially, Christian Frederic Schwartz for a period of no less than forty-eight years, employed his remarkable abilities and great zeal for the advancement of Christian truth and right; and, how at his death in 1798, no less than fifty thousand converts to Christianity had been gathered in from heathenism: to learn this and much more regarding that interesting period the reader must consult the pages of Mr. Sherring's work. Suffice it to say that few pages of Christian history contain a record of greater self-denial, of more disinterested Christian zeal, or of greater natural abilities devoted to a good cause, than is to be found in the history of the first missionary efforts in Southern India.

But, unfortunately, the great success which was attained during this earliest period of Protestant missionary labour, does not appear to have been permanent. We should expect that the Christian faith, if truly planted in the hearts of such a great number of converts, would perpetuate and extend itself till it would become a living and permanent power in the community. "But what do we actually find? Instead of thousands of converts which the Tranquebar Mission possessed for many years in the last century, there were in 1850 only seven hundred and seventeen Christians, and twenty years later only seven hundred and seventy-one. Again, Tanjore, the principal scene of Schwartz's labours, contained in 1850, fifteen hundred and seventy Christians. In the same year, Trichinopoly had six hundred and thirty-eight; Cuddalore, three hundred and twenty-five; and Madras, probably not more than a thousand. It should also be remembered that many of these converts, perhaps the greater portion, were not descendants of the earlier Christians, but were the fruit of labours performed during the first half of the present century, through the instrumentality of a continuous series of missionaries connected with several societies. The truth is, there is strong reason for believing that the earlier Christians died off, leaving but an exceedingly small number of natural successors; and that, had it not been for modern efforts, by this time little would have been seen of the great results of former times."

We now approach a period in the history of Protestant Christianity in India in which the cause of missions had to endure the greatest trials, and began to assume an imperial importance. It was at the metropolis of India that the greatest difficulties in the way of mission enterprise had to be met, and, perhaps, the greatest

achievements effected. Calcutta, being the central seat of the paramount power, was, when the English people became thoroughly aroused to the importance of Christian missions, naturally chosen as the chief centre from which missionary labour should proceed. It was chiefly about the beginning of the nineteenth century that the cause of Protestant Christianity in India had to struggle for its establishment as an officially recognized instrumentality for the benefit of the people; it was not till then that the ruling power gave up the selfish principle of Government which had prevailed from the beginning of its existence and acknowledged its obligation to aid, or at least authorize, the attempts that were being made to spread a knowledge of religious and moral truth amongst the governed. It was then that Carey, and Henry Martyn, and Marshman and others, manfully and zealously encountered the natural difficulties of their endeavour, and braved the narrow-minded hostility of Government officials, and laboured faithfully in their efforts to spread a knowledge of truth. The first thirteen years of the nineteenth century were years of hard struggle and great trial; but at the end of that period, the cause of Christian truth triumphed, and India was opened to Christian Missions. "After a prolonged discussion in the House of Commons, sustained chiefly by Wilberforce on the one side, and retired old Indians on the other, the famous clause in the new Charter, introduced by Lord Castlereagh, under pressure from without, and overpowered by the immense multitude of petitions with which every night both Houses were inundated, was carried. The clause stated that "it was the duty of this country to promote the introduction of useful knowledge, and of religious and moral improvement, in India, and that facilities be afforded by law to persons desirous of going to and remaining in India, to accomplish these benevolent designs."

It is scarcely possible to estimate the importance of this clause in the Charter of 1813. The oppressive and short-sighted restrictions which had hitherto proved great obstructions to the progress of Christianity were now removed; and a host of able and zealous men now found their way to India resolved to do what they could to establish in the hearts and the homes of the people of India the faith which they themselves prized so highly. The churches of England and Scotland, the various Dissenting bodies of Britain, the Presbyterians and Methodists of America, the Moravians and Lutherans of the Continent, and many other bodies besides sent numerous representatives to India to plant the standard of the Cross. Not only in the presidency cities, but in countless towns and villages throughout India, Burmah and Ceylon, amongst the aboriginal races speaking Dravidian tongues, amongst the Southern representatives of the great Aryan immigration, the Uriyas, the Marathas, the Bengalis, amongst the people of the great central

plains, speaking Hindi and Urdu, amongst the tribes of the distant North-East and the still more distant North-West, amongst the primitive hill tribes inhabiting the slopes of the mountains, Christian missions were established, Christian truth taught, and Christian influence exerted. This wonderful development of Christian enterprise takes its date from the opening years of the present century, and surely indicates a remarkable revival of Christian life and a remarkable phase of Christian thought amongst western countries. The various agents of different Christian churches devoted themselves in various ways to the accomplishment of the task which they had undertaken. The education of the young prominently engaged their attention. And, for the degree of educational advancement which at present obtains, India owes her thanks chiefly to the Christian missionaries. They were the first to open up the field ; they were chief actors in pressing upon the Government the responsibility resting upon them with reference to the education of the people ; they took a leading part in discussing and carrying out the educational policy which was ultimately decided upon. And the results of their labours in various departments during the past sixty or seventy years, are such that any body of men might well be proud of them. It would be impossible within our limited space to give even a very condensed account of Mr. Sherring's interesting historical review of the various missionary operations of the last half-century in India. But we must say something regarding the manner in which he appears to us to have accomplished his task. He writes with the calmness and candour of one who knows well what he is writing about, and who wishes to give a truthful impression of it to his readers. He does not hesitate to point out failures as well as successes. While he writes with vivacity, and sometimes even with enthusiasm, we observe none of that vapid rhetoric and hollow-sounding pietism which so often disfigure reports of Christian work, and which appear by some to be considered necessary to catch the ear of the Christian public at Home. And throughout the work we observe no traces of that narrowness of view which characterized too many of the earlier missionaries, and which unfortunately is not yet extinct.

We propose to refer to and discuss some of the important questions connected with Christian missions in India ; but before doing so we shall give ourselves the pleasure of quoting testimony as to the value, modes, and results of missionary effort which must be admitted as impartial. From the "statement exhibiting the moral and material progress and condition of India during the year 1871-72" drawn up by Clements B. Markham, Esq., and quoted by Mr. Sherring, we take the following :—

"The Protestant Missions of India, Burmah, and Ceylon are

carried on by thirty-five missionary societies, in addition to local agencies, and now employ the services of six hundred and six foreign missionaries, of whom five hundred and fifty-one are ordained. They are widely and rather evenly distributed over the different presidencies; and they occupy, at the present time, five hundred and twenty-two principal stations, and two thousand five hundred subordinate stations.

. . . . . .

"The labours of the foreign missionaries in India assume many forms Apart from their special duty as public preachers and pastors, they constitute a valuable body of educators; they contribute greatly to the cultivation of the native languages and literature; and all who are resident in rural districts are appealed to for medical help to the sick. . . . . .

"No body of men pays greater attention to the study of the native languages then the Indian missionaries. With several missionary societies, as with the Indian Government, it is a rule that the younger missionaries shall pass a series of examinations in the vernacular of the district in which they reside; and the general practice has been, that all who have to deal with natives who do not know English, shall seek a high proficiency in those vernaculars. The result is too remarkable to be overlooked. The missionaries, as a body, know the natives of India well: they have prepared hundreds of works, suited both for schools and for general circulation, in the fifteen most prominent languages of India; and in several other dialects. They are the compilers of several dictionaries and grammars; they have written important works on the native classics and the systems of philosophy; and they have largely stimulated the great increase of the native literature prepared in recent years by educated native gentlemen.

. . . . . .

"The great progress made in missionary schools, and the area which they occupy will be seen from the following fact. They now contain 60,000 scholars more than they did twenty years ago. The figures are as follows: In 1852 the scholars numbered 81,850; and in 1872 the number was 142,952.

"The high character of the general education given in the college department of these institutions may be gathered from the following facts: Between 1862 and 1872, 1,621 students passed the entrance examination in one or other of the three Indian universities; 513 passed the first examination in Arts; 154 took the degree of B.A.; 18 took the degree of M.A., and 6 that of B.L. . . . . .

"In 1852 the entire number of Protestant native converts in India, Burmah, and Ceylon amounted to 22,400 communicants in a community of 128,000 native Christians of all ages. In

1862 the communicants were 49,688, and the native Christians were 213,182. In 1872 the communicants were 78,494, and the converts, young and old, numbered 318,363.

"But the missionaries in India hold the opinion that the winning of these converts, whether in the cities or in the open country, is but a small portion of the beneficial results which have sprung from their labours. No statistics can give a fair view of all that they have done. They consider that their distinctive teaching, now applied to the country for many years, has powerfully affected the entire population. The moral tone of their preaching is recognised and highly approved by multitudes, who do not follow them as converts. The various lessons which they inculcate have given to the people at large new ideas, not only on purely religious questions, but on the nature of evil, the obligations of law, and the motives by which human conduct should be regulated. Insensibly a higher standard of moral conduct is becoming familiar to the people, especially to the young, which has been set before them not merely by public teaching, but by the millions of printed books and tracts which are scattered widely through the country. On this account they express no wonder that the ancient systems are no longer defended as they once were; many doubts are felt about the rules of caste; the great festivals are not attended by the vast crowds of former years; and several Theistic schools have been growing up among the more educated classes, especially in the presidency cities who profess to have no faith in the idol-gods of their fathers. . . . . This view of the general influence of their teaching, and of the greatness of the revolution which it is silently producing, is not taken by missionaries only. It has been accepted by many distinguished residents in India, and experienced officers of the Government; and has been emphatically endorsed by the high authority of Sir Bartle Frere. Without pronouncing an opinion upon the matter, the Government of India cannot but acknowledge the great obligation under which it is laid by the benevolent exertions made by these 600 missionaries, whose blameless example and self-denying labours, are infusing new vigour into the stereotyped life of the great populations placed under English rule, and are preparing them to be in every way better men and better citizens of the great empire in which they dwell."

Having seen the valuable testimony which the Government of India have borne to the importance of the labours of the missionary body, we shall now proceed to estimate, as accurately as we are able, the extent, kind, and value of the results of these labours. A difficult task this is, because in social and moral questions, in consequence of the complexity of the phenomena, it is not an easy matter to connect causes and effects; it is not easy to separate

effects produced by other causes, or to trace the effects of the causes we are at present considering. A great deal of the enlightenment which is now passing over the surface of Indian society is, no doubt, the effect of missionary influence ; but a great deal of it is the effect of other causes. The effects of missionary influence, on the other hand, are not only traceable in educational results and in direct conversions, but also are to be seen in the great changes of thought and custom which are gradually overspreading India. We have already repudiated the rough and ready method of estimating the value of missionary labour by the proportion between the money expended and the number of conversions effected as being utterly absurd, and as indicating that those who make use of it are either wilfully or stupidly ignorant of what they are speaking about. But we admit that, in endeavouring to employ a nicer and more accurate method, we encounter greater difficulties in arriving at a result.

There is another mode of estimating the value of missionary labour, frequently adopted by the friends of missions, which we must also set aside. It is assumed by many Christians that the salvation of a human soul is an achievement of infinite value, inasmuch as the soul in itself is of greater value than anything else pertaining to man, and is destined to an eternity of existence either in a condition of happiness or misery. And the value of missionary labour is estimated by the number of converts made, that is, of souls made happy through all eternity. Now we are not by any means of those who despise the immensities and eternities ; and we believe that there are motives to human action of the most ennobling kind which may be drawn from the contemplation of such sublime objects as heaven and eternity and immortality. But when we attempt to apply such a criterion as this to the results of Christian work, we simply land ourselves in obscurity and confusion. We are seeking in the region of the Unknown for what in our present condition we can never find. We are not at all sure of what proportion of professing Christians will find their way to the abodes of bliss ; as "Not every one that saith unto me Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of heaven" said the Founder of that kingdom. By adopting this criterion we would be employing a method the results of which we could never verify ; and those who employ it are generally guilty of what we wish to avoid,—making assumptions which are highly questionable, or descending to vague platitudes which are worse than useless.

We prefer to look for the results by which we shall estimate the value of missionary labour in a sphere within the reach of our present observation. We do not say that the criterion drawn from a future life may not be an important, or even the most

important standard of judgment; but we do say that we are not at present in a position to apply it. We shall therefore content ourselves with studying some of the observable effects of the great development of Christian enterprise which Mr. Sherring chronicles.

The effects to be studied are to be found amongst two great classes of the people of India; those who have professed Christianity, and those who, although not professing Christianity, have been influenced to a greater or less degree by Christian truth and Christian life. And as long continued contact between any two classes of people produces a *mutual* influence, as action is always counter-balanced by reaction, we ought to expect to see some change in the missionary body itself as the result of being so long brought into contact with heathenism. We have, therefore, three classes of effects to be studied: those to be observed amongst Christian converts from Hinduism; those amongst the population of India not professing, but to a greater or less degree influenced by Christianity; and those experienced by Christian workers in India, in consequence of their contact with heathenism.

I. In judging of the effects produced amongst converts from heathenism, we have already decided to throw out of account the blessings hoped for in a future state of existence. We do so, because they in all cases constitute an unknown quantity; and because we cannot be in all cases sure that professing Christians have fulfilled the conditions required to secure them. We confine ourselves solely to what is observable now or may reasonably be expected as the result of Christian training and instruction. And it is manifest at first sight, that a change from heathenism to Christianity supposes, or renders necessary, many important external changes of life and custom. It is now a well-understood thing that Christianity does not tolerate the performance of the various rites and ceremonies connected with idol-worship. Consequently to become a Christian means the giving up of idol-worship and everything connected with it. And as we know that the idol-deities of India indicate, and are the result of, very low and materialistic ideas of the Divine Nature, we have reason to believe, that those who cease to worship them, do so in consequence of having received much purer and more spiritual conceptions of the nature of the Divine Being. And at least we may conclude that the abolition amongst converted Christians of the forms and practices of idolatry will have the effect of greatly modifying and elevating their religious conceptions. Knowing as we do the influence of external forms and rites upon the mind, we cannot but conclude that the adoption of more rational forms and a more spiritual worship must have the effect of encouraging more spiritual ideas of God in the mind. And no one who has any

knowledge of the evils and the follies connected with idol-worship in India, can doubt the enormous benefits which would result from the adoption of the more spiritual forms and worship of the Christian faith. If it is a good thing for human beings to be freed from the power of a superstitious service which is degrading to their nature; if it is a good thing for them to cease being slaves of external rites; if it is a good thing for them to seek blessings from the God and Father of all, instead of worshipping the grotesque productions of their own uncultured imagination, it is good for them to join in the worship of the Christian faith Even although they may not have deep and true conceptions of the nature and doctrines of Christianity, we believe that it is a good thing for them to be brought under that external discipline and instruction which the becoming a member of a Christian Church involves.

But if we would appreciate fully the effects of the Christian faith upon the minds and lives of the converts, we must go deeper than this. Even external conformity to Christian rites and Christian worship, involving as it does the abjuration of idolatrous practices, and a certain spiritualizing of the religious thoughts and feelings, is productive of good results. But these results are scarcely to be compared with those which must follow from a more or less true and genuine acceptance of Christian faith and morals. Mr. Sherring points out that the early converts in the Southern Peninsula, who were brought over to Christianity through the labours of Schwartz and his colleagues, did not produce that influence in their country which we might have expected. Many of them, or at least of their children, must have lapsed into heathenism; and had it not been for the labours of successive European missionaries, Christianity there would probably have long since become extinct. Mr. Sherring accounts for the ephemeral character of the results there by the admission amongst the Christian converts of caste distinctions; there is no doubt but these distinctions are inconsistent with the genius of Christianity, and, where tolerated, must go far to counteract the influences of Christian instruction and worship. And the probability is, that in the early days of Schwartz, there was not enough of discretion made use of in the admission of converts. Elements from heathenism were admitted into Christian life and practice which, like evil weeds, served to choke out the good seed. It is also, probably, a doubtful point how deeply Christian principles had taken root. Mr. Sherring tells us that in North-Western India the severe sufferings and persecutions endured by the native Christians during the mutiny, had not the effect of driving any considerable number of them from their faith. A test such as that must have been, was at least enough to demonstrate the

sincerity of those who endured it. And there can be no doubt but a faith thus shown to be sincere, must exercise a very ennobling influence upon the lives of those who possess it. They have something in their hearts which they deem of far greater value than external peace and comfort, something for which they are willing to suffer and exercise self-denial. And the possession of that something makes them, even humanly speaking, far better and nobler than they could be without it.

How sincerely and how intelligently the Christian faith has been received, as a general rule, by the converts, we have no very accurate means of knowing. But yet there are some considerations which may help to throw some light upon the question. We may, in a rough way, divide the people from whom converts are drawn into two great classes. We have, in the first place, the high-caste Hindus, who are proud of their position in society, surrounded by many social distinctions and social restrictions which make it exceedingly difficult for them to adopt a foreign faith with all its accompanying penalties, and possessed of a comparatively large share of intelligence and of the traditional lore of the country. We have, in the second place, a great variety of low-caste people both in the plains and amongst the hills. These are inferior in physique and in intelligence, belonging to races much lower in the scale of human progress than the former. They are not surrounded by so many social bonds; and their morals and customs are of a much simpler and more primitive kind. They are much more superstitious than their high-caste neighbours, and their superstitions are, probably, of a more degrading kind. In consequence of the simple conditions in which they live, the adoption of a foreign faith is not attended with so many disabilities as amongst the higher caste Hindus. Practically, it would not in all cases be an easy matter to say to which of these two classes particular persons belong; but we presume that, generally speaking, this division expresses a real and easily recognised distinction between the people with whom the missionary comes into contact.

Now, if we compare these two classes with reference to the readiness of their acceptance of the Christian faith, we would expect them to stand about as follows. The higher caste Hindus being surrounded by so many impediments in the way of any important change of life, would not be so readily convinced of the errors or the follies of their ancestral religion. Their conversion to Christianity implies alienations and sacrifices which must be admitted to be very great. Consequently we should suppose that they would not take such a decided step without a genuine conviction of its great importance. We should expect that, as a body, they would defend the fortresses of their national worship as long as possible; and that they would do what they could in the

way of attacking the Christian system offered for their acceptance. Being united so closely by caste ties, the *esprit de corps* amongst them must be intensely strong; and, even where reason and conscience compel them to acquiesce in certain elements of Christian truth, we should expect that they would be reluctant to admit that they had received them from foreigners and would strive to find them in their own ancient faith. As compared with the high-caste Hindus, we might expect that the inferior tribes would be much more easily influenced by Christian teaching. Being so far below the level of the Christian missionary, the spirit of opposition and disputation could scarcely arise. And the benevolent endeavours of the missionary to do them good, could scarcely fail to have a conciliating effect upon their minds, and thus to induce them easily to accept of the faith offered to them. Not being possessed either of much natural intelligence or acquired knowledge, they could not be very critical hearers of the Gospel; and their conversion would be brought about, rather by the exercise of a kindly moral influence, than by an appeal to evidences appreciable by the intellect. And, as the penalties of excommunication from caste are not so severe among them, a much lesser degree of conviction and moral force would have the effect of inducing them to become Christians.

This *a priori* view of the effect of Christian teaching upon the two great classes of Hindus is, we think, to a great extent confirmed by experience. The statistics of missionary results show that only a small proportion of the converts to Christianity belong to the higher castes. And, within the last few years, the success of missionaries amongst hill tribes, such as the Kols and Santáls, has been something marvellous. About Calcutta, and probably in other places, only a very small number of Bráhmans of good position have become Christians. There, the greatest number of converts appear to belong to the lowest grades of the middle classes; although it is also undeniable that some of high position and great worth have united themselves to the Christian body. Thus, an examination of the rank and station of those who have professed Christianity appears to lead to the conclusion that Christianity in India has succeeded most where the difficulties in the way of becoming Christians have been least, and where the amount of knowledge and critical ability have been the smallest.

There may appear, at first sight, to be something in this fact disparaging to Christianity; and the fact has certainly been frequently adduced as an evidence of the want of success of missionary effort. But it is by no means so. Not only with reference to religious changes, but with reference to changes of every kind, the aristocracies of wealth and blood and learning in every country are conservative; are least easily affected by

any new influence. They have a position of which they are proud, and they do not wish to lose it. They have ancestral customs and traditions which have grown stronger in succeeding generations of their families, and which cannot be easily rooted out. No great social, religious, or political reformations have ever originated or readily found favour with the higher classes of any country. And it is thus manifest that the declinature of the higher classes of India to receive the Christian faith, cannot be taken as an evidence in any degree of the erroneousness or worthlessness of that which they reject. Their position, in fact, is just what we ought to expect. From our knowledge of how human nature acts in particular circumstances, we should be very much surprised if the native Indian Christian Church were at first composed, to any large extent, of the wealthy, the learned, or the noble.

We have now to consider the effects of the reception of the Christian faith which have been produced upon those who have submitted to its initiatory rite. It would be quite gratuitous for us to assume that these effects are the same in all, or that the hearts and lives of all have been equally influenced by the new doctrines and motives communicated to them. It would also be unreasonable to expect that amongst converts from heathenism there should be found those excellences of Christian life and character, which in Christian countries have been produced after generations or centuries of Christian training. Character is of slow formation; the production of important changes in the life of the individual or of the society is, as a rule, not speedily accomplished. And those who expect amongst children all the traits of moral manhood, will not be more disappointed than those who expect amongst Hindu Christians the fully-developed principles of Christian maturity. Mr. Sherring in his book gives us no reason to suppose that the native Christians of India have attained to Christian manhood; and the admission that they have not, is no detraction from the value of the work which has been accomplished. But, from a perusal of the work before us, we should say that, as a body, they have effected an enormous advance upon their pre-Christian position. Notwithstanding the fact that only a small proportion of them are drawn from the higher castes, they have already become a moral power of considerable importance in India. All over the country, from south to north, from east to west, they are collected together into smaller or larger congregations. They meet together for religious worship of a rational and purifying kind; they listen to instructions which, whether completely understood or not, have naturally a certain enlightening and elevating influence upon their mind. And, although it may be said, that up to this time, as a body, they

are in a state of dependence and moral and spiritual childhood, it is still none the less true that in them India has a large and yearly increasing body of people whose lives and characters are being moulded for great achievements. And it would be well if missionary societies would direct more of their attention to the preparation of the native church for the future career of arduous, and, it is to be hoped, successful labour, upon which it must enter if Christianity is to be widely established in India.

With reference to the extent to which the native church has imbibed Christian doctrine, it would be hazardous to pronounce an opinion. When we enquire how far they have *imbibed Christian doctrine*, we do not mean how far they have become acquainted with the Christian doctrines taught them by missionaries. We mean to ask how far they have *assimilated* these doctrines, and made them their own ; how far they have taken them into their intellectual and moral being, recognized their truth, and made them the principles of their lives. It is only by obtaining an answer to this question that we could truly estimate the effects of missionary effort amongst them. But an answer is difficult to be got at. However, there is one test which we may apply, which may enable us to determine, in a remotely approximate way, the extent to which the native church has really digested Christian doctrine.

There is an important distinction between the passive reception of any system of doctrines, and the complete appropriation of them, so that they become, as it were, a part of one's own intellectual being. In the latter case, the student examines the doctrines communicated to him in all their bearings, subjects them to careful testing and criticism, rejects what will not bear such examination, and assimilates the remainder as believed truth. In this discussion and examination a certain amount of doubt is implied. People examine and criticise because they are in doubt; doubt originates in the mind in consequence of there being an apparent inconsistency between that which is doubted and something else thought to be true. The critical mind examines the inconsistent elements to see which of them is best founded and which should be rejected or modified. Now, it appears to be necessary that people who pass intelligently from one system of beliefs to another, should pass through a transition state of scepticism and enquiry. It appears, in the ordinary course of nature, impossible that a human mind should give up one system of beliefs and accept another without a great deal of doubt and examination. And this ought to be the case, in an eminent degree, where the system given up and the system accepted are so widely different from one another, have so many and com-

plicated relations, and such important bearings on practical life as Hinduism and Christianity.

Now, we have no doubt whatever that, in individual cases, there is a good deal of enquiry made and instruction communicated before Hindus become Christians. Missionaries, as a rule, especially in modern times, require on the part of candidates for baptism a good deal of knowledge of the Christian faith, and some evidence of the sincerity of the convert. And, perhaps, they make the conditions of admission into the Christian Church as rigid as in the circumstances they ought to do. But it appears manifest that a complete transition from Hindu modes of thought to Christian, can scarcely be effected in the course of the few months or even the few years of enquiry through which converts have passed. And it appears also manifest that the nature and the bearings and the consequences of Christian doctrines could scarcely be intelligently apprehended and digested in the short transition stage between the Hindu *Thakurbari* and the Christian Church. And the fact that this change is so speedily and apparently so completely made, gives an impartial observer great reason to doubt its thoroughness and reality. In all the native Christian literature which we have read we are able to detect scarcely any traces of a past period of anxious doubt and critical enquiry. Stagnant, uncritical orthodoxy is to be found everywhere throughout the literature produced by the Hindu Church This may be pleasing to those who wish merely to see an accurate facsimile of evangelical orthodoxy produced in the East. But, to one who would like to see independent life, intellectual, moral, Christian life springing up in India, a few traces of indigenous mental activity, even although *heretical* in its result, would be welcome signs. The great scarcity of signs of independent thought, the readiness and completeness with which, as a general rule, the standards of Western churches are accepted, appear to indicate the presence of little but that passive reception of Christian doctrine to which we referred.

This absence of independent life and thought is no doubt to be deplored, but at the same time it is, perhaps, what should reasonably be expected. If we study the history of Christianity in Europe, we see that for centuries there was nothing but a passive reception of transmitted Christian doctrines. And even in the present day when these doctrines are being subjected anew to careful and earnest examination, how many thousands are there in Europe and America who accept without criticism and profess without intelligent apprehension. This, too, is to be deplored, because it is a sign of the want of life. But, probably, it will always be true that the many will receive more or less passively the result which the few have reached by long and painful efforts.

In the Indian Church, however, we have yet to look for the few who, through doubt and difficulty, by careful enquiry and independent effort, will find for themselves and their fellow worshippers the foundations on which they may build the future Indian Church.

It may, perhaps, be said that the foundations are already laid; that no other solid foundations can be laid except those which support the European churches. But surely those who say or think thus are ignorant of the searching criticism to which the foundations of European churches are now being subjected. Whatever may be the result of this severe critical examination, it is, at least certain, that many doctrines held by Western churches are not characterized by that indubitable certainty which compels the belief of all reasonable and intelligent human minds. And, it might be well, if those churches would considerably diminish the number of fundamental articles to be presented for acceptance to the office-bearers of the native churches, so as to leave room in future for that free and honest enquiry which is the essential condition of attaining to a sincere and an intelligent faith.

II. We have now to study the effects of Christian effort as seen amongst those Hindus who have not openly embraced, but have to a greater or less extent been influenced by Christianity.

Mr. Sherring after summing up the statistical results of missionary labour in Benares goes on to say:—"These results, however, are no proper criterion of the great work which has been accomplished among the natives of Benares by Christian truth, education, just government, and the general civilising elements in operation in their midst. It is no exaggeration to affirm that native society in that city, especially among the better classes, is hardly the same thing that it was a few years ago. An educated class has sprung into existence, which is little inclined to continue in the mental bondage of the past. The men composing it may be compared to the bud ready to burst into the blossom under the united influence of light and heat. The religion of idolatry, of sculptures, of sacred wells and rivers, of gross fetichism of mythological representations, of many-handed, or many-headed, or many-bodied deities, is losing, in their eyes, its religious romance. They yearn after a religion purer and better. They want to honor God as He is, not as symbolized in these mystical associations. English education, based on the Bible, has thus produced a revolution of thought in their minds. In the Government college and schools the Bible is not permitted as a text-book; yet it is none the less true that the English education they impart is, in no slight degree, Biblical. Thus it has come to pass, that the light which precedes and accompanies conviction, has been shed upon many minds in this seat of Hinduism. A new era of intellectual

freedom and religious life has already commenced. Of not a few it may be said, that 'old things have passed away'; and of the mass of the people, that 'all thing are becoming new.' Such a change as has been wrought is full of promise and encouragement; and is of a much more satisfactory and genuine character than an addition of some scores or hundreds of mere nominal converts would be. On the other hand, stern and persistent opposition must be expected by the advocates of Christianity in a city like Benares, in which old creeds and customs exist, penetrating through and through the social and personal life of the people, and associated with their history for ages past; in which a powerful priesthood is ever on the alert to keep them attentive to their duties, and to mystify them by their magical charms and ceremonies; in which multitudes of persons read the sacred books, and reverence the mingled philosophy and religion they contain; and in which sensuous forms and symbols of the indigenous faith meet the eye in every direction. What wonder, if in such a city, a new and better religion, though derived from heaven, and bearing on its front the glory of its Divine original, should meet with special, unwonted and determined opposition! To reckon on the hasty and sudden downfall of the old religion, which harmonises so completely with the pride and vanity, and other evil qualities of the human heart, and on the rapid and universal spread of a faith which tends to destroy these qualities, and to bring the heart into an entirely new condition, is to indulge in mere quixotism, and to manifest an impatience at variance with the calmness of the Gospel." (pp. 189-191.)

We have introduced this extract because it presents, with sufficient accuracy, the state of things not merely in Benares but at the principal cities and towns of India, where Christianity and secular education have been at work. From it we learn, what is indeed abundantly manifest, that the preaching of Christian doctrine, the exercise of Christian and moral influence, and the spread of secular knowledge, have produced wide-spread effects amongst the intelligent classes of the Indian people. But, in the examination of these effects, it is not easy to say how much of them should be ascribed to the direct communication of Christian doctrine and precept, and how much to the other influences social, moral, and educational which have been widely exerted. There can be no doubt, that the communication of secular knowledge, the imparting of a knowledge of the laws of nature, of the principles of science and of art, and of the thoughts which are stored up in a rich and healthy literature, must have the effect of destroying the superstitious beliefs of the people thus enlightened. But, it does not at all follow, that those in whom the destructive tendencies of secular knowledge have been exerted, are thereby

predisposed in favour of the Christian religion. In fact, we should say that in the majority of cases the result is quite the reverse. Secular knowledge destroys a belief in the superstitions of Hinduism; but in the minds of Hindus it is also likely to create a prejudice against anything else in the shape of religion. And in cases where instruction in the Christian religion is given in combination with secular knowledge, as in the missionary schools and colleges, it is not generally the case that the Christian doctrines are received with favour. Christian morality is no doubt received with approbation, and, probably, does produce some effect in elevating the tone of morals in educated Hindu society. But, the *peculiar* doctrines of Christianity, those which give to Christianity its exclusive character, excite. as a general rule, a spirit of intense opposition in the Hindu mind. We might, perhaps, accurately classify those more or less influenced by Christianity and secular education as follows: those who reject Hinduism and every other system of religious beliefs; those who reject Hinduism, but retain some of its moral elements along with some moral and religious doctrines taken from other sources, especially from Christianity; and those who, rejecting Hinduism, become favourably disposed towards Christianity.

In the first of these classes we have an instance of the same result which has been produced in western lands by the spread of science. Science, professedly and wisely, confines its explanations to the region of phenomenal things, of things that may be seen and touched and measured. But while science, in this its defined sphere is supreme, scientific men have shown a strong tendency to assume that their own sphere of operations is the only one, with which as intellectual and moral beings we have anything to do. This exclusiveness of science, prevalent in Europe, has been imported into India, and as far as it has operated, has tended both to overthrow Hinduism and to drive out Christianity. The importation of this superficial phenomenalism is something greatly to be deplored, by all those who believe that there are interests and powers behind the veil of sense by which we are immediately surrounded, with which interests and powers we are most intimately concerned. Science has a much easier task in demolishing Hinduism than in overthrowing a belief in Christianity, and as the work of establishing the Christian faith in an uncongenial soil is by no means an easy one, we may expect that the class of scientific unbelievers in every form of religion, will likely become a very large one. At the same time the condition of this class may be a step towards something better.

There is also in Hindu society a large class of people who, rejecting many of the superstitions of Hinduism, do not cut themselves off from the sphere of religion altogether, but retain or obtain from

other sources principles of religion and morality which are no doubt of great importance. This class is represented by the Brahma Samáj; but it must be remembered that it contains a vastly greater number than can be counted as members of that body. Generally speaking, we should say, that the minds of the people composing this class are in a state of great uncertainty regarding religious subjects. They have but recently given up the old traditions of their fathers, and they are in search of something which will be more satisfying to reason and conscience. For various reasons they are unwilling to accept Christianity, that faith being, on social and national grounds, peculiarly repulsive to Hindus. And although they, perhaps unconsciously, imbibe many important elements from Christianity; it scarcely appears that they are individually on the way towards an acceptance of that faith. We should say that, generally speaking, their religious principles are of a mutually incongruous character; that they have not thought out for themselves a set of consistent foundations for their religious life; and that, as a class, they are in a state of religious instability, easily led away by any plausible doctrine which presents itself. At the same time, while those whom we place in this class, do not accept Christianity on the ground that they consider many Christian doctrines erroneous, there are yet many features in their position pleasing to the Christian missionary and philanthropist. They appear to be struggling towards freedom from error and superstition; and in doing so should excite the sympathy of all right-thinking men. They are not characterised by that spirit of dependence and subserviency which unfortunately marks, to so large an extent, the native Christian Church; they have imbibed, more or less, freedom and independence of thought, and are unwilling either to retain an old or receive a new creed upon authority, or out of respect to those who expound it. They are, probably, as a whole, to a great extent under the influence of strong national prejudice; they resent with impatience the assumptions of superiority of the rulers of India, and the very fact that Christianity is the religion of their foreign conquerors makes it almost impossible for them to study its doctrines with calm impartiality. But, even with the unfavourable influence of this strong prejudice, they generally avow an admiration for the person and character of Christ, which speaks well for their honesty of purpose, and which is also a very important testimony to the wonderful moral and spiritual power of the great Founder of the Christian religion. There are, however, some features in the Christianity which has been presented to them which appear to their minds insuperable difficulties. Foremost amongst these objectionable elements is the *exclusiveness* of the Christian claims. They have heard over and over again that it is only through Christ

that salvation can be obtained. "I formerly remarked," says Dr. Wilson of Bombay in his "Hinduism," "that God is the Father of all mankind, and no Father gives opposite laws for the government of his own children. God has given one law, and, therefore, there is but one true religion, and one true written rule of religion, in the same manner as there is but one sun for this earth" (p. 104) And again (p. 125) the Hindu religion "is to those who embrace it and adhere to it, the road to death and everlasting destruction. And in order to vindicate this doctrine, he says in the appendix (p. 164), "The statement made in the text may appear to some professing Christians as harsh and severe. It is consistent, however, with the doctrine of all the Reformed churches which have exhibited their creeds and confessions." This mode of presenting Christianity may be taken as the type of what was once common, and these extracts still represent the popular notions of the Christian Gospel amongst the Hindus. And the conclusion is just as manifest to the intelligent Hindu mind as to our own. If this Gospel, as preached by missionaries of whom we have taken Dr. Wilson as the type be true, then the vast majority of mankind have been condemned by One, who is still declared to be their Father, to hopeless destruction. The teeming millions of the Eastern world have never had the most remote opportunities of hearing about Christ; and they are to be condemned. And, it is scarcely to be expected that thinking Hindus would readily receive a faith which condemns their fathers and forefathers of all preceding generations to a destruction which they had not the means of avoiding. They would much rather believe the Christian claims to be false than that One, called a Father, would treat His children so partially. A small number of Christians may look with complacency upon the hopeless destruction of those who have not been so fortunate as themselves; but it is simply impossible that those who belong to the devoted host should contemplate the doctrine with the same degree of calm approval.

Amongst those influenced by Christian teaching, there is a third class to which we must refer, probably smaller in number than either of the others. They are favourably disposed towards the Christian religion, and might almost be described as unbaptized Christians. They have been brought under the influence of strong religious impressions; have compared their own with other faiths; and have come to the honest conviction that the life and the teachings of Christ are incomparably superior to those of any other of the world's religious guides. They may be represented by the late Rajah Rammohun Roy, who, although usually called the founder of the Brahma Samáj, was vastly nearer to Christianity than any of the present leaders of that body. The thoughts and lives of these Hindu Christians have been powerfully

moulded by Christian influence, and it is, probably, only prudential motives which prevent them from professing the faith in which they believe. Or, perhaps, it would be more correct to say, that prudential motives have led them to seek for reasons which will convince their minds that baptism is an unnecessary rite. Although described as Christians, they cannot be called *orthodox*, in the Western evangelical sense of that term ; as we have never met with any who were willing to admit the exclusive features of Christianity to which we have referred. The number of this class is difficult to estimate ; is probably not very great ; but is likely much greater than is usually supposed, as the present writer has some reason to believe. Whatever may be concluded with reference to their number, it is, at least, an important and significant fact that there is a considerable number of honest and intelligent men in Hindu society, who are not afraid to avow their belief in what is most valuable in the Christian religion, and who have drawn the best light of their lives from Him who has produced the greatest religious revolution that the world has ever seen.

III. We now approach an enquiry, probably more difficult than the preceding, regarding the effects upon the missionary body of coming into contact with Hindu beliefs and institutions. During the crusading period in the history of Europe, probably the crusading nations were just as much affected by the Saracens against whom they led their armies as the Saracens were by them. It is impossible for two peoples, differing in religion, customs, and institutions to come into intimate contact with one another without exercising a *reciprocal* influence. And the person who comes to India from Europe or America, and whose views and opinions are not greatly modified by coming into contact with the Hindu people, must be very immovable indeed. There can be little doubt but a great deal of the broadening of the lines of Christian thought, observable in our day, has been the result of getting better acquainted with the literature and the institutions of people called heathen. The early explorers in the fields of Hindu literature returned from their researches with very wonderful results which produced a great effect upon the minds of Christian thinkers. And although the ardent expectations of these early explorers regarding the great value of the mine which was opened up by a knowledge of the Sanskrit language have scarcely been realized, it is at least certain, that in India we have come into contact with a people who have a great historical past to be proud of, and who are as firmly persuaded as any Jews or Christians have ever been, that the moral and religious light by which their fathers have been led, is a light from heaven. An examination of the degrad-

ing superstitions of modern Hinduism appears to indicate a lamentable degeneration from the condition of the ancient Vedic times; but it should be remembered that this degeneration has been produced rather by the absorption of degrading elements from lower tribes than by a natural deterioration. However this may be, the Christian student of the best thoughts that have emanated from the Hindu mind cannot but see in them many things of an elevating kind, many things which might convince him that the people of this land have not been deserted by heaven, and that the Being who is believed in as the Universal Father never ceases to care for any of His children.

Now, we believe that the majority of those who now constitute the missionary body assume a very different position with reference to Hinduism from what was usually assumed, say, thirty or forty years ago. The following extract from Dr. Duff's work on Indian Missions is a fair specimen of the old illiberal way of thinking so common in former times, "The truth of Christianity having been demonstrated times and ways without number, to the entire satisfaction of thousands and tens of thousands of the most rational and enlightened men that ever lived, its adherents have, as they think, an indisputable title to proceed on the admission of its truth. Believing, therefore, as they do, on grounds that have never been invalidated, that Christianity is true, they are constrained to look upon every other religious system as erroneous, dishonourable to God, and destructive of the happiness of man. . . . . Accordingly, they must deny, absolutely and without reserve, the existence of any *natural right*, on the part of any parents to teach and perpetuate a system of *falsehood* and *delusion* so loathsome and deadly (as Hinduism) . . . . . Is it possible, is it for a moment to be conceived, that the God of Truth, the pure and the Holy God, Who cannot look upon sin but with abhorrence, could have conferred upon any of His creatures a *natural right* to inculcate any faith like that of Hinduism, *i.e.*, to impart the knowledge of a system of hideous error.—that by so doing, He could have enforced by the sanction of Omniscience, and the thunders of Omnipotence the exercise of a privilege to insult His own Majesty, to violate His own law, and to cover His subject with confusion, shame, and everlasting dismay?" (Duff on India Missions, p. 460ff.)

It is quite refreshing in the present day to recall the time when such vigorous declamation as the above was commonly indulged in, and, however much we may admire the eloquence and zeal of the "prince of missionaries," there is certainly not much to be said of his breadth of view. At the time, however, when he came to India, his view of the Gospel was the common one. The first word which the preacher of the Gospel uttered to the heaven-deserted

Oriental world was a word of condemnation. The gods of the Hindus were false deities; their religious rites were odious and degrading; their race, from first to last, had been on the downward course to eternal damnation; and even the few traditions they had of a primeval revelation, only served to make darkness visible and increase the misery of their condition. Such were the opening messages of something called a Gospel, which the earliest Protestant missionaries were sent to proclaim, and which, probably, the majority of them did proclaim. And we believe that the proclamation of this preliminary message of damnation, has done more to alienate the Hindu people from Christianity than anything else. Even now the popular conception of Christianity in India is that of a creed which dooms to destruction the vast majority of mankind, including the present and preceding generations of Hindus, and which promises safety only to those who submit to Christian baptism.

Now, we speak advisedly when we say that we believe a very decided change has taken place within the last ten or twenty years in the mode of presenting the Gospel to the Hindu people. It would be strange, indeed, if the great waves of religious thought, which have passed and are passing over Europe, should not influence the mind of the missionary body of India. It will be still more passing strange, if a body of good and intelligent men could remain for years in India, and look the people of India honestly in the face, and tell them that the Father of all mankind, having left their fore-fathers in ignorance of the only knowledge which could save them from destruction, now offered to them, of the present day, a Saviour, and that still that Father was the God of infinite *love*, and impartial *justice;* we say it would he passing strange, if a body of good and intelligent men could continue long to say such things in the face of the people of India, and we believe that, as a body, the Protestant missionaries have ceased to say them. We believe, that they are now willing to recognise whatever is good in the religious faith of the people of India, and anxious to lead them from that to something which is still better. If it be true that Christ is the Son of God, and "*the Light that lighteneth every man that cometh into the world,*" surely that Light has not been withheld from the vast majority of mankind; surely some rays of that Light have glimmered amongst the teeming millions of Asia long before the missionary spirit was kindled in Europe; and surely the spirit of Christ, in whom all earthly divisions and bars of separation are abolished, is not prevented from working and influencing men beyond the sphere of His visible Church. Probably sentiments such as these have found access to the minds of the majority of mission agents in India. At any rate, we have reason to believe that denunciations of the errors and superstitions of Hinduism are, to a great extent, given up; that Christ, the gift of divine love

and the giver of life, is preached rather than the dry-bones of theological dogma; that the old damnatory introduction to Christianity is omitted; and that a message worthy of the name of the *Gospel* is delivered. And, we think that the change which has come over the spirit of evangelical preaching in India, is due just as much to the contact of the preachers with the people of India, as to the influence of the change in religious views which has been experienced by Christian Europe.

We must now close our discussion of the effects of missionary work in India; but before doing so, we should recommend our readers to make themselves personally acquainted with Mr. Sherring's interesting and valuable work. The great Protestant effort, the history of which is chronicled by Mr. Sherring, has attained such dimensions, that it is neither to be sneered at nor treated with indifference. And those who wish to obtain a comprehensive view of the condition of the people of India, or to do anything in the way of improving their condition, cannot overlook a series of efforts so energetic, so wide-spread, and so fruitful of great and important changes, as the Christian missionary agencies.

Art. VI.—THE LOGICAL DOCTRINE OF THE PROPOSITION.

In offering an article upon a subject such as this to the readers of this *Review*, the writer feels a kind of necessity laid upon him to say a few words by way of explanation, perhaps even of apology. The logical doctrine of the Proposition is not one in which probably a large number of readers take a very deep interest; it is not apparently connected with *India* in any peculiar manner or degree; and, therefore, there may seem to be no particular reason why it should be discussed in the pages of the *Review* so long identified with the metropolis of the Indian empire. It is for the purpose of removing this *primâ facie* prejudice against our subject that we offer this explanation.

We presume that all our readers will agree with us in holding that it is the exercise of *thought* which is the crowning glory of man; and that the *proper* exercise of thought is the great distinction between the wise and the foolish man. Thought being thus such an exceedingly important function of humanity, it follows that the correct study and analysis of thought is a very important department of science. What is important for mankind at large is therefore important for the inhabitants of India, and hence follows the legitimacy of the discussion of this subject in this *Review* But we think that we can claim also a *special* appropriateness for our subject. Western education in India is yet in its infancy; the Calcutta University is only a creature of yesterday. While, therefore, it is of importance to introduce from Europe whatever is valuable in literature and science and art, it appears to be of equal importance to exclude or to modify systems or doctrines of questionable worth and accuracy. It would be a pity that the educational system of India should be loaded in its infancy with antiquated or inaccurate doctrines which the leading thinkers of the West have discarded. It is especially in the department of philosophy that there is the greatest danger of antiquated survivals being retained; partly because the science itself is still scarcely rescued from the chaotic haze with which it has so long been surrounded, partly because the students of the science are in too many cases prevented by prejudice from seeing truth, and partly because it is an exceedingly difficult thing to dislodge any system of teaching from its position, even after its inaccuracy or inutility has been demonstrated. The present paper proposes to take only a very limited department of the great sphere enbraced by philosophy, a limited department even of the sphere of thought. And if this humble

contribution has any effect in correcting any erroneous doctrines, or in leading to the introduction of a more accurate study of the nature of the most important function of our mind, the object of the writer will be accomplished.

Every act of thinking involves the perception or the conception of *some relation* between two or more objects of knowledge or belief. A vast variety and multiplicity of objects, presentations and representations combine to make up our conscious mental life; and when we are engaged in contemplating the *relations* of those objects we are said to be thinking. The assertion or the denial of any relation is made in the *proposition*, the nature of which is the subject of the present paper. But, before advancing to the discussion of the nature and form of the preposition, we shall examine and classify the relations which are asserted or denied in propositions.

One of the most essential of the relations of phenomena is *difference*. The only way in which we can distinguish a smell, for example, from a taste, or a sound from a colour, or one colour from another, is by perceiving the difference between them. We could not know anything at all except by knowing it as different from something else, and thus difference is one of the most essential elements of our conscious life. But it would be impossible to perceive difference if we were not able to bring the two differing objects side by side and compare them; and thus the condition of perceiving difference is simultaneous contiguity, or, as we shall call it, for simplicity's sake, *simultaneity* We could not have a continuous and identical conscious life without being able to recall the past and connect it with the present. We believe that we are the same beings that we were some time ago, because we can remember things that we then knew; we can now represent to our minds what was formerly presented. But we could not do this without preceiving a *resemblance* between the present representation and the past presentation. Thus the perception of resemblance is the condition of a *continuous* conscious life, as the perception of difference is the condition of a *momentary* conscious life. The perception of continuity, however, involves that of *succession* of one phenomenon succeeding another; and the perception of succession again involves that of difference. We can only know ourselves as continuously existing cognitive beings by knowing succeeding phenomena differenced from one another, and by knowing past phenomena by means of resembling representations of them.

Here we have described the most universal and essential of the relations of our conscious life. We could not be permanent cognitive beings at all without being able to perceive and actually perceiving these relations. Thus difference and resemblance,

simultaneity and succession, are relations which enter into our very constitution as cognitive beings; without them thought would be impossible, and thus they may be called the *a priori* conditions, or the primitive essential elements of thought.

If now, we consider the *objects* of our knowledge we shall reach another division of relations subordinate to the above. All objects which are related to one another may be distinguished into *quantities* and *qualities*. The latter correspond to the *sensations* of which we are or may be conscious; the former consist of the *Form* of sensations or objects, namely, the space, time, motion and so on, by which sense objects are conditioned. Again the relations of all objects or classes which may be predicated are either *internal* or *external*; the former being the relations of objects or classes to internal constituent qualities or parts, the latter to other external objects or classes. Internal and external relations may be both quantitative and qualitative, and thus we have a four-fold division of relations into:—I, Internal Quantitative; II, Internal Qualitative; III, External Quantitative; IV, External Qualitative. This classification is founded upon and not exclusive of our former division of the four primary relations, as will be seen from the following table:—

I. Internal Quantitative Relations comprehend:—	II. Internal Qualitative Relations comprehend:—	III. External Quantitative Relations comprehend:—	IV. External Qualitative Relations comprehend:—
Relations of figure, size, shape, motion, number, and so on, of the constituent parts or elements of objects, classes or systems. These relations may be any of the four primary relations or any combinations of them.	Relations between the qualities of objects of our knowledge, or classes of objects. these qualities being made known to us by the sensations or ideas which they produce in our minds.	Relations of any of the four primary kinds or any combinations of them between the figure, size, shape, motion, duration, number, and so on, of objects, classes or systems which are external to one another.	Relations between external objects or systems with reference to qualities made known by sense, moral or aesthetical qualities, characters, habits, conditions and any other characteristics of objects of knowledge which may be appropriately called qualitative.

We shall give illustrations of these great classes of relations.

I. Internal Quantitative Relations.

When we construct a geometrical figure, as that of the fifth or the forty-seventh proposition of the first book of Euclid, we constitute a unity, and the subsequent demonstration is a comparison of the different internal parts in respect of their magnitude, and the inferences which result from that comparison. Similarly, many of the propositions of geometry consist of a

combination of predications regarding the internal quantitative relations of different kinds of figures.

The astronomer who studies the motions of the different bodies belonging to the solar system is engaged with internal quantitative relations. The solar system as a whole constitutes a unity, the elements of which are the sizes, masses, distances, orbits, velocities, and so on, of the various bodies which revolve around the sun or the primary planets, and of the central luminary.

The mechanical engineer is similarly occupied when he arranges the figure, strength, motion, position, and so on, of mechanical structures, as houses, bridges, or machines. Comparative anatomists are able to complete the skeletons of animals, having given them certain of the bones. This ability is the result of a careful study of the internal quantitative relations of the bodies of animals.

II. Internal Qualitative Relations.

The qualities of single objects of sense often require to be studied and compared in the interests of science. The chemist in his analysis of the various organic and inorganic substances which come under his notice is engaged in the study of internal qualitative relations. The process of classification involves a careful examination and comparison of the internal qualities of bodies or things classified. The composition and criticism of the productions of the poet, musician, statuary, and painter, consist chiefly of the arrangement and examination of internal qualitative relations. The same relations are the objects of study when we examine the characteristics of a man, of a nation, of a government, of a religious system, of a systematic body of doctrine of any kind, of an oration, in short of any of the vast variety of things known to us which are characterised by internal differences of quality or powers of exciting ideas.

III. External Quantitative Relations.

In classification, when the extension or quantity of one class is compared with that of another, we are dealing with external quantitative relations. Many geometrical propositions are concerned with these relations. Comparisons of the weights, masses, figures, proportions, velocities, numbers, and so on, of distinct bodies not forming parts of a connected system, have for their objects external quantitative relations.

IV. External Qualitative Relations.

The botanist, zoologist, and chemist, in comparing the different specimens of objects which comes within their respective spheres to study are concerned about external qualitative relations. So is the ethnologist in comparing the characteristics of different races of men, the philologist in comparing the principles of different languages, the mythologist in bringing together the myths, legends, and folk-lore of different countries, and the comparative economist

in studying together the different social and political institutions which have sprung up in different countries at different times. This study of the qualitative relations of things and systems has sprung into importance chiefly in modern times and is a very powerful method of scientific discovery. In the comparative study of physical characteristics, of moral and social habits, of myths, of religious beliefs, of languages, of institutions, of laws, and of historical events, consists the only available effectual method of discovering the beginnings and the principles of human progress.

Now all thought is concerned about some, or all or various combinations of the relations which we have just now classified; and the result of every comparison as well as the expression of every relation, is a *predication* or a *proposition.* In the exposition of our own views, we shall use the former term; in the criticism of current logical doctrine we shall use the latter. *Predication,* we may thus define as *the assertion that one object or element of our knowledge or conception stands, or does not stand, in some relation to one or more other objects or elements of knowledge or conception.* In order that we may clearly understand the nature and forms of predication we shall study a few examples of it. And we shall begin with the study of examples of the predication of internal relations.

When we say, *this rose is red,* we affirm an internal relation of simultaneity or co-existence. The redness is a quality found co-existing with all the other qualities which make up our knowledge of the flower. The uniform and inseparable co-existence of these qualities causes us to think of them all as making *one object*; and when we say *this rose,* we mean by it the *one object* made up of all the qualities. The first term of the above predication calls up an image before consciousness; the second term is one of the elements of the image singled out for the moment for particular attention; the predication affirms that the element forms a part of the whole object, or co-exists with the other element of it uniformly and inseparably.

The horse has four legs. This predication also affirms a certain internal relation of the object *horse.* The first term of the relation denotes a particular object composed of many parts and qualities. The second term of the relation expresses particular elements or parts of the whole object. The predication affirms a relation of co-existence of that regular and inseparable kind which constitutes the co-existing qualities an *individual.*

All predications which we make regarding the internal constitution of objects are of the same nature as the above, and have about the same significance. The *form* of the predication is a matter of comparative indifference, as we are now engaged in the

study of *thoughts* not of *words*. The same relation is expressed by all the following forms :—The rose *is* red ; the horse *has* four legs ; the house *consists of* six rooms ; England *contains* Middlesex ; the lion *is possessed of* a shaggy mane ; the solar system *comprehends* the sun, planets and satellites. And in all these cases the first term of the predication denotes a whole object, and the second term expresses some quality, part, or element of the object.

Not only may we predicate internal relations of material objects and systems of objects, but also of mental and social phenomena. The following are examples of such predications :— A moral judgment consists of intellectual and sentimental elements ; the family is composed of a husband, wife, and children ; the Government of England includes the Sovereign, the House of Lords, and the House of Commons. The meaning of the predication in all these cases is the same as before.

There are other predications of relations which may, perhaps, be called internal, but which should be distinguished from the above. These are predications of *intransitive actions*. We may give as examples of these :—The dog barks ; fire burns ; the sun shines ; the river runs ; the wheel turns, and so on. In all these predications, and such as these, there is involved the idea of some thing *proceeding from* the first term of the relation. *The dog barks* means a certain sound proceeds from the dog. *Fire burns*, means that a certain sensation is experienced after contact with fire. *The river runs*, means that a body of water occupies different places at successive times. *The wheel turns*, means that the different parts of the wheel successively occupy different positions. The first term of each of these predications denotes some object ; the second term implies some sensation or action ; and the predication affirms a relation of *succession* between the co-existing qualities of the object and the sensation or action predicated.

We now proceed to the examination of external relations of objects as affirmed or denied in predications, and, for the sake of convenience, shall consider indiscriminately quantitative and qualitative relations. And first amongst these we have relations of difference. A relation of difference, we have seen, is absolutely necessary to enable us to distinguish one object from another. If two objects are *exactly alike* in quality they must, at least, have different *spatial positions* to be distinguishable. Relations of difference are usually expressed by the comparative degree of the adjective which expresses the quality with reference to which two objects are compared. The following are examples :—Red *is brighter than* green. Lead *is heavier than* wood. The sun *is larger than* any of its planets. The conceptions of "Paradise Lost" *are more sublime than* those of "The Deserted Village."

A child *is not so strong as* a man. A greyhound *can run faster than* a bull-dog. The scenes of heaven *are more glorious than* can be expressed by language. The fruit of the pine apple *is not the same as* that of the orange tree. In all these cases, and in others which might be adduced, we see that the two terms of the predication are the two objects compared; and the predication asserts that a relation of difference, in some particular respect, exists between them. The words which we have italicised in the above examples *express the relation predicated* between the two terms; and it is manifest that it is of no consequence which term of the relation comes first in the predication. The substitution of the second term for the first would simply involve a slight change in the *expression*, but no change in the *thought*. *Red is brighter than green*, is in thought the same as *green is not so bright as red*. And so of all the others. Frequently we have to express a difference between two objects which consists in the fact that, along with a certain resemblance, the one possesses qualities which the other does not. For example, the bat differs from the mouse in that the former has membranous appendages answering the purpose of wings, while the latter has not. The zebra differs from the horse in having a regularly striped skin. The whale differs from the most of the mammals in being an aquatic animal. In such comparisons as these it is not easy to adopt such an expression as will show the difference predicated so clearly as in the former cases; but the *thought* is equally simple. There are two objects compared; they are found to differ in a certain respect; and the predication affirms that they do thus differ. And, as before, it is of no consequence which term of the relation comes first in the predication; the thought is the same whatever be the particular mode of expression.

Amongst the external relations of objects, both in respect of quantity and quality, that of resemblance is of great importance. It is in consequence of resemblance in certain respects that we classify objects together and constitute them a unity. It is in consequence of resemblance between objects that we draw inferences regarding them. We are not now concerned, however, with these uses of resemblance, but only with the nature and expression of the predication of resemblance. Let us study some examples:—

This line *is of the same length as* that. These triangles *are all equal-sided*. This piece of lead *weighs* two pounds. In the first and third of these examples there is a comparison of *two* objects, and a predication that they resemble one another; in the second the predication of resemblance has reference to *several* objects. When the terms related to one another in a predication of resemblance are common names, there is always involved a comparison of several objects. For example, when we say, *horses have four*

feet, we mean that all objects known by the term horse resemble one another in having four feet; here we predicate a relation of resemblance between all known or conceived individuals. And, as we said before, we imply that *each* horse has four feet—an internal relation of co-existence.

We often predicate resemblance between things which are not exactly alike, but yet sufficiently alike to be classified together. When we say *crimson is like scarlet*, we mean not that they are exactly alike, but that they are the *same kind* of colour, and thus distinguishable from blue or green. When we say that *the sheep resembles the deer*, we mean to predicate resemblance only in certain respects, and if we state our meaning fully we will particularise the points of resemblance. The most of the resemblances which are affirmed in predication are only partial; when we affirm a complete resemblance we call it an identity, an equality or some such name.

Although mental phenomena and material phenomena are thought to be entirely different in kind, yet they are frequently employed to illustrate one another. We speak of a *lofty thought*, thus implying a resemblance between the excellence of the thought and the altitude of some material object. We use *light* as a symbol of *truth*, or we say that *light resembles truth*, although there is in reality no resemblance whatever between them in themselves; but in their results there is a resemblance since the appearance of light and the imparting of truth are both productive of knowledge in the mind. The relation between a symbol and that which is symbolized, between a sign and that which is signified, is usually either a direct resemblance between the two things, or is accompanied by a resemblance amongst some of the circumstances or results connected with the two things. Sometimes, of course, this is not so, as in the case of the relation of a word to that which is denoted by it, where there is now often no resemblance, although there is reason to believe that originally the application of names was founded upon resemblance.

The relations of simultaneity and succession between mutually external objects are often the subjects of predication. As when we say:—Milton *was a contemporary of* Cromwell; John and James *were class-fellows;* soldiers on parade *keep step with one another*. Or when we say:—Chaucer *preceded* Spenser; *after* the flash of lightning a loud peal of thunder *was heard;* a cause *is always followed by its* effect. It will be observed that the same relation of simultaneity or succession may be expressed in many different ways; and so far as *thought* is concerned, it is of no consequence by what words the relation is indicated, provided only it be indicated clearly. It will be observed, too, that the

order in which the objects said to be related occur in the predication is immaterial. The sentence, *Chaucer preceded Spenser* is the same as *Spenser followed Chaucer*. The predication consists in asserting that a relation of succession exists between the two individuals, specifying which comes first. And, with reference to all the other examples, it will be admitted that the form of predication is unimportant, provided only that it be clearly expressed what objects are related to one another and what is the relation between them.

We have hitherto confined ourselves as closely as possible to *simple* relations of difference, resemblance, simultaneity and succession; but in the great majority of predications the relations predicated are more or less *complex;* and often the relations *implied* in a predication are more numerous than those which are expressed. We may give examples of such complex relations.

The judges in session, having tried the prisoner, agreed to find him guilty. In this complex predication many relations are expressed and implied. The judges *sit simultaneously upon* the bench,—a double relation of simultaneity (1) amongst the judges (2) between the judges and the bench. *Having tried the prisoner,* expresses a continuous process and implies a multitude of relations; it also indicates that the action next asserted *followed* the trial. *Agreed to find him guilty;* here is expressed a relation of agreement amongst the legal opinions of the judges, and a relation of difference between the action of the prisoner and some law.

John struck the table. In this short sentence there are implied several relations. John and the table are in point of time *simultaneous,* in point of space *contiguous;* and contiguity is itself the result of the combination of several relations. The *stroke* of John is an *action,* and therefore involves *succession, viz.,* first the arm is raised; then it is gradually lowered, occupying successively different positions; and then it comes into contact with the table producing, probably, a sensation of sound and certainly one of touch. Thus this simple sentence predicates a complex series of relations between two objects, John and the table.

Many other examples might be given of complex relations being predicated between two or more objects; and it would be a useful exercise in the analysis of thought for the student to examine and separate the relations expressed or implied in the sentences which he reads. We think it will be found that *all relations* may ultimately be reduced to the four simple ones which we have described; and that all predications may be shown to consist of an assertion or denial, that one or more of these relations exists between two or more objects or elements of knowledge or conception.

We have now given and illustrated what we believe is a correct exposition of that most important act of thought which we call

predication. It now remains for us, from the stand-point which we have endeavoured to establish, to take a view of the current logical doctrines regarding the proposition. These doctrines are found in all the smaller text-books of logic ; and they find a place also in many of the more elaborate expositions of logical science. Not, however in all, for we observe decided tendencies towards a departure from the traditional doctrine of the proposition in some modern writers of distinction. The leading features of the traditional doctrine are the following :—

Every proposition consists of *two terms* and the *copula*. The terms represent either concepts classes or individual things ; and the copula serves as the connecting link between them. The words which constitute the copula are *is* and *is not*, according as the one term is to be affirmed or denied of the other. The first of the two terms, that about which the assertion is made, is called the *subject* ; the second, that which is asserted or denied of the first, is called the *predicate*. The subject of universal propositions is said to be distributed, or applied to all the things denoted by it ; that of particular propositions is not. The predicate of negative propositions, being altogether denied of all the individuals denoted by the subject, is distributed ; that of affirmative propositions is not. The copula is simply the sign of the relation of the two terms to one another ; it must not indicate the actual objective existence of the relation or the things related, nor the time when the relation existed, nor the degree of certainty with which the assertion is made. All these accidental things must be included in the predicate. It is always possible, after limitations and changes in the predicate or copula, to *convert* propositions, that is, to put the predicate in place of the subject, and the subject in place of the predicate ; and this conversion, being rendered necessary by the laws of the *syllogism*, is an essential part of the doctrine of the proposition. These are the principal points in the doctrine of the proposition regarding which writers upon logic are agreed ; but there are some points about which they are not agreed. They are not agreed as to the *character* of the *predicate*, some maintaining that it may be either denotative or connotative, others that it is connotative only. Those who believe that it may be denotative are not agreed as to its *quantification*, some holding that its extent should be explicitly stated in the proposition, others that its quantity should be determined by the ordinary rules. They are not agreed as to the *meaning of the predication*, some holding that the subject and predicate are simply asserted to be two different names of the same thing ; some that the predicate consists of attributes asserted of the subject ; and some that a relation of mutual co-existence or mutual inclusion or exclusion or congruence or confliction between the two terms is

asserted. These differing views may be referred to in the following criticism; but we shall give the most of our attention to the foregoing doctrines which are generally agreed upon. For the sake of clearness we divide the subject of our criticism into the following parts:—1. The terms of the proposition; 2. The relation between these terms as expressed by the copula; 3. The doctrine of distribution; 4. The doctrine of conversion.

(1). In examining the terms of the proposition our principal aim will be to ascertain whether they correspond with the terms of predication. All predications, we have already shown, consist of the assertion or denial that one or more objects or elements of knowledge or conception holds some specified relation to one or more other objects or elements of knowledge or conception. All predications have, therefore, two terms related to one another, and the assertion of some relation existing between them. And we have to enquire whether the terms of the proposition, as described by logicians, are the same as the terms of the predications which we consciously make. In every proposition, put into logical form, the predicate must comprehend all the elements of time, mode and action, which are usually expressed by verbs and adjectives or adverbs. A few examples of propositions may form a good basis for our criticism.

Horses are vertebrated. In this predication we affirm that each of a class of individual things possesses a certain quality or rather a certain part called a vertebra. Two objects of thought are before consciousness, the image of a horse or horses and that of a vertebra; and we affirm that the latter constitutes a part of the former. Thus we here assert an *internal* relation between the two terms; and this internal relation is correctly expressed by the word *are*. Neither can there be any doubt that the terms of the proposition correspond to the terms of the conscious predication. But, suppose we modify the proposition, and assert that *horses belong to the class of vertebrata*, it appears manifest that the predication which we make is quite different from the former one. Instead of predicating an *internal* relation we now predicate an *external* one; we assert that the class of horses are included in a much larger class of vertebrated animals. In the former proposition we do not think of any other animals except horses; in this proposition we must think of other animals constituting a large class which includes horses. Now the scholastic doctrine of the proposition teaches that the predicate *vertebrated* is either connotative or denotative, and thus fails to distinguish between the two important kinds of predications above illustrated. This ambiguity in the meaning of the predicate in such propositions should not be recognised either in psychology or logic; a predicate should mean either one thing or another,

and the mode of expressing it should indicate which meaning is intended to be conveyed.

Again, *the sun illuminates the earth.* In this predication we have in thought two objects which are the terms of the predication, and a certain relation existing between them, namely, that light proceeds from the first to the second and thus makes its surface visible to our eyes. This proposition when put into logical form becomes, *the sun is a-body-which-illuminates-the-earth.* There the subject is *the sun,* and the predicate is *a-body-which-illuminates-the-earth, i.e.,* the sun again, along with its relation to the earth. Now we think that an appeal to consciousness will show clearly that the terms of this proposition, after being put into the logical mould, do not correspond to the terms of the predication which we consciously make. The two objects which we think of as related are, plainly, the sun and the earth, *not* the sun and a-body-which-illuminates-the-earth. And it should, therefore, appear that the so-called logical form of this proposition has no foundation in the facts of consciousness. *Gold is heavier than iron.* Here we have the image of two substances before consciousness, and we assert a certain relation between them, namely, that the one substance is heavier than the other. But according to scholastic doctrine, the predicate of the proposition is not *iron,* but *heavier-than-iron.* In this case also an appeal to consciousness will show that the second term of the predication, said to be in a certain relation to the first, does not correspond to the predicate of the logical proposition.

Many other propositions might be adduced which would show that in the majority of cases the terms of the logically-formed proposition do not correspond to the terms of predication which are thought of in consciousness as related to one another. We have seen and admitted that, when a proposition expresses an *internal* relation of an object or class to some of its constituent parts or elements, the scholastic proposition may be correct and adequate. But, when *external* relations are predicated between objects, the logical proposition is quite inadequate to their expression ; the terms of the proposition do not correspond to the terms of the predicated relation.

(2.) We now consider the relation itself predicated between the objects or elements compared. Is this relation accurately expressed by the logical copula? According to logical doctrine the relations expressed by the copula are those of genus, species, difference, property, and accident ; the predicate of a proposition may stand to the subject in any one of these relations. The two first of these are external relations ; the remaining three are internal. Now it is manifest that these relations have all reference to the process of *classification ;* and it appears equally manifest

that there are a multitude of other relations which form the subjects of predication that have no reference to classification whatever. When we say, for example, *lightning precedes thunder*, we do not mean to classify either lightning or thunder with any other phenomena whatever, nor have we in our mind any fact or process involved in classification. We do not mean that the fact of preceding thunder is a differentia or a property or an accident of lightning, or that that fact distinguishes lightning from any other phenomenon. We mean simply to assert that a certain phenomenon, lightning, usually or always, is observed, before another phenomenon, thunder, is heard. And this relation of antecedence or succession is certainly not expressed by the copula. Again, when we say, *elephants are quadrupeds*, these words properly express an *internal* relation between the animals spoken of, and the quality indicated by the predicate, the possession of four feet. But if this proposition is made to mean, *elephants belong to the class of four-footed animals*, we have an *external* relation asserted, and the copula is not adequate to its unambiguous expression. In the same way it might be shown that all the other external relations of difference, resemblance, co-existence and succession, and their various combinations, cannot be expressed by the copula. In fact, logicians do not pretend that they can, because they always consign the expression of these relations to the predicate, thus playing false with the phenomena of consciousness and producing monstrous forms of language. It appears then, that psychology offers no foundation for the doctrine that the copula is the only proper expression of the relation between the terms of predication; and it might also be shown that there is no foundation in language. In many languages which are unquestionably expressive of thought there is found no such abstract verb as our *is*. And, even in our language, the substantive verb requires to be divested of all its meaning before it is fitted for logical use. Thus, it comes to be but an empty symbol, which differs from the symbols of mathematics, in that while each one of them has a definite meaning and represents a relation in thought, it is introduced for the purpose of putting aside the relations thought of which it cannot express.

(3.) The doctrine of distribution is manifestly founded upon facts connected with classification. In the classes which we construct of organized individuals there are some qualities which are found in all the individuals denoted by the class-name; there are other qualities, called accidental, found in some individuals but not in others. We are able, then, to predicate that *all* the individuals of the class possess the former kind of qualities, but only that *some* of them possess the latter kind of qualities. Again, when we predicate an external relation of certain objects, as when

we say "birds belong to the class of oviparous animals," it is evident that we speak of *all* birds, but only of *some* oviparous animals; and in this case the first term of the predication is distributed, the second not. But if we say "birds do not belong to the class of quadrupeds," we speak of all birds and all quadrupeds, and assert that the one class is altogether excluded from the other. In this case both the terms of predication are distributed. Thus, when the first term of the relation denotes a class, we indicate its distribution by prefixing the words all or some. When the second term denotes a class of greater extent than the first, we naturally indicate by the form of the predication whether we speak of all or some of the individuals belonging to it; and at least the accurate expression of thought demands that the distribution of both the terms of the relation should be unambiguously expressed.

These principles of distribution, properly applicable only to terms which denote classes, are applied by logicians to all kinds of terms and all kinds of propositions. All universal propositions distribute their subject, while particulars do not. All negative propositions distribute their predicate, while affirmatives do not. Now, if we had not a particular system to maintain, it might appear plain to us that the principles of distribution cannot be without absurdity applied to anything which does not admit of distribution or non-distribution. If we say, for example, "the Duke of Wellington is a man," neither the first nor the second term of the predication is a class name as here used; and were it not that we import from the process of classification, ideas foreign to the subject in hand, we should never think of the distribution either of "the Duke of Wellington" or "a man." Logicians, however, must reduce every proposition to the normal form, and so they make this a universal affirmation and write it "all of the Duke of Wellington is one of the class—man."

Again, if we take a proposition expressive of an internal relation, we shall see that the rules of distribution are not applicable. In the proposition "roses are sweet-smelling," the first term of the predication may denote either all or some roses according to our opinion of their odour. But the second term "sweet-smelling" expresses a *quality* possessed by roses, and when we speak of a quality, we surely mean the whole of the quality, and it seems absurd to say that the name of the quality is either distributed or not distributed; if we do so we apply a distinction to it which is plainly not applicable.

This objection, however, is got over by changing the predicate and thus forming *another proposition*, thus:—"Roses are sweet-smelling flowers," meaning "roses belong to the class of sweet-smelling flowers." But it is surely objectionable, in order to get

a proposition into such a form that the rules of distribution may be applied to it, *to change the relation* predicated in it. This proposition in its first form asserts an *internal* relation to the second term of which the principles of distribution do not apply; and in order to bring it into such a form that the second term may be tested by the laws of distribution, it is changed so as to express an *external* relation. Surely a correct psychology offers no foundation for such a procedure.

It could be easily shown that the laws of distribution are inapplicable to many other kinds of propositions, of which we may give the following as examples:—The line A is equal to B; the sun is brighter than the moon; the dawn precedes the day; silver is not so valuable as gold; the Prince of Wales shot an elephant; stars bespangle the sky. In all these propositions relations are predicated between two or more objects, the relation being expressed with perfect clearness, and in none of them can we say, with any degree of appropriateness, that either term of the relation is distributed or non-distributed; the distinction is inapplicable and foreign to the subject.

Our conclusion, founded upon an examination of the meaning of propositions, may be thus stated. Only those terms which denote classes of things can be properly spoken of as being totally or partially distributed; the names of single qualities or objects should not be quantified; but wherever a class-name, admitting of quantification, should, for the sake of clearness have its quantity made known, we have a right to insist that its quantity should be explicitly stated. This conclusion is founded upon the great law of expression,—whatever is contained in thought should be accurately expressed in words; whatever is not contained in thought should not be expressed in words. We do not *think* of the quality affirmed in the predicate of a proposition as being applicable to many or few objects; we should not therefore quantify it. But where the subject or predicate is a class-name, wholly or partially distributed *in thought*, its distribution should be expressed *in language*.

(4.) We now come to the doctrine of conversion. For the sake of the transpositions of terms required by the syllogism, it is considered by logicians of importance, that all propositions should be convertible; and there are certain well-known laws laid down for their conversion. The laws of distribution receive their full importance only in connection with conversion; as the importance of the laws of conversion is seen only in relation to the syllogism. The great law of conversion is,—that no term should be distributed in the converted proposition, which was undistributed in the original one. And by the application of this law it is found that universal negative and particular negative

propositions may be converted without any change of quantity or quality, that the universal affirmative can be converted by limiting the quantity of the predicate, and that the particular negative may be simply converted after changing its quality, that is, changing it into a particular affirmative by transferring the sign of negation from the copula to the predicate.

Now, if we examine predications as they are naturally expressed, there does not seem to be any objection to the order of the term, being changed provided there is a sufficient reason for the change. If we say "whales are included in the class mammals," we mean the same as "the class mammals includes whales." If we say "thunder succeeds lighting," we are understood no better than if we say "lightning precedes thunder." The predication "gold is heavier than silver," expresses the same relations as "silver is lighter than gold." The sentence "John strikes the table," is, as far as thought is concerned, exactly the same as "the table is struck by John." In short, if we express any relation in a predication, the laws of thought and language require nothing more than clearness and accuracy in the expression; and it is a matter of indifference which term of the relation comes first.

But, if we examine the conversions of *logically formed propositions*, we cannot so easily admit their legitimacy. The proposition "roses are red," becomes, in the hands of logicians, when converted, "some red things are roses." The simple sentence "thunder succeeds lightning" is metamarphosed into "a class of things succeeding lightning is thunder." The monstrous forms of language which require to be introduced for the purpose or converting the majority of logically moulded propositions appear to afford a strong reason for doubting the legitimacy of the process. But, as we have seen, the principal objection does not lie against transposing the terms of a predication, but rather against the changes to which naturally expressed predications must be subjected, in order to bring them into the so-called logical form.

Having examined the principal features of the scholastic doctrine of the proposition, we may sum up our results. Propositions concerned about classification, are wrongly taken to be the type of all propositions; and all other kinds of propositions are forced into the form naturally assumed by them. The terms of the logical proposition do not, in the majority of cases, correspond with the objects whose relation is predicated in thought. The copula is incapable of expressing the most of relations, and consequently the words expressive of relations are usually relegated to the predicate, this being inconsistent with the facts of thought. The laws of distribution, founded upon facts of classification, are

applied where there is no reference to classification, and where they are consequently inapplicable. And finally the simple process of changing the order of the terms of a relation, when applied to the terms of a proposition forced into the logical form, produces results quite opposed to the facts of thought and the forms of language.

In the preceding exposition and criticism, we have taken our stand upon the position that the psychologist and the logician ought to occupy themselves with the analysis and study of *thought* rather than of *expression.* The scholastic logicians concerned themselves too much with words, mere words; hence the word quibbling, the logomachies of mediæval times. We have inherited their logical system and still teach it in our colleges; and a useless system it is, interesting chiefly as a specimen of the ingenuity of men, who had nothing better to do than to invent puzzles. We hope that the time may soon come when a logic will be generally taught which will attempt to be a real and accurate analysis of thought worthy of the study of men, who wish to understand the working of their own minds in its higher operations, and who desire a method by which their practical researches after truth may be systematically guided.