DUFF MISSIONARY LECTURES.

First Series.

PRINTED BY MORRISON AND GIBB,

FOR

T. & T. CLARK, EDINBURGH.

LONDON, ... HAMILTON, ADAMS, AND CO.

DUBLIN, ... ROBERTSON AND CO.

NEW YORK, ... SCRIBNER AND WELFORD.

Duff Missionary Lectures—First Series.

MEDIÆVAL MISSIONS.

BY

THOMAS SMITH, D.D.,

EDINBURGH.

EDINBURGH:
T. & T. CLARK, 38 GEORGE STREET.
1880.

TO

The Right Honourable LORD POLWARTH,
The Rev. WILLIAM LINDSAY ALEXANDER, D.D.,
WILLIAM PIRIE DUFF, Esq.,
The Rev. ROBERT GORDON,
The Rev. JOHN MARSHALL LANG, D.D.,
HUGH M'LEOD MATHESON, Esq.,
DUNCAN MACNEILL, Esq.,
The Rev. ANDREW THOMSON, D.D.,—
Trustees of the 'Duff Missionary Lectureship;'

AND TO

HENRY TOD, Esq., W.S., *Agent for the Trust,*—

THESE LECTURES ARE RESPECTFULLY INSCRIBED.

PREFACE.

THE DUFF MISSIONARY LECTURESHIP has been instituted under the provisions of the will of the late Dr. Alexander Duff. In arranging for its foundation, his son has complied with the dying instructions of his father, deviating from these instructions only to the extent of designating the lectureship by his father's name,—a deviation which, I venture to think, will be universally approved.

In terms of a trust-deed executed by Mr. Duff, a course of lectures, not fewer than six in number, 'On some department of Foreign Missions or cognate subjects,' is to be delivered once in every four years, each lecturer to give only one course. They are to be delivered in Edinburgh and repeated in Glasgow, or delivered in Glasgow and repeated in Edinburgh, or delivered and repeated in such other places as the trustees may direct. The lectures are then to be published, and copies are to be presented to certain libraries in this country, continental Europe, America, India, Africa, and Australia. The trustees are men belonging to different denominations, and the lecturer

is to be 'a minister, professor, or godly layman of any Evangelical Church.'

In the introduction to the first lecture I have sufficiently explained the circumstances in which I was appointed as the first holder of the lectureship, as having been long associated with Dr. Duff in mission-work in Bengal, and afterwards in the home-management of the missions of the Free Church of Scotland. While I venture to entertain a humble hope that the present volume may communicate to its readers a considerable portion of information, and may stimulate their interest in the great work of missions, I desire that it may be regarded also as a tribute to the memory of one for whom, during forty years of uninterrupted friendship and constant intercourse, I cherished feelings of tenderest affection, while I shared with the universal church the sentiment of admiration of his gifts and veneration of his graces.

I have not thought it necessary to make frequent references to the sources from which I have derived my information. These have been numerous,—English, French, German, Latin, and Greek, — and I have endeavoured to make honest use of them. Without enumerating them, I should state that, next to the general church-historians, Baronius, Schröckh, and Neander, I have been specially indebted to Mr. Maclear (*History of Missions in the Middle Ages*, London, 1860) both for direct information and for

references to original authorities. Besides making several quotations from his pages, I have occasionally followed his narrative with little alteration. I should also acknowledge my obligations to Ebrard (*Die Iro-Schottische Missionskirche*), to Huc (*Missions in China, Tartary, and Thibet*), and to Germann (*Die Kirche der Thomas-Christen*).

The composition of these lectures has been laborious; but it has been a labour of love, and of ever-growing interest in the subject. My prayer is that their perusal may be not less productive of interest in, and love to, the cause which they are designed to promote.

T. S.

EDINBURGH, 1*st May* 1880.

MEDIÆVAL MISSIONS.

LECTURE I.

I AM somewhat painfully aware that I owe my appointment to this lectureship, not to any special qualifications that I possess for discharging the important duties devolving on the lecturer, but rather to the very special relation in which I stood for forty years towards the noble man whose name it bears, and the very close friendship which subsisted between us during that long time. The consciousness of this has made me very anxious, both about the choice of a subject, and about the treatment of it. I have been deeply concerned that the object might be in some degree promoted which lay so near the heart of my beloved friend, and to the furtherance of which so large a portion of his life and of his stupendous energies was devoted,—the object of exciting and keeping alive in the hearts of our people an intelligent interest in the spread all over the world of the knowledge of the glorious gospel of God's grace, and the direction of that interest into practical channels.

After much consideration, I came to the conclusion

that, with the blessing of God, this object might be in some measure effected by the delivering and subsequent publication, in terms of the deed by which the lectureship has been instituted, of a short course of lectures of a historical or biographical character. It appeared to me that such a course—if not in itself preferable for the end in view to one which should bring forward more prominently and more formally the duty incumbent on all Christians, to labour and pray constantly and fervently that the gospel may be accepted by all the tribes of earth—was at all events preferable for me. I was satisfied that, if I attempted the production of a course of lectures of the latter character, I should be able to do little more than introduce and repeat such hortatory matter as is familiar to all our people, but which it would require the sanctified genius and burning eloquence of him whose name is associated with the lectureship to render either instructive or practically effective. I doubt not that many of my successors will choose such themes; and such as may be led to do so have my hearty suffrage, by anticipation,—if that have any value,—to the propriety of their choice, which, indeed, I should have made for myself, but for conscious incompetency to handle such a theme in any worthy manner. I am still more confident now than I was before the preparation of the lectures began, that in this matter my judgment was correct, and that a historical subject was

better, at all events for me, than any other that I could have attempted to handle. At the same time, I should like to state at the outset that the great object which I have in view is to produce or deepen a conviction on the minds of my hearers of the greatness and grandeur of the mission work, — to show how intimately its prosecution by the church is bound up with the glory of her exalted Head,—how necessarily those who are negligent of it cut themselves off from sympathy with the heart which beats in the human breast of that Lord who is at the right hand of the Majesty on high, expecting till His enemies be made His footstool. If in this object I fail, my failure is complete.

The conclusion being reached, that the subject of the lectures should be historical, it next became necessary to select some period or some department of missionary history, to resolve to treat of the missions undertaken by some particular churches or societies, or of the missions conducted in some particular country or countries, or of those carried on, wheresoever and by whomsoever, in some particular period of time. Each of these methods appeared to have advantages and disadvantages peculiar to itself, as compared with the others. I need not detail the considerations which led me, on the whole, to give the preference to the last, and to adopt a chronological, rather than either an ecclesiastical or a geographical division.

This second step having been taken, it remained

to decide upon the particular period whose missions should be reviewed. After no little deliberation I chose the long period which is commonly designated as the *Middle Ages*, and announced that the subject of the lectures was to be MEDIÆVAL MISSIONS. I was well aware that the subject is far too large to be exhaustively treated within the limits of so short a course of lectures; and I am, if possible, more abundantly aware of this now than I was then. But I have a belief that the object of such a course of lectures as the present—and, indeed, of any course of lectures—should not be the exhaustive treatment of a subject, but rather the exciting of such an interest in it as may stimulate to further investigation, and the furnishing of hints and helps for the prosecution of such investigation. I was aware also, and am more abundantly aware now, that to carry out this design in any way not absolutely discreditable, would impose on me an amount of laborious research far greater than what might have sufficed for the adequate treatment of a non-historical theme, or for the adequate presentation of the missions of some other historical period. But the very fact that such laborious research is necessary, inasmuch as it is due to the circumstance that information regarding this particular period is not very easily collected, suggested that the labour bestowed upon it would not be bestowed in vain.

I regret that I should have been obliged to occupy

so much time with these preliminary explanations, but they seemed necessary at the outset.

The terms *Middle Ages* and *Mediæval* are, of course, somewhat indefinite, and have, in point of fact, been variously applied. A very strict determination of the beginning and the end of the period to be understood as comprehended under them is not of much consequence, and is indeed, from the nature of the case, scarcely possible, as every determination of them must necessarily involve the introduction of some more or less arbitrary element. As Protestants, we consider the 'darkness' specially characteristic of these ages, and which warrants the designation frequently applied to them, to have been dispelled by the light of the glorious Reformation early in the sixteenth century. Further, it is at all events convenient, while it is not out of harmony with historical realities, to consider the middle of these Middle Ages to have been about A.D. 1000. The termination of our line and its middle point being thus ascertained, its other extremity determines itself; for, if A.D. 1000 is the middle of a period which ended in A.D. 1500, of course it began with A.D. 500. This somewhat rude or rough-and-ready method of fixing the beginning of the mediæval period gives a result very happily in accordance with that to which we should have been led, and to which others have been led, by considerations connected with the

events both of civil and ecclesiastical history. The continuity of history never is, and indeed never can be, absolutely broken. Yet there are events which so dominate and modify all that follow, that they must be regarded as introducing new eras. If there ever were such an event in European history, it was the irruption of the barbarian tribes into Europe, the overthrow of the Roman Empire, and the substitution, for the frosty stillness and stagnancy of Roman supremacy, of the infinite fluctuations and complications of European interests, and European wars, and European politics. Now, although this irruption had begun before the beginning of the sixth century, and although it was not complete then, yet just about that very time these tribes began to be so consolidated and organized, that they might be regarded thenceforth as virtually the possessors and the rulers of those lands of which till then they had been only invaders, and ravagers, and plunderers. I need scarcely say that I shall not hold myself absolutely bound by the limits which I have thus, somewhat arbitrarily, assigned to my period; for it follows of necessity from what I have alluded to as the continuity of history, that it would be impossible to trace its course satisfactorily, or even to make its facts intelligible, without occasionally tracing back events which have occurred within a given period, and showing their connection with and dependence upon other events which have occurred in an earlier period.

This millennium, then, being our prescribed field, it is manifest that it must be in some way divided, if we are to have any hope of dealing with it satisfactorily. And, happily, I find that it very conveniently divides itself; and that partly on geographical, and partly on ecclesiastical and chronological grounds. In the first place, it is so obvious that it cannot well escape the notice of any one, that the world, throughout the whole course of its history, has been virtually divided into two great sections, which may be designated as the East and the West, although the dividing line has been neither straight nor unvarying. Its reality and its permanence are established by the fact of its recurrence after every displacement. In ancient times it was broken by the Persian invasion of Greece, and the Asiatic expedition of Alexander. But Xerxes never established an Asiatic power in Europe, and the great empire of Alexander speedily fell apart, and was dissolved into its Western and Eastern components. In times nearer to those with which we have to do, it was rudely disturbed by the transference of the seat of empire from Rome to Byzantium, by Constantine, in the fourth century. The emperors of the West thereby became virtually Eastern monarchs, and too sadly realized the ideas that are generally associated with that designation. The people of the West were thereby subjected to innumerable influences of an essentially oriental character. Somewhat of the manner of thought

and manner of life that had before been regarded as distinctively Western was introduced into the East, while the East exercised a still more potent influence upon the West. But the fusion of the two sections was never effected; the dividing line was never obliterated; and ere long the disunion became more absolute than it had been before the union; and so it remains till this day. This great fact, then, suggests the primary division of our subject. Of the seven lectures of which the course will consist, I purpose to occupy five with sketches of missions in the West, that is, in Europe and the western side of Northern Africa; and the other two with sketches of those in the East, that is, in Asia and the eastern side of Northern Africa.

Leaving ourselves free, then, to interject references to other matters, it is proposed, first of all, to give some details as to the spread of the gospel in Europe in immediate connection with a very important event which occurred just at the beginning of our allotted period, the conversion of Clovis. Then we shall come to our own beloved land, and give some account of the work of God in it in the early portion of the Middle Ages, and trace the influence of our countrymen, as for several centuries the greatest missionaries in Christendom, in the spread of the gospel on the European continent. When we come to about the middle of our period, our attention will be chiefly turned to the more northern and eastern parts of

Europe, Denmark, Russia, and Poland; and, finally, we shall be called to notice the missions to the Mohammedans in Spain and North-Western Africa. So much for the division of the first section of our course. The subdivision of the second main division will be stated afterwards.

The time which elapsed between the conversion of Constantine and the middle of the fifth century had sufficed to make Europe outwardly and nominally Christian. It had sufficed also to complete the decline of the once mighty Roman Empire, and to take from the orientalized emperors of Constantinople all but a shadow of the power which had once belonged to the emperors of Rome. Although they boasted themselves to be, and were nominally acknowledged as, the successors of these emperors, yet the empire over which they reigned and did not rule was in no sense the empire of the Cæsars. The decadence of the Roman State began with the extinction of that stern republican virtue, which, with all its defects, had imparted a might and a power to the people, and made them the conquerors of the world. It was accelerated by the ferocious and beastly vices of some of the heathen emperors, and was not arrested by the weaklings who, bearing the Christian name, substituted profligacy, sensuality, and vice in some instances, hypocrisy, and faithlessness, and base favouritism in

almost all, for that stern pride, if it were nothing higher, which made it the first article of a Roman noble's creed to fear nothing but a lie. This it was that called down the just vengeance of Heaven; and the only wonder is that that vengeance slumbered so long. One of the principal means which Divine Providence employed in the infliction of this vengeance was the incursion of the barbarian tribes into Europe. I confess that I have never been able very clearly to understand whence these invaders came in such immense numbers. The countries which are usually mentioned as their previous abode could not, as it appears to me, have maintained so vast a population, even if they had been cultivated in a way in which we may be sure that these tribes did not, and could not, cultivate them. But be this as it may, the fact is unquestionable, that from lands outside the boundaries of the Western Empire band after band poured down upon the European territories, and spread themselves like locust-flights over the various provinces. Never in the history of mankind has there been a similar instance of people so numerous, so far removed and so diverse from each other, being simultaneously inspired with a common feeling, and instigated to similar action. To deny or to doubt that the finger of God was in it, and that these tribes, albeit they knew it not, were the unconscious instruments of the Divine vengeance, were, in my judgment, to contravene the first principle of

human belief, that every effect must have an adequate cause. Any detail as to this strange irruption were manifestly outside my province. It is enough to say that, speaking broadly, these nations were at the opening of the sixth century the virtual rulers of Europe. They had incorporated with themselves so many of the previous inhabitants as they had not exterminated. The proportion of incorporation to extermination would, of course, vary in the different countries; but I suspect that in general the former was the rule and the latter the exception. The people did not generally offer any very strenuous opposition to their transference from the yoke of Rome to another yoke, which could not well be heavier, and which might haply prove less galling and intolerable. By the conquest of Roman garrisons, and in some cases by bribery of degenerate Roman commanders, by receiving into their ranks those mercenaries to whom it was a matter of indifference whether they served Rome or Rome's enemies, they had everywhere reduced the imperial power to a nullity. Some of these invaders had been brought under the influence of the gospel, to a certain extent, before their arrival in Europe,—notably the Goths, whose previous history is better known than that of some of the others, who had been converted to Arianism, whose language had been reduced to writing, and had the Bible translated into it by their apostle Ulfilas, a noble man, who ranks high in the

roll of the great benefactors of mankind. Others, who had come as heathens, had embraced the religion of those whom they had conquered and incorporated with themselves. This, then, was the state of matters, as stated by Gibbon, at the close of the fifth century. 'Christianity was embraced by almost all the barbarians who established their kingdoms on the ruins of the Western Empire; the Burgundians in Gaul, the Suevi in Spain, the Vandals in Africa, the Ostrogoths in Pannonia, and the various bands of mercenaries that raised Odoacer to the throne of Italy. The Franks and the Saxons still persevered in the errors of paganism.' To bring these Franks and Saxons to the acceptance of the gospel, and to bring the other nations to the acknowledgment of Christ as a divine Saviour, was the mission work which the church of the sixth century found ready to her hand to do.

At the head of one of the great divisions of these Franks was Clovis, a man of no ordinary character, a thorough type of the virtues and the vices of the barbarian. Born and brought up in a portion of Gaul which had been more thoroughly Romanized than some others, he came into contact with the Christianity which was professed there. While it does not appear that he ever seriously contemplated either the duty or the privilege of a personal acceptance of the gospel, it is evident that he had a great respect for the clergy, whom, however, he probably regarded with superstitious

rather than religious reverence. An instance of this is furnished by an incident in his early history, which is often related for the purpose of illustrating the relation which subsisted between the chief and the clansmen of these tribes. It is variously told, but the variations do not affect the object which I have in view in citing it. At a very early period of his career he and his troops took and plundered the city of Rheims (or, according to another account, Soissons). The bishop came to him and begged that he would give back some piece of church furniture which formed part of the spoil. As this appears to have been of a fragile nature, it was probably a glass vase, Clovis promised that it should be restored; and when the spoil came to be divided, he begged as a personal favour of his soldiers, that it should be given over to him. As it was probably of small intrinsic value, there seemed to be a general acquiescence that his request should be granted. But just as he was about to remove it, a trooper sprang forward, and, in protest against such violation of the usages of the tribe, shivered it to pieces with a blow of his battle-axe. Clovis submitted in silence; but at the next review of the troops, perceiving, or affecting to perceive, some disorder in the bearing or accoutrements of the same trooper, he snatched his axe from him, according to one account, or, according to another, he drew his own sword, and with the one or the other weapon slew the man. I

would make one or two remarks upon this story. First of all, I believe it to be substantially true; for, coming to us through the channel by which it reaches us, it would certainly have had another complexion if it had been a mere fiction. The holy bishop would have been brought upon the scene; he would have breathed upon the fragments of the vase, and re-united them so that no sign of the fracture could be perceived; then the sturdy soldier would have fallen at his feet, and entreated to be washed in the laver of regeneration! From the narrative itself I derive two conclusions:—*First*, That a soldier in his twentieth year, flushed with victory and elated with the glory of conquest, who restrained his rage when he was defied and insulted at the head of his army, was no ordinary man, but an almost unique instance of that self-constraint which is one of the highest forms of human virtue. *Secondly*, That even at this early period of his life Clovis was on terms of intimate friendship with the Christian clergy; that he must even then have had some knowledge of the Christian system; and therefore that his subsequent conversion was not, as it has been sometimes represented to have been, the result of sudden and ignorant impulse.

In 493, Clovis married Clotilda, a niece of the King of the Burgundians. Although her family were Arians, she was herself a zealous adherent of the orthodox faith. Her character bears the stain of

having induced her husband to take a terrible and perfidious revenge on her uncle for the murder of her father and mother; yet the whole of her history impresses us with the idea that she was a noble woman, a zealous Christian according to her light, which was probably none of the brightest; a helpmeet for her husband, who was evidently won, by the good conversation of his wife, at least to think well of the God whom she worshipped, the Saviour whom she loved. On the occasion of the birth of their first son she was greatly exercised in her spirit, and was very urgent with her husband that he should embrace the gospel, in order that her infant prince might be baptized. She represented to him that the gods of wood and stone could neither help themselves nor others; that they were human attributes that were ascribed to them, and very inglorious deeds. Rather, she added, should we worship Him who has created all things, and has so beneficently contrived them for the use of man. Her husband only answered, 'All is brought to pass at the command of our gods;' and then, apparently referring to the acknowledged humiliation of Christ, and to the Arian controversy as to His real deity, he added, 'It is manifest that your God is altogether without power; it cannot even be proved that he is of the divine family.' Although the king could not be prevailed upon to declare himself a Christian, he seems to have made no objection to the child's being

baptized at the instance of the mother, and it was baptized accordingly. Within a few days the child died, and the father, in the bitterness of his moody grief, reproached the poor mother with having caused his death, by taking him from under the protection of the national gods, and dedicating him to one who could not guard him. In answer to this taunt the weeping mother gave thanks to God for that He had deigned to receive her little one into His kingdom; for I know, said she, that children who die so young are permitted to see the face of God. When another child was born, the queen again insisted on his being baptized, and the king reluctantly consented. He too fell sick, and the mother feared that if he also were taken away the father's heart would be steeled against the name and the gospel of Christ. She therefore prayed earnestly that his life might be spared. Her prayer was heard, and the child lived.

I have entered at some length into these details, in order to show the attitude of Clovis in relation to the gospel, for years before he embraced it. I think it must have appeared that his mind was very much in the condition in which the minds of many are at all times. He could not despise the religion of Clotilda. He knew that *her* Christianity was better than *his* heathenism. He could not, he dared not, oppose it; but he could not take up the cross and follow Christ. The moment of decision came at last. It was, as pro-

bably you all have heard, on the battle-field. In an engagement with the Allemanni near Tolbiacum (Zulpich) the fortune of war seemed to be against him; his troops were discouraged, and even ready to flee. After vain endeavours to rally them and restore their wonted courage, he remembered the God of Clotilda, and appealed to Him for help. 'Jesus Christ,' he said, 'whom Clotilda praises as the Son of the living God! Thou who art called the helper of the helpless, and of whom it is said that Thou givest victory to those who hope in Thee, I humbly entreat Thy glorious succour. Wouldst Thou vouchsafe to me the victory over these mine enemies, and were I to experience the power which those devoted to Thy name profess to have experienced, so should I believe in Thee and be baptized into Thy name. For I have called upon my gods, and they are, as I find, too far away to help me. Hence I believe that they lack power, since they come not to the help of those who obey them. Now I call upon Thee. My desire is to believe on Thee, were I but delivered thereby from my enemies.' Scarcely had he thus spoken when the king of the Allemanni was slain, and his army fled, leaving the victory with Clovis and his Franks. Immediately on quitting the field, which had been converted from a field of expected defeat into a field of victory, he seems to have sent for Vedastus, then a presbyter at Toul, and to have placed himself under

his instruction as a catechumen. On his return to Rheims he gladdened the heart of Clotilda with the tidings of his victory, and with the far gladder tidings of the conquest of his heart by the power of God. At her request Remigius, bishop of Rheims,—probably the same to whom he had made the promise which his stern follower put it out of his power to fulfil,—gladly undertook the office of preparing the royal catechumen for baptism. This was not long delayed. It took place with a degree of pomp which we cannot but regard as unseemly, the bishop charging him to worship henceforth Him whom he had scorned, and to burn the gods which he had hitherto worshipped. Before this he had dealt with his followers, and several thousands of them—3000 according to one account, 5000 according to another—were baptized along with him.

The conversion of Clovis has naturally been the subject of much discussion, in view of its important bearing on the acceptance of the gospel by the new European world. The Franks were, even at this time, a very powerful tribe; and they increased in power by repeated conquests, and by virtue of their superior civilisation, until they became the paramount power in Europe. Although it is from the Franks that France takes its name, and although Clovis is generally spoken of as king of France, yet his kingdom was not co-extensive with the modern France. He

never possessed the whole of that country, and he possessed territories that now belong to Switzerland and to Germany. I can offer but a few observations on so critical an event. First of all, I would refer to two incidents which have been related to show his gross ignorance of the Christian system. The first is, that when Remigius led him into the cathedral for his baptism, and when he saw the gorgeous manner in which it had been fitted up for the occasion, he whispered to the bishop the question, whether this were the heaven of which he had told him so much. Now I cannot believe that this was the question of ignorance; I have no doubt that it was only the extravagant exclamation of wonder. The other is, that on one occasion, long after his baptism, when he was listening to a preacher who was describing in vivid terms the deliverance of our Lord into the hands of His enemies, his feelings were so wrought upon that he grasped his sword-hilt and exclaimed, 'Had I been there with my brave Franks, they had not dared treat Him so.' From this it has been inferred that he was utterly ignorant of the value of the sufferings and death of Christ, and the necessity of these in order to the salvation of men. Now I must protest against such an inference. While we glory in the cross of Christ,—and God forbid that we should glory in aught save it!—we are not to be inhumanly void of human sympathy with the sufferings of the Man of Sorrows.

While we know that His enemies could have had no power against Him except it had been given them from above, we are not to forget that therefore he that delivered Him to them had the greater sin. While we know that both Herod and Pontius Pilate, with the Gentiles and the people of Israel, but did whatsoever the hand and the counsel of God determined afore to be done (Acts iv. 27, 28), we are not to forget that while they were the unconscious instruments in carrying into accomplishment the divine decrees, they were not the less guilty of a most horrid crime; and I venture to think that there was nothing unnatural and nothing reprehensible in Clovis' expression in his own way of his sense of that crime. Nothing unnatural, I am sure, for every child who hears the tale of the oppressions and afflictions of the Saviour has the same feeling; nothing reprehensible, I humbly think, for that was the warrior's mode of expressing the feeling which the child expresses by bitter tears of mingled sympathy and indignation.

As to the terms of Clovis' vow, I am free to say that this kind of bargaining with Christ, offering his allegiance as the price to be paid for victory over his enemies, does not indicate a right estimate of the terms on which a sinful man should deal with the infinitely gracious offer of salvation. But we ought to remember that a right appreciation of that grace is

unattainable and impossible without the experience of it. There is no man who accepts the gospel salvation that does not come to perceive that his motives for accepting it were infinitely below those by which he ought to have been actuated. Yet He, whose blessed characteristic it is, that He quencheth not the smoking flax nor breaketh the bruised reed, deigneth to meet with men on their own low ground, and, by graciously and gradually vouchsafed experience, to lead them to clearer views and higher principles of action. This is especially the case with men brought up under the carnalizing and secularizing influences of heathenism. The same thing goes on every year in many a Bengali village, that was enacted on the battle-field of Zulpich. The poor cultivator will become a Christian if Christ will grant him an abundant crop of rice, or will secure his patch of sugar-cane from devastation by the wild boar, or will enable him to conceal his small hoard, it may be of some few rupees, from the merciless exacter. It is very easy for us to weigh such motives in the balance and find them wanting. Ought we not rather to magnify that blessed grace of the gospel, which accommodates it to the infinitely varying conditions and wants of men, so that all the weary and heavy-laden may come to Christ, and find that if they get not from Him what their unenlightened minds and unsanctified hearts desire, they get infinitely more and infinitely better at the hands of Him who is able to do

for them exceeding abundantly above what they can ask or think?

Then, I think, there can be no doubt that the example of Constantine had been sedulously commended to the imitation of Clovis by his wife and her spiritual advisers. Without doubt, the idea of Christ which had been mainly presented to him was that of a Lord of hosts, a God of battles; and as he had learned that under the standard of the cross Constantine by Heaven's direction fought and conquered, so in the hour of his extreme need, when his brave Franks could not avail him, and when ignominious defeat, in his eyes the greatest of all possible evils, was impending, it is no wonder that it was only by way of experiment that he had recourse to Him of whom he had heard that all power is given Him in heaven and in earth, and that He is willing to use that power on behalf of His votaries. He had faith enough to apprehend that the God whom Clotilda worshipped is able to give good instead of evil; the higher apprehension that He is able to make all things work together for good to them who love Him,—that ignominious defeat sanctified by His blessing were a richer and a better boon than the most glorious victory unblessed by Him,—this apprehension was confessedly beyond his reach.

But in his case, as in every other, the sincerity of his conversion must be judged of mainly from the

consistency or inconsistency of his future life, and judgment must be applied in this case with more consideration of circumstances than we, perhaps, are well able to give. Unquestionably Clovis never came up to, or rather seems never to have come any nearer to, that standard of Christian meekness and forbearance which we rightly regard as essential to the Christian character. Not only was it as a soldier on the battle-field that he embraced the gospel, but as a soldier in days long preceding these, when civilisation and long diffused Christianity have to some extent mitigated the horrors of war; and such he remained to the last. Rettberg says sententiously, that 'his blackest deeds were done after his baptism.' I do not find this verified by his history, excepting in so far that *most* of his deeds were done after his baptism, for he was baptized at the age of thirty, and died at the age of forty-five. This, at all events, ought to be recorded to his credit, that his crimes were those of the warrior and the conqueror, not of the voluptuary or the sensualist. It is freely conceded that he had none of that horror of blood-shedding which the breathing of an atmosphere impregnated with the fragrance of the gospel of peace and love has made natural to us. Nor can it be denied that he had little of that sense of honour which ennobles the bravery of our Christian soldiers, and leads them to temper with the principles of a high morality the old and hateful maxim that all

things are lawful in war. But no one has ever laid to his charge any deed of lawless lust, or sensuality, or intemperance. The virtues which were mainly inculcated upon him by his spiritual advisers he faithfully practised. His liberality to them and to their churches was unbounded. He acknowledged the duty, and I can find no evidence of his having failed to practise it, of treating with kindness such *Christians* as the fortune of war threw into his power. He seems even to have gone a step beyond this. On going to war with the Goths, he intimates (in a letter preserved by Baronius) the proclamation which he made to his army, to the effect that no churches were on any account to be plundered or injured; that the persons of the clergy and of widows devoted to God, and their children living in the same houses with them, were to be inviolate; that every prisoner was to be set free who should be proved to be a Catholic; only that such proof should be rigidly demanded. If by the churches and clergy he meant—as one would think he must have meant—the Arian churches and clergy of the Goths, then it is a monument of a spirit of toleration which is nothing less than wonderful.

There is a reflection of a general kind suggested to me by the history of Clovis and his conversion, which seems worthy of our best attention, not only by reason of its connection with the character of a great deal of the missionary work of the period with which

we have to do, but still more because it refers to matters which will constantly recur in connection with mission work in our own times. The controversy which was recently carried on, more on the Continent than in this country, between the advocates of nationalism and those of individualism, had not formally arisen; but the subject-matter of that controversy must ever exist, and must influence the character of all missionary work. I ought, perhaps, to state that this controversy and this difference have no connection with the controversy and the difference on the subject of established churches, and the duty of nations in their national capacity towards the truth and church of God. The difference may exist inside of established churches and inside of non-established churches, and has no relation to the differences between these two. Both in the case of Clovis, and very notably in the case of some of the Saxon kings of England, it is quite manifest that the great object which the missionaries of those times set before them was the securing of a general or national profession of Christianity, rather than the conversion of individual souls to God. Now, I am far from a desire to depreciate or undervalue the former of these. No one, who has lived so long as I have lived in a heathen land, and so long as I have lived in a Christian land, can have any doubt as to the immense importance of the diffusion of the light of the gospel amongst a

community. The suppression of heathen rites and usages; the creation of a national conscience; the formation of a public opinion in favour of the pure, the honest, the true, the lovely; the elevation of the moral standard by even the formal recognition of the pure law of the gospel; the overthrow of superstition, and the vindication of the right of man to exercise the faculties which God has given him as a rational creature,—all these are unspeakable blessings, and all of them are blessings which the gospel surely brings in its train. But they are secondary blessings, and as such, they are to be received with devout thankfulness. When the spiritual life of church or minister or missionary is vigorous, and the eye is fixed on the rescue of perishing souls from death, these secondary blessings will come unsought, as the thunder follows the lightning,—unsought, but not unheeded or unacknowledged or unappreciated. But when in church or minister or missionary the spiritual life is low, when there is little experience and little appreciation of the blessing of personal interest in Christ's great salvation, then these secondary blessings are regarded as primary. So they are sought, and when so sought, they are not attained. To produce an echo, you must first produce a sound. To diffuse light or warmth through a hall, you must have brightly burning lamps or a glowing furnace. To leaven the three measures of meal, you must have real active leaven inserted into

the mass. Again I say that I do not undervalue the outward recognition of the claims of the gospel by large bodies of men; but yet I maintain that there is a more excellent way. The gospel must first work inwardly before it can effectively work outwardly. I doubt if all the thousands who were baptized along with Clovis did so much to elevate the tone of thought and action in the army and the nation as might have been done by some two or three men in whose hearts the fire of divine love had been kindled, and who were by grace made willing to spend and to be spent for Christ, who counted all but loss for the excellency of the knowledge of Christ Jesus their Lord.

There was doubtless much honest mission-work done in this early period; but unhappily the records of it are so mixed up with matters manifestly fabulous, and the amount of success achieved is so manifestly exaggerated, that it is impossible to separate the wheat from the chaff. The older church historians and the Romish calendars of saints contain innumerable names, and of those who bore them I have no doubt that many did good work, and did it well; but all that is recorded of them is, that they made innumerable converts, and then generally the higher praise is accorded them that they wore foul clothes, and abounded in vermin! Amongst all the causes of complaint that we have against Rome and Romanism, not the least is that her writers, by their inability to appreciate the grandly

simple, and by erecting an utterly false standard of goodness and nobility, have polluted the stream of history, have kept back from us the knowledge of much that we should have been the better for knowing, and have given us a vast amount of information concerning which we can only charitably hope that it is all false. Let me just give two or three specimens, fairly representative of hundreds that I might give, from a great Encyclopædia of Catholic Missions, published in Paris in 1863. Here is what is said of St. Blimond:—

'*Blimond* (Saint), missionary in the seventh century in the north of France. Disgusted with the world, and burning with the desire to extend the kingdom of God, he joined himself to St. Valery of Auvergne, who was first a shepherd, and then the apostle of several provinces in the direction of Belgium. They together preached the word of God to the idolatrous people of these countries; and after having preached with great success the faith of Jesus Christ, and drawn away a crowd of pagans from their errors, they retired to Ponthieu, into a desert place named Leuconay; there they constructed two little cells, which subsequently became the monastery of Saint Valery, around which the town of that name was formed (Saint Valery on the Somme, not far from Abbeville). In this retreat St. Blimond led an admirable life. He was never idle, he drank nothing but water, he never ate till after sunset; sometimes he remained for several days without taking any nourishment. He lay on the hard ground, or on branches of trees laid in a corner of his little cell. All that he could dispose of he gave to the poor, without ever caring for the morrow. He died about the middle of the seventh century.'

Take another specimen, which is not indeed so wholly worthless, but contains a glimmering of that

information which we so earnestly desire, and which we ought to have received so much more abundantly :—

'*Paternus* or *Pair* (Saint), missionary in the diocese of Coutances in the sixth century, afterwards bishop of Avranches. He was born at Poitiers, where his father held an important office. Trained under the eye of a virtuous mother, who instilled into him the great maxims of Christian piety, he was early convinced of the vanity of earthly things, and embraced the monastic state in the abbey of Ansion, afterwards called St. Jouin, in the diocese of Poitiers. Subsequently, in order to advance in the paths of perfection, he withdrew from his relatives, and retired, with another religious (St. Scubilion), into the forest of Scicy, in the diocese of Coutances. Having been ordained priest by St. Léontien, bishop of Coutances, he preached the gospel to the idolaters of the land. He converted an incredible multitude of them, and succeeded in procuring the demolition of an ancient temple, which had always been held in great veneration among the Gauls. We see here one example among a thousand that France did not become Christian from the day of the baptism of Clovis and his warriors. Besides the conquering race, it was necessary to bring into the fold of the church the incomparably more numerous Gaulish race. That race had not been wholly absorbed into the Roman paganism, and had retained, especially in the rural districts, its national worship, which was that of the Druids. It was necessary to root out that superstition from all the provinces, each one of which presented obstacles peculiar to itself, and required to have devoted to it many missionaries during several centuries. St. Paternus, converting so great a number of pagans about the middle of the sixth century, is one of those pious labourers who, under God, have fertilized, by their toils, their sweat, their prayers, and their holiness, that fair portion of the Lord's vineyard which is called the church of France. As fellow-labourers in his missions, he had St. Senateur or Senier, St. Gand, bishop of Evreux, Saroaste, a priest, who lived with him in the forest of Scicy. His zeal led him also to found several monasteries. Raised for his virtues to the episcopal see of Avranches, he governed his diocese

during thirteen years with much edification, and died about the year 565, on the same day with St. Scubilion, his friend and faithful companion. They were buried together in the oratory of Scicy, which is now the parish church of St. Pair-sur-mer, thus named in memory of this prelate.'

There is certainly something more life-like, more human in this notice, than in most of those contained in the work from which it is taken. I quite admit the accuracy and the importance of the statement, that we shall greatly mistake if we suppose that France became Christian from the day when Clovis was baptized. But I doubt whether there were any remains of the Druidic worship of the Gauls then extant. It seems unaccountable that the author speaks of the absorption of the Gaulish race into the Roman paganism, and says not a word of their absorption into the Roman Christianity. Yet it is quite certain that the latter was far more extensive than the former. Roman paganism did not ask of the conquered provinces that they should forsake their own gods, and worship the gods of Rome. Roman Christianity bore the reproach of intolerance by comparison; and, indeed, Christianity is and must be intolerant in the very high and holy sense of holding that truth is one, error thousand-fold; while tolerant in the sense of using neither compulsion on the one hand, nor earthly bribes on the other, to induce men to forsake the false and embrace the true.

I have mentioned Vedastus and Remigius as having

had to do with the instruction of Clovis with a view to his baptism. Of the former we know very little, excepting that he is spoken of in the usual terms by the church historians of the times, and in the Romish saints' calendars, as a most laborious and successful missionary, and the worker of abundant miracles. It seems to have been through his connection with Clovis that he was brought under the notice of Remigius, who thenceforth showed him great favour, and made him bishop of Arras. Here he laboured among the Arian and heathen Vandals and Huns, and so far as we may believe the calendars of which I have spoken, with great success. The following is the conclusion of a notice of him contained in an English calendar:—

'The people of Artois were part of his (Remigius') flock, and were in great need of instruction; their corrupt morals and errors would require one of extraordinary abilities and exemplary piety. He could see no one better qualified for that employment than St. Vedast, and accordingly, in the year 499, he consecrated him bishop of Arras, and made him the apostle of that idolatrous people. As he was entering the town, he restored the sight of a blind man, and cured another that was lame; which miracles had their intended effect, commanded the attention of his people, and made them look on him as one sent from heaven. The gospel had been before received in Arras, when the Romans were masters of that country. But in the year 406 the Vandals committed several outrages on the Christians there, who were quite dispersed or destroyed about fifty years later by Attila, king of the Huns. Since that time paganism was the reigning religion, and St. Vedast could not find the least trace of Christianity. All that the oldest persons there knew was that a church once stood outside the walls of the town. The natives were perversely fond of their super-

stitious worship and practices. Their blindness and obstinacy found employment for all our saint's charity and patience. Remembering St. Paul's conduct, who was all things to all men, he made use of all honest arts to gain them to the truth, and took advantage of every favourable moment to inculcate or insinuate the articles of our faith, and oppose and confute the errors in which they were involved. He spent forty years in these apostolic labours, had the satisfaction to see his church flourish in purity of faith and morals, and died on the 6th of February 539. We have a church still in London that bears his name.'

Remigius occupied a more prominent position than Vedastus, and is still more celebrated as a worker of miracles, both during his life and after his death. But we are to remember that the account of these miracles comes to us through his biographer, Hincmar, a distant successor in his see; and it is quite possible that the whole, or a great part of them, were invented by him. It is to be feared, however, that he and others of his time did take advantage of the superstitious credulity of the ignorant people, and imagine that there was piety in fraud when it was employed in a good cause. But despite of the lying legends with which his biography abounds, he appears to have been a man of high character, zealous for the establishment of the kingdom of righteousness and peace. His influence with Clovis was evidently very great; and, upon the whole, it would appear that he used it beneficially. Only one would have liked better if he had not accepted so large presents from the king. He was appointed to the bishopric of Rheims when he was

only twenty-two years old, and held the office for the long period of seventy-four years.

Another bishop of that age seems well to merit a place even in the brief catalogue of zealous missionaries which I am able to give. I refer to Cæsarius, who had a difficult and delicate part to play, and seems to have played it well. It is noticeable in regard to him, that we find no miracles ascribed to him, but abundant deeds of charity—the founding of hospitals, the redemption of captives, and unwearied constancy in prayer. The praise accorded him in the saints' calendar, however, reaches its climax in the statement, that 'his love of mortification was so great that he wore no linen, though even the monks of those times were not denied that satisfaction.' As bishop of Arles, he lived under Alaric, a professed Arian, who yet seems to have held him in high esteem. His zeal in reforming abuses made him odious to his own clergy, and he was accused, apparently by some of them, of holding traitorous correspondence with the Burgundians, who were at war with Alaric. He was therefore banished to Bourdeaux; but his innocence being afterwards established, he was recalled. His accuser was sentenced to be stoned to death, but was pardoned on the intercession of Cæsarius. His troubles, however, were not over. He was again accused after the death of Alaric; but, again, his innocence was established. Thus, in works of well-doing and in labours manifold, he spent his

days. On occasion of a journey into Italy, he had an interview with Theodoric at Ravenna. As a proof of his veneration, the Arian king made him a present of a large silver basin, and a purse of money to defray his expenses. Cæsarius thankfully received these gifts of the royal bounty, and employed them in redeeming captives. The pope also having expressed a desire to see him, he went to Rome, and was received with great honour. Here also there was presented to him a large sum of money, which he spent in the same way as the other. Even Neander, who is usually very niggardly in bestowing praise, warms into something like enthusiasm when speaking of the virtues of Cæsarius.

'Cæsarius,' he says, 'was distinguished for his zeal in promoting both the spiritual and temporal welfare of the tribes among whom he lived, for his efforts to communicate religious instruction to the people in a manner suited to their wants, by the public preaching of the gospel, and by private intercourse with them, and for his earnest endeavours to ameliorate their temporal condition, and to redeem captives who had been reduced to slavery. He sold the vessels and other property of the church, even down to his own priestly robes, to furnish himself with the means for bestowing charity. The presents which he received from princes he immediately converted into money, that he might have wherewith to succour the needy. Amid the most difficult relations incident to the change of governments under the conquests of different tribes, Burgundians, East Goths, West Goths, Franks, and under the reigns of Arian monarchs, whose suspicions he would be likely to excite by the difference of his creed, he was enabled, by a purity of life which commanded respect, by the wisdom with which he accommodated himself to men of different dispositions, and by a charity which was extended to all without distinction, to pre-

serve his influence unimpaired. Though subjected to persecutions on the ground of political suspicions, yet his innocence brought him out victorious over them all, which caused him to be regarded with still greater reverence than before.'

Such are a few specimens of the leaders of the host. Of the rank and file of the army, we know simply nothing. I doubt not that in many a remote village there were humble, pious men, who bore much at the hands of rude barbarians, and sowed the precious seed of the gospel with tears. Happily cut off by necessity from that ritualism and ceremonialism which was evidently a snare to those in more conspicuous positions, we may hope that they trusted more implicitly to the power of God and the wisdom of God in the cross and the doctrine of Christ. Although we have facts to deal with which prevent our entertaining the hope that the forefathers of the European nations received the gospel of God's grace in its genuine simplicity and the full glory of its grace, yet we may well cherish the conviction that many of them received in the love of it that truth which was brought to them; that the great army of our King, when mustered on the great day of review, shall contain in its spotless and unwrinkled ranks not a few once 'furious Franks and fiery Huns,' who shall be found to have come out of great tribulations, and out of many barbarities, and to have washed their blood-stained robes, and made them white in the blood of the Lamb; and those, too, who

were to them the messengers of divine reconciliation, delivered from all perverted views of the truth of God, shall be acknowledged to have been fellow-workers with those who, in better times and under happier auspices, have been privileged to proclaim a purer gospel; and while the former will rejoice in the superior privilege vouchsafed to the latter, the latter will confess that in this privilege they in no small degree reaped the fruit of what the others sowed; and sowers and reapers shall unite in giving all the praise to Him who sitteth upon the throne, and to the Lamb that hath been slain.

LECTURE II.

IN any presentation of the subject of mediæval missions, it is evident that the early history of the gospel in these British islands must occupy a prominent place. The church historians of other countries than our own acknowledge this; and I do not need to offer any apology for the proportion of our scanty time that I am going to expend upon it. But it is proper that I should explain the reason why I introduce it at this particular stage; and this, fortunately, I can do in a sentence. The reason is mainly this: that I cannot carry the history of continental missions farther without introducing the work of British and Irish missionaries; and in order to do this effectually, or, indeed, to make it intelligible, I must give some account of the evangelization of Great Britain and Ireland.

There is probably no question that has been more discussed, or discussed with less satisfactory result, than that relating to the first introduction of the gospel into Britain. There is no apostle or apostolic man to whom the honour has not been assigned of being the first bearer of the gladsome news to the

barbarous occupants of these remotest isles. While there can be no doubt, as I think, that some knowledge of the gospel was diffused in Britain at a very early period, I have no hesitation in saying that no success has attended the attempts to identify the bearers of the good tidings. The most that can be said to have been accomplished is, that it has been shown that we have very scanty records of the acts and travels of the apostles and first disciples of our Lord, and therefore it is impossible to prove in regard to one or other of them that they did *not* preach the gospel in Britain. But this is no step towards making it even probable that any one of them *did* so. In the absence of any record, or any very distinct trace of any directly evangelistic operations having been carried on, many have come to the conclusion that it was only by intercourse with Roman soldiers and procurators, and their families, or with British hostages and prisoners that were sent to Rome, and were there brought under the influence of the gospel and again returned to their homes, and by the innumerable ways in which the throbs of the great heart of Rome sent their pulsations through all the limbs and to all the extremities of her colossal empire, —that it was only through influences such as these that the people of these lands first became acquainted with Christians and Christianity. I should be the last to dispute the potency of influences such as these; for well I know what often occurs in India in our own

day, and what must certainly have often occurred in old times in lands to which formal missions had not been sent. A pious officer, a devout centurion, or a Christian civilian in a remote district, speaks of that of which his heart is full to his domestic servants, or to the numerous officials and hangers-on about his court; or a Christian physician drops a word to a weary and heavy-laden patient in his native hospital; or an earnest Christian lady gathers her servants together on the Sabbath day, and reads to them the gospel story, and expounds to them, with untrained and stammering tongue indeed, but with the earnest simplicity of a loving heart, the divine method of redemption and salvation. Even little children retail to their 'bearers' and their 'ayahs' the lessons which have been taught them line upon line, and the little prayers which they have been taught to lisp, kneeling with heads bent on their mother's knee. A missionary goes long years after into a district where he supposes the name of Christ to be unknown, and wonders when, at the close of an address, some old man comes forward and tells him that for years he has been cherishing the faith of Christ in his heart, and has been longing and praying for the advent of a missionary who might expound to him the way of God more perfectly. Very closely analogous to the position of such a lady in India now, must have been that of the Christian wife of a Roman centurion or a Roman proprætor in

ancient Gaul, or Britain, or any other of the Roman provinces. Only at the great day of the revelation of secret things will it be known to what an extent Christian officials and Christian ladies contributed towards the laying of the foundation of the British church. Or it might be that a British chieftain or a British merchant went to Rome, or to some other great focus of polity or commerce, attended by a retinue of his retainers and slaves. One of these loiters in the portico of some great house while his master is engaged within, and hears the slaves in waiting bantering one of their number on his attachment to some one who has been crucified. The dignified and calm replies, like an arrow from a bow, penetrate the armour of the stranger, and render it impossible for him ever to be again the man he was. On his return home he tells his barbarian neighbours that the great God of heaven loves them, even them; that he has heard even that the Son of the God of heaven has died for them. One and another regard the strange news as treasure hid in a field; and although they are jeered at and avoided by their neighbours and fellow-servants, yet by some strange instinct those who are in sore trouble come to them for help and consolation, while those who would fain find occasion against them are constrained to acknowledge that they cannot find any, except they find it concerning the law of their God. Let it not be said that, so far as relates to the introduction of the

gospel into Britain, all this is mere hypothesis or conjecture. It is but a fair application of the great principle, that like causes produce like effects. Now it is manifest that when causes like these have operated in the introduction of the gospel into a country, it must be specially difficult to trace their operation. There is no difficulty in distinguishing the brightness of noonday from the darkness of midnight, but the keenest eye cannot discern the instant when the dawn begins. There is no difficulty in distinguishing betwixt the corn-field wholly green and the corn-field fully ripe, but who shall tell at what precise instant the yellowing green dissolved into the greenish yellow? And who shall apportion to each sun-ray and to each rain-drop its proper contribution towards the result? The advent of Paul to Philippi is an event noticeable and recordable; the word dropped by the wife of an Aulus Plautius in the ear of her British litter-bearer or her British tiring-maid is unnoticed and unrecorded.

While, however, we cannot ascertain the beginning, nor trace the progress of the evangelization of Britain, there is no historical fact better authenticated than the introduction of the gospel at a very early period, and the existence of a very considerable Christian community before the Romans quitted the island. In order to a correct understanding of the state of matters, it is necessary to pay attention to the condition of the country at that time. Speaking generally, the whole

of Britain, south of the Firths of Forth and Clyde, had become virtually a Roman province. The inhabitants had, to a great extent, acquiesced in this, and had submitted themselves to the government of the Romans, paid their tribute, and regarded the path to fortune and prosperity as lying through Roman favour and the occupancy of subordinate offices under the Roman government. There was, however, a small body of resolute patriots who had retreated into the wastes of Cornwall and the mountains of Wales, and stedfastly resisted the aggressions of the Roman civilisation, as they had, while it was possible, resisted the aggression of the Roman arms. Amongst the Britons, and Roman officials and legionaries, in this main part of the island, there were many who professed the gospel, and there seems to have existed among them a regularly constituted Christian church. The northern part of the island was mainly occupied by the Picts; of these a small section were also settled in Galloway. In Argyllshire there was a colony of Scoti or Scots, who seem to have come about this time from Ireland, the part of the country which they occupied being regarded as an integral part of Ireland. It was to defend themselves against the incursions and depredations of the Picts and Scots that the Britons called in the aid of the Saxons, after the Romans had been obliged to recall their legions for the defence of the more central provinces of the empire.

It was on the border land of the Roman province, apparently in Dumbartonshire, that Patrick was born, close upon the end of the fourth, or close upon the beginning of the fifth, century. It is almost a matter of selfish regret to us that he was not born a century later, for then we should have been called to introduce into this lecture one of the most interesting biographies to be found in the history of the church, and to consider many questions also of an extremely attractive kind. But the arbitrary line which we have drawn as the boundary of our period excludes the history of Patrick from our province, and we are only justified in referring to it at all on account of its important connection with the history of the succeeding centuries; and it is only on this account, and to this extent, that I refer to it now. The father of Patrick was a deacon of the Christian church; so he tells us in one place; and in another he tells us that he was a *decurio*, which, although properly the designation of a military officer, seems to have been applied to a civil functionary. His grandfather had been a presbyter, a fact, by the way, which his Romanist biographers simply state, without making any remark upon it, or upon its bearing on the question of clerical celibacy. In his sixteenth year Patrick was carried away as a prisoner into Ireland, and was employed as a cowherd —or a swine-herd, according to another account—by his captor. During his captivity he was led to think

of that gospel, the truths of which he had known from his childhood, but which till then had not made an impression on his heart. After six years of miserable bondage he contrived to escape, and to find his way back to his father's house. From this time the desire of noble Christian revenge possessed him, and he longed to make free, with the truth of God, those who had enslaved him. But it was a long time before his desire could be fulfilled. At length, however, somewhere about A.D. 440, he was enabled to set out for Ireland, and from that time until his death, which was probably in 493, he lived a life of incessant labour, and was blessed with wonderful success in the conversion of the Irish. I rest nothing upon the manifestly fabulous legends that are regarded as historical facts by the Romanist biographers of Patrick. In point of fact, the Romanists have no part or lot in the historical Patrick. It has been proved by the late Dr. Tod, as absolutely as any historical fact can be proved, that he had no connection with Rome, ecclesiastical or doctrinal; that *their* Patrick is a creature of the imagination, with nothing in common with the Patrick of history. And as Dr. Tod proved that he was not a Romanist, so I think it can be equally proved that he was not an episcopalian; that when in one place he speaks of his ordination as a presbyter, and when in another place he calls himself a bishop, and tells us that he had ordained 300 bishops,

he has no conception of any distinction between the bishop and the presbyter. It is manifest that within a century of the arrival of Patrick in Ireland the idols had been 'famished out of the land.' Monasteries and churches had been established everywhere, and schools of learning had been founded, in which not only the youth of the country were educated, but to which young men were sent in large numbers from all parts of Britain, and even from the continent of Europe.

Amongst the youth of Ireland thus educated was Columba, who, born exactly one hundred years after Patrick's arrival in Ireland, was destined, in God's good providence, to pay back to Scotland the debt which Ireland owed her for the gift bestowed a century before, and so to contribute to the establishment of that true communion of the saints, in virtue of which the church of Christ, in all ages and in all lands, is one body, in which all the members fitly joined together are mutually helpful, and the body maketh increase by that which every joint supplieth. Columba was of royal lineage,—that is, as we understand it, his family was that of one of the numerous chieftains, each of whom claimed independent rule, and maintained a greater or less degree of royal state. Trained in one of the Irish schools, and early fired with the sacred Christian enthusiasm which knows no quenching, he devoted himself to a monastic life; and

from the influence which he had with the higher classes of his countrymen, and the power with which he attracted all classes to himself, he laid the foundation of several extensive monasteries and flourishing churches.

This may be the fittest point at which to say a few words regarding these monasteries, with which we shall have much to do in the sequel. Lord Bacon has particularized, as one of four great sources of human errors and fallacies, the misconceptions arising from the misuse or ambiguous use of words. We are apt to fall into errors of this kind, by supposing that what is sadly true of some monks and some monasteries is necessarily true of all. We know that the monastic system, as originated in Egypt, and as adopted and developed in the Romish Church, came to absorb into itself, and to foster and exercise, all the thousand evils of the mystery of iniquity. We are safe enough in asserting that it could not well be otherwise with *such* a system. When men separated themselves from their fellow-men, bound themselves by vows and obligations of an inhumane, not to say an inhuman character, professed to seek the attainment of a higher order of virtue than the gospel requires, and represented that virtue as consisting not in deeds of beneficence, but in useless self-inflicted tortures and meritorious acts of unnatural devotion, there could be but one result. The good men among the monks, the good women among

the nuns,—and there were doubtless good men and good women amongst them even at the worst of times, —having set before them an utterly false standard of holiness, would of necessity become weak and feeble in their spiritual constitution, with no spring of happiness arising from thankful faith in their hearts, with none of that healthful exercise of grace which is essential to its growth. But more and more the good would become a minority, as the system had no tendency to make the good better, while it lay under the fatal necessity of making the bad worse. But the Irish monasteries were altogether of a different character. Their occupants were men who found it impossible to maintain the habitudes of a Christian life in their still heathen homes. They therefore formed Christian communities, in which they might be free from the daily distractions of heathen observances, and might concentrate their missionary strength, and more effectively wage war against the idolatry by which they were surrounded. Occupied in the manual arts of husbandry and fishing for their maintenance, ministering to the bodily needs of the sick and the poor, teaching to children the elements of knowledge, and carrying on the education of selected youths to an advanced stage, undertaking long journeys for the purpose of preaching the gospel, taking in turn the duty of living in the monastery and acting as pastors of the churches formed in the

outlying districts, and devoting their scanty leisure to incessant transcription of the Scriptures and other books,—these men were as different as it is well possible to conceive from the Romish monks of later ages. There was no very important difference, I am persuaded, between these monasteries and the Christian villages which have sprung up around all our missions in India and the South-Sea Islands; still less difference probably between them and the Moravian settlements which were founded by the Herrnhuters on the shores of Greenland and on the plains of South Africa. Such settlements may not be the best conceivable or desirable, they may be liable to abuse, and may have a tendency to degenerate; but I have no doubt that in some circumstances they are the best attainable.

To return to Columba. Various accounts are given of the reason of his quitting Ireland; but they all so far agree, that he had in some way given offence to the civil or ecclesiastical authorities, and that it was not purely missionary zeal that led him to seek other scenes for the exercise of his great evangelistic gifts. Be this as it may, it is for us to acknowledge with humble thankfulness that the finger of God was in it; and that it was by Heaven's mission that he and his associates came to Scotland. These associates were twelve in number, and from the harmony in which they lived, and the veneration and affection that they all along manifested towards their leader, it is evident

that they were a well-selected band. I have mentioned that there was an Irish or Scottish colony in Cantyre. It is said that the ruling family in it were related to Columba. At all events it was to them that he first came. Whether they had left Ireland after Patrick had Christianized it, or whether they had heard the gospel after their settlement in Scotland, it would appear that the gospel was known amongst them before Columba's arrival, and that it was not from him that they first heard it. From the king of this Dalriad colony Columba received a grant of the small island of Hy or Iona, and there he laid the foundation of a humble institution, which was destined to realize the declaration that 'God hath chosen the foolish things of the world to confound the wise, and the weak things of the world to confound the things which are mighty; and base things of the world, and things which are despised, hath God chosen, yea, and things which are not, to bring to nought things that are: that no flesh should glory in His presence.' Romanism, by erecting a building whose ruin is but a third or fourth-rate specimen of the later Middle Age architecture, not for a moment to be compared with St. Andrews, or Melrose, or Elgin, or Arbroath, has done all that perverse ingenuity could do to rob us of the hallowed and hallowing associations that ought to cluster around Iona. But, happily, she had no power to clarify the murky air, or to soften the grey rocks, or to silence

the howling winds, or to stop the lashings of the never-resting waves. These sights are those on which Columba cast his grave, earnest looks; these sounds fell upon his ever wakeful ears. These sights and these sounds make it still possible, however difficult, to realize that Iona is a sacred place, a visit to which may stimulate to Christian enterprise, as gazing on the plain of Marathon might fan the flame of patriotism and the love of freedom.

We are probably safe in asserting that for two centuries or more Iona was the place in all the world whence the greatest amount of evangelistic influence went forth, and on which, therefore, the greatest amount of blessing from on high rested. Unhappily, the earliest biographer of Columba is much more occupied in belauding the saint for the performance of innumerable miracles, than in detailing the innumerable journeys which he and his associates undertook, and the toilsome labours which they indefatigably went through; and the later biographers have increased the amount of the chaff and diminished that of the wheat. But it is beyond question that under the ministrations of the 'family of Iona' the Pictish nation were reclaimed from barbarism to civilisation, and converted from heathenism to Christianity. And it is very worthy of notice that in this mission, while the results were national, the processes were individual. We read not of thousands baptized at the bidding of a chief, but of

a single man, or a single pair, or a single family being baptized. During the lifetime of Columba the gospel seems to have been very generally accepted by the whole of the western Picts; by the population of the Hebrides, whose numbers were probably but small, but amongst whom missionary work must have been carried on with immense difficulty; and by many in the Orkney, Shetland, and Faroe Islands. Very gladly would I dwell upon the history and the character of this great man, but I may not. There is, however, such exquisite beauty in his first biographer's account of his death, that I cannot deny myself the gratification of quoting it, with the omission only of two or three semi-miraculous or supernatural incidents which seem to me its only disfigurement. I retain the account of the light seen in the chapel, with the suggestion that Columba probably took his lantern with him, and that it was extinguished by his fall:—

'In the end of this same week, that is, on the day of the Sabbath, the venerable man and his pious attendant, Diormit, went to bless the barn which was near at hand. When the saint had entered in and blessed it, and two heaps of winnowed corn that were in it, he gave expression to his thanks in these words, saying: I heartily congratulate my beloved monks that this year also, if I am obliged to depart from you, you will have a sufficient supply for the year. On hearing this, Diormit, his attendant, began to feel sad, and said: All this year, father, thou very often vexest us by so frequently making mention of thy leaving us. But the saint replied to him, I have a little secret to tell thee, and if thou wilt promise me faithfully not to reveal it to any one before my death, I shall be able to speak to thee with more

freedom about my departure. When his attendant had, on bended knees, made the promise as the saint desired, the venerable man then resumed his address: This day in the Holy Scriptures is called the Sabbath, which means *rest;* and this day is indeed a Sabbath to me, for it is the last day of my present laborious life, and on it I rest after the fatigues of my labours; and this night at midnight, which commenceth the solemn Lord's day, I shall, according to the scriptural expression, go the way of my fathers. For already my Lord Jesus Christ deigneth to invite me, and to Him, at His invitation, I shall depart in the middle of this night: for so it hath been revealed to me by the Lord Himself. The attendant, hearing these words, began to weep bitterly, and the saint endeavoured to console him as well as he could.

'After this the saint left the barn, and in going back to the monastery rested half-way, at a place where a cross, which was afterwards erected, and is standing to this day, fitted into a mill-stone, may be observed on the roadside. While the saint, as I have said, bowed down with old age, sat there to rest a little, behold there came up to him a white pack-horse, the same that used, as a willing servant, to carry the milk vessels from the cow-shed to the monastery. It came up to the saint, and . . . laid its head on his bosom, inspired, I believe, by God to do so, and knowing that its master was soon about to leave it, and that it should see him no more. . . . The attendant began to drive it away, but the saint forbade him, saying: Let it alone, as it is so fond of me . . . and saying this the saint blessed the work-horse, which turned away from him in sadness.

'Then leaving the spot, he ascended the hill that overlooketh the monastery, and stood for some little time on its summit; and as he stood there with both hands uplifted, he blessed his monastery, saying: Small and mean though this place is, yet it shall be held in great and unusual honour, not only by Scotic kings and people, but also by the rulers of foreign and barbarous nations, and by their subjects. The saints also, even of other churches, shall regard it with no common reverence.

'After these words he descended the hill, and having returned to the monastery, sat in his hut transcribing the Psalter; and

coming to that verse of Ps. xxxiv. where it is written: "They that seek the Lord shall not want anything that is good"—here, said he, at the end of the page, I must stop. What follows, let Baithen write. . . . Having written the above-mentioned verse at the end of the page, the saint went to the church to the nocturnal vigils of the Lord's day; and so soon as this was over, he returned to his chamber and spent the remainder of the night on his bed, where he had a bare flagstone for his couch, and for his pillow a stone which stands to this day as a kind of monument beside his grave. While he was reclining there, he gave his last instructions to the brethren, in the hearing of his attendant alone, saying: These, my children, are the last words I address to you—that ye be at peace, and have unfeigned charity among yourselves; and if you thus follow the example of the holy fathers, God, the comforter of the good, will be your helper . . .; and He will not only give you sufficient to supply the wants of this present life, but will also bestow on you the good and eternal rewards which are laid up for those that keep His commandments. Thus far have the last words of our venerable founder, as he was about to leave this weary pilgrimage for his heavenly country, been preserved for recital in our brief narrative. After these words, as the hour of his departure gradually approached, the saint became silent. Then, as soon as the bell tolled at midnight, he rose hastily and went to the church; and running more quickly than the rest, he entered it alone, and knelt down in prayer beside the altar. At the same moment his attendant, Diormit, who more closely followed him, saw from a distance that the whole interior of the church was filled with a heavenly light in the direction of the saint. And as he drew near to the door, the light which he and a few more of the brethren had seen quickly disappeared. Diormit therefore entering the church, cried out in a mournful voice, Where art thou, father? And feeling his way in the darkness, as the brethren had not yet brought in the lights, he found the saint lying before the altar; and raising him up a little, he sat down beside him, and laid his holy head on his bosom. Meanwhile the rest of the monks ran in hastily in a body with their lights, and beholding their dying father, burst into lamentations. And the

saint, as we have been told by some who were present, just before his soul departed, opened wide his eyes and looked round him from side to side with a countenance full of wonderful joy and gladness, no doubt seeing the holy angels coming to meet him. Diormit then raised the holy right hand of the saint, that he might bless his assembled monks. And the venerable father himself moved his hand at the same time, as well as he was able, that, as he could not in words, he might at least by the motion of his hand be seen to bless his brethren; and having thus given them his holy benediction, he immediately breathed his last.'

The book from which I have taken this long extract abounds, as I have said, with lying legends, and yet I have great confidence that this narrative is substantially true, this scene painted from nature; and that for this reason especially, that I am sure that the author or compiler of these legends could not have invented it. It is too grand in its simplicity, too beautiful in its unadorned realism, to have originated with him. I should have been sorry to have been without the description of the meeting and parting of the old hero and his four-footed friend. It tells of a kindly, genial, thoughtful, loving nature, a heart in accord with that of Him who feedeth the young ravens which cry unto Him.

'He prayeth well who loveth well
Both man, and bird, and beast;
He prayeth best who loveth best
All things both great and small;
For the dear God who loveth us,
He made and loveth all.'

And in this connection let me say that many of the legends of miracle stated to have been performed by

Columba, I believe to be nothing more than exaggerations of that power which a man of observant mind and loving heart acquires over the objects, and what we call the powers, of nature. As an observant sailor he was weather-wise. With the practised eye and loving heart of a naturalist, he gained a knowledge of the habits of all the creatures of earth and air,—a knowledge which is essentially power,—and by the very potency of love he went far to regain that dominion over the inferior animate and the inanimate creation which was originally given to sinless man. I have no artistic gifts; but if I had, I know of few subjects that I would prefer to treat, to this parting between the saint and the pack-horse. In looking on the picture of the saint's last day on earth, one almost involuntarily exclaims: 'Oh that I might die the death of the righteous!' Let me, a Scotsman, addressing a Scottish audience, say that we have a noble heritage in the name and memory of Columba; a heritage which entails on us the duty of generous emulation, a shield blazoned in all its quarterings with inspiriting devices; a noble heritage; but which yet is but a heritage of shame to those who are indifferent to the cause of God and His gospel.

What Columba was to the Highlands, that in some degree does his contemporary Kentigern, otherwise called Mungo, appear to have been to the Lowlands of Scotland. But, unhappily, we possess no life of

him of earlier date than the middle of the twelfth century, and the two Lives which have come down to us from that century are not only filled with legends that are incompatible with one another, but the chronology is hopelessly confused. Both Dr. M'Lauchlan and Mr. Skene point out the confusion, and do all, probably, that can be done to unravel it. All that seems to be authentic is that Kentigern was born in East Lothian; that he was educated in a British monastery at Culross, on the northern shore of the Firth of Forth; that he left that place and went to Glasgow; that he was driven thence by a hostile king of Strathclyde, and took refuge in Wales, where he was hospitably received by David, with whom he lived for a time. Learning of a change of dynasty in Strathclyde, he turned northward, preaching all the way, settled for a time at Hoddam in Dumfriesshire, and then returned to Glasgow. The writer of one of the Lives states that he took it from an older MS.; but as that MS. contained matter inconsistent with sound doctrine, he had corrected it. In other words, he had Romanized it. One of the innumerable miracles with which he credits Kentigern is memorable by us, inasmuch as it is commemorated in the arms of the city of Glasgow. Almost the least unlikely thing recorded of him is a visit paid to him at Glasgow by Columba. If this be authentic, it would give a fixed point for the chronology of his life. But if it had

been authentic, we should have expected it to be mentioned by Adamnan in the *Life of Columba*. Altogether, although we doubt not that Kentigern lived, and that he performed an important part in the evangelization of our portion of the island, his history is a virtual blank.

We must now turn our eyes southward. The original inhabitants of Britain who had not been incorporated with the Romans, had withdrawn themselves into the remote districts of Cornwall and Wales. There is a tradition that Caractacus, a British king, and his family were taken as prisoners or hostages to Rome; that there some of them became Christians, and, on their return home, introduced the gospel among the Welsh. Whether this be so or not, it may be regarded as certain that on the invasion of the Saxons large numbers of the Christian Britons betook themselves to Wales, and there was a flourishing church there during the fifth and sixth centuries. I have already had occasion incidentally to mention David, who is regarded as the patron saint of Wales. There were monasteries apparently of exactly the same character with Iona, and there brethren were carrying on mission work vigorously among the Saxons of Wessex. Gregory was evidently aware of this when he sent Augustine to England; and it was with reference to them that he gave him the charge to insist upon absolute submission on their part, while he was

to use great forbearance with the heathen, and to tolerate their practice of many of their acts of worship, if he could only persuade them to practise them under a Christian name. I introduce the mention of Gregory and Augustine thus abruptly, because I take for granted that every one knows the story of the slave boys in the Roman market, of the somewhat poor puns which the future pope uttered on the occasion, and of the resolution which he then formed, and which he tenaciously kept, to contribute towards the Christianization of Britain. But while I do not hold the wit of Gregory in high estimation, I am very far from disparaging his zeal, and cannot help regretting that he was not permitted to carry out his design of becoming himself a missionary to our island. You are aware that he had been appointed by the pope, at his own request, to this mission, and that he had actually proceeded on his journey, when he was recalled, on the representation of the people of Rome that his presence there was essential to the well-being of the city and the church. When, after sixteen years' interval, he himself became pope, and resolved to carry out the design of the conversion of the people of Deira, he was not fortunate in the choice of his chief agent. 'We cannot,' says the present bishop of Ossory, 'give Augustine an exalted place among missionary heroes. Discouraged by the reports which he heard on the way concerning the savage Saxons,

he went back to Rome, and sought release from his arduous enterprise. But he had to deal with a nobler spirit than his own. Gregory would hear of no excuses, and sent him forth once more to the work which had been assigned him.' This, I apprehend, is a fair estimate of the characters of the two men. I should notice that it was in 596 that Augustine was appointed to the English mission, exactly a century after the baptism of Clovis. The history of his first doings in Britain is in some respects a repetition of the history on which I dwelt at such length in my former lecture. Ethelbert, king of Kent, and lord paramount of all the other Saxon kings to the south of the Humber, had, like Clovis, a Christian wife. Like Clovis, too, he acquiesced in her observance of the forms of her own worship. To Kent, therefore, and to Canterbury, the capital of the Kentish king, Augustine and his followers bent their steps, and were joyfully received by Bertha, the Christian queen. The king gave them a residence in the Isle of Thanet, off the coast of Kent, and thither he himself repaired, and gave them an audience in the open air; because, as Bede honestly tells us, he was afraid to meet with them in a house, lest they should practise some magical arts upon him. The interview was satisfactory. The king agreed to give them a place of abode, a stipend for their maintenance, and full liberty to preach to the people. It is remarkable that in Bede we have only a parenthetic

mention of the conversion and baptism of Ethelbert, although it is scarcely conceivable that men who evidently were greatly given to pomp and show, and especially having the example of the baptism of Clovis before their eyes, should have allowed such an event to pass without making it the occasion of a grand display. The success of the preachers in respect of quantity is probably much magnified; the quality of their work will not bear any test which even intelligent Romanists would apply to it. I find the pope writing to the bishop of Alexandria as follows:—

'Whereas the nation of the Angli, placed in a corner of the world, remained even till now unbelievers and worshippers of wood and stone, it pleased God, through the help of your prayer, that I should be led to send a monk of my own monastery to preach to them. . . . Letters have just reached us concerning his welfare and his work. For either he or those who were sent with him flash forth in that nation with so great miracles, that they seem to equal the apostles in the signs which they show. On the solemnity of the Lord's nativity, which was observed in this first indiction, more than ten thousand angels[1] are announced as having been baptized by our brother and fellow-bishop.'

I am not quite sure about the dates, but I understand this statement to refer to the Christmas of 597, Ethelbert himself having been baptized on Whit-Sunday, the 2d of June of that year. My doubt is,

[1] I do not know whether this is a misprint in Baronius, from whom I take this letter, or whether it is a repetition of the old play upon the words *Angli* and *Angeli*, which the writer had made so long before.

whether it be not of the Christmas of 596 that the pope speaks. But taking even the later date, the pope might well say, not that their success equalled, but that it far exceeded that of the apostles; for we read of no such national conversions in apostolic times. But while having very little faith in the conversions effected by Augustine and his associates, and while deeply deploring the contests which soon arose out of their mission, I believe that, in the providence of God, they served a purpose which could not otherwise have been served. So great was the enmity betwixt the Saxons and the Britons, that the former would not receive the gospel at the hands of the latter. It may be doubted even whether the latter would be willing to give the blessed gift to the former. It seems to have been necessary that foreign missionaries should be employed to begin the work of the conversion of the Saxons; and so we may well acknowledge the good to have been of God, while the large amount of evil that soon ensued, and which lasted for many centuries, and which survives to this day in the claim of Rome to supremacy in our land, is due to the pride and evil passions of men.

Bede has preserved for us an interesting correspondence between Augustine and the pope, in which the former put, and the latter answered, many questions of moral and ecclesiastical casuistry. One of Augustine's questions was as to the relations which were to subsist

between him and the Gaulish and British bishops. Gregory tells him very firmly that he has no authority whatever in Gaul, and then adds: 'But all the bishops of the Britains[1] we commit to your brotherhood,[2] that the unlearned may be taught, the weak strengthened by persuasion, the perverse corrected by authority.' We do not hear of any efforts that he put forth to instruct the ignorant or strengthen the weak; but he soon set himself to the correction of the perverse. The great matter of perversity related to the time of observing Easter. Both the Irish and the British churches had a mode of reckoning, in virtue of which their Easter might coincide with that of Rome, but which would sometimes differ from it by an interval of a month. This grieved the heart of Augustine. He offered them permission to retain many of their customs which were not according to Roman usages, provided only they would acknowledge him as their archbishop, and observe Easter at the canonical season. This they refused to do. Then he invited them to a conference,—so they regarded it,—or summoned them to attend a synod, according to his representation of the matter. They asked advice of an old hermit, who was held in high repute among them, as to the course they should follow in the meeting. His answer was,

[1] Plural, meaning the British Islands, including Ireland.

[2] That is, 'to you, our brother,'—as 'your Lordship,' 'his Eminence,' 'your Holiness,' etc.

'If he be a man of God, comply with his proposals.' 'But how,' said they, 'shall we ascertain this?' He answered: 'The Lord says, Take my yoke upon you, and learn of me, because I am meek and lowly in heart.' If, therefore, this Augustine is meek and lowly in heart, it must be believed that it is the Lord's yoke that he carries, and offers to you to be carried. But if he is harsh and haughty, it is manifest that he is not of God, nor ought we to give heed to his speech. Again they said: 'And how shall we judge of this?' 'Allow him,' was the answer, 'to enter first with his followers into the place of meeting, and if he rise up on your entrance, be sure that he is a servant of Christ, and listen respectfully to him. But if he despise you, and do not rise up before you, though you be more numerous than his followers, let him also be despised by you.' Bede, from whom I take this narrative, with perfect honesty tells that Augustine, when weighed in this balance, was found wanting. According to his account, they made the whole matter turn upon the fact of his having failed to render them a kindly greeting. They conferred, he tells us, with one another in this wise. If now he will not rise up to us, how much more will he treat us contemptuously if we acknowledge subjection to him! Thus the negotiation was broken off, and the conference ended with the utterance by Augustine of what Bede represents as a prophecy which was in due time fulfilled,

but that was in reality only a vain threat of Heaven's vengeance upon those who rejected his authority.

In the various Saxon kingdoms of the south there was a pretty regular alternation of Christianity and heathenism. A heathen king becomes Christian, and forthwith all his subjects are Christians too. He returns to heathenism, or he dies and is succeeded by a heathen, and no Christians are to be found. Bede gives us an interesting account of the conversion of the king and people of Northumbria, of which, as it is both important in itself, and may be regarded as a fair specimen of the mode of evangelization adopted in those days, I shall translate a considerable portion :—

'To this nation an opportunity was given of accepting the faith, because their king aforesaid (Edwin) was allied to the kings of Kent, having received in marriage Edelburga, otherwise called Tate, a daughter of King Edelbert. When first he sought this alliance, by sending some of his nobles to her brother Eadbald, who then ruled in Kent, he was answered, that it was not lawful that a Christian virgin should be given in marriage to a pagan, lest the faith and the sacraments of the heavenly King should be profaned by intercourse with a king who was quite ignorant of the true worship of God. When this answer was reported to the king by his messengers, he promised that he would in no way do anything contrary to the Christian faith which the lady professed; yea, he said that he would promise that she should observe the faith and worship of her religion after the Christian manner, with all who should come with her, whether men or women, priests or servants. And he professed himself willing to adopt the same religion, if, on examination by wise men, it were found holier and worthier of God than his own. On these terms the lady is promised and is sent to Edwin; and, according to the arrangement, Paulinus, a

man beloved of God, is ordained bishop, to go with her; and by daily exhortation and the celebration of the heavenly sacraments, he confirmed her and her attendants, that they might not be polluted by the society of pagans.'

The narrative goes on to tell how the efforts of Paulinus to convert the king and the people were for a time in vain. Then, when an attempt to assassinate the king by an emissary of a neighbouring king was defeated, and on the same day the queen gave birth to a daughter,—

'The king promised that he would renounce his idols, and serve Christ, if He would give him life, and victory in fighting against that king by whom the assassin was sent who had wounded him; and in pledge of the fulfilment of his promise, he assigned his daughter to the Bishop Paulinus to be consecrated to Christ. She was baptized on the sacred day of Pentecost, the first of the Northumbrian nation, with twelve others of her family.'

The king recovered from his wound, and completely subdued his enemy. From that time he abandoned the worship of idols, but would not make a profession of Christianity till he had more fully examined it. At last, being eagerly pressed by Paulinus, he resolved to submit the question to a council of his nobles, and to be guided by their advice. Bede gives us the judgment of two of these as follows. The question having been propounded by the king, Coifi, the chief of his priests, forthwith answered:—

'Observe, O king, what is the character of the religion which is now offered to us. I most truly declare to you what I have certainly learned, that the religion which we have hitherto pro-

fessed has no virtue at all. For no one of your people has given himself more earnestly to the worship of our gods than I have, and, nevertheless, there are many who receive from thee more bountiful gifts and higher dignities than I do, and prosper more in all things which they set themselves to do or to acquire. But if the gods had any power, they would rather help me, who have been more sedulous in their service. Whence it remains that if ye perceive on examination that those new things which are told us are better and more efficacious, we should without any delay hasten to receive them.'

The reasoning of the old priest is inimitable. The way in which he involves the king in common condemnation with the gods for the neglect of his merits, is a stroke of wit which we should probably have thought to be beyond the reach of a seventh-century Northumbrian.

The other judgment is often quoted, and sometimes misquoted, as happily illustrating the darkness of those to whom the gospel has not brought life and immortality to light:—

'The present life of men upon the earth, in comparison with that portion of time of which we know nothing, seems to me, O king, to be like as when you are sitting at supper with your generals and ministers in the winter-time, a fire being lit in the middle of the hall, and the supper-room being well warmed, but storms of wintry rains or snows raging outside; then a sparrow comes and flies swiftly across the hall. It enters by one door, and straightway goes out by another. Just as long as it is within, it is not touched by the winter's storm; but having passed over the small space of serenity in a moment, as it came from winter, it immediately returns to winter, and you see it no more. So this life of man appears to us for a little space, but as to what follows or what has gone before we are utterly ignorant. Whence, if this new doctrine brings anything more certain, it seems to deserve to be followed.'

The result was a solemn resolution to abandon idolatry, to devote the idols to anathema and to fire, Coifi, the high priest, volunteering to lead the iconoclastic band. Edwin was baptized at York, of which Paulinus was made bishop. Of all the wholesale conversions that have come under our notice, this of Edwin is certainly the least unsatisfactory. He seems to have been a remarkably thoughtful man, trained in the school of adversity; a man of rare virtue and honour even before his conversion, and subsequently to have adorned the doctrine, which he embraced, of his God and Saviour. He was slain in battle in the year 633. Before he came to the throne of Northumbria, it had been held by his uncle Ethelfrid, who had excluded Edwin, and had been greatly hated by the people. When Edwin succeeded in getting Redwald, king of the East Angles, to espouse his cause, and by his assistance overthrew the usurper Ethelfrid, the three sons of Ethelfrid fled into Scotland, and were educated as Christians in an Irish monastery, which had long existed among the southern Scots in Galloway. On the death of Edwin, these princes returned and seized the kingdom, which two of them divided between them. They apostatized from Christianity, and the nation followed their example. Paulinus and the queen-dowager fled first into Kent, then apparently into France. These two kings were both slain in battle within two years; and in 635 the third brother,

Oswald, again united the kingdom of Northumbria, and soon extended it, so that it included the whole country from the Humber to the Forth. When Oswald came to the throne, he found that the people, if they had not relapsed into idolatry, had at all events abandoned the practices of Christian worship and Christian life. Being himself a sincere believer, and longing for the good of his people, he sent to Iona, and begged that missionaries might be sent, to restore again the knowledge and the worship of God. One was sent, but soon returned discouraged. When the Iona family heard of his failure, they set themselves to inquire into its cause. And Aidan having suggested that perhaps their brother had not been altogether judicious in dealing with the Northumbrians, all eyes were turned towards him. Will *you* go? was the question of all; and he at once consented. In 635, he repaired to Northumbria, and was cordially received by the king. At first he was unacquainted with the Saxon language, and of course the Northumbrians were equally unacquainted with the Scotch, or Gaelic. But the work must not be delayed. To preach through an interpreter is but a poor way of preaching in general; but necessity has no law. And fortunately there was at hand an interpreter skilled in both languages, through whose lips the breathing thoughts and burning words of the missionary might pass, without the danger of their being strangled or quenched in the passage. It

was the king. Hearing the blessed words of the gospel in the language in which he had first heard it from the lips of those who had befriended him in his exile, he could give them forth in the language of his fathers and of the people whom he loved, and over whose salvation he yearned. And so from day to day there might be seen the humble missionary from Iona, attended by the gallant king of Northumbria, bearing one another's burdens, and so fulfilling the law of Christ. But Aidan was not the man to walk long on crutches, and he was not the man to care much for what was merely picturesque in the relation betwixt him and his royal interpreter. He therefore laboured hard in the acquisition of the language, and soon was able to walk on his own feet.

His idea of a mission was founded entirely on the model of Iona. He must have a monastery or settlement which should be a centre of influence, around which should cluster a Christian community, and from which the blessed light of the gospel should radiate into the surrounding darkness, and gradually dispel it. All the better if it were in some island, near enough to the mainland to be, to an Iona boatman like him, virtually part of it, but yet so separated from it as that it should stand out and have a manifest existence apart from it. And this was found in the island of Lindisfarne, now called Holy Island, about two miles from Berwick. From this Northumbrian Iona, Aidan

went forth over the length and breadth of the land, no doubt possessing all the more influence over the people because they knew how high he stood in the estimation of the king whom they admired and loved; but not trusting in an arm of flesh, but in the power of Him whose he was and whom he served. Dr. M'Lauchlan more than once calls attention to the courses pursued by Augustine and Paulinus on the one hand, and by Aidan on the other, as indicative of the spirit respectively of Rome and Iona.

'When Aidan was sent to preach the gospel to the northern Saxons, he fixed his residence in Lindisfarne, and thence went forth to preach the gospel to the surrounding population; Lindisfarne, or the Holy Isle, becoming to the north of England what Iona was to the north of Scotland. In this there was a marked difference between the emissaries of Iona and those of Rome. When Augustine was sent from Rome, he seized upon Canterbury, in the very heart of one of the richest counties of England, and there established himself. Paulinus, in like manner, settled in York, the capital of the north of England. Thus did these men represent the ambitious, grasping spirit of their system, covetous of place and power; while the humble missionaries of Iona and Lindisfarne represented the spirit of their own system, covetous of exalting Christ and crucifying self. In nothing does the distinction between the Church of Rome and the ancient Scottish church appear more clearly than in this.'

Might it haply be that Ethelbert had heard some stories of the family of Iona, and had formed from these his ideas of a missionary institution, and therefore settled Augustine and his followers at first in the Isle of Thanet?

The testimony borne by Bede to the work and character of Aidan is interesting and valuable, inasmuch as he was not disposed to look with favour upon any who disclaimed the authority of Rome.

'Among other formularies of life, he left to clerical persons a most wholesome example of abstinence or continence. This most of all commended his teaching to all men, that he taught in nothing otherwise than as he lived. For it was his care to seek and to love nothing of this world. All gifts that he received from kings or the rich of the world, he rejoiced to bestow upon the poor who came in his way. He used to hasten from place to place in town and country, not on horseback, but on foot, unless by chance some great necessity compelled him. Whenever in his way he saw any, whether rich or poor, he immediately accosted them, and invited them to receive the sacraments of the faith if they were unbelievers; or if believers, he confirmed them in the faith, and by words and deeds stirred them up to almsgiving and the performance of good works. So far did his life differ from the slothfulness of our times, that all who walked with him, whether tonsured or laics, were obliged to meditate, that is, to occupy themselves either with reading the Scriptures or learning the Psalms. This was his daily work, and that of all the brethren who were with him, wheresoever they came. And if by chance it happened (as, indeed, it happened rarely) that he was invited to the king's table, he went with one or two clerics, and after a brief repast, he quickly betook himself to reading with his friends, or retired to pray. . . . Never did he pass over in silence the faults of the rich for the sake of fear or favour, but corrected them with stern rebuke. It was his custom never to give any money to the powerful men of the world, excepting only their food, if he entertained any of them hospitably. On the other hand, the gifts of money which were lavished upon him by the rich, he either distributed for the use of the poor, as we have said, or dispensed for the redemption of those who had been unjustly sold. And many whom he had thus redeemed he made his disciples, and trained and instructed for the priestly office. . . . As he was originally

sent by those who appointed him to preach as being especially imbued with the grace of discretion, which is the mother of virtues, so, as time went on, he appeared adorned both with the moderation of discretion and with all other virtues.'

Thus matters went on till the close of the seventh century. The whole of Scotland and the north of England was Culdee, or, as we might say, Protestant; the midland and southern districts of England were Romanist. This, of course, is a rough and general way of stating the matter. It is to be expected that the two parties were, especially on the border-lands, intermingled to a certain extent. The great controversy between the two parties related to the time of celebrating Easter, and the form of the clerical tonsure. But the incomparably greater question of the authority of Rome underlay these small applications of it. I cannot say that the Scottish party regarded these small questions as so small as we regard them, but they plainly perceived that the concession of these points would be an acknowledgment of an authority which their fathers had never known, and to which they were determined not to submit. The Romanist party prevailed by little and little. Aidan was succeeded as abbot of Lindisfarne by Finnan, and he by Colman. Oswald was succeeded by his son Oswin, whose queen was a princess of Essex, and through her, says a German writer (Ebrard), Romish priests found entrance into Northumberland, and into its then capital,

Edinburgh. In Ireland, too, there was a large sacrifice of the independence of the church of Patrick. At last Adamnan, a successor of Columba and his biographer, conformed to the Romish order. But Iona was too hot for him. He was obliged to resign his abbacy, and retire into Ireland, where submission to Rome had begun, and soon became absolute. The controversy was not at an end. Yea, it will never be at an end, while, on the one hand, Rome's pretensions remain unchanged, and while, on the other, the spirit of Christian freedom is not wholly extinct. But for dark centuries the power of Rome prevailed, until the spirit of Aidan was revived in Wickliffe, and later still the spirit of Columba took possession of Knox.

From the beginning of the seventh century we must regard the British Islands as having ceased to be a theatre for missions, so far as heathenism is concerned. The invasion of the Danes did not very materially or permanently affect the condition of the people, or modify their religious profession. I have been obliged to dwell at considerable length upon the dissensions between the two parties of the old church in these islands. But I should be sorry to leave any impression inconsistent with the strong conviction that there were multitudes of men and women in connection with both sections who received the truth of God in the love of it. The truth was less encumbered with error in the one section than in the other. But it is

impossible to read the works of Bede, a strong adherent of the Romanist section, without recognising him as a Christian man. And, doubtless, there were thousands and tens of thousands who then saw through a glass darkly, but who are now in the light of heaven seeing face to face. So it is in all the controversies which have been carried on in the church of Christ. Truth may be more on one side than on the other, and it is not for us to be indifferent to its preponderance on the one side. Truth is so precious, that its grains and its dust are grains and dust of gold. But never is truth defended in a perfect way, and never probably is error maintained without some admixture of truth. Sometimes those who hold most of the truth lose the blessing of it through their inconsistencies; and sometimes those who hold less of it shrink from the legitimate consequences of their errors. They have not light enough or courage enough to abandon their errors, yet they are saved in good measure from their deteriorating influences. And it is not to be forgotten that the example of the undoubted zeal of these men ought to be all the more prevalent with us in proportion to the imperfection of the light and knowledge which they possessed. If they did so much with their obscure light, it may surely be expected that we should do more; for unto whom much is given, of them much is required.

With one obvious reflection I close this lecture, in

some respects the most interesting of our course. The grand principle of the missionary spirit is embodied in the precept, 'Freely ye have received, freely give.' As the grand impulse to individual evangelistic zeal is the sense of pardon received through the merits and boundless love of our Lord and Saviour, so analogously a grand stimulus to energetic efforts for the evangelization of the nations is a sense of the obligation under which we lie to the efforts of others for the evangelizing of our native land. And so a contemplation of the condition in which the gospel found our fathers—whether Scots or Saxons—may well sustain our faltering faith. From all the attention that I have been able to give to the subject, I see no reason to believe that even the Britons with whom Cæsar came into contact,—and these were only they who were to some extent under the influence of the superior civilisation of the neighbouring continent,—I see no reason, I say, to believe that the Britons, before the gospel was brought to them, were at all in advance of the Central African tribes in our own day, of whose condition we have been made aware by the descriptions of Livingstone and Stanley and Cameron. Let us look, then, to the rock whence we have been hewn, and the hole of the pit whence we have been dug. Such a view may well counteract any tendency to despair that might be induced by the contemplation of the degraded condition of any portion of our fellow-men, and of the

difficulties which have to be surmounted ere men can be brought from the depths of barbaric degradation to the height of civilisation and intelligence. THE LEVER THAT RAISED BRITAIN CAN BEAR THE STRAIN OF THE WORLD; AND THAT LEVER WAS THE GOSPEL OF GOD'S GRACE.

LECTURE III.

IN my first lecture I drew a distinction between what I called, with reference to a recent controversy, the nationalistic and the individualistic modes of conducting missionary operations. I had no hesitation in expressing a very decided preference for the latter. Of course I am quite willing to admit—or rather, if it were controverted, I should very strenuously maintain—that the gospel is designed by its divine author, and is fitted by its character, to act upon men in masses, to mingle itself with, and to elevate and purify the social and national relations, and to convert the kingdoms of the world into the kingdom of our Lord and His Christ. But the question is as to the order in which the objects are to be sought, which the gospel is designed and fitted to accomplish. What I asserted was, that they altogether err in their mode of operation who seek the national elevation as a means towards the individual conversion, instead of seeking the latter directly and constantly, trusting that the former will follow as a natural and necessary result. The two lectures already delivered evince that, in the period with which we have had to do, the nationalistic

method of operation was characteristic of the Romanist ecclesiastics and missionaries; the individualistic, of the British and Irish or Scotch. Perhaps it might be necessary that the two methods should be prosecuted simultaneously; and it may be that it was in order to effect this that the Romish missionaries were, in the providence of God, brought into Britain. It is very probable that, but for their advent, a much longer time would have elapsed before our beloved land had assumed a Christian aspect, and in that case a generation or two would have been without many advantages which they actually enjoyed through the prevalence of the habitudes of Christian life. On the other hand, I am persuaded that, had they never come at all, our fathers would have had a firmer grasp of the truth of God; they would have more fully realized their personal relation to the Saviour of men; they would have resisted more strenuously the usurpations of Rome and the corruption of the gospel of Christ, and might possibly never have needed the tornado of the Reformation to purify the moral and spiritual atmosphere.

Be this as it may, I think there can be no doubt that something of the spirit of Iona was needed to modify the high thoughts and bring down the lofty imaginations of Rheims and Arles; and this leaven was early brought into contact with the mass of continental Christianity. 'The Frankish church,' says an excellent English writer, 'was not destined to evan-

gelize the rude nations of Europe. The internal dissensions and constant wars of the successors of Clovis were not favourable to the development of Christian civilisation at home, or its propagation abroad. Avitus of Vienne, Cæsarius of Arles, and Faustus of Riez, proved what might be done by energy and self-devotion. But the rapid accession of wealth more and more tempted the Frankish bishops and abbots to live as mere laymen, and so the clergy degenerated, and the light of the Frankish church grew dim. Not only were the masses of heathenism lying outside her territory neglected, but within it she saw her own members tainted with the old leaven of heathenism, and relapsing, in some instances, into the old idolatries. A new influence therefore was required, if the light of the Frankish church was to be rekindled, and the German tribes evangelized. And this new influence was at hand.'—(*Maclear's Christian Missions of the Middle Ages.*)

Considering the abundant evidence that exists of the enormous amount of mission work done on the Continent by Irish and Scotch missionaries, it is not worth while to enter into discussions as to the nationality of this man or that, concerning whom there may be doubt as to his having belonged to this class, or his having been an indigenous preacher. But while this is so in the general, there are some exceptional cases in which such questions possess an altogether peculiar

interest. Such a case is that of one Fridolt or Fridolin; and the interest which attaches to it consists in this, that if he was one of the Scottish missionaries, then he was the earliest of whom we have any record, and probably, in point of fact, the first man that ever left these British shores in order to preach the gospel to heathens in a foreign land;[1] the precursor of the Careys and the Martyns, and the Duffs, the Williamses and the Livingstones, who have gone forth in later times to carry the gospel far hence among the Gentiles. It is not surprising, then, that the question of his nationality should have been discussed with some keenness. Briefly, the case stands thus: There is a *Life of Fridolin*, written by one Balthar, a monk who lived and wrote early in the eleventh century. He states that the first part of it is the reproduction of an old Life, which he saw and read in a monastery in which he resided for a time as a guest. He was not allowed to remove it; and he could not copy it, because he had neither parchment nor ink. He therefore read it again and again, till he had committed it to memory, in great part *verbatim*, and in whole as regarded the sense. On returning to his own monastery he wrote the whole from memory; and monks

[1] Supposing that Pelagius was, as he is generally believed to have been, a native of Britain, it does not appear that he went to continental Europe, and afterwards to Palestine, with a view to missionary work. I have not specially inquired into the matter, but my impression is that he did not.

who had seen another copy of the same Life which had once belonged to that monastery, but had been lost, testified that his transcript was substantially accurate. It needs not be said anywhere—and least of all in Edinburgh—that this is a kind of device to which writers of fiction have often had recourse, not always, indeed not generally, with a view to deception. That Balthar's story of the MS. is merely such a device, and that his book is substantially a fiction, is strongly maintained by a critical German church historian, Rettberg. That the story is true, and that the book is no fiction, but a *bonâ fide* biography of Fridolt, is as strongly, and, as I think, more conclusively, argued by an equally critical German church historian, Ebrard.

If this latter judgment be correct, and if it be so that Balthar's book is credible as a biography, then Fridolt was an Irishman, a *bishop* or *episcopus* in his own country, who, after spending some time in Scotland, went to France about the year 500, settled for a time at Poitiers, founded a monastery there, and laboured in the conversion of the Western Goths from Arianism. Then he left the abbacy of the monastery in the hands of two of his nephews, and with permission of Clovis went to preach in the district of Wasgau on the Rhine. There he founded the monastery of St. Avold, where Balthar says that he found the copy of the Life which he committed to memory. Afterwards he built a church in the city of Strasburg,

and last of all founded the monastery of Säckingen on an island in the Rhine, carrying out, so far as was possible, the Columban idea of an insular position for such an institution. It was to this monastery of Säckingen that Balthar belonged.

There are in this statement several particulars which avouch their genuineness, by the manifest fact that Balthar did not really understand what he wrote. For example, his statement that Fridolin abandoned the episcopal office which he held in his own country, and condescended to occupy the condition of a priest, was to a Romanist of the tenth century altogether so marvellous that he never could have made it spontaneously. But to us, who know that Fridolt, like his contemporary Patrick, must have regarded the episcopal and the presbyteral order as identical, and that he belonged to a church in which *abbot-presbyter* and *abbot-bishop* were interchangeable terms, the statement is a perfectly intelligible and a perfectly natural one. Upon the whole, I think we ought to regard Fridolin as the first Scottish foreign missionary; and that, accordingly, we ought to hold his memory in high esteem and veneration. The information that we possess regarding his doings is very scanty, and what there is of it is mixed with legendary matter. Regarding some others who are named as having come from Ireland or Scotland to labour as missionaries in France during the sixth century, we have still less, and less trustworthy, information.

But the most important contribution that these islands made to the evangelization of the European continent was undoubtedly the gift of Columbanus, Gallus, and their associates; and upon their history I am now to dwell at considerable length. Columbanus, or Columba the younger, was born in Ireland in the year 559, of noble parents. His education was begun under a venerable abbot Senile, and was completed in the monastery of Bangor,[1] under Comgall. He seems to have developed a singularly precocious genius. While still very young he composed an exposition of the Book of Psalms, which is still extant, and portions of which have been published. In the preface or dedication he states that he composed it at the request of his teacher, who desired to have a version which should not be liable to objections that were made against the LXX. translation, as not fairly representing the Hebrew original. That an Irish lad, in the sixth century, should have even undertaken to translate the Scriptures from the Hebrew, in order to avoid the errors of the Alexandrian translators, is a somewhat startling statement; but there seems to be no good reason to doubt its truth. From two independent accounts, one English[2] and the other German,[3] it would appear that this work was composed, not during

[1] The scrupulously accurate Ebrard confounds this Irish Bangor with that in Wales.

[2] Maclear. [3] Ebrard.

his residence in Bangor, but before his entrance into that monastery. I do not know on what original authority this statement rests, but if it be authentic, it makes his precocity all the more remarkable. He had not been long in Bangor when the desire was awakened in his heart to preach among the heathen the unsearchable riches of Christ. Here, however, he had the same difficulties to contend with that have often threatened to bar the way of the young aspirant to this good degree. The same arguments and appeals that, uttered by a mother's lips and enforced by a mother's tears, have often tried the faith and the fortitude of one who has in the midnight silence heard in his inner soul the cry of the perishing: COME AND HELP US, — these same arguments and these same appeals were addressed to Columbanus by his mother, and were seconded by the venerable Comgall, abbot of Bangor, who loved him with paternal fondness, and who had marked out for him a career of usefulness in his native land. But he had put his hand to the plough, and he would not, he could not, look back. As soon, therefore, as he had attained his thirtieth year, he and twelve like-minded associates bade farewell to their country, expecting never to tread its green sod again,—an expectation which was realized by all of them whose history we are able to trace, and probably by the others also. In some notes that I made a few years ago I find it stated that, on leaving

Ireland, and on his way to the Continent, he and his band paid a visit to Columba at Iona. But I have given no reference; and I have searched in vain for the authority on which I made the statement. The nearest approach to it that I can find is this sentence of Mr. Maclear: 'He had no sooner reached the age of thirty, than, selecting twelve companions, he bade farewell to his brethren, and after barely touching on the shores of pagan Britain, landed in Gaul.' One would like to picture a meeting, in such circumstances and at such a time, between these two men; as one likes to think of the interview between Milton and Galileo, or to realize the scene 'where Jonson sat in Drummond's classic shades.' But if they met, it is likely that they did not meet as strangers; or if Columbanus did not visit Iona then, it is still likely that Columba and he were not strangers to each other; for Columba was in Ireland just four years earlier, and it is almost certain that Columbanus would be introduced to him.

The original design of Columbanus appears to have been to proceed into Southern Germany. But on landing in France he was welcomed by Guntram, a grandson of Clovis, who was now reigning in Burgundy. Guntram pressed him to remain among his people, and seems to have proposed to appoint him as a chaplain to his own household. But it was not the ambition of Columbanus to wear soft clothing and be

in kings' houses. His mission was to the ignorant, the barbarous, the heathen. His idea seems to have been, that the greater the difficulties were which had to be encountered in the establishment of a mission, the better it was for that mission. In a certain sense, and to a certain extent, this will be admitted by all. As it is good for a man to bear the yoke in his youth; as the judicious father, in rearing the boy whom he would train to a vigorous and energetic manhood, is not careful to screen him from every blast that would dishevel his hair, and to spare him every exertion that would bring the sweat-beads to his brow: so does God usually deal with His children. He will have them become good, and ever and ever better, soldiers of Jesus Christ, therefore He calls them to endure hardness. He would have them lead lives of faith, and therefore He often puts them into positions in which they feel that it is by no might or power of their own, but by the Spirit of the Lord, that they are to prevail. About all this there will be no question among us. But it does not appear to have been only thus that Columbanus and his family regarded the most difficult and unpromising missionary field as the best, and the more unpromising as preferable to the more promising. And I do not see any reason to think that this arose from any idea of merit to be acquired by enduring trials and doing work of special difficulty. Rather it was because they considered that Christian life is a

more important factor in efforts for the conversion of men to God than even Christian teaching. And they doubtless believed that while clearing the forest, cultivating the barren soil, patiently enduring the extremes of cold and heat, singing praises ever to their God and Saviour, and ever making it manifest that even in cold and hunger and peril they had more joy from the light of the countenance of their God than abundance of corn and wine can afford to men of the world, they would have better opportunities of showing the heathen what the gospel could do for them than they could possibly have in positions of less difficulty and fewer privations. Accordingly, they resolved to settle among the Suevi, some of whom were heathens and some were Arians, and who inhabited the district called by the Germans Bodensee, and by the French Vosges. There they settled in the neighbourhood of what had once been a Roman town called Anegrates, and founded the monastery of Anegray. Here they endured incredible hardships with incredible patience and fortitude, living sometimes on the bark of trees, and on such roots and wild herbs and berries as the untilled land and the woods supplied. I translate a paragraph in which Ebrard sums up the account given by the biographer of Columbanus:—

'There, in the forest-wilderness, where men dwelt not, but wild heathen robber-hordes roamed, swarming with wild beasts, unhealthy and fever-breeding, he lived a life full of troubles

and privations, such that seventeen of his associates were cut off within twelve years. With their own hands must these servants of God rear for themselves poor huts, first on the ruins of a dismantled fort Anegrates, now Anegray, and then upon those of another abandoned fort, Luxovium, now Luxeuil. With their own hands they must clear and cultivate a plot of ground; and when the harvest was unpropitious, and the fishing failed in the brooks, often the direst want befell them, so that many a time they had nothing to eat but bark and weeds, or the small fruits which grow wild in the forest, called *bollucæ*. But even in the bitterest necessities Columba's trust in God never failed, and his prayer of faith for help was always heard, and relief was granted; now by means of a wanderer who brought bread and provisions with him; now through presents which a Christian cleric, moved by a dream, sent into the desert; now through a successful take of fish, and such like.'

It is very comfortable, no doubt, and very convenient, to exclaim, What folly! and what self-righteousness! That it was the perfection of wisdom I am not here to maintain; but of self-righteousness I see not a trace. The folly or the wisdom depends upon the proportion betwixt the object sought to be obtained and the price paid for it; and the valuation of the object and the price must be made in the currency of eternity. At all events, the object was not sought in vain. A Christian community of industrious peasants was formed; those forests, where the wolves and the bears had their lairs, gave place to waving corn-fields; and in the midst of the settlement was the monastery, where some of the family were hourly occupied in Christian worship and in Christian work,

and whence daily the voice of Christian psalmody and Christian prayer ascended from numerous, and ever more numerous lips, and entered into the ear of the Lord of Sabaoth. When Anegray and Luxeuil were filled, and the district around them brought under agricultural and moral cultivation, there was an overflow to Fontaines. But Luxeuil seems to have been the headquarters of Columbanus.

But the brethren had other crosses to bear, other trials to endure, besides deficient harvests and unproductive fishings. The Frankish clergy felt themselves rebuked by the zeal of the strangers, and they laid hold of the standing *casus belli*, the Easter-reckoning. It does not appear that the Irish colony attempted any propagandism in this matter. They were quite willing to allow their neighbours to observe their own day; they only asked that equal liberty should be accorded to them to observe theirs. To this effect Columbanus addressed a noble letter to the pope, and another to a synod of Gallican bishops that was called to consider the matter. To neither pope nor synod did he give place by subjection for an hour, while to one and the other he showed a fine spirit of Christian meekness and Christian love.

But he had not only to contend with an unspiritual and pharisaic clergy, but with a licentious court, and with an infuriated woman, and that woman a queen-mother. The divisions and unions, and re-divisions

and re-unions of the descendants of Clovis, the unnatural wars in which brothers and cousins and nephews were engaged, it is fortunately no part of my province to detail. The glimmering of vague half-knowledge that I have been able to acquire by protracted and wearisome study, it would be simply impossible to communicate to an audience. It is enough to say that Burgundy was now under the rule of Thierri, who was living a life of lawless profligacy, and whom his mother, Brunehilde, encouraged in his evil courses, in order to maintain her influence over him. The king apparently was ill at ease in that course of life, which yet he would not relinquish. It is difficult to say what it was in Columbanus that attracted him, but he often visited him. He quailed before the stern rebukes of the fearless monk, and ever promised reformation, which he never accomplished. Brunehilde saw that the influence of Columbanus over her son was gradually lessening her own. She brought the bishops to her aid, and they represented to the king the intolerable scandal that ensued from the Easter divergency. She invoked the nobles and courtiers, many of whom, like herself, were the ministers of his unholy pleasures. They asked whether it were fitting that he, a crowned king, should be at the bidding of a wretched fanatic. At last the poor king so far gave way as to order Columbanus to be deported to Besançon, there to wait further intimation

of the royal will. He escaped from his guards, and returned to Luxeuil; but he was again seized and sent off to Nantes. There he was put on board a ship bound for Ireland. A storm drove the ship upon the coast of Neustria, or Normandy; and the captain, believing that the storm was sent in retribution for his taking part in the banishment of Columbanus, put him ashore and sailed without him. I find a story related of him at the time of his escape from Besançon which is worthy of notice, as casting light on the state of matters:—

'After Columbanus was returned again to his own Luxeuil from Besançon, whither he had been conveyed, Brunehilde and Theodoric (Thierri) sent a cohort thither, with orders to carry him back to Besançon. The tribune with the soldiers rushes into the enclosures of the monastery. Columbanus is sitting in the hall of the church, reading in a book. More than once they go past him; they almost tread upon him, but they see him not. At last comes the tribune himself, looks in through the window, and sees Columbanus sitting and calmly reading in the midst of the soldiers who are in quest of him. Then he orders the soldiers out, and says, "It is madness to expect to find one whom the power of God protects: Go back and tell the king that you have not found him."'

The good monk Jonas of Bobbio relates this with all simplicity, evidently believing, and expecting his readers to believe, either that Columbanus was miraculously rendered invisible, or that the soldiers were miraculously rendered blind. To me there seems nothing miraculous in it, nothing more wonderful than

the proverbially wonderful blindness of those who are unwilling to see. Thus viewed, the incident teaches us several things; as, for example, that this brave monk was a favourite with these brave Frankish soldiers and their captain, which is what we might have expected; but, further, that the captain had a shrewd suspicion that the king himself had no very strong desire that Columbanus should be apprehended; that while he had, like another Herod, given up this stern prophet of the wilderness to the vindictive rage of his queenly foe, he was quite willing to wink at his escaping out of her hands, or even to aid his escape.

When Columbanus was landed on the shore of Neustria (Normandy), he was cordially welcomed by the king, who begged him to remain in his territories, and promised him all facilities for prosecuting his work. But probably he found the Neustrians too civilised, or not in special need of his services. He therefore remained only a few days, and then took a long journey through Austrasia to the banks of the Rhine. Before this several brethren from Luxeuil, among whom was his right trusty and well-beloved Gallus, had joined him. They embarked on the Rhine, and sailed up it and its tributary, the Limmat, to the Lake of Zurich. At Tuggium, the modern Zug, they preached for a time to the pagan Suevi, but apparently with but little success; and it is very likely that they were somewhat too stern and severe

in their dealings with these barbarians, and forgot the principle that a new patch may not be put on an old garment, nor new wine put into old bottles. After sundry wanderings, they fixed upon Bregenz, on the south-east side of Lake Zurich, as the site of a monastery. Here they found a church which had fallen into decay, and had partly been reconverted into a heathen temple; for while it seems still to have been regarded as a Christian church, it contained three brazen idols, before which the people worshipped, and whose protection they sought as the tutelary genii of the place. These idols Columbanus and his friends determined to remove; and on a great festival day, when all the people were assembled, Gallus addressed them in their own language, which Columbanus appears not to have been able to speak. He set forth the absurdities of heathenism, and proclaimed the glorious gospel of the grace of God. At the close he seized the idols and threw them into the lake. As might have been expected, a tumult ensued. Some admired the courage of the strangers, if they did not approve their deed. Some both admired and approved; others neither approved nor admired. Thus the multitude was divided; but upon the whole, it would appear that a favourable impression was made. At all events, the work prospered at Bregenz. A Christian community clustered around the monastery, and the mountains and lakes of Switzerland were gladdened

with scenes akin to those which were exhibited among the Grampians. Columbanus, however, did not remain long in Bregenz, and I have not been able to ascertain why he left it. At all events, he took his departure in 612, leaving Bregenz under the abbacy of the faithful Gallus, and passed over into Italy. Here he was welcomed by Agilulf, king of the Lombards, and here he founded the monastery of Bobbio. Here he occupied himself mainly in study and contemplation, and in the composition of controversial treatises against Arianism. But his active life as a missionary was over, and his work done;—good work well done. He lived only three years in Italy, and died in 615.

No little obloquy, wholly undeserved, as I believe, has been cast on the memory of Columbanus, by the ascription to him of certain monastic regulations, some of which are very silly, and others are certainly not in the spirit of the gospel. Now it so happens that there are two altogether distinct Rules which pass under his name. Of one of these, four MSS. are known to exist, and two of the other. The former is certainly authentic, and it is remarkable that there is nothing in it that is in the slightest degree offensive. On the contrary, it is said to breathe throughout a high tone of spiritual-mindedness. The other is altogether different, indeed quite opposite in its character, so that few critics would hesitate to pronounce, from internal evidence, that its author could not be the

author of the other. And the external evidence points to the same conclusion. Of the four MSS. of the authentic work, two are preserved in the monasteries of Bobbio and St. Gall, the one founded by Columbanus, and the other by Gallus. But the two MSS. of the other Rule are found in Benedictine monasteries, and there is no trace of them in any Columban monastery. We know that, at a later period, a keen contest was carried on all over Europe between the Columban and the Benedictine Rules. So far as I am able to judge, I think it highly probable that the so-called *Regula Cœnobialis Columbæ*, as distinguished from the *Regula Columbæ*, was originally composed by some Benedictine as a *jeu d'esprit*, an extravagant caricature of the strictness of the Columban discipline,—a caricature made very likely in all good nature, but which has had the unhappy effect of materially lowering the reputation of one of the great and good men, whose blessed memory is part of the patrimony of the church.

When Columbanus left Switzerland it was intended that Gallus should accompany him into Italy, but he was prevented by a severe attack of fever from attempting such a journey. He therefore remained as superintendent of the Bregenz institution, which flourished under his care. Some time after he founded another monastery, which was called after his own name, St. Gall. In either place he continued the

work which his chief and he had begun in Luxeuil, clearing the forest, cultivating the waste, reclaiming the barbarian, and ever pressing home upon every heart the duty at once and the blessedness of repentance toward God and faith in the Lord Jesus Christ. Once, on the occasion of a vacancy in the bishopric of Constance, he attended a great meeting of clergy and laity convened for the purpose of electing a bishop. With the solemnity of an aged apostle, with the authority of one whose high character was recognised by all, he set before the assembled brethren the solemn responsibility which rested upon them in the discharge of so important a duty. He dwelt upon the qualifications which they ought to regard as indispensable in him that was to be elected. Unanimously the assembly came to the conclusion that nowhere were these qualifications to be found in so high degree as in him; and he would have been elected by acclamation had he not at once interposed. 'Nay,' said he, 'there is a disqualification which is insuperable. I am a foreigner, ignorant of your language and of your national peculiarities. I cannot be your bishop.' This was not said in the usual *Nolo episcopari* style. Gallus meant what he said, and his hearers knew that he meant it. But there was with him in the assembly a deacon named John, who had accompanied him thither. Him he very earnestly recommended as in every way qualified, and he was unanimously elected to the bishopric.

It has occurred to me as a very probable thing, that there was a reason for the declinature of the office by Gallus, and his recommendation of John to it, which either he did not state, or which has not been recorded by his Romanist biographer. Whoever was made bishop must, of course, receive episcopal consecration. But Gallus doubtless held that he, a presbyter, was already a bishop; and he could neither himself be consecrated as a bishop, nor be a party to the consecration of any presbyter, without sanctioning the distinction between the bishop's and the presbyter's orders. But he could conscientiously recommend a deacon to receive what he regarded as simply ordination to the elder's good degree; and so he had no scruple in taking part in what was regarded by some as the consecration, but by him only as the ordination, of his friend. In this he acted very much in the spirit which was manifested by Knox long after, who heartily aided with his invaluable counsel and co-operation the English reformers, while yet his conscience would not allow him to accept the bishopric which was offered to him. At the consecration or ordination of his friend, Gallus preached a sermon which has come down to us, and forthwith returned to his monastery. The remainder of his days he spent there. Only once did he go to any considerable distance from it, and to it he never returned; for on his way home he was attacked with fever, and died

(A.D. 627). 'His,' says Mr. Maclear, 'had been a life eminent for self-denial and usefulness. He had revived the faith of the ancient see of Constance; he had reclaimed from barbarism the district bordering on the Black Forest; he had taught the people the arts of agriculture as well as the duties of religion; and the humble cell of the apostle of Switzerland became after his death the resort of thousands of pilgrims, and was replaced by a more magnificent edifice, erected under the auspices of Philip St. Heristal, which, during the ninth and tenth centuries, was the asylum of learning, and one of the most celebrated schools of Europe.'

It would not be consistent with truth to say, and it would not be believed if it were said, that Columbanus and Gallus were but average specimens of the Irish and Scotch and Northumbrian missionaries who did so great a work on the continent of Europe. They were leaders of the host; it was enough if the host were worthy of such leaders. And of so much there is abundant and superabundant evidence. As to the numbers who went forth from our shores, we have no means of forming an accurate estimate; but the numbers were certainly very great. They were numerous, says one, as the swarms of bees. They seem generally to have gone in companies either of twelve or of thirteen. Columbanus casually mentions that, in the course of twelve years, seventeen of his brethren

died by his side in the wilderness. Now this is far too small a number to include all the deaths that occurred in his large community during that time. He must therefore have meant his fellow-labourers, his brother-missionaries. But the whole band that originally accompanied him from Ireland consisted of twelve. The ranks must therefore have been recruited from time to time. This is an important fact, because it is fitted to correct an impression which is apt to be made by the scanty records which we possess of these missions. These records very generally amount to little more than this, that this man or that came from Ireland with twelve brethren, and founded a monastery at this place or that. Now one reading such statements is apt to take up an idea that the efforts were of an extremely desultory and unconnected character; and I have no doubt that, as compared with our modern missions, under the direction of church-committees and missionary societies, these early missions were defective in organization. But, if I put a correct interpretation on the language of Columbanus, there must have been some kind of organization with a view to co-operation; thus the home church would be kept in sympathy with her sons who had gone forth from her, and the unity of the church would be realized in the experience of her members.

The men of whom I have hitherto spoken have been pretty much of the same type; grave, earnest,

strong-minded and strong-bodied men; strong to do and strong to suffer; confident that God was for them, and well-nigh indifferent as to who or how many might be against them; men so fearing God as to be free from all other fear. No doubt this was the type of man that was specifically needed to do the kind of work that was then chiefly to be done. But in the great house of God there are at all times both vessels of gold and silver, and vessels of wood and stone, ay, and vessels too of fragile glass, which might seem too delicate for household work. And all have their place, and all their use. The body of Christ requires not only strong arms and toil-browned hands, and feet able to tread the miry way and the thorny waste, but a heart to throb in sympathy with all suffering and with all joy, and eyes to weep over the sorrows of little children, and to beam with joyous laughter on the sight of childish play. As a specimen of a very different sort of men from Columba and Aidan, and Columbanus and Gallus, I should like to say a little of one Fursæus, although I do not know much of any work that he did on the Continent, and, indeed, I do not think that he did much in comparison with what these others did. His work was mainly in England. But I introduce a notice of him here, mainly, as I have said, by way of showing that as God gives infinite diversities of gifts and graces, so He can use all in His great work of the world's evangelization. For

this, after all, is the great lesson which the church of this day needs to learn, that God's call is to all His people to come to His help against the mighty; that none are exonerated from the duty, none are debarred from the unspeakable privilege, of being fellow-workers with Him. It is chiefly from Bede that we get any knowledge of Fursæus, and the account that I shall now present to you I shall partly translate and partly abridge from him. I cannot introduce it without an acknowledgment of the remarkable honesty with which this earnest Romanist records the good deeds and commends the virtues of one whom he must have regarded as a schismatic at least, if not even as a heretic.

During the reign of Sigbert (king of East Anglia) there came from Ireland a holy man called Fursæus, famous in word and deed, distinguished by excellent virtues, desiring to lead a wandering life for the Lord, wheresoever he might find opportunity. When he came to the province of the Eastern Angli, he was received with honour by the king aforesaid; and engaging in his usual work of evangelizing, he converted to Christ many unbelievers by the example of his virtue and the excitement of his speech, and confirmed believers more in the faith and love of Christ. When he was seized with a certain bodily disease, it was vouchsafed to him to enjoy an angelic vision, in which he was admonished to attend diligently upon

the ministry of the word which he had undertaken, and to ply unweariedly his accustomed watchings and prayers. We are then told that he hastened to establish a monastery at a place called Cnobbersburg. This man—I again translate—was of the noblest Scottish extraction, but far nobler in mind than in the flesh. From his very boyhood he gave extraordinary attention to sacred readings and to monastic exercises; and as most becometh saints, he scrupulously took heed to do all things which he had learned to be proper to be done. In short, as time went on, he constructed a monastery for himself, in which he might more freely attend to heavenly studies. There, being seized with disease, he was rapt away from the body; and being separated from the body from evening to cock-crow, it was vouchsafed to him to behold the faces and to hear the blessed praises of the angelic hosts; and he used to tell that he distinctly heard them utter this among others, 'The saints shall go from strength to strength;' and again, 'The God of gods shall be seen in Sion.' Three days after he was again in an ecstasy, and had a revelation of the contests between the good and the evil angels for the salvation or the destruction of the souls of men. Then he was taken up aloft, and saw four fires ready to break forth to burn up the earth—the fires of falsehood, of avarice, of dissension, and of impiety. He saw also the sufferings of souls, and their defence by the good angels. He had also 'a

sight of Scottish men of his own nation, of whom he had ascertained through common report that they had not ignobly possessed the sacerdotal grade.' And so on to great length, telling of the future state of the righteous and the wicked. I introduce this merely to indicate what manner of man he was—an enthusiastic visionary. But it is interesting, because it is said that Bede's record of his visions did much toward the formation of the doctrine of purgatory. Thus an English historian of high name traces the doctrine to him:—'The stranger on the dark marshy shores of the oozy Yare, contemplating the lichen-encrusted ruins of the Roman castramentation, Burgh Castle, or Gariornonum, scarcely supposes that those grey walls once enclosed the cell of an obscure anchorite, destined — so strangely is the chain of causation involved — to exercise a mighty influence equally upon the dogma and genius of Roman Christendom. This was the Milesian Scot Fursæus, who, received in East Anglia by King Sigbert, there became enrapt in the trances which disclosed to him the secrets of the world beyond the grave. Theologically, the development of these opinions concerns us not. But theology was as the sap flowing into all the branches of human literature; and Fursæus kindled the spark which, transmitted to the inharmonious Dante of a barbarous age, occasioned the first of the metrical compositions from whose combination the *Divina Commedia*

arose.' It is not for me here, and now, to express acquiescence in, or dissent from, the estimate of Dante.

Bede goes on to tell how Fursæus, being distracted by the incursion of the heathen, and seeing that danger was impending over the monasteries, arranged all his affairs and set sail for Gaul; that there he was honourably received by Lotharius, king of the Franks, and by a nobleman, Helionvaldus; that he built a monastery at a place called Latiniacum; that he died not long after, and that his body was found many years after to have been kept free from corruption. Scattered up and down through Ebrard's work there are fragmentary notices of the monastic life of Fursæus at Laguy (Latiniacum); as, for example, 'that he had with him very reverend and spiritual men, who profited much by the example of such a man, both in monastic probation, and in diverse labours of life, and in the grace of humility and charity.' I may mention also that Ebrard repeatedly speaks, in stronger terms than I should think of using, of the simplicity and beauty of his visions as recorded by Bede. I repeat, however, that I have introduced his name for the one purpose of showing that there were men of very diverse qualifications, who all found that in the mission-field there was room for all and need of all.

The whole of the mission work of which we have hitherto spoken was carried on within the limits of

the Frankish kingdom. In the German provinces there was no such central event as the conversion of Clovis to give consolidation and unity to the efforts of evangelists. Before the irruption of the barbarians, the state of matters was probably very much like what I have described as existing in France and Britain during the subsistence of the Roman Empire; perhaps with this difference, that the Roman power, I suspect, had not been so universally acknowledged, and consequently the Roman civilisation and the Christian religion had not been so widely operative. Up till a time when the gospel had been very generally received in France, there appear to have been none but isolated and desultory efforts in Germany. In speaking of Patrick, I expressed regret that he lived before the period that falls within my province, as I should have liked to have had an opportunity of detailing the doings of such a man. I make the same remark regarding Severinus, who laboured in Pannonia, a part of the modern Bavaria, in the latter half of the fifth century. No one knew who he was or whence he came, and he constantly refused to give any information respecting his previous history. He found the country in a state of turmoil and confusion, and he set himself with amazing energy and unwearied patience to lessen the evils which could be lessened, and to comfort the people who groaned under those that were inevitable. Never

have I heard or read of more energetic labours, more cheerfully endured privations, more absolute renunciation of self, more single-minded devotion to the glory of God and the good of men. 'All,' says Mr. Maclear, 'were won by the attractive power of his love, by the sincerity and devotion of his life. The sick in their afflictions, the penitent in their remorse, rough soldiers in time of danger, sought his counsel; some he healed, others he advised, all he comforted. Such was his influence, that barbarian chiefs consented at his instance to spare beleaguered towns, to restore captives, and to refrain from cruelty. Even the garrisons of Roman fortresses implored his presence among them, believing that thus they were protected from harm. On one occasion the king of the fierce Allemanni approached the town of Passau, threatening to besiege it. In their alarm the inhabitants sought the aid of Severinus, whose cell was close by the confluence of the Inn and the Danube. He went forth to meet the king, with whom he was not altogether unacquainted. The reverence of the latter for the man of God was so great, that he not only did not dare to attack the town, but abstained from laying waste the neighbouring territory, and restored the captives he had taken.' It was on the first day of the year 482 that this grand man's earthly course was ended. Strong men were standing around his death-bed, rough and blood-stained barbarians gazed

wonderingly on. But the strong men were weak as women under their strong grief, the rough and rude were for the time refined under the influence of sympathy and sorrow. He desired the bystanders to sing a psalm, but their hearts were too full—the great lump was in their throats. Then he himself took up the strain, and died with the words on his tongue: 'Let every thing that hath breath praise the Lord.'

It was professedly to take up the work of Severinus that, a century and a half later, a mission was sent from Luxeuil, the monastery of Columbanus. We know little of the history of this mission, excepting that it was sent under the leadership of Eustasius, the abbot of Luxeuil; that he was accompanied by Agilus and others; that he converted 'very many' of the Bavarians to the faith; that he founded a monastery, and then returned to Luxeuil. Ebrard conjectures that this was about A.D. 618 or 619.

On the other side of Germany, in the country of Frisia, which included not only the modern Friesland, but also some portions of the modern Belgium, there were various missionary operations carried on at an early period of the seventh century. Amandus was born near Nantes about the close of the sixth century. He chose the clerical profession, and for a long time led a wandering sort of missionary life. On a visit to Rome he received from the pope a roving commission,

under the designation of a regionary bishop. After holding the somewhat anomalous position for twenty years, he was appointed to the see of Mastricht in 647. He stood high in the favour of the Frankish king, Dagobert, from whom he received a commission, authorizing him to compel the people to submit to baptism. It was probably by the execution of this commission, rather than by reasoning of righteousness, temperance, and judgment to come, that he brought down upon himself the wrath of the people, which we shall probably be disposed to think that he well deserved. 'In endeavouring,' says Neander, 'to carry this command into execution, and to preach to the people, who, as it may well be supposed, could derive but little benefit from preaching backed by such forcible measures, he exposed himself to the most violent persecutions and ill-treatment, and sometimes to the peril of his life. Yet he endeavoured also to win the affections of his hearers by acts of benevolence. He redeemed captives, instructed and baptized them.' I find mention made (Rettberg, ii. 507) of the conversion of a man of wealth, one Allowin, who afterwards took the name of Bavo, built two monasteries, and acquired fame as an ascetic and a saint. In 649, Amandus resigned the bishopric of Mastricht, on account, it is said, of differences with his clergy, and betook himself again to a wandering life. I should mention that Ebrard represents the difficulties of

Amandus to have arisen mainly from his zeal in attempting to Romanize the clergy, who held by the spiritual freedom and independence derived from Columbanus. Be this as it may, it is evident from his history that he was not altogether worthy of his name, while it ought to be admitted that he was a zealous and fearless man, who acted according to his light in a determined and abundantly energetic way.

A bishop of a far higher order laboured in another district of the same country. Eligius was a goldsmith, who, by great skill in his art, and by great integrity of conduct, stood high in the favour and confidence of Clotaire I., a Frankish king. As court jeweller he made a large income, which he spent freely in works of religion and charity. While working at his art, he always had a Bible lying open before him. 'He made use of his Christian knowledge, in which he excelled many of the clergy, to further the religious instruction of the people.' We sometimes speak as if the influence of laymen, and the value of their aid in the work of the church and of missions, were a discovery of our own times. Here we have a layman of the seventh century abounding in all the good works which are still, alas! exceptional among our laymen of all ranks. I may just say in passing that the life of this man is well worthy of earnest study, and that a good service would be done by any one who should render his life generally accessible. It may be questioned whether a

man occupying so influential a position, and occupying it so nobly, would not have acted judiciously had he abode in his calling. But he did not think so. He abandoned his secular employment, and in 641 became 'bishop over the extensive diocese of Vermandois, Tournay, and Noyon, the boundaries of which touched on pagan tribes, while its inhabitants were many of them still pagans, or new converts, and Christians only in name.' Here he laboured for eighteen years, a noble specimen of the mediæval missionary. His doctrine was thoroughly evangelical; his zeal, animated by that doctrine, was unquenchable; and his whole bearing was that of a sinner saved by grace, and constrained by the love of Christ, because he thus judged, that if one died for all, then were all dead, and that he died for all that they which live should not henceforth live unto themselves, but unto Him who died for them and rose again. In an old and very rare book by Camerarius, I find Eligius mentioned as one of the Scottish missionaries. He may have been, but I do not know on what authority the statement rests. Very likely he was a Scottish missionary, in the sense that he had received his knowledge of the gospel from the disciples of Columbanus, who by this time were spread in great numbers over the country. He might thus be called a Scottish missionary, though he were not a Scottish man.

And now Frisia became the field of another class of missionaries, those who went forth from the Augustinian Church of England. In last lecture I intimated that this church gradually gained the ascendant over the Irish-Scottish Church of Northumbria and East Anglia. Before the close of the seventh century they sent multitudes of missionaries to Frisia. Of these the most noted is Willebrord. He was a Northumbrian, but an adherent of Rome. In 692, he went with eleven companions to Friesland, the greater part of which had just, by the conquests of King Pepin, become French territory. Pepin gave him full permission to labour in his kingdom, but first sent him to Rome to obtain the blessing of the pope. After four years of zealous and successful labour, Pepin again sent him to Rome, with the request that he should be raised to the episcopal office. This request was granted, and Willebrord, who took the name of Clement, returned as bishop of Wiltzburg. He gave himself up heart and soul to his work, and in the midst of much opposition did zealously the work of an evangelist. He even made an attempt to introduce the gospel into Denmark, and escaped narrowly with his life. Returning to his diocese, he continued to labour with equal zeal and with much success. Multitudes of his Anglo-Saxon brethren joined him, and under his direction pushed out into the regions beyond. Altogether, I doubt whether England, in these days of ours, with

all her enormous wealth, with the ordinances of the gospel supplied to her people at home in abundance or superabundance, with all the mysterious workings of providence which have given to so much of the heathen world so strong a claim on her sympathy and her aid, sends forth so many missionaries to all the world, as England, in the end of the seventh and beginning of the eighth century, sent to Frisia alone. Of this I am sure, that from all our Scottish churches there do not go forth as many heralds of salvation as went forth from our shores in the beginning of the seventh century. It is a solemn question which we all have to answer before God: Why is this?

By far the most distinguished of these Anglo-Saxon missionaries was Winfrid, whose missionary career began and ended in Frisia, although the greater portion of it was spent in other parts of Germany. Winfrid was born at Crediton, in Devonshire, of an old and noble family, about the year 680. Although he was designed for a secular career, yet from his boyhood his heart was set on a monastic life. He was educated in a conventual house at Exeter, and there he remained till his thirtieth year; by which time he had acquired such a renown for diligence and devotion, for deep knowledge of the Scriptures, and for power in preaching, that the way was open for him to the highest ecclesiastical preferment in his own land. But his heart was set upon not building on

other men's foundations. He therefore went over into Frisia, and spent some months there; but he lost heart when he saw the difficulties that had to be encountered, and returned to his monastery. But the fire of missionary zeal which had been kindled in his heart would not be extinguished, and soon he returned to the Continent; but this time he resolved to seek the consent and blessing of the pope. With this view he went to Rome, and was cordially welcomed by Gregory II. From him he received a commission, and letters addressed to many civil and ecclesiastical rulers, authorizing him to preach the gospel all over Germany. Thus accredited, he returned to Frisia. Here Willebrord was getting old, and was extremely desirous that his energetic countryman should be nominated as his successor in the see of Utrecht. But to this he would not consent; and as he had before fled from Frisia on account of the difficulties and the dangers which beset the work there, so now he fled from it because of the honours that were attempted to be thrust upon him. And now began a life of unsurpassed laboriousness, and of most earnest contention with heathenism on the one hand, and with Culdeeism on the other. Rejoicing in his success in contending with the former, and deploring his success in contending with the latter, I can but express admiration of the genuine English courage and invincible perseverance which he brought to bear on his twofold

object, the Christianizing and the Romanizing of Germany. After four years' labour, a report reached Rome that he was not altogether sound in the faith. The pope therefore summoned him to Rome to give account of his doctrine. He not only succeeded in vindicating his orthodoxy, but made so favourable an impression on the pope, that he invested him with the episcopal office. He now took the name of Boniface, and returned to his work with redoubled zeal. Now we see him as the earnest preacher, entreating sinners to be reconciled to Christ, and Christians to walk worthily of their holy name; now with axe in hand, plied with his sturdy English arms, like another Jerubbaal, hewing down a great tree sacred to Thor; now settling questions of casuistry respecting the validity of irregularly administered baptism; and on one occasion venturing in a letter to rebuke very sternly the pope himself for the abuses which, as he had heard, were tolerated in Rome. Among all the men with whom we have had to do in this brief chronicle, there is no one who displayed more admirable qualities as a man than Bishop Boniface. These were the qualities of a Christian and an Englishman, and they could not be neutralized by the unchristian and un-English peculiarities of the Romanist bishop. It is said that in the course of about twenty years he baptized about 100,000 of the pagan inhabitants of Germany. Although this number is probably very much exag-

gerated, and although such wholesale baptisms are not an unmixed good, yet it is evident that it was by his zeal, combined with a singular faculty of organizing, that Germany became a professedly Christian land. The remnants of heathenism were put down by Charlemagne by penal laws and the edge of the sword.

When Boniface felt the enfeebling effect of old age, he withdrew to the monastery of Fulda, which he had founded, and where he desired to spend in contemplation the last days of a life of such vigorous action. But the paddocked war-horse scented the battle from afar. The hero of so many victories brooded over the shame of his one defeat in Frisia. He remembered that forty years ago he had fled ingloriously from the field, and he must wipe out the stain by victory, or by death on the field. He seemed to have a presentiment that he would never return, and therefore he ordered a shroud to be packed up along with the books and the relics which he was accustomed to take with him on his journeys. Thus equipped, and attended by ten clerics and forty laymen, he proceeded on his journey; and on arriving at its end, he and his companions set to work. For a time they preached with success, made many converts, and laid the foundations of several churches. But on a June Sabbath morning he was awakened by the noise of an advancing multitude, and, looking forth from his tent, he perceived that they came with no friendly intent. The fact was that the heathen tribes,

enraged at the success of the veteran missionary, had determined to take summary revenge. Some of the bishop's people counselled resistance, and were preparing to defend themselves, when he stepped forth from his tent, and commanded that no weapon should be uplifted, but that all should calmly receive the crown of martyrdom. His followers caught the infection of the old hero's bravery, and calmly awaited the onset of their foes. They were not kept long in suspense. The exasperated heathen deemed that they were doing good service to their ancestral gods in shedding the blood of those who had opposed their worship. When Boniface saw that his turn had come, he took a volume of the Gospels and laid it as a pillow for his head, and stretched forth his neck for the fatal blow, which was forthwith struck. Thus, at the age of seventy-five, with his head pillowed on the Gospels, and I doubt not with the gospel in his heart, the grand veteran wiped off the early stain from his shield, and being faithful unto death, received the crown of life.

The conquests of Charlemagne, a lineal descendant of Clovis, and the repressive measures which he adopted in opposition to heathenism and heresy, completed the external conversion of central Europe. These measures we cannot vindicate; to only a very limited extent can we apologise for them, on the ground that the doctrine of toleration and liberty of conscience

has ever been a plant of tardy growth. It is interesting to know that an English ecclesiastic, Alcuin, who stood high in favour with this emperor, and exercised great influence over him, used that influence to dissuade him from persecution, and to inculcate upon him faith in the cross as the wisdom and power of God, and in the efficacy of those weapons which are not carnal but spiritual, but which are mighty through God to the pulling down of strongholds.

LECTURE IV.

HITHERTO we have had to do mainly with the barbarous nations who had overrun the Roman Empire, and who were to a considerable extent brought under the influence of those whom they had conquered, who were not unwilling to adopt their civilisation, and not very much disinclined to make an outward profession of the religion which they generally professed. It may be safely said that their disinclination was all the less because that religion was generally little more than an outward profession, and a formal and gorgeous ceremonialism. There was little, alas! to repel the corrupt heart of man in the prevalent Christianity of the empire. It was a religion of the empire, much more than a religion of the heart and of the life. Requiring and insisting upon a certain recognition of its ordinances, satisfied with a very limited knowledge of its doctrines, setting up a false and unnatural standard of imaginary perfection to be aimed at and attained by a few, it cared little to exercise a sanctifying influence over the hearts of men, and to direct and control them in the relations and avocations of social and political and military life.

It was the monks' part to pray and fast, and lead a life of ascetic pietism and constrained devotion. It was the part of the kings and the nobles to lavish gifts and endowments, and to afford facilities for the performance of these duties by the monks. It was the part of all to attend upon occasional services of ritual and pomp; but it was not expected of the politician, the statesman, or the warrior, or of the peasant or the serf, to do justly, and love mercy, and walk humbly with his God. We must regret this, but we must accept it as a historic fact. We may wonder that God should have permitted it to be so; but with our wonder we must mingle reverent adoration of that providential wisdom, which allowed an imperfect and deformed Christianity to supersede and bring to an end the abominations of heathenism, and then in its own good time, by means of the blessed Reformation, and by means of various influences that have powerfully operated from time to time, and which are more or less powerfully operating always, has purified that Christianity from the admixture of earthliness which defaced and deformed it. And then I have a stronger conviction than probably I have been able to communicate to you, of the extent to which the Irish or Scottish element, transfused into the blood-current of the continental church, imparted to it a measure of vitality and spiritual strength, and retarded the process of deterioration which it could not prevent, and which

eventually issued in the full development of the mystery of iniquity.

We have now to turn our eyes to those northern European lands which had never been overshadowed by the Roman eagle's wing; where unmitigated barbarism reigned, unassuaged by any admixture of Roman civilisation; where heathenism held undisputed sway over the minds of the people, untempered even by the vicinity of diffused Christianity. Speaking generally, we may say that these lands lie all around the Baltic Sea, and include the modern Denmark, Sweden and Norway, Poland, and the enormous Russian Empire, stretching from the Baltic on the north-west to the Euxine or Black Sea on the south-east. To these countries in their order we shall now ask your attention, and shall endeavour to give such a general idea of their conversion to the Christian faith as we can present in a single lecture.

In the middle age geography, the country which is now Norway, Sweden, and Denmark, was called Scandinavia. As early as the seventh and eighth centuries its inhabitants had become the torment of their neighbours, the French, the Germans, and the English. Large in stature, hardy by their mode of life, savage in their manner of conducting war, pirates at sea, robbers by land, their hand was against every man, and the hand of every man who dared encounter them was against them. We hear of the forebodings

of Charlemagne in his last days, that is, early in the ninth century, regarding them, and these were gloomy enough, and they were realized in the endless conflicts in which his successors were embroiled with them.

In my last lecture I mentioned in a single sentence an attempt of Willebrord to introduce the gospel into Denmark. He was unable to remain there, but it is said that he purchased thirty youths, baptized them, and took them with him into Frisia, that they might be educated, and in due time sent back as missionaries to their countrymen. While on his way back from Denmark, he very nearly attained what he would have regarded as the glory of martyrdom. He was driven by a storm on the coast of an island called Fosetesland, which is understood to have been the modern Heligoland. This island was so sacred that the waters of a holy well must not be polluted, nor the cattle that grazed its fields be slain. The distressed mariners were ignorant of this, or, if they knew it, they disregarded it. They slew some of the cattle, and Willebrord baptized three of his Danes in the sacred well. The sentence was passed that one of the offenders should die. The sentence was carried into execution, the victim being determined by lot. The intrepid bearing of Willebrord on the occasion, and the uncompromising way in which he denounced the superstition of the people, and urged them to accept the gospel of Christ, made a favourable impression

upon Radbod, the king or chief of the island. Nothing seems to have been done for some time. But in 822, Harold, the king of Jutland, and claimant of the crown of Denmark, came to seek the help of Louis the Pious, the son, and one of the successors, of Charlemagne. Louis agreed to espouse his cause, and sent an army to place him on the throne. He had also in his train Ebbo, the archbishop of Rheims, and primate of France, and Halitgur, bishop of Cambray, and a retinue of other missionaries, who thought this a providential opening for the introduction of the gospel. Little success appears to have attended their labours among the people. But after three years Harold came back to France, and Ebbo accompanied him. It does not appear clearly what was the state of Harold's mind at this time,—whether he had resolved to make profession of the gospel, and thought it not expedient to do so in the first instance among his own people, or whether it was during his stay in France that he came under the power of the gospel. At all events, he was baptized in the cathedral of Mayence, and along with him his queen, his son, and several of his courtiers.

This baptism of Harold could not, in the nature of things, be expected to be so pregnant of results as that of the Frankish chief to which I devoted so large a portion of my first lecture. But as a missionary, and as one who has had a good deal to do with the study

of mission history, I must be allowed to dwell for a moment upon the conversion of this Danish king. So far as I am aware, there is no roll of sovereigns who have done so much for the spread of the gospel, and done it so much in the spirit of the gospel, as the kings of Denmark since the Reformation. It was by the aid of the Danish king that the Moravians were enabled to introduce the gospel into the West Indies and into Greenland. It was the King of Denmark that devised and carried out the first Protestant mission to India. It was in his small territory of Tranquebar that Ziegenbalg and Plutsko unfurled the glorious banner of the Captain of salvation. And it was the King of Denmark, too, that took under the protection of his flag, in his small territory of Serampore, that noble band of Englishmen, whom their own countrymen, in base cowardice, dared not allow to preach the gospel of the grace of God within their territory; and very nobly did the small potentate of Serampore defy the great potentate of Calcutta, and refuse at his bidding to violate his promise and pledge of hospitality. Believing as we do that those who honour God, God will honour, we might perhaps have expected that Denmark should have been rewarded by extension of territory and by an increase of influence among the nations of Europe. But although this has not been, and may haply never be, yet none the less may we be convinced that God is not unfaithful to

forget any work and labour of love. We trust it may be long hence, but the day will come when descendants of these Danish kings shall wear the crown of Britain, and wield the imperial sceptre of India. And when that day comes, their rule over these subject millions shall be all the more blessed and all the more prosperous because their maternal ancestors, small as they were in earthly resources but strong in faith, scorned and put to shame the timid policy of their paternal. And even now, the amiable mother of the first of that line of future kings, Denmark's daughter and Denmark's princess, whom England has adopted and loves as her daughter and princess too, when she thinks of the tremendous responsibilities that are to devolve upon the boy whom she so lately dandled on her knee, and like any joyous young peasant mother carried upon her shoulders, may well be sustained by the reflection that when these responsibilities shall come upon him, he shall not have to rule a wholly heathen land, but shall have daily offered for him the prayers of myriads, and ere then it may be millions, of Christian subjects.

On Harold's return to Denmark he was accompanied by Anskar, who well deserves to be called the apostle of Scandinavia. Anskar was born in 801. His pious mother strove to bring him up in the nurture and admonition of the Lord. At an early age he was sent for education to the monastery of Corbie, which was

then in high repute, both for the piety and the learning of its monks. What progress Anskar made in learning we have no means of ascertaining; but during a long life of labour and hardship he gave evidence of fervent and intelligent piety. Once during his boyhood he saw Charlemagne in all the pomp of his personal grandeur and imperial magnificence. Then not long after there came to Corbie the tidings of his death and his unnatural entombment, doubtless substantially as it is described to us by an English writer:—

'In the gallery of the Basilica he had erected his marble throne, covered with plates of gold, studded with Greek cameos and astral gems from Nineveh or Babylon. Before that throne were the stairs descending to the sepulchre which he had already dug deep for himself in the holy ground, even when he raised that marble throne. Soon afterwards the huge broad flagstone which covers the vault was heaved up; there they reverently deposited the embalmed corpse, surrounded by ghastly magnificence, sitting erect on his curule chair, clad in his silken robes, ponderous with broidery, pearls, and osfray, the imperial diadem on his head, his closed eyelids covered, his face swathed in the dead-clothes, girt with his baldric, the ivory horn slung in his scarf, his good sword Joyeuse by his side, the Gospel-book open on his lap,—musk and amber and sweet spices poured around,—his golden shield and golden sceptre pendant before him.'

It is not surprising that the contrast between the noble features, and stately form, and kingly magnificence which he had seen, and the ghastliness of death of which he now heard, made doubly or tenfold ghastlier by the futile attempt to bedizen it with the semblance of life and royal state, should have made

a great impression upon the mind of a nervous boy. Anskar was thirteen years old when Charlemagne died, and from that time he gave himself up with absolute unreserve to the service of God. Ascetic as he was constitutionally and educationally, and over-estimating, as he did all his days, the virtue of wearing a haircloth shirt by night and day, there was a practical element in his devotion which is often wanting in that of the ascetic. His enthusiastic mind glowed with the ambition of preaching the gospel to the heathen, and haply gaining even the supreme honour of the martyr's crown. When Ebbo instituted inquiriès after one who might fitly be sent to Denmark with Harold, Anskar was brought under his notice by the superior of his monastery. He was asked if he would undertake the mission, and joyfully consented. In vain his brethren pointed out to him the difficulties and the dangers of the undertaking. The greater these were, the greater was the chance of his reaching the summit of his ambition, the glory of martyrdom. One of his brother monks, Autbert, volunteered to accompany him, but none other could be induced to face the perils which beset the path which he had to tread.

Thus Anskar and Autbert set out in the train of Harold, and during the journey and voyage a kindly feeling sprang up between the royal and the missionary families. Harold got no cordial greeting from his

proud heathen subjects when he announced to them that he had done homage to the emperor, and that he had embraced the gospel. He seems to have been very sincere and very earnest in his endeavours to induce his nobles and subjects to abandon idolatry and embrace Christianity. To expect that he was altogether judicious in these efforts would be to suppose that he had those views regarding the relation that ought to subsist between rulers and subjects,—those views regarding liberty of conscience and the right of private judgment, which, during the millennium which has elapsed between his time and ours, the nations of Europe have been slowly and painfully learning. The result was that after two years, in 828, he was compelled to abdicate the throne. In the meantime Anskar and Autbert had not been idle, and their labours had not been without some measure of success. Their chief efforts were directed towards the Christian education of the young. They began with a school of twelve boys, and the number gradually increased. Most of the scholars appear to have been slaves, purchased with money probably supplied by the Emperor Louis. This, it need scarcely be said, was putting Christian education to an immense disadvantage. But even under such disadvantages we gladly regard Anskar as a Christian missionary educationist of a thousand years ago, and gladly accord him a place in that catalogue which, beginning with Justin

Martyr, and Origen, and Pantænus of Alexandria, contains the names of Patrick and his successors, and Columba and his, and Columbanus and his, and, after a blank, begins again with Luther and Melanchthon of Wurtemberg, and closes with the names of those who are striving now to impregnate the education of our Indian and African fellow-subjects with the living principle of the gospel of Christ.

The position of Anskar, difficult as it was while Harold was on the throne, became still more difficult after his abdication, and about the same time Autbert fell sick, and was obliged to return to Corbie, where soon afterwards he died. From all that we know of Anskar, I do not think that any amount of personal danger, or of difficulty to be encountered in carrying on his work, would have induced him to quit his post. But just at the time when the door was shut against him in Denmark, another was opened in Sweden, which promised to be wider and more effectual. 'By intercourse with Christian nations,' says Neander, 'some seeds of Christianity had already been scattered in Sweden. Commerce especially had contributed to this event. Christian merchants had conveyed the knowledge of Christianity to Sweden; and merchants from Sweden, becoming acquainted with Christianity at Dorstede, had, many of them, no doubt there embraced the faith. Others, induced by what they had heard about Christianity, betook themselves to Dor-

stede[1] for the purpose of obtaining a better knowledge of the religion, or of receiving baptism. In the expeditions, moreover, which they made to distant Christian lands, they had brought away with them numbers of Christian captives, by which means the knowledge of Christianity had already found its way to Sweden, and had attracted, more or less, the attention of the people.' It having come to the knowledge of the emperor that there were in Sweden many who were willing—and some who were even anxious—to receive Christian instruction, he requested Anskar to go at all events as an explorer or pioneer. Accordingly, having made the best arrangements that he could for carrying on the work in Denmark, he set out in a trading vessel for Sweden about the end of A.D. 829, taking with him presents from the emperor to the King of Sweden. On the way the vessel was attacked by pirates, and Anskar lost both these royal gifts and all his own possessions, and narrowly escaped with his life. But he was not discouraged, and his faith and fortitude met with a blessed reward. He was kindly received by the Swedish king, who gave him permission to preach, and his subjects freedom to accept and profess the gospel of

[1] Dorstede was a town in Holland, the great *entrepot* of the trade of the North. I presume it is the same with Dordrecht or Dort, which long afterwards was the meeting-place of a famous Synod. Of *Dorstatum*, Neander says that it was 'a famous commercial town.' Of *Dordracum* or *Dordrecht*, Cluvier, a Dutch geographer of the sixteenth century, says that it is the city first in dignity in all Holland, and a famous emporium of Rhenish wine.

Christ. As Anskar had been led to expect, so he found, many Christian captives, who had been brought from other countries,—France, Germany, Britain, Ireland,—and who, having been as sheep without a shepherd, gladly received from Anskar those consolations and exhortations which were fitted to alleviate the sorrows of their captivity. His preaching to the Swedes was not in vain. One convert is mentioned by name, Herigar, a man of rank, and governor of a department. He became a zealous promoter of Christianity, and we shall hear of him in the sequel. After a year and a half's stay in Sweden, Anskar returned home, and gladdened the heart of the good emperor, and doubtless of many others, by the cheering prospect he was able to present of the acceptance of the gospel by the Swedes. He was now made nominally bishop of Hamburg, but with the special design of superintending and conducting missionary operations both in Denmark and Sweden.

In the former country nothing could be done. What little could be done *for* it, was done by Anskar in Hamburg, who educated a number of boys, instructing them carefully in the Danish language, in the confident hope that God would yet open a way for them as evangelists into that land. The work in Sweden was entrusted to Ganzbert, a nephew of Bishop Ebbo, of whom we have heard before, and shall hear again. For many years he laboured there with

good success. But this success drew upon him—as success always will draw upon the mission to which it is accorded—the animosity of the heathen. In 845 he was attacked in his own house, and driven away by an infuriated rabble. In the same year Hamburg was attacked and plundered by the Norsemen, and Anskar's cathedral, his house, and his library were reduced to ashes. But his faith did not fail. Gazing with saddened heart upon the ruins, he exclaimed, in words that have more frequently than any others been quoted by bereaved ones: 'The Lord gave, the Lord hath taken away; blessed be the name of the Lord.' For a time he was in dire poverty, the good emperor having died five years before, and his diocese lying in two of the kingdoms into which the empire was divided at his death. But worst of all, Denmark and Sweden were both shut against the gospel, and there was no appearance of any improvement. You will remember that it was Ebbo who originally accompanied Harold into Denmark, and came back with him when he returned and was baptized. Ebbo, too, it was who had selected Anskar for the Danish mission, and it was his nephew, Ganzbert, who had now been driven from Sweden. Unhappily, Ebbo got involved in the meshes of secular politics, and lost his interest in the cause of missions, the cause of God and of man. But sore calamities chastened his spirit, and the embers of Christian and missionary

zeal were blown into a flame by the blast of adversity. Anskar and he met, apparently after a long separation, at the time of Anskar's greatest depression. 'Be assured,' said Ebbo to him, 'that what we have laboured to accomplish for the glory of Christ will bring forth fruit in the Lord; for it is my firm and settled belief, yea, I know assuredly, that although what we have undertaken to do among these nations meets for a time with obstacles and hindrances on account of our sins, yet it will not be lost, but will thrive more and more till the name of the Lord extends to the extreme boundaries of the earth.'

Weeping endured with Anskar for a night, joy came in the morning; and, as so often happens, the darkest hour was that before the dawn. First of all, he was delivered from poverty by having the bishopric of Bremen conjoined to his devastated and impoverished see of Hamburg. But, far better than this, he succeeded in gaining the favour of Horik, king of Denmark, who had driven Harold from the throne, and had been hitherto an uncompromising enemy of the gospel. Anskar undertook the management of some political negotiations with him, and in the conduct of them made so favourable an impression on him that he refused to have any other negotiator or ambassador of the German king at his court. He treated him as a personal friend, and gave him full liberty to conduct missionary operations. These operations he conducted

with his usual zeal, and by God's blessing, with much success. Many were baptized. The Christians of Germany and Holland traded more freely with the Danes than before, and the Danes resorted in larger numbers as traders to Holland and Germany; and in these and other ways a knowledge of the gospel, and some apprehension of the blessings which it brings with it, were diffused among the people.

This favourable state of matters in Denmark allowed Anskar to turn his attention to Sweden, whence Ganzbert was expelled in 845. In 851, Anskar enlisted for this mission the service of Ardgar, a priest who had been some time living the life of a hermit. Him he sent to Sweden; and he was joyfully received by the Christians there, and especially by Herigar, whom I have mentioned before. It was ascertained that he had done much to prevent the dispersion of the small flock when they had no pastor. The mission had been put to the severest test to which a mission can be put, that of being thrown upon its own resources, while as yet the church is unorganized, and in ordinary circumstances would have been dependent upon foreign missionaries for instruction and guidance,—such a test as that to which the mission and church in Madagascar were put in our own time. And as that church in the nineteenth century nobly stood the test, so did the Swedish church in the ninth. An interesting paragraph in Neander is descriptive of but one case, but

there is no reason to doubt that it indicates a state of feeling that was widely diffused:—

'We may conceive with what delight the arrival of Ardgar was hailed by the Stadtholder, who for seven years had not received the Holy Supper from the hands of a priest. Through his mediation Ardgar received permission to preach wherever he pleased. There were many Christians, besides, who had painfully felt the want of a Christian priest, and were not a little rejoiced at beholding one once more among them. One of these was Frideburg, a pious widow, who, in spite of all the violence of the pagans around her, had remained stedfast in the faith, and seeing no prospect that in the hour of death, which to a person of her years could not be far distant, she could receive the Holy Supper from the hands of a priest, she had purchased some wine, and carefully preserved it in a vessel, directing her daughter to administer to her, at the last hour, a portion of the element which was to represent to her the blood of the Lord, and be the sign that she commended herself to the Lord's mercy in passing from the world. The greater was her satisfaction in being able to join in the Christian worship of God restored by Ardgar; and she now had her most earnest wish fulfilled, in being permitted in her last moments to draw comfort and strength from partaking of the Holy Supper.'

I make no comment on this extract, either, on the one hand, with reference to the views which it discloses, which some of us would probably be disposed to regard as having a sacramentarian character, or with reference, on the other, to the manifest absence from the mind of this woman, who was probably a fair representative of the church of the age, that the consecration by a priest gave efficacy to the ordinance of the Lord's Supper by the transubstantiation of the

elements; or to the equally manifest absence from her mind of any knowledge of the doctrine or practice of communion in one kind, or withholding the cup from the laity. But I cannot dismiss the extract without sending back across the intervening millennium a brotherly greeting to this faithful widow, who so earnestly longed for the privileges of God's house, and who panted after communion with the living God, as the heart panteth after the water-brooks. And I may just say in passing, that it is one of the rewards which one meets with who has occasion, as I have lately had, to wander over the rugged wastes of history, that he does now and again come in contact with a jewel such as this, and is made to feel that amid God's hidden ones there are many who shall yet be admired as polished and resplendent gems in His lordly diadem.

But Ardgar, although a man of ardent piety, was essentially a hermit, and not a missionary, or even a pastor. His ambition was not to rescue the perishing, but to prepare his own soul by meditation and devotion for the beatific vision. And it is not for us to sit in judgment upon him. His visit to Sweden did good, by showing the small flock that they were not forgotten by the good Shepherd; but he was not well qualified for the work either of winning or of guiding souls. His hands, never strong, were more enfeebled by the death of Herigar, and in 852 he returned to his hermitage. For a time Anskar found it impossible

to fill his place; and then he resolved to go himself into the breach. It is notable that, on this occasion, he took with him letters of commendation from the royal Dane, who had come to the throne as a professed opponent of Christianity, to his royal brother of Sweden, in which he said that 'he was well acquainted with this servant of God, who came to him at first as an ambassador from the Emperor Louis. Never in all his life had he known so good a man, nor found one so worthy of confidence. Having found him to be a man of such distinguished goodness, he had let him order everything as he chose to do in regard to Christianity. He therefore begged King Olaf to allow him in like manner to arrange everything as he pleased for the introduction of Christianity into his kingdom, for he would do nothing but what was good and right.' Yet the giver of this testimony was not a Christian; at least he never made a profession of a change of faith.

Anskar found the national mind of Sweden actually brought into contact with the question, what the national religion was henceforth to be. Before his arrival a strong heathen party had risen up in vindication of the heathen worship and the heathen gods. Anskar, however, received a kindly welcome from the king, who told him that he was himself in favour of toleration, but that he could do nothing without the consent of the nobles and the people. Then Anskar

gave himself to prayer unto Him who turneth men's hearts like the rivers of waters. By the nobles the question was submitted to the decision of the lot. It was decided in favour of toleration. It was then submitted to the assembly of the people. The proceedings were very much like those of Northumbria, of which we have heard. An old man inveighed against the impotence of the national gods, and recommended that an experiment should be made; and so it was decreed. Thus both in Denmark and in Sweden the gospel had established a footing for itself during the active lifetime of this noble man. We should greatly err if we supposed that all difficulties were overcome, and that no more missionary work was needed. There was in reality but a small beginning made. Yet it was so made that it was manifest that the good work must go on. Even as in India now, although there be but about one professing Christian for every thousand of the population, yet friends and foes alike acknowledge that Hinduism and Mohammedanism are dying, while Christianity is alive. It is a question of time, and so far, but only so far, a matter of uncertainty. They are dying, and must die; it is living, and must live. So it was with Denmark and Sweden at the close of Anskar's ministry and life. The tide had begun to make, and although it came not with the rush of the swelling Solway, yet it did come, even as it is destined to come all the world over, till

the earth be overspread with the knowledge of the glory of the Lord, as the waters cover the sea.

I have spoken of the end of Anskar's life and labours. It was soon to come. His life had been from the first a life of labour, and it was so to the end. It was from beginning to end a life of faith, a life of prayer, a life of devoted and single-hearted service of God, a life of disinterested beneficence toward man. In those rude days it might be expected that such a man should be credited with miraculous powers. But he ever declared that he sought for and knew of no greater miracle than this, that the grace of God should make of Anskar a good man. At last, in his sixty-fourth year, he entered into his rest. '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.' His last words were, 'Lord, be merciful to me a sinner. Into Thy hands I commend my spirit.'

Although the Norwegians were continually coming into contact, in the varying relations of war and peace, with the Swedes and the Danes, the French and the Germans, the English and the Irish, and although in this way some knowledge of the Christian system must have been diffused among them, yet the formal introduction of it into their country was a full century later than its introduction into Denmark and Sweden.

And when it was introduced, it was not by missionaries, but by kings, whose carnal weapons assorted but badly with the spiritual warfare which they undertook. The complicated relations that subsisted at this time betwixt the English and the Danes and the Norwegians, it is not my part to explain. We are in the habit of hearing it stated that Alfred the Great subdued the Danes, and drove them out of England. This is not true, excepting in a very general sense. Long after his time there were Danish princes in England, sometimes asserting independence, and sometimes acknowledging subjection to the Saxon kings; now fighting with them, and now against them. And very similar was the position of many Norwegians or Norsemen in England. Harold, a Norwegian king, was dethroned by his brother Eric, and took refuge in England. His son Haco was brought up at the court of Athelstane, grandson of Alfred the Great. Hearing that the supplanter of his father had made himself detestable to nobles and people by his tyranny, Haco returned to Norway, and was soon seated on the throne, Eric in his turn fleeing to England, which was then, as it is now, and we trust will ever be, the asylum of all who are in distress. The great desire of Haco's life seems to have been the abolition of heathenism and the substitution of Christianity as the religion of his people. That he was always judicious in the methods which he employed for this end,

I will not assert; but the difficulties with which he had to contend were very great. I quote from Neander:—

'Having first gained over his most confidential friends to the side of Christianity, as soon as he had reason to believe that his power was sufficiently established, he proposed, in the year 945, before an assembly of the people, that the whole nation, great and small, masters and servants, men and women, should renounce idolatry and sacrifice, worship the only true God, and Jesus Christ His Son, devote every Sunday to the exercises of religion, resting from all labour, and observe every Friday as a fast-day. Such a proposition to renounce at once the old religion and customs of the land could, of course, serve only to exasperate the minds of a people who were devoted to their ancient sacred institutions, especially as nothing had been done to prepare the way for such a measure by a previous inworking of Christianity upon their modes of thinking. The heads of households declared that they could not gain a subsistence for themselves and their families if so much time were to be withdrawn from labour. The labouring class and servants declared that by so much fasting they would have no strength left to work. In many of the speeches of the nobles who took up the argument, zeal for the old national religion, and repugnance to a new and foreign worship opposed to the customs of the people, were most emphatically expressed, and the king's proposal was repelled with universal indignation.'

It is very remarkable that, in the whole history of the introduction of Christianity into Norway and Iceland, extending over a period of a century and a half, we meet not with the name of any noted bishop, or ecclesiastic, or missionary. There were, no doubt, ecclesiastics employed in the work, and these would appear to have been generally Englishmen; but they occupied a secondary place, almost their only province

being to baptize those whom the kings compelled to submit to that ordinance. The kings were the real missionaries; and one cannot help feeling a kind of admiration of the ferocious zeal which one and another of them manifested in the undertaking,—even as the lord commended the unjust steward because he had done wisely, although his wisdom was wholly misdirected. The most persistent and the most successful of these missionary kings was Olaf the Thick, who came from England in 1017, and set himself with heart and soul to the work of the demolition of heathenism, and the substitution of Christianity as the national religion. Possessed of all the qualities that could fascinate the people,—a handsome person, great bodily strength and power of endurance, absolute fearlessness in danger, and determination to carry out his purpose by whatever means,—he could not but be popular with all classes of a people with whom these qualities were held in the highest repute. By pulling down idol temples, by shivering grim idols with his own battle-axe wielded by his own strong arm, by standing forth as the champion of Christianity in opposition to frantic multitudes mad upon their idols, by being ever ready to fight and to die for his country, which was theirs as well as his, and equally ready to fight and to die for his faith, which was his but not theirs, he gained the admiration of a people with whom, after all, valour and patriotism were the chief articles even of their

religious creed; and his indiscreet zeal was probably not so wholly prejudicial to the cause on whose behalf it was employed as we might perhaps have expected it to be, and as in almost any other circumstances it would certainly have been. By means such as these, worthier of followers of the false prophet of Mecca than of disciples of Jesus of Nazareth, a nominal Christianity was at last accepted in Norway, and even this conspired with other influences to refine the manners of the people, and in the successive generations there were doubtless multitudes who received the truth in the love of it. In contemplating this whole history we find scarcely anything that we can thoroughly approve; and are thrown back upon that adorable providence which bringeth good out of evil, and that adorable grace which makes the wrath, or the fanatic and misdirected zeal of man, to contribute to the praise of God and the benefit of man.

We have hitherto had to do with three of the four great families into which ethnologists have divided the European nations,—the Celts, the Teutons, and the Scandinavians. The fourth, with whom we now come into contact, are called the Slavonian or Sclavonian family. They differed from the others in descent, in language, and in religion. Spread over a vast extent of territory, stretching from the Polar Sea on the north to the Mediterranean in the south, and from the Baltic

on the north-west to the Black Sea on the south-east, they, of course, differed widely from each other; yet they were separated by still more distinct differences from the other nations. So far as I have been able to form a judgment,—though I am no adept in ethnological studies, and have not indeed much faith in ethnological theories and generalizations,—the Slavonian races seem to have been generally less distinguished than either the Teutons or the Scandinavians by what we commonly regard as the special virtues and the special vices of the savage. Less warlike and brave, they were less vindictive and fierce; more willing to endure continuous hardship and toil, they were less truthful and trustworthy. Their weapons of offence were symbolic of their dispositions. These were not the broadsword and the battle-axe and the ponderous club, but the light bow and the poisoned arrow. Their virtues and their vices were such as we commonly regard as characteristic of the Asiatic rather than the European. As they came eventually rather under the influence of the Greek than of the Roman Church, it will be necessary to interject a few sentences concerning the division between these two branches of the Christian church.

From the earliest Christian times there were differences of usages and differences of feeling between the churches of the East and those of the West. The removal of the seat of empire from Rome to Byzantium acted variously, and in some respects in opposite direc-

tions, with reference to the position of the bishops of Rome and those of Constantinople. In the first place, it raised the relative position of the latter by transferring to them that *prestige* which the former had enjoyed as ecclesiastical presidents of the metropolis of the empire. But then, on the other hand, it increased the power and ministered to the arrogance of the former, by making them appear as virtually the sole governors of Rome. In this sense it is that many understand the letting or hindering influence which retarded the development of the mystery of iniquity (2 Thess. ii. 7) to have been the imperial power, and the taking of it out of the way to have been the removal of the seat of empire to Constantinople. Still there was not an absolute breach between the Roman and Greek churches till the ninth century. Till then the Romish popes acknowledged the patriarchs of Constantinople as really bishops of the Catholic Church, and as such claimed supreme sway over them. The patriarchs equally admitted the bishops of Rome to be bishops of the Catholic Church, acknowledged their equality, but refused to admit the superiority or supremacy which they claimed. It was not till the middle of the ninth century that the churches were actually disrupted. In 853, Photius became patriarch of Constantinople. In 862, Pope Nicolas I., in a council at Rome, excommunicated Photius and all his adherents. Four years after, Photius, in a council at

Constantinople, excommunicated Nicolas and all his adherents. While, therefore, I have hitherto spoken of Rome and the pope as if they represented the whole of what was regarded as the Catholic Church, with the exception of the Culdees, I have done so without compunction, because, in point of fact, there was a virtual separation between Rome and Constantinople long before the actual separation took place; and so in the sequel I shall speak of the Greek Church and the patriarch of Constantinople as being virtually separated from Rome, although, as I have said, the actual formal separation did not take place till A.D. 862. Perhaps I shall give all the information that it is necessary for us to possess respecting the differences of the two churches, by simply quoting the five charges which Photius brought against the Church of Rome. These were: (1) That the Romans fasted on the Sabbath or seventh day of the week; (2) That they allowed the use of milk and cheese in the first week of Lent; (3) That they imposed celibacy on the clergy; (4) That they gave the power of confirmation to the bishops alone, and not to the presbyters; and (5) That they held the procession of the Holy Ghost from the Father *and the Son* (*Filioque*), and not from the Father only.

Perhaps it is scarcely correct to describe the Bulgarians as a Sclavonian race; for it seems to be certain that they were a mixed race of Tartars and

Slavonians. But the Tartarian portion of them had adopted the language and customs of the Slavonians. Living on the borders of the Greek Empire, they were engaged in frequent wars with it; and in the course of constant marauding expeditions had carried off many captives, from some of whom they obtained much knowledge of Christianity. Notably, in 813 they took and plundered Adrianople, and carried off its bishop among the captives. Though the bishop, whose name I have not been able to ascertain, was a prisoner, yet the word of God was not bound. The bishop and his fellow-prisoners laboured earnestly for the conversion of their captors, and with some good measure of success. The work was carried on by another captive, a monk called Constantine Cypharas. At the same time a sister of the Bulgarian prince Bogoris was, and had been for a long time, a captive in Constantinople, where she had been instructed in the Christian faith, and had heartily embraced it. An exchange of prisoners was proposed in 861, and the monk Constantine was exchanged for the princess. She, on her return, laboured earnestly for the conversion of her brother, and succeeded in making a favourable impression on his mind. As Bogoris was specially fond of paintings, his sister sent for a monk, Methodius, whom she knew to be a skilful artist. It is said that he succeeded in making a favourable impression on the mind of the prince by a painting

which he executed of the Last Judgment. This impression was confirmed by suitable instruction, and Bogoris was baptized in 863 or 864. On his baptism he took the name of Michael, and forthwith set himself with ignorant zeal to enforce the conversion of his subjects. This gave rise to a rebellion, which he suppressed, and punished the rebels with terrible severity. Although Photius, the patriarch of Constantinople, of whom I have spoken, sent a long letter to the prince on his conversion, yet no steps were taken for the instruction of the people, and the confirmation in the faith of those who embraced it. In 865, therefore, the prince and his nobles applied to Pope Nicolas I., whom also I have incidentally mentioned. He sent them two bishops, with a supply of Bibles and other books, and with a letter which has come down to us, and which, while, of course, it contains a few statements about saints' days, and about referring all matters of doubt to the papal see, with which we do not accord, is upon the whole a fine specimen of a Christian pastoral letter; thoroughly Protestant in its spirit, and singularly free from papal assumption. There seem to have been various negotiations among the Bulgarians as to their attaching themselves to the Greek or the Roman Church, but ultimately the former prevailed; and the Bulgarian Christians, of whom we have lately heard much, are still a portion of the Greek Church.

The evangelization of Moravia is peculiarly interesting on account of the subsequent history of the church in that country, the way in which the nobles and people defied the Council of Constance, and vindicated John Huss and Jerome of Prague; the long persecution which they endured after the Reformation, and the formation of the Moravian Church in Silesia, which for a long time was well-nigh the sole representative of missions among the Protestant churches. The most important distinctive feature in connection with the original evangelization of the country was the use of the vernacular language in the public worship of the church. Cyril and Methodius, the first missionaries, came originally from Constantinople. They set about reducing the language to writing, and translating the Bible into it. They afterwards conformed to Rome, but with the reservation as to the use of the vernacular language exclusively in the public services. This was stoutly resisted, but they stood firm; and I doubt not that the noble struggle which the Moravians made against the corruptions of Rome, and their noble endurance of afflictions and persecutions at Rome's hand, were, under God, due in great measure to their reading in their own tongue the wonderful works of God, and their having access to the throne of grace without the intervention of that middle wall of partition, a foreign language.

Bohemia was at this time a dukedom politically

dependent on the kingdom of Moravia, although Moravia afterwards became a mere province of the independent kingdom of Bohemia. Intensely interesting is everything relating to the Christianization of this land, the birth-place of the continental Reformation. It was from Moravia, and probably in Moravia, that Duke Borziwoi, duke of Bohemia, became acquainted with Christianity, and was baptized. Nowhere was there a keener contest between paganism and the gospel than in Bohemia. The gourd grows in a night and dies in an hour. The trembling poplar grows apace, and is worthless; the sturdy oak grows slowly, but so grows that its timber has the consistency of iron. With man or with church it is no evil thing to attain to blessing and peace through conflict and struggle. The maxim may be misapplied, but in a very important sense it is true, that he never believed who never doubted. It was not till the middle of the eleventh century that Christianity became really the religion of the Bohemian people. Up till that time, although there had been a national church, with an archbishop of Prague and other bishops, heathenism was dominant in the domestic and social life of the people. Polygamy and the slave trade in its very worst form were practised and vindicated, which, I need not say, would have been impossible had the Christian church been much more than a mere name. From this time, how-

ever, the gospel became a power in the life and thought of the people.

There was a large Slavonian tribe called the Wends, who were separated from the other tribes of the race, and inhabited a land which is now an important and central part of Germany, including the great Prussian kingdom. From an early period frequent attempts were made to introduce the gospel amongst this tribe, but with little success. Christianity was associated in the minds of these people with the Germans, with whom they were bravely fighting a losing battle, and they would not take the gospel from their hands. One such attempt is of special interest to us, because a chief actor in it was one—Mr. Maclear calls him one of the last—of that missionary band of our countrymen on whose labours and sufferings we have dwelt so lovingly and so long. For this reason, as well as from its intrinsic interest, I quote Maclear's account of his martyrdom:—

'In this persecution perished one of the last representatives of the earlier Irish missionaries, in the person of John, bishop of Mecklenberg. Leaving Ireland, he had travelled into Saxony, and been hospitably received by the archbishop of Bremen. By the latter he had been induced to undertake a share in the Slavonic mission, and was recommended to Gotteschalk, who stationed him at Mecklenberg. His labours are said to have been blessed with unusual success, but he fell a martyr to his zeal. After being cruelly beaten with clubs, he was carried about as a show through the chief Slavonic towns; and at Rethre, when he would not deny the faith, suffered the loss of his hands and feet, and afterwards

was beheaded. The body was flung into the street, and the head, fixed on a pole, was carried in triumph to the temple of Radegast, and there offered as an atonement to the offended deity.'

It is said that proverbs are the concentrated expression of the experience of man. Yet the experience of man is not absolutely uniform, and therefore proverbs are not universally true. Thus it is with the proverb that the blood of martyrs is the seed of the church. The church did not grow from the seed thus sown,—the blood of John, and many other martyrs. In truth, the Christianization of this country seems to have been the result of the subjugation of the people, the crushing of their national spirit, and the prevalence of German influence and authority over them; unquestionably the most unsatisfactory of all conceivable ways whereby a nation may be Christianized.

In all the vast field over which we have had to travel in this lecture, we have beheld a scene of conflict and struggle; zealous missionaries counting not their lives dear to them, but willing to lay them down as a willing offering to the God whom they served, if thereby the salvation of men might be effected; and brave kings too, with zeal little directed by knowledge, ready to imperil their crowns and their lives in order to confer upon their subjects what they knew would be a benefit to them, although they saw but vaguely how the benefit was to be produced. We have sympathized with the men who bravely, and in the spirit of willing

self-sacrifice, consecrated themselves to do the work of God, although they might in many cases mistake the manner and the spirit in which that work should have been done. And I am free to confess that I am not without sympathy also with those who, with equal bravery, refused to accept that which was presented to them in this erroneous manner and this mistaken spirit. But I have little sympathy with a nation which seemed listlessly to drift into the profession of the gospel, receiving it without any earnestness of opposition, or without any enthusiasm of acceptance. And such, according to the best judgment that I have been able to form, were the characteristics of the Christianization of the greatest Slavonian tribe, who occupied a great portion of what is now the immense Russian Empire. The history of it may be told in a few sentences. In 955, the Princess Olga went, apparently on a visit of ceremony, to Constantinople. Here she was induced to embrace Christianity, and was baptized, the Emperor Porphyrogenitus acting as her sponsor. On her return she endeavoured to induce her son Swiatoslav, and her grandson Vladimir, to follow her example. Upon the former she seems to have produced no impression, but the latter was favourably impressed. Yet, when he came to the throne, he showed great zeal for idolatry. Then missionaries came to him from various quarters, Mohammedans, Jews, German Christians, and Greek Christians. The

Mohammedans and the Jews he seems to have summarily dismissed, and the remembrance of his grandmother's lessons so far prevailed that he was disposed to prefer the Greek to the Romish Church. Yet he came to no decision, and does not appear to have had any particular anxiety on the subject. Next year he conferred with some of his nobles, and they recommended that messengers should be sent to the different countries, and report as to the character of the several religions. The result I give in the words that Maclear takes from a Russian author:—

'Messengers were accordingly despatched to the Jews and Mohammedans, as also to the German and Eastern Churches. Of all they returned the most unfavourable 'report, except only the church of Constantinople. Of this they could not say enough. When they visited the Byzantine capital, they were conducted to the church of St. Sophia, then perhaps the finest ecclesiastical structure in the world. The patriarch himself celebrated the Liturgy with the utmost pomp and magnificence. The gorgeous processions, the music, the chanting, the appearance of the deacons and sub-deacons with lighted torches and white linen wings on their shoulders, before whom the people prostrated themselves, crying, Kurie Eleison,—all this, so utterly different from anything they had ever witnessed amid their own wild steppes, had such an overpowering effect on the Russian envoys, that, on their return to Vladimir, they spoke not a word in favour of the other religions, but of the Greek Church they could not say enough. "When we stood in the temple," said they, "we did not know where we were, for there is nothing else like it upon earth; there in truth God has His dwelling with men; and we can never forget the beauty we saw there. No one who has once tasted sweets will afterwards take that which is bitter, nor can we now any longer abide in heathenism." Thereupon the Boyars said to

Vladimir: "If the religion of the Greeks had not been good, your grandmother Olga, who was the wisest of women, would not have embraced it." The weight of the name of Olga decided her grandson, and he said no more in answer than these words: "Where shall we be baptized?"'

Yet Vladimir did not act. Two years seem to have passed before he took any positive step. Then he invaded the territory of the emperor. He took the town of Cherson, and then proposed peace, and asked the sister of the emperor in marriage. His suit was granted on condition of his accepting Christianity. Immediately after his marriage he was baptized. Then he set himself to the extirpation of idolatry, and seems to have met with no opposition. Then he gave orders for the immediate baptism of his people: 'Whoever shall not to-morrow repair to the river, be he rich or poor, he is my enemy.' The command was unhesitatingly obeyed, and thus, as I have said, the great Russian Empire glided into the profession of the gospel. And such has been the character of the religion of Russia all through,—a religion of pomp and ceremonial, without depth or power; a religion for which no man has ever died, the only one of the religions of any great masses of men, true or false, which never had a martyr. In support of political views and social theories, in the fields of defensive and offensive warfare, Russian blood has flowed like water; but religious zeal, apart from political objects, so far as I have learned, has never been exhibited. It may, of course, be said

that there has been no persecution, and therefore no martyrdom, just because rulers and people have so harmoniously been bound in the ties of a common faith; but it is to be feared that it is rather because the hearts of rulers and people have never been fairly reached by the influence of heart-religion.

And now, at the close of this too long and yet too cursory review, I would only say that the main use to which we should put it is, to deepen the conviction which, I have no doubt, we all feel to a greater or less extent, of the manifold wisdom of God, as in the device of the great scheme of redemption and the application of it to the souls of men, so in the diffusion of it over the regions of earth. We should probably have expected that a purer gospel should have been propagated by more unexceptionable means, and accepted from higher motives. But just as we know that God, infinitely good as He is, permits evil to exist in the world which He governs, for this probably amongst other reasons, that His people may love good the more because they are able to contrast it with evil, so He may have permitted imperfection to mingle with His work as performed by men, in order that we, for whom so large a portion of that same work is reserved, may do it with no less zeal, but with more humility and more earnest cries to Him for guidance and direction.

LECTURE V.

WHILE speaking of the evangelization of the barbarian tribes who invaded and overran the provinces of the Roman Empire, and became the forefathers of the nations of modern Europe, I said nothing of those who took possession of Spain and Italy. These, apparently, were Arians; certainly the Longobardi, or Lombards of Italy, and the Suevi of Spain, were generally professors of Arianism. But I do not find that any special missions, in the proper sense of that term, were sent in order to their conversion to the orthodox faith. I have no doubt that much good work, akin to that which we now call home-mission work, was done among them; and it would appear that Arianism gradually died out, and the Catholic faith prevailed, rather through influence than through direct missionary agency. Just as I have had occasion to show that all over Europe the barbarians showed a willingness to embrace the language and the civilisation, and even to a certain extent the religion of those whom they conquered, so I have no doubt that this was especially so in Italy, and to some extent in Spain. For it is to be noticed that the Catholic

faith never lost its ascendancy in Rome, although the city was taken and plundered again and again. Although there was a succession of Gothic kings of Italy, and although, under the title of exarchs of Ravenna, nominees or rivals of the emperors of Constantinople exercised a very real and important sovereignty over a considerable part of Europe, yet Rome itself fell only the more under the sway of its bishops, who came more and more to assume temporal sovereignty, and to claim that, occupying the city of the Cæsars, they were entitled to wield the sceptre of the Cæsars. It is not within our province now to enter into any disquisition as to the way in which this transference to the popes of the *prestige* which had belonged to the emperors wrought towards the development of papal corruption and papal assumption, and that papal tyranny which in time assumed the triple crown, and trampled under its feet all the temporal and spiritual and eternal interests of mankind. I bring no railing accusation, and I say it more in sorrow than in anger, that from about the middle of the Middle Ages the process of deterioration which had begun long before went on with ever increasing rapidity. Zeal enough was manifested for the enlargement of the papal power, and for the rescue of the Holy Land from unchristian occupation; but little for the truth of God and the salvation of the souls of men. Yet, as there was probably as little earnestness on the

part of the Arians as there was on the part of the orthodox, it naturally happened that the traditions of orthodoxy, and the possession by the orthodox of authority and power, gradually prevailed, and that a cold and heartless Arianism was gradually superseded by an equally cold and heartless orthodoxy.

In Spain it is evident that the triumph of orthodoxy over Arianism was more the result of political than of missionary causes. The Arian Suevi were early conquered by a section of the Arian Goths; and for a time the old Spanish Church, which existed before the incursion of the Suevi, must have held a position similar to that which, as we have seen, the old British Church occupied in Wales and Cornwall and Strathclyde. That efforts were made from time to time for the conversion of the Arians I do not doubt, and we have some faint records of some of them. But very likely the efforts were made very little in the spirit of the gospel. The missionaries probably put more confidence in the efficacy of the relics of certain saints than in appeals to the reason and the conscience of men, and in the exhibition of the work and sufferings, and the death and resurrection, the ascension and intercession, of the incarnate Son of God. Still it must be borne in mind that the records come to us through the channels of later Romanism, and that it is quite probable, indeed quite certain, that they bring prominently forward what was really the worse side

of the labours, while they record and keep out of view a better side, which, we may hope, and indeed believe, had a real existence.

The most prominent name among these missionaries is that of Martin, bishop of Galicia, towards the end of the sixth century. Martin was a native of Pannonia, the native country of Martin of Tours, whose name he seems to have assumed. In his youth he made a journey into Palestine for the purpose of visiting the holy places. On his return he went into Galicia, a province at the extreme north of Portugal, and laboured diligently in the refutation of Arianism, and preaching the gospel of Christ. Gregory of Tours gives a very short notice of him; but Baronius has preserved a contemporary Latin poem composed in his honour, in which are ascribed to him the courage of Peter, the doctrine of Paul, the edifying gifts of James and John. He is said to have converted to the Catholic faith King Theodomir, who had been cured of leprosy by the intervention of Martin of Tours, and was therefore prepared to receive this other Martin, who was represented as coming in the spirit and the power of his great predecessor. This Martin is regarded as the apostle of Spain; and I have no doubt that he was a zealous advocate of the truth, although his history is overladen with manifestly fabulous legends. There seems to be no doubt, at all events, that his labours resulted in the national confession, in

the kingdom of Galicia, of the Catholic doctrine of the divinity of Christ. But the strife was not at an end. A King Lewigild was a violent Arian, and used all the resources of power to compel, and of patronage to bribe, men to the denial of the equality of the Son with the Father. In this, as in so many other cases, we see the bitterness of a queen-mother brought into contrast with the meek stedfastness of an orthodox princess. I quote from Baronius a short passage which he takes from Gregory of Tours and Isidore :—

'In this year (A.D. 583), according to the testimony of Gregory, a terrible persecution was raised by the Arian King Lewigild against the Catholics. Thus he says: "In that year there was a great persecution of the Catholics in Spain; many were sentenced to banishment, deprived of their property, branded on their foreheads,[1] committed to prison, and put to death in various ways." Thus, briefly, Gregory concerning the persecution. In like manner S. Isidore, after relating the brave deeds of the same king in war, goes on to say: "But the error of impiety obscured the glory of so great valour. In fine, filled with perfidious rage, he instituted a persecution against the Catholics, banished very many of the bishops, deprived the churches of their revenues and their privileges, and by his terrible doings drove many into the Arian heresy and pestilence; others he allured and deceived by gifts of gold and riches. Among other of his heretical abominations, he even presumed to re-baptize the Catholics, and not only those of the common people, but even those of sacerdotal order, such as Vincentius, bishop of Cæsar-Augustum,[2] who from a bishop became an apostate, and as it were fell from heaven into hell." Gregory tells us what was the more immediate cause of this persecution. The instigator of this wickedness was Goisuintha,

[1] Such I conjecture to be the meaning of the expression '*facie decocti.*'
[2] Saragossa.

whom King Lewigild married after she had been married to King Athanagild. . . . But Lewigild had two sons by another wife, viz. Hermenigild and Recared, the elder of whom had married a daughter of Sigebert, and the younger a daughter of Chilperic. Ingundis the daughter of Sigebert was brought into Spain with great ceremony, and was received with great joy by her grandmother Goisuintha, for Ingundis was the daughter of Brunehilde, who was the daughter of this Goisuintha. But she would not suffer her to remain in the Catholic religion, but began to persuade her with flattering speeches to be re-baptized in the Arian heresy. But she, strenuously resisting, said, It is enough for me to have been once washed from original sin in the baptism of salvation, and to have confessed the holy Trinity in undivided equality. This I declare that I believe with my whole heart, nor shall I ever go back from this faith. On this Goisuintha became furious, seized her by the hair of the head, threw her on the ground, and trampled on her till she was covered with blood. Then she ordered her to be stripped and thrown into a fish-pond. But never did her mind swerve from the true faith. Then Lewigild gave to Ingundis and her husband one of the cities, in which they should live and reign. Whither when they had repaired, Ingundis began to urge upon her husband to abandon the deceit of heresy, and acknowledge the truth of the Catholic faith. This for a long time he refused, but at last he was converted to the Catholic law, and when he was anointed,[1] he took the name of John.

A civil war afterwards broke out between Hermenigild and his father; and it is noticeable that Baronius very distinctly represents that Hermenigild was fully justified in going to war with his father, simply because that father was an Arian! The historian goes on to relate many contests in miracle-working

[1] The Arians who embraced the Catholic faith were not re-baptized, but they were anointed with chrism, to show the imperfection of their previous baptism.

between the two parties, one challenging the other to restore the blind to sight; or throwing a ring into the fire, and daring the other to take it out with his hand when it had been made red-hot; an Arian general seized with fever on the day on which he has plundered a monastery, cured on the intercession of the abbot on his promising to restore the spoil, relapsing when he refuses to keep his promise, and dying because the abbot refuses again to intercede for him. Hermenigild was defeated by his father, and thrown into prison. Here he was plied with entreaties and assurances of pardon if he would recant. But he stedfastly refused, and was put to death by his father's orders,—a death of martyrdom, according to the church historians; a judgment with which we shall probably hesitate to concur.

Lewigild survived his son only a year. He died in 585, and was succeeded by his other son Recared. He soon embraced the orthodox faith, and strove as zealously in its support as his father had done for its extirpation, and, it is to be feared, by pretty much the same means, punishment and bribery. From this time, however, the Catholic faith became the national faith of Spain. I need not say that orthodoxy has nothing to boast of respecting the whole of its conflict with the Arian heresy. The more we detest that heresy, the more do we regret that its downfall should have been accomplished otherwise than by the glory

of God in the face of Jesus Christ shining in the hearts of men. If persecution on the one hand, and bribery on the other, are not so simply and absolutely evil that they admit of no degrees of comparison, they are worst of all when they are employed in support of that most profound, yet most practically important mystery, with which are associated the doctrines of substitution, and atonement, and imputed righteousness, and all that distinguishes Christianity from a more refined heathenism. In the maintenance of this gospel we need not, and should never use, the weapons of carnal warfare or the arts of a carnal policy. We preach Christ crucified. Behold our armour, for offence and for defence; and we do foul injustice to our cause if we have recourse to the breastplate or the spear of Saul, in preference to the smooth stones, thrown in faith, and carried home by the demonstration and the power of the Spirit of the Lord of hosts.

During the last years of the sixth century, the whole of the seventh, and the first years of the eighth century, Spain formed no part of the proper mission-field, however much it might need careful and laborious culture as a newly reclaimed and imperfectly cultivated portion of the Christian field. It is to be feared that such culture it did not get, and that while the truth was professed, and while there are extant records of many provincial synods or councils which indicate scrupulous orthodoxy on the part of the Spanish

bishops, and abundant zeal regarding the externals of religion, there was but little of the faith working by love, without which orthodoxy and ritualism are equally as sounding brass or a tinkling cymbal.

But ere long, Spain became again a proper field for Christian missions. Early in the eighth century it was conquered by the Mohammedans, and remained for five centuries in their hand. It will be necessary here to give some account of the rise of Mohammedanism, and of its progress up to the time at which we come into contact with it in North-Western Africa and South-Western Europe. The facts of the life of Mohammed are generally well known. Many questions as to his character, and the character of the Mohammedan system, have been keenly disputed, and are not yet, and will probably never be, absolutely decided. These questions do not immediately concern us, and I shall not enter upon the discussion of them, although, from the occasions that I have had to give attention to them, the discussion would be one in which I should engage with pleasure. That Mohammed was the purely virtuous man, the pure patriot, the earnest reformer, the universal philanthropist, the ardent aspirant after the pure worship of God, I believe few who are capable of judging will be prepared now to maintain, as it has been maintained by his panegyrists in former days. That, on the other hand, he was a simple monster of iniquity, delighting

in the two employments of unlimited blood-shedding and unlimited sensuality to a greater extent than that to which any other man in his age and country delighted in them, will also, I believe, be regarded as too extreme a statement. He was an Oriental. He became an Oriental potentate, and he had the Oriental idea that the privilege of a potentate included indulgence in sensuality. He considered himself entitled to such indulgence, and he claimed it. For this idea, and for the claim founded upon it, I am far from apologizing. Only I say that, in judging of the character of Mohammed, we ought to remember that in this respect he acted just as every other man of his age and his country would have acted. It is to the gospel we owe the conception that higher station and greater power do not relax, but strengthen the bonds of responsibility. The fifty-first Psalm would have been simply an impossibility apart from a gospel revelation.

He was not only an Asiatic, but an Arab, an Ishmaelite, nurtured in the faith that his hand must be against every man, strength against strength, stratagem against stratagem, force and fraud against fraud and force. To him the perfection of virtue was success against an enemy, and every man outside of his own tribe—and his tribe in a very restricted sense—was an enemy. That he believed throughout in his own divine commission, no judicious biographer maintains.

That he ever believed in it at all, I think very improbable. That he was earnest and honest in his desire to put a stop to the profanities and the corruptions of Asiatic heathenism, I think should be frankly admitted. But alongside of the first and greatest of the commandments of the law of Islam,—there is one God,—he took care to place in indissoluble union the second as like unto it,—Mohammed is His prophet. By those who have admitted that his religion was not fitted to elevate man to the full height which he is capable of reaching,—to the height to which the gospel can raise him,—it has yet been maintained that it was capable of beginning the process of elevation, and was, like the Jewish dispensation, an essential preparation for the better gospel of the grace of God. One who has had so much to do with heathenism and pagan idolatry as I have, is indeed disposed to admit that anything else is better than it. I should say that I have not had so extensive or so intimate acquaintance with Mussulmans as with Hindus; still I have had abundant opportunities of forming comparisons,—say, of many hundreds of Mussulmans with many thousands of Hindus. And I must honestly say that, comparing the Hindu and the Mohammedan peasant, the Hindu Pandit and the Mohammedan Maulvi, the Hindu rajah and the Mohammedan nawab, I do not think that the followers of Mohammed have purer notions of the Godhead, or purer notions of morality, than the

worshippers of Brahma and Vishnu and Shiva, and *that* although modern Hinduism has degenerated more from the Hinduism of the Vedas and earlier Puranas than modern Mohammedanism has degenerated from the Mohammedanism of the Koran. Of course, in all classes there are better and worse; and it is quite possible that you might find one Mohammedan better in some or in many respects than many Hindus; but with equal ease you will find a Hindu occupying a higher moral and spiritual platform than many, or I believe the great body, of Mohammedans. And then, however it may be theoretically, it has not hitherto been found in fact, that the Koran has led men to the Bible, that Mohammedanism has been a preparation for the gospel. Rather it has been found that the Mohammedan mind and heart are doubly hardened against the gospel of the grace of God, that gospel whose indispensable requirement is that a man be converted and become as a little child, else he cannot enter the kingdom of heaven.[1]

[1] On this important matter let me fortify my position by the judgment of my friend Sir William Muir, who probably knows more of Mohammedans and Mohammedanism than any other living man :—

'A barrier has been interposed against the reception of Christianity. They labour under a miserable delusion who suppose that Mohammedanism paves the way for a purer faith. No system could have been devised with more consummate skill for shutting out the nations over which it has sway from the light of truth. *Idolatrous* Arabia (judging from the analogy of other nations) might have been roused to spiritual life and to the adoption of the faith of Jesus; *Mohammedan* Arabia is, to the human eye, sealed against the benign influences of

The era of the Hejira, from which the beginning of Mohammed's mission is dated, falls in A.D. 622. He lived ten years after this, and died in 632. During his lifetime he succeeded in bringing all the Arab tribes to accept his creed and acknowledge his supremacy. The khalifs who succeeded him immediately set about the work of subduing the neighbouring nations at once to the creed and the supremacy. It is constantly stated that it was by the sword that Mohammedanism was propagated. I suspect that the full meaning of this statement is not generally realized. I know that I did not realize it until I had occasion to institute particular inquiries into the matter. I had supposed, and I think it is generally supposed, that the sword was resorted to when argument and persuasion failed; that force was brought in to the aid of reasoning; that the soldier stood by the preacher, or took up the field when he was driven from it. But the truth seems to have been that preaching or reasoning was never brought into the field at all. An overflowing flood of armed men rushed over land after land, and

the gospel. Many a flourishing land in Africa and Asia, which once rejoiced in the light and liberty of Christianity, is now overspread by gross darkness and stubborn barbarism. It is as if their day of grace had come and gone, and there remained to them no more sacrifice for sins. That a brighter day will yet dawn on these countries we may not doubt; but the history of the past and the condition of the present is not the less true and sad. The sword of Mohammed and the Koran are the most fatal enemies of civilisation, liberty, and truth, which the world has yet known.'

offered the alternative of the Koran or the sword, varied in some cases with the additional option of subjection and tribute. In this way Syria was subdued, then Persia, and then Egypt. From Egypt devastating armies marched along the Mediterranean coast of Africa, taking city after city, and subduing province after province, and ever and anon sending spoil and tribute, in ivory and slaves, to enrich and beautify Damascus. But the conquest was a slow one. The emperors of Constantinople recognised the importance of this province of the empire, and armies were sent from time to time to dispute its possession with the invaders. But in vain. For the people themselves the choice was between foreign governor and foreign government. It was not a matter of much importance to them whether their tribute were uplifted by a Christian or a Mussulman, whether it were remitted to Constantinople or to Damascus. When that is the state of matters, the ultimate issue may come sooner or later, but it must come. The whole of the Barbary States fell under the dominion of the khalif. Mosques were erected on the site of the churches of Cyprian and Augustine, and Christianity was extinct over the vast province. A Saracen colony was settled in the regions of Tripoli and Morocco, and the Moors and the Saracens were gradually amalgamated, and formed a state professing the Mohammedan faith, and acknowledging a certain limitation to their

independence, and a certain measure of subjection to the khalifs of Damascus.

The Spaniards were in possession of the fort of Ceuta, on the African side of the Straits of Gibraltar. To this fort the Saracens, under the generalship of Musa, laid siege, and were repulsed by its commandant, the Count Julian, who was esteemed one of the noblest of Spanish nobles, and was high in the esteem and personal friendship of King Roderick. While Musa was preparing to renew the attack, he received an offer from Julian to surrender the fortress, and to aid him in the invasion of Spain. It is said that he was led to this act of rebellion and treason through indignation against the king, and the desire to revenge dishonour done by Roderick to his daughter. Under the conduct of the renegade Julian, Musa led into Spain an army composed of Arabs, Moors, renegade Greeks, and renegade Spaniards. Roderick fought bravely, but was defeated on the field of Xeres, and Spain became a province of the khalif of Damascus. Some of the nobles, some, alas! of the bishops and clergy, and many of the people, preferred the alternative of the Koran to the sword, while a band of patriots maintained for a time a guerilla warfare in the mountainous districts of the country. I may mention that this is the subject of Southey's beautiful poem of 'Roderick, the last of the Goths,' but I am afraid that the historical basis on which it rests is extremely scanty. Practically,

Spain became a Mohammedan country. The churches in large numbers were converted into mosques, and the people who did not apostatize from their faith purchased the privilege of exercising their worship by the payment of an enormous tribute, and by subjection to innumerable insults and oppressions. All honour to these men who, in the midst of prevailing unfaithfulness, were faithful to their country and their God, who took patiently, if not joyfully, the spoiling of their goods, and who kept alive the knowledge of the truth as a light in a very dark place. At first Spain was ruled as a section of the North-West African kingdom. Then governors were sent directly from Damascus. But after about half a century of such rule, Abderahman, the viceroy of the khalif, declared himself independent, and established the khalifat of Cordova. From time to time, however, Christian principalities arose, until, in the beginning of the eleventh century, the northern half of the country was Christian and the southern was Mohammedan. At last, in 1212, the great battle of Tolosa avenged the great battle of Xeres, fought exactly five hundred years before.

During these five hundred years it can scarcely be said that there were any proper missions in Spain. In fact, a mission to a simply Mohammedan kingdom is an impossibility. For while the Koran allows subjects of another faith to profess their own religion, it punishes with death all Mussulmans who embrace

another faith, and all those who speak disparagingly of Mohammed or Islam. Yet it is evident that there was a very strong spirit of propagandism at work among the Christians during a considerable portion of this time, as is indicated by the number of martyrdoms. These are imputed, both by secular and church historians, to a spirit of fanaticism, which courted martyrdom for its own sake, and poured abuse upon the false prophet with no higher end in view than that of gaining the martyr's crown. I venture to think that this opinion has been taken up and handed from one writer to another without sufficient evidence. In many of the cases of which we have details, I can see no ground for such an opinion, and I cannot doubt that in many others there was a sincere and pure desire to win the unbelievers to the faith of the gospel. Neander, who strongly holds the opinion in question, admits that the first martyr was not one of the fanatical, but of the moderate party :—

'He was a priest, by the name of Perfectus, attached to a monastery in Cordova, then the residential city of the Arabian khalifs. Some time in the year 850, under the reign of Abderahman II., Perfectus, while on his way to the city to make some purchases for his convent, fell into company with a party of Arabians. They asked him many questions about Christianity, and the views entertained by the Christians respecting Mohammed. The last inquiry he strove to evade, telling them he was loth to answer it, because he feared he might annoy them by what he would be obliged to say. Finally, however, he concluded to inform them, since they invited him to speak frankly, and pro-

mised him that, whatever he said, it should not be taken amiss. He then proceeded to represent Mohammed, for reasons which he assigned in detail, as one of the false prophets foretold by Christ among the signs of the last time. To all this the Arabians listened with ill-suppressed anger; yet, for the present, they let the priest go unharmed, that they might not break their promise to him; but the next time he appeared in public they seized and dragged him before the judge, where they accused him as a blasphemer of Mohammed. It was the season of the Mohammedan fast. He was therefore for the present loaded with chains, and thrown into prison. Some months afterwards he was again brought forth, and as he stedfastly confessed his faith, and instead of retracting, only confirmed what he had said about Mohammed, he was condemned to death, and perished by the sword.'

It is remarkable, if Neander's views as to the prevalent passion for martyrdom be correct, that almost all his narratives seem, like this one, to be inconsistent with them. From the innumerable intermarriages between Mussulmans and Christians, considering that the law required that all the children of such mixed marriages were to be regarded as Mussulmans, and that apostasy from Mohammedanism was to be punished with death, it must be evident that we do not need to have recourse to the theory of an unreasoning fanatical zeal in order to account for numerous martyrdoms. Let me again quote from Neander the case which seems the most favourable to his views:—

'Flora was a young unmarried woman descended from parents of mixed religion, her father being an Arabian and a Mohammedan, her mother a zealous Christian. The mother had educated her in Christianity, and from childhood she manifested

a temper of sincere and ardent piety. Her brother being a bigoted Mohammedan, disputes could hardly fail to arise between the two on the matter of their faith; and the fanatical brother, when he found that all the pains he took to convert his sister were unavailing, grew exasperated against her. He accused her as an apostate. She assured the judge that, on the contrary, she had never been a Mohammedan, but had been brought up from infancy as a Christian. The judge ordered her to be severely scourged, that she might be forced to a denial; but as she continued stedfast, and never uttered a syllable against Mohammed, he dismissed her. She spent some time in retirement, but finally felt constrained to present herself again before the judge, and not only confess her own faith, but testify against Mohammedanism and its prophet. She did so, and was executed.'

With all my respect for the name and memory of Neander,—and in the estimation of every student of church history his name is venerable,—I must protest against the comment which he makes upon this. The sentence immediately following the quotation which I have just made is the following: 'There were not wanting both ecclesiastics and laymen who disapproved altogether the conduct of those that were so ready to offer themselves as voluntary victims.' Of course not. When was there ever a time when there were wanting a clerical and a lay Mr. Worldly Wiseman and a Mr. Facing-both-ways, who regarded it as the excess of folly so to profess the faith of Christ as to call forth persecution? Why have we no word of stern reprobation of the unnatural brother, and no word of sympathy with the victim of his fanaticism, upon whose back the ploughers ploughed

and made long their furrows, and who was probably goaded by his reproaches of what he would call her cowardice and her unfaithfulness, to seek to be allowed to seal her testimony with her blood? With no desire to be the apologist of fanaticism or recklessness, I must say that it appears to me that the Spanish and African Christians of those days had but the alternatives of martyrdom and unfaithfulness between which to choose; and in proportion as I feel thankful that such an alternative had not to be encountered by me, and conscious of the sad probability that I should not have chosen the better part, I recoil from the idea of casting a slur upon the memory of those who were enabled to make that choice. Even if they were in some cases mistaken as to the path along which duty required them to walk, let us remember the noble stedfastness with which they were enabled to maintain their grand career; for it is a grand career that ends in martyrdom for the cause of Christ.

Thus far, while acting as the apologist or advocate of those who, from the circumstances of their position, had to choose between unfaithfulness and death, I am confident of carrying with me the sympathy of Christian men and women, and of all who can appreciate courage and stedfastness. I am not quite so sure of obtaining assent when I undertake the same office on behalf of those who voluntarily undertook, as

missionaries, to flaunt the banner of the cross in the face of the serried ranks who rallied around the crescent. And yet I think my case is not a desperate one. We do not generally regard the doings of a forlorn hope as matters for apology, but for eulogy. But then it will be said that they act under the orders of their commander, and that he would not employ them in such service unless he had some hope, however forlorn, of success attending their effort, or at least some hope that their effort, even if it fail, will, by creating a diversion, or by gaining time, or in some other way, contribute to the furtherance of his enterprise. Well, the men whose cause I now plead at least believed that their action was covered by the order of their Lord: 'Go into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature.' And if they were mistaken as to the manner or time of obeying this comprehensive order, is it for us to withhold from them the meed of admiration which we so willingly accord to unflinching courage and self-sacrifice in other fields?—

> 'Was there a man dismayed?
> Not though the soldier knew
> Some one had blundered;
> Theirs not to make reply,
> Theirs not to reason why,
> Theirs but to do and die.
> . . . . .
> All the world wondered.'

Our pulses are quickened when we hear of brave

men rushing into the jaws of death in obedience to an order framed under a misapprehension, or altered in the conveyance, or misapprehended in the delivery. In the case before us, there could be no misapprehension on the part of Him from whom the order came, for He was the omniscient one. The only question is, whether He intended it to be obeyed indiscriminately, or whether with reference to times and circumstances and probabilities of success. This we are surely bound to say, that if these men obeyed the order when cool prudence might have shown them that it could not be intended to be so obeyed, thousands and tens of thousands have veiled under the guise of that same prudence what was in reality downright cowardice and unfaithfulness.

The men of whom I am about to speak had the order conveyed to them by Francis of Assisi, a man who, if he blundered, has at least this to be said on his behalf, that he would gladly himself have gone on the same service on which he sent them;—a man who, if he had lived in the first century, would have been a chosen brother of Paul; if in the sixteenth, would have been a worthy associate or a worthier opponent of Luther than most of those with whom he had to contend; but who, living in the thirteenth, had the worse qualities of his nature fostered, and the better aspirations of his spirit checked, by inadequate and in many important respects utterly

false apprehensions of the character and the objects of the gospel. I shall give, from the French Encyclopædia of Missions, to which I referred in a preceding lecture, a single notice out of many which it contains of the doings and the sufferings of the Franciscans in Spain and Africa. I have no means of testing the accuracy of its statements; but I see no reason to doubt its substantial truth, with the single exception of the account of the miraculous opening of a fountain in the desert:—

'Berard (Saint), a Minorite friar, was sent in 1219 by St. Francis of Assisi, with four other monks, Saints Peter, Otho, Adjuti, and Accursi, to preach the gospel to the Mohammedans of the West. They began their mission in Spain among the Moors of Seville. They stayed eight days with a Christian of that place, spending all their time in mortifications and prayers, and asking of God the courage of the martyr. Their host sought to divert them from their purpose, for fear lest the trade of the Christians in the midst of the infidels should suffer prejudice. They left his house and went first to one mosque and then another, from which they were thrust out with violence. They then presented themselves at the gate of the Mussulman king, saying that they were ambassadors and envoys of Jesus Christ, the King of kings. The prince, seeing four poor monks, was exasperated by a proceeding which he took for a hoax; and besides, his Mohammedan fanaticism was inflamed. He would have had them put to death forthwith had not his son moderated his rage. He only caused them to be shut up in a tower, from the top of which they proclaimed Jesus Christ to all who came within hearing of them. Their apostolic work was stopped by their being put into a dungeon, from which they were brought out at the end of five days. The king had them brought into his presence, and promised them great favours if they would

renounce the faith. They answered him nobly by exhorting him to abjure the error of his false religion, and to open his eyes to the light of the gospel. You may, said they, destroy our bodies, but you will send our souls to heaven; we are sure that death will procure for us immortality. The King of Seville, seeing them animated with such constancy, allowed them to sail for Morocco in a vessel which was conveying into Barbary many Christians who were discontented with their position in Spain.

'Morocco was altogether a Mohammedan town; yet there were in it some Christians, among whom they found a prince of Portugal, named Peter, who had retired thither on account of some differences with his brother Alphonso II. The five monks were presented to him, and he heard what had befallen them among the Moors of Spain. This prince urged them to moderate their zeal, so as not to encounter the same fate in Africa. But next morning at dawn they set about preaching Jesus Christ to the Mussulmans wherever they met them. The king happened to be passing one day when St. Berard, who knew Arabic better than his companions, was surrounded by a large crowd, whom he was striving to induce to accept Christianity. The presence of the prince, far from intimidating the missionary, only caused him to render his exhortations more animated. The emir thought that Berard was a madman, and ordered him and his companions to be sent away into a Christian country. The Portuguese prince, of whom mention has been made, procured for them guides to conduct them to Ceuta, a seaport within sight of Spain. On the way they escaped from their conductors, and returned to Morocco, where they began again to preach in the public square. This time the king ordered them to be seized and thrown into a dungeon, and there left till they should die of hunger. On the sudden occurrence of an epidemic through excessive heat, he gave them their liberty, and directed them to a seaport. They escaped as before, and returned to Morocco, hoping that then the truths of the gospel would find more docile hearts. The Christians of Morocco, fearing that the ardour of so noble zeal would bring persecution upon them, made them stay in the house of the Portuguese prince. These monks accompanied him in an expedi-

tion against some rebel tribes in the interior of the empire. While the army was returning victorious, but exhausted by a three days' march in the desert, and suffering all the torments of thirst, Berard struck the dry sand, as erst Moses did by command of God, and there sprang forth an abundant fountain. God would thus manifest His power in the sight of the unbelievers, give authority to His apostle, and bear testimony to the truth of the doctrines which he preached. On their return to Morocco, the Franciscans began anew to preach Jesus Christ. The king was exasperated, and ordered them to be beheaded. He who should have executed this order had been a witness of the miracle wrought by Berard, and also, in hope that the prince would relent, he only sent the missionaries to prison. Here they endured all sorts of outrageous treatment at the hands of the jailor, who was a Christian renegade. But neither captivity nor sufferings impaired their zeal for the conversion of the Moors, and in consequence they were handed over to the executioners. They were twice scourged with such cruelty that their ribs were laid bare. Then boiling oil and vinegar were poured into their wounds, and they were dragged over pieces of broken pots. During these terrible inflictions they were strengthened inwardly by the grace of Him who had sent them, and uttered nothing but the praises of God. While they were being led away stripped and bound, a Mussulman urged them to embrace the law of Mohammed. St. Otho, to mark the horror which he felt at the suggestion of apostasy, spat on the ground, which brought a blow upon him. Immediately he presented the other cheek, praying God to forgive him who had done him this wrong. The emir questioned them. They confessed bravely their faith, and spoke with freedom and energy of the false prophet Mohammed. Thinking to gain by seductions those who resisted torture, he offered them gold, brought women richly dressed, and promised them to them in marriage, with great riches, if they would acknowledge the law of Mohammed. "Keep your goods and your false pleasures," answered the confessors; "we will have none but Jesus Christ. Torment us by the most cruel tortures. We desire them with all our hearts." The persecutor, furious at the

failure of all his efforts to shake their constancy, drew his scimitar, and acting as executioner as well as judge, cut off their heads with his own hand.'

Such is a specimen of many of those zealous men who counted not their lives dear to them, but freely devoted them—threw them away, some will say—to the hopeless work of introducing the gospel into Mohammedan Spain and Africa.

About the middle of the thirteenth century a new order was formed for the express purpose of work in these countries, which was not indeed mission work strictly, but which was so closely related to the cause of Christ that I must introduce a notice of it here. The order was that of 'Our Lady of Mercy,' or 'Redemptorists;' its object was the release of Christian captives from the bondage in which they were held by the Moors. The founder of it was Peter Nolasca, of whom I shall now give a very short account. He was born in Languedoc in the year 1198. From his early boyhood he showed singular compassionateness for the poor, and used to give to them all his pocket-money. At the age of fifteen he lost his father, and was taken into the suite of Simon de Montfort, who at that time was appointed to lead the notorious crusade against the Albigenses. We are not surprised when we hear that Saul was a persecutor, that Augustine was a Manichean, that Bunyan was a blasphemer,

that John Newton was a slave-trader, that Brownlow North was a gambler; for we know that the grace of God is all-powerful to make men new creatures. But we are surprised to hear of one who volunteered for what we regard as one of the most cruel and impious enterprises that ever man undertook, giving himself up to the accomplishment of works of mercy and charity, without any repentance for his part in the previous enterprise, but in all probability with the continuous conviction that the shedding of heretic blood, and the dashing out of heretical brains, was a work as well pleasing to God as procuring deliverance for the captive and breaking the fetters of the slave. This suggests various reflections, of which perhaps the most obvious are as to the dangerous influence of public opinion in warping the conscience, and as to the influence of the Romanist system in perverting and corrupting all the better judgments of the mind, and all the better affections of the heart. But I cannot enlarge upon this.

Peter III., the Christian king of Aragon, though himself a zealous Papist, though he had in reality given great offence to his nobles and his people by his implicit submission to the pope, though he had betrothed his son, the heir of his crown, to the daughter of Simon de Montfort, yet was led by political considerations to espouse the cause of the Albigenses. He was slain, fighting on their side, at the battle of Muret. De Montfort claimed the guardian-

ship of his son, on the ground that he was to be his own son-in-law; and he appointed Peter Nolasca to the important office of tutor to the young king. It would appear that neither the pope nor the nobles approved of this arrangement. The king was soon taken from the guardianship of De Montfort, and other tutors were appointed. It was, however, while residing at Barcelona in this capacity that the heart of Nolasca was moved with compassion for the Christian captives who were held in large numbers in the Moorish, and I fear also in the Christian, kingdoms of Spain. It is said that during his residence there he redeemed at his own expense more than two thousand of these slaves; and he conceived the idea of the formation of a special religious order for the purpose of collecting funds and applying them to this beneficent object. In 1223 the order was formed, and he was appointed its general. The work was carried on with vigour; thousands of slaves were ransomed, and were provided for by the gifts which the brethren collected. All through Spain and in Algiers he and his brethren carried on the work of redemption, and fearlessly proclaimed the gospel to the Mohammedans, not altogether without success. In these unwearied labours he persevered until they wore out his constitution. He resigned the generalship of the order in 1249, and died in 1256, in the sixty-seventh year of his age.

A contemporary brother of his order was Raymond

Nonnat, whose story is so interesting that I must tell it briefly.

He was sent into Barbary, and at Algiers obtained the liberty of a large number of slaves. When his funds were exhausted, he offered himself as a hostage for the ransom of a number of them. These he sent into Spain under the care of a brother, who promised, as soon as he had conveyed them thither, to return with money enough to pay their ransom-price, and so deliver Raymond from his voluntary slavery. It was for the interest of his masters to preserve his life; for if he had died, the ransom would have been forfeited. He not only ministered consolation to the Christians, but laboured for the conversion of Jews and Mohammedans. It is said that some of the former, and many of the latter, received baptism at his hand. The perversion of Mussulmans being a capital crime, he was sentenced to be impaled; but those who were interested in the payment of the slaves for whose ransom they held him as security, obtained a commutation of his sentence, and he was cruelly bastinadoed. As soon as he was able, he set about the work of preaching to the Mussulmans. He was again apprehended, scourged at the corner of every street in the city, then in the public square his lips were run through with a red-hot iron, and a padlock was put upon his mouth, which was only opened once in three days to allow him to eat.

Then he was loaded with chains, and thrown into a dungeon, where he lay for eight months, till the return of the brother with his ransom set him free. He desired to remain in Africa among the slaves, but the commands of his superior were laid upon him, and he returned to Spain. The pope raised him to the cardinalate, and summoned him to Rome. But he died on the way, while only thirty-seven years old. For these Redemptorists I cherish profound respect and reverence. This does not make me indifferent to their errors or to their inconsistencies. But it suggests the question: If an imperfect apprehension of the truth made them what they were, what manner of persons ought we to be, with our clearer light and our transcendent privileges!

I must now introduce a missionary of a very different type, yet of similar devotedness and self-consecration. Take him for all in all, Raymond Lull was one of the most remarkable men that ever lived; a man pervaded with one idea, that of the conversion of the Mohammedans, but with endless diversity of contrivances for the realizing of that idea; a man who in the fourteenth century travelled more than ninety-nine men out of every hundred travel in these days of railroads and steam-ships; a man who wrote more books than almost any man would be able in a lifetime to transcribe; a man who, with the sentence of death passed

upon him in his fifty-sixth year, and again in his seventieth year, and in each case only commuted for such torments as only Mohammedan fanaticism could inflict, yet continued his work of writing, and preaching, and travelling till he reached fourscore years; the only man who from the days of Mohammed till quite recent times ever succeeded in converting to the faith of the gospel any considerable number of Mussulmans residing in a country under a Mussulman government. We might well occupy with a sketch of such a man's life-history a much larger space than we have still to spare. Raymond Lull was a native of the island of Majorca, which was then under the government of that King James of Aragon of whom Peter Nolasca had been the tutor. He was born in 1235, and lived for thirty years a life of lawless pleasure and sensuality. Although he was a married man, he cherished an adulterous passion for a married woman, who, under the influence of Christian virtue, turned a deaf ear to his solicitations. He was actually engaged in the composition of a love-song in her praise when conviction seized him. He saw, or thought he saw, Christ upon the cross, and could not proceed with his unhallowed work. Day after day he returned to it, but still the same mental vision of Him who came to put away sin by the sacrifice of Himself disturbed his mind and stayed his usually fluent pen. It was natural that decided conversion in those days

should lead to the adoption of what was then regarded as the most religious life, and what was called distinctively *the* religious life. Along with the resolution to embrace such a life, there arose in his heart that desire which never afterwards quitted it, the desire to convert the Saracens to the faith of the gospel. Stranger still, he seems at once to have conceived the method which his whole long life was spent in carrying out, the method of assailing Mohammedanism in its higher regions, through the instrumentality of reasoning and argument with its most intelligent and best instructed professors. Shortly after, he resigned his office, which was that of seneschal of the king's palace, sold his property, and gave a large portion of the price to the poor, investing the remainder for the support of his wife and children, and left them with the intention of never returning again to his native island. After spending a year in Spain, however, and visiting various places of pilgrimage there, he was induced to return to Majorca; but it does not appear that he ever again associated with his wife and children. He bought an African slave, who knew no language but Arabic, and with him as his only companion he spent nine years in a cottage on a hill, intensely occupied with the study of the Arabic language and of the Mohammedan system. One day the servant uttered some blasphemy against Christ, when Raymond lost his temper and struck him a blow on the face. The vindictive Moor

stabbed him in the stomach, and thinking that he had killed him, forthwith strangled himself.

It might probably be the rumour of this adventure that recalled him to the memory of the king, whose service he had quitted ten years before, and in whose palace, it may be well supposed, his name was well-nigh forgotten. At all events, the king sent for him at this time, and he persuaded the king to endow a convent for the support of thirteen Minorite friars, who should devote their time to the study of the Arabic language and of the Mohammedan controversy. Having been thus successful with his own king, he set out for Rome, in order to urge upon the pope the institution of similar establishments all over Christendom. He had reason to suppose that the pope would be favourable to the project, because he had already interested himself in the encouragement of Oriental studies. But before he reached Rome the pope was dead. He therefore set out straightway for Paris, and there he was permitted, in the famous University of Paris, to lecture on his method of demonstrating the Christian religion for the conviction of Mohammedans and pagans. He seems to have been absent from Majorca on this occasion for about two years. On his return in 1289 he composed a treatise on *The Art of Discovering the Truth*, and received from the general of the Minorite friars permission to expound his method in the convents of the

order. His next move was to Genoa, where he translated his last book into Arabic. He then went to Rome, and urged his request upon the pope, but without success. He therefore returned to Genoa, resolved to proceed at once to Africa, and try in practice the potency of his demonstration on the learned Mussulmans, by establishing irresistibly the doctrines of the Trinity and the Incarnation. Arrangements were made for his passage,—his books and luggage were already on board,—when he was seized with one of those unaccountable panics which have befallen many a young soldier on the eve of his first battle, and which are not incompatible with the most dauntless courage. When he thought of the reception that probably awaited him, of the terrible death or the life-long imprisonment, his courage fairly gave way, and he allowed the ship to sail without him. But as soon as it was gone his courage revived, and with it intense shame and sorrow for his cowardice, and for the scandal that it might bring to the Christian name. So intense were his sorrow and shame, we are told by his biographer, that he immediately fell into a serious illness. Might it not be that it was incipient illness, and the depression caused by it, that occasioned his indecision? Be this as it may, he caused inquiries to be made as to the sailing of another ship; and as one was about to sail in a few days, he insisted on being taken on board, although he was not yet recovered.

On his arrival at Tunis, he invited the most learned Maulavis to meet with him. He told them that he had carefully studied the proofs of Christianity; that he had come there to hear what they could urge in favour of Mohammedanism; and that he was prepared to embrace it if they could prove it to be true. Thus they were led into argument with him; and as he had thoroughly studied both systems, and as he had great fluency of speech, and a perfect command of an elegant style of Arabic diction, the argumentative victory was on his side. Several of them professed to be convinced, and to be ready to receive baptism. Such a matter, of course, made a great noise in the place. It came to the ear of the king. Raymond was charged with the capital crime of attacking the established religion, and endeavouring to subvert the Mohammedan worship. There could, of course, be no defence: he was found guilty, and sentenced to death. But, on the intercession of one of his opponents, the sentence was commuted to banishment, on the condition that if he should ever return within the bounds of the kingdom, he should be stoned to death without further charge or trial. He therefore returned to Genoa, and from there he went to Naples, where he occupied himself in expounding his method, and composing books which might be turned to account in future dealings with the Mohammedans. Again he went to Rome, and sought the aid of Boniface VIII., but without suc-

cess. In the year 1298 he was in Paris, and thence he returned to his native island, and held daily disputations with the Mussulmans and the Jews, of whom there were a great number in Majorca. In 1300 he set out for Cyprus, and begged the Christian king of that island to send him to the Sultans of Syria and of Egypt, that he might instruct them in the Christian faith. From Cyprus he went into Armenia, and thence into Palestine, preaching and discussing with Mohammedans, and with Nestorian and other non-Catholic Christians. On his return to Cyprus an attempt was made upon his life by means of poison; but by the ministrations of a knight templar he was cured and sent back to Genoa. From Genoa he went to Paris, where he taught his method; thence to Lyons, and back again to Majorca, incessantly occupied with tongue and pen in expounding and extending his method. Once more he set out for Africa, and landed at Bugia. Here he suffered all manner of indignities, but succeeded in converting sixty philosophers of the sect of Averroes. Next he went to Algiers, where again he is said to have converted many of the Mussulmans. He was thrown into prison; and as he persisted in preaching to his guards, a gag was thrust into his mouth, and he was kept for several days without food. He was then led through the whole town and beaten; and as he had been banished from Tunis with a prohibition to return under pain of

death, so he was now from Algiers. It was now fourteen years since this sentence had been passed on him at Tunis, and probably thinking that after so long an interval he would not be recognised, he ventured to return. He did not stay long there, however, but went back to Bugia. Here he was soon thrown into prison; but, on the intercession of some Genoese merchants, he was made a sort of prisoner at large, and was allowed, like Paul in his own hired house, to receive all who came to him. The most learned Mussulmans of the place took advantage of this permission, and plied him with arguments, entreaties, threats, and promises to renounce the Christian and profess the Moslem faith. It needs not be said that in this they did not succeed. It was then agreed that each side should compose a treatise in support of his own religion. But before Raymond's was completed, the king interposed and banished him from Bugia as a disturber of the public peace. He then set sail for Genoa, but was wrecked within a short distance of the port. He contrived not only to escape on a plank, but also to save his beloved books. He was now seventy years old, but as able for work of hand or head as ever. He made application to the pope for a commission to go into Palestine for the conversion of the Mohammedans there, but his request was not granted. Next we find him in Paris, lecturing and writing books. In 1310 a General Council was held

at Vienne. Raymond attended it, and succeeded in obtaining a decree for the establishment of five colleges for the study of the Oriental languages, at Rome, Bologna, Paris, Oxford, and Salamanca. These were to be maintained at the expense of the pope and the bishops of the several sees. Only the King of France undertook to defray the expenses of that of Paris.

Lull was now in his eightieth year, and, conscious that he had no time to lose, he resolved to pay a last visit to the scenes of his labours and sufferings. He therefore proceeded to Alexandria, thence to Jerusalem, and thence to Tunis. After a short stay there he went to Bugia. There for a time he submitted himself to the counsels of his European friends, by conducting his operations with some degree of secrecy, dealing only with such Mohammedans as were known to be favourably disposed towards him. But this was contrary to the whole nature of the man. Soon he appeared in the public square, declaring that Mohammed was an infamous impostor, and that the salvation of mankind is only by faith in Jesus Christ. A crowd closed around him. Some stones were thrown; he was borne back towards the shore. Yet grandly he kept his face to the foe, and in a voice from which the enthusiasm of the apostle threw off the weight of fourscore years, he still proclaimed CHRIST, NONE BUT CHRIST. At last, he fell down on the sandy shore; but rallying

his strength for one last effort, he raised himself on his hands and knees, and shouted, 'NONE BUT CHRIST!' The furious mob closed upon him, and with blows and kicks and stones finished, as they thought, their unhallowed work. Some Genoese merchants came in a boat by night to carry off his body and bury it. To their surprise, they found him still alive. They carried him on board a vessel which was about to sail for Majorca. But he was not destined to reach the place of his birth. When the ship was within sight of the island, he peacefully breathed his last. He is said to have left behind him 486 different works, and some of them in two, or even three languages, Spanish, Latin, and Arabic, —viz. 60 on the method of demonstration, 7 on grammar and rhetoric, 22 on logic, 4 on memory, 8 on the will, 12 on morals and politics, 8 on law, 32 on philosophy and physics, 26 on metaphysics, 19 on mathematics, 20 on anatomy and medicine, 49 on chemistry, 7 on miscellaneous subjects, and 212 on theology. But, properly speaking, all his works were theological.

Of course, very different estimates may be formed, and have been formed, of the character and merits of this extraordinary man. Those who depreciate him most do not deny him the possession of genius; those who extol him most cannot altogether free him from the imputation of monomania. He would probably

have effected more had he attempted less; and yet, in the state of the Mohammedan world as it then was, and as, alas! to a great extent it still is, not much could have been effected by any means. Perhaps the best that could be done was persistently and fearlessly to testify against error and for truth, that whether the Mohammedans would hear, or whether they would forbear, they might know that a prophet was among them.

And now, in bringing to a close the first section of these lectures, that relating to this Western World, while painfully conscious of their manifold imperfections, I am not without the hope that they may have produced on some minds, and deepened in others, a conviction of the greatness and the grandeur of the missionary enterprise. The young recruit, as he gazes on the time-worn and battle-rent colours of his corps, is animated by the remembrance of those who have borne them forth from the field of victory, or have wrapped them round their breasts on the field of death; and those who now enlist in the missionary army—and may I not hope that some such may be among my hearers?—serve themselves heir to a noble heritage. They register themselves on a muster-roll which contains the noblest names that history records, under the great Captain who is the chiefest among ten thousand. May I not venture to entertain the hope

that those sketches, all inadequate as they have been, may have fired the ambition of some of our ingenuous youth, and that in years long distant some of my successors in this lectureship may have to record the doings of some who hear me now, as I have done those of some of the men of other days ?

LECTURE VI.

IN our inquiries hitherto into the history of the propagation of the gospel, we have seen it brought into contact with men not differing very materially from one another in respect either of condition or character. Frank and German, Celt and Saxon, Norseman and Spaniard, were alike characterized by the vices and the virtues developed by a life in which barbarous war was the prevailing element. They differed, indeed, in respect of the degrees in which these vices and these virtues were exhibited; but the vices prevalent, and the virtues held in esteem, were essentially the same in all. Had the boundary-line assigned to our period not excluded the subject, it would have been interesting and profitable to compare the character and condition of the nations who were evangelized during the Middle Ages, with those of the peoples upon whom the gospel had been brought to bear during the apostolic age and the earlier centuries of the Christian era. We should have seen that the gospel avouches its unearthly origin by its power of acting upon men in all earthly conditions; as the sun, just because he is in the heavens, shines over all the

earth, and from equator to either pole 'nothing is hid from the heat thereof;' while in his daily journey he goes forth from his chamber, rejoicing as a strong man to run his race, and in his annual course he turns his beaming eyes to this side and that, in order that he may behold the extremities of the underlying ball. I do not know that the apologetic value of the absolute catholicity of the gospel system has been adequately appreciated; and I am inclined to think that it has not. It is a simple fact, and a very important one, that the gospel alone, of all the influences that have been brought to bear upon mankind, has been found capable of dealing with men in all the varying conditions in which they are placed; and that it deals with them, not in the way of reducing them to a dead and monotonous level in their physical, intellectual, moral, social, and political relations, but rather in the way of eliminating the evil elements from all these relations, purifying, elevating, sanctifying them all, and calling in their aid for the purification, elevation, and sanctification of those who are so related. Upon this supremely interesting subject we have not been able to enter hitherto, nor must we permit ourselves to enter upon it now. But no small portion of the interest which would attach to the treatment of it is furnished by the arrangement which we have been led to adopt, by which we are called to consider apart the missions of the Western and those of the Eastern

world; for although, in the Eastern section, on which we are now to enter, we shall have to do with the barbarism of the Tartars and the tribes bordering upon the Black Sea, which differed in no material respect from the barbarism of the Teutons and the Sclaves, yet we shall also have to do with the civilisation and the science, the luxury, the refinement, and the effeminacy of Persia and India and China.

Long before our period the gospel had made considerable way in Persia, Arabia, and especially in Armenia. In the great Persian Empire its professors were subjected to very much the same treatment that they experienced in the Roman Empire. To the Persians the doctrines of the gospel were specially offensive. The doctrine of one Creator, and that Creator all good, yet the Creator of evil creatures, wasps, serpents, tigers, devils, was to them intolerable. The assertion that the Son of the good God had become incarnate, and had been put to death by men, was regarded by them as absolute blasphemy. Then the celibacy of the clergy, which had begun to prevail, and all ascetic practices, they regarded as not merely useless, but positively sinful. The burial of the dead, too, was regarded as a grievous offence, as marring the purity of the great earth-element. There were therefore very terrible persecutions and very noble martyrdoms in Persia in the early Christian centuries. At a somewhat later time, yet still earlier than the limit of

our period, the wars that frequently ensued between the Roman and the Persian emperors would appear to have been, on the whole, rather favourable to the Persian Christians than otherwise; for if they were sometimes subjected to persecution from a suspicion that they were disloyal, and too well affected towards their Roman co-religionists, yet this disadvantage was, perhaps, more than counterbalanced by the fact that on every occasion of persecution, such as could manage to cross the frontier were sure of finding an asylum in the Roman territory.

It was probably due, in no small measure, to the political relations between the two empires, that the Nestorians gained so powerful an influence all over the East as they possessed during a great portion of the Middle Ages. As it is with the mission work of these Nestorians that I am to have to do, to a great extent, in this lecture, it is proper that I should interject a short account of their origin and peculiarities as a Christian sect.

Nestorius was a presbyter of Antioch, a man of much earnestness and severity of character, and not, it appears, very much of a theologian. In due course he became bishop of Constantinople. At the same time Cyril was bishop of Alexandria, a man of great ability, and of boundless ambition. It is impossible to study the details of the Nestorian controversy without being impressed with the conviction that Cyril's

desire to humble the see of Constantinople, and exalt that of Alexandria, had a good deal to do with it. At this time it was that the virtual worship of the Virgin Mary was coming into use, and the term was frequently employed which described her as (Θεοτόκος) the mother of God. I do not think that any orthodox Christian, who is not a Romanist, has any liking to the use of this term. All that Nestorius seems to have done, up to the time when Cyril took up the controversy, was to express disapprobation of the use of this epithet, and to urge that Mary should be called (Χριστοτόκος) the mother of Christ, and not the mother of God. But in the course of the controversy Nestorius went farther, and made statements erroneous in themselves, and from which his opponents held, and apparently with reason, that still more erroneous conclusions necessarily followed. Whether Nestorius was a Nestorian or not,—that is, whether he actually held the views which his enemies imputed to him, and on account of which they deposed and banished him,—is still matter of uncertainty. Nestorianism thus consists in holding that Christ Jesus had not two natures in one person, but rather two persons, one divine and the other human, the former dwelling in the latter as in a temple. I am not going to discuss this doctrine as a theologian, else I might show that it would lead to conclusions opposed to conclusions which we must draw from the scriptural statements

respecting the blessed mystery of the incarnation. I have only to do with the inquiry how far we ought to regard Nestorian missions as Christian missions, whether the Nestorians held and taught what we regard as saving truth, or whether their error so corrupted and perverted the truth which they held, as to neutralize it, and render it inefficacious for the salvation of men. Now, the Nestorians never were accused, even by their adversaries, of denying either the divinity or the humanity of Christ. Their error had reference only to the manner of the union of the two natures. They taught that, from the moment of His conception, Christ was truly God and truly man. Although I would not say that their error was only in metaphysics, and not in theology, yet I think it may be safely said that they erred in the metaphysical rather than in the practical or properly doctrinal department of theology. Thousands and tens of thousands of Christian men and women in all ages of the church have never thought seriously of the matters of difference between the Nestorians and the orthodox, and have never formed any definite opinion concerning them. But if this be so, it would seem to follow that these differences do not affect the essential doctrines of the Christian faith; and therefore we may well rejoice in the propagation of Nestorianism, believing that it contains the truth of God for the salvation of man. Indeed, if we were to withhold our sympathy from all

but those whose sentiments we cordially approve, and to regard none as Christian missionaries but those who held in every particular the true doctrines of the gospel as set forth in the word of God, our field should be narrowed to a point; for there was probably no one of all the mediæval missionaries who held and taught every portion of that truth which we humbly but earnestly hold. And as we come down to the later portion of the Middle Ages, the truth of the gospel is more and more obscured. Romanism more and more takes the place of Christianity, the cross more and more supersedes the Crucified One; zeal for the honour of the Holy See is more and more substituted for the desire on the part of Christians to let their light so shine before men, that seeing their good works they might glorify their Father in heaven. In the course of this lecture I shall have occasion to allude at some length to contests long waged between the Nestorians and the Romanists in Tartary and China; and I say once for all, that I do not sympathize fully with either party of combatants.

At a very early period—earlier than that which comes within our cognizance—the Nestorians had established great schools at Nisibis, Edessa, and Seleucia, from which there went forth multitudes of missionaries, men of enlightened and earnest zeal, who had propagated the gospel with much success in various countries. Armenia, for example, boasts to

have been the first nation that nationally embraced the gospel. In Persia, as I have said, there were before this time many Christians, and when the Nestorians laboured there, they would of course receive all the better welcome because they were under the ban of the Council of Ephesus, whose decrees had been confirmed by the emperor of Constantinople. Of these two countries I shall not have more to say for a long time, because the former was not henceforth the scene of any very important mission work, and because the latter was soon brought under the sway of the Mussulmans, who, although they generally granted toleration to the Christians, so far as to allow them to profess their own faith and practise its ordinances, yet refused to allow them to make any attempts at proselytism. But the great work of the Nestorians as missionaries in the earlier portion of the Middle Ages was in Tartary, and through Tartary in China. It is to this work that I am now to call your attention at some length.

All who have had occasion to make any inquiries as to early church history are aware that there is no church of any consequence on behalf of which the claim has not been put forward that it was founded by an apostle, or by some apostolic man. Such claims have been made on behalf of the church in Tartary and China. This matter does not come within the scope of my present inquiries, and therefore I shall only say that there is good reason to believe that the Apostles Thomas,

Andrew, Bartholomew, and Thaddeus, preached the gospel in the eastern countries of Asia, and that it is quite possible that one or other, or all of them, visited those districts to which we apply the general name of Tartary. I shall have occasion to speak of these traditions, though incidentally, in my next lecture, with reference to India; and at present I only say that although it is quite possible that they may have been in Tartary, yet there is no evidence to prove, or even to make it likely, that they were. As to the mission work carried on in Tartary and China during the sixth century we have no details, but we have sufficient reason to believe that it must have been extensive and successful. Thus we are informed that Salibazacha appointed metropolitans of Heria, Samarkand, and China. Now this Salibazacha was patriarch of the Nestorians from A.D. 714 to A.D. 728. 'It is certain, then,' says Mosheim,[1] 'that China must have been converted to Christ long before the times of Salibazacha, for how could a metropolitan have been placed over them if the Christian religion had not spread far and wide among them, and several bishops had governed them? But that could not have been effected in a short time.'

No inconsiderable light has been cast upon the

[1] The numerous references in this lecture to Mosheim are not to his *History*, but to a book of great research and great value, *Historia Tartarorum Ecclesiastica.*

extent to which the gospel had spread in China, and the favour with which it was viewed by rulers and people, by the discovery of a large stone, with a long inscription, in which are set forth some of the doctrines of Christianity, and a statement as to the introduction of the gospel into China by one Olopen in 635. This stone is said to be 10 feet high and 5 feet broad. The inscription is in an old Syrian character, which is known to have been employed in Syria mainly for inscriptions, and differing considerably from the ordinary Syrian character. Copies of the inscription were sent to Europe, and gave rise to much discussion among the learned; I have seen two independent translations of it—one into Latin, and the other, through French, into English. These differ from one another just enough to show that they have been made independently of one another, while they agree so far as to show that each gives a substantially correct account of the contents of the document. There has been a great amount of controversy as to the genuineness of this monument, some maintaining that it had been manufactured by the Jesuits, by whom the inscription was sent to Europe, and others being convinced that it was a real record, constructed at the date which it bears. This is not the time or the place to go into the controversy at any length. I shall only quote the judgment of Mosheim in its favour, with which I see no reason to disagree. 'It is

not my part,' says Mosheim, 'to settle this strife of the learned, or to examine by the scale of exact judgment all the arguments which have been adduced on either side. Meantime, I do not shrink from attaching myself to those who acquit the Romish Church and the Jesuit Society of all deceit in the matter, and who regard this monument as a rare and precious record of antiquity. For, to say nothing of the arguments of the learned men, by which they strove to shake the credit of this monument, and which certainly are not unanswerable, assuredly the ends which the Jesuits might have proposed to themselves, or which they are said to have intended, could not possibly be furthered by such fraud. For they must either have designed to confirm the doctrine of the Romish Church, or to prove the antiquity of the Christian religion in China. It is not easy to accept the former supposition, since the doctrine of the Nestorians rather than that of the Latins is set forth in the Chinese monument; and *that* the Romanists themselves acknowledge. Nor is the latter supposition credible. For the Chinese regard every event that has occurred within a thousand years or more as modern, so that although they believed that the Christian religion was proclaimed to their ancestors in the seventh century, they would by no means regard it as an ancient doctrine.' I venture to think these arguments altogether unanswerable. Once admit the idea

of a pious fraud, and it is impossible to conceive any reason why it should have been so unskilfully—I might say, so suicidally—executed.

The Abbé Huc gives at length the arguments of Voltaire and Mr. Milne against the genuineness of the inscription, and the arguments of Abel-Remusat and others in its favour, and sums up nearly in the words which I have just translated from Mosheim, and which he evidently had before him, although he does not in this place refer to Mosheim. Altogether the question may be considered as settled in favour of the authenticity of the inscription. It gives us but little historical information beyond the fact that it was erected A.D. 781; that in the year 636 a man of high virtue, named Olopen, came from the country of Ta-Thsin; 'Directed by the blue clouds, he bore the Scriptures of the true doctrine;' that he was well received by the emperor; that he translated the Scriptures into the language of China, and that a special edict—which is given—was promulgated for the proclamation and diffusion of this doctrine. It then refers to persecutions which afterwards broke out during the reign of an empress; but a list is given of her successors, all of whom are celebrated for benefactions to the church. Thus I regard it as proved that for a century and a half the gospel was preached in China, and, with the slight exception to which I have referred, tolerated and even encouraged by a succession of emperors. Yet I suspect

that it met with little more success than opposition. I strongly suspect that there was a disposition on the part of the preachers to be satisfied with royal favour, and that they obtained that favour mainly by reason of their being so satisfied. It is not only from this invaluable document, but from the other Chinese records as well, that we infer that at that time the exclusiveness and jealousy which we have learned to regard as the most special characteristic of the Chinese did not exist; that, on the contrary, there was a spirit of catholicity, tolerance, liberalism, indifferentism,—call it what you will,—which was quite willing to be on good terms with a religion of little earnestness, which was too willing to be on good terms with *it*. The emperors who are represented as patronizing the church do not seem to have even professed the gospel themselves; and I have no doubt that they patronized it only as one of various religions, all equally lifeless and cold, while they would either have stood aloof from, or would have set themselves in direct antagonism to, a living and energetic gospel.

It would appear to have been by a political revolution—and it must have been a fundamental and entire one—that this state of things was brought to an end, so that for three centuries we hear nothing of the existence of Christianity in China. Such a revolution took place toward the close of the ninth century, when the Thang dynasty was overthrown, and that of Song

succeeded. The rulers of the former dynasty seem to have been tolerant, after an indifferent *dilettante* fashion; while with the succeeding dynasty was introduced that system of intolerance and exclusiveness which, after another period of toleration to which we shall refer in the sequel, we have learned to regard as specially characteristic of the Chinese rulers and people.

The introduction of the gospel into China by Olopen in 636 appears to have been closely connected with, or rather to have formed part of, a great movement which was made by the Nestorians in the seventh and eighth centuries for the diffusion of the gospel all over the Asiatic continent. I have already stated that Salibazacha, who was patriarch of the Nestorians from 714 to 728, appointed metropolitans of Heria, Samarkand, and China; and this implies that there were extensive churches in these regions. Fifty years later, Timotheus, who was patriarch from A.D. 777 to A.D. 820, sent religious men to preach the gospel to the various nations of Upper Asia. At that time there was a very celebrated Nestorian monastery which Huc calls Beth-hobeh, and which I suppose to be identical with that monastery on Mount Abu, of which the Hon. Mr. Curzon wrote a very interesting account some years ago, and where he purchased whole bagfuls of ancient MSS. at prices which showed that their possessors regarded them as absolute rubbish. In that monastery, in the time of the patriarch Timotheus, there was

a very learned monk named Subchal-Jesu. Him Timotheus sent as a missionary bishop to Western Tartary, to the regions lying to the east of the Caspian Sea. There he preached the gospel with much success, founded many churches, and ordained many priests. Steadily he proceeded eastward, traversed Tartary and China, and laboured everywhere with gratifying success. Fatigued with his abundant labours, or requiring counsel and aid in his developing work, he resolved to pay a visit to the patriarch; but on the way he was attacked by robbers, and murdered. The patriarch appointed two men, Kurdage and Juballah, to be his successors, and sent with them fifteen monks from the monastery of Beth-hobeh. An incident, of no great magnitude in itself, but interesting as casting light upon the simple Christian character of the good patriarch Timotheus, is recorded by several writers. I give it in the words of Huc:—

'Soon after his arrival at the place of his mission, Juballah wrote to the patriarch Timotheus:—"By the help of your prayers, and by the grace of Christ, many nations have been converted to the true faith; and it is important to place at their head bishops chosen from amongst the monks who accompanied us to those countries." The patriarch replied to him and his companions as follows:—"It is true that the ordination of a bishop absolutely requires the presence of three others. But since you are at present in regions where it is not possible to collect this number, it is granted to you by the word of the Lord, which rules and governs all things, that you and Bishop Kurdage shall consecrate the bishop whom you shall have chosen. To represent the third prelate, you will place the book of the Gospels on the seat at the

right hand of the altar, and consecrate the first bishop according to this rite, and by the grace of God. As for the rest, they may then be consecrated by three bishops. I pray the Holy Spirit to pour out His blessing upon you, as He formerly did on the apostles."'

We hear no more of the progress of the gospel in Tartary or in China until the beginning of the eleventh century. Even its existence we only infer from incidental notices in one or two Arabic writings. At the beginning of the eleventh century a very important work began in Tartary, which, at a later period, attracted much attention in Europe, and of which I must now give a somewhat detailed account. In the twelfth and thirteenth centuries all manner of stories were circulated in Europe regarding a certain Prester John, who was said to be at once a king of immense magnificence and a priest of exceeding piety, and who was regarded as a second Melchizedek—a king of righteousness and peace, and a priest of the Most High God. In order to ascertain the truth of these reports, John II., king of Portugal, in 1487 sent Peter Covillanus, Alphonse Paiva, and two Jews, to institute inquiries respecting Prester John and his dominions. They, finding a Christian king in Abyssinia, concluded that this was he of whom they were in search, and on their return to Portugal reported accordingly. That the king of Abyssinia was a Christian king there is no doubt; and, therefore, that some of the things related of Prester John were true of him, is in every way

probable. But it seems to be quite certain that John's ambassadors were altogether mistaken in identifying the one with the other. Without going into details, I shall only state that *Prester John* was evidently a name given to a succession of Christian kings who reigned in Caracorum, the capital of a Tartar tribe called Kerit or Carait. The account of the conversion of the first of them I translate from Mosheim :—

'The first of whom we hear is he who, with his people to the number of more than 200,000, embraced Christianity. This remarkable event occurred in the first year of the eleventh century, and is related by Abulpharagius from a certain letter which Ebed-Jesu, the metropolitan of Maru, wrote to John the Nestorian patriarch. The king of the Tartar people, who are called Berit, while out hunting, lost his way. When he was despairing of safety, a certain holy one appeared to him in a vision, and promised that he would show him the way on condition of his professing the name and doctrine of Christ. Without hesitation he made the promise, and was conducted by the saint into the way. When he returned home he sent for the Christian merchants who were staying in his settlement, and being instructed by them in the doctrine of salvation, he desired to be washed in the holy water of baptism by the foresaid metropolitan of Maru; and as his people used no food but flesh and mares' milk, he asked of him what they were to do in times of fasting. When Ebed-Jesu heard this, he submitted the matter to the patriarch, writing to him the letter which has been referred to. The patriarch instructed him to send two presbyters and deacons to this nation of Tartars, to baptize the converts, and direct them that on fast-days they should abstain from flesh, and use only milk. Although it does not seem that this remarkable conversion of Tartars to Christ is liable to any doubt or uncertainty, yet I would not say that the cause of it is not less certain or probable. Nor, indeed, will we be easily persuaded that in

reality a saint or an angel appeared to the bewildered king. An intelligent judge of the matter will rather believe that the king received the doctrine of the Saviour from the merchants without any miracle. But if any one shall pertinaciously defend the story, and maintain that some such miracle occurred, I would modestly ask of him whether that saint whom the Tartar is said to have seen when in danger of his life might not have been a hermit or anchorite, who, living in these mountains and desert places, and being acquainted with the ways, brought the king back to his friends? However the matter might be in this respect, this prince is the first of those who, among the Tartars, embraced Christianity, and became known to Europeans under the name of Prester John. What was his original name I do not know, for he appears to have taken the name of John at his baptism.'

I would venture to suggest that the story of the king's wandering, and perplexity, and despair is probably an allegorical representation of his doubt and uncertainty while he was groping after God, if haply he might find Him, and that he was directed by a holy man into the way of peace, as many a pilgrim has been guided by many an Evangelist to the wicket-gate and the narrow way. I would venture further to suggest that, as the name John appears to have been given to him only in the European accounts of him, it was probably a corruption of his proper Tartar title of Khan.

There seems to have been a regular succession of these Prester Johns for about 180 years, the priesthood being probably regarded as hereditary as well as the khanate. Their history is little known; but it is evident that the Nestorian Church was established

among this tribe, and that they continued to make a profession of the gospel. As to the extent of the tribe, or as to the extent of its acceptance of the gospel, nothing is known. There is, indeed, a letter extant, said to have been addressed by one of these priest-kings to the Emperor of Constantinople, in which he describes himself as ruling from India to Babylon, and having seventy kings tributary to him; but Mosheim does not accept this letter as genuine; and I think he has good reason for its rejection.

The last of these priest-khans was Tagrul, upon whom the Chinese emperor conferred the title of Ungh-Khan, or Great Khan, by which title, rather than his name, he is generally known. In the time of this khan the strife began, which was long and direfully waged, betwixt the Romanists and the Nestorians in Tartary. In the year 1177, Pope Alexander III. heard from a physician called Philip that he had travelled into Tartary, that he had found there a Tartar prince who was indeed a Christian, but alien from the Roman Church, and that he vehemently desired to be received into that church, and to be instructed in its doctrines. This extremely improbable story the pope seems to have believed. He therefore consecrated Philip as a bishop, and sent him back to Tartary with a letter, which has come down to us. In that letter the pope congratulates the khan on the desire which he understands him to have expressed for

admission into the Catholic Church, and charges him to profit by the instructions of Philip. I have no doubt that Philip, on his first visit, had been deceived by the Oriental politeness of the khan and his courtiers; and that he took for an acquiescence in his proposals as a zealot what was merely the desire not to give a very emphatic contradiction to the statements made by a guest. But it was a different matter altogether when that guest returned invested with official authority, and claimed the right of subjecting his host and his people to an alien power, which asserted indeed a divine right to rule them, but of whose existence they had hitherto been in absolute ignorance. It is not wonderful, then, that we hear no more of Philip and his mission; and that the indefatigable compiler Baronius acknowledges that he has not been able to trace any result of it.

But the dominion of this remarkable race of priestly kings was soon to terminate, through the rise of one of those so-called *great* conquerors, who fought for the mere sake of fighting, and conquered for the mere sake of conquest. The early history of Chenghiz-Khan is involved in considerable obscurity. He was born, it is said, in 1163. His father was chieftain of a tribe of Mongols, who seem to have been either subject to, or in alliance with, Ungh-Khan. According to one account, he was brought up in the court of that khan, and, presuming on the royal favour, asked his daughter in marriage. His suit was contemptuously

rejected. Whether this were the cause of his raising the standard of rebellion or not, he did raise it, and in a great battle obtained a signal victory. This was in the year 1202. He now married as a prisoner of war the princess whose hand had been refused to him by her father in his day of prosperity. Thus descendants of Prester John of the female line still succeeded to the khanate of Tartary. Chenghiz now began his career of conquest. His troops overran the whole of Central Asia, and the whole of the north of China became subject to him. 'From the Caspian Sea to the Indus,' says a historian, 'more than 1000 miles in extent, the whole country was laid waste with fire and sword by these ruthless barbarians. It was the greatest calamity which had befallen the human race since the deluge, and five centuries have barely been sufficient to repair that desolation.' It does not appear that Chenghiz had any religion of his own, or that he cared for one rather than another. In his dominions he had to deal with Christians, Mohammedans, and idolaters, and he does not appear to have treated any of them, as such, unjustly. But his tolerance does not appear to have proceeded from any enlightened views as to liberty of conscience or the right of private judgment. He seems to have had but one idea of the use of men in this world. They were either made that he might kill them, or that they might help him to kill others. No matter whether

they were Christians, Mohammedans, or heathens, they were equally fit for his purpose of killing or being killed. I need not say that the influence of such a man, or rather monster, over his people must have been altogether in an anti-Christian direction; and probably it had been better for the gospel among his people that his Christian subjects had been ranged among his enemies. Yet there do seem to have been some elements of humanity in the monster's breast. And although he was altogether uneducated, being unable either to read or to write, he seems to have had ideas of administration of the countries which submitted to his sword. Nothing is more remarkable than the influence which his name and his understood sentiments operated upon the minds of his successors long after his death. So far as I can understand the arrangement which he made for the succession to the throne, it was to be at once hereditary and elective; that is, all his lineal descendants were to be electors and eligible. They were to choose the one among themselves who should be supreme khan, while the succession to the khanates of the separate tribes was hereditary. He also inculcated upon them absolute indifference in matters of religion; and to this they seem invariably to have adhered. Some represent them as having been a kind of eclectics, acknowledging only the doctrine which Christians, Mohammedans, and idolaters held in common, the doctrine of the existence of a superior

power, but refusing to have any opinion as to any point on which these differed. It may have been so; but it rather seems that they were as little Deists as they were Christians, or Mussulmans, or idolaters. They were, in the most absolute sense, simply secularists.

The dynasty founded by Chenghiz lasted for more than a century and a half. Every one of its members continued the work of devastation and bloodshed which its founder had begun; and as he had left them nothing to do in Central Asia, they turned their arms towards Europe and Palestine. The terror which they created in Hungary, Poland, and Russia, the conquests that they made there, and the devastation which they effected, belong to civil rather than ecclesiastical or missionary history. Immense regions, with flourishing cities, and quiet villages, and waving corn-fields, forts, and mansions, and churches, were converted into absolute deserts, in which neither man, woman, nor child was left alive; but great heaps of corpses, soon converted into skeletons, were the only monument of their ravages. In vain did kings enter into defensive leagues with each other, in vain did pope after pope summon all the princes of Christendom to go forth in crusade to repel them. It seemed as if the world was given over to be the plaything of malignant demons. There was only one thing that seemed providentially to intervene for the deliverance of Christendom. That was

their hatred of the Mussulmans, whom the Christians also hated. There were therefore various alliances formed betwixt them and the Crusaders for the rescue of the Holy Sepulchre from the hands of the infidels; but no good came of them. The saintly Louis IX. (St. Louis) of France in particular sent one embassy after another to the Mongol Great Khan. The ambassadors were ecclesiastics; and we have preserved to us the narrative of one of them, Rubruquis, which has every appearance of truthfulness, and which contains much interesting matter regarding the condition of things in Tartary in the middle of the thirteenth century. The picture which it presents of the Nestorian Christians and their clergy is not flattering, and it is to be feared that it is but too correct. The great Khan Mangou received Rubruquis courteously as the ambassador of Louis. He also arranged and personally attended a great debate beween the Christians, Mussulmans, and Buddhists, where the advocates were prohibited, under pain of death, from saying anything reproachful of one another, and where Rubruquis assures us that he gained a complete victory over both classes of his opponents. This I think very likely; but it is not so likely that these opponents acknowledged themselves to be vanquished, as he tells us that they did. At all events no good came of it, and it seems to have ended, as all gatherings of the Tartars are represented by Rubruquis as ending, in a scene of drunken revelry.

It is indeed related, on the authority of an Armenian historian, that Mangou had before this embraced Christianity and been baptized; and this is not impossible, as he seems to have had a really Christian mother, of the Prester John family. But his baptism, if it really took place, evidently did not mean much.

His successor, Coplai or Kublai, gave up to his brother Haluk the western portion of his dominions, while he himself retained the eastern. Haluk greatly favoured the Christians, though it is doubtful whether he ever embraced the gospel. He at all events had a zealous Christian wife, and she showed her zeal, unhappily not only by heaping favours upon the Christians, but by oppressing and persecuting the Mohammedans. There seems to be no doubt, however, that successive khans represented themselves to popes and European kings as Christians, in order to gain their aid in fighting with the Saracens and Persian Mussulmans. One, who seemed at first to show some genuine Christian zeal, formally apostatized, and embraced Mohammedanism. But this the Tartars did not approve. They acquiesced in the order of things introduced by Chenghiz, that their rulers should be neutral, and they did not object to their making a heartless profession of Christianity; but they could not bear that they should profess the faith of those whom they regarded as their natural enemies. Therefore the apostate was driven from his throne.

I mentioned that Kublai, on coming to the throne, gave up the western portion of his enormous kingdom to his brother Haluk. He himself fixed the seat of his empire at Pekin, and appears to have become more of a Chinaman than a Tartar.

'Kublai,' says Huc, 'was indisputably the sovereign of the most enormous empire that the annals of the world have ever made known. It comprehended the whole of China, Corea, Thibet, Tonquin, and Cochin-China, a great part of India beyond the Ganges, many islands of the Indian Ocean, and the whole north of the continent of Asia, from the Pacific to the Dnieper. Persia also was a feudatory of his throne, its sovereigns, the successors of Houlagou, receiving their investiture from the Emperor of China; and as the dominions of these great vassals extended to the Mediterranean and the frontiers of the Greek Empire, it may be said that the whole of Asia was subject to the laws of the great khan, who had chosen Pekin as the central seat of his government. What was the empire of Alexander the Great, or of the Romans, or even of Genghiz-Khan, when compared with that of Kublai?'

It would appear that Kublai, after he fixed his court at Pekin, embraced Buddhism; but he not only tolerated, but sought to conciliate, the disciples at once of Mohammed and Christ. He used to say that there were four great prophets, Jesus Christ, Mohammed, Moses, and Chakya-Mouni; that he honoured them all, and invoked the blessing and the help of all. It was in his time that Marco Polo, a Venetian, went to Pekin, remained for a long time in his service, was employed in important offices of trust, travelled over a vast extent of country, and, on his return to Europe,

dictated a narrative which is by far the most interesting production of the age. This work, like the *Pilgrim's Progress,* was written in prison; and although its author was at first ridiculed as a romancer, yet subsequent travellers have so confirmed his statements, that they are now admitted universally to be substantially true. Marco's narrative gives very little detail as to the condition of the church and of Christians in the countries where he sojourned so long. But his frequent allusions make it manifest that Christianity had obtained a footing in the empire; that the Nestorian bishops and clergy occupied a creditable position, but that they did not maintain an aggressive attitude with reference to the Mohammedanism and heathenism with which they were in contact. The history both of the Western Tartary, in which Persia was then included, and the Eastern Tartary, of which China was the main constituent, is made very bewildering and perplexing by the multitude of letters which have come down to us, in which the kings speak of themselves as Christians, and are addressed by popes and the Christian kings of Europe as Christian brethren. This must be accounted for in one or other of these two ways,—either that in their correspondence with Europe these kings represented themselves as Christians, in order to procure aid in extending their empire over Syria and Egypt; or else that they had embraced Christianity in a spirit

of indifference, or as simply indicating that they were uncompromising enemies of the Mohammedans.

It was under the popedom of Nicolas III., and in the last decade of the thirteenth century, that the Romanists took up the work of Eastern missions systematically. They sent multitudes of preachers, generally Franciscans, who exhibited much of the zeal which has generally been characteristic of that order. In last lecture I had occasion to speak of the founder of that order, and stated that if he sent his disciples on a hard service in Africa, he did not shrink from equally dangerous service himself. It is said that one reason which influenced the selection of the Franciscans for the dangerous and honourable work of Eastern missions, was that through their numbers and their zeal they were becoming so powerful that the pope began to be afraid of their influence. In order to attach them to himself, or in order to divide and so conquer them, he offered them preferment,—mitres in hand, and cardinals' hats in the bush. Their fiery general took alarm lest in this way his order should be broken up, and his begging brethren should degenerate into mere bishops and cardinals. Believing that active employment, and a definite object set before them, would, more than anything else, tend to strengthen their *esprit de corps*, he set before them the great design of converting the Moslem world to the faith of

Christ. Himself undertook to beard the lion in his den, to deal with those who were actually in the field against the armies of the cross. In the year 1296 he appeared in the camp of the Crusaders, who were engaged in the siege of Damietta, at the mouth of the Nile. There he spent many hours in rapt devotion, and then went forth into the neutral ground between the two camps, wearing the squalid garb of a mendicant, his bare feet torn with the sharp stones of the desert, and his shrill voice chanting the grand words of the 23d Psalm: 'Though I pass through the valley of the shadow of death, I shall fear no evil.' He was apprehended by the Saracen outposts, and, at his own request, was conducted into the presence of the sultan. The sultan is said to have treated him with great respect, to have listened to his preaching on several occasions, and to have dismissed him at last with the request that he would pray for him, that God would enlighten him to hold fast whatever faith was most acceptable in His sight. We are told that he made to the sultan what must appear to us a strange proposal, but which I find was often made in substance by these zealous missionaries. 'Kindle a fire,' said he; 'let thy priests and me enter it together, and let God determine whether the true faith be on my side or theirs.' This challenge, it is almost needless to say, was not accepted by the Imams. 'Then,' said Francis, 'only promise to become a Christian, and I will enter

the fire alone. If I come forth unharmed, acknowledge Christ; but even should I be burnt, conclude not that my faith is false, but only that on account of my sins I am unworthy to receive this honour.' Sir James Stephen remarks that the fact that the missionary's head was neither bartered for a gold besant by the soldiers, nor amputated by the scimitar of their leader, may be explained either by the Oriental reverence for supposed insanity, or by the universal reverence for self-denying courage. No one who had intelligently pondered on our blessed Lord's refusal to cast Himself down from the pinnacle of the temple, because it is written, 'Thou shalt not tempt [make experiments upon] the Lord thy God,' could have made the proposal which Francis made. Yet he who made it, and made it evidently in all sincerity and honesty, had qualities, as I said in last lecture, which Luther might have recognised as kindred to his own.

It is very noticeable, and very lamentable, that this is almost the solitary instance that I have been able to discover of any attempt made to deal with the Moslems by missionary means. The idea with which Peter the Hermit impregnated the very atmosphere of Europe was the reverse of this. To conquer and to slay was the grand object to be achieved; to convert and to save was unthought of and untried. There were doubtless many priests and even bishops in the ranks of the Crusaders, but their office was to receive

the shrifts of the dying, and to bury the dead ; and there were special orders of soldier-priests or priest-soldiers ; and indeed every Crusader was regarded as employed in a holy work, and as having a certain measure of the sacredness of the priestly character attaching to him, but it was a priesthood of blood ; and despite the air of romance that has been thrown around the crusades, and despite the ascription of all noble qualities of chivalry and generosity to the Crusaders, it was a priesthood of hatred and malevolence. But about this time the popes seem to have set in earnest about the conversion of the Tartars, and there are several men who were employed in this work whose names are well worthy to be held in admiring remembrance. At the head of the list, on account of his ecclesiastical dignity, in the estimate of those who hold such dignity in esteem, on account of his virtuous character and his life-long labours in the service of Christ, in the estimate of those in whose reckoning ecclesiastical dignity does not stand for much,—on all accounts, at the head of this list stands John de Monte-Corvino, of whose history I am now to relate some particulars.

He was an Italian, born in 1247 at Monte-Corvino, in Apulia, from which, according to the custom of his time, he took his name. Of his early history nothing is known. He first comes under our notice as a Franciscan sent to Tartary by Pope Nicolas in 1298 ; but in the letters which he took with him from the

pope addressed to various potentates, it is evident that he had been in Tartary before. Thus the pope writes to 'Argon, the illustrious king of the Tartars:' 'Our beloved son, Fr. John de Monte-Corvino, of the order of Minorites, the bearer of these presents, *coming before us from the Oriental regions*, has made known to our apostleship, in the way of accurate relation, that you, as inspired by the Lord, in whose hand are the hearts of the princes of the earth, and prevented by the gift of special grace, bear an affection of great devotion towards us and the Roman Church, and also towards the other churches of Christians.' I may just state, with reference to these expressions, that there seems to be little doubt that the pope, and the people of Europe generally, had been led by representations from the East to think far too favourably of the state of matters in Tartary and China. It has even been suggested that the Romish missionaries must have forged letters purporting to be from kings and Nestorian ecclesiastics to the pope, expressing a desire to be received into the communion of the Catholic Church. One is unwilling to entertain such a position, but yet it seems as if we were driven to it. When, for example, we read a statement that a certain king has been baptized, and when we find the pope, two years after, addressing a letter to that same king, and urging him not to delay his baptism, we cannot but see that the first account must have been inaccurate. So, when we

hear of the Armenian archbishop seeking reconciliation with the Catholic Church, and yet find that nothing ever came of it, we can scarcely doubt that, at the best, some complimentary expressions which he may have dropped, or some sentiment which he may have expressed as to the beauty and well-becomingness of such as are brethren dwelling together in unity, had been taken to mean a great deal more than they were intended to mean. But with all this, it is manifest that Christianity was in the ascendant among the Western Tartars at the end of the thirteenth and beginning of the fourteenth century.

But to return to John de Monte-Corvino. He set out, as I have said, in 1298. He first went to Armenia, and then to Persia, and delivered the letters of the pope to the kings of these countries, who probably were both Christians, although the latter was that king to whom I referred a little while ago, who had not been baptized. This seems to have occupied him for full two years, and then he resolved to set out for China, taking India in his way. Of his visit to India I shall have occasion to speak in my next lecture, and shall not further refer to it now. His land journey, from the south of India to Pekin in the north of China, is a feat worthy of any of our greatest travellers and explorers, and it is greatly to be regretted that no record of it is known to exist. On his arrival in China he did not find the condition

of matters quite so favourable as it was a short time before. Kublai, without altogether breaking off from Christianity and from Mohammedanism, had adopted Buddhism, or rather a composite religion made up of a mixture of Buddhism and Confucianism. Formerly there had been concurrent endowment of all the systems; now this new compound might be said to have become the established religion, while Christianity and Mohammedanism received what we might call a *regium donum.* In this arrangement the Christians seem to have contentedly acquiesced. From the very beginning of his operations John seems to have had obstacles thrown in his way by the Nestorians, who regarded him as a trespasser upon their field. Accord- to his account, their treatment of him was most repre- hensible; but it is to be remembered that if we had their account of the same transactions, they would probably differ very widely from his. He states that they even went the length of accusing him of having murdered in India a man who was going as ambassador to Kublai, and appropriated the rich presents which he was bringing to the Chinese emperor. His account of these matters I translate. It is contained in a letter, of which the beginning is lost, and consequently it is not known to whom it was addressed:—

'I, Fr. John de Monte-Corvino, of the order of Minorite friars, set out from Tauris, a city of the Persians, A.D. 1291, and

entered into India. And I was in the country of India, at the church of St. Thomas the Apostle, thirteen months; and there I baptized about a hundred persons in divers places; and the companion of my life was Fr. Nicolas de Pistoria, of the order of Preaching friars, who died there, and was buried in the same church. And I, proceeding farther, came to Cathay, the kingdom of the emperor of the Tartars, who is called the Great Cham. Having presented to him letters from our lord the pope, I invited him to the Catholic faith of Jesus Christ. But he was too inveterate in idolatry; yet he conferred many benefits on the Christians, and I was with him for two years.[1] Certain Nestorians, bearing the title of Christianity, but deviating widely from the Christian religion, have gained so much influence in these regions that they do not permit any Christian of another ritual to have even the smallest oratory, nor to preach any other doctrine than the Nestorian. As no apostle, or disciple of the apostles, came to these lands, therefore these Nestorians by themselves, and by means of others suborned by bribes, raised the most dreadful persecutions against me, asserting that I had not been sent by our lord the pope, but was a great spy and a perverter of men; and after a time they produced other false witnesses, who said that a nuncio had been sent, bringing a vast treasure to the emperor, and that I killed him in India, and appropriated the treasure. And this machination lasted about five years. Thus I was often brought to trial with the brand of a murderer upon me. At length, by the confession of a certain person—God so ordering—the emperor was convinced of my innocence, and of the malice of my rivals, whom he sent into banishment with their wives and children.'

As it has been wittily said of an epigram, that it is like a scorpion whose sting is in its tail, so it may be said of this extract, the last clause being intended,

[1] The expression is not quite intelligible. I understand him to mean that he was there two years before the occurrence which he is about to relate.

unless I greatly mistake, as a scornful allusion to the non-celibacy of the Nestorian clergy. It is difficult to believe that the good John should have made such a statement as that contained in this extract had it not been true. But it is difficult, on the other hand, to believe that the Nestorian clergy entered into so base a conspiracy; and difficult to believe that the emperor could have kept a charge of murder hanging over the head of a man for five years, merely on the testimony of men who could not have been in India at the time when the murder was said to have been committed. Upon the whole, I think we must just leave the question with unsolved difficulties on either side.

The same letter goes on to tell of his work and his success. For eleven years he laboured all alone. Then he was joined by Fr. Arnold, a German, from Cologne. He built a church at Pekin, in the tower of which were three bells which were rung at all the canonical hours. From the prominence which he gives to this circumstance, it is evident that he set much store by it, and we are not to regard this as a proof of ritualism or externalism, for in the position which he occupied it *was* of some moment to call the attention of the people of the city so many times each day to the fact of the existence of a church among them. He tells us further, that he bought one hundred and fifty boys, of from seven to thirteen years of age, and these he taught Latin and Greek, taught also to

copy manuscripts, and especially to chant the services of the church; and he tells us that the emperor used often to come and hear them sing, and was greatly pleased with their performance. But most important of all his services was, in our Protestant estimation, his translating of the New Testament and the Psalms into the language of the people, a work which few Romanist missionaries of our day think of undertaking. At the date of his letter (1305) he had baptized about six thousand, and was constantly baptizing. Rather strangely, he says that but for the accusations brought against him by the Nestorians, he would have baptized more than thirty thousand, which, I presume, must simply mean that he would have baptized many times more than he actually did. In another part of the letter, lamenting his single-handedness, he says, 'If I had had two or three brethren fellow-labourers, perhaps the Emperor Cham would have been baptized.' He naturally dwells with great satisfaction upon the conversion of a certain king or prince George from Nestorianism:—

'A certain King George of that region, of the sect of Nestorian Christians, who was of the illustrious family of that great king who was called Presbyter John of India, adhered to me in the first year of my coming hither, and being converted by me to the truth of the true Catholic faith, he took minor orders, and when I celebrated mass he assisted me, clothed in his royal robes. But some other Nestorians accused him of apostasy. Yet he brought over great part of his people to the true Catholic faith, and built a church, suitable in beauty to his kingly magnificence, to the

honour of our God, of the Holy Trinity, and of our lord the pope, calling it the Roman Church. Six years ago this King George departed to the Lord, a true Christian, leaving his son and heir almost in the cradle, who is now nine years old. But the brothers of this King George, being obstinate in the errors of Nestorius, after the king's death subverted all whom he had converted, bringing them back to the old schism. And because I was alone I could not go to that church which he built, which is twenty days' journey from this; but if some good coadjutors and fellow-labourers should come, I hope in God that all might be set right.'

His cry for help was heard at length. Pope Clement V., in 1307, elevated Pekin to the rank of an archiepiscopal see, of which he appointed John the first archbishop. He also instructed the general of the Franciscans to choose seven members of his order, who should be sent as bishops under the archbishop of Pekin. Of the seven who were so sent, three died on the way, a fourth lost heart and returned to Europe. The other three arrived in China in 1308, to Corvino's unspeakable joy. At the date of his letter, from which I have quoted, three years before this, he had been twelve years without any tidings from the Western world, and it is not likely that he received any during these three years, 1305–8. To be fifteen years without communication with country or church, to hear no word and see no face which reminds us of home and loved ones, is a martyrdom to which now-a-days no one is likely to be called; and let us not forget that we owe our exemption from it, in great measure, under God, to those who endured it in other

days; for they diffused that civilisation, and opened the way for that commerce which has practically contracted the world into a point, in so far as communication is concerned, and thus made exile an impossibility.

For twenty years longer John de Monte-Corvino continued his quiet work, and died peacefully in 1330, forty-one years after his departure for China, and probably a full half-century after his first entrance upon mission-work in the East. A man apparently of boundless patience and perseverance, rather than of any great power of action;—too ready to acquiesce in a negative state of things, and to rejoice in the absence of violent opposition, while there was no positive acceptance of the salvation which it was his duty and his privilege to proclaim to the millions of China. Not a man of greatness certainly, but apparently a man of quiet unobtrusive goodness, who did well the work which he found laid to his hand to do, without seeking to do better and higher work in which it would have been glorious and blessed even to fail.

Things went on very much in the same fashion in China for about forty years more, until a great revolution occurred in 1368, and the system of seclusion and exclusiveness was introduced, which has, alas! remained well-nigh unbroken for five centuries. Soon every trace of Christianity disappeared, and alike the Jesuits who went to China soon after the Reforma-

tion, and Protestant missionaries who began the work in the first decade of the present century, had to lay afresh the foundations of the Church of Rome and the Church of Christ. One cannot help thinking it would have been otherwise if the first foundation had been laid deep in the hearts and consciences of awakened and converted men, rather than in the indifferentism of a refined but shallow-hearted emperor and his courtiers.

A similar fate befell the church among the Western Tartars. Just about the same time with the occurrence of the Chinese revolution, Tamerlane assumed in Western Tartary the part of universal conqueror, evidently taking Chenghiz-Khan as his model. Very different accounts are given of his character and of his religious sentiments. Some assert that he was either a Christian, or had a strong leaning towards Christianity; others, that he was a Mohammedan; and others, again, that he approved and adopted the maxims regarding neutrality of Chenghiz-Khan. I venture to think the last view both likeliest in itself and best supported by facts. He does not seem to have persecuted Christians as such, or Mussulmans as such. But he overturned all the institutions of the country, and introduced a new order of things, from which Christianity was carefully excluded. His reign was short, and on his death the tribes were set into com-

motion and distraction regarding the succession, and in the midst of the turmoil the Christian church simply disappeared. That such a thing should have been possible, seems to indicate that there was something essentially defective in the church itself. And if I might venture to introduce at the close of a lecture an inquiry, which might well be prosecuted at length, as to the character of this defect, I should say that the church was defective in Christianity! Both the Nestorian churches and the Romanist churches had become communities in which there were Christian men — and our Protestantism has no interest in denying that there were very noble Christian men. But Christianity seems to have been concentrated in these men, generally Franciscan regulars, instead of being diffused throughout the churches. It is to be remembered that we are speaking of the latter half of the fourteenth century, when the Romish and the papal systems had reached their full development, and when men were living whose children were to live to see the days of Luther. Now it is generally brought as a great and grave charge against the papal system, that it concentrated church authority and power in the hands of the clergy. And the greatness and the gravity of this charge can scarcely be over-estimated. Of its truth every Protestant is convinced, and even intelligent Romanists are forced to admit it. But I venture to think that there was a worse and a deadlier

usurpation still, in the development of the idea that religion of the understanding and of the heart was the duty and the prerogative of the few, that a ritual devotion, born of ignorance, was the duty incumbent on the many. Thus the church, as such, was not Christian, although it might have Christian men in it. Such a church might even weather for a time the storm of persecution, for persecution would fall mainly on the more prominent and more zealous members. But it was powerless to resist a commotion which disintegrated the elements of society. It then but took its place with those things which are shaken and removed, while those which cannot be shaken remain. The obliteration of Christianity from Tartary thus lies at the door of the Church of Rome.

LECTURE VII.

IN entering upon the consideration of the mission-work done in the various countries during the period to which our inquiries are limited, we have always found it necessary, by way of introduction, to ascertain in a general way whether any, or what amount of, missionary work had been done in them before the beginning of that period, so as to represent mediæval missions as not wholly distinct from, but as forming a continuation of, the missions of the apostolic and immediately subsequent ages. And this we have hitherto been able to do with convenient brevity, and with no great amount of difficulty; for, with respect to continental and insular Europe, there is no reasonable question respecting those immense districts which had formed part of the Roman Empire, that there was a general profession of the gospel on the part of the native inhabitants, while no missionary agency of any great extent or importance had been brought to bear upon the barbarian invaders before the close of the fifth century. Then, as to the Scandinavian and Slavic races, it seems unquestionable that Anskar and his associates sowed the seed of the gospel on a

hitherto untilled soil as late as the ninth century. With reference to Spain and Africa, we know precisely the date of the Mohammedan conquest, and the attitude of the conquerors towards the gospel. In last lecture, also, we were safe in assuming that the Nestorians had made a beginning in Tartary, but that they had not carried on mission-work to any very great extent.

But now, when we endeavour to follow with reference to India the course which has been pursued with respect to all these countries, the task becomes a difficult one; and with all desire to condense what is not properly part of my subject, but is yet a necessary introduction to it, I shall be obliged to bespeak your patient attention to that introduction, without being able to promise that it shall be brief.

The question as to the first introduction of the gospel into India has been often and earnestly discussed. The history of the discussion I shall sum up in a sentence, and shall then proceed to give some details. In the first place, we have early writings, to which I shall refer at length, which inform us that the Apostle Thomas preached the gospel and suffered martyrdom in India. And a church, which has undoubtedly existed in India for very many centuries, has always represented itself as founded by Thomas, and has retained a tradition of his martyrdom, which sufficiently accords with the account given in the old writings to which I have referred, while it is scarcely

possible that either of them could have been borrowed from the other. On these grounds it was for long the popular belief that Thomas was really the apostle of India. But modern criticism, having examined both the old ecclesiastical writings and the Indian tradition, has confidently decided against them, and has concluded that the Thomas who preached the gospel in India was not the apostle, but some one of a later date, either a Syrian of the third, or a Nestorian of the fifth or sixth century; and this opinion has long prevailed. But a deeper and a wider criticism has shaken the faith of many in this conclusion, and at present, I think, there is a very marked tendency on the part of those who are best able to form a judgment, to revert to the old traditional belief. Thus in this department shall probably be verified, as it has been so often verified in others, the sagacious statement of Bacon, that a little knowledge makes men sceptics, much knowledge brings them back to faith; for in the department of history it is as true as in any other department of investigation, that the part of a shallow and narrow criticism is to unsettle, and that the proper and sure corrective of this is a deeper and a broader criticism. I do not mean to say that this result has been fully attained as yet. I cannot honestly say that the apostolic origin of the old Indian church is universally admitted; but the current of opinion is certainly in that direction. Although I shall not be able to add anything to

the facts to which the controversy relates, I may perhaps be able to contribute something to the argument.

There are two treatises which all admit to be of very old date, and which are commonly included among what are called the apocryphal books of the New Testament, which have the titles respectively of *Acts of the holy Apostle Thomas,* and *Consummation of Thomas the Apostle.* It seems impossible to ascertain the authorship or the date of these compositions, but they are admitted to be very ancient, and they bear abundant internal marks of belonging to that class of apocryphal writings which sprang up like mushrooms in the second century.[1] The *Acts* state that the apostles, after the ascension of the Lord, being still in Jerusalem, divided the world among them by lot, and that India fell to the lot of Thomas. He, however, refused to go. The Lord appeared to him by night, and commanded him to go; but still he refused. Then there came to Jerusalem one Abbanes, sent from India by a King Gundaphorus, with orders to bring a carpenter, who should build a palace for the king after the Western fashion. The Lord accosted him in the market-place, and told him

[1] The translator of them in the 'Ante-Nicene Christian Library' (Clark, Edin. 1870) says of the *Acts:* 'The substance of this book is of great antiquity, and in its original form it was held in great estimation by the heretics of the first and second centuries.' I doubt whether there be any authority for this statement, so far, at least, as it relates to the *first* century.

He had a slave, a carpenter, whom He was willing to sell. He pointed out Thomas to him, and sold him for three pounds of uncoined silver. When this was made known to Thomas, he immediately consented. Abbanes and he therefore set sail, and after a speedy voyage came to Andrapolis, a royal city. Then follows a series of miracles, of curses pronounced upon opposers, and of blessings upon those who vowed perpetual virginity. I may mention in passing that this Andrapolis does not seem to have been the capital of Gundaphorus, as seems to be generally supposed by the critics; for after Thomas had escaped from this place, it is said: 'And when the apostle came into the cities of India, with Abbanes the merchant, Abbanes went away to salute Gundaphorus the king, and reported to him about the carpenter whom he had brought with him.' The narrative goes on to tell how Thomas was set to build a palace for the king. But all the money that was sent him for this purpose he gave to the poor, and went over the country preaching the gospel. Then when the king came to see the palace, expecting to find it finished, he found that the work was not begun; but Thomas told him that the palace which he was building was not on earth, but in heaven, and he should not see it till after his death. I need not continue the narrative, which goes on to tell of the death of the king's brother, of his return to life after he had seen in heaven the palace which Thomas had

erected there for the king, and of the conversion and baptism of the two brothers, and of great multitudes of the people, who were persuaded of the truth by the miracles which Thomas performed.

The objections which have been made to this narrative are the following: *first*, That it is filled with lying legends, and is altogether unworthy of credit; *secondly*, That we have no record of any Indian king called Gundaphorus; and *thirdly*, That it is unreasonable to suppose that an Indian king could have any desire to have a palace built for him in Western style.

As to the first of these objections, I quite admit that the document cannot be received as historical. In respect of the legends, it is neither better nor worse than the apocryphal Gospels of our Lord's Infancy, and the other apocryphal Gospels and Acts to which I have referred. But while every one admits that these books abound with falsehoods, no one believes that they do not contain some truth. Now I do not argue that because *these* contain some truth along with much falsehood, that therefore *this*, along with much similar falsehood, must contain some truth, and that that truth is the mission of Thomas into India; but I do argue that the existence or the preponderance of falsehood in a book does not *prove* the falsehood of all that it contains, and in particular that the existence of any amount of manifestly fabulous legend in a narrative does not disprove, or even render improbable, such state-

ments as it contains which are not in themselves improbable.

Secondly, It has quite recently been ascertained that there *was* a King Gundaphorus, who was contemporary with the apostles. This is proved by the discovery, some thirty or forty years ago, of immense numbers of coins in Afghanistan, and the Punjab, and Scinde. These have brought to light, what there was little more than a suspicion of before, a race of Bactrian kings; and one of them was unquestionably Gundaphorus. It is equally unquestionable that he reigned in the first century of our era. But then it may be said Bactria was not India, and a Bactrian king was not an Indian king. Granted that Bactria was not India, but it is proved that this Bactrian king was also an Indian king. On some of his coins, says Lassen, there appears a figure in Indian costume with a sceptre. Probably it is the king himself. If this be correct, it may be inferred that though he was not properly an Indian, which is impossible, yet that he had among his subjects those whose customs were but little different from theirs, and to whom he wished to show his respect for them, by showing himself to them at the same time in Parthian and Indian costume. Last of all, it may be considered certain that Christianity was known to this king, for one of his coins is marked with four figures, one of which is unmistakeably the figure of the cross.

Thirdly, While it is not probable that a proper Indian king would care to have a palace built in Western style, it is quite to be expected that Gundaphorus would, for his coins have Greek inscriptions.

Altogether, I think it very far from being improbable that Thomas did go into the Bactrian kingdom in the days of this Gundaphorus. There is another small matter which seems to be very worthy of notice. On his landing at Andrapolis, which, being a seaport, could not have been in Bactriana, it is mentioned that he spoke in Hebrew, and could not be understood without an interpreter. But we hear of no such intervention in his conferences with Gundaphorus; and this, I think, may be accounted for by the fact that Thomas, who had a Greek surname, Didymus, and Gundaphorus, whose coins were stamped with Greek characters, could both speak that language, although it was not the vernacular language of either of them.

The other document, the *Consummation of Thomas*, may possibly be a continuation of the *Acts;* but if so, there must be a gap between the two fragments. It introduces us to Thomas abruptly in the country of a king called Mesdeus. Some members of the king's family, and the wife of an influential courtier, had been converted to the faith, and the king threw the apostle into prison, and resolved to put him to death. But he dared not do so in the city, because so many of the people, and even of the chief men, believed. Therefore

he ordered an officer and four soldiers to take him to a hill three stadia from the city, and there to kill him. And so it was done. It is further stated that after a long time the son of Mesdeus was possessed of a demon, and could not be cured. Then the king went to the tomb of Thomas to get one of his bones, in the hope that a relic of such a man would have miraculous virtue. But when he opened the grave he found no bones, 'for one of the brethren had taken them, and carried them into the regions of the West.' Therefore he took some earth from the grave, and when he touched his son with it the demon departed from him.

To me it appears, then, in a very high degree probable that the statements of these two documents, which are probably two fragments of one document, that Thomas preached in the territory of a King Gundaphorus, and that he died in the territory of a King Mesdeus, are substantially true; and I think it not unreasonable to conjecture that the portion of the document which is lost contained the account of his passing from the territory of the one king to that of the other. Now how does this correspond with the tradition of the Syrian Christians in Southern India regarding the introduction of the gospel among them? That tradition is unvarying, perfectly consistent with itself, and not, as I think, inconsistent in respect of its main contents with the conclusions derivable from

the apocryphal narratives. It is briefly, that the Apostle Thomas came to them by sea; that he preached the gospel, and founded seven churches; that he was slain by a Brahmin on a hill near Madras, now called St. Thomas Mount; that he was buried at Meliapur, but that his body was afterwards removed to Edessa, in Mesopotamia. This matter of the removal of the body is of great moment, as bearing upon the truthfulness at once of the apocryphal narrative and of the Indian tradition. We have many notices in the old writers of the bones of Thomas being in the cathedral of Edessa, and of emperors and empresses going thither mainly for the purpose of seeing and venerating so sacred relics. In the face of this undoubted fact, it would naturally have been concluded that Thomas died in or near Edessa. But it is nowhere actually said that he died there. Then the apocryphal account of his *Consummation* states that he died elsewhere, and was buried elsewhere, but that his bones had been subsequently carried to the regions of the West by one of the brethren; and the uniform tradition of the Syrian churches is that his bones were removed from their original resting-place to Edessa. 'The empty grave of Christ,' says a German writer, 'is a sanctuary to Christendom, just because it is empty; but it were a thing unheard of that a church which venerates an apostle as its founder, should affirm that while all others were going in the opposite direction,

and buying bones of saints for themselves, it had parted with these bones, so that its faithful must content themselves with earth from the grave.'

Upon the whole, then, my own belief of what is highly probable, although I dare not say that it is proved, is, that Thomas went by sea from some Levantine port; that after passing through the straits or canal which has been reproduced in our day in the form of the Suez Canal, and touching at some port, probably at the mouth of the Indus, and remaining there for some time, he made his way into Bactria; that after labouring there with some measure of success, he made his way again to the mouth of the Indus, and thence proceeded by sea to the south of India, taking the island of Socotra on his way; that he founded many churches there, and was slain at last, either by order of the king of the country, or by a vindictive Brahmin, or even possibly by a Brahmin king, though that is not very likely.

Having dwelt at such length on the disputed question of the first introduction of the gospel into India, I shall pass much more rapidly over various other disputed questions as to certain men who are said to have acted as missionaries there in the early centuries. Eusebius tells us of Pantænus, who was afterwards at the head of the great catechetical school of Alexandria. Regarding him he says:—

'Among these (teachers of the Alexandrian school), the most distinguished must have been Pantænus, who came over from the philosophic school of the Stoics. It is said of him that he displayed so burning zeal for religion, that he preached the gospel of Christ to the nations of the East, and came even as far as India; for there were still many evangelists who imitated the apostles in godly zeal, and sought with all their might to contribute to the extension and the up-building of the kingdom of God. To this class belongs Pantænus, who is said to have gone to the Indians, where there is a statement that he found, anticipating his arrival, the Gospel according to Matthew amongst some persons there who acknowledged Christ, to whom Bartholomew, one of the apostles, preached, and left among them the writing of Matthew in Hebrew characters.'

Upon this extract it is to be noted that Eusebius carefully avoids expressing any opinion of his own regarding the matter. He only uses the expressions, *It is said* (λέγεται), and there is a statement or tradition (λόγος). But supposing that Pantænus did go to the Indians, the question remains, Who were the Indians to whom he went? for it is well known that that name was applied to the inhabitants of several countries far distant from India proper. Then granting that the tradition of Eusebius was historical, it would follow that he went to the same country to which Bartholomew went, and laboured among the same people among whom Bartholomew laboured. But the universal tradition of the church is, that the scene of Bartholomew's labour was Southern Arabia, or Arabia Felix. It would indeed be no difficult matter to suppose that he had gone for a time into

India; but then the difficulty has to be encountered, that he must have found a Jewish community there, for he could not have thought of copying out the Gospel in Hebrew characters—which probably means translating the Gospel into Hebrew—for the use of any Gentile people. Jerome speaks much more definitely and decidedly on the matter. He says:—

'Pantænus, a philosopher of the Stoic sect, in accordance with a certain old custom in Alexandria, where there were always church teachers from the time of Mark the evangelist, was a man of so great prudence and of so great erudition, as well in the divine Scriptures as in secular literature, that he was also sent into India by Demetrius, bishop of Alexandria, at the request of ambassadors of that nation. There he found that Bartholomew, one of the twelve apostles, had preached the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ according to the Gospel of Matthew, which, written in Hebrew characters, he brought with him on his return to Alexandria.'

In another passage he says, still more decidedly:—

'Pantænus, on account of the renown of his excellent learning, was sent by Demetrius into India, that he might preach Christ among the Brahmins and philosophers of that nation.'

Those who advocate the proper Indian mission of Pantænus consider this last passage as decisive of the question. Pantænus was sent to India, and the India to which he was sent was the India of the Brahmins and philosophers. Now I admit that it is decisive of this, that Jerome believed that the India to which Pantænus went was the proper India of the Brahmins; but I venture to think that it is decisive of nothing

more. Jerome knew a good deal about India. In one of his writings he gives an accurate account of Sati, or widow-burning. He knew, therefore, that India was the land of the Brahmins, and he heard that Pantænus was sent to India. He therefore concluded that Pantænus was sent to deal with the Brahmins; and the conclusion was absolutely warrantable, provided that the India of Pantænus was the India of the Brahmins. But the whole turns upon the answer to this question; and it does not appear that Jerome ever put the question, or that he had any other data for answering it than the sayings and traditions of Eusebius. To me it appears, I confess, that the question is still unanswered. But after all, the question is not one of very great consequence; for the visit of Pantænus to India, wherever India might be, was evidently but a short and flying one, and does not seem to have been productive of any results.

There are various notices of Christian work done in India in the early centuries, but all of them underlie the same uncertainty as to the position of the India in which that work was done. One of the most interesting of these notices is one which relates to a certain Frumentius. It is briefly as follows. Metropius, a Christian philosopher of Tyre in the fourth century, set out on a voyage to India, accompanied by two nephews, Frumentius and Edesius. On his vessel

touching at a port to take in water, the natives attacked them and murdered all on board, with the exception of the two young men. These were presented to the king, upon whom they made a favourable impression by their beauty and intelligence. They were employed in various offices of trust, in which they showed such fidelity as to gain the confidence of their royal master. The king died shortly after, leaving a boy prince as heir of his throne. The queen-mother entreated Frumentius to undertake the education of the young king, and under her the regency of the kingdom during his minority. He invited such Christian merchants as visited the place to meet together for worship, and built them a church for that purpose, himself meeting with them, and probably taking the chief part in conducting the services. Numbers of the natives joined the Christian community from time to time, and there was a small but flourishing church formed. On the king's attaining his majority, the two brothers left the country, carrying with them the hearty thanks and blessings of the queen-mother, the king, and the whole nation. On their way back to Tyre they touched at Alexandria, and related to Bishop Athanasius what had occurred, and urged him to send men to carry on the work which had been thus so happily begun. Athanasius agreed, and proposed that Frumentius himself should return as bishop, and rule the church as he had

formerly ruled the state. Though naturally desirous to visit the home from which he had been absent so long, Frumentius consented, was consecrated bishop, and returned to India in 356, where he preached the gospel zealously and successfully, and ministered to the edification of many converts.

There is no reason whatever to doubt the substantial truth of this narrative; but there is great doubt as to the locality of it. That doubt is increased by the fact that Athanasius in one of his writings mentions a Frumentius as bishop of Axumis, which, we know, was the capital of Abyssinia. There might, of course, be two contemporary bishops of the same name. Some have supposed that Frumentius was first bishop of Axumis and then became bishop of India, but this would be inconsistent with the narrative; and the supposition that he was first bishop of India and then bishop of Axumis, while it would not be inconsistent with the narrative, would, I fear, be irreconcilable with the dates. I have to confess that the weight of opinion is against the supposition that the scene of the civil and ecclesiastical labours of Frumentius was India proper, and yet I venture to think that there is good reason to believe that it was. In the case of Pantænus the question was between India and a far Eastern country not far from India, to which we know, in point of fact, that the vague name India was frequently extended. But the question here is between India proper and

Abyssinia, a country far remote from India, inhabited by an African and not an Asiatic race, and to which, so far as I know, the name India was never applied.

Of a date a few years earlier than this, however, we have an authentic notice of the church of Malabar, about whose locality there can be no doubt. It is so interesting, and so germane to our subject, that I translate a somewhat lengthy notice, given as a Latin quotation in a note by a modern German writer:—

'Afterwards, when one hundred and sixty truly Christian families of Malabar Christians were so long without presbyters and leaders, a dissension arose among them, for what cause I know not; but some of them renounced the orthodox faith, and others did not. Those who renounced it were ninety-six families, and those who retained it were sixty-four. At the same time a vision appeared by night to the metropolitan of Edessa, who arose in the morning and went to the Catholicus of the East, and told him of the vision which he had seen; and when the Catholicus had heard it, he sent messengers to all the churches and monasteries and cities of the diocese, and convoked an assembly. And when many flocks had met, with their bishops, and with merchants belonging to them, he told them what the bishop had seen, and related to them his words. Then one of them arose, viz. a merchant, whose name was Thomas of Jerusalem, who answered, saying, "I have ere now heard from foreign places and travellers a report about Malabar and India." When the patriarch heard this answer, he rose from his seat, went to Thomas, embraced him lovingly, and thus addressed him, "I entreat thee, my very dear son, to go to Malabar, to visit the inhabitants of the country, and to bring me back word as to what has befallen them." Therefore Thomas of Jerusalem set out for Malabar, and coming to Moljomkar he saw the Thomas-Christians; and they were mutually pleased, the Christians telling him of the state of their affairs, which when Thomas had heard, he gave them courage and exhorted them with

kind words, and straightway he embarked and returned into his country. On his return he went to the patriarch, and said to him, "Lo! I have seen with my eyes the Thomas-Christians, and we have spoken together with mutual satisfaction, and I left them hopeful and returned." The patriarch answered, "Although I am ready to lay down my life for them, I ask you to be pleased to point out what these my children would have me do for them." Then he stated to the patriarch what the Malabarian brethren desired. Therefore, not long after, yea, in these very days, with the help of the adorable God, and by the order of the patriarch of the East, Thomas of Jerusalem, the merchant, went forth again, and with him the bishop who had seen the vision, and at the same time presbyters and deacons, and also men and women, young men and maidens, from Jerusalem and Bagdad and Nineveh, and they entered into a ship and set sail for Malabar, and arrived at Moljomkar in the year of the Lord 345.'

There seems to be no reason for doubting the truth of this statement. I have not been able to find any further traces of this colony; but the fact of its having settled among the Malabar Christians accounts for the fact that the Malabar Christians have always been regarded as virtually forming part of the Syrian church, have used all along, and use to this day, the Syrian language in their public services. Who is the pope? said they to the Portuguese in the sixteenth century, who sought to bring them under subjection of the Roman see. We are of that place where the disciples were first called Christians, and we know nothing of you men who have come from the far West. There is evidence enough to show that when the church of Edessa, and of Syria generally, became Nestorian, its

Indian offshoot adopted the same tenets; and it is certain that the Indians benefited by that revival of zeal in the Nestorian church of Syria, of which I had occasion to speak in last lecture.

For many centuries we have nothing like a history of this Indian church, but we have various interesting references to its existence. Thus there is a book by one Cosmas, an Egyptian of Alexandria, who lived in the earlier part of the sixth century, and who took the surname of Indicopleustes, or the Indian voyager, to mark himself out as a great traveller. His voyages seem to have been undertaken with a scientific object, to determine the figure of the earth, and to solve various questions in physical geography. But his book—which I know only at second-hand—seems to contain a record of a vast amount of information which he collected in the course of his travels. Those best able to judge consider that implicit trust may be put in such statements as he makes regarding things which he declares that he has actually seen. Now such a statement is the following: 'The church is not overthrown, but greatly enlarged, and the whole world is filled with the doctrine of the Lord Christ; and yet more shall it be filled, and the gospel shall be preached in all the world. What I have seen in my stay at multitudes of places, I tell in accordance with truth. On the island of Taprobane, in Inner India, where the Indian Ocean is, there is to be found also a church of

Christians, as well clerics as believers. But I know not whether there are any farther in that direction. So also in Male, where the pepper grows; and in the place named Calliana there is also a bishop, who receives ordination from the Persians.' Then he goes on to give a long catalogue of places where churches existed. *Taprobane* and *Male* are unquestionably Ceylon and Malabar respectively. It is not so certain where Calliana was. It does not seem to have struck any one, but I would venture to suggest, that it was probably that same Calamina which was said to be the place of martyrdom of the Apostle Thomas. Suppose the name of that place was simply Kali, it would receive the termination *ana* in order to give it a Greek form, while Kalamina means the rock of Kali. If this be so, then we have the testimony of Cosmas for the existence of churches and bishoprics in his time, both on the Malabar and the Coromandel coasts.

Contemporary with Cosmas, but so that his youth coincided with the old age of Cosmas, was Gregory of Tours, to whom I have more than once referred in previous lectures. He was so credulous respecting miracles and wonders, that his writings have little historical value. But we may believe such statements of his as he declares that he makes on the authority of eye-witnesses, while we may account for the miraculous elements in them as best we may, or be content to leave them unaccounted for. So I am dis-

posed to treat the following statement. In his book on the *Glory of the Martyrs*, he says:—

'The Apostle Thomas, according to the history of his passion, is declared to have suffered in India. After a long time, his blessed body was taken into the city which they call Edessa, in Syria, and there buried. Therefore in that Indian place where he first rested there is a monastery, and a church of wonderful size, and carefully adorned and arranged. And in this temple God exhibits a great miracle. For a lamp which is placed in it, and lighted before the place of his burial, burns by the divine will by night and by day, receiving from no one a supply of oil or wick; neither is it extinguished by the wind, nor overset by any accident, nor is it exhausted by its burning. And it has its supply through the merit of the apostle. . . . This was told me by Theodorus, who went to the very place.'

I may say in passing that I do not think Gregory would have introduced the story of the lamp burning and not consumed, if he had known that the Indian church was in no way in communion with the Church of Rome. He only knew that it was a Christian church, and never thought it necessary to put the question whether it were a Romish church; for in his judgment the two terms were strictly synonymous. The same remark applies to an incident which is of far greater interest to us, the beginning, in all probability, of that relation betwixt England and India which has been, and is, and is destined to be, so pregnant with consequences to the one country and the other; that relation which, more than any other cause, has contributed to the commercial and political greatness

of our country—that relation which has made 240 millions of heathens our fellow-subjects, and given them a prior claim to all others upon our sympathies, and our prayers, and our efforts. And thus it befell. In the last quarter of the ninth century,—either in 872 or 880 (in the latter case, just a millennium from this date),—the town of London was besieged by the Danes. The good King Alfred the Great was more attentive to its defence than, as we have all heard in our younger days, he had been in former years to the baking of the cakes in the neatherd's cottage. Believing that it was to be by the union of prayer and endeavour that he was to save his country, while he made a gallant defence, he made also a vow that if he were delivered from the enemy he would send rich gifts to Rome, and also to the shrine of the holy Thomas in India. The pope sent him a fragment of the wood of the cross of Christ, and the Danes were soon compelled to raise the siege. The good king was not forgetful of his vow, but sent two special messengers to India with rich gifts. One would like much to know what was the nature of England's exports to India a thousand years ago; but of this there is no record. It is otherwise, however, with respect to the gifts which the ambassadors brought in return. We are told that they were splendid gems and liquid spices—the latter probably attar of roses. I cannot quit this incident without repeating in substance the

statement with which I introduced it. It is to me unspeakably interesting, — and I trust not without interest to you,—that the first Englishmen that ever trod India's soil were messengers of peace; that the first contact of India with England was through the medium of India's native church; that that contact was a communion of saints and not a shock of battle; and that, chequered as the relation betwixt the two countries has been, and disfigured, as must be confessed, with many a dark shade, it begins, as we trust it is to end, with a heart-uniting recognition of a common God and Saviour.

The history of these Syrian churches has been remarkable in this respect, that they have continued to live on all through the centuries, and through all the vicissitudes of Indian history, while yet they have never exhibited more energy of vitality than was just enough to keep them alive. When, after the Reformation, Xavier and his Jesuits went to India, they strove to bring the Syrians into subjection to Rome. With some of the congregations they succeeded, and these now form a Romo-Syriac Church, acknowledging the supremacy of the pope, but retaining the Syrian language in its services. Others refused, and they subsist in great respectability, but with a minimum of influence. In our own time very strenuous efforts were made to bring them into alliance with the Church of England, but these efforts failed. One can

scarcely help thinking that a church which has been so long kept in being, while apparently so little fulfilling the ends for which the church exists, must be designed of God for some greater and better work in the future than it has accomplished in the past, or is accomplishing in the present. The figure is there, moulded of the dust of the earth. Would that God would breathe into its nostrils the breath of life, that it might become a living soul!

In last lecture I mentioned that John de Monte-Corvino, on his way from Tartary and Persia into China, passed through India, and spent thirteen months at Meliapur, where he baptized about a hundred persons. It would appear that he fraternized with the Syrian Christians, Nestorians and non-Romanists though they were. But of his visit, so far as I know, we have no record except his own incidental reference to it, containing only the particulars which I have just stated. This was in 1291 or 1292. Some thirty years later, Jourdain Catalan, a French missionary in Persia, conceived the noble idea of making a systematic effort for the evangelization of India. With this view he addressed a circular to his fellow-labourers in Persia, asking them to volunteer for this service. His call was responded to by three Italian friars, Thomas of Tolentino, James of Padua, James of Sienne, and by Demetrius of Tiflis, a Georgian

layman, well versed in Indian languages, who was to serve as interpreter. Rallying at Tauris, the five brethren proceeded to Ormus, whence they sailed for Meliapur. But either through stress of weather, or through breach of contract on the part of the ship-captain, they were landed at Tanna, in the island of Salsette, so celebrated for its cave-temples. In Tanna there were fifteen Christian families, with one of which the brethren lodged. While here they heard of a Christian community at Barotch, who were utterly destitute of the ordinances and means of grace. It was agreed that Jourdain should proceed thither, and he took with him two of the Nestorian Christians, who were to act as interpreters. They halted on the way at Supera, which is identified with the modern Sefer, a seaport on the Gulf of Cambay, where they found a professing Christian community of ninety souls, with whom they stayed a fortnight. On the eve of Jourdain's intended departure for Barotch, it was impressed upon his mind that he ought to proceed no farther, but rather return to his brethren at Tanna. He wrote a letter to them, and despatched with it one of his Nestorian attendants. Then he went into the church and earnestly prayed for his brethren. In the night he was informed that a messenger had come from Tanna with the news that his brethren were thrown into prison, and that they entreated him to seek safety in speedy flight. Nay, said he, I shall go back with

all speed. I understand Persian better than they, and may be able to make their defence before the Cadi. On the way he overtook his own messenger whom he had despatched on the preceding day, who had met Christians from Tanna, and had learned that the brethren were already put to death. Though already footsore and heavy-hearted, he hastened on, mourning the untimely death of his friends, but mourning most of all that he had not been found worthy to share their martyrdom.

It appears that the Nestorian with whom the brethren lived had a quarrel with his wife. She complained of him to the Cadi, and summoned the guests as witnesses. Three of the four obeyed the summons. When they were waiting in the court-house they were led into an argument with a Mussulman, an Alexandrian. As the discussion went on, the other Mohammedans took part in it. The Christians maintained the divinity of the Lord; the Mohammedans denied it. Then one asked in what light they regarded Mohammed? We speak not of Mohammed, but of Christ, was the answer; but from what we believe of the one, you may infer what we believe of the other. But when they were pressed for a more direct answer, one of them declared that Mohammed was the son of perdition, and that he is now in hell with his father the devil. Then a great excitement ensued. The Christians were threatened with all manner of tortures unless they would unsay what they had said, and

repeat the Moslem's creed. This they stedfastly refused to do. They were then tied to posts, and obliged to stand bare-headed, exposed to the fierce rays of a tropical sun from 9 A.M. to 3 P.M. During all that time it is said that they ceased not to sing songs of praise to God. Then a fire was made in the market-place. They were told that if their faith were true they would not be burnt, but if it were false they would be reduced to ashes. We are ready, was their answer, to enter this fire, and to endure all torments for the love of Jesus Christ. But if the fire consume us for the punishment of our sins, our faith is not the less true, for it proceeds from the very fountain of truth; and if we are not burnt, we shall only owe it to the divine mercy, which shall thus make manifest the truth of that faith which we preach. The narrative which I have been thus far partly translating and partly summarizing now goes on to tell of the miraculous escape of one of them from the fire, of his being thrown in again, and again coming forth with not a hair of his head singed, or the smell of fire having passed upon his garments. More likely it was the sight of the eagerness with which they strove for precedence in entering into the furnace — Thomas of Tolentino claiming the honour on account of his age, and James of Padua on the ground of his youth—that excited the admiration and the sympathy of the onlookers, and turned the tide of popular feeling for a

moment in their favour. The governor of the town, who all along had been less hostile to them than the Cadi, set them free, but urged them at once to leave the island, and proceed to the mainland. This they did; but next night the Cadi went to the governor and reproached him with his leniency, insinuating that his own stedfastness in the faith of Islam would be liable to be questioned if he allowed these blasphemers of the prophet to escape. The well-disposed but irresolute governor, like another Pilate, gave them over to the will of their malicious enemies. Four soldiers were sent after them. Their retreat was discovered by the sound of their midnight songs of thanksgiving and praise, and they were speedily despatched. Having finished their work, the soldiers returned to Tanna and arrested Peter de Sienne, who was put to death next day.

Thus died these four, mediæval India's proto-martyrs. If it be so that Christ has redeemed the bodies as well as the souls of men; if it be so that every hair of the head of every one of His people is numbered; if every drop of the blood of every one of them is purchased by Him, made inalienably His, and so made holy to Himself, — may it not be that the shedding of this holy blood, and the mingling of it with the soil of heathen lands, is the means which He employs to purify the soil which has been desecrated by the foul rites and orgies of idolatry, and so in time to make the material world a holy land, a new earth in which

righteousness shall dwell? From the days of Thomas down to the days of these four, we have no reason to believe that martyr-blood was shed in India.

Catalan on his arrival found the bodies of the three who had been first slain. He had them conveyed to Sefer, and buried in the church there. Thence they were afterwards removed by Oderic de Frioul, who carried them with him across India and into China. So it is said, at least. But as he seems to have performed the journey from India to China on foot, we may be pretty sure that he did not carry three skeletons with him, but probably a few bones and relics of each.

Catalan's history for the next two years is touchingly related in a letter of his, which is extant, and of which I translate a portion:[1]—

'Be it known to you, my venerable fathers, that I am alone and without an associate in India, a poor pilgrim, where I have been permitted to live after the passion of my associates. And in the same place, after their blessed martyrdom, which took place in the fifth week before Palm-Sunday, in the course of ten days, in a district which is called Parrot, I baptized about ninety persons, and still I do not cease to baptize; for since then I have baptized more than twenty in Tanna, and thirty-five at Sefer. Praise be to Christ the creator of all! If I had an associate, I should remain for some time. But now I am about to prepare a church for such brethren as may come, and shall dispose of my

[1] The Latinity of this letter is extremely bad, and I am not sure that I have given the exact meaning of every clause. But the general sense is obvious enough.

own effects and those of my associates, and all the books. I am indeed coming; yet on account of matters pertaining to the faith, which are not a little difficult, I shall delay a little. I came to Tanna after the martyrdom and coronation of the glorified ones, and I buried the bodies of the saints, and I remain alone in the foresaid city and circumjacent district for two years and a half, going in and out, not having been held worthy to share the crown of my blessed associates. Who can tell all the adversity that I have suffered since then? I have been captured by pirates, imprisoned by the Saracens, accused, maligned, reproached, and exposed for a long time, like some buffoon, only in my shirt, and to this day I am deprived of the habit of my sacred order. Oh, what hunger, thirst, cold, heat, rage, maledictions, bodily infirmities, poverty, persecution, revilings on the part of false Christians, severity of climate, and innumerable other evils I have suffered! But what matters it? Greater still I am ready, even to death, to suffer more meekly, for the sake of the meek Jesus. Also on account of my extreme poverty, I continually suffer various bodily ailments. But the discord on my account among the people is most of all hateful. Yet I have happily baptized more than one hundred and thirty of both sexes. Therefore let holy brethren come; let them come established in patience, that so the fruit of the baptized may be preserved from evil, and in due time, separated from the chaff, may be happily stored in the garner of the Lord.'

How long Jourdain remained in these quarters is uncertain. He returned to Europe, and was sent out by the pope in 1328 as bishop of Columba, which must not be confounded with Colombo in Ceylon, but is identified with Coulan or Quilon on the south-west coast of India. From this time his history is altogether uncertain. He seems to have gone away to the eastward, probably bound for China. Ultimately

he seems to have returned to Europe through Arabia, Asia Minor, and the island of Chio. We must regard him as the last of the Romanist pre-Reformation missionaries to India. By this time the doctrine of Rome was so corrupt that we cannot much regret that it ceased to be propagated in our beloved India. A secularized and corrupted hierarchy had little taste for the patient toil of the missionary. In the absence of the constraining love of Christ, the religious sentiment of Rome and Europe found more fitting exercise in the excitement of the Crusades, and the romance of what they deemed a holy war. We have given no stinted praise to those Romanists who nobly dared and nobly suffered in the missionary cause. We give Rome full credit for what its sons did and suffered. But we cannot forget that as candid historians we are forced to the conclusion that it is mainly due to Rome's ripening corruption, and to the decay of Christian life in her heart and her members, that India and China, and the other regions of the boundless East, are still in the darkness of heathenism, or under the delusion of the false prophet. As to the Reformers it was assigned to undo the unspeakable evils which Rome's corruptions and Rome's usurpations wrought in Europe, so to the Reformed and Protestant churches it has been reserved to do the work which Rome's decaying piety and extinct spirituality left undone in Asia. It is a great work,

a difficult work, but a glorious work—the work above all others that God has given to men to do in this world, in which it is a privilege to bear a part.

Before concluding this lecture it may be proper to advert to two particulars with respect to these mediæval missions.

First of all, I would notice the fact that in our whole review we have found no missions to the Jews, and scarcely any reference to work done even incidentally among them. While we may conclude from the fact that the time—the set time—to favour Israel had not yet come, we cannot exempt from blame those who so far misread the Scriptures of truth as virtually to exclude the children of Abraham from the blessing which was designed for mankind. I cannot but think that the comparative failure of the mediæval missions was in some degree connected with this defect. It has been no part of my task to advert to the cruelties which were inflicted upon the Jews by professing Christians, though these have often come under my notice in the course of my researches. The particulars of the parabolic narrative were inverted, and the younger brother, received into the father's house, begrudged to the elder a place in that house. If missions are to prosper, all this must be reversed, and every church which desires to claim the name and share the blessing of a missionary

church must care for the lost sheep of the house of Israel. No differences as to the interpretation of unfulfilled prophecy can affect or modify the duty of the church in this matter. We may differ as to the details of the future destiny of Israel, and the relation which the natural and spiritual seed of Abraham on the one hand, and the only spiritual seed on the other, are to sustain to one another when the natural and the grafted branches shall share the sap and the richness of the one olive tree; but there ought to be no difference amongst Christian men as to the duty at once and the blessedness of caring and doing for those 'of whom are the fathers, and of whom, as concerning the flesh, Christ came.'

Secondly, I would point out a very important distinction betwixt the earlier missions—including the apostolic, the post-apostolic, and the mediæval—and those of these later times. In former days there was comparatively little difference, in respect of culture and civilisation, betwixt the preachers of the gospel and those to whom they preached. This is true respecting those of the apostolic missions of which we have any detailed account. These missions were all carried on in the countries around the Mediterranean, amongst men not inferior to those Jewish missionaries in civilisation and intellectual culture. So it was also in the days of Justin Martyr, and in those of Augustine

and Chrysostom. There were doubtless missions to barbarians, but of these we have little or no record. In those whose history is known to us, the teachers and the taught were on the same platform of civilisation. It is perhaps impossible to form an absolutely accurate estimate of the relative degrees of civilisation attained by the mediæval missionaries and the mediæval heathen. Perhaps the difference between them was less than we are apt to suppose. Columba and the 'family of Iona,' Columbanus and the 'family of Luxeuil,' were outstanding men, superior not only to the heathen to whom they preached, but superior also to the great body of the Christians of their time. And the whole body of the Christians had the seeds of the highest civilisation amongst them, in their possession of the Bible, and the knowledge of its elevating doctrines and its purifying precepts. But I am not sure that, in respect of the habits which we consider essential to civilisation, even these men differed very widely from their contemporaries. I am very sure that Columba was essentially a gentleman, a man of great intellectual vigour, and of real refinement. But I should probably err greatly if I conceived the manifestations and the outgoings of these qualities in him to have been at all similar to what they would have been had he lived in our day. I believe, then, that with respect to all that is generally comprehended under the term civilisation, there was no great

difference between the Christian missionaries of the Middle Ages, and those, whether in the West or the East, to whom they proclaimed the unsearchable riches of Christ. Speaking generally, it is very different now. Civilisation has so resulted from the diffusion of Christianity, that modern Christians and modern missionaries are better educated and more cultivated than the Christians and missionaries of the Middle Ages; while the nations and tribes which still continue heathen are infinitely lower in the scale than the Athenians whom Paul addressed on the Areopagus, and probably lower than the European and Tartar tribes of the Middle Ages, with the exception only of our own forefathers, to whose condition I referred at the close of a preceding lecture. In some respects this difference is immensely advantageous to the modern missionary, while in other respects it may prove a snare which he will need the more grace to avoid. The advantage is so obvious that I need not dwell upon it. It is this that gives to educational missions, and to medical missions, and to the colonizing system which is regarded as distinctive of the Moravians, but which is also practised largely by others, their potency and their possibility. The dangers, however, are various and manifold. One of the most obvious of them has not always been avoided. There are unhappy instances in which missionaries have shrunk back from contact with the

rudeness and stupidity of barbarians, and have given up the work in pure disgust, conceiving it to be impossible that the rose of Sharon can ever bloom in such an ungenial soil. Not less unhappily have others come almost unconsciously to acquiesce in the state of matters which they have found to exist, and have been content to go through a dull routine of missionary exercises, without any lively hope or expectation, or even desire, of success. But a subtler form of the snare is when the missionary, commiserating the barbarous condition of those to whom he is sent, has set himself to the elevation of the people by merely material means, or by merely intellectual culture, to the comparative neglect of that which is his proper work, the conversion of souls to Christ. Civilisation and refinement are not the primary objects of the missionary. These will come as a natural and necessary result of the acceptance of the gospel of Christ, — in accordance with the principle contained in the precept: 'Seek ye first the kingdom of God and His righteousness, and all these things shall be added to you.' Far be it from me to undervalue any efforts to improve the physical, intellectual, moral, and social condition of men. But the missionary sent to a barbarous people must remember that he is unfaithful to his high trust if he allows himself for a moment to be satisfied with the production of such a result, or for a moment

to forget that he has to do with the interests of eternity.

And now, in bringing to a close the very imperfect treatment of a subject which has proved too extensive for satisfactory treatment, let me express the hope that this lectureship, in the hands of my successors, may be a means, in God's hand, and with God's blessing, of awakening our Christian people to a sense at once of their duty and their privilege in the matter of the world's evangelization. And conscious as I am of the manifold imperfections of the present course of lectures, I am not without a humble hope that they too may contribute something to this end. It belongs to human nature, and did not originate in the corruption of that nature, however it may have shared in its corruption, that ambition is fired and sustained by the consideration of the continuity of our race, and the continuity of the enterprises in which the great men of all ages have been engaged. This extends through all the professions and pursuits of men. The artist, the student, the cultivator of literature or of science, the physician or surgeon, the young lawyer, the aspirant to the office of the ministry—all are stimulated to exertion, and sustained under difficulties, by the example of the great men who have trodden the same path before them. What soldier is not cheered under the toil of the march, and

the labour of the trenches, and the discomforts of the bivouac, and even amid the tumult and turmoil of the battle, by recollections of the Sidneys, and the Marlboroughs, and the Wellingtons, who have endured the same toils and fought under the same standards? To what sailor's heart is it not a joy to serve under the same proud flag which was flung forth to the battle and the breeze at the bidding of the Blakes, and the Effinghams, and the Trowbridges, and the Nelsons, and the Collingwoods of other days? What statesman or legislator is worthy of the name whose heart is not impelled to self-consecration by the thought that he takes up the work to which the Chathams and the Grenvilles, the Foxes and the Pitts, the Burkes and the Cannings, and others great as these of later date whom I may not name, consecrated their noble powers? The fire of patriotism is fanned into a stronger glow at the mention of the names of Wallace, and Bruce, and Kosciusko, and Hampden, and Washington. The philanthropist is sustained in his heaven-born zeal by the thought of the labours and sacrifices of Wilberforce, and Clarkson, and Howard. And surely it ought not to be wholly without effect towards creating or sustaining some adequate zeal in a cause greater and more glorious than art, or science, or literature—in a conflict of more momentous issue than was ever staked in campaign or encounter of embattled hosts or contending fleets—in a work which is destined to

contribute more to the elevation and improvement of mankind than all the deliberations of senates and all the declamations of orators have contributed or can contribute—in an enterprise of philanthropy which is to the noblest of merely secular philanthropic enterprises as the soul is to the body, or eternity to the life-span of man,—to have unrolled, if we have done no more, a list of names of noble men who have spent and been spent ungrudgingly in the advancement of what they have felt to be a transcendently great and glorious cause. And it should not be forgotten that this list might be extended in either direction, and filled with equally noble names. The Elliotts and the Brainerds of America—the Swartzes, the Careys, the Henry Martyns, the Lacroix, the Wilsons, the Duffs of India — the Judsons and the Boardmans of Burmah — the Morrisons and the Milnes, the Burnses and the Douglases of China—the Williamses of Polynesia — the Vanderkemps, the Livingstones, the Charles Mackenzies, and (I shall be pardoned for naming one living man) the Moffats of Africa, —all these and many more have been worthy successors of the Patricks, and Columbas, and Columbani, of the Bonifaces, and Anskars, and Eligii, of the Corvinos and Catalanis of whom I have had to tell you. And if we trace the roll upward from where we began, as well as downward from where we ended, we shall find it inscribed with many noble names,

though obscurely recorded, till we come to the apostles and apostolic men, who, fresh from the pentecostal fire-baptism, went forth to execute the glorious commission which they had received from their crucified and risen Lord, 'Ye shall receive power after that the Holy Ghost is come upon you; and ye shall be witnesses unto me both in Jerusalem, and in all Judea, and in Samaria, and unto the utmost ends of the earth.' But modern and mediæval, and post-apostolic and apostolic missionary names have no glory by reason of the glory that excelleth—the glory of that name above every name, which, traced in characters of tears and blood, is yet emblazoned with heavenly light and refulgent with a splendour all divine—the name of Jesus, the leader and the Lord of all. That Man of Sorrows acquainted with grief, that Only-begotten of the Divine Father, was in the days of His flesh anointed with unmeasured and immeasurable grace of the Spirit, that He might preach glad tidings to the meek. That Man who is for ever set down on the right hand of the Majesty on high, is hourly claiming the fulfilment of the Father's promise in the eternal covenant of redemption, 'Sit Thou at my right hand until I make Thy foes Thy footstool;' 'Ask of me, and I will give Thee the heathen for Thine inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth for Thy possession.' And, blessed thought! while that same Lord, who in respect of His bodily presence is in heaven, is none

the less with every one of His people on earth, sharing all their joys and all their griefs, strengthening them in all their weakness, and supplying all their wants out of His abundant fulness; yet He is in a more special and peculiar manner at the right hand and the left of every faithful missionary; for it was when He had said: 'All power is given unto me in heaven and in earth; go ye therefore and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost,' that with the same breath He added, 'And, lo, I am with you alway, even to the end of the world.'

THE END.

MORRISON AND GIBB, EDINBURGH,
PRINTERS TO HER MAJESTY'S STATIONERY OFFICE.