

His present lectures are interesting, as everything he writes on history is, in spite of his frequent fancifulness, from his almost passionate love of the subject, and his power of realization. But they utterly fail to prove his peculiar point, and at the hands of Dr. Rainy he meets, we should say, with total discomfiture. He had endeavoured to show that Presbyterianism and Prelacy, so far from being wholly irreconcilable, had long co-existed amicably in Scotland. But this is a mere historical mare's nest. Nominal bishops, abbots and friars, were kept on foot after the Reformation, with the consent of the Reformers, not for religious but ostensibly for legal and constitutional purposes; really with a pecuniary object, the nobles wanting church lands and benefices to plunder, while the clergy hoped to save something for the church. Afterwards, a rich episcopacy was introduced by the Stuarts, but this episcopacy co-existed with Presbyterianism, not amicably, but in a state of internecine conflict. Prelacy, as Dr. Rainy well shows, was abhorred by the Scotch, and is still rejected by them, not only as a form of church government to which they object, but because it always brought with it, and always will bring with it, a whole circle of doctrines and practices to which they have a still greater aversion. When the Dean insinuates that the rising against Charles and Laud was only a fuss about an "Amen," the answer is that if the "Amen" was Amen to the bringing in of Prelacy and the Liturgy, that, in Scotch eyes, was cause enough for the rising. Dean Stanley must know well the saying of Aristotle, that the occasions of revolutions are often small, while their causes are great. The Dean is not more happy in his attempts to accommodate historical characters, or groups of characters, to the object which he has in view. The "Moderates," on whom he naturally fixes as the embodiment of his own sentiments, and whom he wishes to use as historical decoy ducks to bring over the more stiff-necked Presbyterians, were really not a religious party at all. They simply represented the influence of the eighteenth century, or a certain portion of the Scottish clergy, especially the more literary portion. They were, in fact, anti-ecclesiastical, and of some of them it would not be far from the truth to say that they had a strong affinity to scepticism. If "Jupiter Carlyle" had not been a minister, he would probably have found himself at the side of David Hume. Moreover the attitude of the Moderates towards the more fervent high church, or as the Dean would call them "Hildebrandine" Presbyterians, was anything but one of comprehension. The Dean has inadvertently allowed the truth to peep out in recognizing as a valued, though erring friend, the Bloody Mackenzie, a man without convictions, who was ready to take up with any religion established by "the laws of his country," but who was the framer and administrator of sanguinary laws against religious zeal. Dean Stanley is equally unsuccessful in his attempt to present as moderates and mediators the leaders of the Episcopal Church in Scotland. Bishop Joly was a very good man, and a picturesque ecclesiastical specimen, but he very distinctly believed, and very stiffly maintained, that no one who was not in communion with the bishop of his diocese would be saved except through the uncovenanted mercies of God. Turn where the Dean will, he finds "Hildebrandines," whose object in forming and maintaining churches is the propagation of some definite religious truth, and

the inculcation of some definite rule of spiritual life.

He might, perhaps, have made a better point if he had thought of showing historically to how great an extent the various forms of ecclesiastical government in the different Protestant States were the result of political accident. Where the Reformation was made by the kings, episcopacy was retained, as being, according to the well-known dictum of James I., most congenial to monarchy. Where the Reformation was made by the nobles and people, as in Scotland, in Holland, in Germany, in Switzerland, among the Huguenots in France, episcopacy was abolished and some form of government more or less popular was adopted. When a thorough going democracy came to the front, as in New England, and in the old country under Cromwell, Congregationalism prevailed. Still, even when the Dean had reduced all the forms of church government to political accidents, he would have to show cause why the Scotch should abandon their own political accident and embrace his.

Presbyterianism answers by the mouth of Dr. Rainy with courtesy, but with force and with unmitigable decision, bringing out, broadly and impressively, the great distinctive objects of the Presbyterian Church, and the grounds on which it receives, and will continue to receive, the allegiance of the Scottish people. The hitting in the reply is sometimes pretty hard, but never rude or uncharitable. Finally the Dean is politely bowed back to his own establishment, with something like a flea in his ear.

"Very well; we all know that a powerful tide is running in influential quarters in favour of a general relaxation of belief, and that is in favour of the Dean's design. Besides that, in another way the existing forces tend in the same direction. For the more that divisions of opinion multiply, the more temptation there is to men who value an establishment to widen the base indefinitely, as the natural policy for strengthening the institution. So that we can see how the Dean's views of what establishments ought to be and are, might receive conclusive and unanswerable verification. I am bound, however, to record my belief that there are many men in the established churches who repudiate all this, and remain where they are because they do not believe the Dean's theory. Meanwhile, he appeals to us, outside the establishment, not to be so unreasonable as to propose to pull down establishments which satisfy, in the way indicated, such aspirations as his own. Now I will make bold to answer this appeal on behalf—to speak first of them—of nine-tenths of those whom the Dean has thus addressed. And I say that just in so far as the established churches correspond to the Dean's ideal, and in so far as that becomes clear, we will most certainly join with all our might to pull them down. More than that, there are plenty of men in the established churches who, on that supposition, will overcome the temptation of their position, and come to help us. Churches of that kind, if they are to be called churches, are a moral nuisance, not to be tolerated for an hour. I mean churches in which the whole power, the whole means of attraction which the State can employ, is devoted to support the principle that the Church of Christ as such has no principle and no conscience—has no peremptory assertions to make, no distinct truth, and no distinct life to represent and embody to the world."