

The many inquiries addressed to me for such information point in the same direction. I am quite willing to respond to the call, so far as I can, though the little island is so full, both of the life of the present and of the memories of the past, that I have but gathered a few fragments.

In general, I received the decided impression that England, in the Christian as well as in other senses, is, in commercial phrase, "looking up." Henry Ward Beecher said, in a sermon preached some time before the *Trent* affair, that if he were asked in what country of all others Christianity had most thoroughly impregnated the character and life of the people, he would answer, without doubt, in England. It does not become us to make any comparisons in the matter, but it is evident that there is a very great and constantly advancing religious influence exercised on all classes of British society. There are great deficiencies and evils still, it is confessed; but these are not hidden or denied. They are searched out, and some effort is made to remove them. A man convinced of sin is really a better man than in his hardened days: yet he feels a thousand times worse. The public conscience, in England, seems to be in this hopefully sensitive condition.

The condition of the Establishment demands the first notice in any account of the religious state of England. A writer in the *Edinburgh Review*, some time since, classed the several parties in the Church of England under the names of High Church, Low Church, and Broad Church. Under the first were included the old-fashioned High Churchmen and the modern-antique Puseyites. The former I believe to be—as they were. The latter seem to be declining in influence. They never were *popular*—for sturdy English common sense revolted against many of their doctrines and practices, but they had many enthusiastic adherents among the wealthy and cultivated class. So many, however, under their teaching, have—with a too faithful logic—gone on to Rome, that others have become alarmed, while the loss of able leaders has weakened those that remained. The Low Church, or Evangelical clergy, are much more numerous than formerly, and are now amply represented among the ecclesiastical dignitaries. Their preaching—which is generally a simple and earnest presentation of the Gospel, in our own sense—is decidedly the most acceptable to the great bulk of the English people. Thank God for that! But many of them are very exclusive in their spirit. Their retention of office in the Establishment, compelling them to use words whose obvious meaning they pronounce deadly error, is a standing marvel. The Broad Church party is a comprehensive designation for those who are neither high nor low. Dr. Arnold and Archdeacon Hare are claimed as representative men of this class—devout, earnest, learned, strongly opposed to Puseyism, but also charging the Evangelical party with great narrowness. The doctrinal views of the Broad Church men are not defined, indeed, they eschew exact definitions. The writers of the "Essays and Reviews" belong to the "extreme left" of this party. It is, in my judgment, the rising party in the church, the favourite one of the young men at the Universities. The combination of the Puseyites and Evangelicals in refusing to pay Prof. Jowett a full salary for teaching Greek, on account of his opinions, has given him the immense advantage of being a martyr. There seems every prospect that the battle that has been fought in Germany over the whole question of the authority of the Scriptures, will be now renewed in England. But while, for con-