
A table of contents for the *London Quarterly Review* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_london-quarterly-and-holborn-review_01.php

THE

LONDON QUARTERLY REVIEW.

OCTOBER, 1882.

ART. I.—*The Reign of William Rufus, and the Accession of Henry the First.* By EDWARD A. FREEMAN, M.A., Hon. D.C.L., LL.D., formerly Fellow of Trinity College. Two Vols. Oxford: At the Clarendon Press.

NATURALLY there is not the same absorbing interest in these two volumes as in the five which Mr. Freeman devoted to the History of the Conquest. Moreover, in the last of these five volumes he had already followed the main features of Rufus's reign, looked at as specially bearing on the history of the Conquest, and the mutual relations between English and Normans. In the present work he takes up the end of his detailed story at the death-bed of the Conqueror, and thence not only traces the history of his successor, but carries on the tale of England through the struggle which ruled for the second time that England should not be the realm of the Conqueror's eldest son, and, as such, an appendage to his Norman duchy. This verdict, twice pronounced, is one of the most important in history. It saved England from being a mere province of France; it gave us all the advantages of the Conquest, the infusion of new blood, the bringing in of new institutions, while at the same time it undid all its evils. And of these two verdicts the earlier was pronounced at the beginning of Rufus's reign, and gives to that reign its distinctive character.

The reign of Rufus is rich even beyond that of his father in the personal and local narrative which Mr. Freeman knows so well how to embody in his pages; while it is deeply important for general, and specially for constitutional,

history; first, because during it the position of English and Norman was to a considerable extent reversed; next, because of the bearing on our constitutional history of the king's behaviour to Bishop William of St. Calais (or Carileph), with which matter Mr. Freeman claims to be the first to have dealt at any length. The importance of the matter lies, as we shall see, in the fact that it was Bishop William, Anselm's enemy, and not Anselm himself, who first appealed from an English court to Rome. Mr. Freeman is also the first among modern writers who has referred to the mission of Abbot of Jeronto; and he wrote out more fully than any previous writer of the career of Randolf Flambard. In getting up topographic details he shows his usual scrupulous care. "I have visited," he says, "every place that I could, and I have generally in so doing had the help of friends, often with more observant eyes than my own." It is amusing to find him in his preface complain that "where I feel a real deficiency is in Hampshire," though he knows both Portchester, where Duke Robert landed in 1101, and the New Forest. As usual, too, he is severe on those whose spelling of proper names differs from his own, pointing out, for instance, the absurdity of talking of Bishop Karilef, as if Sanctus Carilephus was not a real place, as real as any town in England. We are glad to find in his preface (always an interesting part of Mr. Freeman's books), that he does not yet consider his work is done. He hopes to publish an abridgment of his seven volumes on a scale which shall yet not be a mere epitome, and he gives us ground for hoping that he may by-and-by deal with the history of Sicily, for "the Norman in the great isle of the ocean, and the Norman in the great isle of the Mediterranean naturally form companion pictures."

The reign of Rufus, he points out, may be looked on as either the last stage of the Conquest, or its reversal. It begins with warfare which resulted in a distinct victory won by Englishmen over Normans on English soil. We may define it as the conquest of England completed by English hands; but we must not forget that when Englishmen, by armed support of a Norman king, accepted the fact of the Norman conquest, they also to some extent changed its nature. Rufus's reign completed the Conquest, for during it, specially under the administration of Flambard, the feudal side of the Conquest put on a systematic shape;

it was also the time when the anti-feudal tendencies of the Conquest, "the causes and effects of the great law of Salisbury," showed how firmly this had taken root. In Mr. Freeman's words: "His reign laid down two principles, that, in the kingdom of England, no man should be stronger than the king, but that the king should hold his strength only by making himself the head of the State and of the people."

Another fact which gives special interest to this portion of our history, is the change it wrought in the position of England in the world. In our own island two great steps were taken towards bringing the whole under one head. England was greatly extended on the side of the Welsh marshes, and the north-west frontier was settled, and a new land added to the realm, the fallen city of Carlisle being restored by Rufus, even as Chester had been by Alfred's daughter. But abroad the change was more important still: "The rivalry between France and Normandy grows, now that England is ruled by Norman kings, into a rivalry between France and England. In will, if not in deed, the reign of Rufus forestalls the reigns of Edward III. and Henry V. It sets England before us in a character which she kept through so many ages, the character of the wealthy land whence subsidies might be looked for to flow into the less well-filled coffers of the princes of the mainland. In his reign we see England holding an European position wholly different from what she had held in earlier days. She passes in some sort from the world of the North into the world of the West. That change was the work of the Conqueror, but it is under his son that we see its full nature and meaning. The new place which England now holds is seen to be one which came to her wholly through her connection with Normandy; it is no less seen to be one which she has learned to hold in her own name and by her own strength."

Rufus's personal character, too, as well as that of several of his contemporaries, made a far deeper mark on the time than the character of many a greater man has on other times. "No prince," says Mr. Freeman, "ever made a stronger personal impression on the minds of the men of his age." Therefore, our author says, the history of these thirteen years, the tale of Rufus and England, is worth telling *in extenso;* and he grows enthusiastic in his own fashion, in a way that carries his reader along with

him, when he describes scenes like the fight of Pevensey and the siege of Rochester, episodes in the last armed struggle between Englishmen and Normans on English ground, a struggle in which Englishmen won the crown of England from a Norman king in fight against rebellious Normans. Thenceforth it was to be acknowledged that the house of the Conqueror was to be the royal house; but it was further ruled that the kingship of the Norman was to change into an English kingship. And the fact that Rufus went forth to subdue Normandy, to threaten France, "to dream at least of an empire of the Gauls, as a link between Civilis and Buonaparte, undoubtedly helped to strengthen the national position of England."

We spoke of Mr. Freeman's minuteness of detail. He has no lack of contemporary or almost contemporary chroniclers. William of Malmesbury, the Peterborough Chronicle, Orderic, Florence of Worcester, Henry of Huntingdon; and, not to speak of French chroniclers, for all the very important details about Anselm, Eadmer, the English monk who became so attached to his sainted master. All the chroniclers give full importance to Lanfranc's share in setting William on the throne. His only claim was his father's nomination, or rather recommendation of him to the archbishop. "The Conqueror had not dared to name William as his successor; he had left the kingdom in the hands of God; he had only hoped that the will of God might be that William should reign; and as the best means of finding out whether God's will were so, he left the actual decision to the highest and wisest of God's ministers in his kingdom. He gave no orders for the coronation of Rufus; he simply prayed that Lanfranc would crown him, if he deemed such an act a rightful one."

Modern notions of hereditary right would have given the kingdom to Robert; English feeling would have chosen Henry, who, besides his personal popularity, was so far an Atheling that he had been born in the island. But on former occasions nomination by the last king had always been taken into account by the Witan; and although in this case the Witan was not called on to elect, the primate was its most distinguished member, in some sort its representative. The new king was universally accepted. "All the men in England to him bowed, and to him oaths swore," says the Peterborough Chronicle; and he began well,

by practising his one solitary virtue, filial duty. He carried out his father's will in munificent gifts to religious foundations; every minister got from six to ten gold marks; even every upland church got sixty silver pennies. In every shire, too, a hundred pounds were to be given to the poor; though it takes away from the filial love to which Mr. Freeman attributes this generosity, to find that Robert, the rebel, was doing the same thing just as bountifully in Normandy. And Robert had not the Winchester treasure-hoard to seize, which was Rufus's first act.

But, though acquiesced in at first by all, because it took all by surprise, Rufus's succession was soon disputed by the very men who had been the chief agents in his father's conquests. The fact of their beginning so soon, within nine months of his being crowned, doubtless strengthened his position with his English subjects. They were well disposed to hold to the king whom men like wicked Odo, Bishop of Bayeux and Earl of Kent, was anxious to get rid of. With men who had estates both in England and in Normandy, the arguments against two rulers were very strong; there was no hope of pleasing both; faithfulness to the one would lead to vengeance from the other; and, granted that a single ruler was desirable, it was far better for them to have the tractable Robert than the harsh, insolent William. The death of the king, "at which peaceable men wept and robbers and fiends rejoiced," would profit them nothing if it was to be followed by the rule of one whose first act was to rescind his father's law forbidding the judicial taking of human life—who would slay where his father had merely put in bonds.

Into the minute details of the quarrel, and the strange way in which William of St. Calais was mixed up in it, we need not enter; suffice it to notice that these details give opportunity for some of Mr. Freeman's choicest bits of description. His picture of the Bristol of that day, the great merchant haven of the West Saxon and Mercian border, whose greedy slavetraders *for a time* cast aside their darling sin at the preaching of St. Wulfstan, the "peninsular town," girded to the north by the original course of the Frome, to the south-west by the marshy ground at the junction of the rivers, is all the more remarkable when we reflect how wholly unlike what it is now was the aspect of this old town; how the rivers which defined its shape are so disguised with puzzling cuts and artificial harbours

and archings-in like that which in London has turned the Fleet river into the street of the same name. Bristol was a rebel centre; here the warrior-bishop, Geoffrey of Coutances, a great Somersetshire landowner, was in command, and from hence he harried the land right and left. His nephew, Robert of Mowbray, burned Bath, "the old borough," called also Acemannesceaster, which, as a king's town, was specially hostile to the rebels. He thence marched up to the Roman old station of Ilchester, then a fortified town, now merely a peaceful village, with only one of its five or six churches remaining.* Here he was ingloriously beaten off by the burghers, and Florence of Worcester is quite jubilant at this overthrow. On the other side, Berkeley and its neighbourhood were harried, and Worcester only saved by the prayers and actual help of the saintly Bishop of Wulfstan, and Mr. Freeman revels in the story of how the lamb of Severnside overthrew at once the wolves of Normandy and the wild cats of the British hills. Naturally another more important centre of disturbance was Ghent, Odo's earldom. Odo was in Rochester, whose castle was packed full of Norman knights; and here in the south was William, who, in a proclamation in the English tongue to "the valiant men of the old stock," set forth his need, and craved their help. He was lavish of promises; the two great grievances of his father's time, the heavy taxation and the game laws, were to be done away; and in this hope, strengthened by the feeling that the new king's counsellor was the venerated Lanfranc, the English stood by him. Thirty thousand of the true natives of the land met of their own free will in London, promising the king most zealous service, and exhorting him to press on valiantly. With this host Mr. Freeman contrasts that which only twenty-two years before marched out of London on the like errand: "Men must have been still living and able to bear arms who had dealt their blows in the *Malfosse* of Senlac, amidst the last glimmerings of light on the day of St. Calixtus." Odo was the foremost object of the loyal and patriotic hatred of every Englishman; and to win his castle of Rochester was the great object of the campaign.

The storming of Tunbridge Castle, a work of English

* Rev. W. Buckler's *Ilchester Almshouse Deeds* (Yeovil, 1866) is worth consulting as to the antiquities of this interesting place.

hands turned to the uses of the stranger, was the first act of this part of the campaign; and "no work could be more to the liking of William's English host than that of attacking a Norman castle on their own soil, even with a Norman king as their leader." Meanwhile, Odo slipped out of Rochester, and made his way to his brother's castle of Pevensey, whence he sent to Robert, earnestly beseeching him to come and help his liegemen. Robert, dilatory as usual, did not come. He seemed to think that the crown of England could be won with ease at any moment, and contented himself with repeating the childish boast, which he had uttered when news came of William's accession, that "were he in Alexandria the English would not dare to make William king," and with sending a force to help his uncles. His help was fruitless. "The attempt at a new Norman landing at Pevensey was driven back. Those who escaped the English sailors got to land only to fall into the hands of the English land-force. Those who tried to hoist the sails of their ships found the wind against them. The ships could not be moved; and the Normans, rather than be a laughing-stock to their enemies, leaped from their benches into the less hostile waters. The attempt of the Conqueror's son to do by deputy what his father had done in person had come utterly to nought. The new invaders of England had been overthrown by English hands on the spot where the work of the former invaders had begun."

Pevensey surrendered, and Odo, taken to Rochester and set to call on its defenders to submit, managed to escape into the city. But sickness and a strange plague of flies disheartened the knights, cooped up in such numbers in the narrow compass of the fortress; William, too, proclaimed a grand levy in the old style: every one who came not was to be branded with the shameful name of *Nithing*, so a surrender was determined on, and William, though he at first refused, at last granted terms, pledging his faith—and his faith when once so plighted was never broken—that the garrison's lives and limbs should be safe. Odo had the assurance to ask for the honours of war, as we should phrase it; but not only did the trumpets blow merrily as he and his comrades came forth, he also received a characteristic greeting from Rufus's English soldiers: "Halters, bring halters. Hang up the traitor bishop and his followers on the gibbet. The perjured murderer whose craft and cruelty have taken away the

lives of thousands ought not to live any longer." One would be glad to think that Mr. Freeman is right in believing that William gave to his trusty English the land of some, at least, of the lesser traitors. For the bigger men, who had been his father's helpers and companions in arms, there was an amnesty at once.

This dangerous revolt having been crushed, there came on the quarrel with bishop William of St. Calais, notable because in it we see almost the first beginnings of that doctrine of ecclesiastical privilege to which the Conquest gave such an impulse. William of St. Calais wholly denied the right of laymen to judge a bishop; and he shrewdly remarked that Lanfranc, who asserted that right, had been placed in his see on the very ground that the deposition of Robert and the election of Stigand were for them invented, as being merely the work of the secular power. Such an argument, which would have even the favour of Hildebrand, was wholly unpalatable to Lanfranc, who represented the traditions of the Conqueror. However, the very fact of the doctrine being broached shows us how the new doctrine was gaining ground. One curious feature of the case is, that William demanded to be judged in full episcopal dress, his brother bishops also wearing theirs. To this Lanfranc replied, like an honest man: "We can judge very well clothed as we are; for garments do not hinder truth." Unable to get what he deemed his right, *i.e.*, entire ecclesiastical freedom, bishop William took the stronger step of appealing to Rome; and Rome had begun to be such a power that Lanfranc himself, steadily as he maintained the royal supremacy throughout the case, seems to have shrunk from boldly grappling with this alleged right of appeal. William is firmer than the Primate; he does not deal in subtleties and quibbles about the meaning of fief and bishopric; he says roundly, "Give up your castle, or you shall never go out of my hands;" and when the poor bishop reminds him of his safe-conduct, Lanfranc says he has forfeited it, and may rightly be arrested. In the end, bishop William is forced to go beyond sea, and in his honourable reception by Duke Robert forgets his intent of going direct to Rome.

During the war of the barons, the Welsh had been up in arms. Help from Ireland had enabled them to attack one of the marchers, Lord Robert of Rhuddlan, at Conway. Robert, whose few followers were dismayed by the numbers

of the invaders, rushed out, attended by a single knight, and was overwhelmed by the arrows of the Britons. "They smote off his head and fixed it on the mast of one of the ships; a crowd came together on the shore, but it was too late, the lord of Rhuddlan was already slain." Not content with giving this lively picture of border warfare, at a time when fresh raiders still supplied themselves with slaves from the Welsh border, Mr. Freeman tells us how it comes about that a gleam of light should be thrown on affairs with which the chroniclers in general have no concern. Robert of Rhuddlan was nephew of the founder of St. Evroul, and had himself enriched that monastery. One of his brothers, a monk of St. Evroul, by-and-by translated his body thither from Chester; and the English monk Vital (whom we know as Ordericus Vitalis) was set to compose his epitaph in monkish verse, of which the last couplet is—

> "Ense caput secuit Grithfridus et in mare jecit
> *Soma* quidem reliquum possidet hunc loculum."

But this is only a sample of the picturesque stories with which, more even than in his *Norman Conquest*, Mr. Freeman enriches his narrative. It is important to note that the rebellion of the ill success of which we have given the details did really help on the fusion of English and Normans. When, by-and-by, the barons try another revolt, the traitors are no longer spoken of as "the richest henchmen that were on this land;" they are simply "the head men here on land who took rede together against the king." King and people, too, were on good terms; the Conqueror's stock was freely accepted. Not one voice was raised for Eadgar, or Wulf, or Olaf of Denmark.

The English believed Rufus's promises; and though they were doomed to bitter disappointment, though by-and-by his days must have seemed the darkest of all days, yet his reign marks a stage in the development or recovery of English liberty. Moreover, Rufus was not (Mr. Freeman thinks) an oppressor of Englishmen as Englishmen. He was cruelly unjust to all; his mercenaries were lawless; he broke his word in every particular, making more cruel his father's cruel forest laws, which he had promised to abrogate; and no doubt the English would be the class most liable to suffer, and least able to obtain redress. But, except in the case of the fifty men of old English birth

who had contrived to keep some of their wealth, and who, being tried for having eaten the king's deer, purged themselves by ordeal of fire, Mr. Freeman sees no case in which the conquered race was marked out for oppression. Rather, their joint suffering under the tyranny of the Red King drew the two races together.

The change began even before Lanfranc's death, and was marked by what ere long became a crying grievance, the refusal to fill up vacant benefices. By-and-by even Canterbury was treated in this way, its revenues being poured into the king's coffers. Rufus began with Chichester, which Geoffrey, Stigand's successor, only held a few months. At this point Mr. Freeman takes occasion to give that masterly sketch of the Red King's character which forms the principal feature of his first volume. Lanfranc's influence had been a strong bond to decency at any rate; when he was gone, such evil counsellors as Randolf Flambard and Robert of Bellême strengthened the naturally evil tendencies of "the king of the ruddy countenance." Flambard, son of a low-born Bayeux priest, was the cleverest of financiers, in days when finance meant the transfer by whatever means of the greatest amount of the subject's money into the king's purse. Under the elder William he did not rise high; but the son, "sultan-like in his mood, needed, like other sultans, the help of a vizier." It shows his character that he is said, as Justiciar, to have had a new Domesday drawn up, because the former was not favourable enough to the king. He introduced the feudal tenures and burdens, which were not abolished till Charles the Second's time; as the Chronicle has it, referring to the custom of wardship, "he would make the king ilk man's heir, ordered and lewd." Like our modern nationalisers, he held that all land was, in the strictest sense, loanland, in which the owner had only a life interest, and which at his death fell back to the king. According to him, there could be no such thing as the old *allod*, held of no over-lord. And this notion, with such restrictions as Henry the First's charter laid on it, actually became law; though Flambard's other theory, that personal as well as real property reverted to the king, was by Henry's charter formally denied. Flambard is emphatically the lawgiver of English feudalism, which differs from other feudalism in that our Norman kings, with consummate ability, carefully shut out the side which

tended to weaken the royal power, and fostered the side which tended to strengthen it. England was not to become feudal in the sense in which France and Germany did. No man in England was to be strong enough to stand against the king. But, in all points where the doctrines of feudal tenure could be turned to the king's enrichment, England became of all lands the most feudal. Flambard's system, which the Chronicle calls "unlaw," touched especially the rich, *i.e.*, the Normans; and, as Mr. Freeman remarks, the strangest thing in these times is to see a race of high-spirited conquerors submit to so galling a yoke. Doubtless, they indemnified themselves by passing on the oppression to those below them; indeed, the reforming charter of Henry implies this. And hence there was no power of combination; no class could get help from any other, and the king's picked mercenaries, kept at the expense of all classes, were stronger than any one class by itself. Flambard, then, was chief agent in all the king's "unlaw," his outrageous simony, his systematic appropriation of Church revenues, as well as his seizing of laymen's wealth. Robert of Bellême, belonging to the wicked house of Talvas, "*gens ipsis dæmonibus horrenda*" (Henry of Huntingdon), was simply an evil influence. He was never William's statesman; but in the wars with Robert this powerful and wicked Norman prince, of whose fiendish cruelty* Mr. Freeman draws such a weird picture, was generally on William's side. The two distinctive features in William's own character were his being given up to that foul form of vice which Mr. Freeman calls the sin of the ancient Greek and the modern Turk, and which in his time was looked on as the special sin of the Norman, and his strange and blasphemous impiety. Lavish to his mercenaries, he was so greedy of gain that the criminal at the gallows' foot could rescue himself, if he offered a sufficient bribe. His minions, forerunners of those of the last Henry of Valois, with their long hair, loose womanly dress, and long pointed shoes, made his court as unlike his father's as possible. Then his irreligion led him to favour the Jews, because he was thereby annoying the Christians. Mr. Freeman's picture of the Jew, stalking defiantly among

* The special vices of William Rufus are not laid to his charge. It is to the credit of the Latin Christianity of the eleventh century that it needs the union of its two worst sinners to form the likeness of an Ottoman Sultan, Excellency, or Highness in the nineteenth.

those on whose wants he throve, is very different from what we usually form to ourselves. And doubtless Rufus's fondness for the Jews may have led monkish historians to give a blacker tint to his portrait; but, all allowance made, his irreligion was of a strange and outrageous cast. He is charged with a personal defiance of the Almighty, quite distinct from mere carelessness, and from speculative unbelief. Recovered from a grievous sickness he said, "God shall never see me a good man; I have suffered too much at His hands." He mocked at God's judgment and doubted His justice. Either He did not know the deeds of men, or He weighed them in unfair balances. This direct reviling and defiance of a power which, by the very terms of the defiance, is believed in, is a vice of which Englishmen nowadays have hardly a notion. Then it was not uncommon; our Henry II. indulged in it, and of St. Louis it is set down as a special virtue that never, under any circumstances, would he allow any reviling of God or the saints. And this was one special vice of that king of whom the proverb went that every morning he got up a worse man than he lay down, and every evening he lay down a worse man than he got up. In spite of this almost unmixed blackness it is plain there was something in Rufus which made him not wholly hateful; this was the chivalrous spirit. "The point of honour" could not be spoken of in reference to Harold or William the Conqueror; but however Rufus might break his kingly word to his own people, or to other princes, his knightly word was never, under any circumstances, broken. "Under the influence of the law of honour," the tyrant, the blasphemer, the oppressor, the extortioner, who neither feared God nor regarded man, puts on an air of unselfishness, of unworldliness. Strict in the observance of his own knightly word, he places unbounded confidence in the knightly word of others. His chivalry is his best side, as it is the worst side of other princes. "He who wrought the slaughter of Limoges was also the patriotic statesman of the Good Parliament. The knight, courteous and bloody as became his knighthood, could turn about and act as something better than a knight." But with the Red King his chivalry was his redeeming point; for any check and any law is better than no check and no law. He who cannot rise to the higher rank of an honest man had better be a knight and gentleman than a mere knave and ruffian. If a man cannot be

kept back from all crimes by the law of right, it is a gain that he should be kept back from some crimes by "the law of honour." Such is Mr. Freeman's verdict regarding that chivalry of which the essence is a fantastic and capricious law of honour, displacing all the forms of the law of right, in so far as it affected the character of William Rufus.

It did not keep him from taking advantage of Robert's imbecility and the consequently disturbed state of his duchy to carry war over into Normandy, and, chiefly by a judicious use of the gold wrung from his subjects in England, to gain over a large part of his brother's dominions. This war gives room for Mr. Freeman's descriptive powers. Almost every castle he puts before us is a picture; of almost every noble family he details the origin and genealogy. It was a war of sieges of little general interest; and we cannot help thinking that our English Thucydides is too careful about such small matters. To him such a struggle as that between Normandy and Maine, for instance, is as important as if the disputants were mighty nations; and he carries his readers away with his enthusiasm, making us feel how much the later relations between England and France depend on these earlier matters.

As we have said, the Red King depended on his gold; and the occasion on which King Philip deserted his ally, Duke Robert, Mr. Freeman calls "the first English subsidy." The most striking episode in the war, is the siege of Rouen, in which great and thriving city Rufus's arts and gifts stirred up revolt against the duke which, under Conan, the richest citizen, "the Artevelde of Rouen," took the form of an assertion of municipal rights. How the revolt was crushed by the help of Henry, the Conqueror's youngest son, and of Robert of Bellême, not out of love to Robert, but to check the dangerous example of a great city taking on itself to choose its lord, Mr. Freeman tells with his usual spirit. The death of Conan, whom Henry took up to the top of the castle tower and flung thence to the ground, is not creditable to the cold-hearted, cruel prince who was afterwards Henry I. Small as is the general interest of the war, it was one of fearful atrocities, relieved only by the character of young Roger of Toesny, too good for such a world, whose early death was foretold by his dream that Christ had bowed from the cross and blessed him with His own hand. In describing it, Orderic's English nature comes out. He sees in the woes of Nor-

mandy the righteous punishment for the wrongs of England: "a fury without a curb raged through the land and smote down its inhabitants. The clergy, the monks, the unarmed people, everywhere wept and groaned. None were glad save thieves and robbers, and they were not to be long glad."

By-and-by, in the changeful whirl of affairs, we find William on Robert's side, undertaking, for a consideration, to bring his rebellious duchy under his control, and above all to dispossess Henry, who for £3,000 had bought from his needy spendthrift elder brother the whole of the Côtentin. Then follows the siege of Henry by his two brothers in St. Michael's Mount, with the interesting story, how, when Henry pleaded to be allowed to get fresh water, Robert not only gave leave, but added the gift of a tun of the best wine. Wace thus introduces it:

> "De viande aveient plenté
> Maiz de bevre aveient grant chierté;
> Asiz aveient a mengier
> Maiz molt troveient le vin chier."

Another less known incident is that William impatiently charged alone an attacking force, had his horse killed, and was dragged along by the foot. The knight who had unhorsed him was just about to give him a dagger thrust when he cried, "Hold, rascal, I am the king of England" ("Tolle, nebulo, rex Angliæ sum."—Will. Malmesb.). The words had a magical effect; with all worship his late assailants lifted the king from the ground and brought him a fresh horse. "Who unhorsed me?" asked Rufus. After some delay the man who had done the deed came forward and said: "I, who took you not for a king but for a knight." Rufus, whom a bold answer never displeased, cried, "By the face of Lucca (his favourite oath), you shall be mine, your name shall be written in my book, and you shall receive the reward of good service." This tale explains how it came to pass that the Red King was by his contemporaries compared to Alexander the Great. It is given as an instance of his magnanimity, and certainly contrasts favourably with Richard's conduct to the archer who gave him his death wound.

The two brothers are strangely distinct in character. Robert, heedless of the consequences of his acts, but not cruel in his own person, was, above all men, open to those

passing bursts of generosity which are quite consistent with utter weakness and want of principle. William was always open to an appeal to his knightly generosity, to that higher form of self-assertion which forbade him to harm one who was beneath him, and which taught him to admire a bold deed, or word, even when directed against himself. But the ties of kindred, and still more of common humanity, sat very lightly on him. Before long, Henry, left an almost solitary wanderer after his surrender at the Mount, was reconciled to both his brothers, and William took them both over to England with him, a fact which enables us to measure Mr. Freeman's conscientious accuracy.* "I should hardly have accepted William of Malmesbury's evidence on this point," he remarks, "were it not confirmed by the signatures to a charter granting certain churches to the convent of Durham." In this way a private document becomes a piece of national history; it is mixed up, in fact, not only with the history of Normandy and England, but with that of England and Scotland, for one of the names appended to it, besides those of the three royal brothers, is that of Duncan, son of that Malcolm, between whom and Rufus had arisen the old question of homage, the Scots king sturdily refusing to do homage for any portion of his realm, save the English earldom of Lothian, which had come to him as dowry with Margaret, Eadward's grandniece.

The peace, however, between the brethren did not last long. Robert had to complain that the agreement between them was not carried out; and Rufus had no scruple in breaking engagements entered into simply as a man and a king, and to which his knightly honour was not pledged.

There was no new war; but Robert would not stay to keep Christmas with his brother; and next comes the important conquest of Cumberland and rebuilding of Carlisle. This is so characteristically told, that we must quote a little of the narrative:

"Lugubalia, or *Caerluel*, was reckoned among the Roman cities of Britain. It was reckoned, too, among the cities of the Northumbrian realm, in the great days of that realm, from the victory of Æthelfrith, at Daegsanstan, to the fall of Ecgfrith, at Nectansmere. Then the Northumbrian power fell back from the whole

* An accuracy which even enables him to correct Thierry, who mistakes Norman, the English Christian name, for Le Norman the French surname.

land between Clyde and Solway, and all trace of Lugubalia is lost in the confused history of the land of the Northern Britons. Its site, to say the least, must have formed part of that northern British land whose father and people sought Eadward the unconquered to father and lord. It must have formed part of that well-nigh first of territorial fiefs which Eadmund, the doer of great deeds, granted to his Scottish fellow-worker. It must have formed part of the under-kingdom which so long served as an appanage for the heirs of Scottish kingship. But, amidst all these changes, though the land passed under the over-lordship of the Basileus of Britain, yet it never, from Ecgfrith to Rufus, passed under the immediate dominion of any English king. And, as far as the city itself was concerned, for the last two centuries before Rufus, the site was all that was left to pass to any one. The history of Scandinavian influence in Cumberland is one of the great puzzles of our early history. The Northman is there to speak for himself; but it is not easy to say how and when he came there. But one result of Scandinavian occupation or Scandinavian inroad was the overthrow of Lugubalia. We gather that it fell, as Anderidia fell before Ælle and Cissa, as Aquae Solis fell before Ceawlin, as the city of the legions fell before Æthelfrith. But now the son of the Conqueror was to be to Lugubalia what the daughter of Ælfred had been to the city of the legions. The king who made the land of Carlisle bade the walls of Carlisle again rise, to fence in a city of men, a colony of the Saxon land."

It has been said, but Mr. Freeman disbelieves the story, that those driven out at the making of the New Forest had homes granted them in the new borderland.

And now begins the most interesting episode of the Red King's career, his relations with Anselm. Mean in money matters, as the spendthrift necessarily must be, as that other pattern of chivalry, King Richard, so often showed himself, William systematically kept benefices vacant. After Lanfranc's death, he delayed the appointment of a successor till the murmurs of people forced him to make one. The primacy was something *sui generis;* under English rule the new Primate had always been the foremost man in the realm, and a long vacancy was a sort of lesser interdict. Flambard managed the property, and managed it in such a way that both monks, and clergy, and tenants of Church lands said it was better to die than to live. The bishoprics were filled from time to time, as king's clerks were found who had made purses long enough to buy their preferment. But, bad as he was, Rufus never seems to have thought of filling Canterbury with an unworthy

archbishop. His verderer begged or bought the see of Hereford, his chancellor that of Salisbury; but "the head of Angle-kin," as the Chronicle calls him, must be at once saint, scholar, and statesman. Men were astonished when, seventy years after, Henry II. put his Chancellor, Thomas, into the seat of Ælpheah, Anselm, and Theobald; but Rufus was withheld by something either within or without him from granting or selling the metropolitan see to one of his own creatures. Another feature of the case is that there was no thought of election either ecclesiastical or by the great council. Every one held that the king alone could choose the archbishop; this is Mr. Freeman's answer to that general allegation that the Norman conquest greatly diminished the royal power in matters ecclesiastical.

Anselm is one of Mr. Freeman's heroes. He says of him: "Before all things he was a preacher of righteousness." As Abbot of Bec (chosen on Herlwin's death), he was sought as a friend, a teacher, a spiritual adviser, by people from all parts. "The whole Latin world drank in his teaching with eagerness. Noble ladies in their widowhood sought his neighbourhood and spiritual direction, and received the honourable title of mothers of the house." He was connected with England through having to come over and look at the English estates of his abbey, and here he became "the idol of all the inhabitants, without distinction of age or sex, of rank or race. The land became to him yet another home, a home which he loved to visit, and where he was ever welcome." The men of that age, stained many of them with crimes which they could not help feeling to be crimes, commonly kept enough of conscience and good feeling to admire in others the virtues which they failed to practise themselves. William Rufus himself had moments when goodness awed him. It was only a few exceptional monsters like "the fiend of Bellême," whom no such feelings ever touched. And Rufus felt the influence of Anselm. When in September, 1092, Anselm severely rebuked the king at Chester, Rufus, instead of being violent or sarcastic, turned the matter off with a laugh: "So holy a man as you ought not to believe such stories of me." Anselm's stay in England was protracted; he was called to Chester to reform Earl Hugh's foundation of St. Werburgh's; and afterwards the king forbade him to return to Normandy. Then, when the clamour for an archbishop waxed stronger, the king fell sick at Alvestone,

and before he recovered—Anselm having been with him during his illness—he yielded to the entreaties of his assembled nobles, and, sitting up in his bed, he pointed to Anselm, saying, "I choose this holy man." So great was the joy, that even fear of danger to the sick man yielded to it; a loud shout of joy rang through the chamber, which was soon, as men deemed, to be the chamber of death. Anselm alone resisted. He was old, unused to worldly affairs, and subject of another prince. The bishops dragged him to his bedside, and there Rufus pleaded in whispers: "O Anselm, why do you condemn me to eternal torments? Help me, lord and father. Take the bishopric, for the holding of which I am already greatly confounded, and fear that I shall be confounded for ever." Still he refused. Then the bishops fell and implored, and then he fell at their feet and implored back again. He had to be invested by physical force. The king held out the staff. Anselm's arm was stretched out against his will; but he kept his hand firmly clenched. Striving to force open his fingers till he shrieked with the pain, they at last managed to raise his forefinger, and place the staff between that one finger and his still closed hand; and this piece of sheer violence was held to be a lawful investiture. It detracts somewhat from our estimate of Anselm's honesty to learn that at Bec much the same scene had been gone through. His speech to the assembled gemót shows how high was the estimate Anselm formed of his office. In England the plough of the Church ought to be drawn by two chief oxen of equal strength, each pulling with the same good will. The strong ox Lanfranc was dead; his yokefellow was a young wild bull. With him they wished to yoke an old and feeble sheep, fit to furnish the wool and milk of the Word, and with lambs for His service, but utterly unequal to pull in fellowship with such a comrade. Mr. Freeman notes how ridiculous such a metaphor would have been anywhere but in England; fancy the Primate of Rheims claiming to be yokefellow of the French king. Nor is it for a moment questioned that the king is right in his appointing. Hildebrand has no followers; Anselm has no scruples; they are not called into being till long after. When the king recovered, though he recalled his gifts to monasteries, and laid hold of all whom he could catch of those whom he had set free during his illness, he never showed the slightest purpose of recalling his gift to Anselm:

"The reforms which he had promised, and which he had partly carried out, were part of the ordinary duty of a man in that state of life to which he had been called, the state of a king. As such they were reckoned by him among those promises which it was beyond his power to fulfil. His engagement to Anselm was strictly personal; if it was not exactly done in the character of a good knight, it was done as the act of a man to a man. William's honour did not keep him from annoying and insulting Anselm, or from haggling with him about money in a way worthy of the chivalrous Richard himself; but it did keep him back from any attempt to undo his own personal act and promise."

In sad contrast with this appointment, early in 1093, is the scene when, not much more than four years after, the primate, taking pilgrim's staff and script from the altar at Canterbury, sets sail from Dover, after Flambard had added the last insult of ransacking his baggage in the presence of the vast crowd that had gathered to bid farewell to their saint. Almost the whole interval had been spent in squabbles. William wished Anselm to ratify the alienations of Church land which the king had made while the see was vacant. Anselm's conscience forbade him to allow God's heritage to be wasted. Anselm wished to become the king's special counsellor as Lanfranc had been his father's; he wished, too, to be allowed to acknowledge Urban instead of Clement, the king's favourite. The king was *advocatus* (patron) of the see, bound to act as its protector, and not to spoil it. After Anselm was enthroned, came a question of money. War with Robert was again decreed, and money had to be raised, the great men of the gemôt contributing according to their means. Anselm offered £500, which sum was gladly accepted at first; but by-and-by, persuaded that the bishop ought to have given more, Rufus sent the money back with an insolent message; and when he afterwards asked for it again, he was told that it had been distributed to the poor, and therefore the king could not now have it. Anselm rebukes the minions, not forgetting him who was the chief sinner of all. He urges Rufus to allow him to hold a synod, and speaks words the boldness of which surprises us. Lanfranc would hardly have dared to speak so; but the Conqueror gave comparatively little occasion for rebuke. In these ways the new archbishop lost favour; and at last came the formal refusal of permission to go and receive the pallium from Pope Urban. Anselm was full bishop without this; for he had already consecrated a bishop; but to receive

the pallium was an old custom. William, however, would acknowledge no Pope, and the assembly summoned at Rockingham to consider the case, treated the archbishop as a criminal, and advised him to submit in all things to the king. The people, however, were strongly on Anselm's side; and fear of them may have prevented the king from acting on William of St. Calais' advice, to take away the ring and staff unless he submits. Such advice from one who had once argued that none but the Pope could judge any bishop! At last Rufus pledges his knightly faith not personally to injure Anselm; but this promise he construes after what Mr. Freeman calls a truly chivalrous fashion. He did not promise to abstain from persecuting the archbishop's friends; so them he harasses with exactions and imprisonments, till the Canterbury Church began to doubt if it had not been better off during the vacancy. At last, Cardinal Walter, bishop of St. Albans, comes with a pallium. William acknowledges Urban. Anselm refuses to take the pallium from the king's hand. It must be laid on the altar in the metropolitan church, that he may receive it from the hand of St. Peter himself. Then follows a time of peace for Anselm, during which he consecrates not only English but Irish bishops, Samuel of Dublin and Malchus of Waterford. This was not a new claim; two predecessors of Samuel had been consecrated by Lanfranc.

The crusade, with the pledging of Normandy to William by his brother Robert, must not delay us long. It was followed by new quarrels between king and primate. Anselm found himself so hopelessly trammelled and hindered from all his intended reforms, that he grew thoroughly weary of England and her king, and of everything to do with her. His feelings underwent a marked change; he began to yearn towards Rome, and his wish to go had very much the air of appealing from the king's authority to the pope's. In this way he lost that general support which barons and people alike had before given him. William jokingly refuses to let him go; he will not believe that such a saint has committed a sin so black that none but the pope can absolve him: if he goes the king will seize the archbishopric. He does go, and is present at the Lateran Council, and pleads with Urban against Rufus's excommunication, Mr. Freeman characteristically speculating what might have been the effect had the thunders of the Church fallen on one who

so richly deserved them. William of Warehurst, bishop of Exeter, is sent to influence the pope's mind against Anselm; and then Anselm finally gives up the king. He wishes to give up the archbishopric, but the pope will by no means allow this. He then urges the interdict against which he had before pleaded; but meanwhile William's gold seems to have been more effectual than his ambassador. Urban delays, and Anselm is not only mortified, but also grieved and astounded, to find that Rome was not the place of ideal purity which he had deemed it. Urban proved the same broken reed to Anselm that Alexander by-and-by proved to Thomas; but one of the bishops, Reinger of Lucca, electrified the council by bursting into an eloquent protest against the wrongs of the English archbishop.

If Anselm is in some sort the hero of Mr. Freeman's first volume, Helias of La Flèche, the noble-minded lord of Maine, is the hero of the second. Rufus covets Maine; it was held by his father; and his filial duty makes him anxious that his dominion shall not fall short of his father's. Robert of Bellême, whose evil is always contrasted with Helias's good, is mostly on his side; and the fate of their captives is noted as widely different from the conduct of Helias and of Louis, the young French king, with whom also Rufus had more than one little war on account of the Vexin. Helias and Louis soon got rid of their prisoners; there was always money on the English side to ransom them. When Frenchmen were captured no ransom was forthcoming, they had to languish in bonds. Rufus, indeed, was willing to release those who would bind themselves to enter his service, but Robert of Bellême had a morbid delight in torturing and starving those who fell into his hands.

Throughout Rufus's reign this fact comes out, that England was already an exceptionally rich country. Why it should have been so it is hard to see. The rule laid down by the Conqueror that there should be no private war in England, had hardly been long enough in force; and yet to no other cause can we attribute the difference between France and Normandy on the one hand, and England on the other. The former were almost always being desolated by the feuds of baron against baron. Notwithstanding the respite furnished by the "Truce of God," an institution never needed in our island, it is hard to see how, in this state of perpetual warfare, the husbandman

could find heart to sow the crop which he could not reckon on reaping. England, on the other hand, though she had the king's mercenaries living lawlessly in her midst, grew in wealth so fast that not even Flambard's exactions could make her poor.

Rufus's French wars were neither glorious nor successful; they give Mr. Freeman the opportunity of displaying his local knowledge in a number of masterly and graphic descriptions of towns and castles. Chaumont, Gisors, &c., he characterises them every one, and notes the contrast in an English landscape. Our castles are few indeed. Except during the nineteen years of anarchy, in what is called Stephen's reign, in no part of England, except the Welsh and Scottish borders, did they ever crown every bluff as they do in Maine, and parts of Normandy. Castle-building has always been a grievance; and Rufus's special work, the Tower of London, was by his English subjects classed, with his wall at Westminster and his bridge at London, among the sore burdens which he laid on the land. They were done by forced labour, and the surrounding shires had to take their part.

As the Peterborough Chronicle says: "Eke many shires that with work to London belonged were sorely harassed through the wall that they wrought around the Tower, and through the bridge, and through the king's hall—work that men in Westminster wrought, and many men therewith harassed."

Mr. Freeman seems to think that on the Welsh border Rufus has not got sufficient credit for his work in Wales. He did not conquer the Welsh; he lost many men and horses in his invasions; he did not, like Harold, accommodate himself to the conditions of mountain warfare, and make his men-at-arms dismount and throw aside their armour. But at every fresh inroad he built new castles, and then pushed on the English frontier. As much ground as each castle protected was so much cover from the natives. This, if a less brilliant, was a far more effectual method than that of beating the Welsh in the field. Mr. Freeman contrasts the conquest of Wales with the English and Norman conquests; he might have compared it with the later English system in Ireland. "The pale" there takes the place of England in the larger. This pale is gradually extended, mainly by castle-building, in every direction save where, as in Wicklow, the natural features

made advance difficult. There is the same disunion amongst the invaded people, Welsh and Irish alike constantly serving against their brethren under the invader's banners; there is the same steady purpose among those invaders, not of subjecting the country as the Conqueror subjected England, and keeping it still distinct from the Normandy whence he came, but of annexing the soil piecemeal, and appropriating all the fertile portions of it. The work went on faster in Ireland, because, except in certain districts, the great central plain offers no obstacle to encroachment. And this difference in physical features is, no doubt, the main reason for the different fate of the two languages. Welsh, despite the "Welsh hump," which a century ago had to be worn in schools by the child who was rash enough to speak a word of Cymric, is still a language with a literature. Irish, which till the famine of 1847 lingered as a literary tongue in Clare, is now spoken only by a few unlettered peasants, and will need the best efforts of the "Irish Language Revival Society" to give it anything like vitality.

All Mr. Freeman's remarks about Wales are deeply interesting. We could hardly expect him to notice the great tide of Welsh immigration which has filled our midland and eastern towns with Joneses and Williamses, and which supports two Welsh newspapers in Manchester. He rather prefers to tell of the settlement of the Teuton within the Welsh border. Thus of Glamorgan he says:

"The leaders in the settlement were of course mainly Norman. It has been acutely remarked that they mostly came, as followers of Robert Fitz-hamon most naturally would come, from the old lands of Brihtric, in Gloucestershire and Somerset. They doubtless brought with them an English following; a strictly Saxon invasion of South Wales. Among the Teutonic settlers in this district, it is not easy to distinguish the Saxon from the Fleming. It must always be remembered that, while the Flemish settlement in Pembrokeshire is matter of history, the Flemish settlements in Gower and Glamorgan are merely matters of inference. The English and Flemish settlers were doubtless the chief inhabitants of the boroughs which now began to rise under the shadow of the castles.

"Cardiff, Kenfig, Aberafon, and Neath, arose on the coast or on the rivers from which some of them took their names. Cowbridge and Llantrissant lay in the inland part of the vale; the last, a borough mainly British, was the only one which held

at all a commanding site among the hills. In later times these towns sank into insignificance. Kenfig, indeed, well-nigh perished under heaps of sand; but some of them have in later times been called up to a new life by the wonderful development of mineral wealth which has changed the barren hills which were left to the Briton, into one of the busiest regions of our whole island."

The difference was this: the Normans who came into England, had, from the very beginning, to put on more or less fully the character of Englishmen, and to live according to English law. But the Norman who from England went into Wales had no thought of putting on the character of Welshmen, or of living according to Welsh law. They were not like the Anglo-Normans in Ireland, many of whom adopted the Breton law, and became *Hibernis ipsis Hiberniores*. Wales, again, is, like Maine, a land of castles. They were needed from the circumstances of the Conquest. Of the value of castles in Welsh warfare the siege of Pembroke, a mere fort of earth and wood, is a notable instance. Here Gerald of Windsor held out for over two years against a mighty host, under Cadwgan Howel, and other chiefs.

All Rufus's dealings with Wales are, in the light in which Mr. Freeman puts them before us, very interesting; above all, because this king is face to face with Ireland. When, by-and-by, at the close of the second volume, comes the great struggle between Robert of Bellême, Earl of Shropshire and Lord of Arundel, and Henry I., Robert has not only a great body of Welsh allies, but is promised help by the King of Leinster. His overking, Murtagh, of Connaught, Rufus had threatened with conquest, boasting as he stood at St. David's Head that he would gather there the fleets of his whole kingdom, and make of them a bridge to go over and win the island. "Did he say, 'if God will'?" asked Murtagh, when he heard the news. Of course, Rufus had not; he hated to hear the phrase on the lips of others. "Well," replied the pious prince, "we need not fear one who comes in his own strength, and not in that of the Most High." The harrying of Wales by Irish invaders was no new thing when Robert of Bellême sought to gain their help. Anglesey was often altogether in their hands; and a book by the present Bishop of St. David's, *Footprints of the Gael in Gwynedd*, shows how permanent is the mark they have left on Caernarvon.*

* The Welsh princes often had pirates from Ireland, probably Norsemen (Gentilas de Ybernia, the annals calls them), in their pay.

The Scotch affairs, too, of this reign Mr. Freeman touches with a masterly hand. He paints lovingly the character of Malcolm's wife, St. Margaret, sketches the unsuccessful Gaelic reaction under Donald Bane, and shows how with David and Matilda began a new order of things, Scotland being now truly a northern England, and its earlier life a thing of the past. Of the later competitors he says: "In every aspect, save that by female descent, they came from David and Matilda, they were simply English nobles of the time. It is an odd destiny by which, according as they supported or withstood the rights of their own prince over the kingdom which they claimed, some of them have won the name of Scottish traitors, and others of Scottish patriots." The brief campaign in which Eadgar the Atheling, and Eadgar, son of Malcolm and Margaret, defeated and dethroned Donald Bane, reminds us of the cruelty which the Normans are answerable for introducing into warfare. Donald was blinded. So when the two earls, Hugh of Chester and Hugh of Shrewsbury, ravaged Anglesey, the Welsh captives were not only blinded but suffered cruel mutilations as well.

But we must hasten to a close, the rather that Mr. Freeman does not end with the death of Rufus, but carries on the history to the battle of Tenchebrai. Of course his account of the death, and of the various portents which heralded it, is most graphic. It gives all the different versions, including Geoffrey Gaimar's Rhyming Chronicle, wherein is set down the *gab*, or jesting talk, of Rufus and Walter Tirel, which followed close on Abbot Fulchered's prophetic sermon. Fulchered had said, "Lo, the bow of wrath from on high is bent against the wicked, and the arrow swift to wound is drawn from the quiver. It shall soon smite, and that suddenly." Then follows Rufus's warning dream. In a grand minster, which changes to a bare desolate church, he sees a body on the altar. A cannibal desire seizes him and he begins to gnaw it; whereupon a voice cries, "Is it not enough that thou hast grieved me with many wrongs, wilt thou gnaw my very flesh and bones?" That Walter was the slayer there is nothing to make us believe. He and Rufus, the day before,

> Ensemble vont amdiu parlant
> De meinte close esbanoiant,
> Tant qe Wauter prist à gaber

Et par engin au roi parler;
Demanda lui en riant
A quei il sojournoit tant.

After much discussion, our author concludes that we cannot go beyond the words of the Peterborough Chronicle: "Thereafter on the morrow, after Lammas-day, was the King William in hunting from his own men with an arrow off shot, and then to Winchester brought, and in the bishopric [the old Minster, *episcopium*] buried." The words suggest treason; but they do not shut out mischance. Beyond them we cannot go with certainty. "But the number of men of every class who must have felt that they would be the better if an arrow could be brought to light on the Red King must have been great indeed. The wonder is that no hand had stricken him long before." Yet, in spite of all his unrighteousness and lawlessness, Mr. Freeman cannot help admiring Rufus's elasticity of nature. His vast plans for conquering France and Ireland, for buying Aquitaine, and founding an empire of united Gaul and Britain, all failed, or rather were never seriously taken up. "Strange that a man who schemed so much, and filled so large a place in the eyes of his own generation, after all did so little. Yet, when his plans were utterly shattered, he seems to have felt no shame, no discouragement, no shock to his belief in his own greatness.... What would have been counted defeat in any one else does not seem to have been counted defeat in Rufus. Beaten, he still keeps the air of a conqueror, he still seems to be looked on as a conqueror by others. From beginning to end there is a kind of glamour about all he does. We might even borrow a word from the piebald jargon of modern diplomacy, and say that his reign was the highest recorded effort of *prestige*." Mr. Freeman's summary is: "In his life we may here and there see signs of great powers wasted, even of momentary feelings which might have been trained into something nobler." Of the burying he says:

"A crowd of all orders, ranks, and sexes, brought together by wonder or pity—we will not deem that they came in scorn or triumph—met the humble funeral procession, and followed the royal corpse to the old Minster. The dead man had been a king; the consecrating oil had been poured on his head; his body was therefore allowed to pass within the hallowed walls, and was laid with all speed in a grave beneath the central tower.

"But in those rites at once sad and cheerful, which accompany the burial of the lowliest of baptised men, the lord of England and Normandy had no share.

"No bell was rung, no mass was said, no offerings were made for the soul which was deemed to have passed beyond the reach even of eternal mercy. No man took from the hoard which Rufus had fill'd by wrong to win the prayers of the poor for him by almsgiving.

"Men deem'd that for him prayer was too late; no scattering abroad of the treasure by the hands of others could atone for the wrong by which the treasure had first been brought together.

"Many looked on, but few mourned; none wept for him but the mercenaries who received his pay, and the baser partners of his foul vices."

With Henry's coming everything was changed. By express treaty between Robert and William, England, at William's death, went to the former; but Henry was on the spot. He seized the treasure at Winchester, and then in a popular assembly he was chosen king. The people rejoiced; "*plebeio concrepante*," says William of Malmesbury. The days of tyranny were past, the lion of justice reigned, and before the day of his consecration was over he put into the shape of a charter his promises to act uprightly, and restored the law of King Edward. Mr. Freeman acknowledges that where the king's personal pleasure was concerned, as in the case of the forests, the old laws went for nought, but the charter was a grand thing, the first instalment of many which make up the sum of our liberties. Then followed the imprisonment of Flambard and the return of Anselm, and then war broke out between the brothers, in the midst of which Henry married Eadgyth, and so made the English still more united in their attachment to him. Robert's invasion was marked by the same chivalrous feeling which he usually showed in war. Henry's wife was in childbed at Winchester; hearing which, Robert declined to attack the city, and marched on London. But by Anselm's means a battle was averted, and, satisfied with the complete cession of Normandy, Robert went home. The revolt of Robert of Bellême closes the volume, at the close of which Mr. Freeman repeats what he so often asserts during the two volumes, that England could henceforth be no longer called a conquered land. "The work of the Conquest was from one side confirmed for ever, from another side it was undone

for ever. As to the royal house, the old stock was neither cut down nor withered away, but a new stock grafted upon it."

Our general conclusion from this, his last work, is, that Mr. Freeman's powers are unimpaired, his views unaltered. He is the same champion of England for the English, though he is able to appreciate noble men, like Helias of la Flèche, belonging to another stock. He has the same thoroughness as of old; his appendices are full of the results of recondite reading, and every one of them teaches valuable lessons to the young historian as to the way in which a subject ought to be got up.

We cannot altogether agree with him in his idea of the rapidity with which the English rose after they were crushed under the Conqueror. Rufus, no doubt, was impartial in his tyranny, but, from the nature of the case, his oppression must have told most on his English subjects. And this is proved by the fact that it is the native chronicles which give the darkest details of his life, and express the most exuberant joy at his death. As we said, there was not the same scope here as in the work on the Conquest for broad generalisation. The book is, like the reign of which it treats, a series of pictures, full of personal detail; but these pictures by Mr. Freeman's master hand are so drawn as to fix themselves on the imagination. We live in the times that he describes; we know the Red King, not only as a shadowy oppressor who came to a strange end, but as a real man with some good in him, though on him Mr. Freeman passes the stern verdict (which he repeated the other day at the archæological meeting at Carlisle) that "every night he lay down a worse man than he had got up, and every morning he rose a worse man than he had lain down." That such a king should have been an instrument in welding together English and Norman, and, by his very tyranny, in making it inevitable that England should have law and freedom, is a wonderful instance of the ways of Providence.

ART. II.—*Through Siberia.* By HENRY LANSDELL. With Illustrations and Maps. Second Edition. London: Sampson Low, Marston, Searle, & Rivington. 1882.

IN our article on the North-east passage,* the subject was viewed principally in its scientific connection, not however without hinting at another, viz., the development of Siberia, and of communications with that little known and much despised country. What is the circumnavigation of North Asia but the circumnavigation of Siberia, so far as its coast-line extends? The common belief that where Russian Europe ends Siberia begins is an error, but it is not far from the truth. From Port Dickson to Yokohama all the Asiatic land the *Vega* voyagers saw was Siberian soil. The three rivers we spoke of, the Obi, the Lena, and the Yenisei, are Siberian rivers. Not one of them is much less than three thousand miles; and, together with the Amur, which is over two thousand miles long, they drain an area of 5,750,000 square miles, that could be parcelled out into a hundred provinces of the size of England. Mere size, we know, counts for little, at least in political geography. The sandy steppes of the south, and the frozen tundras of the north, together with the scantiness of the population—less than two to the square mile—may be regarded as reducing the importance of the country almost to a minimum; and the character and composition of its society as reducing it to the very lowest point. But this would be a far too depreciatory estimate. Though only one-fifth of the soil is arable, that fifth is thirty times the extent of soil under cultivation in this country, and is found in almost every variety of climate, from the arctic to the semi-tropical. If roads are defective and railways almost wholly absent, the natural water communication for a considerable portion of the year is as abundant as in the basin of the Mississippi. But this is all internal. The grand defect of Siberia, to which its social and political insignificance may be in large part due, is the want of means of communication with the rest of the world. Its productions are valuable enough to be worth

* See the July number of this Journal.

development, but they cannot be brought to market. This necessity for land-carriage across half a continent, so long as it exists, will always be a prohibitory tax on exportation. The same obstacle will bar the introduction of foreign merchandise. A few statistics will make this clear. The wholesale price of meat at Tobolsk in 1877 was one halfpenny per pound, but the transit, even as far as to St. Petersburg, either cost five shillings per hundredweight and occupied a twelvemonth; or twelve shillings per hundredweight and occupied two months and a half; or eighteen shillings per hundredweight if sent by express sledges, in this last case more than quadrupling the original expense. At Barnaul, farther in the interior, undressed wheat flour cost two shillings per hundredweight. At Irkutsk, farther east still, prices range almost equally low. But these are for home-grown products. By way of contrast to these, a single lemon at Irkutsk costs half-a-crown, sugar from eightpence to a shilling a pound, and champagne twelve or fourteen shillings a bottle. All this might have been very different if either the climatic conditions or the river system of Siberia had been reversed. With the mountains in the north and west, and the rivers flowing to the south and east, or with wider openings between the continents admitting to the north the flow of warmer waters, it is conceivable that Siberia might long ago have taken rank as a great corn-growing and meat-producing country, sustaining thousands where now it numbers tens. But the mountains are where nature has placed them, and the great northern rivers, for the larger half of the year, have their mouths blocked by ice. Nevertheless, the problem of the commercial enfranchisement of Siberia is now being attacked, and, as we think, with good prospects of success.

The interest of the two volumes that stand at the head of this paper is not largely commercial or scientific, though these departments are not overlooked. But neither is it the ephemeral interest of ordinary books of travel. The aim of Mr. Lansdell was chiefly missionary and philanthropic. If not as exclusively so as Howard's, that is due in part to the fact that Howard's work had been done. Mr. Lansdell set out as a visitor of Russian prisoners, furnished with authorisations like the eighteenth century philanthropist, but also furnished, as an honorary agent for the British and Foreign Bible Society, with resources for doing good that the latter did not

possess. The circumstances that led to the undertaking were different. What led Howard to think of his great mission was his sad experience at Lisbon. With Mr. Lansdell, the thought originated in connection with his annual holiday excursions. And a similar difference appears in the execution of the plan. For Howard it became a life-work; for our modern philanthropist it was but a somewhat longer interlude between the exercises of a regular pastoral charge. But though there are these differences of plan and execution, the spirit that animated the two enterprises was the same. Though not so heroic in its performance, or daring in its originality, the modern enterprise presents an aspect of cheerful self-sacrifice peculiarly winning. Holidays, and especially holidays abroad, are popular enough, and, while the world lives at such a pace, they are likely to continue so. But who thinks of turning his picnic into a pilgrimage, and that not a sentimental pilgrimage to an altar of the Virgin, or a jolly pilgrimage, like that of Chaucer's story, to the shrine of a saint, but a business-like expedition, as practical as Nordenskiöld's, uniting the functions of a prison inspector and a Bible colporteur? Such was the unique origin of an unique tour in which, without intending it, Mr. Lansdell did for the first time by land what the *Vega* band did for the first time by sea, crossing the whole breadth of the Old World, and returning, as they did not, by way of the New, and so compassing the globe, in nearly a straight line of 25,500 miles, in the space of 210 days.

Like Baron Nordenskiöld's two volumes, those of Mr. Lansdell are full of interesting details of his line of march, with the difference, of course, that his was a land journey through widely diverse nationalities, and not a sea-voyage, whose principal variations were from fog to ice, or from storm to calm.

Our author possesses all the characteristics of a good traveller, quick perceptions, ready resources, and never-wearied inquisitiveness, together with a dogged patience, imperturbable good humour, and a conciliatory address, which were often of great service in helping him out of a difficulty. He is also a good narrator of travels, being as lively in his descriptions as he must have been as a *compagnon de voyage*, and showing the same facility in reproducing the results of observation as in first acquiring them. He must also have made as good use of

books before and after his journey as of his senses while in the prosecution of it, the list of works consulted numbering one hundred and twenty. We have heard a wish expressed that his next book may be of somewhat more modest dimensions, and be compressed within the limits of a single volume. But we cannot see how much less space could have been occupied in telling so capital a story. The world is overstocked with dry hand-books and merely personal narratives. A goodly array of details is essential to a picture that is to fill the understanding and remain in the memory. And two volumes are not too much for a discriminating public, when the undiscriminating public which feeds upon fiction demands that its novels shall extend over three.

We can only give a brief sketch of our author's journeyings, with an occasional comment on the principal topics which his narrative suggests. His route lay mainly through the southern portion of Siberia, and took generally a south-easterly direction, from Troitsk on the Obi, in N. Lat. 62°, to Vladivostock, his point of embarkation for Japan, in N. Lat. 43°. All the principal towns of the provinces traversed were included in the line of march. Leaving Moscow on Wednesday, the 14th of May, 1879, a thirteen hours' journey by rail brought him to Nijni Novgorod on the Volga, famous for its annual fair. As the river overflows its banks in spring to a depth of several feet, our author had to be rowed through the streets, and in this way visited the principal quarters occupied in July by merchants of all nations, and left desolate for the rest of the year. At this place he was joined by an interpreter, a knowledge of the Russian language not counting as one of Mr. Lansdell's qualifications, and on Friday at noon the two left by steamer, and on Saturday morning reached the Tatar city of Kasan. Its degree of civilisation may be indicated by its being the seat of a metropolitan bishop, and possessing a cathedral, an university, and thirty-eight churches, as also by its manufactures of leather, hardware, soap, cloth, and cotton, and its trade with Siberia. The place is interesting as the locality from which the Tatar hordes made their raids on the Byzantine empire in the fourth and following centuries, until they established themselves in Bulgaria. A collection of Bulgarian antiquities was inspected by Mr. Lansdell, including rude implements of the stone age, and ancient lamps and crosses. Here also he found evidences

of lingering pagan superstition, not only in various idolatrous objects held in honour by the Tatars, but also in the existence of a Russian seminary specially devoted to the enlightenment of these and other heathen belonging to various nationalities scattered throughout the empire.

Quitting Kasan on the Monday morning, our travellers steamed up the Kama, one of the affluents of the Volga, and in three days and a half reached Perm. The first-class fare for the four days' journey from Nijni Novgorod was only thirty-six shillings. The next stage was from Perm across the Ural Mountains to Ekaterineburg, a distance of 312 miles, formerly one of the most dismal of drives, but now accomplished easily in twenty-four hours by rail. The Urals are said to be disappointing. Their conventional grandeur as the boundary of Europe and Asia is not borne out by their actual appearance. The highest peak does not exceed 6,000 feet, and no part of the range is covered with perpetual snow. The Northern Ural is the most elevated and the least known; the Southern is a pastoral country of about 100 miles in breadth, and the Central is a wide undulation. Ekaterineburg is a handsome town, of 30,000 inhabitants, with many fine buildings, including two cathedrals, ten churches, a museum, a mint, an hospital, and an orphanage, the last-named being the only one met with on the route. A principal branch of industry is the cutting and polishing of the precious stones in which Siberia abounds, such as the jacinth, the emerald, the onyx, the jasper in a hundred different varieties, and others. A peculiarity of the recently-discovered Alexandrite—so called from the Emperor, whose crimson and green it shows—is that these colours shine, the one by day, the other by night, *i.e.*, we suppose, by combination with the yellow rays of artificial light.

At this point Mr. Lansdell bade adieu to the convenience and comfort of railway travelling, performing all the other stages of his Asiatic journey either by road or river. Here he may also be said to have exchanged one form of civilisation for another and ruder, the contrast being made all the sharper by the hospitality of English friends, almost the last he was to meet before he reached the sea. Instead of the roomy luxuriousness of the Russian first-class railway carriages, which are pronounced to be among the best-appointed in Europe, acquaintance

had now to be made with the jolting tarantass, a hooded vehicle mounted upon poles instead of springs, apparently for the sufficient reason that no springs could long stand the wear and tear of Siberian roads. The roads, however, are not all bad, those of Yeniseisk being nearly equal to the best of this country. Of the animals that are yoked to these uncomfortable carriages the author says that they are "sorry objects to look at, but splendid creatures to go." They are smaller than English horses, but hardier, and are driven two, three, four, or even five abreast. The cost of locomotion is not great—halfpenny a mile for the hire of each horse in Western Siberia, and a penny a mile in Eastern, while a tarantass may be procured for £20 or £30. To this must be added, however, the gratuity to the drivers—who change with the horses every ten or fifteen miles—euphemistically termed tea-money, on the amount of which depends very much the rate of progress. Ten or fifteen kopecks per stage secured a speed of from a hundred to a hundred and thirty miles a day. The post-houses, like the horses, are the property of the Government, and vary in appearance and comfort from rude hovels to well-established inns. In all is to be found a tariff of meat and drink which sometimes awakens hopes it cannot fulfil, the real meaning of the notice being not that the postmaster has the stock of delicacies set forth upon it, but that the prices affixed are those at which they may be sold if he has them. The benevolence of a paternal Government is to be seen in this judicious ban upon extortion; and if only regular supplies could be requisitioned with equal ease, the picture would be complete. As it is, according to Mr. Lansdell, it is not the tortures of the tarantass, but the exigencies of bed and board that form "the rub of Siberian travel." Boiling water and black bread may be relied upon; beyond this all is uncertainty. The only alternative to the prospect of semi-starvation in this appetite-giving country is to carry a supply of provisions sufficient to last from town to town. To other difficulties should be added that of securing relays of horses with sufficient promptitude. The Siberian mind is not unaffected by the kind of notions with regard to the use and value of time which we generally associate with the warmer regions of the East; and on several occasions our travellers were inconvenienced by the dilatoriness of those on whom they had to depend

for expedition. Mr. Lansdell, however, was favoured above most foreigners by the possession of certain official documents, which had an amazing effect in opening the eyes and quickening the movements of the postal authorities. In one case preparations that, it was said, would occupy from noon to midnight were by this means completed in an hour.

From Ekaterineburg our travellers set out, in the fashion we have described, for Tiumen on the Tura, a distance of 204 miles, which they accomplished in forty-three continuous hours. Tiumen is a town of from 15,000 to 20,000 inhabitants, and important as a centre both for the water carriage of the Obi and for the caravans from China and the East. It is also a kind of depôt to which the Siberian exiles are first brought from Europe, and from which they are sent to their various destinations. Here, therefore, Mr. Lansdell's work of tract distribution began in good earnest. At this point the water communication commences by means of the Obi and its tributaries, the Irtish and the Tobol, which cover nearly the whole of Western Siberia, running east from Tiumen to Tomsk, and north from Semipolatinsk, near the fiftieth parallel to the sea. When, therefore, the railway is completed from Ekaterineburg to Tiumen, steam communication, either by road or river, will be available sufficient to throw open Western Siberia to the markets of Europe. Our travellers, however, did not embark at this point, but travelled by road to Tobolsk, being wishful to spend more time in that important city than the steamer would have allowed them. The journey was not without its advantages, both for the experience it brought of spring travelling and for the opportunity it afforded to visit at leisure several villages peopled exclusively by Siberian Tatars. These differ in one respect from most of the other nations that have come under the Russian yoke, in that they have a history which connects them with some of the greatest conquerors of olden times, notably with Genghis Khan. Like those of their congeners with whom we are familiar under the name of Turks, these Tatars are Mohammedans; and the green domes and cross-surmounted pinnacles of the Russian church now gave place for a season to the crescent-topped minarets of the Mohammedan mosque. Though held in as strict subordination to the ruling race as any other nationality, the Tatars

do not mix with the Russians, the men refusing to eat with the Christians and the women wearing veils.

Tobolsk was reached after a much more protracted journey than was expected, the twenty hours allotted for the purpose expanding into forty-eight. The roads were some of the worst that had to be traversed, the reason being partly the season of the year—the early summer—when the long frost was everywhere breaking up, and partly perhaps the fact that the existence of water communication would naturally tend to neglect of the roads.

The province of Tobolsk is one of the oldest and by far the most populous of the governments of Siberia. The population is variously estimated at 666,000 and 1,100,000, a discrepancy so great as to suggest that the former must be the number of "souls" only, *i.e.*, of males, and the latter the number of human beings. Even the larger estimate seems scanty when the size of the province is considered, 500,000 square miles; and the impression is deepened when we remember that the total town population is only 30,000, of which Tobolsk, the capital, claims 17,000. Another line of thought is suggested by the proportion of the military force to the urban population, the former exceeding the latter by 20,000. The "force," we should suppose, must include all the families and dependents connected with the army. The necessities of prison discipline no doubt account for the magnitude of this estimate. Tatars, Voguls, Ostjaks, and Samoyedes enter into the composition of the population, but nine-tenths of the whole are Russian. The Voguls are foresters that live by hunting. The Samoyedes and Ostjaks were described in our former article, and need not occupy our attention here.

The town of Tobolsk is divided into two parts, an upper and a lower, the former standing on a hill with a precipitous front, the latter lying at the foot of the hill. The houses are built of wood, and the streets of the same material. At present it looks like a place that has seen its best days; perhaps the efforts being made to throw open Western Siberia to European commerce both by sea and by land will revive the prosperity of its chief city. It has, however, the usual institutions that dignify a capital—its military school and arsenal, its theological and normal seminaries, its gymnasium, theatre, and penitentiary, its military fortress and its three hard labour

prisons, and in close proximity to these, as if to make the users thankful for the liberty that others do not enjoy, its pleasure gardens.

From Tobolsk our travellers proceeded by steamer down the Irtish to Troitsk, and thence up the Obi, which there joins its chief tributary, to Tomsk, the former part of the course being almost due north and the latter south-east. In this their first experience of river transit, they came into somewhat closer contact with Russian life than was possible so long as they were simply posting from one wayside station to another in the solitary tarantass. The various grades of society were recognised in much the same manner as in the original haunts of the steam-engine, by the provision of first and second class cabins and saloons, and of quarters on deck for third-class passengers. Among those of the highest grade were officers of the army, navy, and gendarmerie, together with some school-girls going home from St. Petersburg, a distance of 3,000 miles, and some specimens of the ubiquitous Russian merchant. The principal feature of the life on board, during a voyage of ten days, was the determined manner in which many of the passengers killed time by card-playing. One company "played by day and quarrelled by night, and sometimes did not leave off their games till seven in the morning." In the small towns of the interior where there is little to see and nothing to do, this habit, at least among the military population, seems to be almost universal. The same remark applies to European Russia: in Petersburg the gambling is frightful. Usually it is accompanied by heavy drinking, but of this our travellers had happily little experience. Some of the passengers, especially the ladies, were able to converse in French, and thus beguiled the tedium of the voyage.

A curious incident of travel was the taking in tow by the steamer of a barge full of convicts, a companionship, we should suppose, more suggestive than pleasant to a free-born Englishman. But to benefit persons of this class was the precise object of Mr. Lansdell's enterprise, and the opportunity of watching their demeanour and habits for a more lengthened period than usual was not unwelcome. At the invitation of the officer in charge, he went on board at one of the stopping-places, and disposed of books and tracts in abundance to a people clamorous to receive them.

The genuineness of their desire for his wares was proved by their willingness to pay the moderate prices which their very excess of zeal seemed to make it a necessity to charge. The general behaviour of the 800 prisoners, of whom 250 would be murderers, was such as to excite surprise, especially as there were only twenty soldiers to guard them, and a considerable amount of liberty was allowed.

The distance from Tobolsk to Tomsk by river is 1,600 miles, and was accomplished by our traveller in eight days. The province of Tomsk does not, like its neighbours Tobolsk and Yeniseisk, extend to the sea, but runs from the 62nd parallel southward to the borders of Mongolia. Its area is 329,000 square miles, and its population over 800,000, being the next in magnitude to Tobolsk. The mountains of the Altai range in the south abound in mines. In 1874 they produced 5,000 lbs. of gold, 22,000 lbs. of silver, 1,500,000 lbs. of copper, and 1,100,000 lbs. of cast iron. But the main industry is agriculture, and in particular cattle-breeding. The town of Tomsk has a population of 25,000 or 30,000, is better built than some of the provincial capitals, many of the houses being of brick, and now boasts a cathedral and an university, neither of which was finished at the date of our author's visit. At this place Mr. Lansdell had the good fortune to meet a certain Finnish pastor, a M. Roshier, who had been named in his correspondence as likely to assist in the distribution of tracts among the Finnish colonies found in this province. By his help arrangements were made which precluded the necessity of a personal visit, and so saved much time and labour. The existence of Finnish colonies in Siberia is explained by the peculiar relation of the Emperor of Russia to the practically independent inhabitants of Finland. He is their Grand Duke; and when Finnish criminals are condemned to imprisonment by the tribunals of their own country, they enjoy the privilege of appealing to the Czar to commute the sentence into one of banishment to Siberia. As the Finns do not speak Russian, they are congregated in villages of several hundred inhabitants.

From Tomsk our travellers' most direct course would have been due east, but as their luggage had not yet arrived from Tiumen, and was not likely to arrive for a week, the opportunity was embraced of making a détour southward to Barnaul and back, where additional insight might be obtained into the working, not only of government

prisons, but of government mines. As these last had an unenviable reputation for the horrors supposed to be endured in them, a visit of inspection had peculiar attractions for our author. A note of the climate, or rather season, occurs here, which is worth quoting for the different impression it gives of Siberian weather from those which currently prevail:

"Snow fell on the night we entered the country, and the ground next morning, May 29th, was white; but the snow disappeared after an hour or two, and we saw no more for some days. By the 5th of June we reached, on the Obi, a latitude 100 miles north of St. Petersburg, where the buds had not yet opened, nor had the winter floods subsided. I heard subsequently that the opening of spring had come that year unusually early in Petersburg, and exceptionally late in Siberia, where the ice usually breaks up at Tobolsk at the end of April. On the 6th of June we had snow, and the trees on the banks had little verdure till we reached Tomsk on the 9th, after which fine weather set in, and was followed by almost uninterrupted sunshine till the beginning of autumn. The summer climate, therefore, of those parts of Siberia through which I passed I consider simply delightful, neither oppressively hot by day, nor unpleasantly cold by night."

Between Tomsk and Barnaul the character of the country changed considerably, flat and leafless plains giving place to grassy and well-wooded slopes. Still farther south, as the Altai range is approached, the scenery becomes well worth seeing. The flora of the neighbourhood is abundant and varied, the soil rich, and the cost of living almost nominal. Imported luxuries are, however, dear through the cost of carriage; labour is scarce and wages low. After a pleasant visit, in the course of which the rare spectacle was enjoyed of a good collection of English books, the property of the manager of the government smelting works, a Mr. Clark, the son of an Englishman, our travellers returned on their steps, found their luggage waiting for them at Tomsk, and set their faces toward East Siberia, having distributed in Western Siberia a total of 4,000 Scriptures, and 9,000 pamphlets and tracts.

During the third day's journey from Tomsk, Eastern Siberia was entered, and the landscape, hitherto flat and bare, began again to improve as some spurs of the Altai range, which skirt for a long distance the western banks of the Yenisei, made their appearance. The herbage, however, grew less luxuriant, and the hire of horses rose

in proportion. The road from Tomsk to Krasnoiarsk, a distance of four hundred miles, was lined at short intervals with straggling villages, all giving evidence of a low stage of civilisation:

"To describe one village is to describe them all—the chief difference being that, whilst each consists of a single street, with detached houses on either side of the way, some villages are larger than others. One we passed through was said to be nearly three miles long. The said street is usually wide, but never by any chance paved, though now and then a few boards are laid down for a foot-way. Nor is the street usually beautified with anything worthy the name of a garden. Now and then a few trees are planted in front of a house, but with such a high, clumsy palisade to keep off the cattle, that the attempted cultivation of beauty becomes rather a disfigurement than otherwise. The priest's house is often one of the best in the place. So, again, the post-house usually stands out prominently; and if there happens to be any government official in the village, an extra coat of paint, or some little ornamentation about the exterior, may point out the house inhabited by superiors; but ordinarily the houses of the peasants or farmers are very much alike. The foundation may perchance be of stone, but all else is of wood. For the walls, trees are cut and barked, slightly flattened by being cut away on two opposite sides, and then laid one above the other, the ends being dovetailed together at the corners. The interstices between the logs are caulked with moss, and the roof is generally of overlapping boards. So long as the foundation holds good, the houses look tolerably neat; but when this begins to give, or the logs to rot, they become strained and warped in so many directions, as to present a very dilapidated appearance."

The interior corresponds with the exterior:

"When the houses are intended for the accommodation of human beings only, they generally have no second storey; but in the case of farmhouses, where cattle are sheltered, we frequently found them having an upper storey approached by an outside staircase. There were usually also outhouses adjoining and under the same roof; so that one had but to leave the dwelling-room upstairs, cross a passage, and open a door, to find oneself looking down upon beasts and cattle, and other denizens of a farm-yard, which share the same roof, though not, like the Irish pig, the same apartments, as their owners. The interior of the house is as simple as the outside. In the centre is a brick stove. The walls are whitewashed or papered, and adorned with pictures according to the means and taste of the owner. Portraits of the Imperial

family figure largely, so do battle scenes, pictures of the saints, and family photographs."

This description applies more especially to the villages of the peasantry. Some small towns occur, with cross-streets, wooden footways, perchance a small hospital, and the residence of an ispravnik, or a few well-to-do merchants. "In the houses of some of these are to be found large rooms, papered walls, and painted floors, with perhaps a square of carpet near the sofa and table." The houses of persons highest in position are also of wood, but "the rooms are more spacious and *en suite*, enlivened with flowers and creepers, and the tables enriched by articles of *virtu* from Europe." Generally our author was struck with the greater simplicity and frugality of life of the various classes of society, as compared with the luxury and display of corresponding classes at home; and though there was, accompanying this, a certain roughness of manners not at all times agreeable to a stranger, yet the comparison with Western habits was not wholly to the disadvantage of Siberia.

The province of Yeniseisk, in which our travellers now found themselves, takes its name, like so many other provinces, from its principal river, the Yenisei, which, rising under another name in Mongolia, flows through Lake Baikal, and so onward in a north-easterly direction till it falls into the Arctic Ocean, forming a wide lagoon and delta for four hundred miles, before it reaches the gulf which bears its name. Its total length, 3,472 miles, ranks it as the fourth longest river in the world; but this statement applies only to the Yenisei proper, which rises in the Tannu range of the Altai mountains, and a little above Yeniseisk receives as affluents the waters of the Angara which have emerged from Lake Baikal, a tributary stream larger and longer than itself. The province through which it flows is of proportionately vast dimensions, extending, as no other province does, from the Altai mountains to the Arctic Ocean, and terminating in the recently circumnavigated Cape Chelyuskin, the northernmost point of the Old World. Its area covers nearly a million square miles, but its population is less than that of Tomsk, not amounting to 400,000. It is covered with magnificent pine forests as far as the Arctic circle, the trees gradually diminishing in size, from 200 feet and upward, till in the extreme north they disappear.

The Russian population is mainly restricted to the immediate vicinity of the great river, its tributaries, and of the great high road which crosses them from east to west. Yeniseisk is the oldest town, but the honours of the capital are given to Krasnoiarsk, a town of 10,000 inhabitants, a thousand more than those of Yeniseisk. Enormous quantities of corn are raised by the Russians in the districts they inhabit. The remaining portions of the province are roamed by the native tribes, who live principally by hunting and fishing. But the chief feature of this province is its gold mines. Of the total gold produce of the world, Russia furnishes one-eighth, and three-fourths of this come from Siberia. In quality it is superior to Hungarian, having a smaller amount of silver mixed with it in its natural state. But it falls a little below that of California and Australia, which last approximates the nearest to pure gold. The difficulties attending the search for gold-fields are probably greater than elsewhere. For mere physical impediments to locomotion the Australian bush and the Californian wilds are nothing to the Siberian taiga, where the adventurer finds himself bewildered in a labyrinth of small hills and valleys, intersected in all directions by streams, and covered with the dense thickets of the primeval forest. The danger of being lost is too great for isolated action; hence the pursuit is generally carried on by prospecting parties of at least ten, and the outlay for horses, tools, provisions, &c., makes the expedition somewhat costly, especially considering the risks of failure. When indications of gold are sufficiently favourable to warrant prolonged search, trees have to be cut down and tents built, in which the party may have to stay for months. Then a series of trenches must be dug, and subterranean passages made, sometimes nine feet wide and high, the earth thrown up being constantly tested for traces of gold, as indications of the direction in which the passages should run. All this has to be done in the depth of winter, when the ground scarcely yields to a pick-axe, but has to be first softened by huge bonfires. In summer the trenches would be flooded as soon as they were dug, for, of course, it is only in low situations, preferably ancient river-beds, that the golden grains are sought. In some places frozen rivers are dug through, and the earth is worked beneath them. Meantime the wretched log-hut, its crevices caulked with moss, is the only refuge from the rage of the snow-storm, and the portable stove is the only defence against

the rigours of a climate in which the temperature is habitually below zero. When the land promises to pay for working, that is, when the amount of gold that may be got is not less than one-eighth of an ounce to half an ounce for every ton of sand, and when the position of the beds and the number of labourers and the quantity of water available for machinery are such as not to raise the cost of working above a certain percentage of the finds, a courier is despatched to the employers of the party, and the place is registered at once as a gold mine. After this is done, the mine must be worked or sold; if not, it is forfeited to the Crown. The gold, when collected in sufficient quantities, is taken to Irkutsk or Barnaul, where it is first assayed and then delivered up to the Government, gold assignats being given in exchange. Thus all the gold found in the country becomes the property of the Government. Of course, large fortunes are made in connection with gold-mining. One firm, of three partners, obtained enough in a single twelvemonth to yield a net profit of £600,000, and expected to make £1,000,000 the next; and the government surveyor calculated that even at that rate of production the mine would last fifty years. Gold to the value of fifty millions was obtained in Eastern Siberia alone from 1833 to 1870, giving employment to 30,000 workmen. But the evil results of gold-hunting in Siberia are not less marked than elsewhere.

A lively sketch is given by Mr. Lansdell of a visit paid by him to the Archangel Gabriel mine, at some distance from Krasnoiarsk, involving a long day's ride through the forest, where "sometimes the way was all but impassable by reason of masses of shattered-down dry wood; now our horses stepped over fallen trees, and now waded knee-deep up the beds of rivulets; in some places we met with snow-white skeletons of dead trees with branching arms; in others the way, indicated by notches on the trees, had been cut with an axe." Night fell before they got to their journey's end, making the difficulty of progress all the greater; but towards midnight the settlement was reached, and the next day was spent in an inspection of the mine—its processes of gold-washing, and its appointments of barracks, hospital, stables, and houses for two or three hundred workmen. The work was not subterranean, and resembled nothing so much as that of English navvies employed on a railway cutting. Our author saw enough of

the arrangements to satisfy himself that sufficient attention was paid to the comfort of the men, and returned the same day to Krasnoiarsk.

The next few days were spent in visiting the prison and hospital of this provincial capital for purposes connected with the mission, not omitting, however, such other lions as it had to boast, among the rest a church built at a cost of £70,000, by a rich gold-finder named Kusnitzoff—the Russian for Smith—and a public garden given to the town by the same gentleman. On the evening of the 27th of June our travellers set out for a 600 miles' journey to Irkutsk. The weather now began to be very oppressive, though the nights were still chilly, and stages of 200 versts a day must have tested their powers of endurance not a little. Many rivers were crossed, and one or two factories passed, which give occasion for comment on the comparative dearth of manufactures in Siberia. The reason is obvious. The raw material, of whatever kind, is grown at enormous distances from the establishments at which they are worked up, and the goods, when manufactured, have to be taken enormous distances to be sold. Imported goods are, therefore, cheaper than home-grown products, though necessarily dear themselves. Thus at Krasnoiarsk a suit of Tweed clothes costs £6.

When within half a day's journey of Irkutsk, Mr. Lansdell made a short détour in order to visit the Alexandreffsky Central Prison, the largest in Eastern Siberia, crossing on the way the river Angara. The prison he found to be a huge building of fifty-seven rooms, each affording accommodation for from twenty-five to one hundred prisoners. The punishment cells struck him as far more endurable than our English ones, being better lighted and warmed, and only inferior to them in size, not measuring more than 8 ft. by 6 ft., and 12 ft. in height. A considerable amount of liberty seems to be allowed to the prisoners. Their friends visit them every *fête* day, Sundays included, and food may be brought any day between eleven and twelve. They may also write to them when they please, and receive money from them to the extent of a rouble a week. The total number of prisoners is 1,589, gathered from all parts of the Russian Empire. One of the worst features of the place seemed to be, not too much labour, but too little of it—an evil our visitor thought he could have remedied, till on his homeward journey through America he found the

same forced idleness, literally for lack of work to be done. He did what he could, however, in his own way to remedy the evil, by leaving abundance of tracts and Testaments, enough of the latter for one to be placed in every room.

The return journey to Telma was delayed some hours by an accident to the equipage, and the whole time occupied by the excursion was thirty hours instead of five. But the mishaps of the road turned out to be providential. Setting out for Irkutsk on the morning of the 7th of July, a feeling of satisfaction stole over our travellers' minds, as they saw in the distance the goal of their long journeyings, which it had been predicted by many they would never reach. But feelings of the sentimental order were soon lost in deeper and more powerful emotions. They had seen fires before at Perm and other places, and were not greatly disturbed at the sight of two ruined blocks of buildings, the embers of which were still smoking. It soon appeared, however, that this fire was one of no ordinary magnitude, and had by no means spent its force. Everywhere, as they passed through the streets, they met men "running from all directions, not with the idle curiosity of a London crowd, but with the blanched and fear-stricken countenances of those who knew that the devastation might reach to them." The fire brigade arrangements were all in confusion. "There were some English engines in the town—one of them, of a brilliant red, bore the well-known name of 'Merryweather and Sons'—but the Siberians had not practised their engines in the time of prosperity, and the consequence was that the pipes had become dry and useless, and would not serve them in the day of adversity. The arrangements, too, for bringing water were of the clumsiest description. A river was flowing on either side of the city, but the firemen had no means of conducting the water by hose, but carried it in large barrels on wheels." Meanwhile, the flames were spreading through the best streets of the city, and there was no one to take the command. The fire had everything in its favour, most of the houses being built of wood and a fresh breeze blowing. The heat from a burning house of this description was frequently enough to set fire to houses on the opposite side of the street without the contact of sparks. Here and there a work of demolition was begun with a view to arrest the progress of the flames; but little was accomplished to any purpose, and by midnight an area of half a square mile was

covered with flames, and by eleven o'clock the next morning, when their fury had spent itself, three-fourths of the city were consumed. Our author strove to make himself useful to the persons at whose house he put up. As a set-off against the unpreparedness of the officials for the calamity before it happened—which, considering that the town was built of wood, seems almost inexcusable—should be mentioned their promptitude in relieving distress afterwards. The fire was scarcely extinguished before a committee was formed, and handsome sums were contributed by the leading merchants. Proclamations were posted, offering bread and money to all who needed them; and no serious disorder resulted from the confusion into which everything was thrown. The city has since been rebuilt on a grander scale than before.

The province of Irkutsk, whose chief town our author became acquainted with in this dramatic fashion, is smaller than some others, having an area of 300,000 square miles, and a population of 380,000. Mr. Lansdell had now nearly reached the limits of his intended pilgrimage. But in the course of his journeyings the possibility of still greater things had suggested itself, and a desire had sprung up within his mind to "go right across Asia and leave so many copies of Scripture as would suffice for putting at least a New Testament or a copy of the Gospels in every room of every prison, and in every ward of every hospital, throughout the whole of Siberia." The means by which this noble project was to be accomplished were not at first clear to our author; but when he learned that there was a service of steamers on the Amur, which would convey him over three-fourths of the distance yet to be traversed, the feasibility of the proposed extension became at once apparent. On application to M. Lochwitzky, the Governor of Yeniseisk, letters of recommendation were obtained for the provinces beyond; and thus equipped, our travellers set out for their next stage of 300 miles to Kiakhta.

The narrative is interrupted at this point in order to devote two chapters to the river Lena and the province of Yakutsk which it waters. This province our author did not enter, except at its extreme easterly limit, but he made provision for the distribution through it of a full quota of his precious merchandise. The old route for travellers crossing Siberia lay through the heart of this province, the Lena conveying them as far as Yakutsk, where it bends to

the north-west, and post-horses, reindeers, and dogs the remaining 800 miles to Okhotsk. The insufficient sleeping accommodation, however, and the difficulties of reindeer riding and dog-sledge driving, together with the swamps of summer and the snows of winter, make this northerly route very undesirable. A southerly one, across the Mongolian desert to Peking, is also available. The route Mr. Lansdell chose lay between these two, viz., across the Buriat steppe to Chita and thence to Nikolaefsk down the Amur, which forms for a considerable distance the boundary between Siberia and Mantchooria.

Soon after leaving Irkutsk the Angara valley is entered; and, as the road winds through it, many magnificent views are presented.

"In some parts enormous sandstone cliffs rise out of the water, crowned with dark pines and cedars, in others the thick forest descends to the river's brink, and the broad sheet of water is seen rushing madly onwards. Afterwards the valley becomes more rugged, with ravines running up into the mountains. Beyond this the road has been cut along the edge of a cliff at a considerable height above the river, and, about five miles before reaching the Baikal, a scene is presented that may well cause the traveller to stop. The valley becomes wider, and the mountains rise abruptly to a much greater elevation. The Angara is here more than a mile in width, and this great body of water is seen rolling down a steep incline, forming a rapid nearly four miles in length. At the head of this, and in the centre of the stream, a great mass of rock rises, called the *Shaman Kamen*, or "Priest," or "Spirit's stone," held sacred by the followers of Shamanism, and not to be passed by them without an act of devotion. When Shamanism prevailed in this neighbourhood, human sacrifices were made at the sacred rock, the victim with his hands tied, being tossed into the torrent below. Beyond is the broad expanse of the Baikal, extending about fifty miles to where its waves wash the foot of Amar Daban, whose summit, even in June, is usually covered with snow. The mighty torrent throwing up its jets of spray, the rugged rocks with their fringes of pendent birch overtopped by lofty pines, and the colouring on the mountains, produce a picture of extraordinary beauty and grandeur."

The chief feature of this part of Siberia is undoubtedly Lake Baikal, the largest fresh water lake in the Old World, and the deepest lake in either hemisphere, its area being 14,000 square miles, and its depth more than 3,000 metres. The

storms on its surface are very severe: boats used sometimes to be detained three weeks on their voyage of forty miles without being able to land. Now, however, steam navigation has been introduced by an enterprising firm, who built a hull on the spot, and imported engines, boiler, and machinery from St. Petersburg; and the Baikal can now be crossed in the face of a gale. The temperature of the waters is very low even in the height of summer, and in winter they are quite frozen over, the ice being "as clear, transparent, and smooth as glass, so that travellers describe the difficulty of realising that they are not sliding on water." Mr. Lansdell crossed on the 11th of July, and the air was so chilly even then that he found no difficulty in believing that pigeons flying across the lake in winter drop dead from cold. The fish of Lake Baikal are abundant, and include, strange to say, the seal of the ocean.

The only place of interest between Lake Baikal and Kiakhta is Selenginsk, the former headquarters of an English mission, sent out by the London Missionary Society for the benefit of the Buriats. The mission was established in 1817, and seems to have been vigorously worked for about thirteen years, when, on the death of Alexander I., the increasing jealousy of the Russian Church led to an edict by his successor, prohibiting all foreign missions within his dominions. This did not take effect, however, until a translation of the whole Bible into Buriat Mongolian had been effected by the English missionaries. The graves of several members of their families were visited by Mr. Lansdell, but he found no other traces of their sojourn, except such reminiscences as still lingered in the memories of some very old people.

Between this place and Kiakhta was obtained the first experience of a genuine Russian steppe,—"undulating land with a sandy soil, covered with a little grass and a reedy-looking herb, but suffering from a lack of humidity, as the tundra suffers from lack of warmth." On Monday, the 14th of July, our travellers reached Kiakhta, on the Mongolian frontier, or rather a suburb of it, called Troitzkosavsk; for Kiakhta itself belongs to the Chinese, and according to the terms of their treaty with the Russians, no Russian officer or stranger may sleep in it. Kiakhta was for many years the principal emporium of Russo-Chinese commerce, but has lost much of its importance since the opening of the Chinese ports to Russian ships in

1860. A considerable trade is still carried on, however, between China and Eastern Siberia; and the tradition about sea-borne tea losing flavour gives a fictitious value to caravan tea, one of the principal articles of merchandise. The sketch given by our author of this Mongolian town, and of the Mongolian route to Peking, though interesting, we must pass over; as also his description of the Buriats, their physiognomy and costume, their hospitality and pastoral occupation, their character and religions, Shaman, Buddhist, and Christian; contenting ourselves with the observation that the Russians seem to have taken up with some spirit the work interdicted to the foreigners, and to have met with a reasonable amount of success.

From Kiakhta our travellers set out for Chita, across the Yablonoi, or Apple-tree Mountains, the water-shed of this part of Siberia. Beyond these the rivers run easterly, whereas hitherto they had all flowed northwards, to be emptied into the Arctic Ocean. Chita is the capital of the Trans-Baikal province, which has an area of 240,000 square miles, and a population of 430,000. It seems to have a climate of its own. The northerly winds part with their moisture before they reach it among the Altai mountains, while the southerly ones pass over a vast extent of dry land. Thus the only rainclouds are those that come from the Pacific, and consequently the fall of rain in summer and of snow in winter is exceedingly small. Chita is a comparatively new town; but Nertchinsk, the next stopping-place, is one of the oldest in Eastern Siberia, having been founded in 1658, and is spoken of as "black with age and decay." It was long the most easterly of the large Russian towns, and has acquired an unenviable reputation as a place of banishment. Mr. Lansdell was not able to see the great silver mines of Nertchinsk. But having heard many grievous charges brought against these and similar settlements, on the ground of the cruelties practised towards the prisoners who work in them, he was at the pains to collect information on the subject. We cannot stay even to summarise the testimonies he adduces, but must express our conviction that there has been a good deal of exaggeration in the accounts that have appeared in newspapers, and other publications, in reference to this matter. Mr. Landsell's own experience at Nertchinsk was anything but dismal. His entertainment was of the most sumptuous kind. His host was a merchant and miner, ranking in point of

fortune as a millionaire, who had been round the world, and had imported some "foreign ideas" into the construction of his Siberian home.

The next stage, the last by the tarantass, was to Stretinsk, a good-sized town, with hospital, factories, barracks, and other buildings befitting the chief port of the Upper Amur. Here Mr. Landsell parted with his interpreter, and, at the same time, made a most welcome change in his mode of transit, from the road to the river. In a boat provided for him by the commandant of the prison, and under the care of a Cossack specially commissioned to take care of him, he floated in comfort down the forty-four miles between Stretinsk and Ust-Kara, where he was to embark on board the Amur steamer. The penal colony of Kara, numbering some 2,000 convicts and a few political prisoners, gave him an opportunity of still further testing the statements that have been made concerning prison-life in the far East, where alone, according to report, the full-blown horrors of Siberian exile are to be witnessed. Here, as elsewhere, the facts observed not only did not bear out the reports of cruelty, but were in direct contradiction to them. Neither in diet, labour, degree of confinement, nor in any other particular, could our author discover any features in which these prisons compared unfavourably with those of this country, except in the denial of the Sabbath rest and the absence of preaching. The gold mines are not underground; corporal punishment, rarely resorted to, is only inflicted with rods, and is limited even for serious offences to twenty lashes; the branding of prisoners is no longer practised; and a period of good behaviour secures to the prisoners a considerable amount of liberty; in fact, places them in the category of colonists or exiles.

With the Amur—river and province—Mr. Lansdell gained a more intimate acquaintance than he expected, as also with the Primorsk or sea-coast province, the most easterly of the number, stretching from the Corea frontier to Behring's Straits. The occasion of his enlarged acquaintance was the somewhat prolonged detention to which he was almost compelled to submit, owing to difficulties of travel. Not that the means of communication were wanting, but they were not arranged to suit the convenience of a man bent on completing as quickly as possible the tour of the globe. For the first two-thirds of his voyage down the river, indeed,

all went well. The Upper Amur, from Stretinsk to Blagovestchensk, or, more accurately, from the junction of the rivers Shilka and Argun to that of the Zeya with the Amur proper, was traversed by steamer in eight days; and the Middle Amur, thence to Khabarofka, in seven days more, making a total distance of 1,345 miles. Here the service of the Amur steamer should have come to an end, and another steamer have conveyed our traveller up the Ussuri, a tributary of the Amur, southward, in the direction of the Vladivostock, the point of embarkation for Japan. But the Amur steamer having been delayed by various causes, the Ussuri steamer had not waited for her arrival, and the alternative lay between a month's detention in idleness at Vladivostock, and a continuation of the voyage down the Amur to Nikolaefsk, with the chance of an earlier embarkation for Japan there, and the prospect of increased usefulness by the way. For a man of Mr. Lansdell's temperament, enforced idleness would probably be the worst form of punishment; and if we can conceive him to have been guilty during his journey of some political offence or other, and cast into a Russian prison, we may easily imagine that the indolent life of a Russian convict would have had almost as great horrors for him as the English treadmill. So the more enterprising alternative was chosen, and a few hours saw him launched on a supplementary trip down the Lower Amur in its north-easterly course to Nikolaefsk, a distance of 628 miles. The journey was not a fruitless one. In one sense, indeed, it was disappointing, for no steamer was available after all, and every stage of the fifty had to be retraced. But arrangements were made for the thorough distribution of 12,000 books and tracts in this remotest province of the Russian empire, and a knowledge was gained of the country and its inhabitants that amply compensated for the inconvenience of the delay.

Most interesting are the accounts given of the various tribes that roam these Eastern wilds, and of the Russian dealings with them and with their southern neighbours, the Chinese. The history of the Amur is a typical instance of the way in which the stronger form of civilisation has gradually ousted the weaker, and reduced to subjection the nomadic Oronchons, Manyargs, Molokans, Sungari, Daurians, that still retain so much of their savage simplicity, while submitting more or less graciously to the yoke of the stranger. That history is divisible into three periods: first,

that of Cossack pillage and plunder of the native tribes; secondly, that of warfare with China, issuing in Russian exclusion for a century and a half; thirdly, that of Russian annexation and absorption. The first extends from 1636 to 1682; the second from 1682 to 1848; and the third from 1848 to the present time. The character for craft and subtlety which the Russians have earned for themselves in the course of their diplomatic dealings with Western Europe comes out in their early relations with the Chinese, and contrasts strongly with the simplicity of the latter. And it is curious to note how modern events have favoured, here as elsewhere, the course of Russian aggression. Thus the Crimean war necessitated a strengthening of the Russian settlements in Asia, and the successes of the Anglo-French expedition to China, a few years later, enabled the astute Western potentate to wring substantial advantages from his weakened Eastern rival.

Of the various native tribes that Mr. Lansdell encountered in this region, the Gilyaks seem to present the strongest individuality. They were the most thoroughly heathen people he met with. He visited two of their villages, and saw some of them almost daily during his stay at Nikolaefsk. They are of diminutive stature, usually below five feet; they have elongated eyes and tawny skin, like the Chinese, and their hair is long and black, but not luxuriant. Their dress in winter is of dog-skin, and in summer of fish-skin; and their houses are built of small posts or stakes, plastered with mud, the windows being of fish-skin or paper stretched over a lattice. Their occupations are fishing and hunting. Their habits of life are of the rudest; they are said never to wash, and their women hold a very low position, being bought and sold like cattle. They are very superstitious, never hunting the wolf or the tiger, because of some supposed evil influence connected with them, but treating the bear almost as a sacred animal, although not scrupling to kill and eat it. Like most of the Siberian aborigines, they believe in the existence both of good and evil spirits; and by a curious inversion of the order of things, not at all uncommon among the outcasts of humanity, they regard the former as needing no attention, but the latter as requiring to be constantly propitiated to prevent their doing great harm. The Shamans—half doctors, half priests—possess great power over them, and wield it vigorously, though held in check to some extent by the belief

that abuse of authority in this life will be followed by severe punishment in the next. The soul of the Gilyak is supposed to pass at death into the body of his favourite dog, and has to be prayed out of it by the Shaman; it then passes to its underground abode, a place which, lighted by its own sun and moon, affords to its shadowy inhabitants occupations similar to those pursued in the flesh. The Russians have missionaries among both the Gilyaks and the Goldi, who live farther south, but have not been very successful in making converts. Their profession of Christianity seems to have been in many instances merely nominal, and is very liable to be forsaken for the superstitious practices of Shamanism at the approach of death. The statement that the Russian missionaries pay the heathen to be baptised Mr. Lansdell regards as a slander, the presents of a new shirt, a cross, and an ikon, made to a native at his baptism, being looked upon as necessary to the due discharge of that important rite.

The accounts of other native tribes, such as the Kamchatdales, the Koriaks, and the Chukches—the last-named those with whom Nordenskiöld spent the long winter of 1878-9—we must pass over, as well as the description of the island of Sakhalin, concerning which much interesting information was gathered by our author during his stay at Nikolaefsk. Sakhalin is as large as Portugal, and has a mixed population of 15,000. It is the Botany Bay of Russian exiles. From Nikolaefsk, where he was unwillingly detained from the 13th to the 30th of August, waiting in vain for a steamer, Mr. Lansdell returned, as we have seen, to Khabarofka. From this place he proceeded by steamer up the Ussuri, one of the largest tributaries of the Amur, to Lake Khanka, a fresh-water lake of wide extent, having an area of 1,200 square miles, but surprisingly shallow, being nowhere more than seven feet deep. Steering south-east across this for fifty miles without running aground, our traveller reached Kamen Ruiboloff, or the Fisherman's Stone, in the early morning, where he had before him the prospect of one more journey of 100 miles, the last and most difficult of the whole expedition, through a district where even Russians were comparative strangers, and said to be infested alike by ravenous beasts and lawless men. The journey was, however, performed in safety, and with no other mishap than the loss of a large paper wallet containing most valuable manuscripts,

which was only recovered by returning two weary stages through an uninhabited country. Though desolate enough in point of inhabitants, this part of the country was far from being unfit for occupation. "Leaving Dubinskaya, the post-road lay over a range of low hills, the top commanding a view such as I had never before seen. The distant horizon was bounded by pointed hills, and between were enormous plains of tall, brown, luxuriant pasture, waving like fields of corn—a land of plenty, at all events, if not flowing with milk and honey. No cities were visible, nor a human being, nor a habitation. There were just one or two spots where the grass had been cut and piled in heaps, but the abundance that remained seemed to mock such puny efforts. The hills were wooded with oak, and the plains with aspens, elms, lime trees, ashes, black and white birches, maples, and walnuts. In young forests of this district are vines, roses, and a great many lilies. In the grass land there is much wormwood and pulse, the marsh ranunculus, and field-pink clover. There were also wild sun-flowers, and, growing at the roadside, wild millet, and what looked like bastard wheat or darnel."

The fauna of the district appears to have been as abundant as its flora. Happily, no supperless tiger crossed our traveller's path. From Rasdolnoi, the last station on this route, he proceeded by steamer fifty miles down the Suifun to Vladivostock on the sea-coast, a town whose importance is intimated by its name, which signifies "command of the East." Here were gathered the ships of many nations, among which was a Russian man-of-war, the *Djiguitt*, about to sail for Japan; and in it, after a fortnight's pleasant sojourn at this meeting-place of Eastern and Western forms of civilisation, Mr. Lansdell took his departure from Siberia, with feelings of liveliest gratitude that an enterprise so unpromising at the outset, and involving so many hardships and dangers, had been accomplished with complete success, and without so much as a scratch or a bruise. The total amount of publications distributed, personally or by proxy, during this long journey of 8,000 miles, was 55,812, of which 12,000 were sold or given away by our author himself. Such a colportage was probably never before crowded into three short months.

We need not follow our traveller on his homeward course. His route was from Yokohama to San Francisco, thence by rail to New York, and so across the Atlantic to Liverpool,

thus completing in 210 days—of which fifty were stationary —and in nearly a straight line, the circumference of the globe.

The account we have given of his travels, though necessarily imperfect, will not have been without interest for our readers, and that in many ways. It will probably serve to sharpen rather than cloy their appetite for the feast which Mr. Lansdell has provided for readers of his two volumes. They cast a vivid light both on the natural and political features of a country almost unknown to the rest of the civilised world—a country that only needs to have its resources developed, as it seems likely they will be, in order to contribute its share to the material well-being of society, and to gain in return a corresponding mental and social elevation. Russia has done much, no doubt, for the subject races that have been brought under her sway. Her own isolation from Western modes of thought and action has been the chief hindrance to her doing more. There are signs of this exclusiveness giving way. And if only, side by side with the introduction of freer political institutions and social privileges, a quickening influence be infused into her Christianity, neither the paternal despotism of the Romanoffs nor the malicious plotting of the Nihilists can long delay such a moral and spiritual uprising of her people as has been seen in some other nationalities. The Russians still, as a body, retain their loyalty and their faith—two important principles which, however vitiated for a time by superstition and ignorance, can only work for the good of the nation that healthily cherishes them.

ART. III.—1. *The Life of Charles Hodge, D.D., LL.D., Professor in the Theological Seminary, Princeton.* By his Son, ALEXANDER A. HODGE, D.D. London: Nelson.

2. *Life and Letters of Horace Bushnell.* London: R. D. Dickinson.

FOR several reasons the above-named biographies merit some notice here. Hodge and Bushnell were genuine products of American soil. The American stamp was on everything they did. In Europe they would have been very different men. Both are representative men, although in very different lines. Both have exerted considerable influence on theological thought in Europe.

The Princeton divine, best known by his *Systematic Theology*, was born at Philadelphia, December 18, 1797. By his father's side he was of Irish descent, a scion of that strong Presbyterian race which is so valuable a factor in the history of the sister isle. His father, a physician, dying in 1798, the care and training of Charles and of an elder brother, who followed his father's profession, devolved on the mother, who with slender resources nobly fulfilled her task. In 1812 he entered Princeton College, of which, in 1815, he became a graduate. The former year saw the founding of the Princeton Theological Seminary, of which Hodge was to become the most distinguished ornament. The latter was the date of Hodge's conversion to God, which took place during a revival of religion in the College, and which led to his choice of the Christian ministry as a profession. In 1816 he entered the seminary, and in connection with it the remainder of his long life was spent. After going through the usual course in theology, in 1819 he became teacher of Hebrew as assistant to Dr. Alexander, the Principal, and three years later was appointed Professor of Oriental and Biblical Literature. The seminary was most fortunate in its first professors, Drs. A. Alexander and Miller, men rather of great general ability and singular weight of character than of learning as understood in our days. Between Dr. Alexander and

Mr. Hodge the closest friendship existed. The older man early discerned the promise of greatness in his friend, encouraging and counselling him at every step; and the younger man repaid the invaluable help by a gratitude and reverence which thirty-five years of personal and official association only served to deepen. In Hodge's student days the theological instruction was chiefly given through Francis Turretine's *Institutio Theologiæ Elencticæ*, a work which still enjoys, in Presbyterian circles, the high reputation it deserves. A certain portion was assigned for preparation, which had then to be given back by the student. Whatever the deficiencies of such a mode of instruction pursued too exclusively, it was an admirable drill. Whether joyous or grievous at the time, students invariably reflected upon the exercise with gratitude. In the early part of his theological teaching, Hodge partially continued the practice. Among Hodge's fellow-students were McIlvaine and Johns, who afterwards became bishops in the American Episcopal Church. Hodge's lifelong friendship with the latter is one of the most beautiful episodes of his life. The teaching at Princeton College in those days was far from being of the high character which it has attained since. Hodge seems to have learned little logic and less Greek. The best evidence of the deficiencies of the curriculum is found in the fact that after Hodge had married, and served four years as professor in the seminary, he sought two years' leave of absence that he might study in Germany. At the same time nothing could be more honourably characteristic of Hodge himself than such a request.

The detailed account given in the biography of his stay in Paris and Germany from 1826 to 1828 is full of interest, less in reference to its influence on Hodge himself than on account of the men with whom he came into contact. Tholuck, Schleiermacher, Neander, Hengstenberg, Olshausen, Lücke, Gesenius, Ewald, Otto von Gerlach, were then in their vigour, most of them in the prime of youth. Judging from what we read in this volume, we cannot say that acquaintance with them near at hand tends to enhance their reputation. But then it is seldom that greatness in public life and greatness in private life go together. Hodge's chief intercourse was with Tholuck, with whom he walked and talked by the hour. Nothing is more remarkable in these German divines, even the strictest in creed, than the license they allow themselves

in private speculation. Tholuck, evangelical as he was, thought nothing of giving expression to opinions which, if they are to be taken seriously, can only be interpreted pantheistically. Mr. Hodge describes one of his talks with Tholuck thus: "Tholuck maintained that what *actually* is, is all that is *possible*, that the world cannot possibly be other than it is. He bases this opinion on the attributes of God. He urges the idea that attributes and essence are the same in the Divine Being. That God is essential beauty, holiness, and knowledge, &c., and that all the beauty, holiness, and knowledge in the universe is not only derived from God, but *is* the beauty, holiness, &c., of God, so that God is not only the most perfect Being, but *is* all that is good or beautiful in the universe. He makes the conscience of man and all his moral and religious powers the essence of God. For God cannot be only the partaker of good, but must be all that is good. In answer to my objection that we cannot conceive of beauty as an essence or *seyn* (*esse*), any more than of proportion as an essence, Tholuck replied, that proportion was an essence, so that the proportion of four to eight, and of eight to sixteen is an *essence*. Proximity is also an essence, &c. Tholuck appeals strongly to Augustine in support of his ideas on this subject." On another occasion we read of Tholuck maintaining "that everything in nature had consciousness, a sense of life—trees, stones, everything that exists." It would seem as if many German divines had a double creed, a philosophical and a religious one—the first for the school, the second for the church. Tholuck's writings generally, like his letters to Hodge in the biography, are as unexceptionable in point of doctrine as they are poetical and graceful in expression.

Other results of Mr. Hodge's observation of German life are not without interest. He tells us how the church of Lisco, a noted *evangelical* preacher in Berlin, was crowded. The services of Moravianism to evangelical truth in Germany have been very great. Hengstenberg and Olshausen were both decidedly rationalistic in the earlier part of their course, and were converted to evangelical truth by Moravian influence. It is well known that whatever evangelical leaven remained in Schleiermacher was a survival of his early Moravian training.

Several other European experiences of Mr. Hodge are worth mentioning. On more than one occasion he tells

us how he was struck by the superiority of the Romish and Lutheran Churches in the matter of catechising children. Soon after landing at Havre, he entered a church where catechising was going on. He says: "I was very much struck at finding nearly 200 boys, in companies of about fifty each, reciting their prayers or other religious lessons to the priests. I have never in any Sabbath school, or in any Protestant church in our own country, heard children recite so well. They appeared to have got their tasks perfectly, and repeated them with wonderful volubility. The priest appeared to take a great deal of pains in instructing them, explaining and enforcing what had been recited. The necessity of the sacraments was in one case the subject of the teacher's remarks. I found the same thing in Rouen when I went to the great cathedral." This passage undoubtedly touches one of the strong points in the practice of the Romish Church in comparison with Protestant Churches. The systematic labour of the former Church in drilling the young in religious doctrine is amply repaid by the lifelong, intense attachment of its adherents in after years. Mr. Hodge was equally pleased with a confirmation service, at which he was present in a Lutheran church. His comment is: "I could not help feeling that however little authority there may be for confirmation, as of Divine appointment, some service of the kind might properly be introduced into our churches. It would at least have this good effect, that baptised persons would then be brought more under the discipline of the Church, and the nature of their connection with it would be rendered more definite. I could not help feeling also, from the impression made upon the children and the audience, that few occasions would, humanly speaking, offer better opportunities of doing good to the souls of all present." His son and biographer adds, "This I bear testimony was Dr. Hodge's opinion, often expressed to the end of his life."

At Wittenberg Mr. Hodge visited the scenes consecrated by the life and work of Luther and Melanchthon. "I visited in the course of the day the church in which Luther and Melanchthon lie buried. A simple iron or bronze plate marks the spot where these great men are awaiting the resurrection of the just. An original likeness of each hangs on the wall over their graves. The church is also ornamented with bronze figures of the Electors of

Saxony of that period. In walking down the main street I was struck with the following inscription on one of the houses. *Hier wohnte, lehrte und starb Melanchthon.* (*Here Melanchthon lived, taught, and died.*) The house in which Luther lived was formerly a cloister, and is now occupied by the Seminary. His chamber is left, however, as he occupied it; the same stove, the same table of solid oak, and the same window chair, which three hundred years ago supported the weight of the bold reformer." So prosaic a description of such a scene is quite characteristic of the writer. Not many visitors would have refrained from adding some words of reflection.

Mr. Hodge returned to America in 1828. Visits to Europe for purposes of study are common in our day, but were not so then. Until 1840 he continued to labour in his old field of Biblical languages and literature. There could not be a finer training for the Chair of Systematic Theology, to which he was called in that year and which he retained to the end of life. As a professor's life is marked by few outward incidents, we may notice first of all his methods of teaching. These embraced text-book, questioning, oral and written discourse. After the publication of his *Systematic Theology*, this became the basis of his teaching. In the art of cross-examination he was unsurpassed. But in the earlier part of his career his methods varied from time to time. At first he laid much stress on written answers being given to a series of questions on every subject, but he soon found that for the most part his own words were simply given back to him, or the answers were stereotyped, and handed down by one set of students to another. His final conclusion seems to be that no absolutely perfect method of teaching exists. Each method has its advantages and defects. Very much more depends on the teacher than on the method. One of his pupils, Dr. Paxton, says of Dr. Hodge: "His mind was both analytical and synthetical. His resources of knowledge were large, and he often drew together truths and facts from various quarters, and built up massive, cumulative arguments that we could see increasing in force and power until they reached an irresistible demonstration. But his chief power was analysis. A subject, as if by magic, seemed to fall into pieces in his hands, in its most lucid, logical, and striking form. Connected with his lucid thinking was his unusual capacity for putting questions.

He had no vague generalities, he left nothing ambiguous, his questions went direct to the heart of a subject. He had the faculty of putting and following up his questions with such skill as to stimulate the mind of the pupil in the highest degree, and to make him detect and correct his own fallacies."

His exegetical lectures on the Pauline epistles, in which he took great delight all through his life, gave evidence of the same mental characteristics. He had little taste for the niceties of textual and grammatical criticism. His business was with the broad lines of apostolic doctrine. Another pupil, Professor Warfield, says: "He had all Calvin's sense of the flow and connection of thought. Consequently the analysis of passages was superb. Nothing could surpass the clearness with which he set forth the general argument and the main connections of thought. Neither could anything surpass the analytical subtlety with which he extracted the doctrinal contents of passages. . . . At the same time I could not fail to recognise that this was not his forte. Even here he was the clear, analytical thinker, rather than a patient collector and weigher of evidence. He was great here, but not at his greatest. Theology was his first love."

The substance of his teaching is given in his *Systematic Theology*, which will long remain his greatest monument. An intelligent student will not be long indeed in discovering defects. Not the least is the entire omission of all reference to any doctrine of ecclesiastical government and discipline, or, as Dr. Hodge would have called it, Ecclesiology. No explanation is given of the omission. Nor is the division of the work the most happy. The limits and contents of topics like theology proper, anthropology, soteriology, eschatology, are open to discussion. The style, too, has little variety. Dr. Hodge has but one method of expounding every subject. Every detail of doctrine is traced back to the most general principles. Often it is not easy at first sight to see how the premisses are to be connected with the conclusion. To an Arminian of course the Calvinistic, or as Dr. Hodge preferred to say Augustinian, cast of teaching is an objection. But with all these drawbacks, the work is one of which America and Presbyterianism may well be proud. Its assertion of the supremacy of Scripture, its fulness of information respecting divergent schools and theories, its clearness of style,

are high merits. Even its Calvinism or Augustinianism is of a mild, reasonable type. The hyper-Calvinistic school is scarcely noticed. With all its defects the work will remain a quarry of materials to those who reject, as well as to those who accept, its teaching on certain points. With three such works as Dr. Pope's *Compendium of Theology*, Hodge's masterpiece, and Dorner's *System of Christian Doctrine*, the translation of which is just completed, the English theological student has ample means for prosecuting his inquiries. It is not too much to hope that three such works, each great in its particular line, will do much to promote the study of theology in the English-speaking world.

Dr. Hodge's labours were far from being exhausted in his work as Professor of Theology. As early as 1825 he founded the *Biblical Repertory*, which after many changes in title and form still lives a vigorous life in the *Princeton Review*. His almost innumerable contributions cover a very wide field of inquiry. His published commentaries on several of the Pauline epistles possess the excellences already indicated. They deal with the substance and connection of the apostolic teaching, following in this respect in the wake of the old Puritan expositors.

In addition, Dr. Hodge was looked up to as a great Church-leader. He was elected Moderator in 1846. His influence was exerted less in public debate than through writing on urgent questions of the day, and it was always exerted on the side of moderation. Even on such a question as slavery, he could not act with the ultra-Abolitionists. He contended earnestly for the validity of baptism as administered by the Romish Church against a decision of the General Assembly at Cincinnati in 1845, defending his position on grounds both of Scripture and Protestant faith. He held that the great and grievous errors of the Romish Church do not destroy its Christian character. Against extreme Puritanism he laid down the following principle: "We grant that what a man infers from the words of God binds his own conscience. But the trouble is that he insists that it shall bind mine also. We beg to be excused. One man infers one thing, another a different thing, from the Bible. The same man infers one thing to-day and another thing to-morrow. Must the Church bow her neck to all these burdens? She would

soon be more trammelled than the Church in the wilderness, with this infinite difference, the Church of old was mercifully restricted by fetters which God Himself imposed; the plan now is to bind with fetters which human logic forges. This she will never submit to." He was also an advocate of the use of Liturgies on certain conditions.

From the character of his greatest work, we might easily picture Dr. Hodge as hard and severe. His biography, however, reveals him in a very different light. It is pleasant to read of the most sturdy, modern champion of Augustinianism indulging in novel-reading of the best class, croquet and backgammon. His domestic affections were strong and tender. He was sorely chastened by personal and domestic trial. For many years he suffered from an obscure complaint, which was perhaps aggravated by unskilful treatment, and which made work a burden. The death of his wife in 1849, of Dr. Alexander, who had been a second father to him, of some of his colleagues, and of his brother, inflicted deep wounds. Yet his life on the whole strikes one as singular in completeness and success. His labour, instead of being broken and divided, was in one line and one place from beginning to end. His connection with the Princeton Seminary lasted above sixty years. More than 3,000 students passed through his classes. He came to be justly looked on as the patriarch of the institution. Two of his sons were placed on the staff of the same institution. His son Alexander was his successor. In 1872 his professional jubilee, in American phrase "semi-centennial," was celebrated, when representatives came, or greetings were received, from every part of the Presbyterian world. On that occasion the old man eloquent quoted some lines written in his album many years before in Greek by Neander, "Nothing in oneself, all things in the Lord, Whom alone to serve is a glory and a joy." Nor did he fail to commemorate his early teachers and colleagues, saying, "Here lie the ashes of Archibald Alexander and Samuel Miller. The memory of these men constitutes the aureola which surrounds the brows of Princeton, a glory which excites no envy, and yet attracts all eyes."

We have mentioned already the friendship which existed between the Presbyterian professor and Bishop Johns, a friendship commenced at college, and confirmed by the

common joys and sorrows of sixty-four years. Each of the friends delighted in honouring the other. Johns was originally selected by Dr. Alexander as his assistant in Hebrew. When Johns decided to enter the Episcopal Church, Hodge stepped into his place. Hodge says of that period: "Johns was always first,—first everywhere and first in everything. His success was largely due to his conscientious determination always to do his best. He was always thoroughly prepared for every exercise in the college and in the seminary. He would be able, day after day, when in the seminary, to give what Turretine, our text-book, calls the state of the question; that is, the precise point in hand, then all the arguments in its support in their order; all the objections and answers to them, through the whole thirty or forty pages, without the professor saying a word." After thirty years' intercourse Johns concludes a letter, "In the yet beginning of our friendship, yours truly, J. Johns." His letter on the death of Mrs. Hodge runs over with sympathy. It opens thus: "If all the letters which I have penned in thought had been forwarded, you would know how much you have been in my mind. Yes, both sleeping and waking I have been with you—not, indeed, as you now are; for it requires an effort to realise that your house is not as I always, except at my last brief visit, joyed to find it—but as enlivened and cheered by the presence of the blessed one who has from the first been so identified with us that it seems impossible for me to think of either of you without seeing both." On his second marriage, Dr. Hodge sends the news to Bishop Johns in these terms: "I told her what kind of man you were, and she said, 'Well, as I don't know him, I can't love him desperately yet; as soon as I see him I'll do my best.' Her best is very good indeed; so you may be sure of an affectionate greeting from her, as well as from your old friend, when you pay your promised visit. Do not let that visit be only for a day. Old friendship deserves more than that, and remember I spent ten days with you in Richmond as meek as a mouse, never answering to all your sharp things out of deference to your wife." The following is the opening and close of the letter in which Dr. Hodge tells of his brother's death: "March 4, 1872.—Dear John,—We are left like two old trees standing almost alone. The fewer, the dearer. . . . Dear John, let us pray for each other." In 1874 he writes: "Dear,

blessed old John, I did not know you were seventy-nine; though I might have known it, as, if I live to December 27th, I shall be seventy-seven; so that you have not much to brag of.... I am glad you sympathise with what I say of our dear old professors, for you must think it sober-minded; which I fear those who did not know them as we did might be inclined to doubt." Dr. Hodge also sent his friend a print of two old soldiers sitting together on a bench, entitled "The Last Muster," with a question appended, "In the future?" Bishop John replies, "Thank you for 'The Muster.' No, not the *last;* that will be *ever*-lasting." The last communication was a post-card from the Bishop: "January 1, 1876.—To dear Charles and his family, greeting—from all at Malvern, with a specialty from his loving friend and brother of 1812, and since with increase, and so for ever.—J." The Bishop died in April, 1876.

Dr. Hodge survived his friend two years, dying on June 19, 1878, of age and gradual decay. "He being dead yet speaketh."

Dr. Bushnell was born April 14, 1802, and died February 17, 1876, his life thus nearly coinciding with that of Dr. Hodge. Lichfield, his birthplace, New Preston, where his early years were spent, Yale, where he studied, Hartford, the scene of his ministry, are all within the border-state of Connecticut. His parents belonged to the hardy middle class of New England. His father belonged to the Methodist Church, his mother to the Episcopal; but on removing to New Preston they attended a Congregational church, where the preaching was strongly Calvinistic. His grandmother, on the father's side, was also a Methodist. Bushnell only saw her twice, but her fine strong character greatly impressed him. His mother, in the spirit of Hannah, dedicated her child before birth to the Lord.

Beyond being contemporaries in life, the Princeton divine and the Hartford orator and writer had little else in common. Hodge's style is singularly direct and clear. Whether we agree with him or not, we cannot fail to understand him. This can scarcely be said of Bushnell by his greatest admirers. Hodge stood on the old ways of religious faith. He did not think that truth and wisdom are peculiar to the present age. Bushnell was perpetually

seeking novelty, where novelty is scarcely to be looked for. His writings, therefore, are eminently unsettling. The trumpet gives an uncertain sound. Now, the chief interest of the biography is that it explains how Bushnell became what his writings prove him to have been. We know that this will not constitute the chief interest of the work to general readers. The principal charm of the biography to the public will lie in the exuberant geniality and the literary skill for which Bushnell was conspicuous. No one can be insensible to, or wish to diminish, these unquestionable merits. The letters, of which so many are given, are full of interest. In ease and graphic power they are surpassed by few. The letters of travel especially, ranging over a large part of North America and Europe, are far superior to most books of travel. The writer had pre-eminently the faculty both of seeing and of describing what he saw. We wish we could say the same of his travels in the sphere of theology. Here speculation and imagination too often take the place of reason and proof. The theological value of his writings is in about inverse ratio to their literary excellence. If we wished to put the impression made by his works in a single sentence, we should say that it is one of untrained and uncontrolled strength. We are repeatedly told in the biography that Bushnell always acted as if he were conscious of his power, and that his consciousness was verified by the opinions of others. The same is true of his writings. These abound in energy and fluency. There seems to be no limit to the power of invention and expression. The biography explains why this exuberant energy, for want of discipline and intelligent direction, so often ran riot.

His early schooling was desultory. He soon gave signs of a restless activity, to which close study was a fetter. He *could* learn, just as he could do anything well, if he chose. A schoolmate says: "I used to think that he lacked the power to concentrate his thoughts upon any subject for more than a moment. He learned readily when he applied himself to study; but I think at that age he would rather play than study. He would keep up with the best of his class, though, whether he played or studied." Both at school and college he was great in sports, especially in fishing, which continued to be a favourite recreation through life. During his course at Yale College, from 1823 to 1827, he kept up his fame for athletics. But it is not easy to

obtain a clear view of the amount of his intellectual gain. His biographer—his own daughter—says: "The foundations on which he was now to build were good. He had sound health, a clear conscience, strong home affections, and pure tastes. He loved nature, music, and bodily activity." His tutor writes: "His examination for admission indicated a rude, original, discriminating mind—self-possessed and self-reliant, foreshadowing the future man. By the discipline of the college these mental characteristics were only developed, matured, and wrought into greater symmetry and fairer proportions. In his class he soon came to the front, and retained his position without any ambitious strife for preferment." These are the most definite accounts we can find in the chapter which describes this period. His moral conduct was unimpeachable, his moral tone of the highest. Here there came a break in his course. He seems to have lost religious convictions, and to have fallen into a dreamy, impalpable scepticism, of which no further account is given, and which for a time closed his path to the ministry. He next thought of the law, for which he began to read, meanwhile occupying and supporting himself by teaching, then by editing a paper, and again by teaching at Yale College. That he would have achieved distinction at the bar or in the press no one can doubt. But during his second stay at Yale he underwent a thorough religious change, which again opened his path to the pulpit. We read of a previous conversion in 1821, so that the conversion at Yale ten years later was a second one. A revival was going through the College. For a long time Bushnell and his admirers stood aloof. One after another tried to approach him, but in vain. At last, the advance was made by himself. Saying to a companion, "I must get out of this woe. Here am I what I am, and these young men hanging to me in their indifference amidst this universal earnestness," he called his associates together and summoned them to join him in religious decision. "The result was overwhelming. That division-room was a Bochim, a place of weeping." The change was as complete as it was surprising. "On one occasion he came in, and, throwing himself on his seat, and thrusting both hands through his black, bushy hair, cried out desperately, yet half-laughingly, 'O men, what shall I do with these arrant doubts I have been nursing for years? When the preacher touches the Trinity, and logic shatters it all to

pieces, I am all at the four winds. But I am glad I have a heart as well as a head. My heart wants the Father; my heart wants the Son; my heart wants the Holy Ghost —and one just as much as the other. My heart says the Bible has a Trinity for me, and I mean to hold by my heart. I am glad a man can do it when there is no other mooring, and so I answer my own question, What shall I do? But that is all I can do yet.'" Considering Dr. Bushnell's great obligations to revival, one is surprised to find him several times in the biography speaking somewhat disparagingly of the great awakenings for which American Christianity has been remarkable. All the points condemned are faults which do not belong to the essence of religious revivals.

Again, the account of Bushnell's theological course, which might have been expected to give him balance, is very remarkable, and goes far to explain his subsequent course. "In the autumn of 1831 he entered the Theological School at New Haven. Bushnell found there a healthful and invigorating mental atmosphere, in which he felt at home; but his rebellious intellect soon asserted its independence of methods of thought which appeared to him mechanical, and this fact made him an inconvenient member of so small a school. One of the instructors said of him, when questioned as to Bushnell's opinions, that he was 't'other side.' A friend said of him at another time, that 'he abhorred all shams and conventional phrases in argument because he believed so strongly in realities.' Shams apart (for they were not in question here), he doubtless fought with superfluous ardour against the formulas and conventional doctrinal phrases with which his way was strewn, and carried the boldness of his dissent a little further than was needful or comfortable. Reverence for human authority was doubtless lacking in his composition. . . . But dissent was never with him a negative attitude. His ingenious mind had its own fresh provision for every emergency, its own ready substitute of suggestive thought to fill the place of every rejected formula." A dose of Hodge's favourite Turretine might have been an excellent antidote. But Bushnell had a low opinion of the Turretines of theology. In an essay on a congenial subject, *Our Gospel a Gift to the Imagination*, he says: "The venerable dogmatiser is far gone by, but the glorious Bunyan fire still burns, because it is fire; kindles the world's imagination more and more, and

claims a right to live till the sun dies out in the sky"—a strange comparison.

Bushnell also had the lowest opinion of mental and moral philosophy. His biographer says of his student days: "It was at this time that he first addressed himself exclusively to the study of mental and moral science, and its chief value to him seems to have consisted in its rejection." His reason for this course was the action of freewill, which upsets calculations and transgresses all laws, as if the abnormal did not imply the normal. Yet, strangely enough, not long after he is found cherishing secret wishes for a call to a professorship of moral philosophy. His daughter very sensibly remarks: "It is not difficult to imagine what manner of professor of moral philosophy he would have been." Long afterwards Bushnell himself writes: "It is a fact not to be questioned, that metaphysics have never established anything"—a very good specimen of the way in which Bushnell often makes assumption and assertion do the work of proof. He then goes on: "Metaphysics have three uses. First, they show that metaphysics are impossible; secondly, they are a good gymnastic; thirdly, they vary the old questions, so as to enlarge the field." Many readers of the Life will think that metaphysical study would have been the best discipline for one of Bushnell's character.

We also gather from the Life that Bushnell was little given to reading. We know, indeed, that this was partly due to his really original turn of mind. Nor do we forget that many very strong thinkers have not been extensive readers. Still we cannot understand how any one can make any safe progress in theological study without a fair acquaintance with what has been done in this field in the past. It seems the height of presumption to discuss such subjects as the Trinity and the Atonement *de novo*, as if no one had ever spoken or written on the question before. Yet this is what Bushnell does substantially. He is constantly mistaking a new phrase for a new truth, and novelty for certainty. A friend says of him: "He cherished a profound disrespect for large libraries. He thought that the burning of the Alexandrian Library was probably no loss to the world; and that perhaps the major part of the libraries of the British Museum and of Paris could not be worth their storage."

Add the Calvinistic teaching of his youth and of the

surrounding Churches against which he revolted, and we have a tolerably complete explanation of his subsequent course. In 1833, when he began his ministry in Hartford, the antagonism between the old and new school of Christian faith was fully declared. Bushnell at once took his side, and soon became a leader of the advanced school. If he was misunderstood, if coldness and opposition arose on the part of his brethren, all this was owing largely to the position he took, to the obscurity of his language, and to the associations he sought. His position was a most singular one. He undertook not to mediate between, but to reconcile the orthodox and Unitarian creeds, to formulate such a doctrine of the Trinity and Atonement as both would accept. His biographer says: "The subjects on which he had fresh light were largely matters in dispute between the orthodox and Unitarian bodies. The ground on which he stood was singularly separated from the positions of the two hostile camps." His plan, as far as we can understand it, was to eliminate what is essential on both sides, and unite the two parties on things indifferent. At one time he was an eager advocate of a "Christian Alliance," broader than the Evangelical Alliance, which was to include both sides. When the terms were made more definite, he lost all interest in the movement. How any one can believe it possible to frame a doctrine of the Trinity, such as Unitarians will accept, is a mystery. Dr. Bushnell's doctrine of Atonement is a good illustration of his method of proceeding. Stripped of all verbiage, the essence of the Atonement, according to him, consists in love and self-sacrifice. The only novelty in his teaching is in the form of presentation. Again, the obscurity of his style explains much of the opposition he encountered. He was the slave of a singularly rich imagination. Words, if not always ideas, came at will. Large extracts are given from a dissertation, in which Bushnell propounds what he thinks is a new theory of language. "*Here*, we repeat with emphasis, *is the key to Horace Bushnell.*" This theory is meant to explain his teaching on the doctrines in dispute. We can only say that the explanation is more obscure than the thing to be explained. Bushnell's doctrine of Atonement we can understand so far as to see that it is not the doctrine of the Church or Scripture; but "*the key*" we give up. Bushnell often had to defend himself from the charge of obscurity of language. He did so by putting the fault on the mystery of the sub-

jects. What we complain of is that a great deal of his writing is not even intelligible; we find ourselves unable to attach any ideas to the words.

We referred to Bushnell's associations. His most intimate friend and most frequent correspondent is a Unitarian minister. In the correspondence we discover no such keen jealousy for vital Christian truth as might seem natural. The questions which divide Unitarianism from orthodoxy are no mere questions of Calvinism. They go much deeper. The thought of compromise or surrender must be utterly repugnant to honest men on both sides.

It would almost seem as if Bushnell came to feel that he had acted unwisely in the course he took at first. Friends were alienated, opponents in creed were not conciliated. No Unitarian was drawn a step nearer by all the concessions and explanations. Many efforts were made to procure a condemnation of his teaching by the Congregational Associations. However inconsistent such efforts were with the principles of Independency, they revealed to Bushnell the isolated position in which he stood. The issue of all the accusations was "Not proven." No fundamental error was brought home. But even friendly critics regretted the suspicious, ambiguous look of much of Bushnell's teaching. In his desire to come to an understanding with Dr. Hawes, the chief of these critics, he made admissions which the Unitarians regarded as a recantation of all that he had been saying for years. And they were right. Dr. Hawes's creed and that of the Unitarians are opposite, if opposites can be put into words. If, as Bushnell contended, he really agreed with Dr. Hawes, and all opinions to the contrary were a misunderstanding of his meaning, then certainly he did not agree with the Unitarians, who had misunderstood him all along. In an address to the Association he says, in reference to his supposed Unitarian tendencies, "Let me say, for your comfort, that I have not the slightest tendency that way. I hold the fall and depravity of man with a deeper meaning probably than most of you, and believe as much the absolute necessity of his renewal by the Holy Spirit. The Atonement and the Trinity are as dear to me as they are to any." If we are not to go behind words, this is perfectly satisfactory. But his Unitarian as well as his orthodox friends must have been sorely puzzled to reconcile much in his writings with such a declaration.

Let us here note, as one of the most encouraging signs of the times, the desires which have lately been expressed in some Unitarian gatherings for a more positive faith. It would almost seem as if Unitarianism were dividing into two parts, one of which is approximating to the immemorial faith of the Church, the other receding to a bolder and more consistent scepticism. There can be as little doubt of the latter movement as of the former. The advanced school so called is allying itself more closely with the bald Deism of continental criticism. We would fain hope that the other movement will issue in many accessions to the ranks of the Church. Such a result cannot be brought about by the preaching of Bushnell's doctrine of Atonement. That doctrine is one of the perils against which the Church has to guard. It comes recommended by such names as Maurice, Robertson, Campbell, Ritschl. It is advocated with much plausible ingenuity, and falls in with the sentimentalism of the day. But it satisfies neither the reason nor the conscience of man, repelling the former by its shallowness and inconsistency, the latter by ignoring instead of meeting the demand for real propitiation.

If we have noticed what seems to us doubtful and dangerous in Bushnell's teaching, we are not insensible to all that is excellent in him. His honesty and courage, his great powers of imagination and exposition, are enough alone to entitle him to respect. There is much to suggest and stimulate thought, even where the disagreement is greatest. His ingenuity in evolving general principles from trifling incidents is often striking. In a time of great commercial depression he took as a text, "And when the ship was caught and could not bear up into the wind, we let her drive." The text of his well-known sermon on "Unconscious Influence" was, "Then went in also that other disciple." At a time when repudiation of national debts was advocated, he preached from "Alas, master! for it was borrowed," his sermon beginning thus: "This must have been an industrious man, or he would not have wanted an axe; he must have been a poor man, or he would not have needed to borrow it; he must have been an honest man, or he would never have exclaimed, 'Alas, master! for it was borrowed.'" On returning to his church, after a long absence through illness, he preached from "Moab hath been at his ease from his youth, and he hath settled on his lees, and hath not been

emptied from vessel to vessel, neither hath he gone into captivity; therefore his taste remained in him, and his scent is not changed."

The biographer says: "We sometimes read in the biographies of 'great and good men' that they were never heard to speak disparagingly of any human being—a very doubtful compliment. This could not be said of Dr. Bushnell." The truth of this is seen in the letters given in the Life. We scarcely think that Dr. Bushnell would have published all of them in their present form. Still the letters are a very attractive part of the volume. It would be easy to quote many striking descriptions of scenes in Scotland, England, Switzerland, Italy, California, but want of space forbids. The letters to his children especially are quite models of their kind. The power of word-painting could scarcely be surpassed. In this respect the reader will often be reminded of Kingsley.

The style of the biography is not such as to commend it in every respect to English taste. While often vigorous, it is also often inflated. Making all allowance for a daughter's affection, we cannot but think that the estimate of Dr. Bushnell is exaggerated. The descriptions of his appearance, manner, and character by different hands are too numerous. Nor do readers need to be again and again expressly reminded of his "greatness."

ART. IV.—*Hofmann on the Epistle to the Hebrews.*

[A Fragment translated from a Posthumous Work of the late Professor J. C. K. VON HOFMANN, of which a fuller account will hereafter be given.]

THE epistle is altogether exhortation, and its doctrinal contents are only the basis of that exhortation. It begins as a treatise by reminding the readers Who He is through Whom God now—instead of as formerly through the prophets—hath spoken to us: that He is the Son of God by Whom He made the world, Whom He has appointed Lord of all; that He is exalted, after accomplishing an expiation of sin, to God, above the angels, and will reign eternally when God reveals Him again; even as He had been before all things and conserves all things, but now sits at the right hand of God, expecting till all His enemies are made subject to Him. Now in this is the basis of the exhortation of ii. 1 seq., that we should give heed to what we have heard, that we may not have a heavier responsibility on us than those who transgressed the law as revealed through angels. On the other hand, it is also based on the exhibition of the manner in which that word came to us, and the kind of salvation with which it deals: the word has been brought so humanly near to us, when the Lord Himself spoke it, and those who received it from His lips announced it to us; and at the same time so Divinely attested by the miracles which accompanied the announcement. And the salvation of which it treats is precisely that which all men need, inasmuch as we who one day shall rule the world have become subject to death: on account of which Christ also had flesh and blood, in order that by death He might deliver us from the bondage of death, and as high priest might effectually aid us whose sin He has expiated.

Thus Jesus has become to us both Apostle and High Priest, and therein was faithful to God, like Moses, to whom He is compared because His vocation, as that of Moses in his day, embraced the whole work of God in His Church: being, however, as much higher than Moses as a son is

higher than a servant. And as then the people of Moses was the congregation of God, so are we now, if we hold fast our fidelity to the confession of Jesus, and do not act like the people of Moses, who trifled away through unbelief their entrance into the rest of God. That entrance is now promised to us if we remain believers on the word of the promise. Otherwise it consigns us, being as it is the word of the living God, to judgment.

But we may hold fast our confession, since we have Jesus as our high priest, who has undergone temptation like ourselves, and therefore sympathises with our infirmity. He is, on the one hand, the antitype of the Old-Testament high priest, inasmuch as His supplication before that God would save Him from death, and His obedience afterwards in suffering death, are like the sacrifice of the Old-Testament high priest before for himself and afterwards for the people. But, on the other hand, He became a high priest after the order of Melchisedek, and as such the author of eternal redemption.

With this one word all would have been said that the readers needed to be reminded of if they had only understood it. That this was not the case, after they had been long Christians, is matter of the author's reproof; and he advances in his condemnation to the last point of warning, bidding them fear lest they should have departed from the right way without possibility of reconversion, through their not being willing to have the salvation besides which there is no other. Yet he glides into the expression of hope that God would not suffer this to befall them, and of exhortation accordingly that they would yield themselves in satisfied submission to the promise of God, confirmed by oath, which the Scripture contains concerning the priest after the manner of Melchisedek.

What this word of Scripture declares is unfolded in ch. vii. 1-25. First, what was the meaning of Melchisedek and his regal-priestly relation to Abraham; then, what the significance of the Scripture word as concerning Christ, making Christ a priest, in the presence of Whose perfection the legal priesthood has come to an end. Jesus is now established as such a priest, because He is the Christ of Whom the Psalm treats, which declares it to be Jehovah's will that the King of Israel should be a priest like Melchisedek. He is the high priest, antitypical to Aaron as the Expiator of the congregation; but this He is according

to the style of Melchisedek, because after His one presentation of Himself as a sin-offering He stands in the fellowship of the universal majesty of God, whereby the legal priesthood has an end, because the promised new relation of God to His people, resting upon forgiveness of all sins, has come in and has in Him its mediator: ch. vii. 26, viii. 13. But this finds its realisation in that Christ has suffered death and has gone up to God; for herein we have the antitype of the Old-Testament economy, the fulfilment of all that was there figurative only and typical. Thus was the essential and one offering brought, through which we once for all are sanctified, and after which sin-offerings are no longer needed.

On the ground of the exposition beginning with ch. vii. 1, there follows again an exhortation in ch. x. 19 to be joyful and confident in prayer for help in temptation, and not to forfeit the salvation imparted on peril of incurring the condemnation which would then be inevitable. Yet here again there is a return to the note of acknowledgment, reminding them of their early steadfastness against internal assaults; and to that of exhortation, to hold out in the patience of faith until the hope be fulfilled, all the Scripture records of the saints who approved themselves to God having been the manifestation of such faith, and Jesus Himself its example. If, then, steadfast confession should bring them trouble, they must reflect that all this will serve as discipline, and that in all this God displays His fatherly love. So should they also run their course with patience, and have regard to each other that none fall short of grace and repent of it when too late. For the responsibility of him who will not hear Jesus is all the heavier the greater the grace is that the members of His Church partake in common; and their conduct is the more important and decisive because it concerns an eternal kingdom, the revelation of which is the end of the present age. Then follows in ch. xiii. a series of individual exhortations having respect to their deportment towards Christian brethren, in the estate of marriage and in matters of earthly property; to their persistence in the true doctrine which they had been taught, instead of being deluded by the notion that anything might be gained by eating or not eating, or being misled by the longing to remain in fellowship with the adherents of the legal ceremonial worship, praise and benevolence being the best

offerings; and, finally, to docility under their spiritual guides, intercession for himself: ch. xiii. 19. With this last request the document first assumes the character of an epistle; and it then ends in the full epistolary form, although it had begun in the style of a treatise. The author as he writes on becomes more and more personal, approaches more and more nearly to his readers; whereas in the beginning he did not mention his own name.

Everywhere we find the author adhering to the Scripture, to the history narrated in it, to the word of prophecy, to the ceremonial institute of the Old-Testament economy. For he is writing to Jewish Christians. Not, however, that chap. ii. 16, "the seed of Abraham," or chap. iv. 19, "the people of God" (compare ch. xiii. 12), is to be understood of the Jewish people or Jewish Christians; but (compare chap. iii. 6) the Church of Jesus Christ as the antitypical continuation of the Old-Testament Church. But the readers had belonged to this latter; they had lived in its holy writings and religious ordinances. Hence in chap. iv. 8 the reminder that Joshua had not led into the true rest of God; in chap. viii. 7, that the first "covenant" should not abide, but yield place to a second; in chap. ix. 15, that the sins committed under the former dispensation were expiated by Christ's death; in chap. xiii. 13, that they must submit to follow Jesus outside the door of the tabernacle.

Thus the author writes to Jewish Christians who were in danger of departing from the salvation realised in Christ, because they might suppose it not to correspond with the promise of the Scripture. He Whom they acknowledged as Christ became flesh and blood, like all the children of men; He died, so that they were left without Him in the world, surrendered to persecution from without, and excluded from the fellowship of their people and their people's religious ordinances. Hence they are exhorted by the author not to be led away into error by all these things; and he shows them that the promised salvation is actually come, by the evidence of the very things at which they stumbled. The very thing that might make Christianity repulsive to them—that the Saviour was no longer present with them in the world—constituted the glory of Christianity. His death was the once for all accomplished expiation of sin; and in the strength of it He who is exalted to God is an effectual help against all assault. Thus

they have the perfection in Christianity of all that in the old economy was only provisional and typical.

We observe further that the Jewish Christians, to whom the author writes, were habituated to use the Septuagint. He quotes always according to this translation, and adheres to it even in those places where it diverges from the original text. But from this we must not conclude that he himself knows the Old Testament only in this version. On occasions in which he is not quoting, but only employing expressions which he derives from the Scripture passages, he keeps faithfully to the original and forsakes the inaccurate version; for instance, in ch. xii. 9, which refers to Numbers xvi. 22, xxvii. 16; and in ch. xii. 12, which is taken from Isaiah xxxv. 3. Once, that in ch. x. 30, there is a citation from Deut. xxxii. 35 in a form quite independent of the Septuagint. And if he himself had been absolutely bound to this version, he could not in ch. ii. 13 have applied Isaiah viii. 17 in the way he does apply it. The quotation of ch. i. 8 from Psalms xlv. 6 is probably of such a kind as to show by its form whether or not the author had an acquaintance with the original text. That he had is shown also by the style in which he forms his quotation, ch. x. 17, from Psalm xl. If he had quoted literally the Septuagint it is not easy to see how he could construe the sentence as he does. It is said, indeed, that he uses the words of the Seventy with such an emphasis in the incorrect part of them as would have been forbidden by a knowledge of the original text. Certainly he emphasises the expression *σῶμα κατηρτίσω μοι*, which the Septuagint inserted instead of the "Mine ears hast Thou opened," and thereby introduces an allusion to the *προσφορὰ τοῦ σώματος*. But this was only an employment of the ordinary and current translation, just as nowadays we may use the Lutheran or the Authorised translation. The thought remains the same, whether the text is cited from the original or from the Septuagint. The same may be said of the reference to Gen. xlvii. 31, which we have in ch. xi. 21. In this Old-Testament passage the Septuagint read, from a quite different punctuation of the consonants, not "bed" but "staff." If the reader of the epistle read only the Septuagint, the author could refer to the narrative how Jacob took that oath from Joseph, and then fell down worshipping, only in the form that it has in the

Septuagint. The matter indeed is not affected, whether he cites the original or the version; for the main thing is the solemn and still prayer in which, when death approaches, he turns to his God. According to the original he bends back upon his bed on which he is about to yield his breath; according to the Septuagint he leans on the staff on which he had leaned through life. To the author of the epistle the thought is the same in either case. Indeed, if he had not known Hebrew, and gave evidence of not knowing it, that would amount to nothing in consideration of what has been said as to his relations to the Septuagint. That he had not such a knowledge has been inferred from his application of διαθήκη in ch. ix. 17 as "testament," which the corresponding Hebrew word *Berith* does not mean. But the mistake here is on the side of the expositors. For (1) it is wrong to suppose that the author uses the word with such a meaning; (2) it is incorrect to maintain that the proper meaning of the Hebrew word *Berith* is "covenant." It signifies nothing but "appointment, or disposition, or arrangement, concerning something." The arrangement ordains either something that is to be done, or it recognises something that is to be the portion of some one. According to the relation in which the old covenant is spoken of, the one or the other may be made prominent. Hence the passage ch. ix. 17 is abundantly illustrated.

We maintain, therefore, with confidence that the author, knowing the original well, adhered severely to the Septuagint for his readers' sake. They were Jewish Christians who were accustomed to read the Scriptures in their Greek translation; that is, they were Hellenistic Jewish Christians. Chapter v. 12 makes it plain that they had become acquainted with the doctrine of Christ, and so long that he charges it upon them that they ought to have been in a position to instruct instead of requiring instruction themselves. If these readers had been Christians of Jerusalem, the author would in that connection have made it a point that the Gospel had gone forth from them. If Palestinian Christians had been thought of, the author would hardly have said that they had received the Gospel from those who heard the Lord; and in ch. xiii. 7, instead of the "rulers who spake to you the word of God," the apostles would have been mentioned. The readers are in ch. x. 34 represented as having suffered loss in their possessions and

goods for the sake of Christianity, but without having encountered peril of body and life (as ch. xii. 4 expressly declares); and moreover, according to ch. vi. 10, they had ministered to the "saints," τοῖς ἁγίοις, and still were ministering: now these are plain tokens that the author is not addressing Jewish Christians of the Palestine mother country. For these had suffered more than in their goods; and Jerusalem and Palestine were not in a position to be able to succour others, having constantly to receive succour themselves. According to Gal. ii. 10, Paul and Barnabas were expressly besought not to forget the poor of the mother community. Moreover, such passages as 1 Cor. xvi. 1; 2 Cor. viii. 4, ix. 1; Rom. xv. 25, allow no room for doubt that by οἱ ἅγιοι the mother Church is meant (compare Acts xviii. 22: ἡ ἐκκλησία). Accordingly we reach the conclusion that those to whom the epistle was addressed were outside of Palestine. That in the course of it sanctuary and sacrifice are mentioned does not send us to Palestine; for the author speaks of the temple not as it was then known, but as the law ordered temple and sacrificial worship: a remark which turns its argument also against those who think they find in the σκηνή of ch. ix. the temple of Onias, and accordingly suppose that the epistle was written in Alexandria. On account of ch. xiii. 24 ("they of Italy salute you"), and because Clemens Romanus shows an acquaintance with the epistle, it has been supposed that it was addressed to Rome. But that would make it all the more inexplicable that the epistle was so long afterwards unknown in Rome, that it was not found in the Canon, not to say was even esteemed spurious. And precisely that sentence, "They of Italy salute you," speaks against this supposition: for this can be no other than a greeting of the Italian Church generally, which, however, would not be addressed to Rome. In the land to which the epistle was addressed, Christianity was not permanently planted among the Gentiles; for in that case the author must have addressed these Jewish Christians in an altogether different style. Throughout the whole there is no mention of any conjunction or fellowship with Gentile Christians; and this circumstance has made it probable to many that it was addressed to Palestine. But since it was not so, we must think of a land which formed a transition from the mother country of Christendom to the Gentile home of it; and that we find in Damascene and Antiochian Syria. There,

according to Acts xi. 19, the beginning of a Christianity was made through the persecuted Christians from Jerusalem preaching the Gospel to their compatriots in Antioch and Syria, confining themselves to the Jews alone. Thus there must have been at first Christian communities which consisted of only Jews. Although later Gentile Christians also would unite with the Jewish, yet there remained a certain distinction between the two elements, as we perceive in Gal. ii. 12, where it is regarded as something peculiar that Peter, coming to Antioch, participates in the agapæ of the Gentile Christians. Thus there was not a fusion of Jewish and Gentile Christians forming only one community, but they held their lovefeasts apart. Now to such a condition of Christian affairs in Antiochian Syria most aptly corresponds what we gather from the Epistle to the Hebrews. As we find in Acts xv. 23 the decree sent forth to the Christians of these lands headed with the superscription, "to the brethren *of the Gentiles*," so we may suppose our epistle headed, "to the brethren *of the Circumcision*." In due time we mark in this same country certain disciples who did not indeed depart fundamentally from the universal Christian doctrine, but yet held themselves nationally apart: the Nazarenes. It is the conduct of these Nazarenes which is aimed at by the epistle. They had their own assemblings (chap. x. 23); and these were assemblies of Jewish Christians. Elsewhere, among Christian communities which originated on Gentile soil, no such national distinction existed. It was to Jewish Christians of Syria and Antioch also that the author's words in ch. v. 12 applied. What sympathy and help these Christians of the mother community met with may be seen in Acts xi. 29, 30. Now, if St. Paul wrote the epistle, his known relation to the Jewish Christians of this land will enable us to understand the peculiar characteristic of a writing which holds a midway place between treatise and letter. To these Christians the Apostle did not wish to write a letter; for a letter must have been the result of a personal relation to the readers to whom it is addressed; and, though St. Paul was indeed personally known to those Jewish readers—for he had laboured with Barnabas in Antioch—yet as the Apostle of the Gentiles he occupied no such position in regard to these Jewish Christians as would have determined him to write them a letter. The position in which he stood determined him to address

them a word, "a word of exhortation," ch. xiii. 22, which takes the epistolary form first at the end, just because he inserts in it a reference to his coming visit. So far, then, as this goes, the tradition of the Eastern Church, which makes St. Paul the author, is justified. Timothy (ch. xiii. 23) was known to these Jewish Christians. They had learned to know him when he remained with St. Paul in the Antiochian church (Acts xviii. 23). The Apostle might direct his own course thither when he left Italy, in order to commence the missionary journey he had determined on at the point whence he had so often set out for the West.

But it is thought by many that it can be most certainly proved that St. Paul could not have been the author of this epistle. For instance, there have been detected in it examples of a want of knowledge which render the Pauline origin impossible. These however are in reality failures, not of the Apostle, but of his expositors. Thus it has been unjustly alleged that in ch. ix. 4, the altar of incense is said to have *belonged* to the holiest of all in the temple: it is not said, however, that it stood in the holiest, but only that it pertained to it (*χρυσοῦν ἔχουσα θυμιατήριον*). This is literally in harmony with the Hebrew in 1 Kings vi. 22: "By the oracle." We know that the object and use of this altar was really different from that of the golden lamp. It did not belong to the furniture which gave the holy place its distinctive character; for the smoke of the incense was to ascend into the holiest; and it was not itself within the holiest, but close to the veil, only because it must come into daily use. Again, a false construction has been put upon the words *καθ' ἡμέραν* in ch. ix. 27, which have been made to signify that the high priest presented atoning sacrifices daily. The sentence is rather that an high priest hath not need daily to present such a sacrifice as was the high-priestly annual function. What kind of Israelite could he have been who did not know that the altar of incense was not in the holiest, nor could be, and who should think that the high priest discharged every day the function peculiar to him on the day of atonement? Moreover, we find it said expressly in ch. x. 1, *κατ' ἐνιαυτόν*; while in the passage, ch. x. 11, we should not read *ἀρχιερεύς*, but *καὶ πᾶς μὲν ἱερεύς*, κ.τ.λ.

But we are met by the rejoinder: Does not the author himself give us to understand in ch. ii. 3, that he is no apostle? Let us place ourselves in the context. After it

has been shown in ch. i. what Divine Speaker it was through Whom God in these last days has spoken to us, ch. ii. unfolds to us what a great salvation it is which we have in the word of this Divine Speaker; and then it is said of this salvation that its announcement began with Jesus Himself, and that then it had been transmitted to us through those who heard Him. How, they say, could an apostle like St. Paul have spoken thus, as if he had received his Christianity only from those who had themselves heard Jesus? St. Paul himself elsewhere lays much stress upon his having received the knowledge of Christ as immediately from Him as the Twelve did, by direct revelation from the Lord. Assuredly, we answer, St. Paul did lay much stress on his direct instruction; but the directness of his revelation from Christ is quite consistent with the present passage. It takes no account of the fact that his conversion was the immediate act of Jesus; it has only to do with what Jesus when He was on earth had spoken, and with the security we have that the announcement of salvation is now the announcement of the Word of God. Now the first assurance is that Jesus Himself when He was on earth uttered the word of salvation; and the second is, that those who heard Him utter it delivered the same to others, and preached it in such a manner as left no room for doubt that it was actually the Word of the Lord and actually the Word of God. When the question was about what Jesus spoke on earth, then St. Paul had to fall back upon the immediate information of those who had been apostles before him. Only his assurance that the preaching of the Twelve was truth, and that Jesus was truly sent of God, had been immediately imparted to him. Thus we gather from our passage only that no one of the Twelve could have written the epistle. If St. Paul was the author, he saw himself under no necessity, in relation to these Jewish Christians, of laying emphasis on the assertion of his immediate call to the apostleship. When he was aiming at the conversion of souls to Christ, then he might appeal to the special call to Christ and His service which he had received; and he laid much stress on his call to the apostolical function when his equality as an apostle to the Twelve was called in question. But neither of these two was the case here.

Yet it is supposed that the epistle presents a view of Christianity which, however near it might be to the Pauline, is

to be distinguished from it. So says Riehm, while of late Pfleiderer regards the form only, and not the substance, as different. There are four chief points in which a distinction in the *substance* has been thought to be observable.

1. As it regards the relation of the old to the new covenant, St. Paul makes Christianity essentially new, while the Epistle to the Hebrews makes it a glorification of the old. With St. Paul the law is a requirement, in the Epistle to the Hebrews it is a guarantee. But we find in Col. ii. 17 an utterance as to the relation of the old to the new covenant, which is almost literally the same as Heb. x. 1. For the rest we must not forget that St. Paul had no reason for exhibiting the legal economy as a type or mere shadow of Christianity, when he is contending against those who imposed on the Gentiles as a condition of salvation the acceptance of the law, or when he is opposing the Jewish pretension that the possession of a Divine revelation gave them a priority in the Divine judgment. Further, in the Epistle to the Hebrews there was no occasion to treat of the law in respect of its being a requirement of what man cannot render; since its object was not to refute those who trusted in legal works instead of Christ, but to demonstrate that the readers possessed in Christ that which must needs make the continuance of their participation in the national Jewish ceremonial matter of pure indifference.

2. As to the doctrine concerning Christ. Apart from such matters as entered individual epistles of the Apostle for special reasons, and were not repeated, and therefore ought not to be missed in the Epistle to the Hebrews, such as that Jesus is the second Adam; and apart from such points as the temptation of our Lord, which elsewhere has not such express prominence given to it;—there are two important things which may be noticed. It has been thought strange that the resurrection of Jesus, which elsewhere occupies the central place in the Apostle's scheme, is only once cursorily mentioned, while His ascension to the right hand of God is made emphatic. Further, it has been made matter of objection that the epistle moves round the idea that Jesus is the high priest. But as to the former point, the Epistle to the Galatians might for the same reason be reckoned un-Pauline, since it just after the same cursory manner alludes to the resurrection in the introductory greeting, and says nothing about His ascension to

God. As to the latter point, this fact is connected with another, namely, that the author is concerned to make emphatic the typical character of the whole economy of the Levitical service. But the two points have a strict relation to each other. These Jewish Christians were to be taught that precisely in the departure of Jesus by death to God lay the ground of our salvation, since in virtue of His expiation of our sins He represents us before God: hence they have no reason to be troubled about their exclusion from that ceremonial worship of their people to which the high-priestly atoning sacrifice of the Old Testament belonged. In contrast with this latter Christ is described as the high priest after the order of Melchizedek. Here, of course, the resurrection, which is only one stage in His ascent to God, comes not into consideration. On the other hand, the resurrection required to be made prominent when the question was of excluding works from the sphere of justification. For the resurrection was simply the demonstration of the fact, that Christ had on account of our sins been delivered up to death.

3. As it regards the appropriation of salvation, it is objected that the Epistle to the Hebrews makes faith refer generally to God as its object and His promise of future salvation: not specially Christ as our Righteousness; the righteousness of faith, as imputed to us, being foreign to the epistle, just as is the antithesis between the righteousness of works and the righteousness of faith. As it respects this last point, it may be observed that St. Paul says no more about it in the Epistles to the Corinthians than is said in the Epistle to the Hebrews. We are not to imagine that St. Paul had any one system of teaching which he brought forward on all occasions and in all circumstances. His instruction takes a direction and form appropriate to the direction and tendency of the position which gives rise to his teaching. The Jewish Christians, to whom this epistle was addressed, were in danger of falling away from Christianity generally, because it seemed not to them the fulfilment of the Old-Testament promise. Hence there was no occasion to treat of the righteousness of works in contrast with the righteousness of faith; it was necessary only to strengthen faith in reference to the fact that in Christ the fulfilment of the Divine promise had been given and assured. It would indeed be a different matter if in chap. xi. 1, there could be really

detected a definition of faith which contradicted the idea which St. Paul gives of it. But the primary error in this case is that the words of chap. xi. 1 are regarded as a definition of faith. The author certainly says there what believing means: not, however, to explain this idea in a manner universally applicable; but with the directly practical end of impressing upon his hearers that if they would be believers, they must be believers in such a fashion as his context goes on to demand. But he demands that they must be content rightly to estimate and accept the present form of Christianity, which is yet only a hope and expectation. Indeed, here πιστεύειν means no other than the being convinced of that which we do not see. And such an ethical assurance of that of which we can have no sensible evidence is faith, even when St. Paul treats of it as in contradistinction from works. This last contrast, however, does bring another side of faith into consideration. To treat of this—what it is that justifies man—the author has no necessity here. He is not required to establish the validity of faith as opposed to works, which are of no efficacy to save without the consummation of believing: he has to demand faith itself, as that which his readers must hold fast. But they were in danger of giving that up, because it was hard to them to think of possessing salvation only as matter of faith. In this connection of an exhortation to hold fast faith, faith itself is exhibited especially under the aspect of the assurance of what is to be hoped for as opposed to the assurance of what we possess already in the sensible and perceptible present. But that is precisely the same idea of πίστις which 2 Cor. v. 7 gives us, when St. Paul sets in correlation πίστις and πεῖθος. And that it is the same πίστις which he means when he opposes it to works of the law, is evident in Rom. iv. 16-24; and we have only to compare this passage with Heb. vi. 12-15 to see the futility of the objection against which we have been contending.

4. It has been urged that the epistle lacks—not indeed the Pauline universalism, but—anything like a specific exhibition of St. Paul's views of the universality of the Gospel. But it is overlooked that these Jewish Christians had no scruple about general admission into the kingdom of God: they were in doubt about their own exclusion from the fellowship of their own people's worship.

Thus there is no valid ground for denying this epistle to

an apostle who had written epistles like those to the Ephesians and the Galatians. For, in point of fact, the peculiarity of the Epistle to the Ephesians as opposed to the Galatian epistle, is not less than that of the Epistle to the Hebrews. But here a double error is committed by the opponent. St. Paul is regarded as an author who, when he writes, is concerned to establish the truth of his own system of doctrine in all its ideas. Again, the Epistle to the Hebrews is regarded as the exposition of a specific system of doctrine; whereas here and there the common facts of salvation are presented in just such a view, and with just such an application, as the necessity of the readers and the writer's end with regard to them suggested. We have already seen that the remarkable relations of the conclusion of the epistle unmistakably point to the Apostle Paul.

We have yet, however, to investigate the supposed un-Pauline character of the phraseology, which Clemens Alexandrinus and Origen commented on in their day. As it respects the vocabulary, it is asserted that the same words are found with a meaning different from that of St. Paul's usage; and that the same thing is expressed by different words, especially different modifications of words.

It is noted that St. Paul uses the word *τάξις* in Col. ii. 5 and 1 Cor. xiv. 40 with the meaning "order," while in this epistle it occurs in the sense of "series or rank," as in the verse *κατὰ τὴν τάξιν M.* ch. vi. But the author uses the term only in its relation to Ps. cx.; he quotes only after the Septuagint, whose phrase this is and not his own. Again, it is said, that *καθίζειν* in St. Paul means "place;" while in this epistle it means "place himself." But that St. Paul was not unfamiliar with this latter meaning is evident from 2 Thess. xi. 1. It is alleged also that here we have *μακροθυμία* when St. Paul would say *ὑπομονή*. But this is a mistake: they are totally distinct ideas, which, in St. James v. 10, 11, are placed in conjunction, as also in Col. i. 11. We find the former word used only with the sense that the Apostle would have given it: it is a waiting without impatience, while the latter word is a waiting without pusillanimity. Again, the phrase *καταβάλλεσθαι θεμέλιον* is found in this epistle instead of the Pauline *θεμέλιον τιθέναι*; but this latter is found only in 1 Cor. 3, 10, and, as the word *καταβολή* is current in the writings of St. Paul, why should he not use *καταβάλλεσθαι*? In Heb.

xii. 22 we have ἐντέλλεσθαι, for which St. Paul uses elsewhere διατάσσειν, παραγγέλλειν. Certainly the verb does not occur in his other writings; but in Col. iv. 10 we have the substantive ἐντολή in the same sense. In our epistle we find new expressions for "always" or "ever:" such as διὰ παντός (ch. ix. 6, xiii. 15), εἰς τὸ διηνεκές (ch. vii. 2, x. 2, xii. 14), εἰς τὸ παντελές (ch. vii. 26). As to the first of these, it is used elsewhere by St. Paul without the sense of "for ever;" but in the passages we have quoted from the Hebrews it is used for the description of the daily worship, and is taken from the Septuagint, Numb. xxviii. 31. The second is also foreign to the Apostle's usage elsewhere; but it must not be said that instead of it he has εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα, for this phrase has quite a different meaning; it signifies "for ever without ceasing," while the other is "for ever without interruption." The third expression is not at all an idea of time: it signifies "absolutely and altogether," and does not come into consideration here. Again, it is asserted that in this epistle μέτοχος is used where St. Paul would say κοινωνός; but we may answer that here again we have two perfectly distinct ideas, as in ch. xi. 14 the two verbs are found together. The former denotes "to stand in fellowship with each other," the latter "to share something with another." Since St. Paul often uses the verb, why should he not use the substantive? (compare Eph. iii. 6). There remains only ὅθεν, "whence it comes that," which occurs five times in our epistle, and not elsewhere in St. Paul. But it ought not to be overlooked that the διό, which is so customary in St. Paul, occurs seven times in this epistle; and that in 1 Cor. διόπερ is found thrice, which is nowhere else found in the New Testament.

Turning to varied forms of the word, ὁμοιότης is pointed to as a form for which St. Paul would use ὁμοίωμα. These terminations, however, are of so different meaning that it seems incredible that they should be employed for the same thought; and we need only to compare ch. vii. 15 with Rom. v. 14 to see that in the one case the former and in the other the latter is in the right place. Further, the assertion that the author uses verbs in ίζειν where St. Paul would use those in όω, can appeal only to the passage, ch. vi. 6, as compared with Eph. iv. 23. Lastly, if it is said that the author uses many variously combined words, we must claim that the author of the Epistles to the Colossians, the Ephe-

sians, and the Philippians does precisely the same. And it must be remarked that forms such as *ὁρκωμοσια*, *μισθαποδοσία* are not merely fuller forms than *ὅρκος* and *μισθός*, but have a different meaning.

As it respects the syntax, it is said that the author uses substantives in *σις* where St. Paul would have adopted infinitive constructions. Certainly he does use these last in the Epistles to the Ephesians and Philippians, but not once in that to the Colossians; and it seems that he remained faithful in any one epistle to the phraseological strain he had entered on. In Rom. iii. 25, 26, he employs almost to harshness that kind of infinitival substantive. He who could write this and be also the writer of the Colossian Epistle without the infinitive construction might also have so written as we find in the Epistle to the Hebrews. When it is said that the author uses *κρατεῖν* with the genitive, but St. Paul with the accusative, it is to be replied that the two forms, *κρατεῖν τινος* and *τι*, mean different things. When the Epistle to the Hebrews speaks of a *κρατεῖν τῆς ἐλπίδος*, it means "holding fast *to* the hope;" but when St. Paul, Col. ii. 19, 2 Thess. ii. 15, employs the verb with the accusative, he meant "hold fast something" in contradistinction to letting it go. The same may be said of *κοινωνεῖν τινος* and *τινι*. The remark that the author, in opposition to the usual construction of St. Paul's Epistles, uses the comparative with *παρά* (four times) and *ὑπέρ* (once), instead of with the genitive, is correct; St. Paul does not furnish any other example of this construction. Now this remark, and that about the use of *ὅθεν*, are the only ones to which any weight can be attached. But when we compare the epistles, and note how many irregularities of phraseology St. Paul has in any one epistle, omitting them in every other, we shall not be disposed to exaggerate their importance.

It would be a different matter, indeed, if it could be proved that the specific Christological phraseology was fashioned differently in this epistle from that of St. Paul elsewhere. But the striking designations of Jesus, priest, high priest, apostle, mediator of the covenant, &c., are all to be accounted for by the specific object of the epistle; and when the author terms Christ in ch. i. 3, "the effulgence of His glory and the express image of His substance," it is not essentially different from that of the Colossian epistle which terms Him "the image of God, the firstborn

of every creature, and the first-begotten from the dead." Unless it can be proved that the object which the author sets before himself is inconsistent with a Pauline origin, the objections derived from these phraseological peculiarities are of no account.

Still there are two things which are urged in evidence of a religious phraseology foreign to that of St. Paul. It is said that the full formula "our Lord Jesus Christ" never occurs, but instead of it either "Jesus" or "Christ." But this, again, is to be explained by the design of the epistle. It either treats of what took place with regard to the man Jesus, and then we read "Jesus;" or of how the promised Christ by His action and suffering has fulfilled the promise, and then it is "the Christ," as, for example, we find it predominantly in the Colossian epistle. The other observation that has been made concerns the formulas of quotation, which it is said this author employs in a manner quite different from those of St. Paul. But the fact is that his style of citation is, as a rule, just the same as that adopted in Eph. iv. 8, v. 14, or 1 Cor. vi. 16; Rom. xv. 10, 11. There are only two quotation-formulas peculiar to this epistle. One is found in ch. iii. 7 and ch. x. 15: "the Holy Ghost saith." It rests on this, that the word of prophecy (compare 1 Tim. iv. 1) is the word of the Spirit of God; but in both passages this term is adopted because it makes the exhortation all the more solemn, inasmuch as contradiction against the Holy Ghost Who bears witness in man is connected with so much greater responsibility. For, in the one case a warning against that unbelief is in question which delivers over to ruin, and in the other case the question is as to the recognition of the now present new Divine economy; the other peculiarity meets us in ch. xi. 11 and x. 5. There an Old-Testament word is adduced as a word of Christ. In both cases the words are David's which the author introduces, making them words of Christ; or, rather, what holds good of Christ and was to be said concerning Him, he clothes in an Old-Testament Scripture which he places in the lips of Christ. But, in fact, both the words, because they are the words of David, the anointed of God, in which he speaks of himself as such, were typical prophetic words which it was as obvious to paraphrase in the word of the New Testament Anointed as to apply Ps. xvi. in the discourse of St. Peter, Acts ii. There is no other instance of this style of cita-

tion. But the usage as to the use of Scripture on which it rests pervades the entire New Testament.

Thus, of all that has been alleged in proof that the peculiar Christian phraseology of the Epistle to the Hebrews is different from that of St. Paul elsewhere, there remains only this method of quotation; and of the other singularities which are supposed to establish that the Apostle could not be the author, there remains nothing but the use of *ὅθεν*, of the comparative with *παρά* and *ὑπέρ*, and perhaps the verb *ἀνακαινίζειν* instead of *ἀνακαινοῦν*. But now we may set over against these supposed un-Pauline peculiarities much that is strictly and genuinely Pauline in the phraseology of the epistle. The *καυχᾶσθαι* used of Christian joy in ch. iii. 6, the combination "God of peace," ch. xiii. 20, "*κοινωνία*," ch. xiii. 16, in the sense of almsgiving, are found only in St. Paul. Further, the term "follow," used as it is in ch. xii. 14, is often found in St Paul; but elsewhere only in 1 Pet. iii. 11, in a quotation from the Septuagint. Such words and ideas as *κλῆσις*, *πληροφορία*, *ἐνεργής*, *μετέχω* (elsewhere only five times in 1 Cor.), *ἔνδικος* (only in St. Paul and this epistle), *καταργεῖν* (only in St. Paul, and that four-and-twenty times in figurative sense, and in a proper sense only Luke xiii. 7), are purely Pauline peculiarities. The adverbs *περισσότερον* and *περισσοτέρως* are found only in St. Paul; not even in the Septuagint. The turns *εἰ—πολλῷ* or *πόσῳ μᾶλλον* and *ἐπεί* with question, as in ch. x. 2, or in an affirmative sentence as in ch. ix. 20, occur only in St. Paul. Finally, in Heb. x. 34, the words of Deut. xxxii. 35 are quoted in a manner corresponding neither to the original nor to the Septuagint; just as in Rom. xii. 19. If it is not the same apostle who here and there quotes the text in the same words, because it is his habit to do so, we should be obliged to suppose that the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews had the passage of the Epistle to the Romans before his eyes, or fixed in his remembrance.

What as matter of fact is striking is the character of the style taken as a whole. We cannot but mark a greater purity of diction, with fewer Hebraisms, a more careful arrangement of words with observation of tone and cadence, a happier construction of sentences even where parentheses occur, a greater repose and stateliness of discourse, without the many dialectic interruptions and sudden changes. Yet, as it respects these last, they do not indeed occur in all

St. Paul's epistles, but only in those to the Romans and the Galatians, where they are to be explained by the nature of his design. In those to the Ephesians and the Colossians we find long-sustained periods with linked relatival and participial sentences. Again, it is different with 2 Cor. ch. i.—ix., where frequent prepositional definitions make the sentences harsh. And, yet again, Rom. xii. 9, *seq.*, we have simple and short clauses thrown together without any elaboration of style. This manifold variety is a warning against precipitate judgment as to what St. Paul could and what he could not have written. Just as what he writes, so how he writes, varied according to the posture of circumstances, in harmony with his principle of "all things to all men." The many little clauses of Heb. xiii. 1, *seq.*, which are simply collocated in series, vividly remind us of Rom. xii. 9, *seq.*; the long period of ch. vi. 16-20, of the similar periods in the Ephesians. 1 Cor. ch. ix. and x. may be compared with Heb. iii. 7, iv. 13. In short, if we speak of the artificial character of the periods of the Epistle to the Hebrews, it must be remembered that they are only few, and that the entire document is not constructed in periodological style. The epistle sets out with one well-built and long period; but no more like it are found until ch. v. 17. We meet with passages such as 1 Thess. iii. 6-10, Rom. ii. 17-22, Eph. iv. 13-16, Phil. i. 7-11, Titus iii. 4-7, in which quite similar periods are discernible, though a false exposition has tended to mar them.

Assuredly, however, the diction of this epistle is more pathetic, as we say; the flow of the discourse is more transparent, and at the same time more full. But the document is not a letter in the ordinary sense; at least it does not begin as such, but as a literary work which afterwards assumes an epistolary form. It deals with one only theme down to ch. xii. 29; and in such a manner as to make it at once evident that it was written with great pains: which in the case of other Pauline epistles is hardly to be assumed, or at least not till the Epistle to the Ephesians. This is to be explained easily, if St. Paul, expecting Timothy, gave himself the time to construct a literary work which, preceding him, would set him right with the Jewish part of a church to which when he came he might not be able to devote himself exclusively.

If then St. Paul really wrote the epistle, and it was

designed for the use of the Jewish Christians of Antiochian Syria, we pass readily to the supposition that he followed the epistle in person, while he probably first visited the furthest point in the East which he arrived at, in order then to visit his own churches in returning. In Antioch he probably found Titus, and took him as a companion. But it seems to have been a chief concern of the Apostle to come to Macedonia; hence he took the sea to reach it. On this journey he might touch Crete, and occupy himself with gathering into churches the Christians who lived there. But he did not himself remain long: hence he only began this work, leaving Titus behind to finish it, while he himself went on to Macedonia. It does not appear that Timothy accompanied him in these travels. Either St. Paul had sent him forward from Antioch to Ephesus; or Timothy had not met St. Paul, who expected him on the coast of Italy, and, as he knew that the Apostle was going to Asia, went at once to Ephesus to await him there. The latter is the more probable, since the first Epistle to Timothy yields no trace of their having met. As the Ephesian church needed some express supervision, the Apostle let Timothy know meanwhile that he must remain there where he was instead of following him into Macedonia. Thus Timothy remained in Ephesus, and thither St. Paul sent him from Macedonia the epistle which we hold as the first to Timothy. But we turn now to the Epistle to Titus, as the commission given to him was earlier than that given to Timothy concerning Ephesus.

ART. V.—1. *Russia, No.* 1 (1882). *Correspondence respecting the Treatment of Jews in Russia.*

2. *Russia, No.* 2 (1882). [*In continuation of Russia, No.* 1, 1882]. Presented to both Houses of Parliament by command of Her Majesty.

3. *Jews as They Are.* By C. K. SALAMAN. London: Simpkin, Marshall and Co. 1882.

IN the first fortnight of the present year there appeared in the *Times* two articles on the condition of the Jews in Russia, which attracted widespread attention. In the debate which subsequently took place in the House of Commons, and in the memorable meeting which was held at the Mansion House, the interest already created was largely increased. There had been previously a vague notion that all was not right and had not been right for a considerable period. Baron Reuter had occasionally found room for a brief statement in his telegrams that now in this place, and again in that, a riot had taken place in which the Jews were the sufferers, but few, if any, details had been given, and scarcely any one had an adequate idea of the extent of the persecution, or of the savage brutality with which it was conducted. When, therefore, the *Times* spoke of a region, in superficial area as large as Great Britain and France combined, as "the scene of horrors that have hitherto only been perpetrated during times of war," and proceeded to substantiate its assertion, all ranks of society were startled. Subsequent inquiry only made too apparent one of the most cruel outbreaks of race-hatred that has disgraced the annals of civilisation. In nearly 200 places, villages, towns, and cities in Western and Southern Russia, murder, robbery, outrage of the person, and incendiarism had for months been events of common occurrence. In March, Baron de Worms stated in his place in Parliament, without challenge, that 201 women had been violated, 56 Jews killed and many more wounded; that 20,000 people had been rendered homeless, and that property to the value of sixteen millions sterling had been wrecked. The wickedness perpetrated, before the outbreak

of the last Russo-Turkish war, at Batak and Kezanlik was perhaps worse, though in some respects scarcely so, but that was under Mohammedan rule, while this was in a country and under a Government priding themselves on their "orthodox" Christianity. So monstrous, indeed, seemed this return to barbarism, that expressions of unbelief and charges of gross exaggeration were heard in many quarters. Accordingly, under the direction of the Foreign Office, consular investigations took place, the results of which are found in the two sections of correspondence Russia, Nos. 1 and 2 (1882). The consular agents seem at first to have shared the opinion that, to a certain extent, overcharged narratives had found currency, and that in some respects the suffering had not been so great as reported. But later inquiries revealed the fact that while, in one or two matters of detail, this might have been so, on the whole the misery had not been overstated but understated. It would be best, perhaps, to allow the Russian press, as quoted in the reports to the Foreign Office, to speak for itself.

The Odessa *Vestnik* sent a correspondent to visit Vologodtsolof, in the province of Kherson, after the Jewish riots in April of this year. His report, which is summarised by Sir Edward Thornton, describes the place as a complete wreck. "Broken furniture encumbered the streets, which were strewn with feathers, pieces of cloth, paper, &c., whilst burnt and damaged goods were to be met with in confused heaps on all sides. Jews were wandering among these ruins with bowed heads and woeful countenances. Some of them had their faces bruised, and one man carried his arm, which had been broken above the elbow, in a sling. According to official accounts seventy-four men were arrested during the first days of the disturbance."

The *Golos*, perhaps the fairest and ablest of the Russian newspapers, and, if one may judge by the number of warnings it receives from the bureau of the Censorship of the Press, together with temporary suppressions, the most independent organ, describes in great detail what another Russian journal terms "*Le Sac de Balta.*" Balta is, or rather was, a thriving town, chiefly inhabited by Jews, about 140 miles from Odessa, on the Odessa-Elizabetgrad Railway, and in the government of Kieff. The *Journal de St. Petersbourg* gives the population in 1867 at 14,000; in 1870 at 18,000, of whom 8,000 were Jews. Twelve years

later, in 1882, it admits that 20,000 Jews in Balta alone were rendered homeless. But, returning to the *Golos*, the following paragraphs are from its issues of April 22 and 27 (O.S.):

"It is calculated that about 976 houses were demolished, and 250 shops and 34 spirit stores pillaged. The loss of property is reckoned at 1,500,000 roubles; during the riot 211 men were wounded, of these 39 seriously; eight died of their wounds. Some women have gone mad. Some Jews, viz., Schpur, Teplitski, Jacob Beer and Kuschler were killed at a distance of five versts from the town. Hina Kotik, a Jewess, received four wounds and injuries to her breast. . . Many dishonoured women positively refuse to testify to their dishonour."

Referring to the condemnatory articles published in the foreign press with respect to the treatment of the Jews in Russia:

"All these charges," the *Golos* says, "are so clearly borne out by facts, all the allusions to the inefficiency of our administrative ability are so just, that we hesitate in replying, even when there is evident exaggeration. It would be absurd, however, to speak of exaggeration where actual facts are beyond all description; when, in the course of a few hours, thousands of people are reduced to beggary and cast adrift under the eyes of the authorities; where scenes are enacted by a wild rabble, to form some idea of which we must turn to the accounts of the raids of barbarian hordes led by Asiatic despots.

"What can we reply to these accusations when we know that they are deserved, when the facts on which they are based have been verified and confirmed, not only by private, but also by official persons? Never was the Russian press in such a difficult position. Never have we been more powerless in the face of our accusers. Whatever the vices and defects of the Jewish character, there can be no justification for the savagery and brutality to which the Jews have been exposed in an European, and, at the same time, a Christian country."

If it were necessary it would be an easy matter to add to these illustrations, and from sources which no one would be likely to question. Every administrative district of Western and Southern Russia yielded its contribution to the sum total of distress, and frequently in a style so diabolic that it would be impossible to report the particulars. In some respects Baron de Worms' figures were much too low; probably at the date of writing not less than

100,000 Jewish families have been ruined. One addition, perhaps, may be made to this brief statement of the case: the plunder of an agricultural colony in the government of Ekaterinoslav. This is a mode of life exceedingly rare among the Jews in Russia, partly on account of the restrictions placed on the possession of land by them, and partly by reason of their preference for commerce. An attempt has been made, however, by the Government to utilise some of the fertile but unsettled lands in its thinly populated dominions by colonisation. Special privileges and exemptions have been granted to the colonists, and the paternal eye of the Czar was supposed to rest upon them with more than ordinary benignity. In the spring of last year, the colony to which reference has just been made was reached by the wave of persecution, and its prosperity destroyed in a day. The ringleaders of the mob dressed themselves as officers of police, and carried with them a fictitious ukase, decreeing the spoliation of the Jews. The rioters in a few hours drove off 500 cattle and 10,000 sheep. The Jewish question in Russia seems to have reduced itself to this: Whether the tide of affairs shall ebb again to such limits as sufficed, in the fifteenth century, for the bloody days of Ferdinand and Isabella; and as then in Spain, so now in Russia, whether the Jew shall be permitted to have a place in the national life above that of a criminal. Nay, indeed, in Balta, Warsaw, and Odessa the point to be decided is, apparently, whether he shall be permitted to exist even under the most degrading sufferance.

Meanwhile, Germany has its Jewish question as well, but it has assumed a totally different phase. Since the year 1848, or, more strictly speaking, 1850, if we refer to the practical completion of the work, the Jews in Germany have stood on a footing suited to the requirements of the civilisation of the nineteenth century. Restrictions as to pursuits and residences have been removed. The Judengassen, or Jews' quarters, exist no more, except in so far as the Jews themselves voluntarily constitute them for their own ends. Every career in arts, law, science, and legislation is open to them, and the oppressive poll-taxes, insisted upon with such varying ingenuity by one prince after another, have ceased. The famous "Hep! Hep!" riots at Frankfort in 1819, to some extent repeated at Hamburg in 1830, accompanied by the usual concomitants of violence, insults

to women, and destruction of property, close an important chapter in the history of the modern German Jew.* It is true that history often repeats itself; but it is not likely that in Germany the events of 1819 or 1830 will be witnessed again. And yet popular clamour against the Jews has been making itself so powerfully felt of late years, that far-seeing men long ago foretold its extension beyond the frontiers of the Fatherland. What has recently taken place in the neighbouring empire without doubt owes much of its initiatory force to the expressions of anti-Semitic feeling on the part of the German people; and to the same source we may trace the comparatively futile attempts to bring about a similar state of things in the Danubian Principalities and in Hungary. But to-day in Berlin and Frankfort, in Hamburg and Bremen, whatever happens in Poland, Buda-Pesth, or Bucharest, Jew-baiting is out of date. It is a form of amusement as obsolete as bull-baiting among ourselves. The manifestations of race-hatred are of a different kind. It would be a great mistake, however, to suppose that they are, to any appreciable extent, the result of religious differences. That also is a mode of friction which has ceased to have any important influence in Germany, where amongst the cultured classes the opinion is, for the most part, that all religions are equally true and all equally false. Berlin provides places of worship for less than one-twentieth of its population, and these, as a rule, are more than half empty; while of this insignificant and totally inadequate number of churches, one, at least, has lately been conveyed to the Jewish community for use as a synagogue. The educated German of to-day prides himself on nothing so much as his freedom from religious "prejudice." The objection to the Jew arises from an entirely different cause or assemblage of causes. First of all, there is the force of tradition. The ordinary German cannot forget that the Semitic element is practically a new element in the distribution of social forces, one that previously could be left out of consideration, but now can no longer be so treated.

If the German burgher were to speak as he thinks, it

* "Hep!" is not, strictly speaking, a word, but a sound. It is formed by the initial letters of three words: *Hierosolyma est perdita*—Jerusalem is desolate; and has been frequently employed in Continental Europe, in the midst of "Jew-riots," at once to terrify the victims and inflame the Christian ardour of their persecutors.

would probably be to some such effect as this: "Here is one who, in our fathers' time, was not permitted to reside among us, except in certain streets, nor allowed to follow any courses in life but those that we chose for him. He could only marry by permission of the State authority; his costume was prescribed for him, and he had to pay in good hard cash for most of his limited privileges. If he desired to enter into competition with Christians for the prizes of the senate or the bar, he had to submit to baptism, and even then he was only tolerated. It was not so long ago laudable and legitimate sport, on festival days, to hunt him about the streets like a dog. Now, he begins to hold his head high; he regards himself as our equal, if not our superior, disputing the pavement with us on his own terms, and on his own terms successfully contending everywhere for what is most worth having." There has also to be considered the result of oppression and injustice as it has over and over again revealed itself in history. If it had been written, "to the rich and great and powerful the Gospel is preached," instead of to the poor, the thinker might well inquire, what measure of survival, in the struggle for existence, would Christianity have realised? It came first of all to the obscure, to the patient, and the meek—that is to say, to those accustomed to pain and persecution, who had already been disciplined into passive strength and endurance. What others would have cast away or forgotten, they held with ceaseless tenacity until their masters no longer threatened nor proscribed; and then, in their husbanded strength, they went forth to subdue the world. So it was in Germany, so it has often been elsewhere, with the Jews. The strongest of all human instincts, that of self-preservation, was developed in them to its fullest capacity. They learned the secret of living amid surroundings that were inimical wheresoever they turned, and to do this they had to acquire an astuteness and versatility that have now become hereditary. Receiving from others nothing of charity or compunction, they, too, in their turn, learned to be selfish and unscrupulous; and, when emancipation came, they issued from their disabilities subtler, more daring, and more capable of meeting the emergencies of life, and more fitted for the contests of modern civilisation than their former oppressors. In a word, the German hates the Jew for what he was and for what he is. Yesterday he was his servant; to-day, in an increasingly

significant sense, he bids fair to become his master. Yesterday he existed on sufferance; to-day he grasps the national life with both hands. And to the reinforcement of this sentiment the philosophical consciousness of the Teuton lends no small aid. He has discovered, of late years, that the duty of every citizen is to amalgamate his interests with those of the State; that each one should hold a distinct relationship to his political universe. The interests of the community are to be upheld, whether it be a community in the narrow borders of a parish or within the limits of empire itself. One of the charges against the Jew is, that he takes no cognisance of this, and remains an unassimilating intruder—a Semite in the midst of Aryans. The only community he recognises, with anything like spontaneous devotion, is that of his own race; the only general interests he seeks to subserve are those of his own people. Members of this close corporation hold the balance of finance on every Exchange. They are gradually becoming possessed of the finest hereditary estates by taking advantage of the monetary difficulties of their owners, and playing into each other's hands. It is they who victimise the farmer and the peasant by their usuriousness, and who undersell the small tradesman and drive him from the country. It is into the hands of the Jews that almost all the influential, unofficial newspaper press is passing, or has already passed. It is the Jews who are slowly monopolising the profession of the law, and who everywhere push their way to the foremost places in medicine. And what the German feels most of all, and least of all can forgive, is the fact that it is the Jew who is reaping by far the greatest advantages from his magnificent system of education. For, in the ratio of their numbers, as compared with the Protestant and Roman Catholic population, the Jews receive nine times their share of the benefits of the Gymnasia and Realschulen. A gymnasium is equivalent to what is known in England as a middle-class school; a realschule to a high-class school; and a training in one or the other is a necessary qualification for Government employ. These considerations make it plain that, less and less every year, can the Semitic population of Germany be regarded with indifference. The Germans themselves are strongly of this opinion; and whenever Dr. Stöcker, chaplain to the Imperial Court, and champion of the Anti-Semitic Leagues, sees fit to address

the public on this question, he is always sure of an overflowing and sympathetic audience.

In none of their essential characteristics do these difficulties, which have of late arisen in Continental Europe, constitute a new problem. The dissimilarities between the Semitic and Aryan races have, from time immemorial, been marked by mutual hatred and cruelty. If the Gentile has not loved the Jew, neither has the Jew spared the Gentile in his moments of power; but as his has most frequently been the position of the weaker, it is he who has oftenest had to go to the wall. Amongst the many dark pages of its history, Christianity has few darker than those which narrate its relations with Judaism. But the ill-fated race, which has sought and found so few friends in the course of its marvellous career, had not to wait until the lineal descendant of its ancient faith grew to manhood, for contempt and obloquy. At the time of the Christian era, there were many thousands of Jews in Rome. They were not permitted there, however, any more than in other Mediterranean cities, to mix with the ordinary populace, but were compelled to dwell apart. Their uncompromising adherence to their faith, and their dogged clinging to the traditions and customs of their race, seemed to demand this. Nor did the sanguinary feuds among themselves, which sometimes turned the streets of their ghettos into slaughter-pens, tend to bring them any larger share of public favour. The fact that they pursued trades and callings so objectionable and nauseous, that throughout the empire the self-respect of the Roman citizen would not permit him to handle them, did not lift them to any higher level of esteem. Juvenal (in his well-known fourteenth Satire) declares that their sullenness was such, that they would not even point out the road to a man, or show him where he might find a draught of water, unless he were a Jew; and he regards the inclination of the women in Rome (whose vices were certainly sufficiently numerous) towards Jewish tenets as one of the worst signs of the times. Tacitus, in his histories, describes them as soured, malicious, and sensual, staunch only to each other. Suetonius affirms that the Emperor Claudius was obliged to expel them from Rome on account of their venomous, fanatical tumults. Ammianus Marcellinus speaks of *fœtentes Judæi*, reeking of garlic and foul food, and wearing garments shining with dirt. As we are not, however, in these pages

essaying a history of Judaism, but desire only to indicate the course of that stream by whose troubled waters we stand to-day, we pass at once to a period when Christianity, no longer as in the days of the Cæsars struggling for existence, had become the predominant religion. In the early mediæval times, not only were the plunder and massacre of Jews events of ordinary occurrence, but the legislation of that period shows that these were the result, not of the force of circumstances, but of inveterate prejudice. For example, no Christian was allowed to enter into partnership with a Jew, to eat with him, or to use the same bath, while intermarriage was considered a last disgrace. In prison the superior susceptibilities of the Christian were considered, and the Christian knave was isolated from the Jewish knave. Even in death at the hands of the law the distinction prevailed; the Christian malefactor was hanged decently, with a gallows to himself, or at least in the comparatively unstained company of other Christian malefactors. The Jew was hanged between two dogs, and sometimes, when it could be accomplished, with his head downwards. In the twelfth century, Innocent III., who perhaps as much as any single Pope contributed to the aggrandisement of the Papacy, declared the Jews as a race to be condemned to perpetual servitude. Innocent III. was not only an able administrator but also a man of letters; and, if there be such a thing as the unconscious irony of history, surely we discover it in the fact that his principal literary production was entitled *De Miseria Conditionis Humanæ*. In the thirteenth century, Thomas Aquinas, "the angelic Doctor," held that since Jews for the most part acquired their wealth by usury and malpractices it belonged of right to him who could find means to take it—a doctrine which was, apparently, peculiarly comforting to the consciences of needy princes and governors. Perhaps it would be deemed superfluous to say that the Church generally contrived to get her share. In Spain, one of the choicest adornments of an ecclesiastical festival or a Royal marriage used to be an *auto da fé*, comprising a batch of Jews and Jewesses, carefully economised by the Inquisition for the occasion. When the plague or black death decimated the walled and consequently crowded cities of Europe, its devastations were ascribed to the malignity of the Jews, the enemies of the human race. A little light is cast on the familiar words of Shylock's protest when we

remember that it was supposed to be possible to distinguish a Jew, even in the dark, by his odour (a part of the curse pertaining to the race which crucified the Messiah), and that his blood was turbid, black, corrupt, and putrescent. In the sixteenth century Marlowe wrote his play, *The Jew of Malta*, which was, perhaps, the most popular of all the pre-Shakespearian dramas. In the second act, Barabas, the figure about whom the chief interest of the play gathers, and who, according to Marlowe's wont, is the very incarnation of one regnant quality (in this case wickedness for wickedness' sake), utters the following monologue :

"As for myself, I walk abroad o' nights
And kill sick people groaning under walls :
Sometimes I go about and poison wells ;
And now and then, to cherish Christian thieves,
I am content to lose some of my crowns,
That I may, walking in my gallery,
See 'em go pinioned along by my door.
Being young, I studied physic, and began
To practise first upon the Italian ;
There I enriched the priests with burials,
And always kept the sextons' arms in use
With digging graves and ringing dead men's knells :
And after that I was an engineer,
And in the wars 'twixt France and Germany,
Under pretence of helping Charles the Fifth,
Slew friend and enemy with my stratagems.
Then after that I was an usurer,
And with extorting, cozening, forfeiting,
And tricks belonging unto brokery,
I filled the jails with bankrupts in a year,
And with young orphans planted hospitals,
And every moon made some or other mad,
And now and then one hung himself for grief,
Pinning upon his breast a long great scroll
How I with interest tormented him.
But mark how I am blest for plaguing them,
I have as much coin as will buy the town."

It need scarcely be said that this is not "Marlowe's mighty line," so powerful in *Dr. Faustus*, but that rather which reminds us of the nursery tales of our youth, fraught with goblins, "hydras and chimæras dire." But that one so cynically intelligent should have written such a passage, that his actors should speak it and be received with rap-

turous applause, these are the marks to which we must look. Later, the testimony of aversion is taken up by Voltaire, and again by Gibbon. The former, in his *Philosophy of History*, delineates the Jewish race as merciless and treacherous, irreconcilable in its hatred of all other nations, revolting against all its masters, always superstitious, always barbarous, abject in misfortune, and insolent in prosperity. The latter, in his celebrated fifteenth chapter of the *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, covers almost the same ground as Voltaire, but lays emphasis on their jealousy lest their heirship in the covenant should be diminished by the participation of others therein. The continuity of this criticism remains unbroken to our own day, as the utterances and acts of Herr Stöcker, General Ignatieff, and others whom it is needless to particularise, sufficiently prove.

From whatever point of view, then, we consider the Jewish question, we are confronted with this fact,—and apart from it no accurate estimate of the case can be arrived at,—that from the earliest periods of Christian history to the present time, the Jewish race has been the object of hatred and suspicion—feelings, be it remembered, that it is by no means difficult to keep alive. For whomsoever men dislike and suspect they decry and malign as a matter of self-justification. Hence the deep-mouthed reprobation of the Jews from age to age; and hence, also, the baselessness of many of the charges brought against them. Had all the evil qualities that have been ascribed to the Jews, or even a moiety of them, been justly so ascribed, their ruthless and total extermination would have become a necessity to the human race.

But it is equally impossible to consider the historic phenomenon which we have outlined, as being without a substratum of reality. Races and communities do not permanently surrender themselves to a given method of thought, or to an obstinate prejudice, without reason. And the reasons for the perpetuation of that sharply-defined line which still separates Gentile from Jew are not far to seek. There is one characteristic possessed by, at least, the Western Aryan races, which the Semitic races have never exhibited, viz., progress through assimilation. The Saxon who conquered the Dane, and the Norman who conquered the Saxon, needed but a few generations to become one united and homogeneous people. Alsace and Lorraine,

suddenly overrun by their most dreaded enemies, became more French almost than France in a hundred years, and now we see the reflux of this tide, and Elsass and Lothringen slowly but surely incorporating themselves once again with the greatness of the German Fatherland. But with the Jewish race it is not so. Time, which wears all things else away, has left this nation without a country, unassimilated and, it might be said, in its essential temperament, unchanged. The Jew speaks the language of France or Germany or England, as the case may be; he wears the costume of the country in which he lives; but underneath these superficial modifications he is the Jew still. He refuses to mingle his blood with that of the Gentile; he will not even worship side by side with him, though both revere the same God; and he uses the rite inaugurated by Abraham, that he may separate his children from the children of those who are not of the same race. And this separation he perpetuates at every risk, counting it a supreme duty to which every other must give place. Many amongst them would dissent from such a proposition, or in some way attempt to modify its rigour. Mr. Salaman, for instance, writes:

"They will continue, with unwavering decision and constancy, to pursue their onward, upward course of mental and social improvement, and, interfering with none, they will permit no intrusion or interference with themselves in religious matters; but in accordance with the Divine precepts of their creed, they will continue to acknowledge all good men and women as their brethren and sisters, whatever may be their nationality, or their spiritual faith."

This may be the precept, but what is the practice? Let another Jew declare:

"The Jew is everywhere a stranger, an alien. Man is gregarious in his habits, but the Jew, alone of his kind, holds himself aloof from his fellows. He mixes with them, but is not of them, and however firmly he may establish himself in any country, however completely he may share its woes or its prosperity, there is always the indefinable feeling that he is a being apart, that he legitimately belongs to some other sphere, the mysteries of which no Gentile eye can pierce. Thus is primarily engendered a prejudice, somewhat negative in character, a kind of shyness, which gradually developes into a tacit acknowledgment that real kinship is unattainable. Nothing seems to overcome or thaw the invisible separatism of the Jew. The phenomenon becomes irritating

when it is found to be bound up with certain implied pretensions of superiority, a haughty reserve in matters of religion, a disparaging avoidance of the habits, the practices, nay, the very persons of the people amongst whom he dwells." *

Rightly or wrongly, the Gentile world, in its cosmopolitanism, is disposed to resent this unyielding tribal exclusiveness, or, if not actually to resent it, at any rate to withhold its sympathy; and so in a thousand mouths the sentiments of Voltaire and Gibbon find repeated utterance. M. Renan, for instance, puts them tersely enough when he says:

"The Jew has insinuated himself everywhere, claiming the benefit of common rights; but in reality he has not been within the pale of common rights; he has kept his status apart; he has wanted to have the same securities as the rest, with his exceptional privileges and special laws into the bargain. He has wished to enjoy the advantages of nationality without being a member of the nation, or bearing his share of the national burdens. And this no people has ever been able to endure."

In this, as a statement of the relationship of Jews in England, of course we do not concur; but we have only to consider the analogous cases of the Parsees and Armenians to see that there is much truth in it.

A further contribution towards the solution of this problem of racial divergence is perceptible in the attitude, not merely of separatism, but of arrogance deliberately assumed by the Jews themselves. With their sublime traditions and their history of endurance and achievement through so many centuries, it is not difficult to understand how pride of race should sometimes exercise an overmastering influence, and conciliation be carried no farther than is absolutely necessary. Not even conversion to Christianity seems equal to the suppression of this tendency. The late Lord Beaconsfield's novels are full of it. The Caucasian races are described as flat-nosed barbarians, of whom, it is scornfully said, one half worships a Jewish man, and the other half a Jewish woman. "No one has ever been permitted to write under the inspiration of the Holy Spirit except a Jew." †

* "Notes on Modern Jews," *Leisure Hour*, July, 1882, by Lucien Wolf, the Editor of the *Jewish World*.

† *Lord George Bentinck: a Political Biography*. By B. Disraeli.

Heinrich Heine was as free from religious bias of any sort as a man could well be. It does not seem to have cost him much to sunder himself from the race of Israel; there was nothing, apparently, to smirch any part of that self-esteem, of which he always had a sufficiency, in the waters of baptism. Yet he never forgot that he had once belonged to the "chosen people;" that their blood after all flowed in his veins. Many a barbed shaft does he launch at the Gentile and the Philistine in high places; but for the Jew he has only wondering exultation which amounts, at times, to a servility of intellect.

In Mr. Salaman's book, the title of which stands at the head of these pages, we find many instances of the reproduction of this spirit:

"The Jewish race and Judaism among the nations of the world may be likened to a towering rock in the midst of the ever-restless ocean. . . . . The parent rock—still rearing its lofty crest towards the skies—has remained firm and unshaken as of old, and will endure 'for ever and ever throughout all generations,' to the end of time.

"As the descendants of an illustrious historic race of inspired prophets, poets, priests, judges, kings, and mighty warriors, the persecuted, oppressed, and degraded Israelites of the Middle Ages, who were scattered and dispersed among all nations, acutely felt the ceaseless cruelty, injustice, and folly of their persecutors. With humble submission to the mysterious will of God, they recognised the partial fulfilment of His decrees as prophesied by Moses; and believing implicitly in their complete fulfilment, they hopefully looked forward to the future. Firm as adamant, they effectually frustrated every machination of their avowed enemies. Unbending as the forest oak, they foiled every insidious attempt to encroach upon the domain of their religion, and their hallowed convictions. When benighted Christians would reproach Jews with 'blindness and obstinacy' in rejecting Christianity, they scornfully smiled, for they knew full well on which side obstinacy and blindness dwelt. They knew that they did not require Christianity, Judaism being all-sufficient for them. They were conscious that whatever of good there is in Christianity is derived from, and is to be found in, Judaism; and being convinced of the immutability of the Jewish religion, its efficacy for all ages, all circumstances, places, climes, and all conditions of life, they clung to their holy faith with tenacious constancy and courage. To vituperation they opposed disdain and indifference, while they exchanged Jewish for Christian hate."

As the book is not only intended as a delineation of

European Judaism, but in some sort as an acknowledgment of the efforts made to mitigate its recent sufferings, these passages are in singularly bad taste. They diminish the literary excellence of a volume, certainly not too well furnished in this latter respect, its somewhat rude and rhetorical vigour notwithstanding. When the best thought in Europe is lending itself to the accomplishment of the task of relieving the Jews of their last disabilities—social, political, and religious—we scarcely look for this tone. The persistence of this temper has contributed much of late to the trouble on the Continent, particularly in Germany. Every one knows, for it is one of the dreadful commonplaces of history, that for centuries Christendom made their days evil for the Jews. Every one knows that to-day the hand of cruel oppression is not everywhere removed, and from end to end, England has protested against this wickedness, and done all that lay in her power to assuage its resultant miseries. When, therefore, as in France and England, there is perfect liberty of the Jewish subject as of any other, and men have endeavoured to atone for the past, and still watch with equal and jealous care the rights of the Jew as of the Briton and Frenchman, they expect, as a matter of decency, the absence of that Chauvinist spirit which characterises so many of Mr. Salaman's pages. Here, however, owing to the comparatively small number of Jews, and their relative insignificance in this great commonwealth, and also to that liberty of speech which looks with equanimity on what elsewhere would receive official attention, the feeling which animates and has produced the volume in question counts for little, though that little will not be to the advantage of the Jewish fraternity.

In Germany, however, it is different. Very recent returns of the Jewish population are not available, but in 1875 their number in that country was 520,725. In Prussia the census of that year returned them at 339,790, whereas in 1867, after the readjustment of Prussian territory, they numbered no more than 270,000, the increase of 69,790 being coincident with the removal of the last remaining restrictions and the period of unprecedented commercial and financial excitement following on the Franco-Prussian war, and accompanying the payment of "the milliards." What followed let Mr. Salaman describe; how it followed we will endeavour to show further on:

"The truth, which it has been attempted to conceal under a transparent veil, is that the Jews of Germany have been and are actually persecuted for their exceptional success in all their various undertakings; because, in fact, they occupy the most important professorial chairs in the German Universities; because, in the rapid race for wealth Jews are mostly the winners; because they, therefore, possess more riches perhaps than their non-Jewish neighbours; because they drive the best horses and the handsomest carriages that money can purchase, and inhabit the most splendid mansions in Berlin; because, in fine, they take the lead in the world of art, science, and literature; because, moreover, they express their political opinions fearlessly in their places in Parliament; because in some respects, perhaps, they hold superior positions to some of their narrow-souled adversaries, whose envy and jealousy have, in consequence, been painfully excited. Jews of all countries have held their own through so many centuries of dire persecution and virulent opposition, compared with which the present spiteful and malignant *anti-Semitic agitation* in Germany is as nought, that they can well afford to deride their actual traducers, if it were only on the score of the unpardonable and most strange ignorance which they display of Jewish character and conduct, and of their aspirations and daily pursuits."

It is not pleasant, of course, for the Germans that this state of things should exist; no more pleasant in Berlin than it would be in London, to find a race which has not yet at heart coalesced with the country in which it lives, almost monopolising the great prizes in every career. But of the fact itself the Germans have no right to complain; it is they themselves who have deliberately rendered this possible, and they will have to take new lessons in life from those to whom at last they have given what they themselves had long exclusively possessed. But it is not there that the shoe pinches. "The tools to him who can handle them" is a maxim to which sensible men in all countries, Germany included, are not likely to demur. It is the ostentatious luxury, the unscrupulous use of every means of self-aggrandisement, the insults offered by the Jewish press to the Christian religion, the vulgar and almost unbearable arrogance of the Jews themselves, that have irritated Germany, and brought it to a pause of consideration as to the wisdom of its acts of emancipation. For it really amounts to nothing less than this: The Jews have contrived, in these few years of unconditional freedom, to place themselves again on trial before public opinion.

Add to this the force of the traditional convictions, not yet spent, as to the inborn inferiority of the Jew, and something at least has been accomplished towards an estimate of the state of things in Germany. But there is a development which has proved a source of still greater chagrin. Speculations on the Bourse, gigantic monetary operations in loans, limited companies and railways, are impressive enough in their way, but they form the exception and not the rule. It is not in these, nor in the consequent meretricious splendours that the opinion of Europe is for the most part based. In every rank of life the Jew possesses, as history declares, the capacity for taking care of himself in an eminent degree. Mr. Salaman, whose inconsistencies are numerous, disclaims any special tendency to amass wealth on the part of his people, and at the same time excuses it as the only resource placed at their disposal. It is impossible not to recognise the old tone of exultation in such sentences as these:

"Jews in general are observant, discerning, ambitious, and energetic! Recognising the fact that 'there is a tide in the affairs of men, which, taken at the flood, leads on to fortune,' they watch the tides and avail themselves of the floods."

Making reference in this connection to the South Sea Bubble, which burst in 1720, with its accompanying disasters, and seeking to demonstrate by a *tu quoque* argument the unconscionable avarice of Christians, he still finds himself impressed by the superior *finesse* of the Jews. "Consequently when their Christian neighbours were entirely overwhelmed with the loss of all, or nearly all, their possessions, the Jews were found to be unscathed." These words describe precisely what took place in Germany, and notably in Prussia and Berlin, during and following the intoxication of the period of "the milliards," with this difference, that not only did the Jews remain unscathed, but the spoils of the feverish fiscal competition, for the most part, fell into their hands. The complaint is that they have carried out this system of "exploitation" into every rank of life, even into the humblest. In this country, with our ideas of enterprise and abundant means of transit, we do not wholly realise the traditions of inland trade in Central Europe. The commune, the village, frequently has its hereditary tailor or grocer or barber. That the father was either the one or the other makes it a matter of

course that the son should be, and his neighbours are content to have it so. Imagine the disturbance and disgust when some Jew with, let us say, a large supply of ready-made clothing of inferior material but superior finish, suddenly appears and undersells and perhaps ruins the hereditary clothier of a quiet hamlet, and then, the mischief being done and the quality of his goods found out, disappears as suddenly as he came. Again, the testamentary laws of the Continent stand out for the most part in sharp contrast with our laws of primogeniture. An estate, never considerable, divided among two or three, soon becomes a source of difficulty to its owners. Who is it that lends the embarrassed peasant the money which, he illusively imagines, will be the means of placing him in easy circumstances? The same person who, almost on his own terms, takes a mortgage on land, house, furniture, or even growing crops, and, rigidly foreclosing when obligations are not met to the very day and letter, sells to the highest bidder and again disappears—the Jew. At least so say the peasants and small landowners of Germany and Russia, and it is to be observed that the advocates of the Jew have disclaimed, but never confuted, this accusation of their constituting a close corporation of watchful, able, and merciless traders on the needs of others, Moses Mendelssohn and Sir Moses Montefiore notwithstanding. That these circumstances are not accidental, much goes to prove, these aphorisms from the Talmud, for instance:

"When others gather, do thou disperse; when others disperse, do thou gather.

"When thou art the only purchaser, then buy; when other buyers are present, be thou nobody.

"Despise no man and deem nothing impossible; every man hath his hour and everything its place."

The following extracts from Vice-Consul Wagstaff's report, through Consul-General Stanley, to Lord Granville at the Foreign Office, make these facts yet more evident:

"They are the principal dealers in spirits, keepers of 'vodka' (drinking) shops, and houses of ill-fame; receivers of stolen goods; illegal pawnbrokers and usurers. A branch they also succeed in is as Government contractors. With their knowledge of handling money they collude with unscrupulous officials in defrauding the State to vast amounts annually. In fact, the malpractices of some

of the Jewish community have a bad influence on those whom they come in contact with. It must, however, be said that there are many well-educated, highly-respectable, and honourable Jews established in Russia; but they form a small minority. This class is not treated upon in this paper. They thoroughly condemn the occupations of their lower brethren, and one of the results of the late disturbances is noticed at present in the movement among the Jews. They themselves acknowledge the abuses practised by some of their own members, and suggest remedial measures to allay the irritation existing among the working classes. Another thing the Jews are accused of is, that there exists among them a system of Boycotting; they use their religion for business purposes. This is expressed by the words 'Koul,' or 'Kagil,' and 'Kherim.' For instance, in Bessarabia the produce of a vineyard is drawn for by lot, and falls to, say, Jacob Levy; the other Jews of the district cannot compete with Levy, who buys the wine at his own price. Their fame as usurers is well known. Given a Jewish recruit with a few roubles capital, it can be worked out mathematically what time it will take for him to become the money-lender of his company or regiment, from the drummer to the colonel. Take the case of a peasant: if he once gets into the hands of this class, he is irretrievably lost. The proprietor, in his turn, from a small loan gradually mortgages, and eventually loses, his estate. A great deal of landed property in South Russia has of late years passed into the hands of the Israelites, but principally into the hands of intelligent and sober peasants. From first to last, the Jew has his hand in everything. He advances the seed for the sowing, which is generally returned in kind—quarters for bushels. As harvest time comes round, money is required to gather in the crops. This is sometimes advanced on hard conditions; but the peasant has no chance; there is no one to lend him money, and it is better to secure something than to lose all. Very often the Jew buys the whole crop as it stands in the field on his own terms."—*Russia*, No. I., p. 12.

We have been anxious that each side of the question should receive consideration, but there yet remains one aspect of it to be considered. Over the greater part of the area of Europe such brutalities as have occurred in Russia are impossible. Even Spain, whose records are so deeply stained with their tears and blood, opens her frontiers to the expatriated Jews, and almost beseeches them to find a home in her midst. Are there any exceptional circumstances in the Russian national life which explain in any way the recent barbarities that have shocked the moral consciousness of the civilised world? Unquestionably there are.

Stories have been told of the production of a forged ukase, in which the Czar authorised his subjects to plunder the Jews, as a preliminary to several of the most unsparing attacks on life and property. It has been said, too, by the *Golos*, and other organs of Russian public opinion, that the movement, in its inception, has been Nihilistic, the object being to disturb society by any means that presented themselves, so long as a ferment was secured. Apparently there is truth in both these reports, but they do not suffice to account for the facts. The important point is that the Russian peasantry, and Russia is practically without a middle class, are still at best semi-civilised. It is beyond doubt that, whatever may have been the liberal professions of the Russian Government abroad, at home the old policy of autocracy and privilege has never received any important check, due weight being given to the emancipation of the serfs. Russia is still governed not for the sake of those who are ruled, but for the sake of those who rule. Throughout the country the administration is corrupt. In every branch of the Imperial services the revenue is cheated, and bribes pass, almost openly, from hand to hand. The high sense of official dignity and honour, which distinguish Her Majesty's services, are scarcely known; and the result is the absence of respect for those who should claim it, almost by virtue of their office. Even of the courts of justice this holds good, particularly of those which are not courts of appeal; that is to say, of those which are most largely employed by the people. It is no uncommon thing in cases of litigation to find that the amount which has been necessary to purchase a decision is known, and, as well, the way in which it has been raised. To become a judge of a Volost Court, that is, the stipendiary magistrate of a group of communes, is to lose character at once. Indeed, the title has passed into a term of reproach. Nor is it any better with the clergy. Of course, there are exceptions to every rule, but generally speaking, the white clergy—parish priests as distinguished from the monastic orders—are ignorant, of mean birth, and often of bad reputation. In a report presented a few years ago by M. Melnikoff to the Grand Duke Constantine, it was declared that—

"The people do not respect the clergy, but persecute them with derision and reproaches, and feel them to be a burden. In nearly all the popular comic stories, the priest, his wife, or his

labourer is held up to ridicule, and in all the proverbs and popular sayings, when the clergy are mentioned, it is always with derision. The people shun the clergy, and have recourse to them, not from impulse of conscience, but from necessity." *

Once more: in the great educational movement forward, which for the historian of the future will so largely differentiate the present age, the masses of the Russian population have been at a woeful disadvantage. Those who know Russia best, affirm that in the great essentials of national education she is to-day where she was twenty-five years ago, unless, as is probable, she has retrograded. Russia has not yet come to recognise the fundamental axiom of Western civilisation, that the State owes it to itself to make the best of the individuals which compose it. We believe it is not possible to obtain quite recent statistics, but in the latter part of Prince Gortschakoff's chancellorship, with a population of more than 80,000,000, the number of students in the universities was about 6,000. Middle-class schools existed in Poland (where the Jewish population is denser than in any other part of the empire) in the proportion of one school for every 175,000 of the population; in the St. Petersburg district the proportion was one for every 600,000; in the Moscow district, one for every 720,000; in the Kazan district, one for every 1,200,000. The result shows itself plainly enough in the fact that out of every thousand recruits, there are barely ten who can read and write. That is to say, the greater part of the population of Russia is shut out from the commonest benefits of modern progress, and driven to live upon its traditions, superstitions, and ignorance. Consequently, insidious political intriguers, organisers, and agents of secret societies, find an abundance of material ready to their hands. Equally, too, is the Russian at the mercy of such as have taken advantage of what systems of education may happen to be within reach; and throughout Europe the Jews are, with keen prescience, everywhere eagerly seeking and using these advantages. Whatever may be the proportions of literate and illiterate men among the troops, the Russian Jewish refugees at Brody, Liverpool, and New York, were able to read and write almost to a man. But, perhaps, one of the most important facts which it is needful to bear in mind, is the universal pre-

* *Russia*, by D. W. Wallace. Cassell, Petter, and Galpin, Vol. I. p. 87.

valence of drunkenness. The telegrams and despatches in the newspapers and consular reports describe the Jew riots as being commenced by persons (not a few here and there, but whole crowds, hundreds strong) wild with drink. In 1878, when trouble and distress prevailed throughout the country, and the Russo-Turkish war was everywhere adding to the burdens of the national life, the Imperial Government drew from one of the poorest populations in the world, and in the face of wide-spread illicit traffic and administrative peculation, no less a sum than £32,000,000 on account of liquor duties. In 1854 and in 1859, before the system of excise was established under which head the above sum must be classed, the liquor traffic was in the hands of farmers of the revenue, who, as long as they satisfied the Government and the intermediate agents of the Government, were allowed to pillage the people almost at their pleasure. The much-enduring peasantry, exasperated at the prices charged for *vodki*, formed themselves into temperance societies with one simple object in view, to force down the rate at which their favourite spirit was sold. The farmers complained to the Imperial authorities; and, as there was danger that the revenue might be affected, the temperance societies were declared to be illegal secret societies, and were suppressed. The people were compelled to drink, in the literal significance of the words, that the national exchequer might not suffer. They were flogged into drinking, dragooned into drinking; they were seized by soldiers and policemen, and held while the maddening vodki was forced down their throats by means of funnels. They were preached into drunkenness from the pulpit, and every temperance publication was officially declared to be immoral, and was confiscated. In 1865 the same thing occurred with much the same treatment on the part of the Government, with this exception, that fines took the place of physical force and imprisonment. But the monopolists had to give way before the agitation: an excise was substituted, and now that prices rule lower and are less liable to fluctuations, "the lower orders of Russia are drunker than ever."* It will scarcely be credited, though such is the fact, that in addition to this almost satanic pressure, the priest is found in large numbers of parishes acting as the tool in the hands of the landed proprietor and

* *The Russians of Today.* By the Author of *The Member for Paris.* London: Smith, Elder and Co.

distiller, who are often the same person. In many cases he actually receives a commission on the amount of spirits sold within his pastoral jurisdiction, or a *pro rata* present at the end of the year.

In Russia, then, it is tolerably apparent that, while the race-hatred between Gentile and Jew and Jew and Gentile is as powerful as in Germany, there is an absence of those restraints which of late years have kept the Germans within some limits in their relations with the Hebrew people. In many respects, the average Russian still shows himself the original Tatar, and with such examples of tyranny and corruption set before him in high places, and by those to whom he should naturally look for better guidance, he is not to be judged in the same way as the cultured "Anti-Semite" of Prussia and Berlin.

When the question of the relation of the Jew to the Gentile is calmly and impartially considered, it is seen that in many civilised countries the ancient enmity is extinct on neither side. What has transpired of late is the perpetuation of an old feud: the accidental circumstances may differ, but the essential spirit is that which has manifested itself in all history. But the area is narrowing. In France and in Great Britain differences have ceased to exist. In Italy, in Hungary, and in the Danubian Principalities their character is more sporadic than congenital. In Germany they still retain a pronounced definiteness, which, however, has lost the severity of former days, and, in transferring part of its energy to the ranks of those who were formerly the persecuted, shows itself capable of still further adjustment. It is in Russia, the last stronghold of barbarism in the West—for Turkey is ceasing to be a stronghold in any sense of the word—that the old mediæval malevolence still reveals itself; and even Russia, now that Prince Gortschakoff and General Ignatieff have ceased to be the depositaries of the Imperial authority, shows herself under Count Tolstoi to be amenable to reason and compassion. If the question be asked, whether the Jewish race in its European relationships is to be considered blameless, the answer must be distinctly, No! It may suit those who hold a brief for the children of Israel to depict them as shrinking, harmless sufferers, and doubtless there are such among them; but this is only one aspect of the case. Leaving out of consideration the ancient, damnatory traditions, and, excepting a few isolated instances when the old "blood-accu-

sation" has been brought forward, the matter of religious separation, there is, to say the least, enough in the attitude of the modern Continental Jew to provoke remonstrance, and at times to draw upon him an attention anything but friendly. As those of his own race declare, he refuses to blend with his kind; his tribe constitutes a self-seeking brotherhood; he waits upon the weakness and misfortunes of others and is wont only too proudly to display the results of his subtle policy. He claims (there are notable exceptions, of course, and these remarks do not apply to England or France) all the advantages of the commonwealth in which he dwells, while he desires above and beyond this to retain privileges and advantages peculiarly his own. In brief, the Jew has almost everywhere succeeded in impressing on his fellow-citizens the idea that while he holds life to consist in a distribution of giving and taking, it is he, as a rule, who is to take and others who are to give.

But, admitting that there is much to be said on both sides, if the question be now asked, whether the persecutions of the Jews in Russia and the lesser indignities that have been offered to them in Germany are justified, the answer is equally, but with infinitely greater emphasis, No! The Russian persecutions are everywhere felt to be nothing less than a burning shame; and, irresponsible as the great Sclav nation is apt to be to suggestions from without, there are not wanting indications that the pressure of opinion has been too strong to be withstood, and that measures will be taken that the wickedness and disgrace shall not recur. But if the moral sentiments of Russia remain uninfluenced, it is certain that her interests have been touched in another way. The exodus of many thousands of Jews, the financial ruin of many thousands more, and, in addition to this, the entire destruction for the present of commercial confidence, have already cost the empire of the Czar ten times the sum that would have been needed to provide for every Jewish family the most ample protection of life and property. Four-fifths of the population of Russia are engaged in agriculture. Russian merchants and shopkeepers are few. The grain, the timber, the clothing, the provision trades of the west and south were almost entirely in the hands of Jews. The chief bankers were, indeed are, also Jews. But they have either locked up their resources, or, as in the case of Messrs. Ephrussi, of Odessa, the Rothschilds of Southern Russia, have closed their establishments

and quitted the country. Trade has been paralysed, credit impossible to obtain; and in every direction depression and ruin wait on commercial enterprise. The Jews have in large numbers been expelled from Moscow: the approaching Industrial Exposition there is so seriously injured in advance that no one, says the *Golos*, expects that it will prove to be otherwise than a complete failure. For years to come, Russia will have to mourn this national outbreak of savagery.

But, at the same time, the Jew must remember that he also has somewhat to yield. With the exceptions that we have indicated, the desire is everywhere to do justice, and even more than justice, to a people that has seen so many evil days; and in all reasonableness a spirit of reciprocity should be manifested. The time has surely come when many of the tribal distinctions may be modified, and a less jealous attitude towards the affairs of our common kind be adopted. There must be credit given for good-will, and less of the assumption that concessions have been made, not by conviction of right, but by force of circumstances. In Mr. Salaman's book, to which, as we have already hinted, too much importance must not be assigned, either on grounds of literary merit or judicious handling of his subject, it is a matter of regret that this note of feeling is so conspicuous by its absence. For instance, a very brief acknowledgment of the philanthropy of England is scarcely a sufficient counterpoise to the rancorous attacks made on Christian missionary efforts. It is not true that missions to the Jews are a deliberately organised hypocrisy, for the support of a number of men who grow fat on such proceeds as they can gather from credulous people. To select for such an accusation the period when British Christendom was pouring forth her thousands towards the relief of his suffering race, was surely neither a token of generosity nor of refinement of thought. Mr. Salaman must know—if he does not, he is unfit to discuss the question—that the sacred books of the Christians command them to go forth and disciple all nations, "beginning at Jerusalem." The responsibility is not optional, it is obligatory.

It seems never to have occurred to him to ask how much his race, after all, owes to Jesus of Nazareth. As he compares the Jews of Yemen, India, and China with the Western Jews, one thing surely will become clear, that if it had not been for Him whom they reject, the children of Israel must have sunk, long since, into obscurity. It is

His name which defines their connection with civilisation. They will refuse to believe it, but there is a sense in which, even now, He is the Saviour of their race.

It is true that England does not stand in the best conceivable position for making herself heard in the matter of the complete emancipation of the Jews; not in as good a position as that occupied by her, earlier in the century, on the question of slavery. During the first half of this century, and for some years in the second half, their disabilities in this country were greater and more numerous than is generally supposed. For example, in 1846, the sumptuary regulations of Queen Anne, requiring Jews to wear a distinctive costume, were still unrepealed, though obsolete. The same holds good of the Act which compelled Jews to subsidise their children when converted to Christianity. During the first third of the century, no Jew was allowed to open a shop in the City of London proper, and only twelve brokers were permitted to exercise their calling. Baron Lionel de Rothschild was elected to Parliament five times by the City constituency, and was eleven years a member of the House of Commons without being permitted to take the oath. It was only in 1858, after the scandal caused by the omission, on the part of Alderman Salomans, of the words "on the faith of a Christian," from the oath, that it became possible for Jews to enter upon all the rights of citizenship, and represent their constituencies in Parliament. Nevertheless, it may be said that we are in advance of most other nations in the policy of justice and liberty. It is legitimate for us to plead that elsewhere the same policy should be carried out, and, in proportion as the period of injustice was unduly prolonged among ourselves, should be the persistence of our efforts everywhere to alleviate the condition of the Jews.

ART. VI.—1. *The Encyclopædia Britannica.* Ninth Edition. Volume X. Article "Gospels." Edinburgh: Adam and Charles Black.

2. *The Gospel according to St. John: The Authorised Version, with Introduction and Notes.* By B. F. WESTCOTT, D.D., D.C.L., Regius Professor of Divinity, Cambridge, Canon of Peterborough, and Chaplain in Ordinary to the Queen. London: John Murray. 1882.

3. *St. John the Author of the Fourth Gospel.* By CHRISTOPH ERNST LUTHARDT, Professor of Theology at Leipzig. Revised, Translated, and the Literature much Enlarged, by CASPAR RÉNE GREGORY, Leipzig. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark. 1875.

4. *The Authorship and Historical Character of the Fourth Gospel. Considered in reference to the Contents of the Gospel Itself. A Critical Essay.* By WILLIAM SANDAY, M.A., Fellow of Trinity College, Oxford. London: Macmillan and Co. 1872.

5. *Onesimus: Memoirs of a Disciple of St. Paul.* By the Author of "Philochristus." London: Macmillan and Co. 1882.

6. *Through Nature to Christ; or, The Ascent of Worship through Illusion to Truth.* By EDWIN A. ABBOTT, D.D., formerly Fellow of St. John's College, Cambridge. London: Macmillan and Co. 1877.

IT is not to be wondered at that they should reject the Fourth Gospel altogether who fine down the Synoptic Gospels to the smallest possible quantity of original tradition in order to rid themselves of the supernatural. If the presence or absence of that which passes human understanding constitutes the infallible criterion of truth or falsehood, credibility or incredibility, then the Gospel according to St. John stands self-condemned. For this Life of our Lord is of a piece throughout; it cannot be separated into portions, of which part can be pronounced genuine, and part stigmatised as later and unauthoritative additions. No ingenuity of scientific or unscientific criticism can disintegrate it; it must be received as a whole or rejected as a whole. And the supernatural is inextricably inter-

woven into its texture; it is of the substance of both warp and woof. The Christ set forth by "the disciple whom Jesus loved" is the Incarnate Son of God. The acceptance of St. John's Gospel as historically true does not merely drive from the field the coarser and completer forms of scepticism; it leaves no room for the refined rationalism which objects only to the miraculous and what it considers interference with the laws of nature, and which professes faith in God and in a revelation from God through Christ, provided that the quantity and quality of the assent required be sufficiently indefinite, and that God leave the physical universe perfectly free from His own visible action.

The rationalist of every shade must resist the genuineness of the Fourth Gospel even to the death. Its standpoint and his are mutually exclusive, its principles and his bluntly antagonistic. St. John represents Jesus Christ as Lord over both mind and matter; as claiming the loftiest dignity and the most unlimited power; as the sole means by which man can approach God; as the atonement for the world's sin; as operating directly upon physical forces, and subordinating them to His own will, healing by a word and at a distance, raising the dead body which had already begun to decay. The Christ of St. John promises to His disciples His perpetual presence with them, not as a memory, an influence, an inspiration, but in a living Person, the Spirit of God, with whom He is mysteriously one. Union with Him constitutes the only true life; not metaphorical union, but union close, intimate, real, permanent. Here rationalism can have no place; every page of the book is consistently instinct with the supernatural. God has come down to man that He may raise man to Himself. All this is admitted universally and without dispute. It would be easy to indicate other points at which the Fourth Gospel and rationalism, whether ancient or modern, are diametrically opposed. The spirit of the one is at issue with the spirit of the other, and the conflict descends into minutest details.

In the preceding number of this REVIEW* we examined the conception of Jesus Christ contained in the writings of Dr. Abbott, and his opinions regarding the sources whence the true idea of the character and work and history of our Lord must be gathered. We found that Dr. Abbott's

* See Article IV., "The Christ of Fiction," pp. 348-381.

representation of Jesus was based avowedly upon an hypothesis as to the untrustworthiness of the Synoptic Gospels in their present form, and the possibility of disinterring from them an original tradition which, on the whole, may be accepted as an honest and not intentionally exaggerated report, though even this passably genuine narrative must be received *cum grano salis*, and interpreted upon principles very different from those of its compilers. We endeavoured to show that the theory of the fictitious nature of the first three Gospels was an arbitrary assumption, and we pressed the serious and incredible consequences the theory involved as to the intellectual and moral character of the witnesses themselves, and of the Church which received and circulated their testimony. We believe as firmly as Dr. Abbott in the existence of an original tradition, and in the possibility of recovering a more or less close approximation to it; but we do not believe that every addition to it is unauthentic or ought to be looked at with suspicion. Specially do we enter our *caveat* against the implied axiom that every account of a miracle bears upon its face the impress of falsehood, or ignorance, or mistake.

Neither *Onesimus* nor *Philochristus*—in which concrete expression is given to their author's views concerning the historical Christ—directly mentions the Fourth Gospel. Perhaps no real ground of complaint lies against the former of these books on account of this omission. The last of the Gospels was not written at the date at which the martyrdom of Onesimus is supposed to take place. But even in this case we may observe, without carping criticism, that, as we shall see in due course, Dr. Abbott in other works acknowledges the existence of a tradition which gave currency from the earliest times to certain sayings of our Lord's now preserved for us in the Gospel according to St. John. No trace of them appears in *Onesimus*; the *only* tradition is the triple tradition. The absence of all reference in *Philochristus* to the deeds and words recorded by St. John assumes a yet more unsatisfactory aspect. True, St. John receives scarcely worse treatment than St. Matthew and St. Luke, but the bias is worth noting that retails stories contained in isolated manuscripts or quoted by some one or more of the Fathers, and by intentionally significant silence endeavours to affix the stamp of untrustworthiness to the writings of at least three out of the four Evangelists. This question of *animus* derives importance

from the determined manner in which the opinions as to the composition of our present Gospels, popularised in Dr. Abbott's two fictions, are maintained in serious argument in the *Encyclopædia Britannica*. The picture of Jesus Christ limned in *Philochristus* is practically declared to be the nearest approach to a genuine portrait attainable at this day; the method of dealing with the four Gospels pursued in *Onesimus* is asserted to be the only one worthy of sound science and critical scholarship. The purpose of the stories is no less earnest and aggressive than that of the formal discussions. There can be no unfairness in regarding the whole of their author's writings as one work, levelled at one object.

It is, of course, to the *Encyclopædia* article that we must turn for the full statement and defence of the theory before us. It merits attention because of the learning and literary skill of its expounder, but much more because nowhere else can we find the principles of the school of thought whence it proceeds expressed so clearly and authoritatively in native English. These principles must not be confused with those of the author of *Supernatural Religion;* it is not denied that Jesus of Nazareth had a true message from God to man. Indeed the theory as a whole strives to reconcile the conflicting claims of critical science and Revelation, as we noted in our former article, but at the sacrifice of everything save a certain vague sentiment and the shadow of a great—even a Divine—name. The attack upon the genuineness of St. John scarcely stands in as intimate a relation to the general hypothesis as the dissection of the Synoptic Gospels. The rejection of the Fourth Gospel is rather a corollary than a portion of the hypothesis itself; it may be reached too by a distinct line of reasoning. Hence in our examination of it we shall meet with fewer of Dr. Abbott's peculiarities and altogether much less that is novel than we did when we glanced at his criticism of the Synoptists. The *Encyclopædia* article however furnishes an able and thoroughly trustworthy view of the Johannean controversy, as it appears from the standpoint of antagonism to the Gospel. It is not quite easy to name a solitary English champion of the orthodox school. Canon Westcott's elaborate Introduction to his *St. John* might entitle him to that place, were it not that the inclusion of his work in *The Speaker's Commentary* prevented his adding a notice of Dr. Abbott's article on the publication of his

comment as a separate volume. For pith and directness the brief Introduction to the Gospel according to St. John by Professors Milligan and Moulton in the *Popular Commentary* cannot readily be surpassed, but it deals merely with the broadest phases of the question. Nor must we omit to mention Dr. Sanday's book placed at the head of this article, which we regret to hear is "out of print"—unique as a thoughtful study of St. John from within outwards.*

Let us settle it accurately in our minds what the denial of the apostolic authorship involves, what it is that incredulity on this subject requires us to believe. Undoubtedly the Gospel claims to have been written by St. John. "The disciple whom Jesus loved"—"this is the disciple which beareth witness of these things, and wrote these things." The familiar line of argument by which it is proved that the author was a Palestinian Jew, an eye-witness, a member of the apostolic band, the son of Zebedee, is acknowledged to be the inference which the writer of the Gospel intended should be drawn. Plainly, firmly, consistently, the Gospel asserts itself to be the work of St. John. The sole alternative to the acceptance of this declaration is that the witness is a falsehood, the Gospel a forgery. To very many minds this initial difficulty presents a fatal obstacle to any and every hypothesis of a different authorship from that which is impressed upon the book itself. Ponder the intense sincerity, the deep spirituality, the experimental truthfulness, the burning hatred of sin which pervade the Gospel; weigh well the immaculate inward purity of Christ as displayed in its pages, and mark how evidently the painting of this portrait is a labour of love, how thoroughly the soul of the writer is in sympathy with the absolutely guileless Character to whom he testifies; turn to his First Epistle—in all probability the preface or postscript to his Gospel—note his loathing, his holy scorn of the "liar," and that with him the "liar" is

* Lapse of time has rendered the carefully collected and highly useful *Literature* appended to Luthardt's monograph imperfect. But that alone shows that it is impossible for us even to name all the English writers on our subject. We fear that we must direct the English reader to a foreign source for the fullest and most satisfactory discussion of the question. In spite of the great value we attach to Luthardt's volume, for subtlety, insight, and mastery of the subject, the preference must be given to Godet's Introduction to his *Commentary on St. John's Gospel*. We cannot endorse all his opinions, but every line of his is worth weighing. It is perhaps unnecessary to say that his Introduction was written before the publication of the ninth volume of the *Encyclopædia Britannica*.

he who deviates however slightly from "the truth."* Conceive it possible that this man was guilty of deliberate, systematic, cunningly planned and executed falsehood and forgery! Can the intellectual, literary, critical objections advanced — especially when heavily discounted by the various solutions of them—compare with the moral miracle of such a concord between Christ and Belial? The "subjectivity" of the Fourth Gospel is opposed frequently to its historical accuracy. But that very subjectivity has its value upon the other side of the argument. Something must be allowed for the moral qualities displayed. If it is fair to reason that the plan and purpose, the individuality of the book cause us to suspect that facts have been coloured, altered and invented to bring the actual life of Christ into harmony with the biographer's design, it is surely as fair to argue that the high and genuine religious and moral tone of the composer forbids us to think that he could have stooped to the meanness.

Discussions concerning the veracity of the writer of the Gospel called after St. John proceed so quietly, and are conducted so rigorously upon purely critical grounds, that we are apt to overlook the moral question which in reality forms the substratum of the whole. For example, the minute details of events recorded, the accurate acquaintance with the lesser topography of Palestine manifested, the touches of personal and local colouring scattered throughout the narrative, have been urged—and rightly—as proofs that the book must have come from an eye-witness. On the other hand, it is retorted that the knowledge of Judæa shown is not greater than an Alexandrian Jew might have gained who "had spent two or three passovers at Jerusalem" and travelled over the country observantly, and that the Apocryphal Gospels demonstrate that "graphic details of scenes and place do not imply an eye-witness." We strike the balance of evidence—could this or that detail, could the *tout ensemble*, be the production of some Defoe of the second century? The decision that these particulars do not indicate truthfulness would be against the enormous weight of evidence. But if we come to a different decision before passing to the next

* 1 John i. 6, 8, 10; ii. 6, &c. Cf. John viii. 44, 45. That the First Epistle of John came from the same hand as the Gospel is now so little doubted that we can assume the fact as granted. At any rate Dr. Abbott believes their common authorship. His theory of the "motive" of *St. John* grounds itself upon it, as we shall see by-and-by.

point that demands judgment, we are bound to pause and ask, If these "graphic details . . . do not imply an eye-witness," what is it that they do imply? Many of them do not at all help the narrative; they *look exactly like* the semi-unconscious reminiscences of an old man recalling the distant but vividly remembered past. They are then designed to give an air of verisimilitude to a fictitious account. If they do not imply an eye-witness, they imply a consummately skilful and determined deceiver. We are confronted again by the unsolvable psychological riddle that ascribes to one man utterly incompatible relations both to truth and to falsehood. Bare justice would seem to require that these indirect, but none the less forcible and intentional assertions, should not be separated from the character of the speaker as manifested in the substance of his words.

It is needless to pursue this argument further or to meet the objection that the guilt of literary forgery is a modern refinement of conscience. St. Paul has stamped the statement a libel that the early Church permitted the commission of evil in the hope of subsequent good. And if the Fourth Gospel be a forgery, it is no ordinary one. It is not an unintentional or careless exaggeration, but a deliberate attempt to change the world's conception of Jesus Christ, and to lead mankind to worship Him by a series of cunningly devised fables. But this suggests another consideration. The Gospel commonly ascribed to St. John was, *ex hypothesi*, not written by him, but by some unknown author. The Newer Criticism never wearies of pointing out its complex yet readily intelligible plot, its acquaintance with the learning of its time, its profound theology, its *invented* parables, events and discourses. If it be a work of fiction, it stands unrivalled as the outcome of its age. It is a production immensely disproportionate to the rest of the literature of its period. Historic criticism generally regards sporadic growths with extreme suspicion. Why should an exception be made in favour of this half-Christian, half-Philonian novel? Why does the difficulty of accounting for the unlikeness of this marvellous work of imagination to contemporary literature sink into insignificance and never distress the trained taste that perceives it to be fiction, not history? Its author must have been the intellectual giant of his time, yet his very name has perished without trace. He must have possessed

overwhelming influence over the Church to persuade it to receive his fabrication, yet no memory of him survived even for a few decades. So mysterious and complete a disappearance might stagger the most ruthless and confident of destructive critics.

The division of the *Encyclopædia* article devoted to St. John begins with a sharp contrast between the style of the Book of the Revelation of St. John the Divine and the life of Christ attributed to the same pen. The conclusion arrived at is, "that the Apocalypse and the Fourth Gospel should have been written by the same author, would be, we will not say impossible, but one of the most marvellous literary phenomena ever authenticated." That St. John wrote the Revelation Dr. Abbott considers as firmly established as any statement with regard to the authorship of the books of the New Testament can be. It would be perfectly feasible to maintain the equal strength of the chain of evidence in favour of the Johannean origin of the Gospel with that which declares the same origin for the Apocalypse. If the two works cannot proceed from one pen, we think as good—or as bad—a case might be made out for the condemnation of the vision as the history. Certainly the moral turpitude of the former forgery would not exceed that of the latter. And, explicitly or implicitly, it is admitted by almost every one that Father for Father, heretic and gainsayer for heretic and gainsayer, quotation and reference for quotation and reference, tradition for tradition, general acceptance for general acceptance—the external testimony to the Gospel is little, if any, weaker than the external testimony to the Apocalypse. If the witness to the final book of the New Testament is slightly the superior in definiteness, that to the last Gospel possesses a counterbalancing preponderance in the history of the Canon. In truth, the opposition to St. John takes its rise in the contents of the book itself. Imagine that there existed a memoir of Jesus of Nazareth called after one of the Twelve, with no more of external authentication than our present St. John, which recorded no miracle, but represented a loftily human Christ—such a treatise would be hailed rapturously as a survival of the Original Tradition, and every assault upon its genuineness would be laughed to scorn. It does not follow, of course, that objections founded upon internal characteristics should weigh lightly; but it is of importance that the main principles upon which

the rejection* is founded should be clearly understood, that we should discern whence it is that they derive their life. The Apocalypse, it is thought, can be explained without recourse to the actually supernatural. It consists of a series of visions and allegorical representations, which may have been evolved from an excited brain crowded with Old-Testament imagery. But the Gospel is not susceptible of such a simple solution, if it is acknowledged as the testimony of an eye-witness.

No illustrations are vouchsafed of the "complete contrast" between the Gospel and the Revelation. We are summarily assured that "the vocabulary, the forms, the idioms, the rhythm, the thought—all is different." The Christian apologist does not dispute the diversity of style; he contends only that the diversity is not too vast to be bridged over, and that a striking similarity exists side by side with it. Whether it is precisely fair play to assert the discrepancy strongly and to base an argument upon it as though there were no counter evidence, may be questioned. The reader who will consult Canon Westcott's Introduction to his Commentary upon the Gospel, or Archdeacon Lee's equally able Introduction to the Revelation in the concluding volume of *The Speaker's Commentary*, will speedily be convinced that Dr. Abbott's dictum is far too abrupt and sweeping. Nevertheless, the difference in style is broadly marked and must impress every student of the original. But let us assume that the account given by both books of their origin is true; and let us allow that that unknown factor, inspiration, intensified thought and feeling; and the two edges of the gap have nearly met. A banished apostle, on a lonely islet, "in the Spirit," suddenly perceives a terrifying but most exalting Appearance. He is borne from rapt vision to vision; the inscrutable future is unveiled before him and the secrets of heaven are displayed. He has the soul of a Hebrew prophet; and the revelations assume the symbolism of the Hebrew sanctuary. Is it wonderful that his style is impetuous and rugged, that he consciously† or unconsciously violates grammatical constructions of not quite familiar Greek, that his language takes form and even expression from his native Aramaic? Tracing the progress

* *Rejection*, i.e., by the theological school with which we are now dealing.

† In all likelihood some at least of the Apocalyptic violations of grammatical concords have a theologic significance, as Charles Wesley's "The Father, Son, and Holy Ghost *is* ready, &c."

of God's judgments, he speaks with something of the old Boanerges, fire-desiring spirit. Contrast with such an one the saint who has outlived all his fellows, who has seen in the destruction of the Temple the sign that he must lose the Hebrew in the Christian, who waits peacefully for his summons to his Lord. In the tranquil solitude of his chamber, or surrounded with attached disciples, he records memories of his youth, of his intercourse with One Whose gentle spirit has been the model into which his old age has mellowed. Protracted residence in a Hellenist city—possibly even assiduous study—has bestowed upon him facility and precision in the use of the Greek language. The diverse styles are the natural expression of diverse circumstances and emotions. An unprecedented literary phenomenon certainly; but where shall we seek for parallel conditions? Identity of style in so dissimilar mental and physical circumstances would be a greater marvel than the much magnified diversity.

"There is yet another difficulty in the way of believing that John the Apostle is the author: the words of Jesus in the Fourth Gospel (1) differ altogether in style and rhythm from the Synoptic tradition of the words of the Lord; and (2) do not differ at all from the author's own remarks and observations." Here again the dictum stands unsupported, and no notice whatever is taken of the explanations which have been offered of these phenomena. Nevertheless the standard answer to the first objection seems sufficient. Discourses addressed to an inner circle of disciples or spoken in controversy with highly-trained rabbis *ought* to differ from sayings uttered in the ears of an illiterate peasantry. To the second objection a double reply lies to hand. The discourses are not *verbatim* reports. Condensation inevitably betrays the style of the condenser; and, adds Canon Westcott with much pertinence, "The force of these considerations is increased if, as seems surely established, most of the discourses recorded by St. John were spoken in Aramaic; . . . the record of the Evangelist contains not only a condensed summary of what was said, but that also a summary in a translation." It may be however that, consciously or unconsciously, St. John imitates the manner of our Lord in his "own remarks and observations." If the sayings of his Master were the constant meditation of the beloved disciple year after year, it would be but natural that he should catch his Master's tone.

The Evangelist may have given to his report of the words of Jesus something of his own individuality: the thoughts and expressions of Jesus may have permeated the Evangelist's mind, so that he reproduces them instinctively and this dominant influence is ever observable upon his own utterances. The two suppositions do not exclude each other.

If St. John did not compose the Fourth Gospel, there still remains "the hypothesis of joint authorship or revision." The legend preserved in the Muratorian fragment indicates a tradition favourable to this hypothesis, which the contrast between the singular and plural pronouns in John xxi. 24, 25, and in 1 John i. 1, ii. 7, confirms. Hence it is argued that the Apostle "may have written it (1) through an amanuensis, or disciple, who translated his language (and possibly his thoughts also) in the process of expressing them, . . . or (2) it may have been an attempt on the part of a leading teacher of the Johannine school at Ephesus to reproduce the spirit of their Master's teaching after He had been taken from them by death." And at the close of the whole article, after an affirmation that the beloved disciple's name was, in all likelihood, affixed dishonestly to the Gospel, it is allowed that it is not "in the least unlikely that this Gospel does represent the teaching of Andrew and Philip, and Aristion and John the Elder, as well as that of John." The hypothesis of an amanuensis is perfectly gratuitous. If the Apostle dictated, the amanuensis would carefully write down his words. Reverence for the last surviving companion of the Lord and desire to retain his testimony would prevent any tampering with his thoughts and language. The second theory fails in the face of the strongly marked unity and individuality of the Gospel. Every argument we have urged previously lies against it, and it is open, moreover, to the further objection that it involves the Ephesian elders in the crime of fraudulently attaching St. John's name, with all possible solemnity, to a document which they knew to be the workmanship of one or more of their own number. But two admissions deserve to be noted. No valid reason exists for ascribing a late date to the composition of the Gospel, for St. John may have himself written it through an amanuensis. And if so, what becomes of the subsequent suggestions that its events, expressions, and thoughts were modelled upon the Philonian philosophy? The other

admission is scarcely less important. The Gospel does contain genuine historic elements which cannot be explained away. In acknowledging this, Dr. Abbott only puts himself *en rapport* with later criticism of a hostile type. But Rationalism must be hardly bestead before it adopts the desperate expedient of joint authorship, or the capitulating expedient of mediate authorship, which leaves the Gospel in immediate contact with St. John's contemporaries and surrenders incontinently that lapse of time which allows of the development of myth and is absolutely necessary for rebutting the external evidence.

A somewhat extended examination of the alleged quotations from St. John's Gospel by the Early Fathers follows the preliminary objections to the Apostolic authorship. The utmost is made of the possible confusion between John the Apostle and John the Presbyter. Great stress is laid upon the silence of Papias as to the origin of the Fourth Gospel, and upon the fact that the one saying ascribed to St. John that has come down to us through Papias—"the days will come in which vines shall grow, having each ten thousand branches, &c."—is not only uncanonical, but entirely dissimilar to the style of both Gospel and First Epistle, though not to that of the Apocalypse. That the origin of a book of the New Testament about which he had gleaned nothing that was not generally known was distinctly without the limits that Papias laid down for himself, as has been shown repeatedly, goes for nothing. And it is quite overlooked that the admitted likeness of style to the Revelation argues that it is rightly ascribed to John the Apostle, and tends to fix upon him the title "the disciple of the Lord," which Papias uses. Surely there is no similarity between the emblematical "saying" and the style of 2 and 3 John which, according to Dr. Abbott's school, were written by the Presbyter. The references of Polycarp, the Ignatian letters, the Shepherd of Hermas, &c., are not deemed sufficiently definite to be denominated *quotations;* they may be accounted for by the existence of a "floating tradition" from Johannine sources. But Dr. Abbott's full strength is devoted to Justin Martyr. The passages usually adduced in proof of Justin's knowledge of St. John are all tested, especially the crucial reference to the new birth. His doctrine of the Logos is carefully compared with St. John's, and adjudged to be an earlier phase of it. Dr. Ezra Abbott's discovery of an allusion to 1

John iii. 1—"We are both called true children of God, and we are" (cf. the Revised Version)—appears to have escaped his namesake. He concludes this section of the article thus:

"It appears therefore that, although Justin knew certain traditions embodied in the Fourth Gospel, yet (1) it was not read in the church services of the district in the same way as the 'memoirs of the Apostles;' (2) he did not use the Gospel as an authoritative document; (3) his teaching exhibits less of development than the teaching of the Fourth Gospel. An inevitable inference follows that, if he knew of the existence of the Fourth Gospel as a document, he did not believe it to be the work of the Apostle John. The general conclusion to which we are thus led by the external evidence of quotations is that, although some of the *doctrine* of the Fourth Gospel, expressed in words similar to the words of the Fourth Gospel, was probably current in the Ephesian church toward the end of the first half of the second century, yet it was not by that time widely used, if at all, as an authoritative document; nor have we proof that it was so used till the times of Irenæus, *i.e.*, towards the end of the second century, by which time the Gospel was authoritatively quoted as a work of John; and those who so quoted it probably meant by 'John' John, the son of Zebedee, the Apostle."

We had intended to treat the relation of Justin Martyr to St. John at some length, but in the current number of the *Modern Review* * Dr. Abbott commences, though he does not conclude, a fresh essay upon this subject. We will therefore wait till the whole of his case is before us, and content ourselves with a brief remark or two upon his method of dealing with the external evidence. Admit, then, for the sake of argument, that the early patristic references would be adequately accounted for by tradition if the Fourth Gospel did not exist; at any rate some confirmation of the truthfulness of St. John accrues from its agreement with pre-existing tradition. And as these references may be to the Gospel, no inference unfavourable to it can be drawn from the silence of the primitive Fathers. The external evidence previous to the time of Irenæus is assumed to consist solely of these patristic references. But, believers in the Johannine authorship attach high value to the testimony of heretics and gainsayers. Except as the Valen-

* Perhaps it is worth noting that the *Modern Review* is avowedly an Unitarian organ.

tinian heresy bears upon Justin Martyr's knowledge of St. John, not a single syllable is spoken of any witness without the Church. This quiet ignoring of cogent evidence ill accords with the scientific spirit.* Before the end of the second century the Fourth Gospel was recognised everywhere as St. John's. This fact is stated none too strongly. But it cannot remain an isolated fact. The Gospel cannot have dropped from the clouds in various parts of Christendom simultaneously. It could not have found its way into all the churches without a history and an authentication. This point is so admirably and tersely put by Drs. Milligan and Moulton, that we cannot refrain from copying their words:

"The real ground of conviction is the consistent belief of the Church. It is not for those who accept the Gospel to account for its admission into the canon of the last quarter of the second century, on the supposition that it is true; it is for those who reject it to account for this, on the supposition that it is false. The early Church was not a mass of individual units believing in Jesus, each in his own way nourishing in secrecy and independence his own form of faith. It was an organized community, conscious of a common foundation, a common faith, and common ordinances of spiritual nourishment for all persons in all lands who held the one Head, Christ Jesus. It was a body, every one of whose members sympathized with the other members: to every one of them the welfare of the whole was dear, and was moreover the most powerful earthly means of securing his own spiritual progress. The various generations of the Church overlapped one another; her various parts were united by the most loving relation and the most active intercourse; and all together guarded the common faith with a keenness of interest which has not been surpassed in any subsequent age of the Church's history. Even if we had not one probable reference to the Fourth Gospel previous to A.D. 170, we should be entitled to ask with hardly less confidence than we may ask now, How did this book find its way into the canon as the Gospel of John? How is it that the moment we hear of it we hear of it everywhere, in France, Italy, North Africa, Egypt, Syria? No sooner do the sacred documents of any local church come to light than the Fourth Gospel is among them, is publicly read in the congregations of the faithful, is used as a

* Nor is anything said about the recent discovery in connection with Tatian's *Diatessaron*. It is mentioned, however, in the renewed assault. It is enough to observe now that Tatian's *Diatessaron* supplies positive proof of the *existence* of St. John's Gospel shortly after the date of the *Apology*.

means for nourishing the spiritual life, is quoted in controversies of doctrine, is referred to in disputes as to practice. It is simply an impossibility that this could have taken place within ten or twenty or thirty years after some single congregation of the widespread Church had accepted it from the hands of an unknown individual as (whether claiming to be so or not) the production of John the Apostle."

Under the head of "Internal Evidence," we have an elaborate section entitled, "The Fourth Gospel Compared with the Synoptic Narrative." No one questions the difference between the two presentations of Jesus Christ. But we forbear to characterise the tone, surcharged with insinuations of evil, in which this difference is displayed. Practical accusations of effective exaggeration and even falsehood, of colouring and altering the simple statements of the Three so as to exalt the Logos, abound. It is not possible for us within our space to animadvert upon all the charges: let us take, however, three consecutive specimens:

"The agony described by Luke (xxii. 44, and, without Luke's additions, in Matt. xxvi. 39, and Mark xiv. 35, 36) when the Lord prayed that 'the cup might pass from Him,' and when an 'angel' appeared from heaven strengthening Him, may seem, at first sight, to have no counterpart in John. And indeed the Synoptic description of the agony in Gethsemane is not adapted for the Fourth Gospel. Inserted in any page of that Gospel, it could not fail to jar upon us as being out of harmony with the context. Nevertheless, a remarkable passage in John (xii. 27) appears to bear a striking resemblance to the account in Luke: 'Now is My soul troubled.' Thus the Saviour avows a certain conflict in His heart, yet by the very deliberateness (as well as by the publicity) of the avowal takes from it something of the intense and almost passionate humanity of the Synoptic narrative. Immediately after these words the Saviour, in the Fourth Gospel, deliberately suggests to Himself the Synoptic prayer, and repeats it: 'What shall I say? "Father, save Me from this hour?" But for this cause came I to this hour.' At once triumphing over the—from the point of view of the Fourth Gospel—unworthy suggestion, He exclaims, 'Father, glorify Thy name.' Upon this comes the heaven-sent message, but not (as in Luke) an 'angel' to 'strengthen' one 'in an agony praying more earnestly;' on the contrary, the voice does but ratify the Saviour's utterance: 'I have both glorified it, and will glorify it again.' Finally, the author adds, as usual, the babble of the multitude, as a foil to the all-knowing wisdom of the Divine Word: 'The people therefore

that stood by and heard it said that it thundered; others said, An angel hath spoken to Him.' No answer to their doubts and questionings is given by Jesus; but we are left under the impression that the 'I' is uttered, neither by thunder nor by any mere angel of God, but by the Father Himself. A soul 'troubled;' a prayer to be saved from the trouble; the suppression of that prayer, after more or less of conflict, and the substitution of another prayer in its place; and lastly, a message or messenger (ἄγγελος) from heaven—the facts are much the same, both in Luke and in John, yet how different is the treatment of the facts, and what a world of difference in the spiritual result!"

We have given this specimen in full, we will abridge the other two:

"Almost the only passage in which John adopts a few consecutive words of the Synoptic narrative is the narrative of the anointing (xii. 3-8). There is much less similarity between Peter's confession, as recorded in John vi. 68, and as recorded in Matt. xvi. 16, Mark viii. 30, Luke ix. 20; but the narratives appear to refer to the same event. . . . . In Matthew and Mark the confession of Peter constitutes a turning-point in the life of Jesus, . . . in the whole Synoptic narrative of the life of Christ there is not a more important crisis than this. But in the Johannine narrative crises are out of place, where all is preordained; and instead of the tender questioning, the inspired confession, and the fervent blessing, we have simply an almost casual appeal of the Lord to His disciples, 'Will ye also depart?' which, when a response has been made by Peter, is followed, not by a blessing, but by sad words conveying the assurance that the Word of God, who chose the twelve, knows all their weaknesses as well as their strength, and cannot be surprised either by confession or by betrayal: 'Jesus answered, Have not I chosen you twelve, and one of you is a devil?' Both in the Fourth Gospel and in the Synoptists (Matt. xvi. 23, Mark ix. 33), immediately after the blessing of Peter mention is made of 'Satan' or 'devil.' To bless Peter, and to call him 'Satan' immediately afterwards, is consistent with the human Christ described by Mark and Matthew. The difficulty is avoided, in Luke, by omission; but the Fourth Gospel, retaining the traditional mention of the word 'Satan,' or 'devil,' directs it to Judas; upon whom elsewhere the Fourth Gospel (xii. 4-8) concentrates the faults imputed by Matthew (xxvi. 8) not to Judas alone but to all the disciples.

"Readers who may think that this last dislocation of the words of Jesus appears somewhat improbable should consider carefully the patent instance which follows. In the Synoptic account of the betrayal, Matthew and Mark represent Jesus as awaking the

sleeping disciples at the moment of the arrival of the traitor and his band, with the words, 'Rise, let us be going (ἐγείρεσθε, ἄγωμεν). Behold, he that betrayeth Me is at hand' (Matt. xxvi. 46, Mark xiv. 42). Luke alters this; it is too human for him, seeming to imply flight . . . (Luke xxii. 44). But John, while averse to this change of traditional words, neutralises their questionable effect by taking them completely out of their context. Accordingly, he places them between the discourse on peace in ch. xiv. and the discourse on the vine in ch. xv. . . . . Rising from the sacred meal, and going forth to welcome 'His hour,' the Saviour says,—as if with the consciousness that He is the High Priest of the World, going forth to celebrate the sacrifice foreordained before the foundation of the world,—'But that the world may know that I love the Father, and as the Father gave Me commandment, even so I do. Arise, let us go hence (ἐγείρεσθε, ἄγωμεν ἐντεῦθεν).'"

To which shall we pay our first tribute, to the ingenuity of the paragraphs or their effrontery, to their cleverness or their groundlessness? If these surmises had any foundation, it would mean that the Fourth Gospel was written not simply to correct the impressions left by the Synoptic Gospels, but to contradict their statements blankly. Yet it is almost inconceivable that Dr. Abbott intends that the author could have imagined that by the narrative in John xii. he could counteract the misrepresentations of his predecessors about the bloody sweat of Jesus and the prayer that the cup might pass from him. The Original Tradition and the three recensions of it each relate the agony and definitely fix its time and place and witnesses. The pseudo-John describes another scene; locality, auditors, occasion, all are changed. The difference is complete, and every hint that the two events are one is rigorously excluded. There is no angel, no cup, no sweat. Nevertheless, this Ephesian teacher fancies that his readers will perceive without any assistance that the two events are one, and his account the more credible of the four which they possess. If this was his thought, the issue proved him egregiously mistaken. The Church accepted his fiction in complete ignorance of his scheme, and placed it in the same volume as the triple narrative of the agony in Gethsemane, without so much as suspecting that she was duped. And, even stranger, upwards of seventeen centuries passed before the truth dawned upon an exceptionally acute student. This pseudo-John concocted his plan a great deal too cunningly.

Preposterous is not an improper word to apply to the entire theory. The immensity of the alteration, the over-subtlety of the device, to say nothing of the sacrilegious fraud, condemn it. And whether or no the report of the babble of the multitude was designed to exalt by comparison the omniscience of the Divine Word, it sounds like an incident preserved in the memory of a spectator, and uttered as an interesting reminiscence of the event. A forger desirous of embellishing his narrative in order to support the superhuman qualities of Jesus, would have declared that every awestruck auditor at once recognised the voice of God (the Bath Kol), and was terrified into at least temporary submission. Such an author would never have recorded the doubts of the people, lest he should prompt kindred doubts in the minds of his readers.

Similar reasoning applies, *mutatis mutandis*, to the second of our specimens. Moreover, it is difficult to believe that a writer anxious to enhance St. Peter's confession would have altered the wording of it from *Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God* to *Thou art the Holy One of God*, especially when he distinctly declares that his object in writing is to show that Jesus is *the Christ, the Son of God*. The second form of confession is much less Johannean than the first. Nor is it more credible that an author should change "Satan" to "devil," and the personal address to the assertion "One of you is a devil," if he had wished to transfer the epithet from the chief of the Apostles to the traitor. Even the operator acknowledges a "violent" and "improbable" "dislocation." And to call the pathetic, yearning interrogation of the well-nigh deserted Teacher an "almost casual appeal," evinces a genius for misconception that goes far to account for the remainder of the paragraph.

But what shall we say of "the patent instance which follows"? Historical criticism cannot approach much nearer to absurdity without overstepping the boundary. Is "Rise, let us be going," one of the class of sayings tradition would dwell upon, and on which the popular memory would fasten? If transference were intended, few indeed would be the readers who would notice it. The direction is of the character that might be repeated scores of times in any man's life who controlled the movements of a company. How truly remarkable that, speaking to more than one person, our Saviour should on two occasions use the

plural number! How extraordinary that He should twice direct His reclining disciples to rise and accompany Him! And what a pity that the writer who calls our attention to this incredible coincidence should mar the effect of it by adding the altogether needless adverb "hence"! For it is only on the supposition that the coincidence is incredible that the pseudo-John could hope to accomplish anything by the "dislocation."

Scarcely less absurd is the use made of the statement in John iii. 24, that "John was not yet cast into prison." It may be a note of time, an indication that St. John's narrative does not interfere with the subsequent Galilean ministry as related by the Synoptists. But Dr. Abbott sees in it a suspicious demonstration that Jesus was not a disciple of the Baptist, seeing that His active ministry synchronised in part with that of His forerunner. The body of the article more than hints that the assertion is false. Then it occurs to the accuser that, whatever was the design of the information, it may possibly be true, that Jesus may have baptised and taught during the freedom of His baptiser. It is too late to recall the insinuation; besides there is no stronger reason for cancelling this criticism than a number of others of the like kind. Whereupon we are favoured with the subjoined suggestive note:

"It is, of course, possible that here (as in the matter of the Last Supper) the Fourth Gospel may have preserved some historical traditions concerning the acts of the Lord in Judæa, which have not been preserved in the Synoptic record. Nor is it denied that elsewhere, *e.g.*, in the matter of the three passovers, the Fourth Gospel may be historical. There is scarcely evidence enough to admit of absolute demonstration on either side. All that is contended is that, whether historical or not, the incidents recorded in the Fourth Gospel are suggested (1) often by a clearly discernible motive in the mind of the writer contrasting forcibly with the motiveless, simple, inartistic narrative of St. Mark; (2) sometimes by a desire to supplement, if not to correct, the previous narratives of the Synoptists. The presence of such a motive and desire is not, of course, absolutely inconsistent with historical accuracy; but the more we consider the Synoptic narrative to be objective, and the more we consider the Fourth Gospel to be subjective, the more we shall be disposed to believe that, in proportion as incidents in the latter are suggestible by motives and desires, in that proportion are they likely to be non-historical, especially if they appear to be difficult to harmonise with the earlier narrative of the Synoptists."

The reconciliation of this footnote with the text of the article must be left to its author. If this is "all that is contended," the major portion of the article need not have been written. The instances of "dislocation" just considered signify much more than this or they signify nothing. But we must turn from them to the subjectivity of the Gospel. A word or two must suffice, as the most reverent expositors may not—and do not—shrink from recognising this subjectivity. The Fourth Gospel has a plan as well as a purpose. Incident, miracle, parable, discourse are all arranged according to this plan. The "motive" of the writer pervades his work. Practically the aforesaid subjectivity amounts to nothing more. The author has moulded his materials upon a definite model. It does not follow that because he cast the model he also created his materials. Our Lord's miracles were symbolic; they were "signs" as well as "powers" and "wonders." Let this be granted—and surely the postulate is not unreasonable—and there is nothing unnatural, nothing to create surprise in Christ's connecting discourses with particular miracles, or in His suiting His miracles to specific phases of His conflict with the Pharisees and Sadducees. Clearly grasping this twofold connection, and understanding the onward movement of Christ's life till the cross was its appropriate consummation and crown, St. John indites a narrative in which the thoughtful reader can perceive both the connection and the movement. We fail to see why this method in writing history should expose the historian to a charge of untruthfulness. Again and again the struggle between our great parliamentary parties has been described as the conflict of Liberty and Authority; but this conception of the principles involved does not render the historian liable to an accusation of mutilating the debates or inventing incidents. And as to difficulties in harmonising the Fourth Gospel with its predecessors, these are just the difficulties a clever forger would have been most careful to avoid.

The contrast between the historical veracity and the subjective nature of *St. John* receives fresh illustration in a protracted comparison of the Gospel with the writings of Philo. The comparison is made so as to avoid the direct assertion that for this or that particular the Evangelist is indebted to the philosopher, but the entire argument goes to show that the plan of the Gospel is adapted from Philo, the settings of many details are borrowed from him, and

simile and parable are plagiarised from his pages. If the contention were proved, or even approached a high degree of probability, no further question would need to be discussed as to the authenticity of the Gospel. The reader shall judge of the validity of the pleas advanced in its support. These pleas divide themselves into two categories, (1) those that appeal to the general scope and tone of the Gospel; (2) those that adduce specific points of resemblance.

Our rapidly diminishing space compels great brevity in our observations upon the former class, but the *Encyclopædia* article adds little or nothing to the commonly urged arguments. Certain leading ideas and terms are common to St. John and Philo, *e.g.*, the Logos, Light and Darkness, and the notion of the perpetual conflict of these powers. The Evangelist must have been acquainted with the Alexandrine speculations: the atmosphere of Asia Minor was laden with them. How far then is the inference justifiable that the Evangelist adopted and adapted philosophical thought and terminology? In replying to this inquiry the Logos-notion must be separated sharply from all others. Orthodox commentators, we think, often weaken their position seriously by disregarding this distinction. The justice of it is obvious, if only because other conceptions and expressions run throughout the book; this is confined to the prologue. If it were proved conclusively, which it is not by any means, that the immediate ancestor of St. John's doctrine of the Logos was the teaching of Philo, the veracity of his record of our Lord's life would not be affected in the least. However interesting the question, it is in reality almost an outside issue. If the cogitations of Philo had attained to a half-truth, which he mingled and distorted with abundant error, there is nothing alarming or even surprising to the Christian if St. John was inspired to deliver this half-truth from its disfigurement and defilement and to display it in its appropriate relation to Jesus Christ. But the Hebrew faith had as much to do with the genesis of Philo's idea as the Greek philosophy; and it is quite possible to find for St. John's a Jewish, a Biblical parentage. The differences between the Alexandrine and the Christian Logos increase both in number and in weight the more closely the two are scrutinised. "The prologue opens," says Dr. Abbott, "with a protest against Philo's doctrine of an impersonal or quasi-personal Logos." A

wide chasm is cloven at a stroke, and the gulf becomes impassable at the sublimely simple saying, "The Word became flesh, and tabernacled among us."

But if the set of ideas of which Light and Darkness are examples are due to Philo, very serious consequences ensue. Jesus himself employs these, and uses light as a symbol of His person and work. The moment, however, that the accusation is understood, it is disproved. Philo did not originate the symbolic use of light. It appears repeatedly in the Old Testament; it is applied to Christ in the songs of Zacharias and Simeon, which are certainly free from Alexandrine influence. The metaphor is just one of those that are common to all peoples, because it is impressed upon the face of universal nature. Are we seriously asked to believe that the metaphorical employment of light and darkness demands so striking originality that it could not, or was not likely to, have occurred to two minds of different orders, that it was beyond the intellect of the most nakedly human Jesus? There is as strong internal reason for crediting Philo with the paternity of the Hindoo mythology, in which precisely the same conflict continually presents itself. Dr. Abbott admits that the words in John iv. 41 are true to the spirit of "Christ's teaching," a pretty clear hint of the worth he attaches to his theory that they came through Philo. Where was the spirit of His teaching uttered?

The specific points of resemblance adduced between John and Philo do not greatly strengthen an extremely weak case. Jesus is said to have changed water into wine, and this beginning of miracles is designedly illustrative of His turning the water of the law into the wine of the Gospel. But Philo avails himself of the same figure to set forth the superior excellence of his system to all that came before it. What can be plainer than that the pseudo-John has copied Philo, except indeed that Isaiah (i. 22) forestalled Philo by some centuries? Moreover, we do not doubt the spiritual significance of the miracle, but it is somewhat remarkable that the Evangelist, contrary to his custom, has nowhere pointed it out. But Jesus speaks of the temple of His body, and Philo has a very similar illustration. Nevertheless the conception of the body as a house and the soul as its inhabitant is not peculiar to Philo, and the two metaphors do not lie very far apart. And the germ of the idea is in the Old-Testament treatment of the tabernacle.

Another of Dr. Abbott's comparisons deserves graver consideration. In St. John's First Epistle (v. 6, &c.) we read that Jesus Christ "came by water and blood," and "there are three who bear witness, the Spirit, and the water, and the blood: and the three agree in one (εἰς τὸ ἕν εἰσιν), or make up the one." The passage is hard to be understood; but the reference to John xix. 14 is unmistakable. The *Encyclopædia* traces both the number and the nature of the witnesses to Philo. Philo declares that things earthly require but two witnesses, while things spiritual require three. According to him, man has two lives, the irrational or animal, with its seat in the blood, the rational, with its seat in the spirit; and water and earth "represent the origin, growth and maturity of the human body." From the pierced side of Christ there issued blood and water. "If now we could find in the Gospel narrative of the crucifixion some mention of breath or spirit, nothing would be wanting to make up the triple purification and the triple witness mentioned in the Epistle." The Gospel declares that Jesus "gave up His Spirit." The Evangelist's object therefore is to teach that "Jesus took unto Himself not only (*a*) the dead fleshly nature of man typified by water, but also (*b*) the life and passions of man typified by blood, and (*c*) that higher life of man . . . typified by spirit." In each of the three departments of existence He made atonement by three several sacrifices. Thus both the history and the comment are brought into intimate connection with the doctrine of Philo, who also teaches symbolic purification by blood and by water and by spirit. We acknowledge freely that the coincidence is sufficiently remarkable; so ingenious is the analogy that we could almost persuade ourselves it was real, but for the suggestion that the history was written for the sake of the comment. Surprise at the closeness of the coincidence grows less when we remember that Philo's two or three witnesses come from the Levitical law, where also he discovered his purification by blood and by water. If the New Testament stands in integral relation to the Old, and if Philo studied the Old Testament minutely and pondered it profoundly, we may expect to meet with resemblances between the two systems which sprang from the same source. Nevertheless, we can read of no "triple purification" in St. John's Epistle; the Spirit is said to bear witness, not to purify. If St. John's "water" were

intended as the counterpart of Philo's, would he not have sought for an analogue to Philo's "earth," without which the material man is incomplete? St. Luke, on whom rests no taint of Alexandrianism, informs us that Jesus "gave up the ghost."* And the idea of "three departments of existence" seems altogether foreign to St. John. This text reveals the "motive" of the Gospel, in Dr. Abbott's judgment, who devotes a separate section to it. One would have thought that "the motive" would have earned more than a solitary mention.

Other alleged plagiarisms from Philo we may pretermit; there are two, however, that cannot be disregarded. The precious parable of the Good Shepherd, with the entire discourse which it introduces, is filched from Philo, because he compares teachers of men to shepherds, and divides them according as they care for the sheep or for themselves. One can only inquire if Dr. Abbott has ever read the thirty-fourth chapter of the Book of the Prophet Ezekiel. It is a characteristic of Christ, too, to choose homely illustrations which had doubtless been used a thousand times before, but to transfigure them in the using. The final example would be supremely ludicrous, but for its subject. The conversation with the woman of Samaria really belongs, it appears, to Philo. For he uses the simile of the well. Nay, he likens Hagar to the "deep well," and Rebecca to "the fountain that never fails;" clearly the last comparison is the original of the Lord's "living water." If so, it must take credit for the same symbol in Baruch iii. 12 and Ecclesiasticus xv. 3. Again, we have a simile that might well occur to both Jesus of Nazareth and Philo. But the irredarguable proof remains. The woman had five husbands. Now Philo made the hitherto unheard of discovery that man possesses five senses ("the number five is appropriate to the outward sense"); and he compares "the five objects of the senses working through the senses" to five seducers. The force of comparison could do no more; here is a "patent instance" of plagiarism, a positive demonstration that the metaphor has been "transferred from the pages of Philo to the pages of the Fourth Gospel."

* Ἐξέπνευσεν. Luke: παρέδωκε τὸ πνεῦμα, John. The difference is suggestive, but it does not warrant Dr. Abbott's inference: as he evidently perceives, for, avowedly lest the first text should be thought insufficient, he adds the wholly irrelevant text, John xx. 22; the act there described is neither purification nor sacrifice.

Some praise is due to the Evangelist for the addition of one who was not the woman's husband, as it is a deadly home-thrust at Simon Magus, who had led the Samaritans astray. We venture to think that, in spite of the clever hit at Simon Magus, the pseudo-John has done his literary theft but bunglingly. The five *seducers* become five *husbands*, and it would follow that it was right and wise to be led captive by the objects of the senses. But perhaps he meant by the five husbands the religions of the five nations of Samaria; only again the change is unfortunate that constitutes them lawful spouses. Is this, we are fain to inquire, sober "historical criticism"? If it is, let the unaccountable change of *seducers* to *husbands* answer it. It is impossible to insert any numeral before "husbands" without exposing it to this sort of trifling. For "five" read "six": the "six" are Philo's six powers of turbulence; the seventh is Philo's seven powers of peace, which Simon Magus lyingly represents. Or read "four" and add the fifth, and you have Philo's five *seducers* complete—always allowing for the slip which has substituted *husbands*.

The reader will probably agree with us that no cause whatever has been shown for crediting Philo with the beauties of the Fourth Gospel. It would be a work of supererogation to carry our examination of the *Encyclopædia* article farther. We have already seen* how Dr. Abbott regards the resurrection of Jesus Christ. In this matter St. John fares no better at his hands than St. Matthew and St. Luke, and for the same reason, that all three add to the original tradition. He gives also an analysis of St. John's doctrine of the Paraclete, and compares it with that of St. Paul. He is concerned here, not with testimony, but with opinion. The result is that he is almost free from prejudice and discusses the subject with no little ability and suggestiveness. He approaches perilously near to the admission that St. Paul's doctrine must have grown out of that which St. John recorded, and that late though it was delivered by the Saviour. Barring an objectionable phrase or two, his treatment of St. John's sayings about faith deserves recognition. But he forgets that if faith in the Fourth Gospel is a higher thing than in the Synoptists, it is because the Lord's utterances concerning it were delivered to the spiritually cultured in the later

* See April number, pp. 367-369.

Gospel, to those who knew comparatively little of Him in the earlier. A minister's address to a private gathering of church-members upon entire holiness differs, *in toto*, from his sermon to a miscellaneous assembly in the midst of a mission.

We regret that the latest English assault upon the Fourth Gospel should have appeared within the covers of the national *Encyclopædia*. But upholders of the genuineness of St. John can take courage as they study it. The blow aimed by the ablest English rationalistic scholarship is appreciably weaker than less doughty champions of scepticism have dealt in former years. Three points at least we have gained: that it is not demonstrable that the Gospel is non-historic; that it probably proceeded from one of John's disciples and is therefore distinctly Johannean; that there is conclusive evidence of the existence of Johannine tradition among the Apostolical Fathers.

The *Encyclopædia* article expresses the critical basis of the creed of a school that exercises a wide-spread influence over English thought. It believes that Jesus Christ ought to be worshipped because no other Being compels awe, love, and reverence as He does, because a greater nobility than His is inconceivable. One proof of His worthiness is the vast results that have flowed from His life and death. May we submit to this school, and to any who are attracted towards it, two brief considerations? The Christ Who has won your worship and the world's is the Christ of the *Four* Gospels. Forget every story about Him that is not found in your estimate of the Original Tradition. Dwarf Him to the dimensions of *Philochristus;* blot out every word of lovingkindness, encouragement, and power you have been accustomed to listen to from childhood. Where now is the Christ you have learnt to love? At any rate the very triumphs He has achieved, since His crucifixion, which you rightly hold demonstrate His greatness, have been accomplished by means of fraudulent representations. Is this credible? What is the worth of a faith that is founded upon a lie? You warn us of the danger of worshipping the Bible instead of Christ; but is there no danger of destroying the Bible, and leaving no Christ to worship? You adore Jesus because He is man's highest ideal of godlikeness; if John's Gospel be not true, man has attained a higher ideal of perfection than Jesus, for the Christ of the beloved disciple towers far above the Christ you picture.

ART. VII.—*The Revised Form of Baptism. Minutes of Conference.* London: Wesleyan Conference Office. 1882.

THE following record appears in the *Minutes of Conference* for the year 1882: "The Report of the Committee appointed to revise the Form for the Administration of Baptism was adopted by the Conference, with certain modifications. It was resolved that in thus adopting a revised Form of the Baptismal Service, the Conference does not prohibit the use of any Forms which have heretofore been approved by the Conference." Thus terminated—for a time at least—a controversy of seven years' standing: by the adoption of a compromise which gives relief to many minds, while those who needed no relief are left where they were. Compromise, of course, implies that two opposite courses were both rejected, and a third intermediate course accepted. This, however, only affected the Preamble. The Committee presented an elaborate introductory Preface to the Service, on which much pains had evidently been expended: this found no favour, and was indeed dismissed. But the party opposed to the revised formulary also failed to carry their point: they hoped to make the old form acceptable by omitting a few objectionable words; but it finally appeared that the great majority of the Conference—in fact two-thirds—had come to the determination that the ancient Preamble should be renounced altogether. Thus the great testimony of John iii. is given up; and so little consideration did the words meet with, that they were not suffered to find even a subordinate place. A neutral and colourless substitute was extemporised for the emergency. This was hailed as an immense relief. Whether it will find the same favour with the public remains to be seen. We cannot help asking what reception the new office will meet with, and speculating as to the effects which will flow from it: in other words, what the currents of popular opinion will be.

There are many who are saying already that a fine opportunity has been lost. Very little was wanting to make the new Form acceptable all round. Those who were in the minority had yielded much, and were willing to accept the

entire fabric of the Revision, had the amended Preamble been conceded to them. They would have consented to use the invocation Collects at the end of the service, and the Prayers as they have been altered. If, in deference to their strong wishes, the introductory words had been retained, the term "regenerate" being omitted, the Conference would have been of one mind, and a very unseemly division would have been avoided. Unanimity in this matter was exceedingly desirable: that is saying but little; unanimity was worth purchasing at a far costlier expense than the retention of the Redeemer's testimony in John iii. But the majority thought otherwise. They staked everything on this point. They would have it that the Lord has not, in the course of His ministry, connected regeneration with baptism in any way whatever. That was the issue with which all the pleadings were really concerned. Looking at the whole matter dispassionately, and as it were from the outside, the party we refer to are convinced that the majority were wrong; and that upon them lies the responsibility of a failure to harmonise all views in a Form which all might have accepted.

It may be said that this implies—what the other side would never admit—that the words of John iii. certainly referred to the sacrament of baptism. For ourselves, we have not the slightest doubt on that subject; but this is not the time to enter on the discussion more particularly. We are speaking as the representatives of a large portion of public opinion. What many mourn over is, that the question was regarded as a settled one against the possible reference to baptism. Surely that was not wise. It was breaking too violently from the Methodist tradition and standards; from the preponderant expository tradition of all ages, including the earliest and the best; and from what we venture to think the soundest and the most thorough scientific exegesis of our own age. The minority deserved consideration enough to secure the retention of those words, all security being taken that they should remain only as a general testimony, without making emphatic their connection with the present service.

It has never been one of the functions of this REVIEW to sit in judgment upon the Methodist Conference, or to appeal against its decisions. We may, however, while accepting loyally the results of the recent discussion, make a few cautionary observations to which none ought to object.

And, first, it is obvious to remark that there is a danger of the recent action being exaggerated. From much that has

been written and spoken it might be inferred that Methodism had fundamentally changed its views on the subject of baptism, especially infant baptism; that it had renounced part of its old formularies, and with it part of its old teaching; that, in fact, it had given up a certain testimony to which its Standards had been faithful, but which more modern lights had led it to renounce. Certainly, if regard be had to the tone of some part of the discussion, and certain particular speeches which were delivered, that notion would have something plausible to rest upon. John Wesley's sentiments on the sacramental grace of baptism were freely handled. And of course that could not be done without perilously grazing the edge of Methodist adherence to the old Standards. But it ought to be remembered that these were the utterances of individual men, not meaning perhaps all that they seemed to mean. Certainly the Conference has not pronounced—it could not in the nature of things pronounce—that any formal doctrinal statement in the "Notes," for instance, was untrue. Enemies of the dogmatic integrity of the Body will undoubtedly leap to that inference, and leap to it with peculiar vigour. But the Standards are safe, nevertheless. Opinions may differ as to the wisdom of emphatically omitting sentences which had all the weight of those documents in their favour. But, after all, they are only omitted. There is no sentence inserted which formally denies their testimony. The omission itself must be accepted without the commentary, the suspicious commentary, which the speeches afforded. It leaves, indeed, a melancholy chasm; but that is all. And the omission itself is only commended, or as it were permitted, for the relief of honest scruples. The older formulary is untouched for the use of those who prefer it. The ancient order runs on simultaneously with the newer one. And, we repeat, there has been no public repudiation of the Standards with which the existence of Methodism is bound up. Threats of injunctions to restrain, and so forth, are all idle. Equally idle are the fears that the doctrinal bonds of the Connexion are or will be relaxed. That there are now two formularies in concurrent use does not in the least affect the greater question of the integrity of the Standards of the Body.

But here at once rises another consideration. That there will be two rival formularies is itself matter of deep interest, not to say solicitude. It is greatly to be feared that there will be now two, if not more, formularies in use, perhaps in the same congregation; and that the ministrants will come

to be marked as using this one or that. Every one must see the evil springing from this diversity. But none can see how to prevent it. It cannot be expected that men, with deep convictions, will give up their right—a right indeed which cannot be taken away—to follow in the track of their fathers, and adhere to a Form which is to them thrice hallowed. We have heard the hope expressed, and expressed with no little confidence, that the older formularies will die out in the nature of things, and that the "fittest will survive." But that is a vain hope: how vain it would be invidious to prove at any length. The evil to which we refer will, however, be reduced to a minimum by wise men. Entirely removed it will never be; but those who care more for the interests of peace and the harmony of Divine ministrations will feel bound to do all they can to lessen it. They will, many of them, effect the compromise for themselves which the Conference refused. Possibly they will reinsert the lacking Preamble, and then go on with the rest of the service, according to the latest method prescribed. And surely that would be such a temperate use of the toleration conceded to them as must be approved by all.

There is, however, a greater evil to be apprehended than that first alluded to. It is much to be feared that some encouragement will be given to those who have systematically and notoriously administered the sacrament of baptism in a perfunctory and slovenly manner. They will not think the Revision worthy of their acceptance, because it leaves the service too long, and retains in it a sacramental savour which, alas, offends them. For it cannot be denied that the revisers have retained, whether by constraint or willingly, much of the sacramental tone and sentiment: more indeed than they have eliminated. Let any one take the new Form and read it from beginning to end, as it were in the midst of all the accessories—the parents presenting the infant, the infant the central object, with the congregation standing as prayerful witnesses—and he must perceive that the invocations of the Holy Spirit mean a present blessing, that the sacrament is supposed to be attended by its appropriate grace, whatever that may be, and that the whole is more than a ceremonial rite. It is true that the Collects now transferred to the close seem to invoke grace only for the future. But there is the child, still the central object, and it will require a vigorous act of negation to think that the Saviour, the Supreme Ministrant behind the minister, is not confirming the act by signs

at once following. We exceedingly rejoice in the discretion and grace shown by the revisers in their necessary chastisement of the service. We thank them for it; but, alas, there are many who will not rejoice, and will not thank them. They will do as they have done before, to the distress, we hesitate not to say, of the witnessing congregation and of the disappointed parents, not to speak of the displeasure of One higher than all.

The expression "disappointed parents" has fallen from our pen: let us for a moment take it up again. What was meant is that the parents who bring their children to our fonts—true believers, that is, themselves—bring them generally speaking with a large expectation that the service will in some way be a blessing to themselves and their children. The Baptismal Service to which they have been accustomed has tended to encourage their faith by its abundant invocations of present grace. And the best traditions of Methodist administration of the rite have greatly strengthened this feeling. Many still living remember the exceeding importance attached to the solemnity by the elder ministers of the Connexion, some of whom were wont to take such pains to impress not only the obligations but also the present privilege of baptism as to make the impression they produced ineffaceable. The congregations were wont to regard the administration of baptism as by no means a wearisome interpolation in the service. The whole congregation had its interest enlisted; all were witnesses and intercessors; other parents had their responsibilities imprinted on their minds and their past neglects brought to their consciences; while the parents themselves were not allowed to forget that One greater than the minister was present who really and truly took their children into His arms and blessed them. Before such a style of administration a thousand prejudices and prepossessions vanished. Doubts departed, and steadfast believing took its place. There was no disposition to ask in the rationalist spirit how official ministration could do any good to an unconscious little infant. The minister, the water, the baptising into the name of the Holy Trinity, were all parts of a ceremonial in which the chief Ministrant was the Lord Himself; and, this being so, it was felt to be idle to speculate whether or not the infant was in any sense the better for the service. That style of administration has not died out. It is continued still, and as we believe will be continued with the same fidelity and the same results. The Revised Formula will not, on the whole, militate

against it. If it is faithfully used, it will be almost, though not altogether, as good an instrument in the hands of the faithful minister as the former was.

We have put the supposition that some may think the Revision not sufficiently thorough, and be prompted to go their own way of freedom and careless administration of Divine mysteries. But may we not hope that the effect will be quite the reverse of this? Is it not possible that the prolonged attention given to the subject—the gravity of which has never been lost sight of in the Conference, even when most vehemently expressing its feelings against sacerdotalism—will tend to impress upon the younger ministers of the Connexion the deep solemnity of the covenant transaction in which it is their honour to officiate as stewards of Divine mysteries? This is what we hope and will continue to hope: assured that when the present sensitiveness—just in itself and warrantable—as to sacramentarian excesses of doctrine has been allayed, a healthy tone of reverence as it respects both the sacraments will grow and increase. Between those excesses and the latitudinarian indifference which treats the Two Christian Rites as mere outward and visible signs, there is a wide interval. And somewhere in that interval, tending to neither extreme, is our safe doctrine and our safe practice. Some, not deeply enough conscious of the supernatural order, lean with strong gravitation to the latter extreme. Others, too much limiting the supernatural order, gravitate to the former. The sound Methodist doctrine and tradition is happily safe from both. And that will come to be more and more clearly seen and deeply felt. Of the extreme which sees in the two sacraments the only or indeed the chief appointed conduits of grace to the soul we are not in danger. But surely we need not recoil from the thought that He who ordained these sacraments may make them channels of their own specific grace. To hold otherwise is the true and real ritualism: handling, looking at mere signs, to which our own reflections are to give their value. They are signs and seals of a covenant charter, which pledge, convey, and make over to the soul the blessings of which that covenant speaks.

The question as to the specific grace which baptism pledges and conveys to the children of the Christian covenant finds little direct solution in Scripture, but much indirect illustration. Without entering at length on the discussion, we may regard this in reference to the past, and the present, and the future.

As it respects the past, it stands in relation to the universal grace which has been brought to the race by Him whom we delight to call the Second Adam. We presume to believe that His incarnation and atoning death availed for the relief of the race as such; and that all born into the world share the benefit of His mediation. But it has pleased God not to leave us to our inferences and hopes. He has given to us and our children a pledge to assure us thereof. There is a sense, therefore, in which baptism only seals to the children baptised a benefit which they possessed before. Of them that may be said which was said of Abraham. He received circumcision as the seal of a righteousness which he had yet being uncircumcised; and the sign was to him and his posterity the pledge and assurance of what he would not have been assured of without it. And children receive baptism as the seal of an acceptance which they had yet being unbaptised; and the sign is to their parents who bring them, and the Church that receives them, and to themselves hereafter when reminded of it, the pledge and assurance of what we have no right to be assured of without it. Here there ought to be no difference of opinion among those who think it their duty and privilege to bring their offspring to Christian baptism; especially if they believe in the universality of the benefit of redemption. A Hebrew parent would not have dared to ask whether or not his son would partake of all the privileges which had been guaranteed to Abraham and his seed for ever: the penalty would have found him out, and been visited on his child. We must not speak of "daring" in the same sense under the Christian economy. The Christian parent joyfully lays claim on behalf of his child to privileges which are pledged in a rite faithfully transacted between God and himself. He rejoices in the assurance that his child is thus declared to be free from the condemnation of the race, to be adopted into the household and family of God, and to be accepted on the altar of consecration as holy.

But is there no present internal benefit? That there can be none must not be too hastily affirmed. As certainly as a principle which will lead to unrighteousness hereafter, a flesh out of which the old man grows, and the element of future unholiness, are born with the child, so certainly may a principle that will make for righteousness, the seed of the new man, and the first-fruits of the Spirit of holiness, be infused into the unconscious soul of infancy. To deny all this is to undermine and sap the foundations of our bulwark against infidelity.

In fact, this is not denied. But the question is at once asked, Is not this elementary seed of righteousness, regeneration, and holiness, implanted at birth; and if so, what has it to do with baptism? Part of the answer must still be that the universal blessing guaranteed to the children of the race is as it were appropriated by man, and sealed and conveyed by God through the rite of baptism, which is the formal union of these children with Christ. It is thus that He still takes them into His arms and blesses them. Here we take our stand; and on this we ground our appeal on behalf of the many children suffered to grow up unbaptised among us. That this evil exists there can be no doubt: nor that their duty is not enforced upon parents with the earnestness that is to be expected from our avowed principles. Let it not be said that unbaptised children are by this principle committed to the "uncovenanted mercies of God." There can be no doubt that all the infants of our race are claimed as His own by the universal Lord who sanctified infancy by passing through it Himself; and that if they die without baptism He receives them into the "*limbus infantum*" of His own arms for ever. But it is the duty as it is the privilege of Christian parents to honour the sacrament which is the ordained sign and pledge that God has had mercy upon mankind as born in sin.

But that is only part of the answer. It may be boldly added that incorporation into the Christian Church by baptism, which is the formal and declarative adoption into the family of God and household of faith, has connected with it a richer, deeper, and fuller grace than flows from universal redemption alone. There is some danger of undervaluing the Pentecostal gift which is "to us and to our children." It may be difficult to distinguish between the general influences of prevenient grace which all receive, and to which all the good in human nature is to be ascribed, and the special grace which the little ones of the Christian covenant enjoy. It may be hard to define what specific blessing the Lord imparted to those whom He took into His arms: many children were in Israel, but only a few had that distinction. It is not only hard but it is also invidious to give the right answer to such as point to the children of those Christian parents whose interpretation of the Christian covenant forbids their bringing their children to baptism, or even rejects the sacraments altogether. Let us hear the words of Richard Hooker: "Touching infants which die unbaptised, sith they neither have the sacrament itself, nor any sense or conceit thereof, the judg-

ment of many hath gone hard against them. But yet seeing grace is not absolutely tied unto sacraments, and besides such is the comity of God that unto things altogether impossible He bindeth no man, but where we cannot do what is enjoined us accepteth our will to do instead of the deed itself." And again: "Of the will of God to impart His grace unto infants without baptism, in that case the very circumstance of their natural birth may serve as a just argument, whereupon it is not to be misliked that men in charitable presumption do gather a great likelihood of their salvation to whom, the benefit of Christian parentage being given, the rest that should follow is prevented by some such casualty as man hath himself no power to avoid. For we are plainly taught of God that the seed of holy parentage is holy from the very birth (1 Cor. vii. 14). Which albeit we may not so understand as if the children of believing parents were without sin, or grace from baptised parents derived by propagation, or God by covenant and promise tied to save any in mere regard to their parents' belief: yet seeing that to all professors of the name of Christ this pre-eminence above infidels is freely given, the fruit of their bodies bringeth into the world with it a present interest and right to those means wherewith the ordinance of Christ is that His Church shall be sanctified, it is not to be thought that He which as it were from heaven hath nominated and designed them unto holiness by special privilege of their very birth, will Himself deprive them of regeneration and inward grace only because necessity depriveth them of outward sacraments."

These words of Hooker assert a specific grace within the Church beyond what the outer world has received from the redemption of Christ. But they go beyond—when taken in their context—what we here mean. Richard Watson will more clearly, and to our readers more satisfactorily explain that meaning. Here are some few sentences which of necessity we must take out of their context; but those who go to his work for verification, will find that they are still stronger with the context than without it: "St Paul calls the children of believers 'holy,' separated to God, and standing therefore in a peculiar relation to Him (1 Cor. vii. 14): a mode of speech which would also have been wholly unintelligible at least to a Jew, unless by some rite of Christianity children were made sharers in its covenanted mercies." "Infant children are declared by Christ to be members of His Church. That they were made members of God's Church in the family of

Abraham, and among the Jews, cannot be denied. They were made so by circumcision, which was not that carnal and merely political rite which many Baptist writers, in contradiction to the Scriptures, make it, but was, as we have seen, the seal of a spiritual covenant, comprehending engagements to bestow the remission of sins and all its consequent blessings in this life, and in another the heavenly Canaan. Among these blessings was that special relation which consisted in becoming a visible and peculiar people of God, His Church. . . . The membership of the Jews comprehended both children and adults; and the grafting in of the Gentiles, so as to partake of the same 'root and fatness,' will therefore include a right to put their children also into the covenant, so that they as well as adults may become members of Christ's Church, and be acknowledged by Him, in the special sense of the terms of the covenant, to be His 'people.'" "But we have our Lord's direct testimony to this point, and that in two remarkable passages; Lu. ix. 47, 48. . . . The humility and docility of the true disciple corresponded with the same dispositions in a young child; and the receiving a disciple in the name' of Christ corresponds with the receiving a child in the name of Christ, which religious relation can only be well interpreted of a church relation. This is further confirmed by the next point of correspondence, the identity of Christ both with the disciple and with the child. 'Whosoever shall receive this child in My name, receiveth Me;' but such an identity of Christ with His disciples stands wholly upon their relation to Him as members of His mystical body, the Church. It is in this respect only that they are 'one with Him; and there can be no identity of Christ with 'little children' but by virtue of the same relation, that is, as they are members of His mystical body, the Church." "This is, however, expressed still more explicitly in Mark x. 14-16. . . . That official blessing—the blessing which He was authorised and empowered to bestow by virtue of His Messiahship—He was so ready, we might say so anxious, to bestow upon them, that He was much displeased with His disciples who rebuked those that brought them." "If it be asked, 'Of what import, then, is baptism to children, if as infants they already stand in a favourable relation to Christ?' the answer is, that it is of the same import as circumcision was to Abraham, which was 'a seal of the righteousness of the faith which he had yet being uncircumcised:' it confirmed all the promises of the covenant of grace to him, and made

the Church of God visible to men." "Thus this previous relation of infants to Christ, as accepted by Him, is an argument for their baptism, not against it, seeing it is by that they are visibly recognised as the formal members of His Church, and have the full grace of the covenant confirmed and sealed to them, with increase of grace as they are fitted to receive it, besides the advantage of visible connexion with the Church, and of that obligation which is taken upon themselves by their parents to train them up in the nurture and admonition of the Lord."

While transcribing these words we cannot help thinking how effectual an answer they are to much of the pleading in the late discussion: especially to the stress laid, again and again, upon the seal being given of a blessing previously enjoyed. And they establish—so far as so high authority establishes for us—the principle that children are in baptism made one with Christ, and have "the full grace of the covenant confirmed and sealed to them." But it may be thought that an ambiguity works in the phrase "confirmed and sealed to them." There was none in the mind of Mr. Watson. We must quote his words once more, as those of one who has the highest right to interpret to the present generation of Methodists their original and established doctrine. "It conveys also"—he goes on to say, after dwelling on the pledge for the future which baptism gives—"the present blessing of Christ, of which we are assured by His taking children in His arms and blessing them: which blessing cannot be merely nominal but must be substantial and efficacious. It secures too the gift of the Holy Spirit in those secret spiritual influences by which the actual regeneration of those children who die in infancy is effected; and which are a seed of life in those who are spared, to prepare them for instruction in the Word of God, as they are taught it by parental care, to incline their will and affections to good, and to begin and maintain in them the war against inward and outward evil, so that they may be Divinely assisted, as reason strengthens, to make their calling and election sure. In a word, it is both as to infants and to adults the sign and pledge of that inward grace which, although modified in its operations by the difference of their circumstances, has respect to and flows from a covenant relation to each of the Three Persons into whose One Name they are baptised: acceptance by the Father, union with Christ as the Head of His mystical body the Church, and 'the communion of the Holy Ghost.'" Whatever weight

therefore Richard Watson has among Methodists is not found in the scale of those who deny that children are baptised into the Church, who deny that present and effectual grace is imparted in the sacrament of baptism, and who make the sacrament merely a present sign and future remembrancer of obligations assumed.

It will be observed that Mr. Watson falls short of using the term regeneration in connection with infant baptism. He limits himself to "a seed of life," which, however, results from the gift of the Holy Spirit "secured" to them in baptism. Referring to the obnoxious words which are removed from our revised formulary, he says that the Church of England "probably used the term 'regeneration' in the same large sense as several of the ancient Fathers, and not in its modern theological interpretation, which is more strict." He also abstains from the phrase in his exposition of John iii. 5, when he connects it as he does with Christian baptism. "'Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God.' By the kingdom of God our Lord no doubt, in the highest sense, means the future state of felicity. But He uses the phrase to express the state of His Church on earth, which is the gate to that celestial kingdom; and generally, indeed, speaks of His Church on earth under this mode of expression, rather than of the heavenly state. If, then, He declares that no one can enter into that Church but by being 'born of water and the Holy Spirit,' which heavenly gift followed upon baptism when received in true faith, He clearly makes baptism the mode of initiation into His Church in this passage as in the last quoted; and in both He assigns to it the same office as circumcision in the Church of the Old Testament, whether in its Patriarchal or in its Mosaic form." And here we may observe in passing that as Richard Hooker affirmed concerning the early interpretation of John iii. 6, "that of all the ancients there is not one to be named that ever did otherwise either expound or allege the place than as implying external baptism," so we may say that of all the ancients in Methodism there is not one to be named who has not quoted or alleged it in the same sense. But to return: it is an important point for those who maintain—with the Methodist Fathers—the impartation of grace in and through the covenant rite of baptism to determine that their views do not, and why they do not, involve the perilous affirmation of Baptismal Regeneration.

Mr. Watson speaks of the later and more precise theological

meaning of the term regeneration; and by this he seems to indicate that the new birth as the inhabitation of the Holy Spirit through whose indwelling Christ is formed in the soul as its new life is the full development of the germinal seed. But that germinal seed he regards as something different from the preliminary influence of the Spirit given as the light of every man naturally born of Adam. None but the members and children of the Christian covenant are brought into a "covenant relation with each of the Three Persons." Christ has revealed to the world a new life which is Himself: "he that hath the Son hath the life." And he that hath not as yet the Son in conscious possession as the new man in his nature cannot as yet be said to be regenerate. He may have had the beginnings of life—the specific beginnings of the new life which is the glory of Christians—and he may, under the convincing and drawing influences of the Spirit, have reached a high point of preparatory spiritual energy; but the new and proper life in Christ he has not until Christ is fully formed within him. There is consequently no need to speak of baptismal regeneration: indeed there is manifest impropriety in so speaking.

But we are disposed to take a broader view of the subject. Baptism is throughout the New Testament interwoven with all the tissues of the phraseology of the covenant of grace. It is not connected with the new birth only: though, as the new life is the foundation of all blessings, itself the essential blessing, both our Lord and His Apostles speak of baptism in relation to it pre-eminently. It is baptism for the remission of sins, or "the inquiry and pursuit after a good conscience in the sight of God;" it is the "laver of regeneration;" and it is the washing of sanctification also. It is, in fact, the sign and the sacramental pledge of all the blessings of grace in their triune character as righteousness, sonship, and holiness. We may as well speak of a baptismal righteousness and of a baptismal consecration as of a baptismal regeneration. In fact, none of these expressions is suitable to express the gift to an infant only passive, if they signify the interior work carried on by the Holy Ghost in a conscious, responsible, believing subject. But then each of the terms has an external aspect and meaning which is suitable to express that gift. In the adult believer the external and internal are united. In the infant they are not united. There is a righteousness imputed, or a justification, which is sealed to the child in its baptism; but the interior righteousness which is conformity

with the law as revealed to the soul has yet to come. There is a consecration external, in virtue of which baptised infants are accepted on the altar of Christian dedication; but the holiness which is conformity with the nature of God and conscious communion with the Divine sanctity has yet to come. So there is an adoption into the household of faith which is secured to the child in its baptism; but the conscious possession of Christ and the growth into full life of the old man while the old man dies has yet to come. All this, however, must be left to the further thought of the reader: this is not a theological essay.

But whatever name may be given to the grace which is sealed to children in their baptism, and which Christian parents may rely upon in all their efforts, certain it is that nothing but good can come from strenuously maintaining that some grace is verily and indeed given. We cannot believe that some of the intense rhetoric that was spent upon the annihilation of "sacramentarian error" came from the calm conviction of the speakers: or that they would hold by their recorded words now that the storm is over. Some words were spoken in fervid declamation—characterising a supposed grace connected with an outward ministerial act—which we will not repeat, because it may be hoped the speakers have repented of them. But that is comparatively a small matter. What we would insist upon is that no harm ever has flowed or can flow from a Scriptural and guarded maintenance of baptismal grace. John Wesley himself is an example that it need not endanger the earnestness or success of evangelical preaching; and Methodist preachers not surpassed, perhaps not equalled, in the abundance of their successes in the conversion of sinners, have held a doctrine more or less closely approaching what is called, though loosely, baptismal regeneration. And multitudes of Presbyterian divines, holding the high doctrine on this subject of the Westminster Confession, have preached the necessity of a full regeneration without being hampered by their creed of an initial and specific grace "conveyed in the sacrament of baptism." More than that, there are those in other communities whose doctrine allows of only one regeneration, that of baptism—Anglicans and Lutherans, not to speak of others—whose error on this subject has never injured their soul-saving ministry, in some cases almost unrivalled in its power. No Methodist preacher holds the doctrine in this form; but if he did, he would hold it in company with vast numbers of the deepest theologians, the most saintly

Christians, and the mightiest preachers the Church has ever sent out for the salvation of sinners in the world. No Methodist preacher holds the doctrine that underlies the Anglican formularies; perhaps none holds that which underlies the Westminster Confession; but there are very many who believe that there is a baptismal grace which is as far beyond the common grace of the redeemed world as it falls short of the full virtue of consummate regeneration. These will hold their doctrine still, behind unassailable and not merely unconquerable defences, undismayed by the torrent of invective they may have heard or read, and it is their comfort that the Revised Form supports them. They miss in it some things—especially one thing—but they find much taken away in which they can rejoice.

There is one thing that still requires observation. The Revision has introduced a great improvement in the prominence it has given to the parents and the enforcement of their obligation. But it will be found that much in this matter is left—as it always has been left, and always will be—to the extempore discretion of the minister. We certainly expected that something would be inserted to supply the vacancy caused by the omission of the sponsorial confession of faith and pledges for the future. Failing that, we expected that some direction would be given to the minister to demand of the parents—in any way that the circumstances of the case might warrant or suggest—the public pledges which are an important part of the transaction. This question, however, leads to another: the relation of baptised children to the Christian Church. According to the *Minutes*, a committee has been appointed to "consider the position of baptised children, and what means can be adopted to secure their admission to full fellowship." Their report will be looked forward to with deep interest; and, pending that, the subject may be left for the present.

ART. VIII.—*Natural Religion.* By the Author of "Ecce Homo." London: Macmillan and Co. 1882.

THE title of this book is misleading. It is not a treatise on natural religion as commonly understood. Only by a considerable change in the meaning of the expression can it be regarded as dealing with that subject at all. It is true that the aim of the author is to widen the common acceptation of the term religion, so as to bring under it modes of thought and feeling to which the name is refused even by those who exhibit them. And he employs the term in his own sense when he prefixes it to the present volume. But the public are not aware of this, previously to perusing his pages. From such a title they naturally expect a new chapter added to *Butler's Analogy*, a new gateway opened to the temple of revealed religion through those indestructible instincts which constitute its outer court. And this indeed may possibly have been in some sense the author's design. But if so, we can hardly congratulate him on the means adopted to effect its execution. Not only is the new porch constructed out of materials borrowed from the old edifice: the old edifice suffers greatly in the process, and is in danger of being quite eclipsed by the new erection which, although only intended for a temporary halting-place, bids fair to become for many the place of final rest.

But however we may mistrust the issue to which these speculations are likely to lead, their aim is undeniably good. The intellectual world is spoken of as divided into several hostile parties, of which the two ranged under the respective banners of science and religion are the most hostile. It is sought to bring about a reconciliation between them, by persuading each to renounce points of difference and hold fast points of agreement. There is nothing very new in the discovery that this is the only way to reconcile contending parties, if the contest is not to be prolonged until one or both succumb from sheer exhaustion. The only novelty is the way in which this old-fashioned device is applied to the controversies of the time. The plan is

very simple. Science, it is said, contains in itself some elements of religion; let this be recognised on both sides, and all quarrelling will cease. To some minds another plan may possibly suggest itself, just the counterpart of this, even more reasonable, and perhaps quite as likely to command success. Religion contains some elements of science: let this be recognised by both sides, and henceforth quarrelling will cease. On the whole, this plan seems more advantageous than the other. Some scientific men might object to be called religious, but no religious men would object to be called scientific. The two, in fact, might be regarded as component parts of one joint scheme, by means of which each party might be allowed to retain its own peculiarities and to pursue its own calling, only taking care neither itself to forsake the recognised processes of legitimate inquiry, nor to charge others with doing so, because with them the process is applied to different materials and so works out to different, though not contradictory, results. But this is just what all sensible and enlightened men are doing already.

Hitherto our language has been general: to make our meaning plain, we must deal with the particulars which have been summed up in the above. But before doing so, a few remarks must be made on the method adopted by the author in treating of this grave question. The method is, in brief, to assume as proved all that is held by the most extreme adherents of the so-called advanced school, whether in theology or science; to accept as truthful portraits any caricatures that these may have given of the views and principles of more moderate men; to generalise upon the widest assemblage of facts from some accidental feature of one among the number; to pass rapidly from point to point, carrying captive the imagination by brilliant pictures rather than convincing the judgment by sound argument; to conceal personal predilections under the guise of impersonal statements, for the value of which floating rumour is thought to be a better security than the weight of individual names; to appeal everywhere, directly or indirectly, to whatever prejudices against settled belief may have been kindled by the abuse of authority in times past; and so to stir up in favour of change and novelty feelings that are easily mistaken, especially by the youthful and inexperienced, for the promptings of heroism, and the birth-throes of a

glorious reform. By the aid of tactics like these, any writer with a good command of racy and vigorous English is sure of gaining the popular ear, and of creating a temporary sensation; and this is all the more certain to take place when, as in the present case, the writer is one who has once before entered the lists against traditional beliefs, and now after a period of judicious silence comes forward to renew the assault. The only thing demanded of such an one will be a more pronounced and energetic utterance, an attack less covert, and made from some novel point of view. The more vigorous the onslaught, the more welcome: the loudest applause of the spectators will be sure to echo to the most ponderous blows.

There is one thought that should check the confidence of such thinkers: not the responsibility that would rest upon them if the practical outcome of their imaginings were to be a revolution as widespread as their fame, for that is a thought that need never haunt their dreams; but the very opposite of this, the mere uselessness of continuing their labours in view of the incredible stolidity of mankind. Half a generation has elapsed since the appearance of *Ecce Homo*, and in the interval the author has passed from the flush of youth to the sobriety of middle age. We wish we could see some evidences of the change in the tone of this volume, but we search for them in vain. The world has had time in the interim to pass its judgment on the teachings of his earlier work. That judgment is not to be gathered from the number of editions it has passed through, which only proves the momentousness of the question it discusses. Men's judgment in such a matter is to be estimated by their practice; and we are willing to rest the issue upon this everywhere visible test. As the result of the influence of *Ecce Homo*, and of the flood-tide of free thought of which that volume may be said to be the high-water mark, how many churches have been shut up or converted into Unitarian chapels? What closer approximation has there been in the attendance at public worship in the metropolis to the state of things existing in Berlin or Paris? What drying up has there been of the resources of organisations that owe their whole effectiveness to the belief that Jesus Christ is God, or what opening up of new channels for activities inspired by the conviction that He is only the greatest and best of men? Surely, if the feeblest of modern missions, whose work is necessarily

constructive, had to bewail such scanty results as have attended the confessedly easier destructive labours of free thought, their failure would have been everywhere published as evidence, either of the insincerity of their promoters, or of the baselessness of the beliefs which had awakened their zeal. We do not wish to retort the former of these charges on the heads of the critics of Christianity. We do not accuse them of conscious insincerity and wilful disingenuousness. But there is a bias everywhere observable in their writings, which makes it necessary to receive with caution their statements as to the principles of revealed religion, with all that these involve. Such a bias disqualifies a man for the position of a judge, disqualifies him for it most of all when the matter in question is nothing less than the attitude society should assume toward the religion which for two millenniums has been the guiding-star of her life, nursing her in the weakness of infancy, restraining her amid the perils of youth, supporting her under the burdens of maturer age, shaping and perfecting her loftiest ideals, and throwing around her noblest heroes the halo of a virtue that is not of this world. But we must proceed to our examination of this work, in the course of which we shall probably find our assertions as to method of treatment made good.

The author divides the thinking world into three great camps, the partisans respectively of religion, philosophy, and science. The first and third are both hostile to the second, but this hostility is friendship itself compared with the deadly hatred they breathe against each other. What a vast assumption is this! Not a single name is quoted in support of it. Surely typical instances should have been given, illustrative of the three several standpoints. Divines, philosophers, and scientists abound: why not have mentioned some examples? It is possible men might have been found, holding exactly the positions described by our author. We have such men in our minds as we write; but we will not name them, for the sufficient reason that, after we had done so, we should have to add that they are not worthy to represent the parties they belong to. It would be much more easy to find men whose minds have occupied themselves with more than one of the three departments, and whose testimony would be unanimous that Christianity and science are not opposed, either to one another or to philosophy, in the way our author asserts. On the doctrine

of the writer of this book, such works as the Bridgewater treatises ought not to have been conceivable: the question of the value of such works apart, men ought not to have been forthcoming to write them. Perhaps this is going too far back: we should come down to the new era introduced by the *Origin of Species*. Still we find that in 1865, six years subsequent to the publication of that work, a manifesto was signed by 617 scientific men, many of them of the highest eminence, setting forth their "sincere regret that researches into scientific truth are perverted by some in our own times into occasions for casting doubt upon the truth and authenticity of the Holy Scriptures." Of younger men we may mention the name of the late Clerk Maxwell as one uniting a sincere belief in Christianity to a profound study of science, and that of the late Professor Jevons as one whose rigorous scientific method did not lead him to despise either philosophy or religion. Of the attitude of professed theologians toward philosophy and science it is still easier to speak. Philosophy is the life and soul of theology. Germany, the home of the one, is also the fruitful nursery of the other. It is not learning itself that St. Paul discredits, nor any of his successors, but the perverted use that is sometimes made of its powers, such an use, we are bold to say, as is exemplified in works like this on *Natural Religion*. It may not be easy to find instances of men who have united devotion to theology with the practical study of science; but this is more from the absorbing nature of the several pursuits, and the impossibility of doing justice to both of them, than from any necessary antagonism in the pursuits themselves.

There is much more agreement among our intellectual leaders than our author is willing to believe. Perhaps the amount of agreement is not so fully appreciated as it ought to be, and the reason is obvious. It may be stated in his own words. "Agreement is slow of speech and attracts little notice, disagreement has always plenty to say for itself. Agreement utters chiefly platitudes and truisms. And yet, though platitudes and truisms do not work up into interesting books, if our object is to accomplish something for human life we shall scarcely find any truth serviceable that has not been rubbed into a truism, and scarcely any maxim that has not been worn into a platitude." Opinions may differ as to the effect of unanimity in stultifying the minds of those that have found it. Stag-

nation is not the necessary result of agreement: nor is antagonism a condition of life. The sublimest truths are only to be perceived in an atmosphere of calm: as soon as they become the objects of controversy, their glory is obscured. The reason why such truths become truisms and platitudes is that men do not act upon them, not that they do not fight about them.

We must consider the points in which science and religion are found by our author to agree. First, it is said, though the statement is not made without qualification, they agree in denouncing philosophy and literature generally. Now while we believe strongly in the essential harmony of the two contrasted departments, we should be far from basing it on such a foundation as this. We have said already that such a statement ought not to be made without an appeal to representative men. But, waiving this, we may make our appeal to principles. Some principles both theology and science must acknowledge, unless each is to become a chaos. To establish these, they must have recourse to philosophy. They may reject the systems of others; but, if so, they must substitute systems of their own. Even their quarrel with each other cannot begin until they have agreed upon their rules of war, and for these they must go to philosophy. If they quarrel over these, they quarrel, not as scientists or theologians, but as philosophers; and, in so doing, they confess the importance of that which, it is said, they agree to decry.

When we come to the reasons for this alleged agreement, we find that those of the one are of a wholly different order from those of the other. Christians despise the results of philosophy: scientists complain chiefly of the barrenness and insecurity of its method. Christians say the human revelation is worthless in comparison with the Divine. What scientists assail is "knowledge based on authority and knowledge wanting an inductive basis." Now, supposing this to be granted, how much does their agreement come to? If Christians denounce philosophy as human, do they not denounce science in the same breath? If scientists condemn philosophy as knowledge based on authority, must they not much more strongly condemn revelation, which not only rests on authority, but on authority that is avowedly not human?

The assumptions themselves that underlie these positions are worth a moment's consideration. We have said already

that Christianity does not impose limits to human research, nor discredit the results of it. On the contrary, it stimulates that research, and adds to the dignity and value of those results. The effect of the discovery that man is an immortal being is not to dwarf, but to magnify, the interest of his earthly surroundings. The discovery of God beyond Nature enhances the glory of God in Nature. And the stimulus that religion has given to the exercise of the faculties is far greater than any benumbing influence that a mistaken view of it may sometimes have produced. On the other hand, as it regards the attitude of science toward philosophy, according to our author's own showing, it varies so much with its different representatives that it is difficult to speak with precision. The two chief objections, however, are those above stated. The first refers to the influence of authority. "That the utterances of great and famous philosophers are to be taken as truth, that in philosophy as in the civil law the *responsa prudentum* have a binding force, has been accepted in some departments of knowledge up to the present day. . . . Science, as distinguished from philosophy, has always been more republican." This passage suggests two queries. First, whether the subject-matter of philosophy be not of such a nature that opinion must of necessity have greater weight than in the domain of science, where laws, if not distinguished by greater fixity and subject to fewer exceptions, at all events require a far less extensive area of observation in order to establish them, and are much more easily verified or disproved. Secondly, whether the author is not comparing present science with past philosophy, rather than the present with the present or the past with the past. Aristotle's authority was as great in science as in philosophy throughout the Middle Ages. Ptolemy's yoke was as heavy in the kingdom of the visible heavens as that of Augustine in the invisible. And it is admitted that at the present time "we see the régime of science established in philosophy also." Nay, more than this is admitted. Science itself is not quite free from the influence of authority—"not that it refuses to reverence superior minds." A republic it is, but not a republic without leaders: if it were, it would soon become anarchy. Indeed, of the two, it is philosophy, not science, that approximates the more closely to that condition: its great want at the present day is the advent of "superior minds," able to lift up voices that might be heard above

the general clamour, and such as others would "not refuse to reverence."

The second objection of science to philosophy is that which regards it as "knowledge wanting an inductive basis." Now this must be granted, that the man who takes his opinion from another does not himself establish it by induction. He may or may not by a sound induction establish the claims of that other to teach with authority: he does not personally investigate the truths so taught. But does it follow that the teacher does not? Because he has a certain following, is he dispensed from the obligation to test and examine, to observe and to compare? Are his opinions as oracular in their origin as in their utterance? Did Plato's immutable essences spring from a creative fiat, or Aristotle's logic from a *coup de main?* It is quite true that the fault of the ancient teachers was that they did not observe sufficiently, but that is not convertible with the statement that they thought observation needless. And at the present day the general public are not less dependent, nay, they are much more dependent, on their teachers for their scientific beliefs, than in the infancy of human knowledge. The real difference between science and philosophy lies in their subject-matter, not in their methods.

And here we approach a critical point. The methods of physical science, it is said, are being extended "to the whole domain of knowledge." In our judgment it is a mistake to suppose that the methods of physical science differ from those of moral science. The only real novelty will consist in treating mental and moral phenomena as owning the same laws which prevail in the physical universe. This is the tacit assumption that underlies the claim of universal empire now being put forth in behalf of physical science. Hitherto the phenomenon of freedom has been thought to be a barrier to the establishment of that empire. Henceforth that phenomenon is to be pronounced non-existent. Thoughts, feelings, volitions are to be viewed as following one another with unvarying regularity, as the deflagration of gunpowder follows the application of the spark. Any uncertainty respecting individuals is to be remedied by striking an average for the mass. Statistics are to govern everything. The major morals are to be improved by Act of Parliament, the minor handed over to æsthetics. Theft and suicide

are to be eliminated by a modified form of natural selection: defect or redundancy of population to be cured by a mixture of physiology and economics. The whole body of jurisprudence must be made to share the transformation, and, what will be easier, existing dynasties removed to make way for the sovereign people.

Here, it may be, we shall be told to halt. We have let our imaginations run wild over consequences that need never come to pass. The rejection of authority is not a thing to be dreaded, if only it be carried far enough. We must not only distrust others, we must also distrust ourselves. "Truth is not what *we* think any more than it is what famous men have thought." The suggestion is startling. Even the scientific observer may mistake: he may not only miss much that comes before his object-glass, he may see much that is not there. He may "mix himself up with the thing perceived." The old question forces itself upon us with new emphasis, "What then is truth?" The answer is not far off. "The difference between" human knowledge "and genuine knowledge is just this, that it — human knowledge — is adulterated by a human element. It is not the result of a contact between the universe and the naked human intelligence." One would think that here we had reached the *ne plus ultra* of criticism, or that if there were another step it would be to say that truth is indeed a precious jewel, but nowhere to be found. It is not so. By what would seem in some men very much like contradiction, just when all seems lost, we find that—*tout peut se rétablir*—everything comes right again, and the would-be tragedy ends with the diversions of a laughable farce. Here is the solution. "It is not enough to judge for ourselves, to examine the facts independently; we must examine the facts according to a rigorous method, which has been elaborated by a long series of investigators, and without which neither candour nor impartiality would save us either from seeing wrong or from receiving unsound evidence, or from generalising too fast, or from allowing some delusive name to come between us and reality." In other words, we must not trust others, but we may trust others if they occur in a series; and we must not trust ourselves, but we may trust ourselves if we come in at the end of that series. As if investigators had ever occurred otherwise than in a series, as if now for the first time it were discovered that union is strength, as if

"authority" were limited to the influence of a single "delusive name," or as if party-spirit had never been invoked in science as in politics to prop a failing cause. And where, after all, are we to find the mingled humility and trust which are to be rewarded by the discovery of genuine knowledge and unadulterated truth? 'Tis well to praise these qualities, but how may they be attained? Does science itself confer them? That cannot be, for this would make science the condition of its own attainment. Our author suggests, though he does not give, the answer. Christianity is paralleled with science in its requirement of certain moral qualities in its votaries. But the difference is that the qualities it demands it also promises to impart; and it is for want of the power to impart them that science suffers so much at the hands of its advocates, and that the dogmatism they denounce in others reappears so conspicuously in themselves. The only fault that Christianity finds with the modern quest of truth is precisely that presumptuousness which our author here describes as fatal to the hope of its attainment; and it may be noted that the most confident boasters are precisely those that forswear all connexion with Christianity, while those in whom a spirit of moderation appears—some of them chief lights in the world of science—are those who have disciplined their spirits under the yoke of the Great Master, and laid their intellectual trophies as an offering at His feet.

We pass now to consider further points of agreement which our author discovers between religion and science, those on which he mainly depends for bringing about the hoped-for reconciliation. Here the widening process, of which we spoke at the beginning, becomes manifest. Three important propositions are mentioned on which it is possible that science and theology may disagree, and yet have much in common. The propositions are, that a Personal Will is the cause of the universe, that that Will is perfectly benevolent, and that that Will has sometimes interfered by miracles with the order of the universe. The process by which these ideas are eliminated from theology, as mere accidents not involving the substance of it, is a curious study. We can but sketch it very briefly. The benevolence of God is only "a maxim of popular Christianity, supported by Biblical texts." Other religions, and even the Old Testament, have described Him otherwise—the former

as malignant, the latter as "just, but at the same time terrible and pitiless against the wicked." The slander upon the Old Testament we pass over: its contradiction to the spirit of the New is not proved by an assumed incompatibility of justice with benevolence. But the calling in of other religions to aid us in forming our conceptions of theology is an indication of the bias given to modern speculation by the new "science of religion" that cannot so easily be passed by. The question of true or false in religions is not, it appears, of much moment. Get rid of what is peculiar to each, and we shall find something common to all. Just so, but what will it be worth when we have found it? What basis for agreement can possibly be gained by two men, one of whom worships a benevolent and the other a malignant deity? A difference so fundamental must run down through all their provinces of thought, and make the fact that both worship something a matter of ridiculous insignificance. If one of these views of God be true and the other false, any knowledge that claims to be "genuine" and not merely "human," can only be gathered from one side. It is reality and not opinion that we want to be informed about. Let us suppose the same method applied to the history of science. What would be said, if it were urged that the sphere of science is not to be determined by what is now the prevailing opinion about it, but by a collation of the views of all generations? Thus we might include the doctrines connected with astrology, the quest of the philosopher's stone, and the various systems of angelology that obtained currency in the Middle Ages. The answer would be, that such a comparison is useless, because these doctrines are incompatible with the established truths of science, and these systems have no solid foundation upon which to rest. The author has exposed the weakness of "those controversialists who do not differ at all, but who have adopted different words to express the same opinion." There is another weakness which he appears to have overlooked: it is that of those who hold diametrically opposed opinions, but who base a mutual agreement on the adoption of the same form of words.

The personality of God and His miraculous working are got rid of in the same way as His benevolence. And it is maintained that science may discredit all these, and yet retain something that may still be called theology and well

deserve the name. As to whether science, or the chief among those who cultivate it, can justly be charged with taking such a position, we have already expressed our opinion. Some do, however, and it is of these only that we must henceforth be understood to be speaking when we speak of men of science. "Science opposes to God Nature. When it denies God, it denies the existence of any power beyond or superior to Nature; and it may deny at the same time anything like a *cause* of Nature. It believes in certain laws of co-existence and sequence in phenomena, and in denying God it means to deny that anything further can be known. God and Nature then express notions which differ in an important particular. But it is evident enough that these notions are not the opposites that controversy would represent them to be." This passage seems a strange introduction to an argument designed to prove that every man of science is nevertheless consciously or unconsciously a theist. The argument runs thus. "Those who believe in Nature may deny God, but those who believe in God, believe, as a matter of course, in Nature also, since God includ s Nature, as the whole includes the part. . . . But if, on the one hand, the study of Nature be the study of God, is it not true on the other, that he who believes only in Nature is a theist and has a theology?" The words that follow are too pithy and trenchant not to be quoted, but we must leave it to the reader to decide what application to make of them. "Men slide easily from the most momentous controversies into the most contemptible logomachies." Which is it that make this fatal descent, the parties that thus join in deadly conflict, or the umpire that would first part the combatants, arbitrate upon their differences, and, when convinced of their mutual misunderstandings, join them again in loving embrace? As to the theologian, it is no wonder if his purblind intelligence has missed the point at issue. But how about the man of science? Surely he, conducting all his operations upon the "rigorous method" described above, and checking them at every point by comparison with those of his fellows, will not mistake this simple issue? According to our author, it is even so. The most advanced thinkers of the age, the most subtle and perfectly trained intellects that the nineteenth century can boast, men who think themselves to have performed their highest feat of intellectual daring, and to have put forth their strongest claim to intellectual

independence when, with stamping foot and frowning forehead, they have proclaimed, "There is no God," even these are still entangled in the meshes of a theological net from which no efforts of theirs can deliver them. There is a sense in which we believe that this is true. But we are far from believing it necessary to give up the character, personality, and intervention of God in order to prove it. The residuum, when these are gone, is not worth contending about. The line that divides such a creed from atheism is so attenuated as to be, for ordinary eyesight, invisible. Yet our author says, "If we will look at things, and not merely at words, we shall soon see that the scientific man [who opposes Nature to God] has a theology and a God, a most impressive theology, a most awful and glorious God." And what is the proof? The next sentence is as good a summary of it as any that can be quoted. "I say that man believes in a God, who feels himself in the presence of a Power which is not himself, a Power in the contemplation of which he is absorbed, in the knowledge of which he finds safety and happiness. And such now is Nature to the scientific man." Let us add the qualifying admission. "I do not say that it is good or satisfying to worship such a God, but I say that no class of men since the world began have ever more truly believed in a God, or more ardently, or with more conviction, worshipped Him."

Upon the first of these quotations we must offer a brief comment. Is the contemplation of power, even of immeasurable power, religion? We purposely avoid writing the word power with a capital, lest there should be mixed up with it the associations of personality. It will be admitted at once that contemplation is not enough, even though it should reach the point of absorption. There is power in the steam-engine and electric telegraph, and, till we were used to them, these objects awakened our admiration. But nobody invested this with the attributes of a religion. The religious character of the relation must then depend upon the second element, the finding of safety and happiness in the knowledge of the power. Here the question arises whether safety and happiness are actually found. From some later passages it would be easy to show that the safety and happiness attainable in this way are of a very dubious kind. But there is no need to cite them. In the second of our two quotations the confession is frankly

made. The assertion is not hazarded that to worship such a God would either be good or satisfying, and the caution suggests something more than doubt. The meaning of the whole is just this—the men of science find safety and happiness in their knowledge of Nature, but their safety is not satisfying, and their happiness is not good. This is the author's opinion. Of course it is not the opinion of those of whom he speaks. Absorbed, like one of their progenitors, Archimedes, in their researches into the secrets of Nature, they feel perfectly safe and perfectly happy. That their reverie is likely to be rudely broken by the incursion of a foe who will confound their calculations for ever, no more occurs to them than it did to the philosopher of Syracuse. A moment more and they are struck down at their post of observation, their illusions suffer a grievous disenchantment, and the glory of the face of Nature dies out in irremediable eclipse. What becomes of their safety and happiness now? A great change is impending: either they will be resorbed into Nature or they will not. Take the former alternative: is that so pleasant? Does admiration of Nature make men wish to sink their personality in her unconscious being? They can give up the Divine personality and still worship a God: can they lose their own undoubted personality and yet be counted men? Then take the other alternative, that their individuality is to be retained after death. What warrant have they either for safety or happiness in another life? How does their rigorous method serve them here? What comes of their renunciation of all authority save the decisions of their own intelligence? If a persuasion of one's own safety and happiness is to be made the test of a religion, surely we must look for it where it will not be so likely to change into huge confusion and blank dismay; not where the very best that can be said of the professor of it is that he "dies and makes no sign."

Not content with claiming for mere subjective impressions like these—convictions we cannot call them—the dignity of a religion, our author proceeds to a comparison between this religion and that with which alone it is worth while to parallel it. Still speaking of the class of scientists commonly called atheistic, he says: "Comparing their religion in its fresh youth to the present confused forms of Christianity, I think a bystander would say that though Christianity had in it something far higher and deeper,

and more ennobling, yet the average scientific man worships just at present a more awful, and, as it were, a greater Deity, than the average Christian." Let it be understood that it is the idea of God in these several orders of mind that is spoken of. Now, supposing the above statement true, what would it prove? Simply, that some men are more accessible than others to the influence of great ideas; that if a man habitually studies a theme pregnant with great thoughts, his mind will be distinguished by a certain loftiness of conception and sentiment from those of other men. Further, still granting the truth of the statement, we say that the comparison between Christianity and science is unfair when it is founded upon the difference between the average Christian and the average scientist. The former class is very numerous, the latter very select. The former class is not limited to men of exceptional mental qualifications, the latter is so limited. The latter class belong to the aristocracy of intellect, the former are to be found in every stage of mental culture. The only fair comparison would be between believing and unbelieving scientists; if this were made, the argument would fall to the ground. But we do not grant the truth of the statement, and the words that follow, intended to bear it out, too scurrilous to be quoted, are, to our minds, a choice sample of our author's views when he descends from seriousness to buffoonery, and from picturesqueness to vulgar caricature. Passing over this, we must protest against the next assertion, that while the scientific man knows God to be eternal, "to the theologian infinity and eternity are very much of empty words." Supposing the latter to connect eternity with the issues of his own being and those of humanity—surely a fair assumption, for what other business has he with the notion? —the chances are vastly greater of its being thus realised, than in the contemplation of an universe that can only be theoretically called infinite or eternal, and that is scientifically known to be limited both in extent and duration.

In the next paragraph the definition of theism is enlarged. "A true theist should recognise his Deity as giving him the law to which his life ought to be conformed." We have looked already at scientific worship; the following is the summary of scientific ethics: "That all happiness depends upon the knowledge of the laws of Nature, and the careful adaptation of human life to them." The com-

parison here between science and Christianity does not, it is admitted, run upon all fours. Awe and fear may be inspired by Nature, but not love. "The highest love is inspired by love, or by justice and goodness, and of these qualities science as yet discerns little or nothing in Nature." To what laws, then, as embodied in Nature, does the scientific moralist ask us to conform? "Nature, even if we hesitate to call it good, is infinitely interesting, infinitely beautiful." All this is true, but how does it bear upon the subject of "the law to which life ought to be conformed?" Does it mean that, if we study Nature, we shall become interesting and beautiful too? These qualities rank high, no doubt, in certain stages of youthful development, but in any other connection they have been generally regarded as mere feminine accomplishments, quite unworthy of a place in any ethical scheme. This our author evidently feels, for, after some loose talk about the "regularities that glimmer through an appearance of confusion," and "analogies that set the imagination in motion," he wanders back from law to contemplation, and from the stern sense of duty to fascination and "endless delight."

The category of the religious sentiments that cluster around Nature is not, however, exhausted. There is to be added "a sense of personal connection, and, as it were, relationship." The interjected clause should to our minds have qualified the "personal connection" as well as the "relationship." For we take it that connection between an impersonal God and a personal worshipper can never be more than "personal as it were." And this seems to us mere playing with words. What the personal connection is we are not informed: it seems to be a kind of dreamy communion on the part of the worshipper with "something outside himself," of which he "yet knows himself to be a part." It seems to be the scientific counterpart of the mystical absorption into God, but if so, it has little affinity with the more sober devotion of David and Paul. The feature really meant to be described is probably the reverent trust and submission that distinguish the worshipper of the Christian's God; but these are affections that involve too much of personality in the object of them to find a place in the Nature-worship of science. On a review of the whole, we are compelled to say that the ethics of this kind of theism no more deserve to be called ethics than its devotion to be called

devotion. The common ground between the self-styled atheistic scientist and the Christian believer is not the possession of a theology or a religion. It is only the possession of faculties whose proper exercise is the creation, or to speak more properly, the reception of a theology and the cultivation of a religion, but which, turned from their object, severed from their source, wander hopelessly and aimlessly among the secrets of Nature, unable to read the riddle of her or their existence, and unable to offer a panacea for the moral irregularities of man which contrast so painfully with the symmetry and beauty of his natural surroundings.

In the opening of his second chapter, on "The Abuse of the Word 'Atheism,'" the author sums up his reasons for, as he says, "suggesting the thought of a God revealed in Nature," but as we should rather say, for making the sceptical votary of science a theist in spite of himself. The only sentence that calls for observation is the following: "I can conceive no religion as satisfactory that falls short of Christianity, but, on the other hand, I cannot believe any religion to be healthy that does not start from Nature-worship." Of the first clause we can only express our hearty approval, with this qualification only, that we fear the received notion of Christianity suffers as great a depletion at our author's hands as that of natural religion, and that what would satisfy him is a good deal less than would satisfy us. But the second half of the sentence involves a whole world of speculation as to the origin of religion, and sheds a very peculiar light upon the meaning of the first. It points plainly to a naturalistic commencement of supernatural religion, if not to a polytheistic ground of monotheism, which we believe to be totally at variance both with philosophical probability and historical truth. However true it may be that logically and theoretically it is possible to rise through Nature up to Nature's God, actually and experimentally it has never been done. The nearest approach to such a feat has not amounted to more than a guess: it has never attained the dignity of a discovery, nor led to the establishment of a "satisfactory religion." With this member of the sentence we cannot therefore express our agreement, but with the concluding part of the next we entirely sympathise, "I cannot imagine but as morbid a religion which has ceased to admire" the glory of heaven and earth and sea. Nature does not of herself reveal God, least of all to a man determined not to see Him; but

revealed religion, judged by its authoritative oracles and its best expounders, has always welcomed her collateral teachings.

But we must come to the subject of the chapter. One's first impression naturally is that the title must be a misnomer, that instead of "the abuse of the word 'atheism,'" we should read its "meaninglessness." For if a wide-awake scientist, disclaiming with vehemence the imputation of theism, may yet have the charge fastened on him, who can hope to be successful in throwing it off? One would suppose that the issue of the present speculation would be to proclaim the inherent and essential religiosity of the race. In so far as we can see any force in the argument, that is the only legitimate issue. Our faculties, dwarfed and perverted as they are, cry out for the God they deny. The miserable substitute for religion to which those are reduced who reject its evidences, furnishes a new evidence of its own. It is to religion what the shadow is to the substance, having none of its qualities, but reproducing, more or less faithfully, its form. The author thinks otherwise. There are atheists, of many and various shades, but they are not found among those who have clamorously arrogated to themselves the name. "There is an atheism which is a mere speculative crotchet, and there is an atheism which is a great moral disease." We should be the last to deny the moral monstrosity of atheism, and we admit that some of its features are found in those who believe in a God. But we cannot allow that atheism in any man can be "a mere speculative crotchet." That would be to disconnect creed and character altogether. A true creed *may* fail to produce a good character, but a false creed *must* fail to do so. It is not opinions avowed, but opinions acted on, that are effective. This, it may be said, is just the author's meaning; but, if so, the following definition of atheism will show that he is not quite consistent with himself. "Atheism is a disbelief in the *existence* of God—that is, a disbelief in *any* regularity in the universe to which a man must conform himself under penalties." This is obviously intended as a description of the true atheism—not the speculative crotchet, but the great moral disease. Yet surely, though not a crotchet, it is speculative, speculative in its rise, though practical in its progress and completion. That is, supposing that it anywhere exists, a problem worth revolving. Where is the

man nowadays to be found that has sunk to such a nadir of negation as this? If "disbelief in any regularity in the universe" meant "disbelief in any moral order or purpose," it would be easy enough to find examples. If this be the meaning, it is awkwardly expressed. Whether it is or not must be determined by what follows.

Three classes of persons are said to come under the category that has been described. In the first are those who "always refuse to see any power in the universe but their own wills." In the second are those who, "fully believing in an order of the Universe, yet have such a poor and paltry conception of it that they might almost as well have none at all." In the third are those with whom "faith gradually passes into conventionalism," and "moral paralysis sets in." "The common characteristic of all such states of mind is feebleness. In the first example you have violent feebleness, impotence; in the second, cautious feebleness; in the third, cynical feebleness; but in all cases feebleness springing from a conscious want of any clue to the order of the universe." These quotations, taken with their context, clearly show that it is the moral order of the universe that is meant; and they help us to form some conception of what the author means by atheism. In keeping with this is the following. "As atheism is but another name for feebleness, so the universal characteristic of theology—if we put aside for the present the belief, rare till lately, in an utterly hostile or thwarting Deity—is energy. He who has a faith, we know well, is twice himself." It will be seen that our author allows notable exceptions to his own rule. We cannot afford to put these aside. They are, if not a numerous, an increasing class. It is plain that for these the belief in an order of the universe is not enough. They believe there is one, but that it makes against, not for, the interests of the race. They believe they live in the worst possible of worlds. And unfortunately the outcome is not always feebleness: sometimes it is energy of the most destructive kind. From these very exceptions then there is something to learn, viz., that it is only a belief in a beneficent order of the universe that can be of any service to society.

Let us look at the general principle of our author's division. The belief in a moral order of the universe inspires energy: that belief is theology and that energy religion. Who can accept such doctrine as this? Is it so that all

sincere belief in the moral order of the universe inspires energy, and that all energy springs from such belief? Take the first of the three classes. Is the man who mistakes himself for the universe bereft of energy, or does he always live to be undeceived? Take the second class. Are the small conquests these are allowed to make not due to energy, proportioned it may be to the meanness of their conceptions, but energy still? Take the third class. Do they always cease to act because they have ceased to believe? The author seems to found the distinction between theism and atheism on the presence or absence of a quality due rather to temperament than conviction, a quality almost universally diffused and varying in amount according to no law that can be precisely defined. If the energy be limited to that of the beneficent type, that does not mend matters. A beneficent order in the universe will not make my energy beneficent, unless my own spirit be in harmony with my beliefs.

And yet again, the possession or non-possession of a belief in the moral order of the universe seems to be confounded by our author with the presence or absence of a certain natural largeness of mind, which is distributed according to no known laws, and varies indefinitely in amount where it exists.

It is true that the author expressly excludes benevolence from the essential characteristics of a Deity. But it is hard to understand how a belief in a Deity in no sense benevolent can tend to produce energy. The instances quoted do not bear our author out. The followers of Mohammed might not believe in a God of universal benevolence, but they believed in one who would do good to them. The Calvinists believe that God loves the elect. The old Romans believed that Jupiter or Mars would extend protection to Rome. And even science, with all its dispassionateness, holds that Nature is propitious to those who obey her laws. In all these cases the mere belief in a power, or an ascertainable order, could not inspire energy, but other elements, of which the author takes no account.

Still aiming to clear away misconceptions as to the meaning of atheism, our author touches upon its relation to the forces of modern revolution. The latter has been supposed essentially atheistic, and its friendship with science thought to be the outcome of a common antagonism to religion. This turns out to be a mistake. The alliance

of the revolution with atheism is accidental, and founded upon the equally accidental alliance of religion, or some forms of it, with caste and privilege. In this we cannot agree with the author, though there may be some truth in his statement that, were science bound up with patronage in the way that some forms of religion are, notably the Church that is called Catholic, the revolution would attack science as now it attacks religion. Neither can we concur in the belief that the revolutionary spirit gathers no strength, but rather weakness, from its relation to atheism. This is the necessary corollary to our author's definition of atheism as feebleness; but to us it is an opinion the reverse of the truth, and one that tends to overthrow his definition. "The revolution in Europe delights in declaring itself atheistic. So far as it really is so, by being Titanic, it is doomed to failure." The experience of the past does not justify this prediction of the future. There have been many movements much more truly atheistic in the author's sense than the revolution, that have only too completely triumphed. The overthrow of Rome by the barbarian hordes was not inspired by any theory, good or bad, of the universe, but simply by a lust for richer lands and sunnier skies on the part of those who led them; that is, it was inspired by motives purely selfish and personal. Yet it was as complete an overthrow as the world ever saw, and but for the counteracting influences of Christianity would have thrown the world back far more and for a vastly longer period than it did. And what shall we say of the Oriental conquerors, such as Timour and Genghis Khan, who succeeded one another like whirlwinds in the desert? Temporary in their personal influence, they produced effects which are visible still in the apparently hopeless stagnation of the populations of the East. The revolution is perfectly logical in making common cause with atheism: the former is an insurrection against authority in speech and action, as the latter is against authority in thought. And in so far as science decries authority in matters of morals, it lends itself to the designs of both.

In the third chapter our author discusses the two words "theology" and "religion," apparently with a view to determine how far science, having now assumed the *rôle* of the one, may venture to put on the garb of the other. Its hypothesis of the universe being granted, how may it be expected to work? In order to determine this, our

author dwells at some length upon two kinds of knowledge, the analytic and the synthetic, which must combine to make knowledge satisfactory and complete. In relation to God, the first of these is said to constitute theology, and the second religion, the latter coming first in the order of time. He goes on to speak of the disturbing effect of the introduction of analysis upon minds that have hitherto proceeded upon the synthetic method, and of the difficulty of harmonising the two. We do not question the correctness of this, but there is an inaccuracy in the presentation of it that must be noted. According to the terms quoted above, we should suppose that it is theology which, arriving late upon the scene, begins to disturb the equanimity of religion. In speaking of the disturbing element, however, our author calls it not theology but science. Now if by this he means physical science, the question arises, how it is that theology, which comes long before it and is confessedly analytical, does not disturb religion that has been synthetically established. If, on the other hand, he means that theology is itself a form of science, then why should it not have the credit of being truly scientific, and of anticipating by some centuries the application of analysis which has been supposed the great discovery of physical science; or why should that be maligned as the fledgling of authority which has in reality been the nurse of "genuine knowledge?"

However, it is admitted that the advent of analysis is the signal for a testing of time-honoured convictions. The old tendency was to believe too much, the new one to believe too little: the dangers of both—the ancient superstition and the modern scepticism—are alike pointed out. As those more immediately impending, the latter are of course the more important, and we cannot but quote the passage in which they are described.

"That kind of imaginative eclipse which an object suffers when the shadow of science passes over it has obscured in turn the material universe and man and God. Natural mythology has almost become incomprehensible to us: the 'fair humanities of old religion,' which found objects of love in trees and streams, and covered the celestial map with fantastic living shapes—all this has long ago disappeared. More recently man has been subjected to the analysing process. The mechanical laws which were traced in the physical world, it was long hoped would never suffice to explain the human being; he at least would remain

always mysterious, spiritual, sacred. But now man begins to reckon his own being among things more than half explained; nerve-force, he thinks a sort of electricity; man differs greatly indeed, but not generically, from the brutes. All this has for the time, at least, the effect of desecrating human nature. To the imagination human nature becomes a thing blurred and spoiled, not really because the new view of it is in itself degrading, but because the imagination had realised it otherwise, and cannot in any short time either part with the old realising or perfect a new one. Lastly, science turns her smoked eyeglass upon God, deliberately diminishing the glory of what she looks at that she may distinguish better. Here too she sees mechanism where will, purpose, and love had been supposed before; she drops the name God, and takes up the less awful name of Nature instead."

But if the peril be so great as this, what safeguard have we against it? The author does not provide any. Yet he entertains the hope of deliverance. "We may look forward to a time when this transition shall be over, and when a new reconciliation shall have taken place between the two sorts of knowledge. In that happier age true knowledge, scientific, not artificially humanised, will reign without opposition; but, the claims of science once for all allowed, the mind will also apprehend the universe imaginatively, realising what it knows." How is the reconciliation to be brought about? Science has raised the storm: can science also quiet it? At present, its advocates are militant: when will they become ambassadors of peace? Has the analytical method some natural limits, beyond which it must necessarily recoil upon itself? Is it not to be feared lest the failure to find a good theory of the universe should issue, not in taking up with a bad one, but in renouncing every theory in despair, in that very atheism which our author finds it so easy to despise? And if the alliance with revolution should not be discovered to be unnatural and manfully dissolved, might not the very movement that began with "the fanaticism of truth-worship" end with that worship of self which resolves society into its original elements, and proclaims all authority a lie?

This issue, patent enough to most eyes, our author strives to blink by a suggestion startling in its simplicity, but of very doubtful value. The question being what men will have to fall back upon when "the supernatural Person whose will holds the universe together is taken away," and what will counteract the mischief done when

"out of the human mind there perishes the most elevating thought?" the answer is, "the remedy for this is to be found in the study of Nature becoming universal." "Let all be made acquainted with natural laws; let all form the habit of contemplating them, and atheism in its full sense will become a thing impossible, when no mind shall be altogether without the sense, at once inspiring and sobering, of an eternal order." Thus it would appear that science is to become its own corrective. Nature, like the air we breathe, provides in combination what art can only separately present, the properties of a stimulant and a sedative too. The stimulating properties we see in action now: the sedative effects will be manifest by-and-by. But this comforting suggestion does not allay our fears. It is surely scientific to judge from what we see; and, looking at the seething mass of doubt and contradiction, we cannot but ask how it is that upon those who have already renounced the supernatural the visions of peace have not yet dawned? Surely some at least have been drinking long enough at the cup of their inspiration to have passed by this time the turbulent stage; but we see no signs of quiescence.

Very calmly does our author confront the consequences of an unfavourable view of human life, *i.e*, a general view of human life as "unfavourable to ideals." They are crime, apathy, and suicide. The one cause is want of faith. Can the want be supplied by science? After what our author has said about its analytical skill, and his silence as to any synthetical method that is to follow the universal dissection, we should hesitate very much before giving an affirmative answer. He does not scruple to do so, but in the elaboration of it seems to us to assume something that begs the point at issue. The problem is fairly stated.

"The questions which we all understand to be theological are such as these: Is there a reward for virtue? Is there a compensation for undeserved misery? Is there a sure retribution for crime? Is there hope that the vicious man may become virtuous? Are there means by which the pressure upon the conscience produced by wrong-doing may be removed? Are there means by which the mind disposed to virtue may defend itself from temptation? In one word, is life worth having, and the universe a habitable place for one in whom the sense of duty has been awakened?"

No one can deny that the problems of life are here fairly faced. The various solutions are next contrasted, and the palm of superiority naturally awarded to the Christian. But it is maintained that, even in dealing with questions like these, the sceptics have something to say for themselves. We cannot quote the answer put into their mouths. Of course, it sums up the whole business of responsibility and retribution, as well as of moral lapse and recovery, in the discipline of human life. And this utterance has only to be formulated after the manner of a science to become a very respectable defence. Such a science would be that of "the relation of the Universe to human ideals," and it "is constructing itself fast." But now for the assumption. Nature has hitherto been commonly understood to denote the material universe, and not to include man any further than he participates in that. Now, however, its application is extended.

"When it is said Nature consists of relentless and ruthless laws, that Nature knows nothing of forgiveness, and inexorably exacts the utmost penalty for every transgression, a confusion is made between two different meanings which may be given to the word Nature. We are concerned here with Nature as opposed to that which is above Nature, not with Nature as opposed to man. We use it as a name comprehending all the uniform laws of the universe as known in our experience, and excluding such laws as are inferred from experiences so exceptional and isolated as to be difficult of verification. In this sense Nature is not heartless or unrelenting; to say so would be equivalent to saying that pity and forgiveness are in all cases supernatural. It may be true that the law of gravitation is quite pitiless, that it will destroy the most innocent and amiable person with as little hesitation as the wrong-doer. But there are other laws which are not pitiless. There are laws under which human beings form themselves into communities, and set up courts in which the claims of individuals are weighed with careful skill. There are laws under which churches and philanthropical societies are formed, under which misery is sought out and relieved, and every evil that can be discovered in the world is redressed. Nature, in the sense in which we are now using the word, includes humanity, and therefore, so far from being pitiless, includes all the pity that belongs to the whole human family—all the pity they have accumulated and, as it were, capitalised in institutions, political, social, and ecclesiastical, through countless generations."

This passage vexes us sore. Whatever may be the truth as to man's place in the universe, whether outside or inside

Nature, surely it is unfair to claim as part and parcel of her products all the sentiments, laws and institutions which have sprung up under the wing of supernaturalism. That, whatever the fate of supernatural belief, its social influences will long make themselves felt, is undeniable, whether they be rated as superstitions or not. But to count these as a part of Nature is to miscalculate grievously. The religion of the future, if it is to discard supernaturalism, must discard its creations too. It must reconstruct society without them. And if this be done, what warrant is there that the spirit of forgiveness, for instance, will not count for a weakness instead of a grace? Its prototype is found in the God above Nature whom we shall have got rid of, not in the God in Nature whom we shall retain. The very boast of science is the invariableness of Nature, which will brook no mistakes in others, as she commits no mistakes herself. And what is to replace, for binding force and solemn interest, the doctrine of eternal happiness reserved for the just? Why the maxim that "honesty is the best policy." The whole truth comes out in the next paragraph to the one quoted above. "Nature including Humanity would be our God." The antithesis between Nature and Humanity is drawn out in such a way as to show that what we miss in the one we find in the other, so that the terribleness of the earthquake and the fire is softened by the still small voice. But there is another antithesis to be thought of, viz., that between humanity under the influence of religion and humanity left to itself. 'Tis very well to speak of the lifeboat and Grace Darling as rescuing us from the pitiless storm, but what if our greeting be that of the more pitiless wrecker? The antithesis between vicious and virtuous humanity is more striking than that between Humanity and Nature, and overturns all pretence to make it our God.

In the fourth chapter the author works out more fully the alternative to a supernatural religion. By the title "Three kinds of religion," he appears to indicate the three forms which the substitute may take. One of these is the worship of Humanity, the second is Pantheism, and the third a revival of Greek Paganism. The language throughout is that of apology for these forms of religion. High-toned admiration is of course out of the question in presence of the grandeur of their rival. But the shock and jar of their introduction to the Christian public are sought to be

obviated by a variety of plausible excuses. The following are samples. "It is not exclusively, but only *par excellence*, that religion is directed toward God. . . It is surely not to be supposed that every higher form of religion ought to supersede and drive out the lower forms. . . The worship of Humanity belongs to the very essence of Christianity itself, and only becomes heretical in the modern system by being separated from the worship of Deity. . . To those who take the free historical view of Hebrew prophecy, it is not difficult at the same time to revere its denunciations of idolatry and to sympathise with Greek Nature-worship." There is a good deal of vacillation in the author's mind as to the fortunes of the several claimants for the throne soon to be vacated by supernaturalism. He toys with each in turn, but cannot make up his mind about either. Paganism received its death-blow long since, not from Christianity, but before its advent from "the natural progress of human development giving birth to reflection, philosophy, morality." So much of good then, at least, has been done by one of the forces supposed to be inimical to science. And to imagine Paganism as taking the place of supernaturalism is "a mere vague literary fancy." Of the enthusiasm of Humanity, the sole fruitful idea of Christianity, a green and flourishing shoot encumbered by much rank underwood, there is more hope. Yet even this appears to be lacking. It seems to be felt that man can never attempt to deify the race without danger of the self-worship which means atheism.

Man is, after all, not the measure of the universe. There are glories beyond him which he does not reflect. After admitting then to a place of honour the religion of Humanity, and to a secondary one, for those who like it, the sensuous Hellenic religion, the invitation extends a little further. "But would this be all? Is it so evident that all which relates to Deity would pass away? Is there not something wholly independent of marvel or miracle in that idea of Unity, of Eternity?" This is meant to pave the way for a recommendation of Pantheism, which like its predecessors is spoken of with "'bated breath and whispering humbleness," as something that is "seldom thought of seriously." It is mainly its shadowiness that makes against it. It is in the other extreme from Paganism, "austere, abstract, sublime. It worships not the individual forms of Nature; but Nature itself con-

sidered as a unity." The praises that are lavished upon this form of religion are such as most effectually seal its condemnation. The object of worship is so intangible that a name cannot be found to express it. Neither Universe, nor World, nor Nature, will do. The name God has too sacred associations to be abandoned: let the name God be given, stripped only of all connexion with personality, and let it stand henceforth as man's best name for the unity which he believes he sees in Nature and himself. Of the character of such a proposal as this we cannot trust ourselves to speak. Alas, that it should be possible for a man to make it, and not be conscious how deeply he sins against the profoundest instincts of the human heart. Instead of the honest indignation we feel, let us suggest one line of argument. Supposing the name God transferred to man's idealised conceptions of the Universe, would it retain the same power to humble and, at the same time, to help mankind as while invested with its present awful and gracious associations? And supposing Pantheism thus robed in a glory not its own to be blended in some heterogeneous fashion with Paganism and the enthusiasm of humanity, would the three combined furnish a better leverage for the world's moral elevation than has already been employed for nineteen centuries with the happiest results in the single unsubsidised force of Christianity?

In the fifth chapter the attempt is renewed to enlist sympathy in favour of so-called natural, as against supernatural, religion. Here, however, as the title suggests, "Natural Religion in Practice," the question is tested, not by abstract reasonings, but by typical examples. Two illustrious names are selected, Goethe and Wordsworth, as instances of natural piety almost unalloyed; and while allowance has to be made for certain ungenerous impulses which betray themselves in the former, and also for some infusion of Christian ideas in the worship of the latter, it is claimed that they are good samples of what natural religion, divorced altogether from the motives and restraints of another world, can do to support men under the ills of life, and to enable them to play their part well in it.

These names were aptly chosen for the purpose of illustrating the influence of Pantheism. But their characters, even as drawn by our author—and we have no reason to complain of his description—do not strike us as bearing any resemblance to those which are generally found in

leaders of moral and spiritual revolution. 'Tis true, such a revolution as Pantheism might produce must have very different characteristics from those we usually associate with the name. If successful, it would give a final quietus to many forms of activity that now compete restlessly for public favour. It is scarcely possible to conceive the stagnation of energy that would follow from such a reaction against the feverish restlessness of modern times. But for all that, the character of its leaders would require as much solidity as those whose business it has been to fire men's ambition or to satisfy their greed. A dam or a breakwater requires to be strong, no less than a lock or an embankment. But this solidity is precisely the quality that Pantheism fails to impart, that it failed to impart to these typical men. If ever Pantheism is to triumph, it must be through men who have not drunk too deeply of its lethal streams, and whose energies are recruited from unpoisoned sources. Our author sees this plainly enough, and therefore his praise of the two poets is not all enthusiastic. His compliments are occasionally of a very doubtful order, but the effect is intended to be favourable on the whole, favourable that is to an admission of the claims of Pantheism to a place in the future Pantheon. What its simulacrum is to be, and with what rites it is to be nourished other than those of dreamy meditation, we are not told. Certainly it is a form of religion that is not likely to commend itself to busy, practical Englishmen. Their affinities are rather with the masculine spirit of Carlyle than the luxurious sentimentalism of Wordsworth. His robust energy has been claimed for Pantheism, and might seem to stand in conflict with our views as to its enervating effects. But his autobiography has let out the secret both as to the original source of his strength, and as to the personal weaknesses that will so largely neutralise for posterity the vigour of his weird prophesyings. And certainly he cannot be quoted as an example of cheerful optimism in the renunciation, or at least obscuration, of a personal God.

The way in which the author connects the names of Wordsworth and Goethe with the deeper earnestness of art and literature in modern times is another instance of the readiness with which he makes the largest possible demands on the faith of his readers without vouchsafing the smallest particle of proof. "The higher literature was reformed in England by this man's fidelity to the object of his worship."

"The result of the movement in art which was represented abroad by Goethe and in England principally by Wordsworth, is still plainly perceptible both in the art and even to some extent in the religion of the present age." Nothing is easier than for the admirers of a great man to exaggerate his influence. But the great contrast between the seriousness of the nineteenth century and the frivolity of the early part of the eighteenth is not to be set down to the musings of a solitary recluse who seldom quitted his sequestered dales, and whose writings have always been a sealed book to the multitude. Knowing what we do of a widespread religious awakening extending through the very period which precedes the dawn of a brighter day for literature and art, how much more rational it is to suppose that religion gave the impulse to literature than *vice versâ*.

There is something strangely incongruous in the closing paragraphs of this chapter with the tone adopted toward the Christian Church of the present day in the earlier portions of the book. Hitherto the conventionalism of Christianity has been dwelt upon, its confused forms, its loss of the freshness and simplicity of its beginning. Now the admission is made of a great improvement, a deeper seriousness, a more intense realisation. Only here again assumption comes in, when the cause for this phenomenon is to be sought. The old times—not so very old, but just passing out of living memory—are spoken of as the "orthodox times," and it is left to be inferred that the intenser convictions of the present are the fruit of doubting, not of faith. "Men now reason with God as Job did, or feel crushed before Him as Moses, or wrestle with Him as Jacob, or blaspheme Him; they do not so easily attain the Christian hope. But with whatever confusion and astonishment, His presence is felt really and not merely asserted in hollow professions; it inspires poetry much more than in orthodox times." We are constrained to ask what should be the moral? What direction is to be given to the seekers after truth? Is faith once lost so irrecoverable that it can never regain its child-like simplicity? Must all progress be in the direction of novelty and change? Has the world never witnessed periods of rejuvenescence in which, as in the spring-time, what seemed mere lifeless timber has glowed with the warm verdure of renewed youth? This surely should be the application of such a text as our author reads to us out of the book of our modern moral

consciousness. But his voice has no such hopefulness in its tones. The utmost that he can do is to suggest the possibility of better things. "If men can add once more the Christian confidence to the Hebraic awe, the Christianity that will result will be of a far higher kind than that which passes too often for Christianity now, which, so far from being love added to fear, and casting out fear, is a presumptuous and effeminate love that never knew fear."

The slur upon the Christian Church contained in the last clause of the sentence grates painfully upon our feelings. There are those of whom it is true, but it is not true of the Church as a whole. For orthodox Christians the author seems to have no sympathy and no hope left. Their creed can never inspire them with either love or fear; but if the heterodox, the worshippers of God in Nature, could only blend confidence with their awe, from them there might arise deliverance for humanity. That is precisely the stumbling-block and reproach of the so-called natural religion. The fatherhood of God and His kingship are both sacrificed in the rejection of His personality, and of His manifestation by an authoritative message. What is left is the uncertain sound of His footsteps in Nature, which now seems to speak Him friendly, and now to drive us from His face. With this change in the character of the Deity comes a corresponding change in the attitude of His worshippers. From the rapt reverence of dutiful children, attentive to know their Father's will, they sink into the abject prostration of helpless slaves: they cower and cringe in presence of Him that made them, as if the utmost display of favour to be expected were capricious smiles passing over a countenance habitually shrouded in gloom. Whence then can the new confidence arise? Not from the intenser study of the awful Form before them, but from the rolling away of those mists and vapours which have hitherto distorted its image, and from meek submission to the gracious terms which ensure reconciliation and peace.

Such a panacea it is not in the power of the author of *Ecce Homo* to offer. If supernaturalism is an offence to him considered simply as a tradition of the past, a reflection of glories that once shone down from the opened heavens, much more must it be an offence to him considered as a living experience of the present, a form of personal communion as between a man and his friend. If

we spoke of this, we should be ranked with mere enthusiasts, our secret communings would be pronounced the ravings of idiotcy, and our strongest witness regarded as the echo of our own thoughts. Yet it is here if anywhere that the hope of humanity lies hidden, in the acknowledgment of a God dwelling among us, not in the pantheistic sense of a mysterious inscrutable essence, that is and is not the sum of all things, that is good in the good man and evil in the evil man, but a personal Sovereign asserting His will equally in natural and moral laws, in natural and supernatural dispensations, and a loving Father putting at once His gifts in our hands and His love in our hearts.

We have now carried our examination of *Natural Religion* to the end of the first and most important part of the work. The second part, entitled "Natural Religion Applied," we cannot discuss for want of space. But we trust we have said enough already to indicate fully the nature of the argument, to expose some of its weaknesses, and to guard the unwary against an unreflecting acceptance of its specious generalisations. The tone of the work is that of *Ecce Homo*—except that dealing with Christianity as it now is rather than as it left the hands of its Master, it is much more free and fearless in its criticisms—but the whole style and treatment are different. It is often discursive, and sometimes to all appearance aimless in its parenthetical disquisitions, and yet the wealth of illustration is so abundant that the reader willingly loses himself in such company, certain that whenever he pleases the author can unravel the tangled thread; certain, too, that presently it is sure to be tangled again. The book has great beauties and great blemishes. It raises more questions than it settles. The baneful effects of such reading on immature minds are palpable enough. As a set-off against these, its chief and, as it seems to us, only use, though an indirect one, may be to awaken in the minds of some student of the mysteries of Nature the donbt whether that development which presents such resemblance to a religion, and yet lacks its most vital and satisfying characteristics, can after all contain the whole revelation that he needs to know, and whether the old paths be not at once more safe and less thorny than the new.

LITERARY NOTICES.

I. THEOLOGICAL.

BIRKS'S MODERN PHYSICAL FATALISM.

Modern Physical Fatalism, and the Doctrine of Evolution, including an Examination of H. Spencer's First Principles. By T. R. Birks, M.A., Professor of Moral Philosophy, Cambridge. Second Edition. With a Preface in reply to the Strictures of H. Spencer. By C. Pritchard, D.D., F.R.S., Savilian Professor of Astronomy. Oxford: Macmillan. 1882.

WE have only to do with Dr. Pritchard's Preface to the second edition of Mr. Birks's admirable volume. It is a generous and effectual defence of a man who could defend himself very well if the hand of Providence had not laid him aside. "Mr. Spencer assails his literary antagonist in language which possibly might provoke retaliation, and which must certainly leave much to regret on Mr. Spencer's part. For instance, Mr. Spencer has thought it becoming to represent the author of *Modern Physical Fatalism* under the undignified figure of a child pulling about and entangling a skein of silk for half an hour. He intimates that 'an intricate plexus of misrepresentations, misunderstandings, and perversions fills the three hundred and odd pages forming the volume.' In another passage he forgets himself so far as to say that 'Professor Birks apparently thinks that, moved by the high motive of "doing God service," he is warranted in taking a course' the opposite of generous; and 'that he would fail of his duty did any regard for generous dealing prevent him from making a point against an opponent of his creed.' It seems to me difficult to understand how harsh and contemptuous and undignified language such as this is likely to further the satisfactory conclusion of an important argument." These are Dr. Pritchard's words. Accordingly he examines Mr. Spencer's dis-

paragement of Mr. Birks's intellectual and moral capacity at length, and thoroughly vindicates his and our disabled friend. We are thankful for his vindication: indeed, he vindicates us as well as the Professor; for we have more than once made Mr. Birks's principles and arguments our own by publicly expressing our confidence in them. The vindication is all the more valuable because it comes from one whose object is "neither to attack Mr. Spencer's *First Principles* nor to defend Professor Birks's *Physical Fatalism*, taken as wholes, but solely to inquire how far Mr. Spencer is justified in applying the undignified and contemptuous language which he has adopted, to the several passages in question." The defence, with these qualifications, is a masterly specimen of the manner in which discussion should be conducted.

For the sake of those who have the first edition of Mr. Birks's able work, and may not get the second, we select only an instance or two: such, however, as have at the present time a special interest, and may well occupy one of our pages. "Further, Mr. Spencer complains that at the end of the first paragraph which deals with me, I am represented as teaching that 'religion is equivalent to nescience or ignorance alone.'" We confess that we should ourselves have so represented him, after studying his works: allowing for a certain necessary latitude in the use of the terms "equivalent" and "nescience." And certainly the public generally have adopted that language in their estimate of Mr. Spencer's philosophy. But it may be well to hear what he now says in defence of himself. "Though I hold that an Ultimate Being, known with absolute certainty as existing, but of whose nature we are in ignorance, is the sphere of religious feeling, Professor Birks says, I hold that the ignorance alone is the sphere for religious feeling." We might attempt, not without hope of success, to show that Professor Birks is right: that an author who uses the language just quoted does regard the sphere of nescience to be the sphere of religion. For religion means the bond that links a personal spirit with a Person; and, if the nature of the Being with whom man is linked is absolutely unknown, the religion which forms that link must draw the soul into a region where ignorance reigns. Professor Birks never wrote a word too strong on this subject. But our opinion is not now in question. We give Dr. Pritchard's: "A critic who puts a reasonable and probable construction upon an author's writings is not fairly to be charged with literary dishonesty or intellectual capacity if such interpretation varies from the intention of the writer." Then comes the evidence that Mr. Spencer had given the Professor (and we may add ourselves) just ground for such a comment. What do the following words from the *First Principles* mean? "Very likely there will ever remain a need to give shape to that indefinite sense of an Ultimate Existence which forms the basis

of our intelligence. We shall always be under the necessity of contemplating it, as some mode of being, that is of representing it to ourselves in some form of thought, however VAGUE; and we shall not err in doing this, so long as we treat every notion we thus frame as *merely a symbol, utterly without resemblance to that for which it stands.*" Now, as our Apologist justly asks: "Can the critic who represents this sphere for the religious sentiment as equivalent to a sphere of nescience or ignorance alone, be justly stigmatised as acting with literary dishonesty, or as resembling a child ravelling a skein of silk? The author of *First Principles* no doubt feels that his views on Religion are misinterpreted; but it was quite open to him to have stated the fact with emphasis, without the adoption of contemptuous language wholly unwarranted and which can only recoil on its author."

Without introducing Mr. Birks's offence, we will quote a sentence which, coming from a writer who can command and look down upon any position in physical science that Mr. Spencer can take, is significant. "After giving all the attention within my power to Mr. Spencer's explanations of his views on dynamics in general, and the conservation of energy in particular, I find myself unable to apprehend with clearness Mr. Spencer's views on this branch of physics. For half a century it has been my lot to study or to expound the writings of Newton and of his illustrious successors, but I fail to discover anything like a similarity between these investigations and the dynamical theories enumerated by Mr. Spencer. Neither can I discover the standpoint from which he regards them. I find also that mathematicians of great eminence and ability are equally at a loss with myself in this respect... I fear that if I involved myself in the argument respecting Mr. Spencer's views relating to *potential energy* and subjects cognate to it, I might be liable to the same misinterpretations of Mr. Spencer's meaning myself, and I might lay myself open to the same sort of severe and unmerited remark which Mr. Spencer applies to the author of *Physical Fatalism*, viz., that '*there can be but one opinion respecting the honesty of making the assumption.*' All that I can say regarding this portion of Mr. Spencer's rejoinder is, that so far as I can understand the point at issue, I am unable to see how Mr. Birks's *honesty* can be called in question. He or any other competent mathematician may very possibly misunderstand some of Mr. Spencer's dynamical propositions, but surely this misapprehension may be pardonable, probably it is unavoidable, and certainly it is fully within the category of what is honourable." This is severe, but just; and we are grateful for this vindication of one of the noblest and most pure-minded defenders of our faith. Messrs. Macmillan have acted with great discretion in going to the Oxford Observatory for a preface to this new edition.

Commentary on Zechariah.

The Hebrew Student's Commentary on Zechariah, Hebrew and the LXX. By W. H. Lowe, M.A., Hebrew Professor, Lecturer at Christ's College. Macmillan and Co.

Mr. Lowe hopes that the new regulations for the Theological Tripos Examination will introduce a new era in the Hebrew scholarship of his University; and comes forward with his contribution to that end. This consists of a very careful grammatical examination of the Hebrew text, with special reference to its difficulties; none of which have been avoided, "rather some have at times been intentionally raised when by so doing an opportunity has been afforded of explaining some of the *minutiæ* of the Hebrew syntax." We have found great advantage in reading with him, especially in these hard places to which he refers. The excursus at the end treat of some comparatively neglected points, and will be found useful to advanced Hebrew scholars. Mr. Lowe, however, does not absolutely confine himself to the grammatical study of this book. He introduces a running exposition which has its interest: referring, however, to Dr. Wright's Bampton Lecture for the fuller interpretation, and thus showing the general orthodoxy of his principles as an expositor. There is much vigour in some of his notes, and here and there some boldness. The most remarkable instance of this will be found in his conjecture that ch. xii. 10–14 should be inserted after ch. xiii. 3. "We admit," he says, "that we have no authority for so doing, either of MSS., versions, or commentators. Two considerations have suggested to us the rearrangement of the text: (1) We are unable to discover any intelligible meaning which the words, 'And they shall look on Me (or Him) Whom they thrust through,' in the place in which they now stand in the Hebrew text, could have conveyed to the prophet's hearers; and even to us of the present day they seem enigmatical words suddenly introduced without the idea of 'thrusting through' having been supplied by the context; (2) If we place them after ch. xiii. 3, in which the 'thrusting through' of a son is distinctly mentioned, the words which commentators have taxed their ingenuity in vain to explain, will convey the simplest and most obvious sense. In a section in which the phrase 'on that day,' 'and it shall come to pass on that day,' occurs so often it is easy to imagine that a confusion of order may have arisen in early times." Though Mr. Lowe does not alter a single word, but merely suggests a transposition, we cannot help crying Halt! to such a procedure as this. There is no one thing more characteristic of the visions of the prophets than precisely this sudden interjection of Messianic references, the meaning of which only the distant future would declare. Besides,

there are limits to the ambition of private suggestion which has no support from any part of antiquity. And Mr. Lowe, whom we expect to see coming forward as a professed expositor of Zechariah, should reconsider this suggestion, and refer to it only as an expository help, without hinting at a rearrangement of the text. However, it would be unjust to withhold the note that follows: "When, in the blindness of fanaticism, these people should have been led to commit such a crime as that mentioned in ch. xiii. 3, then God would have pity on them and pour out on them the spirit of grace and supplication, &c. The reader will perceive that the application of the expression, 'And they shall look on Him Whom they thrust through,' to our Lord (John xix. 34, 37; Rev. i. 7), is even more appropriate if the words be taken as we have proposed, than if they were left in their present context. For the passage, as we propose to read it, defines a prophet, and a true prophet, rejected by his own people as a false prophet, and slain by them. What more appropriate passage could be cited relative to our Lord? We must not, however, any more than in ch. xi. 12, 13, confine the application of the prophecy to this single fulfilment, though it is certainly by far the most remarkable and important one."

But we must fall back upon the primary purpose of the work, which is to help the student of Zechariah's Hebrew text. That purpose it will admirably serve; and all the more because it offers its help only or chiefly in difficult places. There is not the fatigue of a minute grammatical and philological study of every word and sentence. The student is supposed not to need this. But we cannot help wishing that a bold and beautiful text, corresponding to the Hebrew text in the notes, ran along the top of the page.

Dewes' St. Paul.

Life and Letters of St. Paul. By Alfred Dewes, M.A., LL.D., D.D. Vicar of St. Augustine's, Pendlebury. Longmans. 1882.

The late Bishop of Manchester, Dr. Prince Lee, seems to give his posthumous approbation to this volume. The substance of part of it was laid before him many years ago, and he said: "As your Bishop I tell you that, if you do not continue the work you have begun, you will be culpably neglecting the gifts God has given you." The author, harassed by affliction and pressure of work, waited for the Revision. Like many others engaged in translating and expounding the New Testament, he expected that the new version would supersede at least one part of his labours. But he was disappointed, and, as we think somewhat intemper-

ately, thus expresses his opinion: "Last year, when the seventeenth of May came, the long expected Revised Version appeared; very anxiously had the writer looked forward to it, hoping against hope that it might fulfil all our need. But before he had read three sentences his heart sank within him: it was but too plain that the company of the Revisers had been so hampered by the directions laid down for their guidance that with all their ability and all their zeal they had produced a revision scarcely if at all more intelligible than the one it was meant to supersede." Then follows an attempt to substantiate this charge, which, however, contains nothing new and nothing very effective. But the old Authorised does not gain by this: it also is very severely handled. It is rather surprising, however, to find that the text adopted by Dr. Dewes is that of the much-maligned Two, Drs. Westcott and Hort: a fact which to a very great extent weakens the attack on the Revision. "Only in two or three instances has that text been departed from." "To the present writer it seems far more satisfactory than any we have had before; and he considers it a great advantage that he has had such a text to follow." The work contains a sketch of St. Paul's life, which does not predispose us in favour of what is to follow. There is deep danger in this fundamental principle laid down: "Many readers on principle read them through as they come; consequently they read first of all the letters that were written in the fulness of his prime, then those which were written when his powers were perhaps somewhat on the wane, before they come to the two which were written first of all, and which bear in the eyes of many careful readers marks of immaturity when compared with those which have been placed in order before them." The author sees no peril in this; he has no such views of the inspiration of the Holy Spirit as would save the Christian Church from the necessity of measuring its confidence by the tokens of St. Paul's growing development and decadence. But he feels the difficulty, and hence we read: "Neither in such a comparison, nor in such a suggestion, is there any irreverence whatever. One only is there of those born of women, who received the Spirit without measure; all others, than He, can only receive the Spirit according to their measure. And the measure in which any man, or even any apostle, can receive the Spirit at the outset of his course differs widely from the measure in which he receives it when his course is in its mid career; or, again, when his course is almost finished and he is calmly awaiting the end." The fruit appears in the sketch of St. Paul's life, especially in the entire surrender of the Apostle's character in connection with his assuming the Nazarite vow and his defence of himself before the high priest.

The translation we must leave to speak for itself. It is

exceedingly vigorous, occasionally helpful, and always repays reading through. Undeniably, it sometimes gives a more vivid impression of the general meaning of St. Paul than any other private adventure that we have seen. We meet examples like these: the Gospel is "glad tidings" always; "scorn not inspired utterances;" "if any man do harm to God's Holy of Holies;" "whereas he that cleaveth to the Lord is one Spirit with Him;" the "New Covenant;" "in the habit of being baptised for the dead;" "His Anointed One;" "a man is not brought into a righteous state in consequence of deeds done in obedience to law, but is only brought into that state through faith in Jesus Christ"; "no longer do I live in my own person;" "the mere elements of unspiritual teaching." But we must cut short our long list of renderings which are, however disguised, paraphrases of a subtle kind. They give a great interest to the version read as a refined commentary; and we may say that we have read every word with interest. Still, this is not a perfect rendering of St. Paul's Epistles: that has yet to be produced.

Vaughan's Authorised or Revised.

Authorised or Revised: Sermons on Some of the Texts in which the Revised Version differs from the Authorised. By C. J. Vaughan, D.D., Dean of Llandaff, and Master of the Temple. London: Macmillan and Co. 1882.

Though most English congregations will have heard something about the Revised New Testament, not many will have listened to a judgment upon it which has been associated with the insight, learning, literary experience, and critical taste which belong to the now venerable Master of the Temple. It is the evident aim of this volume of sermons not only to vindicate the claim of the Revision to public sympathy and approval, but also to demonstrate that the changes which have been effected, have a bearing upon doctrine and practice, as well as upon literary accuracy. Dr. Vaughan does not demand the immediate removal of the Old Version in favour of the new, nor does he assert that the Revisers have strictly fulfilled the instructions received. The fact as to the latter point was that no one was able to state the problem until it was carefully ascertained by the selected company of scholars. No absolute direction, therefore, could be given beforehand; but as a majority of two-thirds was required to effect any alteration, there is every probability that no indefensible change has been allowed. Possibly in some cases the refinement of modern scholarship has reduced too much the vigour of some Scripture sayings, just as the ruder strength of a former time gave too much boldness to others; yet no one was content to

leave the English Bible exactly as it appeared in 1611, and a translation in which Anglo-Saxon Christendom is substantially agreed deserves, at least, a respectful treatment.

The first of eighteen specimen texts which Dr. Vaughan examines is 1 Tim. iii. 16: "God was manifest in the flesh." On the new version, "He who was manifest in the flesh," the preacher found the title to his sermon, viz., "The Personality of the Gospel." The change is defended not only on the grounds of authority, but also on those of reason. "He who" is a much more suitable subject for the remaining clauses of this ancient formula than "God." This illustrates a remark in the preface which is to the effect that if a better reading be first accepted on documentary evidence, though at first opposed to our prejudices, it will eventually present a meaning more in harmony with the context. On the clause "seen of angels," Dr. Vaughan accepts the opinion that the "angels" are the Apostles by whom the Saviour was "preached unto the world." But he does not reply to the objections to this view—particularly that of Meyer on the use of ὤφθη.

On John v. 39, Dr. Vaughan shows, in a striking passage, that the imperative rendering has its special lesson to our own time. "'Search the Scriptures'—the reproach is keen, read in the imperative. The men of old time lived in their Scriptures. Scribe and Pharisee gave a lifetime to the study—could tell you the number of verses, and the number of words and letters in each verse—worshipped, idolised, and deified the letter. And what came of it? The Son of God came, and they would not come to Him.

"How is it now? Again there is a study and a measuring and counting, and a deifying of the letter. Men are in disgrace who so much as turn upon it the microscope of scholarship, or the microscope of comparison, or the microscope of intelligence—they are accused of bringing in reason where revelation should reign, of seeing a human element in the sacred books of an Inspiration Divine. The very vestment and cerecloth of Revelation, its versions two and a half centuries old, is held to be profane by a revision and a re-rendering" (p. 30).

But let us also hear the lesson to be deduced from the indicative rendering which has been preferred by the Revisers.

"There is a danger—let none gainsay or make light of it—in the critical and exegetical study. There is a fascination in the investigation of words and idioms, there is a seduction in the comparison of commentaries, there is a glamour in the presentation of thoughts and views which may draw aside the most diligent student into some by-path of intellectual pleasure, the very direction of which is neither Christ-ward, nor heaven-ward, the whole issue of which may be as little spiritual as a life spent

in the illustration of the most entirely human author. The scribe well instructed unto the kingdom of heaven may be less than the very least within it" (p. 33).

This volume of sermons is full of the practical thoughtfulness which appears in these extracts. The author takes especial pains to win for the New Version the ears and hearts of those devout persons who are somewhat unwilling to forsake the older form of our national Bible. It is for these especially that he considers the changes in John xvii., particularly those in vv. 2, 11, and 24. The new rendering in ver. 2, "That whatsoever Thou hast given Him to them He should give eternal life," is not such good English as: "That He should give eternal life to as many as Thou hast given Him." But the sacrifice of linguistic perfection secures more fidelity to the original, and avoids a theological difficulty. Moreover, in the very peculiarity of the expression, Dr. Vaughan finds the topics of his sermon on "The Unity and Individuality of the Church." The change in v. 11 is one of a numerous class of instances in which the Revised Version has given alarm to those who valued the Calvinistic impress belonging to the older. The alteration has been made upon the authority of the four older MSS., as against more modern texts. A relative pronoun which the ancient texts give in the singular is given in the plural by the later ones, and thereby becomes a hinge for controversy. The revisionists accept the view which makes the "Name" of God, given to the Son, to be the antecedent rather than those for whom the Redeemer prayed. "Keep them in Thy name which Thou hast given Me;" and not "Keep through Thine own name those whom Thou hast given Me." But who can compute the effect wrought by that simple change in the number of a pronoun?

Another passage selected by Dr. Vaughan is one which the New Version has changed in its entire aspect. This is John xvii. 19, where the old exhortation to endurance, "In your patience possess ye your souls," becomes a promise to those who endure: "In your patience ye shall win your souls." The change is justified by authority, and by the use of κτάομαι. "The boasting Pharisee does not pay tithes upon all that he *possesses*, but upon all that he gets." Dr. Vaughan readily shows how this translation suits the case of the persecuted disciples who, though hated and injured even to death, were yet saved. By endurance they won true life though the earthly life was lost. But the preacher is more ingenious than successful when he gives the words a spiritual application. He represents the soul as being the centre of a conflict which never terminates until death. But the final glorification of soul and body is one thing; the present emancipation of the human spirit from "sins and doubts and fears" is another. The former is the salvation to be realised in the day of the Lord; the latter is the great promise of the New Testament to believers now.

The important changes in Col. ii. 18 and 23 form the occasion of another sermon. In the Revised Version the Colossian visionary is credited with "dwelling in the things which he hath seen:" whereas the Old Version charges him with "intruding into things which he hath not seen." The external evidence for the transformation of a negative into a positive statement is so far doubtful, that Tischendorf only accepted it in his eighth edition, and it was not received by Bishop Ellicott (Ed. 1861); yet it is now generally regarded as conclusive. Here, as elsewhere, Dr. Vaughan chiefly relies upon the internal evidence in defending what he considers to be the true view. It was not likely that St. Paul would blame any one for avowing his faith in the invisible—τὰ μὴ βλεπόμενα; but he might rebuke the presumption of one who placed his own alleged visions—ἃ ἑώρακεν, on a level with, or even higher than, revealed truth. We may remark, however, that the literal meaning of ἐμβατεύων, to enter upon—which is the only one used by the LXX., scarcely needed to be exchanged for an occasional classical use—to dwell in.

But Dr. Vaughan does not closely investigate the philological grounds for the verbal and phraseological variations introduced into the New Version. For "Sermons," addressed to a miscellaneous audience, it was more suitable to emphasise the increased fidelity and clearness obtained for important passages, as well as in the general structure of the Version. Such a text as Phil. ii. 5–10 affords a good opportunity for this kind of treatment. Every one will see that it is more in harmony with St. Paul's exhortation to self-abnegation to read, "counted it not a prize to be on an equality with God," especially with the marginal alternative of "a thing to be grasped," instead of "a prize," than to read "thought it not robbery to be equal with God." But many of the points selected by Dr. Vaughan for illustration are such as would not at once strike the general reader. The volume throughout is marked by a true reverence for the word of God, by much spiritual earnestness, and practical wisdom. The friends of the Revision will be encouraged by the advocacy of one who can defend their cause with so much "sweetness and light" as Dr. Vaughan, and who meritoriously possesses so large a share of popular esteem.

Christianity and Modern Scepticism.

Christianity and Modern Scepticism. By Rev. A. G. Girdlestone, M.A., Vicar of All Saints, Clapham Park. London. Hodder and Stoughton.

The utmost recommendation of this volume in the eyes of the *Scotsman* is that it "is written in an excellent spirit," but others,

less offended by the absence of the heterodox, may think that it deserves better than to be "damned with" such "faint praise." The author's design is not to add another book to those already existing on Christian Evidences. This work "is addressed to Christians rather than to sceptics," such design being based upon the conviction that the causes for scepticism as existing around us "are remediable by us, being very much due to Christians themselves."

Chapter I. is merely introductory. Chapter II. suggests "Defects in our Methods of Presenting Truth." In no cynical spirit, but with courteous plainness, the author points out that pomposity, dishonesty, thoughtlessness, want of sympathy, misuse of illustration, and employment of foolish hymns and pictures, may all tend to beget or to foster unbelief. There is much truth in the closing sentence. "Similarly with perverted Christian practices, an overstrict bringing up, gloomily-kept Sundays, or that religious dissipation which robs a brother of his Sunday to indulge itself in driving or riding to pet preachers or to distant congregations, these things undoubtedly make it hard to believe in the religion of Christians."

Chapters III., IV., and V. are devoted to the statement and criticism of "Defective Principles in Ascertaining and Teaching Religious Truth." Some of the author's remarks are exceedingly pertinent, and deserve much more notice than they will probably receive. "The use of isolated texts," proof texts as they are called, is justly criticised. As Mr. Girdlestone says, any one who has heard secularist lecturers knows too well the way in which by this means truth may be distorted. It is startling, yet too truly so, to be assured that "this sceptical method has its origin with pious Christians, who pick out texts in a similar manner for their own purposes. The Bible, *as a whole*, is in many instances a neglected book amongst us both in the pulpit and the pew." These are grave charges; alas! that there should be so much ground for them. Yet, probably, despite all that he or we may say, the evil pointed out is not dead yet, nor even dying. "The fragmentary study of Scripture" does only too often "tend directly to the growth of unbelief."

Again, we are urged to "resist the enervating desire for one-sided dogmatism," for which caution also there is ample room. The picture drawn is too sadly accurate, of many Christians who are "impatient of suspense and of elements of uncertainty, and presenting to the world their own scarecrows as being veritable Christianity, are then surprised at the spread of scepticism."

The paragraph headings of some of these pages are mistily peculiar. The reader is puzzled to know how "The Fatherhood and Omnipotence of God," and "The Secularism of Christianity"—meaning its adaptation to this life,—with some others, can be

styled "Defective Principles, &c." A little more classification here would be a great improvement. But there are many excellent remarks, despite the somewhat discursive style. It is to be feared that some forms of evangelicalism do prove that "we are too apt to regard God and Christ as conveniences to ourselves," thus laying Christianity open to the charge of being only a form of selfishness, and to that extent paving the way for scepticism. The use of unscriptural phrases, excessive anthropomorphism, and fanciful interpretations, come in deservedly for their share of condemnation. The effects of defective Christian teaching and practices on scepticism are well pointed out. We are glad to echo the following sentence. "It cannot be laid to heart too deeply or too constantly in this age of doubt, that any and every perversion of Divine Truth is the very opposite of an aid to faith—is an aid to doubt." To carry this out will, however, try the faith of many.

Chapter VI. deals with "The Relation of Reason to Revelation." It can hardly be called a strong chapter in any sense. It is rather too serious a subject to discuss and dismiss in twelve pages of large print. But there is a mellow simplicity about these few remarks which makes them worth both reading and remembering. The appeal of Scripture to the understanding is well attested.

Chapter VII. treats of "The Moral Character of Scepticism." The discussion is far too brief to be satisfactory. It is far easier to say that "doubters" should be "classified," and that "we ought to distinguish between the doubter and his doubts," than it is truly and accurately to do either. Our author's claim, "we have now cleared the ground," viz., in two pages and a half of widely-spaced type, is somewhat large, not to say rash. There follow, however, some very sensible remarks upon "Temptations to Doubt, a Part of our Moral Training," in which Tennyson's oft-quoted couplet about "honest doubt" is fairly rescued, by the addition of its context and some just remarks, from the bad company in which it has been not seldom found.

Chapter VIII., on "Qualifications Required for Dealing with Sceptics;" and Chapter IX., on "Suggestions for Personal Dealings with Sceptics," show that in these matters both our author's head and heart are in their right place. Here is delightful absence of the wild rashness of the tyro, and precious presence of the "wisdom of the serpent in combination with the guilelessness of the dove." If all Christian advocates would work on these lines, there might be some profit in argument.

Chapter X., on "The Relation of Natural Science to the Subject," may be pronounced the best in the book. Without any technical show of scientific attainments, the author makes manifest that he is not one of those Christian teachers to whose "mental idleness" is largely due the unbelief of young men who look to

them as guides (p. 98). It is enough to say that both the scientific and the Christian position are fairly represented, and "the kinds of evidence of the two compared." It is well to be reminded, for it is often forgotten, that "the evidences upon which most persons believe the teachings of science" consist "purely of authority." Few persons can be experts. Whilst even "for actually scientific men the only ultimate evidence for the conclusions of science is experience, either by observation or experiment through the senses, and these may easily delude us." Mr. Bradlaugh strongly insists that consciousness cannot be trusted. If this be so, then scientists should be the meekest and least dogmatic of the proclaimers of would-be truth. *Utinam sic esset!*

Under the head of "The Practical Limits to Scientific Conclusions," there is force in the remark that "the real issue with the scepticism of the day, whether scientific or not, lies as it did in the disputes of the Reformers with Rome, in the preservation of common sense in the world."

The moral force of Christianity is compared with that of science as forcefully as is possible in the small space allotted to it, whilst the summary appears both fair and firm. "We have seen that natural science itself, through its method of induction, ultimately rests upon probabilities and analogies, and so cannot reasonably taunt Christianity with a want of mathematical certitude." It is hardly necessary to point out how true this is, or how often it is ignored by fashionable scientists.

The value of the book, for its avowed purpose, is considerably enhanced by the Appendix, which consists of an abridged form of a reply to a secularist lecture. Forty-six points of the lecture are dealt with seriatim. Not exhaustively, certainly, but with sufficient terseness and clearness to be both helpful to troubled readers, and suggestive of fairly model methods to any whose duty it may be to engage in like controversy.

Taken as a whole, this book may be earnestly commended to the perusal of thoughtful believers. It is idle to deny that we have and shall have increasingly to do with unbelief in varied and especially popular forms. Critical editions or scientific treatises, however valued as manifestations of Christian scholarship, are not always most effective. They are read, because they can only be read, by the erudite few. The volume before us is suited, by its unpretentious but careful simplicity, to the understanding of the many. As such we wish it a wide circulation, and trust that thereby many may be helped to become workmen that need not to be ashamed, "rightly dividing the word of truth."

Blunt's Reformation of the Church of England. Vol. II.

The Reformation of the Church of England, its History, Principles, and Results. By the Rev. J. H. Blunt, M.A. Vol. II. Rivingtons.

Mr. Blunt's first volume extended from 1514 to 1547; the present one covers the period between 1547 and 1662. Dealing with a period of such length and such a character, even a bulky volume like the present can do little more than give a bare recital of events. Mr. Blunt writes, not for the learned, but for general readers. We must add that he writes for his own particular school. His theory of the English Church is that known as the Anglo-Catholic, of which he is one of the most extreme advocates. The Puritans and "the Roman Catholic sect" are to him both objects of abhorrence, although not in the same degree. Of the former, he has nothing good to say. "The Puritans," we are told on p. 411, "were neither educated nor reverent." Owen, Baxter, Howe, Calamy, Manton not educated! The remark as to want of reverence is just as accurate. Such violence and prejudice defeat their own ends. No one who lives outside the atmosphere of partisanship will accept Mr. Blunt's caricature of Puritans and Puritanism as a portrait.

What surprises us most in Mr. Blunt and the writers of his school, is the attitude they take towards the Reformers of their own Church. Cranmer, Ridley, and Hooper find no favour in Mr. Blunt's eyes. According to him they were always and everywhere in the wrong. Everything which tends to their disadvantage is carefully recorded. The assertions of their enemies are accepted without question. Whatever *The Grey Friars' Chronicle* and Huggard's *Displaying of Protestants* say must be true, while Foxe is seldom mentioned without the addition of insinuations against his trustworthiness. We have no doubt at all that Cranmer would receive more justice at the hands of a Roman Catholic historian, not to speak of generosity or St. Paul's charity, than he receives here. We should be sorry to quote the violent invectives to be found on pages 196 and 330. When we are informed that the descendants of Cranmer became Roman Catholics, we ask, What has this to do with the Archbishop?

We read again (p. 152), "Archbishop Cranmer himself was twice married, and Mrs. Cranmer married two other husbands after losing the Archbishop." This occurs in a paragraph which seeks to prove "the growing irreligion of the anti-Church party," and in a note which gives examples of alleged profligacy or laxity. On the other hand Gardiner is painted with a halo of glory,

Bonner is carefully whitewashed, Mary is exculpated and commended. The way in which the persecutions are palliated is often ingenious. We have quite a long description of severities enacted against beggars, by way of suggesting to us that men in those days did not think so much of burning and being burnt alive as we do. But after every possible palliation and deduction, Mr. Blunt is obliged to admit Foxe's hard fact of 277 persons being put to death for heresy within the few years of Mary's reign. If burning alive was thought so little of, how is it that there is no second example on a similar scale in English history?

We do not care to challenge Mr. Blunt on a number of secondary questions, such as his effort to throw the blame on the Spanish Philip and his priests, or the evident delight with which he quotes the Reformers in favour of religious persecution. We will bring the whole matter to a simple test. In his last chapter he accepts and defends the doctrine and institution of the English Church as settled at the Reformation. We ask, Who carried out the Reformation—Gardiner and Bonner, or Cranmer and Ridley? Assuredly not the former. If the latter did not, who did? Who were its leading spirits? Did it transact itself? Has it no living representatives? The answer undeniably is that Cranmer, Ridley, Latimer, and their helpers were as thoroughly identified with the English as Luther and Calvin with the continental Reformation. Apart from them it has no existence. Now, if they were the characters described in this volume, what must we think of the Reformation and the English Church which are their work? How any one can renounce the actor and accept the work is a complete mystery to us. Look at the matter from another point of view. Mr. Blunt's sole defence of Bonner is that in his persecution he simply acted in his "judicial capacity," that he could no more refuse to act than a judge of assize (p. 232). Would not the same apply to Cranmer's proceedings in reference to Anne Askew and others? Yet nothing of the kind is said. On the contrary, no opportunity is lost of repeating the charge of persecution against Cranmer.

Mr. Blunt is greatly shocked at the strong language used by some on the Reformed side about the mass and altar. Yet he himself writes of the Lord's table substituted, "This wretched kind of 'board' was spoken of by old-fashioned people (with an almost excusable contempt) as an 'oyster table,' evidently from its close resemblance to the rough bench table used by the street hucksters" (p. 412). Now, the "mass" is not found in Scripture, whereas "the Lord's table" is (1 Cor. x. 21), so that after all the violent Reformers did not abuse a Scriptural institution, whereas the other side did. We confess that much which is said in this volume in defence of the mediæval mass is as shock-

ing to us as anything which Mr. Blunt condemns. Such a sentence as, "Whether or not the more severe English service of our own time is an improvement upon the elaborate Latin service of our forefathers" (p. 405), sounds passing strange in the lips of an English clergyman. The attempt of Charles I. to force Episcopacy on Scotland is changed into a "secret conspiracy for the overthrow of Episcopacy" (p. 509). The expulsion of the English Nonconformists in 1662 becomes the "secession of the Nonconformists" (p. 578). We are informed that the number of seceders was not 2,000, but 800, and also that "some were men of property, some made wealthy marriages, some returned to the trades which they had given up for the pulpit, and great kindness was shown to those who were poor by the bishops and nobility." Prefixed to the volume is a "Chart of the Ministerial Succession of the Church of England." Immediately succeeding the Apostles are "British bishops, French bishops, Irish bishops, Roman bishops, Milanese bishops." No particulars are given until the sixth century.

Mellor's Hem of Christ's Garment.

The Hem of Christ's Garment, and Other Sermons. By Enoch Mellor, D.D. With a Biographical Sketch by Henry Robert Reynolds, D.D. London: Hodder & Stoughton. 1882.

No time has been lost in issuing this handsome and most acceptable memorial volume. Dr. Mellor was taken from us in October of last year. And now we are presented with a selection from his sermons, including some of his latest, and one that was preached within a month of his death, that will be greatly valued both for its own sake and for the sake of him whose voice will be heard no more.

The brief biographical sketch by Dr. Reynolds is fuller of the loving appreciation of its subject than of narrative and event. A life, indeed, such as Dr. Mellor's, spent mostly in a single town, and in the pastorate of a harmonious church in quiet days, is marked by little incident or change. Dr. Mellor was born at Salendine Nook, near Huddersfield, on the 20th of November, 1823. He was educated at Huddersfield College, and at the University of Edinburgh, where the teaching of Sir William Hamilton chiefly engaged his attention and was the most powerful factor in his training. In 1846 he entered the Lancashire Independent College, and two years later accepted the charge of Square Church, Halifax. It was a feeble and declining church when Dr. Mellor's connection with it began, with a great history indeed, but with little hope or present prospect of anything but

gradual extinction. But from the time of Dr. Mellor's appointment, its fortunes wholly changed. The place, large as it was, became too strait for the congregation. Its liberality and zeal were awakened, and near the site of the old chapel was erected a new one, with which Dr. Mellor's name will long be connected. He continued in its pastorate until 1861, when he was persuaded to succeed Dr. Raffles in Liverpool, but after the interval of a few years he returned to his old home, and gave Halifax the fruits of his ripest experience, as he had given it the vigour and zeal of his youth. In 1863 he was called to the chair of the Congregational Union, and in 1870 his own University conferred upon him the degree of Doctor of Divinity. Twelve months ago, upon his return from a tour in Egypt and Greece, his health began to fail, and in the autumn his labours on earth were ended.

Few men of his denomination were better known outside of it than Dr. Mellor. As a preacher his services were in wide request. The charm of his sermons consisted not in their brilliancy, for the preacher made little pretension to oratory, but in their sublime sincerity. No one could listen to him without seeing that he felt the truth he preached, and endeavoured so to preach it as to make it a regulating principle in the lives of his hearers. His contributions to literature were as large as could be expected when the pressing claims of his long pastorate are considered. Some of the essays he published in *Ecclesia* reveal a master's hold of his theme, and power to maintain it against all encroachments. But his most important work was the treatise which he composed as the Congregational Union Lecture for 1876, entitled *Priesthood Considered in the Light of the New Testament*. It is not an exhaustive discussion of priesthood in all aspects, nor indeed does it profess to be. But it is a thorough vindication of the inalienable spiritual priesthood of every Christian, moderate in statement, clear in its language, and irresistible in its argument.

In this memorial volume some of Dr. Mellor's more widely preached sermons are omitted, to the momentary regret of the reader. And yet it would be difficult to decide which of the twenty that are included should yield their place. They are so admirably selected that they represent Dr. Mellor in his different moods and in his ever-varying treatment of the one theme, from which he rarely digressed, of the Person and Mediatorial work of the Lord. A brief sacramental address even is admitted in the company of a sermon which is a passionate plea for his Master, and another which treats indirectly of some of the connections between religion and moral philosophy, and still others that are vivid and startling pictures of different Christless types of man. "The Uses of Sickness," "No Changes," "At Thy Word," "The Stone and the Image," "The Training of a Child," are other subjects that are dealt with, and will give some idea of the

ground traversed by the preacher. But it is needless to particularise further. No better memento of Dr. Mellor than this volume could have been devised. By all who knew him it will be treasured and often consulted. And to such as never heard him, it will convey a fair representation of the spirit of the man and of his ministry.

Scrymgour's Doctrine of the Cross.

The Doctrine of the Cross: A Contribution to the Theory of the Christian Life. By the Rev. E. P. Scrymgour, B.A., Lecturer on English Literature in King's College, London, &c. London: Bell and Sons. 1882.

Philosophy, says Kant, cannot be learned by rote; each man must learn to philosophise for himself. In this way philosophies threaten to become as numerous as philosophers. Yet every new production as it arises may be referred to its specific class. The author of this book has abundant faith in his system, which he confesses to be partially derived from Hegel. He also claims to have "the liberal largeness of the Comtist;" while "the sublime sentiment of sorrow underlying the extravagance of Pessimism" is also assimilated by his comprehensiveness. "The book is in this sense an Eirenikon." Not only does it aim at the reconciliation of all schools of philosophy, but also at that of philosophy with religion. Such an aim is certainly magnificent; and it would be a great wonder if a book of less than two hundred pages should inaugurate this consummation.

It would require the author's skill in philosophic writing—which he considers to be "a form of art"—to condense his system into statements briefer than his own. The style is not only marked by brevity, but is somewhat mystical and enigmatical. We will do our best, however, to represent the principal features of Mr. Scrymgour's system. In the preface he distinguishes between "theory—the apprehension of law, and hypothesis, which is an assumption of supra-sensible existence, suggested by discovered law." He then proceeds to say that "it is as theory, not hypothesis, that I maintain what in the sequel I describe as the spiritual or ideal sphere, the sphere of law." We are to distinguish "between the sphere of nature, as vaguely known to us in common experience, and the ideal or spiritual sphere which is the sphere of law." Then Mr. Scrymgour would have us to receive the Hegelian paradox. The distinction between nature and intelligence, "though deeply real, is not ultimate;" only, through "the necessary incompleteness of our knowledge it can never pass away." And our author does not seem to suspect any incongruity in this suggestion that we should surrender our reason, such as it is, for

the sake of helping us out of its native difficulties. We must regard our intelligence as a part of nature: the mind which observes is one with the thing observed: subject and object are identical: which is the aboriginal fallacy of Hegelianism, and the confusion of our thought-process with "things as they are."

We suppose that fundamentally most philosophical systems are of two kinds. One is that of materialism. It says that "things as we know them" are identical with "things as they are." Nothing exists which man does not or may not know. The other system asserts that "things as they are" are not within our present apprehension, but are disclosed by "things as we know them." This division of judgment on the primary things of philosophy Mr. Scrymgour thinks he can heal. He does not deny the main position of either school, but is not content with this alone. He proposes to show that they are identical. But he cannot show this to reason, only to faith. "The ultimate perfection of our knowledge is a limit which must ever remain unattainable; but with the genuine pursuit of knowledge, with our grasp of the spiritual sphere, our conviction of the ultimate absorption of the sphere of nature must grow stronger. That conviction is in truth the universal postulate which underlies all knowledge; the supposition that knowledge is possible, the presumption that nature is intelligible. And with the growth of knowledge that presumption is continually confirmed."

We could wish that Mr. Scrymgour had indicated some suspicion that there might be a possible deception lurking under "the presumption that nature is intelligible." Who can dispute that nature is intelligible, in part? But who can doubt that nature can never be *wholly* intelligible to man? It is intelligible now to some extent, and becomes more so every day, but always revealing itself under the principles and limits of human reason. It reveals itself to us always both as the intelligible and as the unintelligible. It speaks both of the finite and of the infinite: it contains both the "mathematical idea" and "the spiritual idea." No combination of these essentially differing elements in nature—by Hegel, Schelling, Principal Caird, or any of their disciples, is yet "intelligible." Mr. Scrymgour may believe that the mathematical idea is included in the spiritual, the finite in the infinite, the sphere of nature in that of law and ideas—and we are not ashamed to confess the same faith; but we cannot yet agree to say that it can be demonstrated to reason or put into philosophical form. Kant seems to have shown that the laws of human reason forbid it.

It is the pretence of philosophical systems that they have bridged the chasm between thoughts and things. Materialism has its short and easy method, which is to assert that thoughts are things. The idealist matches this assertion by his affirmation

that things are thoughts. Both theories have found encouragement in the growth of the doctrine of evolution. The materialist sees in it a triumphant testimony to the sufficiency of nature to account for itself. The idealist, on the other hand, as readily seizes it to assist an exposition of the universe on ideal lines. Even in the blind activity of monads the latter discerns a nascent purpose, a rudimentary intelligence; while the former delights to recognise this as the very point at which molecular motion is passing through sensibility to consciousness. Mr. Scrymgour says (p. 29): "Throughout organic life, therefore, I recognise the germination of the idea of purpose as the inward cause and real interpretation of that outward adaptation which is its correlative. Even in gravitation, radiation, as well as in the polar forces and atomic affinities, we can scarcely stand against the hint of a centralising, individuating process, such as would appear to stamp upon the face of nature, as a whole, organic lineaments, and to confirm our postulate of purpose by marking it with universal validity."

We question whether the Positivist will accept "the Spiritual Postulate" which our author recommends to him under the bribe of so large a concession to his materialism. When Mr. Scrymgour comes, in his second chapter, to discourse on "The Conflict of Ideas," he is compelled to take a side in the great warfare, in spite of his assumed impartiality. He says: "Thought, although inseparable from the world and outward life, is yet distinct, and ought to be regarded as the inward cause, the real and potential form, the law, the ground of all experience..... Between the inward and the outward it might appear that a gulf is fixed: yet to span that gulf no bridge can be constructed. Indeed the relation is too close to admit of such a possibility. Once apprehend it justly, and the gulf disappears." Here we see how this theory lands in a denial of any essential difference between things and thoughts! There cannot be a bridge, for there is no chasm! So says the materialist—with this difference, that he insists that mind is but an extension of matter; whereas the idealist claims matter as an extension of spirit. Who shall decide between them? The materialist thinks his assertion to be quite as good as that of the idealist: and as leviathan laughs at the hook of the fisher, so the Agnostic at the conceits of transcendentalism.

Yet we do not overlook the fact that idealism commands strong positions against the materialist. As Mr. Scrymgour observes, there is "a persistent pretension of the mathematical idea to dominate the realm of the eternal;" but it can only do this by assumptions which it stubbornly refuses to allow to any system except its own. However, natural science reveals too much for materialism to explain. There are not only mathe-

matical proportions in nature, but suggestions of space, motion, force, and adaptation.

"The essence of the mathematical idea is ratio; and the ratios limit and determine each other. Of this central antagonism the antagonistic relations of constant and variable—variable and function are developments, and the law of variation of the function is expressed by an infinitesimal ratio. Ratio itself, in the idea of relative increase and diminution, involves the ultimate antagonism of positive and negative. Then there is the antagonism of algebra with geometry,—either refusing to keep its hands off the other..... Attraction is not motion, yet it passes into motion, and by motion is measured..... Even the law of gravitation is not fulfilled absolutely: there must always be some residue of interference unaccounted for, supposing the material universe unlimited."

Such facts certainly demonstrate the necessary incompleteness of our theories. Mr. Scrymgour, however, makes these contradictions in the sphere of nature, which the materialist cannot explain, to serve his purpose. They evince "the conflict of ideas." But then we cannot help asking to whom the ideas belong, which he alleges to be in conflict. Ideas belong to some mind; and the ideas which are evolved in Nature belong to a Mind in which there can be no conflict. It is only in poetry—and somewhat pantheistic in its character—that the Divine ideas can be said to be in conflict: not in philosophy, which, if genuine, is *the science of reality*. If we had space to follow Mr. Scrymgour through his application of his system to theological and ethical questions, we could show that amongst much that is very suggestive, his subservience to a dubious philosophy vitiates much of his speculation. How far he goes towards pantheism the following extract may show (p. 78):—

"If we cannot entirely imagine its details, we can assuredly grasp and understand it as a whole. With regard to the cosmic systems, and to what we call inorganic nature generally, we know its relation to ourselves in our knowledge of its laws; we know further those intimate relations which subsist betweem our thoughts and feelings, and what we call their physical conditions. And although our knowledge of cosmic evolution is as yet obscure, we can hardly resist that movement of thought which compels us to grasp the unity of nature as an effort of adaptation which may justly be regarded as everywhere organic—*i.e.*, as implying an ideal development. To speak indeed of the consciousness of nature, might appear at first as a whimsical paradox; yet here again I would ask, what is there in experience to preclude this almost irresistible conclusion?"

We can only reply to this final question, that if you begin by denying the distinction between matter and spirit, you will

inevitably fall on the pantheistic conclusion that nature is conscious, and therefore Divine. Mr. Scrymgour evidently follows Principal Caird in his *Introduction to the Philosophy of Religion*, in attributing to nature the marks of an organism. But if it is an organism it has life, and we cannot then hesitate to allow also intelligence; which intelligence, or "consciousness," must be that of the Infinite. Yet Mr. Scrymgour hopes by such reasoning to give to Christianity a philosophic ground. His book is entitled *The Doctrine of the Cross*. That "conflict of ideas" which he finds to be the great law of the Universe, explains the agony of Redemption. The soul is to find rest in the suppression of the mathematical idea of individuality. A man must, we suppose, cease to regard himself as a separate and responsible individual; and begin to consider that he is one with the universe and with God. His happiness is attained in "the ethical idea," which is "the community of consciousness." "The art of reflexion is at once an assertion of eternity—and for all men this possession is at least within reach, as all have the reflexive faculty." Man's way to eternal life, it would seem, lies through philosophy. Having "broken the bond of the mathematical idea, by the spiritual might of the community of consciousness," he gets a hold on real unity. Jesus Christ became "to the Church the symbol of the Divine Presence, because He knew God as the Eternal Father one with His Eternal Son." The "conflict of ideas" went on in Judaism; it accounts for the antagonism to Christ; it is going on still. But we are not to think that sin is eternal. "Without an apprehension of the bond of Divine communion which binds every soul in indissoluble relationship with the spiritual Father, *and renders absolute alienation inconceivable* (the italics are ours), we could not bear to look into the depth of sin." But in this Hegelian amalgamation of the human spirit with the Divine, how can there be such a thing as sin? He says (p. 133): "Here as in all genuine inquiry the shadow of relation pursues us throughout. Except in relation to the spirit of holiness sin is not conceivable at all." Sin consists in man obeying "the organism of desire" for his own sake, and not in pursuit of "ideal development." When a man comes to know his own desires and obeys them for the universal good he has attained "Salvation." "To awaken a genuine repentance is the noblest effort of our life—and in the great agony we can hear the call of God to repentance and life."

We do not know what may be the effect of this philosophical sketch on the Hegelian, the Comtist, and the Pessimist, to whom it is especially dedicated. Some of them may possibly learn from it that Christianity is a system of truth which in view of the real facts of nature and humanity is more comprehensive than their own. The only disadvantage would be that they might soon

suspect that the "doctrine of the Cross" is something very different from the account given of it in this book. We are sorry that we cannot compliment Mr. Scrymgour either upon his philosophy or upon his theology.

Dale's Synod of Elvira.

The Synod of Elvira, and Christian Life in the Fourth Century; A Historical Essay. By Alfred William Winterslow Dale, M.A., Fellow and Lecturer of Trinity Hall, Cambridge. London: Macmillan and Co. 1882.

The *Synod of Elvira* has hardly received the attention at the hands of ecclesiastical historians that it deserves. Beyond a huge and dreary dissertation upon it by Mendoza, and occasional allusions, more or less full, in the pages of Spanish Church history, no adequate attempt has been made to estimate its importance, or to exhibit the information it gives as to the moral character of the age. One of its canons, forbidding the admission of pictures within a church, has been a favourite weapon of Protestant reformers. And now and again, at long intervals, students have found in the authority of other of its canons, the means of refuge or of assault. But the Synod has generally been treated with neglect and indifference. Its date has been left so uncertain, that between the extreme calculations is a chasm of nearly five hundred years. Its locality is a matter only of conjecture and inference. And though it was the first of the Western councils that can fairly be considered as national, and stands in close relation to the great events of the early part of the fourth century, its importance, as the initiation of a new ecclesiastical policy, which was radically to alter the relationship of the Church to the State, has rarely been perceived. And consequently there has long been needed such an attempt as Mr. Dale has made, to recover the action of this Synod from obscurity and misconception, and to trace its moral and political significance. That task, necessitating great labour, and requiring much critical acumen, he has accomplished thoroughly. The more minute difficulties of the interpretation of ambiguous canons and the examination of textual variations are fully discussed, when they are not finally solved. And the details of information thus derived are reduced to an organic symmetry, in which are seen a faithful picture of the Spanish Church of the fourth century, and the rudiments of the policy that prevailed at Nicæa.

Of the controversies of which this Synod has been the subject, the most general relate to its locality, to its date, and to its constitution. Mr. Dale may claim to have settled all three. He shows that the council must have met at Illiberris in Bœtica,

which stood on the site of the modern Granada. With respect to its date, he gives conclusive reasons for fixing upon the earlier part of the year 306, which is about the latest time at which both Hosius and Valerius could have been present. It is very probable that the former of those bishops convened the council, and exerted a masterly influence upon its deliberations and decisions. And no better suggestion as to the standard of precedence in it has been made than that of Dr. Pius Gams, who argues with much force that the order of signature was decided, neither by caprice nor by age, but by the date of the foundation of each bishopric.

The majority of the eighty-one canons of this Synod relate to discipline, and very little light is cast upon either the creed or the manner of worship of the Spanish Church of the period. The range of episcopal authority was extended, and several measures were taken in order to mark the special dignity of the presbyter's office, and to separate the clergy as a class from the laity. A uniform system of discipline was thus for the first time established throughout the dioceses of Spain, which sought to regulate by positive and often minute injunctions the morality of the converts individually, and of all their relations to the State and to society. Sentiments, formerly prevalent but not prescribed, were formulated, systematised, and perpetuated. Hitherto the Church had been simply an aggregate of autonomous congregations, practically independent and related to one another by community of feeling rather than by statute. The greater cities had indeed exerted a preponderating influence over poorer or humbler churches in the neighbourhood; but there was no distinct dependence of the one upon the other, and no legislation that necessarily bound both. The policy of Diocletian had been to reorganise and unite under one regular system the empire which he found threatened with disintegration. Hosius, who was perhaps the first great ecclesiastical statesman the Church had produced, must have perceived at once that a similar policy would be followed by Diocletian's successors, because in it lay the only hope of Imperial security. And the problem, in consequence, to which he addressed himself, was how to prepare the Church that it might take advantage of this change in the methods and views of the Government. He saw that it was necessary for it to assume organic unity, and transform itself into a great corporation. Uniformity of law must consolidate the separate communities, and cohesion among the parts must be secured and maintained; and that, in Hosius's opinion, could be best effected by endowing the clergy with exceptional powers, and knitting them together as a distinct caste. It was left for the later councils of Nicæa and Sardica to carry out the views of Hosius more fully. The great interest of Elvira arises from the fact that there, under his personal influence, was inaugurated that system of

corporate union, upon the basis of which was built the great external prosperity and authority of the Church in later years.

This book will be welcome to students of ecclesiastical history for other qualities than the value of its contents. It is completely furnished with all that apparatus of analyses, notes, and indices, to the omission of which, in connection with such a work, penal consequences should be appended. There are not only appendices, tracing the literature that may be consulted upon every matter of difficulty, and recapitulating the opinions that have been held upon every matter of doubt; but even the magazine articles that deal with this Synod are summarised, and lists are given of the uses to which some of its canons have been put. Mr. Dale describes his work as a "first venture in a new field of study," and inscribes it "*Patri primitias.*" It is to be hoped that his pen will busy itself with similar themes for many years to come.

Brown's Fire-Baptism of All Flesh.

The Fire-Baptism of All Flesh; or, The Coming Spiritual Crisis of the Dispensation. By S. Borton Brown, B.A. London: Kegan Paul, Trench and Co. 1882.

There is no express statement in this volume as to the nationality of the author, but "his speech bewrayeth him." The frequent use of the word "transfigured," in a sense not usual with English writers, and some other peculiarities of style, indicate that he is an American; and he is also a Universalist. Of course there is nothing in his nationality to be ashamed of; and if his views as to the eventual restoration of all moral and accountable beings to purity and blessedness were set forth soberly, and supported by fair argument, we should be bound to consider them dispassionately, and to give our reasons for dissenting from him if we could not accept his conclusions. But he disclaims all controversy, and professes to have transcendental evidence of the truth of his opinions. He has received a fiery baptism of the Spirit which has cleared away all earth-born mists and burnt the truth into his soul. Still there is nothing offensively dogmatical in his style. Whilst he rivals the Pope's infallibility, he lays no claim to Divine authority. He writes for those who have ears to hear and eyes to see; but he breathes out no anathemas against those who refuse to follow him. They lose the benefit of his unerring guidance, and that is all. We must give a few extracts which reveal his state of mind, and leave our readers to judge whether it is one of spiritual elevation or of mental hallucination. In the first paragraph of the Introduction he says: "This book will be helpful and suggestive to those who do not wrest its words or meaning. It is not written

for controversy, but to express what has been burned into me by the *Fire of God*. An intense conviction has taken possession of me, that society is about to be brought, in the love of God, through a great spiritual crisis, which may truly be called a great FIRE-BAPTISM, and which will ultimately result in great blessedness to man, and in the fuller manifestation of the glory of the Lord." Speaking of the great crisis in human affairs which is to be brought about by the rapidly-approaching second advent of Christ, he says: "This conviction has become irresistible in me, not merely through meditation on the old prophecies, but by a personal conviction of spirit, through the inbreathing of the ever-living Word which speaks to the inward spirit and understanding. . . . This conviction is confirmed also by a consideration of the signs of the times, which are, without controversy, intensely significant. But the Word of the Lord needs no controversy or external authority. The authority is in itself, or it is nothing. To whom it comes, it comes right home. The Word, who is Christ, is His own authority" (Introduction, p. 10). Such statements occur very frequently. We shall only quote one or two other passages. "I know in my own life that God is a consuming fire. I know personally that He is light and life and love. I know that by fire and by sword God will plead with all flesh, and does so plead with me and with others. I know, of a surety, that in a yet more remarkable manner than ever, *He will pour out His Spirit on all flesh*, and bathe the heavens and the earth externally as well as internally in His regenerating *Fire-Breath*. The certainty to me is irresistible, and without controversy" (Introduction, pp. 12, 13). Though his certainty "does not pertain to dates and to time perspective," yet he is sure that "We are approaching rapidly a very remarkable *Fire-Baptism of all flesh* which will penetrate and melt the very heart of all society" (Introduction, p. 13). "I have been brought by personal baptism in great conflict, to believe in the terrible as well as in the gentle judgments of God, as being necessary agencies of Divine power, and as answering an essentially loving and beneficent purpose, in the present disordered condition of things" (p. 89). "I speak from a foretaste of this Fire-Baptism, which has burned an experience in me which nothing can gainsay, for the terrible fierceness of the fire of God's Spirit tries the faith and works of men even now" (p. 94). We think it is clear that the author's state of mind is abnormal; but is this "Divine certainty" vouchsafed to Universalists only, or is it found occasionally in connection with all forms of religious belief? The obvious answer is that it is a disordered mental condition, and not the result of supernatural illumination. Any other conclusion would involve us in endless perplexity and contradiction. There are the cases of religious melancholy in which sincere

Christians, whose lives are blameless, give themselves up to despair, fully persuaded that their final doom is sealed. And, on the other hand, we meet with those who believe that they are in constant and visible communion with angels, and are permitted to pay frequent visits to the heavenly world. Emanuel Swedenborg was a notable illustration of this, and the so-called "New Church," which is to swallow up all other religions, has no better foundation than the disordered fancies of an abnormally developed brain. The Plymouth Brethren profess to enjoy the infalliable guidance of the Holy Spirit in all matters of faith and practice. We once met with two Mormon missionaries in the far East who had come twelve thousand miles to convert Mahomedans, Hindus, and Buddhists to their faith, who declared that their commission had been given to them direct from Heaven. We suggested to them that it would be a fine opportunity of exercising the gift of tongues, as they would otherwise have to go through a course of long and painful study before they could fulfil their mission. To this they assented; and they tarried a fortnight, and then left the country because the gift was not vouchsafed! But we need not multiply instances. There are the germs of mysticism in all minds, and although, in most cases, they lie dormant throughout life, they may be quickened into intense activity at any time by bodily sickness or by undue mental excitement. The ascetics amongst the Romanists, Mahomedans, Hindus, and Buddhists can pass into a state of spiritual elevation at will by fasting and "heavenly contemplation;" and they are altogether proof against the usual modes by which intellectual conviction is produced. They know the secrets of the spirit-world, not by external evidence, but direct communion with the unseen, and it is utterly useless to reason with them.

Griffith's From Sin to Salvation.

From Sin to Salvation. The Pauline Picture of the Redemptive Process. By Thomas Griffith, A.M., late Prebendary of St. Paul's, London. Hodder and Stoughton.

The present volume will fully sustain the reputation Mr. Griffith has acquired as a thoughtful writer. Indeed, in our opinion, it is superior to some of his former works, inasmuch as there is more unity of topic. The theme proposed at the outset and accurately described in the title is closely adhered to. Briefly put, that theme is man under sin, in a state of transition, and under grace—the old theme of Christian preachers and writers in all ages, yet how differently treated! In substance there is little difference between Mr. Griffith's small volume and many a laboured Puritan exposition, but in style and mode of treatment the distance is

vast indeed. Mr. Griffith treats the subject in the light of modern difficulties and with all the resources of wide philosophic reading. A marked feature of his work is found in the numerous quotations from writers of the school represented by Plato, Antoninus, Epictetus, Seneca, and Cicero on one hand, and the Cambridge Platonists on the other. At the same time these references are strictly subservient and germane to his own line of thought. We need not say how refreshing it is in these days of crass materialism, both in religion and science, to escape for a few moments into a region of the most elevated spiritual thought. If we had to choose between philosophers and materialists, we could not hesitate long; but we prefer Christian philosophers to both. Another excellence in Mr. Griffith is the high tone of his moral teaching. The object of Christianity, according to him, is not to lower the law to man, but to raise man to the law. Mr. Griffith finds the frame for his teaching in the two wonderfully contrasted pictures of the Apostle in Rom. vii.—viii. 17. These pictures he rightly takes as typical of man unrenewed and renewed universally. The paraphrase of this whole section given in the Introduction is very skilfully done, and the same may be said of the paraphrases of passages of Scripture throughout the volume. We had noted a goodly number of passages for quotation, but give only one. Speaking of God's Fatherhood, he says: "The inscription on the temple of Apollo at Delphi was the first to insist upon this fundamental truth. For that admonition, 'Know thyself,' has not the meaning so often mistakenly assigned to it by modern writers of, 'Delve and grub into the recesses of your own minds to discover their composition and their working;' but, rather, 'Become aware of what you are *in relation to the Supreme;* whence you spring; whose image you bear; with what capacity you are endowed; so that recognising your Divine birth you may live a Divine life! This is clearly the sense in which Socrates understands it when he asks Euthydemus, 'Have you noticed that inscription on the temple at Delphi, and tried to learn thence *what sort of being you are;* what capacity has been bestowed on you for acting as a man should act? For whosoever is not aware of this his proper capacity, *knows nothing of himself;* he fails to know his special business in this world; he falls into numberless errors, and misses his proper aim.' And just in like manner Plato makes Socrates say to Alcibiades, 'When the Delphic oracle enjoins us to know ourselves, it means to *know our soul, what that is;* what that intelligence therein which is *Divine*, which we have in common with God, and which makes us similar to God.'" Cicero, Antoninus, Epictetus, are quoted to the same effect. All this is crowned by the Scripture doctrine of the Divine image in man.

We notice a few defects. "Hindoo Bonze," p. 162, should be

either "Hindoo Yogi," or "Chinese Bonze." If a Bonze is a Buddhist priest, there is no Buddhism in India. We question whether "law of sin" (Rom. viii. 2) means the Mosaic law, as stated on p. 147. Was not the Mosaic law Divine? True, the law aggravates sin, but this result follows from human perversity, and could scarcely justify such a designation of the Divine law. We are sorry also to find "the doctrine of salvation by the vicarious sufferings of Jesus" described as "Calvinistic." We had thought the doctrine, apart from the Calvinistic or any other theory, part of the common heritage of Christianity. Indeed the doctrine is implied in Mr. Griffith's own teaching. On p. 5 we read, "We have had specially purchased for us the Spirit of Christ." Purchased—how, when, at what price? At the same time we confess that we should have liked to see greater prominence given to the objective ground of forgiveness in the seventh chapter of the volume. Some sentences also towards the close of the volume look in the direction of future probation and universal restoration. The danger of the school of thought to which Mr. Griffith seems to have attached himself is that of taking speculation, instead of Scripture, as a guide in matters beyond human ken. We hope he will avoid the snare.

Blencowe's Christian Positivism.

Christian Positivism; or, A Direct Divine Revelation a Necessary Correlative of Humanity. By George Blencowe. London: Published for the Author: T. Woolmer, 2, Castle Street, City Road, E.C.

Our author, who is evidently a wide reader and independent thinker, appears to have written this book as an antidote to Professor Max Müller's *Hibbert Lecture*. Both the object and the method of the lecturer are criticised, the former as aiming solely at the exhibition of the manner in which the various religions might have been developed, and the latter as overlooking some of the most important and fundamental data. Mr. Blencowe proposes to examine the question in the light of the facts concerning the nature of man and his relation to the Creator, which the Professor omits, and undertakes thereby to guide his readers to a directly opposite conclusion. And he writes with considerable knowledge and great vigour. A couple of chapters are devoted to the defence of the positions that a direct Divine revelation is both possible and necessary, and after a further inquiry into the character of the revelation that man needs, the Incarnation becomes the central topic under the belief that "all Divine revelation must spring out of and be completed in it." The latter half of the book is of higher quality than the former. Either the argument is too condensed, or the reasoning is a little disjointed, but there is

certainly some difficulty in following our author at first. Occasionally, too, he permits himself to make a statement, particularly in the unfolding of his philosophy, which needs either to be guarded or to be expunged. To define the will, for example, as "the sum of emotions," is at least to interrupt the reader in his study of the book, and make him feel the necessity of caution as he proceeds. At the same time the book contains much powerful putting of certain truth, and may be read with profit. And those who are acquainted with the past life of its author will be conscious of a great charm in a few passages in which, out of his long and wide experience, he speaks of his own knowledge of the power of the Gospel. He knows how to defend the faith intellectually, but as a witness for his Master he speaks with great boldness. And the testimony which a paragraph in the preface contains is more convincing than mere reasoning. "I have had," writes our author, "during the past forty-five years, so many opportunities of witnessing the operation of Christian faith in purifying, strengthening, and comforting men, both barbarian and civilised, under all changes of life, to say nothing of its influence on myself, that to me the spiritual life is as true an objective reality as the sun in the heavens; hence those theories which ignore, deride, or deny that life, have ever appeared as imperfect and one-sided. And the overpowering conviction of its reality as the end and completion of all Divine operations in and with man, has enabled me to see that in many cases those who have nominally opposed the Gospel have mistaken their object, while the good they have purposed to substitute for the supposed evil has been what the spiritual life alone can produce."

Ellerton's Holiest Manhood.

The Holiest Manhood and its Lessons for Busy Lives. Sermons Preached in Barnes Church. By John Ellerton, M.A., Rector of Barnes. London: Macmillan and Co.

Thirteen ten minutes' sermons or sermonettes of excellent quality. We should be sorry if the sermonette were to become the model of English preaching. In that case all hope of a return of the days of Barrow and Farindon, to say nothing of Howe and Baxter, would be gone for ever. Still, sermons of the kind furnished in the present volume have their place; and this being so, Mr. Ellerton's sermons are quite models of their kind. In extent they range from the story of the Magi to the Ascension, styled in Mr. Ellerton's unconventional language "The Parting." Thorough treatment there is no room for, and it is not attempted. The

object in view is to learn what "lessons" each incident has for "busy lives," and these lessons are drawn out and applied with much insight and force. The language is perfectly simple, yet cultivated. While the great Christian doctrines are not expressly discussed, they are always implied. The preacher's sympathy, like his knowledge, extends beyond his own communion. The pulpit tone is conspicuous by its absence. Everything is fresh, simple, natural. We quote the following simply as specimens of the prevailing sentiment of the volume. Speaking of the way in which God used the Magian astrology for good, the preacher says: "Surely this may teach us not to be too hard even upon ignorance and superstition, when it is honest ignorance and devout superstition. I do not mean that we are to admire and imitate it; that we are to copy forms of devotion because those who use them are sincere, or to adopt religious practices because through them true devoutness may be expressed. God may have taught us a better and a purer way: we have no more right to copy modern superstitions, or revive old ones, than St. Paul would have had to adopt the Magian religion because the Magi had once been led by a star to Christ." "The man who can stand with a sneer and watch the kneeling thousands as they murmur their litanies in the crowded aisles, or wait their turn by the confessionals of some foreign shrine; the man who has nothing but a jest for the eccentricities of an American camp-meeting, nothing but a solemn rebuke for the fervid utterances of some band of evangelists among our own working-people—how can such a man dare to claim fellowship with Him who, spotless as He was in holiness, yet could no longer rest in His sacred seclusion, but was drawn by the power of a Saviour's sympathy down to the Jordan valley, there among trembling publicans and weeping harlots to bend beneath the burning words of the preacher of repentance, and take his place in fulfilling all righteousness, His share in the great national act of return and restoration to God!" Mr. Ellerton has many excellent things to say to over-driven men of business, for which we have no space. We are glad to hear the following protest, which we commend to preachers of the Hessey school: "In the deepest and truest sense of the word, the Sabbath was made for man. Nothing is more false than to imagine it to be a mere Jewish ordinance. Nothing is more ridiculous than the pedantry of some Churchmen who refuse to give to the Christian Lord's Day this grand, and ancient, and beautiful name of Sabbath."

Fac-simile Reprint.

Collection of Psalms and Hymns. Charlestown: Printed by Lewis Timothy, 1737. With Preface by the Rev. G. Osborn, D.D.

This is a *fac-simile* reprint of a work published by John Wesley when he was a missionary of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts, then in its infancy. To this is added a *fac-simile* of the tune-book, "*as they are commonly sung at the Foundery*," published in 1742.

Dr. Osborn's preface is so much to the point, and so abounds in interesting facts, that we should like to insert it at full length, though one or two things in it may be open to debate.

The only copy of the Hymn-Book of 1736 known to exist is in the possession of Mr. Brooke, Richmond Road, Hackney. "This unique volume," Dr. Osborn says, "he has kindly permitted the Methodist Book Committee to reprint in *fac-simile*, and thus conferred a great obligation on that large and increasing number of persons who are interested in the hymnology of Methodism."

Strictly speaking, the interest is wider still. For here are several of Dr. Watts's favourite hymns; and some of the German hymns translated have a very special history. Mr. Wesley was a "missioner in Georgia" when he published this volume. Other "missioners" of the same society, or of its sister, the "Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge," went out not long after to South India. Among these were Fabricius and Schwartz. The former of these translated huge volumes of Wesley's favourite German hymns into Tamil, and they have been sung in the Tanjore and Tranquebar missions for more than a century. The Rev. Elijah Hoole, a Wesleyan missionary, translated some of Mr. Wesley's versions of the same German hymns into Tamil. So did Mr. Peter Percival. In this shape they are sung in the Wesleyan Mission native congregations in Madras to this day.

A good hymn has wonderful vitality, and exercises an enormous influence. How many times have some of these hymns been printed and in how many languages! To think of the infinite number of human hearts that some of these hymns have affected, and of the vast and varied multitudes that have sung them, is quite bewildering.

But we must return to the little volume before us. It is of such interest that we feel sure it will be eagerly bought up. The arrangement of the Hymn-Book is striking. It consists of forty psalms and hymns for Sundays, twenty of a penitential character for Wednesdays and Fridays, and ten rather long ones for Saturdays. Some of these last could not have been sung in public

worship, we imagine. Concerning Eupolis's superb hymn to the Creator and its history the reader must consult Dr. Osborn's authorities. But it would startle many to hear it given out, especially the lines:

> "Thee will I sing, O parent Jove,
> And teach the world to praise and love."

HERBERT'S TEMPLE.

The Temple. By George Herbert. Fac-simile Reprint. Third Edition, with Introductory Essay by J. H. Shorthouse, Author of "John Inglesant."

THIS is a time of *fac-simile* reprints. Some, indeed, delight to see in what garments the old masters of thought and feeling were arrayed, who do not, it may be, pause to consider how little of the spirit of the teachers of a bygone age they have imbibed.

It will be well if the readers (there must be many such, for every one buys "George Herbert") of these wonderful poems, so quaint, so godly, so wise, are brought in any degree nearer to the ideal of the saintly bard.

The interesting and highly original preface by the author of a very successful romance, will hasten the sale of a book which has very many other recommendations.

Perhaps, after awhile, the Aldine edition will be the one oftener taken down; but this will be cherished as a choice relic: a book as quaint in its outward seeming as it is in its every line. Of Herbert's *Temple* this is not the time to speak. His place is well defined, and his value fully estimated.

Mr. Shorthouse's preface will excite astonishment in many quarters, and will be thought to show much of the power of fancy that has made the writer a favourite with many.

It will be a gentle surprise to some learned Anglican divines to be told that "Henry Wotton, George Wither, Francis Quarles, Henry Vaughan (gentlemen and men of fashion), with George Herbert and Nicholas Ferrer, were the true founders of the Church of England." After this the friends of the *Tablet* should hasten to buy up the whole edition.

Still, when taken *cum grano salis*, the preface is suggestive, though its main thought does not commend itself to our judgment. The idea that Herbert and a few of his contemporaries were "the revealers to the uncultured and unlearned of the true refinement of worship," is not a little fanciful. Tallis's music existed before Herbert. Whence did the Anglican Prayer-book obtain its marvellous refinement? In fact, the quaintness and fastidiousness which belonged to the men of whom Mr. Shorthouse speaks, find no place in the formularies of the Church of England.

Many books have had enormous influence on the mind of the Anglican Church; but in estimating that Church as it now exists, the influence of Hooker, Jeremy Taylor, and Pearson must not be understood as sources at once of its strength and of its refinement. After all, it may need to be proclaimed aloud that the power of any Christian community for good depends far more upon the spirit of self-sacrifice, and the realisation of God's presence and help, than upon all the grace that taste and refinement can breathe into it.

Williams's Manual of Theology.

A Manual of Natural and Revealed Theology, Designed especially for Local Preachers and Sunday-school Teachers. By the Rev. Henry W. Williams, D.D., Author of "An Exposition of St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans," &c. London: Published for the Author by T. Woolmer, 2, Castle Street, City Road, E.C. 1882.

This book is precisely what it was designed to be, a concise and comprehensive manual of theology for the use of men of little leisure. It does not profess to compete with more elaborate works. But it supplies a need that has long been felt for a treatise, low in price but full and trustworthy, that might safely be put into the hands of candidates for the Local Preachers' plan and of the teachers of the more advanced classes in the Sunday-school. For such a purpose this book is to be preferred to Field's *Handbook*, and to any of the current *Outlines of Theology* and *Introductory Lectures*. It is neither too long nor perhaps too brief, though a larger reference to some popular objections and controversies, which are not however altogether overlooked, would have increased its value. And passages of Scripture are uniformly cited from the Revised Version, which practice of itself contributes to the permanent worth of the book.

Dr. Williams has chosen a method of arranging the different parts of his subject which tends to lucidity, but which is open to one objection. It makes it necessary for him, once at least, to traverse ground which he has already covered. If it were possible in a future edition, without the sacrifice of clearness, to readjust the parts in some way that would obviate that necessity, the manual would lose almost the only feature that detracts from its merit; and by a small addition, its usefulness to the class of readers for whom it is intended would be increased in another way. The author, in his first part, directs attention slightly to the literature of his subject, and in his preface a very wise recommendation of that character may be found. It would be well if the

same could be done throughout the book. The readers whom he addresses are often at a loss whither to turn for the further elucidation of a matter upon which they desire fuller guidance: and an occasional paragraph, devoted not to the enumeration of all the books that have been written upon the subject, but naming such as might be read with most profit by the readers Dr. Williams has in view, would be a very welcome enlargement. But even in its present form, it will be eagerly secured and studied by the wisest of those who have to face a local preacher's examination, or who wish to fit themselves with ease for their work in the school. Its price puts it within the reach of all; and it is the best book of its kind that has yet been published.

Maskell's Ancient Liturgy of the Church of England.

The Ancient Liturgy of the Church of England according to the uses of Sarum, York, Hereford and Bangor, and the Roman Liturgy arranged in Parallel Columns. With Preface and Notes. By William Maskell, M.A. Third Edition. Oxford: At the Clarendon Press. 1882.

It is now nearly forty years since the first edition of this useful book appeared. During these years there has been a rapidly growing interest in liturgical studies. The knowledge of "the uses" has become widespread since Mr. Maskell made his effort to put within the reach of ordinary readers what could only be read by the few. Many of the works laid under contribution for this volume are still to be seen with difficulty, being found only in the great libraries of the universities or in the British Museum. But were the books in the hands of students generally, the convenience of this volume would not be diminished. To be able to turn at will to any passage in the *Ordinarium Missæ*, or the *Canon Missæ*, and find a clearly printed comparison of it in the four great "uses" of the English Church, and in that of the Roman Church, is a boon for which students of this class of literature cannot be too grateful.

But the volume is more, much more, than a mere presentation of these in parallel columns. It is rich in voluminous notes, which are the fruits of much scholarship and wide research. An English liturgiologist can scarcely afford to be without such a work as this; and we know no one that can be named as a rival to it. In addition to a valuable preface and marginal notes on the services, there are many topics of great interest treated in an "additional note" of sixty pages in length; an appendix of the "Liturgia St. Clementis" in Greek; and "the order of the Communion" from the 1549 Prayer-book, in its own beautiful Old English spelling.

In this book, which is so needful to the student of our English Church history, delicate questions are discussed with calm and sober judgment, aided by thorough and most accurate knowledge. And Mr. Maskell, who so long ago laid earlier students under lasting obligation by the publication of the first edition of his work, has greatly augmented the debt by the presentation to the public of this revised and extended one. Whatever conclusions may be drawn from liturgical studies (and we must leave our readers each to form his own), it would be difficult to speak in terms of too high commendation of the present volume.

Outlines of Sermons.

Three Hundred Outlines of Sermons on the New Testament. The Clerical Library. London: Hodder and Stoughton.

A book has lately been written on *The Decay of Modern Preaching*, the writer of which quietly assumes his fact, and then proceeds to explain it. We should certainly dispute the fact. The form of preaching is no doubt changing; but change, in a healthy state, so far from being a sign of decay, is a sign of life. There was never a greater number of contemporary eminent preachers than the different branches of the Church are able to show at present. Preachers also never had so many counsellors and helps of all kinds as now. Commentaries and homiletic expositions abound. We are not quite sure that these "aids" always answer to their name. Great preachers were never made by outlines and homiletic hints. Still, assuming that there are those who can use outlines without loss of independence, we may safely pronounce the above volume one of the best of its class. The *Outlines* are all by preachers who bear well-known names. The enumeration of some of them will be the best recommendation—Bishop Alexander, Allon, Barry, Barrett, Brooks, Cairns, Church, Coley, Conder, Dale, Dods, Dykes, Farrar, Fraser, Goulburn, Jowett, Ker, Knox, Little, Liddon, Lightfoot, Maclaren, Magee, Martin, Parker, Pulsford, Punshon, Raleigh, W. C. Smith, Spurgeon, Stanley, Tait, Temple, Vaughan, Wace, and Westcott. Whether the outlines are the work of the authors of the sermons or another, is not said. We judge the latter to be the case. However this may be, the sermons are epitomised with much clearness and skill. There is an index of the subjects. An index of the preachers would also have been valuable. The presence on the same pages of sermons by teachers of such different schools is strangely suggestive of the unity of the Church in the substantive truth which it holds. Would that this unity found more general expression in the recognition of each other's work!

Walker's Scottish Church History.

Handbooks for Bible Classes: Scottish Church History. By Rev. N. L. Walker, Dysart. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark.

We have great pleasure in calling attention to the series to which this work belongs. Unlike some other series, the present one includes works on doctrine and Church history as well as expositions of Scripture. The latter are equal to anything else of the same class. Nothing could well excel such expositions in brief as those on the Galatians, the Post-Exilian Prophets, the Epistle to the Hebrews. The former perhaps are most adapted for use in Scotland, but any one wishing for condensed information as to Scotch views on the subjects treated of cannot do better than consult these handbooks. We especially direct attention to the words *for Bible Classes*. Any one of these manuals supplies matter enough for a session's work in such classes. Teachers here obtain the results of the best exegesis digested by able hands. And one such book thoroughly mastered cannot fail greatly to promote an intelligent acquaintance with Christian truth.

Mr. Walker writes with a vivid pen. The reader is borne along by the tide of Scottish fervour. Whether agreeing with every opinion or not, he cannot help feeling the pulse of conviction beating on every page. We scarcely know which is most interesting, the narrative of the Covenanters' fierce struggle, or the account of the modern evangelical revival. Mr. Walker is a sturdy Presbyterian—a Free-Church Presbyterian. Although he writes strongly, we are not disposed to quarrel with him on that account. A book charged with definite convictions acts like a tonic in these days of sentimental eclecticism. Moderatism and Erastianism find no mercy at Mr. Walker's hands. We note only one incident. When a proposal was made in the General Assembly of 1796 to appoint a collection for missions, a member exclaimed, "While there remains at home a single individual without the means of religious knowledge, to propagate it abroad would be improper and absurd." We venture to suggest to Mr. Walker that "Wesleyans and others" are not in Scotland merely "to illustrate the almost infinite variety of religious opinion which prevails in the world."

Newman's Days of Grace in India.

Days of Grace in India: a Record of Visits to Indian Missions. By Henry Stanley Newman, Leominster. London: Partridge and Co.

Mr. Newman, of the Society of Friends, recently made a tour of Indian missions and gives in this volume a plain, unvarnished

account of what he saw. Wide as is the field surveyed, it is representative rather than exhaustive of what is being done for the Christianisation of India. Mr Newman's observation was mostly limited to the missions easily accessible from the great lines of railway. Many other interesting fields are unnoticed. But enough is told to raise wonder and gratitude to the highest point. To all who can appreciate the mighty national revolution which is going on, and to all whose chief interest is in the advance of Christ's kingdom among men, the narrative will be most welcome. One such testimony from an observer who has examined the inner working of Christian missions is worth any number of condemnations by writers who never go near a mission church or school and then come home and write a book about what they have never seen. Two things strike us on reading the narrative; one, the great number of wild tribes lying outside the Hindu race proper, who present as inviting a field to the missionary as any Polynesian island; and again, the great number of missionaries who, unknown to fame, are giving their whole life's work to Christ's cause in India. In the latter fact we specially rejoice. It is such lives which tell most on a country like India. "If India is to be won for Christ, it can only be by true cross-bearing in the spirit of the Master." More precious than anything else is the spirit of self-sacrifice to which Christianity owes all its triumphs. The value of the volume is greatly increased by the map and the numerous illustrations, which are both new and faithful.

II. MISCELLANEOUS.

Lecky's England in the Eighteenth Century. Vols. III. and IV.

A History of England in the Eighteenth Century. By William Edward Hartpole Lecky. Vols. III. and IV. London: Longmans, Green, and Co. 1882.

These two volumes, whilst integrally connected with the preceding ones, are complete in themselves. They cover a period of twenty-four years, from the accession of George III. to 1784, a date which, alike in the domestic history of England and in its relations with its dependencies, marks changes of the highest importance. And it cannot be fairly objected that the events of these years are discussed at too great a length, although the volumes contain more than a thousand pages. Mr. Lecky is a philosophical historian, and it is both a longer and a more interesting process to trace the causes of successive changes in methods, laws, institutions, and manners, than barely to chronicle events. Moreover, the value of the philosophical treatment of history depends very much upon an abundant use of illustration, and hardly Buckle himself can have read more widely than Mr. Lecky, though the latter exhibits more self-restraint and discretion than the former in his control over his information. There is perhaps still a little too much diffuseness in the treatment of constitutional questions, and the occasional essays might have been abbreviated with profit. But in both of these respects, these volumes are an improvement upon the preceding ones. They not only bear comparison with the numerous histories of the same period that have of late years appeared, but they rank distinctly above them. They are full, and with rare exceptions minutely accurate, as might indeed be said of almost any work of Mr. Lecky's. They are also, in spite of his many predecessors in the same field, fresh and thoroughly readable.

The volumes commence, contrarily to the general custom, with an elaborate and very fair portraiture of George III., the last English king who greatly influenced politics. For twenty years he appears to have been swayed by a determination to be his own prime minister, and to restore the royal power to a position not inferior to that which it held under the Tudors. The policy of the Government in all its parts he wanted to superintend, to

direct, and to prescribe. It was for him, as he said, "to steer the bark;" and his expenditure in electoral and parliamentary corruptions, his treatment of all his cabinets, his conduct during the Wilkes agitation and during the American war, all testify to his persistent endeavour to force his own personal opinion upon the country, whatever might be the view of his ministers, of the Commons, or of the nation. Of estimable private character, there are more than sufficient facts to justify the severe censure Mr. Lecky passes upon him; "he spent a long life in obstinately resisting measures which are now almost universally admitted to have been good, and in supporting measures which are as universally admitted to have been bad." And yet one excuse might be pleaded for him, to which Mr. Lecky hardly pays enough attention. Throughout his life his popularity was due not merely to his personal habits and morals, but also to his correct representation of national feeling and opinion. The doctrine of Divine right was still held and emphatically preached by the English Church. Blackstone, in the *Commentaries*, that were not published until several years after the accession of George III., wrote, "The King of England is the sole magistrate of the nation, all others acting by commission from and in due subordination to him." And up to the time of the surrender of York Town, at least, the king's views of the American war seem to have agreed with those of the majority of his British subjects. But none the less, it was in his reign, and chiefly in the earlier part of it, and owing to his persistent efforts to increase the royal authority, that the relation of the sovereign to the other estates of the realm was fixed upon a basis which has remained practically unchanged until the present.

But this period witnessed the settlement of another matter of equal importance. Nothing corresponding to the modern political newspaper can be said to have existed before the reign of George III. The "leading article" is an invention of no earlier date than that of the French Revolution. Before then, the political bias of a paper was shown in scattered comments, and especially in letters written either anonymously or under assumed names. Reports of the proceedings of Parliament were forbidden by standing orders of each House, and any offence rendered the printer subject to arrest and imprisonment. But in 1771, three printers, who were summoned by the Commons, resolved to defy its jurisdiction. They were supported by Wilkes and the City. And at last the House put an ignominous end to the contest by ordering Wilkes to attend on a day when it was itself adjourned. From that time the report of its proceedings was tacitly allowed by the Commons, and the House of Lords a few years later took a similar course. Immediately a great stimulus was given to the progress of the press, which was not seriously impeded by the

addition of a halfpenny which Lord North made to the stamp duty in 1776. The *Morning Chronicle*, which was established in 1770, was followed by the *Morning Post* in 1772, and by the *Morning Herald* in 1780. First legal reports, and then dramatic criticism were added to political and general news. In 1777 there were issued in London alone no less than seventeen papers, seven of which were daily. And from that time the press has been to all practical intents free, and has steadily grown, alike in magnitude, in quality, and in influence.

One matter of surpassing interest in these volumes is the gradual spread of a spirit of religious tolerance, and, in consequence, of a disposition to remove civil disabilities. Already in the previous reigns, prosecutions for heterodoxy had almost wholly ceased; but occasional incidents showed that the spirit of persecution was dormant rather than dead. In 1769, Abel Proffer was convicted at Monmouth of an attempt to roast a Jew, and a Methodist preacher at Gloucester was flogged through the streets by order of the Mayor. The Ecclesiastical courts still possessed, and in cases of contempt often employed, the power of excommunication, which involved the loss of many civil rights, and was sometimes supplemented by imprisonment under a writ *de excommunicato capiendo*. And it was not until 1787 that an Act was passed limiting the time of commencing suits in these courts for different offences to six or eight months, whilst the most serious abuses connected with them continued to the present century. For several years the City of London systematically elected dissenters to the office of sheriff, in order that they might be fined for not complying with the necessary preliminary of communication according to the Anglican rite, and the sum of £15,000 was thus raised towards the cost of the new Mansion House. In 1767 it was decided by the final court of appeal that the Toleration Act took away the crime as well as the penalty of nonconformity, and that no fine could be legally imposed on nonconformists who refused to serve in offices to which conscientious dissenters were ineligible by law. By the Toleration Act, again, dissenting ministers and schoolmasters were obliged to assent to thirty-five and a half of the thirty-nine articles of the Church of England. The law was not, however, rigorously executed, and in 1779 a Relief Act was carried, enjoining no further declaration than that the subscribers were Christians, Protestants, and believers in the Old and New Testaments. Romanism was practically established in Canada by the Quebec Act of 1774, and the Relief Bills of 1778 and 1782 removed the worst disabilities under which the subjects of that creed laboured in Ireland. But England did not fare so well. In the reign of William III. a statute had been passed, subjecting priests found within the realm to perpetual imprisonment, and disabling all Romanists from

holding real property. And though the law was rarely enforced, and was so much disliked that the judges invariably insisted upon an unusual fulness and rigour of proof, it was a cause of constant tremor, and occasionally of very great hardship. In 1767, for example, a priest was convicted upon the testimony of an informer and condemned to perpetual imprisonment, which sentence, however, after the lapse of two or three years was commuted to banishment from England. A few years later the owner of an estate in the north of England endeavoured to deprive a lady, who was a near relative of his own, of her jointure, which was a rent-charge on his estate, on the plea that, being a papist, she could hold no interest in land, and was prevented only by a special Act of Parliament, which interest in her case led Lord Camden to introduce. But in 1778 both of these religious penalties were removed by the Bill the contents of which awakened the fanaticism of the General Assembly in Scotland and in England of Lord George Gordon. And no one who remembers the great advancement in the sentiments and law of the nation that has taken place since then will hesitate to accept Mr. Lecky's opinion that "the changes of the past century in the enlargement of personal and political liberty, and in the mitigation of the penal code, have been accompanied by an equal progress in the maintenance of public order, and in the security of private property in England."

It is impossible to follow our author through his very detailed account of the American war of independence, and of the spread of the volunteer movement in Ireland. But there is no controverted point in the course of each upon which light and generally sufficient light is not thrown. The worst peril against which a philosophical historian has to guard is probably that of partiality. In these volumes Mr. Lecky succeeds almost perfectly in avoiding that peril. He suppresses his own political views throughout, and at the same time does not hesitate to write of the justice of some of the American contentions and of most of the Irish demands. Governments are criticised not according to the party name by which they called themselves, but according to the truth of their opinions, and the righteousness and discretion of their acts. And every stage of the long struggle between the colonies and the mother-country, and between the parliaments of England and of Ireland, is examined in the cool light of reason, and described without prejudice or prepossession.

Mr. Lecky's omissions are probably due to his wise method of classifying his facts according to the matter they illustrate or explain; and it would be unreasonable to dwell upon them before his work has been completed. But we do not forget that in his preface he enumerates among "the main subjects" of his book, "the growth or decline of the agricultural, the manufacturing,

and the commercial interests; the history of art, of manners, and of belief; and the changes that have taken place in the social and economical condition of the people." And we hope to find these fully dealt with in the succeeding volumes.

English Men of Letters.

English Men of Letters. "Gray." By E. W. Gosse. "Landor." By Sidney Colvin. Macmillan and Co.

Both Gray and Landor are examples of an attention to form and style, which in these rapid days has become an obsolete virtue. Gray's works are small in bulk, but quite perfect in grace and finish. For this reason alone they will never cease to hold a front rank in English classics. Where the quality is so good, it is greatly to be regretted that the quantity is so small. Gray might and ought to have done more. A few short poems seem a sorry outcome of life. The explanation is to be found in Gray's persistent melancholy and indolence, and these again are explained by the absence of all outward stimulus to exertion, and by his bachelorhood. Mr. Gosse's is the first complete and satisfactory Life of Gray which has ever appeared; and when we see the result, we wonder at Mr. Gosse's success, and doubt whether it was worth while to rescue so many insignificant circumstances from the oblivion appropriate to them. The most interesting portion of the Life is the account of the Grand Tour which Gray took in company with Horace Walpole, a practice now happily gone out of fashion. The chief impression left on the reader is the thought of what Gray might have done. His unfinished projects were excellent; a critical edition of Strabo, notes on Plato, a text of the Greek Anthology, an edition of Aristotle. "It is hard to conceive of a sadder irony on the career of a scholar of Gray's genius and accomplishment than is given by the dismal contents of the so-called second volume of his *Works*, published by Matthias in 1814, fragments and jottings which bear the same relation to literature that dough bears to bread." The most eventful incident in his life was his migration from Peterhouse to Pembroke College, in Cambridge, out of resentment at a gross practical joke played on him. For years Gray was haunted by a dread of fire. As a precaution, he kept a rope ladder, thirty-six feet long, and had an iron bar fixed to his bedroom window. Knowing this, some rough students one night raised a cry of fire, after placing a tub of water under the window. Their successful trick had the result already stated. Curiously enough, Gray narrowly escaped being burned alive in his place of refuge at Pembroke. "Two Methodists, who had been attending a prayer-meeting in the town, happened to pass very late at night,

and gave the alarm. Gray was roused between two and three in the morning by the excellent Stephen Hempstead, with the remark, 'Don't be frightened, sir, but the college is all of a fire.'" "Gray was the first, and for a long while the only person in the University who made his rooms look pretty. He took care that his windows should be always full of mignonette or some other sweetly-scented plant, and he was famous for a pair of huge vases, in blue and white china. His servant, Stephen Hempstead, had to keep the room as bright and spick as an old lady's bandbox, and not an atom of dust was allowed to rest on the little harpsichord where the poet used to sit in the twilight and play staccatoes of Scarlatti or Pergolesi."

Mr. Gosse's work has been done with much skill and care. "Gingerly" seems to be a favourite word with him. It is certainly rare. The relatives are not always managed correctly. Thus, "The office . . was thus vacated, and there ensued a violent contest, and the result of which was," &c.

Mr. Colvin's *Life of Landor* is full of interest from first to last. Little was known by the public of Landor's personality, and his is a character worth knowing. It is another illustration of the contradictoriness of human nature, that while ultra-republican and revolutionary in theory, he was one of the most imperious and despotic of mortals. His self-assertion was utterly incompatible with the comfort and rights of others. To the last days of an extreme old age he was in conflict with almost every one. Live in society he could not. As an author he is of course incomparable in his own line. He is by far the grandest master of modern English prose. Both Gray and Landor prove once more that the greatest genius is not independent of laborious culture. Both were masters of learning in their respective fields. Mr. Colvin's work is marked by great vigour, acuteness, and impartiality.

Wallace's Kant.

Philosophical Classics for English Readers. Edited by W. Knight, LL.D., Professor of Moral Philosophy at St. Andrew's.

Kant. By W. Wallace, M.A., LL.D., Fellow and Tutor of Merton College, Oxford. Blackwood.

Mr. Wallace has an exceptionally interesting subject. Though Fichte is a more typical German than Kant, and is connected with the politics of his country, from which the philosopher of Königsberg always kept aloof, there is no question that Kant fills far the larger space in the European estimate of German metaphysicians. He is certainly not the father even of modern metaphysic; but he shaped it anew and breathed new life into it.

Therefore it is that every one is anxious to hear all that is known about him, and that Mr. Wallace has done well in going to the latest authorities—to Professor Erdmann and Dr. Arnoldt, as well as to Schubert's Life. His biographical chapters are valuable—light thrown on the early career of any great man is always desirable; and moreover his sketch of Kant's philosophy and summary of his position among other reasoners are lucid and full of instruction, though of course not challenging comparison with books like Professor Caird's *Kritik*, Professor Mahaffy's translation of the *Prolegomena*, &c. Of Königsberg, with which Kant's name is bound up in a way quite unusual in the records of philosophy, Mr. Wallace gives a very pleasing account. Königsberg was to Kant what Athens was to Socrates. All his life, except nine years, was spent there; and those nine years he passed in East Prussia, of which Königsberg is the capital. There was a good deal of intellectual life in the place in the middle of the last century. It was a sort of outlying University for the district north-east of the Vistula, cut off from Brandenburg by what is now West Prussia, but which then still belonged to Poland. But Courland and Livonia were still German—a legacy from the grand-masters of the Teutonic order. In Mr. Wallace's words: "The Russian colossus had not yet thrown its fatal shadow over the Teutonic borderlands." Hamann and Herder, two of Kant's contemporaries, used to go eastward for their long vacations. Hartknech, the Riga bookseller, who published the *Kritik*, was a worthy instrument in promoting the enlightenment of the whole country. The plague of 1709 had made enormous gaps in the population of East Prussia; a quarter of a million are said to have died of it. The vacant ground was occupied with a fresh German sorrow: the Protestants of Salzburg, turned out by their Prince-Bishop, were gladly received as colonists by Frederick William the First. The University had been founded in 1544, by Albert Duke of Hinter-Prussia. It was very poorly endowed. "To hold a professorship in it was as good as taking a vow of poverty." The professors were glad to eke out their incomes by services at the churches, or medical practice, or otherwise. Indeed, besides Kant's early struggles with poverty, he had till the last what, in our rich Universities, would be deemed a ridiculously small stipend. It never exceeded £100 a year, and only reached this sum during the last decade of his life. Indeed from the time when, at the age of forty-six, he gained the summit of his ambition, and became professor of logic and metaphysic, the annual emoluments were for eighteen years only £60. The new king's accession in 1786 gave him forty thalers a year more, at which his income stood till the great rise of which we have spoken. He had absolutely no private means. His father was a strap-maker (belt and thong cutter), with a large

family. His mother, at any rate, was caught in the stream of pietism which was then quickening the religion of Germany. To her instruction he owed much: she used to take him out into the country and explain the properties of plants, shrubs, and what she knew of stars and clouds and dew. Few of us think of Kant as a "scientist" (to use the modern slang word); yet his essay on the *General Physiognomy and Theory of the Heavens*, published in 1755, preceded his metaphysical works; and though it owes much to Newton and Leibnitz and Descartes, and even to a self-taught English astronomer, Thomas Wright, of Durham, author of *The New Hypothesis of the Universe*, there is no doubt it was primarily due to his mind having been guided in that direction by his mother. She died when he was thirteen, of rheumatic fever, caught while nursing a rich friend. Nine years after the father died. Meanwhile, the daughters went out to service, and Kant owed his schooling mainly to an uncle, a well-to-do shoemaker. This is his record in the family Bible of his father's death in 1746: "May God, Who has not vouchsafed him great pleasure in this life, grant him on that account the joy eternal." Lodging he got in return for "coaching" a Lithuanian fellow-student Wlönner, and other pupils paid in kind, not having other means of payment—one, for instance, finding the coffee and white bread (a luxury in that land of rye) which formed the lunch. When any of his old garments wanted repairs, another would lend him the needful article till his own was mended. One biographer (Mr. Wallace declines to believe him) adds that he and his friends, driven to great straits, would sometimes win a little money by their skill at billiards or *l'hombre*. We have gone over this part of the life in detail, because it is interesting to note how the eighteenth century treated its most famous metaphysician, and how Kant's energy forced itself to the front in spite of "his birth's invidious bar."

As to his origin, Mr. Wallace is very anxious to prove him a Scotchman. There had been several emigrations of Scots, mostly very poor, to Poland during the seventeenth century. "Poland was then," says Mr. Wallace, "what America is now. At Dantzig there was, in 1624, a considerable Scotch colony, and the Scotch merchants complained to James I. of the 'exorbitant numbers of young boys and maids, unable for any service, transported here yearly.'" The historian denounces the suburb of *Alt-Schottland* as a scandal (*Schade*) to the place, and more than once the Dantzigers threatened to expel their disorderly colonists. The Scot traveller, W. Lithgow, says of Poland: "For auspiciousness I may rather term it a mother, and nurse for the youth and younglings of Scotland than a proper home for her own birth, in clothing, feeding, and enriching them with the fatness of her best things." Another, probably nearer the truth, says, "Scotland,

by reason of her populousness, is constrained to disburden herself, like the painful bees, and of her swarms great numbers do every year haunt Poland with the most extreme kind of drudgery (if not dying under the burden) scraping a few crumbs together." Cant, then, according to Mr. Wallace, is the true name; and the author of the *Kritik der Reinen Vernunft* is possibly kinsman to Dr. Andrew Cant, the Covenanting pastor of Aberdeen.

We have purposely lingered long on the earlier period of Kant's life, because we wish to induce the general reader to take up Mr. Wallace's very useful little volume. It is most desirable that every one should form a definite notion of what Kant's teaching was; and this cannot be got from a short notice like ours, but by carefully reading Mr. Wallace's chapters on Kant, in relation to Locke, and Hume, and Berkeley, or the Categories, the Unknowable, the Soul, and Freedom. The book will well repay perusal. Even these chapters are full of historical interest. It is curious to see how Zedlitz, in 1775, rates the Königsberg professors, "except Kant and Reusch," with backwardness and obsolete methods. Professor Braun, in particular, is attacked by name, and desired to take new text-books, and give better lectures. In conclusion, to show what Mr. Wallace is like when he writes *ex cathedrâ*, we give a few lines of the comparison between Kant and one of his fellow-thinkers of the same century. Hume points out that "the simple view of any two objects or actions, however related, can never give us any idea of power, or of a connection betwixt them; this idea arises from the repetition of their union: the repetition neither discovers nor causes anything in the objects, but has an influence only on the mind by that customary transition it produces; this customary transition is therefore the same with the power and necessity, which are consequently qualities of perceptions, not of objects, and are internally felt by the soul, and not perceived externally in bodies." "Thus," says Kant, by way of commentary, "the conception of a cause is fallacious and misleading, and, in the mildest way of speaking, an illusion which may be so far excused, since the custom (a subjective necessity) of perceiving certain things, or qualities of things, associated with the existence of others, either simultaneously or in succession, was unawares taken for an objective necessity of assigning such a connection to the things themselves."

Buckland's Animal Life.

Notes and Jottings from Animal Life. By the late Frank Buckland, M.A., H.M. Inspector of Fisheries, Author of "Curiosities of Natural History and Life." With Illustrations. Smith, Elder and Co.

Better than Jesse's *Gleanings*, fuller in detail than Gilbert White's

delightful *History of Selborne*, Mr. Buckland's *Jottings* have the charm of style which, combined with his personal character, made him so altogether popular with all kinds of readers. For the scientist he has close observation; for those who want to be amused, he has hidden stores of fun, of which we are always finding new evidence; for those who want to do good in the world he has careful, practical accounts of salmon-breeding, and other work on that line along which he tried so successfully to lead us—the line of using and not squandering so recklessly as we do the harvest of the sea. Those who knew the man will of course be glad that everything he wrote should be preserved. They will hail Mr. Bompas's promise that another volume like this is to appear by-and-by; and those who did not know him, who have only met his writing by chance in *Land and Water*, or the *Leisure Hour*, will be glad to make his acquaintance in a book which shows us so many of its genial author's amiable peculiarities. It is not all about animals. "Carlisle Cattle Market" is full of contrasts between north and south: the swell Cumberland shepherd in "go-to-meeting" clothes—"I was almost afraid to speak to him"—is contrasted with the Berkshire man who always wears a smock-frock, leathern gaiters, and gigantic ironed boots. The latter always carries a crook like bishops on tombs and in cathedral windows; the former somehow does without one. The latter has a short-tailed dog; the northern colley is long-tailed. Then, after a page of pleasantly humorous description, comes the inevitable touch of fun: "Why should not sheep-dogs be employed as aides-de-camp to a general in war?" and then the story of the dog who, having done his best, and having been rewarded by his master throwing a stick at him, put his tail between his legs and ran off indignant; followed up by humorous regret that "I did not see the celebrated dumb colley, of whom his master said, 'I lets the dog run the sheep, while I sits still and barks myself.'"

Here is a paragraph from the pleasant story of how salmon eggs were shipped for New Zealand:

"Everybody carrying a box of eggs, we arrived at the ice-house on board ship. Captain Smith opened it, and when I looked in I perceived that a portion of the bottom was covered with boxes of eggs and ice. These were Mr. Youl's boxes, that he had packed some three or four days previously. Searle and myself bundled through the 'man-hole' of the ice-house. Captain Smith handed us the boxes of eggs, and Searle and I shifted with the ice-axes and ice-forks the great slippery blocks of ice on to the top of our own boxes, filling up the interstices with broken bits. When we first got into the ice-house it was jolly cold, but we were so busy shifting the blocks of ice, that we soon had no time to be cold."

We should like to quote from the chapter on rats, where the

toothsomeness of these creatures is so enlarged on, that we feel tempted (as Mr. Buckland assures us he is) to try them ourselves. Otters, we are told in the story of "My Otter Tommy," are excellent eating, and from their fish diet are included in the *maigre* diet of the Roman Church. A French gentleman stopped one day to dine with his uncle, the canon of a cathedral. "Not hare," said the canon, when his nephew expressed surprise at such a dish on a Friday; "not hare, but otter, and therefore permissible." More interesting to the Protestant reader is the fact, often asserted, and now confirmed by Mr. Buckland, that otters whistle beautifully. At first he thought Tommy's note was that of some bird—something like the robin.

Of seals he tells us many interesting things in connection with "Lecompte, the seal's friend," who suddenly came out in that character while with some fellow sailors near Cape Horn. They caught a seal and took it to Buenos Ayres, and for two years Lecompte devoted himself to taming it—not a wholly pleasant task, for he carried to the grave marks of its teeth on almost every limb. His right hand, indeed, was so crippled with a bite, that the South American doctors wanted to amputate it. But the seal got tame, and was taught a number of tricks, drilling him, making him fire a cannon, &c. After exhibiting him in Belgium, he brought his sea-bear to England, and was engaged by the owner of a travelling menagerie, who, finding his show did not pay, turned man and seal penniless by the roadside. Here he was found by Mr. Bartlett, and he and his pet were secured for the Zoo, where many of us will remember to have seen him. Here is the account of his dealing with a pair of baby seals that were being taken from Scotland to the Brighton Aquarium:

"It is very interesting to hear Lecompte talk to the animals. They were frightened and very travel-worn. 'Vous ne connaissez pas encore votre papa, mon petit. Restez tranquil, mon cher. Vous avez faim? Je vous donnerai un poisson, voilà.' Lecompte, on this occasion, did not look a bit like Lecompte. When on duty in the Gardens, he was generally dressed in a blue serge sailor's dress. When he went with us to Brighton he had got himself up quite a swell: his handsome face and white beard made him look quite a gentleman, which he really was by nature. He was one of the best talkers I ever knew; he would say the commonest things in the most funny manner. During the journey down the sea-lions cried nearly the whole way, and Lecompte tried to pacify them by paternal exhortations in French: 'Ah! vous criez après votre papa, mes chers phoces.'"

In the chapter on whales we recommend the passage on whale-lice, the use of which terribly sharp-clawed parasites is, he thinks, to prevent whales from filling the seas by over-multiplication, a needless provision, surely, since men have begun to use explosive

harpoons. Elephants, in the same way, are often driven to death by fly-blows, causing pain, irritation, and fever. In everything Mr. Buckland—true son of his father the Dean, and author of one of the *Bridgwater Treatises*—seeks out final causes, wholly ignoring the modern talk about evolution and gradual adaptation. A very curious piece of information is contained in the chapter on "The Waxworks in Westminster Abbey," to which, and to the "Jews' Fish Market in Petticoat Lane," we refer those who think they don't care for natural history, even with Mr. Buckland for their guide. He went to the Jews' market just at Passover time, his object being to see how Mr. Mundella's Freshwater Fishery Bill would affect the Jews, whose fondness for fish of all kinds is so well known. In Petticoat Lane he found people talking a strange dialect,—German and Dutch with Hebrew words; the bills in the windows were in German, written in Hebrew characters; and the whole scene forcibly reminds us of the truth that half London doesn't know how the other half lives. The "Notes from Yarmouth" bring us face to face with a wonderful old "salt," one Silvers, who had strange yarns about the press-gang: "Why, they once took our mayor when he was a standin' on the jetty." But the most genial of all the chapters is that on Preadamite little men, and the clergyman's coachman, "no scholar, but an observer of nature," who believed that his bits of badly-shaped flint were the creatures who lived in the period before Adam. It is too good to spoil by quoting. We commend it to our readers, to whom we also commend the humanitarian spirit of the following passage:

"I protest against the idea that every animal is to be killed by man without check or hindrance. Tigers, though frightfully destructive, are not always the ferocious beasts they are represented to be. A sportsman wanting to kill a tiger intrudes on his retirement in his private jungle, and makes the beast savage. When the beast is wounded it turns on its pursuer, and is forthwith termed 'a ferocious brute.' A man would become a ferocious brute if he was persecuted by all the world. I like to let all things live, for everything has its use. I protest against the wanton destruction of wild animals by sportsmen. It was almost impossible to take up any book on foreign sporting without reading of scenes something as follows: An animal, we will say a bear, is seen quietly enjoying himself or having his dinner. The sportsman immediately contemplates the destruction of the bear. He fires a bullet into him, and breaks the bear's leg, giving the poor animal intense agony. The bear then charges the man who has injured him, and if he survives the attack, the sportsman in his book describes the bear as a ferocious brute. I don't think anybody can blame the bear for taking his own part. If the man had left the bear alone, and not begun the row, the bear, on seeing

the man, would have most likely sneaked away as quickly as possible. I believe that if a tiger were not hungry, and not looking out for his food, he would, if he heard the approach of men coming into his home among the underwood, hide or try to sneak away, and if the men passed on nothing would happen. Tigers must, of course, live, and if they are hungry, would as soon kill a man, woman, or child, as any other animal. Even in this case I almost doubt if the animal can be called ferocious, as he is only following the instincts of his nature, and we do not apply the term 'ferocious' to a cat when she is killing a mouse."

The book is one which will delight young and old. A better present for an intelligent boy or girl we do not know.

Sallust and Juvenal.

The Catiline and Jugurtha of Sallust Translated into English. By Alfred W. Pollard, B.A., St. John's College, Oxford. London: Macmillan and Co. 1882.

Thirteen Satires of Juvenal Translated into English. By H. A. Strong, M.A., LL.D., Professor of Classics in the University of Melbourne; and Alexander Leeper, M.A., Warden of Trinity College in the University of Melbourne. London: Macmillan and Co. 1882.

These works are, we suppose, chiefly intended for the use of University students, but they may also be used with great advantage by readers of other kinds. There are a considerable number of persons who have not received a classical education, but who yet are wishful to make themselves familiar with the productions of the great writers of antiquity. And in addition to these there are many who passed through a regular classical course in their youth, but who, in the midst of the varied activities of life, have not sufficient time for the study of the literature of Greece and Rome in its original form. To such readers translations like these are a great boon.

Mr. Pollard's *Sallust* is a thoroughly complete work. It contains not merely translations of the *Catiline* and the *Jugurthine War*, with explanatory notes, but also a biographical sketch of Sallust, with an account of his position as a political historian, and very full introductions to both of the translations. By the help of these introductions it is possible for an English reader to become almost as familiar with the political questions that agitated Rome in the days of Marius or Cæsar, as by the aid of his daily newspaper he is with the politics of England to-day.

But for his writings the name of Sallust would scarcely have been remembered, for the facts of his life show that he was never

an important man at Rome. Born in B.C. 86 of a plebeian family, nothing is known of him till B.C. 52, when he held the office of tribune. Throughout his career he seems to have been a consistent supporter of Cæsar, under whom he held several commands. He took part in the African war, and was appointed the first governor of the new province of Numidia. In B.C. 45 he returned to Rome, where he lived in retirement until his death in B.C. 35. His writings probably all belong to this later period of his life. The following sentences may serve to illustrate both Mr. Pollard's style and his estimate of his author. The Cæsarism of Sallust "is often alluded to as detracting from the value of his work, but it would be much truer to say that it constitutes his first qualification as a historian. There is a wrong and a right side in politics as in everything else, and in the struggle which brought the Roman republic to an end the partisans of Cæsar, as we now see, were in the right. It need not greatly alter our estimation of Cicero and Cato as men, or even as statesmen, that in that struggle they did battle for a constitution whose continuance would have been Rome's ruin. Their position was intelligible, consistent, justifiable; as it appeared in the heat of the contest, even noble, for they were fighting for an idea, and Cæsar for his personal gain. But despite Cicero's literary power, and Cato's force of character, a history of Rome for the century which followed the fall of Carthage, if written by either the one or the other, would have been a very lamentable production. They would have misunderstood everything, and consequently misexplained everything. . . . . Sallust, though vastly inferior as a man to either of the optimate leaders, was extraordinarily successful in seizing the thread of events. . . . . He may not be the equal of Herodotus, Thucydides, and Tacitus, but by his combination of excellence of style and of matter, he is at least worthy to be ranked in the same class with them."

The *Satires of Juvenal*, in addition to their literary value, must always have a special interest to the student of the history of Christianity, because of the terribly vivid picture which they present of the moral condition of the Roman Empire at the time when the Gospel began to be proclaimed within its borders. Black as is the brief description of the heathen world in St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans, readers of Juvenal know well that there is not the least exaggeration in the Apostle's words.

The above translation "has been made," the preface informs us, "with a view of giving a rendering of Juvenal which should combine accuracy with some elegance of style." The authors originally intended to publish it in conjunction with the text and a commentary, but certain reasons caused them to decide to issue this at once as the first instalment of their edition. There are therefore no notes, except a few purely critical ones. So far as

English prose can represent Latin poetry, the translators have succeeded in what they have aimed at, and have produced a work of real and permanent value.

Works on China.

History of China. By Demetrius Charles Boulger, M.R.A.S., Author of "England and Russia in Central Asia," &c. Three Vols. Allen and Co.

Historic China, and other Sketches. By Herbert A. Giles, of H.B.M.'s Consular Service, Author of "Strange Stories from a Chinese Studio," &c. De la Rue and Co.

Mr. Herbert Giles, in his preface, makes the significant remark that a homœopathic dose of Chinese history is enough for Western readers; but, undismayed by the difficulty of interesting a European in the fortunes of Hoki or Wou Sankwei, Mr. Boulger has planned his history on the broadest lines. In two large volumes, of more than 550 pp. each, he traces the fortunes of the Celestial Empire from the earliest times to the death of Keen Lung at the very close of the last century, a few years after the reception of Lord Macartney's embassy. Early next year he promises to complete the work with a third volume, based not only on official documents, but on private papers placed in his hands by many who took a foremost part in "shaping the destinies of the empire by procuring the increased privileges of foreigners." This third volume is to contain the chronological table and index, the absence of which is a drawback to the use of the portions hitherto published. We are astonished that Mr. Boulger, with the example of every modern historian before his eyes, should not have helped his readers by marking on every page the chapter to which it belongs, and giving in the margin, with dates, a summary of what that page treats of. This adds so much to the pleasure of using a book like *The Making of England*; and, if it is valuable in reading about names and things with which most of us are pretty familar, it is all the more needed when we are trying to learn something about the wholly unknown personages with whom Mr. Boulger wants us to become acquainted. It was a grave mistake to leave his readers for another two years with no help towards analysing events which, when taken in the lump, are apt to seem chaotic, and towards identifying people who, in spite of their wisdom or their heroism, seem to our barbarous ears to have borrowed the names of the heroes of pantomime. Mr. Boulger's first volume details the "making of China," the unification of this vast empire out of a multitude of small states. He is a historian, not an ethnologist; so he wisely says very little about the origin of the race,

not even noticing M. de Quatrefages' theory that from the highlands to the north-west of China the human race spread in its three varieties—the white (which under the name of Aryan became supreme in Europe and Western Asia) degenerating in Chinese soil and climate into the semi-savage white tribes which in China held the place which the Ainos (also whitish) held in Japan.

Of his first volume the interest mainly centres round the wonderful rise and world-wide conquests of the Mongols. A great many of us only know Kublai Khan from Coleridge's wild poem; his policy in China, his attempts in Japan and their disastrous issue, and the fortunes of his descendants are well detailed in the closing chapters of Vol. I. Genghis and Kublai are the heroes of that volume. The next volume opens with the expulsion of the Mongols, effected, after a vain attempt by a scion of the old Sung dynasty, by an able leader, Choo Yuen Chang, who had risen from the ranks in one of the rebel armies, which throughout the Mongol rule kept the feeling of independence alive in one province or another. His manifesto, "It is the birthright of the Chinese to govern foreign peoples and not of these latter to rule in China," was couched in the true *Civis Romanus sum* style, and is justified by the rapidity with which he drove out the Mongols, taking Pekin by storm in 1367. Mounting the throne as the first of the Mings, he took the name of Hongwou, and his long and successful reign is one of the most remarkable in Chinese annals. Mr. Boulger so tells it as to make us feel as if Hongwou ought henceforth to rank with Athelstan and Edward I., and all the ablest sovereigns of early or later time. He had still a great deal of fighting to do both against the Mongols on the side of Kansuh and in Yunan, then, as often since, in revolt; but his closing years were peaceful, and the dynasty that he founded lasted, in spite of internal dissensions, for more than 300 years, and includes the glorious time of Chinese history. It was in Wanleh's reign (died 1620) that the Manchus first appeared as formidable invaders, and their power increased through the weak reigns of his enervated and eunuch-ruled successors. It is the story of the Danes in England over again. The Manchus were a nation of soldiers, hardened by a life of privation in a harsh climate, just as the Viking life produced the daring that carried the Northmen from one end of England to another. China, too, had its Ethelred the Unready. Only Si Wang, "the Western Prince," who raised the national standard in Szchuen, massacred his own people, in default of the Tartars with whom he dreaded to come face to face: "The responsibilities of government brought him neither wisdom nor moderation. Fearful of the strictures of the learned, he enticed into his city, by promises of employment, more than 30,000 men of letters,

and when he had them in his power he gave orders for their massacre. Nor did his inhumanity stop there. The courtiers and attendants of his predecessor, a prince of the House of Ming, had been kept round his person to contribute to the dignity of his position; but when one of these happened to omit the full title of his rank he caused them all, to the number of 3,000, to be summarily executed." Before long, finding the Manchus were preparing to attack his city of Chentu, he behaved with the fiendish cruelty described below:

"The approach of the Manchus warned Si Wang that he could not hope long to maintain himself in Szchuen after they had resolved to annex that province. He came, therefore, to the desperate resolution to strengthen his position, as he hoped, by an act of inhumanity unparalleled in the records of history. The plan he formed was to rid his army of all the women attached to it, and by the lavish promises of future rewards, and of shortly procuring substitutes of these victims in the other provinces, he induced his followers to adopt his advice, and to imitate the example of brutality which he did not hesitate to set them. The slaughter once commenced was carried out with a species of insane fury, and before the butchery ceased more than 400,000 women had been murdered by those on whose protection and affection they possessed every right and claim. Occasions there have been when, in moments of extreme peril, there has been magnanimity as well as necessity in the slaughter of women to save them from a worse fate at the hands of a conqueror; but here the destruction was wanton and unsurpassed in its extent, and in the motives which operated in the minds of the actors." We are told that the evil deed performed, Si Wang was inspired with a kind of frenzy, and swore that he had no longer any fear on the score of Tartars, from whose presence he would "speedily" deliver China.

Si Wang, after this cruel way of making his men reckless, seems to have lost all control of himself. He thought he was predestined to drive out the invaders, and believed that no weapon could wound him. He was soon convinced of his mistake, for a Manchu archer shot him dead as he was riding in front of his host. With him Chinese independence died out on the mainland, though Koshinga and other naval heroes kept harassing the Tartars, who had no navy, and succouring the Chinese, specially mitigating the horrors of the sack of Canton by carrying over many of its defenders to Formosa. This island had been already seized by the Dutch; but Koshinga, whose whole history, including his unsuccessful siege of Nankin, reads like romance, beat them out of it, storming their fort of Zealand. Had he not died at the early age of thirty-eight, the Manchu power would probably never have become established. In 1687 China and Russia were first brought into hostile relations. The latter power

established colonists and a line of blockhouses along the Upper Amoor, but war was staved off by the firmness and prudence of Kanghi, whose long reign is one of the most remarkable in Chinese annals. At his death the Manchus were as much amalgamated with the Chinese as Normans were with English in Henry II.'s time. Edicts against Christianity, and attempts to diminish the population by giving prizes to widows and widowers who did not remarry, filled the reign of his successor, Yung Ching. The increase of the population is remarkable, for the early part of the eighteenth century was marked by grievous famines and earthquakes, in one of which 100,000 people perished in a moment in Pekin.

We have no space to narrate the conquest of Central Asia, and the wars in Burmah, Nepaul, &c., which in Keen Lung's reign brought China to its apogee. With his reign Mr. Boulger's second volume ends. We are promised the third and final volume before long. It will deal with the quite modern history, in which Western nations will not appear to advantage in their relations with the Celestials. Almost the best part in Mr. Boulger's second volume is Lord Macartney's embassy; the account of its reception at Tientsin, and of its progress to Jehol, the emperor's hunting-place beyond the wall, contrasts strangely with later embassies in which the opium trade was really the question at issue.

Mr. Giles's former Chinese books are so well known that there is less need for us to say much about his latest work. Unlike Mr. Boulger, he has compressed his historical part into the narrowest limits; his stories are divided into dynastic and judicial—the latter from the note-book of a famous judge who lived 150 years ago. They give a better insight into Chinese character and habits than many a ponderous volume. Some of the stories are full of humour; several of the judicial sketches set strongly forth the sagacity of the judge. The way in which, in a case of murder by a Buddhist priest, he used the priest's superstition as a means of eliciting the truth, is certainly very clever. "A Visit to the Country of Gentlemen" is a satire in a style well known in Europe. The "gentlemen" never take advantage in trade; indeed, the haggling always is in the endeavour to force things on the buyer cheaper than he offers for them: "You treat me unhandsomely by offering so much, is still the seller's cry." In another country everybody moves along in a cloud of some particular colour which betrays his real character. The devices which bad men in office employ to hide their tell-tale "understandings" are ingenious but usually futile. To our mind the best story in the book is the "Quarrelling Brothers." The judge, by skilfully appealing to their better natures, so works on A-ming and A-ting that, instead of disputing about the land, they both agree to forego it and to give it to a Buddhist temple;

whereupon, in great wrath, he scolds them with so far forgetting their duty to their father as to hand over to a bald-headed priest what he toiled hard for that he might thereby be refreshed in the other world. This appeal to the other world is universal, and shows how little influence Confucianism, cold and agnostic, has on the hearts of the people. Even officialism is bound to recognise a municipal god and other deities. That the dead in Hades should be wronged is as terrible a thing in a Chinaman's eyes as it was in an old Greek's. Other of Mr. Giles's papers (reprinted, these from the *Cornhill*) treat of Chinese education: he believes that on the whole the competitive examination system works well, though the contests are so severe that occasionally not candidates only but examiners go out of their minds. The fear of having the degree taken away is, for the scholar class, a strong motive for good conduct. Of the state of the Chinese people Mr. Giles gives the following account:

"It may astonish a great many persons to hear that the normal state of the people of China is one of considerable prosperity and great national happiness. Those who inhabited the districts visited a few years ago by an awful famine were of course neither prosperous nor happy for the time being; but famine is not the normal condition of any portion of the empire, and it is to the normal condition of China that these remarks refer. No one can live long among the Chinese, and watch them at work or at rest, in city or afield, without being especially struck by their immense fund of buoyancy and cheerfulness of disposition. They seem to have acquired a national habit of looking upon the brighter side. The cheery mirth and laughter, even of the more squalid-looking Chinese villagers, must be seen and heard to be believed in. Apart from their professional beggars, who form a not very numerous class, and pursue their calling according to fixed regulations, there are none of those grim or sad-looking, hunger-stricken, and sometimes drink-sodden creatures, whose presence is such a blot on our own civilisation at home."

Mr. Colborne Babur's travels are most interesting; and their publication in the form of supplementary papers marks something like a new era in the Geographical Society. The old Journal was discontinued last year, having reached the fiftieth volume; and henceforth, from time to time, these supplements will be published, containing papers too long for insertion in the Monthly Proceedings. Mr. Babur's course lay through country in great part unknown—Western Ssu-chuan and Western Yunan. Some part of the way lay through magnificent scenery; elsewhere he had opportunities of investigating the tea trade between China and Tibet. He prints the very striking account of a French missionary; of his being captured by marauding Mantzus or Lolos, nominally subjects of China, but really like Highland

caterans under the Stuarts. Among this people Mr. Babur had an adventure of a different kind. We give it in his own words.

"It was here that I made the most interesting discovery of the journey. The master did not return until next morning, but in the meantime we learnt that he was a Lolo of rank, and that this part of the country, on the right bank of the Gold River, over which his family once reigned, had submitted to the Chinese under his grandfather. He had received a Chinese education, and, except in the matter of intermarriage, had adopted Chinese forms, though still maintaining relations with the independent tribes on the opposite bank. The room in which I was installed measured some twenty-five feet by fourteen feet, and one-third of the floor was covered to an average depth of about eighteen inches with bundles of waste manuscript and printed papers. The Chinese make such collections with the purpose of solemnly burning them, from a pious respect for the art of writing. Now, while travelling along the border, I had been many times assured that the Lolos possess books the power of deciphering which is confined to the priests, or medicine-men, or magicians, or whatever their correct style may be. The Chinese call them 'tuan-kung,' a word which is generally translated by the uncouth term 'thaumaturgist.' I had made every effort to obtain one of their books, but without success. Su, the Ché-po chief, promised to send me an exemplar, but although I have since corresponded with him, no Black-bone classic has reached me. Here then at Ya-k'ou, the point where our route quitted the immediate frontier, an expiring hope prompted me to examine the mass of fugitive literature which encumbered the floor of my chamber." He found what he sought for; and, as he says with pardonable exultation, the discovery was a remarkable one: "Anybody can discover a new people, or even a new language; but a new written character is a rare thing indeed." A fac-simile is given of some pages of the book. The temptation to possess it must have been very strong, but to have tried to buy it would only have caused suspicion and imperilled the traveller's safety.

Lubbock and Romanes on Animal Intelligence.

Ants, Bees, and Wasps, a Record of Observations on the Habits of the Social Hymenoptera. By Sir John Lubbock, Bart., M.P., F.R.S., D.C.L., LL.D.; President of British Association, of Linnæan Society, of Institute of Bankers; Author of "Prehistoric Times," &c. Kegan Paul and Co.

Animal Intelligence. By George J. Romanes, M.A., LL.D., F.R.S., Zoological Secretary of the Linnæan Society. Kegan Paul and Co.

These two consecutive volumes of the International Scientific Series

cover rather different ground. Sir J. Lubbock, it is well known, from hints in the scientific papers, has long been watching ants; he has had some ants' nests in his room for seven years, and his book is the record of personal observation. Nearly the whole is about ants, though the author had intended to make his observations principally about bees. He soon found that "ants are more convenient for most experimental purposes, and that they have also more power and flexibility of mind. They are certainly far calmer and less excitable." As a record of careful observation, conducted by one whose time was greatly occupied by other matters, the book stands unrivalled. Your German *savant* is as close an observer; but then he devotes his life to the little branch of physics which he has taken up. The idea of combining with it politics, banking, and the claims of society, never enters his head. Sir J. Lubbock warns us that for certain months, when Parliament, for instance, is in full swing, his experiments are less full and complete than at other times. Therefore he has dated his observations; for, as he well reminds us, "the instincts and behaviour of ants, bees, and wasps are by no means the same throughout the year." His object is not so much to describe the usual habits of these insects as to test their mental condition and powers of sense. The power of communication of ants, their recognition of friends from the same nest, their behaviour to relations both when in their normal state and when chloroformed and intoxicated, the difficulty of understanding how they can see, the doubt whether or not they hear—such are the matters to which Sir J. Lubbock's experiments were directed. When he was obliged to run up to London he would put his performing ant into a little bottle, letting it out on his return and placing it in the same conditions in which it was before. His chapter on the "Relations of Ants to Other Animals" leads him to speak of the well-known way in which ants use aphides as their milch-kine. They also enslave one another; and among them slavery leads to its inevitable results. These are described as follows:—"In Anergates, finally, we come to the last scene of this sad history. We may safely conclude that in distant times their ancestors lived, as so many ants do now, partly by hunting, partly on honey; that by degrees they became bold marauders, and gradually took to keeping slaves; that for a time they maintained their strength and agility, though losing by degrees their real independence, their arts, and even many of their instincts; that gradually even their bodily force dwindled away under the enervating influence to which they had subjected themselves, until they sank to their present degraded condition—weak in body and mind, few in number, and apparently nearly extinct, the miserable representatives of far superior ancestors, maintaining a precarious existence as contemptible parasites of their former slaves." The power of recognition is marvellous. Young ants

are recognised even when removed as *pupæ* and hatched elsewhere. Sister ants are recognised even when brought up separately; and recognition is important, for the normal state of different ant communities is what Aristotle defined to be the relations between cities that have no treaty between them—a state of war. How they recognise one another it is hard to tell; not by the use of a password (says Sir J. Lubbock), not individually or personally: how then? The experiments on intoxicated ants are curious: the chloroformed, by the way, being to all appearance dead, were treated the same whether they were friends or strangers. The rule was that intoxicated strangers were taken up and dropped into the water, friends in the same condition being carried to the nest; though, sometimes, "as if puzzled at finding their friends in such a disgraceful condition, they took them up and carried them about for a time in a somewhat aimless manner. The origin of queen ants is a moot point. Bees, we know, can by difference of food, treatment, &c., obtain at will from the same eggs either queens or workers. "Mr. Dewitz thinks that with ants the eggs are of different kinds. It is hard (he says) to understand how the instinct which could enable the working ants to make this difference could have arisen. But it is quite as hard to understand how the queens, *which must originally have laid only queen and male eggs*, can have come to produce another class." Here in the words we have underlined is an instance of the assumptions so constantly made by scientists of the development school. In this case there is no greater difficulty than in the case of bees. Divinely implanted instinct taught both creatures alike how to manage best for the good of the community. The longevity of ants is much greater than might be imagined. Sir J. Lubbock had some queens laying fertile eggs when they were seven or probably eight years old. On the curious question whether ants have social games and indulge in recreation he quotes Forel:—"Malgré l'exactitude avec laquelle il décrit ce fait, j'avais peine à y croire avant de l'avoir vu moimême, mais une fourmilière pratensis m'en donna l'exemple à plusieurs reprises lorsque je l'approchai avec précaution. Des ouvriers se saisissaient par les pattes ou par les mandibules, se roulaient par terre, puis se retachaient, s'entraînaient les unes les autres dans les trous de leur dôme pour en ressortir aussitôt après, &c. Tout cela sans aucun acharnement, sans venin; il était évident que c'était purement amical. Le moindre souffle de ma part mettait aussitôt fin à ces jeux. J'avoue que ce fait peut paraître imaginaire à qui ne l'a pas vu, quand on pense que l'attrait des sexes ne peut en être cause." The same thing is mentioned by our own Gould and by Huber; Forel was at first incredulous, but further observation convinced him. The workers we know never possess wings, nor even a rudimentary representative of those organs. Their larvæ, however, have the same disks, which, in

male and female, develope into wings. These disks, during the pupal life, gradually become atrophied, and are in the perfect insects only represented by two strongly chitinised points under the large middle thoracic stigmas. No one unacquainted with the history of these points would suspect them to be rudimentary remnants of wings. The eyes of ants, like those of other insects, present many difficulties. For instance, "if the male of *Formica pratensis* sees one thousand queens at once when only one is really present, this would seem to be a bewildering privilege; the prevailing opinion among entomologists is that each facit only takes in a portion of the subject." From the whole subject Sir J. Lubbock's conclusion is that, though the anthropoid apes approach nearest to us in structure, ants have a fair claim to rank next to man in the scale of intelligence.

Of bees our author notes their want of affection; you may kill a bee close to its sister, and it will go on feeding with the most perfect composure. Of their dead they take no notice except to drag them out of the hive. They have a strong sense of colour, and a preference for blue. Yet, though we know the value of bees in fertilising the flowers to which they are attached, blue flowers are rare. This Sir John explains by the theory that all flowers were originally green and inconspicuous, and passed through stages of white, yellow, red, before becoming blue. This is scarcely true in all cases. The hydrangea, which grows to a great size in West Cornwall, no doubt had originally greenish-white flowers—a mere variegation of the leaves. The next stage would seem to be a creamy white; and this is followed by pale blue, where, as in general in that district, the soil is impregnated with iron. The chapter on wasps is interesting. It is amusing to think of one, *Polistes gallica*, caught in the Pyrenees and kept for nine months.

Professor Romanes' book is, as we said, a collection of facts which he has, as far as possible, taken care shall be trustworthy. His first intention was only to admit the recorded observations of known and qualified scientists; but this, he found, would limit his range so much, that he was obliged to admit those of unknown men when there seemed corroboration, or, at any rate, no contradiction in the circumstances of the case recorded. We cannot see any practical difference between Professor Romanes and the old writers who, from Aristotle's time, have delighted to heap together anecdotes of animal life. If he accepts them, he shows a faith in others strangely at variance with the dicta of modern science. His object, however, is not to add another to the collections of anecdotes, but to "consider the facts of animal intelligence in their relation to the theory of descent." And he promises a second volume, which will be much more interesting than this, inasmuch as, under the title of *Mental Evolution*, it will deal with the facts of comparative psychology

on the lines traced out by Mr. Darwin in the chapter on "Instinct," in the *Origin of Species*. Indeed, even in this volume, a great deal of the hitherto unpublished part of that chapter, so mercilessly compressed from the original draft, has been embodied. The Introduction deals with the question of automatism. It is so much harder, Mr. Romanes remarks, to believe in the existence of rage, sympathy, &c., in creatures so unlike man as ants and bees, than in dogs or monkeys. Of the other part of his book we cannot do better than give a few extracts, showing the principle on which he collects his anecdotes, and which (as he says) lifts him out of the class of mere anecdote-mongers. First, however, let us hear what he says of the word "reason:"

"It is used sometimes for all the distinctively human faculties taken collectively, and in antithesis to the mental faculties of the brute; while at other times it is taken to mean the distinctively human faculties of intellect.

"Dr. Johnson defines it as 'the power by which man deduces one proposition from another, and proceeds from premises to consequences.' This definition presupposes language, and therefore ignores all cases of inference not thrown into the formal shape of predication.

"More correctly, the word reason is used to signify the power of perceiving analogies or ratios, and is in this term equal to 'ratiocination,' or the faculty of deducing inferences from the perceived equivalency of relations. Such is the only use of the word that is strictly legitimate, and thus I shall use it throughout the present treatise. This faculty, however, of balancing relations, drawing inferences, and so of forecasting probabilities, admits of numberless degrees; and as in the designation of its lower manifestation it sounds somewhat unusual to employ the word reason, I shall in these cases substitute the word intelligence. Where we find, for instance, that by an individual experience an oyster profits, or is able to perceive new relations and suitably to act upon the result of its perceptions, I think it sounds less unusual to speak of an oyster as displaying intelligence than displaying reason."

Among reasoning animals he gives the palm to the monkey; and out of several curious instances of monkey wisdom we select the following:

"The orang which Cuvier had used to draw a chair from one end to the other of a room, in order to stand upon it so as to reach a latch which it desired to open; and in this we have a display of rationally adaptive action which no dog has equalled, although as in the case before given of the dog dragging the mat, it has been closely approached. Again, Rengger describes a monkey employing a stick wherewith to prize up the lid of a chest which was too heavy for the animal to raise otherwise. This use

of a lever as a mechanical instrument is an action to which no animal other than a monkey has been known to attain; and, as we shall subsequently see, my own observation has fully corroborated that of Rengger in this respect. More remarkable still, as we shall also subsequently see, the monkey to which I allude as having myself observed, succeeded also by methodical investigation, and without any assistance, in discovering for himself the mechanical principle of the screw; and that monkeys well understand how to use stones as hammers is a matter of common observation since Dampier and Wafer first described this action as practised by these animals in the breaking open of oyster-shells."

With the following extract, showing how far the two books of Lubbock and Romanes overleap each other, we close our notice of two very interesting volumes:

"Bees and wasps have much greater powers of sight than ants. They not only perceive objects at a greater distance, but are also able to distinguish their colours. This was proved by Sir John Lubbock, who placed honey on slips of paper similarly formed, but of different colours; when a bee had repeatedly visited a slip of one colour (A), he transposed the slips during the absence of the bee; on its return the insect did not fly to slip B, although this now occupied the place of A."

Capital and Population.

Capital and Population: A Study of the Economic Effects of their Relations to each other. New York: Appleton and Co. 1882.

This is a singular book. In the first place it is a defence of the Protectionist position, professedly on scientific principles. Still this account of the book is only true with a qualification. It is a defence of Protectionism in certain cases and under certain conditions; for example, in the case of a country mainly agricultural like the United States, as against a country mainly manufacturing like Great Britain. This coincidence between the author's scientific conclusions and the commercial policy of his country is remarkable. On all the topics discussed—capital and labour, credit, wages, &c.—he arrives at Protectionist conclusions. In Chapter XII., on "Distribution of Wealth in a Protected Nation," he tries to explain away the effect of Protection in raising prices to consumers all round by emphasising the advantages on the other side of the account, such as "the increased employment of females and youths," the enjoyment to the poor from looking at the stately residences and luxurious lives of the rich, and other more or less "substantial" advantages. In Chapter XIV., where he expatiates at length on the elevating

influence of "commerce" in the large sense, he is almost wroth with his own country for not carrying the principle of Protection further. After advocating this course, he proceeds: "Curiously enough the American people have steadfastly refused to adopt it, mainly indeed for moral reasons, because the corruption and legislative bribery pretty sure to result from such a policy are rightly odious to them," a strange confession for the advocate of such a policy. But they "subsidise railroads with public lands, and call upon consumers to pay over vast sums to manufacturers" (what does this mean?), "and with a manifest benefit to themselves as a people; while they actually force American ships to carry their mails at a positive loss, and refuse subsidies to them in any way or shape, although no conceivable investment of the public money would so augment the total production of the country. Protectionist in principle, we refuse protection to the very industry in which it might yield to us the greatest benefits at the least cost." He further asks, "Can any one help the deduction that England owes her present commercial position to the protective policy of her navigation laws and to her subsidies?" But on the writer's own showing the advantage of Protectionism can only be partial and temporary. According to him it is good for America, bad for England. Indeed, in some remarks on "Fair Trade" on p. 202, he holds that it would be ruinous to England. But then it is only good for America as a means to enable her to become manufacturing. What when the end is gained? Would not the logical conclusion from the writer's long argument on the different conditions of agriculture and manufacture be that Protectionism and Free Trade are both good for both countries to the extent to which both countries are agricultural and manufacturing? But now comes the singular feature of the book. The writer advocates the doctrines as a disciple of Smith, Mill, and Ricardo! That is, from the same premises he draws opposite conclusions. We may well rub our eyes and ask ourselves where we are? He says, "What I have here attempted is to reason on their lines beyond the limit where they stopped, with the result of greatly modifying and sometimes subverting their conclusions." In all seriousness we ask whether this is possible, and whether it is becoming to use names in this way? If Mr. Hawley has reached opposite conclusions, is it at all likely that he has reasoned "on their lines?" Could Calvinism be deduced from Arminianism? Would it not be better in every way to let theories stand on their own merits, instead of trying to father them on writers who would utterly repudiate them? Mr. Hawley may well say, "My position as an economist is a peculiar one. While classing myself, I believe justly, as a strict disciple of what is usually called the English or orthodox school, I have arrived at results in many instances

diametrically opposed to theirs; especially on the subjects of free trade and taxation. On the other hand, my reason presupposes the falsity of most of the arguments heretofore advanced in support of the very conclusions I uphold." That is, he advocates Protectionist doctrines on Free Trade premisses, rejects Protectionist arguments but receives Protectionist theories, believes in Free Trade arguments but rejects Free Trade theories!

We have not entered into Mr. Hawley's reasonings, but we hope this will be done by competent hands. An exposure of its fallacies by such men as Stanley Jevons (now, alas! no longer possible), Bonamy Price, or Fawcett, would do much to counteract current errors which may otherwise work great mischief.

The Education Library.

The Education Library. Kegan Paul and Co.

An Introduction to the History of Educational Theories. By Oscar Browning, M.A., King's College, Cambridge.

John Amos Comenius, Bishop of the Moravians, his Life and Educational Works. By S. S. Laurie, A.M., Professor of Education in the University of Edinburgh.

Old Greek Education. By J. F. Mahaffy, M.A., Fellow and Tutor of Trinity College, Dublin.

Life is not long enough for all serials; but, whatever we leave out, all ought to read *The Education Library.* It meets a long-felt want. Most of us have heard of Roger Ascham and Dean Colet and Lilly of the Eton Latin Grammar, but very few are aware of the influence which the Humanists and the Reformers, notably Sturm and Melanchthon, the most Humanist of the Reformers, had in remodelling English education. Again, most of us know something about Pestalozzi, but we are still thankful to Mr. Oscar Browning for his interesting Life of the great educationist, and for his careful estimate of his system and of what it owes to his predecessors. Comenius, again, though he came to London full of hopes that here he might set up the "Pansophic school," where the "great didactic" might be properly taught, is, for the average Englishman, a mere name. In Mr. Laurie's pages we have him set before us a living man, full of educational ardour, full also of that zeal for Gospel truth with which so many both of his countrymen and their neighbours, the Bohemians, were inspired. Comenius hoped to have had either Winchester College or the new abortive college at Chelsea handed over to him as the site of his Pansophic school. He came to London at the earnest request of Hartlib, of whom Mr. Masson says: "Everybody knows him,"

though we take leave to doubt whether the "everybody" is as universal a term as Milton's biographer imagines. Hartlib, half Prussian, half English, wholly philanthropist, moved the Long Parliament to invite the Moravian bishop. He came in 1641, but found the times so troublous that he had to go back again without effecting anything. Fortunately, when leaving England, he got a letter from Ludovic de Geer, a Dutchman settled in Sweden, who told him he could so influence the Chancellor Oxenstiern as to secure him ample support. Of his interview with that Eagle of the North (Aquilonaris Aquilo) he gives a lively account. "Can you bear contradiction?" asked the Chancellor, and proceeded to argue against the sanguine Moravian's hopes of a "great restitution" to follow a rightly instituted "Pansophic" teaching. "Does not Scripture," he added, "rather predict that darkness and degeneracy, rather than light and an improved state of society, shall prevail towards the end of the world?" Oxenstiern advised his giving up all his grander schemes, and devoting himself first to the practical work of the "Didactic," *i.e.*, benefiting schools by making the study of Latin easier. Comenius's English friends were bitterly disappointed. They thought Comenius, who undoubtedly owed much to Bacon, was going to carry out in the educational world that *Instauratio Magna* which the English Chancellor dreamed of for science in general. *Quo moriture ruis, minoraque viribus audes?* wrote the disappointed Hartlib, who had on education much the same views as those which Locke soon after enunciated. Comenius was in a strait; but, as de Geer offered means of support, he followed the dictates of prudence, and settling at Elbing, he set about preparing his school books for the press. As soon as this work was over, Prince Sigismund Ragotaki sent for him to reform the schools in Transylvania. This task he undertook the more readily on account of the kindness shown in Transylvania to exiled Moraviana. Here he was led away from his life's work by the attractions of prophetic interpretation, and became mixed up with a charlatan named Dubricius. However, his patrons gave him land and buildings at Patak, so that he was able there to organise a three-class Latin school, which was flourishing in 1657, when its organiser was living at Amsterdam. His objects, as he stated them in a valedictory address when leaving Hungary in 1654, were to give compendiums for learning Latin which would make the acquisition of it pleasant; to introduce a better philosophy into school work, so as to fit youth for investigating the causes of things, and to create a higher tone of morals and manners. With this view he constructed for his three classes a *Vestibulum*, a *Janua*, and an *Atrium*, with their accompanying grammars and lexicons, so framing the three books that they contained the foundations of all departments of knowledge, *i.e.*, "Pansophia"

in its elements. It is as if a Henry's First and Second Latin books, instead of telling us how "Balbus built a wall" and "the Queen is walking in the garden," were to aim at teaching natural history while pointing the use of the subjunctive, and to give a political economy lesson while discussing the ablative of price. A better known work of Comenius is the *Orbis pictus*, which, with its rude cuts, long retained its place in schools, and is the basis of many little books which some of us must have seen in our childhood. His *Janua* was based on the word-book of Bateus, a member of the Irish College of Salamanca, for he never disdained to utilise others' labours; indeed, for his general system, indebted, as we have seen, to Bacon, he was more directly indebted to Wolfgang von Ratich, a Holsteiner, who had a plan of his own for simplifying the teaching of languages and making it interesting. Comenius wrote many more books, several with the curious titles which will be familiar to the students of Puritan literature; one he called *Ventilabrum Sapientiæ, sive sapienter sua retractandi Ars*, to which he prefixed the motto, taken, he says, from Aristotle: "It behoves a philosopher to forswear his own maxims." His life was one long self-denial. As Von Raumer says: "He is a grand and venerable figure of sorrow. Wandering, persecuted and homeless, during the desolating Thirty Years' War, yet he never despaired; but with enduring truth, and strong in faith, laboured unweariedly to prepare youth, by a better education, for a better future. Suspended from the ministry and an exile, he became an apostle *ad gentes minutulas*." The Life of such a man was surely worth writing; and Professor Laurie says his is the only complete life of Comenius existing in any language. For the full account of the good bishop's writings—his *Method of Languages*, his *Great Didactic*, &c., we refer the reader to our Professor's work. Mr. Laurie thinks the circumstances of Comenius's youth, his not having begun Latin till sixteen, and therefore having been able to appreciate the weariness of learning under the old system, account for his having taken up so zealously the work of educational reform. He notes, too, that in no country, save Scotland, was that thorough education for all classes, which it was his aim to give, ever attempted until quite recently. His three-class school is the parent of the system which gave to Germany her graduated schools beginning with the *Real-Schule*. Mr. Laurie's Introduction points out the effect of the Renaissance, that harbinger of the Reformation, on European education.

More generally interesting is Mr. Mahaffy's contribution to the series; for the liveliness of his style, and the freshness which he manages to impart to a subject, make him always exceptionally pleasant reading; and, moreover, the Greeks have still such a hold on us that, much as we care for the beginnings of our modern educational systems, we care even more for the methods which

trained up the philosophers and poets and orators whose names live in the bead-roll of Time's worthies, and whose thoughts are still the storehouse for our young minds to draw from. How the Greek boy was trained, what share athletics had in his training, what use was made of music; how the youth was, on leaving school, taken hold of by other educational influences; what was the real work of the Sophists, how they have, most undeservedly, got a bad name, and to what modern agencies their teaching answers; all this Mr. Mahaffy sets forth most lucidly and most attractively. He also analyses and comments on the educational systems of Plato and Aristotle and Xenophon, and the work of Isocrates, whom, with the other rhetoricians, he compares to popular preachers who learn up all about the science of the day that they may introduce it into their sermons. Isocrates, he says, is the first master of style among the Greek; and he notices the exceeding studiedness of Greek eloquence, its close and perpetual adherence to minute rules. To speak well and readily was in Greek society the highest and best outcome of education, just as with us the writing of elegant English is accounted to indicate a thorough and general culture. It is strange how persistent is the notion, based on the complaints of Aristophanes and Plato, that after Pericles' time the Athenians passed more and more under mob rule. Grote, one would think, sufficiently refuted this; but it comes out as strongly as ever in Curtius; and with it is connected that depreciatory view of the Sophists because they taught for pay, and therefore Socrates and Plato called them hirelings, which the same Grote set himself to counteract, and which Mr. Mahaffy disproves in one of his best chapters. The Sophists he compares with crammers. Both are the product of a special want of the day: "The examination mania produced the crammer; so the rise of democratic institutions and the spread of international debates made the fifth century B.C. in Greece one that required suddenly a set of practical teachers for men who practised at the Bar or debated in the public assembly. We are too much in the habit of thinking that such men required training merely in rhetoric—in the way of disputing and of plausibly stating their views. They required more; they required education in general subjects, and of course not a deep education, but such an one as would enable them to talk intelligently, and make and understand allusions to the deeper questions of the day. We hear that now in America it is not an uncommon thing for men who have risen suddenly in the world, and for their wives, to send for a teacher and say: 'I am now in a position to move in educated society, and to be required to speak in public. My early training was entirely neglected. I want you to instruct me in the ordinary topics of the day, as well as in those points of art and science which may be serviceable for my purpose.' And such instruction,

very superficial, no doubt, and inaccurate, but highly practical, is often given." Still more apposite is Mr. Mahaffy's comparison between Sophists and newspaper editors. Like the former, the latter claim to furnish their readers with all the current topics of instruction, aye, even to enable them to converse intelligibly without further study. They also claim to be leaders of the moral sense of the public, as well as to supply them with arguments wherewith to meet intellectual adversaries. And, like the Sophists, the editors do not do all this out of pure philanthropy, though they would loudly insist that the instruction they afforded was greatly in excess of the pay they received. Journalists too, like the Sophists of old, generally object to be considered a class or profession, asserting that all intelligent men who desire to teach are to some extent journalists, the journalist being marked by the bonds of no special education. But we trust our readers will see for themselves how Mr. Mahaffy draws out the whole parallel and bids us note that the Sophists only lasted a generation or two, their encyclopædic teaching giving place by-and-by to the specialism of rhetoricians and moralists, &c., "just as the professors of geology of thirty years ago are being supplanted by special teaching in fossil anatomy, botany, and mineralogy."

We may learn much from every chapter of the book. The freshness with which Mr. Mahaffy treats his subject is no less remarkable than his courageous disregard of conventionalities. We all feel how true is the charge of "ingrained Hellenic narrowness;" and yet how few would dare to make it, or to speak of Aristotle's *Politics* as the narrow old-fashioned scheme of a pedant Greek, or to point out that the democratic Lycophon, who held that laws were only useful to repress crime, was much more practical, though less Greek, than Plato in his *Republic*. Certainly narrow self-conceit could hardly go further than it does in Plato's recommendation that his laws should be learnt by children instead of poetry. On Plato's view of marriage, and how the community of wives, with advocating which he has been taunted, is only Aristotle's calumny; and how *mariages de convenance*, which are the rule among the poorer Irish, are at least as happy as love-matches, Mr. Mahaffy's remarks are very interesting. M. Renan somewhere throws out a suggestion that by-and-by we may be able, by proper selection, to produce genius, as the cattle-breeder produces what he requires in his stock; and, certainly, Mr. Mahaffy is right in reminding us that hitherto no such pains have been bestowed on selection in marriage as are given to the perfecting of a breed of horses or sheep. On Greek educational endowments and their modern parallels there are some good remarks; and we quite agree with Mr. Mahaffy in deprecating the perversion of the old helps provided for poor scholars into premiums on expensive cramming. Like so many more of the reforms

made by a pseudo-liberalism, this change has almost exclusively benefited the rich. Scholarships and such like for poor scholars may be useful or harmful; but to repay a man in part for extravagantly costly preparation by extravagant prizes is a wholly different thing, and a very absurd thing, though now its absurdity no longer strikes the public mind.

All the three books of the series are well worth reading. Comenius, by the way, insists on the value of teaching by the eye —recommends the walls to be hung with pictures, quite in our most modern fashion. Our only complaint against Mr. Browning is that he might have given Cardinal Wolsey a word. His educational schemes were grand, and his insight into the whole matter of teaching was clearer than that of any man of his day. We wish our readers would take up Cavendish's Life of the great Cardinal, in Bishop Wordsworth's *Ecclesiastical Biographies*. They will learn from it the truth about one whom historians have too generally misrepresented.

Hughes's Memoir of Daniel Macmillan.

Memoir of Daniel Macmillan. By Thomas Hughes, Q.C., Author of "Tom Brown's Schooldays," &c. Macmillan.

Mixed breeds are not always successful either in the human or the animal kingdom; but the Celt and Saxon seems on the whole everywhere a good cross. The borderland which runs in an irregular stripe from the Cheviots to the British Sea has for its extent produced more men of mark than the districts east and west of it. Devon, saturated with "Welsh kind," boasts more worthies than any other county. So in Ireland most of the great names belong to the mixed stock. But it is across the northern border that the most largely successful mixture, that which has not only produced great men but has leavened for good the lower strata of society, is to be found. Whatever the Lothian men may be, and our opinion as to them differs widely from Mr. Freeman's, the western cottier, whose "Saturday night" Burns so lovingly described, is a man of mixed race; and from no part of Scotland has there been a larger number of those who in one way or another have made their mark in the world. The union of Celtic fervour with Saxon steadiness is the very thing to help a young man on in life; the one gives stay, the other push, and both are needed in every kind of calling. The subject of this Memoir was eminently a case in point. His father was a "tackman" in Arran, of a class which originally held the lands of North Kenfdale, in Argyle. His mother, a Crawford, of a Lowland family, which had come of Arran, from Renfrewshire. Both were remarkable people. Of his father, Duncan, Daniel writes much as

Carlyle does of his father; he was clearly a man of whom his son could be proud, who killed himself in working for his family. His mother's teaching and example retained their hold on him through life. "He draws her portrait with the enthusiasm of a boy-lover," says Mr. Hughes. Here are a few of his sentences (he is writing to his brother, who had, rather in the style of Eliab, asked him "What are you and what is your father's house that you should be so ambitious?"): "I know her as well as son ever knew parent, and my persuasion is that she is the most perfect lady in all Scotland. With so little knowledge derived from books, with so very little intercourse with the higher ranks of society, with so little care or thought on what is most pleasing in external conduct, was there ever a lady who so instinctively did what was right in all cases? . . No one ever heard her say or knew her do a mean thing: I think she has one of the *finest*, I mean the most refined, minds I ever came in contact with, and yet she is far from being deficient in strength." We are careful to note this, because his mother's influence was present with Daniel all his life through; on his death-bed her image was still uppermost in his thoughts.

Born in 1813, he was the tenth child of a family of twelve, of whom the four sisters between him and his elder brother William were cut off in infancy by an epidemic. When he was in his third year his father emigrated to Irvine, where he took a small farm, dying when Daniel was ten years old. His elder brothers worked as carpenters till one got his arm shattered by a beam, and then both took to schoolmastering. The eldest, Malcolm, eventually became a preacher. Both of them died before he was twenty-seven; it was not a robust family, indeed one of the chief marvels in Daniel's career was his battling so energetically against continual weak health, amounting every now and then to such illness that he had to give up all work and seek a change either in his native Arran or, later in life, in Torquay. At twelve years old, Daniel, "a boy of rare ability and a voracious reader, whom straitened means had compelled to do with what he could pick up in the common school or from his elder brother at odds and ends of time, was bound apprentice to Maxwell Dick, bookseller and bookbinder of Irvine, at 1s. 6d. a week for the first year, with a rise of 1s. a week for each of the remaining six years. Then, after a violent attack of brain fever, he went to Glasgow to the shop of Atkinson, a noted bookseller, where, having great hopes of getting into partnership, he worked so hard night and day that his health quite gave way, and he was sent to Arran, as soon as medicine and blisters had given him strength enough to be moved. No one imagined he would recover, but he did get, for him, quite strong; and in 1833 he started, like so many other young Scotchmen, to make his way in London.

Here he was much helped at the outset by James MacLehose, then a bookseller's shopman, now one of the foremost booksellers in his native Glasgow. MacLehose shared his lodging with him and gave him advice about a situation. It must have been a wonderful relief to his deeply sensitive nature to have some one in whom he could confide and with whom he could take counsel. That womanly tenderness, which in him was combined with so much power and such tenacity of purpose, belongs to the mixed race; in him it was developed almost to excess. To his brother William, describing his fruitless search for work among the magnates of the Row, he says, "It is an easy thing to depress me; I felt dreadfully depressed, tears relieved me, prayer relieved;" and again, "all the way from Stationers' Court to Goswell Road was sprinkled with tears. These were a relief to me, these and such half-articulate prayers as I could give utterance to."

And here we may note that Mr. Hughes tells everything. In his preface he speaks of the difficulty of selection out of super-abundant material. He has not been troubled with difficulties as to the desirableness of reticence, his aim being to let the subject of his memoir "paint his own portrait." Some will question the wisdom or the good taste of publishing what was so strictly private (the letter to her who was to be his wife, for instance). Such painful mental analysis and confessions of weakness may be misunderstood, but not by those who know Scottish character. Such confessions are like the kneeling before Bannockburn, which Edward thought was a token of submission. "Yes, they crave pardon," replied one near him, "but not of you." To Mr. Hughes's readers the gain is great, for he gives us at the outside only but the picture in all its details of a very worthy man whose inward struggles, no less than his outer life, are full of teaching. The search for employment in "the Row" resulted in Daniel's accepting a place with Johnson, of Cambridge, at £30 a year and board and lodging. What partly led him to prefer this to a more laborious and somewhat more remunerative post at Simpkin Marshall's was his yearning for family life. The Johnsons treated him like a son; he joined their church—they were Baptists—and remained there three years, having made many friends among the rising men of the University, "who often passed Mr. Johnson's desk to consult the Scotch shopman on their purchases or to talk over books with him." On leaving Cambridge he had a desperate attack of illness, brought on by what Mr. M. Arnold, we think, writing of Carlyle, calls the grubbiness which comes of early struggles. He actually travelled to Leith from London in January in a small coaster, the life on board which was the worst possible for a man of a consumptive temperament always liable to severe chest attacks. He got to Edinburgh more

dead than alive, and was laid up for two months, after which he took service with the Seeleys, remaining six years at a salary rising from £60 to £130. His journal during this time, which was broken by two illnesses, is most interesting. He was always in straitened means, and his prayer was, "Though I am pressed under a load of debt, and have sometimes to struggle with hunger, O Lord, preserve me in my integrity. May I never stoop to anything mean. Keep me from cant and carelessness, haughtiness and sycophancy."

The debt was partly due to helping his relations. At last he got a post at Seeley's for his younger brother Alexander, and brought up his sister to keep house, borrowing the furnishing money from Mr. Burnside. The experiment did not answer. Janet seems to have been an indifferent housekeeper; anyhow she went back to Scotland, and Daniel sold his precious library. Precious—for no man was more helped by books, or loved his helpers more than Daniel Macmillan. He and his brother went to board in Charterhouse Square, and before long came what was really the turning point in his life. He had set up his younger brother (his salary being the smaller) in a small shop in Aldersgate Street; and had got hold of *Guesses at Truth*, a book which had such hold on him that at last, after talking of it to his friends, and widely recommending it, he wrote to thank the "Two Brothers" for what he is sure will be a help to the class to which he himself belongs, and which is in danger of hardening into "enlightened selfishness" if it escapes sinking into gross vice. A kind reply was followed up in two years, by Daniel sending to Archdeacon Hare some lectures of Alexander Scott, and dilating still more on the dangers which beset the clerk and shopman class, then far less cared for than now. Before long he is a visitor at Hurstmonceaux, hearing about Landor and Coleridge from those who knew them, and getting to know personally Maurice, whose works he had long valued, and to the rare sweetness of whose nature he bears abundant testimony. And now for the only episode which caused us the slightest pain from beginning to end of the book. He had, as we said, joined the Baptists. The whole Macmillan family had been uprooted from Kirk orthodoxy by the Haldane mission, which had reached Arran in his grandfather Malcolm's day. While at Seeley's he had joined Dr. Binney's church; but, after Hurstmonceaux, he found "dissent so extremely repulsive" that he writes to Dr. Binney withdrawing formally from his congregation. The letter bears too many signs of Scotic haste and impulsiveness. Mr. Hughes hints that the last of his reasons, the visit to Archdeacon Hare, was the true cause of secession—along with the reading of Maurice's *Kingdom of Christ*, which in an amusingly dictatorial way he recommends Dr. Binney to read. Very soon after, a little

business at Cambridge—Newby's—is for sale. He has long wanted to be independent. The narrow theology of the elder Seeleys (one of the younger is, as everybody knows, the author of *Ecce Homo*) must have been distasteful to him. But to start in Newby's would cost money, and so he asked help from Archdeacon Hare, who had often urged him to get into a better neighbourhood than Aldersgate Street. Hare lends him £500 at four per cent., and Mr. Burnside helping also, he is soon established in Trinity Street, Cambridge. His first trade-catalogue stamps the man. Most of the books have remarks; thus on Emerson's *Essays* he quotes Sterling: "Teacher of starry wisdom, high, serene;" and adds his own comment: "Vauxhall stars, I fear," D. L.—a stricture which brought a scolding letter from the Archdeacon. Henceforth his life is a success in every way, except that failing health drives him again and again to Torquay. We do not in the least mean only a financial success. No artist ever had a higher view of the aim and object of his art than Daniel Macmillan had of the bookseller's craft. He was earnestly desirous to do good, while at the same time a thorough man of business.

This is pleasantly shown in a letter to Charles Kingsley about his *Wonders of the Sea Shore*. "We don't think it will pay to give copies to the country papers. The rascals sell and lend the books and do more harm than good." This again, to the same, is amusing as showing that he has his own trade notions and kept to them: "Unless it runs counter to some deep-rooted theory of yours, pray let the novel have head-lines. It is against all the usages to send out a respectable book otherwise. . . . Don't let it go out like a Minerva press novel. . . . Why behead your own book?" Cambridge life to such a man must have been eminently delightful; it brought him into constant intercourse with some of the finest minds in the country, and enabled him to carry on that course of self-education which ceased only when he passed out of life. The sharpness of his criticisms is sometimes most remarkable. Of Kingsley, for instance, while noting his superiority in delineating Scotchmen to Thackeray who "has no insight into them, made a frightful failure of Binnie," he remarks on his unfairness to dissenters, what he says being true only of a class, if even of them. His own faith was a strange mixture. "It may seem odd," he writes, "but I stick fast to the doctrine of reprobation. It seems to me the only scheme that stands clear on its feet. I do believe that the reprobate man in me and in all men will be cast out and destroyed." But this and other matters of personal interest we leave our readers to seek in the book itself. The very fullest review could do scant justice to such a work. Our task has merely been to call attention to a "Life" which we think is about the best present that can possibly be put

into the hands of a lad starting in business far away from friends and home.

Caruana's Antiquities.

Report of the Phœnician and Roman Antiquities of the Group of the Islands of Malta. By A. A. Caruana, D.D., Librarian of the Public Library, Malta. Printed by order of His Excellency the Governor of Malta. Government Printing Office. 1882.

Despite its very moderate price (3s. for 168 pages small folio, with more than a score of excellent autotypes), we cannot hope that this work will find its way into the hands of the general public. It is a work, however, that no library of archæology ought to be without; and is especially interesting to those who care for the megalithic remains of our islands and the neighbouring Brittany. The resemblance between these and those in Malta, which Mr. Caruana calls Phœnician, cannot fail to strike the most superficial. The "Phœnician remains at Gozo" (opposite page 24), for instance, look strikingly like the great stonework near Penzance, known as Chyoon Castle. "Phœnician remains, Malta" (page 22), are like a piece of Carnac; while the ground plan of Hagiar Kim (page 12), or the "Stones of Veneration," near Valetta, closely resembles that of the so-called hut villages found both in Dartmoor and in Cornwall. In this last place were found seven grotesque acephalous statuettes of sandstone, undoubtedly, Dr. Caruana thinks, Cabiri (*i.e.*, the mighty ones; *kbir* still means mighty in the Maltese vernacular). The non-appearance of the heads is due to their having been made of some other material, metal or ivory. Now, of the Phœnician origin of these remains Dr. Caruana makes no question. The Government minute called attention to the state of neglect into which they had fallen, and testifies to their great importance in the eyes of all scholars; but it carefully abstains from giving them a name. Dr. Caruana, however, has the twofold argument, "Who else could have built them?" and also the fact that besides the statuettes, Phœnician sarcophaguses and pottery with Phœnician inscriptions are undoubtedly found in close connection with them. This, of course, proves nothing; for Roman remains are found in British stone circles. Places hallowed by the memory of an extinct race may have been used by their successors. Whether the use of the name Phœnician is justified or not we must leave to more skilled archæologists. Dr. Caruana reminds us that in Malta there is no trace of prehistoric man; the "giant's bones" found in the seventeenth century and since, one of which was sent as a great curiosity to

Pope Alexander VII., are elephant or hippopotamus. He also makes a great deal of the bilingual inscription (Greek and Phœnician) called "Meliteus's prima." But, inasmuch as it is inscribed in "two marble cippi of elegant form," it has no certain connection with the rude stone monuments amid which it was found. The Phœnician alphabet, we need scarcely say, is very like the Samaritan, which was used by the Jews before they borrowed the square Chaldee characters; and one of the means used to interpret this and the other inscriptions was by transliteration into the modern Hebrew character. The two languages are almost identical. Among other Phœnician remains, the only one calling for notice is a golden calf said to have been found in Gozo in 1729. The grand-master, Manoel de Vilhena, put Dr. Cassar, who had bought it of the finder, to the torture; but he could obtain no information about it. It would be interesting to know if it resembled the bronze bull with a crescent on its flank, dug up in the vicarage garden at St. Justin Penwith, and now in the Truro Museum. Of the other remains, Mnaidra in Malta, Gigantia in Gozo, &c., the former has a certain resemblance to some of the dome-roofed burial places found in West Cornwall. Mr. Fergusson, indeed, says the whole are sepulchral, classing them as *columbaria;* but from this view Dr. Caruana loudly dissents, asserting that they are altogether unlike the numerous Phœnician tombs and burying places in these islands. If this is correct, they may still have been burial places for an earlier race, which may even have had its temples and burying places identical, as was for centuries the case among Christians. There are more marks of the metal tool than in most British and Breton works, though less than in some of the early Irish, and several of the photographs show a mushroom-shape stone which may have been a huge table, but of which the letter-press gives no account. The water reservoir near the temple of Melcarth, at St. George's Bay, Malta, belongs clearly to a much later date; it is of hewn stone instead of rough "Cyclopean" work, and resembles the cisterns at Carthage. It is remarkable that the bilingual inscription already mentioned was found in this neighbourhood.

Of Phœnician inscriptions, by the way, there are fifteen; of undoubted coins only five—one first, the rest third brass. Phœnicians lasted on in Africa till the Arab invasions. Procopius, Belisarius's secretary, proved that it outlived the Vandal invasion of the sixth century. "Hence," in Dr. Caruana's quaint phrase, "it could not have been superseded in its own country but by an akin language, the Arab of the Ommiads who settled in Africa at the end of the seventh century." In Malta it was spoken in St. Paul's day, and lasted on till it was incorporated in the Arabic of the ninth century. Of the Greek and Roman remains we will only say that some of the Roman bas-reliefs are

very beautiful, especially a sepulchral slab representing Wandia, wife of Metellus (page 114). Our business is with the so-called Phœnician antiquities, which, by whatever race they may have been erected, much resemble the megaliths found in our own islands and elsewhere in Western Europe, and also in North Africa. Mr. Fergusson has given a map of the distribution of such monuments, which, if we mistake not, he ascribes to a pre-Celtic and non-Aryan race of builders (query, Are all such remains near the sea?). They have, by the early school of antiquaries, been always connected with sun and snake worship, and with mysteries such as are supposed to have belonged to the Cabiric worship. In West Cornwall the Phœnicians are supposed to have been more than visitors; and a good many still assign to them the building of the Irish round towers. Such theorists will find confirmation in Dr. Caruana; and his work will interest those for whom the Phœnicians are a myth, in so far as it is a careful account of what few of us know anything about.

Mozley's Reminiscences of Oriel.

Reminiscences: Chiefly of Oriel College and the Oxford Movement. By the Rev. T. Mozley, M.A. Vol. I.

It is not difficult to account for the sensation created by a work such as this. It will stand side by side with Newman's *Apologia*, Stanley's *Life of Arnold*, Coleridge's *Life of Keble*, and other books of note in many a library, and will rival any of them in interest for many a year to come. As to the propriety of publishing some of its stories in the lifetime of men with whom it deals, or their intimate friends, different opinions will be formed; but personal details, even when they verge on gossip, are fascinating: the writer will be easily forgiven, and his work will be a success. Much of it will be painful to those who know and love many of the men of whom the writer speaks—may we venture to whisper it?—a little flippantly at times. Mr. Mozley's style is affected by his labours, no secret to the world in another sphere, where he wielded the thunder, "rode on the whirlwind, and controlled the storm."

The limits of a notice such as we can now give of these *Reminiscences* will forbid (if on other accounts it were befitting us) a consideration of Mr. Mozley's theological pronouncements, and his sweeping statements on the general character of the "Oxford movement;" but a few circumstances that we know (for we, too, have our "reminiscences") will bear recording. Biographies, when extended and professedly exhaustive, are rarely of much value. Who would really know Arnold, or Keble, or Hook, or Samuel Wilberforce, from their published Lives? We see them

from one point of view, and we say, "Those were not the men as we knew them." *Quantum mutatus* is our involuntary exclamation, as they are made, one by one, to stand before us. We too knew them but in part, and what we saw is ofttimes missing in the elaborate memoir. We venture to say that many of the mighty who figure in the incidents recorded by Mr. Mozley will suffer a great injustice if, as will be the case, they are judged of by the partial light here thrown upon them. Arnold, Whately, Keble, Hook, the three Wilberforces, and even poor Blanco White, are somewhat caricatured in this volume. With regard to White, the essay by the other Mozley (the great Achilles whom we knew) should be read as a corrective, or a much needed explanation of all that is here said of him. The author of the finest sonnet in the English language must be studied as a whole, or let alone: "*Stat magni nominis umbra.*" Again, Whately's opinions and his career may well cause sober men to doubt and wonder; but the random way in which he is set down as a man destitute alike of principles and influence, will grieve many who know what a mighty power he exerted while living, and still wields by his writings. Here we must be content to say *valeat quantum.* We have a few old memories and a few strong expressions of Mr. Mozley to set against the magnificent achievements of one of the calmest thinkers of this century.

When Mr. Mozley gives his judicial estimate of a man, it is tantalising to find the main elements of a satisfactory verdict omitted in his summing up.

This is especially the case, we venture to think, in the case of the venerable Robert Isaac Wilberforce, the rector of Burton Agnes, and Archdeacon of the West Riding. Among the powers that moved England in those days, his works on the "Incarnation," on the "Holy Eucharist," and on "Baptism" were mightier (whether for good or for evil: here men will differ) than any or all of the *Tracts for the Times.* Alas! he fell, and died in the Pontine marshes, where he had gone to study his new theology. We had a letter from him not long before his death, written from Dr. Döllinger's, at Munich, in which he says, "My host is surely the wisest, most learned, and most devout man in Christendom." Had he lived to be one of the leaders with Döllinger in the Old Catholic movement, what might he not have effected? For he was a man who united the saintly simplicity of George Herbert with a keenness of intellect, a wealth of learning, and a dialectic power rarely found in the same person. We were with him when he was writing his book on Baptism, and after reading a chapter of it in manuscript aloud, he said: "How would that strike a Wesleyan?" Our reply was a sketch of Mr. Wesley's views on conversion. The next day he read out his added chapter on the relation of regeneration to conversion,

which is deeply interesting as exhibiting what he thought to be the common ground between those who stand far apart in formulas. Witty he could not help being, and his conversation was often a series of elegant epigrams. In 1851, when some one spoke despondingly of the prospects of the English Church, he turned round, and said: "What can you expect from us on the battlefield, when the enemy appoints our generals?" This was a matter on which he felt keenly. On one occasion, at a dinner where many clergymen were present, the recent appointment of a certain bishop was canvassed. Suddenly the voice of the then vicar of Leeds was heard saying to the archdeacon, who was at the other end of the table, "Archdeacon, what do you think of the new bishop?" An expectant silence at once hushed every utterance, and the effect may be more easily imagined than described, when a silvery voice replied, "Good—very good—*for a bishop:* ignorant of the Gospel, doubtless; BUT NOT HOSTILE TO IT." Men felt keenly in those days. No man was fuller of zeal for the salvation of souls—a zeal, however, as we must think, not always tempered by knowledge. Erastianism was his red rag.

Our point is that, among the *movers*, Mr. Mozley does not give him his due place. He should give us some extracts, at least, from his own contributions to the counter-movement in 1851. Movements are often understood best by considering the amount and direction of opposing forces.

In noticing Vol. II. we shall hope to give a few more "Reminiscences" of others whom Mr. Mozley introduces in this brilliant mosaic.

HICKS'S GREEK INSCRIPTIONS.

A Manual of Greek Historical Inscriptions. By E. L. Hicks, M.A., Late Fellow and Tutor of Corpus Christi College, Oxford. Clarendon Press Series.

THIS work will take its place on the shelves of all students of Greek literature, by the side of Grote and Thukydides. It was much wanted, and it is thoroughly well executed.

Only the man who has referred to the four ponderous folios of Böckh's *Corpus Inscriptionum Græcarum* can dûly estimate the value of a book which places these inscriptions before him in a form easily manageable, and enables him to use them as he studies his Grote or Curtius.

Mr. Hicks has arranged them under nine heads, and the summary of Grecian history prefixed to each division is itself of no mean value. An index enables the student at once to select the inscriptions illustrating any point on which he desires information. It is of surpassing interest to retrace the lines of an inscrip-

tion which Thukydides has read, though it was even in his time "dimly legible" (ἀμυδρὸς γράμμασι). (See p. 9.)

The inscriptions in this volume are wholly historical, though points of archæological interest crop up, as in No. 90, where there is an inventory of works of art found in the temple of Hêra.

We shall expect the other volume, of which a half promise is given, embracing some of the most interesting of the "very large number of Greek inscriptions relating to religious ceremonies, agonistic contests, and concerns of private life."

As to the way to use these inscriptions Mr. Hicks says, "The Oxford reader is invited to work out carefully the printed texts, the originals of which are in the University Collection. If he will then, book in hand, consult the marbles, word by word, he will in a few hours have learned more about Greek inscriptions than any written account could have taught him."

Meanwhile, if he will take one or two, such as those by Simonides (No. 1, 11), and collate them with the *fac-similes* in Böckh, and refer to the authorities cited by Böckh and by Mr. Hicks, he will see it to be a most profitable bit of work, and will be astonished to find how interesting a dry subject can become.

There is a special charm in well-directed epigraphical studies, and they tend greatly to sharpen the critical faculty.

In relation to Greek dialects, as Mr. Hicks points out, though his notes do not pursue the subject, "nothing is more valuable to the student than the evidence of inscriptions."

If we may specify the inscription in this volume which to us is most striking, it is No. 161, where "the repulse of Brennus and the Gauls from Delphi in the early summer of 278 B.C. is commemorated." Mr. Hicks's note to this is a valuable paragraph in an introduction to the Epistle to the Galatians, the descendants of these discomfited Gauls.

We must not omit reference to Mr. Hicks's own neat lines of dedication. They are honourable alike to the pupil and to the master at whose feet he lays his scholarly volume.

Ancient Monuments in India.

Preservation of Ancient Monuments in India. Lists of Buildings under Correction. Reports by Capt. H. H. Cole, R.E., Curator of Ancient Monuments in India. Simla: Government Central Branch Press. 1880-81.

Sir John Lubbock's movement has reached even to India, where there is no Parliament to resist the Preservation of Monuments as an interference with the rights of property. In 1873 an address on the subject to the Indian Secretary was signed by many noblemen and gentlemen in England; and before long Captain Cole

was at work, with what result is shown in the volume before us. It was time for something to be done. The history of India is (as has often been remarked) to be read in her monuments and in them only; and these are in many places perishing through neglect, even where their destruction is not wantonly hastened. Many of them, too, are perishing without any drawing or photograph which might show us what they were. While Hope's great work illustrates fully the Mohammedan fifteenth and sixteenth century architecture of Bijapur and Ahmedabab, while much has been done by Fergusson and Burgess and Rousselat, it is astonishing to find "none," "none known," filling up the column for photographs and drawings or plans on page after page of these lists. Nor is this the case only in outlying places. It is humiliating that, after so many generations, military and civilian have been "shaking the pagoda tree," such deeply interesting remains as the Nalanda monasteries at Burgaon in the old Patna district, containing Buddhist sculptures of great beauty, should be perishing without record, and that of Jamali Kamali's tomb, near Delhi, "decorated in a very beautiful and singular way with encaustic tiles," we should be told "it is fast losing all its beauty by removal of tiles," &c. Happily the case is different at Vellore. We think of this place in connection with an early mutiny; but its fort, memorable in the French and English struggles, contains one of the choicest bits of Dravidian architecture to be found in India. Of this the gem is a stone pavilion, the Kalyan Mandapan, A.D. 1350. The rearing horses, griffins, &c., carved against the columns, are wonderfully done, the style almost exactly like that of Trimal Nayakka's Mandapan (three centuries later) at Madura. All these have been photographed, effective sketches are given by Mr. Cole, and many of the details may be seen in Fergusson. They have also, thanks to the Duke of Buckingham, been put in fair repair, the earth cleared out, and some, though not all, of the disfiguring whitewash removed, and the enclosures, set up when the Vellore pagoda was used as an arsenal store, removed. Another almost equally interesting monument is the Temple of Vittala at Bijanagar, built in the first half of the sixteenth century, and ruined by Tippoo Sultan. Here, as elsewhere, the chief enemies to permanence are the cooking fires of pilgrims and the roots of "jungle" which get a hold on the masonry, forcing out carved fragments, which Captain Cole says should be collected, and, if not replaced, at any rate set where they can be seen. The Duke of Buckingham speaks of this temple as "a marvel of industry in carving, beautiful both in outline and detail; . . the delicacy of the columns in their several groups surpasses any work I have yet seen." He then goes on to lament the state of ruin to which great part of it has been reduced, attributing it in the main to the cooking fires causing the granite pillars to flake until they become too frail to

support the roof. Treasure-digging, stalling of cattle, &c., have also helped on the destruction. Proper custody is the only way to prevent such damage; and in most cases there are lands charged with the support of custodians, though the income has often been long since diverted to other objects. The whole of the Madras section of Captain Cole's reports is properly illustrated, and is well worth the study of those who wish to know something of the Dravidian architecture (Jain and others) of Southern India. This is much less known to the general reader than the Mohammedan style, in which are most of Captain Cole's examples from the Bengal and Bombay Presidencies. Some of these, however, are strikingly beautiful. The perforated marble window at Ahmedabad (A.D. 1411), and the mausoleum of Sultan Mahmud Adil Shah (A.D. 1630)—the dome of which is one of the largest in the world—should be reproduced in every manual that professes to give any account of Oriental architecture. It is startling to read, in the account of the famous Jain rock temples of Mount Abu (A.D. 1032-1240), of which Captain Cole gives two good sketches, that in many cases broken lintels spanning elaborately-carved pillars have been supported by uncouth brick and mortar arches, which thus hide large portions of the delicate sculpture. Here there are ample funds still used, but without judgment. At Ajmeer is a "converted mosque," built out of a Jain temple as early as A.D. 1236. This is most interesting, for the whole is covered with a network of Jain sculptures. In 1874 it narrowly escaped total destruction; a proposal to pull it down was fortunately quashed by the Agent (Mr. A. C. Lyall) and Commissioner (Mr. L. Saunders). Throughout Captain Cole's reports are not only valuable as furnishing material for history based on architecture, but also as showing the contrast between the work of different religious sects; the Siva temples of Conjeveram, for instance, differ greatly from those dedicated to Vishnu in the same and other places. Captain Cole urges speed in carrying out the good work begun in many quarters: thus of a palace at Madura he says, "unless more rapid progress is made the whole stands a fair chance of coming down together." The zeal, too, of the modern Hindoo is generally a zeal without knowledge. He is often profuse in his gifts; but these are spent in gaudily painting the outside of goparums and porticoes, in painting and oiling temple-cars, which thus become so thickly coated with solid dirt that the carved details are lost; while, inside, delicate sculpture is blotted out with whitewash, and cracks in roof are left to increase unnoticed. One thought suggested by this very interesting volume is the value of photography to all who go out to India. We would have it a *sine quâ non*, not only for the Cooper's Hill men, but for the military and civil servant.

KNIGHT'S ALBANIA.

Albania: a Narrative of Recent Travel. By S. F. Knight. London: Longmans.

"THE wild Albanian kirtled to the knee," clothed in what Mr. Knight calls his fustanelle, has always been an attractive personage. On the stage, in the picture gallery, most of us have admired him; some have seen him transplanted as an Arnaut soldier, either to Stamboul or Cairo; but very few have, like our author, had the advantage of interviewing him on his native heath. "Where shall I go?" Mr. Knight asked himself, the autumn before last; and the question was solved by his hearing that "Brown, Jones, and Robinson" were going to Albania, and were quite willing for him to go with them. His companions' peculiarities are amusingly told. Robinson is a very prince of inventors; the mischief is, his inventions turn out irritable *impedimenta;* his tent, for instance, used only twice during the whole tour, is rightly named "the white elephant." However, they got on very well together, and managed to see a good deal of new country and new people. At Trieste of course they met Captain Burton, and came across a commissionaire who had been butler to a Triestine, after having served in an English family. He could not stand the difference. "The Italian," he said, "no understand life like you English. In cellar no wine. I go to my master and say, 'Sar, I leave you. I came here as butler; there is nothing to buttle. I go.'" The voyage to Spalato, along a coast where every turn brings out an old Byzantine church or Venetian fortress, and where the Dinaric Alps form a magnificent background, was delightful. At Pola they met an Albanian officer in the Turkish service, who cheered them by saying, "You're quite safe in Albania, safer far than in Trieste," at the same time telling how a *vendetta*, caused by a man shooting a stray pig, had lately cost twenty human lives. Diocletian's Spalato was of course full of interest, though the Morlaks are by no means a pleasant race, and Austrian officers call Dalmatia the Austrian Siberia. The wines Mr. Knight thinks might be sold very cheap and yet at a profit, in England. Savona, Ragusa, Cattaro (whose splendid scenery forms two of Mr. Knight's best illustrations),—the name of every town calls up memories which appeal to the most superficial reader. From Cattaro to Cettinje our travellers were a mile or two ahead of the Duke of Wittemburgh, who was going to visit Prince Nikita. They thus saw the people in gala dress, and admired the tallness of the Montenegrin bodyguard. It was interesting to find that, here and in Albania, the sovereign and the napoleon were always accepted, even in the smallest villages, and that everybody knew their

proper value as currency. Cettinje is but a squalid village, the most striking object in which is the mound on which the heads of slain Turks used to be set on spikes.

Mr. Knight's opinions on politics must be taken for what they are worth. He thinks it was a mistake to cede Antivari and a district inhabited by most fanatical Mohammedan Albanians when a Christian population which would have welcomed the change lay more convenient. The mistake, he says, was due to the ignorance of diplomatists, of which he gives an amusing instance—one noble English Congress man actually believing that Cattaro was a Turkish fort. The frontier commission, which was to have settled everything, struck work the moment a rain storm in the hills came on. At the hotel table at Cettinje (the hotel is the Prince's speculation), several Montenegrin grandees, the Secretary of State among them, sat down bristling with arms, for they do not, like the Albanians, put aside their weapons when they enter a house. The most notable question asked was: "You English, civilised, Christians, how can you allow a Jew to govern you?" After dinner came billiards, at which the Prince's Adjutant, the Finance Minister, the postman, and the potboy played together. Mr. Knight is careful to explain that his party had letters of introduction to Prince Nikita; but, seeing he was entertaining the Austrian Duke, they did not trouble him. He thinks the Montenegrins have been overpraised; they are lazy swaggerers, who let their women do all the work, even to carrying up loads of bricks all the way from Cattaro. Boating down the vale of the Ricka and across the big lake, our travellers get to Scutari; and there, hearing of Ali Bey and the frontier war, they made for Gussinje, getting no further, however, than the Franciscan mission station of Gropa. How they fared with the hospitable monks, and how very near they came to peril of death, we recommend all who care for a lively book to see for themselves. Mr. Knight's politics are not ours; but he is a shrewd observer, and he learned something about the Albanian league and its objects. "They would like," he says, "to have an Albanian autonomy;" if this is impossible they would like to be under the protectorate of England or France. The Albanian Mohammedans are said to have apostatised, owing to the great unpopularity of a priest. He would not give in in some dispute, and the whole population flung off their rosaries and embraced the Koran, the image of our Lady of Scutari taking flight at the same time, and being found soon after in a remote village in Italy. Albania cannot be altogether a pleasant country for a nervous man to travel in; but our travellers found compensations. They fared well among a hospitable people; the name of Mr. Green, our consul at Scutari, was a talisman. They did all they aimed at, except getting a sight

of Ali Bey's army. They returned by way of Dulcigno, at that time unknown to fame,—a decayed haunt of pirates, some miles from which the Austrian boat landed goods and took passengers on board. "There is something peculiarly pleasing and refined (we are told) in the manners of the high-caste Albanians. Their politeness is charming; they anticipate your every want, and *their movements have a catlike softness, noiselessness, and suppleness*, which is very striking." But if there was Albanian autonomy, what would become of the feud between the Christian and Mussulman tribes?

Mr. Knight's book is not wholly new, but it is the newest on the subject, and the best; and the subject is such an attractive one that we are glad to call attention to it. It forms, too, a very interesting supplement to Mr. Freeman's volume on *The Subject Lands of the Adriatic.*

Confessions of a Medium.

Confessions of a Medium. Griffith and Farran. (Illustrated.)

This is a work of considerable importance, although of somewhat painful interest. We see no reason to doubt that it is what it professes to be, the *bonâ fide* confessions of one who was first the dupe, then the confidant, and is now the exposer of a prominent medium. The writer manifests genuine shame and remorse for the deceptions to which he was a party, and a desire to expiate frauds practised on many kind and generous people, by as full and concise a confession as can be made without revealing their personalities.

In 1878 he was an earnest worker in a Christian church, accustomed both to teach and preach, credulous and weak-minded, perhaps, but evidently sincere. By study of spiritualism, by attendance at *séances*, and by the supposed counsels of the spirits, he became convinced "that spiritualism could be nothing less than the completion of Christianity, and the proper field for the full display of the spiritual gifts promised by the Master and His appointed ministers the Apostles." He thought spiritualism "a new gospel, and the unfoldment of a better dispensation," and "coveting earnestly the best gifts," he threw all his enthusiasm into his search for them. We should be glad to think him the only member of a Christian church who has been thus deluded. Four years later he writes:—"If there is any truth in spiritualism, if there be anything in it worthy of living, it will live; but in my experience of the subject I have never discovered the smallest particle of truth in its professional mediums; and, furthermore, my observations force me to believe that the germs of utter ruin are contained within itself, that is, as now practised. The very wildest doctrines—if doctrines they can be called—and

in some cases the very loosest morality are taught and practised by numbers of its adherents. Stories of the vilest immorality are freely bandied about amongst the adepts; charges of the most degrading character are openly made, and in short the many thousands of its honest believers in England are deluded every day of their lives; and for their sakes, as well as for the sake of others, it is high time that some one who knows should fearlessly speak the truth, and try, however feebly, to open their eyes to their true position."

The reasons which led the author to this conclusion are most clearly indicated, and the reader only wonders that he was so slow in coming to it.

A certain exceedingly shrewd, expert, and unscrupulous "medium," who is called Thomson, but whose real name can be discovered from data contained in the book, proposed to the new and ardent disciple that they should give *séances* together—the author to lecture, Thomson to sit for manifestations, profits to be divided. His earnestness, innocence, and thorough conviction made him a capital auxiliary to Thomson, and the enterprise was most successful. The company might sit in unbroken circle around the table in a darkened room, but the table rose and fell, musical instruments took aerial flights, spirit-hands were ubiquitous, the furniture of the room wandered about the apartment; and although the medium might be fastened in an iron cage, or enveloped in a sealed sack, yet spirits appeared in dazzling white garments, and even left impressions of their faces by dipping them in melted wax.

The ridiculously simple means, the barefaced trickery, by which these and other manifestations were produced are explained, some with the help of illustrations. Take only one example. The most convincing test to which the medium could be subjected was considered to be to put him in a sack, the mouth of which was carefully tied and sealed. To escape from this and return to it undetected seemed impossible; yet it was accomplished by cutting a slit in the sack, and subsequently stitching up the slit from the inside with a needle and thread.

The least satisfactory part of the book, so far as the author is concerned, is that we find him assisting in the tricking after he had discovered that "some of the *séances* were not genuine." He seems to have had a conscientious objection to pocketing fees at *séances* where no manifestations appeared, so in these cases he used to ease his conscience by a little intentional swindling, having carefully practised and rehearsed for the purpose. His tardy recognition of the fraudulent nature of the whole proceedings he accounts for by saying how difficult it was to disbelieve what had been testified to by scientific men after careful testing.

On this point, however, Mr. Thomson's opinions are both emphatic and reliable. A person who does nothing but mediumship will soon become clever enough to deceive anybody, professional conjurors included, and scientific men are just as easy to deceive as any one else; nor is there, says the same authority, one iota of truth in himself or any other medium. After this full revelation they parted company, or rather Thomson deserted him, leaving him the bills to pay. On the blasphemous impiety of some of the mediumistic utterances contained in the book we do not care to dwell.

We cannot but be glad that these revelations have been given to the public at a time when spiritualistic publications are in brisk demand, and when so great an authority as Dr. Joseph Cook, of Boston, is claimed as a champion of spiritualism.

It cannot be maintained, of course, that a negative instance disproves well-authenticated facts, and we readily admit that there are a number of phenomena on record both well authenticated and inexplicable by any known laws; but we do deny that, because inexplicable, they are spiritualistic. And we draw attention to the most valuable researches of Carpenter and others, elucidatory of the phenomena of mesmerism, unconscious cerebration, unconscious muscular action, and the like: researches which, pursued farther, will make additional inroads in the domain claimed by the spiritualists. But let him who doubts that an immense proportion of the phenomena jumbled together under the most unsatisfactory and unfortunate term "spiritualism," are simple instances of fraudulent imposition, read the *Confessions of a Medium.*

The English Citizen Series.

The English Citizen: His Rights and Responsibilities. Foreign Relations. By Spencer Walpole. London: Macmillan and Co. 1882.

This volume is the seventh of the admirable series to which it belongs, and will fully sustain the interest which has been created by its forerunners. The whole series will consist of fourteen volumes, of which the eighth is already in the press. The first chapter gives an interesting sketch of the foreign policy of England from the Norman Conquest to the settlement of Europe which immediately followed the overthrow of the first Napoleon. In the second chapter, which reviews our foreign policy from the Treaty of Paris in 1815 to the present time, the author deals with the two opposing systems which are fairly represented by the names of Palmerston and Cobden—the former being generally disposed to use the influence, and if necessary the naval and military resources of the country to uphold the balance of power

in Europe; and the latter advocating non-intervention in the affairs of other States, and the settlement of all international disputes by arbitration. A brief extract will sufficiently indicate the purpose of the historical outline contained in the first two chapters: "It may be briefly stated that, up to the close of the eighteenth century, diplomatists had almost exclusively been occupied with the interests of dynasties, while during the nineteenth century they have been chiefly concerned with the problem of nationalities. This distinction has been specially visible in the long chapter of European history which commenced with the war of 1859, and was concluded with the war of 1870. The four wars which took place in this period worked out the problems of German and Italian nationality. If men will occupy themselves with bloodshed, it is, at any rate, some advantage to find them fighting for the interests of nations, and not the mere interests of princes. This chapter will have been written with equally little purpose if it has failed to emphasise with sufficient distinctness the gradual progress of British foreign policy from 1815 to the present time. It may be briefly stated that this country under Castlereagh allowed the autocrats of Europe to carry out the principles of the holy alliance; that under Mr. Canning it forbade the interference of autocracy in the internal affairs of other States; that under Lord Palmerston it actively interfered to promote the cause of constitutional progress, and that for the last thirty years, in Western Europe at any rate, it has adopted the policy of non-intervention. The modern foreign minister, in one sense, may be said to have resuscitated the policy of Lord Castlereagh; but Lord Castlereagh stood by while autocracy riveted its fetters on the people of Europe; the modern minister stands by while nationalities shake off the chains which autocracy has imposed upon them" (pp. 68, 69).

The third chapter treats of the foreign policy of England towards America and Russia: the latter, of course, including our relations with Turkey and Egypt, and the all-important interests of our Indian Empire. The two remaining chapters are headed "Ambassadors—their Duties and Privileges;" and "Consuls." Our space will not allow us to touch upon the many interesting points opened out in these chapters, but we heartily commend the book to the notice of our readers, being assured that they will derive both pleasure and instruction from its perusal.

BEVERIDGE AND MILLER, PRINTERS, FULLWOOD'S RENTS, LONDON.