

THE
MERCERSBURG REVIEW.

JULY, 1857.

ART. I.—IMPRESSIONS OF ENGLAND.

First Impressions of England and its People. By *Hugh Miller*. Edinburgh and Boston. 1851.

De l'Avenir Politique de l'Angleterre. Par le *Comte de Montalembert*. Translated from the French. London. 1855.

English Traits. By *R. U. Emerson*. Boston. 1856.

AN American can hardly approach the shores of old England without a deep pulsation of heart. As he walks through her cities and villages; as he hears the familiar sounds of his native tongue, more musical to him than "Tuscan softness or Castilian majesty"; as he converses at the fire-side, and listens to a speech in the court house, or to a sermon from the messenger of God, he feels the charm of sweet associations of home and kindred. His first love and duty belong to his mother, the Anglo-Saxon republic of the West. But this should not prevent him from paying due homage to that venerable and still vigorous grandmother, who gave birth to the Pilgrim Fathers of the Bay State, and the cavaliers of the Old Dominion. Our country is made up, indeed, of all the nations of Europe, and seems destined, on that account, to produce a nationality still more comprehensive and cosmopolitan than even that of Great Britain. But the stem of the American people is the noblest shoot of the royal oak of England, and it will never deny the Anglo-Saxon type, though it should ultimately far outgrow the parent tree.

It is true, there is a great deal of prejudice, envy and jealousy between the two nations, arising from, and nourished by, the oppressions which drove many of our first ancestors from their native home, and followed them even to their adopted country; the declaration and the war of independence, which broke forever the bond of governmental union; the war of 1812, and the burning of our capitol by the British; the annual annihilations of George III. by our fourth of July orators; the large infusion of Irish antipathy and bigotry in our population; the illiberal, haughty and contemptuous tone of many English tourists; and the vain boasting and filibustering spirit of Young America. It vents itself from time to time, not only in English and American newspapers and books of travel, but finds its way occasionally even into the dignified halls of Parliament, and Congress. But this jealousy is owing to the very affinity of the two nations, and the natural rivalry of two ambitious governments, each striving for the supremacy of the seas; just as the diplomatic friendship of America and Russia arises from the great distance and the improbability of a collision of their widely distinct interests. No amount of political prejudice can destroy the fact of the essential identity of language, laws, customs and religion, which makes itself felt even in the midst of strife; and the warlike propensities and barbarous love of conquest, must yield, we trust, more and more to the nobler rivalry in the arts of peace, and the pursuit of the common mission of the Anglo-Saxon race.

Lord Clarendon has, after all, expressed the deeper sentiment of all classes of intelligent Englishmen, when he declared, in an official dispatch on the recent enlistment-difficulty, "There are no two countries which are bound by stronger ties and by higher considerations, than the United States and Great Britain, to maintain unbroken the relations of perfect cordiality and friendship." On the other hand, at this very time, when the two governments were snarling at each other, the genuine American feeling towards England found the truest and noblest exponent in

the person of the late Dr. Kane, who in the blended interests of humanity and science, started a second time, in search of Sir John Franklin, to the eternal winter of the Artic regions, there to fight, "Titan-like, with unchecked nature, with bewildered ice and maddening cold, in a long blind winter and brief blinding summer," and who brought back the fatal disease, but also the immortal record of his heroic adventures and an unmelting crown of icy diamonds, conceded to him as cheerfully and gratefully by England as by his own countrymen.*

As Great Britain may point with the pride of a mother to the United States as her full grown daughter, who rules the destinies of the Western world: so the Americans need not be ashamed of their descent from that remarkable island which gave birth to a Shakspeare and Milton, a Bacon and Newton, a Baxter and Leighton, a Burke and Canning, a Nelson and Wellington, a Howard and Wilberforce; and should rejoice to be the chief heirs of that race which stands at the head of modern nations and carries along with its commerce, the blessings of Christian civilization and constitutional freedom to the ends of the earth.

The present power and greatness of Albion is one of the wonders of the age. That an island, naturally fertile, rich and well fortified, but comparatively small, beaten by the tempest, shrouded in eternal vapors and deemed once beyond the reach of civilization, should attain to the highest eminence in wealth, science and arts, and become the queen of the seas and the ruler over more than eight millions of square miles and two hundred millions of people, stretch-

* The U. S. Consul at Portsmouth, at the recent delivery of the "Resolute," has in a humorous way given a good lesson to the martial fire-eaters of both countries by paraphrasing the well known hymn of children:

Let dogs delight to bark and bite,
 For God hath made them so;
 Let Turks and Russians growl and fight,
 For 'tis their nature too.
 But Anglo-Saxons should not let
 Their angry passions rise;
 Their great big hands were never made
 To tear each others eyes.

ing out its arms from Europe to Asia, Africa, America, and Australia, encircling the globe, and planting the seeds of new empires in the ancient East and the youthful West, in the icy North and the burning South : this is a phenomenon to which the annals of history hardly furnish a parallel. Neither Tyre and Sidon with their extensive commerce and wealth ; nor Carthage, the land of Hannibal and rival of Rome ; nor Rome herself in the height of her glory when her imperial sceptre extended from the banks of the Euphrates to the columns of Hercules, and from the plains of the Nile to the hills of the Rhine ; neither Spain in her proudest days when “ the sun never set upon her dominions ;” nor France under the first empire, when the half of Europe paid reluctant homage to the modern Cæsar ; nor even Russia with her almost boundless territorial possessions stretching over more than half the circuit of the globe, presents a spectacle so sublime and commanding as the power of England, especially if we consider the fact that it rests not in brute force, but mainly in the intellectual and moral superiority of her people, and the solid worth of her institutions. Innumerable vessels start annually from her ports to return in due time with the treasures of every nation and clime. Fifty thousand of her sons alone control one hundred and fifty millions of Hindoos. Her cannons burst the walls of China and bring one third of the human race in contact with the Christian world. Her industry and commerce supply the markets of both hemispheres. Her literature, institutions and example act with growing power among the civilized nations in favor of liberty, virtue and religion. Her missionaries, Bibles and Tracts go forth to all heathen lands and prepare the way for the last and greatest triumphs of the Gospel of peace.

Nor is there any just ground for the expectation that the English nation has already passed the zenith of her greatness. In 1854 I heard Prince Metternich give it as his deliberate opinion that England would soon pass through a radical social revolution, as France did in 1789. But the

fact that it steered unshaken through the continental crisis of 1830 and 1848, justifies a very different view from the one entertained by the veteran statesman of Austria. England understands the art to avoid a revolution by orderly constitutional reform. It reveres the past, and yet keeps pace with the progress of the age. Its people could gain nothing by a violent convulsion which they cannot gain more surely and better by parliamentary legislation. A foreigner is apt to be misled by the tone of the English press, especially during elections and at critical periods, when every abuse is dragged to the light and most mercifully exposed. The Englishman, and the American too, reserves to himself the privilege of grumbling and finding fault with his government and institutions which he would allow to no outsider. But the very boldness and fearless independence of the British and American press betray a feeling of ease and security as to the foundations of society. People who live in impregnable fortresses can afford occasionally to throw stones at each other.

To give a faithful description of the English nation and its institutions, is felt to be more difficult at each successive visit. We can readily understand why Baron Burlow, formerly Prussian ambassador at London, after three years residence in England, thought it impossible to write a book about it, which he intended to write after a residence of three weeks, but which he felt to become more difficult the longer he observed the country. For England is not like an artificial garden of Versailles or St. Cloud, laid out in symmetrical order, straight promenades, regular alleys, adorned by playing fountains, well trimmed trees and rounded hedges, which you can measure with a glance of the eye; but like one of nature's landscapes, presenting, in gradual succession and irregular beauty, charming lawns and impenetrable thickets, fresh meadows and rocky hills, majestic oaks and entangled shrubbery, romantic lakes and abominable quagmires,—but abounding wherever you look, in spontaneous vigorous life.

A general idea of the outside of the country can now be

obtained in a few days. For England is a complete net of rail-roads, whose solidity and safety contrasts strangely with our own. Less accidents happen there in one year than with us in one month, or perhaps one week. A return to the Board of Trade, as quoted by Mr. Lowe in the House of Commons, shows that in 1854 the number of persons carried by rail-road on the British isles was one hundred and fourteen millions, of persons killed twelve, and injured three hundred and thirty one; in 1855 there were carried one hundred and eighteen millions, killed ten, injured 311; in 1856 carried one hundred and twenty five millions, killed eight, and injured 282.

If you wish to see modern Britain with its commerce and manufactures, its noise and bustle, its energy and enterprise, its avarice and generosity, its din and smoke, its wealth and squalor, its splendor and misery, you must go to such cities as Liverpool, Manchester, Sheffield and Hull. If you prefer to go back to the England of Shakspeare and the days of chivalry and romance, you will find it still in living beauty on the walls and in the cathedrals of Chester and York, on the meadows and in the Colleges of Oxford and Cambridge, in the castles of Windsor and Warwick, the ruins of Kennilworth and Melrose. And if you desire to see the stirring life of the present moving on the graveyard and among the monuments of the past, you can satisfy your heart's content in Edinburg and Glasgow, and especially in London, with its Westminster Abbey, and St. Paul's, its Tower, and New Houses of Parliament, its Museum and Bank, its Guildhall and Tunnel, its Buckingham palace and Billingsgate market, its crowded streets and airy parks, its luxury and wretchedness, its virtue and vice, and

“ That mighty mass of brick, and smoke and shipping,
 Dirty, and dusky, but as wide as eye
 Can reach, with here and there a sail just skipping
 In sight, then lost amidst the forestry
 Of masts; a wilderness of steeples peeping
 On tiptoe through their sea-coral canopy.”

What a monster city is this London! Yea, I should rather

say an empire stretching some six miles in every direction from Temple Bar or Charing Cross, and gathering within these limits more inhabitants, (now approaching fast to three millions) more wealth, trade, intellectual and moral power, more happiness and misery than many principalities and kingdoms. It is the metropolis of commerce, the great beating heart whose pulsations are felt and obeyed in the East and West Indies, in Canada and Australasia, in Brazil and China.

But we do not intend, of course, to enter into a geographical and archaeological description of that remarkable island, which realizes on a grand scale Homer's description of the shield of Achilles :

“ Now, the broad shield complete, the artist crowned
With his last hand, and poured the ocean round,
In living silver seemed the waves to roll,
And beat the buckler's verge, and crown the whole.”

Our object is rather to exhibit, in general outlines, the religious, social, and political character of the English nation as it underlies and explains its present commanding position and world-wide influence.

The eloquent French Count Montalembert, in his interesting work on the “ Political Future of England ” draws a parallel between Spain and England such as they were in the sixteenth and such as they are in the eighteenth century. Spain, once the first Christian nation, he says, is now “ nothing! All is gone. Institutions, politics, riches, credit, influence, army, navy, commerce, industry, science, literature—all simultaneously vanished ”; while England, during the same period, has “ advanced from greatness to greatness and disputes with France the first place in the affairs of the world.” The Roman Catholic Count calls it blasphemy to trace the greatness of England to its Protestantism, and the decline of Spain to its Romanism, and accounts for the striking contrast simply by the political liberty of the former, and the political despotism of the latter. We accept the facts as substantially true, but we reject the conclusions as supremely unphilosophi-

cal and superficial. A similar parallel might be drawn between Scotland and Italy, Holland and Portugal, the Northern and the Southern portions of Ireland, the Roman Catholic and the Protestant cantons of Switzerland, and between the United States and the Central and South American Republics, and in each case we would be forced to go back to religion as the deepest cause of the rise and fall, the prosperity and adversity of nations. For it is as true now as in the days of David and Solomon, that "Righteousness exalteth a nation, and sin is a reproach to any people." Political freedom is no doubt one of the greatest blessings, as despotism is one of the greatest curses of a nation. But if we ask what enabled England to maintain and extend her liberty, and what keeps up and nourishes despotism in Spain, as well as in Rome, Naples, Portugal, Austria, and nearly every Papal country on the globe, the natural and only possible answer is to be found in what Montalembert, blinded by his religious prejudices, calls blasphemy. We readily admit that the Catholic Church was the mother of European civilization and national progress from the downfall of the Roman Empire to the beginning of the sixteenth century. But since that time the process of development has been mainly carried on by the Protestant type of Christianity. It is a fact, which no amount of sophistry can set aside, that the decline of Spain and Italy, as well as the rise of Holland and England date from the rejection of the Reformation by the former, and its embrace by the latter. This coincidence is not accidental, but reveals the close and natural connection of Protestantism with civil freedom, national prosperity, and social progress. England is the strongest bulwark of Protestantism, against which the proud waves of Rome cannot prevail.

The English were an earnest and religious people from the days of the venerable Bede and Alfred the Great, and it would be unjust to deny the great merits of Catholicism which converted them to Christianity and developed their energies during the long course of the Middle Ages. But

it is certain that the Reformation acted as a most powerful stimulus upon English piety and gave it its present shape and form.

And here we must specify first the rich diffusion of the Word of God among all classes of society in England and Scotland. There the Bible is interwoven with the inmost life and history of the nation. There it has become as familiar as household words, and enjoys a reverence and popularity as in no other country under the sun, the United States alone perhaps excepted. Much of this is due to the admirable translation, one of the best, if not the very best, ever made, and one, too, which is baptized in the blood and sacrifices of many martyrs. I cannot refrain from quoting here a remarkable eulogy recently pronounced upon it by an enemy, the learned Dr. Newman, the intellectual father of Tractarianism, who saw fit in a strange delusion to exchange the Anglican for the Roman Catholic communion. "Who will not say that the uncommon beauty and marvellous English of the Protestant Bible is not one of the great strongholds of heresy in this country? It lives on the ear, like a music that can never be forgotten, like the sound of church bells, which the convert hardly knows how he can forego. Its felicities often seem to be almost things rather than mere words. It is part of the national mind, and the anchor of national seriousness. . . The memory of the dead passes into it. The potent traditions of childhood are stereotyped in its verses. The power of all the griefs and trials of man is hidden beneath its words. It is the representative of his best moments, and all that there has been about him of soft and gentle, and pure and penitent and good, speaks to him forever out of his English Bible. . . . It is his sacred thing, which doubt has never dimmed, and controversy never soiled. In the length and breadth of the land there is not a Protestant with one spark of religiousness about him, whose spiritual biography is not in his Saxon Bible." (See Dublin Review, June, 1853.)

Another element of strength and national prosperity to

England and Scotland, is the strict observance of Sunday, which obtained there since the seventeenth century, and which America likewise inherited as an invaluable legacy. The continent of Europe, Protestant as well as Roman Catholic, has nothing like it. Every body knows that there the Lord's day is most shockingly profaned and turned into a day of secular amusement and sinful dissipation. Say what you please, the English and American Sabbath is a powerful support of public virtue and piety, a heavenly rest amidst the unrest of earth, a weekly foretaste of the Saints' everlasting rest, a constant exercise of self-collection and self-control, and hence a pillar also of rational freedom and popular government.

Closely connected with this is the ennobling, purifying and sanctifying power of the pulpit, which is nowhere greater than in the British islands, and exceeds the combined influence of human learning, eloquence and art. The Bible, the Sunday and the Pulpit go hand in hand and depend upon each other. Let us hear also on this topic an English authority. The "London Quarterly Review," in a recent article on the Pulpit and its influence, makes the following just remarks which are equally applicable to our own country: "We suppose that it is scarcely possible to overrate the public and social interests which depend upon the sacred institute of preaching. So long as the people of these islands continue to be distinguished by their strict observance of the Sabbath day, so long will the educational influence of the pulpit remain paramount in Britain. Whether we consider the momentous character of the truths which are there asserted and enforced; the number of persons and variety of classes who, by any motive, are brought within their hearing; the regularity, and frequency, and power with which they are proclaimed; or the intimate manner in which the truths themselves are calculated to affect the convictions and the lives of men, we shall find in each consideration a far more than sufficient reason for cherishing a deep concern in the right direction of this great moral power. It is much, and yet it

is little, to say, that all the teaching of the schools and universities of our country exerts no influence upon the chief elements of society at all comparable to the influence of the Christian ministry. The very basis both of national and individual character has long been formed, as it will long continue to be, by those weekly religious services which no wise man is lofty enough to despise, and no child too simple to profit by; and though the instruction is for the most part purely Scriptural and moral, yet perhaps a larger amount of knowledge, intellectual enjoyment, and other elements of sound education, are imparted to a vast proportion of the community by these means than by all the other means put together. . . . The pulpit is the great barrier which mainly resists the influence of an active irreligious press. While no mean proportion of our literature is sanctified to the highest purposes of human life, it cannot be denied that a still more influential portion is imbued with a worldly and unchristian spirit. It is the pulpit which most effectually keeps the press in check, which leavens the whole mass of public opinion, which gives to virtue the order of divine authority, and to morality the sanction of a holy law. How many of the blessings of this great empire are due to the religious principles which—in greater or less degree—restrain, direct, and prompt its individual energies, will never be known till the great day of God; but if it be asked, by what means these religious principles have been rooted and extended in the nation, there is but one answer to be given—this is instrumentally due to the popular and habitual observance of the Christian Sabbath, to the practice of public worship, and the ‘foolishness of preaching.’ ”

If we attribute the greatness of England mainly to the Protestant religion, and more particularly to the influence of the Bible, the Sabbath and the pulpit, we must, of course, not confine ourselves to the two ecclesiastical establishments, the Episcopal Church of England and Ireland, and the Presbyterian Church of Scotland, but make due account of all the various branches of Dissent, especially the

Independents, the Methodists, and the Presbyterian secession bodies, of which the Free Church is the most recent, but the most active and influential. It is a strange fact that the English Reformation, though far less noble and spiritual in its origin, than the Continental, especially if we look to that royal despot, whose sinful passion for the mother of Elizabeth was its first *external* occasion, has yet had a deeper and more lasting effect upon the people, than the corresponding movement in Germany, Switzerland, or France. It is in England and Scotland alone, and in their offspring, the United States, where Protestantism has fully developed itself, not only as a religious and theological, but also as a social and political principle, and that under a truly national form.

To account for this fact we must keep in mind that the English Reformation was by no means completed in the sixteenth century, but was carried on by the Puritan revolution in the seventeenth, the Methodist revival in the eighteenth, and the Evangelical movement in the nineteenth centuries, each of which left its deep and lasting marks also upon the established Church, roused it from its slumber, purged it of many abuses, and proved thus of the greatest benefit to it. The great struggles of the various forms of Dissent with the ruling power, especially during the seventeenth century, called out all the mental and moral energies of the nation and resulted in the gradual abolition of the penal laws in matters of conscience, and the triumph of those great principles of religious and political freedom, by which it is so highly favored above all the nations of the old world.

Great Britain still maintains, it is true, two ecclesiastical establishments, Episcopacy in England, and Presbyterianism in Scotland, and forms thus the transition from the Continent of Europe where dissent is allowed only to a limited extent and by special concessions of the Government, and between the United States where the church is entirely separated from the civil power, and where all religious denominations are placed on a basis of perfect equality before the law. As the English are noted for the tena-

city with which they adhere to long established customs and even old family abuses, it is not likely that the union of Church and State will be entirely broken up, at least not for a long time to come. It is well enough that such a time-honored connection should only gradually be loosened as the wants of the age seem to demand. Radical measures always produce a reaction and do more harm in the end than good. Washington Irving humorously says: "To keep up his chapel, has cost John Bull much money; but he is staunch in his religion, and piqued in his zeal, from the circumstance that many dissenting chapels have been erected in his vicinity, and several of his neighbors, with whom he has had quarrels, are strong papists."

But in point of fact the Dissenters in England and Scotland, according to the Census Report published at London in 1854, are numerically stronger now, than the two established Churches, which hardly keep pace with the growing religious wants of the population, especially among the laboring classes of society. They enjoy at present unrestricted freedom of worship, and for their loss of the temporal support of government they may feel amply compensated by their independence of State control and interference to which both the Church of England and the Kirk of Scotland are subject. Moreover the tendency of the age is evidently to weaken still more the bond of union between the temporal and spiritual power, and it may not be long perhaps till even Jews will be admitted to Parliament, whose doors, since the abolition of the Test Act, have been thrown open already to Roman Catholics and Unitarians. By this mixed character of the legislative council in which the ecclesiastical supremacy of the crown virtually resides, the union of Church and State becomes more and more a glaring inconsistency. The same government which was once purely Episcopalian, now finds it necessary not only to support Romanism in Ireland by the Maynooth grant, but even Buddhism and Mohammedanism in India. The supreme council of India actually paid £2,500 annually for the idolatry of Juggernaut till quite recently when they

discharged all the claims by settling upon it a permanent endowment sufficient to produce \$7,500 a year. The entire separation of such a hypocritical connection would perhaps be better for the spiritual benefit of the Church of England. For she would still remain the central framework of Protestantism in Great Britain and her dependencies, but acquire, at the same time, the right of self-government and independence of action; she could then develop all her internal resources, and by speaking more in love than by authority, and presenting herself as the messenger of God more than as the agent of the State, she would engage to a larger extent the affection of the people. We would hear no more of fox hunting lord-bishops, of non-residence, plurality of benefices, and other crying evils, which were most complained of in the days of her unlimited power; and the ranks of indifferent clergymen of the "high and dry," and of the "low and slow" order, would be filled with laborious, self-denying, devoted servants of Christ. The present condition of the dissenting bodies of England and Scotland, the Episcopal communion of Scotland, as all the Churches of this country, as well as the history of the first three centuries, sufficiently prove that Christianity can get along on the voluntary principle without the temporal support of the civil government.

Yet, we should not forget, on the other hand, the many advantages of the State-Church system, and the large amount of good which a government like the English can do for the advancement of Christianity in the distant colonies over which it is providentially called to rule. In this respect the importance and duty of that mighty nation can hardly be overrated. The English are emphatically the missionary nation of the present age, and no Christian who has the triumph of his holy religion at heart, can wish their downfall, as long as they protect the messengers of the Cross in all their colonies. We Americans should never ungratefully forget that the Northern part of this great country has been gained to the Kingdom of Christ mainly through the early settlers who brought from Eng-

land and Scotland the Christian faith as their dearest treasure to the bleak hills of New England, and the banks of the Potomac. A similar process is now going on in all the immense dependencies of that people. We may justly censure the grasping disposition of the British government and its selfish commercial policy to which every other interest is made to bend. But we should not overlook, on that account, the missionary zeal and activity of the British Churches who keep step with the conquests of the government and labor to make them subservient to the progress of Christian civilization. They contribute more means annually for the spread of the Bible and the Gospel in foreign lands than probably the whole Continent of Europe, Catholic and Protestant combined. Even during the recent Russian war the activity in that direction has rather increased than decreased, and will continue to do so, we trust, for many years to come. Wherever the English rule extends, and wherever the English language is spoken, there the Gospel is preached, the Bible read, the school established, religious and civil liberty planted. One of the most striking features of modern history is the rapid rise of colonies and the springing up of new empires in America, Africa, East India, and the South Sea Islands, under the guiding star of the Anglo-Saxon race, and the Protestant religion. The propagation of Christianity and civilization under its evangelical form is mainly entrusted by Providence to Great Britain and the United States, and this is the highest motive that should prompt them ever to live on terms of sincere friendship and honorable rivalry of peaceful progress.

We next proceed to an analysis of the intellectual and moral character of the English.

To understand this properly, we must take into consideration first the insular isolation, as one of the chief physical causes of their national traits and present position. For while it afforded them opportunities of ready commerce with all the shores of the civilized world, and of accumulating an enormous mass of wealth, it protected

them at the same time from foreign invasion, and was most favorable to the development of home-life and that power of self-government which qualifies them both for the rational enjoyment of liberty at home, and the control of the vast empires abroad.

In the next place we must remember that the English are a mixed race, to which the Romanized Briton, the Anglo-Saxon or German, the Dane, and the Frenchified Norman contributed their share. These elements were not so antagonistic as to refuse an intermarriage, or by intermarriage to deteriorate and degenerate, as is the case with the mixture of the Spaniard, the Indian and the Negro in the South American countries; yet they were different enough to produce a new race that should combine the peculiar energies of all. After long remaining hostile to each other, they coalesced, since the twelfth or thirteenth century, under the influence of Christianity, first Catholic and then Protestant, into an organic unity; the Saxon forming the material foundation, and the Norman the vitalizing soul. To this mixture of different, yet cognate nationalities, must be attributed the peculiar strength and expansiveness of the English character. For

“ Where gentleness with force we find,
The tender with the stern combined,
The harmony is sweet and strong.”

The English excel not so much in showy, as in solid qualities. Their worth lies more in the deep than on the surface. They are not so well calculated to gain your affections, as to command your admiration. Their apparent or real haughtiness, coldness and taciturnity are apt to repel at first, and their eccentricities and splenetic habits, especially when travelling abroad, may provoke a smile. But they gain upon acquaintance, and their manliness, and sincerity, their truthfulness and reliability, their sense of rectitude, and love of plain dealing and fair play, their benevolence and generosity, their intellectual and moral substantiality will secure ultimately your lasting esteem. The English mind is neither as idealistic, contemplative, and

patiently inquisitive as the German, nor as quick, versatile and brilliant as the French; but surpasses them both in that strong sterling good sense which enables it to understand the concrete realities of life, to deal with things as they are, and not as they might be, to engage in any kind of business and to turn everything to proper account.

With this is connected a directness of purpose, a straight-forward single-mindedness, and a power of cool observation which implies real curiosity, but an entire absence of wonder. This trait makes the *nil admirari* a maxim of good breeding, and forbids the Englishman to be charmed with music, to laugh at comedy, to weep at tragedy and to show strong symptoms of joy or grief in the sudden reverses of prosperity and adversity. He smiles at ecstasy and enthusiasm as a species of weakness. But for this very reason he has also a keen sense of whatever is ridiculous.

Quiet, deep, good natured humor is as characteristic of "merry" England, as sprightly, dashing, sparkling wit and *esprit* is at home in the gay society and light literature of France. Humor is more an attribute of the heart and rests on an earnest sense of the vanities and follies of man, "that pendulum betwixt a smile and tear;" wit is an effulgence of the imagination and flows from a keen perception of the strange contradictions and remote analogies of things, and the conviction that man—to use an expression of Pascal—is at once "the guardian of truth, and a mere huddle of uncertainty, the glory, and the scandal of the universe." Wit aims only at others, while humor spares not itself. Washington Irving in his Sketch Book, remarks: "It is characteristic of the peculiar humor of the English and of their love for what is blunt, comic, and familiar, that they have embodied their national oddities in the figure of a sturdy, corpulent old fellow, with a three-cornered hat, red waistcoat, leather breeches, and stout oaken cudgel. Thus they have taken a singular delight in exhibiting their most private foibles in a laughable point of view, and have been so successful in delineations, that

there is scarcely a being in actual existence more absolutely present to the public mind, than that eccentric personage, John Bull."

In a practical point of view, the English have no superior among the nations of the earth, in calm self-possession, dignified reserve, courage and patient endurance. In them the iron strength of the ancient Romans, and the stern severity of Stoicism are revived, but under a nobler and purer form. Massive strength and solidity characterizes all their works, the docks of Liverpool, and the fortress of Gibraltar, their rail-roads and steam-boats, their splendidly bound books and domestic comforts.

British energy is not impulsive, fiery, aggressive as the French, but sober, calculating, tenacious and unyielding. The French can found colonies, but they cannot retain them; they could conquer the half of Europe, but they had their city twice taken at last, and the perseverance of Wellington defeated the genius of Napoleon. The French fight for glory, the English from a sense of duty, and—for pay. Francis I. comforted his troops after the defeat at Pavia with the words: "All is lost, save honor." Cromwell advised his steel-clad Ironsides at Dunbar: "Trust in God, and keep your powder dry." Napoleon always appealed to the ambition of his soldiers and told them before the battle of the pyramids, "Forty ages look down upon you;" while Nelson, just before the victory of Trafalgar, simply reminded his crew, that "England expects every man to do his duty."

In the recent Crimean war, the French have gained the lion's share of military glory, and the boasting of the English about their wonderful Armada has been rather put to shame. This they felt themselves. After the first campaign the London "Punch" in his usual good humor, under the caption: "A distinction without a difference," passed the judgment: "Admiral-Napier was expected to do something in the Baltic, and he did not; Admiral Dundas was expected to do nothing in the Black Sea, and he did." But it must be remembered, that the English

seldom succeed in the beginning of a war, (think of the disasters of the Peninsular war under Moore,) but are roused as it progresses, and would in all probability have come out to much greater advantage from a third campaign; that the shrewd Russians never gave them a chance for a sea fight; that on land their forces were much inferior in number to those of their Allies; that they suffered immensely from incredible mismanagement in the commissariate; and that they had not the benefit of the admirable military school of Algiers. In spite of these disadvantages they fully sustained their high reputation for admirable discipline, indomitable bravery and perseverance, especially in the terrible battle of Inkermann, and the useless and imprudent, but brilliant charge of the Light Brigade at Balaclava, where a few hundred horsemen, in obedience to a misunderstood order, rushed into "the jaws of death and into the mouth of hell," piercing the Russian battery of guns and a phalanx of Cavalry of five thousand men, one British sword being pitted against a dozen swords, muskets, pistols, rifles and cannons of the enemy, so that the wonder is, not that so many of the small British force were killed, but that any returned to tell of the fight and to furnish the genius of Tennyson the material for his immortal poem.

Yet, after all, the heroic self-denial of Florence Nightingale in the hospitals of Scutari and Sebastopol reflects more real and lasting credit upon England than her bloody victories. What a painful fact, that out of the eighty-eight millions of pounds sterling expended by her government during the fiscal year of 1856, more than seventy-four millions were paid for the interest of former wars, and for the support of the present means of defence! It is a poor comfort that she owes her enormous debt, now exceeding eight hundred millions, to her own subjects. The greatest and noblest triumphs of that nation lie in the arts of peace, and the crowning triumph of British civilization would be the abolition of war itself, with its untold barbarities and sufferings.

But there is little prospect for the speedy attainment of

such an end. If Voltaire remarked of the French that they are half tiger and half monkey, it may be said with as much truth that the English are half lion and half bull. The latter trait shows itself in their love for coarse amusements, such as horse-racing, boxing, cock-fighting, dog-fighting, and in their overbearing conduct to foreign nations. The sad experience of the Crimean disasters has wrought no change. For since then John Bull kept up a great roaring in the Bay of Naples to frighten King Bomba out of his cruelties, and before the walls of Canton to teach the Celestials some respect for the terrestrials. In these two cases the thunder of cannon may be perhaps the most efficient means for the moment, but it is certainly not the one most worthy of a civilized and Christian nation.

It would be unjust, not to mention one redeeming feature, viz : the absence of revenge and the sympathy for the weak against the strong which generally characterizes the Englishman. Even in the pugilistic combat he shakes hands with the antagonist before he begins, and scorns to strike him when he is fairly on the ground. If only John Bull would trouble himself less about other peoples affairs, pay his enormous debt to the last farthing, though he should accompany every guinea with a growl, train his unruly children, especially in Ireland, and attend to his business at home, he would save himself a great deal of unmerited reproach. For after all, "with all his odd humors and obstinate prejudices, John is a sterling-hearted old blade. He may not be so wonderfully fine a fellow as he thinks himself, but he is at least twice as good as his neighbors represent him. His virtues are all his own; all plain, home-bred, and unaffected. His very faults smack of the raciness of his good qualities. His extravagance savors of his generosity; his quarrelsomeness of his courage; his credulity of his open faith; his vanity of his pride; and his bluntness of his sincerity. They are all the redundancies of a rich and liberal character. He is like his own oak; rough without, but sound and solid within; whose bark abounds with excrescences in proportion to the growth

and grandeur of the timber; and whose branches make a fearful groaning and murmuring in the least storm, from their very magnitude and luxuriance."

In the social life of England one of the strongest pillars of her happiness and prosperity is the domesticity which contrasts so strikingly with the lounging, open-air existence of Southern nations. The Englishman does not live with half a dozen families in one building like the French and the Germans; but even in large cities he has a house of his own, and prides in it as an inassailable castle and inviolable sanctuary, where he feels as safe and independent as the Queen at Windsor or Buckingham palace. He delights in his home, fills it with the most substantial comforts, and spends his sweetest hours in the bosom of his family. He knows how to convert the rudest habitation and the most unpromising spot of land into a little paradise

"Where bliss domestic finds a dwelling place;
Domestic bliss, that, like a harmless dove,
Can centre in a little quiet nest
All that desire would fly for through the earth; .
* * * * *
That, like a flower deep hid in rocky cleft,
Smiles, though 'tis looking only at the sky."

He holds the conjugal tie peculiarly sacred. Nothing can be better regulated than an English household. Dignity and mutual regard, order and decency rule there supreme. The wife nowhere on the Continent occupies so high and dignified a position. Parental authority is nowhere more respected. The order of servants in the higher classes of England is far superior to anything we know in the United States.

The Englishman delights in the exercise of hospitality on the most liberal scale and will treat you as one of his family, provided you are properly introduced to him. This formality is absolutely necessary, owing to the peculiar reserve of his character and the sacredness of his home. Without it he is apt to take no notice of you whatever. He treats his own countryman no better when he meets

him abroad. It is said that an Englishman let his brother Englishman drown before his eyes in one of the lakes of Switzerland without an attempt to save him, because he was not introduced. *Se non è vero è ben trovato.* To enjoy English hospitality to its full extent, you must follow him to his country seat, where he lays aside the restraints, the hurry, the selfishness of business and city life, and yet surrounds himself with all the conveniences and elegances of polite society, gives full scope to his natural feelings, provides all the means of literary, rural, and social enjoyment to his guest, without putting the least constraint upon him, but leaving every one to his own inclination. Much of that union of strength and elegance, of robustness of frame and tenderness of complexion by which the English gentleman excels, must be attributed to his love for rural life and the invigorating recreations in open air.

English society is thoroughly aristocratic, but with a steady tendency towards an orderly and sensible democracy. The French Revolution, like a flood, swept away the nobility on the Continent, or reduced it to a mere nominal existence. In England it remained unshaken and is as flourishing as ever. Hence the singular fact that there is more equality in France, while there is more liberty, both religious and civil, in England. The former country abolished the law of primogeniture and acknowledges in theory no privileged classes; but it has no habeas corpus act, that strong bulwark of personal freedom in Great Britain and America.

The aristocracy of England is a truly national growth and popular institution. It is not an exclusive and tyrannical power ignoring and disdaining the masses; but it is interwoven with the people by ten thousand ties. It recruits its strength continually from the best elements of the lower classes, and passes into them by a regular gradation from the lords and bishops to the landed gentry and clergy, and from them to the merchants and mechanics; while the aspiring and successful of the lower classes are ever passing into the gentry and occasionally into the no-

bility. The aristocracy furnishes not only the conservative Tories, but also the progressive Whigs, and human rights and liberties find as warm and vigorous champions in the House of Lords as in the House of Commons.

Upon the whole the nobility is the flower of the English nation. As they surpass in physical beauty of the purest and most refined order every similar class of society on the Continent, so also in general education, public spirit, liberal principles and princely generosity. That their immense wealth should lead to many temptations and vices, must be expected. The history of Lord Byron, the Memoirs of Lady Blessington, and the private life of George IV. and William IV.—not to go back to the royal John Bull, Henry VIII.—reveal a large amount of moral corruption among them, but not near as deep and general as that which characterized the French nobility before the Revolution. And after all, there is no class of society which does not furnish the same proof of the awful depravity of human nature. The present royal family of England is esteemed as a model of domestic virtue and happiness, and no one can calculate the power of good example set by an excellent wife and mother, whom Providence has placed on the throne of the largest empire on earth.

But a far more serious objection to the aristocratic institutions of England is the physical and moral degradation of the peasantry, as well as the mining and laboring population which support the higher classes and, like the millions of sand grains at the base of the pyramids, are kept in their place only by the immense weight of the superincumbent structure, however much the whirlwind may scatter them about. It would be unjust indeed to make the nobility alone responsible for the wretchedness of the lower strata of society. Many of the nobles are among the most benevolent and charitable of men. I will only allude to a cotemporary, Lord Shaftesbury, who visits the dens of thieves and holes of misery, who builds model houses for day-laborers, who looks after the interests of the chimney sweeps, in Parliament, and is ever busy in inventing and

carrying out new schemes for the improvement of the sufferers of his fellow-men. Such Christian charity accomplishes infinitely more real good than all the novels of Dickens and that pseudo-philanthropic literature which makes the lower classes interesting at the expense of the higher, which winks at the selfishness of human nature in the one case and exaggerates it in the other, and thus kindles that frightful antagonism between the rich and the poor, which must vent itself at last, if not checked by wholesome reforms, in a fearful social convulsion. The aristocracy proper, then, is clearly not the only cause of the social evils. The manufacturers, the merchants and the moneyed classes generally, are fully as much to blame for them.

For, do we not see already the indications of similar evils in our own country, in spite of its youth, its immense extent, and republican institutions? Does not the inextinguishable thirst for riches, the disgraceful and degrading worship of the golden calf, corrupt our public sentiment and threaten to infect the very life-blood of our community? We will not speak at all of the miserable condition of the unfortunate African race both in the free and in the slave States. But confining ourselves to the white population, it may well be doubted whether even London and Paris exhibit more startling contrasts of wealth and poverty—a fashionable world more extravagant and artificial, hollow and heartless, and a pauperism and crime more sickening and revolting, than New York and New Orleans.

But whatever be the causes, it is a fact that English society presents the greatest contrasts, especially in the mining districts, and the larger cities, such as Edinburgh, old and new, Glasgow, Liverpool, Manchester and London. In close proximity to Dawning street, Westminster Abbey, and the new houses of Parliament which the late emperor Nicholas appropriately called “a dream in stones,” or behind the magnificent dwellings and stores of Regents Crescent and Circus, there are lanes and closes in which ignorance, vice and misery of the most revolting kind dwell together in horrid confusion.

The greatest domestic difficulty, social and political, of Great Britain is Ireland. It is fully as grievous and perplexing as that which arises from the institution of slavery in our own country. It is the curse of the despotism of race over race, and Church over Church, sanctioned by centuries of legal possession, and for this reason almost beyond the possibility of cure, except by a degree of individual generosity, or governmental sacrifice which would far surpass the indemnification required for the abolition of slavery, in the West Indies. In the Roman Catholic or Southern districts of Ireland the amount of pauperism and degradation is incredible. Even in the city of Dublin, where there are so many asylums and charitable institutions, trains of ragged, whining beggars will besiege and entreat you for a morsel of bread. As the nobility and gentry own nearly all the land, the farmers have been reduced to a condition which in point of fact is nothing else than a white-washed system of slavery. Many of them live in low, narrow hovels under one roof with the chickens and pigs, from youth to old age. You may travel through whole counties without finding a farmer who can call one foot of ground his own, outside of the grave-yard, while the proprietor of the immense estate lives unconcerned in princely splendor at London or on the Continent. Add to this, that the poor Irish Catholics are compelled, since the reign of Queen Elizabeth, to support an ecclesiastical establishment which, however good in itself, and however well adapted for England, was introduced among the neighbors by the force of arms, and which they regard not only—to use the expression of Hallam—as “a government without subjects, a college of shepherds without sheep,” but as heretical and pernicious, and you have the chief causes of the miseries of the Celtic population in Ireland.

The dark picture is, however, not without some rays of hope. The first difficulty alluded to is now gradually diminishing in consequence of an act of Parliament, called the Encumbered Estates Bill, which, since its passage some six or seven years ago, has caused quite a salutary revolu-

tion in the agricultural and social condition of Ireland and greatly decreased the number of paupers and criminals. It takes a large amount of sadly abused property from the possession of spendthrift landlords and confers it by sale upon a worthy and industrious class of people.

As to the religious cause of the Irish difficulty, an abolition of the Aglican Establishment, as far as Ireland is concerned, would diminish the animosity and do away with reasonable complaints more effectually than the Maynooth grant, which, however just and politic, is inconsistent as far as the government professes a particular religion antagonistic to the Roman. But even the entire severance of Church and State in Ireland would be no radical cure of the evil, just as the abolition of slavery in our Union with the full compensation to the masters for the loss of property out of the national treasury, would still leave open the question of the moral elevation of the negro to a rational enjoyment of freedom in a land which will forever be under the control of the white race. It would seem, that a satisfactory and permanent solution of the Irish problem under its religious aspect, would require either a conversion of the Catholics to the Protestant faith and industry, which has made some progress at least, within the last few years, or their gradual emigration, which is said to have already diminished the number of the Celtic inhabitants to the amount of about two millions, and made room for the immigration of Anglo-Saxons and Protestants from Scotland and England.

Having now briefly considered the deeper strata of society, we are prepared to assign to political liberty its proper place as the third cause of the power and prosperity of England, instead of making it the first and only cause, as Montalembert seems to do. Political liberty is as much the result, as the guardian of the religious and moral character of the nation. It rests on the basis of self-government and respect for authority. Without this, it would long since have run into licentiousness and anarchy and thus proved a failure, like the French Revolutions and the Con-

tinental outbreaks of 1848. England has certainly succeeded far better than any other country of the old world, Switzerland not excepted, in attaining the great end of civil government by reconciling the claims of authority and freedom and thus securing perfect safety of life and property on the one hand, and the uncrippled development of the national and individual resources and energies on the other. Love of freedom and respect for law, manly independence and sincere loyalty, conservatism without stagnation, and progressivism without revolution, are deep rooted traits in the Anglo-Saxon race. It is just this union of apparently opposite tendencies which enables them to steer between the extremes of despotism and anarchy, of absolute monarchy and absolute democracy or rather mobocracy. In this union lies the true genius and security of rational freedom and constitutional liberty which has been transmitted to the American people from the first settlements in Virginia and Massachusetts, in Maryland and Pennsylvania. Individual and local self-government keeps England and the United States from the dangers of centralization, which destroyed true liberty in France even when it bore the name of a republic. For a centralized republic is only another form of despotism.

The guardian of the British liberties is the Constitution, that unseen, yet real power which the Queen and Parliament are as much bound to obey as the humblest citizen, and which is the protection and safety of all. This constitution is not the work of the moment, like those with which Sièyes stocked the pigeon-holes of his bureau, to suit the varying phases of the French Revolution, but it is the natural growth of ages. It is not an instrument simply on paper and an abstract theory of human rights, but a living power in the heart of the people and a practical system in which its true genius is embodied. Such a constitution to which many centuries have contributed their share of wisdom and experience, must necessarily involve anomalies which perplex the theorist and refuse to bend to the strict rules of logic. It is a compromise of principles

with a considerable admixture of no principle at all. But it has also the power of vitality, expanding and adapting itself to the diversified wants of society, keeping pace with the progress of the nation, and yet remaining the same in substance and spirit.

The leading principles of the constitution which underlie the laws and institutions of England, commencing with the origin of the nationality itself and running through the various stages of its historical development, are especially the following: Supreme authority of law; obedience to it until it is lawfully repealed; limitation of the royal power by a national parliament, partly hereditary, partly elective; representation of the various classes of the nation in the legislative council; trial by jury; no centralization of power except as far as is necessary to give unity to the government; no taxation without representation; no punishment without a lawful trial; the Habeas Corpus Act, or the guarantee against arbitrary imprisonment.

These principles are mainly embodied in three great charters which Lord Chatham called the "Bible of the English Constitution," namely the Magna Charta from the year 1215, the Petition of Right from the year 1628, and the Bill of Rights from the year 1689. In each of them the nation at a solemn crisis declared its rights against the arbitrary encroachments of the royal power, and acknowledged its obligations.

In the middle ages, nearly all the monarchies of Western Europe were restricted by fundamental laws and representative assemblies, by the clergy and the nobility. The German emperor was an elective prince and depended to a considerable extent upon the Diet. Spain was more free under Ferdinand and Isabella and under Charles V., than England under Henry VII. or Henry VIII. In France the States-general alone could constitutionally impose taxes. Even Denmark and Sweden had similar constitutions. But the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries swept most of these constitutions away and introduced royal despotism on the Continent. This was especially the case in France,

where Louis XIV. imposed upon the Parliament a patient silence of sixty years and called himself the State (*L' état c'est moi*). A similar attempt was made in England under the Stuarts. But the Long Parliament, the Puritan convulsion, and the orderly Revolution of 1688 saved, strengthened and enlarged the constitution and the liberties of the country.

In that most eventful period of English history, which covers the greater part of the seventeenth century, Protestantism developed itself consistently as a principle of civil and religious freedom, while on the Continent it has been able to produce only a limited degree of toleration. Even Switzerland, though a republic, recognizes properly only two Churches, the Reformed and the Roman Catholic. The freedom of the Church was indeed one of the fundamental articles of the Magna Charta. But it was understood at that time in a hierarchical sense, and was confined to the Romish faith. Since the Reformation, the conception of Christianity has been enlarged, and religious and civil liberty have gone hand in hand in the Anglo-Saxon race under the controlling genius of Protestantism, growing deeper and stronger with every successive generation and mutually supporting and strengthening each other. This is what constitutes the great advance of England and the United States over all the nations of the earth. In both respects the American constitution again goes, in principle, a step beyond the English, especially in regard to the freedom of religion, which is here left to develop all the energies of Christianity without the interference and encroachments of the secular power.

Yet, after all, the most perfect constitution and the largest amount of liberty could as little guarantee the welfare and prosperity of a nation, without a healthy public sentiment, as a tree may be expected to grow without the continual nourishment of the soil and the supply of air, rain and sunshine. Liberty must go hand in hand with education, education with virtue, virtue with religion. Christianity, as we said in the beginning, is, after all, the deepest

cause of the greatness of England. Blot it out, and her glory is departed, her civilization and refinement would rapidly degenerate, and her liberties perish. True Christianity, the Christianity of the everlasting Gospel is the guardian angel of Great Britain and America, and the only hope of the world.

Mercersburg, Pa., May, 1857.

P. S.

ART. II.—CHRISTIAN ARCHITECTURE.

ARCHITECTURE has been well defined, "an act of devotion symbolically uttered." If to this be added, "through forms and arrangement of rocks and stones resulting in the temple," the definition will be complete, including the whole of Architecture, from the rude cromlech to the great cathedral, and excluding all that ought to be excluded, all structures of wood, iron, clay, brick, in a word of any material different from rock, or that which may be cut with the chisel, and of course excluding all buildings except the temple. Domestic architecture, so called, is a thing not known in the world before the times of the Roman empire. If the palace-temple of Egypt were such indeed, it was so to the same degree in which the Gothic Minster is a dwelling-house because the sexton lives in one of its cloisters. In like manner is it of the essence of our definition to deny positively, even as it were a very article in the matter, that any building made of other material than stone can belong to Architecture. Buildings of wood, iron, plaster, are no more to be included under the term, than figures moulded in wax or glass are to be included under Sculpture. We have here chosen an aesthetic parallel. The true reason, however, why none but the rock