

The Church.

"HER FOUNDATIONS ARE UPON THE HOLY HILLS."

STAND YE IN THE WAYS, AND SEE, AND ASK FOR THE OLD PATHS, WHERE IS THE GOOD WAY, AND WALK THEREIN, AND YE SHALL FIND REST FOR YOUR SOULS.—JEREMIAH VI. 16.

VOLUME III.]

COBOURG, UPPER CANADA, SATURDAY, JUNE 27, 1840.

[NUMBER LII.]

Poetry.

HAPPINESS.

FROM POEMS BY H. MONCTON MILNES, M. P.

Because the few with signal virtue crown'd,
The lights and pinacles of human mind,
Sadder and wrier than the rest are found,
With not their soul less wise or less red'n'd.
True that the small delights which every day
Cheer and distract the pilgrim are not theirs;
True that though free from passion's lawless sway,
A lotter being brings severer cares:
Yet have they special pleasures, even mirth,
By those undreamt of, who have only trod
Life's valley smooth: and if the rolling earth
To their nice ear have many a painful tone,
They know man does not live by Joy alone,
But by the presence of the power of God.

A splendour amid glooms, a sunny thread
Woven into a tapestry of cloud;
A merry child—a playing with the shroud
That lies upon a breathless mother's bed,—
A friend on the front of one new-wed,
A trembling and weeping while her truth is vow'd,
A school boy's laugh, that rises light and loud
In licensed freedom from ungenteled mood:
These are ensamples of the Happiness
For which our nature fits us—more and less
Are parts of all things to the mortal given,
Of love, joy, truth, and beauty; perfect light
Would dazzle, not illuminate our sight,
From Earth it is enough to glimpse at Heaven.

OH SPARE THE FLOWERS.

BY MISS M. A. BROWNE.

Oh, spare the flowers, the fair young flowers,
The fragrant gifts that summer brings,
Bright children of the sun and showers,
Rich in the dew upon their wings.
Green be the thought that o'er you waves,
Weariless watchers by the dead,
Unblenching dwellers midst the graves.

Oh, spare the flowers! their sweet perfume,
Upon the wandering zephyr cast,
And lingering o'er the lowly tomb,
To like the memory of the past.
They flourish freshly, though beneath,
Lie the dark dust and creeping worms;
They speak of Hope, they speak of Faith,
They smile, like rainbows through the storm.

Pluck not the flowers, the sacred flowers!
Go where the garden's treasures spread,
Where strange bright blossoms deck the bowers,
And spiced trees their odours shed,
There pluck, if thou delight'st indeed,
To shorten life so brief as theirs;
But here the admonition heed—
A blessing on the hand that spares!

Pluck not the flowers! In days gone by
A beautiful belief was felt,
That fairy spirits of the sky
Amid the trembling blossoms dwelt.
Perhaps the dead have many a guest,
Holier than any that are ours;
Perhaps their guardian angels rest
Enshrined amidst the gentle flowers!

Hast thou no loved one lying low,
No broken reed of earthly trust?
Hast thou not felt the bitter woe
With which we render dust to dust?
Thou hast! and in one cherished spot,
Unknown, unknown to earthly eyes,
Within their heart, the unforgotten
Entombed in silent beauty lies.

Memory and faith, and love, so deep
No earthly storm can reach it more—
Affection, that hath ceased to weep,
These flourish in thy bosom's core.
Spare then the flowers! with gentle tread
Draw near, remembering what thou art,
For blossoms sacred to thy heart.
Are ever springing to thy heart.

(Dublin University Magazine.)

EPISCOPAL CHURCH IN SCOTLAND.*

ARCHBISHOP ALEXANDER BURNET.

A. D. 1673—1684.

At the beginning of this episcopate the king renewed an order which he had formerly issued, authorizing the two Scottish Archbishops to recommend "fit and qualified persons to fill the higher offices of the Church;" promising to adhere to their recommendation, from having already "seen good and acceptable effects" arise from such a course.

Burnet had formerly held a rectory in England, from which he was ejected by the puritans in the year 1650. After this he went abroad, and was fortunate enough to be of some service to Charles II. in procuring private intelligence for him from his friends in England. For this, and through some interest he had besides, independent of his own personal merits, which were of the highest order, he was made Bishop of Aberdeen in 1662; the year following he was translated to Glasgow; and, after Sharp's murder, to St. Andrews. When in the see of Glasgow, he was so unfortunate as to incur the displeasure of the Earl of Lauderdale, whom no one ever offended with impunity. This nobleman was professedly a Presbyterian, and almost as great an enemy to the episcopals as he was to the covenanters. It has been alleged, and with some appearance of truth, that one of the reasons of his extreme cruelty to the latter was to excite popular odium against the former. His speech to Sharp, when he learnt he was to be made Archbishop of St. Andrews is well known: "Mr. Sharp, (he said), bishops you are to have in Scotland, and you, I hear, are to be Archbishop of St. Andrews; but, whoever shall be the man, I will smite him and his order under the fifth rib;" and he was as good as his word.

Burnet had complained to the king of Lauderdale's unnecessary severity to the covenanters, and recommended more lenient measures. The king, who was naturally good-natured, approved of this recommendation, and gave the earl instructions to proceed in conformity with it. For this interference on the part of the archbishop, and with a view to gratify his spleen against him, he determined to make the whole episcopal order feel the weight of his vengeance, and to stab them under the fifth rib. Accordingly, under the plea of obedience to the king's command, he introduced into parliament, in the year 1669, the famous act of Indulgence, the meaning of which was, that ministers dissenting from the established church might be permitted to hold benefices in it, without, in any respect, acknowledging the jurisdiction of its bishops. This was a measure which it was apparent no established church could approve under any circumstances; yet Lauderdale had the address to persuade both the king and the parliament that it was necessary for the tranquillity of the kingdom. The more

violent covenanters scouted the notion of accepting any favour from Charles's government, and railed very bitterly against those who consented to do so even upon these easy terms; but a considerable number of the more moderate Presbyterians took advantage of the Indulgence offered to them; and among others, Mr. Robert Douglas, who had, since the Restoration, joined the episcopal church, in obedience to the laws, as a private individual, but was now regularly admitted as Presbyterian minister of Pencaithland.

Burnet and the clergy of his diocese took the lead in opposing this dangerous Indulgence, which was so far from being a healing measure, as it professed to be, that it split the established church into two hostile parties, who were wholly independent of and unconnected with one another. This opposition to his own measure, so provoked Lauderdale, that he brought into parliament, and carried, a still more offensive and oppressive measure, namely, the *Asserory Act*, which conferred on the king the exclusive power to change, at his pleasure, "the external government and policy of the church" in Scotland.* The whole of the bishops united in their strenuous opposition to this measure, which, however, did not prevent the king from so far acting upon it as, at the advice of Lauderdale, to suspend Archbishop Burnet, and place Leighton, bishop of Dunblane, in his room. This most obnoxious bill was repealed, after it had been in operation two years; but not before several of the bishops and clergy had suffered by their conscientious refusal to submit to it. Burnet was not restored to his archbishopric till the year 1674.

I have not been able to find any particulars concerning Burnet during the five years of his primacy, excepting that Martine of Claremont, secretary of Archbishop Sharp, and author of the "Reliquie Divi Andree," dedicates his work to him in the year 1683. In this dedication, he says, his great design is to "preserve a just esteem for the worthy prelates of this see, and to beget an utter abhorrence of sacrilege, schism, and rebellion,"—crimes which, among our countrymen of that day, were so disgracefully prevalent that they were scarcely reckoned to be crimes. And then Martine alludes to the archbishop's "exemplary and inflexible virtues, piety, and honour (as much above flattery as your Grace does generously dispense it), that have justly raised your Grace beyond the reach of their malice, under whose tongues lies the poison of asps." Burnet died at St. Andrews, and was buried in St. Salvador's Church, near the tomb of Bishop Kennedy.

ARCHBISHOP ARTHUR ROSS.

A. D. 1684—1688.

This last archbishop of St. Andrews had possessed in succession the sees of Argyle, Galloway, and Glasgow, before being translated to the primacy. I have been able to collect but very few particulars concerning his personal history, and must, therefore, confine myself chiefly to the history of the church, during his brief episcopate. I have now before me a copy of a letter addressed to him, when minister of Deer, in A. D. 1664, by A. Burnet, then Archbishop of Glasgow, offering him a situation in that city of £1,200 Scots per annum, for which he was to preach "only once every Lord's day, and once a week on a week day, unless it be at communions, or some such extraordinary occasions." The archbishop farther evinces his good opinion of him, by requesting him to engage some deserving persons to "come this way, for supplying our vacancies, and, at meeting, I shall study to provide for them as you think their parts and experience do deserve."

Early in the year 1688, Archbishop Ross, in his capacity of Chancellor of the university of St. Andrews, and in conjunction with the vice-chancellor, rector, archdeacon, and regents, sent up a loyal address to James VII. In this document—which is much too long for insertion here—they begin by adverting to the constant liberality of the royal family of the Stuarts to their church and university. They then proceed to expatiate on the nature and principles of government generally,—God, not the people, the only source of power,—absolute power must reside somewhere in every regularly constituted society—the superiority of an hereditary monarchy over every other form of government—more evil to be feared from popular excesses than from absolute power—the monarchy never to be resisted—Buchanan's notions on this point refuted, &c. &c. The address is signed by

Arthur, archbishop and chancellor; Alexander Skein, vice-chancellor; Richard Waddell, archdeacon; James Lorimer, D. D.; Charles Kinnaird, regent; John Menzies, regent; Richard Skein, regent; Patrick McGill, regent; William Comory, regent; James Ross, regent; John Monro, regent.

In conformity with the principles contained in the above document, as soon as Ross and his brother bishops in Scotland heard of the nefarious attempts that were being made by the Prince of Orange and his party, to dispossess James of his throne, they assembled in Edinburgh, and sent up a dutiful address to their unfortunate monarch, in which they give thanks to God for his protection hitherto extended to him; and, also, to the king himself for his favour to their church; at the same time, expressing their dismay at hearing of the intended invasion from Holland. They finish by saying, "As, by the grace of God, we shall preserve in ourselves a firm and unshaken loyalty, so we shall be careful and zealous to promote in all your subjects an interminable and steadfast allegiance to your Majesty, as an essential part of their religion, and of the glory of our holy profession, not doubting but that God, in his great mercy, who hath so often preserved and delivered your Majesty, will still preserve and deliver you, by giving you the hearts of your subjects, and the necks of your enemies. So we pray, &c. &c. Signed by twelve bishops, and dated 3rd Nov. 1688."

To the foregoing letter they received an answer from the king, dated at Whitehall, the 15th of the same month, in which he thanks them for "the dutiful expressions of your loyalty to us in a time when all arts are used to seduce our subjects from their duty to us. We do likewise take notice of your diligence in your duty, by your inculcating to those under your charge those principles which have always been owned, taught, and published by that Protestant loyal church you are truly members of. We do assure you of our royal protection to you, your religion, church, and clergy, and that we will be

* It was said that one object of Lauderdale, in passing this bill, was to gratify the Duke of York, and thus pave the way for his papal encroachments.
† See Stephen's Life and Times of Archbishop Sharp; Keith's Catalogue of the Scots Bishops; and Lyons' History of St. Andrews.

careful of your concerns whenever there shall be a suitable occasion offered to us."

Before it was quite certain how affairs were tending, Bishop Rose, of Edinburgh, and another, were sent up to London on the part of their brethren, to see what could be done for their church, "as far as law, reason, and conscience would allow." The bishop has given a full account of this mission and its unsuccessful termination. There can be no doubt that William would have upheld the Episcopal Church, had his bishops and clergy been willing to acknowledge him as king *de jure* as well as *de facto*: but this they could not conscientiously do, after the solemn oath of allegiance they had taken to James. That oath was: "I do promise to be true and faithful to the king and his heirs; and truth and faith to bear of life and limb, and terrene honour, and not to know or hear of any ill or damage intended him, without defending him therefrom." The great majority of the Scotch people were, at this time, episcopalian, the covenanting Presbyterians being almost entirely confined to the south-western districts of the country; but the excessive clamour and violence of that party, on the one hand, and the non-resistance principles of the episcopals on the other, led William's government to suppose that the former were more numerous, and the latter less so, than was really the case. "I am the more convinced in my opinion," says Bishop Rose, "that William was anxious to protect the Episcopal Church, because my Lord St. Andrew's and I, taking occasion to wait on Duke Hamilton, his grace told us, a day or two before the sitting down of the convention, that he had it in special charge, from King William, that nothing should be done to the prejudice of the Episcopal Church in Scotland, in case the bishops could by any means be brought to befriend his interest; and prayed us most pathetically, for our own sake, to follow the example of the Church of England. To which my Lord St. Andrew's replied, that both by natural allegiance, the laws, and the most solemn oaths, we were engaged in the king's interest, and that we were, by God's grace, to stand by it in the face of all dangers, and to the greatest losses."

Such conduct proved, at least, uncommon magnanimity and disinterestedness on the part of the Scotch bishops, however different persons may judge of their principles. My own opinion clearly is, that they were right, and that to have acted otherwise would have been doing evil that good might come. As to James's wish to promote Popery, there can be no doubt of the fact; and, considering that he was a zealous Roman Catholic, he was quite consistent in so doing; but, if the nation was able to expel him from his throne, much more was it able to hinder him from overthrowing the established religion of Great Britain and Ireland. But I will not enter upon this much controverted topic. I have only to remark on the consistent and conscientious conduct of the Scotch prelates and clergy generally, in refusing to acknowledge the Prince of Orange as king *de jure*. Not only did they suffer severely in their persons and properties for adhering to the principles they had always professed, but their apostolic Church for whose interests they felt a far deeper concern than for their own, became, from that period, and continued for many years, scarcely a tolerated body of Christians in Scotland. No sooner were James's troops called up to England to defend their master, than the Cameronians in the south-west rose up *en masse*, on the Christmas Day of 1688, attacked the established clergy, and in the course of a few days turned 250 of them out of their manse and parishes, under circumstances of extreme barbarity. They violently assaulted the congregation in the cathedral church of Glasgow, when peacefully worshipping God on a Sunday, many of whom they severely wounded; and they then marched for Edinburgh, where they would have committed the same excesses, had not the members of the College of Justice armed themselves in defence of their clergy.

But soon the revolutionized state finished systematically what the rabble had begun violently. The Prince of Orange was proclaimed king by a tumultuous parliament held in Edinburgh, supported by 700 armed Cameronians, under the command of the Earl of Leven; James, for being a Papist, was pronounced to have "forfeited his right to the crown;" prelate, which was confirmed in England, was declared "a great and insupportable grievance" in Scotland; and "the superiority of any office in the Church above Presbytery, contrary to the inclinations of the generality of the people ever since the Reformation, and ought, therefore, to be abolished." The bishops and clergy were instantly deprived of their revenues, and dismissed from their homes, because they would not join in the hue and cry against their unfortunate, though ill-advised sovereign; and what grieved them much more deeply, they saw their apostolic Church, from being in as flourishing a state as any at that time in Christendom, brought down in the course of a few weeks, without any fault of theirs, in all human appearance to the very brink of destruction. These holy men were martyrs in the highest sense of the word, inasmuch as it requires more real courage to suffer patiently in the cause of truth than to fight and die for it.

I am sorry that I cannot furnish any other particulars of Primate Ross, excepting that he died in Edinburgh, in the year 1704. But I may be permitted to add, that I wrote to a venerable old Jacobite lady, a descendant of his, to inquire if she could direct me to any source where I could learn more concerning him. The following is an extract from her answer: "Arthur, Lord Balmerinoch, his grandson and nameson, had undertaken to be the biographer of his grace, and had collected all the best materials for the purpose, viz. letters from the Prince of Orange, from the King of France, from Prince James, the Archbishops of England and Ireland; in short, all the great names of the day; and was busied with a talented scholar at this work, when the ill-fated hero of Culloden cast himself into Scotland. Now whether these documents are still in the deposits of his nearest kin, the following families—the Earl of Moray; Balfour of Fernie; Robertson of Inches; John Crawford Aitken; Sir John Malcom, of Grange—I know not. I am certain, from circumstances, that they did not fall into the hands of the confiscators; and those with me (the only other surviving branch of his only grand-daughter) are on secular subjects, where the archbishop acts as a trustee for properties once in our family. They testify to the rectitude of his mind, and his excellent private character; but if the above documents could be

* It would be foreign to my purpose to controvert these assertions; but Bishop Sage has done this in his "Fundamental Charter of Presbytery," in a most admirable, accurate, and masterly manner. Unhappily, however, for the cause of truth, such works are on the unpopular side, and are little read.

recovered, they would be a once interesting and creditable to the Church; for neither threats nor favors would tempt these good men to cede a point, or teach others to make light of oaths 'once taken.' So very deeply was the loss of Arthur of Balmerinoch felt by the whole connexion—for he was truly amiable—that the half-finished work was hushed up in the awful and almost unjust catastrophe which severed his warm heart from our widely lamenting family; and thus his very purpose was quenched in his blood, and was a subject never touched on, unless mentioned as one of his last employments by those now passed from this life themselves, but whom I remember to have seen drink to his memory on the anniversary of his birth-day, with much affectionate respect. I would not have troubled you with those by-gone griefs, but to account for the non-appearance of these papers, more the property of the Church than of any individual, and to point out where they may be sought."

Thus have we seen the fall of an established episcopacy in Scotland; but, thank God! not the fall of episcopacy itself, which has existed ever since, and will exist, no doubt, to the end of time. It is wonderful to contemplate the mysterious dispensations of Providence, and how God makes even the wrath of man to praise him in the end, though for a long time it seems to bear down all opposition before it. We see, at this moment, the Presbyterian establishment of Scotland, which has always been the avowed enemy of episcopacy, torn asunder by intestine divisions, and thereby working out its own ruin—setting aside patronage which has so long connected it with the state—bidding defiance to the law of the land on this point—putting unendowed chapel ministers on the same footing with parochial ministers, and thus swamping the latter—adopting the voluntary principle, which, till now, they had uniformly opposed—and, finally, admitting into its bosom secession ministers, on the ground that the General Assembly has abolished patronage, at the very moment that the civil courts have pronounced its incompetency so to do!—secession ministers, who have hitherto been the keenest enemies of the establishment, and who now come into it with all their hereditary prejudices against patronage, and an inveterate hatred of episcopacy. And, lastly, we see a great portion of the established clergy using every endeavor to promote what they call "religious revivals," which are, for the most part, disgusting and indecent scenes of nocturnal preaching and fanatical excitement! In this manner is the establishment driving from her communion all the sober and respectable persons who belonged to it, who, under such circumstances, have no other alternative than to take shelter in the episcopal church, which they know, from her very constitution, can never fall into such puritanical and democratical excesses.

THE ANTIQUITY AND INDEPENDENCE OF THE ANGLICAN CHURCH.*

The Gospel was not brought to this country from Rome. There are strong reasons for believing that St. Paul was the first who preached the faith of Jesus on our shores; and it is almost certain that a Church was planted in Britain before the sound of the Gospel had even reached the city of Rome. According to the Roman historian Baronius, Peter arrived at Rome, A. D. 44; but it is probable according to Gildas, that the Gospel was preached in England as early as A. D. 39. At all events we received the glad tidings not from Rome, but from Judea; and the authority under which the Apostle or Apostles, who came first as the heralds of mercy to this land acted, was derived not from the Bishop of Rome, but from the Lord Jesus Christ. The question is by no means important, for it is a matter of little moment whether the Gospel was introduced here by the Apostles or their successors. If we retain the Apostolic doctrines, we need not be anxious to decide the question as to the first preacher in our country. The point is noticed only for the purpose of shewing the folly and the weakness of the Roman pretences. But though we do not build upon the point in question, yet it is certain that the first preachers of the Gospel did not come from Rome. Rome was not the first city to receive the Gospel; the name *Christian* originated at Antioch.

We are aware that Baronius mentions A. D. 63 as the period when the Gospel was preached first in Britain; but he fixes this time for the purpose of supporting his position that we are indebted to Rome for the Gospel. This writer knew well that, as he could not shew that the faith was preached at Rome before A. D. 44, it was necessary to fix a later period for its introduction into Britain. There is, however, other evidence to shew that the glad tidings of salvation were brought hither from the East, and not from Rome. We allude to certain customs which prevailed in the British Churches at and before the arrival of Augustine. It is well known that the Eastern and Western Churches differed from each other a very early period on certain points, such as the time for celebrating the feast of Easter, baptism with chrism, and other matters. When Augustine arrived, he found that the Britons followed the customs of the Eastern Church, and not those of Rome or the Western Church. This simple historical fact affords the strongest evidence that the Britons received the Gospel from the East, and not from Rome, whose customs they refused to receive when Augustine attempted to impose them upon the British Churches. Thus it is evident that Rome is not our mother Church; and even if she were a true Church, in possession of the true doctrine, she could not be viewed in any other light than a sister—and a younger sister, too—since we are of older date than herself.

In regard to the Roman assertion that the country had relapsed into paganism, and that there was a second conversion of Britain in the time of King Lucius, by Pope Eleutherius, the facts of the case are simply these, Lucius being connected with Rome as holding his kingdom in Britain under the authority of the Emperor, sent to that city for a supply of preachers to assist those who were employed in promulgating the Gospel amongst his countrymen. The Romans, he it is remembered, still held Britain, Lucius was converted to the faith by the instrumentality of British Christians. The Gospel had never left the country since its original plantation in the days of the Apostles. It had, indeed, dwindled, but was not extinguished. Prior to this period it had not been received by the British rulers; it was accepted only by private persons; but there was no new conversion under Lucius; the Gospel was only revived and extended more amongst the people. It was about the year A. D. 170, or 176, that Lucius sent to Rome. If it be asked why did he send to Rome at all? We reply, that he sent to Eleutherius for advice. The Church of Rome was then eminent for piety; and King Lucius, who was not now first converted to the faith, as is alleged, but who had previously been made a partaker of the Gospel, was anxious to receive the advice of a bishop so eminent for piety as Eleutherius. That this assertion is founded in truth is evident from the epistle sent by Eleutherius to the King.

* Suscepi in regno Britannie, miseracione divina, Legem et Fidem Christi. Habetis penes vos in regno utraque paginam.
* From the Church of England Quarterly Review.

ex illis, Dei gratia, per concilium regni vestri, sume legem, et per illum, Dei potentia, vestrum regem Britannia regnum. Vicarius vero Dei estis in regno illo."

From this extract it is clear that Christianity was not extinguished in the land at this time; on the contrary, Eleutherius positively asserts that the truth was still shining in Britain. Nor does the supremacy receive any support from the letter of Eleutherius. It is, in fact, a strong proof that such a notion was then unknown. Lucius is styled God's vicar in his own kingdom—a term which was subsequently applied exclusively to the Pope. This letter alone is sufficient to overturn the position, that the Gospel had been banished from our shores, and that it was restored by Eleutherius. So far is this statement from being true, that the messengers sent by Lucius to Eleutherius were two learned British Divines, Elvanus of Glastonbury, and Medivus of Wells, with whom Damianus and Evgatius returned. It is even admitted by Capgrave, a Romish writer, and a man commended even by Parsons, that Elvanus the Briton had scattered the seeds of the Gospel in the country prior to his going to Eleutherius at Rome. At this period the Church of England was independent of Rome. And, moreover, it is a remarkable circumstance, that as Britain probably received the Gospel before it was preached at Rome, so she made a public profession of the faith of Christ long before it was publicly received in the Capital of the Empire. The very first Christian king was a native of and reigning in Britain. Lucius was a convert to the faith of Christ.

It is, too, a fact that when Augustine arrived in England there were in Britain seven bishops and many other learned men, besides two thousand monks in the monastery of Bangor.* Christianity was not extinguished by the Saxon invasion. From the time of Lucius to the reign of Constantine, Christianity existed in Britain in a flourishing state, and the fact is mentioned by several of the early Fathers. We may mention Tertullian and Origen. The first Christian emperor was born in Britain; and as he was the first to introduce the public profession of the Gospel into the empire, it may fairly be said that Rome is indebted to England more than we are indebted to her. At the period of Constantine's reign, the Church of Britain was independent of that of Rome. At the council of Arles, A. D. 314, three British bishops were present; and it is certain that some of the prelates from Britain were among the fathers assembled at Nice, A. D. 325. At the council of Sardica, A. D. 347, the British Church was represented by its bishops. The supremacy was not yet claimed by the Bishop of Rome, for the fathers at Sardica style him their brother and fellow bishop. British bishops were also present at the council of Ariminus, A. D. 359. At length, however, the Romans withdrew from Britain, and the Church was left to the protection of the British kings. The Saxons were called in by the Britons to assist them against the Picts and Scots. In a very brief space, however, the Saxons quarrelled with the Britons and seized upon their territories. During 150 years the two parties were engaged in a constant struggle; but at last the Saxons were victorious,—the Britons flying before them into Cornwall and Wales. The two Archbishops of London and York retired to A. D. 587. It was a few years after this period that Augustine came to England; but the sole honour of England's conversion does not belong to that individual. What are the facts of the case? On his arrival he found that the wife of the king of Kent was a Christian lady, Bertha by name. She, with her attendants, was accustomed to worship in the Church of St. Martin's in Canterbury, an edifice erected by the British prior to the Saxon invasion. A British bishop, Luidhardus, was actually resident, at this time, in the court of Queen Bertha; and in consequence of his ministrations the king himself had been impressed in favour of the Gospel. This British bishop is frequently termed the *forerunner and porter* to give Augustine entrance. It is true that the outward appearance of a Christian Church did not exist, except in Wales and Cornwall; but British Christians were scattered all over the country. Christianity was never extinguished, even though Paganism so extensively prevailed. Many of the Britons submitted to their conquerors, and were consequently permitted to remain in their dwellings. These individuals operated as leaven upon the Saxons, many of whom, by their instrumentality, were converted to the faith of Christ before the arrival of Augustine, whose path was thereby rendered plain and easy. There was a Christian congregation, as has been remarked, in the city of Canterbury, with whom Augustine, for some time, assembled for public worship. It is a pleasing fact, that the Scriptures were preserved during the Saxon invasion. We would not rob Augustine of the honour of preaching the Gospel to the Saxons; but we must contend that the merit of their conversion belongs more to the British Christians than to that distinguished man. Had not the ground been previously prepared by Queen Bertha and the British and Saxon Christians, Augustine would probably have departed from our shores.

DIVISION OF PROPERTY IN EASTERN COUNTRIES.

It was usual in the East for rich men to divide their property; but not always for the purpose specified in Luke, xv. 12.—"Ever apprehensive of revolution and ruin, a rich man generally divides his estate into three parts: one he employs in trade, or the necessary purposes of life; another he invests in jewels, which he may easily carry off, if forced to flee; and the other he buries.—As no one is entrusted with the secret of this deposit, if he dies before he returns to the spot, the treasure is then lost to the world, till accident throws it in the way of some fortunate peasant when turning up his ground. Those discoveries of hidden treasures, and sudden transitions from poverty to riches, of which we read in Oriental tales, are therefore by no means quite ideal, but a natural consequence of the manners of the people. The principles of inheritance differ in the East from those established among European nations. Children are not obliged to wait for the death of their parents before entering on the possession of a portion of their estate. The rights of inheritance among the Hindus, for example, are laid down with the utmost precision, and with the strictest attention to the natural claim of the inheritor in the several degrees of affinity. A man is thus merely considered a tenant for life in his own property; and as all opportunity of distributing his effects by will after his death is precluded, hardly is there ever mention made of such kind of bequest. By these ordinances he is also prevented disinheriting his children in favour of aliens, and of making a blind and partial allotment in behalf of a favourite child, to the prejudice of the rest, by which the weakness of parental affection, or of a misguided mind in its dotage, is admirably remedied. These laws seem strongly to elucidate the story of the prodigal son in the Scriptures, since it appears to have been an immemorial custom in the East for sons to demand their portion of inheritance during the life of their father; and that the parent, though aware of the dissipated habits of his child, could not legally refuse to comply with the application. If all the sons go at once in a body to their father, jointly requesting their respective shares of his fortune, in that case the father shall give (after setting aside a portion for his own maintenance) equal shares of the property earned by himself, to the son incapable of getting his own living, to the son who hath been the most dutiful to him, and to the son who has a very large family, and also to the other sons who do not lie under any of these three circumstances. In this case he has not the power to give to any of them more or less than to the others. If a father has occupied any glebe belonging to his father

* Vide, Hist. Angl. lib. 2, cap. 2.