

removed, the thing need not, perhaps, be regarded as quite impossible, if only negotiations were carried on with tact and in a spirit of prayer; at all events, we may venture to indulge in some hope, if we cannot have much assurance, of success in this direction.

It will always, however, be open to question whether it is worth while to aim at actual uniformity of government and forms of worship in the Christian Church; for it is, to say the least, doubtful whether it may not be more influential by being presented in these respects to different minds in different aspects, just as in the case of the Gospel itself one truth comes out into prominence at one time or place, another at another, to suit the particular exigencies of the age or people. To get the various denominations in our own country to reunite on one common basis of doctrine, and to submit to one common authority, seems at present almost Utopian, and outside the sphere of the practicable; but union in the oneness of the Spirit in the one Lord is attainable, and, indeed, is largely realized to-day by many from all the Churches who are members of "the mystical body," "which is the blessed company of all faithful people," and of which Christ is the living Head. Whether any other union than this is possible until the Lord Himself comes to rectify the wrongs, adjust the disorders, and allay the controversies of earth, is a matter of very grave doubt. Meanwhile, we may join in earnest and frequent intercession to Almighty God that He would be pleased to purify those corrupt Churches, reunion with which now is an absolute impossibility for those very many who, like ourselves, take the Holy Scripture, and it only, as our rule of faith; and that He would, in His good time, hasten the visible fulfilment of the Redeemer's prayer for the unity of all who believe in Him—"That they all may be one; as Thou, Father, art in Me, and I in Thee, that they also may be one in Us."

J. HUGHES-GAMES.



ART. IV.—"THIS DO," OR "OFFER THIS" ?

IN the manual entitled *The Congregation in Church*, on page 49 we read:—"Our Lord's command was, 'Offer THIS in remembrance of Me.' In the Greek version of the Old Testament (commonly called the 'Septuagint') which was in use in our Lord's time and read in the Synagogues, and which was then, and is now by the Greek Church, looked upon as of

equal authority with the Hebrew text itself, the same word (*ποιεῖν*) which is translated 'do' in St. Luke xxii. 19, is used about eighty times in the sense of to *offer up* or to *sacrifice*."

This passage falls naturally into three divisions, which it will be convenient to put in the following order:—

(1) The assertion that the verb *ποιεῖν* is used about eighty times in the Septuagint "in the sense of to *offer up* or to *sacrifice*."

(2) The implication¹ that this alleged use of the word influenced our Lord's language because the Septuagint "was in use in our Lord's time and read in the Synagogues."

(3) The conclusion that *ποιεῖν* does therefore positively mean 'offer' in Luke xxii. 19.

I.

First, then, it is asserted that *ποιεῖν* is used about eighty times in the Septuagint "in the sense of to *offer up* or to *sacrifice*."

Now it might reasonably have been expected that a writer making an assertion of this character would support it by mentioning at any rate some of the most conspicuous passages in which the verb is so used. A foot-note of one or two lines would have sufficed for this; and his not doing it both weakens the credibility of the statement, and lays upon an opponent or an inquirer a very unreasonable burden. Upon an opponent, indeed, it puts the responsibility of proving a negative; and he would be quite justified, if victory and not truth were his object, in refusing either to admit the truth of the assertion, or to enter into argument upon it, until references had been given, which might be used as a test of its accuracy. My own object, however, being not so much to controvert another's opinion as to exhibit the truth, I must, if possible, get over the difficulty which the omission interposes. Now *ποιεῖν* is one of the commonest of Greek verbs, and occurs about three thousand three hundred times in the Septuagint. Am I to go through the whole of the volume, and examine every place in which it is found, in order to ascertain whether it bears the meaning of 'offer'? This is out of the question: nor would it be satisfactory to the reader, since he would have to take my word for the result of the investigation, it being clearly impossible to present each case to him without utterly wearying both his patience and my own. There is, however, another course, which, though it has involved very great labour, I have

¹ If any objection is felt to the assertion that this is implied, the reader will find the matter treated below more fully than would here be convenient.

adopted; which, moreover, will admit of my giving the reader not only the conclusion at which I have myself arrived, but also a considerable proportion of the passages on which that conclusion is based; and which I feel sure every reasonable man will allow to be satisfactory. I have gone through the Pentateuch in the English Authorized Version, carefully noting every place in which I found the verb 'offer'; and for the rest of the Old Testament (in which, from the nature of the subject-matter, the word is much less frequent) I have used *Cruden's Concordance* with the same object. I have taken great care to make the list complete, and hope that no passage, either through my own or through Cruden's inadvertence, has escaped me. I have found the verb 'offer' in 275 places, and in every instance have examined the passage in the Septuagint. The result is that in forty-nine places $\piοαίϋν$ is used, while (as was to be expected) in a far larger number are compounds of the Greek verb $\phiέρειν$, from the Latin form of which 'offer' itself is derived. Of the forty-nine places, thirty-three are in the two books Leviticus and Numbers, five in a passage of only six verses in Exodus (xxix. 36-41), and only eleven others in all the rest of the Old Testament.

Now at first sight the fact that $\piοαίϋν$ is found in so many places in the Septuagint where 'offer' is used in the English Version would appear to justify to a considerable extent the assertion of the writer of *The Congregation in Church*. But he has omitted to qualify his assertion by an additional fact, which, as will presently appear, would have robbed it of all value in his argument. To explain this, I must first observe that the general verb $\piοαίϋν$, like its English equivalents 'do' and 'make,' may be used instead of many other specific verbs, provided that the subject-matter allows it to be substituted without risk of misconception. Let me illustrate this by examples, first of the use of 'do' and 'make' in English, and then of that of $\piοαίϋν$ in the Septuagint. Suppose a number of persons to have met together to execute some work in concert—say, the decoration of a church for a festival. One says, "I should like to *do* the font"; another is asked to *do* the pulpit; and so on. 'Do' is here used for 'decorate,' the general word being less formal and more idiomatic than the special. Now suppose that two of the decorators are conversing during their work about some matter not connected with it, and that one says to the other, "He *did* what I told him": these words would not be understood by the listener to mean "He *decorated* what I told him," simply because the word 'do' had just been used in that sense; but would be interpreted in connexion with the subject about which they were talking. In the same way 'do' may be used for very many verbs denoting

action. Again, in the phrases "make an offering," "make¹ a covenant," 'make' may be said to stand respectively for the verbs 'offer' and 'covenant'; but no one would suppose it to mean 'covenant' when followed by the noun 'offering,' nor 'offer' when followed by 'covenant.' The grammatical object determines its meaning, and precludes misconception in both cases. Now ποιέiv is used in a similar manner in those places in the Septuagint which we have under consideration. On carefully examining the forty-nine passages I find that in all of them, without exception, the subject-matter, and particularly the grammatical object of the verb, makes it clear that offering is intended. In Exodus xxix. 36-39, for example, we have the following:—"And thou shalt offer every day a bullock for a sin-offering for atonement. Now this is that which thou shalt offer upon the altar; two lambs . . . the one lamb thou shalt offer in the morning, and the other lamb thou shalt offer at even." In Lev. xiv. 19, 30: "And the priest shall offer the sin-offering . . . he shall offer one of the turtle-doves." Lev. xv. 15, 30: "And the priest shall offer them, the one for a sin-offering, and the other for a burnt-offering." Lev. xvii. 4, 8: "to offer an offering unto the Lord"—"that offereth a burnt-offering or sacrifice." Numb. vi. 11, 14, 16, 17: "And the priest shall offer the one for a sin-offering, and the other for a burnt offering"—"he shall offer his offering unto the Lord, one he lamb, etc."—"the priest . . . shall offer his sin-offering and his burnt-offering"—"he shall offer the ram for a sacrifice of peace offerings unto the Lord . . . the priest shall offer also his meat-offering and his drink-offering." These examples, which are, indeed, about a third of all that are to be found in the Old Testament, are amply sufficient for my purpose. Let the reader substitute 'do' (or 'make' in some cases) for 'offer' in them, and he will see that, though these words are generally not so appropriate in English as in the Greek, they still convey the right meaning.

The result, then, of our investigation of the Septuagint usage is the following:—When the translators had to express the idea of offering, they employed, more than four times out of five, a word bearing that specific meaning; but, when the context allowed it to be done without risk of misinterpretation, they sometimes used the general word ποιέiv. It must be added that for every example of ποιέiv used instead of 'offer' in the Septuagint nearly seventy could be adduced where it bears another meaning.

¹ This is actually the English rendering (both Auth. and Rev.) in Heb. viii. 10, though the original Greek is "the covenant that I will covenant."

Let me now show by a few examples that the limitation, which I have explained, in the use of this verb is of cardinal importance to the subject under consideration. Ποιεῖν occurs twelve times in the 1st chapter of Genesis, and is represented in the English Version five times by 'create,' five times by 'make,' and twice by 'yield' (fruit), *i.e.*, of course, 'make' fruit. (We also can speak of a tree's 'making' wood, though we do not apply the word to fruit.) Now this use of the verb for 'yield' might fairly be adduced to justify (if justification were needed in a matter which is sufficiently clear to common-sense) the translation of it five times by 'bring forth' (fruit) in Matt. vii. 17-19; but it would be absurd to adduce it in support of translating, in the verses immediately succeeding, 'bringeth forth the will,' 'brought forth many wonderful works.' Again, in Gen. xviii. ποιεῖν is used eight times, and in the English we find in five of these places 'do,' in one 'make,' and in two 'dress' (food). But shall I for this reason maintain that in Matt. viii. 9 the true translation is "And to my servant dress this, and he dresseth it"? Once more, in the eighteen verses of Gen. xx. the verb occurs no less than seven times, the English Version having six times 'do,' and once 'show' (kindness), *i.e.*, do kindness. But how absurd it would be on this ground arbitrarily to render in Mark iii. 14 "He shewed twelve," instead of "He appointed twelve"! Yet neither of these would be a whit less reasonable than to insist on rendering 'offer' in any passage in which the context does not require it. Let me give one other example—a striking one—of the variety of meanings ποιεῖν bears. In Num. xv. it is found twenty times, and is represented in the English by no fewer than six different words, *viz.*, three times 'make,' nine times 'do,' four times 'prepare,' twice 'offer' (vv. 14, 24), once 'observe' (commandments), and once 'sinneth' (margin, 'doeth').

I must not pass over the fact (although it is not pretended that τοῦτο ποιεῖτε means "sacrifice this") that the alleged "about eighty" passages include those, if any, in which the verb means 'sacrifice.' I have therefore, with Cruden's help, examined the verb 'sacrifice' throughout the Old Testament, and have found it in seventy-eight places. In fifty of these θύειν is used in the Septuagint; in nearly all the rest, θυσιάζειν; in only two, ποιεῖν. In the former of these two, as in the passages in which ποιεῖν is represented by 'offer,' the context settles the meaning. It runs thus in the English Version (Exod. x. 25):—"Thou must give us also sacrifices and burnt offerings, that we may sacrifice unto the Lord our God." The Septuagint has, "Thou shalt give us sacrifices and burnt offerings, which we will make to the Lord our God." The other

passage is in 2 Kings xvii. 32, and is thus rendered in our version :—"and made unto themselves of the lowest of them priests of the high places, which sacrificed for them in the houses of the high places." In this case the English translators have either had a different reading of the original before them, or have understood the text differently from the Septuagint translator ; for the Septuagint text, whatever else it may mean, *cannot* mean "which sacrificed for them." Rendered literally, the Septuagint version is as follows :—"and made for themselves priests of the high places, *and made for themselves*" (the very same words being repeated) "in the house of the high places." It is plain, therefore, that this passage has no place in the present argument. I may remark, however, that, even if the Greek had corresponded with the English version, the mention of 'priests' and 'houses of the high places' would have defined the meaning of ποιέiv.

And since the Septuagint includes the Apocryphal with the Canonical books of the Old Testament, I have examined them also. It is true that the writer of *The Congregation in Church* seems to limit his use of the word 'Septuagint' to "the Greek Version of the Old Testament"; yet it may possibly be thought that our inquiry would not be quite complete, if the Apocryphal books were excluded. Fortunately Cruden has a supplementary *Concordance to the Books called Apocrypha*, and by its aid I have found the verb 'offer' twenty-six times, and 'sacrifice' twelve times in them ; but ποιέiv is not used in the Septuagint in a single instance. I proceed now to the second division of our subject.

II.

Having ascertained the extent to which, and the circumstances in which ποιέiv is used for 'offer' in the Septuagint, I have next to examine the reason which is given, not simply for supposing it to be probable or possible, but for virtually asserting, that this use influenced our Lord's language.

The Septuagint, we are told, "was in use in our Lord's time, and read in the Synagogues." The first thing to notice here is the indefiniteness of the language used. It "was in use in our Lord's time." In use, undoubtedly, it was ; but the question is, *Who* used it ? The writer does not venture to affirm positively that our Lord and His followers did so ; but he evidently, I think, wishes to convey that impression to his readers. Again, it was "read in the Synagogues." In *what* synagogues, and *when*, was it read ? If I say that a certain version of the Bible is read in 'the' churches of the Church of England, I mean, of course, in *all* the churches, and should

rightly be so understood ; but if I wish to say that the Welsh language is used at *some* of the services in *nearly all* the Welsh churches, I must express myself in less general terms, or run the risk of being almost certainly misunderstood. Now we may assume that the writer cannot mean to affirm that the Septuagint was read in every Synagogue, and at every service, throughout Palestine ; because that would be an assertion absolutely untenable, and absurdly improbable. But if he means that it was read only at some services, and in some synagogues, he omits to tell us how he knows that our Lord and His followers were accustomed to be present on such occasions—a thing which his argument imperatively requires.

Without, however, attempting further to put a precise construction upon the writer's vague words, let me point out that, in order to show that the use and the reading of the Septuagint have any bearing upon the matter in hand, it is necessary to make one of the two following assumptions:—

1. If our Lord spoke Greek¹ with His disciples on the evening of the Institution of the Lord's Supper, and if, therefore, *τοῦτο ποιείτε* are the very words He used, and not a translation from the vernacular Aramaic, we must assume that He and His disciples were in the habit of using and hearing the Septuagint version, and were for that reason so familiar with the use of *ποιεῖν* for 'offer,' that He was able to employ the verb on this occasion (when it was, as all will admit, of the highest consequence to His Church in all ages that His meaning should be clearly comprehended) with the assurance that they would so understand it. This is the inference which the writer apparently intends us to draw from his words. If he means anything else, he certainly ought to have been more explicit.

2. To avoid, however, all unfairness, let us suppose that he disclaims the interpretation I have put upon his words—that he holds that our Lord spoke in the Aramaic, and that the words *τοῦτο ποιείτε* are due to St. Luke and St. Paul, who have reported His words to us in the Greek language. In that case the assumption must be that those two writers had themselves, and believed their readers to have, the requisite knowledge of Septuagint usage: and further, that, knowing that our Lord used an Aramaic word meaning 'offer,' and being anxious (as they undoubtedly would be) to convey that meaning unmistakably to their readers, they deliberately chose *ποιεῖν* as the proper word for that purpose.

Now it requires little consideration to see that it does not

¹ It is not absolutely certain that our Lord and His disciples did not commonly use the Greek language.

greatly matter to our present purpose which of these alternatives we adopt. If our Lord spoke Greek, we must assume that His disciples were so familiar with the Septuagint that they would understand Him to mean ‘offer this’; and if, on the other hand, the Greek word is due to St. Luke and St. Paul, we must assume that those for whom they wrote were in the same position. The question resolves itself, therefore, into the following:—Was the Christian Church in New Testament days familiar with the use of *ποιεῖν* for ‘offer’? This question can be answered only by observing the language which was used by the Church in those days—that is to say, by examining the New Testament itself. It is obvious that if it was a well-known use, we may fairly expect so large and varied a collection of writings as the New Testament contains to furnish examples of it. The fact is, however, that in the whole of the volume there is not one clear and indubitable example of the usage. I have examined every instance in which *ποιεῖν* is used in the New Testament (Bruder’s excellent Concordance to the Greek New Testament gives the means of doing this with great convenience), and have found only one passage (Acts xxiv. 17), which could be adduced as even a possible example. It is thus translated both in the Authorized and in the Revised Version:—“Now after many years I came to bring alms to my nation, and offerings.” Having used the word *ποιεῖν*, translated ‘bring,’ in reference to ‘alms’ (a usage of which other instances occur in Matt. vi. 2, 3; Acts ix. 36; x. 2), St. Paul, or perhaps St. Luke in condensing the speech, adds ‘and offerings,’ without troubling himself to vary the verb. It does not follow that he would have used *ποιεῖν* with ‘offerings’ alone; and it is improbable that we have here any reminiscence of the Septuagint usage. I am not aware, indeed, that this passage has ever been instanced by those who maintain the meaning ‘offer’ in Luke xxii. 19; but I have not thought it right to withhold it from the reader’s consideration.

I have applied another test. Availing myself once more of Cruden’s Concordance, I have taken every passage in which the verb ‘offer’ occurs in the New Testament, and examined it in the original Greek, with the following result:—The verb occurs 34 times. In twenty-one places the ordinary Greek verb for ‘offer,’ *προσφέρειν*, is used; in five, *αναφέρειν*, which means strictly, and is twice translated, ‘offer up’; *διδόναι*, give, is used three times; *σπένδεται*, be poured forth, twice; *ἀνάγειν*, *παρέχειν*, and *ἐπιδιδόναι*, once each: *ποιεῖν*, never. (It should be observed that in eight places the phrase ‘offered to idols’ represents a Greek adjective *εἰδωλόθυτος*, and these are therefore excluded from the list.)

But after showing, as I have done in Part I. of this paper,

that the use of *ποιεῖν* for 'offer' in the Septuagint is limited to passages in which the subject-matter allows it to be employed without risk of misconception, it would be comparatively little to the purpose to point out that it is not used at all for 'offer' in the New Testament, unless it could also be shown that the writers *had opportunities of using it in sentences similar* to those in which it is found in the Septuagint—in sentences, that is, where the context would have clearly indicated its meaning, if it *had* been used. Now in at least twenty-five passages, out of the thirty-four of which I have just spoken, the writers might have thus used *ποιεῖν*: in eleven, indeed, the object of the verb is actually the noun *θυσία*, sacrifice. Let the reader satisfy himself on these points by referring to Heb. v. 1, 3; vii. 27; viii. 3; ix. 7, 9, 14, 25; x. 11, 12; xi. 4, 17; xiii. 15; Acts vii. 41, 42; xxi. 26; Matt. v. 24; viii. 4; Mark i. 44; Luke ii. 24; v. 14; James ii. 21; 1 Peter ii. 5.¹

We are confronted, then, with the remarkable and highly significant fact that not a single instance occurs in the whole of the New Testament in which *ποιεῖν* is translated by 'offer,' though the writers had twenty-five opportunities of using it under the same limitation which characterizes its use in the Septuagint. And it must be carefully taken into account, in estimating the significance of this fact, that *ποιεῖν* is employed very frequently, and in many shades of meaning in the New Testament. It occurs about 565 times. If, then, as we are asked to believe, 'offer' was a meaning well known to the Church in those days, how is it that the writers of the New Testament, having so many times occasion to express the idea of offering, so carefully avoided the employment of this familiar verb for that purpose, though they were constantly using it in other significations ?

III.

We come now to the third division of our subject—the assertion that *ποιεῖν* does positively mean 'offer' in Luke xxii. 19, and 1 Cor. xi. 24, 25 : and we have to ask, Is this assertion true ?

The results at which we have already arrived lead us, of course, to anticipate a negative answer. But the question must really be decided by considering whether the *context* indicates that this is the meaning ? Is our Lord speaking on

¹ So far is the New Testament from using *ποιεῖν*, 'do,' instead of *προσφέρειν*, 'offer,' that we find the latter verb in a passage (John xvi. 2) where the Authorized Version actually renders it by 'do'—"doeth God service."

the subject of offering? Is priest or altar spoken of? Above all, *does any such word as lamb, bird, meat-offering, follow the verb*, as in the examples in the Septuagint? If such had been the nature of the context, we must have admitted that we have here an exception to the use which prevails elsewhere in the New Testament. But in truth the contrary is the case. So far as the *object* of the verb (*τοῦτο*, this) goes, it can indicate nothing apart from the context, since it is a neuter pronoun; and, indeed, I shall presently show that its use with *ποιεῖν* is limited in the New Testament to *one* meaning of the verb, and that not the meaning 'offer.' And as to the subject-matter generally, it certainly does not point to offering. For what were the circumstances in which the Lord's Supper was instituted? As our Lord and His disciples were eating, we are told, He took bread, and blessed, and brake it, and gave to them, saying, "Take, eat: this is My body which is given for you: this do in remembrance of Me." No word indicating a victim or an offering follows *ποιεῖν*; nor is there any reference to priest, altar, or temple. It follows, then, that the Septuagint gives no authority for translating 'offer' in this passage. Those who assert that that is the meaning adopt the grossly unreasonable theory that the Septuagint usage has been ignorantly followed in this one instance, in which it is *not applicable*, though (as we have seen) the New Testament writers abstained from following it in at least twenty-five cases, in which they might *correctly* have done so. In other words, they assert that either our Lord Himself (if He spoke Greek), or St. Luke and St. Paul, employed, to express the idea of offering, a word which could only bear that meaning in circumstances not then present; which, moreover, so far as we are able to ascertain, was not in *any* circumstances so used at the time; which, therefore, was almost sure to be misunderstood; and which, on that theory, has in point of fact been *misunderstood in the Church from that time to this!* Surely unreasonableness could scarcely go further! We are bound, then, to conclude that the rendering 'offer' must, without any hesitation, be absolutely rejected.

Nor must we stop here. There is much more to be said. Not only are there the indisputable reasons, which I have given, for *rejecting* the translation 'offer,' but there are also very strong grounds for *adopting* the usual rendering 'do,' especially since the verb is followed by the neuter pronoun *τοῦτο*, 'do *this thing*.' Having carefully gone through all the examples of *ποιεῖν* in the New Testament with this point specially in view, I have ascertained the following facts:

(i.) The phrase *τοῦτο ποιεῖν* (*i.e.*, *ποιεῖν* followed by the singular neuter pronoun 'this') is used twenty-six times,

besides the three in the accounts of the Institution of the Lord's Supper; and in every instance it means "do this." The significance and great importance of this fact will be evident to everyone capable of considering the question under discussion.

(ii.) In twenty-five other passages the neuter plural ταῦτα, 'these,' is used with ποιεῖν; and here, too, the verb means 'do' in every instance, except one (Acts vii. 50), in which it means 'make.'

(iii.) There are 112 other passages in which ποιεῖν is followed by neuter pronouns, singular or plural; and in all, without exception it means 'do.'

(iv.) We have in St. John's Gospel (chaps. xiv.-xvi.) a long discourse *spoken by our Lord on the same evening* as the words "Do this in remembrance of Me." The verb ποιεῖν occurs in it sixteen times, and no less than fourteen times is translated 'do'; once (xiv. 23) 'make,' and once (xvi. 2) 'put' (here also really equivalent to 'make,' when taken in connection with the Greek adjective used—"put you out of the synagogues," Greek, "make you excommunicated"). It is interesting to notice, also, that this discourse contains one of the examples of τοῦτο ποιεῖν, of which I have just spoken—"that (or, this) will I do" (xiv. 13).

'Offer,' then, must be rejected, not only because it is itself untenable, but also because there is overwhelming evidence in favour of translating 'do.'

SUMMARY.

It may be useful to conclude with a summary of the results at which we have arrived.

I.

In about four-fifths of the instances in which we have the verb 'offer' in the English Version of the Old Testament, the Septuagint translators used a word bearing that specific meaning. In nearly one-fifth, consisting of some of the passages in which the context, and especially the object of the verb, precludes misconception, they employed the general verb ποιεῖν, 'do' or 'make.'

II.

There is no evidence that this use of ποιεῖν for 'offer' in the Septuagint was familiar to the Church in New Testament days. Even if it were known (as it may possibly have been to *some*), the New Testament writers scrupulously abstained from adopting it (with the one very doubtful exception of

Acts xxiv. 17), although there are at least twenty-five passages in their writings, in which they might have done so with perfect accuracy.

III.

(a) The Septuagint usage gives no authority for translating 'offer' in Luke xxii. 19 and 1 Cor. xi. 24, 25, since the context does not indicate that meaning.

(b) There is overwhelming authority in the New Testament for the rendering 'do,' especially since the verb is followed by the pronoun *τοῦτο*.

(c) The translation 'offer' must therefore be absolutely rejected.

CHARLES M. OSMOND.



ART. V.—THE RELIGIOUS POETRY OF TENNYSON.

ALFRED TENNYSON, born in 1809, in a Church of England rectory, was about thirty years of age when the Oxford Movement began to stir in the Church of England and to revive ecclesiastical theories long dormant or discarded, while about the same time criticism and philosophy, which had passed over to Germany from England in the last century, were now returning with renewed vigour, to search the foundations of belief, to drive many into scepticism, and to widen religious belief, and make thought more tolerant. By the former movement he was influenced only in his sense of the picturesque; to the teaching of Coleridge, Maurice and Kingsley his own is nearly akin. Tennyson, having probably the most representative mind in the present century, and sensitive with poetic responsiveness to every wind of thought, speculation and emotion, with a very firm and independent will and a noble character, becomes a figure typical of the mental difficulties and struggles of his era, and the positive conclusions at which he arrives are of profound importance to contemporary religious belief.

All through his life he took a deep and even passionate interest in theology and religion. Thus we read in the Biography that in 1842, "the new poems dealt with an extraordinarily wide range of subjects: chivalry, duty, reverence, self-control, human passion, human love, the love of country, science, philosophy, simple faith, and the many complex moods of the religious nature. 'It was the heart of England,' wrote Aubrey de Vere, 'even more than her imagination, that