
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.

JANUARY, 1863.

ART. I.—*Introduction to the Old Testament.* By SAMUEL DAVIDSON, D.D. Vol. I. London: Williams and Norgate.

WHATEVER be the merits by which the Rationalist school is distinguished, modesty, at all events, cannot be reckoned in the number. Their extravagant pretensions would excite indignation, if they did not tend rather to provoke ridicule. Thus, with the most unblushing assurance, they proclaim themselves the friends of free thought, as though liberty and orthodoxy were incompatible, and as if a sincere faith in the Bible, or, at least, in the old-fashioned notions regarding it, could be found only in those who are still in bondage to childish superstitions, or fettered by sectarian trammels. In like manner they speak of themselves as the 'advanced' school, and represent all attempts to vindicate the infallible authority of Holy Scripture as evidences of a retrograde tendency, unworthy of so progressive and enlightened an age. If we are to trust them, they enjoy a monopoly of learning; and the prevalence of views different from theirs is to be explained only by a deficiency of scholarship, which makes men quite incompetent to appreciate the nice points of the higher criticism. They advance their claims to superior piety as confidently as if they had attained to the true spirit of godliness, which others, in their eager zeal for the mere letter, had utterly missed. Such pretensions might be safely left to

find their own level, were it not for the mischief they are calculated to do to unthinking minds. Freedom, intellect, progress, goodness, are all high-sounding words; and there are not a few who are caught by them. It is this aspect of the subject alone which compels us to notice and rebuke an arrogance as contemptible as it is offensive, as unworthy the dignity of a philosopher as it is inconsistent with the humility of a Christian.

We have rarely seen a worse example of these vices of the school than is to be found in this new work of Dr. Davidson's, and especially in its Preface. For quiet assumption of moral and intellectual superiority, for scornful contempt of opponents, and for implicit confidence in his own infallibility, our author has few equals. All this, bad enough in itself, is nothing less than intolerable when we take into account the vacillations of a teacher who speaks with such dogmatism, and requires such implicit deference to his authority. Let us suppose an inquirer, entirely ignorant of the Hebrew language, and therefore, as we are here taught to believe, quite unable to form any judgment on the questions relative to Holy Scripture here discussed. He has unbounded confidence in Dr. Davidson, and is prepared at once to trust himself to his guidance. He takes up his book on *Sacred Hermeneutics*, reads and digests it, and from it gathers a certain set of opinions which he regards as indisputable. Some years elapse, and then another volume makes its appearance, which he is told is 'not *to supersede*, but to *supplement*, its predecessor;' and, being directed to consult both, he meekly obeys, and is somewhat astonished to find that the differences between them are many and serious. Still he follows the instruction given, to 'follow the last in preference to the first work,' and modifies his views accordingly. But scarcely has he settled down into these altered opinions, when he is required again to renounce them. The oracle has given forth a fresh prophecy, and in this case the new work, we are told, 'must speedily supersede its brief precursor.' With the extent and character of these changes, we shall deal afterwards; all that we note here is the fact, and the difficulty which it creates for those who are willing to admit their ignorance, and commit themselves to the hands of so experienced a guide. Those, certainly, who do not know Hebrew (and, so far as we can understand, it is only

Dr. Davidson, a few German Rationalists, and, possibly, a stray Englishman here and there, who can pretend to any intimate acquaintance with it) are in poor plight if their instructors themselves are so wavering in their own ideas. We shall be told, doubtless, that this is only a necessary development, which nothing but our own ignorance or narrowness prevents us from understanding. But here, at least, we may be permitted to exercise our own common sense. It does not require an acquaintance even with the elements of Hebrew, to teach us that these frequent changes of opinion are, of all things, the most fitted to excite our distrust of a man who forbids us to exercise our independent judgment, and requires us to submit to his *dicta* on the ground of the superior light which he enjoys.

Dr. Davidson explains all this, by telling us that hitherto he has been restrained by 'the trammels of a sect in which religious liberty is but a name.' The sect which he assails will not, we fancy, care much for this imputation. It is because of the wide bearings of the question, that we notice the false idea of freedom that is here involved. It is a very common, but a very erroneous, notion, that a sect cannot insist on the maintenance of its own doctrines, by its ministers, without infringing on Christian liberty. It may be alleged, and not without some force, that a Church sustained by national resources ought to include many shades of opinion, and that a policy of exclusiveness is a policy of injustice. But such a plea cannot be urged in favour of a liberty exercised in distinct violation of the vows a man has solemnly accepted; and has no weight at all in relation to societies formed by men, in obedience, as they believe, to the will of Christ, on certain definite principles. There is no compulsion resting on any one to belong to them; but those who become members, and, above all, those who aspire to their ministry, do so on the understanding, more or less distinctly expressed, that they hold their great doctrines. To complain that they have not the further liberty of using the power and position which they enjoy in consequence of their professed faith for the overthrow of the very doctrines which they are bound, by every consideration of truth, and honour, and righteousness, firmly to uphold, is simply absurd. 'O liberty,' said one of the most illustrious victims of the French Revolution,

'how many crimes are perpetrated in thy name!' And, certainly, when we find men claiming, in the name of liberty, to violate the first principles of honour, we feel that there is still room for such lamentation.

The idea which Dr. Davidson appears to entertain is, that Christian sects should give their ministers full licence to inculcate principles subversive of the very foundations of the faith. If they refuse to tolerate such a process, they are guilty of persecution. If any seek to controvert the positions of these innovators, and to expose the tendency of their teachings, they are to be denounced as malignant bigots. On points of infinitely less importance, such claims would hardly be advanced, or, if advanced, could never be sustained. If we are rightly informed, Dr. Davidson himself thought it necessary and right to secede from a Presbyterian, and join an Independent, community,—voluntarily assuming those 'trammels' which have since so sorely galled him. Why should such a step have been taken, or why should not the necessity for it have been regarded as a grievance? Simply because he must have felt that he could not honourably occupy a position in a Presbyterian Church, and use it to advance the interests of Independency. Had he done so, all would have condemned him, and would have justified the action of Presbytery and Synod in depriving him of a trust he had so abused. Had seven clergymen united to assail Episcopacy and the Liturgy,—had they published a volume of essays on such subjects as, 'Independency the true Polity of the Church,' 'The Sin and Inexpediency of Forms of Prayer,' 'The History and Natural History of Episcopal Usurpations,' 'The Heresies of the Book of Common Prayer,'—had they especially claimed the liberty to discuss or vary the appointed forms at their pleasure,—had they, in short, proclaimed strong Nonconformist views, and dealt with the Prayer-Book as they have treated the Bible, we fancy that many of the strong pleadings for liberty, which have been put forth on their behalf, would never have been heard at all. 'Broad-Church' would have united with the 'High' and 'Low,' to condemn these rebels against ecclesiastical authority. It is only in relation to the essentials of Christianity that such breadth and freedom of thought are demanded. A Churchman must not adopt and advocate the principles of Dissent. A Methodist would not be suffered to

occupy the chair of an Independent college, there to insist on the authority of Conferences, and disseminate the doctrines of John Wesley; and the man who should arrogate the right to do this as necessary to his enjoyment of perfect liberty, would be scouted as a fool. But Churchman or Dissenter, Methodist or Independent, must be free to assail the first principles of that Christianity which is common to them all; and if any community should put its ban on such vagaries, and refuse to tolerate them, then the facile and charitable inference is, that 'in it liberty is but a name.'

Dr. Davidson, indeed, seems disposed to claim immunity from all criticism, and to describe all who express antagonistic views as possessed of 'evil tongues.' If, indeed, any are guilty of assailing men rather than their principles,—if any 'can heartily blacken the character of men who dare to differ from their dogmas,'—we have not a word to say in their defence. Believing ourselves that the principles avowed in this volume are, if followed to their logical issue, utterly destructive of the Bible as a book of Divine authority, we are far from implying that the author has himself reached this point, or has ever distinctly realised the existence of this tendency in his speculations. Men shut up in their studies, and rarely brought into contact with the every-day things of life, dealing with the great truths of religion as subjects of intellectual exercise, and insensible to any injurious influence exerted on their own spirit by the particular conclusion at which they have arrived, may fail to perceive the deductions which others will fairly draw from the notions they have accepted and promulgated. Thus their own personal faith in the Gospel may remain, while, at the same time, they have cut away the foundations on which alone the faith of other men rests. To ordinary thinkers, the ideologist's notion of rejecting many of the Scripture narratives, and still retaining the truth which lies enshrined in them, is utterly absurd; and there is little doubt, if he could succeed in destroying what has been called the shell, that, so far as the generality of men are concerned, the kernel would also be thrown away as utterly worthless. While we do not, on this account, impeach the sincerity or doubt the personal godliness of the teachers, we cannot be hindered from expressing our views as to the perils attendant on the acceptance of

their views. Beyond this no one has a right to go. We may pronounce on the logical weakness of a man's position; but we have no right to impugn his motives. We may feel that could we accept the premises, we could reach no conclusions but those of extreme scepticism; but we are not justified, therefore, in classing him among the votaries of infidelity. A few may have transgressed these limits; but we think that ours is the view which will be endorsed by all calm Christian thinkers.

But of all men Dr. Davidson is among the last that ought to complain of 'evil tongues;' for, certainly, no one is less disposed to consult the feelings of opponents, or more ready to fling around wholesale imputations of incompetence, superstition, sophistry, and all sorts of evil motives, against all who dare to dispute his dicta. Nothing appears so difficult for him as to believe in the integrity of those who cannot utter his Shibboleth. A very precious anthology might be formed of the choice specimens of vituperation and abuse which adorn his book. Thus, even in the few pages of the Preface, we hear of the 'narrow notions of noisy religionists,' of 'harsh-minded theologians, who have inherited a little system of infallible divinity, out of which they may excommunicate their neighbours,' of 'sectaries who quarrel over their "principles,"' (the inverted commas are intended to point a sneer,) 'and cast stones at the unfortunates who do not choose to walk after their rule;' and all this while assuring us of what certainly without such assurance no one would have suspected, 'his righteous abhorrence of malice and uncharitableness.' If he believes 'that the most unworthy views of Jehovah's nature and perfections are current in the religious world,' he is doing good service in seeking to rescue men from such errors; but he will not advance his own cause by describing orthodox divines as 'fashioning God after their own image, and expecting that others will see Him as they do,—a Being malignant and partial,—the creature of a corrupt imagination.' The book itself is full of similar manifestations of feeling. Macdonald, as an English writer on the Pentateuch, appears to excite his special ire, and it seems scarcely possible to refer to him without some disparaging epithet. He is a 'pretentious' and a 'self-sufficient writer,' he displays 'a reckless ignorance only paralleled by the epithets he applies to scholars of whom he should speak with modesty,'

and belongs to a class of apologists whose 'determination is to shut their eyes against all evidence contrary to their prepossessions' The only reason for the rancorous treatment of a man whose book gives evidences of undoubted scholarship and research is, that he believes in the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch, and has dared to dispute the judgment of Dr. Davidson's German masters. He is, however, in good company. B. B. Edwards, an American divine, is contemptuously relegated to the ranks of 'perfunctory writers in ephemeral publications.' Moses Stuart, Pye Smith, and men of like character, meet with but scant respect; and even German critics find little favour unless they follow in the steps of the 'immortal De Wette,' for whom and the other members of the destructive school all the author's eulogiums are reserved. Hengstenberg, perhaps, is better treated than others of the orthodox school; but even his apologies are described as 'uncritical and far-fetched,' and a long and bitter passage, imputing to him and his associates conduct utterly incompatible with any recognition of their honesty, closes by saying, 'Such criticism is perfunctory and deceptive.' It is on the unfortunate English theologians, however, that the full vials of his bitter wrath are discharged. Words seem too weak to express his utter contempt alike for their learning and piety. Thus, after referring to the long list of passages in favour of the early existence of the Pentateuch, he proceeds, 'The list will be long enough to impose on the reader who does not care for *quality*, if he can have *quantity*. Nothing is welcomer in England to a very large class of theologians than such a cumulative argument, because it is ready for acceptance in the lump, and saves the trouble of sifting. The true critic can estimate it at its real worth, which is small. The stereotyped and timid divine is prepared to swallow the draught because it is orthodox, at least in the eye of his ignorance.'

We must dwell a little longer on this point, not because of its personal relations, but because of its important bearings on the general question. Nothing could, in our view, be more injurious than to concede to a few literary men the prerogative they so confidently claim for themselves. 'The Bible,' they tell us, 'is a very difficult book; and it demands great study and very considerable learning to understand and to read it wisely. It

has the Divine essence, alike imperishable and immutable; the human form, which is necessarily imperfect. It contains writings that have been supposed to be of high antiquity, which are really of comparatively modern date. What has been regarded as history is often only myth or legend. To decide on the real character and authority of each part must be the task of scholars, and especially of those who are well versed in all the minutiæ of the Hebrew tongue. For others to form an opinion is sheer impertinence. It is enough for them if even the results, at which the higher criticism has arrived, can penetrate their understandings.' All this is simply another illustration of the way in which extremes meet. Rationalism and Popery alike proclaim the difficulties of the Bible, and argue from them to the necessity of infallible guides, to whom the mass of mankind must pay deference. It matters little that this new despotism of philosophy is heralded with loud professions of freedom, or that it has no power to coerce our conscience, or fetter our action. The spirit of a literary Papacy is essentially the same as that of its ecclesiastical prototype; and nothing can be more inconsistent than for the men who would arrogate to themselves the right to sit in the high court of criticism, and prescribe to the world the way in which the Bible shall henceforth be treated, to talk about free thought. They have, as yet, no weapons but the pen and the tongue, and these they use without stint or scruple. They cannot anathematize or excommunicate men as heretics,—they can only brand them as 'smatterers in Hebrew,' who have no right to form an opinion as to the conduct of their betters. We feel bound to resist the one tyranny as much as the other; and, above all, are constrained to raise our protest against an idea which tends so directly to scepticism as the denial to plain men of the power to decide on the claims, or estimate the true significance, of a revelation sent from God to man. Let it be understood that there are exoteric and esoteric notions as to the sacred Scriptures; that the mass may be permitted to repose their old trust in the antiquity and faithfulness of the records, but that those competent to judge have no faith in the authenticity of the books, or the literal truth of their narratives, but hold fast only by certain great spiritual truths therein contained; and the effect is not difficult to foresee. Infidelity alone would be gainer by

any attempt to limit the rights of the individual conscience, whether in the interests of priestly assumption, or of literary conceit.

We grant, at once, that there are points which only learned men can settle, and in relation to which others must be content to exercise trust. Arguments professing to determine the age of writings by certain linguistic peculiarities, or to decide as to the unity of authorship in different books by a careful comparision of the characteristics of their style, of course can be appreciated only by those whose acquaintance with the language is intimate and extensive. But even here the uninitiated are not left to passive obedience. They can, at least, see that these experts differ from each other, and often contradict themselves; and they are thus led to the not unnatural conclusion, that the evidence on which they rely so confidently is not so clear and decisive as they would have the vulgar believe. When Ewald detects five different hands in the first four books of Moses, where Dr. Davidson sees only four; when Vaihinger can trace a fore-Elohist 'in his minutenesses,' while our author is unable to see his individuality; a man may be quite unable to decide which is right, but he will find good reason to distrust the species of evidence which has led scholars of such admitted eminence to these opposite results. So, when Dr. Davidson, having five years ago fixed his Elohist in the time of Joshua, now assigns him to the days of Saul, a man who cannot examine the process may very lawfully doubt its validity, from noting such vacillations in so learned a Rabbi. It will hardly be contended, then, that the issue can be decided solely by reference to these niceties of language; and, however absurd it may sound in the ears of Dr. Davidson, we maintain that, on many of the other points raised by him, a reader may arrive at sound and intelligent opinions, though entirely ignorant of Hebrew. The supposed traces of a later age in the Pentateuch may be examined, and their weight as arguments against its Mosaic authorship correctly determined, by those who have nothing but the English Bible in their hands. A man's own good sense will enable him to decide how far there are needless and sometimes inconsistent repetitions or inextricable confusion, not to say contradiction, in the narrative, and whether these can be fairly explained without denying the unity of the work itself. Whatever difficulties arise

out of these points appear, for the most part, in the translation, as well as in the original, and may be considered honestly and wisely by men of the most limited attainments. So, also, the degree of importance to be attached to the references to the law in other parts of the Old and in the New Testament, as testimonies to its age and origin, is only, to a very slight extent, a question of language. But especially the great moral points involved are such as plain men are as competent to pronounce upon as the most accomplished Hebraists. No wonderful scholarship is necessary for a judgment as to the general impression of truth and honesty produced by these old Jewish records, or as to the amount of credit which they would retain if the world was once led to believe that the history they transmit is largely intermingled with myth and legend. The moral sense of man alone would suffice to show the position Deuteronomy would hold, were it once conceded that its author was a late writer, who has woven a very ingenious fiction, and assumed the name and character of Moses to secure high authority for the modern forgery. There are many who never heard of a Hebrew point, but who could easily expose the absurdity of an attempt to save the distinctive truths of the Bible, while throwing discredit upon the books in which alone these doctrines have been revealed to us, and whose own strong love of the right, clear perceptions, and reverential feelings, would be sufficient to preserve them from many follies and errors into which great masters in Israel have been betrayed.

There is some satisfaction in feeling that Rationalism has in this volume done its best, or rather its worst. Whatever objections can be taken to the old views relative to the origin of the early books of Scripture, are here urged with a force that can hardly be surpassed. Ingenuity could not be more subtle, or research more minute. Criticism could hardly be more hostile in spirit, more keen in its analysis, or more remorseless in its conclusions: it uses the most rigid tests, and applies them with unsparing hand. There is not a difficulty which has ever been suggested with which Dr. Davidson is not familiar, or which he fails to present in its strongest colours. The industry with which he appears to have waded through the interminable disquisitions, even of the most obscure German writers, and the care with which he has examined their innumerable theories,

(and what German is worth anything unless he has a theory of his own?) are something marvellous. After going through his elaborated list of objections, there is one consolation that remains to us. At all events, we know the worst. The array may be very threatening; but at least we feel sure that there is no other force in reserve. The exultation with which the work has been received by the friends of unbelief, as though another Goliath had arisen to challenge the hosts of orthodoxy, is sufficient to indicate the significance attaching to its appearance, and to awake the zealous vigilance of all lovers of the old truth. It would have added more to the author's reputation, if his power of arranging his materials had been equal to their affluence. These are frequently best described as '*rudis indigestaque moles.*' There is, however, an immense accumulation of matter; and the book is invaluable to all who desire to mark the vast range speculation has taken on these questions.

The views advocated are not such as would produce any sensation in Germany; but we are happy to believe that our English Christianity is as yet hardly so well disciplined as to receive them with perfect calmness. Speaking generally, the Mosaic authorship, and the historic credibility of the Pentateuch, are both denied. It is admitted, indeed, that there are fragments from the hand of Moses; but these are said to be few, and not in their original form. So also is there an historic element; but as there is an admixture also of myth and fable, the trustworthy history is an uncertain quantity, becoming more or less according to the predisposition of individual theorists. In the first four books of the Bible, there are traces of as many separate writers. First came the Elohist who, as we have seen, lived in the days of Saul. After a considerable interval, he was followed by the junior Elohist, who was a contemporary of Elisha. To him succeeded the Jehovist who flourished in the reign of Uzziah. Finally, we have a redactor, whose epoch is not so exactly determined, but is said to have been prior to that of Ezra. He revised all these documents, gave them a certain unity, and fashioned the four books, in the main, to the shape in which we at present possess them. Deuteronomy is from the hand of another writer, who also slightly retouched the preceding books, though without any material alteration. He simply committed a pious fraud; for, being desirous to correct the

errors both of prince and people, he produced a work professing to come from the hand of Moses, and containing laws delivered by him that had special reference to the existing circumstances of the nation. The second half of Manasseh's reign is fixed upon as the date when this remarkable piece of literary imposture was palmed upon the Jewish nation by an author who must surely have anticipated the favourite Jesuit maxim, that the end justifies the means.

The Book of Joshua was written neither by the great leader whose name it bears, nor by any of the elders who survived by him, but was another production of this extraordinary Deuteronomist, who incorporated in it the Elohistic and Jehovistic writings, which, however, had been already combined by some previous redactor. It is a pity that the name of this Deuteronomist has passed into oblivion; for certainly it would be hard to find one who has practised more successfully upon human credulity. The Book of Judges is a compilation of fragments which were reduced to order by an editor who lived in the reign of Ahaz. The two Books of Samuel are attributed to another of these redactors, who made use of materials supplied by oral tradition, national annals, the Book of Jasher, and probably some short monographs composed in the prophetic schools. The later historic books are treated in a similar fashion; special discredit being thrown on the compiler of the Book of Chronicles, to whom also we owe the Books of Ezra and Nehemiah in their present form. These questions of authorship are, however, of secondary importance as compared with the character assigned to the book by the admission of a large mythical element. The Fall, the confusion of tongues, the wrestling of Jacob with the angel, the plagues of Egypt, the dividing of the Red Sea, the descent of manna, the answer by fire to Solomon's prayer, and many of the miracles of Elijah and Elisha, are only specimens of the large portions of the sacred record which, we are told, cannot be regarded as veritable history.

It needs no argument to show that the points at issue are of vital moment. Once adopt our author's views, and the Old Testament is deposed from its high position, and reduced to a place scarcely superior to that of the ancient literature of Greece and Rome. We have no longer records of the highest antiquity, in some cases contemporary narratives, but compilations made

centuries afterwards by men whose very names have perished, and one of whom has forfeited all claims to be regarded as an honest witness, by forging the name of the great lawgiver of the nation in order to secure higher authority for his work. We are no longer reading history, but a mythology, to which for the present a certain value may be ascribed, but which must ultimately rank with the poems of Homer, and the histories of Livy,—very beautiful in its conceptions, and interesting in its legends; but utterly valueless as a basis for historic narrative. That all this can be done, and the books retain their former religious influence,—that the integrity of the writers, and the veracity of the books, can be thus discredited, and the spiritual truths they taught still be regarded as infallible,—is the mere dream of minds unable to perceive the logical issue of their own principles. Nor will the evil stop with the Old Testament. The *Westminster Review* very truly says, 'The Pentateuch lies at the foundation, both of the Jewish and Christian religions; and, according to the interpretation and value set upon many of its parts, the interpretation of the Gospel itself will be modified or affected. The settlement of some questions, discussed in the present volume, for the place in which they first arise, may involve a like settlement in subsequent parts of the Bible, and may reach even into the New Testament.' This, though the testimony of an enemy, is a fair estimate of the tendency of Dr. Davidson's speculations. It may serve, at least, as a warning for those who regard the Old-Testament history as a Jonah, that had better be thrown overboard, in the hope that the vessel, thus lightened, may hold on its course in safety. The reviewer is quite right. The same principles that are applied to the Pentateuch may be used in relation to the Gospels, and nothing is more certain to us than that the views avowed by Dr. Davidson undermine the foundations on which both rest.

It is not wonderful that such ideas should not meet ready acceptance among those who still regard the Bible with reverence and faith, or that the pretensions of a teacher, in whose learning and judgment we are invited to repose so much confidence, should be narrowly scrutinised. If there are some points we cannot decide for ourselves, but in which we must defer to authority, it is the more necessary that we be thoroughly satisfied as to the spirit and temper of the man who

offers himself as our guide. Before we can give our trust, we must be assured not only that he is an accomplished Hebrew scholar, who has given to the subject his most careful attention, but also that there is nothing in his tone of thinking or feeling which would dispose him to conclusions opposed to what are termed 'traditional opinions,' no love of novelty, no undue veneration for men of high literary standing, no contempt for what he deems the narrow prejudices of religious men, or no feeling of pleasure in placing himself in antagonism to them. The moral are as necessary as the intellectual qualities in such a case. It is just here that we doubt Dr. Davidson. We do not dispute his scholarship, his research, his conscientiousness; we believe him to be thoroughly honest, and do not question his desire and effort to be candid and impartial; but we continually find traces of a spirit the most unfitted to deal rightly with the great problems he here attempts to solve.

No careful reader of the book can fail to be struck with the arbitrary treatment adopted with respect to all the questions raised. We have already referred to the case of the number of writers engaged in the composition of the Pentateuch. There is another example in the assertions as to the character and authorship of the Elohim document. 'It was a private writing which attained to general acceptance, and was circulated among the people who could read, by whom its contents were made known to others.' All this is pure hypothesis, without a vestige of proof. There may or may not be internal evidence to prove that such a document was employed in the preparation of the earlier books of the Pentateuch; there is literally none to justify the dogmatic statement as to its origin. Equally unsustained is the assertion that its author belonged to the tribe of Judah: for the reason that is given—the prominence assigned to the progenitor of the tribe—can have weight only on the supposition that the writer was manufacturing history to suit his own predilections. It would be about as reasonable for some New Zealand explorer among English historic remains in the year 5060 to say that Alison must have been a Corsican, because of the important part played by a distinguished Corsican in his History of Modern Europe.

What, again, can be a more gratuitous assumption than the answer given to Tuch, who supposes the 'Jehovist' to have

lived in Solomon's reign, that 'he had too little regard for the degree of religious development, exhibited by him in comparison with the Elohist, for which much more than a century is required?' Here we have a whole string of assumptions: first, as to the date of the Elohist, the evidence for which is so meagre and uncertain, that Dr. Davidson himself has altered it by three centuries from that adopted by him five years ago. Then we have a marked difference asserted between the ideas of these two writers,—a conclusion which can be sustained only by a process the most arbitrary: and, finally, it is taken for granted that a century is quite insufficient to accomplish the change. To us who believe that both 'Jehovist' and 'Elohist' are pure myths, the point is not of much interest, save as indicating the slight grounds on which such positive theories are built up. But it is really scarcely necessary to point out individual cases; for the whole theory relative to the origin of the Pentateuch bears the same characteristics. Principles are assumed only to be ignored on the first occasion where their application would lead to inconvenient results, the only ground either for their adoption or rejection being the caprice of the writer himself. The presence of myths is admitted in certain places; but there is only censure for those who would extend this element beyond the limits that to him appear proper, although others would be puzzled to discover any reason for this difference in the treatment of the several cases. The unsupported assertions of any of the critical school are accepted as sufficient warrant for regarding a point as settled; and the reasoning that does not receive their dicta as axiomatic truths is treated as worthless. Thus, take for example the reply to Hengstenberg's citation of passages from the other historical books, indicating acquaintance with the Pentateuch, and so pointing to its early origin.

'It is convenient for Hengstenberg, Hävernick, Keil, Caspari, &c., to overlook the late dates of almost all the historical books in which they find quotations from or allusions to the Pentateuch. It is also convenient to ignore the fact that unwritten historical tradition may have supplied authors with many things which are also recorded in the books of Moses. It is highly conducive to their cause to ignore the separate existence of the Elohim and Jehovah documents before they were incorporated in the present Pentateuch. It suits their purpose to amass everything in the other books that has a semblance to the Pentateuch, and say, "Here are plain allusions to the written Pentateuch we now have." But such criticism is perfunctory and

deceptive. It saves trouble, certainly. It is also well adapted to English theological conservatism. But the honest lover of truth cannot be satisfied with it. Unappalled by the calumnies of Pharisaical evangelicalism, he must open his eyes, use his judgment, and look round about the theme.'—Pp. 55, 56.

Passing over the very modest implication that he and they who share his opinions are the only fair and enlightened inquirers, what is the ground of the charge here brought against men as learned and candid as himself? Simply this: Dr. Davidson has formed certain opinions, some of them only recently—these men have not chosen to accept those opinions as the bases of their reasoning—therefore they are to be assailed in language that casts suspicion not so much on their learning as on their honesty. Where, for instance, has Dr. Davidson adduced any evidence to show that the two documents spoken of ever had a separate existence, and what can be more arbitrary than the demand that others should receive this as an established fact, on pain of being charged with disingenuous treatment of the subject, in case of their refusal? He cannot be ignorant either that the grounds on which he has pronounced as to the late date of some of the historical books are not such as they would admit to be valid, and that the whole process he has adopted is the most arbitrary possible. It is only by claiming a large number of postulates, involving notions that would be disputed at every stage, that he is able to lay a foundation for his reasonings at all. To some of these we shall afterwards call attention, but meanwhile must pass on to other points.—The *petitio principii* is not the only fallacy into which the Doctor has been betrayed. Not less marked is the tendency to accept a conclusion as established by arguments the most insufficient. It is really amazing to find the miserable evidence that is often accepted as satisfactory. Thus, condescending to the case of plain readers, he professes to satisfy them that the Pentateuch has been made up of separate documents, by an appeal to evident facts. He quotes two: the second and more important is as follows:—

'Again we read, "And Jacob awaked out of his sleep; *and he said, Surely the Lord (Jehovah) is in this place*, and I knew it not." The very next verse is, "And *he was afraid, and said*, How dreadful is this place! *this is none other but the house of God*, (Elohim,) and this is the gate of heaven." The patriarch speaks twice in immediate succession; using, however, two different appellations of Deity. The

former verse belongs to the redactor; the latter to the junior Elohist.' —Page 56.

It is really hopeless to argue in such a case: for one man, among those competent to judge, who would find here the presence of two separate writers recording the same utterance of the patriarch, we will undertake to find a hundred who, even after their attention has been drawn to it, will find nothing of the sort. To ourselves the passage, as it stands, has such an air of native simplicity and truthfulness, that we are at a loss to comprehend the state of mind that could inspire such a criticism. Assuredly, the fact that the sentiment of the two verses is very similar, or that the two appellations of Deity are used, is a very poor ground on which to rest it. As to this mysterious 'redactor,' who interpolates words and verses in so extraordinary a style, he must, in Dr. Davidson's view, have been singularly lacking, not only in good taste, but in every qualification for his work, if, finding the latter verse already standing in the work of the 'junior Elohist,' he thought it necessary to prefix to it another bearing so close a resemblance. The whole comment is to us only a proof that something more is necessary for the work of the higher criticism than a familiarity with the niceties of the Hebrew tongue.

Another and equally egregious example of the same tendency is found in the inference based on the narrative of the punishment inflicted on a Sabbath-breaker :—

'"And *while the children of Israel were in the wilderness*, they found a man that gathered sticks upon the Sabbath day." (Numbers xv. 32–36.) Here there is a historical fragment interpolated in a context to which it bears no proper relation. It seems to have belonged to another connexion, whence it was transferred unaltered to its present place. The *manner in which it is introduced* shows that it was not written in Moses's time; for it presupposes that the Israelites were no longer in the wilderness. Neither Moses nor any of his contemporaries could have written it.'—Page 95.

Again we say, here is a very important conclusion drawn from very narrow and uncertain premises. The mention of the wilderness as the scene of the event is a proof that already the Israelites had passed into the promised land! We must, to give any force to this, not only reject the idea of a prophetic power as enjoyed by Moses, (supposing him to have been the writer,)

but also of any truth in the history; for if the Israelites looked forward to a possession of Canaan, and regarded their passage through the wilderness simply as a prelude to and preparation for it, what would be more natural than such a phrase as this? Dr. Davidson, however, positively asserts that neither Moses nor any of his contemporaries could have written it. Did none, then, of the contemporaries of Moses enter into Canaan? What makes it *impossible* for Joshua to have penned such a record? We do not suggest the idea as at all probable, but merely to show the fallacy of Dr. Davidson's sweeping statement. It is only, however, a sample of numbers that go to swell his list of objections to the Mosaic authorship, and to which we may often apply his own words, that it is 'long enough to impose on the reader who does not care for *quality*, if he can have *quantity*.'

Another case may be taken as illustrative alike of the same fault, and of the disposition to decide all doubtful points in a way unfavourable to the authority of the Old Testament:—

'Various incidental notices show that the book (Deuteronomy) was written when the Israelites were established in Palestine. Thus, in ii. 12, we read that the children of Esau had succeeded in driving out the Horims, who dwelt in Seir, and taking possession of their territory, *as Israel did unto the land of his possession, which the Lord gave unto them*. Here the phrase *land of his possession* cannot be restricted to the territory east of Jordan, which the Israelites had already taken in Moses's time. It can only mean Palestine Proper; and therefore the occupation of Canaan was an event long past to the writer.'—Page 378.

We entirely demur to this conclusion, as one which the evidence does not warrant. Certainly the requirements of the language are all met by supposing a reference only to the territory on the east side Jordan, of which the two tribes and a half had already taken possession; and no critic has a right to extend the meaning of the words beyond what absolute necessity requires, in order to put into them an argument for his own peculiar views. It would hardly be possible for a writer to give more decided proof of strong bias, than in the adoption of such an inference from such reasoning.

It would not be possible, except in a volume larger than his own, to examine minutely all the objections started by Dr. Davidson to the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch. All

that can be attempted is to consider some of those to which most importance appears to be attached. We have, first, the alleged traces of a 'post-Mosaic time and writer,' in certain historical, geographical, archæological, and explanatory notices. Thus the phrase, 'And the Canaanite was then in the land,' (Gen. xii. 6,) is adduced as a proof that when the author wrote the Canaanite was no longer in the land. But it is a case of *non sequitur*. It is only if we are resolved to eliminate the supernatural element from the book, to disbelieve the fact of promises having been made to the patriarchs, and to regard them as men sustaining no special relation to the Most High, that there can be any ground for the inference. For if such hopes had been awakened in the mind of Abraham and his descendants, nothing seems more natural than the insertion of such a clause in the record. We suppose it to have proceeded from the pen of Moses, who is here recording the story of Abraham for the benefit of his posterity. He recites the command of God, and the encouraging assurance by which it was accompanied, tells of Abraham's obedience, and then adds, very significantly, 'And the Canaanite was then in the land.' It was the proof of Abraham's faith that he went to a land where not only he had no inheritance, 'no, not so much as to set his foot on,' but where a powerful tribe was already in possession. Our explanation may, or may not, be right; it appears to us, at least, quite as reasonable as the objection, and may show that there is no warrant for the dogmatic assertion that Moses could not have written this and the similar verse in the thirteenth chapter.

The name 'Hebron' used of Kirjath Arba in Gen. xxiii. 2, is said to have been given by Caleb at the conquest, and therefore to be posterior to the time of Moses. Now this itself is a pure assumption. Nowhere have we the explicit statement that the name was given by Caleb. Hence the conjecture of Hengstenberg, Hävernick, and others, that Hebron is an older name, given by the Amorites, at a time when the place was in their hands, and endeared to the Israelites because it was a memorial of the alliance then existing between their father Abraham and the Amorite nation, is not to be dismissed as groundless. On this theory, the earliest name of the city was Mamre, which the Amorite leader changed to Hebron, ('place of alliance,') probably

when the league mentioned in Genesis xiv. was made. Subsequently the Anakim obtained possession of it, and called it Kirjath Arba, from Arba, one of their leaders; but when Caleb took it, he restored the name of Hebron, which would have an interest for the Hebrews from its connexion with the history of their great progenitor. Again, we say, this solution, whatever air of probability it may have, may not be the true one. It is sufficient for us if it is possible, and is not at variance with the terms of the record. It meets the objection, if it shows that it is not impossible that Moses may have used the name. We may, however, carry the argument a point further in the present case. The frequent appearance of the oldest name 'Mamre' in the Pentateuch, and its absence from the other books, affords a very strong presumption in favour of the high antiquity of the former. In relation to all these cases, we may adopt the words of the Rev. G. Rawlinson. 'There is no really valid or insuperable objection to any of these explanations which may not strike us as clever or dexterous, yet they may be true nevertheless; for *"le vrai n'est pas toujours vraisemblable."*'

Dr. Davidson finds in the repetitions of the same events indications of two narrators. Thus there are two accounts of the creation, presenting several points of diversity, that lead him to assign that in the first chapter to the Elohist, that in the second (with the exception of two words inserted by the redactor in the ninth verse) to the Jehovist. We do not find these evidences of inconsistency; but, on the contrary, agree in the views of a great Hebraist, who tells us, 'The writer gives, in the first place, a general account of the six days' work, and returns, at chap. ii. 4, to enter more fully into various particulars respecting Adam and Eve. *He resumes the narrative, in order to give several details.*' So wrote Dr. Davidson once,* and we do not discover in his maturer views any evidences of a riper wisdom. He has been looking at the differences in the two narratives with a critical microscope of extraordinary power, until he has, at length, magnified them into discrepancies of vast importance. His former opinions are more in accordance with the true phenomena, and we prefer to abide by them,—and the rather, as no fresh evidence has been produced, and as the only change is

* *Sacred Hermeneutics*, p. 536.

in the spirit of the judge. The pleadings on both sides are very similar, the same objections are urged, and the same answers given. Formerly the latter appeared satisfactory to Dr. Davidson; now they do not. We do not quarrel with him because he has changed his opinions; but we certainly object to make a corresponding alteration in ours.

It is said that we have two 'parallel accounts of the flood, each complete in itself and independently written;' and an ingenious effort is made to show discrepancy, and even contradiction, in several particulars, such as 'the flood's continuance, the animals taken into the ark, &c. Critics have tried in vain to harmonize them. Strange as it may appear, we have seen an attempt to show, from parts of the two flood-narratives, that there is nothing but one and the same historical account.' We, too, have seen an attempt which, in our view, was quite successful, to show that the accounts are not contradictory. Strangest of all, it was from the pen of Dr. Davidson. In the work already referred to, he discusses the very points of apparent opposition here named, and shows that they are quite reconcilable with each other. Eighteen years have since elapsed; but there is no new light thrown on the subject. The verses stand as they did then, the difficulties he urges now are those he himself considered and removed then; and as we can find no reason given for a change so serious, we decline to imitate his example.

Whatever difficulty may be felt by any from the occurrence of duplicate accounts of the same transactions, it can hardly be alleged that it is insuperable, unless there were irreconcilable contradiction. To vindicate the authority of the history, we are not required to explain the reason of the particular form into which it has been cast. The repetition on which most stress has been laid, is that of the taking of Sarah by two separate kings, with the intention of making her their wife, especially when viewed in connexion with a similar occurrence in the case of Rebekah. It must be remembered, however, that the whole matter is so thoroughly in harmony with the habits of the times, that there is nothing very wonderful in the fact of its recurrence; that the points of dissimilarity, in all the cases, are as remarkable as those of resemblance; and that the narrative is one of the last which a Jew, desirous to enhance the fame of the head of his nation, would have been likely to create. Dr. Davidson

himself confesses that 'there is some room for doubting the original identity of the facts on which these portions of the history are founded in consequence of the dissimilarities. But we are more inclined to give them a common historical basis, than to maintain their original independence.' To this we object. Unless the unfavourable view be established, it ought not to be brought forward at all. It is only the most certain evidence that can be admitted as having any weight against the strong case on the opposite side. In speaking thus, we are sufficiently sustained by Dr. Davidson himself, who once gave a wise and judicious caution against the formation of views unfriendly to the sacred writers, even in cases where there are disagreements that we cannot explain.

'Should it even be ascertained, that they did come in that condition and form from the inspired penmen, we should not be justified by our puny and weak understandings in pronouncing an unfavourable verdict on the writers. It should first be investigated, whether our own ignorance may not stand in the way of reconciling certain passages. Our short-sighted vision may not have been sufficiently purified to discern the utterings of the Divine mind through the medium of His messengers. May not prejudice so blind the understanding, that it cannot comprehend the details of the marvellous record which God has given? In a word, our ignorance may be the very reason why portions of the written word appear to stand in opposition to one another.'—*Sacred Hermeneutics*, pp. 518, 519.

Now if such a principle apply even to cases of apparent contradiction, how much more must it hold good in relation to cases where there is no actual discrepancy! Doubtless Dr. Davidson will repudiate such a sentiment now; but assuredly it is a right one, whatever be his views in relation to it.

We have preferred to look at these alleged instances of anachronism, confusion, &c., as though they had all proceeded from the hand of Moses; and we do not see in any of them the necessity for any other hypothesis. Still, a belief in the Mosaic authorship does not imply, either that Moses did not use existing documents in the preparation of the earlier parts of the history, or that the Pentateuch, after it came from his hands, was not subjected to later revisions. There are some passages, such as the record of his death and burial, that must necessarily have come from a later hand; but in the main we agree with Macdonald, that 'it is a very unsatisfactory and also unsafe

expedient for the defender of the Pentateuch to endeavour to dispose of any alleged anachronisms on the mere assumption of interpolations; for such an admission is utterly inconsistent with the character and claims of the document, as the sacred book of the nation, with which none, even if disposed, would be allowed to tamper.' This, however true, does not exclude the idea of an authoritative revision, whether by Ezra or some other set apart by God Himself for the work, and divinely guided in its execution. Certainly Dr. Davidson is one of the last to object to such a supposition, considering the way in which he has recourse to the agency of a redactor to meet the emergencies of his own hypothesis. He says, 'No interpolation hypothesis can be regarded otherwise than as a tacit admission of the insuperable difficulty that exists in the assumption of Mosaic authorship.' Let any reader bear this law in mind, and apply it to the Doctor's scheme of Elohistic and Jehovistic documents, and he can arrive at but one result.

All the objections hitherto considered, however, are but subsidiary arguments. The diversity of authorship is asserted, mainly on the difference observable in different sections of the Pentateuch, in the use of the names 'Elohim,' and 'Jehovah,' as designations of Deity. We can conceive of a case in which this argument would be almost irresistible. If the latter name had been unknown till after the date of Moses, and if the so-called Elohist had lived in a period when it had not come into ordinary use,—if there were large and continuous portions of the books in which 'Elohim' alone occurred, even in connexions such as in other parts invariably had the name 'Jehovah,'—if the line of demarcation was thus distinct and definite,—and if, in addition to this, there were other slight but significant circumstances conducting to the same conclusion,—we should feel that the case in favour of separate documents was very strong. But the evidence must be clear, extensive, and unmistakeable, and the conclusion must rest upon a wide induction, not upon limited and uncertain data. Now, the opposite of all this is true. No doubt there is a peculiarity in the use of these two names, which it is not easy to understand; and the difficulty is increased by the declaration in Exodus vi. 3. There are, however, modes of explanation, which, whether they give absolute satisfaction or not, are infinitely more probable than any of the countless speculations in

which the 'Higher Criticism' loves to indulge. For, assuredly, it is much more probable that Moses, writing after the name 'Jehovah' had become familiar to the people, should use it as well as 'Elohim' in the earlier portions of the history, than that centuries afterwards a writer should set himself to compose a document in which this name of God alone should appear.

But, apart from the question of antecedent probability, there are other circumstances that throw discredit on these theories. It is true that Dr. Davidson speaks very confidently, and maintains that the idea suggested by the difference in the use of the Divine names, is confirmed by the entire circle of ideas by which the writings are characterized. The one is more primitive, simple, and natural; the other more elaborate, with a richer mythology, a more fully-developed religious system, and a more evident purpose to exalt the Jewish nation. These allegations are very strong, and, if established, would be very staggering in their effect; the only misfortune is, that when put to the test, the proof is miserably defective, and all sorts of expedients are adopted in order to give it some appearance of strength. Thus, when it is found that there are passages in which ideas resembling those of the Jehovist are found associated with the use of the name 'Elohim,' we have the interposition of a 'Junior Elohist' to explain the difficulty; while, if there still remain some places that cannot be thus treated, then we have the never-failing redactor to fill up a gap. No possible difficulty need long perplex a man who is at liberty to deal with records as Dr. Davidson has handled these Books of Moses. We have rarely seen a more astonishing document than that in which he professes to map out the first four Books of the Pentateuch, and assign separate portions, verses, half-verses, nay, individual words, to their respective authors. Once admit his position, and the process is very simple. Take a section in which, from the use of the name 'Elohim,' you think you detect the hand of the Elohist. As you read on, unexpectedly you meet with the other term, 'Jehovah.' Here, you think, is something that militates against the theory: not at all; for this is an insertion of the redactor. Then you are told, that 'manifestations of angels, as representatives of God, first appear in the Jehovist, growing out of the idea that the Divine Being is too exalted to manifest Himself.' Accordingly, the expression, 'angel of

Jehovah,' or 'angel of God,' does not occur in the Elohist. But presently you find it in Gen. xxi. 17, in a section bearing strong marks of an Elohistic hand. The answer is at hand: that particular part of that special verse is from the redactor. So, too, we are taught that in the Jehovist 'there is a Levitical tone, which it is useless to deny, by quoting a Levitism in Elohistic passages, which are not Elohistic at all; for *cleansing*, in Gen. xxxv. 2, belongs to the redactor.' The erection of altars, Gen. xxxiii. 20; xxxv. 1–7, is in the 'Jehovist and redactor,' &c. There is no possibility of reasoning with an opponent who has a licence of this character. But surely it must occur to Dr. Davidson, that there are others beside 'smatterers in Hebrew' who will hesitate as to the adoption of conclusions, whose only recommendation is, that they lend an apparent support to his theory. He is himself apparently unconscious that the junior Elohist and redactor, at least, are only two mythical beings, of whom we should never have heard, had it not been impossible otherwise to lend an appearance of plausibility to his speculations relative to the Elohistic and Jehovistic elements. Yet he talks of these two as confidently as though they were his intimate friends; or as if, at least, their manuscripts were lying before him as he wrote. Others will see, what he seems unable to discern, that the very necessity for the introduction of these two auxiliaries gives the death-blow to his system. The man who can believe that the Pentateuch is nothing better than the curious piece of mosaic work into which our author's table would convert it, need not sneer at the credulity of the vulgar and ignorant.

The fact is, the Pentateuch has presented greater difficulties to these German artists than they expected. At first it seemed a comparatively easy task to deal with a book professing to narrate the history of so remote a period. It was only an uncritical age that had been satisfied as to its genuineness and authenticity, and it would need very little effort to expose so absurd a delusion. Men who had overthrown the pretensions of Livy, and Homer, and Herodotus, could not have much trouble in destroying those of Moses. But the result has not answered expectations. One theory after another has been adopted, without being found satisfactory. Astruc, Ilgen, De Wette, Eichhorn, Von Bohlen, Ewald, Vater, Knobel, Hupfeld, and a host of

others, have tried their hand. We have had the document hypothesis, the fragment hypothesis, the supplement hypothesis, the crystallization hypothesis, and we know not what beside, each one living its own brief day, and then giving place to another as pretentious, as extravagant, and as short-lived as those by which it has been preceded. Dr. Davidson's improved edition of Ilgen's and Hupfeld's will share the fate of its predecessors.

When, indeed, we see the way in which the Doctor deals with opinions expressed in the most confident manner only five years ago, we can scarcely expect that the present scheme will very long have the allegiance even of its own author. The most noteworthy example of the change that has passed over his views since the issue of Horne's *Introduction*, is in the case of Deuteronomy. At that time it was regarded by him as a veritable production of Moses. 'That the Book of Deuteronomy,' (he then said,) 'with the exception of the appendix or continuation, proceeded from the pen of Moses himself, we infer from Deut. xxxi. and xvii. 18.' Now it is simply from an unknown writer who personates Moses, and the arguments then dismissed as inconclusive are now accepted as the grounds for denying the Mosaic authorship. There are very few points on which he insists now, to which we may not find an answer in his own previous words. Thus stress is now laid upon the alleged difference between the legislation of the earlier books and that of Deuteronomy, especially in relation to the position of the Levites, the payment of tithes, and the references to the kingly and prophetic offices. The very mention of these latter offices at all is now assumed to be a proof that the book was not written till a late period, while the curtailed revenue and increased power of the priestly class are thought to point to the same inference. But what said Dr. Davidson on these very subjects five years ago?—

'The later character of the laws respecting royalty, which De Wette conjectures to refer to Solomon, we are quite unable to perceive. Moses knew that when the people got into the land of Canaan, they would be desirous of having kings like other nations; and therefore he thinks it necessary to regulate such desire. In like manner the judicial and military constitution involves a prudent forethought on the part of the great Lawgiver for the future welfare of the people. He knew that they would require new arrangements after their

entrance into the Promised Land,—that they should need regular judges and magistrates, and be involved in wars with external people. A wise and far-seeing legislator, who had become familiar with the temper and habits of a rude people like the Israelites, and with the disposition of the neighbouring tribes, could have foreseen of himself much of what is implied in the passages indicated, and would doubtless have provided for it. But the legislator with whom we have to do was guided by a higher wisdom than his own; and therefore there is nothing strange in the laws under consideration. The same remark will also account for the regulations concerning false prophets, interpreters of dreams, sorcerers, &c. The promise to send true prophets certainly presupposes a supernatural illumination on the part of Moses. Taught of God, in this point he is enabled definitely to predict the existence of a prophetic order. Divine revelation implies the reality of prophecy. As to the alleged fact of Deuteronomy presenting a homeless, destitute, but powerful, priestly tribe, there is some plausibility in it; but it rests on false assumptions. Because the Levites were to receive cities to dwell in, they were not thereby excluded from dwelling among Israel, in the gates or cities, because the Levites were not the only possessors of the cities allotted to them. They had merely the necessary number of houses in them, the others being inhabited by the Israelites of other tribes. Besides, Moses foresaw that the Canaanites would not be expelled at once from the land. All the towns and provinces of it would come by degrees into the possession of the Israelites. If so, the Levites would be obliged for some time to live among their brethren in their own towns. Again, there is no real discrepancy between Deuteronomy xviii. and Numbers xviii. The former does not contain a full statement of the revenues of the priests, but a mere supplement to the passages relating to this subject in the earlier books. It is not an account of their only revenue. Although, therefore, Deuteronomy is silent respecting the Levitical tithes, their previous existence is implied.'—*Horne's Introduction, Davidson's Volume*, pp. 610, 611.

We do not quote this simply to expose the writer's extraordinary change, although certainly few things are more calculated to shake confidence than such complete revolutions of opinion, but because we know not where we could find a fuller or more triumphant answer to the objections on which he now insists so strongly. It is to be regretted that his own reasonings have not satisfied himself; they certainly are quite sufficient for us. Let us say, too, that the principles laid down in the above extract not only meet this particular case of Deuteronomy, but are quite enough to overthrow very much of the reasoning in other parts of the volume relative to the authorship of the Pentateuch. The late date assigned to the books is reached by refusing to admit not only the prophetic

element, but even that wise forecasting which we expect to find in a sagacious ruler. Thus we read, in reference to the age of the so-called Jehovist:—

'David's conquest of the Moabites and Edomites (comp. Numbers xxiv. 17–19, with 2 Samuel viii. 2, 14) was also past. The dependence of Esau on Jacob, put in the form of a prophecy in Gen. xxv. 23, and unknown to the Elohist, implies these conquests. But the words of Gen. xxvii. 40, "And it shall come to pass when thou shalt have the dominion, that thou shalt break his yoke off thy neck," refer to the time of Jehoram, when Edom first threw off the yoke of Judah, and elected a king of its own.'—Page 49.

Here the prophetic element is repudiated altogether, and the rejection is made the basis of an argument for fixing the date. Refuse to accept this ground-work, and the elaborate superstructure of theory as to the age of the documents falls to the ground. With remarkable, but, we had almost said, characteristic, inconsistency, Dr. Davidson does not follow it out, or the prophetic allusion in Deuteronomy to the dispersion would cause him to refer that book to a period subsequent to the captivity. That view, we suppose, was too monstrous for him, and therefore he ignores the principle for once, forgetting that such admission may be turned with fatal effect upon his own reasonings, in relation to other parts of the Pentateuch.

We must confess that Dr. Davidson's views as to Deuteronomy fill us with more surprise than any other part of the volume. We are amazed at his belief in the success of an imposture such as that he ascribes to the unknown author of the book. That the Jews would quietly suffer a man to impose on them a 'pious' forgery of his own as the work of Moses, is what we are not prepared to believe. When, especially, we remember that the writer's design was 'to check the corruption of the times, to repress prevailing superstitions and kingly tyranny,' we are the less disposed to think that so daring an attempt to secure authority for its exhortations would pass unchallenged, or that the 'temper of the times,' confessed to be times of Jewish degeneracy, would be favourable to its reception. Still more strongly must we protest against the lax notions relative to the *morale* of such a proceeding: 'The deception was an innocent one, being merely a veil or form for communicating and enforcing lessons of importance.....It is little more than a reproduc-

tion of the Mosaic in a developed and later form, with such changes as had arisen in practice. The sentiments conveyed by the Deuteronomist are essentially those of Moses. In this manner we reduce the fiction of the writer to a very harmless thing.' On this there can be no need for comment. If an assumption of the name of the ancient lawgiver of Israel to secure authority for a composition that had no connexion with him be a 'harmless fiction,' we are at a loss to understand what kind of fiction would, in the author's opinion, be deserving of censure.

The question as to the Mosaic authorship is not a point of secondary moment. Dr. Davidson indicates its importance when he says:—

'The authorship of Moses implies the literal truth of the history, especially the portion that narrates events with which he was personally concerned. Hence all who suppose him to be the writer maintain the *historical accuracy* of every narrative. But we shall see that legendary and traditional elements belong to them. This conclusion arises from the insuperable difficulties and inconsistencies of the history; and shows that Moses could not have been the author.'

There need be no mistake, therefore, as to the position occupied. Before, it was represented as a mere question of names, that did not at all affect the authority of the record. 'We do not believe that the authority or credibility of the Pentateuch is lessened by repudiating the Mosaic authorship of the first four books, with some important exceptions.' * Now the battery is unmasked, and we understand plainly that the assault is directed against the truth of the narrative, and that with the Mosaic origin must also go its historic accuracy.

And why (it is asked) be so afraid of the recognition of a mythic element? Is it not to be expected that the Hebrews should have their mythology as well as other people? Why regard them as an exception to all the nations of the ancient world? 'The traditions are remarkably alike: why should a different mode of interpretation be applied to them?' We must take the liberty of saying, that the traditions are remarkably different, as any one may discover who will take the trouble of comparing the mythology of any people whatever with the wonder-

* Horne's *Introduction*, vol. ii., p. 633.

ful records of the Book of Genesis; and this difference itself is enough to make us regard them in an entirely different light. To assert that the Hebrews must necessarily follow the law that holds good in reference to other peoples, is simply to deny the possibility of their having been employed by God for a special purpose, and favoured with a special revelation of His will.

That this is the point to which all these assertions tend, may be seen from an examination of the cases in which a mythical element is supposed, and the ground on which the idea is defended. Our space forbids us to do more than select one example. In relation to the plagues of Egypt, we read:—

'These visitations are related as extraordinary and miraculous. They are founded upon ordinary phenomena in Egypt. But they are represented as taking place at a season contrary to the usual occurrence of such phenomena, and appearing in rapid succession; as occurring at the time foretold by Moses, and at his command, while they commonly ceased at his intercession, and as passing over the Israelites.....In regard to the miraculous element connected with these plagues, it appears to us that the *national traditions* account for all that appears as miraculous. Exaggerations of periodical visitation, or of the regular phenomena of Egypt, along with everything of the wonderful, are an embodiment of the popular traditions. Moses performs extraordinary deeds as the lawgiver of the nation. This was a general belief among the ancients. We resolve what is miraculous in the plagues of Egypt into a *traditional element*, naturally shaping itself, among the Israelites, into the form presented by the narratives. The Almighty does not violently interfere with the eternal laws of nature which He established at first; for these laws are sufficient to effect whatever He intended to bring about in the history of redemption. When He established them, He foresaw all that He would be required to accomplish. If, therefore, a miracle mean an interference with, or a suspension of, nature's fixed laws, we cannot assume its existence; especially as we are ignorant of many such laws, as well as of the effects they are capable of producing.'—Pp. 220, 221.

It does not need much consideration to show that any admission as to the historic truth of the narrative in this and similar cases is utterly worthless. It makes the statement less offensive; but if any friend of Christianity supposes that he has secured any point by it, he is labouring under a miserable delusion. All that is of any value in the record is carefully extracted from it, and the reader is left, if he will, to believe what remains. All notions of a special interposition of God on behalf of His people, of any miraculous character attaching to the

plagues, or of any connexion between the occurrences and the agency of Moses and Aaron, are rejected as incredible. 'Real miracles were not wrought by the hands of Moses and Aaron.' Subtracting this supernatural element, you may believe that certain calamities fell upon Egypt, which exerted a powerful influence on the minds of the king and the people. On what grounds such a faith rests, or what special value it can possess, we are at a loss to perceive. The miracle is the very essence of the history, and must stand or fall with it. Whatever foundation there may be for the history as it stands, for a narrative thus shorn of its characteristic feature there is literally none. We have here records attested by certain evidence: if it be satisfactory, they are to be received; if not, they are to be rejected: to weave out of them a story entirely different from that which they contain, is altogether inadmissible. Nay, by the denial of the supernatural element, the credibility of the whole has been materially weakened. It may be difficult to accept the idea, that God, having set apart a nation for a special purpose, did employ towards them a course of discipline, and interpose on their behalf in a way, which have no parallel in the life of any other people; but it is surely infinitely harder to believe that such a train of events occurred, as the normal result of natural causes, and without any special Divine interference. We are more and more satisfied that in this controversy there can be no compromise; that, of all hypotheses, that of Paulus, and others of like spirit, who admit the truth of Scripture history, but explain the miraculous phenomena on rational principles, is the most untenable; that we must either hold fast by the history as it stands, or abandon it altogether. The mythical or legendary theory may be a very convenient halting-place; but there are very few who will find in it rest for the soles of their feet. If men can be convinced that the Egyptian plagues were periodical visitations, or 'regular phenomena;' that the passage of the Israelite host over the Red Sea was owing only to the sagacity of Moses, 'who was acquainted with the peculiarities of the sea, and took advantage of the ebb-tide, which was assisted by a strong north-east wind;' that the narrative of Abel's sacrifice was only a mythical creation, designed to exalt the nomadic above the agricultural life; that the deluge was a poetic myth arising out of yearly inundations; that the

wrestling of Jacob with the angel was a national legend, invented for the purpose of glorifying the patriarch, explaining the names Israel and Peniel, and accounting for the abstinence of the Jews from a certain part of the flesh of animals; and a multitude of other ideas of a like sort;—it will not be long before they will agree to abandon the books as undeserving of any credit at all. Speculation will follow the same course it has taken in relation to early Roman history, and, after first seeking to discover the fact concealed in the drapery of the myth or legend, will end by regarding the whole as a mass of fiction, amidst which it were vain to search for the few grains of truth.

The recognition of myths and legends does, in fact, amount to the denial of the miracles. Dr. Davidson has not reached this point, and would repudiate any such opinion. But it is very hard to see on what grounds he has stopped short of the extreme conclusion. 'Care should be taken' (he says) 'not to assume any mythical element or elements except where the accounts contain what is unsuitable to the Divine Being, or contradictory to the reason He implanted in man.' Here is breadth enough. Take it in connexion with another statement, and we see not how it is possible to escape the disbelief of all miracles. 'The laws of nature are unchangeable. God does not directly and suddenly interfere with them on behalf of His creatures; neither does He so palpably or constantly intermeddle with men's concerns.' It seems to us that any one resolved to deny the reality of every miracle might completely justify himself by an appeal to these two principles. If we are allowed to form our own conceptions of what is suitable to God, and to reject every narrative that clashes with them, especially if we start with the assumption (for it is no more) that the sequences of cause and effect which we observe are unchangeable laws of nature with which our reason teaches us God does not interfere, we have no other resource, when a narrative is set before us involving a violation of these principles, than at once to deny its truth on the ground of impossibility. It may be a consolation to the friends of Dr. Davidson to know that he does not absolutely disbelieve all miracles; but his own personal position cannot affect the tendency of the principles he has laid down, and which others are sure to apply with more logical consistency, and press to more sceptical conclusions.

For the present we are compelled to reserve the discussion of the general question of miracles; but we cannot suffer some of Dr. Davidson's statements to pass unnoticed. He talks about 'laws of nature,' and the possibilities of the Divine operations, with a confidence that is entirely alien from the philosophic spirit, and therefore entitled to little weight. We cannot see, indeed, (and our opinion is in harmony with that of our most profound thinkers, and even of some unfriendly to the claims of Revelation,) how the possibility of miracles can be denied, except by those who have already renounced all faith in a personal God. For if there be a Being of infinite power and omniscient wisdom, who controls all the agencies of the universe, the 'laws of nature' being only the general principles by which He regulates all its procedure, who can be entitled to say that there are not higher spiritual laws to which even these may be made subservient? We see a certain cause constantly producing a particular effect, and we infer that the connexion between them is indissoluble, and often talk as though we had reached the knowledge of a law possessing all the certainty of a mathematical demonstration. Yet is it only a conclusion, derived from the observation of a certain number of phenomena, which, therefore, some new observations might compel us to modify. 'It is surely in the power of common sense,' (says a recent writer,) 'as it is certainly in that of philosophy, to discern that the imputation of mathematical necessity to the sequence of natural phenomena is a complete subversion of reason.' It may be part of God's great plan, to us all unknown, to call in the operation of new causes, or to act independently of nature's processes; and what we in our ignorance regard as special interpositions in violation of established laws, may thus be only the revelation of other laws as eternal, as fixed, and as enduring. To assert that 'God does not suddenly and directly interfere,' &c., is a simple begging of the question. If there be no limits to His Omnipotence, if our knowledge of the Infinite is necessarily so imperfect as to forbid arbitrary decision as to what is worthy of Him, then our acceptance of a miracle must depend on the testimony by which it is sustained, and not on abstract notions as to its impossibility.

It is to be remembered that many of the Mosaic and other miracles of the Old Testament can plead the authority of our Lord and His Apostles on their behalf. We conclude, however, that Dr.

Davidson would not attach much weight to this, if we are to judge from observations relative to corresponding testimony as to the authorship of the Pentateuch. His teaching on the point is singularly confused, not to say contradictory. Thus we are first told that he might object 'to the union of Christ and the Apostles, as though they occupied the same stand-point. Our Saviour had the Spirit without measure, and knew all things. He was properly and truly infallible; whereas the Apostles had the Spirit in measure, and did not know many things.' Within a page we read, on the contrary, 'It should also be observed that historical and critical questions could only belong to the sphere of His human culture,—a culture stamped with the characteristics of His age and country. The development of Jesus is distinctly recognised in the New Testament, and is not incompatible with His Divine nature. (Luke ii. 52.) Considering, therefore, the human limitations to which our Lord was subjected on earth, we are not irreverent in supposing that He shared the common views of the Jews in His day, in regard to points ethically or doctrinally unimportant.' Which of these two statements are we to accept,—that asserting our Lord's infallible knowledge of all things, or this latter one, which tells us that there were questions in which He erred in common with the Jews of His day? If the latter, who is to decide as to the points in which He may have erred? There will be all possible diversities of opinion as to what things are 'ethically and doctrinally unimportant.' Among them Dr. Davidson classes the authorship and consequent authority of the Pentateuch. We take an entirely opposite view. If the Jews were receiving as a sacred work, containing the history and laws of their nation, a compilation of various authors, in which myth and legend are strangely blended with history,—if they had certain notions of God, pronounced by Dr. Davidson to be very unworthy, and yet received on the teaching of this book, whose authority rested on the fact that it bore the honoured name of Moses,—was it a matter of unimportance whether or not this delusion should continue? And was this a subject on which, owing to the limitations of His human nature, it was likely he would share the errors of His country and His age?

But even if our Lord's infallibility be allowed, Dr. Davidson

would not admit that we have improved our position; we are told that both He and His Apostles 'adopted a wise accommodation to popular views. They did not in matters of moment; but with such unimportant points of criticism as the authorship of the Pentateuch.' Again we are at variance as to the importance of the point, and ask for some test by which to decide on the relative value of any truth. How are we to know when our Lord is using the popular belief as an *argumentum ad hominem*, and when He is giving His own sanction to some ancient narrative by quoting or referring to it? An element of uncertainty is introduced, which at once weakens the force of His words, and leaves us without solid foundation on which to rest. It can, however, only be by some such expedient that the force of the New-Testament evidence can be escaped. Let it once be admitted that its teachings contain unalloyed truth, and all attempts to shake the authenticity of the Pentateuch are at an end. Our Lord Himself appeals to various portions in it as the words of Moses, and both He and His Apostles refer to several of the narratives now said to be mythical. The fall, the deluge, the destruction of the cities of the plain, the passage of the Red Sea, the descent of manna, and others, are all quoted by Christ Himself, or some of the Apostles, as real facts. The evidence is sufficient to convince us that, whoever may seek to make a distinction, the authority of the New is so pledged to that of the Old, that the assault directed against the one tells with equal effect against the other. Both will assuredly be sacrificed, if their true historical character be impeached, and a mythic interpretation be put on all narratives of a miraculous character. Most cordially do we endorse the following remarks:—

'To all who entertain a true regard for revelation, considered as a Divine system, it is superfluous to say, that the mythical interpretation is *untenable, erroneous, and impious*. With *infernal zeal it sets itself to destroy the sacred character and truth of the books of Scripture*. But the Bible is historical to such a degree as not to submit to this treatment, without losing its essential characteristics. It is true that myths are interwoven with the histories of all heathen nations. They originated at a time when there was no authentic or true history. But the Scripture contains a system of doctrines based upon history, available for the instruction and moral renovation of men. If we strip it of its history, we take away the doctrine also, or reduce it at least to a meagre skeleton, without flesh, and blood, and vitality. We fritter away its contents to a shadow devoid of substance or

solidity, where nothing is left but the *few moral truths which each interpreter is pleased* to deduce from the record. The Jewish religion, as developed in the Old Testament, was unfavourable to myths. They could not have been introduced into the sacred books unless it be affirmed that prophets and inspired men wrote at random, without the superintendence of the Spirit. To intersperse their compositions with such legends is contrary to all our ideas of inspiration; and can only be attributed to them by such as deny their spiritual illumination.'

How different this from the assertion, 'From *ignorance* it has also been said that the mythical view is incompatible with every idea of Divine inspiration!' Yet both are from the same pen; the former in the *Sacred Hermeneutics* (p. 215) of 1843, the latter in the Introduction of 1862. We prefer the notions of Dr. Davidson's 'iguorance' to his 'maturer view.' The objections to the mythical view could not be better set forth than they have already been by himself in anticipation. In one point he is consistent. His notions of inspiration are altered and lowered in accordance with this change of opinion; and we know not that we need seek for any stronger illustration of the fatal tendency of such views than is thus presented in his own case.

It will not be possible for us now to enter into the subject of inspiration. We only wish our readers to understand the ideas respecting it which find favour in the schools of the 'higher criticism.' The following passage, perhaps, best embodies the views of our author:—

'When it is said, "The Word of the Lord came," &c.; "Thus saith the Lord; Son of man, write thee the name of the days;" "Gird up thy loins, and speak unto them all that I command thee;" nothing more is meant than that inspired men gave expression to their inward consciousness. It is not intended that the Deity *really* spoke to their external organs of hearing, or that they received *a distinct commission* to write. They were moved by their own spiritual impulse to utter or write the extraordinary intuitions of truth which the Spirit had enabled them to reach. The *very words* were not dictated to them, nor need it be thought that they spake on every occasion because they received *a special* impulse from above to speak at that very time and in the very way recorded; nor that they recorded by the *special* command of God that which they did write: all that is fairly implied is, that they possessed a consciousness of the Divine, which is represented, according to the ideas of the age, as coming to them directly from God, and were impelled to body it forth in a way resulting from the circumstances of their condition. They said that the Holy Ghost spake by them, or uttered such words, when that inward prophetic consciousness was revealed to others. The phraseology in question refers to a subjective process in the prophets, not to objective phenomena acting upon them

from without. It is the internal reflexion of their spiritual intuitions. In short, God spake to them not by a miraculous communication foreign to human experience, but by the inward voice of spiritual consciousness which daily and hourly tells every one, if he will listen, what his work in this world is, and how he should do it.'—Page 239.

Here, at least, is no disguise. It is no longer a question of verbal and plenary inspiration, of suggestion and superintendence; for here is an utter abandonment of both. The inspiration here attributed to the sacred writers is no more than may belong to any preacher of the Gospel, nay, to any man who feels himself stirred up to an 'external reflexion of his spiritual intuitions;' or, as it may be rendered into the vernacular, to an expression of his own thoughts. There is nothing at all new in the idea: it is the favourite notion of a school who delude the unthinking by talking of inspired men, when the only inspiration they admit is shared in common by Moses and Mahomet, by Isaiah and Goethe, by St. Paul and Shakspeare. Deny it as he may, this is the point to which Dr. Davidson's doctrine comes; and, if it be once established, the entire character of the Bible is changed. We may still find in it instructive lessons; we may admire the interest of its stories (if, indeed, we can ever manage to forget the torturing process to which higher criticism has subjected them, and in which it has sought to represent them as a series of confused and contradictory fables); we may be fascinated by its poetry, and charmed by its high-toned morality; we may even continue to rest in some of its spiritual truths: but it will be deposed from its high throne; it will no longer be the infallible authority that must end every controversy, and pronounce on every doctrine.

But we must not go further into these points here. In our next Number we shall resume the subject, and consider at length Dr. Davidson's second volume, and the more recent work of Colenso, especially in their bearings on this question. Perhaps Dr. Davidson will say that we have only met him with 'stale arguments.' Our reply is, We have had to do with stale objections, that did not seem to us to require other answers than had already been given. We deeply regret that we have had to speak of the work of a man, so eminent in his own department, in the style we have been compelled to adopt. The defiant and contemptuous tone of our author would have justified much stronger censures; but we have been willing to allow something

for the extreme soreness of feeling which he appears to harbour. We would, however, assure him and his supporters, that they will be more likely to secure a candid hearing as soon as they learn that they have opponents as conscientious as themselves. It may be from a narrowness that cannot take in large and advanced conceptions,—a prejudice that blinds their eyes to evidence,—a conservatism that trembles to disturb the existing faith,—or an ignorance which induces them to remain satisfied in their own errors; but certainly there are men who do sincerely hold the views that have obtained in the Church relative to these books,—that Moses was the author of the Pentateuch, and that he and other holy men spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost,—that this Scripture was given by inspiration of God, and that it is of infallible authority. They not only believe these things to be true, but they feel them to be of essential importance to their own happiness and the well-being of the world. To require them to renounce that faith at the bidding of a few scholars, is a mere piece of literary arrogance. To ask them to be silent as to their convictions on the tendency of opinions that 'higher criticism' approves, is to assail that very freedom which these critics profess to love. To expect them to countenance men in diffusing sentiments which they regard as pregnant with mischief, is a simple absurdity. To represent them as persecutors because they will not suffer instruments, designed for the defence of the Gospel they love, to become engines for its destruction, is injustice and folly.*

---

* This article was ready for the press prior to the appearance of Bishop Colenso's melancholy critique on the Pentateuch. It was thought better not to recast the present review, but to consider the bishop's work in conjunction with Dr. Davidson's second volume, where his notions on inspiration, &c., are more fully developed. These two works will furnish an opportunity for the discussion of points that have here either been cursorily touched or altogether omitted. Of these none is more important than the influence of such views on the authority of the distinctive doctrines of Christianity.

ART. II.—1. *Handbook to the Pictures in the International Exhibition.* By TOM TAYLOR, M.A. Bradbury and Evans.
2. *Descriptive Handbook to the Fine Art Collections in the International Exhibition.* By FRANCIS TURNER PALGRAVE, Fellow of Exeter College, Oxford. Second Edition. Macmillan and Co.

IT may, perhaps, seem strange that we have waited till the Great Exhibition of 1862 became a thing of the past, before making any remarks on the picture galleries, and on the handbooks of Messrs. Palgrave and Taylor. The delay has indeed involved the disadvantage of preventing our observations from being of any practical service in the study of the paintings. But it must be remembered that our many serial contemporaries have rendered that service almost needless; while, on the other hand, there are many of the visitors at South Kensington with whom some of the pictures still live

'upon that inward eye
Which is the bliss of solitude,'

and who will, we are sure, be glad to have those images brightened and perpetuated in their minds. Moreover, a final and dispassionate retrospect upon the whole gallery, and its several courts, obviously presents peculiar advantages of its own. Such a review has, therefore, seemed to us appropriate; and we are the more disposed to linger upon this great international display, inasmuch as it is to be greatly feared that it will be a long time before London sees such another.

The two handbooks differ in almost everything, and in nothing more widely than in the objects and aims of the writers as set forth in their prefatory remarks. Mr. Palgrave is the teacher. He lays down certain laws of criticism according to which all works of art should be tried, and then proceeds to inquire whether the pictures in the galleries are found wanting when tried by his rules. His remarks have, therefore, a certain value, independent both of this collection and of the correctness of the individual application of his own laws. Mr. Tom Taylor, on the other hand, disclaims any such intention. 'This handbook,' he says, 'does not aim at criticism, except incidentally

and by implication; its main purpose is to give such information as shall enhance the visitor's enjoyment of the feast here spread for him.' Now there is certainly room for both handbooks; nay, the one is even necessary as a complement to the other. Yet the former is the more useful of the two, as it is undeniably more important to have correct principles to judge by, and a habit of applying them correctly, than to know the innumerable anecdotes and interesting gossip which Mr. Taylor retails so pleasantly. To go through the galleries with this gentleman, was a delightful holiday amusement; to go through them on Mr. Palgrave's principles, hard work.

Still, though Mr. Taylor thus disclaims criticism, his little work contains many incidental observations, revealing the canons he adopts. These, as might be expected, differ in almost everything from those of Mr. Palgrave. The latter lays it down as the fundamental doctrine of his philosophy, that 'nature' is the one standard and test by which 'right and wrong in art are tried as surely as right and wrong in morality by the standard of conscience and religion;' or, in other words, that what is technically called *truth* is the great object of art,—truth to nature being synonymous with beauty,—and that any work found wanting when weighed in that balance must be unhesitatingly cast aside. The former proclaims a different and more catholic doctrine: the right way to estimate the value of any artist's work, is not to adopt some arbitrary rule which he never thought of, or perhaps rejected, and then to try him by that; but to endeavour, as far as possible, to regard his production from his own point of view, and, if it comes up to his own standard, and that standard be not obviously a bad one, accept the work as good in its kind. 'In short,' to use his own words, 'we should recognise the principle that if truth be one, beauty, the pleasure it gives, and the faculties that appreciate it, are various; and, whereas the end of science is truth, the end of all fine art is pleasure.' Again, Mr. Palgrave tells us to regard *thought* as that which emphatically constitutes art, though he admits that thought enters largely also into the mechanical execution of a painting. Mr. Taylor, on the other hand, remarks, with reference to four pictures by the Belgian artist, Alfred Stevens, that they 'may be referred to as excellent illustrations of the truth, that in pictures—considered as such—the first thing is the

painting, the thought the second thing,—to be taken into account only in determining the place of the painter *ceteris paribus*.'

These differences show themselves in a great many things, which it would take too long, even if it were worth while, to enumerate. It will, perhaps, be better to endeavour to discover what is the fundamental difference between their two systems, —the root from which these divergences spring.

Mr. Palgrave himself gives us a hint for the solution of this question, where he speaks, in the passage already quoted, of the right and wrong of art being as certain as the right and wrong of morality when tried by the standard of conscience and religion. Mr. Ruskin, whose disciple he all but declares himself to be, carries this doctrine a great deal farther. In all his works, he not only assumes that there are art principles, discoverable by the human mind, which are absolutely true; but he further seems to consider it established that these absolutely true principles and his own are identical,—and woe to the unhappy artist whose precept or practice does not accord with them. All the terrible artillery of Mr. Ruskin's invectives is directed against the purity of his character, and the value of his works; such terms as 'base,' 'unfeeling,' 'untruthful,' are discharged at him, and he sinks beneath a heavy broadside of sonorous sentences. Now this springs—and it is a point to which we wish specially to direct attention—from his fundamental doctrine, laid down in the first volume of *Modern Painters*, that the distinction between good and bad art is felt by a moral sense, similar, as Mr. Palgrave says, to the conscience; and that that moral sense, when properly enlightened, is unerring. Mr. Tom Taylor does not seem to consider that there is such a thing as an absolute standard, either internal in the mind of man, or external in nature, by which art can be tried; but that, within certain limits, every artist may select his own ends, aims, and methods, and, if the effect produced is satisfactory and pleasing, there is nothing further to be sought for.

Now it will at once be seen that these two methods of criticism represent two systems which divide between them philosophy, morality, and religion, and which enter more or less into all our objects of thought,—two systems, of which perhaps the ablest exponents in England have been Coleridge and John Stuart Mill. The one side maintains that there are in the human

mind certain faculties, such as the reason or conscience, capable of touching absolute truth, or, in other words, capable of knowing by intuition truths that are true at all times and under all circumstances,—truths utterly uncoloured by the constitution of the human mind itself, but standing in the pure, untainted light in which they appear to the mind of God. The other side holds that there is no such faculty in the mind; that all our knowledge is only relative; that what is a truth for one age is a lie to another; that what one mind holds as the dearest and most certain of its convictions, is to another the vainest and most empty of shadows. Mr. Maurice and Mr. Mansel may be said to stand forward as the champions of these two systems respectively on the religious ground.

Now it would be foolish, within the limits of such an article as this, to attempt to settle a question about which so many volumes have been written. It will be enough to remark that both lines of thought, as applied to art, have their special dangers, against which the followers of each should be on their guard,—dangers which neither Mr. Taylor nor Mr. Palgrave has always escaped. Those who think that their own artistic moral sense, or taste, is identical with that of all other men, and, when duly enlightened, an absolutely true test, should be specially careful never to mistake any individual crotchet of their own for a decision of that universal sense; and they should also study to remove from their minds every possible prejudice or disturbing influence that would tend to impair the accuracy of the organ. This, Mr. Palgrave will forgive us for saying, he does not seem always to have done; as, for instance, in the case of Mr. H. O'Neill and Mr. E. Warren, to whom we are inclined to think, according to his own principles, he ought to have awarded a much warmer meed of praise than he has done. The danger against which the other school has to guard, is that of dwelling so much on differences of opinion, and on the plausible and often powerful arguments that every opinion can offer on its own behalf, as at last to look on all fixed principles as vanity, and on their pursuit as useless. It may be that it is impossible on any side to touch absolute truth, and that our opinions on many subjects are probably false; but still that exonerates us neither from the duty of forming the best opinions we can with the intellect God has given us, nor from the duty of showing why we differ from what

is at variance with the principles so formed. But nature in this, as in many other things, kindly prevents mankind from falling very deep into absurdity. Few men follow their own principles to their utmost logical conclusions; few men think that they are in everything right, and everybody else wrong; still fewer, that not one of the opinions either of themselves or of any one else is right.

Which is the true way to write history? To adopt a standard of morality totally different from that which the men we are writing about were in the habit of acting on, and which they had probably never either thought or heard of? or to justify every wicked action committed in the past on the plea that it was in accordance with the habits of the times? Neither, certainly. The proper course is to endeavour as far as possible to discover what was the highest standard acknowledged at the time, and then to judge the men by that, not forgetting to point out in what respects it differed from our own, and how far it was the fault of the men of that age that it was not higher. This, or something like it, is the spirit in which art should be studied and criticised.

The thing that most immediately struck one, on passing from the English to the French portion of the gallery, or *vice versâ*, was the great contrast in the general tone of the colour. This difference is so marked and so thorough, that it is very difficult for any one who has been in the habit of seeing exclusively the pictures of either country, to judge fairly of the other. To our eyes, the French colouring wants truth and brilliancy, and seems toned down till all the gorgeous or sparkling hues which delight us so much in nature are lost. To them, on the other hand, the English painting is crude and glaring. For ourselves, we are Englishmen, and own that we think our system of colouring more beautiful, and at the same time more true, affording the artist also a far wider scope for his powers. Such a colourist as Turner is an impossibility on their principles. On this subject Mr. Palgrave makes the following remarks:—

'Wherever painters who cannot colour have flourished, we find a world of subtle theories and learned labour spent to prove that colour is an unimportant, or even a degraded and sensual, quality; or perhaps it is settled that all tones are to be kept "low," (which means

only, in fact, feeble and obscure,) or in some other way should deviate from nature. This doctrine has had its day in Italy and England; and in France it is still popular.....With colour may be placed good management of light and shade, which are only colour in its simplest stage.....A natural eye for these qualities is an instinct, which, like other human instincts, differs from those of animals in this, that it may be either lost or refined. To think of nature is, of course, the one standard by which spectators should try the colouring of pictures, —bearing this in mind, that as the lights and darks of nature immensely surpass those that art can produce, but the lights more especially, the painter must always make a compromise between the intensity of his hues compared with one another. Pictures may be roughly divided into three classes, in regard to this gradation or scale of tone: 1. Those where every colour is treated in relation to the rest, so as to gain the greatest general truth of effect. 2. Those where some relations of tone are carried out correctly, and the rest sacrificed; 3. Those in which a subject is chosen admitting of reproduction, more or less complete, by our range of colours. This last is the manner of Rembrandt; the next, of the old landscape painters, and many of the modern French; the first, of Turner, Reynolds, and the really great colourists of all ages.'

To this we will add that there are other foreign schools, and those by no means the worst, whose colouring quite satisfies an English eye, as is the case with those of Holland and Belgium. The Netherlands have always been noted for their colour, and it would be strange indeed if the descendants of Rubens 'kept their tones low.'

And here we may observe, what a very good selection of paintings Belgium sent,—as a whole, certainly the best on the foreign side of the gallery. By this, we do not mean that the other collections did not contain individual pictures as good, but that there was none that contained so few that were indifferent, or, in other words, in which the average of excellence was so high. Gallait and Leys rank high among the very best historical painters who exhibited. The latter is almost painfully accurate, and there is a certain want of relief in his figures,—notwithstanding his excellent honest colour,—that takes away from the attractiveness of his works; but the way he throws himself into the scene he has to paint, realising it as if he had been not merely one of the spectators, but had also been in the habit of living among the persons, and thinking their thoughts, is truly wonderful. There was not any other instance in the building in which the peculiar character of the faces of any past age was thus reproduced. For

it is a strange, but we think an undeniable, fact, that the faces of men in different ages differ: compare, for instance, the men and women painted by Holbein, Vandyke, Kneller or Lely, Gainsborough or Reynolds, with the faces we see around us, and it will be found that each group has a separate type. It may be objected, that the distinction lies in the style of wearing the hair or beard, in the dress, and also in the peculiar manner of each painter; and thus, no doubt, the difference may in part be explained. But, even after making this deduction, there remains enough to suggest that there was something essentially different in the expression of the faces themselves. Nor will this surprise us, if we reflect a little more deeply on the matter. The countenance follows the habitual thoughts and feelings of its owner so far, that it is possible to give a shrewd guess at a man's general intellectual and moral character from his face:—for the purposes of the argument it will be quite enough if it be conceded that this guess is more often right than wrong. Now, it is undeniable that the men of various epochs have been animated by a different spirit, and have looked at life from different points of view. The men of the Reformation were noted for hard, logical thinking, and earnestness of purpose; those of the days of Elizabeth for activity and enterprise; those who strove in the great Rebellion, for noble unflinching fanaticism on the one side, and chivalrous loyalty on the other; those of the Restoration for immorality and vice; those of the eighteenth century for their frivolity, cleverness, and want of depth. Can we wonder that the prevailing disposition of each age should have left its mark upon the heads and faces of the men who underwent its influence? That this was the case, is evidently the opinion of Leys. His 'Institution of the Order of the Golden Fleece,' and 'Publication of the Edict of Charles V., in 1550, introducing the Inquisition into the Netherlands,' show how wonderfully he has succeeded in that most difficult of undertakings, the absolute realisation of a scene in past history. It is difficult enough to imagine truly any contemporary event; and of course the difficulty increases fourfold when the personages represented had different thoughts and manners from our own. Robert Browning, in his dramas and dramatic pieces, does much what Leys does in painting, and often with equal success.

Very dissimilar from the careful productions of Leys are th

gorgeous and powerful paintings of Louis Gallait. Yet we must not be understood to mean that they are deficient in historical truth; but their truthfulness is obtained with less painful antiquarian research into the details of face and costume. Gallait's men and women might unquestionably, as regards their countenances, have belonged to the times he places them in; but they might also, without any great anachronism, be living now. Those of Leys would look as strange in the streets of London as any of the inhabitants of the antipodes. Of the paintings exhibited by the former, we prefer the 'Last Honours paid to Counts Egmont and Horn;' nor can we quite admit, with Mr. Palgrave, that it 'shows a display and sentiment verging on the melodramatic.' We agree with him when he admires Leys' pictures of the 'Founding of the Order' and 'Reading of the Edict,' because of the absence of all the excitement an inferior artist would have ostentatiously displayed; but he should recollect that men found an order, or even listen to the reading of a hateful edict, with very different feelings from those with which they look at the ghastly heads of the leaders they regarded as the champions of their country, unjustly cut down in the flower of their days. The men who looked unmoved on such a sight as that would never have striven through long, hopeless years against the king who, when he heard that his invincible Armada had been destroyed, thanked God for having given him the means of building another such. No wonder that, with such a history to paint, Flemish artists should turn to historical painting. We would specially remind our readers of the grand head of the noble who, hat in hand, sadly and sternly gazes at his old comrades; and the Spanish soldier in armour who stands scowling at the knot of sorrowing Flemings; and last, the thin, dark, clever Spaniard, looking half in scorn and half in wonder at their honest indignation, fingering his dagger the while. In him the government of the Low Countries has evidently an astute and observing servant, and one who will rise high in diplomatic service. Hardly, if at all, less satisfactory are the 'Last Moments of Count Egmont,' the 'Abdication of Charles V.,' and the 'Delilah.' The latter is, as far as we know, an original treatment of the subject: it represents the harlot at the moment when Samson had been dragged out of her tent, and when she is overwhelmed with shame and disgust at her own vile action. The ill-gotten gold, for which she had bartered

all that her conscience now tells her was worth having, lies spurned at her feet.

The historical art of Germany forms a striking contrast to that of Belgium. It is weak and exaggerated in the extreme; as Mr. Taylor very well observes, 'the personages strike attitudes, roll their eyes, and pucker up their brows, like bad actors.' What can possibly be worse than the apish, undignified attitude of F. Goune's 'Blondel in Search of his Master,' or the exaggerated melodramatic positions of Rustige's 'Countess of Rudolstadt threatening the Duke of Alva,' or of Schrader's wretched 'Lady Macbeth walking in her Sleep?' They look more like badly-arranged *tableaux vivants* than groups of persons in the full play of excited action and feeling. For the credit of Teutonic art, historic and dramatic, we must admit that it contains better things than these; but yet, with the exception of Piloty's 'Nero after the Burning of Rome,' to be presently mentioned, there was nothing that calls for particular notice. This picture, notwithstanding its many serious defects, must be excepted from the general condemnation. It is a much more genuine piece of work; and, though it may be true, as Mr. Taylor notes, that the grouping and composition are bad, that the lines of the picture do not lead the eye to the figure of Nero, and that we are left in anything but a pleasing state of uncertainty as to how the Christian martyrs in the foreground have come by their death; yet there is a ghastly force in that scene of charred and crumbling desolation that stamps it as a great picture. Unfortunately, the success of Germany in any other branch of the art is not such as to make us forget its deficiency in this; their religious art, as a rule, is equally bad, and their incident pictures and landscapes little better. Indeed, with the exception of Italy, there is no country represented in the Exhibition that did not show more life and vitality.*

The display of French and English historical art was much better. Paul Delaroche's 'Marie Antoinette' is a grand painting. The poor, worn woman, still proud and queenly, walks out of the infamous den, where, with scarcely even a semblance of the forms of justice, men were sentenced to death wholesale, and

* We should, however, note that Ussi's 'Expulsion of the Duke of Athens' will bear comparison with the best historical pictures in the Exhibition, and shows better promise for the future of Italian art.

whence few escaped. In her case, she had not only been accused of '*incivisme*,' or any of the other grotesque crimes for which men were condemned to die in that fearful time, but the most vile and filthy charges had been brought against her. She had been accused of leading her son, the Dauphin, into immorality, in order to undermine his strength of body and mind, and thereby keep him constantly in her leading-strings; and she had given that noble answer, 'I appeal to every mother in this assembly whether such a thing be possible.' After this cruel interrogatory, we see her slowly walking out of the lurid court,—a kind of dim hell in miniature,—the mob either excited with insane anger against the 'tyrant,' or here and there softened to pity by her sorrows and noble bearing. Mr. Elmore's two pictures of 'Marie Antoinette in the Temple,' and 'The Tuileries, June 20th, 1792,' are not quite equal to this; though we cannot consent to bestow on them such very faint praise as Mr. Palgrave, nor concur in his verdict, that 'the frightful beldame passion and impotent pride of the latter are hardly fit matters for art.' This, by the way, is a remark he is rather fond of making about any picture that appeals to any very strong feeling; as, for instance, when he says of Mr. Solomon's 'Waiting for the Verdict,' and 'Not Guilty,' that they show

'dramatic power and steady careful painting employed on a subject too painful for art. It is not that this suspense of agony, or revulsion to happiness, are in themselves inadmissible; but they far outrun the bounds of the mere incident style: they require the tragic earnestness of Hunt, or must be relieved by Hogarth's deep humour. Lacking these qualities, Solomon's work is only spirited melodrama.'

Now, with deference to Mr. Palgrave, we think this is rubbish. What is his complaint against the artist? That he far outruns the bounds of a style in which there is nothing to show he intended to confine himself? That he does not display humour in a scene where humour would be out of place, or that his name does not happen to be Hunt? These two pictures *are* painted with tragic earnestness, and with a truthfulness which quite redeems them from the charge of being melodramatic. And with regard to Mr. Elmore's work, what can be a better subject for art than a noble woman,—for she was that, notwithstanding all her faults,—by her queenly and undaunted demeanour in the midst of a crowd of men whom long oppression had goaded to madness, gaining the pity of one of the

women who had come to revile her? That crowd is a painful sight to look upon, certainly; but he must be made of very poor stuff who cannot occasionally bear to see something not altogether pleasing. That is mere sentimentalism. We should not care for a gallery filled with nothing but representations of the 'thorns of life,' any more than we would have all music to consist of dirges and funeral marches; but we cannot think it wrong to strike the more painful chord occasionally.

Neither can we go with Mr. Palgrave in what he says of Mr. Ward's 'Antechamber at Whitehall during the Dying Moments of Charles II.,' viz., 'that here we reach a meretriciousness of colour, and vulgarity of sentiment and character, (besides the slovenliness of handling,) which are only in too close accordance with the scene represented.' Now it does not seem to strike that gentleman, that a picture is not necessarily vulgar because it represents vulgar people; (else, where would poor Hogarth be?) that it is impossible to depict truthfully persons who dressed and decorated their rooms in a gaudy and tasteless manner, without introducing gaudiness and tastelessness into the picture; and, lastly, that it is a very questionable defect in a painting to be in accordance with the scene it represents. It may serve to show the different effect produced on two minds by the same object, and therefore the extreme difficulty, we had almost said impossibility, of obtaining an infallible test in art, when we say that this seems to *us* one of the most terrible and tragic paintings in the Exhibition,—pointing its moral with fearful force. Hardly less terrible, in fact, than Piloty's Nero, or Gerome's '*Ave, Cæsar Imperator, morituri te salutant.*' It is an awful scene, the dying king reaping the harvest of his profligacy and selfishness; his room surrounded by the worthless men, and still viler women, who had benefited by his easy bounty; and going down to his grave without causing one sign of pity or affection to rise on their painted faces. It is as powerful a sermon against heartlessness, and against the misery heartlessness brings, as can well be imagined. At the same time it must be admitted, that the charge of slovenliness of handling is well founded.

It would take a separate article to review thoroughly the illustrations to Shakspeare, which abounded in the English col-

lection. Their number is not to be wondered at: a dramatist's scenes are almost ready-made pictures; and when the dramatist is also England's greatest and best-known poet, 'with tears and laughter for all time,' it is natural that painters should vie with each other in giving their idea of what the great man intended. But the task is a very arduous one; as Mr. Palgrave remarks, 'nothing, perhaps, is so uncommon as a true illustration to good prose or poetry; the artist, painter, or sculptor, or musician, by some natural law, almost always (promising as such a class of subject may seem) sinks below his author.' Among those, however, who have not been successful in this line, we certainly cannot number Leslie: his exquisite and delicate wit and humour are admirably shown in the 'Scene from the Merry Wives of Windsor,' and 'Dinner at Page's House,' from the same play. The latter especially struck us with renewed and increased admiration every time we saw it. The group of Mrs. Ford, Mrs. Page, and Falstaff, should be specially noted; it is perfect. But, indeed, so are all the *dramatis personæ*; (for they are nearly all here, down to Bardolph with his fiery nose.) And here we may observe, *en passant*, what everybody knows, and cannot fail to admit, that no one has so thoroughly entered into the subtle, unboisterous wit of the elder humorists, such as Cervantes, Goldsmith, and Addison, as this charming artist. There is none of the noisy fun of *Pickwick* in him or in them, but wit of a far more ethereal and far higher kind. His mantle, since his death, has fallen upon the not unworthy shoulders of Mr. Marks, whose 'Dogberry's Charge to the Watch,' from *Much Ado about Nothing*, and 'Franciscan Sculptor and his Model,' show a fine and keen sense of the ludicrous. But, clever as both these undoubtedly are, we prefer 'The Jester's Text,' which he exhibited in this year's Academy. Mr. Palgrave admires Mr. Severn's 'Ophelia;' and condemns Cope's 'Othello relating his Adventures to Desdemona.' We should be inclined to reverse the judgment. Of the first, he says, 'that it is picturesquely arranged, and the figure pleasing and unaffected; but the passion of madness does not seem to be here.' With this latter clause we quite agree; the lady does not seem to be perfectly happy, but quite sane, and lies against a bank, with her arms extended, in what Mr. Palgrave must allow us to call, a 'melodramatic' position.

Instead of weaving the 'fantastic garlands' spoken of by the poet, she has confined herself to setting the 'long purples,' or foxgloves, in a row, leaning against the bank. A more ugly or prosaic arrangement of flowers it is hardly possible to imagine; and we cannot think so meanly of Shakspeare's beautiful creation as to suppose she should ever have resorted to one so tasteless. The colour, too, is dull and very unsatisfactory. A fine contrast to this is the 'Ophelia' of Mr. A. Hughes. It was, however, hung so high, that we fear most of our readers never even noticed it. She is here seen seated on the root of the willow, whose hoar leaves fall aslant the brook, with a tangle of wild flowers in her lap, which she is dropping, one by one, into the motionless and glassy water below; her arms and her whole body are thin, and worn with her sorrow and with the restlessness of her insanity; and there is a wonderful look of madness in the averted, fearful glance she throws at the flowers as she lets them fall into the stream. All over the horizon the mists of evening gather, like the mists that have overshadowed her young life,—both soon to resolve themselves, the one in night, the other in death. The beauty of the accessories, such as the trees, the bank, and the weed-covered water, is very great. We have, however, to note one defect, viz., that the arm she is holding out is too large and bony for the figure. With Mr. Palgrave's admiration for this painter we heartily agree. His 'Home from Work,' showing a labourer bending down to kiss his little child who is just going to bed, is a fine piece of manly, unaffected feeling, and would alone, even if we had no other instances to bring forward, disprove Mr. Tom Taylor's statement, 'that we may seek in vain among our own school, past or present, for men who show the peculiar sentiment for natural rustic poetry, of painters like Frere, Breton, or Henriette Brown.' Such names as Gainsborough in the past, and Faed, Webster, Hook, and Hughes, in the present, go far to disprove this statement. What more exquisite piece of rural poetry can the French school show, than the first-named painter's 'Girl with Pitcher?'

But, to resume our Shakspearean observations. There was a very fine picture of 'Lear and Cordelia,' by Mr. F. Madox Brown. Here, again, we agree with Mr. Palgrave in admiring the face and figure of the old king, as being a very good delinea-

tion of 'the sudden calm after the long agitation;' and also in thinking that the Cordelia is unsatisfactory. Maclise's 'Banquet Scene, Macbeth,' is a well-arranged picture, the eye being led at once to the central group formed by the black, transparent outline of Banquo's Ghost, the ghastly and terrified king, and the undaunted queen. She is a fine and commanding object, as she stands, reassuring the astonished nobles, and endeavouring to calm her husband,—evidently a woman who would dare and do anything. The last illustration to Shakspeare we shall mention is that marvellous piece of colour, and fine piece of expression, 'Valentine rescuing Silvia from Proteus,' being the last scene in the *Two Gentlemen of Verona*, by Mr. Holman Hunt. We would especially point to Silvia's face as truly representing that kind of stupor which follows the sudden deliverance from any great and imminent danger; and also to the instinctive way in which she clings to Valentine for protection. It is a great charm in this artist's work, that while he paints every accessory with such power and minuteness, he never forgets the 'human face divine.' To neglect this, as Mr. Millais so frequently does, is an unpardonable fault; for the face is unquestionably the noblest part of the noblest thing in creation, and its dignity should never be slighted. Here, notwithstanding all the care bestowed on the exquisite play of light, and on the gorgeous colours of the dresses, dead leaves, and tree-trunks, yet the four heads are quite as satisfactory. There are few men who can thus do everything, and everything well.

In one thing this Exhibition contrasted very favourably with the annual one of the Royal Academy,—the comparative absence of modern portraits. This, every one must admit, was a great advantage; for a 'Portrait of a Gentleman,' however interesting it may be to his own family circle, is not generally an attractive object to the public; and the Commissioners, or whoever else had the selection of the works to be shown here, acted most wisely in confining this branc of art to the smallest possible limits. This general mediocrity depends chiefly on the fact, that portrait painting is practically given up to a separate class of men, who either do not or cannot paint anything else, and make a mere trade of the whole matter. It was not thus that the great portraits of times past were painted. Titian, Raffaelle, and

Rembrandt are much better known for their works in other branches of the art than for their portraits, splendid as they are; and Vandyke, Velasques, Reynolds, and Gainsborough both could do and did other things besides. The imagination and penetrative insight required to produce a genuine portrait of a man or woman,—a portrait that shall be a real index to the soul within,—is such as few men possess; and to do the work adequately demands the great powers of a great man; for if the meanest human creature has in him much that even a Shakspeare does not know, and if, as Reynolds said, a painter cannot put more into a head than he has in his own, is it not evident, that the likeness of a great man should not be undertaken by any one who has not at the same time a large mind and great knowledge of human nature? Titian, before he began the portrait, always studied the man. We cannot go one by one through the fine collection of the works of Reynolds and Gainsborough. Their grace and beauty are inimitable; and though the ease and rapidity of the execution occasionally degenerate into slovenliness, yet the absence of effort is far from unpleasant. The loveliness of the beauties of that day is perfectly rendered; but both artists could paint men equally well; and it is, perhaps, a pity that some of the space was not given to more of the portraits of the contemporary worthies. And yet we do not know which we could have spared,—certainly not the arch beauty of innocent-looking Nelly O'Brien, to our minds the flower of the flock; nor pensive Nancy Parsons, nor the rival Duchesses of Devonshire, nor Viscountess Althorp, nor—nor, in short, any of them. But still the honest, manly face of Reynolds's Admiral Barrington makes us regret that we had not a few more men of the same stamp. The children are equally fine: who but Reynolds would have caught the demure primness of the expression which little Miss Price had evidently put on for the occasion? What need is there of repeating what everybody knows full well, that Gainsborough's 'Blue Boy' is a marvellous piece of rich colour? Hogarth's portraits of his wife, and of benevolent old Captain Coram, who established the Foundling Hospital, are the able, honest pieces of work we should have expected from that honest, genuine man, who hated shams as much as Mr. Carlyle himself. Mr. Watts's two portraits of Alfred Tennyson and Sir John Lawrence,

and Paul Delaroche's portrait of M. Emile Péreire, are instances of what portrait-painting is when it is not undertaken by a mere hack. Notwithstanding a certain heaviness and deadness of colour, we cannot forbear to express our approval of M. Hippolyte Flandrins' likenesses of Prince Napoleon and of the present Emperor: the former is chiefly remarkable for its resemblance to the founder of the dynasty; to the latter what higher praise can we give than that it brings vividly before us the great abilities of Napoleon III.,—all his duplicity and cunning, all his iron determination and resolve, and all the mystery in which he habitually shrouds his actions? How far can any one see into those unfathomable eyes? When we are in our graves, our children will be grateful for such a description of a man who has already played so prominent a part on the world's stage, and for whom the future has, perhaps, strange things in reserve. Another very fine portrait is that of 'Madame De C———,' by Louis Gustave Ricard. There are signs of great power for good or evil in that face, with its large, dark, impassioned eyes, very beautiful, to our thinking. If any one is of opinion that what we have said of the female face in the eighteenth century is not true, let him contrast Reynolds's and Gainsborough's faces with this, and we think we may predict that his doubts will vanish. Why, this woman, walking into a drawing-room of that period, would, we fancy, have produced much the same effect which reading Shelley or Mrs. Browning would have produced on Pope, and Carlyle or Kingsley on Addison. For Winterhalter, who apparently basks much in the sunshine of court favour, we can express no great amount of admiration.

The notice of the last three or four works leads us to make a general remark on the whole of the French collection; viz., that it does not seem to us to have been very well selected. In the first place, the restriction to pictures painted by living artists since 1850, and by deceased artists since 1840, necessarily limited the choice, and took away from the value of the display. In the second place, as the space at the disposal of the French Commissioners was by no means too large, they might easily have dispensed with some of the huge battle pieces and colossal scenes of allegory and history, and given us instead a few more of the paintings of such men as Ingres, or, notwith-

standing Mr. Palgrave's attack, Ary Scheffer, each of whom, by the bye, is represented in this parliament of art only by one picture. All this was, we think, a mistake. It is certainly fair to living men that they should have more space afforded them than the dead; but the restriction to works painted by them since 1850 seems unnecessary, not to say absurd. A man's work is still his work, whether done ten years ago or twenty. And as regards the battle pieces, they may have a certain value in the eyes of the French Government, as tending to keep up the military spirit of the nation; but on this side of the channel that tendency will scarcely be regarded as a recommendation; and few persons will find anything to interest them particularly in these acres of struggling men, and dust, and gunpowder. Mr. Tom Taylor, indeed, observes, that 'such art, at least, serves a public purpose,—aims at impressing and influencing crowds,—has a prouder function than that of adorning Mr. Grimes' cast-iron gallery at Edgbaston, or the drawing-room of Mr. Spindle's Palladian villa in the outskirts of Manchester.' But, like most sneers, this is only half convincing; for it is not at first sight quite apparent why it should be more noble to influence the gaping crowd who generally hurry through the long galleries of Versailles, than Messrs. Grimes and Spindle, who will see their pictures every day, and are therefore much more likely to let them find an entrance into their hearts. Here we may note what a great proportion of the French pictures were large in size, as compared with those of any other school: this springs from the constant demand kept up by the Government for decorative pictures to adorn its palaces or churches. In England there is scarcely any scope for artists in this style, the 'chief consumer' being the private individual, who, of course, has not room in his 'Palladian villa' (though he certainly might have in his 'cast-iron gallery') for works measuring some twenty feet by thirty.

The Dutch school is more conservative, and is more influenced by the traditions of the past than any of the others. The French and English have almost entirely abandoned the styles and methods that prevailed during the last century; but the Dutch still cling to the glories of their ancestors, and paint the same small, finished pictures that their fathers painted before them. Now, whatever may have been the defects of the old

school, (and it had many,) this good quality it at least possessed, that it was no insipid imitation of Italian art, but a vigorous outgrowth of the national mind; and this, when we remember what soulless copying the art of France and England was for so many years, is no small praise. In this the modern men have very sensibly followed in their fathers' steps; and, indeed, it may be noted, that where any school sets itself with loving aim to portray the real life, either in the present or the past, of the people among whom it exists, and the true character of the national scenery, there it is sure to be successful. For instances, take Holland, Belgium, Scandinavia, and England. But when, as in Germany or Italy, it affects to disdain such humble themes as the home life and the home country, it enters upon a course of ambitious weakness, leading to apparently unavoidable ruin. All kinds of scenery have their own beauties; or, as Wordsworth poetically expresses it, in speaking of the fen country round Cambridge, the earth is

> 'nowhere unembellish'd by some trace
> Of that first paradise whence man was driven;'

and the endless pastures dotted with cattle, quaint old houses, and lazy canals of Holland, with the constant haze resting on them, have a certain beauty which its painters do well to study lovingly. Besides this, the Dutch are a seafaring race,—once, indeed, they were England's not unsuccessful rivals,—and this opens to their painters all the vicissitudes of the great deep, and the glories of its 'many-flashing waters.' Such scenes as A. Mollinger's 'Landscape after a Shower of Rain,' and 'Heath, Drenthe,' A. Schelfhout's 'Landscape, Winter,' and W. Roelof's 'After Rain' and 'Dutch Landscape in Rain,' impress us at once with their truthfulness. The first, especially, is an exceedingly beautiful piece of painting, with its gleaming sky and long stretch of canal and meadow. It cannot be denied that J. Israel's 'Shipwrecked' is most impressive: the broken grey clouds of the sky fading into pale blue against the horizon, and the sad procession bearing the dead sailor up the sand dune, are very powerfully given; so is the almost heart-broken widow walking in the blankness of her utter despair a little in front, holding her orphan children by the hand, one of whom nestles up against her. It seems almost like criticizing the language of a prayer

sent up to God by a man in some great agony, to say anything about the merely technical qualities of a painting such as this; and yet, for the sake of giving a warning to one or two of the Dutch artists, who seem to be under the influence of a reaction, against the perhaps over-finish of their brethren, we will say that the great roughness in the execution takes away some of the pleasure we should otherwise have had in looking at this fine work. This is the dark side in the existence of those who 'go down to the sea in ships, and earn their bread on the great waters.' Mr. Hook gives us the bright reverse. The Dutch collection also contained some highly-finished architectural pictures, such as Springer's 'Town-Hall at the Hague,' and 'Great Church and Orphan-House, Leyden,' and Bosboom's 'Kitchen of a Monastery,' and many good specimens of what, in default of a better name, (for Mr. Palgrave's 'incident paintings' does not quite meet the case,) we must still call '*genre*' pictures. These have acquired refinement since the days of Teniers, and now represent drawing-room scenes instead of the drunken revels of boors.

The English range of landscape painting is, of course, much wider than the Dutch; for it is one among the many advantages Great Britain enjoys, that it contains every variety of scenery, from the bold rocks and hills of Wales and Scotland to the low meadow-flats of the fen country. Nor is there any aspect of nature in England so sublime as to daunt and terrify the artist, and make him fear to attempt, because failure is almost inevitable. The reader may smile at the apparent absurdity of thinking that the grandeur of the scenery in any country should act injuriously on its landscape painters; but yet an examination of the Swiss pictures seems to show that this is the case. Except in a few instances, such as Louis Mennet's 'Storm on the Lake of the four Cantons off the Grüttli,' and Charles Humbert's 'La Mare des Fontaines—Vaudois Alps,' and 'Cattle on the Pastures—Bornese Alps,' in which the gloom and mist coming down the valley are very finely rendered, they seem almost crushed beneath the weight of their 'great argument.' But various as are the aspects of nature in England, there is scarcely one which has not its devoted lover. Newton gives us the naked grandeur of the mountain, Bennet the rich foliage of park scenery, M'Callum the delicate intricacy of the trees in

winter and early spring, E. Warren the light-dotted gloom of the summer woods, the Linnells the rich glow of summer and autumn over the Surrey hills, Creswick the delicious coolness of the rippling lowland stream with its well-wooded banks, and David Cox many things, and everything well. And this is saying nothing of the men who, since the days of Prout, have devoted a great portion of their time to making us familiar with the aspects of other lands; as Roberts, who, we may almost say, has made the architecture of the world his study; Carl Haag, whose paintings of Greek and eastern scenes and temples are beyond praise; Dillon, who has made himself at home among the pyramids, and whose grand 'Colossal Pair—Thebes,' was here to challenge admiration; Rowbotham, who year by year sends us scenes from Italy; Cooke, whose home is on the water; and Clarkson Stanfield, who paints the sea as only one other man has painted it, and whose pictures of foreign towns and mountains show the same truthfulness and power. Lewis is scarcely a landscape painter, the landscape in his pictures being entirely subordinate to the figures and animals. For thoroughness of workmanship and perfection of detail, his eastern scenes are unrivalled; they are præ-Raffaelite in the best sense, without the mannerism and ugliness that disfigure so much of the work of the genuine members of the P.R.B.

But the man whom most Englishmen regard as the first landscape painter who ever lived,—the man who, in the course of his long, industrious career, tried everything, and in everything succeeded better than those who had made that one thing their special study,—was very inadequately represented in his oil-painting, and not thoroughly in his water-colours. This is a pity. The artist who is unquestionably the greatest of a nation standing *facile princeps* in this branch of the art, should have had more attention directed to his works, so that other nations might, at any rate, have seen what we consider the pinnacle of the art. But it somewhat mitigates our regret when we reflect that foreigners in general would not have understood, or cared to understand, him. He is not a painter to be appreciated at once, or until the eye has been properly educated in his service; and even in England it took some time before his real rank was recognised. Still, we might have given the foreigners the chance. And though it be true that they can see many of his glories at

the National Gallery and the South Kensington Museum, yet that is no reason why some of his less generally known paintings should not have been brought forth on this occasion. We are, of course, speaking of Turner. The four or five oil-colour pictures exhibited were all in his earlier manner, and done before he became the unrivalled colourist; but the 'Schaffhausen,' with all the sobriety of its hues, has that in the force and vitality of the leaping water which shows what the man was made of. Will those who think his merits exaggerated say, after having looked at the thirty or forty water-colour sketches in this water-colour gallery, that they have ever seen in any other painter's work such endless stretches of distance as in the 'Vales of Ashburnham' and 'of Heathfield,' and such colour as in the 'Heidelberg?' It is to be very deeply regretted that, owing to his own carelessness, many of his best pictures are quite losing their colour, so as even now to be scarcely more than the pale ghosts of what they were. We cannot agree with Mr. Taylor, that 'in many of Turner's later works all sense of the massiveness and nearness of earth is lost, the sky seems more compact and substantial than the buildings or the ground they stand on.' It is true that he seems gradually to have made the glories of the sky the chief aim of his art, and in the latter years of his life to have loved them better than anything else; but the epithet of 'substantial and compact' applied to the skies of the man who has best rendered the idea of almost infinite space, seems to us singularly inexact and inappropriate,—as inappropriate, indeed, as when Mr. Palgrave talks of Hogarth's '*demure* delight in the ludicrous,' or of Hook's feeling for the 'gladness and glory of our *blue* waters.' The painter of several scenes in the Rake's and Harlot's Progresses, of the 'Strolling Actresses,' and of the 'Beer Street and Gin Alley,' can scarcely be called demure; and we have never seen any sea of Hook's that was not so green as to be almost mistakeable for grass. Mr. Palgrave will perhaps say that these adjectives were used inadvertently; but a writer's adjectives are analogous to a painter's colours; and he who is so severe on any artist whose colour is not *true*, should have been specially careful of the *truth* of his language. Both infractions of the truth are equally objectionable.

We know we shall incur the charge of very serious heresy in saying, that there is to us something unsatisfactory in the fruit

and still-life of William Hunt, notwithstanding his marvellous colour. They are beautifully, we had almost said perfectly, done, and the imitation is complete; but they seem to us to have the defect which Mr. Palgrave, with great truth, objects against the landscapes of Mr. Brett, viz., of being too much a mere transcript of nature, or what a perfect photograph, capable of reproducing colour exactly, would give. In other words, we find them wanting in the evidence of human feeling, and in the signs that in coming to us they have been acted upon by another mind. The following remarks, made by Mr. Taylor, quite express what we think on the subject:—

'In landscape art proper this school (that of the præ-Raffaelites) may be studied, in its fullest development, in Mr. Brett's "Val D'Aosta." Here, as Mr. Ruskin complained at the time the picture was exhibited, though there is the most extraordinary study of the separate details, there is no sense of an impression in the painter's mind. His effort seems to have been to convert himself into a mirror of the scene. This effort, I believe, must end in failure for every man past the preliminary stages of studentship. The human mind can never, by playing the part of a mirror, produce anything recognisable as a reflection by other minds. The part of the mind in an artist's work is precisely to colour, modify, and in some sense recreate, the scene before it. When it does this, when it has completely made the scene its own, and, so to speak, set its seal of individual ownership upon it, then, and then only, its work will be recognised by other minds as faithful and worthy.'

All this seems to us true; and it is for this reason that we hesitate to adopt any theory, however attractive, that says there is an absolute standard in matters of art; for, if a true definition of art is 'nature reflected in the human mind and thence reproduced,' who can doubt that every man's mind is, at any rate in some respects, different from that of its fellows, and, consequently, that the same objects, reproduced by different minds, will be different? And if so, where is the infallible standard to be found?

Some of the Scandinavian landscapes were very good; as, for instance, Gude's 'Norwegian Forest,' and 'Norwegian Mountain Scenery,' and 'View of the Valley of Christiania,' and also Morton Müller's 'Norwegian Pine-Forest,' and 'Views at Trollhättan and Venern,' and several others. We cannot quite agree with Mr. Taylor that Sorensen's 'Early Morning off the Skaw' is the best of sea-painting in the whole Exhibition—not

while Stanfield's 'Abandoned,' with its heaving, storm-tortured ocean, and flying spray, is here to contradict him; but it is a fine work, nevertheless; the cold, glassy semi-transparency of the sea under a cold sky being excellently rendered. This is no 'idea of the sea evolved from the painter's own consciousness,' like that of one or two of our German friends,—as, notably, A. Achenbach's 'Sea-Piece,'—but a picture by a man who evidently knew what he was painting.

We have a single observation to make with reference to Mr. Palgrave's strictures on one of our landscape painters, and then we have done with this part of our subject. He accuses Mr. E. Warren of want of tenderness, and calls his favourite effect of sunlight falling through the breaks in a thick roof of trees, morbid and theatrical. Now it might with some truth have been urged against this artist's style, that it was much better adapted to oil than water-colour painting, and that his constant use of body-colour is hardly legitimate; also, that he has not sufficient breadth in dealing with distances, or with a long stretch of landscape. But Mr. Palgrave may convince himself, by going into the gloom of a thick wood on a bright summer day, that this effect of sunlight is a very common and a very beautiful one, and can, therefore,—being in accordance with nature,—hardly be called morbid and theatrical; he will see, further, that the nearest trees, the dead leaves lying on the ground, and the tangled tufts of underwood, will have very much the appearance Mr. E. Warren gives them. Of his works exhibited here, we prefer the 'In the Forest of Dean.' As to the word 'tenderness,' it is rather a cant expression of Mr. Palgrave and Mr. Ruskin, and we should like to have it more completely defined.

Considering that at one time religious art meant nearly all art, it is strange how little of it there was in these galleries. In one sense this is by no means a subject of regret; for if there are few things more calculated to 'give noble pleasure' than a really worthy religious painting, there are, on the other hand, few things more painful than a bad one. In other spheres it may be great to fail in great attempts; but in art, especially religious art, this maxim certainly does not hold good; for the greatness of the theme, and the strength and depth of the feeling appealed to, will not brook anything short of excellence. It is in the German and Austrian courts that we find most pictures of sacred

subjects; and, with a very few exceptions, such as Gustave Richter's 'Raising of Jairus's Daughter,' we cannot say that their Saints, Madonnas, and Holy Families, soulless imitations and dim reflections of works done by men who really felt what they painted, have any charms for us. In striking contrast with all this, were Paul Delaroche's three small pictures of the 'Virgin in Contemplation before the Crown of Thorns,' the 'Return from Calvary,' the 'Good Friday,' or even the 'Martyr in the Reign of Diocletian.' Of these the 'Good Friday' pleases us much the best; it brings before us a grief and terror-stricken group, looking out into the streets of Jerusalem, through which the Son of God is carrying a cross; the Virgin kneels in anguish and horror before the window; Mary Magdalen, as befits her weaker nature, lies prostrate on the ground, unable to endure the sight; the other women crouch about the further parts of the chamber; John, in his sorrow and dismay, scarcely dares to look out; Peter's attitude and clenched hand show that the desire of resistance, notwithstanding his Lord's rebuke, is not yet dead within him. This is a great and original work. Equally so is Mr. Holman Hunt's 'Light of the World,' respecting which Mr. Tom Taylor gives us dark hints, as if he could say some bitter things if he would. Well, after all, what could he say? We suppose, that the figure is too tall, and that it is the nature of light, whether in the form of a halo or any other, to diffuse itself, and throw its beams on surrounding objects. We confess we do not know what other objections he could make. The first of these remarks is, we think, founded; to the second, it may be answered, though not quite satisfactorily, that a halo is a thing of which so little is practically known, that the painter is at liberty to subject it to what laws he will. But, even admitting the force of these two objections, do they destroy the sad, yearning, loving look of that wonderful face, the great beauty of every detail, and the deep religious poetry of the whole scene? There is no face more difficult to conceive, and therefore to paint, than that of the God-Man; and, among the thousands of artists who have tried it, we do not remember one who has produced what is, to our minds, a more successful head than this. Mr. Tom Taylor's observations, indeed, cannot be looked upon as anything else than cowardly: he says, 'To those whom Mr. Hunt's imaginations and methods satisfy, it would be

utterly futile to give reasons for thinking differently; and the believers must, for the present at least, relinquish the hope to convert the unbelieving. The contest is one that posterity only can settle.' It is but seldom that a conviction is changed by mere argument; but that does not exonerate us from the duty of giving our adversary the reasons why we differ from him, especially if we have taken on us the office of critic. By a very similar piece of reasoning to Mr. Taylor's, it would be easy to show the uselessness of all criticism.

Mr. Palgrave is hardly fair to Herbert or Ary Scheffer. We are inclined to agree with him that there is a want of manliness in a great deal of their work, and that the colour of the latter is very far from good; yet we cannot concur in his wholesale condemnation. The 'Magdalen on her Way to the Sepulchre,' by the former, is very beautiful, and the clear, cold colour of early morning very well rendered. The face, with its look of sorrow and perplexity, almost amounting to doubt, is a very beautiful and intellectual one; truly a most noble head. This element of *doubt* has scarcely been sufficiently dwelt upon by the many painters who have treated scenes between the death and resurrection of our Lord; yet this must have been a time of fearful trial for the faith of the young Church, which scarcely yet understood the true mission of its Head. Herbert's two other pictures, 'A Magdalen,' and the 'Outcast of the People,' together with most of his water colours, were not favourable specimens, and we are quite prepared to give them over to the tender mercies of Mr. Palgrave. The one painting of Ary Scheffer is not a particularly favourite example of ours: we prefer the scenes from *Faust*, and several of his other works; but St. Augustine's head is not the weak one our critic would make it out to be: it shows intellectual power, as well as devotional feeling. We allude, of course, to the 'St. Augustine and St. Monica.' But there is one thing which this artist's men and women unquestionably possess, viz., souls. They bear signs of having within them something that holds communion with the infinite around, and that is not bounded by the world of things they see, and feel, and hear. It may be admitted that they are generally dreamers, and neither energetic nor self-reliant; but still they retain the excellence we have spoken of, and which is by no means to be despised. Of Mr. Dobson's and

Sir Charles Eastlake's religious pictures Mr. Palgrave says, with truth, that they are pretty, but weak.

In animal painting the continental schools run us hard, but cannot quite come up with us yet. Mademoiselle Rosa Bonheur's 'Ploughing in the Neighbourhood of Nevers' is characterized by all her usual vigour. Equally forcible is M. Troyon's 'Oxen going to the Plough.' To find equally powerful work in our own part of the gallery, it was necessary to go to Ward's 'Alderney Bull, Cow, and Calf,' and to his 'Boar;' but there can be no doubt that there we have found it. This is genuine animal painting,—real, downright, honest work,—and very superior to the over-smoothness of Cooper and the Belgian painter Verboeckhoven, though the gallery contained some very creditable specimens by both of them. Their works have great similarity in colour and treatment. Sir Edwin Landseer's art is totally different in kind; he does not so much aim at obtaining a literal transcript of the animal, as at getting into its mysterious mind, and showing the working of its instincts and affections. This, undoubtedly, is a very difficult and dangerous course, the painter being in constant danger of transferring the workings of his own mind into that of the brute. Nor has Landseer always sailed perfectly clear of this rock, as notably in his 'Diogenes and Alexander,' exhibited at the South Kensington Museum; unless, as we are inclined to think, some of his works are less studies of animals than satires of mankind, such satires as Swift has given us, except that the painter of the 'Shepherd's Chief Mourner' has a vein of tenderness and kindliness in his heart which quite separates him from the raging misanthropy and horrible bitterness of Swift. Of his works exhibited here, we prefer the 'Combat—Night,' and the 'Defeat—Morning;' these are exquisitely poetical pictures. In the first, we see the two 'antlered monarchs of the glen' locked in deadly struggle on the shores of a mountain tarn, whose waters are lashed into fury by a strong mist-laden breeze. In the second, the night and the storm have both fled together; the tarn is as smooth as glass; the light of the morning shines rosy and clear upon the hill-tops; but the two noble beasts lie side by side upon the rocks, dead; a fox prowls round their carcasses, and the birds gather above.

One of the many advantages derived from this international

collection, has been a knowledge of the satisfactory state of art in Norway, Denmark, and Sweden. We are free to confess we were not aware they could make such a display, or show such painters as Exner, H. Hansen, Sörensen in Denmark, Tidemand in Norway, and Hockert, Miss A. Landegren, and Nordenberg in Sweden. Of these, the greatest is undoubtedly Tidemand. He has really grappled with the life of his country, and given us revelations of its thoughts and feelings, which go home to our hearts at once. For his people are related to us by blood and faith, though the kinship is somewhat distant; we have no difficulty in understanding their strong, earnest faces, and appreciating their simple and deep-hearted character. Is not the old couple reading their Bible, in the 'Sunday Afternoon,' such a scene as might easily be found in many a cottage of old England? The 'Administration of the Sacrament to Cripples and Sick Persons in a Norwegian Hut,' is a fine and touching picture.

Equally fine is the 'Haugians.' It represents the meeting of a religious sect in Norway, which Mr. Taylor compares to the Primitive Methodists. The various feelings called forth on such an occasion are well depicted in the faces and attitudes of the several persons, from the young 'local preacher' who stands on the stool with the Bible in his hand, exhorting his fellow-religionists, down to the little urchin who leans against his mother with his hands in his pockets, fast asleep. The 'Farewell,' showing the parting of an old, bedridden peasant and his wife from their son and daughter-in-law, is a very beautiful work. The earnest beauty of the faces of Tidemand's peasant women is very remarkable; as, for instance, the woman who is supporting her son in the 'Sacrament,' the one who sits in deep religious thought in the 'Haugians,' and the one who is just preparing to depart in the 'Farewell.' The 'Catechisation by a Schoolmaster in a Norwegian Country Church,' shows the humorous side of the artist's mind. In this he is not so successful as in his serious pieces, only because his success in those is so great. His colour is not always as pure and clean as might be wished; but we willingly forgive any such defect, in consideration of the many new and pleasing emotions his pictures have aroused in our minds. Nordenberg's 'Celebration of the Lord's Supper in a Swedish Country Church,' and 'Collection of Tithes in

Scania,' are very good, and the latter most humorous. Equally so are J. J. Exner's 'Close of a Feast—Morning,' and 'Sunday Visit to Grandpapa—Island of Amach.' Altogether, we hope this is by no means the last time Scandinavia will afford us the opportunity of enjoying her artistic productions.

Among the painters who have given us scenes from English everyday life, Mr. Martineau deserves special commendation. His 'Last Day in the Old Home,' is a very noble and careful work; as Mr. Palgrave says, it is a novel, or at least a novelette, in colour. A 'fine young English gentleman' has just risen from the last dinner he is to take in the old mansion that has been in his family for generations; a betting-book, and several prints of the winners of the Derby, &c., to say nothing of certain peculiarities in his dress, sufficiently explain the reverse of fortune that renders his leaving the place necessary. In foolish bravado he tries to pass the matter off lightly, and holds up a glass of champagne; his son, a curious repetition of himself in face, figure, and attitude, does the same. His noble wife sits at the table, looking over advertisements of furnished lodgings, and sadly bends back towards him, either in the vain endeavour to draw his attention to more serious business, or to prevent his teaching the child to drink. His weeping mother is paying the auctioneer for some few articles, rendered dear by old associations, which she has purchased from him at a valuation. The many antique ornaments and articles of furniture scattered about the fine old room are ticketed with lots for the ensuing sale; and one of the auctioneer's assistants is busy taking some of them down in the passage. This is too often what children call 'a true story.' The colour and execution are excellent. Equally good is Mr. H. O'Neil's 'Eastward Ho!' It shows us the friends and relations of a party of soldiers coming down the side of the troop-ship, which is just about to sail for India. The officers and soldiers crowd round the steps, and about the bulwarks, to get a last look, and a last word, from their loved ones. A widow, who has just bid good-bye to her bonny boy, hides her face as she goes down, while her little daughter waves him back a half smiling, half tearful, farewell; a young officer kisses his lady-love as she leaves the deck; a sad soldier's wife is helped off the bottom step by a kind-hearted sailor; the ship's officer, whom long acquaintance

with such scenes has rendered callous, smokes his cigar in pompous dignity; but the gem of the whole is the woman coming down with the child on her right arm, who has stretched out her left to meet the hand her husband has extended over the bulwarks, so that they may feel one another's touch as long as possible, and who gazes up at him with such a look of unutterable love. This was one of the most touching pictures in the Exhibition. Let it be compared in thought with Mr. F. M. Brown's 'Last of England.' Mr. O'Neil's other picture of 'a Volunteer' preparing to leave a wreck and swim to shore, so as to establish a communication and save the passengers and crew, is not so satisfactory; he has not quite shown himself equal to the occasion. Mr. Faed is not very well represented; his 'First Break in the Family' has considerable merits, but is far inferior to the 'From Dawn to Sunset,' exhibited in last year's Academy.

And now that we have ended our necessarily brief and cursory observations, we wish to say a few words on the great profit and pleasure derived from such general gatherings of the art of Europe, and especially on the desirability of making them more frequent. The benefit is similar in kind to that derived from the display of the selected merchandise of the world in the other parts of the Exhibition; for no nation can stand aloof from its fellows either in literature, manufacture, science, or art, unless it consents to lag far behind them in the race. Providence has wisely bestowed different gifts on all, in art as in other things, and it is a pity if each does not profit by the various excellences of the others. There are thousands of persons who are unable, from want of time or means, to travel for the purpose of studying the art of the various countries, and who yet take great and beneficial interest in it. Would it not be possible to have an art exhibition in London oftener than once in eleven years? This suggestion is the more worthy of being considered, if, as now seems but too probable, the present international display will not be repeated at the expiration of that period. For it is understood that an opinion prevails very generally among the manufacturers that, considering the exhibitions at Paris and elsewhere, one every eleven years in London would be too much; and that, if they are so multiplied, the advantages

derived from them will not compensate for the loss of time and trouble involved. But the same objections do not lie against an international art exhibition; and we certainly think it would be very desirable if one could be instituted every five years. To this it may be said, that our own art is very adequately represented in the annual exhibitions of the Royal Academy, water-colour societies, &c.; and that foreign art is, to a certain extent, represented in the rooms of the French Exhibition in Pall Mall. But the latter, as its name implies, is confined nearly entirely to the works of French, and occasionally Belgian, painters; and even they scarcely do more than send a few of their pictures which they wish to dispose of in this country: and, as regards the former, it would certainly be a public benefit if the owners of the best works painted in the course of the five preceding years could spare them to be seen once more after they had left the walls of the Academy and the other galleries. Now they are seen and admired by many for a few summer months, and then go into comparative oblivion, or, at any rate, retirement. If this could be done, with what pleasure should we not welcome our old favourites! Of course there can be no doubt that any such scheme presents great difficulties: many of the artists and owners of pictures might scarcely deem it worth their while to incur the risk, trouble, and expense attending on the transport of their property to a distant country; though, as the English are by no means niggardly in their dealings with art, it might even, in a pecuniary point of view, be to their advantage to have the opportunity of publicly exhibiting in London. Again it might be urged, that an exhibition of art alone would not be sufficiently attractive to draw the necessary number of spectators to insure the payment of the expense. But the remembrance of Manchester rises to contradict any such objection. We hope, therefore, that the difficulties, whatsoever they may be, will be surmounted, and that we shall have another International Exhibition of Art, before the very problematical period when we may again expect to see the world's industry collected under one roof.

ART. III.—*St. Clement's Eve.* A Play. By HENRY TAYLOR, Author of 'Philip van Artevelde.' London. 1862.

IT is a duty, as well as a pleasure, to welcome the re-appearance of such an author as Mr. Henry Taylor. A generation of hurried readers has given rise to a world of hasty writing, and the higher qualities of composition are in danger of being fatally discouraged. We suppose it is of no use quarrelling with the law of supply and demand, as it operates in literature and art. Nor is it altogether an evil; for the stimulus of competition has certainly raised the quality of regular professional writing. Yet it *is* refreshing by way of change to meet with a book which does not owe its existence to the inspirations of trade,—which comes with evidences of loving care in every part of its composition,—which reminds one gracefully of the old classic literature of our country, and breathes in every line the spirit of a pure and cultivated taste. Such a book is that which lies before us in the shape of a new drama from the pen of Henry Taylor. It is full of quiet beauties as a work of art, and offers many quaint pictures of an early epoch of the history of France. There is little in the volume to make it popular, and the poetic connoisseur must have a rare appreciation who enters into all its nice and scholarly merits. It is not a picture of the school of Delaroche,—the signature of genius is not so distinctly marked, and the impression of the whole is far less deep. Neither is this play eminently dramatic: it is rather a succession of scenes linked skilfully together, and distinguished more by truth of detail than by force or unity of conception. Hence a first perusal is not attended by any very striking effect; but a second is sure to be rewarded by delicate traits of character showing with more distinctness, and noble sentiments couched in pure Saxon phrase.

The scene of Mr. Taylor's new drama is laid in the capital of France, and its action passes in the eighth year of the fifteenth century. The citizens of Paris were then a turbulent and superstitious people, divided into factions, but for the most part loyally attached to the person of their afflicted Sovereign, Charles VI. It was the misfortune of Charles to suffer fits of

mental alienation; but this misfortune was not without a mitigating circumstance, since it relieved him in the eyes of his subjects 'from all responsibility for their sufferings,—showing how deprivation of power in a Sovereign may tend to enhance, rather than abate, the love and reverence of the people.' In the intervals of his attacks he was not unmindful of his royal duties, but evinced a real sympathy with the citizens in their own sufferings. His brother Louis, Duke of Orleans, may be considered the principal personage or hero of this dramatic poem; —in his character the reader is most interested, and the issues of the play turn upon his fortunes. Louis is no faultless hero, but magnanimity is among his saving virtues; while the Duke of Burgundy, his cousin and his rival, has no great quality to redeem the vices of his character. In his delineation of these princes, our author adheres with sufficient closeness to historical tradition, and well it serves the purpose of his dramatic chronicle.

The incident on which the story turns is very slight, but characteristic of that age of violence. The Bastard of Montargis, a principal follower of the Duke of Burgundy, plans the forcible abduction of Iolande de Remy, a pupil in a convent of Celestines, founded by the Duke of Orleans. In this design he is foiled by the founder and patron himself, who conceives a pure and exalted passion for Iolande, that promises to draw him from the errors of a reckless youth. But the Bastard of Montargis has vowed the Duke's destruction. With that object he would fain revive the personal feud of Orleans and Burgundy, whose reconciliation is only of recent date, though apparently sincere. The amity of the royal cousins is not, however, easily disturbed, till Montargis inflames the jealousy of his chief by secretly conveying a portrait of his Duchess into Orleans' private chamber, and as secretly revealing it to the enraged husband. Burgundy vows to avenge the insult by the immediate death of his cousin, and reluctantly remits the task of vengeance from his own hand to that of his ready follower. In the meantime the fate of the Duke of Orleans becomes nearly involved with that of Iolande de Remy. The Duke is tenderly attached to the King, his brother, for whose mental affliction every remedy has been sought in vain; and now his fraternal zeal is seconded by the new affection that inspires him. According to

the superstition of the time, it is thought that if a maid of saintly and unsullied purity, bearing that most precious relic of the Convent, the tears of St. Mary Magdalene,—

> 'Shed as she stood before the tomb of Christ,
> Ere Christ appeared,—

shall solemnly exorcise the evil spirits that molest the King, his malady will cease from that time forth. In humble but enthusiastic trust, the youthful Iolande performs this function; it signally fails in the desired effect,—the King's malady returns in violence upon him, and he bids them take away his sword. The Duke of Orleans and his *protégée* have now a common danger. The former has given a handle to his enemies, and both are exposed to the indignation of the populace. The sacred relics of St. Magdalene are thought to be profaned; and Iolande de Remy is pronounced a sorceress. While the Council signs the warrant for the death by fire of the unfortunate maid, the Duke of Orleans hastens to her defence; but the Bastard of Montargis intercepts his steps, and stabs him in the dark,—his own squire, De Vezelay, arriving too late to save him, and only in time to bear his fainting person to the convent of the Celestines. There the last scene discloses the body of the Duke, watched by the kneeling form of Iolande; she starts up on the bleeding of the wound afresh, and the entry of the murderer, Montargis, who receives his quittance at the hand of Vezelay. Meantime the howling populace demand the life of the sorceress who has bewitched their King; Iolande throws wide the window; an arrow from the crowd pierces her bosom; she falls, and, with some words of pious resignation, dies. All this occurs on St. Clement's Eve,—a time that had long been ominously foreboded by the House of Orleans.

Such is the mere outline of Mr. Taylor's dramatic poem; and with him (as we have intimated) it is more emphatically true that the detail and the shading are all in all. Even the beauties are of that chaste and equable description, that makes it difficult to convey any adequate idea of the author's style by means of short quotations. Sweetness and nobleness are diffused throughout the whole; not lavished in passages of sudden greatness, but showing tenderly in every line and phrase. We read the poem as we walk a flowery meadow,—a

blossom lurks at every step, and beauty and fragrance are the very path we tread. Much of the delicate humour and by-play reminds us of the Shakspearean comedy; the lyrics have the same delightful *naïveté*. The verses of the court-fool (p. 48) are a good specimen of motley wit and wisdom, after the same exquisite model. Yet we like Mr. Taylor best in his serious and moral mood. His style is hardly flexible enough for the play of jest and merriment; and, indeed, it is somewhat too frigid and scholastic for most dramatic purposes; but when the occasion calls for high-toned sentiment, for the expression of fervid or exalted passion working itself clear of all unworthiness, his genius rises into its proper element, and vindicates the eternal beauty of virtue and religion. The interview between the Duke of Orleans and Iolande de Remy, to which the former is admitted *incognito* by the Abbess of the Celestines, is an occasion of this kind, and is happily improved by our author. We may quote a part of it for the reader's gratification:—

'DUKE OF ORLEANS. Once in a midnight march—'twas when the war
With Brittany broke out—tired with the din
And tumult of the host, I left the road,
And in the distant cloisters of a wood
Dismounted and sat down. The untroubled moon
Kept thro' the silent skies a cloudless course,
And kissed and hallowed with her tender light
Young leaf and mossy trunk, and on the sward
Black shadows slumbered softly, counterchanged
With silver bars. Majestic and serene,
I said, is Nature's night, and what is Man's?
Then from the secret heart of some recess
Gushed the sweet nocturns of that serious bird
Whose love-note never sleeps. With glad surprise
Her music thrilled the bosom of the wood,
And, like an angel's message, entered mine.
Why wander back my thoughts to that night march?
Can you divine? or must I tell you why?
The world without and world within this precinct
Are to my heart, the one the hurrying march,
With riot, outrage, ribaldry, and noise,
Insulting Night; the other, deep repose,
That listens only to a love-taught song,
And throbs with gentlest joy.

IOLANDE. What march was that?
Said you the Breton War? You followed then
The banner of the Founder of this House,
His Grace of Orleans. He is brave, they say,

But wild of life, and though abounding oft
In works of grace and penitence, yet as oft
Passing to sin, and dangerous even to those
His bounty sheltered.

DUKE OF ORLEANS. By his enemies
All this is said, and more. Are you, then, one?

IOLANDE. Nay; I know nothing but the gossiping tales
That flit like bats about these convent walls,
Where twilight reigns. Gladly would I believe
Our Founder faultless, if I might; but you,
Living in courts and camps, must know him well.

DUKE OF ORLEANS. He is not faultless.

IOLANDE. Are his faults as grave
As tattling tongues relate?

DUKE OF ORLEANS. They 're grave enough.

IOLANDE. Are you, then, to be numbered in the file
Of the Duke's enemies?

DUKE OF ORLEANS. Indeed I am.
No one hath hurt him more.

IOLANDE. What is your name?
The Abbess vows—what I but scantily credit—
She knows it not. May I not know it? No?
She says you are of credit with the Court,
And hope, through certain ministries of ours
With holy relics, to restore to health
One whom the Founder hath in high regard.

DUKE OF ORLEANS. Soon will you know mine errand and my name;
My name too soon for me. It is well known
To calumny. When told it, will you fly,
And banish me your presence?

IOLANDE. Never. No;
If calumny assail you, much the more
Be gratitude intent to do you right.
That you are true, and generous, and brave,
Not all the falsehood which the world can forge
Shall sunder from my faith.

DUKE OF ORLEANS. Yet is there more;
I said that calumny had soiled my name,
Which is a truth. But bitterer truth 's behind.
My life deserves not that my name stand clear;
I claim but to be true; save loyalty,
Few gifts of grace are mine.

IOLANDE. But you are young,
And you will grow in grace.

DUKE OF ORLEANS. It should be so;
But hardly may I dare to say it will.
I came upon a holy errand hither;
Yet something but half holy in my heart
Detains my tongue from telling it.

IOLANDE. Your words
Are strangely dark. I guess not what you mean,
And almost fear to ask. I know but little,
Yet know that there are dangers in the world
I have but heard of. May I trust in you?
Oh, that 't were possible to trust in you
With boundless and inalterable faith!
Oh, that 't were possible to cast my soul
On you as on the pillar of its strength!
But you, too, you are weak; you say you are;
And only God is strong, and in His strength,
And in none other strength, may strength be found;
And in His love, and in none other love,
His child may win an unbewildering love,—
Love without danger, measureless content.
Leave her to seek it there.'

Here we must pause, though the scene advances in interest. The duke reveals the existence of a tie which forbids his most cherished wishes, and Iolande breaks into a passionate rebuke of his presumption, and begins in earnest to quell down every sentiment of tenderness in her own breast.

One of the most interesting characters in this volume is that of Robert the Hermit. He seems to be intended to represent the better aspect of religion in that age of superstition; and the pure enthusiasm which animates both him and Iolande de Remy affords a fine contrast to the gross delusions of the people and the cruel frauds of the monks. Robert is, of course, not free from superstition; he looks for the happiest results from the application of the tears of St. Magdalene, and urges this duty on the reluctant maiden. When the occasion arrives, he invokes the blessing of Heaven in strains of great beauty. These are too long to quote; but we may find space for the brief and passionate apostrophe which he addresses to the sainted Magdalene:—

'O thou
Redeem'd from sinful love by love Divine,
Who, weeping in the darkness nigh the tomb,
Wast by the angels bidden not to mourn,
For Christ was risen, which heard thou went'st thy way
With fear and with great joy,—teach us to weep
In such wise that great joy may come through tears,
Knowing Him risen: thou debtor unto whom
Love brought forgiveness and forgiveness love,
Redounding each to other, ask for us

That love and pardon our great debt demands:
Thou who with tears didst wash the feet of Christ,
Wash them again with tears, wash them again
With tears of intercession for the sins
Of God's afflicted servant, Charles of France.'

The issue of this pious conjuration, as already intimated, is not favourable. The King almost immediately suffers a relapse; the evil spirit returns with sevenfold violence, and the people are roused both to anger and compassion. From this time Iolande loses something of her confidence in the mercy and acceptance of Heaven, and might be an easy prey to temptation through despair. The Duke of Orleans has extorted the promise of another interview, and takes the opportunity to urge her flight with him. Perhaps such a proposition was only too natural under the circumstances,—only too consistent with the temper of the royal lover, attracted rather than converted by a loftier form of excellence in the object of his love. Yet not less certainly it grievously assoils the hero's fame; it tends to lower the crest of his pretensions, and shows him to have belonged (as our author in his preface says of the Duke's historic prototype) to a chivalry that was neither virtuous nor stainless. The scene has at least the warrant of dramatic propriety. Nor is morality left unvindicated in the end. The lover's error is momentary and the reparation prompt. The pitiful appeal of Iolande recalls his knightly spirit;—then the alarm suddenly occurs, Iolande is driven to sanctuary, and the mercy of death speedily divides them for ever.

Such are the incidents and moral of this elegant performance. We cannot claim for it the high place and comprehensive merits of *Philip van Artevelde;* it lacks the force which distinguishes at least one of the characters in *Edwin the Fair;* but it has many of the attractive qualities of both these dramas, and shows perhaps a superior exercise of art to either. The action is conducted with great skill, and brought to a sad inevitable close. The principal characters have individuality, though not very strongly marked; and the whole piece is in admirable keeping as a picture of the state of Paris in the troubled morning of the fifteenth century. Of its poetic quality the reader may form his own opinion even from the brief extracts we have made. Those familiar with the dramatic compositions

of Mr. Taylor will recognise his peculiar dignity of language, and the noble though somewhat laboured style of his blank verse. It is worthy of notice that our author's most characteristic merit is inseparable from an equally characteristic defect; for the one arises out of the other. His uniformity of polish and unfailing purity of sentiment have the effect of monotone and mannerism; and the moral strength of the poet cannot entirely compensate the weakness and deficiency of the dramatist. Yet the lovers of Mr. Taylor's writings—and they are an increasing number—find a charm in this very constancy of manner, and even in this elaborate and formal speech. They are pleased to hear the same fine strains of moralizing from the lips of Comnenus and of Artevelde, and renew their pleasure when the same pure notes dwell for a moment in the pleading voice of Orleans. The enjoyment they derive is identical with that which is yielded by his thoughtful minor poems, and especially by the lines which so beautifully commemorate the virtues of his friend young Villiers.

The truth is, that the genius of Mr. Taylor is not dramatic. The soil of his invention is naturally poor; and only by good tilth and husbandry,—by careful intellectual culture turning the accretions of knowledge and experience to best account,—has he at all succeeded in giving variety and character to so many as five dramatic pieces. We would recommend him to be satisfied with the measure of success he has attained in this department, and in the future to cast the products of his refined and thoughtful intellect in other forms. His muse is essentially lyrical; and so long and so far as poetry retains his loving service, we hope to be regaled from time to time with measures of ode and song, bars of melodious wisdom, resembling the happiest strains which parted the lips of Wordsworth. But there is another walk of literature to which we would preferably invite our author. The intellect of Mr. Taylor is so reflective and philosophical, that its maturest efforts should rather be devoted to enriching the stock of classic English prose. This is not with him a novel and untried department. Among his earliest publications is a little volume entitled, *The Statesman*. It contains maxims and rules for the guidance of those who enter upon public or official life; and though its scope and purpose have not been well appreciated, and though its author

would probably now pronounce it an inadequate exponent of his views, and modify the claim suggested by its title, we cannot but deem it the most pithy and sententious production of its class which has appeared since the date of Bacon's *Essays*. This manual of administrative wisdom is now extremely rare. Better known to the reading world, and more interesting to society at large, is another prose production of our author, *Notes on Life*. Both in matter and style, the book is nearly perfect. The Essay on Choice in Marriage is eminently beautiful; that on the Life Poetic is a fine example of elegant and 'numerous' prose. The volume consists of little more than a hundred pages, and may be purchased for a single florin; yet no production of our day is more truly classical, and none more likely to become a favourite in the future. It may be winnowed by the fan of criticism without yielding a pellicle of chaff; and only too small is the heap of golden grain.

Mr. Taylor has been silent now for many years. We cannot accept *St. Clement's Eve* as the only tribute of his genius for so long a term. We indulge the hope that some superior flight of his muse,—or, better still, some more important fruit of his philosophy, of which the works last mentioned may be considered foretastes,—has already advanced towards perfection in his studious retirement. We long to welcome from his hand a work that shall rebuke the heartless sciolism of the present age, and remain a worthy monument of his own disciplined and thoughtful powers.

ART. IV.—*The British Association for the Advancement of Science at Cambridge.*

THE recent Meeting of the British Association for the Advancement of Science at Cambridge was neither its first nor its most enthusiastic one in that University town. In 1833, when the organization of the Association was scarcely completed, it met under the shadow of the same colleges, and it was there that its first-fruits were gathered in the results of experiments instituted expressly at its request. But how many who sat in the Senate House on that occasion, and listened to Sedgwick's brilliant speech, have gone hence; some leaving no name, others leaving names yet remembered, and held in the highest honour! No longer will Buckland explore stone quarries, and preach geology in Westminster Abbey; no longer will De La Beche plan geological surveys, and busy himself with his 'Geological Observer.' And how many others who gave or received instruction in that first meeting, and who heard from Malibran, in the University church, those strains which still ring in the memory of all who listened to them, were absent from this second meeting! But Science dies not with the philosopher; it even gathers new life out of the decay of old themes, becomes young again in new and ardent inquirers, and with renewed energies, and an almost immortal youth, regards the lapse of nearly twenty years as only a fleeting shadow upon the great dial of Knowledge.

It was at Cambridge, and at the Meeting of 1833, that one of the chief literary ornaments of that University, the Master of Trinity, directed attention to the subject of the tide-wave. He there explained that the great wave which initiates the tidal movements took a course which might be accurately observed, and the time noted at which it reached particular stations. He there first demanded for these observations pecuniary grants, which have now reached the sum of £1,800, and by the aid of which the course of the tide-wave has been determined in relation to the coasts of Europe, of the Atlantic, of the United States, of New Zealand, and of the East Coast of Australia. To enlarge and complete the observations then begun, a special vessel is required; and no doubt the influence of the Association will soon secure a ship and a competent crew. Meanwhile the indefatigable Dr. Whewell

still lives and labours; and what he has accomplished in science and literature since the first meeting at Cambridge is indeed memorable for one man. He has given to the public the results of ample explorations on the history of science and philosophy; he has discussed the habitability of other and higher worlds; he has conversed deeply with Plato, and enabled the English reader to do the same; he has, moreover, expatiated in the field of ethics, and issued *Elements of Morality* and *Lectures on Systematic Morality*. No principal department of inquiry seems to be strange to him. As a most accomplished and versatile philosopher, no name at the late meeting stood higher, and none commanded more respect. He was honoured in his own field of triumph, and crowned with heartily bestowed laurels.

That the late meeting of the Association was, on the whole, a scientifically interesting one, must be acknowledged, and at least in some of the sections important and instructive papers were read. It was, perhaps, in the discussions that an absence of animation was chiefly felt. Undoubtedly the most energetic, indeed almost angry, discussion took place in the section for Zoology and Physiology, when Professor Owen had read his paper 'On the Zoological Significance of the Brain and Limb Characters of Man, with Remarks on the Cast of the Brain of the Gorilla.' The Professor exhibited two casts, one being the human brain, which had been hardened in spirits and therefore not preserved in its original form, although sufficiently illustrative; the other being a cast taken from the interior of the cranium of the gorilla. He contended that, by examining these casts, the difference between the brain of man and that of monkeys was at once perceptible. In the brain of man, the posterior lobes of the cerebrum overlapped to a considerable extent; whereas, in the gorilla the posterior lobes of the cerebrum did not project beyond the lobes of the cerebellum. In the one, the posterior lobes were marked and prominent; in the other they are deficient. He felt persuaded, from a very prolonged investigation into the characters of animals, that the characters of the brain are the most steadfast; and he had been induced, after many years of study, to propose his classification of the mammalia, which was based upon the development of their brain structure. Man had been placed by him in a distinct sub-kingdom, (which he had named Archancephala,) owing to the prominence of the

posterior lobes of his brain, the existence of a posterior *cornu* in the lateral venticles, and the presence of the *hippocampus minor* in the posterior *cornu*. These distinctions between the brain of man and of the other members of the mammalia were very marked, and the rise in them was a very abrupt one. Thus man was elevated from the sub-kingdom to which the monkeys belonged, and placed by himself in a distinct sub-kingdom.

Such, in brief, were the statements of the physiologist who has been called the British Cuvier; and they were but repetitions of formerly-announced views. They might in this form be regarded as a challenge to other physiologists; and accordingly they were instantly seized upon by the president of the section, Professor Huxley. This accomplished physiologist is the vigilant, bold, and open opponent of Professor Owen. There has long existed a rivalry between them which the public generally little suspected, even perhaps little heeded; in scientific circles, however, it has often been the subject of remark, and either of amusement or disapprobation. Huxley is much the younger man; and is thought by his friends to represent advanced views. Owen stands upon his broad and stable reputation; but he is neither easy in private under the vigilance of his rival, nor indifferent to it in public. He evidently feels that he must look to his laurels, although they are green and ample. Huxley has a higher reputation to make; and a successful attack upon Owen would be a decided step in advance. Here there was another opportunity of assailing his rival, and he did not refrain from using it.

He declared that the paper of Professor Owen failed to represent the real nature of the problem under discussion. The question was partly one of facts, and partly one of reasoning. The question of facts was, What are the structural differences between man and the higher apes? The question of reasoning, What is the systematic value of those differences? As to the facts, he adverted to the controversy which had existed for several years between himself and Professor Owen, in which the latter had repeatedly asserted and reiterated, as facts, differences which he, the speaker, had as repeatedly denied to be facts. He himself had affirmed, that the three structures named by Professor Owen as distinctive of man, not only existed also in the apes, but were even better developed in all the higher apes

than in man. He now appealed to the anatomists present to say, whether the universal voice of Continental and British anatomists had not entirely borne out his own statements, and refuted those of Professor Owen. He adverted, also, to affirmed differences in the relations of the feet of man and those of the apes; and concluded by expressing his opinion of the futility of all such discussions, seeing that the differences between man and the lower animals are not to be expressed by his brain or his toes, but by moral and intellectual qualities.

This view was ably supported by Professor Rolleston, who affirmed that the discoveries of foreign anatomists on the brain had been ignored in the present discussion. A careful anatomical study of the brain had established four great distinctions between that of man and that of the ape. Two of these related to form, and the other two to quantity. In quantity we mark the great absolute weight, and the great absolute height, of the human brain. In form there were the frontal lobes in man, corresponding to what is popularly called the 'forehead;' and this was a fair exponent of man's intelligence. This professor imputed blame to Professor Owen for not mentioning these facts, and expressed himself with some vehemence, for which he afterwards apologised; yet adding another sting, even in his apology, by observing, that 'he felt there were things less excusable than vehemence; and that the laws of ethics, and the love of truth, were things higher and better than the rules of etiquette or decorous reticence.'

Others followed on the same side; and the *hippocampus minor* came up so prominently, that it might have passed from a minor to a major. Animation increased, 'decorous reticence' was at an end; and all parties enjoyed the scene except the disputants. Surely apes were never before so honoured, as to be the theme of the warmest discussion in one of the two principal University towns of England. Strange sight was this, that three or four most accomplished anatomists were contending against each other like so many gorillas; and either reducing man to a monkey, or elevating the monkey to the man!

In one respect, Professor Huxley advanced a great truth, and a truth which really deprives the whole discussion of much

significance; viz., that the differences between apes and men are mainly moral and intellectual. That they are principally such is unquestionable, even though there are decided cerebral distinctions both morphological and quantitative. We are deceived by *exterior* resemblances between men and monkeys; for man *interiorly* is as immeasurably above the ape, as the ape is above the worm. Let material distinctions be dismissed:—the mind, the soul, the grand mystery of thought, the airy magic of fancy, the boundless range of imagination,—these are the true and noble distinctions of the human being. These are marked and majestic, above all possibility of mere physical distinctions. The sense of 'after and before,' the consciousness of self, the large power of reason and discourse, the capability of mutual and mental communication with our fellow-men, the gift of speech, and the apprehension of its melodies, and its infinite resources,—in fact, all that is sublime and noble, all that is great and godlike,—those rays of heavenly glory that brighten and burst even through the thick darkness of a sin-clouded soul,—compose a total of distinctiveness that throws physical similitude entirely out of consideration.

To derive, by any kind or degree of development, a man from an ape, is to derive light from darkness. The gulf between the two is impassable by any theory of development. The most improbable of all improbabilities is, that a Darwin should be developed out of a gorilla. No lapse of centuries, no fineness of continually-approximating gradations, no conceivable progressive improvements of species by 'Natural Selection,' no imaginable accumulation of small differences by a natural optimism, can bridge over the broad, deep, and full river that flows between the human race and its mimics. In man we have everything that could exhibit the strongest mental and moral contrasts between himself and the inferior mammalia. That soaring elasticity of spirit, which neither ignorance nor misfortune can hopelessly depress; that original nobility of nature which even mortal sin has not wholly obliterated; that mysterious confidence in the dawning of a life beyond the grave, of responsibility beyond the judgments of this world, of an imperishable principle of existence of which no power without, and no decay within, can deprive him, of an immeasurable duration of

either bliss or woe,—these are the glorious yet tremendous prerogatives of a creature who may indeed discern his exterior mirrored or mimicked in the theatre of animated nature; who can even turn his own knowledge into a weapon for attempting to destroy his own distinctions; but who, despite his wilfulness, and perils, and sin, cannot discover any living thing around him that possesses his own mental gifts,—that feels and fears, hopes and looks forward, dies and yet is deathless like himself!

If, in passing away from this topic, we may be allowed for a moment to pass also from the grave to the gay, we would add another distinction between man and the monkeys. Man alone is a *ballooning animal*. No known ape ever yet aimed to ascend higher than the top of a tree; and the ape only reaches that small elevation by the aid of hands and feet. A balloon has never entered his head; nor has he ever entered a balloon. The most sensible gorilla would decline the honour of even his patron Mr. Darwin's company, in a car bound for the skies.

Man is not only a ballooning animal, but also progressively such. After all the ascents of Lunardi, Gay Lussac, our own Green, and many others, there comes in our day, and before this meeting of the British Association, a philosopher who outvies and overtops them all. '*Excelsior*' has been Mr. Glaisher's motto; and he has truly verified its meaning. If the physiologists had the warmest words, Mr. Glaisher has soared into the coldest regions. That enterprising meteorologist has made no less than eight scientific balloon ascents, and with the greatest advantage to the science he professes. In fact, the balloon, in place of a huge toy, has now become a philosophical instrument; and its application to higher purposes has been shown to keep pace with its ascension to higher regions. By no other means could science rise above those distracting influences which affect all experiments near the surface of the earth; where are felt all the consequences of radiation, conduction, and the reflection of heat, and of currents of air, with many other influences of a similar character. In the aërial regions, these causes of disturbance are escaped; but the doubt was, whether an aëronaut could make the required observations with comfort and safety to himself at great elevations. There was

the strongest inducement to make the trial; not only meteorology, but all the allied sciences, as astronomy, magnetism, and chemistry, would be benefited by success. It might not be obvious how astronomy would be advantaged, until it is remembered that our acquaintance with the true position of every heavenly body depends upon an accurate knowledge of the laws of refraction.

Before ascending, let us look at the principal objects of the experiments to be made. The primary one was, the determination of the temperature of the air, and its hygrometric state; or its capacity for and condition of moisture at elevations varying up to five miles. A secondary object was to compare the readings of an aneroid barometer, (now much in favour with observers,) with those of a mercurial barometer, also up to an elevation of five miles. Another proposition was to determine the oxygenic condition by means of ozone papers,—that is, by papers made sensitive to the influence of ozone, a recently-discovered ingredient in the atmosphere which has perplexed meteorologists, and has been thought by Faraday to be a mode (allotrope) of oxygen. It was also highly desirable to determine the temperature of the dew-point, by different instruments, particularly up to such heights as those at which man may be somewhere resident, or at which troops may be located, as in the plains and highlands of India. All these objects are of practical as well as of scientific importance.

Amply provided with well-made instruments, Mr. Glaisher ascended from Wolverhampton in July, August, and September last; from the Crystal Palace, near London, also, in July, August, and September; and once from Mill Hill, near Hendon, where the balloon had fallen the preceding night, and had been anchored during the darkness. By the first ascent a height was reached of 26,177 feet, and in the descent a mass of vapour, of 8,000 feet in thickness, was to be traversed, so dense that during the passage through it the balloon was not visible from the car. By the second ascent (August 18th) an altitude was attained of 11,500 feet. The balloon then descended to 3,200 feet, and afterwards ascended to a height of 23,400 feet. Then a consultation was held; and, as clouds of unknown thickness and moisture were immediately above the aëronauts, they decided not

to pass into them. At the third ascent, (August 20th,) from the grounds of the Crystal Palace, Sydenham, the air was so calm, that the balloon hovered for a long time over the Palace, and afterwards over London, while it was lighted up. Then it soared above the clouds, and, finally, descended at Mill Hill, near Hendon, some eight or nine miles from London. There the balloon was anchored for the night, and the lower valve closed, with the hope of retaining the gas. Before the next sunrise the machine and its human freight were afloat again and afar. At a height of 5,000 feet the light of the sun increased, and the balloon gradually emerged from dense clouds into a basin, surrounded with immense black mountains of cloud, confusedly piled. Shortly after, Mr. Glaisher beheld below deep ravines of grand proportions, bounded with beautiful curved lines. Soon the tops of the mountain-like clouds became silvery and golden; and, at 8,000 feet, the aëronauts were on their level. Now the sun flooded with its golden radiance the whole space directly right and left for many degrees, until all before and behind seemed tinted with orange and silver. It was a glorious scene; and even a calculating philosopher, accoutred with all kinds of instruments, was compelled to pause from all science, and to admire the ravines of wonderful extent which opened every minute upon his view. Shining masses, in mountain-like chains, rose perpendicularly from cloudy plains, dark on one side, but bright and silvery on the other, with summits of dazzling whiteness. 'Some there were,' says Mr. Glaisher, 'of a pyramidal form, a large portion undulatory, and in the horizon Alpine ranges bounded the view.' On this occasion a height of nearly three miles was attained.

Each ascent had its notable scenery, but apparently none so grand as that just described. The ascent from Wolverhampton, on September 5th, was remarkable for the great height reached. It is estimated that the altitude was from 35,000 to 36,000 feet. At 29,000 feet from the earth Mr. Glaisher became insensible, and only recovered his consciousness when he descended to the same height as that at which he had lost it on ascending. This fact serves to determine the limit of human consciousness; and above this there is evidently danger, since the balloon is necessarily left to itself. An ingenious suggestion has been made of a contrivance by means of which the opening of the escape valve

will, when desirable, depend on the relaxation of voluntary exertion on the part of the aëronaut. When insensibility supervenes at great altitudes, the valve would open spontaneously by means of a weight attached to its rope, thus causing a descent of the balloon to safer altitudes. Without the adoption of some such expedient, there will be peril of life at 30,000 feet and upwards.

It would naturally be expected that the diminished pressure of the atmosphere, occasioned by balloon ascents, would exercise a very different influence on different persons. In all probability this difference depends upon individual temperament and organization, and even the same man is differently affected at different times.

From his eight ascents Mr. Glaisher has deduced many results of great interest to aëronauts and meteorologists. In respect of aëronautics, it is found necessary to employ a balloon which will contain nearly 90,000 cubic feet of gas, for great altitudes; and even with a balloon of this magnitude, it is impossible to reach a height of six miles, unless carburetted hydrogen, varying in specific gravity from 370 to 340, is supplied for the purpose. We have a ready method of predicting the altitude attainable by a balloon, in the fact that at three miles and three quarters in height a volume of gas will double its own bulk; and it is obvious that, in order to reach an elevation of six or seven miles, one third of the capacity of the balloon should be able to support its entire weight, inclusive of sufficient ballast for descent. The amount of ballast taken up also affords another mode for calculating the power of ascending. By reserving less a great height can be attained; but then a large quantity is necessary to regulate the descent, and enable the aëronaut to select a favourable spot, with security of reaching it. In this respect, there seems to be a limit never to be exceeded; for the necessity of carrying five or six hundred pounds of ballast at once clips the wings of fancy, and reminds man of gravitation. Moreover, excessive altitude is found to be incompatible with philosophical observations on several accounts,—one being, that the balloon holds its highest place very briefly, and appears reluctant to linger even in a much lower elevation, even should there be no leakage or any imperfection in itself.

What has been said by an aëronaut of experience, that strong

opposing upper currents have been heard in audible contention, and sounding like the 'roaring of a hurricane,' seems to be exaggerated; for Mr. Glaisher and his companion found themselves in the most perfect stillness, excepting a slight whining noise in the netting when the machine was rising with great rapidity. Possibly the supposed 'roaring like a hurricane' was caused by the flapping when the balloon descends, and especially when it tends to collapse. In a rapid descent the lower part of the balloon might flap so loudly, that the noise might be mistaken for wind.

It is satisfactory to learn that ballooning is not confined to men of extraordinary nerve or endurance; for Mr. Glaisher assures us, that any person possessed of an ordinary degree of self-possession may ascend to a height of three miles; but he warns all who are affected with heart disease, or pulmonary complaints, that they should not attempt an altitude of four miles. Above all, the balloon must be properly handled; and if the adventurer can secure Mr. Coxwell, the companion of Mr. Glaisher, he will be fortunate, and may be daring; for Mr. Coxwell has made as many as four hundred ascents, and knows the why and wherefore of all aëronautic operations. 'I saw this immediately,' says Mr. Glaisher, 'from the clearness of his explanation to me of each operation; and it enabled me to dismiss from my mind all thoughts of my position, and to concentrate my whole energies upon my duties.' In fact, Mr. Coxwell did wonders before he started, for in six weeks he built a balloon larger than any which had been seen in England. Its dimensions were,—sixty-nine feet in height, diameter fifty-four feet. It met, however, with mishaps before ascending; and, while in process of inflation at Wolverhampton, a gust of wind tore the ring from it, and the consequence was a rent from bottom to top, a speedy collapse, and the loss of 58,000 feet of gas. In the whole eight ascents 329,000 cubic feet of gas have been used, of which as much as 115,000 cubic feet have been lost. The total expenditure has been £270; and it was recommended that the Balloon Commitee should be re-appointed, with a grant of £200, estimated as sufficient to cover all the probable expenses of the ensuing year.

Reducing the scientific results of these atmospheric explorations to as small a compass as possible, we may state that Mr.

Glaisher has tabulated the mean temperature of the air at every 5,000 feet of elevation above the level of the sea in each ascent up to the height of 30,000 feet. From this table we observe that the average decrease of temperature in the first 5,600 feet exceeds 20°; while in the next 5,000 it is little more than 10°. The average decrease for 25,000 feet is nearly 51°. It seems that two-fifteenths of the whole decrease of temperature in five miles take place in the first mile, and therefore that the decrement in temperature is not uniform with the increment in elevation. From another table we learn that the mean decrease of temperature exceeds 21° for the first mile, and that the rate of decrease of temperature is not uniform up to 5,000 feet. More information is desirable upon the actual decrease, seeing that it is not uniform, and particularly as to its influence on the laws of refraction.

With reference to barometers, an aneroid can be made to read correctly, certainly to the first and probably to the second place of decimals, to a pressure as low as five inches. As to hygrometric conditions, the humidity of the atmosphere does decrease with the height, and that at a remarkably rapid ratio; until at heights exceeding five miles the amount of watery vapour in the atmosphere is very small indeed. This briefly compressed residuum of aëronautic experiments must be regarded as the mere first-fruits of ascents advancing to altitudes of seven and eight miles. It is to be hoped that a grant in the ensuing year will aid in the accomplishment of other and important observations.

It is not impossible that in future ascents we may learn something of the extent of the earth's atmosphere. Analogy and reasoning lead us to infer that it is only of limited extent, and, as Professor Challis has argued, there are good grounds for thinking that it does not extend to the moon. From a consideration of the atomic constituents of bodies, it would seem that beyond a certain point there can be no more atoms; and there the atmosphere would terminate with a small finite density. It has been generally supposed, though on no sufficient or definite grounds, that the atmosphere of our earth is about seventy miles high. Those who suppose that it extends to the moon, have to meet the objection of Professor Challis, that in such case 'the moon would attach to itself a considerable portion of its gravitation, which

must necessarily have connexion with the remainder, and thus there would be a continual drag on the portion of atmosphere more immediately surrounding the earth, and intermediately on the earth itself, which would in some degree retard its rotation on its axis. If, therefore, that rotation be strictly uniform, which is fairly presumable, the earth's atmosphere cannot extend to the moon.' The same gentleman proposed observations by barometer and thermometer in balloon ascents, with a view to insure an approximate determination of the height of the atmosphere. It is most philosophical to suppose that atmospheres generally have definite boundaries, at which their densities have small but finite values.

While we are discoursing upon the presumed limits of our atmosphere, and are so far in the clouds, we may as well continue our upward flight, and even dare the dazzling sun himself. Observations of the great source of our light have always been attended with inconvenience, and often with danger. Sir John Herschel has fr ently found the heat of the sun to be so intense as to break the obscured glass by which his eye had been protected, and that so suddenly as to threaten the loss of sight. That eminent astronomer, therefore, proposed a reflecting plate of glass, of which the Rev. Dr. Pritchard gave a description to the proper section. By using this, the observer is placed in the most absolute security, and can at pleasure moderate the light reflected to the eyepiece; so that, with an ordinary-sized telescope, the object-glass of which is not more than three or four inch aperture, the willow-leaved objects of which the sun's luminous surface seems to be entirely composed, can be distinctly seen and studied at leisure.

The mention of these objects leads us to notice more particularly what they are. Mr. Nasmyth gave an account of them in a short but highly interesting sketch of the character of the sun's surface as at present known. The 'spots of the sun,' so familiar to us all by name, are, in fact, gaps or holes, more or less extended, in the photosphere or luminous surface of the sun. They expose the nucleus, or totally dark bottom of the sun, and over this appears a misty surface, a thin, gauze-like veil. Then comes the penumbral stratum, and over all the luminous stratum. The latter, as Mr. Nasmyth had the good fortune to discover, is composed of a multitude of very

elongated, lenticular, or, to use a more familiar term, willow-leaf-shaped, masses, crowded over the photosphere, and crossing one another in every possible direction. To represent these pictures to the eye, Mr. Nasmyth exhibited an odd-looking diagram, on which he had pasted elongated slips of white paper over a sheet of black card. These crossed one another in every direction, and in such numbers as to hide the dark nucleus everywhere, except at the spots.

The exhibitor had found the elongated lens-shaped objects to be in constant motion relatively to one another. They sometimes approached, sometimes receded, and sometimes assumed a new angular position, in which one end either maintained a fixed distance or approached its neighbour, while at the other end they retired from each other. Some of these objects were in superficial area as large as all Europe, and some even as large as the surface of the whole earth. They were seen to shoot in streams across the spots, bridging them over in well-defined lines; sometimes, by crowding in on the edges of the spot, they closed it in, and by this closing in frequently obliterated it. It was discerned that, although these objects were of various dimensions, yet generally their length was from ninety to one hundred times as great as their breadth at the middle or the widest part.

These observations unquestionably form, as Dr. Pritchard remarked, a very important addition to our knowledge of the physical structure of the sun. The whole difficulty lies in at first detecting them; as soon as they are once observed, there is no difficulty in studying them and their relative motions at leisure. It was objected that these willow-leaved appearances might be produced by diffraction, caused by the numberless minute ridges which even the finest polishing powder, and most careful labour, must leave upon the surface of even the best polished glass. Such an objection demanded refutation, and received it from Dr. Pritchard, and Mr. Nasmyth himself. They particularly noticed that the changes of relative position in these objects were incompatible with the objector's supposition.

Mr. Nasmyth may well be gratified with the marked attention his short paper received; and may readily be pardoned for saying that 'he felt more proud of some of the too flattering observations of Dr. Pritchard, than if an order of knighthood were

conferred upon him.' Should the willow-leaves not fade away as mere foliage of fancy, and should Mr. Nasmyth's observations be confirmed by others, we shall certainly know more of our brilliant and beneficent illuminator than we could have anticipated. And the dark reflector of Sir John Herschel, already alluded to, may add to the facilities for protracted telescopic study.

From the physical condition of the body of the sun to the distribution of its rays is a natural transition; and we may here advert to a paper read by Professor Hennessy, 'On the Relative Amount of Sunshine falling on the Torrid Zone of the Earth.' By a mathematical calculation, the area of that portion of the equatorial regions of the earth which receives as much sunshine as the rest of the earth's surface, is ascertained. This area is found to be bounded at the outer limits of the earth's atmosphere by parallels situated at distances of 23° 44′ 40″ at each side of the equator. Consequently the amount of sunshine falling upon the outer limits of the earth's atmosphere between the tropics, is very nearly equal to that which falls upon the remaining portions of the earth's surface. Principal Forbes has shown that the amount of heat extinguished by the atmosphere before a given solar ray reaches the earth, is more than one half for inclinations less than 25°, and that for inclinations of 5° only the twentieth part of the heat reaches the ground. Hence we at once infer that the torrid zone must be far better situated for receiving solar heat than all the rest of the earth's surface; and it follows that the distribution of the absorbing and radiating surfaces within the torrid zone must, upon the whole, exercise a predominant influence in modifying terrestrial climate in general.

Since the sun has now so long been the great portrait-taker of society, it does seem a singular omission that he was never compelled to take a portrait of himself. Sir John Herschel suggested in 1854 that daily photographs of the sun should be made; and this suggestion gave birth to a remarkable instrument which at first bore the name of the solar photographic telescope, but which is now known as the Kew photoheliograph. The British Association assisted in carrying out this work by assigning to it the dome of the Kew Observatory, and by securing its completion in 1857 in their workshop at the

same place. The expense of its construction, £180, was defrayed by Mr. Oliveira. This instrument was conveyed to Spain at the time of the eclipse in 1860, and did good solar service under the care of Mr. De La Rue, who has generously undertaken the charge of the instrument for the present. The object is to continue the use of the photoheliograph for a series of years, and by accumulating observations to afford fair grounds for reasoning. In plain language, the sun must be made to take a large number of likenesses of himself for every day in every year, and then we may form a warrantable idea of his real condition. We shall then know his frowns and his smiles, his spots and his luminous surface, and learn how he really appears when he looks his best or his worst.

Professor Selwyn exhibited several 'autographs of the sun' taken by a photographer at Ely. The phenomena shown in these autographs seemed to confirm the views of Sir J. Herschel that the two parallel regions of the sun where the spots appear are like the tropical regions of the earth where tornadoes and cyclones occur. The *faculæ* indicate that the tropical regions of the sun are highly agitated, and that immense waves of luminous matter are thrown up, between which the dark cavities of the spots appear, whose sloping sides are seen in the penumbra, as explained by Wilson in the last century. Other solar phenomena might be pointed out as analogies between solar spots and earthly storms; and the autographs here referred to confirm the observations of Mr. Nasmyth.

The subject of Refraction was treated by Professor Challis; but it is too scientific for brief popular representation. Its importance is practically great, as, for instance, in the case of determining the real diameter of the moon; for if refraction in any atmosphere which the moon may have, be such as it is in that surrounding our earth, the apparent diameter of the moon as ascertained by measurement would be greater than that inferred from the observation of an occultation of a star, because by reason of the refraction of the atmosphere the star would disappear and re-appear when the line of vision was within the moon's apparent boundary. The same result would be obtained from a solar eclipse; and it was affirmed that by a direct comparison of these two kinds of determination, such an excess was found to be from 6″ to 8″. This difference may be reasonably

attributed to the existence of a lunar atmosphere of very small magnitude and density. The apparent diameter of the planets will, for like reasons, be augmented to a certain amount by the effect of refraction.

In astronomy, and indeed in all the other mathematical and physical sciences, we remark continual approaches to nicety of reasoning and observation. The very technicalities which forbid the masses of ordinarily educated persons from entering into the purpose and the intelligence of the papers read in Section A, viz., that for Mathematical or Physical Science, are themselves indications of the precision at which the philosophers are zealously aiming. Although this section is generally but thinly attended, and minute details of abstract science cannot be made attractive in an exposition *vivâ voce*, but must be studied at leisure, yet by a judicious arrangement and exhibition of results, some of the most recondite subjects can be made interesting to a generally cultivated mind. In the ability to render such subjects attractive, men, of course, widely differ. If the reader of a paper confines himself to his notes and to algebraic notation, of course he wearies all but his fellow-labourers; but if he can occasionally lay aside his notes, and use chalk and the black-board, if he can show in plain terms how his researches bear upon important results, and how far they elucidate them, he may be assured that he will not want listeners besides astronomers and physicists.

Take as an illustration a paper read in this very section A, 'On the Three Reports of the Liverpool Compass Committee, and on some recent Publications on the same Subject,' undertaken at the request of the British Association. As to the mathematical formulæ involved in the consideration of this subject, they are exclusively for scientific labourers; nor does it much enlighten the public to learn that 'the first and most important general result which is derived from all the observations recorded in these works, and from many more which have not been published, is, that the observed deviations of the compass are represented by the formulæ derived from Poisson's theory with a correctness which is within the limits of the error of observation;' but general interest is immediately awakened when the practical conclusions are added in plain terms, as follows: 1. That the magnetism of iron ships is distributed

according to precise and well-determined laws. 2. That a definite magnetic character is impressed on every iron ship while it is on the building slip, which is never afterwards entirely lost. 3. That a considerable reduction takes place in the magnetism of an iron ship on first changing her position after launching, but that afterwards any permanent change in its direction or current is a slow and gradual process. 4. That the original magnetism of an iron ship is constantly subject to small fluctuations arising from change of position, and therefore to new magnetic inductions. 5. That the compass errors occasioned by the more permanent part of a ship's magnetism, may be successfully compensated; and that this compensation equalises the directive power of the compass-needle in the several courses on which a ship may be placed.

All these results possess a general bearing upon naval commerce which will interest thousands, not to advert in particular to the possible saving of life from shipwreck, which may follow from due attention to magnetic laws. One of the first practical consequences from such researches is, that in the construction of iron vessels due regard should be had to influences adverse to the rectitude of the compass. At present there is great difficulty in finding a proper place for the compass, so as to reconcile its position with the requirements of the construction and free working of the ship. Much yet remains to be discovered on these and kindred problems, and a complete magnetic history of some iron vessels in various latitudes should be preserved. Such knowledge may be fairly hoped for in due time, when we remember that it is not long since absolutely nothing was known of the important distinction between permanent magnetism, and that induced by the change of position of the ship, and the action of the sea upon her.

In all investigations into magnetism and meteorology the value of the Kew Observatory must be prominently noticed. Long a useless building, Her Majesty granted it, in 1842, to this Association. It then became the depository for instruments, papers, and other property of the Association; but on several occasions it was in imminent danger of being relinquished in consequence of a decline in the funds of the Society. In 1850, however, a Committee reported that this Observatory had already given to science self-recording instruments of great value

for electrical, magnetical, and meteorological phenomena, and that it was certainly capable of much further improvement. The tide soon turned in its favour; some money unexpectedly flowed in; great interest was felt in its preservation and adaptation to several practical purposes; and now an establishment is founded and fostered by the Association, the importance of which is very considerable. There all the barometers, thermometers, and hydrometers required by the Board of Trade and the Admiralty are tested; there standard thermometers are graduated, magnetic instruments constructed, and their constants all determined for foreign or for colonial observatories. Sextants, also, are verified; and there is now a workshop fitted up with a lathe, tools, planing-machine, dividing-engine, &c., all presented by the Royal Observatory. This scientific furniture and labour have of necessity been costly, and, in fact, have absorbed between £5,000 and £6,000, while the annual sum allotted has for each of the last six years reached the amount of £500. That an Association for science, required to be nearly self-supporting, should have been enabled to convert the old out-houses of George the Third's day into a building of acknowledged scientific value, is much to its credit, and was claimed by the President of the late Meeting as 'one of the triumphs of the British Association.' A very detailed 'Report of the Kew Committee' for 1861–1862 was read, from which it appears that the sum expended there really produces a full harvest of action and observation. In this respect the British Association sets a good example to Governments; for as we listen to or peruse such a report, we clearly see the truth of the common saying, that individuals work cheaper than Governments, and work better also. Here we have receipts and payments to the extent of only £760 for the year, with a balance (including a deficiency in the previous year) of £182 against the Observatory. Yet for this small sum the actual work has been abundant, and was fully reported; nor is it an unimportant circumstance that a Portuguese Professor (De Souza) has been so much aided by the Kew Observatory, that he thus writes to the Chairman:—

'I cannot leave England, where I have been exceedingly favoured by the Committee of the Kew Observatory of the British Association, without expressing to you my hearty thanks for the help I have experienced from the Committee in the construction and

verification of the magnetic and meteorologic instruments for the University of Coimbra; as well as for the valuable instructions which I have received, guided by the Director of the Kew Observatory, and the kindness which the British Association has shown me in their magnificent Meeting. I shall never forget the help afforded to me in so many different ways, and I desire earnestly to put it in immediate contribution towards the *advancement of science.*' A complete set of the Transactions of the British Association has been transferred to the University of Coimbra.

Other foreign professors have also profited by the Kew Observatory, during the month of August. Dr. Sabler, Director of the Observatory of Wilna in Russia, resided at Cranford, and received instruction in astronomical photography. For this gentleman a photoheliograph is now being constructed, and it will embody all the optical and mechanical improvements which have been suggested by the experiments with the Kew heliograph. Thus the unpretending dome-covered house at Kew, for an annual expenditure considerably under £1,000, is aiding our own Government in the testing of instruments, and binding it to others with ties of philosophical amity. This is, perhaps, about the best conducted and the least expensive of all such establishments.

In Botany and in Physiology, including also Zoology, the Association has expended altogether £1,400, of which nearly £900 has been applied to Zoology alone, partly for the expenses of the Dredging Committee, whose work was to employ the best dredges in the best manner for obtaining specimens illustrative of marine Zoology on our own coasts, and on those of the Mediterranean, and other seas. These, together with others of a like character, demand a detailed notice, which we hope to be able, on some future occasion, to present.

We may simply notice, in passing, that a Botanical Committee, consisting of two eminent botanists, was appointed in 1840, to make experiments on the preservation of the vegetative power in seeds. They continued their almost unknown labours for sixteen successive years; assisted by a grant of £200, and reporting annually certain results. They dispelled some popular delusions, and found that the greatest age at which the tested seeds were found to vegetate was about forty

years; and therefore, little credit is to be attached to tales of re-vegetation after centuries of quiescence. Another committee also was engaged in a kindred inquiry, during seven years; viz., the influence of coloured light on the germination of seeds and the growth of plants; and certain practical conclusions have been drawn, of which horticulturists may now avail themselves.

In Mechanical Science much has been discussed, and something discovered, under the auspices of the Association. Many experiments have been made by Mr. Fairbairn and a thoroughly practical assistant of his, now unhappily deceased, Mr. Eaton Hodgkinson, on the strength and best forms of iron girders. The results are important for constructors of iron bridges, and, indeed, for all builders who employ large iron girders.

At the late meeting the Astronomer Royal appeared as a mechanician, and read a highly technical paper, 'On the Strains in the Interior of Beams and Tubular Bridges.' Mathematical *formulæ* were here enclosed and walled round, as with iron, from all but mechanicians and mathematicians; but these found much to admire in the Astronomer's disquisitions.

Unhappily, the chief attention of mechanicians is now directed to projectiles, and the means of defence against them. In this subject we feel only a painful interest; and, while admiring the skill of our mechanics, and feeling gratified that we have men amongst us who can shed light even upon throwing shells and shot, nevertheless, we cannot but wish and pray that science may become only beneficent, and her professors only benefactors to their race. Since, however, weapons, and ships of war, and arms, and armour of defence, do employ our foremost practical mechanicians, we must at least attend to their researches, hoping that they may finally discover some projectile so powerful, or some armour so projectile-proof, that war will be rendered hopeless by the very perfection of its implements. This, indeed, seems the one re-assuring hope which the Christian and the man of peace can now entertain: speaking merely in the interests of humanity, when cannons are discovered which will pierce any armour-plate, or armour-plate employed which will be proof against any cannons, supposing either of these two eventualities to be possible, then, perhaps, nations may

hesitate before embarking in useless warfare, and causing unjustifiable carnage.

Ex-President Fairbairn, the well-known and now be-doctored Manchester man, states that, in the investigations which have taken place with regard to projectiles and armour-plated ships, one great difficulty was to get good plates of sufficient thickness, and another to get vessels of sufficient tonnage to carry them. We are limited to plates of five inches in thickness; for with heavier plates a ship cannot be 'lively.' With reference to their qualities, there were three which were essential, —first, that the iron should not be crystallized; secondly, that it should be of great tenacity and ductility; and, thirdly, that it should be very fibrous. He then detailed the results of experiments, showing the statical resistances of different kinds of shot in tons per square inch, and the dynamical resistance in feet per square inch. The shot which would cause the greatest damage to iron armour-plate would be one of adamant, incapable of change of form. Such a shot would deliver up the whole of its *vis viva* to the plate it struck; and, so far as experiment yet goes, those projectiles which tend nearest to this condition are the most effective. Steel shots offer the greatest statical and by much the greatest dynamical resistance; but their greater expense is against their adoption. Yet Mr. Bessemer assures Dr. Fairbairn that if he had a large order he could produce them at a little more than the price of iron; but if the ingots when cast had to be rolled or hammered to give them fibre, they would cost nearly £30 a ton, instead of £8 or £10 a ton.

The penetrating power of projectiles received full consideration in another paper, in the course of which a tabulated comparison was given between the guns of Armstrong and Whitworth. The conclusions drawn from this may be generally interesting. The first two results of experiments show that the Armstrong rifled gun is a worse compromise than the old gun it was intended to supersede; and the total results are decidedly in favour of Whitworth's gun, Whitworth having adopted the best compromise of conditions by combining all the three necessary ones of proper form, proper material of projectile, and sufficient velocity. The reader of this paper, Mr. T. Aston, described the form of both shot and shell projectiles,

and adverted to homogeneous iron as combining the toughness of copper with the hardness of steel. It undergoes a carefully regulated process of annealing, and is used in the Whitworth field guns.

By many experiments it was early ascertained that there was a distinction between the penetrating power of shot and shell, the shell invariably failing to penetrate even a moderately thick plate of iron. Hence it was concluded that even a moderately thick plate, or a comparatively thin plate, was proof against it. Late experiments, however, with the Whitworth gun and flat-fronted hardened shells have dispelled these notions. The twelve-pounder, at a distance of two hundred yards, sent three shells through a two-inch plate backed with a foot of timber. From other experiments, also, it became manifest that four inches of solid iron and nine inches of wood formed no protection against such a gun, and that no gun-boat, such as those on the American waters, was proof against such a weapon. In point of fact, Whitworth, with a rifled gun lighter than a sixty-eight-pounder, could destroy such boats with his steel-hardened shells at a distance of one thousand five hundred or two thousand yards. With a large Whitworth gun, (a hundred-and-twenty-pounder,) an experiment at a distance of six hundred yards proved that even the sides of our famous 'Warrior' are no longer shell-proof. From several experiments Dr. Fairbairn inferred that the victory is on the side of the gun, and that 'it will be difficult, under such powerful odds, to construct ships of sufficient power to prevent their destruction by the entrance of shells.'

It seems, then, upon sufficiently high practical authority, that we have been expending millions in constructing iron war-ships, which, after all, are not impregnable. As fast as plates are affixed, guns are planted in position, each alternately rivalling the other, and at last the gun gains the day. Not only so, but, in addition to this, Mr. Nasmyth starts up, and, resuming his favourite proposition of a huge ram, assures us that if he were allowed to experiment with a ram properly constructed, he could dash in the sides of the 'Warrior' 'like a bandbox.' Poor comfort this for a nation already loaded with an immense burden of taxation, partly imposed for the construction of iron ships, which one *savant* declares to be as breakable as a bandbox, and another assures us can be pierced by a shell.

From the huge 'Warriors' that press with their untold tons of iron upon the bosom of the swelling seas, let us for a moment turn to the waves themselves. Few would suppose that waves are subjects for mathematical investigation. If one thing in nature appears to be more capricious in its form and motion than another, it is a wave of the sea. Yet it results from the investigations of the Astronomer Royal and Mr. Stokes, on the question of straight-crested parallel waves in a liquid, that the displacements of the particles of water are small compared with the length of a wave. On further investigation, Professor Rankine has discovered that on the surface of very deep waters the particles of waves move with a uniform angular velocity in vertical circles, whose radii diminish in geometrical progression with increased depth, and consequently that surfaces of equal pressure, including the upper surface, are in form trochoidal. Again, the same professor proved, as an inference from mathematical research, that the mechanical energy of a wave is half actual and half potential—half being due to motion and half to elevation; while the destructive power of a wave is double of that due to the motion of its particles alone. In this paper, and an Appendix to it, several results were given which may have a practical bearing on the forms of ships or boats; as a previous paper in 1861, on the resistance of ships, was found useful to naval engineers.

In the section for chemical science the papers read were for the most part technical and unattractive to all but chemists. The principal exception to this rule was Dr. Moffat's paper 'On the Luminosity of Phosphorus.' In this some singular facts were enunciated. It is well known that if a piece of phosphorus be put under a bell-glass and observed occasionally, it will be found at times luminous, and at other times not luminous. When luminous, a stream of vapour rises from it, which sometimes terminates in an inverted cone of rings similar to those given off by phosphuretted hydrogen; and at other times it forms a beautiful curve, with a descending course equal in length to the ascending one. Results deduced from daily observations of the phosphorus, in connexion with the readings of the barometer (and other particulars), continued during eighteen months, show that periods of luminosity and non-luminosity of phosphorus occur under opposite conditions of the

atmosphere. By a certain action of phosphorus on atmospheric air a gaseous body (super-oxide of hydrogen) is formed, which is analogous to, if not identical with, atmospheric ozone, and it can be detected by the same tests.

Luminous periods commence and luminosity increases in brilliancy on the approach of storms and gales, and ozone periods commence and increase in quantity under similar circumstances. It would also appear that there is an intimate connexion between the approach of storms, the commencement of luminous and ozone periods, and disorders of the nervous, muscular, and vascular systems. Dr. Moffat gave the dates of many storms and gales, and the occurrence of diseases of the above class, showing their coincidence; and added, in corroboration, that there was a concurrence in the issuing of Admiral Fitzroy's cautionary telegrams and these diseases,—that is, when the Admiral sends telegrams to various coast stations, forewarning of the approach of storms, as the result of observations which he has made, then these diseases are most prevalent.

The Doctor further looks upon the part performed by ozone in the atmosphere as being similar to that performed by protein in the blood. Protein gives oxygen to the products of decomposition and putrefaction, and renders them either innocuous or salutary compounds. With this view he had used phosphorus as a disinfectant; and he believes that by using ozone, artificially formed by the action of phosphorus, in localities tainted with the products of putrefaction, just in sufficient quantities to tinge the usual test paper, all diseases of the pythogenic class (otherwise the putrefying class) would be prevented. This may prove to be a hint of great sanitary importance.

Ozone is in all probability formed wherever there is phosphorescence, and the latter is by no means so uncommon a phenomenon as might be supposed. In life and in death, in the animal and the vegetable kingdom, and in the mineral kingdom too, it is often visible. Many phosphorescent bodies were enumerated, and amongst them the night-shining Nereis was named, and affirmed to become particularly brilliant with a direction of the wind from points of the compass between east and south. It is also well known that the sea becomes luminous with the flotation of marine animals upon its surface, on the approach of storms. We might also instance many phosphorescent

minerals, fluor spar (the Blue John-of-the-Peak in Derbyshire) becoming particularly phosphorescent on an increase of temperature. But it is needless to enlarge the list of phosphorescent objects; their number, however, renders it still more probable that atmospheric ozone is formed by the phosphorescence of bodies. Moreover, it is during periods marked by the absence of ozone and by great magnetic action, being periods of non-luminosity, that cholera prevails. On the other hand, with the setting in of the equatorial current, which brings ozone with it, and is favourable to luminosity, cholera generally disappears. Possibly, too, the aurora borealis may prove to be a luminosity of the same character. In this paper, the points we have briefly touched upon were developed with talent, and were full of practical interest.

In the Section for Mechanical Science, a paper was read 'On Artificial Stones' by Professor Ansted. There was nothing in this paper new to those who had studied the subject, which, however, is an interesting one to all who are connected with architecture and building, and also to practical chemists. Of the various materials employed as substitutes for stone, when it cannot be procured from the quarry, *terra cottas*, (baked clays,) cements, and compositions of a silicious order, are the principal. They have respectively some advantages and some disadvantages. *Terra cotta* may be used for architectural ornaments; but it does not present a perfect appearance, and is easily distinguishable if not placed far from the eye.

The most important inquiry in connexion with this topic relates to the possibility of preserving stone from atmospheric influences and consequent decay in unfavourable positions and localities. All our readers must be aware how greatly the exterior faces of the Houses of Parliament have suffered from the decay of the Magnesian limestone of which they are built. Various causes have been assigned for this decay; but all that can be certainly affirmed is, that by some natural process the Dolomite (or Magnesian limestone) has effloresced considerably, and that large flakes have peeled off from the new but injured building.

The Board of Works recently appointed a Committee to investigate this matter, with special reference to the palace of Westminster. During the investigations, Mr. Ransome, who

has devoted much time and talent in this direction, submitted a singular material for inspection, which was discovered during the practice of preserving stone by creating a deposit of silicate of lime within the substances of the absorbent stone. This is effected by saturating the surface with a solution of silicate of soda, and then applying a solution of silicate of chloride of calcium. A rapid double decomposition is thus produced, leaving an insoluble silicate of lime within the stone, and a soluble chloride of sodium which can be afterwards removed by washing. By this method, as was shown by experiment, a perfectly compact, hard, and apparently perfectly durable, solid can be formed almost instantaneously. Carrying out this result, Mr. Ransome succeeded in producing an artificial stone which will probably combine several of the advantages, balanced by some of the disadvantages, of other artificial stones.

This substance is used in the stations of the Metropolitan Railway, and a specimen weighing two tons was shown in the International Exhibition. It is said to be cheap, and that it can be made upon the spot out of almost any material or rubbish of a building kind. This renders its discovery important to builders of all classes; while, as respects church and chapel architecture, it appears to be peculiarly serviceable. Against suppositions of its weakness as compared with real stone, Mr. Ransome instituted experiments which demonstrated that, in comparison with Portland stone or Caen stone, (two ornamental building stones very commonly employed,) a bar with a section four inches square and eight inches long, between supports, sustained 2,122lbs., suspended midway between the supports; while similar bars of Portland and Caen stone broke respectively with 750lbs. and 780lbs. Other similar experiments were made to show the adhesion of this composite material, and a cube of four inches supported thirty tons. The process was exhibited to the Section by Mr. Ransome, who made several pieces in the sight of the members. Unless some practical test should detract from the apparent excellence of this material, it will doubtless come into extensive use.

While this discovery affects the adornment of our towns and cities, another paper of particular interest concerned the preservation of our lives. It was on 'Secret Poisoning,' and was read by Professor Harley. He stated his conviction to be the same

as last year, viz., that the cases of slow and secret poisoning which are discovered form but a small per-centage of those which actually take place. He even believed that we not only magnified the difficulty of committing the crime, but were also deceived as to the difficulty of detecting it when committed. Although discoveries in physiology have enabled us to distinguish between the effects of poison and disease during life, and discoveries in chemistry to detect and extract the poison from the tissues after death, at the same time modern research has made known many subtle poisons which have been hitherto undiscovered or unused. There is, in fact, a rivalry between the chemist and the criminal, the latter employing a new poison which he may use, as he thinks, without detection, and the former determining to render its detection practicable. The great aim of the poisoner is to obtain a poison, the effect of which would so nearly resemble that of a natural disease as to be mistaken for it. The Professor then showed that fortunately this was not easy, since the effects of a poison were generally sudden in their commencement, and rapid in their termination; neither has the poisoner, in general, such facilities of frequent administration of the poison as to produce an artificial state of disease, whereby the skilful medical attendant would be deceived. But there is one commonly received maxim which Professor Harley attacked, viz., that in all cases of poisoning, followed by death, the poison ought to be detected in the tissues of the deceased. This is not strictly true; for even in the case of arsenic, which is presumed to be the most persistent of all poisons, if the sufferer only survives sufficiently long, every particle of the mineral may be eliminated, and not a trace of it be discoverable in the body after the decease. In the case of Alexander, who did not die until the sixteenth day after being poisoned with arsenic, as was certainly known, no trace of it was found in the body. The Professor said that, 'as the not finding poison in the system after death is no absolute proof that the patient did not die from its effects; so the symptoms observed during life, in conjunction with the morbid appearances observed after death, even when no poison is discovered by chemical analysis, should be sufficient to convict the poisoner; and even the symptoms alone, if there be good circumstantial evidence, especially if combined with proof of a motive, ought to convict,

—as in the instance of Palmer's trial.' In conclusion, the Professor suggested that, in all cases of suspected poisoning, great care should be taken to refrain from communicating the suspicion to persons around. The patient himself should be first informed; for he is most likely to be acquainted with evil motives in the persons around him. The doctor should be next informed, in order that, by obtaining some of the secretions, he may have them carefully analysed, and then decide if the case be one of secret murder. The whole question is one of interest in the light of recent trials, and generally in its bearing on points of medical jurisprudence.

The Geological Section ought to have presented peculiar attractions at Cambridge, the town containing the excellent Woodwardian Museum, and recently affording in its vicinity many curious fossils from the Greensand Formation. The discovery of these latter is singular. Certain persons had found that this formation included layers of phosphatic nodules, which, from the abundance of their phosphate of lime, formed excellent manure. Geologists soon signified that these nodules were coprolitic, and in fact the accumulated refuse of innumerable ancient animals. Amongst these we have found teeth and other parts of Pterodactyles, vertebræ of fishes, and portions of turtles. Some of these specimens are in the British Museum; but Cambridge is the chief repository of them. They were viewed with much interest by the Geologists, and are evidence of abundant animal life once flourishing on broad sandy shores, and in deep waters, where now learning holds one of her chief seats, and science was at this time holding one of her principal festivals.

It so happened that the papers read by Geologists in the Section were not of absorbing interest, or of particular significance. Dr. Daubeny, true to his favourite theme Volcanoes, and the author of a well-known volume upon them, read a somewhat attractive paper; viz., "On the Last Eruption of Vesuvius." He showed that this volcano appears to have entered during the last few years upon a new phase of action. Its eruptions are less frequent, but more violent, and they come forth from a lower level than they formerly did. They also give vent to new volatile or gaseous principles, as the vapour of naphtha and marsh gas, (light carburetted hydrogen,) and others never previously

detected. An elevation of the coast to the height of three feet seven inches above the level of the sea, has been caused by the last eruption. No such effect had been observed on any previous eruption.

Dr. Daubeny speculated upon the causes which have produced these changes in the action of Vesuvius, and first considered the theory which recognises a class of volcanoes distinguished from those commonly so called, and named mud-volcanoes, from their emitting a semi-fluid mud, as well as carburetted hydrogen and naphtha. From the phenomena lately displayed, it might be supposed that Vesuvius is now passing into the condition of a mud volcano, of which one in Sicily, and one in the Sea of Azof, are types. The Doctor, however, contended that Vesuvius has no such character, but that the products above named are generated simply by the action of volcanic heat upon contiguous beds of limestone in which bituminous matters are imbedded. To this cause may be attributed enormous evolutions of carbonic acid, carburetted hydrogen and naphtha-vapour, the two latter products being regarded as secondary to the first named, and as incidental to volcanic action, whilst muriatic acid and sulphureous acids are the primary products. It is important to study the nature of the gases evolved, as being the best clue to the understanding of the true nature and causes of volcanic action.

The Doctor adverted particularly to the chemical theory of volcanoes which he has long espoused, and which he has expounded in the volume above alluded to. Other geologists approved the opposing theory; but into neither of these can we now enter. It is, however, as the reader of the paper observed, only by a continual and diligent recording of facts, chemical as well as physical, that we can arrive at a satisfactory theory of volcanic phenomena. Too many have simply contented themselves with referring eruptions to certain great cosmical changes which they conceive to be taking place.

Perhaps a more generally interesting subject was that taken up by Mr. W. B. Dawkins, who brought forward a paper upon 'The Wokey Hole Hyæna Den,' a singular cave recently discovered, and which but for an accident might have remained unknown for centuries, as it has for centuries been unknown; for it was filled up to the roof with *débris*, stones, and organic remains.

In three areas of this cave were found ashes of bone, and especially of the Rhinoceros, (*Rhin. tichorrinus,*) associated with flint and chert implements, of the same type as those of Amiens and Abbeville in France. These were supposed to be of human workmanship, though they were ruder, and probably earlier, than the similar flints discovered in France. They were found *under-lying* layers of peroxide manganese and comminuted bone; and at the same time, *over-lying* remains of the hyæna which mark the old floors of the cave in one of its areas.

From these facts the reader of the paper inferred that man, in one of the earlier, if not the earliest, stages of his being, dwelt in this cave, as some of the most degraded of our race do at the present time; that he manufactured his implements and his weapons out of flint brought from the chalk downs of Wilts, from the least fragile chert of the greensand of the Black Down Hills, and also arrow-heads out of the more easily fashioned bone. Although he made use of fire, and was acquainted with the bow, he was far worse armed with his puny weapons of flint and bone than his contemporaries the wild beasts with their sharp claws and strong teeth. The very fact that he held his ground against them shows that cunning and craft more than compensated for the deficiency of his armament. Again, as he was preceded in his occupation by some kind of beast (evidenced by the *under*-lying fragments of concomitant bone), so he was succeeded by another, the hyæna (proved by the *over*-lying bones).

The organic remains found in this cave are both numerous and curious. They comprise upwards of one thousand bones, one thousand and fifteen teeth, one hundred and fifty-six jaws belonging to the lion, wolf, fox, bear (of two species), badger, hyæna (the cave hyæna), ox, deer (six species), Irish elk, horse, and rhinoceros of two species. One of the latter fixes the date of the cave as belonging the pre-glacial period, while the remainder of the organic remains belong to Fauna which are typical of the post-glacial period.

The whole question of presumed human works—in flint, chert, and bone—will very shortly be brought before the public in connexion with the supposed date of the appearance of man upon this globe. Probably before these pages come under the eyes of our readers, the book of Sir C. Lyell on this sub-

ject will have appeared. We are already aware of some of his opinions and of most of his facts; but we shall defer any observations respecting them until we can find an opportunity of presenting a *résumé* of both facts and opinions in the pages of this Review.

In the above popular selection and summary of the principal readings, discussions, and observations of the Members of the British Association at Cambridge, we have endeavoured to present the whole in such form and arrangement as may enable the reader at one sitting to acquire a fair idea of what was done and said by the principal speakers on this most interesting occasion. The few interspersed comments of our own have been chiefly elucidatory, and we reserve for another opportunity and for ampler space a consideration of the tendencies of the present schools of Physical and Natural Science.

ART. V.—*History of the Revolution of* 1848. By GARNIER-PAGES. Vols. IV. and V. Paris: Pagnerre. 1861. (Vol. IV. *The Fall of Royalty.* Vol. V. *The Twenty-Fourth of February,* 1848.)

THE first three volumes of the above-named history, reviewed in a recent Number of this journal, (January, 1862,) presented a vivid picture of the sudden and uncontrollable reaction produced upon the Continental nations, by the French Revolution of 1848,—a Revolution which set Europe on fire from one end to the other, and within six months enveloped sixty millions of men, kindling into new life the inert, apathetic, or desponding masses, and arraying oppressed subjects against the misgovernment of hereditary despots, or the tyranny of foreign usurpers. In the two volumes before us, we have the history of the central Revolution itself, and of its predisposing causes, traced by a shrewd and observant eye, through some preceding years, down to the moment at which the great eruption shook to the ground the constitutional monarchy set up by the Revolution of 1830.

Few Revolutions have been hailed with greater enthusiasm than the one which, in July, 1830, raised the Orleans-Bourbons to the throne of France, and substituted for Charles X. and the *régime* of royal ordinances, Louis Philippe and the Charter. The lovers of constitutional freedom saw in the emancipation of France the hope and strength of free men all over Europe. It is the recorded opinion of British political writers of that day, that under the liberal provisions of the Charter France had 'a freer government than England;' that the battle of English liberty had been fought and won in Paris; that Englishmen must bestir themselves if they would hold their own in the race of improvement between the two greatest nations of modern Europe; and that, by perfecting our own institutions, we must restore England to her pristine station, and regain for her what Milton called 'our prerogative of teaching the nations how to live.' The impulse given by the Revolution of July to the extension of popular rights in England, was prompt and decisive. The Tory ministry, more devoted to royal immunities than to popular rights abroad, retired before the resolute assertion of

political freedom at home, and made way for a ministry pledged to Parliamentary and Municipal Reforms, and to the extension of religious liberty. These improvements were carried into effect by the new Parliament, and have been sustained and extended ever since. How was it then that the reign of Louis Philippe, under a Charter the envy of other nations, resulted in the repression of liberty at home, the disparagement of free institutions abroad, and the downfall of his government and dynasty?

The solution of this question will be found in the egotistic system of government adopted and tenaciously adhered to by the 'King of the French;' an autocracy under the form of a Constitution; electoral corruption; subservient Parliaments; dependent functionaries; the King his own counsellor; the Ministers his pliable instruments; everywhere the maximum of royal power and prerogative, and the minimum of popular freedom; in a word, the falsification of the Charter, and the perverting of constitutional forms, for the gratification of his ambition and the aggrandisement of himself and his family. In the carrying out of such a system of government—fairly exhibited in these volumes—over a civilised and enlightened people, we have the explanation of its inevitable failure.

We follow M. Garnier-Pagès as our guide through the scenes he narrates, and in which he was a prominent actor, with the confidence due to his rare opportunities of knowledge and observation, as well as to the patient investigation of facts, the scrupulous regard to accuracy of statement, and the honest and impartial spirit, which characterise his work throughout. The Revolution of 1830, which invested the Duke of Orleans with the office of Lieutenant-General of the kingdom, was itself the protest of the nation against the encroachments of royal prerogative on the rights guaranteed to it by the Charter at the Restoration in 1814. In the proclamation issued on his entry into Paris, Louis Philippe declared, 'The Chambers will be assembled, and will take measures for the maintenance of the laws and the rights of the nation. *The Charter henceforth shall be a reality.*' The alterations made in the Charter, by the peers and deputies, were all in favour of equality and of freedom, civil, political, and religious. The change of the royal title, 'King of France,' into 'King of the French,' discarded

the feudal notion of the universal proprietorship of the Sovereign. The censorship of the Press was abolished, and the Charter itself placed under the protection of the National Guard. To these conditions, offered by the Chambers, Louis Philippe subscribed in accepting the crown; and thenceforward stood pledged to the faithful observance of them. How was that pledge redeemed? Here M. Garnier-Pagès begins his narrative:—

'The Chambers, nominated in 1842, had lasted four years. The events of that period, favourable or adverse, had not ceased to strengthen the parliamentary situation of the Cabinet, which M. Guizot and M. Duchatel directed with nearly equal authority under the feeble presidency of the aged Marshal Soult.

'The Chambers, on the contrary, became every day weaker, both by its duration and its votes. An entire renewal had become indispensable. The general elections were fixed for the 1st of August, 1846.'—Vol. iv., chap. i., p. 2.

It had for some time begun to be perceived by liberal statesmen, that the parliamentary government of the Charter had become a mockery, and that power had got more firmly established in royal hands, under these deceptive forms, than in the time of the legitimate Kings. A cry suddenly arose in all quarters, except from the benches of the Ministry, for electoral and parliamentary reform, accompanied by incessant calls, premonitory of serious disturbance, for a diminution of taxes. The court and country parties prepared in earnest for the struggle. In the state of the electoral law at that time there was little ground to hope for a Parliament more devoted to the best interests of the country, or less supple to the bidding of power. The holders of authority in all its grades were resolved to maintain the system which maintained them, and to bring their influence to bear, by whatever means, upon the personal interests of the electors, with the view of securing the return of a subservient majority, ever at the beck of the party in power.

The Liberal Opposition counted upon this result, but were not disheartened. The public circular of the Minister of the Interior to the Prefects, was met by the counter circular of the Central Committee of Electors of the Seine,—a committee which comprised among its members men of all shades of opinion, liberal and democratic. This circular exposed, in the strongest light, the anomalous vices of the electoral law, by

which 120,000 electors named only 181 deputies; whilst in more favoured districts 98,000 electors returned 278. The aim of the Dynastic Opposition was, to preserve the morality and dignity of constitutional monarchy, by confining it within its proper sphere. The Republican allies inwardly felt that monarchy was playing its last stake, and that victory might be more fatal to it than defeat. On the eve of the vote, M. Guizot, the real chief of the Conservative Cabinet, in addressing his constituents at a banquet at Lisieux, although resolved to concede nothing, ventured to say, 'The Opposition promises you Progress; the Conservative party alone is able to give it to you.' These words, insincerely spoken, were not lost either on friends or foes, exciting in the one expectations not intended to be realised, and sanctioning in the other the series of banquets, at which, a year later, the Opposition transferred its appeals from a heedless or derisive majority in the Chamber to an aroused and earnest people. A singular incident occurred two days before the election, which powerfully seconded the influence of the Court on the electoral body. The population of Paris were celebrating, on the 29th of July, the *fête* of the Revolution, or of the Dynasty. Whilst Louis Philippe, surrounded by his family, presented himself in the balcony to the crowds gathered around the Tuileries, two pistol-shots were fired from the garden. It was thought at first to be an attempt at assassination, and instructions were instantly sent by telegraph to the Prefects, throughout the kingdom, to post up, in all the electoral colleges, placards announcing the crime. Under this impression, sympathy, indignation, and fear, came into action, paralysing or abating opposition, and deciding the wavering to support the King's ministry. In Paris an hour sufficed to re-assure the electors, by the official announcement that Joseph Henry was an unhappy maniac, and not an assassin. The victory of the Opposition was now complete. Out of fourteen Deputies, Paris returned eleven Oppositionists. The Minister consoled himself for his reverses in the capital, however, by his success in the Departments. His force in the Chamber numbered 270 against 180 members. Its supplest element, the band of functionaries, was increased. The elections, so far from removing this evil, had added to it, and the prospect of Reform was more remote than ever.

In the election for the renewal of one-third of the General Council in November, the Government interest was still paramount.

It was somewhat different in the case of the municipal elections which took place at the same time all over France; the returns in general being little favourable to the policy of the Government. The contemporary elections of the National Guard offered a character of more marked hostility. The Liberal Committees saw in these elections the means of setting the nation in opposition to the electoral body, (*le pays légal,*) and of taking on this larger field a striking retaliation for parliamentary defeats. Almost everywhere success attended its efforts; at Paris the victory was complete. Meanwhile causes of discontent were gathering elsewhere. Frauds in the maritime service at Rochefort, and at Toulon, committed by Government functionaries, and investigated by a ministerial commission, were left unpunished. A deficient harvest, portending a scarcity of food for the winter, and the actual advance in the price of grain, were urgently pressed on the notice of the ministry; but the applications were either disregarded or treated as factious. At the same time symptoms of a formidable financial crisis rapidly multiplied under the triple influences of scarcity, augmented expenditure, and the reckless multiplication of railways, with a view to electoral influence. Then came the disclosure of a deficit of 433 millions of francs in the budget, with want of gold in the Bank. Credit was restricted. Commerce and industry were at a stand. National securities were depreciated. Everything portended some inevitable disaster. The foreign relations of France, moreover, were far from satisfactory. Russia was openly hostile. Prussia, occupied with difficulties of her own, was neuter. The relations with England, at first intimate, then indifferent, then delicate, and now menacing, were definitively broken off on the marriage of the Duke de Montpensier with the Infanta of Spain, in direct contravention of the understanding with the British Government in reference to the Spanish marriages. The absolutists of Europe lost no time in benefiting by the breach between England and France. The marriage of the head of the house of Bourbon to a Princess of Modena, was an intelligible menace to the dynasty of Orleans. Within a month after the Spanish

marriages, Russia, Prussia, and Austria, without consulting the other powers, which had guaranteed the independence of Cracow, put down this last relic of Polish nationality; and to the energetic protest of England, and the feeble remonstrance of France, deigned only an acknowledgment of receipt. In these unpromising circumstances ended the year 1846.

The session of 1847 was opened by the King in person. The royal speech evinced the most imperturbable serenity and inscrutable reserve. The King announced to the Chambers the marriage of his youngest son; which received the sanction of a large majority of both Houses. On the reception day, the first of January, the Nuncio, speaking in the name of the diplomatic body, lavished praises and flattery on the King. Truth, unfortunately, was less flattering. A large deficit in the Exchequer; in the country, scarcity of the means of subsistence; on the high roads of the centre and west, bands of armed peasantry opposing the transport of grain, and, impelled by the pangs or the dread of hunger, perpetrating the worst excesses; these were subjects for grave anxiety and energetic counterworking. But neither the murders in the provinces, nor the disastrous effects of a commercial crisis, disturbed the security of the Court or Cabinet, confident as they were in their unwavering majority in the Chambers.

'Thus,' writes M. Garnier-Pagès, 'the system triumphed. The political fortune of the head of the house of Orleans was at its apogee. France obeyed him. Europe in the end accepted him. He had at first but princely alliances, now he had royal ones. Full of himself, he cast a complacent look on the present, a tranquil look on the future.....One year more, and a fugitive, an exile, he was to quit France for ever.'—Vol. iv., chap. ii., p. 31.

On the motion for the Address to the throne, an amendment was moved by M. Duvergier de Hauranne, urging the Chamber to take immediate measures to restore order and economy into the public service. He proved from official documents, that Ministers were responsible for the expenditure of 1,000,000,000 francs, (£40,000,000 sterling,) which must be repaid by subsequent budgets. This enormous waste he traced mainly to the multiplication of railways for political purposes. His amendment was rejected, and the Address passed by 248 votes against 84. Specific measures, subsequently introduced

by the Opposition, for Electoral and Parliamentary Reform, were also rejected by larger majorities, being denounced by the Ministers as unnecessary in themselves, uncalled for by the country, and undeserving the notice of the Chambers.

The motion of M. Remusat for Parliamentary Reform followed. Its object was the exclusion from the Chamber of the officers and functionaries of the military and civil households of the King and Princes. It was resented as a denunciation of hostility against the Court, and was rejected by 219 votes against 170. Of the majority of 219, not less than 129 were paid functionaries. The majority in the Chamber represented the administration; of national representation there was none in France.

The session had now lasted three months. Even the bit-by-bit reforms, promised by the Cabinet at the opening of the session, had been kept back. The Ministry seemed struck with impotency, as averred by one of their veterans, M. Desmousseaux, a Conservative *par excellence*, who, after reviewing their negations and subterfuges of past years, characterized the whole policy of the Cabinet in the emphatic exclamation, '*Rien! Rien! Rien!*' ('Nought! Nought! Nought!')

The remainder of the session wore more of a judicial than a political character. Revelations were made of frauds of the gravest character committed by ministerial agents in the military and naval departments, and of venal intrigues in the disposal of patronage, or in railway concessions,—frauds brought home in certain scandalous instances to Cabinet Ministers themselves. In some cases parliamentary inquiries were ordered; but as the Government continued to obtain the conduct of them, they, of course, ended in nothing.

The Parliamentary session had now closed; that of public opinion was opening. The rejection of the measure of M. Duvergier de Hauranne for Electoral Reform had convinced the dynastic Opposition, that nothing more was to be expected from the Court, and least of all from the King. The older he became, the more obstinate was his contempt for everything that was not proposed by himself, and the more deeply rooted his conviction, that adherence to his cherished system of governing by himself, and not by responsible Ministers,—a virtual autocracy,—could alone give security to his reign, and insure

the future fortunes of his race. All sections of the Opposition concurred in the necessity of looking, not to Parliament, nor to the electoral colleges, but to the people, for the sympathy and support they needed. It remained only to regulate the conditions, ground, and limit of the coalition of the Reformist forces. Amongst all shades of the liberal and democratic opposition there was a sincere determination to act in concert for securing the freedom of the people, and their just share in the government.

Their first conjoint meeting was held at the house of M. Odillon Barrot. The bases of loyal and hearty co-operation were there agreed upon. The concert was not difficult. If the future were in reserve for the Republicans, the present belonged to the friends of representative government and constitutional monarchy. The progressive liberty and prosperity of the country was the immediate object of both; and each frankly engaged to assist the other in obtaining these results, so long as their principles were not compromised.

These several parties, each in its own sphere of action, commenced a systematic agitation on political and social questions, which pervaded the nation and roused the popular mind into unwonted activity. To the Central Committee was confided the initiating of the Reform movement; and, on the proposal of M. Duvergier de Hauranne, M. Pagnerre was commissioned to draw up a petition for Electoral and Parliamentary Reform, which demanded an electoral law having for its principle equality of rights, for its basis the population, and for its form universal suffrage. To obtain this reform three courses of action were adopted: the petition just named, pointing out the glaring abuses of the electoral law as it then stood; the holding of banquets at Paris and in the departments, to exhibit the agreement of all sections of the Opposition; and the formation of a mixed committee, centralising the management of the Reform movement.

Towards the end of May, the petition was unanimously adopted at a large meeting at the house of M. Odillon Barrot. The Reform Propaganda by banquets, proposed by M. Garnier-Pagès, was readily accepted, and felt to be the most efficacious means of eliciting the answer of the country to the insolent defiance of the Cabinet. Finally, the creation of a mixed com-

mittee was agreed upon. The alliance was now definitely concluded.

The decision taken, execution followed. The petition was widely circulated, and was eagerly read and discussed in all the electoral districts in the kingdom. The first banquet offered by the Central Committee of the Seine to the members of the affiliated committees and to all the deputies of the Opposition who had voted for the Reform Bill, was, after numerous formal delays and objections interposed by the Minister, held on the 9th of July, when twelve hundred persons assembled at 'that great *Agape* of the Revolution.' Electors, deputies, journalists, all shades of the Opposition, came together: putting away the recollection of past differences; blending in the one thought of the public good; tending towards one end; gathered under one flag, *Electoral and Parliamentary Reform*. After the repast toasts were given to *the National Sovereignty*, and to *the Revolution of* 1830. To this last toast M. Odillon Barrot replied; his speech, resounding with indignant eloquence, loudly proclaimed that 'the Revolution of 1830 had been falsified since its origin by a corrupt Government, which had given the lie to its principle.' Other patriotic and constitutional toasts followed; and the most perfect order prevailed from beginning to end. The effect of the banquet was decisive, and the example was rapidly followed. The speeches at the Chateau Rouge, reproduced by the Reform press, and profusely circulated, sowed the seeds of Reform agitation on all points of the territory. The north-east began the movement. The banquet of Calmar was the first after that of Paris. Strasburg followed, mustering seven hundred guests from all parts of Alsace. After a banquet at Soisson came the grand banquet of St. Quentin. The Government, meanwhile, was not slow in furnishing new matter for animadversion. The appointment of the young Duke d'Aumale, scarcely twenty-five years of age, to supersede Marshal Bugeaud as Governor-General of Algiers, was the final act of Marshal Soult before retiring from the Presidency of the Council, where M. Guizot succeeded him. This appointment, the last expression of the royal policy, had been long expected, and occasioned no surprise. But it revived the ominous name of M. Polignac in the memory of the people, and it re-appeared in the debates. Strengthened by these and similar causes, the

agitation of the banquets extended through all the principal cities of France; but nowhere exceeding constitutional limits. Rouen terminated this brilliant campaign. At its banquet were assembled eighteen hundred guests, amongst whom were twenty deputies. Finally, it was decided that a last banquet should take place in Paris before the Session, as the definitive consecration of the alliance of parties. The association of the National Guard with this demonstration was proffered by its officers, and accepted. This banquet of the twelfth arrondissement, which did not take place, will remain more famous in history than all the rest. The Revolution of the 24th of February, 1848—the Republic sprang from it.

The Cabinet, deaf to the suggestions of prudence and sound policy, redoubled its acrimony and imprudence at the opening of the Session. In the speech from the throne the King was made to intervene directly against the deputies of the Opposition, whose opinions he treated as 'issuing from blind or hostile passions.' This descent of the King into the arena of Parliamentary warfare, for the purpose of insulting the Opposition to its face, was a manifest abdication of royal irresponsibility,—the first step in the way of a more real and serious abdication. The Opposition took up the gauntlet of defiance which the King and his Minister had thrown down, and M. Guizot accepted battle on ground where the stake was the monarchy itself. Staking this, he might lose it. In less than two months afterwards he lost it. Much uneasiness was felt in the royal circle at the danger of so critical a situation. Amongst the children of the King was one whose open character and vivacity of mind made him the object of Louis Philippe's peculiar affection. This was the Prince de Joinville. The Prince's first remonstrance with his father was received as the ridiculous temerity of a young man. When he persisted in his warnings, not always in words the most respectful to M. Guizot, the King 'invited' him to go to Algeria to join his brother, the Duke d'Aumale. He soon after left Paris in despair. A confidential letter written by him at that moment to his brother, the Duke de Nemours, and since published, shows plainly that he considered the throne and the country well-nigh lost to the family:—

'I am troubled,' he says, 'by the events which I see accumulating

on all sides.....The King is inflexible, and will listen to no advice. His will must carry it over everything. What I regard as a great danger is the exclusive action he assumes in everything.....It seems to me inevitable that the debate this year in the Chamber should turn on this anomalous position of things, which has effaced the Constitutional fiction that the King can do no wrong, and brings the monarch into question in all discussions. There are ministers no longer; their responsibility is null; everything is attributed to the King. The King has reached an age at which observations are no longer acceptable. He is used to govern; he loves to show that it is he who governs. His immense experience, his courage, and all his great qualities make him confront the danger boldly: but the danger exists none the less. This false position, I believe, will be contested more than ever. It will be urged, that constitutional government is especially established to avoid these alternatives of kings too young or too old, to calm the too great ardour of sovereigns, or supply what is wanting in them. In the present instance we shall have need of both these things, and both are wanting.

'The accession of Palmerston, in awakening the passionate distrust of the King, led us to make the Spanish campaign, and invested us with a deplorable reputation for bad faith. Separated from England at a moment when the affair of Italy turned up, we have not been able to take that active part in it which might have diverted the attention of the country, and would have been in accordance with principles which we cannot abandon, for it is by them we are here.

'We have not dared to turn our arms against Austria, for fear of seeing England immediately form another Holy Alliance against us. We come before the Chambers with a detestable internal situation, and with a foreign position that is no better. All this is the work of the King alone, the result of the old age of a Sovereign, who *will* govern, but who has no longer the spirit to take a manly resolution.

'The worst is, that I see no remedy. At home, what is to be said or done, when our bad financial condition is pointed out? Abroad, what can be done to restore our position and follow a line of conduct to the taste of our country? It is certainly not in causing an Austro-French intervention in Switzerland, which would be to us what the campaign of 1823 was to the Restoration. I had hoped that Italy would have furnished us with this diversion, this revulsion, of which we have so much need. But it is too late. The battle is lost here. We can do nothing in that country without the concurrence of England; and every day, in making them gain ground, throws us of necessity back into the opposite camp. We can do nothing here* but go away; because in remaining we should be necessarily led to make common cause with the retrograde party, which would have a disastrous effect in France. These unhappy Spanish marriages! We have not yet exhausted the reservoir of bitterness they contain.

* With the French fleet on the coast of Italy. This letter was written in the Gulf of Spezzia, on board the French ship of war '*Le Souverain*.'

'To sum up. In France, broken down finances; abroad, placed between an *amende honorable* to Palmerston on the subject of Spain, or common cause with Austria to play the *gens d'armes* in Switzerland, and struggle in Italy against our principles and our natural allies; and all this is the work of the King alone, who has falsified our constitutional institutions. I deem this a very serious matter, because I fear that the question of the Ministry and the portfolio may be put aside; and it is a grave danger when, in face of a bad situation, a popular assembly begins to discuss questions of principle. If some event should still arise, some affair to conduct with spirit, and which by its success might rally our people a little, there would be some chance of winning the battle; but I see nothing.

'You will forgive what I say of our father; it is to you only that I say it. You know my respect and affection for him; but I find it impossible not to look into the future, and it alarms me a little.'

'*Dated on board "Le Souverain," Spezzia, 7th Nov.*, 1847.'

—Vol. iv., chap. v., p. 142.

Referring to the above, M. Pagès says,—

'The Opposition has said nothing more explicit and precise; and the history which I am retracing appears to be only the development, the proof, and the conclusion of the facts and sentiments enounced in this letter, the outpouring of a forecasting mind and upright heart into the bosom of a beloved brother.'

For the discussions in the Chambers on the home and foreign policy of the Cabinet, we must content ourselves by directing attention to the clear and spirited summary given by our author. In these debates the financial condition of the country was declared by M. Léon Faucher to be characterised by remissness in administration, and by irregularity and disorder in fact. Commerce and industry were alleged to be languishing, public credit to be depressed, and the revenue to be pledged for eight years to come. Of the foreign policy, it was said by M. de Lamartine, 'that, contrary to her nature, her history, and her traditions, France since the Spanish marriages had become Ghibeline at Rome, sacerdotal at Berne, Austrian in Piedmont, Russian at Cracow, French nowhere, counter-revolutionary everywhere!'

On the decisive point of this great struggle, the question of Banquets, a few words may not be out of place. The Ministers, in the exercise of 'a vigour beyond the law,' had declared in the Chamber of Peers their intention to refuse their authorisation of the banquet of the twelfth arrondissement, and henceforth to interdict all political banquets. Upon this it was resolved, at a

meeting of Liberal Deputies, of Journalists, and of the Central Committee, held at the house of M. Odillon Barrot, that honour would not allow them to abandon the defence of the right of assembly; and that the question should be brought to an issue forthwith. It was already the 7th of February, when the discussion was opened by M. Duvergier de Hauranne. The right of meeting was maintained on the authority of law, and supported by reference to the precedents set by the Prime Minister, Guizot, and other members of the Cabinet; at the same time, the glaring inconsistency of their prohibiting them was argued and exposed. The Minister, in reply, boldly insisted that 'there were no other rights than those expressly inscribed in the Charter.' 'How of the right to breathe?' asked one. The question was not replied to. Conciliatory amendments, by moderate Conservatives, were disdainfully rejected by their leader. A division and scrutiny followed. 413 Deputies voted: 228 for the Ministers; 185 for the Opposition. The discussion opened on the 22nd of January, and closed on the 12th of February. This grand debate occupied twenty-two sittings. The Opposition was finally conquered.

We cannot follow our author through his perspicuous and animated narrative of the events which followed the refusal of the Government to admit the right of assembly. The refusal of the Deputies of the Opposition to accompany the Deputation for the presentation of the address; the bringing before Parliament a formal impeachment of the Ministry for their policy and acts, together with a vindication of their own honour, assailed in the offensive allusions from the lips of the King himself; the agitation in the city and the departments; the steadfast purpose shown by the people and the National Guard to obtain, by all justifiable means, the dismissal of a Cabinet inveterately hostile to their dearest rights; the irritation of the people at the threats of repression held out by the Government; their prompt resort to measures of self-defence; the erection of barricades; the seizing of arms; the rapid and skilful fortification of the central streets, lanes, alleys, and squares of the city, their camp and *point d'appui* in the now inevitable struggle; finally, the annihilation of the last chance of a pacific solution by the calamitous massacre of the Boulevards des Capucins;—for the details of these and the other events of the opening

crisis, we must have recourse to the volume before us. Of the event last named, M. Pagès writes:—

'The fall of the Ministry had calmed the hostility, but not the effervescence. The Reform manifestation gained every moment in extent, in force, in importance. Everything tended to inflame it,—success; the contagion of example; the desire of new concessions after a first advantage; the suspected loyalty of the King; the vague promises made; the absence of any formal public engagement; and, finally, that passion, irresistible in the crowd, curiosity. All the population poured out into the streets. The *gamins* of Paris, whose audacity and love of mischief nothing can arrest, were running in all directions, crying out, "Lamps! Lamps!" In a moment, voluntary or forced, the illumination was general. Men, women, children, National Guards, *bourgeois*, all conditions elbowed each other in the vast mass.

'Formed in column, the compact crowd traversed the principal streets of Paris, headed by officers of the National Guard, preserving a pacific attitude, and exchanging friendly salutations with the troops of the Line stationed along its route. On approaching the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, the column found itself directly in face of troops drawn up in square, who barred their passage. The impulse from behind rendered it impossible to halt or recede. M. Schumaker ran forward to the Colonel, who was on horseback in front of his men. "Colonel," cried he, "open your ranks to us. Our intentions are pacific. You see that retreat is impossible; the crowd presses us." "These are not my orders," replied the Colonel; "you cannot pass;" and withdrew within his ranks. Here the impulsion of the enormous mass bore down all resistance, broke the first rank of the procession, and threw it in disorder upon the troop. "Grenadiers! cross bayonets," shouted the Colonel; and in an instant the arms were lowered; a shot was fired from the extremity of the line; other shots followed; then, as by electric communication, a discharge; then another; the whole troop, from each face of the square, had fired point-blank upon the compact crowd! It was seen to fall like corn beneath the scythe; to rise, fall again, roll over upon itself with shrieks of terror, and rush away in inconceivable disorder. In some seconds the road, emptied of living beings, exhibited in its whole length a confused mass of dead, dying, and wounded, weltering in pools of blood, in the midst of a frightful pell-mell of arms, flags, torches still smoking, clothing and fragments clotted with gore and red mud. The soldiers shrank back, horrified; the ranks were confounded; the infantry threw itself upon the cavalry; a hurried rush began; and already the foremost fugitives had passed the Hotel of the Ministry, ere the energetic intervention of the officers rallied the troop and restored order. To the first affright of the people succeeded universal and terrible indignation. "We are assassinated! Treason! Vengeance!" The crowd began to flow backward upon the soldiers with menaces and imprecations, when the timely arrival of a battalion of the Second Legion prevented further disorder.

'The authorities felt the importance of effacing, as quickly as possible, all traces of this disaster. But, before their agents could be sent to the spot, the citizens and National Guard obtained the use of a waggon from the Messageries of Lafitte and Co., and placed in it sixteen corpses left upon the Boulevard. A great number of persons then came and took possession of this funeral car. The *cortège* of death and vengeance moved on, and the victims sprinkled with their blood the same boulevard which they had trodden an hour before with joyous steps. For three hours the funeral procession passed along, amidst gathering crowds and cries of, "Vengeance! To arms! To the churches! Sound the tocsin! Let us organize resistance! Away to the barricades! To the barricades!" The gates of the Mayoralty of the fourth arrondissement were opened to the funeral train. The bodies were taken out and deposited in an apartment until they could be conveyed to the Morgue. The effect of the volley of musquetry was decisive everywhere. In the palace all was gloom and discouragement. M. Molé urged the King to call to power, without delay, the promoters of the banquet. The Deputies who had accompanied the procession returned to the house of M. Odillon Barrot, and concurred with him in the necessity for energetic measures; that the battle was now inevitable, and that honour required the intervention of the Deputies in support of the people. They adjourned all resolution till the morrow. But the popular initiative brooked no delay. The rising became general. Many threw themselves into the struggle, who till now had been neutral. From eleven o'clock until after midnight, the tocsin from all the churches called the people into the streets, and the night was passed in earnest preparation for the inevitable battle of the morrow.'—Vol. v., chap. i., p. 19, *seq.*

At the moment when Louis Philippe learned from M. Montalivet the failure of M. Molé, the sound of the tocsin struck his ear. It was the whole situation clearly expressed, and called for prompt discussion. But it was repugnant to his nature to take a decided line of action between parties. His reliance on kingcraft was unshaken. He would fain conciliate and menace at the same time. Accordingly, he sent for M. Thiers on the one side to sooth public opinion, and for Marshal Bugeaud on the other to overawe and control it. Against this latter nomination M. Thiers remonstrated in vain. He was allowed, however, to associate the name of M. Odillon Barrot with his own in the formation of a ministry. In a few hours after, the *Moniteur* announced the intended accession of a Thiers-and-O.-Barrot Cabinet, and the appointment of Marshal Bugeaud, the most unpopular soldier in France, to the supreme command of the army and the National Guard, with full powers to act. The Marshal entered resolutely at once

upon his functions. His fundamental idea was not to wait for attack, but to be beforehand with it. His new dispositions were promptly planned, his orders clear and peremptory, and at five o'clock in the morning he was ready. When he had transmitted his orders, he looked to the execution of them himself. Resolute to meet the perils that menaced royalty, he did not perceive that the great peril was himself.

The people of Paris were not less resolutely organising resistance. Barricades were multiplied at every point, and a girdle of stone was raised around every post of each detachment. By daybreak all the communications were broken. From the centre to the circumference, even under the windows of the Tuileries, the insurrection was on foot behind its ramparts. These were no slight or hasty constructions, but strong works of art; battlemented, open for sally, closed against entrance, and some, the more important from their position, were cannon-proof. Their number was more wonderful than their construction. On a careful inquiry afterwards, it was found that there had not been fewer than 1,512 barricades, for the erection of which 1,277,000 paving stones had been taken up, and 1,043 trees cut down. Gunsmiths and private citizens were ransacked; military posts and barracks furnished arms in abundance. Cartridges were made by thousands; and where gunpowder was not to be had, the manufacturing chemists were employed preparing fulminating cotton. The nomination of Bugeaud, after the massacre of the Capucins, was a challenge to the people. This was their answer. M. Garnier-Pagès is of opinion that, even after the massacre of the previous evening, the withdrawal of Marshal Bugeaud for a less unpopular General, and the frank concession of the demands of the people, would have restored peace, and saved the monarchy.

'Thus in the night of the 23rd and 24th of February not a word was said of the forfeiture of the throne, not a syllable of the Republic. The Republicans were silent; none of them hoped for the immediate fall of the monarchy.....But in the morning, when they saw that a Liberal Ministry was neither definitely named, nor officially proclaimed; that Marshal Bugeaud was invested with general command; that the columns of attack were in motion, and that the battle was become inevitable; that, in fact, it was begun; all energetic men threw themselves into the struggle, and took the direction of it, resolved to push it to extremity, even to the triumph of democracy.'—Vol. v., p. 29.

Events were now moving on with fearful rapidity. When M. Reims, the friend and secretary of M. Thiers, who had been sent out to procure information, repaired to the Bureau of 'the National,' and thence to the house of M. Marrast, and informed him of the appointment of the Thiers-Barrot Ministry, and of the conditions accepted by the King,—'That will no longer suffice,' interrupted the celebrated Journalist: 'there must be the abdication of the King before noon! In the afternoon it will be too late.'.....As the deputies proceeded towards the Tuileries, barricades already intercepted their route. To obtain a passage they were obliged to name themselves. 'They are deceiving you and the people; they send for you merely to amuse public opinion; the King will not give way; has he not chosen Bugeaud to mow us down with grape-shot?' The deputies with difficulty made their way to the palace about half-past eight. It was easy now to tell the results of the double policy of the King and his Minister. As early as seven o'clock in the morning all the strategical positions were surrounded, all the corps intercepted on their march. Collisions necessarily occurred, in which the people for the most part prevailed. Before nine o'clock a great many military posts were taken, and five barracks were in the hands of the people, who were vigorously besieging others. They were masters of the Place des Victoires, the Porte St. Denis, and the Porte St. Eustache. The Bastille was evacuated. The depôt of cartridges was removed from the Barrière du Trône to Versailles; and the cavalry condemned to helpless inaction in the Place de la Concorde. The column of General Bedeau, in execution of its orders, advanced to the centre of the Boulevard. It was stopped by a formidable barricade, held by men resolved to defend it. The General announced the formation of a Ministry of the Left, the appointment of Marshal Bugeaud, and his orders to storm the barricade. His statements were disbelieved. The General dispatched an officer to head quarters for printed copies of the royal proclamations and fresh orders. The proclamations were sent, with directions to employ force if further resistance were made. The proclamations were distributed; but there, as elsewhere, the name of Bugeaud destroyed the effect of the Opposition Ministry. The good sense of the people protested against these irreconcilable contradictions; they stood

firm. Resolved to fight his way, General Bedeau called lou y on the Chasseurs de Vincennes to advance; but at that instant an officer arrived breathless, with a note from the Marshal, as follows:—'My dear General, my dispositions are modified; announce everywhere that firing is to cease, and that the National Guard assume the service of the police. Speak words of conciliation.—LE MARECHAL DUC D'ISLY.' This announcement was received by the crowd with enthusiastic applause, but without hostility or insult. It was nine A.M., when the General commanded the retreat.

The tidings received at head-quarters became more and more alarming. The Dukes of Nemours and Montpensier no longer concealed their anxiety. The day discovered the difficulties which the night had concealed; the ground gained by the people, the prodigious activity of the night, the loss of important strategical positions, &c., as already described. The people everywhere advanced on the heels of the retiring troops. At one point only the movement of the troops was free—the Carrousel, where the Marshal had fixed his head-quarters; the forecourt of the Tuileries, already the network of barricades, was visibly closing around the sacred enclosure. It was no longer a question of attack, but of defence. The King was at last persuaded to obtain the Marshal's consent to transfer the command of the National Guard to General Lamoricière. 'Make Bugeaud swallow that,' said the King, 'and proclaim it at once.' To this the Marshal readily consented, and it was then he issued the general order to cease firing.

But the most delicate question was the dissolution of the Chambers. So long as the existing Chamber was under his hand, the King was still the master; the Conservative party still standing; King, Ministers, Deputies, all cherished the certain hope of returning to favour. In giving way to a dissolution, on the contrary, Louis Philippe abdicated irrecoverably his personal government. At the first mention of it by M. Barrot, his vehemence was extreme—'He would not consent to it at any cost!' 'There must be a dissolution,' said M. Duvergier de Hauranne. The King remained deaf. From time to time he disappeared in an adjoining saloon, re-appearing with a look of confirmed obstinacy, and reiterated his refusals with redoubled energy. What genius inspired these perilous

counsels? Through the half-opened door the Deputies thought they detected the profile of M. Guizot. They were not mistaken. The Deputies returned to the charge; but the obstinacy of the King was not to be shaken, until the Duc de Nemours wrung from the Monarch his reluctant assent. It was now half-past nine. At ten the King was still higgling with the men who were to be his Ministers, but who could not obtain authority to act.

It was with extreme difficulty that General Bedeau effected his retreat along the Boulevards, through the obstacles that barred his way. The two pieces of cannon attached to his column he was compelled to abandon. They were taken to the Mayoralty, and the powder and ammunition distributed to the people. Near the Madeleine he halted, on perceiving some videttes of cavalry and a platoon of the Municipal Guard stationed on the Place de la Concorde, the latter occupying the Poste Peyroud. On hearing of the approach of General Bedeau's column, General Raynauld ordered the Municipals to retire within the guard-house. They refused, and the quartermaster gave the word to fire point-blank upon the compact mass of people,—killing and wounding many persons. At the first flash of the discharge General Bedeau rode up in front of them, and ordered them to stop firing; but they persisted. At length the infuriated people rushed through the shower of balls, forced the gate and seized the Municipals, who must have fallen victims to their own brutal obstinacy but for the intervention of the National Guard, who removed them to a place of safety. But the indignation of the people was not to be restrained. Post after post was stormed and burnt; toll-gates and bridges were destroyed; and the passage from one bank of the river to the other was cut off from the troops. At eleven o'clock the people forced their way into the Hotel de Ville, and were soon masters of the building. They did no wanton injury. Over the library and saloons of painting and statuary a workman chalked the inscription, 'Respect to the Arts and Sciences,' and they were safe. Left to themselves, the troops of Sebastian's division stationed there offered no resistance. The infantry gave up their muskets, the cuirassiers their arms, and the artillery their pieces. Some members of the Municipal Council then present, in the absence of the Pre-

sident, M. Rambuteau, who had abandoned the Hotel de Ville in dismay, installed themselves as the municipal authority, and hastily convoked their colleagues to exercise in the name of the city the power fallen from the hands of the Government.

Meanwhile the Deputies of the Left, together with representatives of every section of the Opposition, were assembled at the house of M. Odillon Barrot, discussing the dissolution of the Chamber as the final concession. M. Garnier-Pagès and his friends, however, had seen all along from day-break that the fall of the system involved that of the King; and they now openly demanded the abdication of Louis Philippe, as that which could alone arrest the imminent effusion of blood. 'You have no time to lose,' said M. Marrast to M. Thiers, M. de Morny, and others. 'If within an hour the abdication of the King, and a Regency, be not proclaimed, the sections will come here, and it will be a complete Revolution.'

Up to this moment no one had cried '*Vive la République!*' The most conscientious and determined Republicans durst not hope for it. In the evening they had demanded only reform and dissolution; now the abdication of the King presented itself to them as an obvious necessity; and to the most advanced this was an immense satisfaction.

All the interest of this great drama was now concentrated upon the Tuileries. The Hotel de Ville was in the hands of the people, the Prefecture of Police menaced, and the Pantheon blockaded: the palace was the last line of defence for the Government against the insurrection. Towards that all the forces of invasion were now directed. Already from all parts were marching the columns of the National Guard, tradesmen, students, and work-people; and they arrived successively with a precision, a compactness, and a power of cohesion, which the most skilful general can seldom obtain from veteran troops on the best studied battle-field.

Let us now follow M. Garnier-Pagès, as he traces the effects of the deadly collision, brought on by the Municipals on the Place de la Concorde.

'A few minutes after the discharge of musketry, M. de Remusat and M. Duvergier de Hauranne entered in great agitation the saloon in which the King and the royal family were taking their last repast at the Tuileries. Distressed at the sight, they stood for a moment silent. The Queen asked quickly, with looks of uneasy apprehension,

"Has anything more serious happened?" M. de Remusat replying evasively, the Princess led them into an adjoining apartment, and the King immediately followed. It was then declared to him that the personal safety of the royal family was endangered;—that the people were already masters of the Hotel de Ville, and, possibly, of the Palais Royal; and that they would ere long be in the Place de la Concorde. Not a moment must be lost in insuring the safety of the royal family. The King saw at a glance the imminence of the danger. Two of the Deputies present were sent to see with their own eyes the real state of things in the Place de la Concorde, and the order was then given to prepare the carriages of the court for a possible departure. An aide-de-camp from General Bedeau next arrived, who stated that the fears excited by the fight of the Municipals had been exaggerated, that calm was re-established, that the people had retired, and that the troops, in good order, occupied the Place and all its avenues. This changed at once the character of the deliberation. No longer regarded as a measure of immediate personal safety, the retreat became a political question. M. Thiers advised the King to retire at once to St. Cloud, to collect there fifty or sixty thousand men, and three days afterwards to re-enter Paris. Marshal Bugeaud approved the suggestion. It was now eleven o'clock. Louis Philippe wished to see for himself the disposition of the troops and of the National Guard; perhaps he flattered himself with some return of enthusiasm for royalty under the prestige of his person. He would review the troops on the Place de la Concorde.

'The King on horseback wore his habitual uniform of Lieutenant-General of the National Guard, with the grand cordon of the Legion of Honour. The Princes, the Marshal, Generals Lamoricière, Trezel, and others, with MM. Thiers and Remusat, followed on foot. The Queen, the Princesses, the children up at the windows of the Palace, followed the dear old man with their looks, trembling with fear, emotion, and hope. He himself advanced slowly, his dejected features appearing rather to implore sympathy than to command respect. On entering the Carrousel, he came upon the 1st Legion. Cries of "*Vive le Roi*" rose from the ranks, mingled with shouts of "*Vive la Réforme.*" The King approached the Commander, M. Roussel. "You may," said he, "assure the National Guards under your orders, that they shall have Reform. They should have had it sooner, had I known that they desired it so eagerly." Authorised by these words, which Louis Philippe repeated in a loud voice, the National Guard expressed as one man their desire for Reform. Before the 10th Legion he had the same reception. Some persons who had slipped behind the ranks, shouted vociferously for Reform. The King rode forward some paces, and said to them with much firmness, "My friends, you shall have Reform; you shall have it; there is no longer any pretext for agitation; go home."

'But the National Guard of the 4th Legion had reserved for Louis Philippe another reception. As soon as he appeared in front of the battalions, there was a unanimous explosion of, "*Vive la Réforme!*" "*A bas les Ministres!*" The King would fain speak;

but the tumult stifled his voice. "My friends, you have Reform," cried he with an effort; "the Ministers are changed." They do not listen. The officers raise their swords; the National Guards their muskets. The excitement became intensely formidable. They uttered cries more directly hostile. "*A bas la système!*" "*A bas Guizot!*" Their hands were outstretched in menace. The escort approached and surrounded the King, and the clamour was redoubled.

'Louis Philippe turned away intimidated, his head sunk down upon his chest. Without noticing the troops that awaited him, he rode through the Arch of Triumph, alighted from his horse at the Pavilion of Flora, and, turning to M. Thiers, who had never quitted him, he said sorrowfully, "Ah! I see plainly enough, all is over!"

'Scarcely had M. Thiers entered the Palace, when news was brought to him by his secretary, M. de Reims, and one of his friends, M. d'Artigue, a Republican, that the National Guard of the 2nd Legion insisted on the abdication of the King, and the nomination of a Regency. The Dukes were called in. Both listened—the Duke de Nemours without any token of surprise, the Duke de Montpensier with emotion. "We must inform the King," said the Duke de Nemours. Then turning round, "You have spoken of the Regency: it is the Regency of *St. Helena*. Is it not, gentlemen?" Firm and sad words, (remarks M. Garnier-Pagès,) containing at once a personal renunciation, and an admission of painful unpopularity: nobly felt, and nobly uttered.

'To the grave communication then made to him the King gave no answer. "If," observed the Duke de Nemours, "the King judges that abdication is necessary, I demand of him to abdicate for me the Regency." The ice was broken. "Do you think," said the King, "that in abdicating I shall save the throne of my grandson?" "It is doubtful, Sire."

'The King called his family around him. The deputies retired. When they next saw the King, he frankly declared he would only abdicate his throne with his life.

'Meanwhile, another collision occurred between the troops and the people, and a bloody fight of half an hour's duration took place near the Chateau d'Eau. The rattle of musketry resounding through the city, turned the march of the insurgents towards the Tuileries. The King, having refused to abdicate, was negociating with M. Cremieux the formation of a Ministry of which M. Odillon Barrot should be the head, when M. Emile Girardin, making his way through the useless crowd that thronged the Tuileries, penetrated into the royal closet, exclaiming, "They are making your Majesty lose precious time..... Minutes are hours. In an hour hence there will be neither King nor kingship in France. Abdicate, Sire, in favour of the Duchess of Orleans. Here is the paper of the people's conditions." And he reads,—

"Abdication of the King.
Regency of Madame the Duchess of Orleans.
Dissolution of the Chamber.
General Amnesty."

'After a brief struggle, the King let fall the words, "I have always been a pacific King. I abdicate." No sooner were the words

uttered than M. Girardin hurried to the Palais Royal to announce the abdication. But it was vain: the tumult of the fight made a hearing impossible. Meanwhile the Princes in person announced the abdication throughout the crowded halls of the palace, and to the officers outside. The vehement protest of the Queen and the Duchess of Orleans again made the King waver; and very shortly after, in answer to the question of M. de Lerey, whether he had abdicated, he said, "No; as yet, I have signed nothing."

'The Princes declared that they had everywhere announced the abdication in favour of the Count de Paris, and that retraction was out of the question. The King then inquired of the Generals present, whether it was not possible to defend the Tuileries. On being assured it was not, he replied, "I do not wish that blood should be uselessly shed; I abdicate." Still this was but a verbal declaration. In a few minutes messengers arrived from the Duke de Nemours and Marshal Bugeaud, requiring the written act of abdication from the King. It was not without the most urgent entreaties of the Duke de Montpensier, who placed the paper before him and put the pen in his hand, that he was induced to comply. Then slowly, and in his round hand, he wrote as follows:—

'"I abdicate this crown, which the national voice called upon me to assume, in favour of my grandson, the Count of Paris.

'"May he succeed in the great task which devolves on him this day!

"LOUIS PHILIPPE.

'"*This 24th of February*, 1848."'

'It was now,' continues M. Garnier-Pagès, 'a quarter past twelve. At ten o'clock Louis Philippe still declared that he would never consent to the dissolution of the Chamber; at eleven o'clock he exclaimed that they should not have his abdication but with his life; at noon he was no longer King. Two hours had sufficed to precipitate him from the height of his throne and of his pride. If there are grander tragedies in history, there is not one so brief.'—Vol. v., p. 103.

The abdication of the King was the signal for a general abandonment of the falling house. Generals, officers, deputies, and most of the servants fled away, spreading amazement and consternation wherever they went. Others silently departed, without troubling themselves to ask whether their services were any longer required. At the same time, the battle continued to rage in the precincts of the Tuileries, notwithstanding the gallant efforts of Generals Lamoricière and Perrot on the one hand, and of La Grande and other leaders of the insurrection on the other, to put an end to the murderous fire. In the palace all was desolation and solitude. Assembled in the cabinet of the King, surrounded by a few faithful friends of the dynasty, the royal family were waiting in painful anxiety to learn the result of the written act of abdication sent to Marshal Gérard.

At this instant a discharge of musketry was heard in the Place Carrousel. The Princesses uttered cries of terror. The King, alarmed, inquired by a look into the cause. His attendants were obliged to tell him, that as the carriages prepared for their departure were crossing the Carrousel, preceded by an outrider at full gallop, the people, mistaking him for an orderly, had fired upon him, and he was seen to fall; and that the people and the National Guard had thrown themselves before the carriages, and forced them to return. Already, then, the insurgents were in sight of the chateau, the King's servants killed under his own eyes. All the avenues were in the power of the enemy, and the means of flight taken from them. Just then, M. Cremieux arrived in disordered attire and the greatest agitation. 'Sire,' cried he, 'lose not a moment. The people are at hand. In a few minutes they will be in the Tuileries!' The King, without saying a word, rose, took off his grand cordon, laid aside his military uniform, put on with the Queen's help the dress of a citizen, asked for his watch, his portfolio, and a small bunch of keys he always carried about him, and, taking a hurried leave of the Duchess of Orleans, gave the signal for departure, and led the way. A dimly lighted narrow passage, communicating with the King's private apartments, terminated under the Clock Tower; and through that private outlet he passed. The Queen, greater than her adversity, gave him her arm. On reaching the wicket of the tower she perceived M. Ary Scheffer, and, beckoning him to her, said, 'The King abdicates; we are going; cover the King's left.' In the garden at the foot of the chateau was M. de Montalivet, with twenty mounted guards. The National Guards of the First Legion, posted at the gates, presented arms. The garden was entirely free. It was then about twenty minutes before one o'clock. The only procurable vehicles were three miserable one-horse coaches, in waiting at the foot of the Obelisk. 'Where is the King's carriage?' asked a bystander. 'He has no other,' was the reply. The King himself opened the door of the first coach, and threw himself on the further cushion. Into these three coaches, having in all but eight seats, fifteen persons were crowded. 'Away!' cried the King to the coachman. The carriages set off at full speed for St. Cloud. The Princess Clementine, for whom no place could be found, joined

the Duchess of Montpensier, and took refuge at the house of M. de Lasteyrie.

M. Thiers and Marshal Bugeaud, left together in the palace, bereft of their little brief authority, parted with mutual condolences, and betook themselves to their own homes, not without sundry perils on their way. Neither the one nor the other assisted the Duchess of Orleans, when she came to the Chamber of Deputies to dispute with the Revolution the throne of France for her son.

The Duchess of Orleans, as soon as the King was gone, retired into her apartments, by the interior passages of the palace, having with her the Count de Paris and the Duke de Chartres, her two sons. There, surrounded by a few members of her household, without army, without General, without Ministers, knowing not what was to happen or what part to take, she waited. On hearing of the abdication of the King, M. Odillon Barrot, accompanied by MM. Havin, Abatucci, and Biesta, hastened from the Ministry of the Interior to the Tuileries, in quest of the Duchess of Orleans, and made their way to the outer court. The people were already firing from the Carrousel upon the palace. The Duke de Nemours was on horseback, giving his orders; he would not tell them in what part of the Tuileries the Duchess was to be found, but advised them not to stay longer amongst the bullets whistling around them. After an unsuccessful search, M. Barrot departed, having commissioned MM. Havin and Biesta to inform the Duchess, that he had returned to the Ministry of the Interior, to make known the regency to France, and that he strongly advised her to proceed to the Hotel de Ville, whither he would accompany her. Shortly afterwards, M. Dupin found the Duchess in the Pavillon Marsan, and prevailed upon her to accompany him at once to the Chamber of Deputies. The Duke de Nemours sent an officer at that instant, urging her to place herself and her children under his protection, and quit the Tuileries without a moment's delay. She repaired with her children in haste to the Pavillon d'Horlage, where the Duke awaited her with companies of the 69th, 14th, and 45th of the line. Under his escort she walked onward, leaning on the arm of M. Dupin. At the Pont Tournant she was met by MM. Havin and Biesta, who urged her to follow the advice of M. Odillon Barrot, and go straightway to the Hotel de Ville. The solicitations of her per-

sonal friends prevailed, and to the Palais Bourbon (the Chamber) she went. The crowd, touched with the sight, pressed around for a nearer view of this noble mother and her child, and the greater number cried, *'Vive la Duchesse! Vive le Comte de Paris!'* Her heart was cheered by this first breath of popular sympathy; and when the gates of the Chamber opened to receive her, she had sanguine hope of success.

The Duke de Nemours had less confidence. Foreseeing a final check, he was occupied in insuring the retreat. He ordered General Bedeau to take command of the cavalry, and form an advanced guard at St. Cloud. The infantry, massed at the entrance of the Rue Royale, were to be subsequently placed by his direction under the orders of another General, and to form the rear guard. Having made these dispositions, he rejoined his sister-in-law, resolved to quit her no more, and to share the perils he could not avert. If, at the beginning of the crisis, he showed himself wanting in promptitude and decision, his conduct at the close was perfectly honourable; and by his self-sacrifice, fraternal piety, and devotedness, he earned a high place in the esteem of all good men.

M. Odillon Barrot, on his return to the Ministry of the Interior, found there M. Malleville with some of his political friends, as well as M. Garnier-Pagès, Pagnerre, and other Radicals. Ignorant of what was passing in the city, he could decide upon no course of action, and begged Messrs. Malleville, Beaumont, and Garnier-Pagès to go to the Hotel de Ville, and ascertain how things stood. Making their way across the ruins of barricades and other impediments, they found the streets deserted. On the Quai Pelletier they met a column of armed men coming from the Hotel de Ville, and dragging a cannon, decked with flags, in the direction of the Tuileries,—a sure proof that the Hotel de Ville was already taken. On entering the square M. Garnier-Pagès was immediately recognised; way was made for the party; and they entered the Hotel de Ville amidst cries of *'Vive Garnier-Pagès!' 'Vive les Députés de l'Opposition!'* The members of the Municipal Council were busied in preparing a proclamation to the people to be issued forthwith, when a great tumult was heard, and a flood of people broke in, bearing along with them Garnier-Pagès, de Malleville, and Gustave de Beaumont, followed by two men, armed, who took the highest seats on the right, facing the President's desk,

whilst M. Garnier-Pagès and his companions announced to the incredulous assembly the abdication and departure of the King which they had just witnessed. One of the two men rose, and, arresting attention by his stern aspect, his long, tufted beard, and the musket in his hand, demanded that, before the Commission drew up the proposed proclamation, the meeting should be informed what were to be its contents; and then declared, in the name of the people in arms, that its announcements should be the following: 'The King, Louis Philippe, is deposed from the throne. Royalty is abolished. The absolute sovereignty of the people is recognised. The Republic is proclaimed. The King, Louis Philippe, for having, at various times, driven the citizens to destroy one another, is condemned to instant death!'

This atrocious proposition was met by a burst of indignant reprobation. A stormy debate followed, whilst the Commission were drawing up the Proclamation. Presently a prodigious noise was heard; when M. Delestre appeared with the proclamation in his hand. At the first words, 'The King has abdicated,' a formidable cry was heard, 'Deposed! deposed!' 'Yes!' said M. Delestre, 'himself and his dynasty!' Notwithstanding this energetic addition, it was impossible for him to continue the reading. Propositions were made from all sides. A thousand voices cried, 'The Republic! the Republic!' M. Delestre was compelled to retire, and rejoin his colleagues. In the fiery heat of men's minds at the Hotel de Ville, the proposition of a Regency would have been madness. It was not made. M. Garnier-Pagès instantly dispatched a line to M. Odillon Barrot:—'The people are masters of the Hotel de Ville. The presence of the Duchess of Orleans is no longer possible. She would incur the greatest perils.' M. Garnier-Pagès owed this to M. O. Barrot,—the moment foreseen at the origin of the Campaign of Banquets had arrived. The radicals had never abandoned aught of their principles, and were free to proclaim them. M. Garnier-Pagès advanced, and in a voice that stilled the tumult, 'Citizens,' said he, 'the People is Sovereign. It is the master of its destinies. It will come forth victorious out of this struggle. But regularity must be given to the movement. The Revolution must be directed. The Republic is the dream of my whole life. I would have accepted

a government of conciliation; but since the Republic is possible, we must proceed regularly. Authority must be organised.'

Immediately, by a spontaneous impulse, the Radical leaders present, and many others, exclaimed, 'We must name a Mayor of Paris!' 'Garnier-Pagès! Mayor of Paris!' A universal shout of applause followed. Not an objection was raised. The acclamations became more eager. Notwithstanding the grave reasons for refusal which thronged upon his mind, M. Garnier-Pagès believed it to be his duty to accede to a unanimous wish; but he declared that if he yielded to the wish of the people, it was under the formal condition that the power vested in him should be obeyed. 'Yes!' 'Yes!' 'Well, I accept; and I will do my duty.' M. Flottard: 'He accepts; and we will not allow him to be killed as was M. Bailly.' '*Vive Garnier-Pagès! Vive le Maire de Paris!*'

The election of the adjoint and the subordinate officials was soon completed. The call for the proclamation of the Republic was incessant.

The Mayor demanded a hearing, and declared that he would at once confer with his colleagues of the Radical opposition on the means of giving effect to their wishes.

It was now three o'clock.

In the meantime the murderous fight of the Chateau d'Eau had been brought to an end by a terrible expedient. Of the carriages from the King's stables, stopped by the people on the way to the Tuileries, some were unburnt. These were drawn before the Poste; straw, dry hay, and tarred planks were heaped upon them; and they were then set on fire. The flames ascended; the smoke filled the building. Exhausted and half-stifled, the soldiers threw down their arms on the threshold, and cried out that they surrendered. The people were infuriated, and some exclaimed, 'Death!' 'But the people of Paris,' says our author, 'were not the populace of Imperial Rome. The generosity of their instincts survived and prevailed. Not a single soldier was killed or wounded after surrender.' Generals Lamoricière and Perrot were furnished with blouses and set at liberty, and their uniforms were scrupulously restored to them at their homes.

All the approaches to the Tuileries were now in the hands of the people. Soon after the departure of the Duchess of

Orleans, the National Guard penetrated into the interior of the palace. Everywhere they saw traces of recent and sudden flight. The breakfast-table was still laid. The new comers counted and assorted the silver plate, and conveyed all to a place of safety. Everything was respected but the throne. On discovering this visible sign of vanished royalty, the crowd raised a shout of triumph. A proposal was made that the throne should be promenaded through the city, and burnt at the foot of the column of July. Instantly flags, platform, chair, were carried off, hoisted upon a cart, and, after perambulating Paris, burnt to ashes in the Place de la Bastile. On the arrival of the combatants from the Chateau d'Eau, heated by the fight, the sight of the portrait of Louis Philippe roused their fury; this was torn down and trampled under foot. This first act of violence led the way to others. Busts were mangled. Mirrors served for targets and flew to pieces. Porcelain was broken. A quantity of precious ornaments strewed the floors. There the work of destruction ended. The apartments of the Duchess of Orleans were respected. The diamonds of the crown, and most articles of value, were saved.

'A higher thought,' says M. Garnier-Pagès, 'sprang up in the minds of the people. If royalty exists no longer at the Tuileries, it is still on foot in the Chambers.' 'To the Chamber!' 'No Regency!' cried a thousand voices; and several columns of two or three hundred men each are speedily organized to march upon the Chamber of Deputies.

Our readers must go to the animated and graphic pages of this history for the discussions in the Chambers, and for the public demonstrations which issued in the annulling of the Regency, the proclamation of the Republic, and the establishment of a Provisional Government. When the Duchess of Orleans appeared in the Chamber of Deputies, accompanied by the Duke de Nemours, and holding the Count de Paris in the one hand and in the other the Duke de Chartres, she was hailed with shouts of welcome. *'Vive la Duchesse d'Orleans!' 'Vive le Comte de Paris!' 'Vive la Régente!'* At the same moment M. Arago, Sarrans, and others of their party, entered the Chamber to announce the formation of a Provisional Government. It remained to be seen which party would obtain the upper hand. M. Dupin, M. Odillon Barrot, and others warmly advocated the claims of the Regency. M. Marie, M.

Lamartine, Arago, &c., strongly urged the recognition of a Provisional Government. Whilst the debate was proceeding, a crowd of armed men, National Guards, Students, and Operatives, forced their way into the Chamber, which instantly became a scene of uproar and confusion; the event being the adoption and nomination of a Provisional Government. During this formidable scene the Duchess of Orleans sat with admirable dignity and firmness. Calm in attitude and countenance, she listened to the counsels of her friends, evidently inclining to the more energetic. Several times she essayed to address the Chamber; but her voice was drowned in the tumult. Repeatedly entreated by her friends and by the President himself to quit the Chamber, she refused to do so, whilst the shadow of a hope remained. When she saw the Regency rejected, the Dynasty deposed, a Provisional Government enthusiastically appointed, her friends powerless, and her hopes destroyed, she ceased to contend for the rights of her children, and turned all her thoughts to their safety. The Duke de Nemours stood bravely by her. Though informed by a deputy that his life was threatened, he would not abandon his sister-in-law or his brother's sons. They quitted the Chamber, and traversed the narrow corridors leading to the street, with imminent peril to their lives, not from the people, but from the over-hasty zeal of persons anxious for their safety. Happily she reached the Invalides in safety, and, after many hours of maternal anguish, saw her children, who had been torn from her side in the struggle, successively restored to her. Soon after she quitted the Chamber the people retired, and the hall was completely emptied. It was now past four o'clock.

'If the last sitting of the Chamber of Deputies was so full of interest and emotion, that of the Chamber of Peers was utterly devoid of either. Opened at half-past one o'clock, it was soon suspended after a discussion on some point of form. The people did not think of troubling it with their presence, or seem to know whether it were yet in existence. After a life without *éclat*, it died without a sound.'—Vol. i., p. 272.

After the invasion of the Chamber of Deputies, M. Odillon Barrot had abandoned the theatre of an unavailing struggle, and returned to the Ministry of the Interior. Determined to make a final attempt to promote the Regency, an appeal was to be made to the devotedness of the Legions. M. Barrot wrote with his own hand to the Mayor of the 2nd Arrondissement:—

"In the name of Order. M. Berger is invited to send the 2nd Legion on the Place of the Exchange (*la Place de la Bourse*). —O. Barrot."

All was in vain. M. Berger, on whom M. Barrot thought he could rely, replied that he recognised the Provisional Government. The information given by M. Garnier-Pagès to M. Barrot completed the ruin of his hopes. Henceforward he thought only of the safety of the Princess, whose crown he had been unable to save. Having learned that the place of her retreat had become known, and sensible of the perils which might ensue, he hastened to the Invalides.

The organization of the Provisional Government, and the names of its members, were made public without delay by a proclamation issued from the Hotel de Ville, signed by M. Garnier-Pagès as Mayor of Paris, and calling on the National Guard and the citizens of Paris to concur in maintaining the security and defence of the country. M. de Lamartine was instructed to prepare a proclamation, which should announce to France the Revolution and its Government, whilst his colleagues dictated orders required to prevent the resumption of hostilities, to insure the safety of Paris, to provide, in short, for the various necessities of the moment. These were written by impromptu secretaries, and dispatched by an infinite succession of faithful messengers to their several destinations.

When, at last, with no small difficulty, the members of the Provisional Government were collected at the Hotel de Ville, M. de Lamartine presented the Proclamation to the French people, which was read, approved, and put to press. A Provisional Ministry was formed, composed as follows:—President of the Council (without portfolio), M. Dupont de l'Eure; Public Works, M. Marie; Foreign Affairs, M. de Lamartine; Justice, M. Crémieux; Public Instruction and Worship, M. Carnot; Marine, M. Arago; Commerce, M. Bethmont; Finance, M. Goudchaux. The War Office was offered to General Lamoricière, and afterwards to General Bedeau. Both declined, but the former accepted a command on the frontier, and the latter was charged with the first military division. General Cavaignac was proposed to supersede the Duke d'Aumale as Governor of Algeria. M. Garnier-Pagès preserved the Mayoralty of Paris, with the Prefecture of the Seine and of Police, accountable only to the Provisional Government. The most exaggerated fears

prevailed for the safety of the Palais Royal, the Tuileries, and the immense artistic wealth of the Louvre. The diamonds of the Crown, with the plate and pictures, called for especial care. A number of brave men of all classes volunteered their services to watch over the precious property, and fulfilled their duties with patriotism and courage. It was needful at the same time to care for the safety of the city; to send orders to the several mayoralties; to insure subsistence for the people, and provisions for the army; to provide, in fact, for all those details of administration, which, while they are not few in times of peace, become countless in times of trouble. The members of the Government multiplied themselves to accomplish this task with a fertility of invention, a decision and an activity, incredible to those who have not seen with what prodigious energy the human faculties can work in the heat of a great crisis. The Proclamation of the Republic underwent repeated discussion; was finally printed and published; and, before the day closed, it was circulated by electric telegraph through the length and breadth of France.

'Eleven o'clock now struck by the great clock of the Hotel de Ville. Night was to give repose to the inhabitants. But to the members of the Provisional Government it brought that superhuman labour, which was to last two months and a half. Exhausted with fatigue and hunger, the founders of the Republic obtained with difficulty a piece of bread and cheese and a glass of water. Such was the repast, which in the history of calumny was called sometime afterwards, "the orgies" of the Provisional Government.'

'The 24th of February was thenceforth one of the most illustrious dates of French history. Between midnight and noon the monarchy had fallen; between noon and midnight the Republic was founded.'—Vol. v., p. 350.

This Revolution was a violent and sudden explosion; but its causes lay deep, and had long been gathering strength. During the eighteen years of his reign Louis Philippe had wounded to the quick the moral sentiment of the nation, by stimulating its selfish and material interests; had outraged its liberal instincts, by the repression of the liberty of the press, and of the right of public meetings; had offended unpardonably its just pride, by the weakness of a diplomacy more and more debased. He had especially irritated the popular classes by the maintenance and aggravation of all laws hostile to their physical, moral, and intellectual development.

Patient, calm, indisposed to extreme measures, the nation

had suffered in silence. It wished to redress, not to destroy. But neither the King nor the Government understood it.

The Revolution was the protest of public discouragement against a system tending to dissolution. Resistance to all progress; obstinate and organized corruption; the blindness of the Conservative party; insult launched from the mouth of the King himself against an Opposition bold but legal, daring but constitutional; the indifference of the National Guard; the coolness, amounting almost to disaffection, of the army; disgust and anger on the part of the people;—all concurred to produce it.

It is impossible to follow M. Garnier-Pagès through the mazes of this intricate history, so skilfully unravelled by his masterly hand, without sympathizing with him in the bitter disappointment he must have felt, on seeing the people of France dispossessed of its newly-acquired sovereignty after so brief a tenure, and that, in a great measure, by a section of the late Provisional Government, implicated in schemes which were to terminate in its overthrow. It may suggest a doubt to a Republican himself, whether the Revolution was, after all, the wisest solution of the difficulty; whether the Regency did not offer a better prospect of stability in its Reforms; whether, in short, France was ripe for a Republican Government. The very test of a political arrangement should be its practicability. It has been well said that 'political constitutions are not made, but grow;' that the art of political change is an art of grafting, and not of planting; and that the law of continuity and the influence of time are not accidental but essential conditions of all political solidity. These maxims, we think, find strong confirmation in the recent history of France from the speedy displacement of the Provisional Government, and the restoration, so shortly after, of the Imperial dynasty. It forcibly reminds us of the lesson inculcated so wisely by Mr. Fox, that 'resistance was a right which the People should as seldom as possible remember, but which their Rulers should never forget.'

We look with unabated interest for the remaining section of the *History of the Revolution of* 1848,—that of 'The Provisional Government,—of which the first volume has already appeared, and is to be followed by two others. The merits of M. Garnier-Pagès as a historian lead us to anticipate from it much valuable illustration of political truth, in that luminous arrangement and vivid presentation of facts which is the charm of historical writing.

ART. VI.—*Ten Years of Imperialism in France: Impressions of a 'Flâneur,'* Blackwood and Sons. 1862.

THE title and preface of this work by no means do justice to its contents. The information which it contains, whatever its value may prove, has evidently been most laboriously collected, and most carefully digested. According to the French dictionaries, a *flâneur* is an idler, a loiterer, a trifler; but the author is quite conscious that the word cannot be applied in any of these senses to himself. He disclaims, on the other hand, the epithet of an 'observer,' since that implies the concentration of faculties 'towards a definite aim and in a certain direction;' whereas, 'the true *Flâneur* has a horror of all definite aim; he never seeks,—he trusts to chance.' 'His mind is like a sensitive photograph plate, ready for any impression which may present itself.' We will not stay to discuss the correctness of this explanation; but, assuming its accuracy, we must say it is altogether inapplicable to the writer. Lively as is his book, vivid and fresh as are the pictures which he draws, he has favoured us with something far more thorough than a series of 'impressions;' and, unless we have wholly misread his volume, he has both observed and written with a purpose, and a very determined purpose too. Indeed, we are much mistaken if it does not turn out to be, both in intention and effect, the most artful and elaborate apology for the second French Empire that has yet appeared.

The work opens with a very striking picture of new Paris, and of the process of reconstruction which the present Emperor has applied so liberally to the French capital,—a process which has already entirely changed the face of a large portion of the city. Adapting a rhapsody of poor Edgar Poe's, he imagines Sinbad the Sailor travelling westward instead of eastward; visiting Paris at intervals of several years; and on his last visit making the tour of it under the guidance of 'the good-natured Arab who keeps the shop of Mauresque finery at the corner of the Place du Palais Royal.' Sketching the imaginary journey, he entertains us with very amusing versions of the scene, from opposite points of view.

'I don't happen to know what the politics of the Arab shopkeeper at the corner of the Place du Palais Royal are, whether he is a supporter or an adversary of the Imperial government; so there are two versions of the account which Sinbad the Sailor might give of what he saw in Paris. The first is as follows:—

'"While drinking one evening sweet Sheraz wine with some of my boon companions, and relating to them my past adventures, I was seized with a violent desire to see the wonderful things which had passed in the land of the West called Frengistan since I had been there, and of which I had heard through divers natives of those regions, who are to be recognised by the strange felt tubes on their heads, and by coats cut away in front, and hanging down behind like swallow-tails. Having heard, likewise, that the mighty King of Frengistan had given orders that the Sea of Yonistan should be allowed to flow into the Sea of Arabia, I took my ship in that direction; but finding that the orders had not yet been executed, owing to the cunning devices of a neighbouring mighty island Queen, I continued my journey into the great ocean of the West. After many days' and months' journey, and many perils, I arrived at the chief port of Frengistan, called Marsilia. Having disposed of my vessel, which was brought up to be shown for money to the natives, I proceeded to the capital of the country, which lies many miles inland, on the banks of a muddy, unwholesome stream. By the aid of the genius of fire, which a great wizard called Fulton has subjected to his power, I was carried by fiery steeds in a few hours to the capital, or rather to the site where it formerly stood.

'"When I was last in that place the whole country was under the rule of a bloodthirsty foreign tyrant, called Liberty, who kept the people in dingy, high, and narrow houses, from which he drove them forth from time to time to wage war against each other, in order that he might feed on their corpses and drink their blood. At last the scion of their good old Padishah, who had ruled over many seas and lands, came back from across the water, where he had been driven by the tyrant. He assembled his followers, and struggled with the oppressor, until he drove him away. There was great joy among the people. Having thus come to the throne, the new Padishah sallied forth with a numerous host to wage war in the east and south, and even in the far land of Tshin, bringing back great glory and treasure. After this, in order to make the return of the tyrant impossible, he destroyed his den, the dingy old town, and built another town, opening out large roads, protected by huge fortified places called barracks, and flanked by trees. Alongside of these roads are magnificent palaces for the people to dwell in, and all over the town delicious gardens with fountains, lakes, and kiosks, destined, above all, for women and children. He cleansed the river by building huge walls alongside of it, and threw bridges across it. Being a pious man, he built great mosques; and for his people, who like mummery, he built large halls in which they can indulge in that pastime; and his people are the happiest people of the earth."

'Now for the other version:—

'"A great calamity has befallen the capital of Frengistan since I had last seen it; the country was then governed by a divan of the wisest in the land, who were called up from all parts to assist with their counsel to make the people happy. Since then, the nephew of a great tyrant and warrior, who had already tried several times to seize the crown, introduced himself into the palace under the pretext of contributing to the same aim. The people, being themselves true, believed in his word; but they soon repented; for one night he seized hold of the wisest and most influential men in the country, shutting them up or driving them out of the country. The people who came to their assistance were destroyed by his troops, and he became the ruler of the country. To punish the people for their hostility, and to secure his dominion, he determined to destroy their old town, which they had learned to fortify and defend. He summoned workmen and cunning artificers from the whole country, and constructed for himself and his favourites a city of palaces fair to behold and easy to defend. In order to carry out this plan he taxed the people heavily, and kept up a large armed force of foot and horse ready to obey his slightest wink. The country has a heavy time of it."'—Pp. 4–7.

The truth no doubt lies between these two accounts, and readers will be biassed towards one or the other according to their political predilections. The author evidently prefers the former version; but it must be stated, by way of caution, that in support of it he dwells chiefly on the physical and material advantages which the Second Empire has conferred on France. He does not, indeed, omit moral considerations, but he says little about them, and that little in a cynical and indifferent spirit. His own moral instincts, we should think, are not particularly delicate or sensitive. In spite of this, however, and of the evident attempt to extenuate what he can neither wholly justify nor ignore, he records enough to warrant a severe condemnation, on grounds of public morality, of the imperial *régime*. But we will not anticipate. His account of the process by which the magical transformation of the city is effected is extremely graphic. 'The *Flâneur*' sees a number of placards on the shops in a given district, announcing the removal of business '*pour cause de démolition;*' in another week or two, if he strolls thitherward, he sees only tenantless and lifeless dwellings; in another, 'the doomed quarter is hidden in a dense cloud of dust, and closed by palings,' behind which axe and hammer are merrily at work. The spectacle always attracts crowds of observers, and the workmen seem to vie with each other in the work of destruction. The roof, the uppermost storey of lath

and plaster, the lintels, walls, &c., disappear in rapid succession, till in a few days the foundations are laid bare. Thus 'the whole south-western face of the Tuileries, about one-third of the whole building, disappeared last autumn in a couple of weeks.' Much of the old material is at once purchased for the foundations and partition-walls of the new houses; and scarcely are the thoroughfares marked out than the work of re-construction begins; and in an incredibly short time magnificent boulevards, lined by palatial buildings, stretch away in long perspective.

'A striking instance of how quickly this immense material is worked into shape was visible last summer in the large block on the Boulevard des Capucines, fronting the site for the new opera house, and destined to serve as a monster hotel. Its area is considerably larger than that of the grand Hotel du Louvre. In July the frontage toward the boulevard was above the ground-floor only, and by the end of October the building was under roof. Quite as quick in proportion were the western front of the Bibliothèque, in the Rue de Richelieu, and the Jeu de Paumes, in the garden of the Tuileries, run up. And yet, in spite of this rapidity, the style of building is not only solid, but almost what might be called monumental.'—Page 10.

Besides this wonderful progress in buildings and thoroughfares, three new bridges have been thrown across the Seine, and the tolls of nine bridges have been redeemed, at a cost of nineteen millions of francs. Several of these bridges have been nearly rebuilt, others are in course of re-construction, the embankment on both sides the river has been renewed for a considerable distance on a colossal scale, sewers and water conduits have been laid down everywhere, and all sorts of ornamental improvements accomplished. The *Flâneur* justly claims for the French Emperor praise almost equal to that awarded to Augustus, who 'found Rome built of wood, and left it built of marble.'

But next comes the question, 'What is the cost, and who pays it?' Our author devotes fourteen pages to the task of answering this question. We confess that the impression made on our minds by his bewildering details, is that of the most reckless extravagance. He acknowledges at the outset that the imperial government has acted very much as private persons do who begin to gratify expensive tastes out of newly-acquired fortunes. Beginning with little alterations and trifling improvements, it soon found that one change suggested others on a larger scale, and these suggested others more gigantic still. By

and bye special organisations were created to carry on the public works, the old administrations completely breaking down under the load thrust upon them. At last, by an Imperial decree of November 4th, 1858, the *Caisse des Travaux de Paris* was established under the guarantee of the town, and the authority of the prefect of the Seine. This department has managed the financial service of all works begun since its establishment. Previously the utmost confusion seems to have prevailed, and the works to have been undertaken and the resources provided by a series of chance expedients. The income exceeds the estimate of the budget. Instantly larger works are undertaken, which in their turn far surpass the estimated cost. Then come supplementary credits, which again exceed anticipation, and leave a surplus; and so on, by a succession of expensive undertakings, and prosperous supplementary credits, till a budget starting with 70 millions of francs for revenue, and 52 millions for expenses, winds up with 109 millions for revenue, and 85 millions for expenditure. Two facts are given in explanation of this great expansion. First, the resources of the city, which are very great, and continually increasing beyond the increase of its expenditure. Thus, in 1852 the incomings amounted to 17½ millions more than the outgoings, while in 1859 the difference was 30 millions. The second fact is, that at the close of the latter year the limits of Paris were by decree extended to the fortifications, increasing the superficial territory by 5,100 hectares, and the tax-paying population by 351,596. In the very next year, the added district contributed such a surplus that the ordinary revenue exceeded the expenditure by 33 millions, and gave an extraordinary revenue besides of 6½ millions. Should the same ratio of excess have continued in 1861, the total surplus revenue available for public works in the last ten years will prove to have been not much short of ten millions and a half sterling.

If this were all, we could only congratulate the good citizens of Paris on the wonderful prosperity of their municipal revenues. But this sum, vast as it is, represents not even a moiety of the expenditure on the new works. There have been loans amounting in round numbers to seven millions and three quarters sterling, to which must be added sums arising from sales of ground, and other items, amounting to two millions and a quarter more, and swelling the grand total expended on the

public works to nearly twenty-two millions sterling;—all this, too, exclusive of bonds issued by the *Caisse des Travaux* to an unknown amount, of what the State has spent on its own account in public buildings, and of what may have been expended by private speculators. One wonders how such burdens could be sustained; and our surprise is increased when we are told that the ordinary revenue still exceeds the current expenses, interest on loans, &c., by thirty-three millions of francs per annum; a surplus which would pay back the whole debt of the municipality in a few years. But this supposes that the appetite for such fabulous expenditure shall cease to grow by what it feeds on,—a result which we are not credulous enough to expect.

Of course, murmurs, not loud but deep, are heard against this amazing revolution, for such indeed it is. Dispossession can be enforced by a simple decree; and, as great secrecy is observed, ostensibly with a view to prevent jobbing, this rule operates oppressively, and the victims throw out many a sarcastic hint about those in favour buying cheap in the quarters doomed to destruction. Dispossessions and indemnities are fixed chiefly by juries; but, as the *Préfet de la Seine* must authorise the acts of these juries, the public suspect him of favouritism and partiality; and, if the district under sentence of demolition be moderately aristocratic, and not particularly well affected to the Imperial Government, the curses become loud as well as deep. The hardship inflicted on the poorer quarters is sometimes very great, because of the stationary character of the various branches of industry in Paris. The dispersion of the workmen, and of the regular *clientèle* by which each industrial quarter is surrounded, sometimes inflicts absolute ruin. Moreover, rents and indirect taxes are rapidly increasing under the influence of these expensive re-constructions, and both inhabitants and visitors complain loudly of the price which everybody has to pay for the transformation of Paris. Politicians and economists have their own special objections founded on the overgrown sovereignty of the Prefect, which it is said is destroying all municipal authority; on the wanton destruction of capital; the unnatural forcing of one branch of industry; the increasing costs, involving increasing sacrifices, and ultimate collapse; and so forth. Imperialism can, of course, find replies to all these very natural

objections; but few persons can or dare to look far into the future, relying on present plenty and prosperity, and agreeing with our '*Flâneur*,' whose nonchalance in this instance almost makes us revoke our protest against his assumption of the title of a trifler, that 'in the meantime, volcano or not volcano, it is pleasant to lounge about it.'

Our author next conducts us on a very interesting and delightful ramble over old Paris,—*Lutetia Parisiorum*, as he styles it,—noting what remains of the city of history and romance before it shall have vanished away for ever. We have not space to accompany him on this excursion. It is here that you see 'the true Parisian tripping swinging gait,' the smiling expression and lively nature of the French cockney. Here are the scenes depicted but too faithfully by the author of *The Mysteries of Paris*, and other novelists of the school of horrors. Here are the old aristocratic quarters, degraded into streets of merchandise, or deserted and forlorn. Here are the ancient industries of the city, each aggregated in its traditional quarter, which is almost always immensely over-crowded. It is very interesting to stroll with our author through the classic regions of the ancient city, and under his guidance to note the changes which its imperial master is pushing with such rapidity and energy. Very soon, if his *régime* last but a few years longer, there will be little left of the terrible faubourgs that have so often precipitated the great unwashed upon the streets in times of revolution, little of the well-known paving-stones whose choicest use was for the construction of barricades. The workmen will be dispersed in wide and airy suburbs; and rectilinear *façades*, wide thoroughfares, smooth Macadam, with the *enceinte* and the detached forts around Paris, and barracks here, there, and everywhere, will place the citizens at the mercy of their ruler, if he be but master of an army on whose loyalty he can depend.

But we must leave the Paris mud, and come into closer contact with the Imperialism whose doings our author has set himself to chronicle. The fourth chapter is entitled, 'Garrison and Camp,' and is a very able and interesting account of the way in which the French army has been remodelled, so that it is now in no proper sense an army of conscripts, young, reluctant, and unreliable, but in a very great degree a volunteer and veteran

army, thoroughly devoted to the empire and its master. It is a mistake, it seems, to suppose that Paris is full of soldiers. Fortresses all round the city, kept in first-rate order, and within easy communication by means of those broad, rectilinear streets, where large bodies of troops can easily manœuvre, and which can be easily swept by cannon, enable the Emperor to dispense with any formidable show of troops; and Paris is, as our author states, 'simply the most agreeable garrison in France,' especially to the regiments of the *Garde Impériale*, who have good quarters, pleasant posts, extra pay, a mess after the fashion of English regiments, and are, like our own household troops, the spoiled pets of the army.

As to the army at large, however, it is notorious how, in times of public revolt, the French soldiery, during and since the first revolution, have generally espoused the popular cause as against the monarch. The days of July, 1830, with the ideas of citizen kings and soldiers which they introduced, increased the tendency of the soldiers to become politicians and patriots; and we all know how quickly the disloyalty of the army transformed king Louis Philippe into plain John Smith, and sent him over to this refuge of the royal destitute for the rest of his natural life. The humiliation of that disloyalty, however, was keenly felt, especially among the officers; a strong re-action set in, which in June, 1848, made the generals 'masters of the situation; and the names of Lamartine and his coadjutors were exchanged for those of Cavaignac, Changarnier, and their comrades. When these in their turn had degenerated into cunning politicians and talkers,' 'the scion of the good old Padishah' stepped in,—the man of action and of the hour,—and completed the military reaction which they had begun by the establishment of a military despotism. Our author refrains from discussing the *coup d'état* of December, 1852, and we are not disposed to enter on it here; but we must bestow a few sentences on the measures by which, when discipline and the military spirit had been restored, the service was made attractive, and the taste for 'professional soldiering' thoroughly revived.

The first measure was the revival of the Imperial Guard; and the second, contemporaneous with the former, is called the *Dotation de l'armée*. The Crimean war showed in strong relief the disadvantages of a military system whose all but sole basis

was conscription; and accordingly, on April 25th, 1855, appeared a law which 'modified considerably the position of the soldier, and which is tending to alter completely the character of the French army.' The conscription is regulated by the law of 1862, according to which the annual contingent is furnished by all young men who have completed their twentieth year. Certain exemptions are allowed, which we need not specify; but the law also allowed every one to find a substitute at his own expense. This last provision created a regular trade of substitution, in which the utmost fraud was practised, and many other evils were perpetrated, besides sending into the army great numbers of scamps who were very difficult to manage, and extensively demoralised their comrades. In 1855 substitution was abolished, and exemption adopted in its stead. By payment of a certain sum to government any man can secure exemption, and his family will be relieved from all responsibility on his account. The money thus raised is paid to the *Caisse de la Dotation de l'Armée*, and enables this administration to provide a corresponding number of soldiers by voluntary enlistment and re-enlistment. 'The sum fixed for exemption from the whole seven years of service' is now 2,500 francs, and 250 for each year which the soldier has still to complete. The bounty for a seven years' enlistment is 2,000 francs, and for enlistments of less than seven years, 280 per annum,—one half paid at the time of enlistment, and the other half at the close of the term, an annuity representing the interest due being paid to each soldier for this latter half. Old soldiers and non-commissioned officers receive additional pay after the second and third re-engagements. Twenty years' service entitles to a pension, instead of twenty-five as formerly; every year of service in Algeria reckons as two; and the obtaining of the *medaille militaire* gives an annuity of 100 francs. There is, besides all this, the prospect of being admitted into the Imperial Guard, which is no doubt very attractive. The result is that the service is eagerly sought, and that re-enlistments have rapidly increased in number. From 1853 to 1859, there were 62,398 voluntary enlistments, and 81,212 re-enlistments, of which latter 51,850 re-enlisted for seven years, and the remainder for shorter periods. We need say no more to show how rapidly and thoroughly the French army is losing its

character of being compulsory and conscript, and becoming both voluntary and veteran. Other circumstances mentioned by the author conspire to impart to it every year an increasingly professional character; and, as the result, we have 'a new army, as different in outward appearance, material, and spirit, from the army before 1848, as this latter was from that before the Restoration.' We close our notice of this chapter with the following very lively account of the transformation which the French conscript rapidly undergoes when once he has joined his regiment:—

'In spite of exemptions, and voluntary enlistments and re-enlistments, there are annually from 60,000 to 70,000 young Frenchmen called upon to march on the road to glory, most of whom would prefer following the plough, or sitting quietly in their workshops, engaged in the useful arts of peace. The light-hearted youth of the towns, whose delight it was, in his gamin days, to admire the gilt cane of the tambour-major, and keep step with every marching body of soldiers, accepts his lot with tolerable equanimity; not so the conscript from the country, whose whole existence has until then been centred within the narrow sphere of his village. Those who know conscription only by name have no idea of the tears, heartburnings, and misery which the system causes every year to many thousand families. There is the preliminary wretchedness of suspense, when the time for drawing lots approaches; then there are the six months' delay which intervene between the drawing of the *bad* number and the joining of the depôt. The author of the '*Derniers Jours d'un Condamné*' might write a scarcely less distressing diary of these six months. The silent resignation to inevitable fate often gives way at the last moment to a fit of temporary and impotent rage, which ends at the departure in an outbreak of false gaiety produced by a reaction of vanity. The first days in barracks are days of despondency and prostration, under the sway of which the recruit still is when he is taught the first arduous steps in the path of glory. The time seems scarcely well chosen; for if we behold at drill a couple of these terrified wretches, red in the face and sweating, looking in their ill-fitting clothes and strained attitude like puppets dressed up and every moment in danger of falling, we cannot persuade ourselves that they will ever bear the faintest resemblance to that smart wiry little fellow, in full possession of all his muscles, and set off by his well-fitting uniform, who bullies them to his heart's content; and yet, probably not more than two years ago, that tyrannizing self-contented individual was looking as uncouth and unhappy as number one or number two, on whom he practises now; and certainly no one would recognise, six months after, our two miserable conscripts in the two *troupiers* sauntering along the garden of the Tuileries with conquering airs, and eyeing the *bonnes* with conquering looks.'—Pp. 67, 68.

The three chapters which follow, and which are entitled

respectively, 'Terrestrial Providence and its Drawbacks,' 'Terrestrial Providence and its Advantages,' and 'The Imperial Fertilising System,' describe very fully and graphically the centralising policy by which the Imperial government undertakes, imitates, fosters, and controls, every public enterprise. It must be said, in simple justice, that centralisation is by no means an attribute of Imperialism alone. France has long been accustomed to the meddling of government in every possible relation and transaction of life; and, as our author justly remarks, 'such a system of tutelage, long continued, has contributed to weaken individual energy, and to efface by degrees, in the minds of the people, the line of demarcation between individual exertion and government interference.' It is, indeed, very remarkable that, in all the convulsions of France for now nearly a century, and amidst all the crimes that have been committed, and sacrifices that have been endured in the name of 'Liberty,' the whole nation seems to have acquiesced, without a murmur, or a thought of resistance, in this system of government tutelage and intermeddling. All, therefore, that can be said for or against the imperial *régime*, on this subject, is, that it has discharged what all Frenchmen agree in considering one of its most important and obvious duties either better or worse than its predecessors. It would be very surprising if any Government undertaking to act the part of 'Terrestrial Providence,' should succeed in reality,—still more so, if it should succeed to the satisfaction of all the parties over whom it spreads its fostering wing. And it has happened to the present French Government after the usual manner. In this case, indeed, praise and blame are both exaggerated, because, in comparison of all its predecessors, that government has undertaken the task on a truly gigantic scale. Our author thinks, at the same time, that His Imperial Majesty has a clearer conception than those who have preceded him, of all that this task implies. He appeals to the *Bulletin des Lois*, or list of the laws and decrees made within the last ten years, in proof of the greatness of the undertaking, and the fertility and zeal displayed in prosecuting it. Each year adds several large volumes, and hundreds of decrees and laws, which for number and variety throw into the shade the legislation of all the rest of Europe combined. Every side of French social existence is affected and metamorphosed by these laws, which

extend to the smallest communities, and even the affairs of private individuals, as if the aim were to save every living Frenchman the trouble of thinking and acting for himself.

But the *Flâneur* truly says,—

'To act the part of Providence is an expensive pastime; and in this case the funds must come from those for whose satisfaction they are to be employed. The fears which were entertained in this respect, and the sinister predictions which were made, seemed to have found an official confirmation by the late disclosures in financial matters, and the changes made in consequence.'—Page 77.

This statement is confirmed by a series of colossal and complicated calculations, for which we have neither space nor inclination. The imagination is fairly bewildered with estimates and revenues extending to thousands of millions of francs; and we are forced to the conclusion of the second version of the imaginary Sinbad's story, that 'the country has a heavy time of it.' The following remarks on this head of expense are very suggestive:—

'It is not the past expenditure and actual deficit which are alarming. The danger lies in the financial system which has hitherto prevailed. It can be best characterized by saying, that the right hand did not know what the left hand gave. As there is no solidarity among the Ministers, there can be, properly speaking, no question of a regular Budget. Each Minister makes his report direct to the Emperor, trying naturally to show the increasing wants of his department,—the Minister of Finance like the rest. These conflicting demands are brought into some sort of shape, and submitted to the *Conseil d'Etat*, so as to be presentable to the *Corps Legislatif*; but this was hitherto the least important part of the business, and the influential Ministers, above all, reserved their powers for the struggle which began after the Budget had safely passed.'—Page 86.

After showing how power was given to the Emperor to authorise, by simple decree, public works, and extraordinary credits for their execution, he proceeds,—

'Immediately after the voting of the Budget, the race began between the Ministers to get the largest shares in these credits. Every one had one or more pet projects which he submitted to the Emperor. When the consent of the latter was obtained, it was as a matter of form presented to the gentlemen in the *Conseil d'Etat*, and it became quite a triumph to surprise less fortunate colleagues in the ministry by the appearance of the decree in the *Moniteur*. No one counted to be worse off than his neighbour, and the surprises became every day more numerous. As experience showed the convenience of improving a Minister's department in this way, the taste for extra-

ordinary and supplementary credits daily increased. Above all, since the Crimean war, these credits, which, until then, oscillated between tens of millions, began to move among hundreds of millions. It seems almost as if the large credits required during the war had familiarized people with large figures.'—Pp. 86, 87.

Yes, indeed: and which shall we pity most, the 'incarnate providence' whose self-imposed task has involved it in this fatal necessity of spending, or the country which will one day have to pay the piper?

But there are said to be advantages to counterbalance all this, and especially 'sweets which are reserved for those who are bold and powerful enough to aspire so high.' The private bounties of the Emperor have largely increased; the Civil List has arisen from twelve to twenty-five millions of francs; and wherever the Emperor and Empress go, a truly magnificent liberality marks their progress. The Senate and *Corps Legislatif*,—now, by force of the money-power, become the friends and supporters of the Government,—share in its largess to the tune of about seven millions of francs per annum. The vast number of government *employés* required to work the centralizing system come next,—so many *pensionnaires* on the imperial purse. Then we have the splendour and state proper to an Emperor, so very different from the belongings proper to a bourgeois king. The Minister of State supplants the simple Prime Minister of the constitutional monarch. The latter could never provide more than four or five millions' worth of splendour; but his glittering successor can obtain, as the normal amount, not less than ten millions per annum. And was it not at once an act of benevolence and policy thus to utilize the national love of display, and to strengthen the Government while causing even the thrifty bourgeois 'to forget the cost while beholding the splendour,' and applauding the munificence to which that splendour was due? To these things must be added the gratification of the national pride, by the vindication which the Empire has secured to France of her place among the nations. We need not recapitulate the measures which have been taken for this end. No doubt the secret of their success is to be found chiefly in the basis on which they rest; namely, that magnificent and thoroughly appointed army which, whatever it may have cost, assures Frenchmen that *la belle France* is able to go to war 'almost at a moment's notice.' Scarcely inferior to this is the astonishing

development of the navy, of which some notion may be formed from the fact that the annual expenditure under this head has increased from between sixty and seventy millions of francs (the sum before 1860) to about one hundred and twenty-four millions in the last year, and that the same astute administrative wisdom which has so wonderfully improved the army has directed the application of these naval resources. When we add that, with all these astonishing expenditures, the material growth of society, and the prosperity of all classes, have proceeded in at least an equal ratio, it is impossible to deny that there is much to be said for the *régime* under which such results have been obtained.

We must reluctantly pass over the deeply interesting chapter on 'The Imperial Fertilising System,' which describes in what way, and to what extent, 'Terrestrial Providence' has employed its bounty in stimulating enterprise and material development all over the country, and in reference to all kinds of undertakings. Railways, roads, rivers, ports, quays, bridges, towns, streets, swamps, waste lands, machinery and manufactures, agricultural societies, canals, insurance companies,—these names indicate only a few of the directions in which the bounty of the State has been made to flow in the shape of grants in aid. The effect of all this has of course been to stimulate enterprise and industry in an extraordinary degree, and to secure the production of results the most flattering and gratifying possible. Whether the splendid whole is a reality, or only a glittering but transitory show, time will declare; and the following chapter, entitled 'Money-mania,' will probably assist conjecture in a tone not the most hopeful or agreeable.

That chapter is devoted to an exposition of those enormous and almost fabulous operations on the Stock Exchange which have won such notoriety for Mirès,—'another Hudson' our author calls him, but as it seems to us as far before Hudson in boldness and daring as in adroitness and finesse. Such of our readers as take an interest in these matters are as familiar as ourselves with this story of yesterday, and we shall not recapitulate it. How Mirès was found guilty on charges of fraud and embezzlement by the *Tribunal Correctionel de la Seine*, and sentenced to five years' imprisonment; how the *Cour de Cassation* on his appeal acquitted him of these charges, but main-

tained the sentence of the Court below 'as a punishment for the illegal practices amounting to a betrayal of trust which the defendant himself had admitted his being guilty of;' and finally how the *Cour Impériale* of Douai, to which he appealed in the last instance, acquitted him of all the charges brought against him, and entirely expunged the sentence; and how on his return to the Bourse he was received 'with quite an ovation,' —are matters that, for good or evil, belong to history, and will be felt in their effects for many a year to come. The following passages from our author supply much food for reflection :—

'The acquittal pronounced by the High Court of Appeal has been sanctioned by the verdict of the Bourse, which received Mirès like a hero and martyr. The ovation was less to the martyr of a powerful cabal than to the most daring champion of the current ideas of the Stock Exchange. His acquittal is the triumph of the Stock Exchange, which is now relieved of judicial apprehensions, and may indulge freely in its rage for speculation. No one has a right to complain that the law has withdrawn its protection from the public, and has delivered the shoals of small fry to become the prey of large fish. The position is clearly defined, and whoever goes under the colonnade on the Place de Bourse knows what he has to expect.

'Shocking as the legalized money-mania may appear to the moralist, dangerous as it may prove to individuals, it can plead marvellous success in extenuation of its excesses and its wildness.

'There is probably no country in the world in which example has such power as in France. The French soldier alone is a forlorn, helpless being; but he becomes a hero when before the eyes of his comrades. Similarly, the small French capitalist, timid and narrow-minded, drawn by this system of popular association into the vortex of speculation, has now become bold and enterprising. As he formerly toiled to secure his *rentes* and idleness, he works doubly now to enable him to try his luck on the Stock Exchange. Having once tasted the sweets of rapid gain, and the excitement produced by it, he can no more do without it. He seeks for them, not only in the Exchange, but in his own business; he becomes enterprising, enlarges his manufactory, improves his material, takes a shop in a better position, increases his business relations. Thus the mania for speculation has brought into activity, not only a vast amount of capital, but likewise a sum of individual energy which was formerly unemployed, and which has become now a rich source of wealth for France.'—Pp. 128–133.

To our simple minds the true rendering of all this is that the government of Louis Napoleon is rapidly transforming the French people into a nation of gamblers; and, while human nature remains what it is, and an unerring rule of righteousness

metes out the consequences of human conduct, there can be, whatever may be the aspect of the present, but one end to such a state of things.

'The First of October' is the title of a chapter which describes the anticipations and immediate results connected with the Treaty of Commerce between France and England. Great were the clamours of the interested and the bigoted, terrible the apprehensions of the ignorant and timid. But the dreaded day came and went, and no harm was done. What with the delays of the French 'circumlocution office,'—*alias*, the Custom House, —the combination of the French manufacturers and dealers to cheapen prices, and refuse to sell English goods by commission, and the vulgar, not to say rubbishy, character of much that the English importers sent to Paris, the blow that was to have well-nigh annihilated French manufacturing industry fell quite harmlessly. Indeed, when the great competitive race between the two peoples was to have come off, the French walked over the course,

> 'Whereby their victory was the more complete,
> For that they had no foes to fight withal.'

Now, however, the best classes of English goods begin gradually to make their appearance; and a demand has already arisen which has greatly mitigated the effects of the American civil war in some of our own manufacturing centres; while the French trading interest is recovering from its ignorant terrors, and abandoning the narrow-minded and exclusive system to which they gave rise; and there is every prospect that very soon this favourable change 'will lead to the true equilibrium in the new commercial relations of the two countries.'

Chapter X. is occupied with the subject of 'Socialism,' and details the means employed by the government of the second empire to adjust the relations between capital and labour. We cannot stay even to sketch an outline of this history; but, if our *Flâneur* reports truly, the Government has, on the whole, adopted very wise measures, and been rewarded with a wonderful degree of success. The hot-headed and turbulent Paris *ouvrier* is being rapidly converted into a very contented and well-to-do artisan; and, what is perhaps more wonderful still, the narrow-minded and egotistical *bourgeois* has been brought to

co-operate most intelligently and generously with the authorities for the improvement of the condition of his work-people. The artisan is even learning to be independent of, and to deprecate, Government assistance and interference; and on the whole the effect of the Imperial measures on this class seems to be fairly told in the following passage:—

'While holding aloof from any partisanship for or against the Government, and steeled against all its allurements, nowhere else, perhaps, are the efforts of Imperialism to promote the material well-being of France better understood and appreciated than in this growing class of industrials of the new school. Among the first in embracing free-trade notions, they were of great assistance to the Government in helping to carry them out, and in persuading of their beneficial effect the parties most directly interested. They are fair enough to admit that they, and the whole French industry, owe a great deal to the judicious impulse given by the Imperial Government to the material interests of the country. They cannot but see how much assistance they can derive in times of crisis, like that of last winter, from the watchfulness and prompt measures of a clear-sighted Government. The latter may act partly in the interest of its own safety; but without its action all other well-meant efforts would have been sufficient. [Query, insufficient?] They may have their ideas, too, about political government as it ought to be, about freedom of the press and of the elections, about constitutionalism and other "isms;" but from no other quarter is there less danger of any assertion of these ideas by material force.'—Page 167.

These are the changes which, according to our '*Flâneur*,' have led the Government to review, amend, and enlarge the constitution, so as to introduce the semblance, if not the reality, of 'regulated liberty.' This is the subject discussed in the chapter entitled 'Death and Resurrection.' Our author takes very sanguine and hopeful views of the Emperor's intentions, and of the effect of his measures. We can only express our wish that the French people may get as much 'regulated liberty' as this writer anticipates for them, and that they may prove themselves better fitted to use and enjoy it than, judging from the history of the last eighty years, we grumbling Englishmen are disposed to place to their credit.

The chapter entitled 'Body and Mind' very plainly and with some severity intimates that all the material advantages so elaborately set forth in the previous chapters have been purchased at the price of intellectual and literary decay and degradation. It could not be otherwise under the rigid censorship of

the press inaugurated and still maintained by Louis Napoleon. 'Even the old brilliancy of French genius seems to have faded away.' The noble band of thinkers, poets, artists, historians, novelists, dramatists, actors, and musicians, who have so illustrated French literature since the Restoration, has dwindled down 'to a very small remnant;' Victor Hugo, Lamartine, Guizot, and Thiers still live, and still write; but compare their recent with their former productions. 'Ah! what a fall is there!' There is, indeed, no lack of writers. The publishing trade thrives amazingly,—more than ever; but there has been produced 'scarcely a single work which promises to outlive its author,' or a name brought forward 'which could be placed side by side with even the second-rate celebrities of the past generation.' True, 'great attention is paid to the study of the exact sciences,—*as was the case before and during the first revolution.*' But does history warrant us in concluding that this is any substitute for a vigorous, healthy, and ennobling general literature? Treatises on money-making, 'short spicy tales,' sensation-novels, and all kinds of extravaganzas, may, as our author says, be very amusing and pay well. We fear this is but too true in other countries besides France; but, alas for the land where literature has abandoned a lofty ideal, and become the pander to avaricious or polluting passions! Alas for the land where 'Aristophanes has supplanted Sophocles and Euripides!' Well may this writer add,—

'To acquire again its former elasticity, the French mind must conquer the scepticism in which it has sunk, and regain its faith in something higher than the transient success of the moment and the *pièce de cent sous*. To doubt that it will be so would be almost a crime; but the question when and how this will happen,—whether, as before, it will be a conversion by some catastrophe, or else a gradual rise from the present disbelief,—time alone can solve.'—Page 199.

True,—solemnly true. And this leads us to express our sincere regret that our author has given us no insight into the state of morals and religion under the new régime. Any description of Imperialism and its effects which does not include this, is vitally defective. The moral life of a people is incomparably the most important element in any estimate we wish to form concerning that people's character and prospects. Such glimpses as he affords into the stock-jobbing tendencies of the country, into the decline of intelligence and the loss of public

spirit, into the character of the fashionable literature, and the rage for luxury and 'sensations,' are unspeakably disheartening. Other critics speak of 'gilded filth and decrepit frivolity;' of the extraordinary increase of cowardly, ignoble, and bestial crimes; of the physical degeneration and numerical decline of the population. If these representations convey any tolerable expression of the truth, the second *avatar* of French Imperialism has not brought in a social millennium for our light-hearted and reckless allies across the Channel. There is wanting, amidst all this golden glitter and delusive show, the only thing that can give true exaltation or abiding life to nations. One hopeful sign exists, of which our author says nothing, and of which perhaps it scarcely became his vocation as a '*Flâneur*' to write. In some of the ancient seats of learning, a conviction has arisen and is spreading that what France wants above all things is the Gospel. That conviction has found repeated and solemn expression of late from more professors' chairs than one; and if it shall take possession, in any considerable degree, of the educated youthful mind of the country, a brighter day than Imperialism designs or can imagine will soon dawn on France, and, after a century of blood and strife, 'great shall' yet 'be the peace of her children.'

ART. VII.—*Histoire de la Théologie Chrétienne au Siècle Apostolique.* [*History of Christian Theology in the Apostolic Age.*] Par EDOUARD REUSS. Deuxième Édition, revue et augmentée. 2 Vol. Strasbourg et Paris. 1860.

THIS is a profound and brilliant book on one of the most delicate questions to which Christian criticism can address itself. There are those whom the very title will startle. They will be ready to demur to the fact which it postulates. In regard to this, however, we are at one with the author. There was, as we fully believe, in apostolic times, a Theology, properly so called; and this Theology had its History, as M. Reuss assumes and argues. We differ widely from him in many of his principles and conclusions. His point of view is not ours. Where he sees mainly, if not altogether, the subjective and the human, we often mark the express co-working of the Providence and Spirit of God. What with him are speculative developments of truth, the result of accident, or at best of circumstances, appear to us not seldom as fresh discoveries made by the Holy Ghost with little or no qualification of secondary causes. So far are we from allowing the doctrinal incongruities which he thinks he detects in certain instances on comparing the New Testament with itself, that his historical analysis of the contents of its books has only strengthened our conviction of the absolute harmony of their teaching. The truth, as it shows in the writings of the Evangelists and of their inspired contemporaries, we grant, has manifold phases, but it is one and the same truth notwithstanding; and if it was less full and definite in 'the beginning of the Gospel' than it afterwards became, we discover no exegetical basis whatever for the idea either of antagonism between the earlier and later productions of the same New-Testament writer, or of want of agreement between the theological systems which certain Apostles are supposed to represent and expound. But we do not object to M. Reuss's topic as a topic. The Christian Scriptures themselves are abundantly in evidence of the general fact implied in his thesis; and it is the fault of the author, and not of the subject, if the views he sets forth are such as an enlightened belief in Divine Revelation declines to endorse.

We have said that we are not unfrequently at issue with the writer; and the following pages will furnish examples of the contrariety we speak of. At the same time we are bound to express our warm admiration of the manner in which, for the most part, M. Reuss has performed his difficult and laborious task. We dare not affirm that he does not write under an insensible bias. He is prepossessed in favour of a certain class of opinions. He does not go the whole length of what is commonly regarded as orthodoxy. He draws a strong line between the teaching of Scripture and that of the Church. He doubts whether the popular creed is not guilty of over-refining and exaggeration. And his sentiments and judgments are often coloured by his ecclesiastical scepticism. But with all this, there is nothing of critical arrogance or snarling in his work. He neither attempts to carry his points by dint of strong affirmation, nor to shelter the weakness of his cause under cover of sarcasm and abuse. Even where we think him most wrong, he exhibits a candour, an evenhandedness, and a moderation, which it would be hateful not to recognise and commend. The purely literary qualities of M. Reuss's book are of a very high order. It is rare to find the philosopher, the logician, the scholar, and the orator together in one and the same person. The combination exists in the writer of these powerful and fascinating volumes. He has a wonderful faculty for sweeping a wide field of inquiry, and for gathering, systematizing, and expounding the scattered parts of a great scientific or historical whole. Yet his analytical skill is not inferior to his synthesis, and he uses the scalpel of a clear-sighted criticism with a precision and delicacy which few could rival. His theme required a large and exact erudition, both Biblical and general; and he is every way equal to the demand of it. Hardly a page of his book but is rich in proof of high mental culture, of extensive and well-assorted knowledge, and of a learning which has struck its roots deep in the spirit of the writer, and thrives and yields fruit in the atmosphere of his active intellectual sympathies. To crown all, M. Reuss bears his reader along with him on a stream of gentle yet forcible eloquence, the spell of which neither philology, argument, nor transcendental mysticism is able to dissolve.

The precise object at which our author aims, and the method

and plan according to which he pursues it, are explained in a chapter or two which form the Introduction to his work. As he employs the term, Theology is not taken in the wide and comprehensive sense in which it is commonly understood; much less does it rank with other sciences, strictly so called, as belonging wholly to the sphere of human observation and reason. It is the science of Divine Revelation; in other words, the formal and systematic statement of the truth which God has delivered to man, not by nature or conscience, but in the way of direct communication from Himself. M. Reuss, indeed, contends, in a noble passage, that where there is no Revelation there is no Theology in any sense worthy of the name. The religious beliefs of Paganism, even the most cultivated forms of it, never shape themselves into a Theology. Theology universally is the child of Revelation. The first age of Christianity had its Theology. Our blessed Lord's disciples, during His personal lifetime, held certain religious opinions, which were less or more formulated among them into a theological system. And from the time at which His teaching ended, till the close of the apostolic age, as the New-Testament Scriptures sufficiently prove, the Christian revelation became increasingly distinct and determinate in the form which it assumed. We need not now refer to the theory by which M. Reuss accounts for the fact. We believe his theory, and we do not believe it. We believe that the character, history, and circumstances of several leading Apostles go a long way to explain the phenomena in question; but we believe also in a much more immediate action of the Spirit of God in the communication of new truth, or of new views of truth previously known, than our author ever acknowledges. This Christian Theology it is M. Reuss's endeavour to reconstruct. How did it come into existence? What were the successive steps by which it rose to be what it eventually was? And what is the character of the several branches into which it appears to divide itself? For the answers to these inquiries,—inquiries which belong simply to the historian and the interpreter of Scripture,—the writer proposes to travel up the line of the Old-Testament Church and Revelation, and, after a rapid survey of the national life of Israel before the exile, to dwell at large on what he rightly conceives to be closely bound up with his topic, the formation and for-

tunes of the Synagogue, and the religious state of Judaism at the time of the coming of Christ. His programme next contemplates as full an exposition as possible of the teaching of our Lord, and of the doctrine promulgated by the Apostles in connexion with the early planting and spread of Christianity. The last four of the seven books into which the author distributes his work, are devoted to the subject which most directly corresponds to the title he has given it:—an elaborate examination, that is to say, of the apostolic writings, with a view to the formal exhibition of the divers views of Divine Truth, which show on the very surface of these writings, and which it is the province of Christian philosophy to develope and expound. We wish we could subscribe, without reserve, to the contents of this introductory chapter of M. Reuss. There is so much truth and beauty in it that we almost shrink from expressing the dislike we feel for some of its sentiments. But what are we to think of the notion that Providence selected the Apostles as being 'the loftiest minds, the Coryphæi of their age'? Or of the assertion that Anselm was the first to tell us how Christ redeemed the world? Or of the not very oblique hint on page 22, that the theological systems of St. Paul and St. John are at variance, because the former 'sets his view of the Gospel in opposition to every other that does not exactly tally with it'? Pity that so much excellent writing on the subject of Inspiration, and on topics akin to it, should be spoiled by even a touch of sentimentality or unmeaning paradox!

The book by which M. Reuss prepares the way for his discussion of the Gospel as delivered by our Lord, is one of the most valuable and interesting parts of his work. Again and again, in following him, we stumble on opinions which appear to us to be utterly irreconcilable with reason and history; but the philosophical discernment, the wealth of learning, and the power of rich and vivid description, which everywhere show themselves, exert a strange witchery over the mind of the reader. Some of his continental censors complained of his work, on its first appearance, as being a series of highly wrought pictures of various eras and phases of religious belief, rather than the 'history' which the title led them to look for; and though there was little weight in their criticism, we do not wonder that it was made, considering the dramatic life and

movement which the author gives to much of his composition. The subjects with which he deals in this section of his book are the cluster of doctrines forming what he denominates 'Mosaism before the Exile;' the events which led to the creation of a new Israelitish nationality after the return from Babylon, together with the character of this nationality; the rise, progress, and development of 'the Synagogue;' the origin, history, genius, and tendencies of Pharisaism and Sadduceeism; the nature and contents of the Jewish Theology, properly so called; the genesis and distinctive features of 'Hellenism;' the Alexandrine philosophy; Ebionism and Essenism; the Messianic expectations of the age immediately preceding the advent of Christ; and the person, office, and work of His great forerunner. Under these several heads the reader will find a store of historic facts, and of subtle and suggestive thought, the treasures of which he will not easily exhaust. We call attention especially to the sections on the political and religious restoration of Judaism, on the much-misunderstood question of the constitution and mutual relations of the so-called 'sects' of the Pharisees and Sadducees, and on the later theology both of the Palestinian and extra-Palestinian Jews, as abounding in exact information wrought up by the hands of a large-minded philosophy, and as radiant in every part with the splendours of genius, and with the jewel-like brilliancies of style which distinguish the best French writers.

Our limits forbid us even to enumerate the particulars in which we dissent from the opinions and arguments of this portion of our author's work. We believe he greatly under-estimates the theoretical knowledge which the mass of the ancient Israelites had of the religion and moral principles of the Mosaic legislation. The whole current of Scripture testimony seems to us to run counter to the hypothesis that this knowledge was shut up within a narrow circle of individuals. In like manner we think M. Reuss fails to do justice to the organic unity of the teaching of Moses and the Prophets; exhibiting these last, not indeed as in antagonism with the Levitical institute, but as independent of it in a sense and to a degree which history will not recognise. The writer's doctrine, moreover, as to the growth of 'prophetic enthusiasm' among the Jews of the Exile, as to the almost utter want of the idea of the love of God in the

Israelitish theology prior to this period, and as to the manner in which the hypostatizing of the Divine attributes formed the bridge between the earlier Old-Testament view of God, and that under which He is exhibited in the New Testament, is throughout too purely human in its texture, if it is not distinctly impugned by the very letter of Scripture. With regard to one great question,—we mean the teaching of Moses and the Prophets on the subject of future rewards and punishments,—we cannot but marvel that so acute an observer as M. Reuss should add his name to the list of those who maintain, that the sanctions of the ante-Christian revelation were altogether limited to the present world. Does not every one see that the Theocracy could not have upheld itself for a generation on a basis which the events of every day must have shown to be unreal? The remarkable expression which occurs so often in the Mosaic code, 'That soul shall be cut off from among his people,' while it directly contradicts M. Reuss's assertion that the Theocratic economy took no cognizance of the individual man, is, of itself, as we judge, conclusive against this restricted idea of Old-Testament retribution. Once more, while we except to several points in M. Reuss's representation of the character and relations of John the Baptist, we must protest emphatically against the unscientific forwardness shown by the author in a note to his chapter on the Baptist, and in so many other places in his work, to array the facts of the Evangelical history against what he calls the results of 'Christian reflection' upon these facts. If it be so that the writer of the fourth Gospel describes the forerunner of Christ as saying of himself, 'I am the voice of One crying in the wilderness,' and that the Synoptists declare him to have been sent in fulfilment of this prophetic language of Isaiah, what reason is there for assuming that the two statements are any way inconsistent with each other; and why may not both the one and the other be equally true? We shall have discrepancies in plenty as well in profane as in sacred history, if a principle like this is to govern our judgment of trustworthy authorities. On the territory of Scripture, above all, it is the duty of the historical interpreter to do his best to dispose of difficulties, and not to exaggerate or create them.

In entering upon the second great division of his book, M. Reuss expresses himself with a diffidence well becoming a writer

who would furnish, in outline at least, a complete account of the teaching of the Great Teacher; and if we cannot always accept his exposition, even where capital truths are concerned, the demur arises from no want of appreciation of the difficulties of his undertaking, or of the ingenuity, zeal, and patience with which he has sought to execute it. The starting-point of his synthesis is the substance of our Lord's original preaching as given by St. Matthew and St. Mark. *The time is fulfilled; the kingdom of God is at hand: repent ye, and believe the Gospel.* From the first of these expressions he takes occasion to define the relations which unite the doctrine of Christ to the Law of Moses. The second leads him to consider the kingdom of God and its essential characteristics. The two conditions of entrance into this kingdom, repentance and faith, as laid down in the third, are finally brought under discussion; the latter of them, determined as to its particular meaning by the use of the term 'Gospel' in connexion with it, being made the basis of a series of critical inquiries into the nature and character of the Gospel, the means by which it seeks to fulfil its Divine purposes, and the issues to which it points and is designed to lead us. Under this general plan, the author is necessarily brought face to face with the great questions of the Person of Christ, of the nature of Conversion, of the Constitution of the Church, and of the Last Things, as taught and explained by the Saviour during His ministry on earth; and on all these points M. Reuss exhibits what he takes to be the testimony of Scripture, as collected and examined under the light of Christian science.

We wish we could congratulate the author on the results of his labours. They are many of them admirable. We would not willingly forget the passages, for example, in which he argues and illustrates the principle, that Christ came not so much to communicate new truth as to impart new life; nor will any of his readers fail to do homage to the beauty, force, and moral worth of the brilliant contrast which he draws between the spirit and tendencies of Mysticism on the one hand, and of Rationalism on the other. There is much, too, which will strike every thoughtful student of the New Testament as well worthy of his attention in the views which M. Reuss expresses on the comprehensiveness of the Gospel, on the nature of faith, on the forgiveness of sins, on the sacraments, and on other elements of

our Lord's teaching. But with all that is excellent, there is not a little, in this second part of his work, which is hazy; there is more that is questionable; and there are several important points at which the sentiments of the writer stand in antipodal opposition to our own.

We do not now pause on the question whether the New Testament presents, as M. Reuss intimates, only a partial view of the character and work of Christ. Nor do we stay to show how his philosophical interpretations, in more than one instance, mar the majestic simplicity of Christ's words as recorded by the Evangelists. Neither shall we now contend, that it is quite arbitrary to assume that St. Matthew has fallen into an anachronism in putting into our Lord's lips the words, 'Tell it unto the Church.' But when we read that the Gospels contain no proof of any gradual unfolding of truth on the part of Christ, that according to Christ's doctrine there is no interval between death and the resurrection, and that what Christ delivered on the subject of a final judgment is pure anthropomorphism,—a region opens upon us in which we find it hard to discover any standing-ground in common with the author's exegetical system. Does M. Reuss deny, that Christ did not hold in reserve, during the greater part of His ministry, the doctrine of His passion, and that He did not break the seals of the Scriptures to His disciples, just prior to his return to heaven, as He never did before? And if it be true, that in answer to Martha's expression of belief that her brother should 'rise again in the Resurrection at the last day,' the Saviour taught her that there was another and earlier Resurrection, the condition and guarantee of that of which she spoke, is there a shadow of evidence tending to identify with the close of our natural life that 'last day,' of which Christ elsewhere declares, that it shall be the period of the rising again of His people, and of the judgment of those who reject Him? And with regard to the purely figurative character of what our Lord taught with so much detail and solemnity as to a Final Assize; while we need not profess our dissent from the view which takes the terms in their absolute literality, we cannot for a moment admit the theory, which transfers to the realm of consciousness and individual experience, what the doctrine of Christ so plainly represents as an event distinctly objective, affecting at one and the same time the whole mass of mankind,

and connected chronologically with the simultaneous resurrection of the dead, both just and unjust. We are bound to add, too, that throughout this book, as in general through M. Reuss's volumes, we are far from being satisfied with the manner in which he speaks of the Person of our Lord. We shall avail ourselves of no party watchwords to throw discredit on the author's opinions. We fully agree with him, that here, no less than at some other points in the Gospel Revelation, the later Scriptures of the New Testament speak with a logical precision and fulness such as do not usually characterize their earlier records. But with all allowance for this, and remembering, as we ought, the author's obligations as a critical historian, we still think he falls below the level of his authorities in speaking on this great subject. We feel a strong revulsion from the humanistic phraseology, which the writer perpetually employs, in treating of the character, claims, and life of our Lord. Christ's 'conviction' of His Divine Sonship; His 'belief' of this or that; 'the impossibility of His deceiving Himself in calculating the probable success of His work;' 'the persuasion He had in His deepest consciousness as to the origin of His doctrine;' these and the like expressions are a profanation of the mystery of the Redeemer's Person, and a wrong inflicted in the name of science on writers, the letter and spirit of whose language alike lift us to a sphere unspeakably higher. How far the feeling, which can adopt a vocabulary such as this, is to be held responsible for the use made of certain texts bearing on the doctrine in question, we do not presume to conjecture. But so long as the generally-received canons of Scripture interpretation hold their ground, we must maintain that neither the words of Christ to the young ruler as to God alone being good, nor those which He employs in referring to the Father's exclusive knowledge of the time of the end, ought to reduce by the smallest fraction the weight of that enormous mass of evidence by which the Gospels certify us of the absolute Godhead of the Son.

The author's third book, devoted to the subject of 'the Apostolic Church,' carries us into the heart of his philosophy. Hitherto we have been preparing the way for the coming of Christ; or have laboured more toilsomely than successfully in furnishing ourselves with a systematic view of the Redeemer's

personal teaching. The Master is now gone, and the disciples are before us. What use did they make of the truth they had received? What is the history of Christian doctrine during the age immediately succeeding our Lord's lifetime? These are the questions to which M. Reuss now girds himself; and in dealing with them he follows that same historico-critical method which he has all along adopted. It is hardly possible, within the space at our command, to do justice to the richly-wrought argument and exposition to which we are here introduced. The position, however, which it occupies in relation to the rest of the work, obliges us to run the risk of presenting it in outline.

The doctrine of Christ was no less wonderful for its simplicity than for its depth. No age or Church has ever been able to sound the depth of it. Not even the first age and Church were able to do this. The earliest disciples, it is true, by their personal intercourse with Christ, and in other ways, enjoyed great facilities for understanding the truth. But they lay under disadvantages also. The grain of mustard-seed was only just put into the ground. There must be lapse of time before it could become the great tree. And if we follow the history of the Gospel, as the New Testament unfolds it, we shall find that after the day of Pentecost, and within the apostolic period, there was a marked progress made by the Church in its knowledge and appreciation of what Christ had taught. 'The Gospel, with the first disciples, was not a new religion; it was the fulfilment of the old one.' Their theology was contained in the doctrine, 'Jesus of Nazareth is the Christ.' This was the substance of what the Apostles preached; and on this basis, partly through the wonders of Pentecost, partly through the concurrent aid of the dominant belief of the age, the Church soon multiplied its converts from scores to thousands. The position and sentiment of this original Christian community were essentially Jewish. Its faith, its observances, its whole religious life, were those of pious Jews who had waited for and found the redemption of Israel. It was a Church of the circumcision. It never dreamt of breaking with the Synagogue. It laboured simply and exclusively to spread the doctrine of Christ among those who, like their Lord, were of the stock of Abraham. And this most ancient type of Christianity involved the germ of all that the Gospel afterwards became. It was not, however, an

adequate expression of the teaching and will of Christ. It was too local, too cramped, too narrow. Accordingly the Providence of God threw open the door to a better state of things. Stephen, the Hellenist Jew, began to preach a broader Gospel; and when martyrdom cut short his ministry, and persecution scattered his friends, a number of these, Cypriots and Cyrenians by birth, began, in Antioch and elsewhere, to preach Christ to the pagan Greeks as well as to the Jews. Their word prevailed; and in a short space, side by side with the Jewish converts to the faith, multitudes of persons were enrolled as members of the Church, who had been nurtured and brought up in heathenism. The Christians of Jerusalem seem to have looked upon this new fact with surprise, if not with suspicion; and the Cyprian Levite, Barnabas, was directed to visit Antioch, and adopt such measures as he might deem necessary under the circumstances. His observations and inquiries satisfied him that the work was of God; and first alone, afterwards in conjunction with an immortal name, the Tarsian Saul, he did his best to regulate, direct, and extend it. The union, however, of the heterogeneous elements, which now met in the Church, led on to controversy; and controversy became not at once, but eventually, the parent of Christian theology. M. Reuss argues, not very convincingly, that the first discussions in Jerusalem respecting the observance of the law by Gentile converts did not raise any question of principle. It was fact, not principle, that was dealt with. And the decision that was come to was simply a measure of conciliation. On the one hand, the Gentile members must abstain from certain practices, partly moral, partly ceremonial, which Judaism abhorred and condemned; on the other hand, it was not needful that they should be circumcised, or conform in all respects to the Mosaic code. Thus the rights of the law were vindicated, while the stringency of its requirements was relaxed for a particular class of the believers. Things were not likely to remain in this position; and they did not. The Jerusalem conferences were scarcely over before we see the standard of a free Gospel raised, with a powerful Judaizing opposition bent on destroying it. The Apostle Paul was the great representative and promoter of this new movement. Not that even he in the outset went the full length of proclaiming, as he afterwards did, the abrogation of the law. But the ground that was taken was

distinctly that of the principle of its weakness and comparative unprofitableness; and out of this soon grew larger and more definite ideas,—ideas, however, which the old Judaic spirit hotly contested,—as to the Messianic kingdom, and the Person and work of Christ. Here is the daybreak of our theology. At the same time, influences of a very different sort from those referred to above, contributed to the rapid development of that fructification of truth which was thus begun. 'The religious philosophy of the Synagogue' was the first great power that gave theological form to the apostolic teaching, and moulded the polemic of the earliest Christian divines. But though less strongly, it was likewise very sensibly determined in the end by the superstition and religious speculation which then obtained so widely through the Greek and Grecized world. The Gnostic doctrines as to Divine emanations, and as to the necessary connexion between matter and evil, led to the shaping of a Christian Gnosis, which, while it refused to harmonize in some respects either with the Judaic or Pauline scheme of Christian faith, is, chronologically considered, the ultimate type under which the Gospel presents itself in the writings of the New Testament.

Brief and imperfect as is the sketch we have now given of M. Reuss's theory, we cannot here weigh and pronounce upon the merits of its several parts. There is much in it which we accept. There is not a little in it which we wholly disbelieve, or can only admit subject to important guards and qualifications. Speaking generally, however, and with the author's elaborate and often eloquent exposition of himself before us, there are one or two points on which it is easy to express an opinion. It is almost superfluous to say, that we have no sympathy with that 'free handling' of Scripture which we here meet with, and which becomes bolder and bolder as M. Reuss moves on in his argument. The term 'ecclesiastical tradition,' so often applied either to the New Testament or to its sources, is a disparaging assumption, which we do not recognise as carrying with it the signature of a rational criticism. What is no less objectionable is the almost entire exclusion of the agency of the Holy Spirit in connexion with the early history and progress of the Church. The Spirit is named, indeed, and a sort of influence is acknowledged as having proceeded from Him; but the proportion which the supernatural bears to the natural in

M. Reuss's theory is an infinitesimal thing, compared with the all-penetrating presence of it in the Acts of the Apostles and in the other inspired documents which supply us with the facts of the case. While we readily grant that external circumstances moulded to a great degree the forms under which Christian truth presents itself in the pages of Scripture, we believe that there was a much more direct action of the foreknowledge and will of God in the determination of this issue than our author's scheme allows. At the same time, the arguments advanced by M. Reuss against the unity of the teaching of the New Testament, appear to us to be singularly inconclusive; nor do we admit for a moment the soundness of the principle which, as we have seen already, is the keystone of our author's argument, that no new truth was communicated to the disciples after their Master was gone from them. It is with express reference to the apostolic theology that M. Reuss says of all theology, that 'it is a scientific appreciation of religious facts; it ascends to principles, it weighs arguments, it draws conclusions, but it does not create ideas.' In this respect we hold that the theology of the Apostles was not a theology. If the promise which Christ made them, that He would teach them 'many things' by the Spirit of truth after His departure, which they were not then prepared to hear, has any meaning whatever; and if the history of the primitive Church is not to be reduced to a mere concatenation of natural causes and effects; we must hold, against all comers, that there was not only a rational development of Christ's doctrine in the ordinary course of Providence, but a specific creation from time to time of Christian ideas, or rather an immediate and extraordinary communication of fresh truth by the power of the Holy Ghost. On this subject we believe, in short, what M. Reuss believes when he forgets his theory for an instant, and virtually allows that an Apostle might receive 'new and special revelations' of Gospel verity. Let this only be granted, and we are not afraid of a cautiously-stated principle of dogmatic ripening and progress.

Our author has now traced what he conceives to be the beginnings of Apostolic Theology. From this point he goes on to mark certain 'forms and shades of Christian thought' which fall within the province of his criticism. Of these there are but two which either require or admit of full and systematic

exposition: the one the scheme of doctrine contained in the letters of St. Paul; the other that which is formulised in the Gospel and Epistles of St. John. The rest, so far as they can be defined, are all less or more related to these, and flow through obvious channels from those 'Jewish-Christian' doctrines which were the common well-head of the teaching alike of Peter, James, Paul, John, and all the New-Testament writers. Nearly the whole of the second and larger volume of M. Reuss's work is taken up with his conspectus of the theological systems of St. Paul and St. John. Before proceeding to this, however, he sets apart the concluding division of his first volume for a critical survey of what he styles the Jewish-Christian theology, as it obtained in the Church 'before the march of events and the privileged instruments of Providence had succeeded in separating the evangelical element from its foreign envelope.' The substance of this theology, as already stated, was contained in the great thesis, 'Jesus is the Christ.' This carried with it, however, 'three elements or applications.' In the first place, Messiah having appeared in the flesh, His kingdom would soon come. Here we have to do, then, with the doctrine of the last things, as held by the primitive Church. In the second place, the views which obtained in the Church as to the person and character of Christ, a subject closely connected with the former, claim to be considered. Last of all, the terms of admission into Christ's kingdom, with the benefits it conferred,—in other words, the doctrine of salvation, as set forth in the well-known formula of the Acts, 'Repent, and be baptized in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins,'—forms the final topic to be discussed. This is the plan of our author's fourth book.

The great authority on which M. Reuss relies for his exposition of the Jewish-Christian Eschatology is the book of the Revelation. He takes this to be the earliest written portion of the New Testament. Not only, he contends, does it belong to the canon, but it is the only Christian Scripture that was known to the first believers. He maintains that, apart from the amazing prejudices which have perplexed and darkened it, it is the simplest and most transparent book that prophet ever wrote. It was written before the fall of Jerusalem, under the Emperor Galba, in the second half of the year A.D. 68, and refers exclusively to the speedy re-appearance of Christ and the establish-

ment of His kingdom on earth. The churches of Asia Minor, seated in the very centre of heathendom, were the chief sufferers under the persecution by Nero. So far were they, however, from renouncing the faith, that the trial only heightened their courage, and 'filled their leaders with a prophetic enthusiasm which was itself well nigh a pledge of victory.' Plainly the end was approaching. The misery of the world, the wickedness of the enemies of God, the afflictions of the righteous, had reached their meridian height. The Saviour was at hand. That very generation would see Him in His glory, His foes His footstool, and His servants universally and completely triumphant. In support of these views, M. Reuss furnishes a lengthened analysis of the Apocalypse, marking, as he proceeds, the illustrations which he finds in it of the sentiments of the contemporary Church as to the kingdom of Christ. Of the analysis, as such, we can only speak with respect; it is clear, succinct, and graphic. As to the principle of interpretation, and the uses made of it, we have scarcely more faith in M. Reuss's doctrines than in the wild and fantastic theories of the empirical commentators whom he lashes so unmercifully. With respect, however, to the tone and style of our author's criticism on this Divine and most sacred Book, we must express the strongest possible dissatisfaction. It is as intensely cold and earthly as criticism can be; and if it does not charge St. John with falsehood in affirming that the contents of his book were an explicit revelation from Christ, we do not know what other conclusion can be reasonably drawn from M. Reuss's premises. If it really be, as he affirms, that we are indebted to the 'tact,' and 'taste,' and 'imagination' of St. John for the marvellous pictures of the Apocalypse; and if it be altogether a mistake to suppose that there are any 'new and special revelations' in it, or that its visions have any 'objective reality;' it must be confessed, to say the least, that the book presents one of the most curious puzzles for the moralist to be found in the entire circle of psychological phenomena.

In regard to the substance of the doctrine of Christ's kingdom, whether as contained in the Apocalypse, or elsewhere in the New Testament, M. Reuss finds little reason for distinguishing the views of the primitive Church from those of the later Jews. Of course the belief in a double manifestation of the Saviour, first as past, then as future, was peculiar to Christians. But so far as the

character and results of the great Epiphany were concerned, their hopes had pretty much the same border-lines, the same texture, the same colouring.

If space permitted, we should be glad to follow the author through his chapters on the early Christian Creed as to the Person of our Lord, as to good and evil angels, and as to the nature and method of the Gospel salvation. Readers who know how to discriminate between the solid and the shadowy will find much both to condemn and to admire in the course of his inquiries. Let them not be surprised to hear that St. Matthew's genealogy of Christ is valueless for those who believe Him to be more than a man, and that it is absurd to suppose that Christ from His birth was in full possession of the attributes of Divinity. They must be prepared for other strains upon their faith no less heavy than these. At the same time there is a preponderance of truth over error in the writer's philosophy; and a well-judging and reverent mind will not fail to gather wisdom from it. On one great point the author speaks with a candour and an emphasis every way worthy of his facts. He discovers no trace, he says, in the writings of St. Paul, of any contrariety between his Christology and that of the earliest Church; and he maintains that the Apocalypse, that book which, as he believes, was at one time the only New Testament the Church possessed, indisputably claims for Christ the titles and prerogatives of God.

The analysis and scientific exposition of the Epistle of James, with which M. Reuss closes his fourth book, is not without its provocatives to criticism, though we assent for the most part to the view he takes of its theological position and scope. This topic, however, as well as the profoundly interesting sections on Scripture Exegesis and Inspiration, which the author introduces in the earlier part of the book, we are compelled to pass over. M. Reuss's criticism on the points last named has more than one edge; but it proves unanswerably, that the first Christians held in the strongest and most absolute sense the Divine authorship of the Old Testament; and we commend his arguments, both on this particular question and on that of the typological principle of interpretation adopted by the sacred writers of the New Testament, to the attention of all who seek to fix their judgments respecting these momentous verities on stable foundations.

The first two hundred and sixty or seventy pages of our author's second volume, forming the sixth great division of his work, are taken up with a minute examination of the theological system of St. Paul. As might be expected, M. Reuss is here at his full height; and the independence of thought, the breadth of view, the subtlety of analysis, the keen perception of differences, the power of sharply defined and forcible description, which distinguish his writings, are nowhere seen to greater advantage. We wish we could add, that he becomes less paradoxical as he advances, and that we find increasing reason to trust him with the direction of our intelligence and religious feeling.

In endeavouring to reconstruct St. Paul's theology, the author does not avail himself of the Acts of the Apostles. There is nothing in this book which appears to him to be specially characteristic of the Apostle's teaching. The Epistles are his sources; and the whole of those commonly attributed to St. Paul, with the exception of the Hebrews, he accepts as authentic. His theory of the dates of the Epistles, and of the places in which they were composed, is simply stated in the present work. The grounds on which it rests are exhibited at large in his *History of the Sacred Scriptures of the New Testament*. The following is the outline of his scheme, as here given.

'The oldest Epistles of St. Paul which have come down to us are those to the Thessalonians, written from Corinth about the year 53 and 54. After these comes the Epistle to the Galatians, written at Ephesus immediately after Paul reached that city, about the year 57. Then, during a journey to the island of Crete, to Greece, (where he made but a short stay,) to Illyria and Macedonia, the Apostle wrote at Corinth the Epistle to Titus, and about the same time, perhaps a little later, the First to Timothy. On returning to Ephesus, about Easter in the year 59, he wrote what we call the First to the Corinthians, and during the following winter, in Macedonia, the Second to the same Church. In the spring of the year after, during his third stay at Corinth, he composed the Epistle to the Romans. During the imprisonment at Cæsarea, between 60 and 62, he wrote the Epistles to the Ephesians, the Colossians, and Philemon. Conveyed to Rome in 62, he almost immediately dispatched the Second to Timothy. Last of all, towards the end of his imprisonment, and a little before his death, which occurred in 64, he wrote the Epistle to the Philippians, which is the latest of those that have come down to us.'

The doctrine of St. Paul M. Reuss regards as the corollary of his life; and the leading idea of it he takes to be that which

is so precisely and emphatically expressed in the well-known passage, Romans iii. 21–26. This is the starting-point of his exposition; and, in pursuing it, he discusses in succession the views which the Apostle's writings present of Righteousness and Sin, of the Law and the Gospel, of God as the Author of salvation, of the person and work of Christ, of the typical relation between the Old and New Testament, of Faith, of Election, of Divine Calling and the Holy Spirit, of Regeneration, Redemption, Justification and Reconciliation, of the Church, of Hope and Temptation, and of the Last Things and the Kingdom of God.

It will be impossible for us to traverse this enormous field so as to do justice either to the merits of the writer, or to what we deem his mistakes and deficiencies. We must content ourselves with a hurried glance over the surface of it, and with such observations as we may be able to make on its more prominent features.

The fundamental axiom of the teaching of the Old Testament, according to M. Reuss, is that blessedness depends on righteousness; and this, he says, is the ground-doctrine of St. Paul. Experience, however, shows that no man is righteous; on the contrary, all men, Jews and Gentiles alike, are sinners, that is to say, faulty before God. The cause of this is the ascendancy in human nature of the bad principle, the flesh, over the good principle, the spirit. This ascendancy is universal; all from the beginning have sinned. The consequences are partly present, partly future. Now, the sinner is either in despair because of the bondage from which he suffers, or he is insensible to it, and follows implicitly the dictates of the flesh. The future is darker still: God is angry with him,—though this is only to be understood anthropomorphically,—and his blessedness is forfeit; he must die. If he do not, if he become righteous, and consequently live, it can neither be by a power within himself, nor by virtue of the law, whether that of the Old Testament, or its equivalent written on the hearts of the heathen. So far from the law having power to render men righteous, it stimulates to sin and awakens the sense of sin. The law, indeed, was never intended to justify. It was given as a 'schoolmaster,' to hold men back from the extreme consequences of their carnality, and to prepare the way for Christ, who is its end. Not that the Gospel and

the law are hostile; only the former is higher, paramount, and everlasting. The law leaves us guilty, morally helpless, and miserable through fear of the Divine anger; in a word, slaves of sin. The Gospel is the good news of our redemption. Of this redemption God, in His character at once of just and good, is the Author. His grace is the primary source of it. The Son of God, by His sinless life on earth, free altogether from the rule of the flesh, and in particular by those two great acts, His unmerited and voluntary death, and His resurrection from the dead, actually achieves the redemption. The mode in which His dying and rising again become our life will be explained if we consider the typical relation which, in the appointment of God, subsisted between the Old Testament and the New. What the first man was to the one, Christ, the second Adam, is to the other. They are related to each other as type and antitype; and the parallelism, which is often an antithetical one, teaches the real character of Christ's redeeming work. The earthly Adam was flesh and blood, and therefore mortal and corruptible. The heavenly Adam lives for ever in His celestial body; and those who become His by spiritual regeneration share His life with Him. Whereas, again, the breath of God made the father of us all a living soul, the Spirit of God, 'the principle of the life' of the second great Head of mankind, imparts a real and durable being to those who receive Him. In like manner, as the first man sinned, and all have sinned after him, so those who follow Christ obtain the 'same exemption from sin, and the same righteousness as He had.' Finally, what is more important than all, just as all die in Adam, seeing that he is their natural forefather, and that they have walked without exception in the steps of his disobedience, so Christ transmits to those who enter into communion with Him the life of which He is the possessor and spring. That which makes His redemption a redemption is our personal faith in what M. Reuss calls—though we do not understand what meaning the term can have under his theory of salvation—'the efficacy of the blood of Christ.' When a man accepts the truth of the Gospel, confides in the Divine grace which it manifests, and, renouncing himself, 'subordinates his whole human personality to that of the Saviour, identifying himself with His ideal existence, and entering into perfect communion with Him,'—such a one is redeemed; the triple servi-

tude of guilt, sin, and the law is abolished; his faith is imputed to him for righteousness. That there is a distinction, in fact, among mankind with respect to Christ's work, some being saved through it, others not, St. Paul explains, as our author teaches, by the doctrine of an eternal predestination, which is at once individual and collective, and which leaves the human will free, while it satisfies the claims of the Divine foreknowledge. It may be thought that this is a contradiction. The author, however, is not concerned to make the Apostle agree with himself. His part, he says, is that of a historian, and he frankly expresses his regret that St. Paul should have touched a question which 'all philosophers, ancient and modern, as well as he,' have failed to satisfy. Election with St. Paul, M. Reuss proceeds to state, carries with it, as necessary consequence, the Divine calling to salvation. The elect are in due season called. And the means employed for this purpose is the communication of the Holy Spirit,—a subject on which the views of the author are most misleading and defective. Regeneration is the immediate effect of the receiving of the Spirit, a change by which the personal being of the individual is merged in that of Christ, and the bad principle of our nature is abolished. A new life comes in the train of regeneration,—a life the nature and excellence of which are set forth by the Apostle with great wealth of descriptive and illustrative language. Not that such a life can be really lived. Theory and practice are here at issue. But we have now to do with the ideal, not the actual.

We may very well pause at this point. If we needed to justify the view expressed a page or two back as to the character of this part of our author's work, we hope our readers are now convinced that our judgment was sound. No one will deny that the hand of a bold and vigorous thinker is visible in the picture to which the foregoing outline must serve as index. And as little do we doubt the verdict which most students of St. Paul will pronounce upon several of M. Reuss's positions as they appear in our sketch.

Speaking generally, we cannot but remark what we deem an unscientific humanising and naturalising of the Apostle's doctrines in what our author has written upon them. They are poor, shrunken, shrivelled things in M. Reuss's hands, as compared with their own Divine bloom and nobility. The awful

grandeur of them is gone, and no less their ineffable charm and sweetness. The danger of sacrificing life to form is inevitable to religious philosophy. It has assuredly been fallen into here. At the same time we meet M. Reuss on his own ground; and, while we find ourselves involved at every turn in the difficulty which an intimate mixture of the real and unreal creates for the critic, we distinctly question the correctness, in more than a few instances, of the interpretation he has put upon the teaching of St. Paul. We are by no means content, for example, with his rendering of the Apostle's doctrines of righteousness and of sin. Both the one and the other appear to us to be greatly understated. The ideas to which these terms answer have a width, and a profundity, and a positiveness of meaning in the Pauline Letters which we miss in M. Reuss's exposition. We note this fact the more, because we not only discover in it the explanation of some other views of our author, but because we are persuaded, that inadequate notions of the Scripture doctrine of sin lie at the root of much of the popular theosophy of our times. Again, we wholly dissent from the opinion which excludes from the theology of St. Paul the doctrine of an hereditary corruption of our nature. M. Reuss contends that such cannot be the meaning of the Apostle, because it would contradict 1 Cor. xv. 45–47; it would not agree with his teaching as to the eternity of the Divine decrees; and, last of all, it implies that Adam was originally impeccable, an idea inconsistent with his having fallen, seeing that 'the fact of sin supposes the natural possibility of sin.' Does M. Reuss really intend what he says in this last argument? It is a very patent fallacy. Of course, the fact of Adam's sinning proves the natural possibility of his sinning; but what then? Are natural possibility of sinning and natural disposition to sin one and the same thing? We hold that, in the case of the first man, there was the former, but not the latter. We hold that in all his descendants, by reason of their relation to him, there is the latter as well as the former; and that not only is this the doctrine which St. Paul argues in Romans v., and assumes and teaches elsewhere, but that the core of the meaning of the word 'flesh,' so often used by the Apostle of human nature in its unregenerate state, is to be found in the same great truth. We must not dwell on the groundlessness of the author's

reflection on St. Paul for venturing to touch the problems of God's foreknowledge and man's free will. The ethical uses to which he puts his teaching on this point, are an abundant answer to every objection which metaphysics can raise against it. Neither shall we now labour to show at large that the criticism on which M. Reuss finds so much support for his theory of the natural subordination of the Son of God to the Father, is completely destroyed by a power before which no etymology or *usus loquendi* can stand for a moment. Let the words 'firstborn of every creature' mean what they may, considered severally or collectively, no doctrine of word-building or array of parallels can ever escape the force of St. Paul's own interpretation of his own terms; 'for by Him were all things created that are in heaven and that are in earth; all were created by Him and for Him.' Even M. Reuss's view of the Pauline doctrine of the Holy Ghost, unworthy as it is, we must let pass with a note or two of admiration. Will it be believed that St. Paul is declared to have nothing to say on the subject of the Spirit of God viewed as to His natural relations to the Godhead, and that his writings 'seem to favour but little the idea of the Spirit's personality, if they do not, in fact, exclude it?' After this most extraordinary dictum, our readers will not be surprised to learn that St. Paul speaks of the Spirit as 'a sword,'—viz., in Eph. vi. 17, where he exhorts the Church to use the 'Sword of the Spirit, which is the Word of God;' and likewise as 'a field;' for in Gal. vi. 8, we are told of those 'who sow unto the Spirit.' We are sorry to say, that the whole chapter on 'Calling and the Holy Spirit' is of a piece with this criticism; and, considering our author's general candour and acuteness, we know not how to account for the phenomenon, except by referring it to the insensible bias of which we spoke in the outset.

There is one point, however, which we must not dismiss without more formal challenge. We have no faith whatever in the theory of redemption which M. Reuss constructs out of the letters of St. Paul. This theory, already explained to some extent, is to the effect, that Christ, by His sinless life, and in particular by His death and resurrection on our behalf, having conquered sin and fulfilled the righteousness of the law, 'became incorporated as sin's conqueror into human nature, so that it

might in this way reap the benefit of his triumph.' He shed His blood on the cross 'with the design and in the view of His death being substituted for that which men ought to have suffered for their sins.' Not that His death was in our room in the sense in which it is commonly believed to have been suffered. The justice of God has nothing to do with it. It is the manifestation of Divine grace—a grace which, with Christ's offering of Himself in view, ceases to be grieved with men, and shows them favour. And he who believes in Christ's death as having the design and value described, receiving with thankfulness the grace of God in Him, unites himself to Christ spiritually and essentially, and becomes a new creature in Him. 'In a manner quite mystical...faith transforms the natural death of Christ into the equivalent of the spiritual death of the old man. The substitution, and with it the redemption, are then, in fact, accomplished, because the old man is dead by mystical participation in the death of the Saviour, and the extent of this death is just in proportion to the measure of our participation in Christ's death.' 'We repeat it,' says M. Reuss, 'the turning-point of the Apostle's whole system,' with respect to our redemption, 'is faith, always faith.'

It will be observed that in all this the author not only shuts out the juridical notion of our Lord's death, but, in fact, denies it to have any really objective value whatever. His redemption, so far from being a display of the justice of God, or, in any proper sense of the term, an atonement for sin, is no further a redemption, considered externally, than that it renders God well affected towards man by the satisfaction which He finds in His Son's perfect righteousness; nor, indeed, is it thus a redemption, until, 'in a manner quite mystical,' our faith causes us to lose our personality as sinners in His personality as the conqueror of sin.

Does M. Reuss really believe that this unintelligible mongrel of quasi-Platonist idealism and religious sentimentality is that Gospel of the blessed God which had been hid from ages and from generations, and which Paul, the pupil of Gamaliel, the convert of Damascus, and the great Missionary Preacher, burned with Divine enthusiasm to announce all over the world? Surely the weakness and self-contradictions of which this theory makes the Apostle guilty, are a strong presumption against the sound-

ness of it. We believe it to be utterly unsound. If anything be demonstrable from St. Paul's writings, this appears to us to be taught in them beyond all contradiction—that the death of Christ is, in itself and objectively, a Divinely-appointed sacrifice for the sins of all mankind; and though we have nothing to say for the extreme sense to which the ultra-Calvinist theology carries the juridical notion of Christ's death, we hold that this is the view under which it is constantly exhibited in the writings of St. Paul. We do not deny, of course, that while the Apostle represents the death of Christ as potentially conferring salvation on all men, he restricts the actual experience of salvation to those who believe in Christ. Nor, while repudiating the notion of any such ideal death and life in Him, as M. Reuss's theory involves, do we deny that St. Paul speaks under these images of a mystical oneness of the Saviour and His people. But our position is this: that these views of Christ's work and relations to us are not exhaustive of the Apostle's idea of them; that, on the contrary, they are subordinate to the prime and master doctrine, which makes the death of Christ a truly objective satisfaction in law to God for the sins of men.

We shall not attempt to argue this at length. Suffice it to say, that in the absence of all proof to the contrary, we are bound to recognise, in the language used by St. Paul on this subject, the strictly historical value, which, apart from prepossessions and theories, no one would have dreamt of denying to it. When God is said to have made His Son a sin-offering, when Christ is declared to have died the just for the unjust, and when we are told that whereas all have sinned, there is justification for all through our Lord's redemption, we have no more reason for questioning the purely objective character of this entire cluster of facts, than for doubting whether Job's burnt-offering for his friends, and God's acceptance of it, are to be referred to the sphere of external realities; or whether the sacrifices of Israel, on the great day of atonement, were actually performed, and had the efficacy attributed to them. And with respect to the juridical view of Christ's sacrifice, we are quite at a loss to understand how any force less than that of an overmastering prejudice can convert St. Paul's doctrine into anything else. What are his views of God as the universal lawgiver, of sin as violation of the law, involving guilt and exposing the sinner

to the wrath to come, of justification as carrying with it peace with God and salvation from His anger, of the Christian life as a fulfilling of the righteousness of the law, but so many juridical aspects of man's relation to God, and of God's relation to man, in connexion with the Gospel of Christ? The whole terminology of the Apostle rests upon a juridical conception of the evangelical economy. And if the central fact of that economy be not juridical, what becomes of the doctrine of the typical relation of the Old Testament and the New, of which M. Reuss rightly makes so much? Was the death of Christ a thank-offering, or any kind of offering, less than what St. Paul calls it, a sin-offering? And if a sin-offering, can any other idea of it than that which finds in it the character of a propitiation in sight of violated law be admitted for an instant, with the Old-Testament doctrine of sacrifice before us? If sin be what the whole tenor of Scripture teaches, not an infirmity of our nature, or an unfilial naughtiness on the part of man, but an awful infraction of the law of the moral Governor of the universe, and if the death of Christ be a Divine provision whereby God may be just and yet justify the ungodly, it is mere trifling to say that this is not a juridical transaction. Such and no other, we believe, is the fundamental doctrine of Christ's death, as taught and expounded by St. Paul; and we are not afraid of the charge of solemn dogmatism, when we express our deliberate judgment that the non-juridical and idealistic view of our Lord's sacrifice is arbitrary, meaningless, and profane.

We cannot follow our author through the remainder of his exposition of the Pauline theology. His views on the subject of Justification and Reconciliation are deeply coloured with the principles we have just adverted to. There are few portions of his book so little worthy of the reader's attention. We hope he will think so, when we inform him that M. Reuss says in so many words, that the word 'reconciliation' is 'badly chosen' for St. Paul's purpose. The chapter on the Church is more satisfactory. It contains several valuable and suggestive passages, of which those on the Church's unity and on the Lord's Supper are among the best. Yet even here the doctrine of the Holy Spirit sinks below its true rank; and there is a want of reverence which cannot but be hurtful to the unprepared and unwary. The three sections succeeding are occupied with the doctrine of

Christian hope, and so with the objects of it, as they appear in the writings of St. Paul. We hardly know whether we ought to be more interested or provoked by some of the contents of these sections. Is it creditable to our theologians to persist in saying, as so many of them do, notwithstanding St. Paul's express declaration to the contrary, that he looked for the speedy return of Christ in His glory? We confess to a feeling of impatience under this often-repeated affirmation. M. Reuss repeats it; and explains 2 Thess. ii. 2, as simply meaning, that 'all delay was not absolutely excluded, as would be the case, if the end must needs be looked for the very next day.' Whatever may be the basis of the current language of St. Paul and the other New-Testament writers, when they speak of Christ coming again, there is no evidence whatever that any one of them either believed or taught that the event was actually at hand. The nearness of it, to which they refer so often, is a fact of ethics, not of chronology. The manner in which our author treats St. Paul's descriptions of the future world—Jewish-Christian descriptions, as he styles them—does not provoke us; it awakens a deeper feeling. We are thankful we do not yet read the New Testament with M. Reuss's eyes.

We are now near the close of the author's fifth great division of his work. Some twenty pages devoted to critical discussions on the theology of St. Paul as compared with the Jewish-Christian doctrines, and on the relation between the systems of St. Paul and St. James, bring us to the end. Both questions are handled with great ability; and if we do not adopt M. Reuss's views, as we do not, without sundry demurs and restrictions, we cannot but admire the combination of muscular grasp and delicate analytical skill which his argument exhibits.

M. Reuss's sixth book, entitled, 'The Theology of Transition,' forms a bridge of a hundred pages, by which we pass from his exposition of St. Paul to the more extended conspectus of the theological system of St. John, with which his work concludes. His heading indicates the view which he now proceeds to illustrate. Midway between Judæo-Christianity and, to a certain extent, the doctrine of St. Paul on the one side, and on the other, the theology of St. John, in which, as he thinks, the historical development of Christ's teaching culminates, there was a transitional theology, represented by the Epistle to the

Hebrews, the First Epistle of Peter, and the Epistles of Barnabas and Clement, together with the Acts of the Apostles and the Synoptical Gospels. The controversies of which we have already spoken had a double issue. In the first place, they led to the formation of two separatist bodies of quasi-Christians; the Ebionites, who clung to their old Judaism, and the Gnostical anti-legalists, who wholly rejected the law and its obligations. In the second place, the great mass of the believers held together on the principle of mutual concession. And, as M. Reuss will have it, the New-Testament books just named present us with the belief of the Church in this second great stage of its progress. Whatever may be thought of the author's general theory, —and we deem the foundations of it at many points very precarious,—his critical investigation into the origin, character, and contents of the authorities on which he builds, will repay careful study. Comparing the theology of the Epistle to the Hebrews, which he presents at large, with that of St. Paul, he remarks upon the numerous and striking resemblances which they bear to one another. At the same time he perceives, as he thinks, broad lines of distinction between them, and especially in their doctrine respecting Christ's redemption, which, the author here again insists, is a mystical complex of the subjective and objective, as it appears in St. Paul; while the writer of the Hebrews treats it as 'an external, objective, and sacerdotal act, performed altogether apart from the individual who is to profit by it.' We do not accept the contradiction. We have no difficulty in allowing that our Lord's work appears under different phases in the inspired books which are here put into contrast; but we deny the assumption respecting St. Paul's theology on which the idea of a conflicting doctrine is reared. M. Reuss does not weary of paradox as he advances; and his summary of the doctrines of St. Peter contained in his next chapter, supplies us with a notable example. After stating that in St. Peter also, as well as in the Hebrews, the death of Christ is represented as 'an external act of expiation,' he goes on to say, that the Apostle gives us no information, however, as to the way in which we may make the grace of the atonement our own. We have looked again and again at the passage, to be sure that our eyes did not deceive us. It is so: '*Il ne nous est pas dit que nous avons aussi quelque chose à y faire, ni comment nous devrons*

nous en approprier le bénéfice.' Verily nothing is too hard for philosophy.

We pass over M. Reuss's discussion of the letters of Barnabas and Clement, each of which he analyses and turns to account for the purposes of his argument, and dwell for a moment on the position which he assigns in it to the first three Gospels and the Acts of the Apostles, and on the use he makes of their 'theological ideas,' as he expresses it. There is no New-Testament book, in our author's view, which exhibits more plainly than does the Acts of the Apostles a 'conciliatory tendency.' The author of it in his Gospel is simply the narrator of an 'ecclesiastical tradition.' Here he passes judgment on the facts he recounts. According to the ordinary view, the book does not answer to its title. It is a book of Acts; of Acts of Apostles; but not of the Apostles. There are but two names that occupy any considerable place in the history. These are Peter and Paul, the two great representatives of Jewish and Gentile Christianity. St. Luke's work, though historical, is in reality 'a theological work, didactic in its basis, apologetic and polemical in its form.' Its object is by a recital of facts to give prominence to certain theories which gave them birth, for the purpose of repudiating or consigning them to oblivion. The original controversies are the body of the book, and the compromise the soul of it. M. Reuss endeavours to establish this hypothesis by a critical scrutiny of the contents of the Acts. We are satisfied neither with the process nor with the result. In several instances St. Luke's doctrine is lamentably abraded and mangled; and where it seems to favour the author's scheme, his arguments rarely carry with them full conviction. As an example of exegetical injustice we would point to the interpretation given to chap. iii. 19–21; and we shall hardly be thought to have made M. Reuss more Procrustean than he is, when our readers have heard him say, that in the inconvenient passage, chap. xx. 28, the use of 'God,' instead of 'Lord,' is due either to 'the inadvertence of a copyist or to dogmatic prepossession.' What may not be extorted from a sacred writer by this mode of treatment?

With respect to the Gospels of St. Matthew and St. Luke, our author is dissatisfied, as he well may be, with the theory which supposes that the former was written in the interest

of the Jewish-Christian theology; while the latter was intended to give currency to the opinions of St. Paul. He finds too intimate a mixture of the Pauline and the Jewish-Christian in both to allow of this hypothesis. No. It was the design of the Evangelists in question to write not dogmas, but facts; and the explanation of their doctrinal system, so far as it enters into their narrations, is to be sought in the circumstance, that chronologically they stand on the border line between the original and ultimate type of Christian faith. St. Mark's Gospel M. Reuss considers himself to have proved elsewhere to be the most ancient of the four, and one of the principal authorities used by the other Evangelists in the composition of their works. 'His book is the first attempt,' he says, 'to fix the evangelical tradition in writing.' It is a mistake, therefore, to suppose that it was written on a principle of selection from the first and third Gospels. Internal as well as external evidence is against this. Nor does it bear any marks of a design to harmonize conflicting theologies. It is less theological in its colouring than either St. Matthew or St. Luke. Neither Jewish-Christianity nor Paulinism can claim it as its own. It also belongs, though earlier in date than its fellows, to the middle-point between the boundaries already indicated. Reserving the question of the date of St. Mark's Gospel, and its relations to the other Evangelists, we think there are elements of truth in this part of our author's argument. And though, as we have said before, we do not admit the doctrine of a historical development of the Gospel in the same sense in which M. Reuss holds it, we readily grant that the synoptical Gospels represent a different phase of Christian truth from that which we find in the Gospel by St. John; and we are at no loss for explanations of that joint action of the Spirit and Providence of God, which has made them what they are and nothing else.

And now we reach the seventh and last stage of our author's work, in his elaborate survey of the theological system of St. John. We wish we could testify that it is as trustworthy as it is elaborate. There is no part of his book in which the writer's powers are either more heavily tasked or more signally displayed; and there is none which betrays more obviously a theological bias, or does greater violence to the instincts of a reverent Christian faith. The section opens with a statement

of the peculiar difficulties which beset the study of St. John's theology, and, after a lengthened dissertation—full of points that suggest doubt and question—on the structure of his Gospel, proceeds to discuss, first, the general idea of the Johannine system; then, in a series of brilliant paragraphs, the several doctrines of the essence of God, of the essence and incarnation of the Word, of the world and the action of the Word on the world, of the Judgment, of Faith, of the Spirit, of Love, and of Life; last of all, the relations which subsist between the Apocalypse and the fourth Gospel, and the correspondences and contrasts exhibited by the doctrine of St. John and St. Paul respectively.

The Gospel of St. John, M. Reuss argues, is of a very different character from the narratives of the Synoptists. They write biography; he writes theology. They relate facts; with him facts are only points of attachment for doctrinal discourse. The ethical is the end at which they aim; he has more to do with dogma and abstract truth. In the Synoptists it is the teaching of Christ which is prominent; in St. John it is rather the teacher than His doctrine. At the same time St. John also has a great practical object in view. He writes, as he tells his readers, that 'they may believe that Jesus is the Son of God, and that believing they may have life through His name.' And in pursuing this object along his own peculiar path, the Apostle devotes the bulk of his book to a twofold picture of the relations in which the Word Incarnate stood to the world, and of those which He held towards the men who believed in Him. Thus far all is good, and we have little reason to dispute M. Reuss's positions. But here we must break with him. In the passage which follows, he adopts and maintains a theory of the composition of the Gospel, which can never be made to consist with the veracity of its author, much less with any adequate doctrine of Scripture inspiration. The discourses which St. John puts into the mouth of our Lord and others were not really uttered in the form in which St. John delivers them. The conversations with Nicodemus and with the woman of Samaria, for example, did not actually occur as the Apostle describes them. There is a historical basis in them; but they are wrought up by St. John for dogmatic purposes. Nicodemus and the Samaritan woman are representative per-

sonages, invented for the most part by the Apostle as historical figures, enabling him with greater animation and force to bring out certain Divine truths which he wished to illustrate. This is in brief M. Reuss's doctrine; and he endeavours to establish it by numerous arguments, some of them plausible, others transparently fallacious, others, again, conceived and shaped in a spirit as alien as possible from the character of St. John and his writings. We refer to vol. ii., pp. 412–414, for ample proofs of our assertion. No one will deny that there is a marked difference between the Synoptical Gospels and St. John. But to those who believe that John was the beloved disciple of his Master; that the foundations of this friendship are to be sought in the mental constitution and religious life of the Apostle; that, in all probability, he was made by Christ the depositary of higher and more explicit revelations of His doctrine than were accorded to the rest of the Twelve; and that, more than all, he was a chosen vessel to do, in the order of God's providence, and under the special anointing of the Spirit, the work with which he has blessed all subsequent ages; a line of reasoning such as M. Reuss has here pursued will appear to be little better than a scientific impertinence.

The fundamental doctrine of St. John's theology, according to our author, is life through faith in Jesus, the Son of God. Or, expanding it a little, in the Apostle's own words, 'In this is manifested the love of God to us, that He sent His only-begotten Son into the world, that whosoever believeth in Him might have eternal life.' Within the compass of this sentence M. Reuss finds all the key-words of the Johannine system; and he uses them to open the door to the successive parts of his exposition. We cannot accompany him through it. Not seldom he writes in a strain which leaves us little disposition to accompany him. To this category belongs the laboured argumentation by which he endeavours to show that the 'beginning,' mentioned in the first verse of the Gospel, refers solely to contingent existence, and that if it is to be understood in the highest metaphysical sense, we are landed at once in Manicheeism, since St. John makes our Lord to say the same of the Evil One. With no less impatience we hear M. Reuss explain the ascending and descending of the angels upon the Son of Man as meaning that active community of will and

action, which the possession of the same Divine perfections caused to subsist between the first and second Persons of the Godhead during Christ's state of incarnation. And when we see him wrestling with 1 John ii. 2, and vi. 10, to make them reject the juridical notion of our Lord's propitiation; when he affirms that John only uses the language of the multitude, where he speaks of God as being angry with sinners; when the doubtful reading of chapter vii. verse 39 of the Gospel, *οὔπω ἦν Πνεῦμα Ἅγιον*, is forced into the service of a halting and inconsistent theory of St. John's teaching as to the Spirit of God; when a distinction without a difference is made again and again between the Father and the Son in relation to the honour which the Apostle would have us render them; when St. John in several places is represented as at issue with himself; and when, lastly, it is urged upon us, with John xvi. 12 before our eyes, as a principle which ought never to be let go, that the Holy Ghost revealed nothing new to the Apostles;—we lose heart in the presence of that which would otherwise stir the depths of our nature, and inspire us with an almost enthusiastic admiration of the writer's brilliancy and power. We will do neither ourselves nor our author the injustice to deny the great merits of his performance. He has sounded the depths of many of St. John's terms and doctrines, so far as natural reason can sound them; and whoever makes himself master of his views and arguments, will find frequent occasion to wonder at the quickness and sureness of the philosophical perception which enables the author to connect the various parts of the Apostle's theology either with itself, or with earlier Scripture doctrines of the nature, government, and grace of God.

For vigour of thought, and clearness and beauty of style, no part of M. Reuss's book surpasses its three concluding sections. In these he sums up the results of his investigations, and exhibits in form the principles which he thinks he is warranted and compelled to draw from them. The point on which he most insists is, that the various theologies which he has found in the New Testament are simply intellectual and human developments of the teaching of our Lord; and that while in a multitude of particulars they coincide with one another, they often show divergences and disagreements which ecclesiastical empiricism alone can blend and harmonize. 'What a distance,'

exclaims M. Reuss, when treating of the contrast formed by the Apocalypse and the Gospel of St. John, 'between the Lion of Judah, who breaks the nations in pieces like a potter's vessel, and the good Shepherd, who lays down His life for the sheep!' We acknowledge it; and yet, marvellous as it may seem, we have no more difficulty in understanding how Christ may at one and the same time be both the one and the other, than had the writer of the second Psalm in combining the two ideas of the terribleness and attractiveness of the King in Zion. We know of no contradictions among the writers of the New Testament greater than these; and that the progress of Christian doctrine, of which the apostolic history informs us, was not a merely logical or mystical development, but the direct and extraordinary result of the working together of God's Spirit and Providence, we hold to be certified to us, alike by the word of Christ and by the facts of the case, as among the most certain of all certainties.

It is impossible to lay down M. Reuss's book without feeling that it is designed to be a foil upon orthodoxy. We are not surprised that Protestant theology should be in danger of running into extremes, with the shallow and imperious dogmatism of continental Popery at its doors. But there is a worse evil than a too definite and rigid faith; and we think the author of this clever book has run into it. We have as great an aversion as M. Reuss to the strait-laced divinity which allows neither faith nor charity an inch of elbow-room. But we believe that the ministry of the Master did not end when He left the earth, but was continued by His disciples; and that, though there is a homage due to Him and to His teaching, which not even the Apostles whom He chose may share with Him, yet their formally written words of religious instruction are His words also,—many of them fuller and more complete expositions of the doctrine of Christ than any He Himself saw good to give; and that, therefore, it would be to reject His own interpretation of His own utterances, were we to go back to these, and to say, My creed is here, and I acknowledge no authority beyond. If we do not mistake, this is the practical lesson which M. Reuss would fain inculcate. Not less in the name of Science, than in that of Religion, we decline to listen to it.

ART. VIII.—*Nova Scotia, and her Resources.* By THOMAS F. KNIGHT. A Prize Essay. Published by Order of the Nova Scotia Commissioners for the International Exhibition. Halifax, N.S.: A. and W. Mackinlay. London: Sampson Low and Co. 1862.

A CORRECT view of the Industrial Resources of its Colonies is essential to a right estimate of a nation's wealth; and any trustworthy contribution, however humble and limited, which may assist in informing the national mind, is entitled to respectful and attentive consideration. It is impossible to over-estimate the importance of our two great Expositions of Industry in this respect. Besides making us more familiar with the products of our own skill and industry at home, the textile fabrics of Yorkshire and Lancashire, the mechanical ingenuity and complicated manipulations of our Bezaleels and Aholiabs in Birmingham and Sheffield, and the gossamer-like products of the looms of our distant Indian Empire,—they assembled and spread before the eyes of the nation, and of all the world, proofs the most amazing, and such as in no other way could have been furnished, of the progress and prosperity of even our most distant colonies and dependencies.

No reflecting mind could have passed through the different colonial departments of the late Exhibition, without feeling the truth of these remarks. Who had ever realised the aggregate amount of gold exported from Australia, until that wondrous golden obelisk met his gaze? Who had ever imagined the forest wealth of Canada, until he saw there its timber trophy; or the almost fabulous richness of the coal-fields of Nova Scotia, until he saw that section of the Pictou seam of thirty-three feet in thickness? Yet these were only salient points of interest: in every colonial court we were astonished at the skill in manufacture, and beauty in finish, of all that was exhibited for the requirements of the farm, the road, or the drawing-room;—the elegant carriages, the fur-robed sleighs, the cutting tools and labour-saving machinery, the exquisite drawing-room furniture, including musical instruments of delicate touch and tone, and costly ornamentation. These, with numberless proofs

of ingenious industrial skill, and not a few cunning inventions, challenged our admiration at every turn.

Deeply convinced of the value of our North-American colonies,—for extent unrivalled, and in undeveloped resources most fertile in promise for the future,—we were tempted to wander through the different courts occupied by their productions, and to illustrate our sense of their importance by a rapid description of their contents. But we were deterred by the magnitude of the undertaking; and determined instead to select one of those colonies for direct notice: one of which little is generally known, but which at the present time, for reasons which will presently appear, assumes a position of peculiar interest and importance.

The pamphlet, which furnishes us with a text, might almost claim a notice from us on account of its paternity. It is the production of the son of a Minister who was, till lately, one of the oldest and most effective agents of the Wesleyan Missionary Society in Nova Scotia and New Brunswick;* and it has been honoured by the provincial adjudicators, as being entitled to the prize of £100, offered by the Nova Scotia government, for the best exposition of the industrial resources of the province.

The writer claims for his subject 'even a romantic interest,' and demands for it, in common with its sister provinces, 'a niche amongst the memorials of those states which were created by the intellectual impulse of the fifteenth century.' We shall see how far these claims can be sustained. The discovery of America by the Venetian, Cabot; the occupation of Newfoundland, soon valuable for the amount of its fisheries; the first colonization of Nova Scotia, by the French, under De Monts, in 1603; its subsequent cession, by royal grant, to Sir W. Alexander, in 1611; its reversion to English rule during the administration of Cromwell, in 1654; the period of frequent exchanges between the two rival kingdoms in the reigns of the second Charles and Anne, until its final settlement, by the Treaty of Utrecht, in 1713; and the settlement of Halifax, in 1749, by emigrants sent out with Lord Cornwallis;—all these topics are very concisely, but correctly, sketched in the introduction of this essay; which winds up with the rather startling

* The late Rev. Richard Knight, D.D.

assumption, that 'to her natural resources, taken as a whole, the Continent affords no parallel; and she needs only energy, population, and accumulated capital, to develope her resources, and fulfil her destiny.'

The geological structure of a province which bids fair, as we shall show, to rank respectably among the gold-producing countries of the world, deserves special consideration.

The granitic resources of the sea-board of the province are literally inexhaustible, and are already extensively worked. They will eventually become a rich source of wealth; beside furnishing for the larger towns an imperishable material for building purposes, which is destined largely to supersede the unsightly and perishable wooden erections which have disfigured them to so large an extent. In addition to this, and obtainable for the same purposes with far greater facility, there are, on the eastern part of the province, valuable quarries of freestone, unsurpassed in beauty of colour. And, as the essential value of such sources of wealth and commercial speculation is subject to deduction in proportion to the difficulty of obtaining them for shipping purposes, it is important to remark, that along the Atlantic coast-line (which extends upwards of two hundred and fifty miles) there are many harbours which are unrivalled for facility of access and for perfect security.

'The coast abounds in bays and commodious harbours, which greatly conduce to its maritime prosperity. It is the nearest point of communication with Europe of any part of the British possessions on the continent of America. It lies in the direct course of vessels sailing between the north of Europe and America; it is obvious, therefore, that it possesses, from its geographical position, peculiar commercial advantages. It is not too much to assert, that Nova Scotia must ultimately become the great highway for traffic between Europe and the North-American continent; and, when the projected railways shall have been completed,—which passing circumstances seem to indicate will be at no distant time,—Halifax will be, from the possession of its peerless harbour, the *entrepôt* of the British provinces, and, perhaps, of the far-western States.'

These remarks may be considered in some degree prophetic; for, since the publication of this essay, the liberal offer of the British Government (which, through the enlightened administration of the Secretary of State for the Colonies, the Duke of Newcastle, has offered imperial guarantee and assistance for the

construction of an Intercolonial Railroad between the Lower Provinces and Canada) has been accepted by the delegates lately assembled in Quebec; the expenditure being adjusted on a liberal scale,—five-twelfths being assumed by Canada, and the remaining seven-twelfths respectively by New Brunswick and Nova Scotia. At the present time delegates from the three provinces are in London negociating the preliminaries for this grand undertaking.

That there are disadvantages necessarily arising out of the climate of these provinces, will be readily imagined; but these may have been exaggerated. It is true there is a thermometrical maximum both of heat and cold which is unknown in the climate of England; but there are some circumstances which ought not to be overlooked. While the rivers and lakes are invariably sealed in winter by the formation of ice of no mean thickness, the harbours are generally open. The closing of the harbour of Halifax, previous to the introduction of steam navigation, has rarely exceeded once in seventeen years. Since then, from 1840 to the present time, no inconvenience from this cause has arisen; although twice during the same period the harbour of Boston has been firmly closed, the steamer having been liberated each time at an expense of many thousands of dollars. The mean temperature of Halifax in the winter season is registered as 43°, in summer 62°. 'The annual quantity of rain which falls is about 41 inches, of which about 6½ inches is in the form of snow, making the annual depth of snow about 8½ feet. There are about 114 days of rain, and 60 days of snow, on the average, in each year.'*

---

* The Secretary of the Nova Scotia Commission informs us in his catalogue, sent to the Exhibition of 1862, that 'the climate of Nova Scotia is particularly suitable to the growth of the apple-tree; the crop is generally sure and large. Sorts which in England require a wall or espaliers will here grow and thrive in the open orchards as standards. Fruit attains an enormous size; specimens of "*Gloria Mundi*" sent to England measured from fifteen to seventeen inches' circumference.' He states that 'hardy sorts of grapes will, in the western counties, do well in the open air, and even "Black Hamburg" and "White Cluster" have, during the past year, ripened their fruit thus. All the best sorts will (under glass without artificial heat) grow most luxuriantly, and bear better than in England under the same treatment. Mr. Justice Wilkins for several years most successfully ripened "Black Hamburg" at Windsor, Nova Scotia, on a stone wall; and in the last year raised, on two vines not more than seven years old, thirty-three pounds of grapes of flavour quite equal to those ripened in a hot-house. The vines, of course, required careful covering in winter. Mr. Downing, the eminent

THE NATURAL RESOURCES of the province may be classed under the heads severally of zoological, botanical, agricultural, and mineral.

Amongst the quadrupeds may be named the moose, carriboo, bear, lynx, minx, porcupine, beaver, besides many other species found in this country. Of birds, in addition to those that are familiar in England, may be reckoned the bald-eagle, the stork, blue-jay, king-fisher, and humming-bird. In fish, the resources of Nova Scotia are inexhaustible. Cod, haddock, halibut, herring, mackerel, shad, and salmon, are in quality unsurpassed. The halibut not unfrequently attains a prodigious size, sometimes weighing 500 lbs.*

In wild plants, and forest trees, and indigenous fruits, Nova Scotia abounds. Many of the first are medicinal in their character. The swarthy Indian is the repository of many a valuable secret in this department; tradition and instinct have been his teachers, and his skill seldom fails. The trees afford a valuable article of export, both as fuel and lumber; while the fruits, easily accessible, are in the summer season a source of support to the poorer districts in the neighbourhood of the larger towns and villages.

From the brevity of the period of vegetation, it may be supposed that the agricultural resources of the province may be also of a limited and inferior kind; yet this is by no means the case. Vegetation is remarkably rapid; and though wheat in particular is not considered a profitable article of growth amongst the cereals of the province, yet a comparative statement, tabulated from authentic sources, shows that in agricultural products generally Nova Scotia stands deservedly high.

American authority on horticulture, in a communication addressed to Judge Wilkins, expressed his great surprise at the adaptation of Nova Scotia for the growth of the grape, and stated that the "Black Hamburg," with similar treatment, would only ripen one year in six at his gardens at Newburg, on the Hudson. The pear grows vigorously, and is very productive.'

* The fish market in Halifax is one of the finest in the world; often in the season it is full to repletion of every sort. Last spring, on a favourable morning, while every range in the market-house was full to overflowing, thirty large halibut were counted lying on the slip outside, waiting an opportunity to take their place, many of these weighing above two hundred pounds. The retail price of this most delicate fish is twopence sterling per pound; salmon, when plentiful, fivepence; lobsters, the year round, at one penny each, often less; oysters, in the season, two shillings per bushel.

The following is a comparative table of *produce per acre*, as drawn from the best sources available for present use:—

	State of New York 1845.	Ohio 1848.	Canada W. 1848.	New Brunswick 1849.	Nova Scotia 1860.
Wheat, bushels	14	15¼	12⅜	20	25 to 33
Barley	16	24	17⅛	29	39 „ 40
Oats	26	33⅜	24½	34	35 „ 45
Rye	9½	16½	11¼	20½	35 „ 45
Buckwheat ...	14	2½	16⅜	33⅜	40 „ 45
Indian corn ...	25	41½	24⅜	41⅜	———
Potatoes	90	69	84	226	200 „ 300
Turnips	88	—	—	460	400 „ 600
Hay, tons of..	—	1½	—	1⅜	1½ „ 2

The whole area of the province, including the island of Cape Breton,—which is separated from Nova Scotia by the gut of Canso, a strait or rift of most remarkable character, indicating the manner of its separation from the mainland,—may be computed as upwards of eleven millions of acres; of which about one half has been granted. 'The price charged for crown lands in Nova Scotia is 1*s.* 9*d.* sterling per acre. The prices of cultivated lands vary according to the degree of improvement and their situation. In 1851, the *improved* lands amounted to 839,322 acres. In 1861, the returns make them to be 1,027,792.'

The contrasts in the scenery of some of the different counties are very strongly marked. In the centre of the western portions of the province there are many square miles of unexplored country, where inaccessible swamps, and immense granitic boulders, and dense forests, impassable from their thickly-tangled undergrowth, present nature in its wildest aspect. On the entire sea-board industrial toil has pushed its efforts back to the very outskirts of such scenery; and smiling settlements and single farms bear witness to the untiring energy of the hardy settler. In more favoured localities,—such as Windsor, with its beautiful orchards and intervales; Horton, with its prairie of dyked land of ten thousand acres, the actual home of the *Evangeline* of Longfellow's poem, and the valley of Annapolis,

unsurpassed for its meadows, and gardens, and orchards,—there are farming spots of such value and beauty as few countries can surpass. But we can hardly dismiss the consideration of the natural resources of Nova Scotia without introducing from the essay the annexed table of the

OFFICIAL RETURNS OF AGRICULTURAL AND DAIRY PRODUCE, COMPARING FAVOURABLY TWO DEFINITE PERIODS.

The following marks the difference between		1851	and 1861.
Hay	tons	287,837	334,287
Wheat	bushels	297,157	312,081
Barley	"	196,097	269,578
Rye	"	61,438	59,706
Oats	"	1,384,437	1,978,137
Buckwheat	"	170,301	195,340
Potatoes	"	1,986,789	3,824,864
Turnips	"	467,127	554,318
Apples	"	——	186,484
Plums	"	——	4,335
Timothy seed	"	——	9,882
Maple sugar	lbs.	——	249,549
Butter	"	3,613,890	4,532,711
Cheese	"	652,069	901,296

A very careful and well-digested Census of the province taken by order of the Government in 1861 gives a somewhat favourable view of its statistical progress; and this is entitled to consideration when it is remembered that, unlike the sister province of Canada, no systematic efforts have yet been made towards encouraging immigration. The ungranted lands do not present the same advantages or inducements as those of Canada; nevertheless, the increase of the population in ten years is upwards of 54,000. *The Quebec Chronicle*, in a late article, makes the following statement:—'Comparing our population (the whole of Canada) in 1861 with that of 1852, we note that the whole population has increased 36 per cent. The increase in the United States during the same period has been 35½ per cent.' While we cannot expect to report an increase like this, a close examination of some of the New-England States gives a very favourable account of the proportionate increase of the population of Nova Scotia; for it shows that, while from 1783 (the year of the peace) to 1850 Connecticut increased less than twofold, Rhode Island and Massachusetts nearly threefold, and New Hampshire nearly fourfold, in the

same period Nova Scotia increased more than sixfold. If the calculation is extended to 1861, it reaches to eightfold; so that it may be very fairly supposed that, when the position of this rising colony comes to be fairly appreciated, its progress will be still more rapid and satisfactory.

The manufactures of the province may be considered as being only in their infancy. There were some specimens of home-spun cloth in the late Exhibition very creditable to individual skill; but there are as yet no mills or factories in Nova Scotia to produce anything like a supply for the industrial population. At present the substitute for these is found in hand-looms, of which there are upwards of 13,000, producing, in 1861, 1,320,923 yards of cloth. The historian of the next decade will probably register a large advance.

On the sea-board, in addition to those who are engaged in farming and in fishing, a large number are engaged in preparing sawn timber, (termed 'lumber,') and in ship-building. The great abundance of valuable timber in close proximity to the coast, as well as the number of convenient harbours and navigable rivers, renders it comparatively easy to pursue both these occupations; at the same time the greater proportion of the vessels constructed in the province are of the smaller class, adapted to the coasting trade with the sister colonies and the neighbouring States.

There are 1,531 saw and shingle mills, some of which employ steam-power. Their aggregate value is returned as 730,104 dollars in 1861. In the same year there were built 216 vessels, registering 23,634 tons, of the value of 972,448 dollars. The total imports of the province in 1861 amounted to 7,613,227 dollars; the exports to 5,774,334 dollars. The total amount of vessels owned in the province, in 1861, amounted to 3,258, representing a value of 6,487,490 dollars, and registering a tonnage of 248,061 tons; only 13,161 tons less than the whole mercantile marine of England at the end of the reign of William III.

The Mineral Resources of the province are very various; but, with the exception of the coal mines, they have, down to the present time, been very imperfectly developed. We have yet to speak of its latest discoveries, which, it may be safely presumed, are yet in their infancy. If these recent discoveries

had been made a few years ago, a very different position had been the inevitable fate of this country; inasmuch as a grant of the crown had secured to the creditors of the late Duke of York, in liquidation of his debts, all its coal mines, in addition to all the deposits of gold, silver, copper, and iron ore. Even under all disadvantages, its coal trade was remunerative: and, although no elaborate and distinct survey of other deposits has been perfected, yet very large and productive stores of iron ore have been successfully worked, and there unquestionably remains a rich harvest in store as the reward of the employment of capital and skilled labour.

'The "General Mining Association," which held the lease from the heirs of the Duke of York, long operated injuriously against the rapid development of mineral wealth: its monopoly was long a cause of much dissatisfaction to the colonists, and strenuous efforts were made by the Legislature to induce the Imperial Government to annul the grant, or to limit the terms of its continuance. It was impossible but that the discussion of such a measure, in which rival interests and existing rights were involved, must have been prolonged and sometimes discordant.

'It was at length, however, satisfactorily compromised, and now—reserving to the Association their former privileges within a circumscribed distance from the centres of their operations—the minerals of Nova Scotia have been resigned to the control of the colonial authorities.'

The immense and exhaustless treasures of its coal fields are, or were till lately, comparatively little known beyond the limits of the province; its export trade being confined, after home consumption, almost entirely to the adjoining States. The comparative ease with which they are worked, and the breadth and extent of the seams, place them beyond comparison before those of any yet known in the world. The principal mines are at Pictou, in Nova Scotia proper, and at Sydney, in the island of Cape Breton. In the mines at the former place the seams vary from 22 to 37 feet; a block from the largest of them was on view at the late Exhibition.*

* A similar section was exhibited at Montreal in 1855, with the following label attached:—

'Section of the Main Coal Seam, Albion Mines, Pictou, N.S. This vein is one of the largest in the world; its vertical section being from 33 to 36 feet; and its qualities excellent for the following purposes: generation of illuminating gas, and of steam, and for manufacturing and domestic purposes. It is the property of the General Mining Association, and is worked by them to the extent of about 70,000 tons per annum. This specimen was extracted by James Scott, Esq., Superintendent of the mine, for the Exhibition at Montreal.'—*Catalogue, International Exhibition.*

The Pictou coal holds a high place among bituminous coals as a steam-producer; and that of Sydney is held in just esteem for domestic uses. Since the reversion of the grant, to which reference has been made, the spirit of private enterprise has been more fully developed. New mines have been opened at Lingan near Sydney, and at the Joggins in Cumberland; while, near Pictou, oil coal has been discovered in large quantities, the material of which is immensely productive, affording upwards of sixty gallons of oil to the ton of coal. By reference to the Journals of the House of Assembly for 1860–61, we find that the amount raised in the whole province was 286,700 tons of large, and 22,540 tons of small, coal. Of this, 59,121 tons were for home consumption, 72,881 tons were exported to the sister colonies, and 187,506 tons sold to the United States.

Among the other mineral products of the colony we may notice brown hematite, sulphate of barytes, iron ochres, sulphuret of lead and manganese, with gypsum and limestone in inexhaustible supply. Of gypsum alone there were quarried and exported, in 1860, 105,431 tons.

At Cape Blomidon in the county of Hants, and at Partridge Island, near Parrsborough, in the county of Cumberland, (both of them on the shores of the Basin of Minas,) beautiful specimens of precious-stones are to be picked up. Geodes of amethyst, fortification agates, jasper and garnet, are very common, with many others: while, during the past year, a considerable number of pearls, several of them as large as a pea, have been obtained from the shells of the fresh-water mussel, (*alasmod. margaritifera,*) a species found in considerable quantities in the Annapolis valley.

'Many of the choicest Nova-Scotian jewels set in Nova-Scotian gold were sent to the Industrial Exhibition. Among others was a beautiful bracelet, ornamented with pearls, having a wreath of May flowers, with the motto, "We bloom amid the snow;" and a necklace ornament of gold, with a large pearl as a pendent, the upper part showing the figure of a gold-digger, with a pickaxe uplifted, and a piece of quartz at his feet.'

This brings us to a very important part of our subject, on which we would write with becoming caution, yet with an earnest desire to do it full justice: we allude to the recent discoveries of gold in the province.

It is scarcely possible, it is almost dangerous, to predict the future of a land where the auriferous deposit is first found. The amazed surprise of men, that the roads over which they have passed and repassed continually, without suspicion of the value concealed beneath, are veritable fields of gold; the hesitancy and doubt with which the first intimation of such a discovery is necessarily received; the fear of an immigration which may be doomed to grievous disappointment and consequent loss; in short, all the exciting experiences which those countries have passed through whose fabulous wealth has exceeded all anticipation, are now being passed through by Nova Scotia.

When the rumour first gained credence that the shining metal had been found at a place called Tangier, on the coast, about fifty miles east from Halifax, there was a rush of effort, promptly followed by the close inspection (as it was then thought) of the provincial authorities, and an unfavourable verdict; so that the whole scheme collapsed, and became a bubble burst. The excitement subsided, and the streams of commerce again sought their accustomed and safe boundaries; but, after a year's repose, reports were freely circulated that later efforts had been far more successful. Again the excitement rose to fever height. Tangier gold in remunerative quantities was found; and the windows of jewellers' shops in Halifax began to display unmistakeably beautiful specimens of auriferous quartz, and of scales and dust of gold. No large nuggets were found, yet a considerable amount was obtained; and the Government at once proceeded to set off claims, which were eagerly taken up. The slate rocks of the district were found intersected by veins of quartz from one inch to twelve in thickness: when these were taken from their bed, and broken with the hammer, beautiful specimens of gold were met with in the fractures: while the unusual density of the quartz itself, where no gold could be detected by the eye, afforded promise of what it would yield after being submitted to the operation of the crusher.

Almost at the same time 'placer diggins' were discovered in the sand on the sea shore at a place called 'The Ovens,' near the town of Lunenburg, sixty miles west from Halifax. On a bluff promontory, worn into caverns by the constant action of the waves,—from which the name is derived,—the eye could

distinguish veins of quarts, similar to those at Tangier, running in all directions. A happy conjecture suggested itself that the sands below the cliff might be impregnated with particles of gold. Experiments proved successful, and those shore claims have proved abundantly remunerative.* What tale of fairy riches can rival the negligent luxury of these honest German settlers? Cleopatra, to impart splendour to a feast, dissolved and drank her choicest pearl; but the worthy dames of Lunenburg have for generations past, after scrubbing their farm-house floors to their wonted whiteness, absolutely strewn them, broadcast, in blessed unconsciousness, with this auriferous sand.

Only a short time elapsed when gold was discovered at Allen's farm, about nine miles distant from the city of Halifax. Then, indeed, doubt could no longer exist, or, if it still lingered in any minds, subsequent events soon dispersed it. At Indian Harbour, Wine Harbour, Sherbrooke, Gold River, and as far west as Yarmouth, the discoveries were almost simultaneously made, the three first-named localities being particularly rich. When the account of the discovery at Allen's farm reached Halifax, the excitement became great; and in two days fifty applications for claims were lodged in the office of the Commissioner of Crown Lands. It is supposed that eighty different places in the province have been found to be auriferous.

We must bear in mind that we are not writing an account of the discovery of gold in Nova Scotia; but are reviewing a work which, among other matters, very properly treats of this important epoch in the history of the province. There are facts, however, which we are anxious to present before the eye of a discerning public. Let it not be forgotten that, at Vancouver's Island, and Fraser River in British Columbia, flour is quoted at 75 dollars (£15) per barrel of 196lbs.:—at any of the gold diggings in Nova Scotia it may be purchased for thirty shillings, and sometimes for less. A long and expensive voyage of some months by Cape Horn from Liverpool is necessary to reach California and British Columbia, or of at least two months by Panama *vid* New York; but the field before us may be trodden

* One hundred bags of auriferous sand were landed in one day, from one schooner, in Halifax, each of which was valued at £50. This was the second consignament of a similar kind within the month; and will certainly be conclusive evidence to doubtful minds of the value of these first discoveries.

and surveyed in ten days by steamer from Liverpool, or in four or five weeks at most by sailing vessels,—a steerage passage in the latter costing but five pounds. All the necessaries of life, including food and clothing, may be readily obtained; the former at far less than English prices, and the latter at almost the same. The cost of production being thus diminished, the experiment must be more safe, and promises a large and remunerative return.

Such are some of the claims which Nova Scotia very modestly prefers, to be ranked among the gold-producing countries of the world. The period of the discovery is very recent; the mechanical attempts have been in most instances crude and unscientific. Yet, notwithstanding this, a large amount of gold (certainly not less than £60,000) has already found its way to the world's market for the precious metal; and at the present moment one large new company is forming in this country. The best appliances for crushing and amalgamation have been sent out; other wealthy organizations have been formed and are already on the ground, and no one can doubt of their ultimate successful operation.*

We have exhausted the space allotted to this article; but much of the contents of Mr. Knight's valuable essay has been passed over. We could have liked to wander amongst the wigwams of the Indian, a small tribe of which (the Micmac) is still found in the province. We might have lingered over the painful history of the French Acadians, who are still found in distant settlements in some of the counties. We might have extended our notice so as to include its Social Institutions—its government, its judiciary, its fourth estate, its educational institutions. But there is one department to which, as a religious journal, we must make very brief reference—its religion.

---

* A few known facts may supplement the above. Large sums have been made by the purchase and sale of claims. One gentleman *refused* 1,200 dollars for what had a few days before cost him 80 dollars. And why? The previous day, a single blast had thrown out 4,000 dollars' worth.—The passengers on a single steamer (the writer was one of them) had amongst them, for conveyance home, upwards of 40,000 dollars' worth.—A newspaper just received mentions that a nugget of gold has been dug up at Lunenburg, which is valued, at a low estimate, at 1000 dollars. The owner substantiates this fact.—The last products of the crusher are recorded as yielding two ounces of gold to the ton of quartz, which did not to the eye indicate the presence of gold; while some six tons crushed at Tangier yielded £216 on the whole. All this was exceeded by three samples sent from Lunenburg to London, which were found by analysation to produce respectively sixty-one ounces of gold to the ton.

The utmost liberality marks the annals of its legislation. No supremacy of any one of the different religious sects is recognised by law. The Church of England assumes a highly respectable position, with its 139 churches and 47,744 communicants. The Presbyterian Churches are the most numerous of all; having in the united body 164 places of worship, and nearly 70,000 adherents. The Baptists come next in point of numbers; while the Wesleyan churches, under the care of the Conference of Eastern British America, have 136 places of worship, and nearly 16,000 members.

With these remarks we bring our notice of this interesting province to a close. We confess to have had an object in view. As a colony, though the nearest of the transatlantic dependencies of the crown, it is comparatively but little known in England; and we think that more widely diffused information would lead to a well directed and wisely chosen emigration. What its future may be,—with its unsurpassed harbours, its canals, its railroads, (of which there are two already in successful operation,) its facilities for rapid postal communication, its telegraphs, its educational institutions, its political freedom, its proximity to England, (so much advanced by its steam communication every alternate week,) its regular steam traffic with the other provinces and the States,—it is impossible to predict; but on a very moderate estimate of its resources and capabilities, there is little doubt that Nova Scotia is yet destined to occupy a much higher position among the colonial dependencies of the British empire.

ART. IX.—1. *A Grammar of the New Testament Diction: intended as an Introduction to the Critical Study of the Greek New Testament.* By GEORGE BENEDICT WINER. Translated by EDWARD MASSON, M.A. Edinburgh: Clarke. 1859.

2. *A Treatise on the Grammar of the New Testament; embracing Observations on the Literal Interpretation of numerous Passages.* A new Edition. By the Rev. THOMAS SHELDON GREEN, M.A. Bagster. 1862.

3. *A Plain Introduction to the Criticism of the New Testament.* By F. H. SCRIVENER, M.A. London: Bell and Daldy.

4. *A Course of Developed Criticism on Passages of the New Testament materially affected by various Readings.* By the Rev. THOMAS SHELDON GREEN, M.A. Bagster.

5. *Tamicion, sive Concordantiæ omnium Vocum Novi Testamenti Græci, secundum Critices et Hermeneutices nostræ Ætatis Rationes emendatæ, auctæ, meliori Ordine dispositæ, Curâ* CAROLI HERMANNI BRUDER. Lipsiæ. 1853. [D. Nutt.]

6. *The Greek Testament, with Notes Grammatical and Exegetical.* By WILLIAM WEBSTER, M.A., and WILLIAM FRANCIS WILKINSON, M.A. Two Vols. J. W. Parker.

DEAN ELLICOTT,* when he gave to the world the first-fruits of his most valuable labours, seemed to be oppressed with the conviction that the tendency of the times was adverse to an exact study of Biblical Greek. 'I am well aware,' he then wrote, 'that the current of popular opinion is now steadily setting against grammatical details and investigations. It is thought, I believe, that a freer admixture of history, broader generalizations, and more suggestive reflections, may enable the student to catch the spirit of his author, and be borne serenely along without the weed and toil of ordinary travel. Upon the soundness of such theories, in a general point of view, I will not venture to pronounce an opinion; I am not an Athanase, and cannot confront a world; but, in the particular sphere of Holy Scripture, I may, perhaps, be permitted to say, that if we would train our younger students to be reverential ministers, earnest Christians, and sound divines, we must habituate them to a patient and thoughtful study of the words

* Now Bishop Ellicott (designate), a promotion which many grateful students of St. Paul's Epistles will rejoice at, though not without an uneasy apprehension; but it is a satisfaction to reflect that some of our bishops have done their hardest literary work after, and not before, their elevation.

and language of Scripture, before we allow them to indulge in an exegesis for which they are immature and incompetent. If the Scriptures are divinely inspired, then surely it is a young man's noblest occupation patiently and lovingly to note every change of expression, every turn of language, every variety of inflexion, to analyse and investigate, to contrast and to compare, until he has obtained some accurate knowledge of those outward elements which are permeated by the inward influence and powers of the Holy Spirit of God. As he wearisomely traces out the subtle distinctions that underlie some illusive particle, or characterise some doubtful preposition, let him cheer himself with the reflection that every effort of thought he is thus enabled to make is (with God's blessing) a step towards the inner shrine, a nearer approach to the recognition of the thoughts of an Apostle, yea, a less dim perception of the mind of Christ. No one who feels deeply upon the subject of inspiration will allow himself to be beguiled into an indifference to the mysterious interest that attaches itself to the very grammar of the New Testament.'

This eloquent protest was written ten years ago. It was perhaps, even at that time, somewhat querulous. The writer was right in saying he was not *Athanasius contra mundum*, inasmuch as a worthy band of the most thoroughly furnished English scholars were strenuously engaged in the same cause with himself, some of them having already published the mature results of their toil, and others beginning to give pledges of service which they have since amply redeemed. The lamentation would be still less appropriate at the present time. It is true, that during the last ten years some attempts have been made to introduce a species of commentary that makes the letter unduly subordinate to the spirit; that, in fact, *divides them asunder*, and pays attention to the letter only when it sanctions the subjective interpretation of the spirit which the expositor has already framed. But these commentaries have not found favour; at least, not to such an extent as to guide the public mind, or to inaugurate a new type of English exposition. They are poor rivals of the masterly works which issue from the other side. And, moreover, these very commentaries of the 'wavering' spirit—whether produced in Germany or in England—exhibit a happy inconsistency which almost presses them, against their will, into the service of orthodox and exact interpretation. The volumes of Jowett—the English head of this class, and a scholar who deserves a far

better tribute than that of Ellicott's 'clever writer'—are a very remarkable illustration. In his Essay No. VII. he lays down principles—it were opening an old wound to quote them—which would resolve the diction of the Testament into such a conglomeration of the uncertain dialects of declining Greek and reprobate Aramæan as ought never to be made the standard of theological dogma; but in the same essay he sketches the minute characteristics of that strange conglomerate with a skill that betrays at once his conviction of its perfect precision as a vehicle, and his own absolute reliance upon it as such. Accordingly, while we find in the dissertations that intersperse their subtle caveats through the volumes of his commentary, the most desponding notes of uncertainty as to the Apostle's use of language, we find, when we turn to many passages of the commentary itself, the hand of a grammatical master, who, in his loyalty to the text, leaves his doubts behind him, and knows how to do full justice to the exact laws that rule its structure. And we have no scruple in saying that—notwithstanding the excursus on 'The double meaning of words' in Vol. I., and the vital error of his canon of interpretation generally—Professor Jowett's volumes have contributed something permanently valuable to the exact study of the Greek Testament. And the same might be said, with some abatement, of several similar works which, with the primitive lie reigning through their exposition, nevertheless subserve in their grammatical details the cause of precise interpretation.

Nothing is more obvious, and at the same time nothing is more grateful, to the thoughtful observer than the stamp of exactitude which, through the care of Providence, is being impressed upon every department of Greek-Testament literature in England. Works are appearing, from time to time, of finished accuracy, and in such regular succession that we may hope soon to have a complete vindication of the biblical letter. We have placed a selection at the head of this short paper, partly for the purpose of appeal in making this remark, and partly as furnishing a text for a few general observations upon each of the three departments of our present subject—general remarks now that may hereafter be expanded into more detailed examination of some of the individual works. They are representative books which serve to mark the progress of exact investigation, in respect, first, to the settlement of the text; secondly, to the elucidation of its grammatical structure;

and, thirdly, to the determining of its literal meaning. The goal of triple perfection—a sure text, a thorough grammar, and a perfect exposition—may be far distant yet. Perhaps it may never be granted to mortal study to gain it; the Holy Records may have accomplished their work before they themselves are known and read of all men in their absolute integrity; the Word may reveal Himself as He is, long before the words concerning Him have shone forth in all their undimmed brightness. Meanwhile, there is a steady advance towards that goal. The cause of a dreary, disturbed, and disturbing rationalism is, be appearances what they may, declining; and the true doctrine of inspiration is becoming more and more clearly apprehended. Every year a step is taken towards a certain text, a certain translation, and a certain exposition of its meaning.

As regards the text of the Greek Testament, it might seem to one who superficially looks at the subject that confusion and uncertainty everywhere mock, and must always mock, our desire to reproduce the original words of the sacred writers. But a deeper study would correct that error; and in such a study there is no better guide than the recent volume of Mr. Scrivener, who has only not yet proved himself the foremost English authority in this branch of criticism. A hasty glance at his book may leave the impression that the transcriptions of copyists, subject to so many causes of error, running through so many generations, and made independently in so many parts of the world, can never converge to textual unity; that by no possibility shall human skill avail to eliminate all errors, and extract the unmixed verity. Such a glance would also confound the reader by showing that the greatest critics are not at one—nay, rather, are at open, and in some cases, alas, implacable, war—about the general principles which regulate the decision between rival classes of manuscripts; and also that the ablest editors—and notably the German head of them all—are for ever amending their own recensions, retracting and cancelling in one edition the seemingly well-sifted results of that which preceded it. But a deeper study of this admirable volume would show many reasons for a more hopeful view of the question. The great body and truth of the Greek Testament is accepted of all critics, is common to all texts, and the same in every edition. The few larger fragments, over the genuineness or spuriousness of which critics contend, are gradually and surely becoming recognised by all, either as Scripture or not Scripture. The sentences and

words which still fluctuate between acceptance or rejection are slowly but surely lessening. Many expressions which have long been doubtful have at length resigned their place; many others which have been enveloped in the haze of suspicion have been vindicated, and now assert their rightful dignity. Some indeed, but not many, and those not important, fall more and more deeply under suspicion; they are already bracketed as charged with usurpation, and will by and by be summarily banished. More than all this, the canons which have ruled the decision of these cases since Bengel's time are becoming more and more distinctly defined and generally accepted:—it need not be stated that with the universal acceptance of a few of these canons, the whole question would be settled for ever. Best of all, there is among the learned a nobler, more tolerant, and more reverent spirit than in the days of the irascible Lachmann; and when 'diplomatic criticism' has lost the remaining traces of that evil spirit which made the text of the New Testament in the last generation the arena of such disgraceful quarrels, we may hope that some œcumenical council of critics will give us a *textus receptus* more worthy of all acceptation.

The best comment on these remarks may be found in the third volume of our list, Mr. Green's *Course of developed Criticism on Passages of the New Testament materially affected by various Readings*. This little work runs through all those passages of the Greek Testament which may fairly keep the reader's mind in suspense; but we cannot travel far with the author without feeling that it ought not to be regarded a thing impossible that honest men should sooner or later come to an almost unanimous agreement. There is a peculiar fascination in reading Mr. Green's judicial summing up in every case. We feel that we are sitting in judgment on sacred sentences; and can hardly bring ourselves to give our condemning verdict, even where the condemnation is just. It is grievous to give up a clause which has become endeared to us as the familiar finish of a precious text; to lose 'through His blood' after 'in whom we have redemption,' (Col. i. 14,) or to give up 'we have peace' in favour of 'let us have peace,' (Rom. v. 1,) or to lose the majestic rounding of 'to the acknowledgment of the mystery of God, and of the Father, and of Christ.' (Col. ii. 2.) But it is pleasant to mark in how great a majority of cases there ought to be no reason for hesitation; to observe, also, how many of the clauses we must give up have slipped in from other parts, and are safe,

therefore, where they came from,—intruders *here*, but legitimate *there*; and, lastly, to reflect how very little (in fact, absolutely nothing) is lost to us, even after we have rendered its due to the utmost exaction of criticism.

But this topic we must postpone. Suffice it now to say, that the Text of the Greek Testament is becoming by slow but sure degrees a more and more near approximation to the lost Autographs. The competent hand may rectify his old edition, by striking out here and inserting there, without any fear of the apocalyptic penalty. But this is a business which should be very cautiously meddled with. The text is in the keeping of a very select circle. Even men of considerable learning, as we have seen in our own time, have egregiously erred when they have rashly invaded this province. But, though we must leave the decision to the few elect, we may weigh for ourselves such arguments as are within our range; and at any rate may be thankful that the hard labour of so many lives is bringing nearer the *editio princeps* of the coming age.

Passing on to the purely grammatical and lexicographical Helps to the Study of the Greek Testament, the number of works to which we can refer is certainly small; but those which we have are perfect in their kind, or at least point the way towards a not-far-distant perfection in this department. They show that the time is coming when the language which it has pleased God to honour beyond any other that men ever spoke, will have its own complete apparatus of instrumental aids.

A generation has hardly passed since the first Greek-Testament grammar—or rather suggestions towards such a grammar—introduced a new era in biblical studies. The Essay of Planck on the Peculiarities of Greek-Testament Diction stimulated the youthful genius of Winer to undertake that great task. His honour it has been, amidst a multitude of other labours, both classical and Semitic, to bring slowly but surely to a point within sight of perfect completeness a work that has given birth to a number of imitations in England and America, but has never yet had a rival. The publication of that work was the sign that, after generations of conflict and confusion, the day had dawned for sounder views as to the characteristics of the Greek-Testament diction.

During nearly two centuries the Purist controversy had agitated the question whether that diction was pure Greek or translated Hebrew. From the time that Erasmus kindled the dispute by

saying that the 'speech of the Apostles was not only unpolished and unformed, but also imperfect and confused and solecistic,' the controversy raged over the whole of Christendom between the Purists and Hebraists. So long as the disputants made the language of the Testament oscillate between these two extremes, there could be no end of the controversy. But at last a general pacification or compromise was effected; and the learned diverted their energies from the fruitless contest with each other to a more profitable investigation of that *tertium quid*, that great underlying phenomenon of Hellenistic Greek, or fusion of the languages of the East and West, in the secrets of which were to be found the real elements of the New-Testament diction. As soon as that great body of Oriental Greek, with all its treasures, was examined in earnest, the grammatical study of the sacred dialect made rapid advancement. The learned materials which were before empirical and unregulated and uncertain, began at once to take the determinate form of a Greek-Testament grammar. And it is no more than justice to mark Sturzius (*De Dialecto Alexandrinâ*) as the patriarch of modern Hellenistic literature. He began, where all such researches should begin, by endeavouring to determine with precision the changes which the common Greek language, diffused by Alexander's conquest over the East, had undergone through its mixture with Oriental forms and subjection to Oriental ideas. That vast province of inquiry was not, however, very extensively explored. Research was too soon limited to the narrow domain of the Greek Testament. And it is to this day the lamentation of the most eminent critics that the general question of Hellenism, one of the most wonderful phenomena of history or literature, has not been more profoundly studied in its bearings upon language and theology. But we must resist the temptation to digress.

It is now universally acknowledged that the basis or body of the Greek-Testament diction is pure Greek,—the term, however, being understood in a sense rather different from that of the Purists. It is not the pure and undebased language which, in the hands of Sophocles and Plato, was the most perfect instrument that ever did convey, or probably ever will convey, human thought. But it is pure when judged by the standard of the common Greek which had become the most universal vehicle of communication throughout the Eastern world when it was written. It is an all but pure specimen of the Greek of

the degenerate or silver age, after it had lost its earlier glory, but before it had sunk to its Byzantine debasement. As to its main features the diction of the Greek Testament only shares, though it must be admitted sometimes exaggerating, the defects exhibited by a long and illustrious series of writers beginning with Aristotle. Its syntax almost everywhere betrays a loss of power, and skill, and grace; but never any actual disdain of grammatical principle. It has forgotten the exquisite precision of the ancients in the distinction of tenses and the use of moods; it is unconscious of some of the finer shades of difference in negative phrases; its sentences do not tremble and fluctuate under the subtle influence which the conditional particles diffuse over the pages of the supreme artists; and relations of thought which, in classical Greek, were expressed by delicate inflexions, are in the Testament expressed by the rougher use of prepositions. But most of these defects are to be traced in the great mass of the writers of the *common dialect*, from whose pages, equally with those of the New Testament, much of the glory of Greek has faded away. Whatever peculiarities mark the sacred writers are only peculiarities; they are never violations of rule; they are variations from the law conducted lawfully. Hence the syntax of the Greek Testament is on the whole the syntax of the common Greek, but written with a copious margin of dialectical notes. Its real and vital points of divergence from classical Greek belong rather to the lexicon than to the grammar.

These essential peculiarities may be summed up under two heads: such as spring from the Jewish element, and such as result from the perfectly new ideas which were imported into it by the Christian revelation.

The sacred writers were Jews, and wrote as Jews. Their first allegiance had been to the Hebrew Scriptures, although we can never know to what extent they were learned in the pure original. Their own Aramaic mother-tongue had been for ever consecrated to them by their communion with the Lord. And, although each of the three languages had become sacred by being written on the cross, and all of them were more or less familiar to them by their current use in Palestine, yet they could never cease to think and frame their thoughts in what their people always delighted to call the *Hebrew* tongue. (Acts xxii. 2.) St. Paul was no exception, although his training for the work of inspiration was in many respects different from

that of the rest. His knowledge of Greek, like theirs, was mainly derived from colloquial intercourse; and, whatever may or may not have been his familiarity with the best Greek writers, he likewise 'thought and spoke as a Jew,'—his hand never forgot Jerusalem. But the Holy Spirit who prepared these men for their work, so ordered it that their Hebraisms, their Aramaisms, their Cilicisms,—all the elements in short that they brought from their birth and training,—were so controlled by the supremacy of Greek grammar, that the result should never repel, at least never embarrass, any reader in the great Greek world to which their writings were to bring life. He willed that the Old Testament should furnish a soul for the body of the new Scripture; He did not, therefore, raise up an order of writers classically trained, or overrule the natural laws which regulated the diction of those whom He did raise up. But He so conducted their education, during long years of intercourse with men of a 'strange speech,' that their Hebrew soul should animate a body which the Greeks would not disown. Hence the Hebraisms and Rabbinisms of the New Testament are all interwoven in an orderly and, so to speak, grammatical manner. They impress their influence, but gently. A careful perusal of Winer and Green will show that the sacred writers never violate a rule needlessly, and always violate it according to rule:—if the preposition, that is, for example's sake, displaces the delicate inflexion, the preposition is the right one, and governs the right case. They throw their Hebrew colouring over the whole, but it is no more than colouring. Consequently the grammar has only to introduce them all, and account for them all, as regular variations. And so they appear in the excellent Grammars to which we have referred.

But we are further bound to remark that, though Plato knew them not and Aristotle be ignorant of them, most of these Hebraisms are elements which add to the artistic grace of the style, and impart grandeur as well as grace. Beza was not far wrong when he said, at the very beginning of the great controversy, that 'they were not blemishes but improvements; and of such a kind that they could not be so happily expressed in any other idiom, or even sometimes expressed at all, gems with which the Apostles adorned their writings.' Sometimes they throw a beautiful disguise over the repulsive nakedness of the thought; sometimes they give a touching simplicity which belongs of primitive right to the Hebrew idiom; and sometimes

they raise the reader to the utmost height of pure contemplation. Who does not feel the unspeakable sublimity of the Hebraist phraseology in which St. John clothes his loftiest and deepest thoughts? But, not only in St. John, everywhere and in all the writers, the sentences which have become dear to all Christian hearts, and with which we associate our profoundest emotions, are such as the cold grammarian would note as Hebraisms. It cannot be denied that many of the turns of expression which result from a translation of the Hebrew idiom into grammatical Greek are but poor substitutes for the sentences as they would have flowed from the hand of Plato; but any one who should honestly and with a sound critical taste set the one class over against the other, would be forced to the conclusion that on the whole the Greek-Testament diction is gainer rather than loser by its Jewish element.

The other main distinguishing element of the Greek-Testament diction is the body of new terms which the new revelation introduced. After all that had been done by philosophical writers to furnish the Greek vocabulary with abstract and moral terms, there was a large class which either had to be invented or sublimated to higher purposes; and after all the passion of the dramatists and lyrists, the Christian life demanded an altogether new phraseology to express its experiences. The Septuagint was here very often at fault. A whole circle of the elect words of the Greek Testament are altogether wanting in that version, or, if present, have only a dim anticipation of their future meaning. The new revelation required a whole constellation of new phrases to represent to men the truths of the Christian salvation, and to be the germ of the theological doctrine of future ages. These words were to be of such a character that Jew and Greek might have an equal share in them: hence it will be found that all the terms which we regard as distinctive of Christian doctrine are such as both Jews and Gentiles might recognise, however transfigured and glorified in their new uses.

So large is the number of words found nowhere else in Greek literature, and so almost universal is the Jewish modification in the meanings of the rest, that a lexicon of the Greek Testament is a first necessity to the student. But there is no lexicon extant which comes up to our idea of what such a work should be. The great dictionaries of Germany are more like concordances than lexicons; and the well-known one of Robinson, however excellent in its English edition, is not such a work as

ought to keep possession of this important domain. The promised lexicon of Dr. Scott has not yet made its appearance;—but such books come no faster for hasty clamours. Meanwhile, the student cannot do better than take the quarto concordance of Bruder, and press it into the service as auxiliary to all other aids.

The two grammars mentioned at the head of this Article are too well known by all who are concerned with these studies, to need much description here. Winer's is a work which is above criticism; in fact there are very few who are really competent to criticise it. Some deduction must be made from its excellence by reason of its author's latitudinarian theology; sometimes he makes his notion of St. Paul's doctrine bias his judgment, as when, for instance, we read: 'In regard to Titus ii. 13, the word σωτῆρος does not appear to me a second predicate of Θεοῦ, as if Christ were first styled μέγας Θεός and then σωτήρ. My reasons for taking this view of the passage are grounded on Paul's teaching,' &c. But the learned and faithful translator has judiciously warned the reader wherever danger lurks. In most other respects, also, the translation is faultless: or, if we must find fault, we should complain only of the too scrupulous fidelity with which innumerable references are retained which do worse than encumber the page. Messrs. Clark never did a better service than when they gave the public this cheap and yet beautiful edition of a work that ought to be always in the hands of the student of the Greek Testament.

Mr. Green's work is equally good in a different style. In this second edition he has thrown more system into his work, and added many admirable applications of his rules to the interpretation of Scripture. The book aims at a concise and yet thorough statement of the main points which mark the departure of the sacred writers from the classical usage; the examples are given in full, and thus the reader can see at a glance how far the sacred differs from the classic usage, and how far it is sanctioned by later writers. We cannot help expressing our regret that Mr. Green has felt himself obliged to disparage (practically, though not avowedly) some of the results of Middleton's great labours on the Greek article, and to neutralise the application of Granville Sharp's canon. After a very thorough and very able series of disquisitions on every possible use of the article, Mr. Green adduces the passages which, under the application of Sharp's rule, as sustained by Middleton,

so triumphantly declare the supreme Deity of Christ, and then observes: 'The question which arises on those passages, is whether the two terms in each having a single article prefixed are descriptive of a single person, so that, for instance, the rendering in the first would be, "Of our great God and Saviour Jesus Christ." To this it may be answered, that such a view is undoubtedly legitimate as a matter of grammar. It was also adopted without hesitation by the Greek Fathers. But since there is also no absolute bar to their being regarded as instances of the second class above described, so that the terms, so coupled, would be descriptive of two distinct persons, presented under a certain combination, the former view, though grammatically legitimate, is not a necessary one.'

Turning to the 'second class' here referred to, we find that it 'embraces those instances, where each of the words, which are generally, though not always, incompatible, is descriptive of only a part of a subject; which cannot, therefore, be numerically single, but is only viewed as such by aggregation in virtue of some connecting circumstance which, in the actual instance, places its members in that light.' Into this question we shall not enter, at least at present. But it ought to be remarked that Bishop Middleton is at direct variance with this second class, denying that the second article is ever omitted unless the attributives are in their nature absolutely incompatible. We would not be unduly anxious about any merely grammatical argument in favour of the fundamental doctrines of our faith; but we must suggest to the reader, or rather the student, (for none but a student can understand it,) of the admirable section on the article, that he should be sure to arm himself with the last edition of Middleton's great work.

And here we must seize the opportunity of saying a word about a book that has done more than any single volume, not professedly a grammar, to shed light upon the grammar of the Greek Testament. But instead of any remarks of our own, we shall borrow those of Mr. Scrivener, who, in his 'Supplement to the authorised English Version of the New Testament,' thus speaks: 'On the subject of the Greek article I must profess myself a disciple of Bishop Middleton, whose work has taught us more concerning the use of this important little word than former scholars had thought it possible to attain. His treatise is a perfect model of close argument and accurate learning, applied to the support of a most ingenious and elaborate hypothesis. The reader is probably aware that Middleton does

not agree with the majority of grammarians in considering the nature of the Greek article demonstrative, but pronounces it to be the *prepositive* relative pronoun, &c. Now, although this definition is far less simple than that of the great body of critics, and though the direct evidence urged in its behalf may be slight and precarious, it is difficult to study the beautiful process of analytical reasoning by which its author deduces from it the principal phenomena of the use of the article, without feeling a growing conviction that the theory which satisfactorily accounts for so large a body of philological facts cannot be entirely false. Still, the peculiar excellence of Bishop Middleton's volume arises from the circumstance, that its value as a practical guide is nearly independent of the correctness of his hypothesis.' *

It does not come within our province to examine Mr. Green's grammar in detail: our purpose is rather to recommend others to do so. But it is a book which, after repeated reading, we must speak of in the highest terms. It is not so much a grammar, as an appendix to the Greek syntax, applying it to the Testament; or rather a comparative syntax of classical and New-Testament Greek. Its definitions are good, though not clear: a paradox which nothing but a close study of them will solve. The student will find himself everywhere in the hands of a master, who shows his skill in making everything subordinate to the one object of sharply defining what are the real peculiarities of the Greek-Testament diction. The whole subject of the moods and tenses is handled in a very original manner; and it is no small praise to say that the Aorists and Perfects are freed from much of the mist which hangs about them, and which even Winer has more or less failed to dispel. In this field of Greek-Testament usage, as well as in those of the hypothetical clauses, the negative particles, and the prepositions, Mr. Green has abundantly shown—without seeming unduly anxious to show—that the

* We cannot refrain from appropriating as a note of our own one of Scrivener's notes, in which he deals with Moses Stuart's 'Hints and Cautions respecting the Greek Article.' It will partly excuse our making no allusion to Stuart's well-known grammar. 'To name but one instance of this gentleman's fitness for compiling grammars of the New-Testament dialect, will it be credited that he is perplexed at the very common construction of *παύομαι* with a participle? At least, the following is his *whole* note on Heb. x. 2: "'Επεὶ οὐκ ἂν ἐπαύσαντο προσφερόμεναι: 'for otherwise, *i. e.*, if the sacrifices could have perfected those who presented them, would not the offerings have ceased?' To *προσφερόμεναι* most critics subjoin *εἶναι* understood [it would be worth while to know what critics, since the days of poor Lambert Bos], which would be equivalent to the infinitive *προσφέρεσθαι*, rendering the phrase thus: 'They (*i. e.*, the sacrifices) had ceased to be offered.' The sense of the phrase, thus explained, is the same as I have given to it. But *προσφερόμεναι* (*θυσίαι*) *ἐπαύσαντο* seems to me more facile than the other construction!" *Facile* with a witness!'

sacred writers have retained in the service of inspiration most if not all of those subtle elements of precision and power which the Greek language retained in their day.

But, after all, these works are only treatises on the grammar of the Greek Testament, supplements humbly waiting on the classical grammars. And the question rises to our mind whether the holy volume does not demand a complete and fully furnished grammar of its own—exhaustive in all its parts. The ideal of such a work often rises before our imagination: a work, namely, that should make the Greek of the Testament its material, as if no other Greek existed; or, at any rate, which should invert the usual order, and make all classical usage illustrative and supplementary. Such a work would contain, also, what has never yet been attempted, an exhibition of the varieties which distinguish the sacred writers themselves from each other—a *comparative* view of the dialectical differences, so to speak, between St. John and St. Paul, and of the shades of the Hebraic colouring from St. Matthew and the Apocalypse down to the two prefaces of St. Luke. Such a complete and independent grammar would be no more than a befitting tribute to the majesty of the Book that rules or is to rule all human thought; it would be no dishonour to the other, secular majesty of the older Greek; and it would tend very much to smooth the progress of many poor students to whom the classics are by Providence interdicted, but who would fain consecrate what leisure they have to the study of the very words of the last revelation.

But to return. Mr. Green's volume derives much of its value from the application of its grammatical canons to the interpretation of the New Testament. And this leads us, or would lead us if space permitted, to make some remarks on the third department of Greek-Testament literature, its exegesis, as bearing happy testimony to the same sound and healthy progress which we have noted in the other two departments. These remarks, however, must be deferred; at least, so far as concerns their illustration from our modern contemporaries. It is enough to say that, in Ellicott's words, 'theologians are coming to the opinion that the time for compiled commentaries is passing away,' and the expositions which guide the great bulk of students are based upon a thorough investigation of the grammar of the original. Commentaries doubtless there are, or if there are not there might be, which should suffice for all the purposes of a human commentary to the unlearned. Indeed, the supreme service of learning to our generation would be an exposition of

Scripture containing all the results of learning without any appeal whatever to the original. But, pending that great achievement for the masses, we cannot be too thankful that students may read the several books of the New Testament with such helps as the commentaries of Ellicott, Alford, Vaughan, Webster, and others. Whatever theological prepossessions such expositors may bring to their text, and whatever errors they may impose upon it, at least they aim at laying bare to their readers all the niceties of its construction; and we do not run much hazard in saying that in a great multitude of cases a precise and satisfying appreciation of the writer's phrase cannot be obtained but by a clear understanding of the grammatical rule that moulded it.

But we must, for completeness' sake, specify some one work at least which illustrates our subject. And it is with great pleasure that we single out the Commentary which Messrs. Webster and Wilkinson have recently completed. In the preface of the first volume, published seven years ago, the following observations were made as to the writer's plan of applying grammar to exposition:—'In connexion with the style of the New Testament, we have thought it important to adduce analogous instances of the way in which the same words are employed by classical writers. Several of these expressions, which have been very improperly branded as Hellenistic, will be found to be in the strictest accordance with authors of the highest repute. Gregory Martin, the Romish oppugner of the English Translations of the Bible at the close of the sixteenth century, objected to Beza and others, that they supported their translations by appealing to the use of words in profane writers, and that they rejected the ecclesiastical use of words as adopted by the Fathers. To this Fulke replied, "I think there is no better way to know the proper or diverse signification of words, than out of ancient writers, though they be never so profane, who used the words most indifferently in respect of our controversies, of which they were altogether ignorant." Acting on this principle, we have invariably consulted the Lexicon by Liddell and Scott, and have pointed out how naturally the particular meaning of the word in the passage under consideration flows from its general and ordinary use in classical authors. The results thus obtained have in some instances been quite startling to our own minds, as evincing the utter recklessness with which it is assumed that the degenerate Hellenists have set at nought classical propriety. Throughout we have inserted quotations from classical authors

which illustrate the sacred text, either in language or in sentiment. We have usually selected these from such works as the student will meet with in the ordinary course of his reading; and we hope we have not presented so many as to be deemed an encumbrance, or to be passed over as superfluous.'

This passage we have quoted, partly for its bearing on our previous remarks, and partly that the reader may know what to expect in this Commentary. It seems to us the best exposition of the Greek Testament, combining grammar and exegesis: at least there is none that we can recommend within the same compass, and equally attainable by the poor student. It has precisely the amount of grammatical detail that such a book should have; while as an exposition it comes nearer to our idea of orthodoxy than any complete work on the Greek Testament which our language contains.

We are not writing for the learned, or for those to whom the Greek Testament is becoming daily as familiar as the English, or perhaps more familiar. We have had in view a large and rapidly increasing number of young students, many of them also teachers, of Scripture, who are toiling on their way to a fair practical acquaintance with its original language. And we would recommend to them—but that is a faint word, we would urge upon them—to make their Greek Testament a daily and fervent study, with the help of the books we have been recommending. In this matter it is our conviction—many a sagacious proverb notwithstanding—that a slight touch of presumption does no harm, and that a little learning is not so dangerous a thing. It does not require the critic's acumen to appreciate the point of his criticism; it does not require the expositor's learning to feel the force of his argument from the grammatical structure. We can see and feel, when pointed out to us, what we could never discover or perceive for ourselves. Nothing more is needed than patient, plodding industry in the use of these helps. Let the young student have his broad-margined Greek Testaments always at hand,—in one of them inserting notes purely grammatical, in another notes purely exegetical,—we dare not add, in a third notes purely critical; let him spend an occasional hour in tracking, with Bruder's help, a word or a root through its way of light up and down the Testament; let him, above all, accustom himself to verify what he reads, and thus make his copy of the Book itself familiar;—and, with the blessing of Him who once called His ministers 'scribes,' he will soon make the Greek Testament from end to end his own.

ART. X.—*The Mission and Extension of the Church at Home, considered in Eight Lectures.* By JOHN SANDFORD, B.D., Archdeacon of Coventry. London: Longmans. 1862. (Being the 'Bampton Lectures' for 1861.)

THE publication in 1854 of the returns of the Census for Religious Worship inaugurated a new chapter in the history of the Church of England. One of the earliest results of this publication was Dr. Wordsworth's eloquent and elaborate work 'On Religious Restoration in England,'—'a Series of Sermons preached in Westminster Abbey at the Boyle Lecture,' (in 1854.) Since then, the same general subject has been kept constantly before the public. Sermons and pamphlets in great abundance have continued to issue from the press. Dr. Wordsworth, especially, has not ceased to press his views by all available methods; his letter to Lord Dungannon being one of the ablest and best known of the minor publications which the discussion has called forth. Bishops and leading statesmen, at diocesan meetings and elsewhere, have dilated on the evils complained of, the objects to be aimed at in order to the remedy of those evils, the claims, the capabilities, and the duties of the Church of England, the plans and methods by which its efficiency may be augmented and its supremacy secured. Convocation has in the interval—at least the Convocation of Canterbury—become a real power; and many proposals and discussions relating to the general subject have occupied the attention of both the Houses. And, finally, the vital and commanding importance of the questions which have been raised is signalised by the call of Archdeacon Sandford, as Bampton Lecturer, to direct the attention of the University of Oxford, in the first place, and of the whole Church, to 'the Mission and Extension of the Church at Home.'

During the past autumn, the remarkable speech of Mr. Disraeli at High Wycombe, on occasion of a Meeting of the Association for the Augmentation of Small Benefices in the Diocese of Oxford, attracted general attention, and called forth the comments of the public press. A former speech of Mr. Disraeli's, relating to church matters, is quoted, at considerable length, and with commendation, by Mr. Sandford, in the

volume before us; and it is very evident that the brilliant statesman in return has carefully studied the Archdeacon's Lectures. In fact, the measures which he recommends as remedies for the deficiencies of the Church of England are an epitome of what is set forth by Mr. Sandford with the same view. To quote an article in the *Times* for November 3rd, Mr. Disraeli 'offers five remedies: The Church is to obtain a command over popular education; the Episcopate is to be increased; the "lay-element" is to be developed and organized; the parochial system is to be strengthened; and the clergy are to be made more efficient.' Here, in fact, is the pith of Archdeacon Sandford's recommendations.

The volume before us, however, is one which will well repay a somewhat detailed examination. Its frank confessions are always instructive, and sometimes piquant; its notes are full of interesting evidence as to the prevailing spirit and the present projects of Churchmen; the character, and the ecclesiastical and theological views, of the Lecturer himself come clearly out in his writing, and are deserving of attention and remark.

To begin with the Lecturer himself: Mr. Sandford belongs to a class of clergy of whom we imagine not a large number now survive. We presume that, although a dignitary in the Church of England, he is himself a native of Scotland,—probably of the Scottish border. His Lectures are inscribed to the memory of his two brothers, one of whom was the late distinguished scholar Sir D. K. Sandford, and the other Mr. Erskine Douglas Sandford, late Sheriff of Galloway. It is forty years since Mr. Sandford entered the ministry of the Episcopal Church. He has been from the beginning an active parish clergyman, has sustained the office of examining chaplain to the Bishop of Worcester, and has for a number of years past had official charge of the important archdeaconry of Coventry. He is a man of business, of experience, and of energy. Most carefully, however, does he disclaim the character of a speculative philosopher or theologian. 'My subject,' he says at the close of his last Lecture, 'has led me to speak chiefly of the Church's active life. It indeed best became me to handle topics with which I am myself familiar. But am I therefore unmindful of the labours of men of more sedentary lives and recondite pur-

suits?' &c. (P. 219.) And he prefaces his discussions by this modest sentence, 'Had any course of Lectures addressed to what may be deemed by some the more immediate necessities of academic thought been before the electors, it would not have been my privilege to address you to-day.' (P. 3.) Now we have no doubt that, as Mr. Sandford is evidently a man of high and honourable principles, so he is a modest man; and therefore we would not put to an improper use such candid admissions as these. We do not doubt that the Archdeacon is a divine of some learning, and that he was fairly competent to the duties of examining chaplain so long as he held that office. At the same time, no one can carefully read this volume without coming to the conclusion that, although the author must of necessity have written very much, he is no master of style. His writing is not ineffective, and at times approaches eloquence; it is always manly, unpretending, unaffected, and thoroughly earnest: but the craft of English composition has evidently not been a cherished study with him. Doubtless his useful, busy life has held him otherwise engaged,—perhaps, much better engaged,—than in building up sentences and balancing periods, although that, too, in its place and for right ends is, to those who have the vocation, a noble and truly useful business. As a specimen, however, of the earnest, unfinished onwardness with which he sets forth his thoughts,—of the substantial interest and power, and yet the defect of art and mastery, which characterizes his writing,—let us transcribe one passage.

'That any right-minded man can contemplate the moral and religious state of this country without serious misgivings, is next to impossible. The national standard and practice so often at variance with Scripture—the multiform shapes of misbelief and infidelity, which among us no longer seek the shade, but court observation—the discontent and socialism of large and banded masses of our operatives—the flagrant and unblushing vice and intemperance of our streets—the inadequate influence exercised by the Church over the bulk of the people—the numerous separatists from its fold—added to which, the attitude of hostility which many of these have recently assumed; above all, the feuds and divisions within the Church itself—what Christian man can view these things without great heaviness and continual sorrow of heart!'—Page 6.

Mr. Sandford's ecclesiastical and theological tenets are such as might be expected from what we have already stated. He is

a practical English High-Churchman, without any special superstitions, any subtleties, or any eccentricities; and he believes strongly and generously in the Church and Churchmen, as such. He appears to take little heed of the varieties of Church-schools, and to understand nothing whatever of the tendencies and perils of philosophical heresy. Henry of Exeter, the Dean of Chichester, the late Mr. Robertson, of Brighton, and even Mr. Maurice himself, seem to be quoted by him with equal cordiality, and equally without exception or caveat.

Nevertheless, Mr. Sandford himself is both orthodox and high. He accepts fully what he states to be the unquestionable doctrine of his Church, that 'our Bishops are the successors of the Apostles; that our Priests are the representatives of those on whom any of the Twelve laid holy hands;' and 'that our Deacons exercise an office equivalent to that possessed by the earliest Seven'! He maintains that, in Ordination and the Sacraments, the Bishops and 'Priests' (so-called) are the official and personal channels of grace to 'priests' and people; that the 'blessings they dispense are real, though they may not themselves partake of them;' and that the prophetic commission and authority invests them each and all. (P. 26.) He teaches that 'baptism is the bath and grave of sin, in which the soul is both cleansed and vivified, and through the Holy Ghost participates in Christ's atoning blood and resurrection power.' (P. 26.)

Our high ecclesiastic further regards with the gravest dissatisfaction the ecclesiastico-political legislation of modern times. He admits, indeed, that 'our legislature has rightly abolished tests which, to create civil disabilities, profaned a sacrament, and were practically an outrage on religion.' But he regards the enactment by which it is required that all infants must, within a certain time after their birth, be registered by the Registrar of the District, as a measure the effect of which is 'to supplant Baptism by an act of Registration.' The inference is, that he would have baptism of infants made compulsory, as indeed it formerly was; or that he would leave the legislature without the means of ascertaining the number and the dates of births in the country. To be consistent, Mr. Sandford would need to go back to those 'ages of faith,' or at any rate to those following ages of a despotic and

Erastian state-churchism, when the children of all parents were required, under severe penalties, to be brought to the parish clergyman for baptism. This is still the case in Romish and in Lutheran countries. But surely this also is 'to profane a sacrament,' and is practically 'an outrage to religion.'

His high and most orthodox Anglicanism is yet farther signalised by his having persuaded himself that 'a society *similarly organized*' with the Church of England, 'with like creed *and like polity*, existed in these realms at a date coeval with the Apostles.' (P. 40.)

He maintains, moreover, as a true son of the Church, in time-honoured formula, that 'the Church has authority in controversies of faith,' (p. 48,) a proposition which (he does not appear to see) is in one sense a mere truism, or very little better, as true at any rate of the Moravian, the Presbyterian, or the Methodist, Church, or even of a separate Congregational Church, as of the Episcopal Church of England; while, in any larger and loftier sense, it amounts to nothing less than a claim of spiritual and quasi-Popish despotism, such as it is suicidal in the 'Reformed Church of England' to assert.

He holds that the interpretation of Scripture must be 'according to the rule of ecclesiastical and catholic sense,' (p. 48,) and acknowledges as the standard of doctrinal and ecclesiastical perfection 'the consent and practice of the Church catholic in its primitive purity,' (p. 50,) as ascertained from the early patristic writings;—not seeming to have recognised the fact, so largely demonstrated in Mr. Taylor's hitherto unanswered work on 'Ancient Christianity,' that the earlier body of patristic writings, later than the apostolic age, is full of the evidences of existing, allowed, and progressive diversities, errors, and corruptions, both in doctrine and practice.

He finds the 'hermeneutical tradition of the English Church' in the Liturgy and Prayer-Book. This was his answer—he really seems to have no doubt as to its being a conclusive and triumphant answer—to the question on this point not long since 'proposed to himself in a tone of triumph within the walls of the Vatican.' (P. 60.) He is evidently blind to the truth, which is yet so obvious, that if the Church of England takes up, in the way of offence or defence, that sword of 'tradition,' it cannot fail to perish by the self-same

sword, wrested out of its hands and turned against itself by the elder and more consistent hierarchy of Rome. Tradition is doubtless a most important witness; rightly cross-examined,—for its utterances are manifold and not seldom contradictory,—it may throw light on many perplexing points, and even afford conclusive evidence as to some important matters; but tradition exalted into an authoritative interpreter cannot fail utterly to confound and mislead.

Mr. Sandford, good Churchman as he is, and notwithstanding much personal liberality of feeling, and no doubt a perfect gentlemanliness and courtesy of behaviour towards Nonconformists, has a pious horror of 'Dissent,' which he appears to consider the sorest of existing evils, and as including all evils in one. He of course identifies *dissent* and *schism*, according to the 'tradition of the elders' which, all scholars must surely admit, 'makes void' the actual texts of Holy Writ, justly interpreted. And he stands in amazement, if not in alarm, at that 'spurious charity' which 'goes so far as to demand that we should not pray against it, that the word "schism" should be expunged from our Liturgy.' (P. 70.) Surely it is a thing to be wondered at that such dignitaries as Archdeacon Sandford do not perceive that the right reason for retaining that most excellent petition in the Liturgy is not, that it is fitting for the Church of England to pray to be delivered from the Dissenting sects, but that the afflictive 'schisms' within that Church itself, the discord which tortures its own vitals, are indeed a sore evil, from which all its faithful members may well pray to be delivered.

But, as befits his school,—though this be not the very highest 'Anglican' school, and has but imperfect sympathy with ritualist and semi-Romanist follies or superstitions,—Archdeacon Sandford looks upon Dissent as much more radically and essentially evil than Popery.

'How—it may be asked—has Romanism stood its ground for so many centuries, and held its sway over so large a portion of Christendom, in spite of its manifold corruptions, and transparent impostures? And how, though the marks of decrepitude and the tokens of decay are upon it, does it seem still to renew its youth, and recruit its strength? Is it not because it is a branch of Christ's Church, though a recreant and a fallen one?

'And why is it, that forms of Protestant Nonconformity never per-

manently thrive: that the society which boasts of a Watts and a Doddridge, and other eminent names, has in so many instances decayed and died out, or become Unitarian?—but that the very principle in which Dissent originates involves its disruption and extinction.

'Again, why is it that the successive assaults that have been made on the Church of England seem only to rectify and consolidate it?—but because these show where it has failed,—and thus serve to resuscitate some dormant grace or latent principle, and cause it to bring forth from its spiritual armoury and furbish some weapons that have been allowed to rust.'—Pp. 201, 202.

The parallel with Popery, into which the Lecturer has in this extract inadvertently brought his own Church, does not to us at least appear to reflect much honour on that Church. But we would point attention more particularly to the fact that Dissent—merely and abstractedly as Dissent—is brought into contrast with Rome to the disadvantage of the former. Yet, in what did his own Church originate but in Dissent, Dissent from Rome? Whether Dissent be wrong or right, schismatic and evil or the expression of self-sacrificing truth and righteousness, depends entirely on circumstances. To assert that 'the very principle in which Dissent originates involves its disruption and extinction,' as it is here asserted without any guard or qualification, is perilous folly on the part of an English Churchman, is to put a trenchant weapon into the hands of the Romanist adversary.

As a matter of fact, Dissent, in the general sense in which Archdeacon Sandford uses the term, as equivalent with Nonconformity, originated in a conscientious and righteous resistance to ecclesiastical tyranny. Is such a principle of action one which of necessity involves 'disruption and extinction?'

It is, at the least, singularly premature, in the face of the results of the religious census, to say that 'dissent'—that 'forms of Protestant Nonconformity'—can never permanently thrive. There can be no question of the immense strides which have been taken by the Congregational Dissenters since the commencement of the present century. For our own part, indeed, we are persuaded (as are many besides Binney and Spurgeon among Congregationalists themselves) that the isolation of the Congregational Churches is, in nearly all respects, a great cause of weakness to the Independents and Baptists, as

regards doctrine, moral power, and denominational development. Nevertheless, in all our large towns, Congregational Independency holds a position of great influence; and, on the whole, its power in this country is much greater in proportion than it was at the beginning of the last century. As respects doctrinal heresy, moreover, the Church of England has no advantage over Dissent. It is true that the English Presbyterianism of 1662 has languished into feebleness, and also, for the most part, fallen into heresy. Still Dissent in general has but partaken of the same influences which have left their mark upon the Church of England. The same age which saw a Clarke, a Conyers, a Middleton, and a Hoadley in the Established Church, nurtured the Socinianism of Priestley, and gave his early training to Belsham. The evangelical revival which has visited the Church of England within the last forty years, took firm hold, at an earlier period, of the Dissenting Churches; and for nearly half a century the Dissenting Clergy and Churches, as a whole, have been eminently orthodox and evangelical. Surely the Archdeacon, remembering the history of the past, and in view of the present state of the Church of England, should beware of claiming orthodoxy as the inseparable heritage of the Established Church, or of stigmatizing Dissent as of necessity tending to heresy.

It appears from the Archdeacon's style of argument and remark, not only that he regards the Church of Rome as a 'branch of Christ's Church,' although a 'recreant and fallen one,' but that he does not admit the various denominations of 'Protestant Nonconformity' to be in any sense branches of Christ's Church. There can be no doubt, after this, of the exalted Anglicanism of the Lecturer.

We hardly know, judging from an indication here and there, whether or not Mr. Sandford intends to include Methodism, as undoubtedly it should be included, among 'the forms of Protestant Nonconformity.' Surely he will not deny that Methodism, at any rate, has 'thriven' during the last century; or that its progress, all things considered, has been greater since its separation from the Church of England than it was previously. The Wesleyan Methodists, indeed, have always and rightly objected to be called Dissenters. Their organization did not originate in Dissent; Dissent from the Church of England had

nothing whatever to do with any part of their peculiar and essential economy as Methodists. Methodism went forth from the tents of the Mother-Church, because it was, in fact, driven forth. The Church of England counted Methodism as a Hagar, and thrust her out into the wilderness with her sons. If these have not proved to be as Ishmael, but have rather been blessed and led into settled possessions like the children of Israel, this has been through the good hand of God which has been upon them for good. Yet Mr. Sandford, unmindful as are nearly all of his Church—or else, which were strange to suppose, ignorant—of the part, not of a mother, but of a harsh stepmother (*injusta noverca*), which the Church of England played towards Methodism, complains mournfully of the 'separate and rival altars raised by the followers of John Wesley;' (p. 11;) complains of 'separate altars' set up by those who, coming humbly to the 'altars' of the Church of England, were repulsed from them in crowds, often by 'priests' no better than the sons of Eli. It is certain, indeed, that, even though the Methodists had been treated with a wise and politic generosity and kindliness, their organization could not always have remained attached to the Church of England; the connexion was too formal, there was no community of genius and life, and the new outgrowth was far too large and ponderous to be retained by a tie so slight and artificial. It is certain also that those earnest and often eloquent men,—men, for the most part, superior in theological attainment to the parish clergy,—who acted as the preachers and spiritual shepherds of the Methodist people, could not have been always withheld from 'ministering at the altar,' as a Churchman might say;—from completing their pastoral character and functions by assuming their obvious right to administer to their flocks the Christian sacraments.

Nevertheless, at certain points, Mr. Sandford's personal candour and liberality of character get the better of his ecclesiastical prejudices. It is not much to say, yet it is sufficient to discriminate him from the genuine Tractarian school, that he recognises the true, though (as he conceives) incomplete, church character of the Continental Protestant Churches. 'It is one thing,' he says, 'to unchurch those who differ from us, and another to uphold our true position.' (P. 43.) Although he

thinks it his duty, when comparing his own Church with others in this country, to speak of 'the Church and the Sects,' yet he goes so far as to admit, in manifest reference to the era which culminated in 1662, that 'it is difficult to say whether the domineering spirit of the one (party), or the narrowmindedness and contumacy of the other, was most to be deplored.' Though not ourselves prepared to admit the contumacy of Baxter and his friends, we mark some spirit of candour and concession in this passage. Moreover, having occasion to refer to Mr. Binney's interesting and suggestive volume on *Church-Life in Australia*, he speaks of it in high terms of 'admiration,' and designates Mr. Binney an 'eminent Nonconformist divine.' (P. 10.)

As respects his own Church and the differences of opinion and, to some extent, of forms, which are found within it, Mr. Sandford is, as might be expected, in favour of a large and tolerant comprehension. 'The necessary conditions are, Truth, Comprehension, Charity. Its tests and formulas of doctrine ought, therefore, to be few and simple, laying traps for none, excluding none who do not perversely exclude themselves. Otherwise, the Church becomes a sect.' (P. 53.) This is one of the points on which our High-Churchman refers (in a note) to Mr. Maurice's remarks, in his 'important work, entitled, *The Kingdom of Christ*.' 'Important work,' indeed; but it is evident that Mr. Sandford does not understand what is its true import, and wherein consists its importance.* Moreover, the 'Charity' of Mr. Sandford is not of such a quality as to enable him to love Nonconformists any otherwise than as erring and contumacious, though it may be unconsciously erring, subjects of his own queenly Church. Even Dr. Wordsworth admits that Nonconformists, though unhappily in a state of schism, may yet be children of God, and spiritual members of Christ, claiming all such as real, though not willing, members of the apostolic Church of England—the only possible Church of this country. Mr. Sandford, we apprehend, substantially agrees in

* We notice, too, that the able reviewer in the *Quarterly* for October last, on *Essays and Reviews*, is fairly baffled by Mr. Maurice's doctrine as to the Articles and their subscribers. Let him read Mr. Maurice's tract, *Subscription no Bondage*, and master his doctrine of ideas as applied to theology, and he will understand the Maurician word-juggling.

this, as in most things, with his abler and more learned brother of Westminster, Canon Wordsworth.

For the rest, Mr. Sandford looks with great and natural repugnance upon the strifes and diversions which disturb and rend his own Church. 'Nothing,' he insists, 'can justify the jealousies, the party names, the separate interests, which embroil and divide Churchmen. Those parti-coloured banners under which silly men and women range themselves,—those criminations which they bandy to and fro,—their jubilations at the preference and preponderance of their own clique,—the readiness with which they receive and propagate reports injurious to those who differ from them,—impede religion and degrade the Church.' (P. 73.)

Such is the man, such his principles and views, whose exposition of the defects and needs of his Church, and of the remedies which are to bring her full prosperity and functional perfection, we are now about to analyse. Such a man reading the *Bampton Lectures* at Oxford may speak with authority, and out of the fulness of experience and knowledge.

Perhaps we cannot better introduce our readers, at a glance, to the Lecturer's point of view, than by quoting some pages in his closing lecture, in which he sums up, in general terms, a great part of what he had set forth in preceding lectures.

'When we review the past, the wonder ought not to be, that the English Church has a great work still to do and much ground to recover,—that there are numerous dissidents from its fold,—that there are multitudes ostensibly belonging to it, baptized with its baptism, called by its name,—whose spiritual condition is a scandal and a snare to it. If it had not been a true branch of Christ's Church, and planted on the Rock of Ages, it must have come to an end long ago. When we recall its somnolency, its unfaithfulness, its repose on an arm of flesh—what has been called the dreariness of political Anglicanism—how, for long, its dignities, and emoluments, and the trusts these involved, were bestowed—how its cures were served—how its parochial offices were filled—what was the condition of its fabrics, and the manner in which its services were performed,—we must feel that but for its Liturgy, and its seminal principles of life, and the truths of which it is the depository,—and, above all, the infinite forbearance of God,—its light must have been quenched, and its candlestick removed out of its place.

'But then, to invalidate its claims as a Church, you have to prove

that its system is to blame; that its principles are erroneous; that it fails, when the conditions of success are complied with.

'There is no question about the lethargy, and the nepotism, and the shortcomings, and the wrong doings of so-called Churchmen in days gone by,—any more than there is about their imperfections and failures now. But these are attributable to a neglect of the true principles and actual mission of our Church. They occurred because its rule was disobeyed, and its observances were neglected, and its truths were kept back, and its offices were improperly filled—because what it enjoined was set at nought, and what it forbade was done. Had its spirit been understood, and its requirements complied with, the religious life of those who belonged to it would have been altogether different. We should have had devotion in the reading-desk, and light in the pulpit, and exemplary holiness in the parish.

'To establish the Church of England in the heart of the nation—to recover those who have forsaken its fold—you must embody its principles, exhibit its doctrines, and exemplify its teaching.

'It asks for greater freedom, and for fuller development—to have its parochial and diocesan system carried out—to have its offices properly filled, and its ordinances duly administered. It needs more bishops, more clergy, more abundant and more efficient ministrations, more co-operation on the part of its members, more systematic religious training, more places of worship. It needs to have its property secured, and rightly dispensed. It needs to have the means of manifesting itself to every man's conscience, and carrying its message to every man's door.

'The National Church cannot adequately discharge its mission,—but it is misrepresented and misunderstood—if it is cramped, and crippled, and badly served; if it is shorn of its strength; if you deal with it as the Philistines did with Samson.

'Give it greater liberty, and greater scope; give it a due supply of the weapons of its spiritual armoury. Let its apostles, and its teachers, and its helps, and its governments, and its administrations, be such as are enjoined in Scripture, and are proportioned to the exigencies of the day. Give it rulers and pastors according to God's heart. And then see if it will not approve itself as the Spouse of Christ, and the spiritual mother of your people.'—Pp. 198–201.

There can be no doubt as to the honesty with which Mr. Sandford has laid bare the failings and faults of his Church; there can equally be no doubt of the justice of his criticisms, and the accuracy of his statements. The whole volume is in perfect accordance with the lecturer's assertion towards its close: 'I have wished to exaggerate nothing, to extenuate nothing, to keep back nothing; but to admit blemishes and deficiencies, candidly and explicitly; and to put forth remedies, as they have

suggested themselves to my own mind during a varied pastoral experience of many years.' (P. 196.)

Mr. Sandford begins to deal with this branch of his subject in his third lecture. He draws a somewhat gloomy picture of the general condition of the English nation. 'Six millions in England are calculated never to enter a place of worship, or make any profession of religion. The National Church has little hold of the operative classes; of the middle order of the community in our large cities, many are disaffected to the Establishment. And as to the bulk of the humbler classes of our people, it would be easy to furnish instances from amongst them of as profound an ignorance of God, and of a moral degradation as gross and intensified, as ever existed in Pagan Rome, or could be found to-day in Central Africa.' (P. 67.) Infidelity, licentiousness, profanity, commercial dishonesty, combine to fix a mark of unrighteousness and irreligion upon the age, notwithstanding all the religious zeal and life with which these sore evil are intermingled. (Pp. 68, 69.) Sectarian divisions aggravate all these evils, and prevent the easy and effectual application of the needful remedies. Dissent is 'among the foremost' of the 'obstructions' which impede the conscientious and earnest-minded pastor. (P. 69.) Disunion within the Church itself, although the lecturer hopes it may be what he calls a 'decreasing hindrance,' is yet another and most serious obstacle in the way of the Church's efficiency and prevalence.

The evils, however, which the lecturer thus describes are rather effects than causes. It is his business to search into the causes of the state of things which he exhibits as so lamentable, with a view to discover the remedies. The first of these causes which the lecturer sets forth is the insufficient supply of clergy in the country, especially in the large towns. Ignoring, of course, the clergy and the Church-organizations of all other denominations but his own, he states the 'theory' of 'our parochial scheme' to be 'a clergyman for each thousand' of the people; but for town parishes thinks the demand may be limited to a pastor for two or three thousand. He points to the city of Worcester as a bright example of what ought to be in other towns. In that city there are at least twenty clergy to the thirty-two thousand inhabitants. Unfortunately, however, for his argument, it is the fact that such cities as Worcester,

Norwich, Exeter, and Hereford, and such towns as Cirencester, where the influence of the Church of England is universal and all-controlling, are notorious as being deficient, notwithstanding their outward devotion to the Established Church, in general intelligence, public spirit, and civic and social morality, especially as compared with towns of the same size, and under the like general conditions, where there is a more even balance between Churchmanship and Nonconformity, such as York, Lincoln, Bedford, or Penzance, or even as larger towns, under less favourable circumstances in many respects, such as Hull. Our observation and experience have taught us that a town is best off which is well provided with both Episcopal and Nonconformist congregations in about equal proportions, and so as fairly to command the whole population.

Another defect of modern Church-of-Englandism which Mr. Sandford insists upon is the want of adequate provision for the poor in the churches, and in general the pew-system, which he would altogether explode. It is well known that this is the feeling of Churchmen generally. As anxious to carry out thoroughly and consistently the principles of State-Churchism, they can have no other feeling. The idea of universal pervasion dictates this; the perfection of the parochial theory demands it. But if, as we believe, the Church of England, although retaining its endowments and its sacred edifices, is destined never again to be the spiritual mother, in real influence and efficiency, of more than a moiety of the people of England, then the pew-question may well be regarded in another light. To insist upon the sittings being all free, even in Anglican churches, may perhaps be to lose the substance in pursuing the shadow. Here, however, is the dilemma, which is certainly a grave one. In parish churches to charge pew-rents is obviously inconsistent, inequitable, and illegal,—contrary to the very definition of a parish church. And yet pew-holders claim their customary family-pews as their own property, and will suffer none else to occupy them,—evidently an abuse and dishonesty. Hence the demand that pews should be abolished. The district churches are not in the same difficulty, and, but for the pew system, would often be seriously deficient in revenue. The pew-rents compensate for the poverty of the endowment. Mr. Sandford

would have the endowments increased, and the pew-rents done away. But can the former be accomplished?

Whatever, however, may be the varieties of opinion respecting the question of pews and pew-rents, there are some points in which all Christian people ought to be agreed. The sittings for the poor ought to be as convenient as those for the well-to-do, ought to be easy of access from the door, and as near to it as can be well arranged, and ought to be in full proportion to the requirements of the surrounding population:—

'It is in evidence,' says the lecturer, 'on the testimony of one who held the office of archdeacon, that in a church in which, by Act of Parliament, one-third of the sittings was reserved for the poor, the warden, on being asked to point them out, said at last, "I have *one* free sitting in *one* pew." It was a little bracket in the passage. "But," said he, "the poor never come here; it serves me to put my hat upon."……

'In a church in London it was elicited by the Bishop of Exeter, that the free sittings, which are in the roof, out of sight of the minister in both the pulpit and the reading-desk, must be reached by an ascent of nearly one hundred steps.'—Page 79.

These may be extreme cases; but there are many approaching to them in iniquity. That these are parish churches is a grievous aggravation of the offence. But even in proprietary churches, and in denominational chapels, it is an undeniable offence against the spirit of Christianity that there should be an inadequate supply of comfortable and accessible free sittings. In some instances with which we are acquainted there are none, or none available; in few is there the just and right proportion. All this is lamentably adverse to the spread of Christianity among the masses of the people.

The family-pew, indeed, is to us a beautiful sight, and a truly blessed institution; and on all hands it is conceded that perfectly free churches must do away with family-pews. The model of Romanist cathedrals and churches is set before us, with much ignorant sentimentalism about the devotion of the poor people, who are seen at all hours of the day, and on all days of the week, thronging the pavements. But surely those who prefer this sight to that of the well-filled and intelligently-devout circle of the family-pew, have

yet to learn in what consists the true 'beauty of holiness,' are strangers to the meaning of 'reasonable service.' By no means, indeed, are we prepared to relinquish pews. We can in no respect afford to dispense with them. The loss of the moral and religious influence of the family-pew would be irreparable. And although this be a much lower consideration, yet the pecuniary loss would be most serious; we imagine, in its kind, equally irreparable. The charge for the advantage of a fixed sitting in the house of God—not otherwise to be secured—is one which no one grudges, which all feel to be reasonable.

At the same time we lift up our voice against luxurious saloon-pews for the rich, standing in odious contrast with the stiff, cold, cramped, and comfortless seats for the poor. We would, in fact, have no difference between the free seats and the pews, except such fittings and furniture as the occupiers of the pews might see good to provide.

Mr. Sandford, whom on this as on all other points Mr. Disraeli followed, in his speech at the Wycombe diocesan meeting to which we have already referred, regards the small endowments of many of the clerical incumbencies as another great evil, and points with undisguised discontent to the large Church possessions in the hands of lay impropriators. He thinks that 'the spoliation' of which he complains, 'the confiscation of ecclesiastical revenue in the sixteenth century,' was 'the cause of much of the spiritual destitution under which we labour.' (P. 100.) This is one of the weakest and most prejudiced portions of his volume. He shuts his eyes to most material facts, in order to bring himself to this conclusion. He forgets that the present spiritual destitution is not, for the most part, co-incident with those parts of the country where the possessions of the Church are in the hands of lay impropriators, but is concentrated in limited areas, where population has multiplied owing to the new forces of modern industry, and for which no ecclesiastical provisions of a thousand years ago could have in the least sufficed; he forgets, too, that since the time of 'spoliation' there have been many and heavy Parliamentary grants and endowments, which have furnished at least a quota worthy of note towards repairing the losses of which he complains; he forgets that Church property has shared, to a remarkable extent,

both in town and country, in the advantages of modern enterprise, and that its value has in consequence been so greatly enhanced that, whatever may be its relative amount, as compared with the ecclesiastical wealth of the fifteenth century, the English Church, of the poverty of which he and Mr. Disraeli complain, is at this moment the wealthiest national Church in the world.

Indeed, if many of the clergy are in deep poverty, the better-placed clergy are in a good measure, on the showing of the lecturer himself, liable to be charged with the 'spoliation' of their poorer brethren. It is well known that the first-fruits and tenths of all Church lands had been usurped by the Roman see, and that to this usurpation the Crown succeeded in Tudor times. It is also known that Queen Anne absolutely remitted these first-fruits and tenths in the case of the poorest livings, and made them over, in the case of the better livings, to the Church of England as a general fund for the augmentation of the income of poor livings. This is what is called Queen Anne's Bounty. Now these first-fruits and tenths constitute evidently a sort of tax on the richer livings for the benefit of the poorer, with this important point, however, to be noted, that they never belonged—at least, that from time immemorial they have not belonged—to the incumbent clergy, but either to the Romish see or to the Crown. The fact is, however, that the greatest part of the benefit, intended only for the poorer clergy, has been reaped by the wealthier.

'It cannot be doubted,' says the lecturer, 'that the present valuation, by which the payments of the clergy to Queen Anne's Bounty are regulated, bears no sort of proportion to the actual value. The assessment was originally made in the reign of Henry VIII.; it has never since been revised; it is not one-fourth of the present nett value on an average; in the case of some of our larger benefices it is considerably less.' (P. 103.) And from a note we learn that 'if the real "tenths" of the ecclesiastical nett incomes were now paid, and first-fruits left out entirely, the actual product would be not less than £300,000 per annum. In lieu of this, if a rate were imposed graduating upwards upon all livings above £200 yearly, beginning with sixpence in the pound, it would, without hurting any one, raise a nett yearly sum of £120,000, and provide for the endowment of seventy or eighty churches yearly, at £1,500 average each.'—Page 255.

The passages which we are about to quote are very suggestive. Nonconformist readers may here and there with advan-

tage take a hint to themselves. They, too, have not unfrequently thought of multiplying places of worship, when they should first have seen to the due maintenance of the pastors. Many amongst them, again, have, in their ignorance and their desire of finding an excuse for inclining towards the Church of the wealthy and the fashionable, attributed to their own clergy failings which this passage proves, and men of understanding and education would have perceived, to be more justly chargeable on the clergy of the Establishment:—

'I would put it to men of intelligence and generous nature, whether, if they expect to have clergy with the education of scholars, and the habits, much more the principles, of gentlemen, they must not afford them the means to maintain a respectable position in society—whether, if allowed to marry, the clergy should not have provision to bring up and to educate their children—whether, if they are to be alert and diligent,—with clear heads and hearts enlarged in the daytime,—they must not be allowed their night's rest unbroken by the gnawings of care, and the pressure of pecuniary anxiety—whether, in a rich and luxurious age like this, when talent finds a ready market, and every profession has its recompense, the clergy ought to be the dependent ministers of independent congregations.

'I urge this the more, because the poverty of the pastor and the opulence of his flock are not unfrequently painfully contrasted; and it is in rich and thriving communities that the disproportion between the services and the emoluments of the clergy is at times most observable.' —Pp. 97, 98.

'Another hindrance to the mission of the Church—and that of terrible magnitude—is the poverty of many of our most laborious incumbencies. It may even be stated, as the rule, that the clergy are worst remunerated where their duties are most onerous. The cry, till very recently, has been for *buildings*, when the primary consideration should have been endowment. And public and private charity has been lavished upon churches, while the clergymen who serve them have been left to starve.

'The evil in every way of such a system is tremendous. You place a man, with onerous and anxious duties, and with crippled means, in the midst of a dense, and impoverished, and disaffected population. You overtask his physical and mental energies. You throw him into hourly contact with distress, which he can by no possibility relieve. You deprive him of the influence which the exercise of a wise benevolence would procure him. You demand from him superhuman exertions, when his spirit is broken and his rest disturbed by his own domestic anxieties. You drive one incumbent to eke out his livelihood by tuition, and another by secular employment. You extort such confessions as these: "My clerical income is so wretched that I am not able to devote my whole time, as I ought to do, to my

church and district:" "My endowment is only £80, and, being a family man, I am obliged to educate my children myself."

'As one consequence, we have a lower type of man and feebler ministrations, where ability and energy are most required. Ordinarily our best and ablest men are not found in the most important and prominent pastoral positions. Our town parishes are often inadequately served. And just where commanding qualities are most called for—in the centres of intelligence and civilisation—our Church is often the worst represented; while generally there are complaints,—and these loud and increasing,—that the homilies of the clergy fall below both the requirements and the literature of our age, and that the press, and not the pulpit, is the instructor of our people.

'Noble exceptions there doubtless are;—and men of lofty intellect, and a zeal truly apostolic, may be found labouring on a pittance in the most important, as well as in the poorest and most degraded, districts. Yet it is the complaint of one, perhaps the most qualified of any man in England to speak on such a subject,—I mean the present Dean of Chichester,—that the best educated of our clergy are not commonly found in the great manufacturing towns, where their influence is most required: "where we have a commercial aristocracy, full of enterprise and intellect, whose minds, from constant exercise, are vigorous and acute; men of literature and science,—who, if they are to find in the clergy their associates and friends, must find in them companions, not only their superiors in theological science, but at least their equals in every department of human learning." And then men talk of the inefficiency of the clergy, of their lack of eloquence and learning, of the failure of the parochial system, of the degeneracy of the Church,—even of Christianity itself as effete, and of the Gospel as having lost its power,—when in fact the action of the Church is suspended, and the agencies of religion are either crippled or withheld. And this in the face of what is now happily established—that wherever, with a reliance upon God, the suitable agencies are employed, the Church recovers its influence, and the cause of vital Christianity revives.'—Pp. 81–83.

To the poverty of so many of the livings Mr. Sandford attributes in great measure the deficient supply of competent and able candidates for the ministry. The inducements presented to able and vigorous young men by other professions are so superior, he thinks, in most respects, to those offered by the ministry of the Church, that the greater number of such men are 'being drafted into secular professions.' (P. 83.)

That this has its effect in reducing the number of competent and educated candidates, we do not doubt. But, as we showed in our Number for last July, the whole system of the Church of England in regard to its candidates for the ministry is faulty, and needs to be revolutionised. If the supply of candidates

from the best classes were all that could be desired, still the means to convert this superior material into 'able ministers of the New Testament' are wanting. To fill the ranks of the clergy with thinkers, scholars, gentlemen, men of vigour and knowledge of the world, is one thing; to fill them with Christian pastors and teachers is, after all, a higher and another thing.

To judge by the tests to which the candidate for orders is subjected, one might suppose that unfit persons could never find their way into the sacred places of the Establishment. His bishop, his college, the parish in which he has resided, vouchers of the highest respectability, must all combine in attesting the excellence of the candidate's character, and his qualifications for the holy office; and he must undergo a personal examination 'of some days' duration,' in his 'scholastic and theological attainments, and religious principles and creed.' (Pp. 117, 118.) Nevertheless, Archdeacon Sandford bears witness that, 'notwithstanding these precautions, unfit persons do at times gain admittance into the orders of our Church. Without personal piety, without religious earnestness, without any aptitude or liking for sacred functions,—even with a conscious distaste for these,—it may be, with loose habits and a damaged reputation,—persons sometimes intrude themselves into our ministry.' (P. 119.) The reason of this is not far to seek. The demand for clergymen much exceeds the supply of suitable candidates; consequently unsuitable persons must be ordained, or the livings and curacies lie vacant. The way to cure this evil, is to take steps for ascertaining, calling forth, and then for efficiently instructing and training, duly gifted and qualified men for the work of the ministry. Till this is done, it can be of no avail to multiply tests and vouchers. Mr. Sandford, as we shall see, is fully awake to the truth of this. Meantime, let us hear his complaints respecting the deficiencies of many of the clerical neophytes of his Church.

'As, therefore, our Church would retain its hold on the national mind, and maintain the cause of God amongst us, its clergy must be duly qualified for their mission. They must be conversant with the themes they undertake to handle, and apt to teach others also. Meagre attainments, a bad address, want of rhetorical power, are not compatible with their position as public instructors in days like these.

'The laity complain of the bad elocution of many of our younger clergy, of their inexperience in pastoral duties, of their mediocrity in the pulpit, of their want of breadth of view, and grasp of mind,—of their inability to catechise a class in the national school, or to take a part in parochial details, or to address an audience with the freedom and force which might be expected from a well-educated gentleman, much more from "a scribe instructed unto the kingdom of heaven." They allege that our newly-ordained curates, for the most part, are mere novices in the sick room, and in domiciliary visitation; and are neither so ripe in attainment, nor so ready in utterance, as the licentiates of dissenting bodies.

'They allege, moreover, that in the current literature of the day,—even in the newspapers,—religious topics are handled with a vigour and an ability, rarely to be met with in the discourses of the clergy.

'Now it must be admitted by all, who take a practical view of the subject, that the standard proposed to the clergy of this country is not only a high one, but demands qualifications almost incompatible. They are required to be diligent in pastoral duties, and at the same time furnished for public ministrations; "they are to serve tables," and yet to "give attendance to reading, to exhortation, to doctrine." They are to "meditate upon these things, and to give themselves wholly to them; that their profiting may appear to all;" yet withal to be prompt and diligent in practical details.

'Other communions recognise in those who minister a diversity of gifts, and admit of a division of labour. And this on the principle laid down by the Apostles, "that having gifts differing according to the grace that is given," "as every man hath received the gift, he should minister as of the ability that God giveth." Thus Rome selects her instruments with regard to their different qualifications; and assigns to each his appropriate work. Amongst Dissenters oratorical gifts are believed to be chiefly prized; and ministerial energy to be mainly employed in the pulpit. But with us every man in orders—whatever his capacity—whether priest or deacon—is expected to be student, pastor, preacher; to occupy the pulpit, to work the parish, to drill the school, to manage the accounts, to superintend the charities, to take the lead in every beneficent and scientific institution; and to bear a prominent part in the social intercourse of life.

'It avails little to cavil at such requirements; still less to take umbrage at strictures which, if sometimes unreasonable, cannot harm us, if we learn from them a more excellent way. Our wisdom is to see that, as far as may be, our acquirements and practice as clergymen keep pace with the spirit and standard of our age.

'And this pleads forcibly for some formative process, some distinct preparatory training for Holy Orders, such as is insisted on in every other walk of life. Professional training is required in all to whom secular interests are committed. We trust neither our persons nor our property to the ignorant or the inexperienced. We do not consider it enough that practitioners should have good natural abilities, and have received a superior general education; in them we require

special preparatory study, and professional practical knowledge.' —Pp. 123–126.

'We are, as a Church, without any such special systematic training for the clerical office; and in this respect are unfavourably contrasted with almost every other religious body.

'The Church of Rome has its Propaganda, and numerous seminaries for educating its clergy in every part of its obedience. The Protestant communions of Germany, Switzerland, and Scotland are similarly provided. So is the reformed Episcopal Church of America. Amongst the dissenting denominations in our own country also there is regular and systematic preparation for their ministry. Can it then be a matter of surprise if many of the most practical, experienced, and pious members of the English Church feel and deplore its deficiency in this respect,—and ask for the future pastors of its people that course of study and special training, which the theological students of all other religious communities enjoy?'—Page 127.

Mr. Sandford expresses himself as favourable to such supplementary theological institutions, for the reception and training of University graduates, as those of which we spoke in the article to which we have already made reference on 'The Vocation and Training of the Christian Ministry.'* It would appear, however, that, lecturing in Oxford, he felt in some degree restrained from saying all that he feels on that subject. There is a prejudice at Oxford, shared by a number of eminent professors and college dignitaries, against any course of instruction elsewhere than in the University. Obvious reasons might account for a jealous feeling on the part of college professors in regard to any supplementary collegiate institutions; there may also be some just ground for the doubts which have been entertained by many as to the healthy tendency of such institutions. Everything must, of course, depend on the influences which prevail within them; these *may be* priestly, castish, or conventual. It is also evident that a two years' training in such a supplementary college, added to a three or four years' residence at the University, involves a very long abstraction from family life and the general world, and also a considerable addition of expense to the student or his family. Nevertheless, it would seem to be very difficult to secure within the University, and during their term of residence as under-graduates, the requisite special instruction and discipline and the right influence for students, in order to prepare them duly for enter-

* July, 1862.

ing upon the responsibilities and engagements of the pastoral office. The first vital deficiency prolongs its evil influence throughout. There exists no instrumentality for eliciting, cherishing, and testing beforehand the spirit and qualifications of candidates for the ministry. Young men are left, after they have gone to the University, to decide upon 'the Church,' as they might upon any other profession. There is no preliminary exercise of gifts, no call of the Church, no opportunity for a clear manifestation of mental and spiritual adaptation, and of a providential designation.

Mr. Sandford evidently doubts as to the possibility of the Universities affording the needful special preparation for the candidates. He prefers, and he approves, the method of instruction in the theological colleges. But he is most of all in favour of a plan to which the attention of Nonconformists has often been directed, and which, so far as it has been employed among them, under prudent care and favourable circumstances, has produced as good results as it appears to have done within Mr. Sandford's experience, in the case of young men training for the Anglican ministry:—

> He is 'mainly in favour' of such 'a course of teaching and training supplemental to the Universities, as may be furnished in a well-ordered parish, under the supervision of an incumbent of adequate ability and experience.' 'It has always appeared to me,' he says, 'that the insight into pastoral work, the practice in the schools, the domiciliary visitation, the acquaintance with parochial machinery, the contact with the middle and poorer classes, the points, in fact, in which our younger clergy are generally and, under existing circumstances, necessarily so deficient, would be better attained in this than in any other way.'—Page 187.

Mr. Sandford, as we have seen, does not spare to expose the deficiencies of his own Church and of his brother clergy. He speaks with a brave and wise candour on such points, which, we fear, Nonconformist ministers do not often exemplify, when speaking in reference to their own Churches. But in his notes he introduces quotations, chiefly from critics of his own community, which are much more outspoken than even his own text. For example, in reference to the point with which we have been dealing, he gives in a note an extract from an article in the *Christian Remembrancer* for January, 1862, on Father

Felix and his conferences at Notre Dame, from which we quote the following passages:—

'Most worthy of imitation, in one notable respect at least, is the system of theological and pulpit training existing in the French Church. ....Among us, theology is seldom studied as a science, frequently it is not studied at all.....

'In another respect does this portion of the life of Father Felix teach us a valuable lesson. When once we do possess an able and eloquent preacher, what use do we make of him? Is he placed in such an appropriate sphere of duty as is likely to afford full and unfettered scope to his powers?.....No! instead of regularly, or at least at stated periods, occupying our cathedral or metropolitan pulpits, he may be vegetating, unhonoured and unknown, on some paltry curacy in some remote village, or be relegated to the headship of a school, or the vice-principalship of a hall, with but scanty opportunities of exercising his peculiar talents, and even then possibly only in a very limited and contracted sphere.'—Pp. 124, 125.

From the same article the lecturer quotes with approval the following passage:—

'The tameness, the monotony, the want of naturalness and reality, the undignified attitude, the listless and inexpressive countenance, the soul-withering coldness, with which sermons are delivered in this country, strike foreigners particularly. If there be some exaggeration, there is at the same time much truth in the following passage from Coquerel's recently published volume on Preaching.

[Here we translate.]

'The Anglican bishop or clergyman, conveniently supported (*accoudé*) on a velvet cushion large enough to receive his portfolio, read with the most contented placidity, without risking any other action than the movement of turning the leaf, and scarcely allowed himself, at distant intervals, what is called "the waving of the hand," that is to say, the effort of lifting the hand to let it fall again immediately on the edge (*rebord*) of the pulpit. It was a systematic and constant denial given to the old maxim, that action is the essence of oratory.'—Page 293.

Another point on which Mr. Sandford insists, is the necessity of more effective and economical provision for proceeding against and dealing with clerical delinquents. He remarks, in a note, (pp. 119–123,) that 'in the recent notorious case of the Bishop of London *versus* Bonwell, though the defendant was cast in every case, his Lordship's expenses are understood to have exceeded £1,200.' (P. 290.)

But, as respects that which is the great and vital deficiency

of the Church of England, the absence of any provision whatever, either for living and truly reciprocal Christian fellowship, or for godly discipline, among the professed members and communicants of the Church, Mr. Sandford says not one word. That evil, in the constitution of the Erastian and secularised Church of England, lies too deep to be eradicated. They will be the best friends and the most effective defenders of this grand and beautiful, but mixed and worldly, Church-Establishment, who shall show the way to her reform in this vital point. This lies at the root of all her defects and evils; and if this could be remedied, other things, in due course, would right themselves.

To several of the remedies proposed by Mr. Sandford for the faults and defects of the Church of England, we have been led to refer in speaking of the evils which they are intended to meet. He would multiply clergymen, divide parishes, largely increase the number of districts. He would improve poor endowments, without materially reducing the number and wealth of the rich preferments.* He calculates that to accomplish what he deems necessary there would be required an addition of 2,300 clergymen, and of an annual revenue of half a million of money. He would very largely increase the number of the bishops, and would abate materially from the splendour of their estate, leaving, however, a certain number of great 'spiritual peers' still in the Upper House of Parliament. 'What is asked for,' he tells us, 'is prelates of an humbler type, less dependent for their station upon outward rank than on the sacredness of their office;—who would command respect by their learning, and win affection by their apostolic labours and their exemplary devotion and self-denial.' (P. 110.)

He would call into action a sort of inferior diaconate, unpaid

* We do not exactly admire the manner in which the Archdeacon keeps clear of the idea of improving the poorer livings by subtracting from those rich benefices in which the actual amount of labour and responsibility is out of all proportion small when compared with the income. Take, for instance, the living of Adisham and Staple, lately bestowed on Mr. Villiers, about which so much has been said in the papers. The population is very small indeed, while the income is £1,300 a year. Staple, it appears, is to be separated from Adisham. In that case, the income of Adisham will be reduced to £700; but the population will be only 410. (See *Times*, November 8th, 1862.) About £1 12*s.* per inhabitant, including children,—not much less than £8 per family! If all such cases as these were duly rectified, there would at least be a sensible and material contribution towards the reform so greatly needed.

spiritual labourers, whose office should not be indelible, nor conferred by ordination, but by the commission of the bishop, and revocable by his act. Their office would be, in effect, that of Scripture-reader and sick-visitor combined. (Pp. 112, 113.)

He is also in favour of organizing and employing deaconesses, in harmony with the principles of Protestantism, and as a part of the established machinery of the Church.

He would further associate the laity with the clergy, not in Convention or in Synods, but in all works of practical Christian enterprise and charity, and especially in church-meetings and on diocesan committees.

He would obtain the sway of religious education through the land, not only by means of Day-schools, but, if possible, of Sunday-schools. Here, however, we must interject a word. It is impossible to read the Archdeacon's observations, and the passages which he quotes, especially in his Notes, on the subject of Sunday-schools, without being impressed with the conviction that the Church of England, notwithstanding its zeal in schooling the children of the people, (for the most, after a certain low type,) will never gain much sway by means of its educational activity, until it better understands the secret of conducting these schools with interest and efficiency. Church Sunday-schools, it appears, are, for the most part, places of dull drudgery which the children feel the greatest repugnance to attend, and are conducted by an inferior and illiterate class of teachers. Dr. Hessey, in *his* Bampton Lectures, had borne testimony to the same effect, and has attained to the recondite and notable conclusion that, to relieve the task-work of the Sunday-schools, and to prevent the effect of them from being to infuse into the children's minds a hatred of the Lord's Day—a play-ground, which he designates 'a recreation-ground,' should be provided in connexion with every Sunday-school, in which the children should be allowed certain 'regulated amusements at intervals throughout the day.' Mr. Sandford approves of Dr. Hessey's suggestion, and quotes at length 'the important passage' in which it is given. To those who are familiar with the lively, happy Sunday-schools of Nonconformists, especially in the North of England, all this will sound passing strange. But strangest of all will appear to such the remedy by which Mr. Sandford and Dr. Hessey would win their scholars to a due and religious observance of the Day of Christ.

The archdeacon touches but lightly upon the question of Liturgical revision. It is evident, however, that he is altogether favourable to certain moderate, yet important, changes, which might go far towards removing scruples and offences on the right hand and on the left. (P. 187.) We can hardly be mistaken also in supposing that he is favourable to some relaxation of the terms of subscription for clergymen.

If all should be accomplished which is sketched in these Lectures,—and doubtless much of it will be accomplished, probably before many years have gone by,—the benefit will be great to the Church of England, to our common Christianity, to the nation at large. Not less will the benefit be great, as we think, to the other Christian denominations of this land. It is evident that the leaders of reform in the Church of England are, generally speaking, well agreed among themselves as to the platform according to which their Church is to be reformed. There is a very close conformity between what Dr. Wordsworth proposed in 1854 and what Mr. Sandford now recommends. We expect to see the greatest part of it accomplished, if our lives should be spared for ten or fifteen years.

But all this will not restore to the Church of England the spiritual supremacy within this nation. The living organizations and manifold forms now conspicuous in England will not cease or languish. Episcopalianism will be a great power, but not the only, hardly the paramount, organization. In truth without such a radical reform as shall make effectual provision for true reciprocal fellowship and for godly discipline among its members, and shall also extricate its polity and administration from the meshes of lay-patronage and of merely political control, the Church of England, whatever functional and merely administrative improvements may be effected, will still remain a mixed, worldly, and, to a large extent, a spiritually ineffective, Church. Other Churches may be, in some degree, liable to the like charges; but the Established Church embalms abuses in its fundamental principles and constitution. As ourselves well-wishers of the Established Church, and desirous that its days may be prolonged in growing efficiency and undiminished lustre, we trust that a wise, well-considered, and at the same time thorough, reform may adapt it to the conditions of the incoming age, and save it from divisions, from degeneracy, and from decay.

BRIEF LITERARY NOTICES.

The Pentateuch and Book of Joshua critically examined. By the Right Rev. John William Colenso, D.D., Bishop of Natal. London: Longman and Co. 1862.

THE circumstances under which this book was written and the general purport of it are only too well known. We shall, as already intimated in the first article of our present Number, take an early opportunity of expressing our judgment somewhat at large in regard to it. Here we can only give a general indication of our views respecting the arguments and tendency of this startling volume.

We have no wish to caricature the position assumed by Dr. Colenso. He has taken great pains to define it to his readers, and is entitled to the benefit of his own explanations. He does not mean to say that there was any 'conscious dishonesty' on the part of the author of the Pentateuch. The Books of Moses are not a fiction, in the sense of having been written with 'intention to deceive.' The writer 'had no more consciousness of doing wrong than Homer had, or any of the early Roman annalists.' But his work is 'not historically true.' It is not a narrative of actual events. We wrong both the writer and his 'story' by maintaining, either that it is a record of facts, or that it was 'meant to be received and believed as such to the end of time.' It has a 'real excellence' indeed. Its 'errors and misstatements' need not be regarded as 'in the least detracting' from its absolute value. Of course, if the history be not 'veracious,' the miracles which it relates 'must necessarily fall to the ground with it.' But still it may be viewed, in common with other parts of the Bible, 'as containing a message of God to our souls.' Just as Numa, Lycurgus, and Zoroaster were channels of communication between mankind and the Divine, just as we have the voice of God in the theosophy of the Sikh Gurus, so, whether in the Pentateuch or elsewhere in the Bible, let us look for 'that which is pure and good—that which speaks from God's Spirit directly to [our] spirits—that which makes the living man leap up, as it were, in the strength of sure conviction' that the words which thus affect his reason and conscience are the words of God. At the same time let us not throw dust in our own eyes. The Books of Moses are not historically true. They may have a historical basis, perhaps. But as they are, they contain 'absolute, palpable, self-contradictions,' which no ingenuity of conservative criticism can ever reconcile.

Dr. Colenso endeavours to maintain the position which he thus defines by a series of arguments founded on the scriptural account of the Exode and the settlement of the Israelites in Canaan. We will not affirm that we are prepared at once to deal with all the difficulties which he raises. We will even grant, that a very small minority of them is at present and possibly may always continue to be irresolvable. But we boldly maintain that the great bulk of his instances are no violations of historic truth whatever, and that, considering the enormous mass of evidence on which the popular belief in the unity and authenticity of the contents of the Pentateuch rests, it is an affront upon the first principles of science to allow an exceptional discrepancy or two to set this evidence at nought. Let due account be only taken of the injuries which time may have done to the sacred text; let the principle which Dr. Colenso approves, but entirely forgets to act upon, have only justice done it, namely, that 'in forming an estimate of ancient documents, we should be very scrupulous about assuming that it is impossible to explain satisfactorily this or that apparent inconsistency, contradiction, or other anomaly;' finally, let the important fact be kept in view,—which our author loses sight of from one end of his book to the other,—that the writer of the Pentateuch, in his narrative of the Exodus, and in many other parts of his work, does not pretend to be recording 'common history,' as Dr. Colenso alleges, but the history of that which lies beyond the sphere of the purely human and natural, the history, in a word, of stupendous and inexplicable miracle; let these considerations but be allowed their proper weight, and we are not afraid to meet even the most searching historical criticism on the ground occupied by 'holy men of old, who spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost.'

Dr. Colenso's first point is the list which Moses gives of the family of Judah, in connexion with his account of the migration of Jacob and his children into Egypt. It is certain, he says, that the sacred writer intends us to understand that Hezron and Hamul, Judah's grandsons, accompanied Jacob into Egypt: and yet, it is quite incredible, looking at other parts of the 'story,' that they can have been born at the time. Now, with respect to this last point, everything depends on two assumptions. In the first place it is not quite clear that the expression 'at that time,' in Gen. xxxvii. 1, on which Dr. Colenso relies for the date of Judah's marriage, must of necessity have the value which he gives it in his argument. And in the second place, we do not hold it unquestionable, that Jacob's age at the date of the birth of Judah was as great as the common interpretation of the 31st of Genesis makes it. Has Dr. Colenso weighed the arguments of Kennicott and Lengerke on this subject? Besides, it is perfectly possible that Moses, with full knowledge of the facts, and with the strictest intention of writing historic truth, may have put those two names in his catalogue, though they were not born till after Jacob's settlement in Egypt. If he could say, as he does in Exodus i. 1, that 'seventy souls, every man and his household, came with

Jacob,' into Egypt, when, in fact, Joseph and his two sons, who are reckoned among the seventy, were there already, and if there were special reasons, as there may have been, why Hezron and Hamul should be counted among the forefathers of those who left Egypt at the Exodus, why should not the historian be as much at liberty to condense his narrative in the latter instance as in the former? This solution is of itself sufficient to take off the edge of Dr. Colenso's argument; and where there are so few data on which to build a complete and certain judgment, the sacred historian ought to have the advantage to which the dimness of the ages entitles him. Dr. Colenso allows that the Hebrew is not false in calling a daughter 'daughters,' or a son 'sons;' and we confess to something more than mere regret at seeing him both here and elsewhere exacting from a Shemitish historian what he would think it unfair to require of Tacitus or Thucydides.

A second difficulty is the 'size of the Court of the Tabernacle compared with the number of the congregation' of Israel. In Leviticus viii. 4, for example, 'the assembly' of the people is said to have been gathered together unto the door of the Tabernacle.' How is this possible? On a very liberal interpretation of Moses's words, we may suppose him to mean that the crowd on this occasion consisted of the grown men of the congregation, and that it extended in breadth from the actual entrance of the tabernacle to the curtains of the court on either side. Now, even if this were the case, and the multitude marshalled itself into a dense and orderly mass, rank behind rank, it must have reached to a distance of nearly four miles. But we can hardly grant the historian so much licence. He informs us that the people were gathered 'unto the door of the Tabernacle;' and while we ought, strictly speaking, to understand this of the front of the door only, yet if we interpret the expression as applying to the whole front of the Tabernacle, we shall then have a rectangular column of men stretching to a distance of about twenty miles. It must be remembered, however, that the text says distinctly, 'at the door of the Tabernacle,' and therefore it follows that, according to Moses, 'all the congregation.....must have come *within the court*.' The italics are Dr. Colenso's. And he would have those believe this who can. The area of the court of the Tabernacle, deducting for the dimensions of the Tabernacle itself, was 1,692 square yards; and into this space a multitude is to go, which, 'packed closely together...would have covered an area of 201,180 square yards.' Our readers will be ready to doubt, on reading the above, whether we have dealt fairly by the author in the putting of this part of his case. We assure them that it is as we have stated it. 'The assembly' means, to say the least, the mass of the 603,550 adult males of the congregation; their being 'gathered together unto the door of the Tabernacle,' means that they stood in a body 'at the door,'—that is, in front of the door, or, at any rate, in front of the Tabernacle, not going beyond the breadth of it, or, by an extreme freedom of interpretation, in front of the Tabernacle, and on each side of the front as far as the boundaries of the court; finally, by their being represented as thus gathered, Moses

means that they were all assembled inside the Tabernacle court. Is Dr. Colenso serious in all this? If he were not a bishop, and were not just now doing what bishop never did before, we should conclude that this most grotesque piece of literary argumentation was designed for the amusement of Eton and Harrow. We hope the prevalent belief in the historical truth of the Pentateuch does not tremble before it. The Hebrew, the exegesis, and the logic of it are equally harmless.

The incredibility of Moses and Joshua's addressing all Israel, is our author's third point. As if any human voice could have reached the ears of a crowded mass of people as large as the whole population of London! Why, the crying of the little ones must have rendered it inaudible a few yards off! We will not dwell upon this. We again ask, Is Dr. Colenso serious? Does he really believe that any writer in his senses could mean what is here wrung out of the words of Moses and his fellow-historian? Has Dr. Colenso never heard of Herod's slaying the children in Bethlehem, or of the multitude of an ancient city who 'all with one voice about the space of two hours cried out, Great is Diana of the Ephesians;' or of a lady who is solemnly averred by respectable men to have defeated a Spanish Armada? He must excuse us if we say, that the captiousness of this objection—an objection which lies equally against the best writers of history, sacred and profane—is only rivalled by the astounding misrepresentation of Joshua viii. 32, 33, which we find side by side with it on page 37; and by the sneer on page 36, which we shall not characterize, at the declaration of the Psalmist, that there was 'not one feeble person' among the tribes of Israel when they came out of Egypt.

We shall not dwell in detail upon the next three or four difficulties raised by Dr. Colenso. In every case, however, we remark the same forcing of the literal sense, the same unaccountable looseness in stating the facts of the sacred narrative, and the same ignoring of the extraordinary interposition of God, which distinguish the foregoing parts of his argument. What is to be thought of a criticism which invariably overlooks the prospective character of the instructions given by God to Moses? Or which pins down the expression, 'Aaron and his sons,' to three individuals, when Moses distinctly tells us that the Levites were appointed to 'minister to' the Tabernacle, and were to 'encamp round about' it for the purpose? Or which cannot see that Exodus xxxviii. 21, &c., is a formal statement, in a place suitable to it, of the precise amount of the money-contributions to the sanctuary, as finally made up at the census of Numbers i. 1, &c.? Or which maintains, in the face of the very letter of the sacred history, that Moses represents the Israelites in Egypt as making all the preparations for the Passover, and as celebrating it within the compass of a single day?

Dr. Colenso's twelfth incredibility is too tempting to pass over. 'The whole land' of Canaan, he says, 'which was divided among the tribes in the time of Joshua, including the countries beyond the Jordan, was in extent about 11,000 square miles, or 7,000,000

acres. And, according to the story, this was occupied by more than 2,000,000 of people...without reckoning the old inhabitants.' What the number of the 'seven nations, greater and mightier than' Israel may have been, the author does not compute. But supposing that there were eventually 2,000,000 of Canaanites and 2,000,000 of Israelites living together on the soil; we have then the fact past all belief, that in 'those early days' the 7,000,000 acres of Canaan had a population of 4,000,000 persons. Now Natal has only 150,000 inhabitants on its 18,000 square miles. And 'the three English agricultural counties of Norfolk, Suffolk, and Essex,' at the census of '61, gave only 1,149,247 as the population of their 3,362,531 acres. But are these the only statistics bearing on the question? What was the area of ancient Attica—the barren Attica? Mr. Clinton estimates it at 478,720 acres. And what was the population of the district, as the same authority gives it, in the year B.C. 317? 'The total population of Attica in B.C. 317 may be taken at 527,660.' More than 500,000 people on fewer than 480,000 acres! We certainly do not see, with these figures before us, that it is quite beyond the line of things credible, that the 7,000,000 acres of Canaan may have found room for not much more than half the same number of inhabitants. It is true that Attica contained Athens; but it is true, also, that all ancient testimony goes to show that large portions of the country between the Tigris and the Mediterranean were densely populated at a very early period of antiquity; and, for our own part, we should not be sensible of any strain upon our faith, if the sacred records had considerably exceeded their actual statements on this subject.

We think we have now said enough to prove, that some at least of Dr. Colenso's 'contradictions' are either purely imaginary, or much less formidable than he would make them. In the remaining part of his book he discusses the questions of the proportion between the first-borns named in Numbers iii. 43, and the aggregate of male adults in the congregation; of the length of the sojourning in Egypt; of the Exodus in the Fourth Generation; of the number of Israelites at the time of the Exode; of the Scripture figures affecting the Danites and Levites at this epoch; of the Duties and Perquisites of the Priests, whether at the Passover-celebration or at other times; and of the War on Midian. It is through no disposition to gloze over real difficulties, that we affirm these sections of Dr. Colenso's work to be full of unwarrantable assumptions, of most uncritically violent interpretations of the sacred text, and of such a persistent confounding of the spheres of the natural and the Divine, as we scarcely remember to have met with in any sceptical work that ever came into our hands. On several points, as for example, where the Israelites could find pigeons for sacrifice in the wilderness, or how the blood of the sacrifices could have been sprinkled by Aaron and his sons, unless the animals were all killed within the Court of the Tabernacle, or how the priests could eat what the law made their portion of the offerings of the people—we are sorry to say, Dr. Colenso makes us laugh, like Simmias in the

Phædo, when we have no desire to laugh. But there are passages of his work, and particularly of the latter half of it, in view of which we do anything rather than laugh. When we see him unfairly collocating scriptures, (Exod. xxi. 4, and Exod. xxi. 20–21,) and so drawing inferences to the disadvantage of the Mosaic legislation; when he ridicules the idea of not an Israelite being slain in a war which God bade Moses to wage, and of which it is distinctly said, in the terms of the Divine command, that it was a judicial war (Num. xxxi. 1, 2); and when 'the tragedy of Cawnpore' is put in the same category with a destruction of life which the moral Governor of the universe saw fit, under special circumstances, to effect by human agency, we are bound to say, that this is a type of writing which has commonly been restricted to authors with whom we wish to have the least possible commerce.

Dr. Colenso has not overlooked one great argument bearing against the views he propounds. He naturally anticipates the objection that Christianity itself, in the very person and teaching of its Author, is implicated in the historic truth of the Old Testament; and if this gives way, what becomes of the Faith? We hope Dr. Colenso will strike out of all future editions of his work the paragraph in which he endeavours to dispose of our Lord's testimony to the five books of Moses. Still more earnestly do we trust the author will expunge the melancholy section in which he questions whether Christ 'was acquainted, more than any educated Jew of the age, with the mysteries of all human sciences,' and whether He had granted to Him as the Son of Man, *supernaturally*,' such 'full and exact information' respecting the Pentateuch as to be likely to speak about it otherwise than 'any other devout Jew of that day would have employed.' Dr. Colenso asks if it is not bringing 'the Sacred Ark itself into the battle-field' to make Christ a witness to the historic truth of Moses. We ask whether he does not hazard the safety of what is even more sacred than the ark, by writing thus of Him on whom the Holy Ghost came without measure at His baptism, and who was the fulness of the Godhead bodily.

We feel ourselves bound to add that there is a strong flavour through Dr. Colenso's book of what we must call theosophic sentimentalism. Fifty years ago this element would have received another and harsher name. We hear a good deal, for instance, of the Fatherliness of God, of our all coming to the footstool of His love, and of Eternal truths which reveal themselves to 'brave souls that yearn for light,' and of God's Bible in our heart, and the like. And this the author puts as a set-off against the popular view of the Scriptures, and to a certain extent of the Gospel also. We have no sympathy with this creed. Its affinities, its substance, and its tendencies are all bad. It is pantheistic in its basis; it tends to lower the Scripture doctrines of sin and the atonement; it confounds the human and the Divine; it leaves the soul no foothold either for time or eternity. We rejoice that Dr. Colenso has confidence in the illumination of the Holy Spirit, and in the goodness and mercy of God. But where are the vouchers for his

confidence, if they are not in that objective Revelation of the Scriptures, one great and essential part of which it is the object of his book to discredit?

Dr. Colenso believes everything he has written. He is as transparent as a child. He has not sent forth his book with a view to do mischief. It was only after sore buffeting with himself that he landed in the theory which he now holds so strongly; and he has given his views to the world with a reluctance which all his readers will perceive. At the same time we think him utterly and lamentably mistaken. He has allowed a few historical difficulties to swell into proportions, which have shut out from him a world of counter evidence such as the great majority of Christian thinkers hold to be conclusive and incontrovertible. By a strange freak of conscience—surely not a conscience gifted with quick sight—he has been led, in the name of religious self-sacrifice and chivalry, to assail the most cherished convictions of myriads of the best and wisest men of his generation. To crown all, he has published a work, which even favourable critics must pronounce to be desultory, crude, and inconclusive; which, while it exhibits him as sincere and out-spoken, is creditable neither to his scholarship, judgment, nor taste; which, so far from meeting any real want of the age, we deem to be as disastrously ill-timed as the most fervent enemy of the truth could desire; and which, as coming from an Anglican Bishop, will assuredly be hailed with rapture alike by secular opponents of the Church of England and by the libertine spirit both of speculative and practical infidelity.

The Last Day of our Lord's Passion. By the Rev. William Hanna, LL.D., Author of the Life of Dr. Chalmers. Fourth Edition. Edinburgh: Edmonston and Douglas. 1862.

If this volume had not already made its own mark, and become extensively known, we should probably have made it the subject of detailed criticism. There is no need, however, for the reviewer to do anything in the way of commending to public notice a work which has already been so widely read; neither, happily, is there any occasion afforded by Dr. Hanna's volume for antagonistic or cautionary general criticism. It is an admirable volume; and its beauties and excellencies are of such a kind, that, while the profound student of the Sacred History will most fully appreciate them, they cannot fail to be more or less perceived and felt by all intelligent readers.

It seems strange that expositions of the like nature with this of Dr. Hanna's are so scarce amongst us. Here is a clear and thorough combination and harmony of all in reference to the sublime and affecting subject of the volume which is related by the different evangelists. Dr. Kitto's delightful Readings are almost the only well-known examples of any similar method of setting forth the truth of Scripture history which we have in our biblical literature. But his Readings are brief and fragmentary; they afford but glimpses. Dr. Hanna's volume furnishes a continuous and complete view of all that belongs to the wonderful history of our Lord's last day upon the

earth, before His 'decease at Jerusalem.' There is too a thoughtfulness, a mastery, a depth, and a tenderness about Dr. Hanna's presentation of the sacred history, which even Dr. Kitto's excellent writing nowhere equals.

We have spoken of this volume as an exposition of the history. Not, however, the bare order of facts; it is not a dry harmony. The actors live: motives, feelings, character, are excellently set forth. Dr. Hanna is a man of insight, sympathy, and earnest thought. He has visited Gethsemane and Calvary; has watched with profoundest attention the evolution of events during the tragical and unparalleled night and day of which he has to speak; has mused and meditated on the whole, until he has become familiar with all the bye-play of the crowded and often changing scenes, as well as with the great and obvious circumstances and events. The result is, a book which answers objections by its full exhibition of the living truth, which forestalls the cavils of the captious, and the doubts of the perplexed; a book which establishes the truth of our Lord's Divine life and divinely determined and efficacious death, of His Godhead and Manhood, and Atonement; by showing the perfect harmony which this ONE TRUTH, and this alone, makes and establishes among all the facts and circumstances of the stupendous and miraculous history. Those who read it feel, as they read, that a true history is passing before their view, a history which no man could have invented or imagined; which could least of all have been brought out in such deep complete harmony of life, and love, and miracle, and prodigy, from the fragmentary accounts, and seemingly casual hints of four independent, unpractised, inartificial narrators,—if it were not the very 'truth, as it is in Jesus.'

We do not, indeed, quite agree with Dr. Hanna on every point. If we did, as to such a subject, it would be passing strange, and the fact would reflect no credit on ourselves, and therefore none on Dr. Hanna. Admirable and convincing, in general, as is his exhibition, here and there we have to differ from him. For example, we presume to think that he has followed Alford into an error, in supposing that Annas conducted that examination of our Lord, respecting 'His disciples and His doctrine,' which is recorded in the eighteenth chapter of St. John's Gospel, in verses 12 and 24. Kaiaphas, *in explicit contradistinction to Annas*, is, in the intermediate verses 19 and 22, specifically entitled 'the high-priest.' How then can we suppose 'the high-priest' to mean Annas? Moreover, Dr. Hanna supposes that, although Annas conducted this examination, his son-in-law, Kaiaphas, 'was by his side, eager and ready to proceed.' Is it likely, under such circumstances, that Annas would conduct the examination, and not 'the high-priest' himself? Besides, if this were so, what could be the meaning of the words in verse 24, which inform us of Annas 'sending' Jesus 'bound unto Kaiaphas the high-priest?' Dr. Hanna, following Alford, as we have said, would translate this verse in the past tense, (*sent*,) and not in the pluperfect, (*had sent*,) as in our version. That is to say, he would represent Annas as sending Jesus away bound to Kaiaphas, after this preliminary examination was over,—when Kaiaphas,

at the very time of sending, was sitting by the side of Annas. To our thinking, Alford's view confuses a very plain matter. We adhere to the authorised version of verse 24, *had sent*, and believe that prior to this first examination by Kaiaphas, itself but preliminary and informal, Jesus had been brought in custody to Annas by the officers, and had by him been sent to the tribunal of Kaiaphas.

The only other matter of moment as to which we differ from Dr. Hanna, is the view which he gives of the comparative estrangement of Mary from her son for months (if not for years) prior to the crucifixion. This we regard as an unsustained and violent hypothesis. We revolt from it, and we reject it.

These, however, are but isolated blemishes in a beautiful and admirable volume, which we most heartily commend to all our readers without exception, as a book to be purchased and prized.

The Bible and Modern Thought. By the Rev. T. R. Birks, M.A. New Edition, with an Appendix. London: Religious Tract Society. 1862.

It was our pleasant duty, less than twelve months ago, in a somewhat lengthened notice, to commend the first edition of this admirable book to our readers of whatever class. We are glad to find that another edition has been called for. The value of this edition is greatly enhanced by the addition, in an appendix, of five elaborate Notes, which altogether increase the matter of the volume by nearly one fourth, and which relate to controversies of the highest interest and importance. The first, on the Evidential School of Theology, examines the statements of the Sixth Essay.* The second endeavours to throw some light on the controversy occasioned by the Bampton Lectures on the Limits of Thought. The third selects four topics, from Baron Bunsen's work on Egypt, by which to test the amount of authority due to its negative criticisms. The fourth offers some remarks on the Human Aspect of Scripture, as essential to a just view of inspiration; and the last enters at some length into the question of Geology, in connexion with the Essays in the 'Replies' and the 'Aids to Faith.'

These Notes are distinguished by the author's characteristic ability, thoroughness, and candour; and the whole volume, as now supplemented and enriched, may be safely recommended to all men of intelligence as one of the best contributions to our biblical and theological literature which the controversies of the present age have called forth. Let us add that it is without doubt the very cheapest work on the matters treated, which it is possible to purchase.

Imputed Righteousness: or, The Scripture Doctrine of Justification; being Lectures on the Argumentative Portion of St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans. By the Rev. W. Tyson, Wesleyan Minister. Mason.

This work was published in the year 1858, when the author was resident in the West Indies; but it has been recently brought

* *The Oxford Essays and Reviews.*

into notice in this country, and is attracting the attention of many readers. It contains a series of Lectures on important passages of the Epistle to the Romans, and exhibits clearly and forcibly the general teaching of St. Paul. The lecturer has clearly set forth the doctrine of justification by grace through faith, and has seized the import and spirit of several of the more difficult passages of the Epistle. The book is a valuable contribution to the elucidation of this important portion of the New Testament; although it does not, of course, profess to furnish a continuous and complete exposition. We regret that the plan of the author has not allowed him to treat of the tenth chapter; and we could have wished that another lecture had been given to the difficult ninth chapter. We are thankful, however, for what we have; and can heartily commend the volume to our readers.

The Complete Works of Richard Sibbes, D.D., &c. Edited, with Memoir, by the Rev. A. B. Grosart. Vol. II. Edinburgh: James Nichol.

A FURTHER portion of that wonderful series of which, as it has already received our hearty and manifold commendation, we need add no more at present than our sincere wish that its success may be equal to its merits.

The contents of this volume are three expository treatises and two single sermons. Among the former is that which has always ranked amongst the most valuable of the author's writings, although disfigured by an unfortunate title. Perhaps, had he lived to complete the publication of the discourses on Canticles v. and vi., he would have chosen some more attractive phrase by which to designate them than 'Bowels Opened;' but, however that may be, the reader who desires to know how to turn to the utmost advantage a portion of Holy Writ too frequently neglected, if not even shunned, in modern times, cannot do better than make himself acquainted with the volume before us. It is at once richly experimental and closely practical, affording valuable lessons to those guides of souls and stewards of the household of God, who would fain give a portion to every one under their charge in due season.

It is almost superfluous to add, that our Methodist readers, while they find much to admire, will also find some things to make them thankful for the more consistent and scriptural teaching of Mr. Wesley on certain points both of doctrine and experience. We cite a single example: To speak of 'Death' as 'that excellent physician which perfectly cures both soul and body,' is a style which ill accords with any scriptural representation, and necessarily, though not intentionally, reflects upon the power and grace of the Divine Spirit.

The Works of Thomas Goodwin D.D., sometime President of Magdalen College, Oxford. Vol. IV. Edinburgh: Nichol. 1862.

THIS volume contains Seven Treatises, all valuable—some of them very precious. In others, we trace that tendency to be 'wise above what is written' which is more or less common to all who hold the views of Calvin on the subject of predestination, and especially (if any difference must be made) to those of the Supralapsarian school. But

all who read with discrimination and care will find much to interest and profit them in each of the seven treatises. The first two, entitled, 'Christ Set Forth,' and 'The Heart of Christ in Heaven towards Sinners on Earth,' were abridged by John Wesley, and inserted in his *Christian Library*, where they follow in immediate succession to the Extracts from Sibbes's great work mentioned immediately above. The preface to the first-named treatise in the volume before us might have been written to-day, so exactly has Goodwin described the state of many among ourselves.

'I have by long experience observed many holy and precious souls who have clearly and wholly given themselves up to Christ, to be saved by Him in His own way,.....who yet, in the ordinary course and way of their spirits, have been too much carried away with the rudiments of Christ in their own hearts, and not after Christ Himself; the stream of their more constant thoughts and deepest intentions running in the channel of reflecting upon, and searching into, the gracious dispositions of their own hearts, so as to bring down or raise up;.....and so get a sight of Christ by them. Whereas, Christ Himself is "nigh them," (Rom. x. 8,) if they would but nakedly look upon Himself through thoughts of pure and simple faith.....But let these consider what a dishonour this must needs be unto Christ, that His train should have a fuller court and more frequent attendance from our hearts than Himself, who is the King of Glory. And, likewise, what a shame it is for believers themselves, who are His spouse, to look upon their Husband no otherwise than by reflection, and at second hand, through the intervention and mediation of their own graces.'—Pp. 3, 4.

As a remedy against this state of things, the first-named treatise was written, and it is admirably adapted to answer the purpose.

An Exposition of the Second Epistle General of St. Peter. By the Rev. Thomas Adams, Rector of St. Gregory's, London, A.D. 1633. Revised and Corrected by James Sherman, Minister of Surrey Chapel. Royal 8vo. Edinburgh: Nichol. London: James Nisbet and Co. 1862.

This is an Appendix to Mr. Nichol's scheme. It would appear from the Advertisement, that Mr. Sherman, on his death-bed, saw and approved the prospectus of the series of reprints, and offered the publisher the stereotype plates of four Commentaries, which he had formerly issued in this size. The public may thus obtain these volumes for little more than the cost of paper and press-work, thanks to the estimable donor of the plates, and thanks to the spirited publisher too, for bringing within the reach of poor students and pastors a volume which they cannot read without advantage and admiration. Adams has been sometimes called 'the Shakspeare of divines,' such is the richness of his fancy. But the soundness of his judgment is fully equal to his other qualities; and, best of all, his heart is never cold. Instead of a dissertation, however, we will give an extract, taken almost at random, which will give those who do not know our author a fair idea both of his matter and manner:—

'But knowledge to the Christian is like his soul to his body; a kind of all in all. As it quickens, it is life; as it resolves, it is will; as it thinks, it is mind; as it knows, it is understanding; as it deliberates, it is judgment; as it remembers, it is memory; as it judgeth, it is reason; as it desires, it is affection; as it breathes, it is spirit; as it feels, it is sense. So knowledge concurs to every grace: they that know Thy name will trust in Thee; (Psalm ix, 10;) so it is faith. Know the Lord and tremble before Him; so it is fear. Abraham knew God, and called himself dust and ashes; so it is humility. They that know Christ will become new creatures; (Eph. iv. 12;) so it is sanctity. The faithful know Christ, and relieve His poor members; (Matt. xxv.;) so it is charity. Be wise, know the Lord, and serve Him; (Psalm ii. 10, 11;) so it is all piety. I have determined to know nothing among you, but Christ crucified; (1 Cor. ii. 2;) so it is all Christianity. Let us know the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom He hath sent; and so it is eternal life. (John xvii. 3.) As feeling is inseparable to all the organs of sense, the eye sees and feels, the palate tastes and feels, the nostril smells and feels; so knowledge is involved in every grace; faith knows and believes, charity knows and loves, patience knows and suffers, temperance knows and abstains, humility knows and stoops, repentance knows and mourns, obedience knows and does, confidence knows and rejoices, hope knows and expects, compassion knows and pities, thankfulness knows and praiseth the blessed name of God. As there is a power of water in everything that grows; it is fatness in the olive, sweetness in the fig, cheerful wine in the grape, strength in the oak, tallness in the cedar, redness in the rose, whiteness in the lily; so knowledge is in the hand obedience, in the knee humility, in the eye compassion, in the mouth benediction, in the head understanding, in the heart charity, in the whole body and soul piety. How miserably are they deceived that think they can find the way to heaven blindfold; as if holiness were the daughter of ignorance! Alas, it will be more possible for them to weigh the fire, or to measure the wind, or call again the day which is past, or recover the verdure of the withered grass, than to get salvation without knowledge. If there be such an answer to such as have known Christ, and so known Him as to have prophesied in His name as an I know you not; (Matt. vii. 22, 23;) how will He pour out His indignation among the heathen that know not His name, (Psalm lxxix. 6,) and in flaming fire take vengeance on those that know not God! (2 Thess. i. 8.) But let us know Him that we may love Him; and love Him that He may both know and love us in Jesus Christ.'

A hundred closely-printed pages of such matter for less than a shilling, or nearly nine hundred pages for eight shillings and sixpence, is the rate at which Mr. Nichol's subscribers are supplied. Our readers, if they are not already subscribers, need not be told that they will do well to become such without delay. Let the age see that there is at least one magnificent project for supplying good reading at a low price that does not involve its author in loss and sorrow.

The Syrian Leper; a Chapter of Bible History expounded. By the Rev. Charles Bullock. London: Wertheim and Co. 1862.

MR. BULLOCK is already known to the Christian public as the author of *The Way Home*, and of several smaller productions, which do equal credit to his intelligence and his Christian feeling. The present work contains an admirable series of expository lectures on the history of Naaman, designed to bring into view and to enforce the great practical lessons suggested by the Scripture narrative. It is rich in evangelical sentiment; it asserts and vindicates many important principles of Christian duty, which are apt to be overlooked or underrated; and it is written in the straightforward, unaffected style which commonly distinguishes the pulpit of the Church of England.

Pentecostal Blessings: What were they? And may we still pray for them? Notes of Lectures, with an Introduction. By the Rev. David Pitcairn, Author of 'Perfect Peace,' &c. London: Wertheim, Macintosh, and Co. 1862.

MR. PITCAIRN, residing at Torquay, has been hindered in his work by finding the errors of the 'Plymouth Brethren' in relation to the Holy Ghost and pentecostal influence more or less current in his neighbourhood. These lectures were originally delivered mainly to counteract those errors. They are thoughtful, scriptural, and useful; and in tone thoroughly Christian. We could wish, however, that Mr. Pitcairn would avoid characterizing our Lord's Sermon on the Mount, as His 'very instructive and practical sermon.' That is much as we might characterize a book like Mr. Pitcairn's in recommending it to our readers.

Notes on the Gospels, Critical and Explanatory. By Melancthon W. Jacobus. Matthew. Reprinted from the Thirty-Third American Edition. Edinburgh: W. Oliphant and Co. 1862.

A PLAIN, popular commentary, designed especially for Sunday-school teachers and other instructors of the young. We shall be glad to hear of its superseding the use of Barnes, to which it is very superior in tone and doctrinal sentiment. Unpretending as the work is, it presents in small compass the results of much sound scholarship and well-digested reading. It comes nearer to our idea of what a book of this description ought to be, than any we have hitherto met with. Its value is increased by the illustrative woodcuts which are scattered up and down through the volume; and we need hardly say that, like all books published by Messrs. Oliphant and Co., it is a model of typographical neatness and accuracy.

Beaten Oil for the Light of Life: being Daily Thoughts on Bible Texts. By the Rev. Hugh Baird. Edinburgh: W. Oliphant and Co. 1862.

THE author of this work doubts whether most books of the class to which it belongs 'bring out clearly the ideas contained' in the texts

with which they deal. He endeavours in this respect to improve upon his predecessors, and at the same time to furnish Christian people of little leisure with 'daily reading of a scriptural, devotional, and practical kind,' such as may awaken reflection and 'give a right current to the train of thought' amidst the hurry and business of the world. We question whether persons who are used to handle books of daily meditations will mark as strong a contrast between the present volume and others of the same general class, in the particular to which the author adverts, as his language might lead them to look for. The work is well adapted, however, to the purposes contemplated in the publication of it. The evangelical earnestness, the muscular Christian sentiment, and the plain, manly speech of the Scottish pulpit, are found in every part. What is no small virtue, the impertinences of a conceited theosophy and of a sentimental rhetoric are alike absent from this sensible, sterling volume. We commend it to all who require the religious aids it offers as one of the best books of its order.

Reposing in Jesus: or, The True Secret of Grace and Strength. By G. W. Mylne, Author of 'Thoughts for Spare Moments at Sea,' &c., &c. London: Wertheim, Macintosh, and Hunt. 1862.

It is pleasing to find that there is, in this day of hurry and worldly competition, a steady demand for such thoroughly spiritual and experimental treatises as the one before us. It is a book for a devotional Christian.

The Targums of Onkelos and Jonathan Ben Uzziel on the Pentateuch; with the Fragments of the Jerusalem Targum: from the Chaldee. By J. W. Etheridge, M.A. Genesis and Exodus. London: Longman and Co. 1862.

Considering the doctrinal importance of the Targums, together with their general literary interest, it is strange that they are not in common circulation among us in our own language. Hitherto, however, they have never been translated into English; and we heartily thank Dr. Etheridge for breaking ground in a field which ought to be familiar to all educated readers of the Bible. In the present volume we have translations of Onkelos and of Jonathan, with the addition named on the title-page, so far as they belong to the Books of Genesis and Exodus. The translator proposes in a second volume to do for the rest of the Books of Moses what he has here done for the first two of them; and we trust the demand for his work will be such as to lead him to extend his labours considerably beyond the limits of the Pentateuch. It is superfluous to say, that Dr. Etheridge makes his Aramaic speak as good English as Aramaic can, and that his renderings put the reader in possession both of the spirit and form of the original texts. Prefixed to the translation is an introductory chapter on the origin, history, and character of the Targums; and, what greatly heightens the value of this part of the work, two brief but elaborate episodes are wrought into it, in which the author

discusses the great questions of the teaching of the Paraphrasts respecting the Divine Logos, and the testimony which they bear to the Scripture doctrine of the Messiah. Those who are acquainted with Dr. Etheridge's previous writings will not need to be told, that the learning which these prolegomena exhibit is large and trustworthy, and that the value of the information they contain is equalled only by the manly modesty, the well-disciplined judgment, and the tender yet noble Christian feeling, which pervade and adorn every production of his pen. We commend this important book to all students of the word of God, and especially to those who wish to trace the providential links which bind together the Church of Moses and the Church of Christ.

Ancient Empires: their Origin, Succession, and Results; with a Preliminary View of the Unity and First Migrations of Mankind. Religious Tract Society.

A CONTEMPORARY journal, distinguished by its hostility to every kind of alliance between knowledge and earnest religion, took great pains, on the first appearance of this book, to laugh it out of circulation. No secret was made of the principle which animated the Reviewer. The book was written by a believer in the historic truth of the Bible; and was intended, within its chosen province, to illustrate the ways of God to men. This was enough. It was a narrow book, a weak book, a book for Exeter Hall and Evangelicals. Had the writer said that the work was not distinguished by any original research, that it did not embody as many of the available results of modern criticism as might be expected, and that its style was not remarkable for pictorial impressiveness, we should subscribe to his opinion. But it is a solid, trustworthy, and useful book notwithstanding; and to those whose leisure for reading is scanty, and who have the good sense to value that literature the most which is Christian in its tone and tendency, we recommend this volume as containing abundance of valuable matter, collected and shaped by a cultivated, practical mind, and leavened throughout with the spirit of an intelligent faith in the existence of God and in the reality of His moral government. The Religious Tract Society has conferred incalculable blessing upon the world by the publication of books on general subjects, written in a manner becoming our Christian nationality and civilisation; and this work on Ancient Empires is no dishonour to the series of which it is a member.

Two Lectures on the Wesleyan Hymn-Book; with tabulated Appendix of the Hymns, and their respective Authors. By the Rev. Joseph Heaton. London: John Mason. 1862.

THE literature of the Wesleyan Hymn-Book is accumulating so rapidly as to merit a more extended notice than can be given to it at the end of this Review. In a future Number the subject will receive fuller consideration. In the mean while we have great pleasure in calling attention to Mr. Heaton's concise and admirable pamphlet. There is material enough in these sixty-eight pages to fill a goodly volume; and if Mr. Heaton's readers are disposed to find any fault

with him, it will be on the score of his almost lamentable brevity. The First Lecture is devoted to brief and graphic sketches of the Poets of the Hymn-Book, and to those romantic incidents of its History which invest many of its beautiful hymns with undying interest. The Second Lecture treats of the excellencies of the Hymn-Book, and its influence. With great judgment and discrimination Mr. Heaton reviews its poetry, its evangelistic tone, its paraphrastic and expository value, the spirituality of its sentiments, and the diversity and fitness of its metrical construction. His style is clear, vigorous and racy. The large fund of illustration which he has gathered he uses with great effect. Over all is shed the glow of reverence and devotion.

The Influence of the Mosaic Code upon subsequent Legislation. By J. Benjamin Marsden, Solicitor. London: Hamilton. 1862.

This book contains much interesting matter, culled from a great variety of sources, in relation to the different national codes of the world, and their analogies with the Mosaic legislation. But its argument appears to be often loose and inconclusive.

Beginning Life. Chapters for Young Men on Religion, Study, and Business. By John Tulloch, D.D. Edinburgh: Alexander Strahan.

The book is what it professes to be, and is practical, weighty, and wise. There is no attempt at elaboration, none at minute discussion. Sound principles are laid down as the basis of all counsel, and are never lost sight of by the writer, though they may be by the reader.

Revelation and Science, in respect to Bunsen's Biblical Researches. The Evidences of Christianity, and the Mosaic Economy, &c. By the Rev. Bourchier Wrey Savile, M.A., &c. London: Longmans. 1862.

Mr. Savile is not only an M.A., but he is really a learned man; yet he has neither common sense, nor even common acquaintance with the rules of English composition.

It seems he is one of those who suppose themselves to have discovered the true and precise interpretation of the Apocalypse. 'The number of the beast' means 'the number of some man's name who would towards the close of this age possess dominion in the Roman empire.' 'And,' says Mr. Savile, 'it is somewhat curious to find that, by writing the various names of the present Emperor of the French in the three languages which told the world the death of the Saviour of men, we have in the Latin tongue *Louis*, i.e. Ludovicus; in the Greek tongue, *Louis Napoleon*; and in the Hebrew tongue, *Charles Bonaparte*, as the equivalent to the required No. 666.' Dr. Cumming, we fancy, in presence of this interpretation, must 'hide his diminished head.'

Mr. Savile also, in his zeal for the minute scientific accuracy of the Scriptures, discovers the 'true theory of the formation of dew, as distin-

guished from that of rain,' in Deuteronomy xxxii. 2: 'My doctrine shall drop as the rain, my speech shall distil as the dew;' and an anticipation of Liebig's exposition, that death by hunger is a process of slow combustion, in Moses' prediction, contained in the 24th verse of the same chapter, that the guilty children of Israel should be 'burnt with hunger.'

As to Mr. Savile's syntax, it reminds us as much of the style of 'Caroline's' English in the tedious 'Adventures of Philip,' as of anything we have seen lately. The following sentence, on p. 4, may be taken as a sample: 'Indeed, so objectionable do some of the statements appear in Dr. Williams' Essay, that we are afraid of breaking that precious and boundless law of charity, which the Gospel so highly exalts, if we gave utterance to the feelings which spontaneously arise in the mind when reflecting on the lengths in scepticism which a professing Christian, much more an English clergyman, can permit himself to go antagonistic to that faith, and that revealed word of God, which he is bound by every tie to defend.' Or the following, from the Preface: 'In thus exposing the failings of our clerical brethren, we have endeavoured, with what success our readers must judge, to avoid that rock on which theological controversialists are too often apt to split, as it has given rise to a well-known and unhappy proverb amongst us; and the way by which some, especially platform orators, have sought the condemnation of the authors of "Essays and Reviews," is a melancholy illustration thereof.'

Of 'faith' Mr. Savile says, that it is 'genuine, fruitful, salvific.' His book is 'genuine,' but we fear, as regards the work of opposing the 'Essays and Reviews,' it will neither prove 'fruitful' nor 'salvific.' Nevertheless, as we have intimated, Mr. Savile has not been to the University altogether for nothing. His book contains much learning, and some useful applications of it in defence of Scripture truth.

The True Figure and Dimensions of the Earth, &c. In a Letter addressed to G. B. Airy, Esq., M.A., Astronomer Royal. By Johannes Von Gumpach. Second Edition, entirely recast. With Diagrams. London: Hardwicke. 1862.

Mr. Johannes Von Gumpach (a German we presume him to be, but his present abode appears to be in Guernsey) has been led, by a train of logical and geometrical reasoning, to the unavoidable conclusion that the earth, *instead of being flattened*, as has been held by all mathematicians and astronomers since the time of Newton, '*is elongated at the poles.*' It is calculated by such astronomers as Airy and Bessel that the polar diameter of the earth is 7,899 miles, and the equatorial 7,925; Von Gumpach supposes himself to have demonstrated, on the contrary, that the polar diameter is 7,955 miles, and the equatorial 7,872; in other words, that the form of the earth is rather like that of a lemon than of an orange.

If any of our readers wish to enter into this argument, we must refer them to Mr. Von Gumpach's volume, in reference to which, in general, we have only to say, that, although we cannot doubt that somewhere and somehow he has found a mathematical mare's nest,

yet the author is evidently a man of attainments and ability. The Astronomer Royal, however, quietly contemns his correspondent's calculations and arguments; and will not admit that any error, in the least material, can exist in any element of the customary calculations. We have no doubt he is right; and shall as little allow our confidence in Newton's theory to be shaken by Von Gumpach's geometry as in the historical character of the Pentateuch by Colenso's arithmetic. We must confess, in conclusion, that our time is too valuable to admit of our doing more than read some small portions of this portentous assault by Johannes Von Gumpach on the theory of universal gravitation and the Newtonian astronomy.

London Labour and the London Poor. By Henry Mayhew. Four Vols. London: 1861, 1862.

If, as Bentham assures us,* that man 'renders the most substantial service to morality, who labours to destroy the prejudices which separate between man and man, by making men acquainted with each other,' this service has certainly been rendered in an eminent degree by Mr. Mayhew. In these four valuable volumes, which present us with a perspicuous photograph of lower-class London society as it exists at the present day, it is but faint praise to say that he has taken every pains to make the rich better acquainted with the poor. He and his colleagues have gone to work in our own streets, amongst our own poor. They have instituted their inquiries, and expended their curiosity, upon a class of our countrymen, with regard to which we were almost as much in the dark—as far as their manners, morals, economics, and statistics were concerned—as we are with respect to the Ojibeways and Choctaws.

At a meeting of ticket-of-leave men, convened some time ago at the National Hall, Holborn, Mr. Mayhew opened the proceedings by saying: 'When I first went among you, it was not very easy for me to make you comprehend the purpose I had in view. You at first fancied that I was a Government spy, or a person in some way connected with the police. I am none of these, nor am I a clergyman, wishing to convert you to his peculiar creed; nor a teetotaller, anxious to prove the source of all evil to be over-indulgence in intoxicating drink; but I am simply a literary man, desirous of letting the rich know something more about the poor. Some persons study the stars, others study the animal kingdom; others, again, direct their researches into the properties of stones, devoting their whole lives to these particular vocations. I am the first who has endeavoured to study a class of my fellow-creatures whom Providence has not placed in so fortunate a position as myself; my desire being to bring the extremes of society together—the poor to the rich, and the rich to the poor.'—Vol. iii., p. 430.

Although Mr. Mayhew states that his enterprise is 'the first commission of inquiry undertaken by a private individual,' he cannot but be aware that others—perhaps less ably and less systematically—have long essayed to do for us what he has done.

* *Traité de Legislation de Bentham, par E. Dumont*, p. 355.

The agents of the City Mission, the teachers of Ragged Schools, and the like, have long since adduced equally extraordinary and startling facts about the undiscovered country of the poor. To the generality of readers no doubt it is a *terra incognita* still; but we claim for the despised tract distributor, and the much maligned City Missionary, the honour of having been the pioneers in this work, and the foremost champions in this new crusade. And we make this claim with all the more confidence after remarking that one or more agents of the City Mission, according to Mr. Mayhew's own showing, 'have been engaged with him from nearly the commencement of his inquiries,' and that 'to their hearty co-operation the public is indebted for a large increase of knowledge.'

The first three volumes of the work have now been for some time before the public, and have been received with much favour. The 'extra volume,' which brings the work to a close, has appeared within the present year; and we have a few words to say concerning it specifically. This last volume, we affect no reluctance to say it, has not only disappointed, it has disgusted us. We do not deny that the book contains much curious information; that it must contribute in no inconsiderable degree to a more accurate knowledge of the depraved and dangerous classes of the country; that in these respects it may possibly prove of some service to the police officer, the magistrate, the missionary, and the minister. But, at the same time, it contains a vast amount of worse than useless, or positively pernicious, information; and it will be well if it do not produce more harm than the preceding volumes produce of good. The last volume is devoted, in accordance with the author's original design, to 'those that will not work;' a class compriaing 'prostitutes, thieves, swindlers, and beggars.' The first-named are first reviewed. About two hundred and fifty pages, or just one-half of the entire book, is devoted to this subject. To this class in London, however, only some sixty pages are appropriated; the remaining space being occupied, needlessly and perniciously, with the history of their vice in almost every land and age.

Les Misérables. By Victor Hugo. Brussels: Lacroix, Verboeckhoven, and Co. 1862. Ten Vols.

Victor Hugo is incontestably the greatest French poet, and one of the first French prose writers, now living; and in this book he has displayed all his wonted eloquence and ability, and, we may add, all his usual discursiveness and diffuseness. It is quite a quarter too long; and though a liberal allowance must be made for large print, large margins, and numerous blank leaves, yet we have no hesitation in saying, that the ten volumes of which it is composed might easily have been compressed into seven. Not that the digressions are in themselves valueless, or even in general uninteresting; on the contrary, they are most of them well worthy of being read. But then they have scarcely anything to do with the story, and merely serve to impede the action. For instance, having occasion to describe how

one of his two heroes carries the other, who had been wounded in defending a barricade, through the Parisian sewers, he seizes the opportunity of giving, not a chapter merely, but a whole book, on the past, present, and even future history of the system of sewage in that city. The subject is important, but to the general reader uninteresting. Whole books are also devoted to a vivid and picturesque description of the battle of Waterloo, to a dissertation on the good and evil of the convent system, to the natural history of the Parisian *gamin* or street-boy, to the history of slang, and to the right and wrong of riots.

The book may be described as coming within the class of 'novels with a purpose;' but it is distinguished from the other individuals of the same species by an important feature, viz., the difficulty of making out what is the particular lesson society is to learn from it. The preface, which is very short, cloudy, and enigmatical, does not help us in the least. It merely says that 'so long as the three problems of this century—the degradation of the man by want, the fall of the woman by hunger, and the atrophy of the child by night (whatever that may mean)—shall remain unsolved,' so long shall such books as this be not altogether useless. Victor Hugo probably intends that the numerous dissertations alluded to above should convey whatever lessons he is desirous of teaching; but as they are scattered here and there throughout the book, and embrace the most different subjects, it is impossible to follow him in the narrow space at our disposal. We shall therefore merely say, that the author's chief aim has apparently been to describe the fearful obstacles which society throws in the way of those who have once offended against its laws, and are painfully trying to retrace the difficult upward path to virtue. Jean Valjean, the hero, had, in a season of great scarcity, stolen a piece of bread for his sister's famishing children. For this he was sentenced to the galleys for four years; but, having several times endeavoured to escape, it was nineteen years before he obtained his freedom. He had entered the galleys an ignorant, affectionate, country lout; he left them a hardened wretch, with his whole soul in a state of revolt against society and its laws. The treatment he receives on his journey homewards embitters him still more; he is refused admittance at every inn—nay, even a dog turns against him, and bites him when he endeavours to find refuge in an outhouse. In this condition he is received by the bishop of the town, who not only takes him into his house, but gives him a supper and a bed with the utmost fearlessness. The description of this good bishop, his mode of life, and his entire unselfishness and great charity, is sadly spun out, (it occupies 165 pages,) but it is very beautiful and touching nevertheless. The man, to whom such kindness is incomprehensible, and who is thoroughly brutalised by his long years of ill-treatment, requites the bishop's goodness by rising in the night and stealing the silver forks and spoons they had used at supper, and which, with two silver candlesticks, were the only superfluous articles his host possessed. The next morning, Jean Valjean is brought back by three *gendarmes*. The bishop immediately walks up to him and says, 'Here are the two

candlesticks I gave you. They are made of silver like the others; why did you leave them behind?' By this falsehood he of course delivers the man who had been taken up on suspicion of having stolen the articles found on him; and when the *gendarmes* have taken their leave, he says, 'Jean Valjean, my brother, you belong no longer to evil, but to good. I have just bought your soul. I withdraw it from dark thoughts, and from the spirit of evil, and give it to God.' The man departs in a state of indescribable agitation; his whole soul, his whole being, is moved to its inmost depths, and in his excitement, almost amounting to delirium, he again steals a piece of money from a little *Savoyard* boy. But from that time forward he repents, and through all the vicissitudes of his subsequent life, notwithstanding many sore temptations, he still manages, like a storm-beaten sailor, to keep the loadstar of right steadily in view.

The description of the state of Jean Valjean's mind when he steals the child's money is very grand; but it is surpassed in a subsequent chapter of the book, entitled '*Une Tempête sous un Crâne.*' After having, under an assumed name, realised a considerable fortune, and been appointed mayor of the town of M——-sur-M——, in consideration of the enormous good he had done there, he hears that another man has been taken up as the true Jean Valjean, and is to be tried for stealing the boy's money; and this chapter describes the terrible conflict in his mind whether he shall give himself up, and so deliver the innocent man, or not. He finally determines to do so, and is condemned to the galleys for life as an old offender. But for the remainder of the story we must refer our readers to the book itself. When we come to speak of beauties, they are too many for enumeration; we will, however, just note that there are two chapters, one describing a man overboard, and the other a traveller sinking in a quicksand, which are masterpieces of graphic power. Equally excellent is the description of Louis Philippe, the citizen king. We have already referred to the book on Waterloo. Whatever may be its inaccuracies, it is a very grand account of the battle. But we cannot mention all the passages that struck us,—a dozen pages would not suffice.

It is very characteristic of Victor Hugo's being a Frenchman, that he should have made the thief's conversion result from a lie; and that further on in the story he should again extol a lie told by a nun to favour Jean Valjean's escape, and call it *sublime*. No Englishman would have dared to enlist sympathy in such a cause. But there is one respect in which the book is more English than French, viz., that, with the exception of a few words here and there, it is such as a lady need not be ashamed to be seen reading. And this, considering the small number of really able French novels of which it is possible to say anything of the kind, is no small recommendation.

In conclusion we can only add to this brief and necessarily incomplete notice of a book composed of ten large volumes, that the *Misérables* bears the marks of being the work of the same mind that had already produced *Notre-Dame de Paris*, *Le dernier Jour d'un Condamné*, and *Napoleon le Petit*; and powerfully eloquent as these

works are, there is no falling off here. It is the work of a man whose imagination is gorgeous, whose reasoning powers are far from despicable, (though he is rather wanting in the English quality of common sense,) and whose command of language is wonderful. His native tongue is an instrument over which he has the most perfect mastery, and from which he can draw whatever sounds he will.

Last Poems. By Elizabeth Barrett Browning. Chapman and Hall. 1862.

THESE poems, some of which have been previously published, exhibit all the peculiarities of Mrs. Browning's former works. They are disfigured by many instances of extreme harshness. She abuses poetic licence by violent and rugged transpositions, such as are without example in our canonized bards, and are contrary to the very conception of poetry. For example:—

'She who scarcely trod the earth
Turned mere dirt? My Agnes—mine!
Called so! Felt of too much worth
To be used so! too divine
To be breathed near, and so forth.' (!!)—Page 45.

And again:—

'Cross her quiet hands, and smooth
Down her patient locks of silk,
Cold and pensive as in truth
You your fingers in spilt milk
Drew along a marble floor.'—Page 2.

These poems exhibit the old confusion of thought and expression. For example:—

'What she sinned
She could pray on high enough
To keep safe above the wind.'—Page 8.

Here is an unwarranted use of an intransitive verb as transitive. But to pass by this, the meaning would seem to be that 'Little Mattie' could pray her sins high enough to keep them safe above the wind; which to us is the merest nonsense. Professor Wilson used to write his poems in prose, and afterwards versify them: perhaps some of our young poets would talk better sense if they followed his example.

We regret to say, also, that these last poems of a gifted and lamented authoress are deformed by the strange and startling coarseness which was one of her most unpleasing occasional characteristics.

'She lied and stole,
And spat into my love's pure pyx
The rank saliva of her soul.'—Page 21.

And there is a broadness and strength of expression in speaking on certain subjects, which borders closely on indelicacy, and is especially displeasing in a poetess. Yet, in these poems, Mrs. Browning's genius is as apparent as ever. We have always admired, since its first appearance in the *Cornhill Magazine*, the poem entitled, 'A Musical

instrument.' There, by an analogy finely conceived and powerfully sustained, is taught the truth that only through suffering can the poet learn 'that which he teaches in song;' and, moreover, that a chief element in the suffering consists in this, that he who has once been thus raised above his fellows can no more enjoy the luxury of being a 'mere man among men:'

> 'The true gods sigh for the cost and the pain,
> For the reed which grows never more again
> As a reed with the reeds in the river.'

Several of the poems are on subjects connected with Italy, on whose behalf Mrs. Browning's sympathies were strongly enlisted during her long residence there. The finest of these is the 'Austrian Recruit.' That on Garibaldi, though beautiful and even noble in conception, is unwieldy and ungainly in expression.

But the finest poem is her 'Song for the Ragged Schools of London.' That poem is the voice of the enlightened philanthropy of to-day: but it is the voice of that philanthropy, when her keenest sympathies are excited, and when the noblest enthusiasm is filling her heart.

Appended to these last poems are several paraphrases, so called; which are really translations. They are all of them exquisitely musical. If Anacreon himself had been an Englishman, he could hardly have written airier verse than the 'Ode to the Swallow.'

In the management of one fine and famous subject, the interview between Hector and Andromache, in the sixth book of the Iliad, the poetess has succeeded admirably. She has proved herself capable of appreciating perhaps the most exquisite passage in all the range of the old classic poets; and her success has justified her bold attempt to grapple with the difficulties arising from its very perfection. The rendering is on the whole remarkably close; and the poetical form—the rhythm and the phrase—is very happy and effective. One thing only we must blame: the introduction at the most tender point of the passage of the epithet 'sweet,' for which there is no shade of warrant in the original, and which ill befits the mouth of the κορυθαίολος Ἕκτωρ.

All lovers of true poetry will treasure this book as the last they shall receive from Mrs. Browning. But if it cannot detract from, it will not enhance, her former fame.

Documents relating to the Settlement of the Church of England by the Act of Uniformity of 1662. Edited by the Rev. George Gould.

English Puritanism, its Character and History. An Introduction to the above. By Peter Bayne, Esq., A.M. W. Kent and Co.

These documents are very carefully edited. 'The orthography has been modernised, and the punctuation corrected; in every other respect the documents appear in their original form.' The size of the volume necessarily precluded the introduction of many papers which would illustrate the history of that eventful period, in connexion with

whose commemoration this book is published; but those here given are sufficient to meet the wants of all who are not proposing to write a history. Especially the documents relating to the Savoy Conference are very fully given. The book does credit to the editor; and it speaks well for the honesty of the Bicentenary Committee that they are willing to supply to the public at an extremely low price the original records of the struggle which they are celebrating.

We think it is to be regretted that the editor of the Documents did not write the Introduction to them. Why he did not, we are entirely ignorant. But if we may judge from the tract which he published in the Bicentenary series, and from his published lecture on this subject, his temper is not a whit inferior to Mr. Bayne's, and certainly his style is much less objectionable. However, since Mr. Bayne undertook to do it, he ought to have produced a much better book on such a subject and such an occasion. The history, indeed, is very fairly given; though his work would have been more proportionate, and therefore nearer to perfection, had he devoted less space to the earlier age of Puritanism, and discussed at greater length the struggle which ended in the ejection of the Nonconformists from the Established Church.

Nor are we disposed to quarrel with his estimate of the character of Puritanism. He might justly have dealt somewhat more severely with its failings. It would have been better if he had not assumed the righteousness of Strafford's execution, an act whose questionable legality will always throw a tinge of suspicion on the Puritan jurisprudence, if not on the Puritan justice. His estimate of the mental feebleness of Laud is probably extreme, and his admiration of Cromwell is blind; but there is no more partiality than we ought to expect from one who writes about people because he loves them.

Besides which, his admiration of the Puritans does not make him unfair to their opponents. Such a passage as the following ought to disarm some at least of the Anti-Bicentenary criticism. 'Cromwell's Triers, while turning out many incumbents for vice and incapacity, turned out some for "frequent use of the Book of Common Prayer." Of all such what have we to say? We have to express for them unfeigned admiration; to extol their fortitude and virtue; to appeal to their example against the gold-worship and respectability-worship of the present time; and to reflect, in pride and mournfulness, of a time when what we believe to have been the less great and the less noble of the contending parties consisted of men so great and so noble as the Churchmen and cavaliers of the seventeenth century.'

Having so many excellences, this book, if it had been well written, would have served well the purpose of the Bicentenary Committee. But it is disfigured by passages of such unaccountable barbarism that, on reading them, one is divided between amusement at their absurdity, and regret that Nonconformity should in any sense be represented by such a writer. Moreover, Mr. Bayne's bad writing is the less excusable because awhile ago he could write well. But his admiration of Thomas Carlyle has got the better of him; he has become an imitator; and, like all imitators, he resembles his type only in its weakness, not in its strength. His style is too spasmodic; he affects originality;

and his love of finery leads him to disfigure what ought to be grave and vigorous historical writing with similes grotesque and ridiculous. Here is a specimen of his Carlylism:—

'Was it strange if rugged Prynnes, terribly afraid of hell, and with their sense of ecclesiastical æsthetics rather deadened in the pillory and the dungeon, and earnest prayerful Cromwells, for whom the clear shining of Gospel light was the sole beauty of holiness, should have viewed these things with infinite alarm and dismay?' (Page 46.) Almost everything is 'infinite,' 'infinitely wrong,' or 'infinitely right,' with the modern spasmodic school.

Here is a specimen of his eloquent imagery. Speaking of Laud, he says, 'In one man alone did he find sympathy vehement enough to cheer his dark soul, and stroke his raven plumage till it smiled. He sent croak after croak across St. George's Channel to a strong eagle which answered with proud exultant scream.' (Page 47.) He does not tell us what kind of bird that is whose 'raven plumage' is 'stroked till it smiles' by the 'vehement' (!) 'sympathy' of the eagle. And surely the subtle machinations of 'dark Wentworth' were not much like the 'proud exultant scream' of an eagle.*

But our author's imagination is capable of a still higher flight:—

'That stool of Jenny's flying aloft conspicuously was a cinder from the deeps of a true burning mountain.' (Page 52.) If so, we cannot help wondering that Jenny liked to sit upon it.

But the flower of all Mr. Bayne's rhetoric is to be found on page 132:—

'Still the fury did not abate; the pace did not slacken. The bull had its head down, its eyes shut, its mane erect, its tail in the air, and went straight forward. At last, concentrating all its energy into one tremendous toss, it flung the Puritans clear over the battlements of the Church of England.'

We have heard of a 'bull in a china shop,' but we never before heard of a bull's getting upon the roof of a castle, in order to toss people over the 'battlements.'

On page 93 there is a poetic (!) description of Richard Baxter's mental constitution, which, taken in conjunction with such passages as the above, makes us think of Mr. Bayne as a sort of prose Robert Montgomery, with a dash of the grotesque.

It is only fair, however, to say that there are parts of the book worthy of Mr. Bayne's earlier and better style. We are glad to quote such a passage as the following:—

'He who expects in the most illustrious heroes a stainless perfection, or in the worst of men the depravity of demons, may move us with the grandness of poetic passion, but will not ultimately satisfy

---

* Mr. Bayne had Milton's lines ringing in his ears,—

'How sweetly did they float upon the wings
Of silence, through the empty-vaulted night,
At every fall smoothing the raven down
Of darkness till it smiled!'

But he should not be misled by imperfect memory of words apart altogether from their sense.

our judgment. To realise that the men of the past were our brothers, to feel the force of their motives as presented to their own minds, and to attain any apprehension of those high intents of Providence in which men are always more or less unconscious actors, we must pay homage to truth and to truth alone.' (Page 3.)

On the whole, the fairness of the book, its freedom from undue party bias, and the general ability it displays, only make us regret that it is disfigured by literary *gaucheries* which will expose it to not unmerited ridicule in circles from which we had rather that it should extort respect.

English Nonconformity. By Robert Vaughan, D.D. Jackson, Walford, and Hodder.

Dr. Vaughan is one of those gentlemen—in number still too few, though rapidly increasing—whose learning and reputation tend to lessen the palpable difference between the scholarship of the Establishment and that of Nonconformity. The author of 'John De Wycliffe,' and of the volumes on 'Revolutions in English History,' needs no introduction to the readers of this journal. Although, here and there in his pages, we meet with words of doubtful acceptation, such as 'accroached' and 'controversional,' yet his style is clear, interesting, and, for the most part, pure. We do not wonder, therefore, that the Committee appointed by the Congregational Union to promote the commemoration of the 'Exodus of 1662,' intrusted to Dr. Vaughan's hands the preparation of a 'volume on that chapter in our national history, considered in its relation to our earlier ecclesiastical annals and to our modern Nonconformity.' (Preface.) Nor do we wonder that with Dr. Vaughan's tastes and aptitudes, he set about his task *con amore*, especially on the understanding that 'no one besides himself should be in the slightest degree accountable for any statement or expression that will be found in these pages.'

A book with such an origin is sure to be considered as a party production: and we fear that in some quarters it will on that account receive less justice than if it had appeared at a time not signalised by ecclesiastical controversy. We regret this because, except in one direction, the volume is free from an undue party bias. It is not every man who can attain to the sublime impartiality of Hallam. An honest and intelligent man cannot but have his historical preferences: and very few are able to make those preferences yield with perfect submission to the claims of even-handed justice. Yet even when cherished preferences appear in the historian's pages, it is still possible that there may be exhibited at the same time a profound regard for truth —a stern determination to smother nothing favourable to the men or party from which he dissents, and nothing unfavourable to the men or party which he prefers. Nay, the votary of Clio should with a chivalrous honour withhold no consideration which could palliate the evil of a foe, just as he would withhold none that might exalt the good of a friend. If Dr. Vaughan does not rise to this elevation, at least his statement of facts is generally accurate and complete, with one considerable exception; his historical opinions are not distorted by his ecclesiastical preferences.

That one exception is our author's estimate of the motives, principles, and career of the Independent party, between 1643 and 1660. He claims for them, as a party, a singleness of motive and a liberality of sentiment, which he makes to contrast very strongly with the duplicity and narrowness of the Presbyterians. We cannot but regard his *rationale* of the rise of the Independent party as altogether incorrect. It is in short as follows:—The Presbyterians rose against ecclesiastical tyranny and wrong, but only that they might gain for themselves the seats of the expelled tyrants. As they did not understand the principle of toleration, their endeavour was simply to make the Establishment Presbyterian instead of Episcopalian, keeping it just as rigid and exclusive, as harsh and intolerant, as before. But the policy of the Independents was more liberal. They asserted it in the Westminster Assembly; they proclaimed it in the army; and, grappling at length with their rivals, they overthrew Presbyterian intolerance, that they might make way for Independent toleration. This appears to be Dr. Vaughan's estimate of the motives and policy of the Independents, as we gather it from his rendering of the story.

'The grand point at issue between this party and the Presbyterians concerned liberty of conscience.' 'In the autumn of 1644 a committee was appointed to see if a settlement could not be realised which should comprehend the Independents. Nothing could well be more moderate or reasonable than the course now taken by the Independent party; and nothing more partial, unbrotherly, and unwise, than the conduct of their opponents.' (Page 168.) 'Independency, accordingly, with its "great Diana"—liberty of conscience—was denounced from both sides the Tweed as the patron of all heresies and schisms.' (Page 169.)

One or two saving clauses are inserted, as notably Pp. 149, 150; but the impression made by the whole narrative is that the Independents rose to power by asserting the principle of religious liberty, on the ruins of the Presbyterian party, whose narrowness was their perdition.

From this view we entirely dissent. We do not believe that the Independent party as a whole had more enlightened views on religious liberty than were possessed by their political rivals. A few of them spoke outright nobly on the subject; and Cromwell himself understood the grand principle, although as Protector he sanctioned the proceedings of his 'Triers;' in this, however, acting rather as the servant of the general will than in conformity with his own convictions. Dr. Vaughan is obliged to confess 'that Barrow, Greenwood, and the Independent exiles in Holland, supposed the magistrate to have some province in regard to religion. There are passages in which they speak explicitly as to the right and duty of the State to suppress false doctrine and to uphold the true; though the mode and extent in which this may be done, they nowhere clearly state. Robinson says, "That godly magistrates are by compulsion to repress public and notable idolatry, as also to provide that the truth of God in His ordinances be taught and published in their dominions, I make no doubt; it may be also, it is not unlawful for them, by some *penalty or other*, to provoke their subjects universally unto hearing,

for their instruction and conversion; yea, to grant they may inflict the same upon them, if, after due teaching, they offer not themselves unto the Church." This is not language we should have expected from an Independent. But most of the Independents of that time spoke more or less after this manner.' (Pp. 149, 150.) Jacob, quoted by Dr. Vaughan (page 151) as the earliest assertor of the principle of toleration, like Milton, did not desire that it should be extended to Romanists, 'because that profession is directly contrary to the lawful state and government of free countries.'

The earliest honest upholders of the principle of unlimited toleration were doubtless those Baptists who in 1611 published in their confession of faith, 'that the magistrate is not to meddle with religion, nor matters of conscience, nor to compel men to this or that form of religion, because Christ is the King and Lawgiver of the Church and conscience.' In a treatise published in 1614, entitled *Religion's Peace*, the author prays 'that the King and Parliament may please to permit *all sorts of Christians*, yea, Jews, Turks, and Pagans, so long as they are peaceable, and no malefactors.' Dr. Vaughan quotes these passages; but he subjoins, 'If the Baptists generally were prepared to endorse this opinion, certainly it is more than could be said of the Independents. How far the somewhat more limited concessions of the Independents were the result of a more considerate estimate of the circumstances of the times, and of a wiser precaution, we shall not attempt to determine.' (Page 153.)

It would have been more generous if our author had freely conceded to his Baptist brethren the honour they can justly claim, instead of grudgingly allowing that perhaps they were somewhat in advance of the Independents, yet insinuating that the Independents were equally clear as to the principle, though they wisely hesitated to express it fully, owing to a more considerate estimate of the circumstances of the times.

The plain fact is, that the Independent party as such, no more than the Presbyterian party, understood the principle of true religious liberty. The attempt to deny it is useless. Nor, indeed, is it fair to expect of them, living two hundred years ago, a liberality of sentiment at which we have arrived only within the last thirty years, and which some Englishmen are slow to admit even now. That those men had it not was the fault of the age, in which but a few eagle spirits had caught sight of what now seems to us a self-evident truth, that every man has a right to choose his own church and worship, without hindrance or interference from the State.

Neither do we believe that the Independent party seized upon power, in the hope of giving to the country a larger liberty than the Presbyterians were disposed to grant. The Presbyterians wished to extend the pale of the Establishment, so that it should contain them. The Independents wished to enlarge it still more, that it might comprehend them also. There was as much selfishness in the one case as in the other. And so far from the Independents, when in power, being the champions of an unlimited toleration, we find that Cromwell's 'Triers,' including Presbyterians, Independents, and even some Baptists, persecuted more than one who came before them because of his sincere attachment to the Book of Common Prayer.

It appears to us that a tendency to exalt unduly the principles of Independency has been developing itself in the Bicentenary movement. That movement in its commencement proposed to unite Presbyterians and Independents in a common celebration. Hence overtures for co-operation were made in many cases to Wesleyan Methodist ministers,—overtures which were declined, not because the Wesleyan ministers did not sympathise with the desire to do honour to the confessors of 1662, but because they feared that uniting in the movement would commit them to a political action from which they have uniformly and consistently stood aloof. Mr. Stoughton's 'Church and State two hundred Years ago' (still unrivalled in the Bicentenarian literature) was consistent in tone and spirit with the first principles of the movement. Mr. Bayne's Essay, with all its faults, did not lower itself to denominational partisanship. But the publication of certain so-called Bicentenary Prize Essays,—distinctly Congregational in their teaching,—was in our opinion a great mistake. The books themselves were admirable in temper, and in a different connexion would have been perfectly unobjectionable; but their publication under the title of 'Bicentenary Prize Essays' hints strongly at a desire to use the Bicentenary movement for purposes specifically denominational. And now Dr. Vaughan's book seems to give substance to what was before only a half-defined suspicion. It seeks to be fair towards the Episcopalians; failing, however, sometimes, as in the case of Gauden and Sanderson. But the tone of the fourth chapter is unfair both to the Baptists and to the Presbyterians. The author told us in his preface to the 'Revolutions in Religion,' that he wished to write 'as an Englishman.' He should have carried the desire on to his present publication. We do not wish to charge a great and good man with intentional misrepresentation. Possibly the haste with which the book has been prepared may partially account for it; but he has so allowed his prepossessions to interfere with his philosophical calmness and candour, that he seems to have written not 'as an Englishman,' but as an Independent.

We refer with pleasure to the third book, entitled 'English Nonconformity since 1662.' The style has a glow and warmth which is lacking elsewhere, except in a few passages of the two former books. It is entirely free from those irritating expressions which might so easily have been introduced, and which would only have exasperated the ecclesiastical differences now so keenly canvassed. We cannot blame Dr. Vaughan, nor do we think that any honest and intelligent Churchman will blame him, for the free expression of his opinions in the concluding paragraph—a paragraph in the sentiments of which we do not fully concur, but which we quote because it is manly and outspoken, and because it expresses the profound conviction of a large and increasing number of the Englishmen of to-day.

'Nonconformists suffer little now from bad laws. That stage of evil is happily passed away. But let not our Episcopalian neighbours account it strange if there are still signs of discontent among us. Churchmen cannot persecute us after the manner of their fathers; but they often persecute us bitterly, after a manner of their own. The many forms of social disparagement, disownment, and wrong, to which

Nonconformists are exposed as such, it would require large space to describe. So long as our Established Church shall continue to be the great vested interest it is, so long, in ten thousand quarters, all that can be done to discredit, to depress, and to crush us, will be done. Our very strength subjects us to penalty. A weak Dissent might be despised: a strong Dissent is an object of fear; and we all know what the courses are to which fear generally prompts. Were the Episcopalian Church in England a free and self-sustained Church, the motive to this policy would cease, and the policy would come to an end. But the cause is not likely to be removed; and so long as human nature is what it is, a Church conditioned as the Church of England now is, will be sure to be, to a large extent, a persecuting Church. We may be told that we profess to be Christians, and should know how to bear these things. No doubt we should, and we must try to do so,—but let our friends bear in mind that we are men, and not angels.'

With much in this paragraph we do not agree; but we are sorry that there is too much reason for the complaint of Nonconformists. Whilst the honours of the national Universities are denied to all who are not of the Episcopal persuasion; whilst clergymen of the Established Church arrogantly refuse to acknowledge the orders of Nonconformist ministers,—and, in some cases, even attempt to refuse burial to the children of Nonconformist parents; whilst clergymen of the Established Church refuse (as the other day at Folkestone) to sit at a public entertainment because the mayor asks his own Nonconformist chaplain to say grace, and decline, as was the case not very long since at Lincoln, to receive a Wesleyan minister into the fellowship of an Antiquarian Society, unless he will consent to exchange his customary style of Reverend for that of Esquire; whilst a thousand other petty arrogances and insults are being constantly offered to Nonconformists, so long at least will there be need for improvement in the Establishment itself, and need for improvement in the public feeling which allows such insults to be offered.

The uncharitable expressions of some Dissenting ministers during the Bicentenary controversy are not to be excused; and we have not scrupled to express our condemnation of them. But the blind arrogance and intolerance of some of the Anglican clergy are qualities which daily express themselves in slight and contumely. Till these become rarities, Dissent will be embittered.*

---

* Let the notice in the text be our reply to the unworthy note, referring to ourselves and our recent article on the Bicentenary, which appeared in the last No. of Dr. Vaughan's Review, evidently from the editor's own pen. (*British Quarterly* for October.) In this journal, now and heretofore, we have aimed to do Dr. Vaughan justice. But his temper seems to be ill adapted to controversy in which any personal element mingles. That Dr. Vaughan, whether in his own person, or as editor of the *British Quarterly*, should charge the Wesleyan Methodists with hostility, is surely one of the oddest things imaginable. It is the old story. The lamb it is that troubles the stream! Has Dr. Vaughan forgotten Bradford and the Congregational Union? Has the editor forgotten the articles in his own Review? Or shall we go still further back, and remind Dr. Vaughan of earlier matters? Why should there be strife among brethren?

INDEX.

LONDON: PRINTED BY WILLIAM NICHOLS, HOXTON SQUARE.