

reason to believe that there were multitudes who clung to the persecuted faith. But the time of the middle class was not yet.

If, however, Wyclif's influence had ceased or was hidden in England, it was spreading elsewhere. It is no longer doubtful that Hus and Jerome had imbibed the doctrines of the English reformer, and they were burned at Constance in 1415. A long time had to pass before Luther arose to continue the work which they had begun, but it is certain that he was stimulated by the remembrance of the Bohemian Reformers. It is true that Luther spoke of Wyclif's work as mere hair-splitting; but Luther was apt to say strong things, and sometimes without due consideration. At least he was indebted to Wyclif for giving the beginning to the work which he was himself appointed to continue. A chronicler of the 15th century declares, that the "books of the evangelical doctor, Master John Wyclif, opened the eyes of the blessed Master John Hus, as several trustworthy men heard from his own lips," and Paletz, one of the opponents of Hus, told the latter, "Since the birth of Christ, no heretic has written more dangerously against the Church than thou and Wyclif."

We cannot here dwell upon the incidents in the life of Wyclif. Its earlier portion is hid in obscurity. During his residence in Oxford, first as master of Balliol and afterwards as warden of Canterbury Hall, he warmly espoused the nationalist side against the claims of the papacy. For a long time he escaped formal condemnation, even although he attacked the central dogma of transubstantiation. Ultimately he was forced to leave Oxford; but although he was exposed to a good deal of annoyance, it is astonishing to remark how little of real danger he incurred. On these matters of detail we cannot now dwell. Those who wish to study the life and works of Wyclif at length may safely be recommended to read Lechler's *Life*, translated by Lorimer. There are several smaller compilations which will give the mere facts; indeed most of the histories of England will furnish the principal incidents in his conflict with the authorities of the Church. We must here confine ourselves to pointing out some mistakes which have been made respecting his motives and his teaching.

It is to be regretted that the usually fair and moderate Lingard should have displayed such bitterness in his account of Wyclif. According to this historian the reformer was provoked by his removal from the wardenship to attack the friars, and so continued their enemy through life. There is no doubt that Wyclif, as a secular priest, had to give way to the regulars, but his rivals at Oxford were monks and not friars; and no one could know better than Dr. Lingard the difference between these orders.

It was not until quite late in life that Wyclif began his attack on the friars, perhaps not before 1381, certainly not before 1378, and this was long after the Oxford dispute. So far was he from turning against the friars because of his dispute with the monks, that, in his earlier writings he spoke of them often with commendation on account of their voluntary poverty. It is quite clear to any one who studies Wyclif's life or writings that he was in downright earnest, whether he was rebuking the avarice and luxury of the clergy, or protesting against the arrogance and greed of the papacy, or arguing against what he regarded as the prevailing corruption of doctrine.

As regards those portions of his teaching which have been assailed with peculiar virulence, we select that on "Dominion" for notice, because his opinions on this subject have been declared to be subversive of the rights of property. The origin of this controversy was connected with the claims of the Papacy to universal authority over things temporal as well as things spiritual. Among the schoolmen there were some who supported this view, and others, such as William of Ockham, who, like Dante, declared there were two masters of the world, the Pope over spiritual things, and the Emperor over temporal things. But in England the Emperor had no authority, and another chief lord had to be found from whom property should be held. Wyclif was not the first to go to the root of the matter. It was one whom he acknowledged as his master, Fitzralph, Archbishop of Armagh, who first maintained that God Himself was Chief Lord, and that every man held of Him and must do Him service for all that he possessed. This doctrine, which was defended by Wyclif, was directed against the claims of the Papacy; and it is obvious that, if stated without qualification, it might become mischievous. Only those, it might be inferred, who were in grace, had any right to their earthly possessions. And Wyclif declares: "He that standeth in grace is very lord of things, and whoever faileth by default of grace, he faileth right title of the things that he occupieth and unableth himself to have the gifts of God." But Wyclif and his followers drew no such inference from this principle as has been imputed to them—namely, "that they were saints and their adversaries sinners, and therefore the application of the doctrine was very simple." On the contrary, he makes it clear that he is here dealing with man's relations to God, and in this respect no theologian would

differ from him, and not with the mutual relations of men in society. "There are," he says, "two titles by which a man holds temporal goods; the title of original justice and that of earthly justice. By the title of original justice Christ possessed all worldly goods, as Augustine often says; by that title—the title of grace—all things belong to the just; but civil possession has little to do with that title, therefore Christ and His disciples despised civil rule and possession, and contented themselves with holding only according to the first title." It is clear that this was directed against the Pope's claim to control, as the Vicar of Christ, all earthly things, secular as well as spiritual.

It may, however, be inferred that Wyclif encouraged men to refuse their dues to men who were living in sin, and this has actually been asserted. But this is not the case. He certainly taught that a man in sin forfeited his dominion, but he also taught that no one could tell who was in mortal sin, for he did not accept the division of the casuists, of mortal and venial sins; and he distinctly and continuously asserted the duty of obedience to wicked rulers. It will be remembered that, when Mary Queen of Scots accused John Knox of teaching treason in his "Regiment of Women," the sturdy reformer replied that the theories of Plato and others had not prevented them from being loyal citizens in the countries to which they belonged. In the same way, Wyclif held that, ideally, only the godly man could properly hold of God his over-lord, and most religious men would say that he was right; but this in no way interfered with a man's obligation to observe the laws under which he lived.

We have drawn special attention to this point, as it is one which is often urged as a fatal objection to Wyclif. There are many other things which we would gladly dwell upon, more especially upon his work as the first translator of the Bible into English, and the first writer of English prose who could claim distinction in that department. We should also have liked to bring out more clearly the individuality of the man in his combination of earnestness and moderation, of prudence and heroism, for it is not true that he trimmed and evaded the force of his own words. His later writings make this quite clear. For satisfaction in these and many other points, we must refer our readers to Lechler and Buddensieg and others who are entitled to speak with authority on the subject. C.

THE C.P.R. BY THE KICKING HORSE PASS AND THE SELKIRKS.—XI.

DOWN THE ILLE-CILLE-WAUT ON FOOT.

AT McMillan's camp on the Ille-cille-waut, the trail that we had followed from the summit of the Selkirks ended; and the valley that extended before us was clothed with a pathless tangle that the trail markers were cutting through at the rate of perhaps half-a-mile a day. The distance to the second crossing of the Columbia, however, was estimated at only seventeen miles, and we felt that old travellers ought to be able to worry through in some way or another. Our chief apprehension was that the Indians from Kamloops might not be at the mouth of the Ille-cille-waut. We had telegraphed from Winnipeg to British Columbia that they must be there between September 8th and 12th. So far we were up to our programme, for we had reached McMillan's camp on the evening of the 6th; and the Major said that the intervening seventeen miles could be made in four days. Our party numbered twelve; the original three, Al., Dave, and seven fine fellows from McMillan's camp. Mr. Fleming and I carried little; all the rest shouldered packs from forty to nearly a hundred pounds in weight, carrying them knapsack fashion, or by means of a tump-line across the forehead, after the manner of the Scotch fishwives to be seen on the streets of Edinburgh with their great baskets of fish from Newhaven.

In all my previous journeyings, other men had been before me and had left some memorial of their work, a railway, a Macadamized or gravel road, a lane, a trail, or at least, blazed trees to indicate the direction to be taken. Now, we learned what it was to be without benefit of other men's work. Here, there was nothing even to guide, save an occasional glimpse of the sun, and the slate-coloured churned-up torrent, running generally west or south-west, hemmed in by cañons, from which we turned aside only to get mired in beaver dams or alder swamps, or lost in labyrinths of steep ravines, or to stumble over slides of moss-covered rocks that had fallen from overhanging mountains. It rained almost every day. Every night the thunder rattled over the hills with terrific reverberations, and fierce flashes lit up wierdly tall trees covered with wreaths of moss, and the forms of tired men sleeping by smouldering camp fires.

How our men managed to get along, carrying packs which, of neces-