
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.

APRIL, 1870.

ART. I.—1. *A Bill to Provide for Public Elementary Education in England and Wales.* Prepared and brought in by Mr. WILLIAM EDWARD FORSTER and Mr. Secretary BRUCE. Ordered by the House of Commons to be printed, 17th of February, 1870.

2. *The History and Present Position of Primary Education in England and in connection with Wesleyan Methodism:* An Inaugural Address to the Students of the Wesleyan Training Institution, Westminster, on Feb. 11th, 1870, by the Rev. JAMES H. RIGG, D.D., the Principal. Sold at 66, Paternoster Row.

WE foretold three months ago that the Birmingham League would prove to be a failure; that it would disappoint most grievously its most advanced friends; while, at the same time, its most moderate and most responsible leaders would be held responsible for many sayings and doings of which they could not but disapprove. "The basis of the League," we then said, "is vague and unpractical; the motives which animate its leaders are incoherent, if not contradictory; the constituency of members is altogether heterogeneous." All that we said has been abundantly demonstrated by the history of the League agitation. The London Committee has rebelled violently against the Central Committee at Birmingham, because that Central Committee was not prepared to give up the Bible and altogether to proscribe, frankly and honestly, any sort of religious instruction in the schools. The Welsh Leaguers also, on similar grounds, have lifted up their voice on high till they have made the whole country ring with the sound of their protestation against the Central Committee.

The Welsh advanced Leaguers, indeed, could neither express nor contain their indignation that the chief authorities of the League were not prepared to proscribe and cast off altogether and at once all denominational schools; denying to such, however long established, or successful, or liberal, any fraction of support from the rates or of aid from the national funds.

On the other hand, the Rev. E. A. Abbott, the Head-Master of the well-known City of London School, is only one of many who, having originally joined the League because they believed it to be possible for all sects and classes to unite in national education on a common basis of unsectarian Christianity, which should leave adequate scope for religious instruction, have found themselves mistaken and disappointed in the result. "If a common prayer," he says,* "could not be so drawn up as to be compatible with 'unsectarian' education, what about religious instruction? If the Lord's Prayer was too 'sectarian' for the League, what part of the Bible was 'unsectarian'?" Having attended a meeting on this subject held at Freemasons' Hall, he found that "the members (of the meeting) were divided among themselves whether even the reading of the Bible in common (with exemption where desired) could be sanctioned as sufficiently 'unsectarian.' It was suggested, as an 'unsectarian' scheme, that the pupils should be sorted out on certain religious teaching days into little flocks of sects, each with its separate sectarian shepherd, and that this might be done out of school hours. This would not be against the 'principle' of the League; but to collect rates, or to enforce religious education (even with exemption from the religious part of it), would be contrary to the League's principles."

In another letter to the *Times* of Thursday, March 8th, Mr. Abbott further says: "The members of the League appear to have been divided from the first into what may be called the honest section and the politic section. The former said 'unsectarian,' and meant 'unsectarian'; the latter said 'unsectarian,' and meant anything—anything that would catch members and subscriptions. Honesty and policy have from the first divided the councils of the League; and honesty has proved the weaker. This is intelligible enough, and I need now only point out that the large list of subscribers which lately occupied your pages is likely to impose on the public. It doubtless contains many members who, like myself, can no longer consider themselves members, or have

* See the *Times* for February 25.

been even alienated into active opposition. Enormous deductions must be made from the list; perhaps a half, perhaps even more, are not really members; and the frequent accounts that we read of crowded meetings and enthusiastic votes of assent to the 'principles' of the League, are also to be received with great caution, for it is doubtful whether the meetings have really understood what these 'principles' are."

That Mr. Abbott, in thus writing, is the spokesman of very many there can be no doubt. At the same time we cannot magnify the penetration and foresight of Mr. Abbott, and those like-minded with himself. Had they been familiar with the history of the educational controversy during the last thirty years, had they only studied it as much as they ought to have done, they could hardly have been so far misled. Nor do we impute "policy" to all those who, having adopted the word "unsectarian," finally slip out from any admission whatever of Christian instruction or devotion in the schools. Many of these accepted the word as honestly as Mr. Abbott at first, but have been led, by their inquiries and quasi-legislative attempts, to the discovery that that which is perfectly unsectarian, taking the word *sectarian* in their sense, must be absolutely colourless, must be null and void, or, as Mr. Herbert Fry puts it, in his reply to Mr. Abbott in the *Times*,* that "there is no religious teaching which will fit all sects." But then we have a right to say that Mr. Herbert Fry, and his fellow-agitators of the League, might easily, and therefore ought to, have found this out before they started a blind and headlong agitation, a destructive and denunciatory agitation, on behalf of a well-sounding, but utterly Utopian, project. It is evident enough that as nature, it used to be said, abhors a vacuum, so there is a large class of eager and impulsive minds in this country who cannot live without a political war-cry in the interests of what is called the party of progress. They do not see at present what else to agitate about in England, so they have welcomed the programme of the Birmingham League. It finds them occupation and excitement; it sounds liberal. To many minds it appears to be the more certainly wise and good, and is much the more congenial and delightful, because it affords an effective way of signalising their dislike of the Church of England, and the parochial clergy in general. As a certain proportion of the clergy are really narrow, bigoted, and oppressive on principle, they have themselves to thank for a good deal of

* March 3.

the ill-feeling abroad; their intolerant, oppressive, and sometimes cruel, behaviour to their Nonconformist parishioners, in respect of the Sunday-school attendance of their children, of parish gifts, and sometimes of the burial of the dead, have gone far to add power and popularity to the Birmingham League.

There was, no doubt, a certain amount of truth which gave plausibility to the popular declamations of League orators on the subject of unsectarian teaching. It is, beyond question, possible for a good, large-hearted teacher, on the basis of the Scriptures and his Bible-lesson, so to teach his school, with full moral and religious influence, as that it would be scarcely possible to say to what denomination he belonged. It might, indeed, be laid down that such a teacher would be neither an Ultra-Churchman nor an Ultra-Calvinist. But he might be almost anything between. Now, very many will be ready to say, upon the admission of such a fact as this,—Then why not let us have such teachers as these in all the schools? The answer to this question is two-fold. One answer is, that such teachers, however unsectarian their own spirit, and however large-heartedly Evangelical their faith and teaching, must yet have received their earnest Christian training at some denominational college, and on the basis of a definite dogmatic faith. But the other answer, and the one on which in this place we wish to insist, is that their teaching after all, if judged on the principle of the Birmingham platform—free, compulsory, universal education—is sectarian. It proceeds upon the basis of the Bible-lesson, and that is to be altogether sectarian in the view of a Roman Catholic; and the Roman Catholics most assuredly cannot be overlooked, and must not be wronged, in a scheme of universal education, specially intended to meet the case of the poorest and most ignorant classes. Besides which, to a Positivist, or a Pantheist, or a Deist,—and there are many such in all classes of English society, from the refined apostles of culture downwards,—Christianity in general is sectarian. Even Mr. Bright's summary of undogmatic fundamental teaching of religion and morality, as the Bishop of Peterborough has well shown in his very able speech, delivered at Leicester, is mere antiquated dogmatism, what, in Mr. Carlyle's phraseology, might be described as no better than "Hebrew old clothes," to many an English citizen who claims for himself in the education of his children equal rights with any other citizen.

The League itself, as organised for the purposes of positive legislation, can hardly be said to be any longer in the field.

Its Bill was scarcely shown to the public, and is now withdrawn from view. Its function henceforth is to be the comparatively humble one of criticising Mr. Forster's measure. In this capacity we have no doubt it will do good service. But the observations which we have made are still pertinent to the phase of controversy now before the public. The struggle will now be waged around the School-Boards. The Rev. R. W. Dale, a gentleman whose name we cannot mention without great respect, gave in his adhesion late, and on some points with reservation, to the League. He is now, however, the principal name of strength and high Christian repute left in its array; and he is doing his best to direct its movements to what he conceives to be wise and good ends in the present stage of the controversy. He addressed to the *English Independent*, of February 24 last, a letter in which he proposes that the Bible shall be read in every school, either at the beginning or the close of the school, no child being compelled to be present, and that no "religious catechisms or formularies shall be used in such schools, nor shall anything in support of, or in opposition to, the peculiar tenets of any religious sect or denomination be taught therein."

Now, we agree with Mr. Dale that, in School-Board Schools proper, it would be wise to exclude the teaching of all catechisms or religious formularies. But at the rest of his provisoes a smile rises unbidden. Mr. Dale is conscientiously careful to keep the Bible in the school, and have it read; but it is merely to be read, and the reading may be at the end of the school hours. It is evident that Mr. Dale does not understand the relation of the Bible-lesson as such to the moral tone and the general discipline of the schools which are managed by the best teachers. The Bible-lesson is the teacher's sword and shield; his instrument of "reproof and correction in righteousness" for his scholars. Give him this, and, if he is a model teacher (such model teachers there are in hundreds), he will be able to dispense with personal chastisement and coarse modes of punishment, such as prevailed in the barbaric ages of education, and up to the time (one short generation back) when it was discovered how the Bible-lesson gave both fulcrum and leverage to the trained Christian teacher and trainer. And then what sort of religious instruction and influence will that be which involves nothing "either in support of or in opposition to the peculiar tenets of any religious sect or denomination?" Why, the most popular Christian hymns of the best day-schools would infallibly be regarded as in opposition to the tenets of the

Particular Baptist denomination, as that may still be found in East Anglia, Essex, and Kent. Besides, why is not the conscientious conviction of a man whose sect is perhaps not religious, but philosophical, or merely negative of all dogmatic religion, to be respected, as much as that of a narrow, irreligiously religious, bigot or devotee? We commend the Bishop of Peterborough's speech to the study of Mr. Dale.* Do what he will, Mr. Dale will find himself in this dilemma; he must either insist upon the schools being all barely and dryly secular, or he must admit the *principle* of the existing system, with the safeguard of a conscience clause. He must have his school utterly non-religious and non-Christian, or he must give up the vain attempt to realise a universal unsectarian system of schools.

Three months ago we wrote as follows:—"Denominationalism in England may, with advantage, be made less intensely denominational than it is. The denominational schools in any district might be correlated to a general district board. The rights of conscience might be rigidly enforced on behalf of parents and children in every school. Denominational inspection might be done away. All non-denominational schools might be admitted, on condition of inspection, to equal advantage with denominational or British schools. In a word, the existing system might be disdenominationalised to the utmost extent compatible with the maintenance of denominational interest and energy in the conduct of the schools, and provision made for the development of all varieties of effective education in the future, on the common platform of a nationalism combining variety of form and mode with unity of purpose and effect, so far as the essentials of an education proper to British citizenship are concerned." We urged that it should be "the avowed policy of the Government to chasten the intensity of denominational dogma and separatism by a regard to the demands of national unity, to maintain this unity under the denominational diversity and multiplicity, to recognise only the national element in the school, and, above all, to suffer no ecclesiastical power to take out of its hands the right of effectively overseeing the education of the people." Our last sentence was: "Let the Government come forward with a measure at once Conservative and Liberal, building partly on the past, but yet extending the foundations in order to rear a broader and truly national structure; sacrificing nothing good which has been gained, but opening the way for

* This speech may be obtained of Messrs. Longman and Co.

new ideas and fresh adaptations; the Ministry of Mr. Gladstone and the Vice-Presidency of Mr. Forster will then have earned a special title to the respect and confidence of the English people." In a passage intermediately placed between those we have quoted, we indicated under what conditions we should approve of rating as a "right principle."

That in these passages we gave by anticipation not only a general, but, in most points, a very close description of Mr. Forster's measure, as it has now been actually introduced, is unquestionable. We, therefore, as we have said, have excellent reason to be content; and we need not praise Mr. Forster's bill now, for we have in fact pronounced its eulogy beforehand.

Undoubtedly, however, the Bill is weak at one point. What was needed for the country was, primarily, a measure, or a combination of measures, so designed and adjusted as to ensure habitual regularity of attendance on the part of school-children, and, secondarily, a measure to ensure an adequate provision of really effective elementary schools. What the Vice-President has given us is a measure almost the whole of which goes to the supply of schools, while only one clause, the sixty-sixth, is directed to meet the point of school-attendance, and this clause is permissive and almost exceptional in its character; and even if carried anywhere into effect, cannot, in our judgment, be made practically operative to any great extent.

It is evident that even Mr. Forster, candid and well-informed as he is, has been misled by the outcry and exaggerations of men, with whom in many points he has sympathy, respecting the number of children who go to no school and the want of schools. At one point in his excellently proportioned, fine-toned, and altogether admirable speech, he gave an advantage to pert, impulsive Lord Robert Montague, through his misconception of this part of the problem which he had to solve. Whilst not committing himself to any definite estimate of the number of children in the country who are not sent at all to school, he cited some recent statistics in relation to the town of Liverpool, which were a part of the results of the special inquiry which was made, on the motion of Mr. Melly, as to the state of education in several large towns, and which has just now been brought to a close. According to Mr. Fearon's inquiries and calculations, it appears that in Liverpool, between the ages of five and thirteen, there are 80,000 children, while there are only 60,000 children at school. Mr. Forster's inference was that a fourth of the

children in Liverpool of school age are not sent to school. Such an inference afforded the ex-Vice-President an easy triumph over his successor. Mr. Forster's inference went on the assumption that all the children who go to school at all, ought to go, and, in fact, do go, to school during the whole of the eight years between five and thirteen. Lord Robert affirmed, reasonably enough, that six years of schooling was a fair average for a working-man's child, and showed that, if six years were taken as the average, there ought to be only six-eighths of the 80,000 children at school at any given time during the eight years between five and thirteen, *i.e.* that there ought to be precisely 60,000, that being the very number reported by the Commissioner as being actually at school. The returns reported by Mr. Fearon from Manchester, which were in the same proportion as in Liverpool, and were quoted by Mr. Forster to sustain a similar inference, yielded, of course, under the experienced manipulation of his lordship, a corresponding result. It is certainly remarkable that Mr. Forster should have laid himself open to such a correction; and the instance is exemplary and instructive, as showing how very easy it is for even able and practised men to be misled by statistics, and how little reliance can be placed on the statistical eloquence of those members of the League who make a false muster of hundreds of thousands and of millions to aggravate the features of their case.*

We have small admiration for Lord Robert Montagu. We have no sympathy with his unyielding Conservatism on the education question, in regard to which he evidently considers himself to be the champion of the denominational citadel. We could hardly condemn too severely the taste of his speech on the occasion to which we refer, or the style and tone in which he catechised Mr. Forster—the substance of his questions and challenges, we may add, being as absurd as the taste and manner of their delivery was offensive. Nevertheless, it is certain that his lordship knows a great deal more arithmetic than most Eton boys, and that he ably defended the calculations which he brought forward at the Union Meeting at Manchester. He further tested and confirmed these by a calculation differently worked out, and singularly resembling that which we ourselves published three months ago, by the favour of the Rev. G. W. Olver. We may safely take it now as

* Since the text was in type, Mr. Fearon's report has been published. Mr. Forster's 80,000 for Liverpool (it seems) should have been 90,000. In Manchester the number of children of school age is estimated at from 50,000 to 61,000, while the number who go to school is 40,000, a very full proportion.

established beyond reasonable controversy, that the number of English children, between the ages of five and twelve, who are never sent to school at all, cannot be taken at a larger estimate than 400,000.

It remains, accordingly, that the master evil of the educational condition of England is not that an immense number of children go to no school—the number of children on English school registers is, in fact, very far larger in proportion than the number on the register of the schools of the great American Union—but that the school-going of so very many does them little or no good, in part because of the lamentable irregularity of their attendance, and in part because of the inferior quality of the schools. As to the former of these points, we need add nothing in the present article to the particular discussion of it which made a part of our article three months ago. As to the latter point, all we need to say is, that while about 1,500,000 children have their names on the registers of inspected public schools, about 1,200,000 are numbered as attendants at uninspected public or at private elementary schools for the poor. Perhaps it would not be going too far if we inferred that of the total number of 2,700,000 children one-third (900,000) are attending schools at which the instruction given is almost worthless. It is an excellent point, accordingly, in Mr. Forster's Bill, that it makes provision for stimulating and improving defective schools very largely and effectively, and for providing good new schools where necessary. Only we venture to think that the first and most pressing need is to insure regularity of attendance, and if this were but secured, as we showed in our former article, the direct result would be an immense stimulation to the establishment of good schools, and the transformation of thousands of inferior into really efficient schools. However, Mr. Forster has probably done all that it was in his power to do. He wisely determined to act at once. Any deficiency in his measure not essential and incurable, was a far less evil than delay. Mr. Forster is only Vice-President of the Council. He is not Home Secretary; he is not even—and here all the world joins in Sir John Pakington's generous lamentation that it should have so to be said,—he is not even Minister of Education. What the country needed was a system and combination of indirectly compulsory measures, which would have brought a steady, pervasive, disciplinary pressure to bear over the whole surface of society, wherever labour utters its demand, and holds out its inducements, and down to the lowest depths of bread-winning activity, making it understood

and felt that labour and learning are not to be dissociated, that the one is to help the other, and that the needful school education is to ease the way to the best rewards and occupations of labour. Such a pressure would involve no invidious distinction between grade and grade; it would not necessitate any machinery or intrusive appliance of special police investigation and *surveillance*; it would operate merely as need and occasion openly presented themselves, and in conformity with a principle manifestly just and long recognised in this country, viz. that, when young children are put by their parents to labour, the State has a right to take cognisance of the fact of their being so put to labour, and to take care that the hours and the conditions of labour are such as are not oppressive and injurious to those so young and helpless, that they are not put to work before they are fit for it, or any further than such work is compatible with their due development, physically and mentally, as children and as citizens. Such a pressure, moreover, would be impartial and universal, and would operate throughout the whole country and all the population; it would not, like Mr. Forster's expedient, be merely local and permissive; it would be a great reality, whereas Mr. Forster's provisoes may come to nothing, and are hardly likely to amount to much.

But then such a combination of measures for direct compulsion as we are now speaking of, would have required several Acts to be recast and digested into one whole, many reforms to be effected in existing measures, and not a little new legislation to be worked out; all the measures in question being such as belonged, not to Mr. Forster's department, but to the department of the Home Secretary, because of their relation to manufactures, and all kinds of labour. To compare, digest, and supplement the existing statutes, as it would have been necessary to do, would have been in itself a voluminous and very difficult work. And if Mr. Forster had delayed his measure until the Home Secretary was prepared with a grand Bill, regulating the employment of children, to accompany it, such as might cover all trades, all sorts of labour, workshops, factories, mines, farm-labour, and whatever else, it is certain he would have brought in no Education Bill this session, and doubtful whether he would have been able to do so next session or the session following. Meantime the country was full of clamour on the subject, the need was pressing, a painful and threatening agitation was growing up—the case, in fact, would not brook delay. Mr. Forster has accordingly done his part; Mr. Bruce's Children's Em-

ployment Bill must follow after. We shall probably have such a Bill much sooner than if Mr. Forster had not moved as he has done. When that Bill is passed, Mr. Forster's measure will have fair play. Till then, its full scope will not be known, nor its powers tested and brought out.

It is remarkable, however, that Mr. Forster appears not only to have no authority to promise, on behalf of Mr. Bruce, any legislation in the way of indirect compulsion, but that even where almost all parties are agreed that direct compulsion ought to be applied, the Vice-President encourages no hope of any such legislation. We had thought that at any rate it might and would have been enacted that all indoor pauper children should be removed from the unwholesome influences of the Union workhouse into district schools, and that all out-door paupers should be obliged, in accordance with the principle of Mr. Evelyn Denison's Act, to send their children of suitable age to school, such children's school fees being paid out of the rates. But no, these points are without Mr. Forster's range, they belong to Mr. Goschen and the Poor Law Board, and Mr. Forster cannot deal with them. Indeed, oddly enough, as it seems to us, he appears rather to doubt as to the propriety of extending and enforcing the operation of the principle of Denison's Act. We are reminded, by the evident reluctance of Mr. Forster and the present Government to interfere with the supply and disposal of children's labour by any special enactments, or in any other way than by a law of direct compulsion operating on the parents, of the notable repugnance of the Government of Sir Robert Peel and Sir James Graham, nearly thirty years ago, to limit the hours of labour in factories. Sir Robert Peel's may be said at that time to have been a commercial Government; its sympathies were very strong with manufacturers; its repugnance was very great to interfere with the demands of labour and the hours of labour, even though women and children were the victims of the so-called laws of supply and demand. The Ministers were sustained in their opposition to Lord Shaftesbury's (then Lord Ashley) Bill by such men as Mr. Cobden and Mr. Bright; and the excellent Ten Hours Bill was forced on the Government at last by the power of Christian philanthropy and the voice of the people, giving weight to the arguments of Lord Ashley, supported, as he was, by a large body of non-manufacturing, and therefore, to a considerable extent, of Conservative members of the House. Now the present Government is a commercial Government, and, to a considerable extent, a Government of manufacturers. No

doubt this contributes to its power; it is, in fact, one of its merits. Mr. Gladstone, versatile and highly cultured as he is, is, nevertheless, a true scion of the commercial class, and is full of Lancashire industrial and economical sympathies and proclivities; Mr. Bruce, Mr. Bright, Mr. Forster, are personally identified with great manufacturing industries; Mr. Goschen is a merchant; Mr. Lowe, of Revised Code memory, is the keenest, hardest, driest of the *doctrinaires* of political economy. We like the Ministry none the less that it includes such elements of strength and of experience. But we cannot but trace to the fact that the Government is of such a complexion, the reluctance which we seem to discern in their measures and their manifestoes to do anything which manufacturers might dislike as interfering with the free supply of children's labour for their use. What manufacturers seek is to keep children close at school from four till eight, nine, ten, or eleven, that, within the age when they are not very fit for labour, they may be forced to get as much education as is necessary (many would set down the necessary amount, in the spirit of the Chancellor of the Exchequer and the Revised Code, at a very low estimate); and that, as soon as ever they are hard and big enough to be of use in the great labour-grinding mill of this industrious nation, they may then be continuously available for the employer. We confess that we regard the cry for very early and for continuous labour, viewed in this light, with great jealousy. We adhere, on every account, to the principles which we indicated in our former article:—Up to eight or nine, no wage-labour whatever anywhere; after eight or nine, those only to be suffered to begin any sort of wage-labour who have received a certain amount of education; from eight or nine to twelve or thirteen, all children employed for wages to be employed on the half-time principle; after twelve or thirteen, the child to be available for full employment in labour only on condition that he has received a certain amount of education, special provision being made at each stage to meet cases of natural incompetency. We are aware that this scheme is repugnant to the ideas and predilections of manufacturers generally. But we are convinced that this repugnance in the present case is as much mistaken as was their repugnancy thirty years ago to the Ten Hours Factories Act.

Before we proceed to some criticisms on the details of the Bill, we wish to say one word as to the point of school-provision. We have already described Mr. Forster's Bill as primarily a Bill for the provision of suitable and adequate

elementary schools. We have also stated that about a million and a half of children have their names on the registers of public inspected schools. The accommodation provided in these schools, however, would be adequate to the accommodation of upwards of 1,700,000 children, while the actual average attendance is just about a million. That average attendance is, of course, much too low—much lower than we ought to calculate upon in future. Ninety per cent., however, will probably be accepted by practical and experienced men as a high standard for average attendance, if the attendance were to become as good as could ever reasonably be hoped for in the case of the children of the working classes in this country. It follows from this that the inspected schools, if filled with 1,700,000 scholars in actual attendance, would represent 1,900,000 children on the registers. Of these, however, many even now would be half-timers, and, under a proper provision of Half-time Children's Employment Acts, very many more would be. If there are ten half-timers attending at one time in a school, ten other half-timers may of course be in attendance in their places in their alternate seasons. If the 1,900,000 children in ordinary attendance included 100,000 half-timers, in reality 2,000,000 might be on the books, because only 100,000 would be at liberty to attend at one time. If the Children's Employment Acts were revised and extended and made universal, as they ought to be, certainly 250,000 children might be expected to come under their provisions, and probably very many more. We are quite within the mark, accordingly, in saying that in existing inspected schools there is provision for the attendance of 2,000,000 children out of the 3,000,000 to be educated. In uninspected schools there are at present about 1,200,000 children on the registers. It is probable that these schools, according to the Government standard, would not furnish proper accommodation for more than that number. Still, taking together the inspected and uninspected schools, there can be no doubt that they would afford, on the whole, very fair accommodation for 3,000,000 children; and that, if the half-time system were carried out, as it ought to be, they would accommodate many more. Now, between the ages of five and twelve there are, so far as can be ascertained, not more than three millions of children belonging to the operative classes. In other words, so far as mere school room is concerned, there is already enough in the gross for the full demands of the country, although, no doubt, the distribution of the supply will often be very faulty; that is to say, there

is often too much school accommodation in one neighbourhood while there is too little in another.

But we are well aware that nine-tenths of the private schools for the working classes are altogether unworthy and inefficient, and that two-thirds of the uninspected public elementary (which are chiefly National) schools are also utterly incompetent. What is needed is that uninspected public schools should be so changed and improved in character as that they should all be made both adequate in teaching power and organisation, and thoroughly Catholic and generous in the spirit of their denominational management. If this were done, public elementary schools of the right sort would be available for about 700,000 children more than at present (the actual number in attendance at the uninspected public schools being nearly 600,000); thus raising the 2,000,000 provided for in schools now under inspection to 2,700,000. Private schools for working classes provide, after their own fashion, for 570,000 children. Under Mr. Forster's Bill these schools will either have to be, for the most part, wonderfully improved, or they will be "improved off the face of the earth." We can hardly doubt that the revised Minutes of Council, when they make their appearance, will provide some opportunity of inspection and examination by Government officers for such of these private schools as may desire it. By this means the best of them might be certified and preserved, and, in our judgment, it is not only required by considerations of justice to the teachers, but by a regard to the best interests of education and of the country at large, that all should be done that can be done to insure, as one exceedingly valuable element in the general supply, the due encouragement and the preservation of a class of meritorious and really efficient private schools for the working classes, as well as for those placed above them in the social scale.

The way is now clear for us to present a plain, practical view of the way in which Mr. Forster's measure, as at present drawn, will be brought into working, and will operate especially in relation to existing schools. We cannot do better than show this in the words of an excellent paper in the British and Foreign School Society's Extra Number (for March) of their *Educational Record*:—

"As soon as possible after the Act has become law, the country will be mapped out into education districts, some of which will be large, others small; though the power given to the Education Department to group together parishes will probably prevent very small districts from being formed.

"On or before January 1st, 1871, the local authorities of each district (viz. school boards, if appointed, *or* town councils, vestries, and overseers, *or* two or more persons appointed by these bodies), with the aid of managers and principal teachers of schools, assisted by any paid agents who may be required, will furnish the Education Department with particulars respecting the elementary schools, and the children requiring elementary education, on forms supplied to them for the purpose.

"The accuracy of these returns, and the efficiency of all the schools of the district, will be tested by the Education Department; and, in cases where the school accommodation is insufficient, a notice will be issued, setting forth the number, size, and description of the existing schools, together with the amount and description of school accommodation which seems to the Department to be required. In making out this return, no account will be taken of existing schools, the managers or teachers of which neglect or refuse to fill up the required form, or refuse to allow the inspector to examine the scholars and premises.

"Within *one month* after the publication of this notice, provided there be no appeal from the ratepayers or the managers of any elementary school in the district, and as soon as possible, in case there should be an appeal, a final notice of the requirements of the district will be published.

"*Twelve months* from the date of this, final notice will be allowed for voluntary effort to supply the deficiency; at the expiration of which, if the need still exists, the Education Department may require the formation of a school board.

"Within *twelve months* from the date of the formation of the school board, the deficiency is to be supplied by it. Failing sufficient action on the part of the school board, the Education Department will take the matter in hand at the end of this time, and do what is needful at the expense of the ratepayers.

"If the school boards do their work, there will be, on or before March 31st, 1873, two classes of school districts—*one*, in reference to which the Bill will have no effect at all, save the enforcement of the conscience clause in all schools aided by the Committee of Council, such conscience clause being made a condition of any grant in aid after March 31st, 1872; and *another*, in which the elementary education will be wholly or partially managed by school boards. In districts of the latter class, the elementary schools will be either *private*, and not included in the school lists of the Education Department; or *public*, and reckoned in estimating the available school accommodation.

"The *public* elementary schools will fall into five classes, all of which *may* exist in each district.

"1. Schools managed and supported as at present, but with a conscience clause and undenominational inspection, and having to take children whose attendance is compulsory, and whose fees are paid by the school board.

"2. Schools differing from the above only in having grants in aid from the local board, in addition to, or in lieu of, voluntary contributions.

"3. Schools supported by the school board, under the control of the board itself, or managers appointed by it; and in all other respects being like schools of the first class.

"4. Schools as No. 3, but without school fees—*i.e.* schools for the poor, altogether free.

"5. Industrial schools, in which something is given and required in addition to elementary instruction.

"Existing schools, then, may (A) continue as they are, either (1) being disregarded by the educational authorities altogether; or (2), by accepting the conscience clause and undenominational inspection, entering class 1; or (3), where aid can be obtained from the school board, entering class 2; or (4), with the consent of the managers, be transferred to the school board, either as (1) pay schools or (2) free schools.

"Where a school is working well, the school board will probably appoint the existing committee of that school to be the school managers, and in this case the details of school management will go on much as at present.

"In all of these schools the Bible may be read and taught, unless excluded by the school board; indeed, any religious instruction may be given, subject to the same condition; it being, however, enacted that no child shall be present at such instruction whose parents or guardians make objection in writing."

Such will be the inworking and the outworking of the measure, so far as may now be foreseen. There are two points which, in the first place, as the most salient and those of the most immediate practical concern, it will be well for us to examine. Both of them derive their paramount claim to attention from their relation to the "religious difficulty." The first is the Conscience Clause, and the second is the character of the School-Board Schools, with which in part is implicated a question on other and wider grounds deserving of attention, viz. the constitutoin of these boards.

There are those who seem to imagine that the measure ought to be so framed as to dispense altogether with a Conscience Clause. Indeed, the very name of a Conscience Clause fills with bitter scorn and impatience many of those who assume to be the representatives *par excellence* of the principles of religious liberty and of the widest and most advanced Liberalism. But we must be allowed here to reiterate the pertinent and searching question which Mr. Gladstone put to a member of the League Deputation which

waited upon him on the 9th of last month. How, without a Conscience Clause, are the existing denominational schools to be dealt with? Are National schools, now without a Conscience Clause, to be left without one, and yet to continue in the receipt of annual grants from the national revenue? Or are all existing denominational and British schools to be cut off from the national aid which they have hitherto received? The latter alternative is too strong even for the advanced friends of unsectarian education to urge upon a Minister of State. They cannot quite get to the length of proposing to cast away and disinherit all the societies and organisations to which, during the last half-century, England has been indebted for whatever of educational zeal, knowledge, and beneficence the country has possessed, and for all the progress which has been achieved. All that they venture publicly to ask (as we understand them) is, that in the case of denominational or British schools aided by local rates the religious instruction should be given at a separate hour, before or after the rest of the school instruction, so that children might absent themselves without difficulty and without any detriment to their general instruction. This request, in the case of rate-aided denominational schools, does not appear to us to be exorbitant. But if, indeed, this is all that the wholesale objectors to a Conscience Clause have to ask or suggest about the matter, surely they must see that their resounding and indiscriminating clamour against any Conscience Clause whatever is petulant, unreasonable, even childish. The true friends of Nonconformist rights and of religious liberty in general will still ask whether there is to be no protection for the consciences and the religious rights of parents and children in the case of the thousands of inspected and State-aided National schools which are without a Conscience Clause. These rash and heated denouncers of a Conscience Clause might be playing into the hands of the Archdeacon of Taunton and the men of his party. It is no wonder that some of the extreme and intolerant Church party have cast in their lot with the League.

Mr. Forster's Conscience Clause is not, in our judgment, perfect. We would omit the qualifying words, "on religious grounds," and the last words of the clause, viz. "sending his objection in writing to the managers or principal teacher of the school or one of them." The sub-clause (3) would then stand as follows:—"No scholar shall be required, as a condition of being admitted into, or of attending, or of enjoying the benefits of, the school, to attend or to abstain from

attending any Sunday-school, or any place of religious worship; or to learn any such catechism or religious formulary or be present at any such lesson or instruction or observance as may have been objected to by the parent of the scholar." We would also, as a minor but still useful amendment, omit the word *such* before *catechism* and before *lesson*, and substitute *which* for *as* before *may*. We would, further, under the head or sub-clause (1) of this Conscience Clause (Clause 7), of which Conscience Clause the sentence given above stands as sub-clause (3), omit the words "except with the permission of the Education Department, and on the request of the managers of the school," and so leave the head (1) to read, "The school shall be open at all times to the inspection of any of Her Majesty's Inspectors, so, however, that no such inspector shall inquire into the religious instruction given at such school, or examine any scholar therein in religious knowledge or in any religious subject or book."

We have heard on the best authority of one of Her Majesty's Inspectors, who, in examining the children in religious knowledge, dilated on the distinction between church and chapel, and on the sin of schism; and, for various reasons, we would insist, and we have no doubt that Nonconformists generally would insist, on the absolute and unconditional prohibition of religious examination by Government Inspectors. The National Society may not like it, many clergymen may object to it, but on this point they may as well make up their minds to the necessity of concession. Not a few clergymen, we know, will hail the change as an excellent reform.

Finally, as respects the Conscience Clause, we would have it printed in large characters on a board, and hung up in a conspicuous place in the school. We would so print and place in conspicuous view the whole clause in its three sub-clauses, the first relating to the inspector, the third to the conscience-rights of the parent and child, and the short intermediate (the second) sub-clause declaring that the school must be conducted in conformity with the conditions of the Act "in order to obtain a Parliamentary grant."

Such a Conscience Clause standing continually in the school would exercise a powerful educating effect on all the parties concerned. It would educate the child and the parent in the knowledge and consciousness of their rights as children, as men, as heirs of English liberty, civil and religious; it would educate the clergy (pity it is that some of them have needed such education) in what a respect for conscience and religious liberty

requires from them. And, as the yearly grant would be made dependent on the faithful observance of the clause, and the clause itself would make this dependence known, there can be no doubt that the clause would be extensively effective. The extract we are about to cite from Dr. Rigg's Inaugural Address for the present year will be understood to represent the views of such Wesleyan Methodists as are opposed to the root-and-branch policy of strong Leaguers and are prepared to contend for the right of religious instruction in public elementary schools. Many Methodists are undoubtedly in general sympathy with the objects and spirit of the League.

"No doubt there have been some errors in the history of the educational movement. It was, I venture to say, a weakness and an error in the Government twenty years ago that they yielded to the obstinate immobility of the National Society on the Conscience Clause; it was a far greater error on the part of that society that it persistently withstood the arguments and solicitations of the Government on that point: the immunity of the National Society could not but embolden the Roman Catholics to follow the example and to plead the instance of that society. It is our satisfaction as Methodists to know that from the beginning, and prior to any transaction with the Government, we had recognised the rights of conscience in the deeds of our schools and in their rules and administration. But the worst folly of all, more conspicuous as a blunder than even as an injustice and wrong, has been the policy too often pursued in the Anglican National schools of using coercive influence to compel the attendance of the Nonconformist day scholar at the Church Sunday-school. For this violation of the rights of conscience a retribution has now come, as it was sure to come, on the wrong-doers and on their Church. Many Methodists now swell the number of those who demand, in hasty but not unnatural indignation, the destruction of the denominational system that they may make an end of Church school bigotry. If the National Society and the parochial clergy had been wise, things would never have come to this pass. I do not wish to accuse all the clergy. I have the happiness to know not a few whom I cannot but esteem as men not only of a Christian character, but of a truly generous spirit. But too many have trespassed in the manner I have described.

"The Conference last year instructed your Committee to represent and enforce the views of the Connexion as to the necessity of an adequate Conscience Clause. Such a Conscience Clause, broad and trenchant, you may rely upon it, will have to be accepted by all schools which look for annual Government grants. And when such a Conscience Clause has become a matter universally known, when it is made public in large and conspicuous printing in every public school, when the poor man's child sees it there, and the poor man himself knows it to be his right, when the poor man's minister can

appeal to the law and to the printed and public announcement of it; above all, when the parish clergyman, instead of being urged, as now, by the pressure of his Society, and by the letter of its rules, is made to understand that the Government grant which he seeks is expressly suspended on the strict and full observance of this rule, and that his honour and conscience bind, and public opinion and State authority require, him to keep it, there can be no doubt that such a Conscience Clause will speedily work a searching change in the administration of National Schools.

"Such a Conscience Clause would, I doubt not, be operative. High Churchmen of the class who have hitherto insisted on maintaining the Conscience Clause are so alarmed at the prospect of such a clause being enforced, that some of them are willing rather to accept the secular system than to submit to it. A secular school in a village left to contend against the parson and the squire would not be so fatal to their plans and aims as an adequate and well-understood Conscience Clause. In spite of the unpatronised secular school, with its free scholars, the National school, under due patronage and fostering care, would flourish; and, for the purposes of the semi-Popish High Churchman, it would work more effectually without Government grants than with them, because the grant implies inspection, and inspection means a somewhat high standard of intelligent education and a certificated schoolmaster of some position and independence.

"Such a Conscience Clause would convert many sectarian schools (I apply the adjective here discriminatingly) into really National village schools, to which Nonconformist children might well be sent."

It is continually forgotten by disputants of a revolutionary turn, or of a heated denominational and anti-Anglican temper, that hitherto, with rare exceptions, there has been no Conscience Clause operative in National Schools; that, where there has been, it has been merely a clause somewhere to be found, if searched for, in a voluminous trust deed; and that the Government grant has been in no way dependent on the observance of the clause; while, on the other hand, the deeds of many National schools, and the rules of all, have made it a duty incumbent on the clergyman to enforce, at least as an ordinary condition of attendance at the day school, that the scholar should attend church on the Sunday. The really liberal clergyman, in making exceptions and remissions in the case of Nonconformist children, has often had a question to settle with his own conscience how far he had a right to dispense with the requirements of the National Society's rules and his school deeds. But an Act of Parliament will override all these considerations.* The annual grant, moreover, will

* Earl Nelson writes to the Secretary of the National Union as follows:—"It is stated that to admit a Conscience Clause into a School Deed, *ipso facto*

be made conditional on the observance of the Conscience Clause. Thus the truly liberal clergyman will be free, while the intolerant clergyman receiving a grant will be bound to respect the religious convictions of the parents and children.

We are told, indeed, that after all the Conscience Clause will be evaded. We are told that parents, after all, will not dare to object, and that clergymen, in spite of all, will contrive to influence. Our reply is that, if there is any way of making the Conscience Clause better and more effective, it may and will so be made, when the way of improvement is shown; let the objectors show it. Mr. Forster, the Government, all liberty-loving supporters of religious education, all Nonconformist, and, as we believe, a large proportion of the Anglican supporters of existing schools, will unite to support and sustain any such improvement as can be suggested. But if it be admitted that such a clause as we have suggested, and its public exhibition in every aided school, are all that can be done in the case, then we ask—why object to that which will do good, which cannot fail to do much good, because you fancy it may in some instances fall short of efficiency? There are thousands of schools now without a Conscience Clause, and yet in receipt of Government grants. You dare not propose, you are not so carried away as to imagine, that these schools can be done away, or that the grants hitherto made can or will be with-

---

unchurches the school. A Conscience Clause, by a general Act of Parliament applicable to all, would not do so, and would be, therefore, more unobjectionable." Canon Trevor, also, long known as a strong opponent of the Conscience Clause, addressed the letter we are about to quote to the *Times* of the 11th ult.:

"TO THE EDITOR OF THE TIMES.

"Sir,—As it has fallen to my lot to take part in resisting the so-called 'Conscience Clause' imposed in certain cases on the managers of Church schools, I hope you will permit me to explain that the same objections do not apply to the regulations contained in the 7th section of Mr. Forster's Bill. The clause hitherto demanded and resisted was a clause in the trust deed of the school, impairing its denominational character, and pledging the managers beforehand to a questionable compromise to meet a speculative grievance, in the existence of which we did not believe. Mr. Forster's is a clause in the Act of Parliament leaving no power of selection to the Government of the day, requiring no bargain with the school builders or managers, and involving no compromise of religious convictions. It is simply a condition imposed by Parliament on the receipt of public aid, and taking no effect whatever till an attempt is made to violate it. To such a condition I have never had the slightest objection; indeed, I have more than once suggested it.

"This section of the Bill has been accepted without a dissenting voice by the Convocation of York, and the 'religious difficulty' never need more be heard of except from the undisguised advocates of the purely secular system.

"Mr. Forster is undoubtedly entitled to the merit of removing this obstacle out of the way. The very phrase 'Conscience Clause' is wisely banished from his Bill, and it would be a blessing if Parliament and the Press would follow the example."

drawn, if the managers express their readiness to respect the rights of parents and children under a Conscience Clause. Then why not try to secure the best possible Conscience Clause? Why flout the endeavours of those who are trying to do all that can be done on behalf of the rights of the parents and children? Is it really better to leave all these schools without the protection of a Conscience Clause, and still to leave them the annual grant?

But we have shown that such a clause as we have defined, made public as we have described, will, beyond question, do good. It will reverse the conditions under which thousands of schools now work, and it will bring the eye of public opinion and the vigilance of undenominational Government inspection to bear upon the school administration. It will prohibit and make punishable, by a serious fine, all cases of the infraction of conscience, and will appoint a strict and experienced staff of inspectors to take cognisance of all such cases. There will of course remain, after all, means of influence which would find their way into any sort of school, and which no parliamentary enactment could provide against. There is now, not far from Maidstone, a public school for children of all denominations—by no means a National or in any strict sense a denominational school. Nevertheless, the clergyman of the parish visits this undenominational school now and then, and sometimes when he comes talks to the children. One day he brought with him into the school some ladies and a basket or two. They produced from their stores bottles of lemonade and some cake or buns. Then the village parson told those children who went to Church school, or who wished to do so, to come forward. Them he and his feminine fellow-helpers treated to lemonade and cake; the other hapless children, chapel-goers all, were left without. Against such tactics as these, occurring now and then in obscure villages, no measure passed by Government could afford a defence. Such cases must be dragged into daylight, that the wretched and infinitely petty bigots, whether of the clerical or of the "silly women" order, who perpetrate them may be exposed in the pillory of public notoriety to the scorn which they so richly merit.

Nor can any educational measure whatever, or any Conscience Clause, avail of itself, or all at once, to infuse manliness and a worthily independent spirit into the semi-pauper, serf-like sons of the soil. In spite of all that any Act of Parliament can do, many of these will still cringe to squire and parson, however they may dislike Church or Church Cate-

chism. Set them upright on their legs, and they will go down on their knees when the living images and symbols of Church and State, of territorial power, and of administrative influence, come within their view. Instruct them in their rights, and make their rights equally secure and plain, they will, notwithstanding, go out of their way to offer up their rights and their allegiance to others. What is to cure this? Leaving out a Conscience Clause, or bringing in an "unsectarian" school? Among such a population, rates for an unsectarian school could hardly be levied; and, if such a school were set up, it would remain empty, even though it were a free school, while the children of such parents would be sent to the school of the parson and the squire. To do away with the cringing subserviency complained of, more, much more, is needed than any educational measure can supply. The relations of the labouring peasantry to land and cottage need to be revolutionised, the pauper condition to be redeemed, and the pauper prospect to be removed away, before the abject spirit can be taken out.

Accordingly, we do not admire either the wisdom, or the candour, or the patriotism of those who, in such a condition of things, can do nothing but abuse the Conscience Clause. We cannot but suspect, that being intent, mainly for political or ecclesiastical party reasons, or because they dislike religion and religious instruction altogether, upon a sudden, violent, and wrongful revolution, they are determined to decry and denounce all measures of reform, and to denounce them all the more, the more reasonable and likely to be efficient they appear to the mind of the unprejudiced.

After all, it cannot be denied that a large part of the feeling on this subject of the Conscience Clause is but the result of imagination and theory. The real grievance is one thing; the grievance about which men, whose strongest passion is jealousy of the Anglican clergy, or of religious instruction and influence generally, have lashed themselves into rage, is quite another, and, to a large extent, an imaginary thing. The wrong which the clergy have done is that of making their day-school the engine and instrument for forcing Methodist and Dissenting children to attend church and church-school on Sunday. The imaginary evil, which excites to wrath the people of the towns who know nothing of the matter, is some supposed violence and corruption forced upon the tender minds of children by means of the lessons taught in the day-school and on week-days. Now of this there really has been very little. National schoolmasters do not themselves teach

sacramental mysticism or ecclesiastical superstition. With rare exceptions, their teaching is simply Scriptural, is plain and practical. What the clergyman teaches is of comparatively less consequence. Children under ten or eleven are not very receptive of such doctrines as those which prevail respecting baptismal regeneration, the real presence, and, in a word, "the extensions of the Incarnation." Not one clergyman in a hundred has acquired the very difficult art of so addressing children in a school-gallery as to engage and impress, and convey real ideas into their minds. The children of Dissenters generally have no innate or acquired reverence for the parson or his doctrine, even although he should wear his surplice in the school. A few lessons of the doctrine of their own meeting-house, and the air of their Sunday-school, will take the taste out of their mouths, and leave them, with their parents, most self-satisfiedly convinced that the clergyman, however good and kind a gentleman, is in a pitifully benighted and deluded condition as to Gospel doctrine. Then, as respects the Catechism, Baptist children learn about being "made a child of God in baptism," as about "godfathers and godmothers," merely as an exercise of memory. They know that what they learn by heart is, so far as they are concerned, simply unreal; and, although they know they are expected to learn it, they are sure they cannot be expected to believe it, and so the whole catechismal exercise becomes to them a matter of mere repetition. The one thing that redeems it is the questions relating to their duty to God and their neighbour. These they feel to be good and true; and this feeling so far qualifies the pity they feel for those children, who are expected not only to learn but to believe, and on Sundays to hear expounded and applied by the parson, what they are strongly enough taught to look upon as a pitiful Catechism, which has not very much of genuine chapel doctrine as to faith, salvation, and holiness about it, from first to last. Let these Nonconformist children have their Sunday for chapel and their own Sunday-school, and they will, during the six days of the week, and in the day-school, survive the clergyman's distinctive doctrine. Nay, they will not only do this, but will also get a great deal of good from the plain and sound teaching, both secular and religious, of the day-school master or mistress.

We do not say this because we think it desirable for Nonconformist children to learn the Church Catechism. Far from it; everything unreal is a moral evil. But yet we would have it seen and felt where the real pinch of the question lies. For

the most part, if the Sunday is saved, the effect of the week-day catechetical instruction will be, that the Methodist and Baptist children will look upon Church peculiarities as curious and pitiful follies, and will by no means feel themselves very painfully aggrieved by them. But to keep the children at church on the Sunday is indeed a cruelty and oppression which pierces deep into their heart. Now, it is the special merit of Mr. Forster's Conscience Clause, that it puts the Sunday-school and Sunday-service rights of the child and his parent into the most prominent place. This clause, joined to a little wholesome publicity, will soon make an end of the odious form of oppression of which we have been speaking.

It was this form of oppression of which Dr. Rigg and Mr. Olver spoke with so much emphasis at the Manchester meeting of the Educational Union. It has been the custom of the clergy to ignore this complaint of Dissenters. They seem to have made it almost a general rule to assume that to take to church on Sunday those whom they instructed on the week day, was a plain right that no one could dispute. They have assumed that the only complaints possible must relate to the matter or manner of religious instruction during the week. They have sailed aloft in entire unconsciousness that *this* was the real grievance. Hence they have been able to declare that they meet with no complaints, or scarcely any, in regard to the teaching imparted in their schools. "No Dissenters objected to anything they taught;" they forced no catechism or religious instruction on parents or children; there were no cases of oppression; even Inspectors met with none, heard of none. As if Inspectors were likely people to hear of such complaints; as if they could at all hear officially of complaints which related not to the teaching in the school, but to the influence used to force the day-scholars to the Sunday-school. If the oppressed parents had only dared to appeal to the press; if the Church of England laity at large, much more the general laity of the country, had only been aware of the policy systematically pursued in not a few parishes, this form of tyranny would long ago have been put down by public indignation. The letter from Dr. Rigg to Mr. Prebendary Meyrick, from which we are about to quote some extracts, is one of the results of the Manchester Union meeting. It will explain itself, and we think it opportune to avail ourselves of the present occasion for publishing the passages we quote. It would not have been written but for Mr. Meyrick's demand that Dr. Rigg should either prove his cases or publicly retract

his statement; and it has not been before published, because the writer was unwilling to publish anything during the earlier stages of the educational controversy which might have a tendency to add to the feeling against the oppressive conduct of many of the rural clergy which has grown so high in Methodism:—

"130, Horseferry-road, Westminster, S.W., 26th Nov., 1869.

"My dear Sir,—On my return home I find your letter of the 23rd inst. . . . At Manchester you stated something to the effect, as well as I remember, that you had never, or that you had never of late, heard of any cases of oppression of conscience in the schools of your district, and that you had never heard of any complaints of such cases.

"In reply, I felt it my duty to state that 'from the self-same counties which you represented, the Methodist Conference received year after year grievous complaints of religious intolerance in the management of National schools.' Your negative experience I did not deny; I did but affirm an opposite experience on the part of the Methodist Conference. Your testimony to your own experience is not impugned, but only the inference which might have been drawn from that experience. As was afterwards shown by my friend, Mr. Olver, you were one of the most unlikely parties to hear of such complaints. . . .

. . . "In May, 1867, the Norfolk District Meeting (embracing Norfolk and Suffolk, and part of Cambridgeshire) having found serious injuries to result to Methodist Sunday schools from the oppressive policy pursued in the management of National Schools, and, in particular, that two Sunday schools in one circuit had thus been destroyed, passed the following resolution:—

"'Resolved: That this meeting, while it feels called upon to make continued and renewed efforts in the promotion of Day and Sabbath School Education, at the same time deplores the oppression on the part of clergymen of the Established Church which some of the Superintendents report and complain of, and trusts that some Connexional effort may be made to counteract these oppressive influences.'

"In May, 1868, the following resolution was passed:—

"'That this meeting would repeat its earnest desire that Connexional effort may be made to counteract the oppressive influence exerted by clergymen of the Established Church in opposition to our Sunday Schools, especially in rural districts.'

"In May of the current year it was resolved and recorded that 'our efforts are greatly impeded by the illiberal spirit and conduct of the clergy of the Established Church.'

* * * * * *

"You asked me privately at Manchester whether the cases referred to were cases of inspected schools, or of National schools not

inspected. I have now before me the names of a considerable number of parishes and of National schools in Norfolk and in Suffolk in connection with which complaints of intolerance have been made at the Norfolk District Meeting. On referring to the Blue Book, I find that all these are cases of schools which are either in the receipt of annual grants, or, as having received building grants, are under inspection.

. . . "I think it of some importance to add that the District Meetings are assemblies of the ministers and leading laymen connected with Methodism throughout the District, and that the resolutions I have quoted above were occasioned by statements made in the Sunday and Day school schedules returned from the various circuits in the district, and by the oral communications of ministers and lay gentlemen from various localities.

"I am obliged to add that, parallel with these complaints from Norfolk, Suffolk, and Cambridgeshire, during several years past have been complaints, emphatic and reiterated, from Lincolnshire, East Yorkshire, and other Eastern counties, through their respective district meetings. The records are now before me. Of late, too, there have been heavy complaints from Essex. And, besides these, from Somersetshire, Wiltshire, Hampshire, and other predominantly agricultural parts of the kingdom, we hear the like accusations. . . .

"The feeling against such intolerance as I have referred to has risen high in our Connexion. The patience with which it has been endured is exhausted. Such denials as yours do but exasperate the feeling of indignation. At this moment there are in our Connexion those who, justly aggrieved by such wrongs as you and others ignore or deny, are in earnest to bring the denominational system to an end. Those of us who do not wish the denominational system to be destroyed will be met by no argument which will produce so powerful an impression as the intolerance and oppression of many of the clerical managers of schools."

In regard to all such wrongs as those referred to in the foregoing letter, Mr. Forster's Bill will be a great educating power, a public lesson of liberty and popular rights, both for the oppressor and the oppressed.

We turn now to the case of the new School Board and rate-sustained schools. It will be observed that the School Board, by this Bill, is only to be constituted in districts which, after the assigned interval, remain deficient in educational provision of the right sort. The educational deficiency in such districts may be supplied, either simply and directly, by the establishment of School Board schools, or indirectly and distributively by the School Board making use of existing schools, or by both these methods together. In some districts

it would be much wiser for the School Board to avail itself of existing schools than to set up new schools of its own. Of course, no favour must be shown to any particular existing school, and this is provided by the Bill. If any one existing school, denominational or British, receives aid from the School Board to enable it more precisely and more adequately to provide, in its own sphere and measure, for the educational wants of the neighbourhood, similar aid must be proportionately given to every other public inspected school which is willing and able to do the needful educational work. This is the principle of working which was in our mind when, three months ago, we suggested that "the denominational schools in any district might be correlated to a general district board." On such a plan there will be strong security for the working of a Conscience Clause. And it would afford an easy and happy mode of introducing the operation of District School Boards. We are no exception to the general rule of disliking and distrusting the School Boards, as proposed to be constituted. But, still, we have long been convinced that district boards and local authority and responsibility are necessary, in order to the complete solution of the educational problem. Centralisation, alone and apart, has been carried quite far enough. We do not object to centralisation; it is the necessary condition of high and masterly organisation. But, besides the great central brain, there need to be ganglia distributed throughout the system. There must be local centres of sympathy and influence; local subcentres of intelligence, sensibility, and activity. If local interest is to be excited and sustained, and local resources are to be brought adequately under contribution, there must be district organisation with local centres.

The *crux* of the question, however, has respect to the other mode of supplying local necessities by means of local help and direction, the direct method of setting up School Board schools wholly or mainly dependent for direction and support on local board management and local rates. It is alleged that, according to the Bill, these may be denominational schools, Anglican, or Methodist, or Roman Catholic, or that they may be British schools. We do not precisely so construe the Bill or understand Mr. Forster's speech. It is true that it is left open to the School Board to settle the religious question in these schools as they think best,—a latitude of discretion, of which, as left in widest indefiniteness, we do not ourselves approve. But no School Board school can by possibility be, strictly speaking, a denominational school. De-

nominational schools must be schools under the management of denominational committees, if not settled on denominational trusts; and the denominational committees which manage denominational schools must be committees appointed by the respective denominations, and not by the School Board. The School Boards have, however, undoubtedly, according to the Bill as it now stands, power to decide that a school in any locality be taught by a denominational schoolmaster, that the denominational catechism be there taught, and that the denominational minister be appointed the minister of such school, and have authority to oversee its religious instruction. It is plain enough that such indefinite powers ought not to be entrusted to a School Board. We hope that, before this article is published, Mr. Forster will have accepted Mr. Baines' amendment, excluding all creeds, catechisms, and denominational formularies from School Board schools proper. We are convinced, however, that it will be necessary to go farther. Not only creeds, but clergymen, of whatever denomination, must, in their denominational and ministerial character, be excluded from School Board schools. No one ought to give any religious instruction in those schools but the appointed and responsible teacher or teachers. To interfere with the Bible lessons, and with the moral instruction on a Christian basis, of a school master or mistress of approved character, who has been trained to give Bible-lessons, and to govern the school, and train the scholars by Christian influence, would, as we think, be the utmost folly of ignorant and intolerant anti-Christianity; but we would leave the whole matter in the hands of the teachers alone. Good and capable teachers, large-hearted and successful child-trainers, do not teach religion in a sectarian spirit, or on the lines of a hard and dry dogmatism. The religious difficulty is not of their making. Bitter and bigoted infidelity, and the dry, bloodless type of Unitarian heterodoxy, have combined with hierarchical intolerance and oppression to nurse up the religious difficulty to its present dimensions; and those men whose strongest feeling is a dislike of Evangelical Christianity will do their best to prevent its being done away.

But the nation will never consent to go the length of Mr. Winterbotham and the more advanced Leaguers, in decreeing that in School Board schools the school teacher shall be prohibited from giving any religious instruction or using any religious observance. Children cannot be morally trained on the basis of ethical philosophy or political economy; indeed,

such moral training has not been found practicable even for men and women. Mr. Winterbotham's amendment would really exclude all moral training from the schools. This, in the department of children's education, would be a regression to the ages of barbarism, before training was known. The Bible-lesson must go out, and flogging must come in again.

The history of the origin and development of the admirable modern methods of child-training should not be forgotten by those who undertake to direct public opinion on the question now before the country. David Stow, the Christian philanthropist, was the inventor of "the Glasgow system." The Glasgow system has furnished the basis and substance of all the modern science of training. Christian sympathy and self-denial have been the great source of power and inspiration in all our recent educational progress. The discipline which is now universally applauded could only have been developed under Christian influence. The very school hymns, the tunes, the maxims, the moral tone and training, are all the growth and fruit of Christian influences. No secular platform could have produced them. No secular system can sustain them. The stream can hardly rise higher than its fountain-head. To expect to retain the life and methods of the best modern models of teaching and training after the Christian spirit has been cast out as though it were a demon to be exorcised, is as reasonable as it would be to expect a mechanical agency under galvanic influence to perform the functions of life.

It is evident that such School Board schools as we have described would closely resemble what are known as British schools. The teachers employed in them, however, would, we imagine, be most frequently teachers who had previously been employed in connection with National parochial schools. Such teachers, of a fair quality, could be engaged for School Board schools at a much less cost than teachers of any other class, except, perhaps, the lower and less able sort of British teachers. We should not wonder if many of the School Board schools should turn out to be failures, which no method of compulsion that Vestry or Town Council can devise will avail to fill with scholars. In that case, the Board may find it their wisdom to let their schoolroom at an easy rent to the denomination or society which can furnish the best security that the needful education shall be given in an unsectarian spirit.

The constitution of the School Board is only to be defended upon the ground that it furnishes the foundation for the

mastery of the religious difficulty. The entire experience of the Poor Law Board, and of the Sanitary Department, forbids us to expect much enlightenment, patriotism, or moral disinterestedness in Boards appointed by Vestries and Town Councils. Nor is the parochial division adapted to serve as the geographical unit in the development through the country of Mr. Forster's plans. It ought not to be possible for any very small parish to have its separate School Board. All parishes of less than a certain population ought to be annexed to another parish. Except in the case of very wide or very populous parishes the rule ought to be combination. A vestry representing two parishes would be much more likely to be fair and impartial, and very much more likely to be active and working, than the vestry of a separate parish. Three parishes, when the combination would not be too large, would again be very much better than two.

On the whole, however, we can hardly doubt that, at least for the present, the Vice-President has acted wisely in excluding all other but local elective representatives from the Boards. Any infusion of other elements would abate the sense of local interest and responsibility, and might bring in a suspicion of class or caste influence. The purely local and elective character of the Boards, in fact, enables the Bill to devolve upon them a purely local responsibility and authority, both as respects the religious difficulty and the question of compulsory education.

As respects this last question, we do not think it worth while to say much. All parties alike object to the indefinite powers granted by the Bill to the local authorities. We do not, however, apprehend that the powers given will be much used; if they were unwisely pressed, they would prove to be a dead letter.

We have confidence in the patriotic moderation, as well as the determination and earnestness of Parliament. We have no fear that the Government will yield to undue pressure on either side. Their measure is unpalatable to the National Society; but that society is not so bereft of common sense in its counsils as to oppose the Bill. It is odious to pure secularists; but it is really acceptable, in its main features, notwithstanding all the clamour of the League and the strong politico-ecclesiastical bias which prevails in the Congregational Union, to many of the ablest and weightiest men of the Congregational and Baptist communities, and of the Nonconformists generally. The Methodists will certainly not unite to oppose it, whatever a few individuals may choose to say or do. The liberal-

minded supporters of denominational schools give the Bill, on the whole, their strong support. It happily hits the general tone of the House of Commons, which is not strongly *doctrinaire* on the one side or the other. It will be amended, we have no doubt. Year after year, also, we doubt not, measures for its further amendment will be introduced. But it will, substantially unaltered in its main features, take its place in the legislation and the Parliamentary history of our country as the fundamental measure for the permanent organisation and adequate extension and improvement of public elementary education; and, with all its imperfections, whether of conception and general scope, or of detail, it will honourably hand down Mr. Forster's name to posterity as a powerful and beneficent minister and organiser of education for his people. Such a distinction will well befit the son of the devoted and beneficent Quaker philanthropist.

ART. II.—1. *Raphael.* VON ERNST FORSTER. Two Vols. T. O. Weigel: Leipzig. 1867, 1868.
2. *Vite de' piu eccellenti Pittori, Scultori, e Architetti.* Firenze, 1550—1568; and Ed. Lemounier, Florence, 1846. Twelve Vols.
3. *Rafael von Urbino, und sein Vater Giovanni Santi.* J. D. PASSAVANT. Two Vols. Brockhaus: Leipzig. 1839.
4. *Histoire de la Vie et des Ouvrages de Raphael.* QUATREMERE DE QUINCEY. Paris. 1824.
5. *Les Musées d'Italie. Musées de France.* Par LOUIS VIARDOT.
6. *Coindet's Histoire de la Peinture en Italie.*
7. *A New History of Painting in Italy.* J. A. CROWE and G. B. CAVALCASELLA. Vol. III. 1856.
8. *History of Our Lord in Sacred Art.* Two Vols. Mrs. JAMESON and LADY EASTLAKE.

THERE are a few great questions, around which the tide of human interest perpetually ebbs and flows, but from which it never finally recedes. As much may be said with truth of a few great names, perhaps of none more truly than of Raphael Sanzio, of Urbino; though to most of us, the man, as distinguished from the artist, is little more than a name. We are more or less acquainted with his work. The pictures which, rightly or wrongly, are attributed to him are well known to the art-loving public; but, to the best informed, the outlines which should render to us the portrait of the man are usually broken, dim, and unfamiliar. The key to this lies probably in the exceptional success of his busy career and in its speedy close. The notices by contemporary hands of, beyond all comparison, the most successful artist of his age, are singularly few and meagre. Should the public and private records of Italy ever be thoroughly explored, we may possibly gain many details of his character and history now unknown. Meanwhile, for those to whom original research is impossible, the sources of information respecting Raphael are, first and mainly, Vasari's *Biography*, and Passavant's *Rafael*; then the article on Raphael in Crowe and Cavalcasella's new work on Italian painters; lastly, the two

volumes by Ernst Förster, with which this article is chiefly concerned. These volumes undertake to present the few facts relating to the artist's personal history, and the many disputable points belonging to his work, cleared, as far as possible, from the inaccuracies which surround some of them in Vasari's narrative, as well as from the long and often technical discussions in which Passavant has enveloped them. Passavant is, undoubtedly, the first foreign authority on Raphael. Learned and exhaustive in its range, his voluminous work exactly suits the student whose appetite demands a liberal diet of literary uncertainties—a type hitherto more common in Germany than in England.

Mr. Förster is well known in Germany as an art critic of very considerable ability and experience. His opinions, where they differ, as they sometimes do, from so formidable an authority as Passavant, are, at any rate, entitled to the consideration which attaches to a long course of patient and enlightened study. The well-known questions with regard to certain pictures, which divide, and probably ever will divide, the judgment of the very few persons competent to form an opinion upon them, are discussed by Mr. Förster with a skill and candour eminently scholarly and philosophical, and cannot fail to secure a respectful hearing for the author, even where his conclusions are as little fitted to carry irresistible convictions as those of his opponents. In the absence of new facts a high degree of probability is mostly all that can be attained. Mr. Förster treats Passavant's work with ample honour. Not so Vasari's, whose easy-going narrative, with its often doubtful facts, and now and then downright blunders, is not likely to be acceptable to modern criticism.

Mr. Förster begins with a careful summary of the state of art at the time of Raphael's birth. To enter into this would lead us beyond the limits of the present article; our object being less to analyse Mr. Förster's book, than to gather, so far as may be, the scattered facts relating to the person, life, and work of Raphael, and then to realise for ourselves what sort of nature it was which carried his transcendent gifts; how far he was moulded by, and how far he escaped, the complex influences of his age; how he bore his marvellous honours; and how he viewed the grave problems of life and destiny, which lay like dark shadows near, though beyond, the golden pathway of his art.

During the last twenty years of the fifteenth century the Emperor Maximilian in Germany, Charles VIII. in France, and our own Henry VII., were the chief holders of

imperial power in Europe. Through this same period the Roman Pontificate was filled by Innocent VIII., and then by Alexander VI., the infamous Roderic Borgia. Lorenzo de' Medici, meantime, had ruled and died at Florence, while Florence herself, having passed through her brief season of enthusiasm for Savonarola, had given up her idol and confessor to a martyr's death, and had scattered his ashes to the Arno. Among the many minor changes which had taken place was the elevation (in 1474) of Count Frederic, of Montefeltro, to the dukedom of Urbino. The new duke straightway set to work to change his narrow ancestral castle into a palace befitting his now princely dignity. The best artists were summoned to give their aid, and the duke succeeded in erecting a residence, which, in magnificence, was out of all proportion to the position of its owner. In 1484 he died, and was succeeded by his son Guidobaldo, still a child. There is a picture of him in the Colonna Gallery at Rome, said to be the work of Raphael's father. The face is delicately painted, and the picture is remarkable for its lustrous, gem-like colour.

Duke Guidobaldo married in 1489, being then in his seventeenth year, Elizabeth Gonzaga, daughter of the Duke of Mantua. Falling into feeble health, he left the care of presiding over his court to his very competent wife. Count Baldassare Castiglione, in his *Cortegiano*, has left a portrait of her and her surroundings drawn in the courtier fashion of the day. It is curious in itself and interesting, as giving us, with rare minuteness, a sketch of the best society of the Italy of those days. It has besides a special interest here, as nearly all the persons constituting this brilliant circle were more or less the patrons and associates of Raphael. Their gatherings were held in the sumptuous drawing-rooms built by Duke Frederic; the duchess presided; in the courtly language of the narrator, "it was she who united all, so that greater harmony or a heartier affection could not have subsisted among brethren than did in her presence." She was seconded by the duke's widowed sister, Johanna Dilla Rovere, Duchess of Sora, of whom we shall hear again. A third lady, Emilia Pia, was a near connection, being widow of Antonio, of Montefeltro, natural son of Duke Frederic.

In attendance on these ladies was the Count Castiglione, author, scholar, and diplomatist; Julius Medici, brother of Leo X.; Cardinal Bembo, afterwards private secretary to Leo; Cardinal Bibiena, whose name is so closely connected with Raphael's (all preserved to fame in the portraits

of them by the great painter). In addition to these were Aretino, most vain and irascible of men, whose complaints of Titian's bad painting of his jewels and robe amuse us still; Count Ludovico Canossa, for whom Raphael painted a Nativity, which princes coveted in vain; and Cristoforo Romano, the much-esteemed sculptor of his day.

It is clear that the duchess had a genuine taste for mental qualifications in her courtiers. She gathered them around her nearly every evening in the week to hold a sort of literary tournament, in which wit and coquettish raillery were the weapons—tempered, if we may believe admiring contemporaries, to the finest edge. "The virtues above all others desirable in a lady-love, and the faults she might be permitted to possess," is proposed as a subject of discussion by Pallavicini. Cesare Gonsago thinks the inquiry too delicate, and proposes, instead of it, "that in all men there is a spice of madness, and that the company do proceed to investigate its particular development in each person present." Fra Serafino gravely suggested, that such an inquiry might be more easily begun than ended, and presented for consideration a curious fact (we presume a discovery of the good gentleman's own), viz. that ladies, as a rule, dislike rats, but have a fancy for serpents. Aretino, whose excellence in this elegant trifling had gained for him, some three hundred years before Jean Paul, the sobriquet of the "Only One," had his answer ready, and descanted at large on the dangerous arts of a charming woman, with her serpent-like subtleties and fascinations.

The conversation sometimes attempted a more ambitious flight. Bembo proposed to discuss the relation of beauty to the passion of love. Ludovico Canossa following him propounded the query, What qualities and acquirements should be possessed by a model courtier? and maintained some practical skill in the fine arts to be indispensable. "Do not be surprised," says the Count, "that I demand from nobles these acquirements, which have been supposed hitherto to belong to another class. In ancient Greece was it not precisely the children of the first families, who were permitted to practise painting as the noblest of the free arts—an art forbidden to slaves? Assuredly, he who has no reverence for art must be without soul." A discussion on the respective merits of painting and sculpture followed. Count Canossa expressed himself warmly in favour of the former, whereupon the sculptor Romano rejoined, "I really believe you say that contrary to your secret convictions, and only from your love to

Raphael. I can well understand that, acquainted as you are with the wonderful excellence to which he has carried painting, you should think it impossible for sculpture to attain to a like perfection; but then you should tell us that your praises are rather for the artist than the art." The Count, whose susceptibilities as connoisseur and art critic were somewhat roused, answered rather shortly, "I was not speaking from partiality for Raphael. Do not suppose that I am ignorant of the achievements of Michael Angelo, yourself, and others, in sculpture. I was speaking of art, not of artists."

In the meantime, the gigantic game of "beggar my neighbour" (prince or republic) was being carried on in Italy, as it was to be for centuries to come, and the ducal house of Urbino came in for its share of vicissitude. Hard lots and reverses of fortune were to be found among the dwellers at courts; and if we care to know what a huge mass of misery and wrong lay about the skirts of palaces, almost within earshot of the elegant discussions on the relation of love and beauty, we shall find enough in the pages of Sismondi. Thus it was that Duke Guidobaldo found it desirable to add to the fair palace built by his father a strong fortress on the summit of the hill, which could overlook both palace and town, and furnish him in case of need with a safe retreat from the assaults of unquiet subjects.

Like so many Italian towns, Urbino was perched high on the hill-side, so high as to be overlooked only by the castle, itself so elevated that to this day nearly all the road to it, as well as the streets in the town, is inaccessible to carriages. It looks out on a noble circle of mountains, where, even in summer, the snow often lingers, giving an Alpine character to the view. On a crag to the north-west may be seen the little capital of the Republic of San Marino, from its position and antiquity the most curious relic of republican institutions in Europe.

The fortress of Urbino has long since fallen into ruins, but in the steep, narrow street, Contrada del Monte, stands to this day the small house where lived the painter Giovanni Santi, with his sister Santa, and his wife Magia, daughter of Battista Ciarla, merchant of Urbino. Here, April 6th, 1483, was born a son, who, being placed by his parents under the special protection of the Archangel Raphael,* received his name. A

* Raphael signed his name indifferently "Raphaello," or "Raffaello." Passavant has written it "Rafael." Förster considers this change inadmissible in German orthography, and always writes Raphael, as we must in English therefore.

brother and two sisters followed, but they died in infancy. According to Vasari, Giovanni Santi's domestic virtues were superior to his gifts as a painter. The judgment of modern times has to a great extent reversed this estimate of his ability in art. Indeed, Förster goes so far as to attribute the superiority which always distinguished Raphael from the other scholars of Perugino distinctly to the influence of his father. He specially instances with this view a large composition of Giovanni Santi's (an enthroned Madonna with Saints) still preserved in the Church of St. Francesco, in Urbino. Giovanni seldom dated his works, but from an entry in the church records this picture is known to have been placed over the chapel altar in 1489, when Raphael would be in his sixth year, and, as Förster thinks, already susceptible to the influences of art. How far this was the case is open to grave doubt; but we may be sure the father's work would in later years have great interest for the son, one of the rarest qualities of whose genius was its capability of taking in impressions from the most opposite quarters, while it surrendered itself implicitly to none. Giovanni's pictures were numerous in Urbino and its neighbourhood; moreover, he painted chiefly the pictures which, to the close of his life, the son loved best —the Madonna enthroned, or in glory, nearly always with the Divine infant, and surrounded by stately saints and graceful angels. The colour is apt to be somewhat cold, and the drawing hard; yet in spite of these defects they are dignified and expressive compositions. Here and there they show the same rare perception of beauty which was the unfailing quality of the son's work, to such a degree as to have given rise to the idea that portions of the pictures were painted by Raphael himself. A reference to dates will show this to have been little probable, since Giovanni died in 1494, before Raphael was eleven years old.

These works of his father's were probably the best art with which he was familiar before he entered Perugino's studio. Their influence may probably be traced in the delicate grace of his children's heads—amongst the most precious creations of Raphael's hand. Giovanni lost his wife, and Raphael a loving mother, in 1490. Six months later his father married for his second wife the daughter of Peter Parte, goldsmith of Urbino. The brief relationship does not appear to have been a happy one for Raphael; and shortly after his father's death (1494) the orphan boy was released from his step-mother's care, and placed under the legal guardianship of his father's brother, Don Bartolommeo Santi, a priest. An interval of

about a year followed, in which the only clue to Raphael's occupations is to be found in the drawings preserved in the Academy at Venice. The name Seneca, Cicero, &c., is affixed to each. They are copies of certain studies in oil, twenty-eight in number, painted by command of Duke Frederic for the palace library at Urbino. They are characterised by Flemish coarseness; but they had attracted the boy's fancy, as is shown by the careful copying. It would seem from this circumstance that Raphael had free access to the palace. To this year also must be assigned the small portrait in the Borghese Gallery in Rome, which is supposed to be the work of Simoteo Viti, and to be the portrait of Raphael in his twenty-first year. It is sufficiently probable, since Viti returned this year to his native town, Urbino, and the features resemble those of Raphael. It does not appear that either step-mother or uncle took much notice of the boy. The relative who really supplied to him his father's place, and who was loved and reverenced as such by Raphael, was his uncle Ciarla, his mother's brother. He it is who is the "dearest, best uncle—dear as a father" (Carissimo quanto Padre) of his letters. He appears to have been well fitted for the charge. His must have been the discriminating eye which first discovered the rare promise of his nephew's talent, since to his wise care Raphael owed it that he was emancipated so easily and so early from the narrow limits which bounded his studies in his native town. Belonging to it by birth, talent so promising must be preserved if possible to the Umbrian school—so thought Battista Ciarla: and with a view to this, what so desirable as to place him with the chief of that school, Pietro Perugino, in whose hands the quaint purity of the elder artists had developed into a fair grace and golden splendour entirely his own? Bartolommeo Santi gave his consent; and some time in the spring of 1495, in company with his good uncle Ciarla, Raphael left his native town and began his journey to Perugia. We cannot do better than quote here Förster's estimate of the qualities of Perugino's art and its influence on Raphael's own:—

"In him (Perugino) culminated all the excellences of his school, as in him its weaknesses were also fully developed. Raphael's career, begun under Perugino, bore in its later progress the traces of its origin. He was unable to cast aside like a worn-out garment the Principles and the Ideal which he had adopted under Perugino; rather his own grew out of them, as the youth grows into the man, and there is truth in the German lines:

"'Denn um einst Raphael zu wer den
Muss er erst Perugino sein.'"—Vol. i. p. 128.

Doubtless in the main this describes the process of his artistic development, though it is impossible from any examination of pictures in which he is presumed to have had a share to trace it step by step. Perugino was in the zenith of his powers when Raphael entered his studio. It was in this year (1495) that he completed his great picture of the "Entombment," painted for the nuns of Sta. Chiara, Florence, and now in the Pitti Gallery. Conceived with the solemn dignity befitting the subject, yet profoundly pathetic in its representation of human grief, it is, perhaps, the noblest representation in the wide range of art of that often-repeated subject.

Whether Raphael learned to paint from the living model under Perugino is doubtful, but it is certain that he learned from him his habit of preparing with the greatest care the first sketch of a composition, each figure being the subject of a separate study, often of several studies, first from the nude, then draped. An anatomical drawing for the figure of the Madonna in the Borghese "Entombment" still exists, and a study from the nude of the lower group of figures in the "Transfiguration" is preserved in the Archduke Albert's collection, Vienna.

Several years passed in a course of busy, careful study, only broken by a visit to Urbino (1499) to settle a dispute between his step-mother and his uncle. The former had from time to time made claims on the family inheritance, which, as the guardian of his nephew's interest, the uncle strenuously resisted. Nothing short of Raphael's presence, however, could re-establish peace. This is interesting to us as a proof of the same sweetness of disposition which in after life rendered him so unusually beloved. On his return to Perugia he took the way by Città di Castello, and in the latter place, through what circumstances are not known, received his first commission.

The Church of the Holy Trinity required decorations for one of the banners carried in its processions. Raphael executed two subjects for it—on one side the Trinity; on the other the Creation of Eve; each, as was to be expected, entirely in Perugino's manner. The tattered flag is still preserved. The work must have given satisfaction, since he immediately received two commissions of much greater importance, one from the Augustine Convent, and the second from the family Gavari, both of Città di Castello. The year 1500 found him again busily at work in Perugino's studio; and several pictures, all more or less Peruginesque in character, belong to this period. In 1504 he received a commis-

sion to paint for San Francesco, Città di Castello, the picture of the Marriage of the Virgin, now in the Brera, Milan. Here, for the first time, we find more of Raphael than Perugino, and therefore with it we may consider his career as a pupil of Perugino brought to a close. Raphael was now twenty-one years old. Four years of constant, careful labour had put him in possession of all that could be learned from the master. If he hoped for any career beyond that of Perugino's most able assistant, it was time to consider where and how it was to be shaped. It was time that he should see for himself how art had expressed itself in other schools, and through other lines of thought and methods of procedure. The place of all others where this could best be done was Florence. Perugino* too was known and loved there, and his name would secure to Raphael a kind reception. In Florence therefore Raphael could best try his fortune. Before deciding, however, on so important a step, he went to Urbino to take counsel of his friends there, and most of all of his wise uncle Ciarla. The visit to Urbino proved not a little helpful, for Raphael set out for Florence furnished with a letter from Johanna della Rovera, Duke Guidobaldo's sister, to no less a personage than the Gonfalonier of Florence. The Republic had just conferred the office for life on Soderini; and the letter to him runs thus:—

"To the most mighty and high-born Lord, my highly-esteemed father and friend, the Lord Gonfalonier of the Florentine Republic.

"The bearer of this letter is the painter Raphael, of Urbino, who, being furnished by nature with the most admirable gifts for his calling, desires to reside some time in Florence for their further cultivation. His father was a man of excellent character, for whom I had a great esteem, and as I know the son to be equally modest and deserving, I take a very special interest in him, and am anxious that he should obtain every advantage which can contribute to his success. I desire, therefore, to bespeak, very specially, your highness's good offices in his behalf, and beg you, out of regard to me, to afford him, as he may require, all possible help and favour, assuring you that I shall take such help and favour as done to myself, and as deserving my highest thanks, and for which I shall hold myself indebted.

"JOHANNA FELTRI DI ROVERA,

"Duchess of Sora and Prefectin of Rome.

"Urbino, Oct. 1st, 1504."

---

* There were already gathered many of the most precious treasures of the fourteenth and fifteenth century art. It was besides the home of Leonardo da Vinci, Perugino's most trusted friend, of Fra Bartolommeo, and of M. Angelo.

This letter, of course, secured to Raphael a reception into the best society of Florence. The rivalry between M. Angelo and Leonardo was now at its height, and the followers of each took up the cause of his chief with the fierce passion which the men of that day carried into everything. To Raphael's peace-loving temper this strife must have been entirely distasteful, for to his splendid talents had been added, in a remarkable degree, the gift of a sweet and gracious nature. Never the wreck of overpowering passion—like Georgione; nor provoking enmity—like M. Angelo; abhorring excess of every sort, he moved only in the calm regions of his art. He combined, in a degree rarely equalled, and never surpassed, all the elements of success, so that without descending to unworthy scheming, he seemed to play the winning card, as if by instinct. These qualities enabled him in the hour of his triumph to conciliate all, in an age when each man had his enemy more surely than his friend, and yet in a position which, from its singular eminence, was sure to provoke envy. What view he took of the question *Leonardo versus M. Angelo* is not recorded, though the conclusion is not doubtful if we take the evidence of the pictures which he painted at this time. As might be expected from the characteristics of his talent, not less than from his training, his sympathies were with Leonardo, whose work he would know as the perfect expression of the artist's thought, and not as the mutilated relics which have come down to us. Leonardo, Fra Bartolommeo, and Masaccio were the artists whose influence Raphael most strongly felt; and though somewhat modified in his later works, their influence was abiding. To give no other instance, it is well known that certain figures in the cartoons are adopted from Masaccio's work in the St. Carmine, at Florence.

The first of the pictures, since so celebrated, which Raphael painted during this his first stay in Florence (it is not known for whom) was the "Madonna del Granduca," now in the Pitti, and only less popular than the "Madonna della Sedia," in the same collection. He painted, also, Lord Cowper's Madonna, and one, now at Berlin, which bears the name of "Terra Nuova." Before his departure from Perugia his talent was so far known that he had various pictures on hand, the completion of which required his return there, and he accordingly returned in 1505. To this period of his return belong two large works. The first is a Madonna enthroned with the infant Christ, and surrounded by saints. This used to be one of the great ornaments of the palace at Naples, but

since King Ferdinand's flight in 1860, it has not been heard of! So strange and recent a disappearance of a picture by Raphael one hopes cannot be final.* This painting is said to have displayed so marked a contrast between its several portions as to suggest the idea that it was begun before his journey to Florence and finished on his return to Perugia. The second picture is the Enthroned Madonna at Blenheim, among the very finest of his early works. It shows unmistakably the influence of Masaccio.

Raphael's name was now rising rapidly, and work grew on him. The Princess of Monte Luce, near Perugia, wanted a Coronation of the Virgin for the high altar of her convent. It was to be executed by a first-class artist, and, as such, "Maestro Raffaello" (so the contract styled the painter, who had just reached the mature age of twenty-two) was recommended to her. But the good lady never got her picture, though the contract was renewed so late as 1516, accompanied by an offer on her part to increase the price. This Raphael declined, adhering to the first bargain, but he never did more than complete the drawing for it, which is said to be in England. The last commission received by Raphael before leaving Perugia fared more happily. It was from the Countess Atalanta for the "Entombment" which now hangs in the Borghese Gallery, Rome. The painter spent only a few months at Perugia, for in the close of the year 1505 he was again in Florence. The contest between the rival artists there was going on, if possible, more keenly than ever, since both Leonardo and M. Angelo were engaged in the decorating of the Palazzo Vecchio, as was also Fra Bartolommeo. The new influences which surrounded Raphael in Florence were not confined to the region of art. In the republican city, the great questions relating to religion and politics were uppermost in men's minds. Vasari tells us that Raphael was often to be found in the studio of Baccio d'Agnolo, sculptor and architect. This was a favourite gathering place for artists of the best standing, and here, in company with their friends, they discussed many weighty questions. Here came the architect Masi, much given to the telling of long stories, which he did well, and hence was surnamed "cronaca" by the "set" that met at Agnolo's. He had been in Rome, and was familiar with the monuments of the great city. But his favourite theme was the teachings

* Does this throw light on more ancient disappearances and re-appearances of noted pictures? Were they secreted against a rainy day?

and sufferings of Savonarola, of whom he was an ardent disciple. One may imagine how feelingly Fra Bartolommeo would respond, who had mourned the loss of his friend so deeply as to abandon his pencil for four years after his martyrdom. Boticelli, Lorenzo Credi, Andrea del Sarto, Albertinelli, Ridolfo Ghirlandajo must all have been well known to Raphael. Ghirlandajo, indeed, added the last touches to the Virgin's robe in the picture known as the "Belle Jardinière" of the Louvre, by Raphael's request, when he received his sudden summons to Rome. The study of the antique began now to occupy him also, for to this year belongs the small picture of the Three Graces, the property of Lord Ward, which was exhibited at Leeds last year. About this time, too, he made the acquaintance of Francia, at Bologna. He painted an "Adoration of the Shepherds" for Gio Bentivoglio, of that place, with which Francia was so delighted that Raphael gave him the drawing, and with the drawing sent a letter dated September 5, 1508. As it is one of the very few remaining to us we give it in full:—

"My dear Master Francesco,

"I have just received your portrait, by Bazzotto, in excellent condition, quite uninjured, and I thank you heartily for it. It is very beautiful, and so spirited, it seems to me I am still with you, and hear you speak. I must beg you to have patience with me, and to forgive my putting off sending you my own, as we had arranged, which I am forced to do, in consequence of heavy work, that cannot be delayed. I might have let one of my scholars do it, contenting myself with only giving the finishing touches, but this I would not do. Anyhow, I could not equal yours, so I beg you will excuse me, since you too must have known what it is not to have your time at your own disposal, but to be at the call of another.

"Meantime, I send you by the same messenger, who passes through again in six days, another drawing, and also the sketch for that Nativity (you will see it differs considerably from the finished picture) which you were kind enough to praise so much, as you do all my things to such an extent as to make me blush, as verily I do, at sending you such a trifle, which I hope will please you more as a proof of my esteem and affection than from any merit of its own. If you would give me in exchange the drawing of your 'Judith' I should put it among my choicest treasures.

"The President of the Council, Baldassare Turini, of Brescia, is impatient for his small Madonna, and Cardinal Riario for his large one, as you will hear more in detail from Bazzotto. I shall welcome them with that pleasure and satisfaction which all your pictures of the Madonna cause me. I know none more beautiful, purer, or better executed.

"Now, be of good courage; take things with your wonted wisdom, and be sure I feel your grief as though it were my own.* Keep a warm remembrance of me, as I do of you from my heart,

"Yours ever, in all

"Readiness to serve,

"RAPHAEL SANZIO."

The time was past in which Francia's art would have had a powerful interest for Raphael—their intercourse was one of friendship merely. Raphael returned to Florence by Urbino, where Duchess Elizabeth was holding court, surrounded by the brilliant company whose acquaintance we have already made. He painted several pictures there, now hopelessly lost. During this visit it seems likely that he painted the portrait of himself, not improbably a gift to his uncle Ciarla—an engraving from which, by Gonzenback of Leipzig, fronts the title-page of Förster's first volume. The authenticity of this picture, which we believe has never been questioned, is its chief interest, for as a work of Raphael it is in no way characteristic. It represents a young man of delicate mould, the face certainly not handsome, though pleasing, and, indeed, feminine in the graceful melancholy which is its prevailing expression. It, probably, gives us a fair representation of the youthful painter of the "Sposalizio" and the "Madonna del Granduca." It must ever be regretted that not one of the artists to whom Raphael was known has given us a portrait of him in the maturity of his powers. Looking at his pictures one would fancy, not one short lifetime, but many lives must have filled up the distance which separates such works as the "Sposalizio" from the "St. Cecilia," the "Transfiguration," and above all the "Disputa," and the "School of Athens." So wonderful a development of the soul within must have left its trace on the outward form. He (Raphael) had now fairly entered on that course of ceaseless production which only increased in intensity on to his death. A number of studies for pictures which, though bearing his name, are, probably, only very partially the work of his hand, belong to this time. Amongst his undoubted works of this period we must reckon the "St. Catherine of Alexandria," in the National Gallery; the "Colonna Holy Family," at Berlin; another small one, said to be of great beauty, at Madrid; the "Belle Jardinière" of the Louvre; the "Madonna del Cardellino," now the ornament of the Tribune, that

* This last reference is to the banishment of Bentivoglio from Bologna, by Julius II., which Francia had taken much to heart.

chamber of treasures, at the Uffizi; and, lastly, the "Entombment" of the Borghese Gallery, Rome. This last was his first attempt at anything like a large dramatic composition, and the importance he attached to it may be gathered from the immense number of studies, now scattered through all the collections in Europe, which he made for it. Lady Eastlake remarks on this picture, that "although meriting all its fame, in respect of drawing, expression, and knowledge, it has lost all signs of reverential feeling in the persons of the bearers. . . . Nothing can be finer than the figures, if we forget what it is they are carrying."* An evidence, this, how wide already was his departure from Peruginesque traditions. While he was painting the "Entombment," his friend Dom. Alfani was busy with an altar picture for the Carmelites; and finding the difficulties besetting the composition too much for him he applied for help to Raphael. Both Alfani's picture and Raphael's drawing have been preserved, but more interesting to us is Raphael's own letter to Alfani, which we translate—

"Do not forget, Menicho," (diminutive for Domenico) "to send me Ricciardo's songs on the love fever that seized him when he went on his travels; also remind Cesarino to send me the sermon, and remember me to him. Also do not forget to see the Lady Atalanta about sending me the money" (for the picture of the Entombment) "and see that you get it in gold. Ask Cesarino to look after it as well. If I can do anything more for you, let me know."

From which last phrase we gather that Raphael was a helpful friend to painters whose compositions did not go satisfactorily. At the same time it would seem that in return he required from them such services as he knew they could render, such as looking up patrons who were readier with commissions than with payments, and catering for his literary tastes, which appear to have been sufficiently varied.

His present prosperity did not make him, by any means, unmindful of the future. His next letter is to his uncle, urging him to obtain an introduction for Rome, because the Pope has the painting of a room at his disposal—

"Carissimo quanto Padre,

"I have received your letter telling me of the death of our sovereign lord, the duke,—to whose soul may God be gracious! Be very sure I did not read your letter without tears, but it is useless to waste words about what cannot be changed—one must be patient, and submit to the will of God. I wrote to my uncle, the priest, to

* *History of Our Lord*, vol. ii. p. 49.

send me a panel, which served as a cover for a Madonna belonging to the Lady Prefectin (the duke's sister), but he has not sent it. Pray, therefore, let him know, in case anyone should be coming this way, that I may be out of the lady's debt, for she would, probably, be glad to have it.*

"I also beg you, dearest uncle—and tell my uncle Santi and aunt Santa—in case Taddeo (Taddeo of Florence), of whom they have often heard me speak, should come to Urbino, to spare no pains to show him all honour, and I beg you also, for my sake, to do the like, since there is no one in the world to whom I owe so much as to him.

"As to the picture (not the one for the Prefectin) I have mentioned no price, nor should I like to do so; it will be all the better for me if it be reckoned below its value—on that account I sent you no estimate, nor, indeed, could I yet do so—all I know is that the owner of this picture told me he could get me plenty of commissions for pictures worth about 300 gold ducats, both here and in France; perhaps after the holidays I may be able to tell you what the expense of the picture will be. I have finished the cartoon for it, and I shall begin it after Easter.

"It would be a great thing if you could get me a letter from the Lord Prefect (Duke Francesco Maria) to the Gonfalonier of Florence. I wrote lately to uncle and to Giacomo, to have it sent to me from Rome, as it might procure me the painting of a room there, which his Holiness has in his gift. I beg of you, therefore, if possible, to get the letter for me, for I feel sure if you apply to the duke he will have it drawn out at once. I beg to be remembered a thousand times to him as his old servant and friend, and also to Ridolfo, and all others.

"Your Raphaello,
"*April* 21, 1508." "Painter in Florence.

Happily for us, either by favour of the duke, or by his own fame, he did get the painting of the Pope's room, and was summoned to Rome in all haste very shortly after the writing of this letter. Indeed, it is this hasty journey which accounts for several of his pictures of this date being left to other hands to finish.

It should be remembered that the Rome which Raphael now saw for the first time was materially different from the city with which we are acquainted. The Temple of the Sun, erected by Aurelian, still stood on the Quirinal, a building of which all that now remains is the boulder-like mass in the garden of the Colonna Palace. The Farnese Palace was not yet built out of the spoils of the Coliseum, nor the Triumphal

* We presume the panel was to be painted, and he was anxious to execute the commission for so kind a patroness.

Arch of Marcus Aurelius removed from the Corso. (The exigencies of the papal horse races required this last sacrifice.) Above all, the most venerable of Christian temples, the Basilica of St. Paul, remained in all its splendour. Pope Julius II. had just concluded those successful wars by which Umbria, the Marshes, and Bologna became again the patrimony of the Church; and he determined that the magnificence at home should crown his military successes abroad. Detesting the memory of his predecessor, he would not even enter, much less inhabit, the rooms which had been used by Borgias; and he resolved that a new series of decorations, the most splendid which art could furnish, should enrich the palace of the Vatican. Four rooms, since known as the "Stanze of Raphael," were to be appropriated to this purpose. The talent of the best painters of Italy was put into requisition. M. Angelo was at work on the Sistine Chapel; Perugino and Antonio Razzi, of Siena, had already made a beginning in the Vatican, when Raphael arrived in Rome. "The lad" (Ragazzo), as the Pope called him, was received kindly enough, and one of the large spaces in the Sala della Segnatura was given up to him. This was the Pope's council chamber, whence Bulls and Decretals were issued to listening Europe. We are without exact information as to how far the subjects of this and the following pictures were dictated by the Pope and the chief persons of his court, or were the artist's own choice. It would be easily enough understood that in this august spot one theme only would be welcome, and that the triumphs of the Church as expressed in the history of its visible Head! Surely, never was genius set down to the working out of a more unmanageable problem. In one respect, at least, we must pronounce that the problem was solved, for if we are to trust the testimony of these pictures, nothing in heaven or earth had resisted the successors of St. Peter. The poets gathered en masse on Parnassus; the philosophers assembled in the school at Athens; the fierce armies of the Huns; the gathering flames ready to devour St. Peter's itself; and, perhaps more formidable still, the priestly unbelievers in the Mass of Bolsena, each and all had succumbed to the power of the keys. Happily for Raphael, Julius's personal vanity was easily satisfied. It was otherwise with Leo, his successor. Leo insisted that, in the designs for the tapestries, his own history should be mingled with that of the Apostles. Raphael evaded the difficulty. Even *he* could not venture on a cartoon in which the fishermen of Galilee should appear side by side with

this magnificent successor. The incidents relating to the Pope himself were executed, like footnotes to a book, in spaces beneath the main subject. If artists' talk was then what it is now, the suggestions of his Holiness must have given birth to much irreverent discussion. The unlucky painters had cause indeed to invoke the supernatural aids of the Church to deliver them from their dilemmas. As a matter of fact, Raphael soon lost patience with this employment of his powers. Only four of the compositions in the margin refer to Leo.

The picture of the "Disputa" (the Dispute of the Sacrament) was the first of a series of magnificent works, which may safely be said to make Raphael's fame imperishable. It was finished during the year 1509, and gave Julius such satisfaction, that, with the soldierly decision distinguishing all his proceedings, he determined that Raphael alone should adorn his rooms, and gave orders for the destruction of all the other painters' work, except a ceiling by Perugino, spared at Raphael's intercession. Raphael then proceeded to develop his subject. Four allegorical figures—Theology, Philosophy, Poetry, Jurisprudence—occupy the spaces on the ceiling; and of these, the large compositions on the walls beneath are the illustrations. The "Disputa" represents Theology; the "School of Athens," Philosophy; the group of poets on Parnassus, Poetry; and Justinian presenting the Pandects to Trebonius, Jurisprudence. It will be well for the student desiring to estimate the influence exercised over Raphael by M. Angelo to remember that the frescoes on the roof of the Sistine Chapel were first shown to the world in the autumn of this year, while Raphael was at work on the "Disputa." It is impossible to enter into any description or analysis of these works in the Stanze, Raphael's greatest compositions. The reader will find this admirably done in Coindet's *Histoire de la Peinture en Italie*, p. 113. The pictures in the Segnatura were completed in 1511. To this two years' period belong also some of Raphael's most admirable easel pictures, of which the "Madonna di Foligno" and the portrait of Pope Julius are the most famous.

To this same time, or at most to a year later, belong also two pictures, around which clings a thread of romance of which it would be ungracious not to give the reader the benefit. They both bear the name of the "Fornarina." No one who knows Rome and Florence but has had his attention drawn to these pictures by friend or guide book. As far as we know, the authenticity of the picture

in the Barberini Palace, as a work of Raphael and a portrait of the Fornarina, has never been disputed. This being the case, it is a marvel how the other picture, which hangs in the Tribune, in the Uffizi, at Florence, can have come by its misnomer. It requires no careful training, but merely a common-sense glance, to see that if the picture in the Barberini be the Fornarina, the one in the Uffizi cannot represent that personage. The Barberini portrait is that of a bold gipsy in the perfection of her charms, and with the coarse handsomeness belonging to the type. The other represents a face of the Roman type, it is true, though this only heightens the contrast in all other respects. The stately beauty of the one, the dignity expressed in the turn of the head, and, above all, the calm look of the eyes, are the product of very different influences from those which go to make up the light woman of the other picture. The excellence of the picture in the Tribune as a work of art; the admirable painting of the flesh, and the exquisite contrast between it and the white lining of the bodice; the modelling of the hand which grasps the folds of the mantle; the truthfulness with which the texture of the fur is given (reminding one, in this item, of the best productions of our own art); lastly, the wonderful feeling for subtle differences of colour shown in the painting of the dark hair against the wreaths of bronze leaves lying upon it; these and many other features of the picture an artist only can adequately estimate. The authenticity of the Florence picture has been called in question; but the balance of authorities is in favour of it. Viardot and Passavant consider it to be Raphael's; and Förster, who, as we have seen, is not given to hasty conclusions, is of the same opinion. Who the lady was has never been ascertained. Written on the back of the drawings for the "Disputa" are certain love songs in Raphael's own hand, which make it evident that he was but a poor hand at making verses, even when under the influence of the passion which is supposed to lend itself most readily to poetry. The few facts to be gathered from the songs are all the more certain, because the writer lacks the skill to clothe them in a poetic disguise. We learn the existence of an unknown lady loved passionately by Raphael, and by whom he was beloved. The writer is too much on his guard to let any word escape him that should lead to the identification of the object of his passion; from which we may conclude that some terrible danger to one or both of the lovers must have resulted from discovery. The verses record one interview, in which both—

"Caught up the whole of love and uttered it,
And bade adieu for ever."

But for this glimpse into the secret chambers of the soul, we might have supposed that the storms of passion had never disturbed the great painter.

As Förster points out, the description of the lady given in these verses in no way corresponds with the portrait in the Barberini. The "bel parlar" would as little have suited the lips of the real Fornarina, as the "onesti costumi" could have applied to her character. On the contrary, the "lumi dei occhi" and "candide braci," while utterly inapplicable to the Fornarina in the Barberini, correspond singularly with the picture in the Tribune. We wonder it should not have occurred to the many writers on Raphael to connect the verses directly with the picture. We think the connection a highly probable one, and that in this picture we have the portrait of the painter's unknown love. If it be so it adds interest to one of the loveliest existing pictures of a lovely woman. We may be sure that to Raphael it would not be less than to other men to part from his hopes. With what anger, dejection, or despair he did so we know not. We know that henceforth he turned from

"April hopes, the fools of chance" . . .

to

"Love that carves a portion from the solid present,
Gets and uses careless of the rest."

Subsequently such domestic life as he sought amidst the ever increasing demands of his art, the Fornarina represented, till the day when he lay dying, and she was sent from the house in obedience to a dictate of ecclesiastical propriety which we can hardly comprehend in an age when popes owned their children, and cardinals their mistresses.

To return, however—the works in the Vatican proceeded steadily; and side by side with them others of a strictly clerical class, such as the "Madonna del Pesce," now in the Museum at Madrid; and the "Madonna del divino amori" at Naples; also the portrait of Raphael's Roman friend Bindo Altoviti, now at Madrid, and for some time supposed to be Raphael's own portrait; together with the "Isaiah," in the Church of S. Agostino. Raphael was painting at the Mass of Bolsena, in the Stanze of Heliodorus, when a startling change took place in the great world. Pope Julius died, and anxiety and uncertainty, as usual, took possession of Rome and of Christendom. Raphael's future at Rome almost entirely depended on the character

and tastes of the new ruler of the Papacy. Julius's death occurred on the 13th of February, 1513. On the 11th of March, 1514, the Cardinals unanimously elected Giovanni de Medici, henceforth known as Leo X. In the person of Julius, Rome may be said to have been ruled by a successful general. Leo believed in diplomacy as the mainspring of fortune, and was a cunning master of it. Significant enough at his election was the circumstance that his most zealous partisan was Cardinal Soderini, the brother of the fallen Gonfalonier of Florence, himself the hereditary chief of the enemies of the house of Medici. Leo's absolute self-control was such that in the conclave assembled to decide upon his pretensions, it being his office to read out the list of the voters, he did so without betraying, by voice, or look, or movement, his knowledge of the result, though a glance at the paper must have sufficed to put him in possession of the fact of his own election. What views he took of the responsibilities of his position may be gathered from his remark to his brother Giuliano: "Now let us enjoy the power God has given us." From anything like belief of Christian dogma he seems to have been perfectly free. He was only careful to keep his power and enjoy it, as the most magnificent and pleasure-loving prince in Europe. Under him Rome became more infidel than it could have been under the Pagan Emperors. What the result on Roman society was we may learn from a later authority, who says that in his time, under Paul IV., "It was impossible to be a man of fashion, above all a successful courtier, without holding some heretical opinions on the dogmas of the Church."

At Leo's court soon gathered all the men of whom we have heard already at Urbino. Among them was Baldassare Castiglione, now ambassador from the young Duke of Urbino. Leo, though he meant no good to the Duke, treated his ambassador with much distinction. Under such a sovereign as Leo, a member too of a house whose patronage of art was already a family tradition, with most of his best friends at the court, Raphael's prospects became more brilliant than ever. His relations to distinguished persons in the fifteenth century were very much what they would have been in the eighteenth, judging from a graphic little notice of Cardinal Bembo's in a letter to C. Bibiena. "To-morrow, for the first time for twenty-seven years, I am going to see Tivoli again, in company with Navaggiero, Biazzano, the Lord B. Castiglione, and Raphael. Antiquities, modern objects of interest, in short whatever of interest and beauty the place offers, we are going

to see. The party was arranged on Mr. Andrea's (Navagni) account, as he is obliged to return to Venice after Easter." The portraits of the two Venetian historians, on one canvas, are very celebrated, and are the finest examples of Raphael's portrait painting in the Doria Gallery at Rome.

During this year Raphael painted "The Sibyls" in Sta. Maria della Pace for an important patron of his, Monsgr. Chigi, for whom also he designed the chapel, as well as the decorations for it, in Sta. Maria del Popolo. A tale of somewhat dubious authority is told in connection with the payment for this work. Raphael, who had already drawn on account 500 scudi, went to get the balance. The prince's steward refused to pay it, saying that Raphael had no right to anything further. Prince Chigi did not disavow the conduct of his subordinate, but referred the question to M. Angelo, who accordingly went to the church and examined the work carefully. The steward, anxious for his answer, asked, "Well, what do you say?" "That head," replied M. Angelo, "is worth 100 scudi." "And the others?" asked the steward. "Each the same," was the answer. (There are five Sibyls.) As soon as this report was carried to the prince, he ordered, in addition to the payment already made, a further sum of 500 scudi, for, said he, "At this rate we might have to pay for arms, legs, and clothes, and our purse might not hold out."

Raphael's constant occupations at the Vatican made a permanent residence near to it indispensable, and about this time he employed his friend Bramante, the architect, also a native of Urbino, to erect a house for him in the "Borgo." Of this house, in which some of his greatest works were executed, and where he died, no portion remains, except a fragment of a pillar built into the present Palazzo Accoromboni.

During the summer of 1514 the duties of a very onerous office fell to him. By the death of Bramante, the post of architect of St. Peter's became vacant. On his death-bed Bramante recommended Raphael to the Pope as his successor. The works then in progress at St. Peter's were the most extensive that had been attempted since the time of the Roman Empire. Before entrusting so grave a charge to Raphael, the Pope required some proof of his fitness for it. Accordingly he was directed to prepare the plans, and also an estimate of the cost. Hereupon Raphael constructed a model of the intended alterations, which gave such general satisfaction, that the appointment was formally conferred upon him by Leo, in a decree dated August 1st, 1514.

No wonder that he says, in a letter written at the time, to Count Castiglione—

"Our Lord and Master, though he has conferred on me a very great honour, has, nevertheless, laid a heavy burden on my shoulders. . . . I should greatly like to restore to the world the beautiful forms of ancient architecture, but I am in doubt whether the attempt be not a hopeless one. Vitruvius gives me a good deal of light, but not enough."

The main feature in Raphael's plan was the substitution of the Latin cross for the Greek of Bramante's design. After numberless vicissitudes this was the plan finally carried out, many years later. The actual progress made under Raphael himself was limited to the strengthening of the foundations, especially those intended to support the dome. These having been hastily put together to satisfy the impatience of Pope Julius, were found to be insecure. Perhaps the best known of our painter's architectural undertakings is the court of San Damaso, in the Vatican, which in its present form was almost entirely constructed by him. A year later, by a decree dated August 27th, 1515, all the antiquities, monuments, marbles, &c., in Rome, and within a radius of ten miles of the city, were placed under Raphael's supervision. All persons making excavations were bound to report to him, under a penalty of from one to 300 gold pieces. At the same time it was forbidden to any workman to make use of stone or marble bearing any inscription. A reckless destruction of the most valuable objects had gone on under previous popes, to an almost incredible extent. It is mentioned in this decree that the remains of ancient buildings were still to furnish the materials for the construction of St. Peter's; but it appears to have been entirely owing to Raphael's representations, that in future the spoliations were to be strictly controlled by authority, exercised under his own direction.

Home interests had some place in his regard yet, for in 1514 he became a member of one of the charitable orders in Urbino; and the following letter, written in July of the same year, to his uncle, shows his unabated affection for him:—

"BEST LOVED, IN MY FATHER'S STEAD,

"I have received your kind letter, and am glad to see from it that you are not angry with me, as, indeed, you ought not to be—if you recollect how painful it is to me not to hear from you, and so to have no inducement to write to you; now that I have, I reply at once, that you may know plainly what answer I can give to your proposal. First, then, as to 'Lordona'—whom you formerly thought

so suited to me,—I am very glad, I shall thank God my life long that I did not marry her—nor, indeed, anyone: in this matter I have followed a better instinct than yours, since you proposed to give her to me. I am sure you will allow, you never thought I should succeed as I have done. I have property in Rome worth 3,000 gold ducats, with an income of 50 gold scudi, besides which his Holiness has granted me, for the superintendence of the works at St. Peter's, a salary of 300 gold ducats, for my life; I am, also, pretty sure to make more still. In addition to all this, I can sell my pictures for the price I set on them, and I have begun a second room for his Holiness, which will bring me in 1,200 gold ducats; so that you see, dearest uncle, I do credit to you and to my relations, as well as to my country. Be sure I do not lose my love for you amongst it all. When I hear your name it is to me as if I heard my father's, so do not complain if I do not write, for it is I who might rather complain, for you can be pen in hand all day if you like, and yet you let six months pass from one letter to another. But all this shall not make me angry with you, as you have been, indeed, very unjustly with me.

"I began before about your proposal of a wife. I must return to the subject, to tell you the Cardinal S. Maria, in Portico, (Bibiena) has proposed to me a lady, a relative of his own, and I have promised to agree, with your and uncle Santi's consent. Now I could not take my word back; indeed, the thing seems nearer a conclusion than ever, and as soon as I know I will be sure to let you have all information. Wait a little and you will see the thing will turn out right, but if nothing come of it I will then do as you wish. Also let me tell you that if Francisco Buffa knows of good matches I can have plenty here too. I know a handsome girl, now in Rome, she and her family held in the highest repute, and with a fortune of 3,000 gold scudi; besides, I live in a house in Rome which, if it be only worth 100 ducats here, I would rather have it than one worth 200 down there. As to my stay in Rome, I shall not be able to live elsewhere for a long time on account of the building at St. Peter's, which I superintend in Bramante's place. And what residence in the world can be finer than Rome? and what employment more worthy than the building of St. Peter's, the first temple of the world, as well as the largest building that has been seen, which is to cost more than a million of gold ducats? Indeed, you must know that the Pope has ordered 60,000 ducats a year to be spent on it, and he thinks about nothing else. He has given me a very learned old monk, more than eighty years of age, as my colleague (for the building), and as the Pope sees that he cannot live long, he has let me have him to help me—for he is a man of great reputation and experience, so that if he has any secrets in the art of constructing buildings I may avail myself of them; his name is Fra Giacondo. The Pope sends for us every day to talk it over with us. I should like you to go to the duke and duchess and tell them this, for I know they are pleased to hear when

a subject of theirs gains distinction. I pray you to keep your old love for me. Remember me to all friends and relatives, especially to Ridolfo, who has shown such true regard for me.

"Your RAPHAEL,

"*July 1st*, 1514." "Painter in Rome.

Altogether prudent and prosperous beyond the wishes or dreams of the old uncle!

It may be well to say a word here of Raphael's engagement to Maria Bibiena. The causes which delayed the marriage until all prospect of it was put an end to by her death, are undiscovered, and have been variously accounted for by his biographers. Förster's supposition seems the most probable, viz. that she was a young girl in feeble health, and that on this ground and no other the marriage was from time to time delayed. There is evidence that Raphael's favour with the Cardinal was in no degree diminished, which could hardly have been the case had he showed any indifference to the marriage of his niece. That his feelings were little concerned, that, in fact, he had open relations with the Fornarina at the time, would be no obstacle in that day to an engagement held on other grounds desirable. The tablet erected to Maria's memory in the Pantheon was placed there near Raphael's own grave at his own expense, and in conformity with his last wishes, by one of his executors. In the inscription she is called his "betrothed," showing that he looked upon the relation as broken only by death.

It now remains for us to notice briefly the great works which succeeded each other with increasing rapidity during the very few years of life that remained to Raphael. We have seen that his marvellous talents stood him in place of training and experience as an architect. Engraving, also, shared his attention. Its importance as a medium for increasing the knowledge, and consequently, the influence of an artist's work, could not have escaped him. The latest researches show that he even engraved a few plates with his own hand. An interesting pamphlet on one of these has been published by Professor Müller of Düsseldorff, in which a fac-simile of the engraving by Raphael, and a photograph of Mark Antonio, of the same subject, are placed side by side. Lack of time must soon have compelled Raphael to abandon this department of art to Mark Antonio Raimondi, who was entirely employed by him, and who finished his plates, not only under his superintendence, but subject to corrections from his hand.

In sculpture, several works are known to have been executed by Raphael. One piece, the original of which has disappeared, was a boy and a dolphin. The fountain delle Tartarughe, in front of the Palazzo Mattei, Rome, Passavant thinks was probably designed by him. The statue of Jonah, in the Chigi Chapel in the "Santa Maria del Popolo," most critics agree bears to a singular degree, both in composition and outline, the characteristics of Raphael's mind. This last is certainly a work not only of uncommon beauty, but of great finish, and being his, would prove that want of opportunity alone limited his attainments in this most difficult walk of art. During the year 1516, the stanze of the "Incendio" (Vatican) were begun, and a considerable number of portraits painted, amongst others that of Cardinal Bibiena. Besides these, two series of great works were commenced, viz. the Cartoons, and the series of Old Testament subjects, in the Loggia, often called Raphael's Bible. The Cartoons were completed the same year. It is sufficient to say of them, that they bid fair to be the models of historic composition for all time. They were designs for tapestries to be hung on the walls of the Sistine Chapel, and were executed at Arras—hence their Italian name "Arazzi." They were cut into strips, for the convenience of the manufacturers, and were found at Arras by Rubens, and purchased by him for Charles I. Cromwell saved them when the private collections of Charles were sold by Parliament. They are now, as everyone knows, well cared for in the South Kensington Museum, and ought to be familiar to English people. The tapestries themselves, that is, those of them which remain, are now in the Vatican. When Rome was sacked, a few years after the death of Raphael, the soldiers of Charles V. actually made an attempt to melt them down for the sake of the gold thread! Happily, the process was not remunerative, and the barbarians found it more profitable to sell them as they were.

The Loggia consists of a series of thirteen arcades, on the roof of each of which are painted four subjects taken from Scripture history—in fact, fifty-two independent compositions. On the walls are decorations of the sort known as Arabesques, representing flowers, fruits, and animals. They are a wonderfully lovely expression of the main thought which runs through the whole of the works designed by Raphael for the Vatican, viz. that the world of nature and the unseen world also are all the creation of, and under the dominion of, the God of Revelation. Doubtless the teaching is often marred to us by the peculiar dogmas through which it is

expressed, but the truth is none the less grand; and we gain a high impression of the capacity of the painter to whom this lofty and far-reaching train of thought was possible. The internal evidence of Raphael's works shows that he had a minute acquaintance with Scripture narratives. Indeed, as far as the narratives are concerned, these old painters are no mean expositors.

The scholarship which some of his admirers have attributed to him is, probably, mythical. All evidence goes to show that his classical lore was gathered from no more original source than Petrarch's translations, which sufficed to preserve him from blunders in the grouping of the deities on Parnassus, and the sages in the school of Athens. Of Latin he knew very little, for Vitruvius was translated for him by Marco Fabio, of Ravenna, who was his guest at the time. The translation, with some marginal notes in Raphael's handwriting, is preserved in the public library at Munich. A letter which makes mention of this incident renders so vividly the impression made by him on his contemporaries, that we insert a portion of it. It is written by an official of the Papal Court, Calcagnini by name. After describing Marco Fabio as a specimen of the philosopher who supports life on roots and vegetables, living in a tub—after the fashion of Diogenes—the writer goes on to say:—

"This man is tended and cared for like a child by a rich favourite of the Pope's—Raphael of Urbino, a young man of most amiable disposition and wonderful genius. He is distinguished by most splendid talents, and is, beyond all comparison, the first painter of his time, whether as to theory or practice. As an architect he is so clever in expedients that he suggests and carries out things which the most experienced would have thought impossible."

With more in praise of the care and energy of Raphael in preserving the monuments and antiquities of Rome:—

"With all this he is so far from having any conceit of himself that he is gentle and kind to everyone, and avoids neither admonition nor discussion. He likes nothing better than to have his own views called in question and examined, for to instruct or be instructed seems the one object of life with him. This is the man who trusts Fabio as a guide and father; he tells him everything, and goes by his advice."

Three out of the four "stanze" being now completed, as well as the series in the Loggia, Raphael was free to turn again to the subjects which had occupied him in the earlier part of his career. In 1514 he had painted for Agostino Chigi the well-known "Galatea" in one of the rooms of the

Farnesina. The connection in the thought is apparent enough between this subject and that of Cupid and Psyche, which he now designed for the same place. In all his later pictures he was largely aided by his pupils, and the series of Cupid and Psyche are known to have been executed by Giulio Romano and Francesco Penni, save one of the Graces, which, from its great excellence, is supposed to be Raphael's own work. The "Spasimo di Sicilia," now at Madrid, and held to be a worthy pendant to the "Transfiguration," belongs to this year. Also the "Holy Family," likewise at Madrid, called the "Pearl," from its peerless excellence. Besides these there is the picture called the "Violin Player," which last rivals strongly in all artistic qualities of colour and composition, the famous portrait in the Tribune, already described.

In this year, (1518), too were painted the pictures for Francis I., as to whose munificence various stories were long in circulation. The facts now known have brought to light a painful and humiliating incident in Raphael's history too important and peculiar to be passed over.

Hitherto his life, both as a man and an artist, had been almost untroubled, unless it were by the burden of accumulating honour and occupations. Now evil came. The facts are briefly these:—Leo X. was at this time busily engaged in dispossessing the Duke of Urbino of his dominions, and by a Bull he declared them to be forfeited in favour of his own nephew, Lorenzo de' Medici; while Cardinal Bibiena was sent to Urbino, charged with the execution of the decree. So iniquitous a proceeding excited great indignation throughout Italy, but the results were not likely to be dangerous until Francis I. threatened to use his influence on behalf of the dispossessed prince. Lorenzo's prime object was to avert this calamity, and the French king's known taste for art was made to serve his turn. He therefore applied to Raphael to paint two pictures for Francis; the large "Holy Family," which has since borne the king's name, and the "Archangel Michael subduing Satan," both now in the Salon Carré of the Louvre. Raphael consented, and the pictures did their work. Francis was won over to the usurper, and, in proof, married him to a subject of his own, who became the mother of Catherine de' Medici. Lorenzo knew that the commission was a distasteful one to Raphael; and, judging from the urgent missions despatched every few days to his agents in Rome and Florence, to whom he had committed the business of getting the pictures, it would appear he thought it necessary that the artist should be keenly looked after. Alas, for poor human nature! It

was Raphael's unwilling and reluctant fingers, guided by others, it is true, which first kindled the flame which, after smouldering long years, lighted all Europe with its lurid blaze on the night of St. Bartholomew. Few of the thousands of Frenchmen and foreigners who go to look on Raphael's pictures in the Louvre know how strange and dire an influence they have had on the destinies of France and of Europe. There is no exaggeration in the statement, for if Raphael had refused to paint those pictures for Francis in all probability France would have had no Catherine de' Medici and no Massacre of St. Bartholomew. Besides these, the only pictures remaining belonging to this year that need be mentioned, are the "Madonna de San Sisto" and the portrait of Leo X. with the two Cardinals, his relatives. As portraits, nothing finer exists than this and the "Julius II." Förster expresses well the impression made by both pictures: "We feel that here we have perfect truth—that we are brought face to face with the real personages of that age." As a warning to all connoisseurs in time to come, an excellent story is told in connection with the portrait of Leo, which is as follows:—"Pope Clement VII. (Giulio de' Medici) had promised the picture to the Duke of Mantua, and had a copy of it made for himself by Andrea del Sarto. The copy was so excellent that the Pope was able to pass it off on the duke as the original. As such it was accepted by Giulio Romano till Vasari, who had seen the copy when in progress in Andrea's studio, pointed out to the owner a private mark made by Andrea and shown by him to Vasari, which distinguished the copy from the original."

Of Raphael's many pictures of the Madonna, the one known as the "Madonna di San Sisto," at Dresden, has been, perhaps, the most highly praised, as it is also the one which is most unhesitatingly linked with Raphael's name, notwithstanding that one or two German critics have been bold enough to maintain that the picture is the work of a second-rate Italian artist. How they account for a fact so much in the nature of a miracle as this, if proved, would be, we cannot tell. In 1826 a careful attempt at restoration was made, with a view to stop the mischief going on in the picture; but it was found impossible by any mechanical process, however careful, to imitate the singularly broad and free touch with which it is painted, and which gives the impression that it was thrown off by the force of a single inspiration. The resources of modern *science* have been applied lately with better effect. A new canvas carefully placed at the back of the picture was moistened with a chemical solution, which, penetrating to the picture,

has had the effect of reviving the freshness and brilliance of the colours.

Before speaking of the last year of Raphael's life, it seems fitting to refer more particularly to a name with which the events of that year were closely interwoven, the name of Raphael's most distinguished contemporary and rival, Michael Angelo. The character of M. Angelo and the hot partisanship of their respective scholars threw an element of bitterness into Raphael's relations to him, they would not otherwise have had. This, Raphael must have resented, though, temperate and conciliatory as he was by nature, no evidence of angry feeling has come down to us, save one or two casual remarks, dropped in familiar conversation, and which, if authentic, express even more his appreciation of M. Angelo's great powers, than his consciousness of the jealousy with which both his work and his success were regarded by the former. It remains a lasting stain on the memory of M. Angelo, which no circumstance and no provocation could justify, that time and death alike failed to soften his relentless jealousy, and that after Raphael had been twenty years in his grave he should have permitted himself to pen the lines to the Bishop of Sinigaglia, as foolish as they are untrue, "What Raphael knew of art he had from me" ("Ciò che aveva dell' arte l' aveva da me").

Any comparison between the powers of these extraordinarily gifted men, with a view to deciding whose were supreme, has, we confess, little interest for us. Goethe's answer, when teased to settle the same question with respect to Schiller's genius and his own, is final, than which no better can be given: "Germany may be proud to have produced a couple such fellows as we are." In truth, M. Angelo and Raphael were as far removed in genius as in character. Each was supreme in his own sphere, but the spheres lay far apart; and in proof that the highest genius has its limits, each was singularly unable to enter that of the other. To attempt it, was to deprive both of their special strength, and they became as other men. To enter Raphael's domain M. Angelo never attempted. Once only, in the fresco of the Prophet Isaiah (painted 1514) Raphael is held by many to have tried to do what M. Angelo had done in the Sistine. It may, or may not, have been so. The condition of the fresco existing in the Church of S. Agostino, Rome, is such as to preclude any certain conclusion founded on an examination of it, and the experiment, if made, Raphael did not repeat. As realisation by the human spirit of the grand, the awful, the superhuman, M. Angelo's con-

ceptions remain unapproachable. Who, that has looked upon his "Moses," has not felt a wish to creep away, and hide his nothingness from that tremendous presence, which seems to fill the columned nave? Yet in him (M. Angelo) the perception of beauty was strangely feeble; that of delicate, what we must call for want of a better word, sympathetic grace (never entirely absent from the highest beauty in nature or art), was almost wholly lacking. Surely, if anywhere, we might justly expect to find this in his fresco of "Eve," in the Sistine. The conception is certainly a noble one, something between Venus and Minerva; but any one of Raphael's endless Madonnas comes nearer our ideal of the gracious "Mother of all living," of whom

> "The world hath not another
> Though all her fairest forms are types of thee."

It is the absence of this quality which has always made M. Angelo the master of the few, as its unfailing presence has made Raphael the exponent and the idol of the few and of the many. Every artist, or every school of art, overlooking, or rejecting, in the search after truth, that beauty which allied to it, is God's truth in nature, will as surely fail to retain a permanent hold on the world as when the opposite course is taken, and truth is sacrificed to what is deemed to be beauty. If, as men have hitherto believed, the Greek be the highest type of art the world has seen, then was Raphael the greatest *artist*, inasmuch as his works approach more nearly the Greek models than do those of M. Angelo.

We have often referred in the course of this article to the immense number of Raphael's works, and have noted that as a consequence he was compelled to make large use of the help of his scholars, a circumstance which even in his lifetime began to tell prejudicially upon his fame. It is generally believed that he was aware of this, and that he had resolved to gather himself up for a great effort which should silence detractions for ever. The opportunity was found in a commission which he now received from Cardinal Giulio de' Medici to paint an altar-piece for his cathedral at Narbonne. The occasion assumed much more the aspect of a personal contest, from the fact that the Cardinal commissioned, at the same time, a large picture from Sebastian del Piombo—the "Raising of Lazarus"—now in the National Gallery, and that M. Angelo was understood to be prepared to furnish any help which might be needed to supplement Sebastian's shortcomings. Raphael is reported to have said, referring to this

arrangement: "I am sufficiently honoured that M. Angelo should think it necessary to enter the lists against me himself instead of leaving it to Sebastian."

In the picture of the "Transfiguration" (now in the Vatican) Raphael had intended to leave to the world, not merely his own thought clothed in forms the creation of his own mind, but in work entirely from his own hand. To this picture belongs a pathos, a tragic interest which has gathered about no others—not excepting the unfinished one by Titian, at Venice, for Titian had almost completed his hundred years when death came to interrupt his work; but Raphael was struck at an age when men usually reckon themselves short of their prime. He was seized with illness, variously reported as "fever," "a chill taken in the Vatican," "une maladie de langueur ou d'épuisement," but which must in reality have been the result of utter bodily exhaustion. Beyond the brief statement of Vasari, that he made his confession and received the last consolations of the Church, no record has survived of those days of darkness, when hope, and fame, and art were for him no more, and death and its issues the only realities. No utterances of any sort have reached us across the silence of the centuries. We know that the near presence of a Divine Helper was the last thought with which the genius of the mighty painter was occupied. He died on Good Friday, 1520, having lived exactly thirty-seven years. We close our account of the last scene of his life in the words of Mrs. Jameson:—

. . . "We must bear in mind that it ("The Transfiguration") is not an historic, but a devotional picture—that the intention of the painter was not to represent a scene, but to excite religious emotion by expressing, so far as painting might do it, a very sublime idea which it belongs to us to interpret. It is in truth a fearful approximation of the most opposite things; the mournful helplessness, suffering, and degradation of human nature, the unavailing pity, are placed in immediate contrast with spiritual life, light, hope, nay, the very fruition of heavenly rapture. . . . It was the last picture that came from Raphael's hand; he was painting on it when he was seized with his last illness; he had completed all the upper part of the composition, all the ethereal vision, but the lower part of it was unfinished, and in this state the picture was hung over his bier, when, after his death, he was laid out in his painting room, and all his pupils, and his friends, and the people of Rome came to look upon him for the last time; and when those who stood round raised their eyes to the Transfiguration and then bent them on the lifeless form extended beneath it, 'every heart was like to burst from grief' ('faceva scoppiare l' anima di dolore a ognuno che quivi guardava'), as, indeed, well it might."

Thence he was carried—the picture of "The Transfiguration" borne in the procession—attended by immense crowds, and lamented as it has been given to few men to be, through the streets of Rome to the grave he had chosen for himself some time before in the Pantheon. The spot is marked to this day by a tablet, placed there by Cardinal Bembo, and bearing a Latin inscription of little interest.

Raphael's will has never been found, though it is referred to in an inscription on Maria Bibiena's grave, and though an entry of its having been drawn up and the names of his executors exist. He left his artistic property, drawings, &c., with a sum for the finishing of his pictures, to his two scholars, Giulio Romano and Francesco Penni, his house in Rome to Cardinal Bibiena, a sum of 1,000 scudi to be expended in masses for the repose of his soul, a pension to the Fornarina, and the rest of his property to his relatives. The bequest to these last, as in the case of another great man, our own Turner, was the cause of quarrels and litigation. The last link appertaining to his personal history, if not for all time, probably for our day, was added, when, on the 15th of September, 1833, his tomb was opened in the presence of the Roman authorities and a numerous gathering of distinguished personages, in order to ascertain the truth of Vasari's statement respecting his last resting place. The coffin was found, as described by Vasari, behind the altar of the chapel. One of the members of the commission charged to preside over the proceeding addressed a letter to Mons. Quatremère de Quincey giving a description of the remains found:—

"Le corps est bien proportioné, il est haut de cinq pieds deux pouces trois lignes; la tête, bien conservée, a toutes les dents encore belles, au nombre de trente et une; la trente-deuxième de la mâchoire inférieure à gauche n'était pas encore sortée de l'alvéole. On revoit les lineaments exacts du portrait dans l'Ecole d'Athènes: le cou était long, les bras et la poitrine délicats, *le ex cru marqué par l'apophyse du bras droit parait avoir été une suite du grand exercice de ce bras dans la peinture.*"

The delicate questions involved in any critical examination of Raphael's works lie beyond both the limits and the object of this paper, the purpose of which is to furnish the reader with the kind of preparation of which most strangers feel the want, when visiting the principal galleries of Europe, viz. such a summary of the facts of the painter's life as may enable them to recall the circumstances under which his best known works were produced. Nevertheless, before dismissing the subject we offer a word of advice to those who

are beginning their art studies. First of all, we recommend them to look, observe, and compare for themselves. Art, like her great original, Nature, will disclose many of her precious things to patience and humility; but these qualities are indispensable. Our second counsel is, to beware of much that is called art criticism, even the criticism of very clever persons. We cannot better illustrate our meaning than by citing a passage from an otherwise charming book, entitled *Idées et Sensations*, by Messrs. De Goncourt Brothers. The passage refers to Raphael's pictures of the Madonna, and runs as follows:—"Il lui a attribué un caractère de sérénité tout humaine, une espèce de beauté ronde, une santé presque junonienne: ces vièrges sont des mères mûres et bien portantes, des épouses de S. Joseph. Ce qu'elles réalisent, c'est le programme que le gros public des fidèles se fait de la mère de Dieu. Par là elles resteront éternellement populaires. . . . . La Vierge à la chaise sera toujours l'Académie de la Divinité de la femme." A more flagrant example of the worst sort of criticism could scarcely be found, since it is both unfair and inaccurate. The first gross inaccuracy lies in citing the "Vierge à la chaise" at all as an example of Raphael's usual treatment of the Madonna, when, as these gentlemen must be aware, it is in this respect no example at all. With the exception of this picture, which is a late work (1517), all his strictly lyrical pictures of the Virgin (and to these only the passage we have quoted applies) are early works, as, for example, the "Belle Jardinière," "The Madonna del Cardellino," "The Madonna del Gran Duca," and that of the "Casa Tempi." They, one and all, present in point of treatment as entire a contrast to the "Vièrge à la chaise" as it is possible to imagine. In the early works every quality is subordinate to, and held in abeyance by, the religious sentiment, whereas in the "Vièrge à la chaise" every trace of it has vanished. The wonderful beauty of the picture we acknowledge as freely as Messrs. Goncourt themselves, at the same time that their own words furnish the most striking testimony we could desire to its utterly pagan sentiment, since it is "L'Académie de la Divinité de la femme," that is, the impersonation of the Divinity of woman! As far as we know, the Divinity of woman has ever been, purely and pre-eminently, a pagan doctrine, and Fra Angelico, Perugino, and even Leonardo da Vinci would have protested against this representation of the Madonna, as ardently as any Protestant. Again, Messrs. De Goncourt say, Raphael's Madonnas have a calmness born of this world, the sort of beauty which comes of robust health: they

are perfect Junos in the amplitude of their proportions and the maturity of their charms. If, for Raphael, we could read Titian, Giorgione, or Guido, we should have understood the meaning of these critics, though we might not have shared their opinion; as it is, we confess to being hopelessly bewildered. To us it seems—and we would put it fearlessly to anyone familiar with the pictures we have named—that the fault of those pale, golden-haired women is, that they are hardly enough of women,—too ethereal, too rapt in mystic musings,—a trifle unreal. In spite of these abatements we should still say, that in his lyrical pictures Raphael is pre-eminently the painter of the Madonna—the artist who has given us the visions that most satisfy heart and imagination, of her who was pronounced "blessed among women,"—of her whose position towards our race is one of mingled dignity, humility, and mystery, and whose own estimate of her wonderful lot was expressed in the accents of devout submission, "Be it unto me according to Thy word." Her vocation implied the blending of elements so various, so strange, and so inconceivable, that we are at a loss to imagine the type of human character which would be least unfit to receive their impress. The Highest Authority has declared that the undoubting, loving, child-like spirit inherits "the kingdom of heaven," and we cannot suppose it was not possessed by her who was preferred before all her race. It is precisely this character which Raphael has given to his representations of the Madonna. These pictures as pictures, by no means his finest, prove that he possessed the very highest imaginative and creative powers; they mark his superiority over the greatest artists who had already treated this subject, as, for instance, Fra Angelico—whose creations, tender and lovely as they are, never walked this earth; or those of Perugino, which, in spite of their exquisite sentiment, are neither women nor angels. Into any consideration of his more extensive works we have no space to enter.

ART. III.—1. *The Restoration of Apostles and Prophets in the Catholic Apostolic Church.* London: Bosworth and Harrison. 1861.

2. *Edward Irving and the Catholic Apostolic Church.* By one of its Members. London and Liverpool. 1856.

3. *The Purpose of God in Creation and Redemption, and the Successive Steps for Manifesting the Same in and by the Church.* Edinburgh: Laurie. London: Bosworth. 1866.

4. *The Liturgy and other Divine Offices of the Church.* London. 1863.

WE remember Edward Irving as he was in the prime of his popularity. Our first sight of him was on a Sunday morning, outside the Presbyterian Church in Cross-street, below Hatton-garden. He had just brought home his bride, who was leaning on his arm, as they approached the church for morning service. There was a considerable crowd waiting for admission, if space could be found within, and the people respectfully fell back, that the couple might pass through. Meekly proud, as well she might be, the lady shared with her reverend husband a silent and admiring welcome. Wearing the robe of a Scotch Presbyter, he ascended the pulpit, and presented an appearance which none who saw would soon forget. Expressive features, rendered yet more striking by the cast in his piercing eye; the flowing locks of raven black; the gravity of his first address, with its thorough northern accent; the solemn, long-protracted prayer, profoundly devotional, and in some passages sublime; the fluency and passion with which he delivered a sermon from the manuscript before him, enchained the attention of his audience. Standing in the high pulpit, with rows of seats beneath him, widening to the base, and crowded with the chief members of his church, he seemed to form the apex of a living pyramid. The kirk was crammed with people from floor to ceiling. Peers and peeresses, ministers of State, privy councillors, and members of Parliament, with bishops and bishops' wives, participated in the form and method of a Presbyterian service. They drank in an elaborate discourse on prophecy, fulfilled and unfulfilled; they suffered words of cutting exhortation, with rebukes for godlessness and mammon-worship, and listened with decorous reverence to thunders of denunciation. There

was so much unaffected earnestness, with great originality of conception, that no intelligent audience could possibly be inattentive. His eccentricities were considerable, but they were quickly overlooked as the hearers yielded to a torrent of unfailing eloquence; and while he was intensely natural and plain-spoken, his directness was never offensive. Being well educated, and some time an esteemed assistant minister of the eminent Dr. Chalmers, he could maintain a dignified self-possession in the presence of any audience. The humble kirk being too small and incommodious for the aristocratic congregation from the West End, a larger building was soon erected for him in Regent-square, and thither he transferred his ministrations.

His doctrine, as everyone knows, was decidedly millenarian, and in that particular he was not singular, nor would millenarianism be counted as a grave heresy by thousands who afterwards turned against him without mercy. But his impetuous imagination was not brought under due control. While devoutly believing in the mystery of the Incarnation of the Son of God, worshipping the Godhead of the Saviour in agreement with the Catholic Church of all ages, he essayed to inculcate, with greater clearness than his brethren, the undoubted truth that the man Christ Jesus was perfectly human,—that He was very man as well as very God. In striving to be clear he became obscure, and worse than obscure. His teaching, as it was understood, might be summed up in such propositions as the following.

Human nature is one. God made of one blood all the nations of men. From one man the entire race descended, and all mankind flows from that one source in a living, unbroken stream. The source was polluted: the stream is polluted also. The universality of the pollution attests the oneness of the nature. To cleanse this nature from its utter pollution the Son of God took it into union with Himself. When He took part of a nature which is one He became one with it all, and sin being part of the nature, He necessarily took sin upon Himself as well as flesh. *In* our nature He overcame sin, for in *Him*, that is to say, in His Godhead, there was no sin. Having taken the *nature* which had *sinned*, He became in very truth identified with *it*, and was made a curse for *it*, even as it is written, "Cursed is everyone that hangeth on a tree." And now, to quote the summary of an apologist, the member of the Church whose book is noted above :—

"Though it (the humanity) was sinless in His person—pure as God is pure—it was still part of the accursed thing; and *as such* its

proper doom, its righteous desert, was seen when it was crucified and lifted up a spectacle of shame to angels and to men. On that cross we behold and see what was due to our flesh. And it is the oneness, the identity of our nature, which alone explains the mystery of the Just One suffering, and suffering righteously for the unjust. It was no fiction, it was no make-believe, that 'He bore our sins in His own body on the tree.' *They were the sins of His own flesh, inasmuch as all human flesh is one.*"

This last sentence conveys the ruling thought, and while often insisting on it with elaborate argument and attempted illustration, it was not possible for so intensely vehement a preacher to avoid conveying an impression to the popular mind highly injurious to the honour of the unspotted Lamb of God, in whom there was no sin. Nay, it was impossible to pursue such a course of reasoning without himself falling into an error deeper than perhaps at first he thought. He had confounded the idea of *nature* with that of *person*, attributing to the latter all that is attributable to the former. He had in effect ignored the plain statement of Holy Writ that τὸ ἅγιον, *that holy thing*, which was conceived by the Holy Ghost in the womb of the Virgin Mary was without inbred sin in birth, and without actual sin in life. He had overlooked the truth that a human being can be cleansed by the grace of God from the moral corruption of his nature, and that, moreover, the Son of God incarnate must be, from His conception, pure from sin. Irving's error characterised what was afterwards known as Irvingism, and its taint pervades the doctrine which has not yet been repudiated by the organs of the so-called Catholic Apostolic Church.

His meditations, however,—or, as he considered them, *studies*,—were chiefly on prophetic subjects, but they were not pursued under the clear light of history, nor aided by thorough scholarship in Biblical science. He groped his way in darkness, or he resorted for support to the speculations of minds kindred with his own. By incessant introversion on himself he mistook his dreamings for Heaven-taught realities, and at length believed that he had gained a special insight into the depth of hitherto unfathomed mysteries. Under the stimulation of excessive popularity as a preacher, and surrounded by enthusiastic admirers in the higher circles of London society, he had too little time for sober thought and recollection. It is well known that he translated a Spanish work on *The Coming of the Messiah in Glory and Majesty*, composed by John Jehoshaphat Ben-Ezra, the pseudonym of a Jesuit Father, Manuel Lacunza, a native of Chile. That

person had undertaken to interpret what he confessed himself unable to comprehend. Yet he fancied that he could read the hidden meaning of the Apocalypse, every word of which he regarded as of special interest, not only because the book is Divinely inspired, wherein Irving and he, and all of us, might well agree, but also as its meaning seemed to be brought out to his own perception by the shining of an inward light. Difficulties which were as yet insuperable to other men, were nothing to Lacunza. He could step over a difficulty in argument, or an impossibility in fact, and pursue his way content, satisfied in unreasoning faith. His own account of this happy frame of mind is clear.

"In truth," he says, "many of these things I do not understand. I cannot form a clear and precise idea of the manner in which they all should come to pass. But what does this matter? Can I comprehend the wonderful manner in which Christ is in the Eucharist? Nevertheless, I believe it. I believe it without understanding it, and it is this belief, faithful and sincere, which enables me to find in this sacrament the sustenance and life of my soul."—*Venida del Mesias*, Parte Primera, cap. i. sec. i.

Lacunza was well persuaded of his conclusion: his premises he did not understand, but neither did he understand the Saviour's words, *Hoc est corpus meum*, yet in them he rested his faith in transubstantiation. The same faith served him for both conclusions; first, that the Messiah would come again in glory and majesty in His human person to reign visible upon the earth, and also that the Messiah is bodily present in the Eucharist. There was a consciousness of grandeur in this heroic abnegation of reason, and in the glorious object to be contemplated by Lacunza: there was a charm which fascinated the ardent mind of Irving. Severely Presbyterian though he was, he could sympathise with the Jesuit, Ben-Ezra, in foretelling to the Jews the advent of the Messiah in such a form of majesty that this time they would receive the very Saviour that their fathers had looked for, but had not found in the Prophet of Nazareth. There was an air of sincerity in Lacunza which overawed the childlike soul of Irving, and must have won his unreserved adoption of the next following sentences, which we also translate from the original Spanish:—

"This reflection, which is doubtless the greatest and most solid consolation, I apply without any fear to all things that I read in Holy Scripture; and full of confidence and security, I lay down for myself this simple proposition: God is in everything infinite, and I am in everything little. God can do with infinite ease more than I

am able to conceive. Therefore it would be an infinite absurdity for me to think that I could measure His work according to the littleness of my ideas: therefore, when He speaks, and I am sure that it is He who speaks, I must surrender my understanding and my reason to lie captive in obedience to faith: therefore I must believe exactly whatever He says to me, and this not in the way that I think best, but precisely in that manner, and with all those circumstances which He has been pleased to reveal to me, whether I am able to comprehend them or not, because it is my faith that He requires, not my understanding."

There are cases in which such words as these may be consistent alike with piety and reason. When matters of absolute revelation are concerned, which it cannot be any man's duty to understand, he may surrender the reason which he cannot use; but in most cases God, who gave us understanding, requires us to use it, and in the lips of most men such language would be at variance with both. But it is remarkable that in this unqualified profession of implicit faith Lacunza, the author, and Irving, the translator, habitually agree. The sentences of the Spaniard represent perfectly the spirit of Irving's teaching, and therefore we borrow them as the key to some things which will follow.

The ministrations of Irving in Regent-square, in the years 1829 and 1830, were more than ever marked by the exceeding prominence given to the expectation of a personal advent of our Lord Jesus Christ to reign visibly over the Church on earth, and to a promised restoration of the miraculous gifts of healing, prophecy and tongues. The effect of this preaching was extensively felt. Millenarianism sprang up afresh, and became nothing less than a part of the personal religion of some of the most pious persons in Great Britain. In England, Cunninghame and Irving among the clergy, and Drummond among the laity, were its foremost representatives. At Albury, in Surrey, weekly conferences for searching out the meaning of the prophetic books of Holy Scripture were continued for about five years, from 1826 to 1830 inclusive, but there could not have been much progress made in real study where a select society of fifty enthusiasts were expecting to gain by prayers and debates knowledge which cannot be acquired without the aid of a kind and degree of learning which none of them were known to possess. Mr. Irving blew the trumpet of an approaching jubilee loudly in his pulpit, and Mr. Drummond kept alive the flame of speculative zeal within the extensive and ever-widening circle of his friends and correspondents at home and abroad.

As if the echoes of Irving's voice had resounded in his native country, the expectation of a second advent of the Saviour, with a revival of spiritual gifts like those possessed by the Apostles, prevailed in some parts of Scotland. Some persons looked for them, and were actually praying for them daily. Such prayers had long been offered up by some whose hope grew stronger as they advanced in life, and although there were as yet no visible tokens, declared on their death-beds a strong assurance that some extraordinary outpouring of the Holy Ghost would soon take place. Their utterances were mistaken for the voice of inspiration. The faith of those good people, like the faith of Lacunza, would have been admirable had it not been misdirected in looking for the Messiah that is already come; but when men expected to see decaying Christianity revived by signs and wonders which it is "tempting God" to ask, the compound of ignorance and fanaticism whereon such faith is built could not but lead to results like those which actually followed.

The chief seat of prophetic excitement in Scotland was a place called Port Glasgow, and its influence spread into the neighbouring parishes. At Roseneath, for example, a lady named Isabella Campbell died declaring that God was about to do great things for His people. Her "saintly life and glorious death were so extraordinary that a memoir of them was published after her death, by the minister of the parish, which excited much interest among religious people at the time."* The sister of this lady was at that time sick, and apparently dying of consumption; and one Sunday, after lying on the sofa all day, praying for the Church, she began to prophesy, and, as report said, speak with tongues, like the Apostles at the Day of Pentecost. All this some few of her friends confidently believed. For more than an hour the house rang with her exclamations, either in intelligible language—which was called prophesying, or in unintelligible sounds—which was called speaking in an unknown tongue; and all this she did without any appearance of fatigue. A few days afterwards the same "gift" fell upon a pious family named Macdonald, consisting of two brothers and a sister, in Port Glasgow. They, too, had been praying for the Church, but, as the writer of *The Purpose of God* says, "without any thought of asking for any extraordinary gift of the Holy Ghost for themselves," expecting nothing more than His ordinary sanctifying grace. But the Macdonalds also spake with

* *The Purpose of God in Creation and Redemption*, p. 151.

tongues and prophesied. The sister of the two Macdonalds, after lying in a dying state, as it was thought, was raised up by "the Word of the Lord," delivered through her brother, who commanded her, in the name of Jesus Christ, to arise and walk. She stepped out of bed, called for her clothes, dressed, and was healed immediately. The consumptive lady above mentioned, who had by this time grown worse, and seemed very near death, received an extraordinary letter from the same J. Macdonald. Mr. Macdonald wrote that he had been bidden by the Holy Ghost to command her in the name of the Lord to rise up and come over from Fernicarry, the residence of her family, to Port Glasgow. She received the message when in bed. The power of God, they said, came upon her. She arose, dressed herself, felt strong, ran to the ferry, went over to Port Glasgow, came back very well and cheerful, and when her mother thought her delirious, she quietly answered, "No, mother, I am healed."

The two ladies both prophesied and spake with tongues, were soon married and had children, and still retaining the gifts, lived in the enjoyment of them for some years. When those marvellous events occurred the alleged miraculous manifestations multiplied, and the house of the Macdonalds was crowded daily with persons who came to witness or to exercise the gifts. Messengers went up from England to inquire how far the reports of those manifestations were correct, and returned with so favourable an account of what they had witnessed that Irving fancied himself assured that his own predictions were fulfilled, and that the second coming of Christ in the flesh was near at hand. One of his congregation opened his house for weekly prayer-meetings, where supplication was made for the outpouring of the Holy Spirit, to be manifested by gifts like those bestowed upon the brethren in Port Glasgow, and elsewhere in the west of Scotland. Mr. Irving attended those meetings, joined in prayer, and now more than ever, both in public and in private, insisted that the looked-for time was come, and that the prophetic promises he had so often quoted from the Scriptures of the Old Testament were actually fulfilled. He insisted on this in every sermon, and his church in Regent-square was crowded with curious hearers by the renewed attraction. Cures, reputed miraculous, and noises of a strange sort began in England. In these prophetic prayer-meetings a lady began to pray under special influence, speaking partly in English, and partly in an unknown tongue. An intimate friend thus describes those early days:—

"I heard Mrs. ——, for the first time, speak in a tongue, and prophesy. It was very solemn. There were distinct sentences in an unknown tongue, and then three in English; viz. 'The Lord will speak to His people,—The Lord hasteneth His coming,—The Lord cometh;' the last words repeated many times with gradually increasing and then diminishing strength and loudness. At one of the meetings, not long afterwards, Miss —— sang in the spirit, and Mrs. —— spoke twice, ending with an earnest exhortation to holiness in the prospect of the coming of the Lord. When alone with her, she told me that she had been tempted at first through fear to restrain the power which came upon her, and that when speaking in a tongue, the nearness to God she then felt was unspeakable. One evening when regret was being expressed that only women had received these gifts, the power came on ——, with these words:—'It must be so, God hath chosen the foolish things of the world to confound the mighty, and things which are not, to bring to nought things that are, that no flesh should glory in His presence. The time is coming when with stammering lips and another tongue He will speak to His people, to whom He said, "This is the rest wherewith ye may cause the weary to rest, and this is the refreshing."' Then followed earnest exhortation to become fools for Christ's sake, to leave all for Him, yet not to desire opposition or persecution for self-glorifying, ending thus:—'Look to Jesus the Man of Sorrows; see Him your brother. He is glorified in saving you, in blessing you. Let Him be glorified, yield to Him.'"—*Restoration of Apostles and Prophets*, pp. 42, 43.

Common readers will find it difficult to discover any indications of a prophetic spirit in the effusion of Mrs. ——, which could be poured forth by any uninspired person of sufficient simplicity, and taking into account the many repetitions of "The Lord cometh," and the successive intonations *crescendo* and *diminuendo*, must have been ridiculous rather than solemn. Then the *power* necessary to constrain Miss —— to sing in the spirit! Then, again, the pressure needful to induce Mrs. —— to speak twice! Such amazing manifestations must have moved the company to express regret that gentlemen, as yet, had not received powers of supernatural extemporaneous utterance, and might have provoked the unseasonable wit of ——, who remarked with "power" that it must be so, since God had chosen *the foolish things* of the world to confound the mighty. No wonder that the clergyman of the parish, when duly informed of these proceedings, refused to sanction them, and no wonder that the new-born prophets went on without his sanction. The strange tongues, on this occasion, must have impressed the hearers with solemnity, *omne ignotum pro mirifico*, for certainly the monotonous Saxon rant could not. Nevertheless, as Fame

with her thousand tongues magnifies trifles, the report spread with almost electric speed that ladies spake with tongues and prophesied. Great was the excitement out of doors.

At the request of some young men in his congregation, Mr. Irving permitted special prayer-meetings to be held in his vestry, and himself presided over them, while they sought the like gifts for themselves, and, as might be reasonably expected, a manifestation of the usual description soon took place. At an early morning meeting, when one Mr. Taplin was beginning to read a chapter in the Old Testament, a voice like thunder burst from him in words—if words they were that none could understand. It was instantly attributed to the Holy Ghost. Mr. Irving, in his most implicit faith, gave thanks to God that he, through Mr. Taplin, had at length responded to their cry. This was repeated day after day, and the thundering noises, or the report of them, no doubt, sounded night and day, in the imagination of thousands. Meetings were then held in private houses for the purpose of seeking those unprofitable gifts, Mr. Irving doubting all the while whether the exercise of such powers ought to be allowed in public; for while his theory of implicit faith in things not intelligible required him to be thankful, his reason and sense of propriety revolted against such exhibitions. Yet some of his flock were by this time fluent in the mysterious exercises.

On Sunday, October 16, 1831, when the forenoon service in the church in Regent-square had proceeded "to the end of the chapter," which was, no doubt, eked out to considerable length by an exposition suited to the time, a gifted female left her pew, went into the vestry and closed the door, but uttered a sound loud enough to penetrate to the utmost corner of the church. The congregation was disturbed. Mr. Irving himself was startled, and thought it necessary to explain that "a member of the flock, being moved by the spirit, and not being permitted to speak, had withdrawn." He seemed agitated and perplexed, but the voice ceased, and the service continued. When the service was over, he went to the woman, accompanied by his elders and deacons, and had conversation with her on the subject. While they were speaking, the spirit, such as it was, again found utterance through her, exhorting and reminding him "that Jesus hid not His face from shame and spitting, and that His servant must be content to follow Him without the camp, bearing His reproach." Mr. Irving sank into a chair, and groaned with distress.

At the evening service, at which the congregation was

densely crowded, he referred to what had occurred in the morning, and then pleaded most eloquently. He declared that by silencing that woman he had grieved the Holy Spirit, and felt himself forsaken of God. No sooner had he ceased than a sound, unlike any human voice, burst from a man in the congregation, as if it would rend the roof. First, nothing was distinguishable but that strange tongue, and then the words, "Why will ye flee from the voice of God? The Lord is in the midst of you. Why will ye flee from His voice? Ye cannot flee from it in the day of judgment." Consternation, horror, disgust seized upon the crowded mass. Shrieks of alarm and shouts of anger drowned the voice of the mad prophet. Some escaped at the doors, some cried that the church was falling, some tried to pacify others, and Mr. Irving strove to quiet the alarm, but even his voice was lost in the tempest of confusion. Every eye was turned away, and no gesture of his caught the least attention. At length he was seen standing erect, as if petrified, his long arms pointed straight upwards, and his eyes labouring to follow in the same direction, as if he feared to see the deadly crash, and was imploring safety from Him who sits above.

This was a crisis in the preacher's career, and in the religious history of thousands. We could borrow much from the graphic sketches of spectators which appeared for many days in the newspapers, and from other sources, but the first and second volumes noted at the head of this article contain as full an account as could be desired. Mr. Irving's faith and courage, strong as they were, were sorely tested. For his part, he attributed the confusion to Satan, and in that delusion perhaps found some relief, being assured that Satan would soon be bruised beneath his feet. The violence subsided. The thousands who really served him found courage to return, and the riotous, content with the demonstration they had made, retired. The fanatics, however, were more stubborn, and the so-called prophetic utterances continued, but with abated vehemence.

Possibly, he might have retained his position as minister of that congregation, but he published a defence of the tongues, the prophesying, and the miracles, all which were indefensible; the tongues being a mere rattle of scarcely articulate sounds, more or less cleverly produced by imitation of what, at first, may have been idle sport. The prophesyings were incoherent rhapsody. The alleged miracles of healing had not one feature of miracle about them. Some of us have witnessed similar delusions on the Continent, and heard of many more.

The trustees of the church were offended, as were the members of the Presbytery, who summoned him to appear before them, and answer for himself. He came, and did his best to answer, closing with a speech in defence, four hours long. Mr. Taplin also was examined as to the gifts he had so wildly exercised. Mr. Irving could not change his views, and the National Church of Scotland, of which he was a member, could not tolerate his teaching or his practices. He was forthwith ejected from the church in Regent-square.

One morning, at six o'clock, when the usual congregation for early prayer proceeded thither, they saw their pastor outside the door, standing bare-headed, with a paper in his hand. He read the notice of ejectment which had just been served on him, gave an affectionate address to hundreds that stood around, and instructed them where to apply for information of the place that might next be found for their assemblage with himself. This was the first step in the secession which gave the name of Irvingite to his followers, and led to the organisation of that body which now assume the style of Catholic Apostolic Church.

He and they assembled for a time in Newman-street, Oxford-street, but very soon the Presbytery of Annan in Scotland, where he was ordained presbyter, deprived him of his orders on the charge of heresy, sustained by his own writings. The heresy was his doctrine of the sinfulness of our Saviour's human nature.

Meanwhile events were advancing rapidly. At the close of their first service in Newman-street, when, as pastor, he was about to pronounce the benediction, "Mr. D—— rose, in the power of the Holy Ghost, and blessed the people." Such are the words used to describe the promptitude with which Mr. D—— could seize on that opportunity for telling his troubled pastor that he must no longer occupy his usual position, and it is impossible to disguise the profaneness manifested in ascribing his rude impatience to an impulse of the Holy Ghost. The utterances of official prophecy were all extremely opportune. They came just in the nick of time, to meet the desire of the moment, or to sanction some cherished project, or to confirm some previous determination. So it was at Newman-street.

A few days after Mr. D—— had taken his minister by surprise, and cleverly set aside his pastoral benediction, Mr. C—— feels himself moved by the spirit to commit the like incivility. Again, a few days afterwards, while Mr. C—— was in prayer, asking God for the outpouring of His Spirit

upon the Church, there came a word of prophecy, declaring that the Lord had called him to be an apostle, and to convey His holy unction. Of course, the prophet, whoever he was, prophesied out of his own heart, and the blasphemy of such an imposture ought to have startled many, unless it had been most artfully concealed. Mr. Irving does not seem to have been satisfied that the word of prophecy was genuine, nor yet to have expressly conceded that either a prophet or any other person could commission an apostle.

"The next morning Mr. Irving, narrating the dealings of the Lord in the designation of Mr. C——, solemnly addressed him accordingly, adjuring him to be faithful, and warning him of the exceeding great responsibility and awfulness of his office. Also warning us against any idolatry or undue exaltation of a man, inasmuch as the whole Church was Apostolic, and, instead of needing to lean on any man, was itself 'the pillar and ground of the truth.' "—*Apostles and Prophets*, p. 66.

Now, if these last words were not utterly meaningless, which cannot be believed, they were almost a protest against the mockery of pretending to send forth an apostle, whom only Christ could send. Edward Irving might be deluded and deceived into a false course, but we believe that he could neither flatter nor dissimulate to gain a private end, or to gratify any man.

Other apostles were, nevertheless, called by the never-failing spirit of prophecy then active, and the company of apostles and prophets felt themselves at liberty to take measures, at their own discretion, for laying the foundation of an entirely new ecclesiastical system. But as the builders of a fabric must clear the ground of the deserted habitations before they can proceed to build the new, these persons began to do the easy work, not indeed of actual demolition, but of pointing out the defects of all existing Churches, and marking them for disoccupation at no distant period. In every one of the more ancient institutions they discovered signs of imminent dilapidation. They pronounced the Churches of England, Scotland, Rome, and Greece to be, each one of them, glaringly defective, yet each an integrant part of Christendom. They declared that Presbyterianism had proved itself unworthy by rejecting their signs and wonders. English Dissent and English Methodism they noticed little, if at all.

But while they sagaciously avoided hostility towards any established Church, and eventually determined to claim kindred with all, they made not overtures to any, nor com-

mitted themselves to direct aggression, but set about fixing upon some scheme of doctrine and government for themselves. They ransacked the Bible for all that might be appropriated to their purpose. The Song of Solomon was very fruitful of types and mysteries. So was the Apocalypse. The Pentateuch yielded for their edification all the objects of Hebrew ritual, the historical books furnished them with types at pleasure, and the prophetic books afforded symbols. The Book of Esther, "interpreted by the Holy Ghost, chapter by chapter, proved to be a most instructive and gladdening prophecy of the various events connected with Christ's kingdom." The times, they truly said, were perilous, and the new apostles flattered themselves that they might successfully invite the "Oxford professors, full of vain philosophy and presumptuous learning," and tossed on a dark and shoreless sea of inquiry and doubt, to accept "a haven of peace, and rest, and sunshine in the shelter of a Church where the Holy Ghost is ever taking of the things of Christ, and showing them unto us: irradiating with heavenly light and purity all that otherwise might seem trivial or earthly."*

Meanwhile this embryo community had sore trials. Even unclean spirits, as they believed, came to mock their prophesyings and disturb their brotherly unanimity. Mr. Irving and others tried to cast them out, and their experimental exorcisms succeeded sometimes, but at other times failed. Discernment of spirits they could not yet boast of, apostles though they were, and exorcism proved insufficient for the amendment of false brethren. Some even doubted whether, with all their pretension, there were any Holy Ghost among them. One of their number, Mr. Robert Baxter, seceded, and in self-defence published a pamphlet to show that although he had himself prophesied, his prophecies had not turned out as he expected, that many of his own firm convictions had given way, and there was too much reason to fear that many of the supernatural manifestations which took place among them betrayed the agency of a Satanic spirit. Mr. Baxter's secession brought much discredit on them; they greatly lamented his "fall," and perhaps that fall of a prophet contributed largely to the care they have taken to speak more lightly of prophets since the nomination of apostles has been accomplished, than they could have presumed to venture before the prophetic authority had impelled Messrs. D—— and C—— to thrust themselves into their old pastor's

* *Apostles and Prophets*, ut supra.

place, and establish an apostolic council, supreme and irresponsible. The gift of tongues, too, having proved eminently unsatisfactory, had to be somewhat lowered, as well as the gift of prophecy, and accordingly the new apostles discovered that their less learned predecessors, bearing the same title, did indeed need the power of speaking so that other people could understand, in order that they might preach the Gospel to the heathen, but that the power was not supplied to them in their own persons, but in another way, as was proved by the very ancient tradition that "because Paul could not speak Greek he was obliged to have Luke as an interpreter, and Peter was obliged to have Mark for the same purpose." So that the gift of tongues was never of very great importance. Assuredly this proves that these new apostles were not cumbered with any of the presumptuous learning of Oxford professors, for there was never an interpreter among them.

The "gift of tongues," as they called it, very quickly ceased, but it lasted long enough to attract considerable notice, and now serves the purpose of unbelievers, who would fain mark it as analogous with the gift bestowed on some of the Apostles, if not all of them, and their immediate successors. The notion of reducing a miraculous endowment and a fanatical delusion to the same level, was a chance not to be lost, and has been made the most of by Renan in his reckless parody of the narrative of the Day of Pentecost in *Les Apôtres*. It suited his purpose to overlook the facts and teachings of the New Testament, and adopt the theory that the real gift of tongues was not made for the sake of propagating the Gospel by means of verbal instruction, but that it was a jargon utterly unintelligible, and incapable of interpretation. This appears to be the recognised doctrine of the "Catholic Apostolic Church," and it prevails in some quarters where sobriety of judgment should have led to a more rational conclusion. M. de Pressensé, a French writer on *The Early Years of Christianity*,* makes it entirely his own.

"The Spirit of God," he says, "on its descent from heaven, finds human language a vessel too small to contain it. The ordinary forms of speech are broken through; a language which is beyond all known forms takes the place of ordinary words. It is the burning, mysterious tongue of ecstasy. Thus we regard those unknown tongues, of which mention is made in the Church of the first century. To speak in an unknown tongue, was to use that ineffable language which has no analogue in human speech."

* De Pressensé, translated by Annie Harwood. Hodder and Stoughton, 1869.

But this is all gratuitous. The testimony of ecclesiastical history is against it. The Apostles needed no interpreters, but always spoke intelligibly, and even the statement that St. Peter had an interpreter to attend him in Rome, for which Papias in Eusebius is cited, is not found on reference to the text of that historian. But the unreasonable faith of a Lacunza or an Irving naturally leads to infidelity.

After Mr. Irving had been sufficiently humbled by his ejection from Regent-square, his degradation by the Presbytery of Annan, and his strange position as an unauthorised layman in the midst of his former flock, some one prophetically conveyed the promise that "the Lord would renew his ordination, and place him as a lamp in His golden candlestick by the hand of His apostles." A few days afterwards a prophet was made to speak much in the spirit concerning the words of Jeremiah, "I see a rod of an almond tree," and to call on an apostle to ordain him as an angel over the Church on the following evening. The prophetic spirit seemed to have regard to the convenience of the gentlemen concerned, and on the following evening the arrangement was carried into effect. The parties duly assembled. "The mystery of the candlestick was shown forth." The ex-Presbyter knelt down very humbly, was kept kneeling a long time, and then by imposition of the apostle's hands exalted into the dignity of angel. Elders and deacons having been previously "called forth," they were sent out to procure unleavened bread, which they themselves made with their own hands, baked it, and brought it in, with wine. The apostle consecrated the elements, and the newly-ordained angel Irving himself gave them to the elders and the congregation, thus departing from the former Presbyterian custom.

A few days afterwards evangelists also were ordained, and thus was completed, or thought to be completed, the hierarchy of a new-born Church. "This, the 14th day of the first month,—our renewed Passover,—was ordered to be noted as an epoch, the beginning of a new series of years." "Angel" in the new vocabulary is equivalent with bishop, as it certainly was in the Seven Churches of Asia, enumerated in the Book of Revelation. Their complete hierarchy, as it now stands, consists of—

1st. Apostles *not ordained*, because they are said to be sent of God, with the remarkable limitation that there should neither be more nor fewer than twelve over the whole Church.

2nd. Prophets *not ordained*, for the same reason. Their only power is to prophesy, and their utterances are authoritative.

3rd. ANGELS or BISHOPS *ordained* by Apostles.
4th. PRIESTS or ELDERS *ordained* by Apostles, and EVANGELISTS or PREACHERS.
5th. DEACONS and DEACONESSES *ordained* by Apostles.
There are also *Under-deacons*, *Singers*, and *Door-keepers* admitted to their offices by *blessing*.

It is not our present business to trace to its close the history of Mr. Irving in connection with "the Church" in London, nor to recite the troubles of that remarkable man in his latter days: all this was done a few years ago in a very interesting biography by Mrs. Margaret Oliphant. He departed this life on the 8th December, 1834.

In the year 1835, the apostles, being increased to the full number of twelve, retired to the village of Albury, there to spend a year in consultation, and in some kind of reference to the Bible; an occupation which they designated study. The object of their meditations was to devise a system of administration for the Church recently extemporised: how to order public worship—how to administer the sacraments—how to set forth their doctrine. They further employed themselves in preparing "testimonies" against the prevailing evils of all the Churches and all the States of Christendom. The latter part of their work was by far the easiest. They could discern the motes in the eyes of their brethren, even if they could not see to pull them out. The Papal Government was favoured first of all with their animadversions. After lecturing the mother and mistress of all Churches, they addressed their testimony to the archbishops and principal clergy of "our own land," to King William IV., who received the paper with "his own hand," to as many of his Majesty's ministers as would take it, to the Pope as a temporal Sovereign, to the Emperor of Austria, and other kings and princes. They warned them all of the judgments they must expect from God if they did not mend their ways.

A decade of years was then spent in travelling on the Continent, to learn the customs of foreign Churches, in settling differences or putting disputants to silence at home, in framing and finishing a prayer-book, preparing vestments and church-ornaments, and thus fitting a miniature system by putting together a "tabernacle" of their own with fragments borrowed from ancient Judaism, and from the Greek, Roman, and Anglican Churches. They also sought to impart to their eclectic community a certain character of Catholicity by dividing the population of Europe into twelve "tribes," corresponding to the twelve apostles; and, to complete the

nominal perfection of the scheme, they declared Jesus Christ to be at the head of all, His twelve apostles under Him to be the rulers of the Catholic Apostolic Church, sent forth by Him into the whole world again to sit on twelve thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Israel restored. The division of Europe, however, was but provisional, and the boundaries of the tribes were neither territorial nor final. A mission has been sent to America, and it appears that congregations were established there after visitation by one of the twelve. The world lies before them, but how far they have gone to take possession it is not possible to say. Neither can we tell how far they have gone to adapt themselves to the diversities of language and customs in foreign parts, but they are their own masters, and will no doubt make themselves everywhere as much at home as possible. They will probably obtain from prophets opportune instructions to sanction any necessary adaptations, and to make such doctrinal and disciplinary amendments or additions as may be expedient from time to time. It is with them an avowed principle to profess themselves members of the Catholic Church, recognising in every branch of it enough of the primitive truth to make it Catholic, and to allow of their communion with it, and of occasional conformity.

The volume containing their Liturgy and Offices exhibits the fruit of considerable ingenuity, and might furnish some few useful hints if a revised edition of the Prayer-book of the Church of England were a revision seriously undertaken; but on the whole it is only an abortive effort to combine the English, Greek, and Roman rituals with the novelties of Newman-street and Albury, and establish the motley compound in Gordon-square, and its metropolitan and provincial dependencies. The doctrine of this "Catholic Apostolic Church" is not fully exhibited, not even in the Catechism which this book contains, but is in perfect agreement with the contents of the work printed in 1866, which bears for its title, *The Purpose of God in Creation and Redemption*. A few notes are all that can here be offered on the religion once called Irvingism, but now divested by its followers of any distinctive name, except it be Catholic Apostolic, which could scarcely be allowed it if the teaching of Athanasius were taken as the standard of Catholicity, and if the rule of apostolicity were sought in the writings of those holy and inspired men in whom the universal Church of Churches acknowledges the distinctive and incommunicable title of Apostles of the Lord Jesus Christ.

We have already noticed Mr. Irving's doctrine on the humanity of Christ, which he taught was sinful, although it did not sin. The confusion of ideas might have sufficed to make that teaching harmless if his disciples could have discovered it, but they did not. The manner in which they continue to speak of Him as "the *Man*" is utterly inconsistent with the worship due to Him as GOD. They practically overlook the explicit statements of Holy Scripture in regard to the perfect sinlessness of the incarnate Son of God, and the spirit which pervades their writings is precisely that which would be calculated to attract to their community the Socinian and the Jew. It is true that they worship Christ as God, but they only conceive of a secondary Godhead; and although the Liturgy abounds with verbal confessions of His Divine Majesty, it is so framed as to be entirely consistent with the reserve of an underlying Arianism, and does not prevent the members of their congregation from falling into the snare. Take, as an example, the following fancy. The writer sketches two systems—one religious, and the other political. The former represents the faith of the "Catholic Apostolic Church," the other is his ideal of a perfect temporal constitution:—

"RELIGIOUS.

"Those who believe that there is a God; that in the Godhead there are three persons, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit; the Father indeed a person with will supreme; everywhere present, reigning, ruling, governing all things; but who, at the same time, never does anything without taking counsel with Him who is the Wisdom of God, His Son Jesus Christ; who knows all men, their state, their wants; and as Almighty God our heavenly Father never does anything without taking counsel with the Son, so in all His government of the creatures He hearkens to the voice of His Spirit, making known to Him the wants, the groanings, the miseries of the lowest of His subjects, and also to the voice of those subjects themselves when they present their petitions unto Him; and who *forces* no man's will; while He punishes the transgressors of His laws."

"POLITICAL.

"Those who believe that there should be a king, whose will should be supreme; who is everywhere present by his officers; and who governs as well as reigns; whose ministers, by whom he governs, are *his* ministers, not the people's; but who, at the same time, never does or can do anything in the kingdom without taking counsel with his counsellors, his peers, yet his subordinates; and also with his commons, the representatives and voice of his subjects; who also has an ear ever open to the feeblest cry that comes to him from the lowest and meanest of his subjects, and a heart to discern their wants, even when unexpressed."

This is not Catholic doctrine, but a grovelling tritheism, in which each God is equally imperfect. There is no appreciation of that which is truly Divine, and the "Almighty Father," in this ideal, dependent for wisdom on the counsels

of a Son, possessing wider knowledge, and, for communication with His creatures relying on the more intimate intelligence of an all-pervading Spirit, is not many degrees higher than the god of Mormonism. The resemblance is not altogether imaginary in this respect, however little there may be found in others.

The establishment of prophets as an order in their Church, with prophecy as a gift to be had and exercised in the appointment of apostles, is a form of human presumption hitherto unequalled. A prophet is a messenger of God, Divinely inspired, charged with the burden of some special revelation, and furnished with such credentials as only He who sent him can bestow. He has authority to say that *thus saith the Lord.* He is taught by the Omniscient. He foretells events far distant. His predictions are in due time fulfilled. He is never sent without an errand. He never contradicts nor sets aside the revelation of a predecessor. He is never at the beck of any man, or any community. But if anyone pretending to prophetic authority lacks the credentials, or falls beneath the dignity of such a mission, he is a false prophet, obnoxious to disgrace and to the woes that are denounced against such pretenders in the unchanging Word of God. The same may be said of persons who call themselves apostles—messengers from whom? certainly not from the Lord Jesus Christ. If it had pleased Him to send forth any other, as He did send Saul of Tarsus, we should have heard of his call, we should have had witness of his power, and he would have shown us the signs of an apostle. To affirm, therefore, in so many words, and without hesitancy or abatement, that apostles and prophets are restored in the Catholic Apostolic Church, is to commit so strange and monstrous an offence against that Spirit whose Divine prerogative it is to lead into all truth, that human language does not yet afford a name by which it can be adequately described.

But if this be thought too severe a censure, and if it be possible that, after candid examination, the present writer has misunderstood the plainest words,—if the word God in the lips of these new teachers means, as it seems to mean, something less than the Being known to the ancient prophets, and if the Christ recognised by these apostles has attributes inferior to the perfections of Him whom all the angels of God worship,—then these apostles and these prophets may claim to be no more than shadows of the once accredited messengers of Heaven, and must expect the world to judge them, not by their pretensions, but by their works.

Let us mark those works. Compare one of Mr. Irving's best orations, delivered by him without any pretence to inspiration, with the shrieks of the prophetess who published her gift on that Sunday morning in the church in Regent-square, or the insane vociferation of the prophet who provoked a riot there in the evening, and say whether those effusions were so far superior to the eloquent discourses of the preacher, that their utterances should be declared Divine, and his human. Which of the two performances indicates the agency of that Spirit which giveth understanding? Or let anyone who has been present in any of the accustomed prophetic assemblies where pious people, without any pretence to inspiration, offer up their prayers with reverence and godly fear, say whether the incoherent ejaculations and heathen repetitions of which we have borrowed one of the least offensive descriptions from the pen of an advocate, are not senseless ravings. But it will be said that such scandals are not repeated now. If not, why not? They were the chorus of exultation that was raised while the foundations of this Apostolic Church were laid. They are still acknowledged as Divinely inspired utterances. Why, then, let us be told—why have these tongues been silenced? Why is the prophetic power now restrained?

If the Good Spirit of which they speak did really inspire the founders of this neo-Apostolic Church, and it pleases Him thus to come in answer to His people's prayers, why, during the last forty years, has not something great been wrought in evidence of His gracious presence? After all the study and apostolic travel of the founders, and after all their promises and protestations, they have done no more than bring back a parti-coloured wardrobe of sacerdotal vestments, incense, candles, chrism, and the consecrated host. This is all they have to show after their own prophets shouted so loud and long that Christ Himself was coming. If miracles, as they say, can be wrought by any who have faith enough, why do not these apostles work them? For what else were they sent? But we find no provision made in the Liturgy before us for such exercises. There is prayer four times a day. There are offices for all occasions. There is the "perpetual sacrifice," the consecrated elements, the "body and blood of Christ," as they say, ever kept upon the altar. There are the angels ministering with the sacraments, conveying grace continually, there is confession, absolution, and anointing with oil, but no signs of spiritual power for the renewal of Christian life.

Tongues and miracles have given place to an excessive

ritual, and the study of types and symbols, a modern cabbala, with perpetual predictions of the coming of a triumphant Christ in glory and majesty, to excel the Jesus of Nazareth, and satisfy the just expectations of the Jews, whose fathers were disappointed in the poverty of the Man of Sorrows. Professing to trust in revelations given to themselves, they look forward, in moments of despondency, to the expected coming of the Lord Himself to bring salvation with His own arm. "Until then," says the author of *Apostles and Prophets*, "we have no expectation of completing the deliverance of Christendom, or the rescue of more than a remnant from its impending judgments."

This is indeed a forlorn hope. It contrasts mournfully with that hope which maketh not ashamed, in which the Apostles themselves rejoiced with joy unspeakable and full of glory. The precious hope which has been sufficient for the confessors and martyrs of all ages, and which at this hour fills myriads of Christians in every land with peace and joy, is confessedly wanted in the Church whose history and experience is recorded in the volumes before us. Still there is a remedy. If the Albury apostles would turn away from the imagery of prophetic visions and the ornaments of their tabernacle, and devote themselves to the study of the whole Bible, with its plain history and explicit teaching, and, like their old friend Mr. Baxter, try their own spirits and distrust their own understanding, there is no reason why they might not return to the bosom of Christendom again, and adopt with joy the language of the Psalmist, "The entrance of Thy Word giveth light; it giveth understanding to the simple."

But while the apologists of this new community profess great reverence for "revelation,"—to which word, however, they attach an excessively comprehensive meaning, and quote from Holy Scripture for the sake of supporting the views they have adopted,—they deny the sufficiency of the Bible for our instruction, as earnestly as do the teachers of the Church of Rome. The only difference is that the Romanists supplement the Bible with tradition, that is to say, with teaching derived from Fathers, from Councils, and from Popes. "The Apostolic Catholics" supplement God's written Word with a something which they miscall "Prophecy," but in reality with decisions of their own. While St. Paul exhorts the Corinthian Christians to covet spiritual gifts, but chiefly that they may prophesy, or speak to men for their edification, and Our Lord commands us to search the Scriptures; these new expositors travesty Scripture, pretend that their prophets

are an ancient order restored to the Church, but assume the imperfection and insufficiency of prophecy itself. For our own part, so long as we believed a man to be indeed a prophet of God, we should bow submissively to every word proceeding from his lips, and consider him far superior to a bishop, as having a superior mission. Samuel, for example, was superior to Eli. But our friends have learned that, "in the Christian dispensation, prophecy, without apostles to rule and guide the Church, and all spiritual persons in it, is insufficient to keep the Church from error and confusion." This view of the matter is justified by their own experience of what they are pleased to regard as prophecy, and their practice is regulated accordingly, as well it may be.

The apostles whom they ordain pretend to have a wisdom superior to the persons whom, as they say, God inspires. It is the peculiar gift of these apostles "in the matter of words of prophecy, to combine those words which are spoken at divers times and divers places, and which at first sight might appear contradictory, and to make a whole out of them." For example, "Two words of prophecy came the same day—one in London, the other at Oxford—both having reference to the services in the Tabernacle as types of the services in the Christian Church, one of which said, 'The way to enter the house and upon the service of God was with a song, and then to offer prayers, supplications, intercessions, and thanksgivings.' The other word said, 'The way of the Lord for us in entering His house and on His worship was to kneel down, and to confess, and this to be followed by the word of absolution.'" When these two words were brought before the ministers they were perplexed, because they said they were contradictory. The apostle, however, settled the difficulty by declaring that the second sentence referred to the entrance of the priests into the outer court of the Tabernacle, to minister at the brazen altar, and the first had reference to the service of the golden altar in the holy place. To the brazen altar they came with confession, and sought for absolution, and they approached the golden altar with a psalm. After this manner prophets are managed and prophecies revised.

Then, as to the use of prophecy, which is often so contradictory and perplexing, the source of confusion rather than the means of life and order:—

"The revival of the word of prophecy and of other gifts has led to the restoration of ordinances of light and government, and the result of the restoration of these has been the setting in order of churches, and the recovery of the right forms of worship, and of all

things pertaining to the house and service of God."—*The Purpose of God, &c.*, pp. 165, 199, 201.

That is to say, new light is given, but it is uncertain as it comes, and *government* must regulate and direct the heavenly ray. The prophets are the lights, but the apostles trim them. Yet the Divine origin of such agencies is at first sight questionable, for can it be believed that while the Most High is in such a manner breathing His inspiring Spirit into the hearts of prophets, that they shall find out, somehow, the little details of a very artificial ritual, there is everywhere a silence of that same Spirit in the hearts of the people, even of the sealed ones, and such lack of guidance as to the sanctification of their homes, and neglect of that written Word which was given by the same Spirit to be the law of our life? In all the system, as we read of it in their own authentic works, there is a fatal oversight in this respect. The writers, without exception, grope in the dark, seeking after trifling matters relating to what they call Church Order, while the law of God, the pure and holy ethics of vital Christianity, are set aside, and slumbering prophets speak only as they dream. Some incoherent sentences escape them, which twelve apostles must labour to interpret. Men must wonder at the folly of leaving the lively oracles of God and waiting for another revelation of His will. Yet in the same books we read:—

"The worst mark of the times is the increasing infidelity as to revelation which pervades all ranks of society. In the lower orders it takes the form of the most audacious denial of everything ever made known from God to man; even to the very existence of the soul, and of any future state. And in the better educated, it is eating its cancerous way by the more subtle process, that while men profess to believe the Scriptures, they explain away the substance of the truth that is in them, and by their sciences of induction and deduction sap the foundations of all truth. 'Moses and St. Paul did very well for those days of ignorance that are past; now we have wiser men than they, who explain God's mind to us better than they could pretend to do.'"—*Ut Supra*, p. 187.

All this is too true, and if the Roman Catholic and the Catholic Apostolic propagandists would but make a better use of the Bible and cast aside their tradition and their prophecy, then the *Essays and Reviews*, and the writings of Colenso and Renan, of whom this author bitterly complains, would get fewer readers than they have, and, in a sense not intended by St. Paul, prophecies would fail and tongues would cease.

Novelties of any kind, we all know, will have their day. The species of ritualism industriously exhibited in some parts

of the country under the name of Catholic Apostolicity has not yet ceased to be a novelty, and in some parts of it there is a certain semblance of earnestness and piety which cannot but impress a numerous class of earnest and less guarded minds. Such is the great care taken of inquirers. The "evangelists" are zealous, no doubt, and their warnings of approaching judgments cannot fail to work upon many of their hearers, while their general courtesy and attention to hopeful proselytes cannot fail to subdue much hostile prejudice. As soon as an inquirer desires instruction in the faith and shows a willingness to seek for grace in baptism—for baptism previously received does not appear to be acknowledged*—the candidate is directed to take his stand at the farther end of the church, where he will be met by a priest, who is to conduct him as a catechumen. The priest kneels down with him and prays according to a form prescribed in the Liturgy, performs an exorcism over him, and having cast out every evil and unclean spirit, signs him with the sign of the Cross, and blesses him. After receiving instruction for a sufficient time, the catechumen, as he is then called, comes again to the same place, bringing persons with him; usually as many catechumens as can be collected are brought together, and in that case the ceremony becomes imposing. The angel, attended with four officiating ministers, comes down from the altar to the party of catechumens and sponsors, reads them a solemn address, accepts their vows of obedience to Christ alone, prays, blesses, retires with the ministers, and, when he and they have put on their proper vestments, they proceed to celebrate the Eucharist, but before communion the catechumens are forbidden by a deacon to depart. Within ten days they are directed to return again for baptism, which is administered with great solemnity according to a form compiled chiefly from the Anglican and Roman rituals.

The baptized proselyte should now be taken under special pastoral care, in the character of penitent, at least if he so desire, and having confessed, shall be absolved by the priest, and blessed in due form; but whether he passes through this

* The author of *The Purpose of God, &c.* (p. 349) professes to recognise all the baptized as of the Church, entitled to all its blessings, and subject to all its responsibilities. But the Liturgy shows distinctly that the baptism of persons not baptized in their infancy as Catholic Apostolics is utterly ignored. By the order for receiving a catechumen it is imperative that all such persons be treated as heathens who have hitherto wandered and strayed in darkness and uncertainty in the midst of the darkness of this evil world, and are now moved to seek for the grace of God in baptism.

ceremony or not, he must be publicly and solemnly committed to the charge of the pastors of the Church, on which occasion the angel, or bishop, will lay his hands upon him, if there be an angel to do it. He will then receive a solemn benediction, and be admitted to his first communion. In due time it is expected that an apostle will officiate, and in view of that further advance in sacramental privilege there will be solemn renewal of vows, and next after that ceremony a laying on of the apostle's hands. The communicants are acknowledged as persons who have been made children of God, members of Christ, and partakers of the Holy Ghost, "that they may be established, strengthened, and settled by the anointing of the Holy Ghost, *which is the sealing of the Lord.*" The address to be delivered by the apostle is absolute beyond anything that we can remember to have read or heard of elsewhere, and contains this extraordinary sentence: "So in like manner this holy seal, which is the very seal of God by the Holy Ghost, and strength and confirmation unto all goodness, will also confirm and bind upon the unclean the chain of those sins which are not put away with indignation and abhorrence." This ceremony exceeds in effort to awaken awe all that have preceded. The service is incorporated with that of the Eucharist, and at the proper time the angel comes down the altar-steps, leads up the privileged communicants within the choir, when the apostle calls down on them the Holy Ghost, prays Christ Himself to seal their foreheads with the seal of the living God, to write on them His Father's name, the name of the city of their God, and His new name, and bestow on them the manifold gifts of His Spirit. He signs each one with the chrism, or "ointment of salvation and eternal life," and, after all are thus sealed, he declares to them collectively, "Ye are washed, ye are sanctified, ye are anointed with the unction from the Holy One, in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost." This, he finally declares in a post-communion prayer, is "that anointing whereby they should know all things," which they have received from Christ Himself.

This is gathered from the last completed Liturgy, and must therefore be accepted as the authentic standard of their profession and teaching. The apostle who can bring his conscience to minister in such terms as these in direct appeal to God must be indeed stout-hearted, especially as all is not said in Latin, but plain English, which those present can hear and understand. Yet the sealing is no more effectual for personal sanctification than an ordinary Protestant English

Confirmation service, as their own experience must have shown, for the author of *Restoration of Apostles and Prophets* distinctly acknowledges that—

"Those who have received the sealing of their Father's name on their foreheads are in themselves as imperfect as others; even as Sarah was no better than other women. . . . In like manner there will be no undeniable, irresistible proof of the present work of God until the translation of the sealed, when it will be for ever too late to win the first prize. Until then we must be content to walk by faith, and not by sight."—Pp. 177—179.

But what is meant by the translation of the sealed?

They confidently affirm that the time is very near indeed when Christ will come in person to put an end to the present dispensation. They "believe that the Lord's coming is at hand, and that it is likely to take place in our day, and may take place at any moment." When He comes, the first resurrection will be the immediate consequence of His advent. The sealed ones will then rise "from among the dead," ἐκ τῶν νεκρῶν, and reign on earth with Him a thousand years. Thus will He take His kingdom. Then will be the translation, and, according to Albury faith, all persons who wish to enjoy the millennial glory should be catechised, exorcised, absolved, baptized, and sealed without delay. "Let them be warned, therefore. The Lord is nigh, even at the door. 'Behold, the Bridegroom cometh, go ye out to meet Him.'" The evangelists who preach and lecture to this effect are said to be Elias; theirs is the voice of one crying in the wilderness, Prepare ye the way of the Lord. The Catholic Apostolic Church prepares it. The peculiarities of worship, which are declared to be the appointed channels of the grace of God, the very way of holiness, are necessary to salvation. They are "the realities of worship." God has restored apostles to His Church to bring back the religion which was lost, and to anoint with the Holy Ghost all that will hear His voice through them, that so they may escape the judgments that are impending over apostate Christendom, and may stand before the Son of Man. The prophets who speak in His name are men inspired, and they who will not hear those prophets cannot hope to escape the vengeance they denounce.*

It is not our business to argue with the prophets, but simply to set before the reader a statement of the origin and characteristics of what is commonly called Irvingism, and

* *Truths for our Days.* A Tract.

refer to the books at the head of this article for information at first hand. The recent upspringing of the "Church;" its birth-pang when the woman in Regent-square "cried out with a loud voice," ἀνεφώνησε φωνῇ μεγάλῃ, as a learned narrator is careful to write it; the presumptuous biddings of Mr. D—— and Mr. C——, calling themselves prophets for the nonce; the season of quiet consultation in check of the first precipitate conclusions; the confidential comparison of notes at Albury; the Continental travels; the eclectic Liturgy; the symbolic vestments, ornaments, and ceremonies for public exhibition; the supplementary revelations, not much unlike those of Mohammed in their method; the comparative silence of their literary representatives as to personal religion in the members, contrasted with the clear injunctions as to "the Lord's tithe;" the system of exact internal discipline, with absolute authority vested in the apostles; the utter abnegation of reason in obedience to a blind faith in senseless and interminable revelations; the casting off all concern for evidences of the reality of a mushroom scheme sprung up in a hot-bed in Surrey a few years ago, until the translation of the sealed after the second advent of Christ, which is now expected to take place at any moment—all this is matter for misgiving to any who, under the fascination which sometimes lays hold on persons of imaginative temperament, have been fixed by the mesmeric glance of a skilful practitioner, and when utterly infatuated fancied themselves convinced.

After all that Christianity has done for the world during the conflict with evil for more than eighteen centuries, it is now pronounced a failure. These persons presume to say, in direct contradiction to Holy Scripture, that Christ, although enthroned in heaven, has not yet taken His kingdom, but that the triumphant faith of hosts of martyrs was of no significance, that the practical benefits of Christianity are a delusion, and the millions who have proved themselves to be made new creatures by its power, whose faith is dearer than life, and their love stronger than death, are living under an imperfect dispensation, which is doomed to a swift and sudden abolition. Yet these very persons coolly tell us that although they boast a restoration of the glories which dying Christianity has lost, they cannot show any undeniable or irresistible proof that they are much the better for it. Their high pretensions, therefore, may be successfully resisted, and their statements as to prophecy, and so forth, may be confidently denied.

ART. IV.—1. *Hiberniæ Leges et Institutiones Antiquæ. The Senchus Mor.* Part I. The Introduction and the Law of Distress, as contained in the Harleian MSS. Published under the Direction of the Commissioners for publishing the Ancient Laws and Institutes of Ireland. Dublin: at Her Majesty's Stationery Office, published by Alexander Thom. 1865.

2. *Rerum Britannicarum Medii Ævi Scriptores. Chronicum Scotorum.* A Chronicle of Irish Affairs, from the Earliest Times to A.D. 1135, with Supplement to 1150. Edited, with Translation, by W. M. HENNESSY, M.R.I.A. Published by the Authority of the Lords of the Treasury, under the Direction of the Master of the Rolls. London: Longmans. 1866.

3. *Rerum Britannicarum, &c.* The War of the Gaedhil with the Jaill, or the Invasions of Ireland by the Danes, and other Norsemen. Edited, with Translation and Introduction, by JAMES HAWTHORNE TODD, D.D., M.R.I.A., F.S.A., Junior Fellow of T.C.D., &c., &c. Published under Authority, &c. London: Longmans. 1867.

4. *Hiberniæ Leges, &c. The Senchus Mor.* Part II. London and Dublin. 1870.

> WHYLOM, when Ireland flourished in fame,
> Of wealth, and goodness, far above the rest
> Of all that bears the British islands' name,

are Spenser's lines referring to the time when the island of saints was as a light in a dark place, amid the thick gloom which covered Western Europe. But the lines may very well be referred to a still earlier date; for it is undeniable that in Ireland there was also a pre-Christian civilisation, though whether it was not already declining when St. Patrick came over is a doubtful point. Certain it is that before the saint's arrival disputes had broken out between the priestly and the bardic order, which, while they facilitated the introduction of Christianity by making the latter accept it as a means of thwarting their rivals, show, also, that the supreme power was weaker, and therefore the State less flourishing, than it had been.

To many readers, indeed, the idea of there having been any early Irish civilisation is simply absurd; for them the many remains betokening a high state of culture prove nothing, and the records which incidentally bear witness to the same are fabrications. Unless, however, the whole early literature of the nation is a forgery, this pre-Christian civilisation is a fact; and, as for priests and bards and ollamhs (learned doctors) and brehons (judges), these orders did exist, inasmuch as at no later period would it have been possible to forge so artistically the story of their existence. Has this age left any record of itself? How far is the law which, under the name of "brehon," lasted in Ireland till the seventeenth century, to be attributed to the natives, and how far to St. Patrick and his clergy? Were there any buildings such as might have been expected from a race which could appreciate such an advanced system of legislation? These questions are more easily asked than answered. With regard to the latter, many Irish antiquarians, the latest of whom is Mr. Marcus Keene, author of *The Towers and Temples of Ancient Ireland*, say that the men among whom St. Patrick came were quite unequal to the construction of buildings like round towers, or stone-roofed churches; not only they tell us, the old Irish civilisation had passed its apogee, but it had set and had been succeeded by a barbarism which (says Dr. Todd, *Life of St. Patrick*, p. 456) "had not reached the civilisation point of even idol conception, properly so called." This new school bases its theory on the often-noticed fact that the oldest Irish buildings are far better built than those of which the date is certainly post-Norman, than those of King John's time, for instance; the inference being that if the Irish, when taught by the Anglo-Normans, could only build very poor structures, they surely could not, unassisted, have raised marvels of masonry like the round towers of Cormac's Chapel. There are, also, the rhetorical statements of a whole string of writers, from Cambrensis to Sir John Davies, to the effect that the native Irish never used stone till they were taught to do so by their conquerors. Among these statements is that in St. Bernard's *Life of St. Malachy of Armagh*, about the outcry raised when the saint, otherwise unpopular, had built a stone church at Armagh, after the pattern of those which he had seen abroad: "We are Scots, we are not Gauls, that we should care for such vanities," said the Armagh people; but St. Bernard's evidence is hardly conclusive: he held a brief for his friend Malachy, whose appointment to the see was one of the earliest acts of Papal interference with the

old Scotic Church, and who was forced into an office till then hereditary (as all high Irish clerical dignities were) in the family of the local chief. St. Bernard's language about the Irish is as coarse as anything in theological writing; they are "a beastly race," because they don't pay tithes and keep Easter at the right time, they are hardly human, and so no wonder he deems them incapable of building with stone. Nor does the fact that, except for forts and churches, the Irish long preferred wattles, prove that they could not build with stone when they pleased; dwelling-houses they thought wholesomer when raised fresh and fresh, than when, lasting from age to age, they get saturated with organic matter. We fancy Miss Nightingale would be of their opinion, and would delight in the palace prepared in Dublin for Henry II.—"built of fair rounded wattles, after the Irish fashion." Further, the falling off in the quality of work is only too readily accounted for by the state into which the country fell after the English invasion; when, owing to the constant wars, barbarism increased, and whatever arts there had been in the country wholly died out. These new antiquarians who say that the earliest Irish buildings are the work of a wholly pre-historic race, possibly coeval with that which raised the mounds round the North American lakes, and with that which filled Easter Island with such a strange pantheon of giant statues, have found an unexpected ally in Mr. Parker. He, wholly disregarding the annals, and shutting his eyes to existing monuments, lays it down as an axiom that—

"There is no stone building in Ireland of earlier date than Henry II.'s reign. 'True (say they), Mr. Parker is quite right in one sense: there is none built by the inhabitants whom the English found in the island, and who were as incapable of building round towers and such like as the Red Indians are of reproducing the cities of Yucatan. The Scoti raised no stone buildings till the English taught them; the buildings which remain are the work of an extinct race.'"

This view is, we said, wholly indefensible if we accept the testimony of the annals, of which Ireland has a larger mass than any European country; for they speak of a regular series of building and repairing round towers, and these could hardly have been built except by men well able to construct ordinary stone structures. The object of these remarks is to throw some light on the social position of the people among whom St. Patrick preached; for on the estimate which we form of this depends our answer to the question—what part of the brehon law was self-evolved, and what a barbarous adaption of the

Theodosian code? We shall see, as we proceed, evidence that the brehon law was framed for a people well practised in the arts and possessing many of the luxuries of life: but first we must say something of the circumstances under which this code was traditionally put together. "Secundinus and Auxilius and Esserninus are sent to the Irish; but they obtain not pre-eminence or authority in the time of Patrick alone. The Senchus Mor was written this year." That is the entry in the *Chronicum Scotorum* for the year 438; 432 being the date of St. Patrick's arrival. In fact, when St. Patrick came the Irish seem to have been employed in codifying their laws, and, of course, their rapid conversion to Christianity rendered it needful that the saint should take part in the work in order that nothing contrary to the new faith might be retained. Hence the appointment of a committee of nine: three kings —Laeghaire, Corc, and Daire; three bishops—Patrick, Benen (his pupil Benignus), and Cairnech; three learned doctors—Rossa (after whom, it is to be presumed, the Fenian ex-schoolmaster O'Donovan named himself), Dubhthach (Anglicè Duffy), and Fergus. Of these the most active seems to have been Dubhthach Mac na Lugair, chief of the royal poets, and head brehon of Ireland; he (in the words of the introduction to the Senchus—

"*Put a thread of poetry around it for Patrick*, besides the judgments which had been pronounced by previous law-givers, and which he explained to Patrick." The principle on which the nine proceeded is made evident as follows: "Then Dubhthach was ordered to exhibit the judgments and all the poetry of Erin, and every law which had prevailed among the men of Erin, through the law of nature and the law of the seers, and in the judgments of the island of Erin, and in the poets. . . . Now the judgments of true nature which the Holy Ghost had spoken through the mouths of the Brehons and just poets of the men of Erin, from the first occupation of the island down to the reception of the Faith, were all exhibited by Dubhthach to Patrick. What did not clash with the written Word, and with the consciences of the believers, was confirmed; *for the law of nature had been quite right, except the Faith and its obligations, and the harmony of church and people.* And this is the Senchus."

The sentence which we have italicised, and which re-appears more than once in the preamble, is perhaps, all things considered, the most remarkable admission ever made by a missionary. It confirms all that we read elsewhere about the beauty of Patrick's character, his great tact, the breadth of his views, and his enlightenment, so wonderful in that, or, indeed, in any age. It also surely says a good deal for the intelligence and culture of those whose legal system could, in

the main, be adopted by one versed in Roman law—an intelligence which developed so rapidly that, at the time when the first commentary on the Senchus was written, we are told: 'these are the five things which should be known every day to every one who has ecclesiastical orders: viz., the day of the solar month, the age of the moon, the flow of the tide, the day of the week, and the festivals of saints." This was at the time when Alfred was complaining that he had only one priest south of the Humber who understood his breviary. Dr. Neilson Hancock, who has written the preface to the volume before us, accepting the tradition which makes Patrick a Roman citizen of Gaul, supposes that he learned his toleration from Theodosius, who, in framing his code, had selected the writings of five jurisconsults, two of whom, Papinian and Ulpian, were heathens. As, therefore, a Christian emperor recognised the opinions of great heathen lawyers, so it was natural that a Roman citizen should recognise all that was good in the pagan laws of Ireland. We cannot have Patrick's originality brought in question in this way. The Theodosian code could not have taught him much, for it was not published till 438, in which year it received the royal assent. If the Theodosian code taught Patrick toleration, how is it that no other missionaries —none of those, for instance, who before long came thronging into Germany, ever learned the same lesson from it? We adhere to our belief that Patrick "was as judicious as he was great, that he dealt tenderly with the usages and prejudices of the people among whom he laboured, and that he was guilty of no unnecessary or offensive iconoclasm." Thus it was that he was enabled to do a vast work in the way of converting, and also to make the Christianity which he introduced self-supporting. But to return to our code and to those who framed it. Benignus was Patrick's favourite disciple; he left his father's house when he was a lad of seventeen, just after the great missionary had begun his work, and followed him throughout, translating for him into Irish, and acting, first as his secretary, and then as his coadjutor, in the see of Armagh. His name, comparable with those of Donatus and Paganus (preserved in St. Donat's and St. Fagan's, the Glamorganshire villages where they were martyred), reminds us that the use of clan-names did not exist in early Ireland (it was introduced in the eleventh century); for in spite of his Latin surname, Benen was a "pure Celt," of the royal family of Munster. His mind seems to have been specially given to legal matters: besides his share in the "Senchus," he composed the "Psalter of Cashel" (all early Irish books are called Psalters, probably

because the chief part of them were in metre), which treats of the laws and prerogatives, etc., of the kings of all Ireland, and also the original of the famous "Book of Rights," in the more modern edition of which he is constantly mentioned as "the authority." Nothing, indeed, is so remarkable as the number and elaborateness of the old Irish law-books. In Cormac's Glossary, the greater part of which was composed (say Stokes and Petrie) in the ninth or tenth century, and which was rendered necessary by the change which had made so much of the earlier book-language unintelligible, there is a list of the best-known books of the time, and of these all but one are law treatises.

The third of the clerical compilers of the code, Cairnech, is said to have been a Cornishman who followed Patrick to Ireland, and devoted himself chiefly to the evangelisation of Leinster. There is a life of him among the Cottonian MSS., which Rees has translated in his *Lives of the Cambro-British Saints*. If he did come from Cornwall, Ireland afterwards well repaid her debt to that county by sending Perran and others to keep up the religion which Saxon inroads and intestine quarrels had brought to almost total decay. We may note that Patrick's name is known at Glastonbury, and his grave used to be shown there; but the person so named seems to have been the "old Patrick," named in the *Chronicum* as dying in 457. His great namesake lived till 489, and was buried in Downpatrick.

Of the three kings who took a share in the work, Laeghaire, son of Nial, of the nine hostages, was Ard-Righ or over-king, exercising such general authority as that unequally recognised suzerainty gave. He does not seem to have become a Christian:* there is the tradition of his burial in the rampart at Tara, and of his directions to his son that he should not be interred in the Christian fashion, but "planted upright like a man in battle, and with his face to the south, still bidding defiance to the Leinstermen." Anyhow he gave the "clerics" full leave to preach and teach, "provided the peace of the kingdom was not disturbed." His associating Patrick and his friends with the compilers of the code, was (says the introduction to the Senchus) "because he saw all his Druids overcome by the great signs which Patrick wrought in the presence of the men of Erin." At first his position towards the new faith had been

* The non-conversion of Laeghaire is confirmed by the following entry in the *Chronicum*:—"A.D. 507. Death of Lughaidh, son of Laeghaire, king of Temhair (Tara). He was struck on the head with lightning from heaven, for denying Patrick."

one of decided hostility: he caused Patrick's charioteer to be put to death, in order to bring on a quarrel in which the newcomers might be destroyed; but his people, with characteristic kindliness, did not combine against Patrick; the missionaries rapidly made way; the tide set strongly in their favour, and Laeghaire turned with it. Neither is it supposed that Corc, of Cashel, accepted Christianity, for his grandson, Ængus, is always spoken of as the first Christian king of Munster. He is, however, always mentioned in the Chronicles in terms of affectionate esteem, as "Corc who did no evil deeds!" Of Daire little is known, except that, as king of Ulster, he granted to Patrick the site of Armagh. These three, then, represent the lay-element among the compilers. The code is stated in the "introduction" to have been put together "by the composition of the poets, the addition from the law of the letter (*i.e.*, of the written word), and strength by the law of nature," which is explained in the commentary as "the part of the law of nature from which the pagans passed their judgments." These three kings, then, stand in just the same place as the four Frankish chiefs who, about 421, drew up the Salic law, and whose work was revised by Clovis, after the Franks had, as a nation, accepted Christianity. The fact that the other three who were associated in the work were not Druids but poets, points to the feud which we spoke of as going on between the two orders. Of late, the very existence of Druidism has been called in question, and men like Sir G. Cornewall Lewis and Mr. Burton have been disposed even to throw overboard the authority of Cæsar and Strabo and Diodorus. This is surely scepticism run mad. While no one but a Welshman would uphold the elaborate system of Ovates and the like, with all their sharply-defined functions, and their elaborate ceremonial, it is impossible to reject Cæsar's testimony to the effect that what we call Druidism existed in Gaul, and that in Britain it was found in still greater purity. Hence, it could scarcely have been altogether absent in Ireland. Druidism in Ireland appears as antagonistic to the power of the chiefs; this is explained either by its being a recent importation, brought in, perhaps, by the Pictish tribes who early settled in Wicklow and elsewhere, or by its having been the worship of the earlier race, called *tuatha* (people) *da Danan*, who were crushed by the last wave of Celtic invaders, those whom tradition represents as coming in by sea from Spain. The latter view would be undoubtedly correct, but for the universal practice among Irish writers of using Druid as an adjective to mean magical, so that when the earlier people are spoken of as "great

Druids," it may merely mean they were looked on as enchanters —as the Finns were by the Scandinavians. Mr. O'Beirne Crowe, in a remarkable essay on the religious beliefs of the Pagan Irish (Kilkenny Archæolog. Assoc., April, 1869), gives reasons for believing Druidism to have been introduced into Ireland in the second century, "probably by Druids whom Roman persecution drove over from Gaul and Britain, and who were looked on as magicians;" and he contrasts the ease with which Patrick made his way with the difficulties which he would have had to encounter in dealing with a highly organised system such as Cæsar speaks of in Gaul. The word "Druid"—very common, as we said, in all the later Irish writings, especially in the romantic tales, of which so many are extant—is very sparingly used in the earliest pieces which have come down to us. It occurs only once in the very early ancient piece, called "The Guardsman Cry," the preface to which tells us:—"Patric made this hymn. In the time of Laeghaire, son of Nial, was it made. And the cause of its making was for his protection, with his monks, against the death's enemies who were in ambush for the clerics." In this hymn, about which there are some interesting remarks in the *Saturday Review* (5th Sept., 1857), the author prays "against incantations of false prophets; against spells of women and of smiths and *of Druids*; against every science which is wont to profane the souls of men." So again, St. Columbkille—if the poem is authentic which he is said to have composed when escaping from King Diarmuid—prays against *sreod* (some Druid charm), and says he puts no trust "in the voice of birds, or in warnings of chance, or in spells cast by a woman; *Christ is my Druid.*" Other writings, of more certain antiquity—Fiacc's *Life of St. Patrick*, Brocan's *Life of St. Bridget*, Colman's *Hymn*, etc.—do not mention the word; a sure proof that the thing was not universally spread over Ireland at the time of the introduction of Christianity. Dubhthach, then, the most important of three poet-lawgivers, author of hymns preserved in the ferial of Ængus the Culdee (*circa* 780), is styled in the *Senchus*, a doctor of the Berla Feine (speech of Irishmen, the most ancient, *i.e.*, of the known dialects of the Erse). The "introduction" to the code begins with a poem by him, the occasion of which is as follows:—"Laeghaire ordered his people to kill a man of Patrick's people;" and the king's nephew, then a prisoner, volunteered to do the deed, if liberty and other rewards were promised to him. He took his lance and went towards the clerics, and hurled it, and slew Patrick's charioteer. "Then the cleric

was angered, and lifted up his hands to the Lord. . . . And the Lord ordered him to lower his hands to obtain judgment for his servant who had been killed, and told him he would get his choice of the brehons in Erin. And the choice he made was to go according to the judgment of Dubhthach, the royal poet, *who was a vessel full of the grace of the Holy Ghost* (probably, therefore, already a convert). Hence the custom that whenever anyone comes over sea to prosecute his cause he shall have his choice of the brehons in Erin; and when he comes across the boundary of a province he shall have his choice of the brehons in the province."

Dubhthach does not relish his position: "It is severe in thee, O cleric (he says) to say this to me; it is irksome to me to be in this cause between God and man. If I say eric-fine is not to be paid, it shall be evil for thy honour; if I say it is to be paid, it will not be good in the sight of God, seeing thou hast brought in the judgment of the Gospel, to wit, the rule of perfect forgiveness, whereas there was before in Erin the law of retaliation." Patrick then blesses his mouth, bidding him speak by the grace of the Spirit, and the end is that the murderer is condemned to die; but, "since all deserve pardon since Christ's crucifixion," his soul is forgiven, "so he is adjudged to heaven, and it is not to death he is adjudged." The case is remarkable, as proving an attempt on the part of the "clerics" to introduce the punishment of death for murder, like the attempt made by Alfred nearly four centuries later. It did not succeed; the commentary quaintly explains why: "now-a-days we keep between forgiveness and retaliation, and exact the eric-fine, for now *no one has the power of bestowing heaven, as Patrick had in that day.*" This judgment having been accepted—a sure sign that Laeghaire saw that the mind of his people was with the new-comers—Dubhthach, as we have said, exhibits "the judgments and all the poetry of Erin, and every law which had prevailed through the law of nature and the law of the seers, and in the judgments and in the poets; for it was the Holy Ghost that spake and prophesied through the mouths of the just men that were formerly in Erin." What part Fergus, "a poet," and Rossa, "a doctor of the Berla Feine," took in the work we are not told; doubtless they helped their colleague in "putting a thread of poetry" around the code. Thus this first authorised collection of early Irish laws was put forth, of which its introduction says: "no human brehon of the Gael is able to abrogate anything that is found therein." It is variously called the "Cain Patraic" (Patrick's Canon) or the "Senchus Mor," the great *Senchus*, about

which untranslatable word the glosses heap together a more than Talmudic amount of twaddle. Senchus, for instance, is traced to the Hebrew *son*, to the Latin *senex;* it is rendered "the old road to knowledge," "the old contract," etc. Then another commentator suggests that the true form is *Fenchus*, "the way of knowledge of the Feine" (or old Irish), and that the *F* was changed to *S*, because "Soiscela" (Gospel) begins with *S*, or because "Soter" is a name for Christ. Of the important part that Patrick played in its composition, we may judge from the note that "until he came only three kinds of men might speak in public—a chronicler to relate events and tell stories, a poet to eulogise and satirise, a brehon to pass sentence from the precedents and commentaries. Since his coming the utterance of each of these classes is subject to the man of the white language (*i.e.*, of the Gospel)."

What was the result of all this law-making and compiling? Are we to suppose, with some, that Patrick and his successors merely filled the land with religious houses where literature was cultivated, while all around was left in savagery, even the Christianity which had been promulgated being strongly tinctured with heathenism; or are we to believe that the culture became general, and that nothing but the thorough break-up of "the egg-shell civilisation" of the Irish Celts during the desperate struggle with the Norsemen prevented the Island of Saints from showing to Europe, not only a remarkable series of great Christian teachers and missionaries, but a whole people law-fearing and highly educated? We incline to the latter opinion—the traces of culture left after so many centuries of war, the poor scholars, the hedge-schools, the old chroniclers wandering about in poverty and neglect, with their precious manuscripts in their bosoms, all testify to that innate love of letters which (though it seems wanting in the Gaul) has always been found both in Gael and in Cymri. Just now, when our Laureate has once more called attention to the Arthurian romances, we may well be pardoned for dwelling (as we have done) at some length on the intellectual status of the people for whom the brehon-code was compiled. If anything in the range of comparative mythology is certain, it is that the Arthur story is a mediævalised version of the Scotic epic of Diarmuid and Graine (of which we spoke when discussing Mr. Campbell's *West Highland Tales*). When we think of the number of Irish works awaiting, in the Bermingham Tower in Dublin Castle, or in the Dublin Custom House, or in foreign collections, some new O'Donovan or O'Curry to give them forth to the world, we may well be struck with

amazement at the tenacity with which those who had lost everything else clung to their literature. They had lost everything else before the zeal for chronicling died out among them. The case of the O'Clerys, hereditary bards of the O'Donnells, is known to all readers of Irish history. They, ruined clients of a ruined house, wrote the annals of the Four Masters within the roofless walls of Donegal Abbey after their chieftain had been dispossessed. As melancholy as anything in Irish literary history is the fate of the Mac-Firbis (the name is another form of the Scotch Forbes), who compiled the book which stands second on our list. About this zealous compiler, the most striking fact is the miserable poverty in which he lived and died. And so it was with the rest. The Elizabethan invaders were strangely incurious about the antiquarian lore of those among whom they came as "undertakers." Spenser dismisses the Irish poets with a line of faint praise, and the brehons (or judges) with a half-sneer (though he cannot help admiring the equity of their decisions). But if he, and Raleigh, and Sidney cared nothing for Irish literature, they did not actively suppress it; they left it to the chances of war; and, in spite of all the misery of Elizabeth's Irish wars, the Mac-Egans, hereditary brehons, to whom we owe that splendid MS. the "Speckled Book," compiled in 1397, still kept up their law-school at the village of Lecan in Tipperary, and the O'Donovans, another learned family, still taught at Burren, in Clare. It was reserved for Cromwell's men to finish this work of degradation and ruin. Henceforth books, yellow or speckled, would have to be kept secret and written by stealth. The brutal and unappreciative colonel who had bought his men's shares of land for a barrel of beer, and had settled down with the Book of Joshua for his guide among a nation of "Canaanites," would not be likely to respect an Ollamh or a professor of brehon-law. The wonder is that so much has come down to us, that all was not sold and conveyed abroad, as indeed we know that so much was (the "book of Lecan" itself did not get back from France till 1790).

Dr. Molyneux, writing in 1709 of another distinguished Irish antiquarian, Roderick O'Flaherty, heir to a handsome patrimony which he had lost by "confiscation," says:—"I went to visit old Flaherty, who lives, very old, in a miserable condition, some three miles from Galway. . . . I expected to have seen here some old Irish MSS.; but his ill-fortune had stripped him of these, as well as of his other goods, so that he has nothing left but some few of his own writing, and a few old rummish books of history printed."

Forty years before this, Mac-Firbis, in a note to one of his books, wrote:—"It is no doubt a worldly lesson to consider how the Gaedhil were at this time conquering the countries far and near"—he is speaking of King Dathi, whose raid into Gaul reached right on to the Alps—"and that now not one in a hundred of the Irish nobles possesses as much of his land as he could be buried in."

It is a "worldly lesson," and some of its teachings assuredly remain to be learnt by both sides now-a-days. On the one hand, men ought to know when they are beaten—in spite of the proverb, it has been at all times the wisdom of the English to know that; only Irishmen and Poles refuse to do so. On the other hand, men should cease to be astonished and to talk nonsense about "race" and "ne'er-do-weel Celts" and so forth, when it is plain that the present state of Ireland follows inevitably from its past history; it did not need a Goethe to tell us that—

"Böses muss mit Bösem enden."

But why, asks the modern Scot, with an excusable curl of the lip, did no Wallace, not even a Norman Bruce, arise among those nobles of the Gaedhel? Plenty of Wallaces, in good sooth; but, unhappily, an utter want of the needful Edward II. Moreover, Ireland had the fatal gift of fertility, which enticed swarm after swarm to go across and lay deep the roots of that "ascendancy" which has so long been one of its troubles. Take this one fact: James I., who so cleverly "settled" Ulster, wanted, at the same time, to "settle" the Isles after the same fashion. He had Skye advertised for the "undertaker;" but Skye was not a tempting investment. Listen to the groans of the French, who from time to time came to help the Scots, and got hard fare and sore discomfort for their reward, and you will understand why Scotland held her own—kept that without which no nation can thrive—her native aristocracy, while the Irish nobles were replaced by the Strongbownians and these again by others, and so on, till we must look to successful commissariat agents in Cromwell's army for the origin of men who now own half a county. Surely, looking at things as they are—as, for long years yet, it is to be feared they must be—the most English of Englishmen will allow that it would have been far better for Ireland to have been "settled" somewhat in the Scottish way, than as it was in 1649 and at the Boyne. One word more about Mac-Firbis. He came by his death in a manner strangely indicative of the times. He was going to Dublin, probably to visit Robert, son of Sir John Ware, in whose house he had

lived for some time, collecting MSS., and assisting Ware in his researches. Ware, by the way, repaid himself for Mac-Firbis's board and lodging by coolly appropriating his work without even once mentioning his name. On his way up, the old Ollamh stopped for a night at a small house in Dunflin, in his own county. While he was resting in the back room "a young gentleman of the Crofton family" (as Mr. Hennessy calls him) came in and began to take liberties with the girl who served in the shop. She, to check him, said the old gentleman inside would see him, whereupon, in a rage, the savage seized a knife from the counter, rushed in, and plunged it into Mac-Firbis's heart. The murderer was never brought to trial. Mac-Firbis was one of those mere Irish whom it was no murder to kill. The Crofton family was powerful. Even Dr. Charles O'Conor simply says: "This last of the Firbises was unfortunately murdered at Dunflin in 1670, and by his death our antiquities received an irreparable blow. . . . . The work which employed the last years of his life we may well suppose lost, for he lived without a patron, in days unfavourable to the arts of which he was master." So says the author of *Oggyia Vindicated*, "withholding the details from publicity (says Mr. Hennessy) *out of consideration for the descendants* of the murderer."

Very different were the lives of O'Curry and O'Donovan, and yet there is something exceedingly melancholy in their being taken away before the work to which they had devoted those lives was half accomplished. O'Curry especially seems to have been the most careful and scrupulous of interpreters; his county (Clare) was always noted for having kept up the tradition of its Irish scholarship; he was (as Mr. Matthew Arnold calls him) "the last of Irish scholars;" and verily to interpret the *Senchus Mor* good scholarship was needed. The text in the Berla Feini (oldest Irish) had become obsolete when Cormac wrote his glossary (not later than 950). Again Cormac's "hard Gaelic" needed in the fourteenth century to be put into "fair Gaelic;" and fourteenth-century Irish is so different from that spoken now-a-days as to be to an unlettered person almost unintelligible. No wonder, therefore, the plan had to be adopted which Dr. Hancock details in his interesting preface*: "Preliminary translations were made, in which many words and phrases were left untranslated, and many more

* We wish the Government would separately publish the prefaces to the Irish laws as well as to several of the other volumes in the Rolls series; the books can only interest a few, but all would be interested in knowing something about them.

remained obscure. The entire version in this form was read over by other Celtic scholars; and then the glosses were studied, as well as the various existing glossaries, and at last, after repeated consultations, meanings were assigned to almost all the passages." Unhappily, Dr. O'Donovan died after he had finally corrected the second proof of the first few pages, and Professor O'Curry's death, almost immediately after, prevented the remainder from being submitted to him. The advantage of this joint editorship is seen by a reference to the ludicrous "various renderings" of Welsh triads, &c., given in Nash and Stevens; sometimes what one sanguine Cymrian has made into high-flown rhapsody on some grand speculative question, becomes in the version of one who takes to the task no preconceived ideas about "hidden meanings," a satirical doggrel, coarse in sentiment, and scurrilous in language. Those indeed who have at all looked into the subject know that of many of the extant Welsh poems the import will never be ascertained. Welsh literature is far less continuous than Irish, and the key to much of the old Cymric seems hopelessly lost. Even of works like the *Senchus Mor*, with all its apparatus of glosses and comments, we can fancy O'Curry saying to his less-practised associates, as Merlin says to Vivien:

> "*You* read the book!
> And every margin scribbled, crossed, and crammed
> With comment, densest condensation, hard
> To mind and eye; but the long sleepless nights
> Of my long life have made it easy to me.
> And none can read the text, not even I;
> And none can read the comment but myself."

However, the volume is a very shapely one, with its Erse on one page and English on the other, the former oddly mixed up here and there with bits of Latin written in Irish character, just as if (as the commentary says) "it was written by Patrick, and Benen, and Cairnech in a chalk-book (vellum prepared with chalk) to preserve it for the men of Erin."

Of the code only one volume has already appeared. The Brehon Law Commissioners are as slow in bringing out the next volume as if they had had the whole weight of Irish affairs on them for the last four years; but before this is published the next volume will have probably appeared. The present volume treats wholly of the "*law of distress*"—the universal remedy, it would seem, for vindicating a right or redressing a wrong. The plaintiff or creditor, after due notice, took witnesses and a law-agent and distrained. But in almost every case there was a certain "stay" allowed—the

chief subject-matter of the book being the specification of this "stay" in a multitude of particular instances. The "distress" was placed during the "stay" in a public pound, and fed at the defendant's charge, and, at last, if the claim was not satisfied, it was valued, and its value, less the fine or debt and the expenses, was returned to the defendant. It is strange that distraining should in these early days take such a prominent place in Irish law; but so it is, as in the Teutonic codes of the time, as in the laws of Howel Dha (A.D. 934), every possible offence has its price, measured either in *seds* (apparently "cattle," cf. *mulcta*, a fine, and *multa*, a sheep, our "mutton"), or in *cumhals*, which originally meant female slaves, and was retained in after times as a measure of value; or in *screpals*, seemingly some money value.

The chief interest of the book is in the immense amount of incidental information which it gives as to the state of the Irish in the fifth century. These hints are all the more unsuspected, as they are combined with a primitive simplicity of arrangement. Thus the code begins with a wild legend which is supposed to account for the way in which "distress" is levied. "Fergus Ferglatha ('the grazier,' because he was a successful horse-breeder), King of Ulster, was driving by the seashore with his charioteer, when they rested and fell asleep, whereupon the fairies came and carried away the king; but as soon as his feet touched water he awoke and caught three of them. 'Life for life,' said they; but Fergus would not let them go until they had taught him how to pass under loughs, and pools, and seas. 'Thou shalt have this,' said they, 'save as regards one lough. Into Lough Rudhraidhe, which is in thine own country, thou hadst best not enter.' So Fergus could pass under seas, and one day he would go under Lough Rudhraidhe; so he left his chariot and his charioteer on the bank, and went in. And in the lough he saw the Muirdris, a fearful monster. One moment it used to shrivel up, and then swell out like a smith's bellows. Whereupon, through the horror of that sight, Fergus' mouth became stretched from ear to ear, and he rushed out of the lough, and said to his charioteer, 'How seem I?' And he said, 'Thy aspect is not good; but sleep will restore thee.' So Fergus slept in his chariot. Howbeit, his mouth remained stretched so, as at the sight of the Muirdris, and the wise men of Ulster consulted whether they should take another king, because a king with a blemish might in no wise rule in Emhain. But because they loved Fergus, their counsel was on this wise—That before he returned, his palace

should be cleared of rabble, that there should be no fools or idiots in it who might reproach the king with his blemish, and that for his daily bath muddy water should be provided, that he might not see his face therein. So for three years King Fergus reigned, and knew not that he was blemished. But one day he bade his bondmaid, Dorn (who was a hostage for the slaying, by her brethren, of King Conn's brother while he was a fugitive with Fergus), get ready his bath; and it seemed to him that she did it slowly, so he touched her with his horsewhip; and she straightway taunted him with his blemish; so in his madness he cleft her in twain with his sword. Thereupon he arose and rushed into the lough, and stayed therein a night and a day, during which time the lough bubbled up, so that the noise was heard far over the land. And there was a manly attack of Fergus on the monster, and at last he rose to the surface, holding in his hand the Muirdris's head, and cried to those who were watching, 'I am the conqueror, O Ulstermen.' He then went down into the lough and died. But the Feine demanded eric-fine for Dorn; and none durst take it till Asal, son of Conn, to whom the King of Ulster was fain to yield eric, according to the law then established. And the settlement was on this wise—For the slaying of Conn's brother, Fergus's fugitive, 18 cumhals, to wit, the honour-price of a king for violating his protection; and to Fergus, also, because Dorn reproached him with his blemish, half-honour-price, because she was a bondwoman, nine cumhals. And on the other side, to the Feine for the killing of Dorn, the hostage whom they had given in pledge to King Fergus, 23 cumhals; and to Dorn's father, a chieftain of the first rank, six cumhals for the killing of his daughter; and to her brother four cumhals. So that from the Feine were due to the Ulstermen 27 cumhals; and from the Ulstermen to the Feine 33 cumhals. So that, by the judgment of Sen, son of Aighe, this first sentence concerning 'distress' was pronounced; and Sen also ruled 'that the crime dies with him who committed it.' And this was the first beginning of the law of distress."

A strange story it is, almost like what we should look for among South Sea islanders: yet it is surely full of points of interest. It tells us, more than pages of "chronicle" would, what manner of people these were among whom the code grew up. This Sen mac Aighe, by whose decision the Ulstermen and the Feine consented to be bound, was a Connaughtman, like many more of those pre-Christian brehons, whose wisdom and justice are left on record. These men were

bound in the strictest way to impartiality. Of Sen, as of several others, it is recorded that whenever he pronounced a false judgment blotches appeared upon his right cheek, and did not disappear till the false judgment was reversed. We all remember the story of Moran, who never passed sentence without a chain about his neck which tightened if he decided wrongly. Some of them needed no such monitor. "Fithel had the truth of nature, so he pronounced no false judgment. Comla never decided wrongly, through the grace of the Holy Ghost which was upon him." If the brehon-law had, as we are constantly told, no sanctions for the people, it certainly had, in pre-Christian times, at least, very strong ones for those who administered it. Now, all this is very valuable, not, of course, as actual history, but as showing the character and feelings of the people among whom such stories grew up. Here is a race which has often been stigmatised as lawless; and yet, not only is the great bulk of their earliest literature made up of law-books, but nowhere, not even in the Hebrew Scriptures, is the need of justice in a judge so strongly insisted on. Surely we see in this the natural appeal from the horrible injustice of the present to that golden age, which the vanquished have always seen somewhere in the past. It was the feeling which led the English in Stephen's time to crave the laws of the Confessor. Crushed by the Norsemen, nay, worse, first reduced to lawlessness and demoralisation by the persistent invasions of those marauders, and then crushed again by the Anglo-Normans, and forced under a law which they did not understand, and which no one was careful to explain to them, the Irish Celts extended the Latin proverb, till to them English law and injustice seemed synonymous. Then awoke the passionate looking back to old annals, the perpetuation, among Ribbonmen, among Terry-Alts, among Peep-o'-Day Boys, among all those whom we look on as most lawless, of the old forms. The Ribbon-agent who shoots the landlord, or houghs his cattle, is but carrying out the principle of "the law of distress." A man has been wronged, according to the views of himself and his fellows; he is turned out, perhaps, with no compensation for improvements; his rent is trebled on the patch which by five years' work he has won from the waste. He has a right to redress; English law will give him none; so the old code is appealed to. Due notice is given to the oppressor, before witnesses, as the brehon law required. In these degenerate times the notice often takes the uncanny form of a coffin sketched and posted on a tree in his demesne. But notice it is; and then, after

the proper "stay," in the barbarous way necessitated by the circumstances of the time, the "distress is levied." There is not the slightest doubt that, when the inhabitants of a Donegal glen resent the handing over to a Scotch sheep-master of the "mountain" which is their life, by making his sheep have a hard time of it, they are acting, in their own opinion, up to the spirit of the native code. This provided that every tribesman should have land proportioned to his needs. The chief saw that this was done, and made periodical redistributions to suit changes in families. No doubt it was a barbarous system, "striking at the root of property," rousing, therefore, the ire of men like Spenser, full of all the new Tudor notions of individual landed-proprietorship. It gave no encouragement to building, for who would build on what might next year be assigned to another? But it was the Irish system; it produced a certain amount of happiness, and allowed a certain degree of culture, and it has remained up to the present day deeply rooted in the affections of the people.

Four years ago, when this instalment of the *Senchus* was published, an essay on it appeared in the *Revue des Deux Mondes*, and the writer called attention to its political value, and to the need for studying it on the part of any statesman who would get at the grounds of Irish discontent. Statesmen have been doing this; and it is not too much to say that, though the volume is still withheld which treats of the land-law of early days, more than one English statesman has been aided in finding what Irish ideas about the land really are, by seeing what were the provisions of the brehon law on that subject.

Having given the wild story which stands at the head of this law-book, let us now mention a few of the notes which it supplies as to the state of the people for whom it was framed, and who (be it remembered) had poets—as the word *fili* is inadequately translated—and not priests for their lawgivers. This separation of king, and priest, and lawgiver is in itself a mark of culture and of advancement. As for etiquette, in which Ulysses found the Cyclops so sadly wanting, there is only too much of it in this, as there is also in the Cymric codes. This, too, proves a certain kind of civilisation—not, indeed, the highest kind, and often (as in Mexico) connected with much moral evil; but still, where it involves consideration for the weak and helpless, showing a spirit essentially Christian. The rules, for instance, laid down in this code for the care of the sick would do honour to any community. The man who is preparing medicines for them is exempt from

"distress." It is provided that the sick man be duly taken care of—he must have a proper house, "not a dirty snail-besmeared house, but there must be four doors to it, that he may see and be seen from every side, and water must run across the middle of it. Dogs, fools, and female-scolds are to be kept away from it; and there must be due provision of plaids and bolsters." There are similar provisions for maintaining fools and lunatics. "Five cows is the fine for neglecting to maintain the fool who has land and *power of amusing;* and his having both is the cause of the smallness of the fine. Ten cows is the fine for not providing maintenance for a mad woman; and if the fool has no land, or has not the power of amusing, the fine for neglecting him is equal to that for the mad woman who can do no work, *and her rights precede all rights.*" Parents, of course, are cared for; and it is enacted that after a man's ninetieth year his land shall pass from his family who have not maintained him, to an extern family who have maintained him. There is a great deal, too, of what Mr. M. Arnold calls "sweetness" in the laws respecting "satirising"—somewhat answering to our law of libel. Specially severe is the punishment for satirising a man after his death, and still more severe that "for false boasting of a dead woman." Rank among the Irish Celts, theoretically at least, instead of giving immunity for wrong-doing, ensures heavier punishment. We have seen how strictly the judges were bound to justice. So, again, the offending poet is punished more severely than other men; and, in general, "as to all persons who have full honour-price, every crime they commit is a full crime." And this, again, is notable: "There are four dignitaries in a territory who may be degraded—a false-judging king, a stumbling bishop, a fraudulent poet, and an unworthy chieftain who does not fulfil his duties. . . . If men have worthiness and property with which they do good, they have full honour-price because of them. If they have worthiness without property, and do good, it is half the honour-price. If property only, without worthiness, and good be done with it, half the honour-price. If they have worthiness and property, and do not do good therewith, there shall be only one *screpal* for them. And should any one have property, it shall not increase his honour-price unless he does good with it." What a comment, all this, on the behaviour of the typical Irish landlord: he has property, and he has worthiness, *i.e.*, social rank; but as for doing good with them, Charity herself cannot assert that he does so. No wonder, then, that his "honour-price" is low among people

who have been taught to value men by such rules as that just enunciated.

Here again is a rule which stands out in striking contrast with the intolerable grievance of separate courts for ecclesiastics, a grievance which did so much to make people in England ripe for the Reformation. After naming a list of offences—wounding, betraying, refusing to give food, adultery, &c., the doer of which, if a layman, loses half his honour-price until the third offence, and then only is mulcted of the whole, it is enacted that, if the offender is a cleric, he is to lose his honour-price *at once*. Even here there is a distinction: after paying eric-fine and doing penance, the cleric returns to his grade, unless he is a virgin bishop. The married bishop, after due penance, resumed his office; but the virgin bishop, for that he had made a greater profession of holiness, could not recover from his fall, but was bound to become a hermit. There are many spots still shown in which such bishops made their retreat. On the coast of Clare, not far from Loop Head, is a steep rock, the flat surface of which contains a few perches of ground; here are two of the "bee-hive houses"—stone-roofed buildings, in appearance just answering to their name—which are found here and there in the south-west. The rock is called "The Island of the Starving Bishop," and indeed it is difficult to see how the penitent who established himself on it could escape starvation.

The people for whom this code was put together made bridges; had roads, for the keeping in repair of which there were special provisions; held fairs on public greens, for disturbing which there were special "distresses;" set aside a portion of land (called cumhal senorba) to support the indigent members of the clan; had elaborated all the complications of special water-rights, and "several fisheries," which have given so much trouble in modern Ireland; had set apart a sort of consuls to see to the maintenance of strangers cast ashore; they *levied fines for quarrelling in a fort*, and for leaving gaps open in fences, and for damaging herb-gardens; moreover, worked iron ore as well as gold; used kilns and churns; had intricate rules for the employment and remuneration of law agents in levying "distress;" took care that the common tillage and pasture lands of the tribe were properly worked and fenced; received (as did the Anglo-Saxons) men's testimony according to a graduated scale—the King's outweighing that of all others, *except the doctor of learning, the poet, and the bishop.*

These people held truth in such esteem that the liar lost his

honour-price (*i.e.*, the privileges of his rank), and special fines were imposed on the man who spread abroad a calumnious story: they had a common net just as they had a common pasture for every clan; they had clan-physicians; they practised hospitality by keeping in the chief's house "the ever-full cauldron, out of which came the haunch for the king, bishop, and literary doctor; the steak for the queen, the leg for the young chief, the heads for charioteers, etc." (hence, the fondness for "bit and sup" in modern times); they understood the use of salt-marshes; they used the bones of stranded whales for making saddle-trees and the backs of sieves; they had, besides the periodical distributions, strict notions as to personal property in land, the fact that a man had trenched or walled it, or had had it spoken of as his in the songs of the poets, being held as evidence of title. This fragment of old verse, embodied in the text, shows the state of the people in very early times: it may be compared with "the three precious things," in the laws of Howel Dha:—

> "The seven valuables of the chief of noble bounty,
> Who exercises hospitality in various ways—
> A cauldron, vat, goblet, mug,
> Reins, horse-bridle, and pin."

The pleaders in the law-courts were timed, not by clepsydra, but by the more primitive method of counting the breathings (eighteen to the minute). But the things which surprise us most are the *objets de luxe*—mirrors, all sorts of requisites for embroidery, chess-boards, playthings for children (in the distress on which there is a delay, "for they are requisites"—the old Irish law is as tender towards children as is the modern Irish custom); lap-dogs and other pets (the pet word is *peatha*, pure Gaelic). And combined with all this culture they had slavery—slaves being of three kinds—hereditary, or strangers purchased from over sea, or *men who had fallen from their rank*. War-prisoners were held to ransom, and not enslaved, at least in the period when the code was put together.

From these facts we may form a fair notion of their state. We may also notice their custom of frank-pledge; their strong regard for truth (already referred to) shown in the proverb, "By the truth of the men of the Feine," and in the memorial verse (or triad)—

> "There are three times when the world dies—
> At the time of a plague, of a general war,
> *Of the dissolution of verbal contracts.*"

In poetry we expect to find them excelling; and if an elaborate division of styles and metres is of any value, they

certainly had it in perfection. The old Irish poet was an improviser; indeed the claim to the first poetical rank was "composing a quatrain without studying." The poets also performed incantations; hence, of course, their feud with the Druids, whether these were later in-comers or the priestly caste of an earlier race. Several charms are detailed in the *Senchus*, among them one very like that which King Latinus performs in Æneid vii.; but we are told that "Patrick abolished all these, and judged that whoever practised them should have neither heaven nor earth, because it was renouncing baptism." One point deserves notice as being contrary to the usage of the highly-civilised nations of antiquity: "there is distress with a stay of three days for mutilating or stripping the slain in battle." It is also notable that the looker-on at any transgression is punished with fourth, half, or whole fine, "except clerics, women, boys, and imbeciles." It is not often, indeed, that clerical influence comes prominently forward, though one of the triads recommends the payment of tithes, first-fruits and alms, as preventing plagues (apparently common in old Ireland), general wars, and troubles between king and subjects. Two enactments have a strangely modern look—that about "removing the vagrant," and that providing reapers for the chief—just the "duty work" of which the Irish tenant complains. Indeed, it is clear that in return for fixity of tenure, or rather for his right to a sufficient plot of land, the clansman had to do a good deal which his descendant would find very irksome. One more custom must be noticed: if the defendant was a chief distress could not be levied until the plaintiff had *fasted upon him*, a custom which may be compared with the sitting *dherna* at the debtor's door which is described in the laws of Menu, and which has occasionally been made such an alarming process (as where troops have taken this means of enforcing payment of arrears) that it is prohibited by special regulation in the Bengal Provinces. As to the language of the code, we have already noticed that some portions are much older than others; the more modern, with the usual vice of later Irish style, launch out into most curious and grandiloquent language about the Creation and the universe, and talk pure Ruskinese about the colours and forms of the clouds; the older parts are very terse, full of minute points like the old Roman law, though often (as in the case of Fergus) a legend is brought in, mostly by reference only, to illustrate a case. Such is the early Irish code, and it undoubtedly bears witness to a certain kind of civilisation; moreover it enables us to

understand the sense of injustice which has rankled in the Irish mind because the English ignored all this, and, by persistently treating the conquered race as barbarians, succeeded in making them such.

We spoke of clerical influence: this, though, as everyone admits, it was usually exerted for good, was seldom able to countervail the thoroughly unchristian influence of feudalism. Hence, despite all that is said about Mariolatry being a witness for the emancipation of the weaker sex, there is a growing tendency in the mediæval codes to lower the legal status of woman, which among the Celts (as Cæsar testifies in his account of Gallic marriage settlements) was one of independent equality. The compilation known as the laws of Howel Dha, at least 400 years later than the Irish code, shows again and again this feudalistic deterioration; for instance, "a woman is only the third part of a man, therefore in court she does not stand as one against another." The Irish code, on the contrary, is most tender of women's rights, and allows them special privileges as pleaders. Here is a case in point: when a man brings a suit against a woman of chieftain grade he serves a notice of ten days and fasts; when against a woman of lower grade, he serves a five days' notice without fasting; but when a woman brings a suit she has only to give a two days' notice, with or without fasting, according to the rank of the defendant.

As to the question whether it is possible to establish between Celtic and Teutonic codes a distinction depending on supposed peculiarities of race—the former being deductive, the latter inductive—we hold the attempt to be delusive. It is by no means certain even that the last pre-Christian immigration into Ireland consisted of Celts; they might have been another race, who, while adopting (as the Scandinavian settlers in Donegal and Man and the Hebrides did in later times) the language of the aborigines, may have sensibly modified their institutions.

Questions like these need an amount of Celtic scholarship such as we are not likely to have till Mr. Matthew Arnold's hint about a Celtic professor is acted upon. Men such as O'Curry and O'Donovan are most valuable; but men like Zeuss are still more precious. Their general culture gives them qualifications for criticism which the others cannot possess, just as Wilson or Max Müller would probably be better critics of a Veda than the most learned of pundits. Of course Mr. Lowe will scoff, and will go on snubbing science and literature after his fashion, but there is no doubt that a chair of Celtic, or better,

one of Gaelic and another of Cymric, at Oxford, would be the most useful, as it would be the most graceful act which could accompany the throwing open of the Universities. A Celtic professor under Cullenite influence is almost worse than useless; his views must be prejudiced; but the founding of such a chair at Oxford would be immensely valued by our Celtic fellow-countrymen, and would be one of those really conciliatory measures (like the union of the Irish and English Bar) on which the *Saturday Review* wrote so sensibly not long ago.

Spenser's notices of the brehon code (in his *State of Ireland*, that quaint colloquy between Eudoxus and Irenæus, which shows such a wide knowledge of facts, such a shrewd insight into immediate causes, combined with a more than "Philistine" want of sympathy with the people) are curious. "It is a nation (says he) which scarcely knows the name of law, but instead thereof hath always preserved and kept their own law, which is the Brehon," and the instances that Irenæus gives, especially the composition for murder, which Spenser does not seem to have known was common to all the Teutonic codes, led Eudoxus to say "This is a most wicked law" indeed; to which his friend replies, "It is a rule of right *unwritten*, but delivered by tradition, in the which oftentimes there appeareth great show of equity, in determining the right between party and party, but in many things repugning quite both to God's law and to man's." Elsewhere he speaks of the whole posse of Brehons, advocates, law-officers, &c., as "a rabblement of runagates, for whom the short riddance of a Marshall were meeter than an ordinance or prohibition to restrain them;" and he heaps contempt on "the great use among the Irish to make assemblies together upon a rath or hill, there to parley about matters and wrongs between township and township, or one private person and another." He wonders that any should hold themselves bound by the decision of such rabble meetings. Even he, however, sees clearly that English law did not suit the then position of Ireland: "laws ought to be fashioned unto the manners and conditions of the people to whom they are meant;" and, while he is careful to show that the brehon code gave no man more than a life interest in the land, he points out that it secured to everyone a maintenance, which the practice, taught by the English invaders, of "keeping a man as a tenant-at-will, by which means the landlord thinketh he hath him more at command," made precarious. Thus the principle of periodical redistribution, and that fixity of tenure for which the tenant is now crying out, are at bottom

the same; both give the occupier a personal interest in the land which, under modern ideas of property, he cannot hope for.

We revert, then, to our three original propositions. Is the existing code authentic? The best authorities (and men like Dean Graves and Dr. Hancock are not likely to be moved by considerations which might sway O'Donovan or such mere Celts) believe, after patient investigation, that it is. What portion of it may be safely referred to the date of its compilation (the comments are confessedly later), and what part is pre-Christian, is a question for the Celtic professor when we get one; and the settlement of this point involves the answer to our second question—how far the code as it stands is based on the Roman law, in which Patrick must have been versed, and how much on pre-existing customs? We may say at once that the land-regulations are all eminently un-Roman, for (however it may have been in earlier days, when the *ager publicus* was not a legal fiction) the tendency in Roman codes was more and more to regard land as the landlord's property. In the case of punishment for murder, the endeavour to introduce Roman use and abolish the eric failed, though (as we saw) it had Patrick's express sanction. We may therefore fairly argue that the foreign influence was small, except, of course, in ecclesiastical matters; in fact, that the code itself gives a fair account of the principle on which it was drawn up. As to the third question—how far it was ever acted on, and what sanctions it had amid the wars and tumults which mark the Irish annals, we can only say that universal testimony (we have just quoted Spenser's) is in favour of its having been respected in a way which, considering the times, is absolutely marvellous. Spenser, indeed, qualifies his admission by hinting that "the judge, being, as he is called, the chief's brehon, adjudgeth for the most part a better share unto his lord or to the head of that sept, and also unto himself for his judgment a greater portion than unto the plaintiffs;" but if injustice had been the rule we cannot imagine the people clinging obstinately, as Spenser says they did, to a code which they were always free to exchange for the English common law. We have no wish at all to talk wildly about a golden age of clanship which never existed save in the fancy of the modern Celt; but a careful study of the *Chronicum* and other annals leads us to the conclusion that the state of Ireland did deteriorate rapidly after the Norse invasions began. That, then, becomes true, for the first time, which unhappily continued till the extinction of the native rule, that it is the exception for an Irish king to die in his bed. It is always so with these "egg-shell civilisa-

tions;" the bringing in of a foreign element is the sure precursor of disorder and misrule. Sometimes, as in the case of Mexico, the native system wholly passes away; sometimes, as in Ireland, it struggles on, showing itself in blind attempts at restitution more or less contrary to universal law. How will it be in Japan? Europeans are now brought face to face with a civilisation as elaborate as any that the world has seen; will it share the fate of the Mexican? or is there persistence and vitality enough in the Japanese system to outlast the shocks inevitable on the first coming in of Western nations?

Of the other two books on our list we have said comparatively little, because they are of less general interest than even the instalment of the brehon code which has already appeared. What will most strike the general reader in the *Chronicum* is the life of Mac-Firbis, the compiler. The *Chronicum* is his; just as the *Annals of the Four Masters* belong to the O'Clerys; while the *Senchus* was an heirloom of the Mac-Egans, brehons of the O'Connors, kings of Connaught. On one of the MSS. on which the published volume is based there is a marginal note, dated 1350, by Aidth (Hugh), son of Connor Mac-Aedhagan (Egan)—"who in his 20th year wrote this in his father's own book, in the third year of the great plague (the black death)."

The *Chronicum* forms a pleasing contrast to the forged annals of the Pictish kings, and other such like documents. Of course, there are a few pages at the beginning about Partholan and the Fomorian pirates, and Milidh, or Milesius, and Scota, daughter of Pharaoh, and the other worthies of pre-historic Ireland; but they are only a few pages, and just where later forgeries begin to be precise there are large and frequent blanks. In the introduction, too, there are remarkable notes about physical changes—the formation of rivers and loughs, and the breaking out seaward of waters from the great central bog, changes which the present physical aspect of the country makes highly probable. Naturally, a large part of the later period is devoted to the struggle with the Danes and the "hostings," both against the strangers, and of one tribe-clan against another. Yet the chronicler finds time to record such things as the catching of a 12 feet long salmon, a great yield of nuts one year, frost, and great sweeping snow (as in 1094 and 1111), "so that droves of cattle walked across most of the loughs and rivers," as well as marvels, like the "stealing off" of a certain lake, and its re-appearance elsewhere. Very important are the Church records towards the middle of the twelfth century, *e.g.*, the synod of native bishops

under the comarb of Patrick in 1148, at Inispatrick, near Dublin. This shows the working of that evil leaven, which was to leaven with Popery the whole lump as soon as the English supremacy was established, and which originated with the Danes, who refused Irish orders for their bishop of Waterford, and went to Canterbury, *i.e.*, to Rome.

Irish antiquaries are much disappointed at the selection of our third book, *The Wars of the Gael against the Gall* (strangers). It is contemporary indeed, or nearly so, with the closing scene, the great battle of Clontarf; and its accuracy has been curiously tested by Professor Haughton, who calculated the time of high water in Dublin Bay on the day named in the annals, and found it was at the very time at which a body of retreating Danes are said to have been caught by the tide and drowned. The original, however, probably the work of Brian Boru's poet, has been much retouched, and is disfigured by that bombastic style, that heaping together of adjectives, and affectation of classical forms, which disfigure the later Irish writings. Still, it is interesting as the record of a momentous struggle, which ended gloriously for the Celts, but unfavourably for the independence of the island, for had the Danes beaten, and had they cemented that wide dominion, of which Dublin was for some time the centre, the Anglo-Norman conquest would have been no such easy task. If, instead of coming to an Ireland in which Danes and natives were alike exhausted with a long and deadly struggle, Henry II. had found a strong, united government, Danish or native, the history of Ireland might have more resembled that of Scotland, and, the nations coming together on terms of equality, centuries of misery and heartburning might have been avoided. But speculations of this kind must rank with those which deal with the possible fate of Ireland had it continued heathen, in which case, we are sometimes told, the Popery imported by the English would probably have remained foreign to the minds of the people. More to the purpose is it to remark on the notes which this volume affords of the social condition of the Norse invaders. Fiercely cruel, they were at the same time far better armed than the Irish; they wore "blue shining mail," and in every great battle they brought into the field bodies of horse clad in complete armour. They were of two races—the white and black strangers—Fingall and Dubhgall (Dougal), and, though they never succeeded in permanently annexing any large tract of country, and did not (as in England) give names to town after town, they held all

Ireland under tribute on more than one occasion, and by the encouragement of lawlessness and disorder they gave the clan-system a blow from which it never recovered. One of these times, when "Irishmen scarcely dared to move for fear of the Danes, and when they worked their will through the whole length of the land," was when Brian Boru persuaded his brother and the clan of the Dal-Caes to make a stand in county Clare. After much fighting, there was a desperate battle on a hill near Limerick (then a great Danish capital). The invaders were defeated, and driven into Limerick, whither the Irish followed them, capturing the place, and winning immense spoil, which, in all its variety of "rich silks, gorgeous saddles, and horse trappings, armour, blooming girls, &c.," is described with great unction. With this victory the "mission" of Brian begins. He has vast difficulties, for it is impossible to knit a set of clans into a compact people, such as the English became under Alfred. The record mentions cases in which a clan marched off the field, or stood by without striking a blow, because the place of honour was not assigned to it in the order of battle. Still he does wonders; he keeps his half-hearted brother true to the cause; he parries domestic hostility; he makes way, in spite of the worse than lukewarmness of the over-king; and, after long preparation, he brings his forces to bear on Dublin, and wholly breaks the Danish power in that place. His own character is far below Alfred's; the self-will which led him at quite an advanced age to entangle himself in a marriage with a Danish princess marks the man: but his death at Clontarf, where he was basely murdered by Brodar, a Danish jarl, atones for all. Brian, more than eighty years of age, is praying in his tent, while his sons and grandsons head the different divisions of the army. When the battle is won, Brodar is fleeing away along with a Dane of Dublin; they pass Brian's tent. "Priest? priest?" asks Brodar. "No; king, king," replies his attendant. Whereupon the savage turns back, and with his battle-axe dashes out the brains of the aged king. The Norse saga, which tells the story of the defeat, and the prediction respecting it by the mother of Sigurd, Earl of Orkney, who came to help the Dublin Danes, are given in the notes, which are every way worthy of the scholarly biographer of St. Patrick, now, alas! no longer among us.

What Government has already done only reminds us of the vast amount which, despite the labours of the Ossianic and kindred societies, remains to be accomplished. Besides the publication of a selection from the rich stores of very early

Irish mythological romance, there remains to be made a careful and scholarly comparison between the literature of the Gael and that of the Cymri. We have spoken of some of the points in which the laws of Howel the Good resemble the Brehon; we have also the Arthurian cycle, which appeared in Wales not long after the country had begun to breathe, after the cruel inroads of Harold and other English kings, and when its princes had sent for teachers from Ireland to re-introduce the forgotten use of the harp.

Then, again, there are the very scanty records of Gaulish mythology, about which the lamented Le Flocq lately put forth some suggestive hints. Our Celtic professor would have to put these in their place in a grand comparative scheme; and to rate at their true value the "discoveries" of M. de la Villemarqué.

The question of language is a specially interesting one: there are dozens of Irish words (as there are of Welsh) which are as clearly taken from the Latin as *boule-dogue* is from the corresponding English word. Such are saggarth, *sacerdos;* donagh, *dominicalis;* lesanma, *quod lædit animum.* On the other hand, a large number of words, like mbo, *boves;* talahm, *tellus;* sailigh, *salix;* chappel, *caballus,* surely point to some common source from which both languages are derived. It is needless to point out how this consideration bears on Gallic, and even on modern French, as well as on Gaelic. Another point which we are not competent to discuss, is the extent to which abstract terms—theological, moral, &c.—were invented by the first missionaries. We know the strange mistakes which have been made by some Christian translators into Polynesian and Dravidian dialects, and we can understand the shifts to which even the best of them would be put in such a case. Did the Gaelic lend itself readily to theological phraseology? Anyhow, in works of acknowledged antiquity, like *The Guardsman's Cry,* before referred to, we find expressions such as, "I believe in a triadness (treodataid) as basis of the unitness (oendatad) in the elementer of elementation." As to this last portentous phrase, it appears certain that *dúl* (neut.) is an element, and *dúil* (fem.) a creature; and that these distinctions are pre-Christian. At the same time it is hard to believe that the people who worshipped *side* (spirits dwelling in *sid,* a vault for the dead), and who, when told of God's Son, asked, "Does He love the daughters of men?" could have had much taste for abstract conceptions, though the grand, wild myth of Cuchullin, which seems in so many points to be based on

the history of Our Lord, might prepare them to receive the doctrine of the Incarnation and the Passion.

What has been published, then, of old Irish literature shows that the mine is well worth working; and the code, much the most important of the three works hitherto published, is specially interesting, because it illustrates the character of the great missionary, the type of the Romanised Celt, with his innate energy, guided by tact and tempered with discretion. How grandly he displays that power of becoming all things to all men which belonged to the Roman race! how he contrasts with St. Columbkille, the typical Irishman, the Celt uninfluenced by Imperial culture, the Scot with his *perfervidum ingenium!* Patrick came among a people who showed a self-evolved culture higher than that of Teuton or Scandinavian. They were nearer to the Teutons than people suspect: as we get higher up, the different families of the Aryan stock draw towards one another, like the branches in a river-delta; they had frank-pledge; they had that scale of fines (as had all the German races) which makes Mr. Froude call the brehon "an admirable system for compounding felonies." They had tribal laws about the land (which the Teutons had had in Tacitus's days, though they soon learned feudalism in the service of the Romans); and they had an element—Phœnician, shall we say, in spite of Sir G. C. Lewis?—or Iberian, which was found nowhere else in the British Isles. As to this element, there seems no valid reason for rejecting the persistent tradition about early immigrations from Spain; the "Spanish type," so noticeable in parts of the South and West, cannot all be due to intercourse in Tudor times, and to wrecks of Armada ships; it does not exist in Donegal, though galleons were wrecked there. Such was the man, and such were the people; and we think the story of the compiling well suits the character of both. We have no sympathy with the hyper-sceptical view, which holds that laws and institutions grew like plants, or rather like geological strata, and which puts human energy and individualism wholly out of account. These were naturally far more powerful in early times, and among half-savage people, than in the days of complex civilisation. Yet we know what John Wesley did, in the way (we mean) of organisation, and knowing this, we cannot, in the face of evidence, deny a like immense organising power to St. Patrick.

The brehon code, then, is important archæologically; comparative philology will embrace by-and-by the comparison of early law-codes. It is important æsthetically, as being an

important part of what Mr. M. Arnold has shown to be a too-long neglected literature. It is a shame that, while small, poor countries like Denmark are pursuing such researches so vigorously, we should be content, like "Philistines," that all the great Celtic, as well as the great classical authorities, should be foreigners. If the thing is to be done, now is the time for doing it: the power of giving the necessary help is fast disappearing from Ireland; the long line of Clare poets, hereditary expounders of the old tales, is extinct, or is represented only by "some poor fellow about Kilrush who once could tell something, but who is near forgetting it all." The "hard Gaelic" will soon be a sealed book to the few natives who are still qualified to interpret it. It is only not too late to found the chair of Celtic, our not possessing which is the wonder of the whole literary world. For what has been done in the publishing of these books we have to thank the Germans: it is said that Prince Albert, yielding to the solicitations of Berlin *savans*, ordered the formation of the Ancient Irish Laws' Commission. And yet everyone who would understand the Irish character must study the Brehon; its political importance is far greater than its archæological. Even Spenser recognises this; the non-recognition of it has made chronic a feeling of hatred and the practice of lawlessness. Those who knew the English law only as an oppressor whose requirements they did not understand, and which was as diligently kept from them as was that Liturgy which they were forbidden to hear in their own tongue, grew up with a morbid dislike to it and a passionate longing for their own code. Hence (as we said) Ribbonism, and so many other isms; hence, too, absurd customs like rundale, which is the brehon subdivision carried to extremes. It is a sad case of the evils which come through want of sympathy, and neglect of the needful effort to understand subject races. This brings about speedy extermination if the subject race is weak; if it is strong and vital, the result is hatred, or at best, dislike on both sides. The English people is now making a great effort to get rid of this dislike; there is much talk about governing Ireland by Irish ideas. How can we better learn what those ideas are than by studying that old literature which has, perhaps, sunk deeper into the heart of the race than that of any other race since the Greek? From this point of view the code is most valuable: it shows us that lawlessness is certainly not an Irish idea; that full solidarity and State interference (a very material point when we come to carry out arterial drainage) are Irish ideas. But, if the code is

most valuable, the other books included in our list are (as we pointed out) valuable also in helping us to form a notion of the Irish now, by seeing how they grew to be what they are.

Since this paper was written, the second volume of the *Senchus Mor* has appeared. In general interest it is much superior to the former volume, for it deals with the law of fosterage—that custom of which poets and novelists have so often availed themselves when writing on Celtic subjects; with the law of social connections—showing how strikingly the old Irish marriage-laws with regard to property agree with those which Cæsar found existing in Gaul, and which are, to a great extent, still in force in France; and also with some of the laws of land-tenure. Here it is exceedingly curious to note that the Metayer system, still in use over a large part of the Continent, existed among the early Irish. Dr. Graves, in the admirable preface prefixed to this second volume (with reference to which we repeat our hope that the prefaces to these Irish books may be separately published), thus speaks of *saer-stock* and *daer-stock* tenants, the two kinds of tenants who held under the pre-invasion chiefs:—

"In *saer-rath* the chief gave the stock, without requiring any security from the tenant. He gave it in consideration of receiving an annual return for seven years, of the value of one-third of the stock given. He might claim this return in the form of manual labour at the time of building his 'dun' (fort), or of reaping his harvest; or else he might require his *saer* tenant to attend him on a military expedition. No tribesman could be compelled to take *saer-stock* from his chief; he was, however, obliged to take it from the king; and in this way a rich king could, by judiciously distributing his stock, secure a valuable force of soldiers in his *saer* tenants. The tenant might, if weary of the tenure, return the stock at any time. If the chief reclaimed the stock, the tenant might offer to take it on security, *i.e.*, by *daer* tenure; and if the chief did not comply *he had to leave a third of the stock with the tenant, as compensation.*"

This last is a most important provision, throwing light on the origin of those claims which are a regular Irish "custom," wherever the old customs have not been thoroughly effaced, and also showing how old is the feeling which our legislators have now to reckon with, that the tenant is joint-partner with his landlord, and not merely a contractor at a certain rent. The mischief was that, in James I.'s day, the Irish laws (the suitableness of which for the people and the country had been proved by their adoption by the Norman chiefs, in spite of all the efforts of England to substitute ordinary feudal tenure)

were abrogated *en masse*, as "lewd customs," instead of being made the basis of new legislation. The old law lived in the affections of the people; and all their secret societies have been blind attempts to force it upon the landowners. We cannot fully understand the old Irish land system until, in a succeeding volume, we get the tribal law, and that relating to chiefs of various grades; but enough is contained in this second volume to furnish the legislator with matter for serious reflection. The provisions of the brehon for protecting either party against the wilful neglect of the other might well be adopted with little or no alteration.

The state of society which such laws imply is by no means a savage one. Whatever may have been the weakness of the brehon in its *sanctions*, however soon it may have given way to the wild confusion introduced by the Norsemen, in the form in which we have it, it will bear a comparison with any ancient code whatsoever. The provisions of the family law, for instance, are of far higher tone than those in the code of old Rome. The father had not that despotic power which reduced his whole family to the level of slaves. The collateral claims of daughters on fathers, and sisters on brothers, and female orphans on the men of their tribe, are clearly defined. Altogether, the code breathes a humane spirit, which (for reasons given above) we believe to be in part due to ante-Christian influences.

The preface contains a very interesting discussion on the age of Patrick, and a complete answer to the recent doubts thrown by Mr. Nicholson on the received chronology. Into this matter our space forbids us to enter. We trust we have shown that the work is deeply interesting, not only to the archæologist, but to the politician.

ART. V.—*Life and Remains of Robert Lee, D.D., &c., &c.* By ROBERT HERBERT STORY, Minister, of Roseneath. With an Introductory Chapter by Mrs. Oliphant. London: Hurst and Blackett. 1870.

DURING the year 1834 the voluntary controversy waxed with great heat in Scotland. Disestablishment and disendowment were to be the speedy fate of the national Church, and public meetings were held up and down for the purpose of hastening the crisis. One of these was held in the town of Arbroath, and the addresses of the appointed speakers were as fair and unimpassioned as the addresses of partisans usually are. The audience was all but unanimous; and Scotchmen, when they wander ever so little from the boundaries of their cool common sense, especially on subjects of religion, are the maddest of enthusiasts. Three men, however, all of clerical appearance, were there, who showed no kind of sympathy with the proceedings. Two of them were young clergymen of the Establishment; the third was the Methodist minister then stationed in the town. He held strong opinions on the subject under discussion, and was a man naturally brave, and fond of fight. Some statement from the platform roused his indignation, and he loudly signified his dissent. There was a great clamour. Some were for ejecting him forcibly; others, ascertaining who he was, insisted that he should be heard. When the orator in possession had finished, the Methodist left the pew in which he sat, and tried to reach the platform. Part of the mob endeavoured to prevent his doing so; and, in the struggle, he was hustled and maltreated. The two young clergymen, who had gone to the meeting from motives of pure curiosity, and with a resolute intention not to take any part in it, became very indignant. They threw themselves into the contest, rescued the champion of their Church from the violence of the crowd, themselves addressed it, rebuked its intolerance, and, in the excitement of the moment, pledged themselves that they would shortly hold a second meeting, and confute their opponents. They did hold it; and, whatever were the merits of their cause, their advocacy ensured for it a signal popular triumph. The proceedings were published, and excited great attention throughout the country. Who were these two young men;—one of them a speaker of extraordinary power;

wise, witty, brilliant, humorous, and tender;—the other as clear, subtle, incisive, and clever at fence as Cobbett himself? During such a period, these were the very men to occupy high places in the Church. One of them, accordingly—his name was Thomas Guthrie—soon became one of the ministers of Edinburgh; the other—Robert Lee—a little sooner, the minister of a large parish in the west of Scotland. The Methodist, to complete our story, was James Kendall, now deceased, a man of great excellence and capability, but who, owing to some very patent, but very innocent, eccentricities, did not take that position in the Connexion which he deserved. It was our pleasant lot, some years ago, to be present at a casual meeting between him and the first-named of his deliverers, in a crowded thoroughfare in London, and to hear the latter declare how he owed all his success in life, and the chances of doing good he has so faithfully improved, to Mr. Kendall's intrepidity at the Arbroath meeting.

Thus we introduce Dr. Robert Lee to our readers. He became the pioneer, and practically the leader, of the broad school of theology in the Church of Scotland. It is in this light that his course becomes specially interesting to the student of the times. It is sympathy, more or less, with his views that has commanded for his biography so much attention from a large portion of the periodical press; for no man of right feelings, accustomed to the amenities of literature, and sensitively reverent of the character of the dead, can read these volumes, apart from a lively interest in their subject, without displeasure and disgust. We shall dismiss Mr. Story's book in a very few sentences. Full of matter, as they could not fail to be, and respectable as a composition, they are, all the more offensively, self-opinionated and self-conceited, full of sneers and ill-nature, and the essential bigotry of a would-be sceptic. Dr. Lee, with all his faults, would have scouted and scorned them. We cannot doubt that, could he have foreseen what uses Mr. Story would make of diaries and letters, on the very face of them strictly private, they would have been destroyed. As it is, everybody who at any time, or on any subject, differed from Dr. Lee, perhaps the most disputatious ecclesiastic of his time, and certainly not the most consistent, is, in this biographer's eyes, either fool or knave; with the exception, perhaps, of one instance, in which he himself, and as to the very gist of one of Dr. Lee's most important controversies, happened to differ from him. As to Mrs. Oliphant's preface, it is perhaps not less partial and inaccurate than her *Life of Irving*. She has great gifts

in her own line; but no kind of qualification or, therefore, of right to lecture the churches.

Dr. Lee, born at Tweedmouth in 1804, was one of the very few Englishmen who have taken orders in the Scottish Church. His parents were poor, but very pious people—we presume, Presbyterians. The Berwick grammar-school developed to himself and to others his great natural powers; and, when he left it, he entered the University of St. Andrew's. The pluck and thrift of young Scotch scholars are proverbial. Lee had not the means of obtaining the education he desired; so he learned the craft of boat-building, built and sold a boat, and, with the proceeds, started for college. His aim was the Church; and he went regularly through the eight years' curriculum required of candidates for holy orders. His course was highly creditable to him. He took the first prizes in the senior Greek, Latin, and Moral-Philosophy classes, Dr. Chalmers, then Professor, testifying to his eminence in the class last named. His Diary, during this period, contains some suggestive observations. "I believe my quick talents are a snare to me." "Half the session is passed, and I shall certainly gain far less honour than I have ever yet done. But is honour worth attaining? No, but knowledge is." His time each day was carefully distributed. Rising before eight, and concluding at midnight, with a chapter of the Bible and prayer, two hours were allotted to exercise, but no time was set apart for dinner. We are reminded of old Thomas Taylor, sent by Mr. Wesley to evangelise Glasgow, who, often short of the means of buying his mid-day meal, used, in order to save his dignity, to dress himself in his best when the time arrived, and take a protracted walk, hoping that his landlady would believe that he was gone to share the hospitalities of a friend.

This period of Lee's life presents marked indications of his future career. He began to familiarise himself with the hymns and prayers of the Latin Church. He was a diligent student of Principal Campbell's works. He acquired power and readiness in debate in the literary society connected with the University. A little later on, "fondness for music, love of books, and a consuming desire to" compose with more freedom and ability" are noted.

Early in 1832 he left the college, and, in the same year, was licensed to preach. He did not long wander in the weary wilderness traversed by preachers without charges.* In 1833

* In the Scotch Church there are no curates, and comparatively few of what are called assistants. Some preachers, who have subsequently attained the

he was elected to be minister of a chapel-of-ease at Arbroath, diligently pursued his studies, mingled much in society, and, altogether, led a very active life. He carefully prepared his public discourses, including his addresses at the Communion service. His theology at this time seems to have been distinctly Evangelical, though, even then, he had fallen into the common error of thinking that what is called practical is something different from Evangelical preaching. It is the practice of the Scottish clergy, when the Lord's Supper is administered, to "fence the tables;" that is, to warn the profane from joining in the celebration. Lee pre-composed his addresses on these occasions; but Mr. Story states that recent usage has much modified the character of this part of the service, and tells the story of an old minister who wound up his address by saying, "And, finally, brethren, I debar from this sacred ordinance any man that puts twa fingers into his neighbour's mull, and but one into his ain." We may laugh at the saying, but the hint was, we doubt not, wise and profitable. Lee very early adopted the practice of preaching courses of sermons. He was remarkable amongst the clergy of his neighbourhood for his copious reading of the Scriptures in public, and for his constant use of the Lord's Prayer. His congregation multiplied, and he filled the church.

In 1835 the parish of Campsie, in the presbytery of Glasgow, became vacant, and the Crown, on the petition of the parishioners, appointed Dr. Lee to the charge. For this he seems to have been mainly indebted to the recommendation of Dr. William Muir, of Edinburgh, an eminent divine, frequently consulted about the qualification of applicants for vacant parishes.

It was a time of great religious activity. The Evangelical party in the Church had, under Dr. Chalmers' leadership, gained the ascendency in its counsels,—not without fierce struggles on the part of the Moderates to retain their ancient sway. The contest issued in the disruption of 1843. Lee seems to have taken little part in it; a fact amusingly accounted for, both by himself and his biographer, by vehement assertions of his hatred of controversy. In 1843, however, he voted with the majority in favour of the Duke of Argyle's Bill, proposing to give legality to the *Veto* Act passed by the Church, but declared unconstitutional by the courts of law,

highest eminence, have remained for many years without charges. The most popular of Scotch preachers was placed in this position. The mischievous law of patronage was, and is, the chief cause of this state of things.

giving to the parishioners the right to object to the nominee of the patron. He opposed all attempts to abolish patronage itself. He seems to have been influenced by two considerations. Forgetting the mixed constitution, clerical and lay, of all the Scotch ecclesiastical courts, he regarded all their proceedings as the acts of ecclesiastics, and had, we doubt not, an honest dread of the undue assumption and exercise of ecclesiastical power. And, again, while he recognised the expediency of such measures as the Veto Act, he held that the Church, being national, had no right to enact them without the previous or concurrent sanction of Parliament. His speech on these subjects in the Presbytery of Glasgow in 1840 is a fair sample of his style of arguing, both on this and other subjects. Availing himself of some general statements, made by his clerical opponents, that lay-patronage was contrary to Scripture, he asked them, it seems to us unfairly, why they had personally accepted presentations by lay-patrons, and reproached them with their willingness still to submit to patronage, if only the conditions of its exercise were limited. He stood up boldly for the scripturalness of the principle, on the ground that it is nowhere distinctly forbidden by the Word of God—a mode of reasoning obviously fallacious, but which he subsequently adopted in many similar cases. The Divine law, and especially the law of the New Testament, having established certain great principles, it is for the Churches to apply them in detail. He began, however, clearly to apprehend a proposition which, once established, would settle most of the ecclesiastical pretensions and crotchets of our time. "I cannot assent," he said, "to the position that all Church practices of the Apostolic Church are necessarily binding on us, or that nothing is lawful in the Church but what is expressly enjoined or exemplified in the New Testament."

We need hardly say that Mr. Lee did not join the great secession. Like the infatuated statesmen of the time, he had never believed that it would be numerous and influential. But it set him a-thinking, and in a wrong direction. After all, he did not feel quite sure that the separatists had not firm standing on what, according to the standards of the Church, were Scriptural principles. So he began to doubt whether, for any practical and permanent purpose, there were any such principles at all, and to disbelieve the standards. To him the contest suggested that "the Church of God has sinned in binding herself to relinquish her liberty to interpret the Word of God otherwise than as God Himself shall give

light." Nothing, therefore, is to be considered settled until we are assured that no more of that light will be vouchsafed to us. Apply the proposition to the teachings of other science, and its absurdity is plain. In all departments of knowledge there are "things which are most surely believed," and to reject which is to be for ever starting afresh, to the discouragement of all continuous investigation. Painstaking criticism will yet explain and illustrate passages of Scripture now obscure, or partially misunderstood. Much in future, as heretofore, will be gained by the comparison of such of them as are apparently discrepant with the received "analogy of faith." But the standard must previously exist; and there are "first principles" of theological as of all other sciences.

No wonder that, with these new habits of thought, Lee soon revolted from the general strain of teaching in Scotland, as to the peculiarities of Calvinism. On these topics the Scottish creed is rigid, and its meaning indisputable. The result was but too certain. We cannot doubt that a principal cause, both in England and Scotland, of much of the modern defection from essential truth is to be found here. The fact *may* illustrate the ignorance and rebelliousness of man's "carnal mind," or it *may* furnish a strong argument against the distinguishing doctrines taught by the great Genevan reformer; but it *is* a fact. Lee began to disparage the standards of his own Church; then to talk mistily about the truths held by all the orthodox. And so, he gradually, we hope almost unconsciously, reconciled himself to the degradation of eating bread, and occupying a position, in all law and honour not fairly his. We must speak tenderly of the dead; but, in the case of many living, we trace the action of a loose system of faith upon morals, and again of these on faith.

We must hurry over the period of Lee's ministry at Campsie. We can but notice (vol. i., pp. 46—50) two admirable letters, one to a parishioner who had been led away by the Mormonites; the other to a younger brother who had taken orders in the English Church, and lay on his death-bed; and Lee's edification when listening to "that impressive Liturgy of the Church of England." A friendly parishioner, speaking of him, writes, "——'s remark on his preaching I thought very just. The Apostle Paul says with the *heart* man believeth unto righteousness; Mr. Lee says with the *head*. Even his criticisms on the Bible were injudicious. Yet his self-denying diligence and zeal gained him the respect of many." "He

had none of the nervous hesitation," says his biographer, "some men feel about preaching a good sermon," *even twice within three years.* He would not let his hearers indulge in sleep. "I am now coming to an important point, so I hope those who are sleeping will awake, and those who are awake will pay attention." He took great pains in the establishment and conducting of a weekly prayer-meeting, at which none but himself and his assistant prayed. It sounds strange to persons accustomed to such exercises to read, "I had not time to *compose the second prayer*, but I think the service was edifying; *as little exciting as it was possible.*" He tried in vain to secure the theological chair at Glasgow, Chalmers and Dr. Hill being the respective candidates of the two opposing parties in the Church, and Sir James Graham, then Lord Rector, travelling all the way from London to oppose the Evangelicals. Dr. Hanna says of this matter that the "same University which had refused the chair of logic to Edmund Burke refused that of theology to Dr. Chalmers."

The extracts from his Diary during this period are very characteristic, many of them illustrating his natural shrewdness and much religiousness of spirit; others vague, hasty, and inaccurate. We must give some specimens:—

"An argument which shows demonstratively that Jonathan Edwards' notion of freedom of will is utterly wrong, is that the liberty which he allows man is exactly that which a horse or a dog enjoys. The horse or the dog does as he wills, but his will is irresistibly determined by circumstances; so, says Edwards, is a man's will. Therefore, on this supposition, the freedom of a man is of no higher a kind than that of the dog or the horse. The advocates of Jonathan Edwards' liberty, *i.e.*, the Necessitarians, allow that if their theory were carried out to its consequences and acted on, the result would be the same which Fatalism has produced in Mohammedan countries, and must everywhere produce, when fairly acted on, the suspension of all activity and energy.

"But this difficulty they seek to surmount by saying the *practical* result of the *doctrine is not such*, that men do and should *forget* the doctrine; that it is necessary they should, and act as if all depended upon themselves. Now this apology seems *fatal to the truth of a doctrine;* for God, the God of truth, never can require a man to act on a false supposition. Neither can He require him to act in forgetfulness of the truth, nor in a manner inconsistent with what the fullest conviction and remembrance of the truth would dictate. The Bible represents holiness as the necessary and natural result of knowing the truth; and therefore holiness is styled by St. John, 'doing the truth.' But if a man must hold necessity to be true, and yet act as if it were not true, he must do, not 'the truth,' but falsehood. This

is, I think, an objection utterly fatal to the doctrine."—*Life and Remains of Robert Lee*, vol. i., pp. 58, 59.

"God grant unto me to love the truth! How excellent is truth! How miserable to be deceived, and how wretched to love and court deception and darkness. Surely this makes men like devils, whose element is darkness, and whose whole existence is one great lie."—*Ibid.* p. 60.

"This morning (August 12), I found a beautiful butterfly in my dressing-room when I entered. The creature kept flying against the window, and would by no means come from it into the darker part of the room. But I reflected that this was a child of the sun, whose light was her life, and that she was but seeking her native region, to bathe again in her father's beams and rejoice in his smiles. So let me be a child of light and of the day, and then shall I not willingly fly towards the darkness of this world, but shall draw as near as may be to that light which is my life. And though God, my Father in heaven, and the Father of lights, has given me to see as yet through a glass darkly, through that glass let me continue to gaze, that when His gracious hand opens the casement, I may be found ready to fly direct to heaven."—*Ibid.* p. 60.

"When I read the philosophers and their tenets,—thus Plato taught, thus Aristotle; Pythagoras held this, and Epicurus that; Plotinus reasons in this manner, Proclus in the other; this notion was maintained by the Stoics, this by the Sceptics, this by the Eclectics; the old Academy was distinguished by these tenets, the Middle by those, and the New by a third set; and when I turn to all the prophets, evangelists, apostles, by whom the Sacred Books were composed, and find them all agreeing as one man, I am forced to remember that truth is *one* and ever consistent,—the dictate of one spirit, and that of God. And I am compelled to conclude that those philosophers were inspired by that demon whose name is legion, and who was a lying spirit in the mouth of all the priests and prophets of Gentile philosophy. Give me, O Lord, meekly and humbly to sit at the feet of Thy dear Son Jesus Christ, and hear His words."

"It is huge misfortune when he has much wealth who has not also much discretion; for a poor foolish man can only *talk* his folly, whereas a rich fool can *act* his."—*Ibid.* pp. 60, 61.

"There never can be peace in the Church so long as the different forms of Church government are held as being of *Divine appointment*. For, on this supposition, to persevere in adherence to a wrong form is to persist in rebellion against the declared will and institution of Christ; and persons who are regarded as doing this never can be viewed but as (so far) enemies and rebels against the Lord's authority.

"All those who contend a particular form of Church polity is laid down in Scripture, assert it is there *plainly* laid down; and all who, instead of apprehending its plainness, cannot even discover its existence, will inevitably be looked upon as persons who close their eyes against the clearest light. Mutual tolerance, mutual love and peace,

never can grow in such a soil as this. The *jure divino* Prelatists and the *jure divino* Presbyterians appear to me men of the same class, and subject to the same delusions, and both of them infected with the temper which that delusion creates."—*Ibid.* p. 68.

"Very often when I have a great many things to do, and a very oppressive sense of the number and urgency of them, I can do no one of them, for going from one to another; I have this book to read, that and that to write; I have several matters of business and out-of-door duty to attend to; when I take up one book and cast it down—it is too light, take up another—it is too solid, and requires more leisure than I can spare at present. I try to write, but then I should be about my out-of-door duties. I go out accordingly; but then I am grown good for nothing but walking about the world and talking in it,—I am ceasing altogether to be a studious man, and should get home again without delay, to apply to reading and meditation and prayer. When one is in such humours, the attempt to study is almost a certain throwing away of time. It were better to dig in the garden, or hear music, or talk to a friend, or ride, or go out and scold any of one's neighbours whom one has met drunk yesterday, or in short engage one's self in anything that will exercise the body and not vex the mind.

"I find it impossible to study on summer evenings, or almost at any time in summer except the morning. The sun, and the sky, and the earth, and every shrub and flower seem to upbraid me with deserting their society, and every breeze appears to murmur a gentle complaint against me that I will not be found when they are at the pains to breathe so sweetly. In one word, when God's book is open so wide, my taste for men's books decidedly abates, so that my mind is the reverse of the bear's body; for he subsists, during winter, on the fat with which he has clothed his bones during the summer, but I live all the summer upon the stock of ideas I have been able to lay in during the dark and gloomy months. Though fond of books, I cannot say I am a determined thorough-going reader. My eyes will not permit it. Did I attempt the thing, I should soon finish my reading for ever. Neither, in truth, will my *patience*. My curiosity generally outruns the writer's pace, so I take the liberty of out-going my guide. Unless in literary works of art, such as poetry, oratory, &c., when the *very thought* depends upon the words, I should much prefer to have the notes and memoranda from which the book was composed than the book itself. Very few books are worth reading quite through. Most authors give you all the thoughts that they have to give, I mean that are peculiarly theirs, long before the end of their work is reached. Yet I deeply blame my want of application; I am sensible that it is a fatal habit; and I deeply reverence any one who has fairly mastered a huge tome of solid matter. Such a person, I think, might have been a builder of pyramids, and would have been, if he had lived soon enough and in the proper country, and had been born of suitable parents. I never judged myself a great man but

once. It was when I had finished Hooker's *Ecclesiastical Polity*, but that sentence has been long ago and frequently reversed, for, since then, not only Ralph Cudworth and Thomas Aquinas have absolutely routed me, but my march has been stopped by far less formidable opponents. With shame I confess it, but confess it I will, the truth constraining me, that Basil and Cyprian, Raleigh and Milton, yea, Burnet himself, have all of them, as well as numerous others, decidedly forced me to lay down my arms.

"I will confess further, as I am got into a humour of confessing (a fact for which I feel somewhat at a loss to account), that my patience wears much better upon dull and dry authors than upon such as are professedly written to amuse. With Chillingworth, or Butler, or Hooker, I really proceed with a respectable pertinacity, but *Hudibras* foiled me in two readings. Smollett, Fielding, Sterne, have all gained easy triumphs, while *Don Quixote* so frightened me at the first onset that I was discomfited almost before the encounter began. I say I feel shame in making these acknowledgments, which I consider really humiliating, and which I am quite at a loss to account for. Looking at my library, I see the tomes of Jeremy Taylor, T. Aquinas, and Laurence Sterne. I believe, if spared, I may go quite through the *Ductor Dubitantium*, into which already I have made considerable inroads. I think it possible I may peruse the most important questions in the *Summa Theologiæ*, but I feel a strong prophetic impression that my patience will never carry me through *Tristram Shandy*."—*Ibid.* pp. 65—67.

But now for other sides of this many-sided man:—

"The *consistency* of theological systems is generally regarded as a powerful evidence of their truth. I believe it is a sufficient argument of their being ill-founded. For, seeing only a part of the moral system is revealed to us in the Bible—a fact which no competent judge will question—any system which harmonises these parts so as to give them the completeness of a finished and consistent whole, must misrepresent the parts and force them into combinations not natural, as if a person should attempt to form a complete map when some of the sections into which it had been cut were wanting."—*Ibid.* p. 61.

Is it true that only a part of "the moral system," by which we understand God's mode of dealing with His moral creatures and their duties to Him, "is revealed to us in the Bible"?

"That orthodoxy has commonly been error is plain from this; that orthodoxy is another name for the opinion of the majority; and in religious disputes the majority has for the most part been wrong. And this is only saying in other words that truth has commonly been known and believed by a few."—*Ibid.* pp. 61, 62.

Is it true that "in religious disputes the majority" of those who have tried to define or defend Christianity "have

for the most part been wrong;" that the faithful as such have but seldom been in the right?

"It is vain to expect that those whose incomes are provided independently of the people among whom they minister will ever, as a body, cope in point of attention to their flocks with those whose livings depend upon the people; for, how many motives to diligence so ever may actuate the former, the latter have always *one additional*. And this one, it is not unworthy of being remarked, acts most powerfully upon those persons who are least sensible to the higher motives. Hence a grossly careless minister, not a very uncommon phenomenon in Established Churches, is very rare among Dissenters. For among them the carnal restraint comes in to check the carnal indulgence. On the whole, however, I suppose more may be lost than is gained by the strength thus allowed to so inferior, not to say culpable, a motive; which, if it hinders bad men appearing to be so bad as they are, also tends to prevent good men becoming so good as they might."—*Ibid.* p. 63.

Could not Lee conceive of a motive which should absorb all the rest? Did he never hear of the constraining "love of Christ"?

Whilst at Campsie, he conceived the notion of establishing "a Brotherhood—a kind of reformed and non-celibate order among the clergy of the Church," and sketched the plan of its intended constitution. It is too long for insertion here. Its objects were stricter life and increased ministerial fidelity. Its members were to be "ministers, preachers, &c., who hold that the Gospel is a message of peace to all men, and who appear in earnest to save their own souls and those of other men." It was to be governed by a general! A congregation was to be held annually, at which the Eucharist was to be dispensed. The members were to be pledged to absolute silence as to what passed at their meetings. The project, of course, failed. A new scheme of Church government which his fertile mind suggested to him, does not seem to have been ever launched. His list of Church officers descends, by seven steps, from "the pastor" to "singers."

In August, 1843, the disruption having occasioned many vacancies in the Edinburgh Charges, the Town Council presented Lee to the church and parish of the Old Grey Friars. We like the honesty with which, in his last sermon to his people at Campsie, he avows that one of his reasons for a change was the wish for a larger stipend:—

"A bishop, says St. Paul, must be given to hospitality, and though he may innocently dispense with this duty when he finds it impossible to perform it, there is surely no reason why he should continue in

those circumstances when he may relieve himself from them. A minister who has not a shilling to give to a poor man is justified in withholding it; but it is not desirable he should be in those circumstances if he can help it."—*Ibid.* p. 74.

Though Lee had loosed himself from his moorings, his preaching during his earlier years in Edinburgh seems to have been substantially Evangelical. But contact with society and conflicting opinions soon kindled his natural pugnacity; and, for nearly a quarter of a century, he was the Ishmaelite of his Church. Doctrine and discipline were alike to him. Often in the right, sometimes advocating the soundest views on questions of ecclesiastical arrangement and order, it was enough for him that he rowed against wind and tide. Some people never know when they are beaten; his restless mind seemed incapable of appreciating, enjoying, and improving a victory.

As was probable, his first blow was aimed at the Free Church, against which his resentment never ceased. In 1845 the Old Grey Friars was burnt down, and, during its rebuilding, he preached but once a day; worshipping, for the second time, with another congregation. Up to this period he seems to have at least tolerated the mode in which Scotch ministers conduct the service of the sanctuary; but, becoming a frequent spectator, and not the actor, he became less satisfied with what Mr. Story calls "the ordinary Scottish ritual." This state of things lasted for twelve years. After having formed a very low estimate of the mode in which ecclesiastical affairs were conducted, he began to take part in them—of course, to find himself continually in a minority. Quick, impulsive, opinionated, he was, withal, so every reader of these volumes must delight to see, and, so far as man can judge, honest to the convictions of the hour.

On the question of University Tests he soon adopted what are called liberal views; but, with a strange contradictiousness, he during the earlier part of his course stood firmly by the old, and yet unshaken, doctrine, that religious and secular instruction are to be combined in systems of primary education. In later years, however, he abandoned the latter view, contended fiercely with Dr. Guthrie and his friends as to the constitution of ragged schools, and advocated the separation of the religious from the secular: ultimately he carried out these opinions to all their legitimate consequences.

The General Assembly of 1799 had passed an Act, aimed at the itinerant labours of the Haldanes and Rowland Hill, and generally against all zealous Evangelism, prohibiting any person, save an authorised minister or licentiate of the Church,

from officiating in any congregation of the Church, and "ministerial communion" with any person not qualified to accept a presentation to a charge over such a congregation. The Assembly of 1842, the last before the disruption, had repealed this Act; but the proceedings of that Assembly were, after the disruption, for reasons which it is not necessary to detail here, regarded by the Church-courts as invalid; and the law of 1799 was still in force. It was now proposed to repeal it. Dr. Lee was foremost in the opposition. He denied that the exchange of pulpits by ministers constituted, in any sense, ministerial communion. He argued that the unity manifested by an exchange of pulpits was not the unity of different churches, but unity between individual ministers; and that the only modes of indicating union were communion in the Sacraments, and mutual "ministering to the necessity of saints;" that, inasmuch as the New Testament condemns all sects and divisions as scandals, in the very nature of things it throws no light on either the terms or mode of intercommunion; that the existence of sects being a great sin, we must all ascertain at whose door sin lies; and if it is at ours, repent of it; and if at theirs, refuse any intercourse with them. He further urged that no Dissenting ministers wished admission to the pulpits of the Establishment, and that the existing law was occasionally, and not disadvantageously, broken; "for foreign churches stand on a very different footing from the Dissenters at home. The individual discretion of ministers may, I think, be safely trusted in this matter." Strange to say, though the law of 1799 was ultimately repealed, Lee never changed these sentiments.

He commenced the study of German, and we are informed that he came under the "liberalising process" of German criticism, and of De Wette in particular. "I am sorry," Lee himself writes, "that Origen is not more studied and known. A passage of his *Contra Cels.*, 142, seems to lay the foundation of all the fabric of Rationalism." And, again, "I think the Quakers are clearly right in saying that the ultimate ground of faith is the witness of the Spirit in our hearts, and nothing else. . . . I, therefore, look with more and more aversion on the Bibliolatry, &c."

We must hasten on. In September, 1846, he was appointed one of the chaplains to the Queen, and one of the Deans of the Chapel Royal, and, almost simultaneously, Professor of Biblical Criticism in the University of Edinburgh. We cannot omit one passage taken from his Diary, in reference to the last-named appointment:—

"This is my forty-third birthday, and it is to me probably the most important day of my life, as on it I propose commencing my duties as Professor of Biblical Criticism, &c. All men, no doubt, have, but it seems to me as if I had, above all men, reason to praise and bless God Almighty, for His mercy and loving-kindness. For I cannot look back on my past life without acknowledging that He hath loaded me with His benefits. And when I reflect on my unworthiness and sinfulness, I am humbled in the dust before God, my Heavenly Father. Unless I quite deceive myself, I am conscious of a desire to glorify God, who has redeemed me with the precious blood of Jesus Christ His Son, so that I might enjoy the liberty of doing His holy will in my body and spirit. And in humble faith in His promise, I would now implore of Him to baptize me with His good Spirit, that I may be filled with wisdom, love and power; and may obtain a victory over all my corruptions and enemies within and without, and may prove the *perfect* will of God.

"I remember with thankfulness, on this day, my dear, pious, benevolent, and excellent parents. If I may not pray for it, I may yet hope in God, that they may sleep with the saints, whose dust is precious in the sight of the Lord, and may obtain a joyful and blessed resurrection. I remember in like manner my dear brother Anthony, who lived the life and died the death of the righteous. I remember all my departed friends. And I humbly pray that God, my loving Father in heaven, would pardon all my sins against them.

"I bless God that I am not alone and desolate in the midst of the earth; having the most affectionate and prudent of wives, and one who perfectly sympathises with me in all good things; and having children who are now, and promise to be yet more, a comfort to us. Also, for our dear adopted mother, Miss Napier, who loves us, and whom we love, with the strongest affection: and for all our friends, and all our other mercies. Bless the Lord, O my soul!

"I am not forgetful of the dark and cloudy day. Whether or not I improve it, the thought of it is habitually present with me. But I fear no evil, for Thou art with me. I endeavour to remember that death as well as life is the property of the children of God; and that tribulation and distress shall not separate them from the love of God in Christ Jesus our Lord.

"Let me, therefore, not cast away my confidence, which hath great recompense of reward. In Thee, O Lord, have I trusted; let me never be confounded.

"Let me remember these things:—

"1. To be more earnest and frequent in prayer.

"2. To read the Scriptures with a view to edification.

"3. To be slow to speak, and slow to wrath.

"4. To judge not; and to speak evil of no man.

"5. To labour with the students, to free them from superstition, fanaticism, and bigotry; and to instil into their minds, as I may be enabled, principles of true wisdom, piety, and charity.

"O God, give me grace, that what I intend piously, I may perform effectually, to the honour of Thy name, through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen."—Pp. 120, 121.

Who can help regretting that a man like this went so far astray, or learning once more the lesson, how very often men are, in heart, much better than their creed, or, though less frequently, of their creedlessness? His inaugural discourse is almost all that it could be wished to be. During this year he was again prominent in the ecclesiastical courts. We can only intimate his opinions. He opposed a motion that the civil disabilities affecting the Jews ought to be removed. As to the running of railway trains on the Sunday, he insisted that, as the railway companies had practically usurped control of the usual means of conveyance, they were bound to afford the public opportunities of travelling on that day, leaving the use of them to be decided by the conscience of the public; declaring it was for him to determine, under the guidance of the Word of God, whether he should travel on a Sunday or not, and not for railway directors to decide whether his errand was, or was not, one of necessity and mercy. In December he writes:—

"I am amazed to discover that since the beginning of August I have spent £20 on books alone. This is my great expense. I am sufficiently saving and prudent in everything else. But this folly must not and, by the grace of God, shall not be repeated. There is no reason why I should heap up books. . . . Too much has also been expended in wine; a considerable folly also, inasmuch as no man knows what shall be on the morrow, and this looks like making 'provision for the flesh to fulfil its lusts.'" Again: "My resolution against buying books I have rigidly kept so far as this year has yet gone—5th February, 1848. 'Yet herein am I not justified;' neither do I feel confident that I may not again fall into the same weakness, or perhaps some other that is less excusable." His objection to book-buying was founded on a serious consideration of the real evil of the tendencies which it gratified. 'Few follies,' he says, 'are greater than that of book-buying. I know of no weakness of which so many, otherwise sensible, men are guilty. It is a species of avarice or covetousness, and arises from the same causes, and is covered over with the same disguise as the more vulgar avarice of money. The books are desired, in the first instance, as means of knowledge; as money is, in the first place, coveted because of the things which money can buy. But gradually, because of this close association of money with these objects, the money *itself* gradually becomes an object of distinct regard and appetency, and this is covetousness in its grossest form. So do *books;* and by a like association of ideas; because themselves objects of covetousness,—*to have them*, satisfies the collector, for that he ever

can or will *read* them, is what we cannot obviously suppose: as, instead of doing so, his thoughts and time are taken up in hunting after more. Of all the books in his library, a bookseller's catalogue is to him the most interesting and engrossing. Surely this is the folly of wisdom, or the ignorance of knowledge: it is to mistake the meanfsor the end.' "—Pp. 136, 137.

During the years 1848 and 1849, his reading related much to the subject of the Westminster Assembly, and its Confession of Faith and Directory for Public Worship. We doubt whether, on the whole, the result of these studies was favourable. They increasingly estranged him from his own Church; and yet he continued a minister of it.

The year 1850 brought with it the fierce, but abortive, controversy respecting the Papal aggression and the "Ecclesiastical Titles Assumption Act." At this time, Dr. Lee happened to be in a fit of indignation against the Scotch Episcopalians; and the principal ground he took in opposition to the Bill was that it allowed that class of Scotch Dissenters to do what it forbade in the case of Roman Catholic Dissenters in England. He seems to have forgotten that, in the latter case, the titles assumed were not self-assumed, but conferred by a foreign ecclesiastic. Very soon afterwards, the question of the Maynooth Grant came up; and, on the ground that the grant had failed to secure its intended objects, and had become a grant in aid of the spread of Ultramontanism, Dr. Lee took the right side. He published a discourse on Papal Infallibility, containing a great deal of shrewd common sense. He traced modern secessions to the Church of Rome—chiefly by members of the Church of England—partly to what he quoted Lord Chatham as calling the latter Church's Popish ritual; partly to the reaction against Liberalism and Rationalism, driving the Anglicans towards tradition; and partly to the presence and aspects of English Dissent.

"When an Anglican priest (he argued), devoutly believing in the pleasant figment of an Apostolical succession"—quoting a phrase used by Dr. Chalmers—"looks at a Dissenting teacher on the one hand, and a Roman Catholic priest on the other, he naturally feels more closely allied to the latter than to the former: for does not he, too, share in that ineffable and mysterious gift, which links the dullest curate to St. Peter and St. Paul? Thus the Anglican finds himself entangled in a net of his own spreading, which inevitably lands him on the banks of the Tiber." One of Sir William Hamilton's comments on this discourse was,—"Catholicism seems to me to be a respectable doctrine; Popery utterly contempt-

ible." In truth, Dr. Lee hated all authority but his own. "Tradition," he had written, "is, so far as it goes, the denial of the authority of Christ." In the next sentence but one, however, we are favoured with an extract from one of his note-books, in which, admitting "that the Bible is, or rather contains, the Word of God, and as such, entitled to most reverent regard," he goes on to assert that, "while very little is said in the New Testament of the Scriptures, and hardly anything at all of the New Testament Scriptures, as teachers and guides of faith, the Church is perpetually spoken of there in the most emphatic manner, and is declared, besides other attributes, to be the 'pillar and ground of the truth.'" "So that, looking at the matter from the New Testament point of view, the Scripture and the Church, being both of them Divine ordinances, and both, in some sense, organs of the Holy Ghost; and the Church being always spoken of as an *inspired body*, not less (or rather much more) than the Bible as an inspired book, it will not do to ignore the Church in favour of the Bible, any more than to suppress the Bible that the Church, under claim of inspiration, may teach for Gospel whatever it pleases. For, if the inspiration of the Apostles and that of the Church be the same (reasonable allowance being made for the distance of time and mode of thinking), the teaching of the Church and that of the Book must coincide, at least in substance; else we must conclude that there are two Spirits suggesting the ideas and feelings of the two. Also the Church with the Bible means something. Thus Christianity would at least live and propagate itself; but without the Church the Book were nothing, barren, dead." "But while the Romanists have witnessed for an essential element of Christianity in upholding the claims of the Church, they have quite misinterpreted the thing they have upheld. For they understood by the Church, not the enlightened and sanctified body of Christians,—all whose reason and conscience were cleansed by the Holy Spirit and so were taught of God,—but only the clergy of one communion, multitudes, not to say the majority of whom" "no more were guided by reason and conscience than if they had not been endowed with such faculties. This doctrine of the Holy Spirit guiding the Church comes very near the Rationalist notion of Reason being the supreme judge and ruler in all matters whatever, even religious matters; for 'He that is spiritual judgeth all things,' even the contents of a Book claiming to be inspired." "We all, whatever we may pretend, can admit in Scripture only so much as we see to be reasonable, and feel to be right.

Our creed, in spite of ourselves, constantly shifts with our advancing reason. The page is the same, the words continue; but we read under new lights, and we discern something new or different. It matters not how infallible the Book may be in itself; it is to us just as wise and infallible as is the interpreter. 'If the eye be single the whole body is full of light.'" This mass of inaccuracies and inconsistencies was, unfortunately, the staple of Dr. Lee's creed. How we are to acquaint ourselves with God, be relieved of the burden of conscious sin, gain purity of heart, and the power to live good and useful lives; these, surely, are the matters with which religion most concerns itself; and they are to depend, from the first, upon our singleness of eye, or if we still need help, upon the *consensus* of all those who tell us that their consciences are cleansed by the Holy Spirit, and that so they are taught of God, and, taken together, are an inspired body; these, moreover, having no common standard of faith, and differing among themselves what that standard ought to be.

Objections were made to Dr. Lee's retaining his pastoral charge, after he had been appointed to a chair in the University. It was an old subject of contention in the Scottish Church; and Dr. Lee, as might be expected, stood up stoutly for the practice. He made great efforts to raise ministerial stipends, which, in Scotland, vary annually in amount, according to the prices of grain, and which had been materially reduced in consequence of the repeal of the Corn Laws. He argued in favour of private communion in cases of sickness; a practice forbidden by his Church. He withdrew, almost entirely, from any interference with the Evangelistic efforts of his Church. "He had grave doubts about the scheme for the conversion of the Jews." "He thought that the Church did not offer to the ignorant at home, or to pagans abroad, such unexceptionable instruction, or so pure an example of high and united Christian life, as to make it worth a man's while to give her much aid in her enterprises in Scotland or in India." To multiply preachers who fancied there was no word of God but in the Bible was a very small benefit. There had been infinite controversies how ministers should be appointed; but the great question was how, being discovered to be no ministers, they should be removed. Many Unitarians now attended at his church, not allured, as his biographer assures us, by his preaching Unitarianism. "Like every thoughtful man," we are told, "he felt the difficulty of pronouncing dogmatically upon the mysterious dogma of the Trinity." He declined to address any prayer to Christ. Yet

to a lady who knew him well, and who asked him if he had become a Unitarian, he said, "Those who charge me with such opinions little know me; my entire trust for everything is placed in the atonement of our Lord Jesus Christ." He became very intimate with Lord Murray and George Combe, a frequent visitor at the *Scotsman* office, and a welcome contributor to its columns. He preached and published discourses on the Laws of Nature, denying, in the strongest terms, the very possibility of the punishment of national sins by means of national calamities. Prayer he thought useful by leading us to study the laws of nature, and rendering us willing to obey them. Another published discourse was levelled at those who hold the opinions of the Peace Society. He reviewed, with much wit and pungency, some of Dr. Cumming's lucubrations on prophecy. We cannot resist the temptation of making one quotation:—

"We do not conceal from ourselves that between Elijah and John the Baptist on one side, and our contemporary antitype of those ancient seers, there are, with this admitted identity, also certain points of difference. But it is an established maxim that as 'every parable limps on some foot,' so every parallel, the closest, fails in some particular. We, therefore, hold very cheap such objections as that Elijah and the Baptist were not fashionable preachers—did not make fortunes by prophesying—did not brag of their intimacy with Ahab, Herod, or Pilate, their courtiers and ministers—had not their town-house and country-house—and that they did not lay hands on other people's prophesyings, and do them up for the market. To all such quibbles we have two short answers—first, that these dissimilarities, even admitting their reality, are unimportant, and of very small significance; and, secondly, that, in so far as they do exist, our modern prophet has plainly the advantage over his predecessors. Nor can we seriously think there is much weight in another reproach that we have heard uttered, as if a person who knew that the world was to surcease in ten years should throw it away and contemn it; whereas true wisdom rather suggests that those good things should be diligently used and eagerly enjoyed which are so soon to be taken from us."

He himself preached a course of lectures on prophecy, treating the Book of Revelation as already fulfilled.

We wish we could give some epitome of Dr. Lee's mode of handling other important matters. He became a strenuous declaimer against subscription to articles of faith, whether by ministers or office-bearers of his Church. He embarked with great zeal on a project for a union between it and the Scottish Episcopalians. He attacked, with much ability, and with successes which will no doubt end in the triumph of the course

he advocated, Lord Aberdeen's but recent settlement of the question of lay-patronage. He wrought and wrote, protested and denounced, complained, and struggled about almost everything. But two ideas gained the masterhood over all others. Dogmas were mischievous, and must be discountenanced. Ritual was the specific to revive a fainting Church—to attach and enhearten languid supporters; to put down Episcopalian and all other forms of Scottish dissent; in short, to bring on, and, indeed, to be the millennium itself.

We must, however, pass at once to a very short history of the more memorable of these controversies. Traces of Dr. Lee's dissatisfaction with the modes of worship permanent in Scotland have already abundantly appeared. In 1857 the restored church of the Grey Friars was opened, fitted up with considerable taste, and with the novelty, startling all Scotland, of having all its windows filled with painted glass. From this date, until the time of his death, Dr. Lee devoted himself mainly to the one object of reforming the public services of the Church. There can be no doubt that some alterations were very desirable. It is a singular fact that, in the most Protestant country in the world, every part of the Sabbath service is, with the exception of singing, exclusively in the hands of the minister. There is a substantial uniformity in the mode of conducting these services, the differences allowed by custom having reference only to the order of the particular exercises, and to the postures of the worshippers. Mr. Story quotes an old complainant as follows, and we agree that, on the whole, and except in the cases of many large congregations, chiefly in towns and cities, the representation is not very seriously exaggerated:—

"'The fault that I have to bring against our Scottish service,' says a complainant not very long ago, 'is that it is too bare and lifeless, too purely intellectual in its nature and aspect. Look at any country congregation, and deny this if you can. The congregation assembles, coming into church with hardly any show of reverence for the sacred place, sitting down without any sign of prayer or blessing asked. The minister enters the too often ugly and ungainly pulpit, or preaching-box, as one might call it. A few verses of a psalm are sung, the singing led by some discordant or bull-throated precentor. A long, often doctrinal, and historical, and undevotional, prayer is uttered by the minister, the people standing listlessly the while, most of them staring at the minister or at their neighbours. Then, as he nears the end of his supplication (in the course of which a number of women have generally sat down), there is a universal rustle, and before he is fairly done with the "Amen," in which the people never join, they are in their seats. A chapter is read, more psalm-singing, then probably

an exposition; then again "praise and prayer" as it is called; then a longish sermon, then more singing; a concluding prayer, which is regarded as merely a matter of course, and to which the inattention of the now wearied congregation is more obvious than ever; and a benediction, during which the men get their hats ready, and the women gather up their Bibles, and draw their shawls and cloaks into the most becoming drape; and as soon as the last word is uttered, they are all charging out of the kirk as if for their dear lives. This picture is no exaggeration; you and I have seen it a hundred times. Now, a service of such a nature as this is very remote from the ideal of true Christian worship.'"

Dr. Lee lacked some of the essential qualifications for the task he undertook. A man who could find it in his heart to alter the "Te Deum" was not to be entrusted with the framing of a liturgy. He commenced, too, on a wrong basis, by asserting his right himself to frame services for the use of his own congregation. Still more unfortunately for his cause, after the manner of some of our English Ritualists, he contended that he did not need to ask leave to do that which no law forbade his doing. Without seeking the sanction of the Church-courts, because he thought it would be useless, and, so far as we read, without communication with any of his ministerial brethren, he taught his congregation to kneel at prayer, and to stand up to sing. Contrary to usual practice, he commenced the service with prayer; but for this innovation he was able to quote an express rule of the authorized Directions for Public Worship. Possessed by the strange notion that it is improper to approach God without elaborate and complete preparation of the matter of prayer, he began to read forms of public worship. There is a curious story of his preaching before the Queen at Crathie, and of her politely sending for a copy of his prayers, which it would seem had interested her more than his sermon. Ere long, he published an elaborate series of Church-services, which was adopted in his congregation.

As to the principle of a liturgy, Dr. Lee enjoyed some vantage-ground. After the Reformation, the Prayer-book of King Edward VI. was ordained to be read in the parish churches of Scotland. Very shortly afterwards, a book of services, prepared at Geneva, as modified by Knox himself, and commonly called *Knox's Liturgy; or, The Book of Common Order*, supplanted King Edward's book, and was commanded to be used by the Assembly of 1564. This command was never repealed by any lawful Assembly; and when, in 1637, the further use of Laud's Liturgy in Scotland was

stopped by the cutty-stool of Jenny Geddes, the prayers of the *Book of Common Order* were regularly read in St. Giles's Church, in Edinburgh, and, indeed, prevailed generally. The disuse of the book was gradual, and an attempt to legalise the disuse was resisted and failed. An Act of Parliament, passed in 1693, by which time it seems to be admitted the disuse had become universal, had, indeed, ordained that uniformity of worship, and of the administration of public ordinances within the Church, be observed by all ministers and preachers, as they were then performed and allowed therein. But Dr. Lee's contention was, that the object of this Act was to secure the Presbyterian as against the Episcopalian mode of worship; that the mode of worship intended by the Act was that, and that only, which the existing law of the Church sanctioned, to the exclusion of any consideration of custom; and that, while the authorised direction of the Church, approved by the Assembly in 1649, was silent on the subject of the reading of prayers, the law of the Assembly passed in 1564 prescribed the mode of worship which the Legislature had enacted in 1693.

Dr. Lee seems to us to have made two great mistakes. He insisted on a right we think he did not possess, of putting his individual interpretation upon the laws by which, as a minister of the Church of Scotland, he was clearly bound. Even if that interpretation were correct, he was in the wrong; because the contest lay, not between Knox's Liturgy and no Liturgy at all, but between Knox's Liturgy, sanctioned of old by the Church for its own uniform use, and a modern Liturgy, prepared by Dr. Lee, for the use of a single congregation. Above all, and the truth cannot be too often insisted on, there is a great, comprehensive, over-riding, New Testament Law of Peace which, in all matters not affecting vital truth or pure morals, is to regulate the administration of all ecclesiastical affairs, and the action of each individual member of the Church in reference to them. Every candid person, however favourably impressed, as we ourselves are, in favour of the blending of liturgical with free forms of public devotion, must admit that most of the charges preferred, as we have seen, against the customary modes and habits, could have been met substantially, without any violent or sudden alteration of form, by a revival of the true spirit of worship.

Dr. Lee, of course, soon fell into the trouble he was so fond of. Much discussion on the general subject took place in the General Assembly of 1858, and that body, taking it for granted that the order and form of public worship, as

sanctioned by the Church and by Parliament, was that usually adopted, recommended the inferior Church-courts to inquire into any alleged innovations, and to endeavour to restore uniformity and prevent division in the Church. Dr. Lee challenged the Church by publishing a second edition of his Prayer-book, enlarged by forms for the administration of the sacraments, for marriage, and for burial. The Presbytery of Edinburgh, of which he was a member, could not help dealing with the case. After the manner adopted, in grave cases, in the Methodist Conference, and which made it very unpopular some twenty years ago, one of the oldest ministers in the Presbytery put the question to Dr. Lee, whether he had not introduced an order of service, together with a Liturgy and certain forms or postures, unknown to the Church, and inconsistent with its rules and practice. Dr. Lee was too much of a Christian, of a gentleman, and of a combatant to decline answering the question; and he answered it at great length. His main point, of course, was that, whatever might be the existing usages of the Church, its rules sanctioned, and, indeed, enjoined his proceedings; but he weakened his case by what was undoubtedly a very clever retort upon his opponents, asking whether he had not as much right to read his prayers, as they to read their sermons. It utterly broke down, in our opinion, when he insisted that whatever in such cases was not prohibited was permissible. The Presbytery resolved, by a large majority, to appoint a committee, instructing them to confer with Dr. Lee and his congregation, and to report on his service-book, so far as he admitted it to be an exponent of the mode in which public worship was conducted in his church. The committee met and reported accordingly; and then a resolution was passed by the Presbytery, by but a narrow majority, which seems to us to have been singularly unfortunate. It declared that standing to sing, and kneeling to pray, as practised in the Old Grey Friars Church, were inconsistent with immemorial usage; that the prayers in that congregation were read; and that the order of worship differed from the order recognised by the Church, inasmuch as it began with a recitation of passages from Scripture, and included certain verses, or "comfortable words," analogous to the Absolution in the Anglican service; and that the congregation said "Amen" after the prayers. They further found that all these were innovations, and ordered them to be discontinued by Dr. Lee and his congregation. Dr. Lee appealed from this decision—first to the superior Synod, which affirmed it,

and then, to the last resort, the General Assembly. That body allowed the appeal, but found that Dr. Lee's practice of reading prayers from his service-book was contrary to the laws and usage of the Church, and enjoined him to discontinue the use of it. In the majority were to be found the names of Dr. Norman M'Leod and Principal Tulloch.

For two or three years the controversy was lulled. Dr. Lee, however, to all appearance, took no kind of heed of the direction of the Assembly; and the "sticklers for the good old ways" felt that something was going wrong when read prayers, and responses, and prose chants, and even a harmonium, afterwards exchanged for an organ, were allowed in his church. In 1863, the General Assembly was besought by the Synod of Aberdeen to secure, as far as possible, uniformity in the form of public worship within the Church, and appointed a committee to consider the whole subject of laws, usages, and practice; discountenancing, meanwhile, all changes likely to impair the harmony of particular congregations. In June of the same year, Dr. Lee published *The Presbyterian Prayer-book and Psalm-book*, being a third edition, altered and enlarged, of his original prayer-book. In 1864 he published *The Reform of the Church in Worship, Government, and Doctrine: Part I., Worship.* It is hard to see how he reconciled projects of reform with his stout and persistent contention that the practices he pursued were in conformity with existing laws, except, indeed, that he wished to carry his innovations a little further. He now formally argued for the use of instrumental music, and for the observance of the Christian festivals.

The General Assembly of 1864, on the reception of the report of the committee appointed in 1863, again wavered, and ended by expressing their determination to put in force the laws of the Church in respect to any innovations whereby the harmony of particular congregations, or the peace of the Church in general, was disturbed, and with an exhortation as to the peculiar importance of the exercises of prayer and singing. Dr. Lee considered, and we think fairly, that this deliverance practically sanctioned his proceedings. An attempt made, two months afterwards, in the Presbytery of Edinburgh, to deal with him, notwithstanding what had passed at the Assembly, signally failed, and an appeal to the Synod was unanimously dismissed. It had become plain that a considerable number of influential clergymen had begun to sympathise more or less with Dr. Lee's views. One foolish and fussy friend urged a combined movement to show the

strength of the party, but Dr. Lee had become a little cautious. "I think it likely," he writes, "we may have innovation enough by-and-by; we must take care to direct it wisely. Undoubtedly, the organ is a small matter compared with the ritual. We must have something to distinguish us from the Dissenters." In 1865 the "Church-service Society" was formed. Its object was to promote the study of ancient and modern Liturgies, with a view to the preparation of one for the Scotch Church; but Dr. Lee declined to become one of its vice-presidents, standing resolutely by his own service-book. He became a member of the society, however, and contributed to its transactions; but, while he thus dwelt in peace, another storm was brewing. The subject of innovations was again raised in the Assembly of 1865. Dr. Pirie attacked the congregationalism of Dr. Lee's views and practices, and proposed, and carried by a respectable majority, that the Assembly should enact that all religious services and ecclesiastical arrangements of every kind, in parishes or congregations, should be regulated by the Presbyteries, subject to appeal; even in the absence of express law on the points to be regulated, the decisions of the Presbytery in each case to be obligatory until finally reversed; and prohibiting all ministers from assuming independent jurisdiction on pain of the highest censures; and enjoining Presbyteries to proceed with such censure.

This certainly appears to be a substantial reversal of the decision of 1864; but, though Dr. Lee accepted it as such, he continued the practices complained of. We cannot stay to specify the reasons, some of them plausible, by which he justified his conduct. The Presbytery of Edinburgh again became unquiet; but Dr. Lee's opponents were defeated by the carrying of "the previous question." His next innovation was to perform the ceremony of marriage in his church, after a mode prescribed by his own Liturgy; with choral accompaniments, and, we feel almost ashamed to say, with some addition to the vestments usually worn by Scotch clergymen. He must have known that such courses were needlessly offensive and irritating. Relying upon his latest success in the Presbytery, he proposed and carried a resolution recommending to the General Assembly the repeal of the Act of 1865. The Synod, however, reversed this decision; and Dr. Lee appealed to the General Assembly of 1866. There Dr. Lee spoke with his usual ability, and ere he closed his speech, used this language—"If it will satisfy my brethren, I shall disuse my book, either in manuscript or print, though

by doing so not abandoning my right to read my prayers." The announcement was received with loud cheers; but it is not clear whether his brethren were, or were not, satisfied. The Assembly passed another vague resolution, instructing the Presbytery to confer with him as to his present and proposed mode of conducting worship, and to take such steps as the result of the inquiry might show to be requisite for the regulation of the services in his church, in a manner consistent with that deliverance, and with the law and usage of the Church. Dr. Lee's motion to repeal the Act of 1865 was lost by a very large majority. Still no change in the service was apparent. On the 27th of June, it was moved in the Presbytery of Edinburgh that a committee should be appointed to inquire into the mode in which public worship was proposed to be conducted by Dr. Lee. An amendment objecting to a committee, and proposing that the inquiry should be conducted by the Presbytery itself, was lost. Its supporters appealed to the Synod; and so the matter was hung up for five months. The Synod sustained the original motion. The committee proceeded with the inquiry. Dr. Lee, fairly at bay, does not seem to have conducted himself with his usual courage and candour. He declared that he had literally obeyed the injunction of the Assembly of 1859, because he had not read from the proscribed book, but from a manuscript of it; that he had not resumed the book till the winter of 1863, and that, indeed, it was not the same book, because he had altered and enlarged it; and that, since the last General Assembly, he had again discontinued the use of the printed book. As to the future, he boldly stated, that it was not his intention to make any alteration unless legally compelled. Upon the reception of this report, the Presbytery passed a resolution, finding that Dr. Lee had not obeyed the injunction of the Assembly of 1859, and now requiring him to yield obedience to it, and to conduct the prayers of his congregation in a manner consistent with the laws and usage of the Church. Of course, Dr. Lee appealed again to the Synod, who, of course, again affirmed the judgment of the Presbytery. Dr. Lee now began to consider the propriety of an appeal to the Civil Courts; but he seems to have shrunk from such an extreme course. The Assembly met in May, 1867, but "man disquieteth himself in vain," and, before the case could be argued, Dr. Lee was smitten by paralysis. He lingered, with varying hopes of recovery, until the following March, and then died. The great Grey Friars case is still unsettled.

We have given but a very imperfect account of a very remarkable man, and but a peep into the contents of a very suggestive book, and have left ourselves no space to point out the many morals of the story. No man who reads it will think worse of Dr. Lee, or better of his principles; if, indeed, any man, always himself trying to doubt, and encouraging doubt in others, can be said to have held any principles at all. We think Dr. Lee did not. Who shall say, however, what were the prevailing and innermost thoughts of his heart? We charitably hope that he reveals them in a letter to a friend, written not long before his death: "Are we not all inconsistent and self-contradictory somewhere? And I confess I have a secret sympathy with those who are determined to hold fast their faith, however reason or doubt may struggle to tear it away; for without that anchor it is hard to live, and impossible to die in peace." Such was Dr. Lee's own "conclusion of the whole matter;" and such is ours.

ART. VI.—1. *The Holy Grail and other Poems.* By ALFRED TENNYSON, D.C.L., Poet Laureate. Strahan and Co., Publishers, 56, Ludgate Hill, London. 1870.

2. *Idylls of the King.* By ALFRED TENNYSON, D.C.L., Poet Laureate. Strahan and Co., Publishers, 56, Ludgate Hill, London. 1869.

3. *The Works of Alfred Tennyson, Poet Laureate.* In Ten volumes. Strahan and Co., Publishers, Ludgate Hill, London. 1870.

ASSUMING the existence of a series of poems wherein certain things are narrated in the form of separate episodes, each complete in itself and none necessary as a condition of the existence of another; assuming such poems to have been always found pleasant reading, in whatever order read, each being worked out and rounded in in a manner not merely suggestive of, but betraying clearly, an intention to produce a complete and independent whole; assuming thus much, would such a series of poems rise to the dignity of one grand work by the mere discovery that the author intended, or might be assumed to have intended, to fashion forth certain connected moral sentiments or religious doctrines, to be discovered by careful dissection of the characters of the poems and deep consideration of the episodes composing the whole? We think not. Provided a poet have the keen creative faculty of setting before us living beings, whose lives and thoughts come to us with the force of experienced realities, whatever purity may be in his soul is sure to pass outward unharmed through the medium of the mingled good and evil of whatever characters he may depict; and, in exercising the noble function of poet, force is more likely to be lost than gained through trenching on the noble function of preacher by becoming directly appellant. In drama, monologue, or idyll, the best path to greatness lies, we believe, in nobility of human conception, and grasp and firmness of human delineation; and we should almost fear that the attempt to make human beings the types or masks of dogmas and principles might result in a greater or less failure of the result. Still, if we were called upon to reconsider, in the light of some newly-discovered subtlety of ulterior intention, a work of such strength in human delineation that its cha-

racters had commended themselves to us as veritable men and women, and taught us the great lessons to be deduced, by proper consideration, from the lives of all men and women, we are unprepared to assert that the ulterior intent would lend no new value to the poem. But no clandestine thread could ever create in our eyes a unity between poems possessing no unity by virtue of palpable fleshly ties. If a true poet have the gift of large construction added to that of lofty song-craft, he will not need to seek cement in the rich stores of religious thought or codified morality: his religion and his morality will be throughout and under all, not in set symmetrical order, not in encyclopædic arrangement, but blended into the lines of his work irregularly, flashing here and there with the fluent flashes of that grander conscientiousness which has become a natural habit of the heart, instead of a mechanical function of the mind. The most religious man is not he who can repeat most glibly the dogmas of his faith and quote the greatest amount of sacred tradition, but he who has most faithfully assimilated true principles of religion, and holds them dispersed, half-recognised, unboasted, guiding and tinting his universal life; and thus we believe the greatest inculcation of religion open to art to be that accomplished with a fervid intuition of rectitude, the lines and exactnesses whereof are lost in the outlined fulness of a grand human conception. For a poem wherein the intimate tissues are thus qualified by an ante-natal religiousness, wherein the morality is not merely anatomical, but actually cellular, there will always be (to follow up this analogy suggested by the high science of life) critical histologists to lay finger on this and that part, and announce to the untechnical the quality and meaning of the tissue; but such quality and meaning would often be knowledge as new to the poet's self as to the uninstructed audience—knowledge, indeed, as new as the chemistry of honey to the bee, or as the laws of uterine gestation to the fruitful rabbit. Doubtless the poet's mind would grasp and recognise the codification deduced from his work, but he would also, doubtless, deny any intention that such codification should ever have been deduced—his proper *rôle* lying outside and around the considerations set forth by the critic. If this were not the case, and if the poet's retort to the critic were, "Yes, that *was* my intention," then we should suspect the human depth of the poem, and examine scrupulously its texture to satisfy ourselves as to the order of the men and women delineated, and the intrinsic value of the situations in which such men and women might be placed.

It is strange that this is a close description of the attitude into which we have been forced in regard to the Laureate's collection of beautiful mosaics from the Arthurian mythology. It would not have been at all incumbent on any critic to bring forward for present discussion the long-published and largely-popular *Idylls of the King* if Tennyson's new volume had consisted of a fresh series of idylls unaccompanied by any remark as to connection with the former series. But this is not the case: we have a note facing the title-page of the volume, directing that the new idylls are to be taken with the old ones and the *Morte d'Arthur*, and read in a prescribed order; in that order they were published in the charming "pocket-volume edition" of Tennyson's works issued simultaneously with the new book; and in that order they have been subsequently* published as a separate whole. Nor is this all; for a new position has been boldly and authoritatively claimed for them on grounds of their alleged connexity through ulterior and ordered significance.

The claim is made by Dean Alford in a very interesting article which appeared in the *Contemporary Review* for January last, and in which we are taught to regard the whole of the *Idylls*, old and new, as "a great *connected* poem, dealing with the very highest interests of man." We are told to look upon the King Arthur of those idylls as figuring forth the "higher soul of man," a term which Dean Alford fully explains and recognises as synonymous with various other terms in use now-a-days. The sense in which he uses it is laid down unmistakably: it means "the highest part of man —that which leads and commands—that which is alone receptive of kindling from heaven—this it is which the ages educate—this, which is susceptible of defeat, corruption, postponement of its high aims and upward progress,—but which, in the long run of the world's complete history, we have faith to believe shall prove to have been well led, through all its compound action and passion, by Him who has the hearts of men in His hand." This higher soul "in its purity, in its justice, in its nobleness, in its self-denial," the Dean understands Tennyson to figure forth by "the King." In the King's coming—in "his foundation of the Round Table —his struggles, and disappointments, and departure," Dean Alford sees "the conflict continually maintained between the spirit and the flesh;" and, in the "pragmatical issue," he

* Tennysonian bibliomaniacs will question this statement on seeing the dates of the respective title-pages. The order of *publication* is, however, that given above, and we can only assume that the *Idylls* complete were first *printed*.

recognises the "bearing down in history, and in individual man, of pure and lofty Christian purpose by the lusts of the flesh, by the corruptions of superstition, by human passions and selfishnesses." "But," he continues, "in history likewise, and pre-eminently in the individual human life, though the high soul of man is surrounded and saddened and outwardly defeated by these adverse and impure influences, yet in the end shall it triumph, and pass into glory. This is the theme which we trace through the *Idylls of the King*, and, tracing it, we regard it as simply ridiculous and beside the purpose, to speak of the four which were, or the eight which are, as insulated groups or pictures. One noble design rules, and warms, and unites them all." Not merely figurative is the expression "we trace," for in the article in question the next and principal step is to trace through the newly-arranged idylls the workings of that design; and most lovingly has this been done—such allegorical significance as may be found in the poems in question being brought forth to the light thoroughly, and in a manner which we have certainly not remarked elsewhere as qualifying the published criticisms of Tennyson's poetry.

It is not a part of our purpose to follow the learned divine through the details of his exegesis: nor is it for the mere sake of recommending this article specially to the notice of our readers, and stating the opinion that, to all Christian people reading the same, the *Idylls of the King* will be shown in a new and important light, that we now bring forward the article. It is not even altogether because Dean Alford has claimed for the poems in question—on grounds which appear to us inadmissible—a place which we altogether dispute, that we have introduced this exposition; but because also, in concluding, he tells us that such exposition is not "a mere invention of his own," implying, beyond a doubt, that the poet's intention is *known* to him to be that expounded: it is on that known intention, and on that alone, that the claim of greatness as a complete whole is based, for Dean Alford says expressly that he believes this "general design to constitute the essential unity of the whole collection;" and, coming from the source whence it does emanate, accompanied by the authorised re-arrangement of the old idylls together with the new, we must regard the whole exposition and claim as being in a measure a challenge from the poet.

We must confess that the *Idylls* have not from the first been highly esteemed by us, in proportion to the greatness of the author: if M. Taine's theory of a decadence in every artist

and school of artists be ever applied in this case, we believe the decadence period of Tennyson will be taken as commencing with the issue of *The Idylls of the King*. They are full of beauties in their own peculiar manner of workmanship; fine ideas abound throughout them; the music of words is heard through their varying pages in many a perfect lyric; and they possess numerous passages which, for weight of thought weightily set forth, have long ago passed into the permanent station of household words. In fine, the stock of the English tongue and the tone of the English mind cannot fail to benefit from them. But the men and women—do they individually and collectively stand carved in the heart as well as shaped in the mind? Does one feel towards them as towards brothers and sisters, whether in misery or in triumph? To us they have always presented a certain remoteness, totally unconnected with the remoteness of the times; and we have never been able to divest ourselves of the idea that they were being moved by an external hand, holding with a somewhat painful anxiety all their threads, rather than by inner, deep-down impulses, such as would lead us to lay heart to heart with them and share in the burden of their woe, or joy in the brightness of their joy. It is not that the poems are wanting in pathos, be it remarked; for much that we read in connection with the long-suffering Enid, the love-stricken Elaine, the vanity-befooled Merlin, the conscience-crushed Guinevere, is moving and eloquent, as well as beautiful; but if we analyse carefully the nature of the feeling called up by this motive eloquence, we find it to be rather a sense that such things as the poet tells are possible as occurrences to ourselves, or to those personally dear to us, than a vivid carefulness as to what is happening to the persons concerned in the poetic fiction,—in a word, a *lyric* rather then a *dramatic* pathos. Take the supreme situation of all, the grovelling of the adulterous Guinevere at the feet of her husband—the prostration of convicted corruption before stainless and immovable virtue: we see the delicate beauty of the pencilling, we hear the large, rolling, fluent majesty of the king's accusation and forgiveness; but Arthur seems to speak less from a form of flesh than from a sun-irradiated cloud, and the dissection of Guinevere's conscience is not carried deep enough to show the human heart of her in its rags and tatters of sin, and also in its glow and warmth of humanness, and thus fill us with a real breathless awe at her situation. She is young, beautiful, sinful, convicted, repentant; but these qualities are thrown together in her rather with the delicate strategy of great

mosaic work than with the naïve reality of what Mr. H. A. Page happily terms "vicarious thinking;" and unless the poet can so far shake off the weight of all *sense* of poetising as to place himself absolutely in the position of each individual treated by him, it is impossible that his characters should attain the needful degree of *insouciance* for convincing reality.

Thus much in illustration of what we have termed the "remoteness" of the men and women in the *Idylls*. But the real and more important grounds on which these pieces seem to us to fall short of ranking as a whole lie in isolation of interest, total unsuitableness of the plan for purposes of large construction, and even what would scarcely be expected —heterogeneity of conception; for after all, whatever may be said about the peerless conception of King Arthur in these poems, the King Arthur of 1842* is not the same embodiment as the King Arthur of 1859 and later years. The former exceeds the latter in reality and attraction to the intelligent reader of to-day as greatly as the author's marvellous lyrics exceed the maudlin sentimentalities of Tom Moore. The Arthur of later times is made to have too much of the apocryphal, unattainable demigod, and we are apt to leave him with a sigh, as we might leave an exhortation to do things beyond human power; but the other is practical and real, as well as noble and magnificent, and we feel that Arthur is

> "*Then* most God-like, being most a man."

The Arthur of that poem, which we still prefer to name by its own insular name of *Morte d'Arthur*, is before all things a man of immense personal ascendant, and the traits of humanity so plentifully developed throughout the piece convey to us a warm sense of fellowship, even though of worshipful fellowship: the quick pant of a strong man dying, and who knows himself dying, rises to our ears distinctly and pathetically; and yet, blended with this, we find an indomitable fortitude and preparation for every emergency, and that splendid command of kingliness shown in the *compulsion* of Bedivere to do what he has hesitated to do for love's or duty's sake. It is probably in that one passage, more than in any other modern passage on Arthur, that sympathy and respect are most forcibly engaged—there that we feel the hero to be at once a man and a king:—

* The hero, that is to say, of the *Morte d'Arthur*.

> "Yet, for a man may fail in duty twice,
> And the third time may prosper, get thee hence:
> But, if thou spare to fling Excalibur,
> *I will arise and slay thee with my hand.*"

This electrical threat, embedded as it is between death-throes and followed by immediate performance of the task imposed, we have always regarded as one of the master-touches of a masterly poem—a poem, indeed, so masterly that we cannot feel its fitness of companionship with the Arthurian *Idylls* among which it is now classified. The *Morte d'Arthur* stood alone when it was published, and, as far as one can judge from all subsequent works by the same hand, is destined to stand alone—not, be it undertood, from *superiority* to poems in a different manner, but simply by virtue of difference. It is straightforward, direct, muscular in every line; and in general order of narration, there is no swerving, no approach to that inversion of points of time which suits the other poems well enough as having no sufficient scope or grandeur of action to magnify, as the *Morte d'Arthur* does, the direct manner of narration. Inversions of the order of time are among the technical artifices tending to give a variety to the texture of each *Idyll of the King;* and it is just this artificially attained variety which, more perhaps than any other of the considerations we have named, separates these poems irretrievably, and gives to them, when one attempts to look at them as a whole, a sort of oscillation most uncomfortable to the artistic sense. No one can ever truly think that, to attain this pleasing variety in each piece, the poet, having regard to the project of making the whole a connected work whereon to base his reputation for sustained power, elected to use this form, bearing condemnation on its very surface as a form for divisions of one work: for to what does this same cleverly attained variety lead when considered in the long run of the series, and not in the pieces as individuals? What is the consequence from a technical, or even from a mere common-sense point of view, if we take up the old *Idylls* and the new, read them as directed, and try to imagine that what we have before us is one work, and that a great work? "Inextinguishable laughter!" We get on very well to the end of the first poem, which treats of the advent of the hero; but even then we are rather surprised, considering that we are reading an "Arthuriad," to find the formation of the Round Table, the consolidation of the kingdoms under one crown, and the twelve battles with the heathen, disposed of in five lines, and still more rudely surprised to find the King married in that

idyll, when we know that the history of Lancelot's fetching the bride elect is to be given in a later one. But next comes *Enid*, in the opening of which we are introduced to Geraint as leaving Court with his wife, for fear her purity may be tainted by contact with the ill-reputed Queen: then we go back to Geraint's courtship of Enid, their marriage, &c. (an immense digression), and return to the point of divergence to wind Geraint's and Enid's life up to what one would not suppose an *untimely* end,—the death of Geraint, who

> "Crown'd
> A happy life with a fair death, and fell
> Against the heathen of the Northern Sea
> In battle, fighting for the blameless King"—

fell, that is to say, in one of the twelve great battles so summarily disposed of in the last book; so that we come round again to the point we left there. The next poem, *Vivien*, is not so clear as to point of time, but is more than any disconnected from the rest by manner of treatment, though in it too there is much retrospective discussion of Arthurian characters. Again in *Elaine* we open on a certain situation, are carried back to work up to it again, and afterwards pass on beyond it. Then in *The Holy Grail* we are shown the death-bed of Sir Percivale, who reveals, in dialogue with a monk, his reminiscences of the quest of the "holy grail." Again in *Pelleas and Ettarre* comes the forward situation, the knighting of Pelleas, and afterwards what led to it. But here, to do justice, we must note that there is an attempt at the end to lead up to *Guinevere*, the next piece in the prescribed order; the last line of *Pelleas and Ettarre* is—

> "And Modred thought, 'The time is hard at hand.'"

For Modred sees the scandal of the Queen and Lancelot to be near breaking into an open shame; and *Guinevere*, as our readers all know, opens upon the Queen in hiding at Almesbury. Then, as usual, the poet carries us back with him to learn the particulars of her fleeing thither. Afterwards he gives her interview with the outraged King Arthur, dismisses the King to fight his final battle, and leaves him, "moving ghost-like to his doom," to return and show us the concluding years of Guinevere's life. This must have been a considerable number of years; but we are called upon to annul the interval in our minds, take up again the story of Arthur, and follow him to his death (or rather his "doom,"

for he does not die at all), although his passing is really far earlier than Guinevere's.

A more lamentable state of things than this it is hard to imagine as the sober and well-considered plan of a great poet; and we cannot conceive how the Laureate can have persuaded himself or been persuaded to run the risk of challenging public opinion by putting the poems forward in the character of a whole. Perhaps, after seeing the rubbish which in 1868 was put forth in magazines under his signature, we ought to be prepared for anything; but we certainly were not prepared for *this*, and *must* regard the scheme as a hasty and ill-considered one—not as the mature execution of an old and cherished design. To think otherwise would be to undervalue those technical abilities for which the Laureate has held for so many years, and worthily held, an undisputed reputation among the best modern poets. We are of course bound to accept the positive statement that these poems are now connected "in accordance with an early project of the author's;" but we must also allow ourselves the liberty of accepting it *cum grano salis*. It is not at all unlikely that the poet who wrote the *Morte d'Arthur* (prefixing to it a scene of college friends talking over the epic whereof one of them, the author, had burnt all but one book) had even then conceived the notion of writing a great deal more poetry of the same kind to lead up to the grand termination already executed; but, in justice to the poet's sense of artistic propriety in 1842, we must assume that whatever "project" then existed had reference to poetry of strictly the same class —not to little pieces of cramped scope and other workmanship which might be issued separately without its ever being suspected that they were meant to be made into a book including their great predecessor; and perhaps we are further justified, or indeed doing the greatest justice to the author, in assuming that this project had been long abandoned when *Enid*, *Vivien*, *Elaine*, and *Guinevere* were taken severally in hand. Granting this, and knowing how weak the flesh is to sustain even the shadow of a relaxation of once-accorded worship, how unwilling to submit to any division of kingship, we can well understand how the issue and approval of several recent works, on a large scale, by other poets, should revive in the Laureate's mind that "early project." If this be so, it was perhaps a pardonable weakness in a man whose judgment is so endangered by public adulation, and peradventure by private too, to turn to the vastly popular *Idylls of the King*, patch them together with a few new ones, crown them with

the vigorous, youthful *Morte d'Arthur*, and present them as his *magnum opus*.

So far as regards the great aim now claimed for these pieces as an entire work, we must, in honesty, aver that we fail to see that aim underlying the whole. The idea of man's higher soul striving, through all obstacles, to attain to a vast altitude of holiness and purity is a magnificent idea; but it is an idea which, while possessing an almost incalculable virtue for the inspiration of a noble didactic poetry, is not quite calculated to form the basework of a noble epic or dramatic structure. In many parts of the *new* idylls of the Laureate, this idea is plain enough; but as to its "ruling and warming and uniting the whole," we must entirely dissent from Dean Alford. For, firstly, they are often cold; secondly, as we have seen, they are not united; and thirdly, such poems as *Vivien* and the *Morte d'Arthur* stand too rigidly apart for any critic to maintain successfully that they are in any sense subject to this general regulation. The Dean's criticism is able and acute: it pierces to the end of the question, and shows up thoughts correlative to the acts expressed in these poems; but, as regards the establishment of those thoughts in the position of an underlying and permeating influence, we cannot bring ourselves to feel any conviction, and must always regard the grand thought of the struggling soul of man and its weary noble wars with the world, the flesh, and the devil, as an after-thought, supervening in all probability at that point in the construction of these poems when Tennyson took in mind the subject of the holy grail. The fact that all the poems may be wrested to an allegorical sense carries nothing with it, and can never drive acute men from the position that the idea on which so much is claimed is more properly a coping-structure than a basework.

We may respect the oneness of sentiment shown by those who accept the collection in this light—respect the sturdy determination to support the popular idol in every position. Tennyson never has been reputed a poet of large constructiveness; and we cannot expect those who, ignoring *Maud*, have yet supported his reputation as a *growing* one through the issue of the old *Idylls*, *Enoch Arden*, and the new *Idylls* to trouble themselves much about the question of construction and conception. But to those who held by *Maud*, when that beautiful work came out in its originality and excellence of form, in its truth of humanness, and in its large and subtle dramatic unity, came out too decked in a new guise of

that old lyric loveliness always the salient characteristic of the Laureate's books, came out and was received with general coldness and occasional contempt—to those who built on *Maud* large hopes of an ever-increasing greatness in Tennyson's poetry, had those hopes undermined by *The Idylls of the King* and toppled over by *Enoch Arden*, it comes home as almost a bitter and insulting jest to be asked to take the collected *Idylls* as what they now aspire to be thought.

Rejecting, then, the clandestine articulations so far as they claim to make the *Idylls of the King* a great poem, failing to comprehend the validity of any shadowy attachments between poems that do not hold together as one whole by obvious ties, and yet not failing to appreciate at their due worth these and all other poems susceptible of a religious interpretation, we are not called on to discuss the individual *Idylls of the King*, except those which appear in the Laureate's new volume, entitled *The Holy Grail and other Poems*. Three of the new poems in that volume are Arthurian "Idylls," *The Coming of Arthur*, *The Holy Grail*, and *Pelleas and Ettarre*; and one old one is meant to come under the same head, *The Passing of Arthur*, well known* to us all since 1842, and already referred to under the title of *Morte d'Arthur*, but now furnished with a new opening of a hundred and forty-five lines and a new conclusion of twenty-four.

The Coming of Arthur has the same curved form as that notable in the *Idylls* of the first series, as regards the arrangement of the incidents. We do not get directly from the fundamental narrator any straightforward statement of the main events in their natural order. First come the misfortunes of King Leodogran, the father of Guinevere, then his appeal to Arthur for help, then the coming of Arthur to Leodogran's realm of Cameliard, and his exploits there. Afterwards he returns, smitten with the love of Guinevere, to his own kingdom, whence he despatches Ulfius and Brastias and Bedivere to ask her hand of Leodogran; and it is then, at the discussion of this proposal, that the question of Arthur's birth is raised, for, says Leodogran,

> "How should I that am a king,
> However much he holp me at my need,
> Give my one daughter saving to a king,
> And a king's son?"—P. 9.

* Probably the only exception to this remark is the writer of a review in the *Athenæum* for the 18th of December, 1869, wherein the grand speech, "The old order changeth, yielding place to new," &c., is brought forward with much simplicity as one of the poet's new triumphs!

The varying accounts of Arthur's birth given at the king's demand render such a form as this suitable enough for the narration of this particular portion of the Arthurian traditions; for, though Arthur's birth is a matter of primary importance, the supernatural or magical element in the accounts makes the incident unfit for a telling opening, and better suited for internal digression. Among the really great passages contained in the new *Idylls*, there is none more notable for descriptive force and fineness of workmanship than one account of the birth given by Bellicent, Arthur's supposed sister; and the account terminates with some "riddling triplets" of Merlin's which form so delicate a specimen of the Laureate's old sweet propriety of expression in song that we transcribe the whole tale as it stands:—

"But let me tell thee now another tale:
For Bleys, our Merlin's master, as they say,
Died but of late, and sent his cry to me,
To hear him speak before he left his life.
Shrunk like a fairy changeling lay the mage,
And when I enter'd told me that himself
And Merlin ever served about the King,
Uther, before he died, and on the night
When Uther in Tintagil past away
Moaning and wailing for an heir, the two
Left the still king, and passing forth to breathe,
Then from the castle gateway by the chasm
Descending thro' the dismal night—a night
In which the bounds of heaven and earth were lost—
Beheld, so high upon the dreary deeps
It seem'd in heaven, a ship, the shape thereof
A dragon wing'd, and all from stem to stern
Bright with a shining people on the decks,
And gone as soon as seen. And then the two
Dropt to the cove, and watch'd the great sea fall,
Wave after wave, each mightier than the last,
Till last, a ninth one, gathering half the deep
And full of voices, slowly rose and plunged
Roaring, and all the wave was in a flame:
And down the wave and in the flame was borne
A naked babe, and rode to Merlin's feet,
Who stoopt and caught the babe, and cried, 'The King!
Here is an heir for Uther!' And the fringe
Of that great breaker, sweeping up the strand,
Lash'd at the wizard as he spake the word,
And all at once all round him rose in fire,
So that the child and he were clothed in fire.
And presently thereafter follow'd calm,

Free sky and stars: 'And this same child,' he said,
'Is he who reigns; nor could I part in peace
Till this were told.' And saying this the seer
Went through the strait and dreadful pass of death,
Not ever to be question'd any more
Save on the further side; but when I met
Merlin, and ask'd him if these things were truth—
The shining dragon and the naked child
Descending in the glory of the seas—
He laugh'd as is his wont, and answered me
In riddling triplets of old time, and said:
'Rain, rain, and sun! a rainbow in the sky!
A young man will be wiser by and by;
An old man's wit may wander ere he die.
Rain, rain, and sun! a rainbow on the lea!
And truth is this to me, and that to thee;
And truth or clothed or naked let it be.
Rain, sun, and rain! and the free blossom blows:
Sun, rain, and sun! and where is he who knows?
From the great deep to the great deep he goes.'"—Pp. 22-25.

This poem is not on the whole a particularly happy one; and we do not think it will ever be very popular. Those things in it which might have afforded a vivid human interest are so extremely sketchy that the total result is somewhat cold. Though Arthur's love for Guinevere is noted in strong terms—

"Travail, and throes and agonies of the life,
Desiring to be join'd with Guinevere" (pp. 7, 8)—

yet one does not quite realise that the obtaining of his heart's desire is a matter of as grave importance to the somewhat immaterial paragon as it would be to an ordinary man of flesh and blood, born of a woman beyond question, and not perhaps cast up from the womb of the sea at the feet of a couple of wizards. So that when Arthur's desire is crowned by the arrival of Guinevere, and the poem closes on a very calmly stated nuptial, it is hard to realise the full weight of the grave step taken.

The Holy Grail is altogether a far finer poem than this, is more beautifully coloured, and has the air of a poem written congenially throughout. Having regard to the lyric nature of a great portion of Tennyson's poetry and the brevity of his usual efforts at dramatisation, and forgetting the great dramatic poem *Maud*, the ungenerous will probably trace to a personal superstition the evident delight with which the poet has dwelt on every available detail of the legend of the quest of the holy grail—will almost suspect that he believes in the existence of the wondrous cup brought to Glastonbury

by Joseph of Arimathæa; and, indeed, the vivid richness of this poem, as compared with *The Coming of Arthur*, the great abundance of considerable passages of fine imagination, the superiority of the workmanship, seem to point to a feeling on the subject not altogether "vicarious." However, of this we can know nothing, nor need we care to know; for, whatever the poet means as to the grounds of the legend, one thing he clearly does *not* mean: he does not mean, namely, that anyone should learn from the work that it is well to leave solid and evident duties for the sake of following after vague shadows; and he who runs may read in the disastrous results of the quest a good sound lesson for his whole lifetime. Arthur's knights, we are to understand, had much better have left the cup unsought; and yet, of persons who sought and found it, we have some pictures painted with a deliciously sympathetic hand, as for instance this, told by Sir Percivale of the fragile and lovely nun, his sister, who first set the idea of the grail-quest afoot among the knights:—

> "For on a day she sent to speak with me.
> And when she came to speak, behold her eyes
> Beyond my knowing of them, beautiful,
> Beyond all knowing of them, wonderful,
> Beautiful in the light of holiness.
> And, 'O my brother, Percivale,' she said,
> 'Sweet brother, I have seen the Holy Grail;
> For, waked at dead of night, I heard a sound
> As of a silver horn from o'er the hills
> Blown, and I thought, "It is not Arthur's use
> To hunt by moonlight;" and the slender sound
> As from a distance beyond distance grew
> Coming upon me—O never harp nor horn,
> Nor aught we blow with breath, or touch with hand,
> Was like that music as it came; and then
> Stream'd thro' my cell a cold and silver beam,
> And down the long beam stole the Holy Grail,
> Rose-red with beatings in it, as if alive,
> Till all the white walls of my cell were dyed
> With rosy colours leaping on the wall;
> And then the music faded, and the Grail
> Pass'd, and the beam decay'd, and from the walls
> The rosy quiverings died into the night.
> So now the Holy Thing is here again
> Among us, brother, fast thou too and pray,
> And tell thy brother knights to fast and pray,
> That so perchance the vision may be seen
> By thee and those, and all the world be heal'd.'"—Pp. 39-41.

Of all the knights fired to go forth upon the quest, Sir Galahad is alone wholly successful. On him the idea of the holy grail seizes in the same measure as upon the nun, and with such a force as to transfigure him, in Sir Percivale's sight, into likeness of face to the nun's self; and for him she makes a belt of her hair, weaving into it an image of the grail, and binding it upon him with touching words such as the poet can so well phrase:—

> "My knight, my love, my knight of heaven,
> O thou, my love, whose love is one with mine,
> I, maiden, round thee, maiden, bind my belt.
> Go forth, for thou shalt see what I have seen,
> And break thro' all, till one will crown thee king
> Far in the spiritual city."—Pp. 42-3.

And it is this same Galahad through whose means Sir Percivale, at first lacking true humility, but eventually humbled by adversities, attains to a distant vision of the "holy thing." The passing away of Sir Galahad to the spiritual city is perhaps the highest strain of imagination and description reached in the whole poem—though that position might be claimed by some for Lancelot's account of his faring on the quest. The miraculous element in Lancelot's story takes, to our mind, a slightly *bizarre* tone, notwithstanding its masterliness of diction; and on that ground, principally, the passing of Sir Galahad seems to us handled better and with a more masculine touch. This is what follows when Percivale joins Galahad and they start on the final journey of the latter:—

> "There rose a hill that none but man could climb,
> Scarr'd with a hundred wintry watercourses—
> Storm at the top, and when we gain'd it, storm
> Round us and death; for every moment glanced
> His silver arms and gloom'd: so quick and thick
> The lightnings here and there to left and right
> Struck, till the dry old trunks about us, dead,
> Yea, rotten with a hundred years of death,
> Sprang into fire: and at the base we found
> On either hand, as far as eye could see,
> A great black swamp and of an evil smell,
> Part black, part whiten'd with the bones of men,
> Not to be crost, save that some ancient king
> Had built a way, where, link'd with many a bridge,
> A thousand piers ran into the great Sea.
> And Galahad fled along them bridge by bridge,
> And every bridge as quickly as he crost
> Sprang into fire and vanish'd, tho' I yearn'd
> To follow; and thrice above him all the heavens

Open'd and blazed with thunder such as seem'd
Shoutings of all the sons of God: and first
At once I saw him far on the great Sea,
In silver-shining armour starry-clear;
And o'er his head the holy vessel hung
Clothed in white samite or a luminous cloud.
And with exceeding swiftness ran the boat,
If boat it were—I saw not whence it came.
And when the heavens open'd and blazed again
Roaring, I saw him like a silver star—
And had he set the sail, or had the boat
Become a living creature clad with wings?
And o'er his head the holy vessel hung
Redder than any rose, a joy to me,
For now I knew the veil had been withdrawn.
Then in a moment when they blazed again
Opening, I saw the least of little stars
Down on the waste, and straight beyond the star
I saw the spiritual city and all her spires
And gateways in a glory like one pearl—
No larger, tho' the goal of all the saints—
Strike from the sea; and from the star there shot
A rose-red sparkle to the city, and there
Dwelt, and I knew it was the Holy Grail,
Which never eyes on earth again shall see.
Then fell the floods of heaven drowning the deep,
And how my feet recross'd the deathful ridge
No memory in me lives; but that I touch'd
The chapel-doors at dawn I know; and thence
Taking my war-horse from the holy man,
Glad that no phantom vext me more, return'd
To whence I came, the gate of Arthur's wars."—Pp. 62-5.

The unreality of the experience of Lancelot surpasses considerably, and to some extent inartistically, the unreality of the rest of the poem. The various visions of the grail occur, or are said to have occurred, in such a manner that they can be easily regarded as the results of short spaces of mental delusion, such as one would expect to supervene under protracted fasting and unusual excitement; but Lancelot's wild and extraordinary experience is too minute in detail, it would seem, for the occasion. It is true that he confesses to his madness having come upon him "as of old;" but what he tells he tells for actual fact, as he would scarcely have done with the delusions of insanity: nor are we in any way led to think that his tale was an insane delusion. The following is the most remarkable part of his speech:—

"Seven days I drove along the dreary deep,
And with me drove the moon and all the stars;
And the wind fell, and on the seventh night
I heard the shingle grinding in the surge,
And felt the boat shock earth, and looking up,
Behold, the enchanted towers of Carbonek,
A castle like a rock upon a rock,
With chasm-like portals open to the sea,
And steps that met the breaker! there was none
Stood near it but a lion on each side
That kept the entry, and the moon was full.
Then from the boat I leapt, and up the stairs.
There drew my sword. With sudden-flaring manes
Those two great beasts rose upright like a man,
Each gript a shoulder, and I stood between;
And, when I would have smitten them, heard a voice,
'Doubt not, go forward; if thou doubt, the beasts
Will tear thee piecemeal.' Then with violence
The sword was dash'd from out my hand, and fell.
And up into the sounding hall I past;
But nothing in the sounding hall I saw,
No bench nor table, painting on the wall
Or shield of knight; only the rounded moon
Thro' the tall oriel on the rolling sea.
But always in the quiet house I heard,
Clear as a lark, high o'er me as a lark,
A sweet voice singing in the topmost tower
To the eastward: up I climb'd a thousand steps
With pain: as in a dream I seem'd to climb
For ever: at the last I reach'd a door,
A light was in the crannies, and I heard,
'Glory and joy and honour to our Lord
And to the Holy Vessel of the Grail.'
Then in my madness I essay'd the door;
It gave; and thro' a stormy glare, a heat
As from a seven-times-heated furnace, I—
Blasted and burnt, and blinded as I was,
With such a fierceness that I swoon'd away—
O, yet methought I saw the Holy Grail,
All pall'd in crimson samite, and around
Great angels, awful shapes, and wings and eyes,
And but for all my madness and my sin,
And then my swooning, I had sworn I saw
That which I saw; but what I saw was veil'd
And cover'd; and this quest was not for me."—Pp. 81-4.

The "veiling" and "covering" appear to refer to the vision of the grail alone, and not to the approach to the vision; and

the characteristics of this approach have an Oriental smack foreign to the texture of the piece, sending our thoughts back to the days of our childhood, when we gloried in *Aladdin and the Wonderful Lamp*, and other Eastern marvel-tales.

The third of the new Arthurian poems, *Pelleas and Ettarre*, has more affinity with *Vivien* than with any other of the collection; but it does not come up to that in respect of strength. We are disposed to think that, as regards strength of conception and treatment, *Vivien* is the greatest of all *The Idylls of the King*, except the *Morte d'Arthur*, now so objectionably interpolated under that title. In *Vivien* there is a weird power of imagination, binding the whole into something more than an episode, and giving it a singleness of tone not to be found in the other *Idylls of the King*. The same cannot be said of *Pelleas and Ettarre*; but in that, as in *Vivien*, a man is undone through devoting himself to a beautiful, though worthless woman—the man in this case being a raw youth instead of a centenarian mage. In *Pelleas and Ettarre* there is also a freshness of out-door scenery suggestive of *Vivien*; and, in general, it is more nearly muscular in treatment than either of the two pieces which precede it.

Whatever be the date of the project of uniting *The Idylls of the King* in their present form and order, it has not been beneficial in its effect on *Pelleas and Ettarre*, which opens somewhat abruptly, with reference to the preceding poem, instead of beginning independently, as the rest do. We are told at the commencement of this piece that—

> "King Arthur made new knights to fill the gap
> Left by the Holy Quest; and as he sat
> In hall at old Caerleon, the high doors
> Were softly sunder'd, and thro' these a youth,
> Pelleas, and the sweet smell of the fields
> Past, and the sunshine came along with him."—P. 91.

The last three lines are exceedingly happy in effect, and fully prepare us for the delicious landscape painting exhibited in the very next page. For fresh greenery and broad clarity of air it would be hard to find anything surpassing this—

> "And this new knight, Sir Pelleas of the isles—
> But lately come to his inheritance,
> And lord of many a barren isle was he—
> Riding at noon, a day or twain before,
> Across the forest call'd of Dean, to find
> Caerleon and the King, had felt the sun

Beat like a strong knight on his helm, and reel'd
Almost to falling from his horse, but saw
Near him a mound of even-sloping side,
Whereon a hundred stately beeches grew,
And here and there great hollies under them.
But for a mile all round was open space,
And fern and heath: and slowly Pelleas drew
To that dim day, then binding his good horse
To a tree, cast himself down; and as he lay
At random looking over the brown earth
Thro' that green-glooming twilight of the grove,
It seemed to Pelleas that the fern without
Burnt as a living fire of emeralds,
So that his eyes were dazzled looking at it.
Then o'er it crost the dimness of a cloud
Floating, and once the shadow of a bird
Flying, and then a fawn; and his eyes closed.
And since he loved all maidens, but no maid
In special, half-awake he whisper'd, 'Where?
O where? I love thee, tho' I know thee not.
For fair thou art and pure as Guinevere,
And I will make thee with my spear and sword
As famous—O my queen, my Guinevere,
For I will be thine Arthur when we meet.'

Suddenly waken'd with the sound of talk
And laughter at the limit of the wood,
And glancing thro' the hoary boles, he saw,
Strange as to some old prophet might have seem'd
A vision hovering on a sea of fire,
Damsels in divers colours like the cloud
Of sunset and sunrise, and all of them
On horses, and the horses richly trapt
Breast-high in that bright line of bracken stood:
And all the damsels talk'd confusedly,
And one was pointing this way, and one that,
Because the way was lost.

And Pelleas rose,
And loosed his horse, and led him to the light.
There she that seem'd the chief among them said,
'In happy time behold our pilot-star!
Youth, we are damsels-errant, and we ride,
Arm'd as ye see, to tilt against the knights
There at Caerleon, but have lost our way:
To right? to left? straight forward? back again?
Which? tell us quickly.'

And Pelleas gazing thought,
'Is Guinevere herself so beautiful?'"—Pp. 92-5.

Here, too, the pliant and sunny youth of the new knight is very finely blended with the sights and sounds of the landscape; and the foundation of the whole poem is beautifully and solidly laid for throwing Pelleas into sudden love of Ettarre, under very natural circumstances—the newness of knighthood, the charm of seductive warm weather, the dreaminess of a sunny out-door somnolence and sudden up-rousing, all combining to prepare the youth's affective nature for the reception of whatever best idol might be cast up by favourable or adverse circumstance. This tender and delicate opening forms a noble contrast with the sombre close, showing the same youth maddened by unrequited love and gross deception, and rendered reckless in a very different sense from that in which his sudden capture by love had been reckless. The savage chagrin and mad remorse of Pelleas on discovering the woman he has adored sleeping in her tent beside Sir Gawain, who has sworn to help Pelleas to her love, and betrayed him instead, is vigorously and appallingly truthful:

"Back as the coward slinks from what he fears
To cope with, or a traitor proven, or hound
Beaten, did Pelleas in an utter shame
Creep with his shadow thro' the court again,
Fingering at his sword-handle until he stood
There on the castle-bridge once more, and thought,
'I will go back, and slay them where they lie.'
And so went back, and seeing them yet in sleep,
Said, 'Ye, that so dishallow the holy sleep,
Your sleep is death,' and drew the sword, and thought,
'What! slay a sleeping knight? the King hath bound
And sworn me to this brotherhood;' again,
'Alas that ever a knight should be so false.'
Then turn'd, and so return'd, and groaning laid
The naked sword athwart their naked throats,
There left it, and them sleeping; and she lay,
The circlet of the tourney on her brows,
And the sword of the tourney across her throat.
And forth he past, and mounting on his horse,
Stared at her towers that, larger than themselves
In their own darkness, throng'd into the moon.
Then crush'd the saddle with his thighs, and clench'd
His hands, and madden'd with himself and moan'd:
'Would they have risen against me in their blood
At the last day? I might have answer'd them
Even before high God. O towers so strong,
Huge, solid, would that even while I gaze
The crack of earthquake shivering to your base

> Split you, and Hell burst up your harlot roofs
> Bellowing, and charr'd you thro' and thro' within,
> Black as the harlot's heart—hollow as a skull!
> Let the fierce east scream thro' your eyelet-holes,
> And whirl the dust of harlots round and round
> In dung and nettles! Hiss, snake—I saw him there—
> Let the fox bark, let the wolf yell. Who yells
> Here in the still sweet summer night, but I—
> I, the poor Pelleas whom she call'd her fool?
> Fool, beast—he, she, or I? myself most fool;
> Beast too, as lacking human wit—disgraced,
> Dishonour'd all for trial of true love—
> Love?—we be all alike: only the King
> Hath made us fools and liars. O noble vows!
> O great and sane and simple race of brutes
> That own no lust because they have no law!
> For why should I have loved her to my shame?
> I loathe her, as I loved her to my shame.
> I never loved her, I but lusted for her—
> Away ——' "—Pp. 117-19.

But fine as the poem is altogether, the conclusion, already referred to, has the same vice as the opening has, from any point of view regarding it as a complete poem: it opens with backward vista, and it ends, not with climax, but with forward vista. Having discarded the idea that these poems of Arthur and his times are one, we must of course regard as a vice this that we have so represented; and it must obviously, on this view, be regretted that so strong a poem as *Pelleas and Ettarre* should not have been rounded to completeness in its own method (whatever may be said of the absolute merits of that method), instead of being forced into the bootless and somewhat lowering service of patching together a fabric which time must inevitably re-sunder.

To the *Morte d'Arthur* taken as an independent poem, no evil has accrued through its pressure into the same service after new baptism. The fresh opening and conclusion tend in every sense to ennoble what was already almost inconceivably noble, and to render more complete what was never before to be called incomplete. Workmanship and imagination have here entered into the highest union. The additional portions are felt with an exquisite delicacy: the idea of patching is so remote that it is almost a marvel to the reader that the poem did not always open and close as it now does. To this order of poetry we may truly apply the majestic words of a comparatively little known poet, Mr. W. Bell Scott—

"And poetry is the harmonious voice
Of thought and feeling, moving so together
That words acquire the bridal sound of song."*

The ominous music which preludes the battle-scene, now affixed to the immortal poetry commencing, "So all day long the noise of battle roll'd," is a touch invaluable as a gage of unimpaired power to write what is most fitting, when once the happy subject and the happy method are leagued to set the poet at his best. There is something impossible to describe otherwise than by quotation in this dream of Arthur's:—

"Before that last weird battle in the West
There came on Arthur sleeping, Gawain kill'd
In Lancelot's war, the ghost of Gawain blown
Along a wandering wind, and past his ear
Went shrilling 'Hollow, hollow all delight!
Hail, King! to-morrow thou shalt pass away.
Farewell! there is an isle of rest for thee.
And I am blown along a wandering wind,
And hollow, hollow, hollow all delight!'
And fainter onward, like wild birds that change
Their season in the night and wail their way
From cloud to cloud, down the long wind the dream
Shrill'd; but in going mingled with dim cries
Far in the moonlit haze among the hills,
As of some lonely city sack'd by night,
When all is lost, and wife and child with wail
Pass to new lords. . . . ."—Pp. 131-2.

We would fain transcribe, and but for lack of space would do so, the whole of the new opening, describing how Arthur "moved his host by night" and pursued his nephew to a land "where the long mountains ended in a coast of ever-shifting sand, and far away the phantom circle of a moaning sea"—how "on the waste sand by the waste sea they closed"—how "a death-white mist slept over land and sea"—how men fought disastrously, not knowing each other, and how Modred and the King, at last meeting, exchanged death-strokes. One more passage we must extract before passing to note the sublime conclusion:

"And in the mist
Was many a noble deed, many a base,
And chance, and craft, and strength in single fights,
And ever and anon with host to host

* See *The Year of the World; a Philosophical Poem on "Redemption from the Fall."* By William B. Scott. William Tait, Edinburgh, 1846.

Shocks, and the splintering spear, the hard mail hewn,
Shield-breakings, and the clash of brands, the crash
Of battle axes on shatter'd helms, and shrieks
After the Christ, of those who falling down
Look'd up to heav'n, and only saw the mist;
And shouts of heathen and the traitor knights,
Oaths, insult, filth, and monstrous blasphemies,
Sweat, writhings, anguish, labouring of the lungs,
In that close mist, and cryings for the light,
Groans of the dying, and voices of the dead.
Last, as by some one death-bed after wail
Of suffering, silence follows, or thro' death
Or death-like swoon, thus over all that shore,
Save for some whisper of the seething seas,
A dead hush fell; but when the dolorous day
Grew drearier toward twilight falling, came
A bitter wind, clear from the North, and blew
The mist aside, and with that wind the tide
Rose, and the pale King glanced across the field
Of battle: but no man was moving there;
Nor any cry of Christian heard thereon,
Nor yet of heathen; only the wan wave
Brake in among dead faces, to and fro
Swaying the helpless hands, and up and down
Tumbling the hollow helmets of the fallen,
And shivered brands that once had fought with Rome,
And rolling far along the gloomy shores
The voice of days of old and days to be."—Pp. 186-7.

All who knew the *Morte d'Arthur* as ending with, "On the mere the wailing died away"—and who did not so know it?—must have felt that anything after that exquisitely modulated *finale* would be anti-climactic; and yet the event has shown us that this is not so, for what now follows furnishes a sublimity of climax beyond climax—a something that must needs be admired intensely, and therefore of highest power as coming after the point where dead stillness used to fall upon the imagination. Of Sir Bedivere we are now further told:

"At length he groan'd, and turning slowly clomb
The last hard footstep of that iron crag;
Thence mark'd the black hull moving yet, and cried,
'He passes to be king among the dead,
And after healing of his grievous wound
He comes again; but—if he come no more—'
* * * * *
Then from the dawn it seem'd there came, but faint
As from beyond the limit of the world,

Like the last echo born of a great cry,
Sounds, as if some fair city were one voice
Around a king returning from his wars.

Thereat once more he moved about, and clomb
E'en to the highest he could climb, and saw,
Straining his eyes beneath an arch of hand,
Or thought he saw, the speck that bare the king,
Down that long water opening on the deep
Somewhere far off, pass on and on, and go
From less to less and vanish into light.
And the new sun rose bringing the new year."—Pp. 156-8.

Our remarks at the opening of this article will have made clear the opinion that the rest of Tennyson's Arthurian poems are not only not of *the* first order, but also far below *his* first order. Those poems and the two larger ones in the *Enoch Arden* volume, as has been seen, we regard as a steady falling away from the high standard attained in *Maud*. Those of the Laureate's poems which take, to our thinking, real and permanent rank divide themselves into lyric, idyllic, and dramatic. As a poet influential on other lesser poets, he seems to claim position chiefly as idyllic—his strictly idyllic poems constituting a collection of pieces in a new and admirable method, suited well for modern purposes; but the idyllic method so perfectly used in *Dora*, so exquisitely modified in *The Brook* and *Sea Dreams*, appears to have escaped from all bounds in the so-called *Idylls of the King*, *Enoch Arden*, and *Aylmer's Field*, and to have run quite wild even in an earlier work, *The Princess*. In the lyric division of work the poet has made several perfect additions, meanwhile, notwithstanding that the bulk of his labours issued since 1855 falls so much short of satisfactoriness; and in the dramatic* division some splendid results have been attained—the three most notable being *Tithonus*, the *Northern Farmer (Old Style)*, and *Lucretius*. Among the miscellaneous contents of the new volume there are superb samples of both lyric and dramatic work; or, to speak in strictness, let us apply the plural form to the dramatic pieces only, for we can scarcely describe as "superb" either *The Victim*, or even *Wages* (both reprinted in this volume); while a small untitled piece, commencing—

"Flower in the crannied wall"

* The Laureate is, we are aware, hardly ever dramatic in the full sense of the word as applied to Shakespeare and Browning; but the expression is here used to indicate those of his poems which are spoken wholly or mainly from other mouths than his own, such as *Œnone*, *Ulysses*, *St. Simeon Stylites*, and, on a large scale, *Maud*.

may be fairly classified with the *Spiteful Letter* verses and *I stood on a Tower in the Wet* (not, happily, reprinted in this volume); so that we are reduced, for miscellaneous lyrics of a high order, to the one which remains among the new poems. This one is entitled *The Higher Pantheism*; and, whatever be the philosophic or theological issues involved in it, it has the true lyric note of the author's best manner—a flash of the vigour and originality of musical word-work that characterise *Maud* throughout so many of its sections. *The Higher Pantheism* we extract, as one of the choicest portions of the present volume:—

"The sun, the moon, the stars, the seas, the hills and the plains—
Are not these, O soul, the Vision of Him who reigns?

Is not the Vision He? tho' He be not that which He seems?
Dreams are true while they last, and do we not live in dreams?

Earth, these solid stars, this weight of body and limb,
Are they not sign and symbol of thy division from Him?

Dark is the world to thee: thyself art the reason why;
For is He not all but thou, that hast power to feel 'I am I'?

Glory about thee, without thee; and thou fulfillest thy doom,
Making Him broken gleams, and a stifled splendour and gloom.

Speak to Him thou, for He hears, and Spirit with Spirit can meet—
Closer is He than breathing, and nearer than hands and feet.

God is law, say the wise; O Soul, and let us rejoice,
For if He thunder by law the thunder is yet His voice.

Law is God, say some: no God at all, says the fool;
For all we have power to see is a straight staff bent in a pool;

And the ear of man cannot hear, and the eye of man cannot see;
But if we could see and hear, this Vision—were it not He?"

Pp. 201-3.

Every now and then in the world's history some variation of the pantheistic doctrine crops up among the multitudinous false ideas to be found at all seasons in the mind of man; and in these later times an ornate but bootless pantheism has taken its rank among the rest of modern mental vagaries. Now and again the writings of the Poet Laureate show a tinge of this same pantheism; but in no poem has he given it so complete and straightforward a treatment as here. Dissenting utterly as we of course do from all forms of pantheism, we cannot but set down in self-defence our dissent from this particular manifestation of the doctrine—lest in praising the manifestation it be supposed that we countenance the doctrine's self. All pantheism, even the best

worked up to theory-pitch, is but vague and cloud-shrouded stuff; but in no instance have we seen any form of the doctrine thrown into so perfect a poetic shape as in this lovely lyric. We do not conceive that the amount of dogma in the poem holds poison enough to corrode the texture of the whole. The dogma is in no sense insidious, and cannot force its way into youthful minds for anything other than it is. In general, these noble couplets appeal through the ear to the sense of enjoyment for beautiful harmonies; and in the one couplet where the religious or devotional sense is awakened, the heart is stirred by a sense of *personal* deity very remote from pantheism in any of its forms. We refer to the sweet lines—

"Speak to Him thou, for He hears, and Spirit with Spirit can meet—
Closer is He than breathing, and nearer than hands and feet."

These lines are, of course, accurate enough from the point of view of pantheism—the existence of God as the good element in everything; but as lines which will probably rest more firmly in the mind than any other portion of the poem, they will speak to the heart distinctly of a personal omnipresent God, cognisant of the individual joys and sorrows, and sympathetic with them.

It would be exceedingly difficult to find a happier instance than this poem of the fine effect attainable by the judicious and sparing use of dactylic and anapæstic feet; and, after these feet being used with a delicately-retentive hand almost throughout, such a line as the second of the last couplet but one comes in with masterly effect with alternate anapæsts in its six feet:—

"Fŏr āll | wĕ hāve pŏwer | tŏ sēe | Is ā strāight | stāff bēnt | ĭn ā pōol."

It is, indeed a trial to turn from a poem like this, and encounter on the very next page such a piece as the following:—

"Flower in the crannied wall,
I pluck you out of the crannies;—
Hold you here, root and all, in my hand,
Little flower—but if I could understand
What you are, root and all, and all in all,
I should know what God and man is."—P. 204.

Sans music, sans form, sans grammar, sans everything!

One charming new lyric in addition to *The Higher Pantheism* was issued *with* the new volume, though not *in* it. In the *Enoch Arden* volume of the pocket edition a poem of five verses has been interpolated under the title of *Literary Squabbles*. It possesses really Tennysonian qualities—that is

to say it is very nearly as faultless in sound and cadence as a poem can be: it is this:—

> "Ah God! the petty fools of rhyme
> That shriek and sweat in pigmy wars
> Before the stony face of Time,
> And look'd at by the silent stars:
>
> Who hate each other for a song,
> And do their little best to bite
> And pinch their brethren in the throng,
> And scratch the very dead for spite:
>
> And strain to make an inch of room
> For their sweet selves, and cannot hear
> The sullen Lethe rolling doom
> On them and theirs and all things here:
>
> When one small touch of charity
> Could lift them nearer God-like state
> Than if the crowded Orb should cry
> Like those who cried Diana great:
>
> And I, too, talk, and lose the touch
> I talk of. Surely, after all,
> The noblest answer unto such
> Is perfect stillness when they brawl."—
>
> *Works*, vol. x. pp. 179-80.

Most true, the sentiment of the last verse! and here, then, we have a noble apology for the *Spiteful Letter* verses in which the poet fell so far from this very ideal, and fell also at the same time deep below any ideal of fine workmanship. When such an apology figures not where the sin apologised for would have taken its place if persisted in, but is modestly inserted in another place for those to find who may, it will perhaps be thought a little hard to revert to the sin itself. But we hold that, in criticising a poet, such sins cannot be unduly reprehended. What a man like the Laureate writes and once commits to print can never be suppressed, but must remain against him for ever—seeing how every scrap put forth by him is treasured by hundreds, perhaps thousands, against the day of expiration of copyright. What he issues once, posterity *will* have; and therefore should he take good heed to follow the course praised by him in his predecessor and "utter nothing base."

The dramatic pieces of the new book are two, whereof the finest is *Lucretius*, that poem being, indeed, incomparably the noblest thing in the volume. As, however, it is a reprint

and was reviewed by us* at the time of its appearance, we need not now to make any remark on it, further than that the poet has restored to it a passage suppressed from the English edition† at first issued, though printed in the American edition‡—a passage of doubtful taste—and that he has very greatly improved the termination, not indeed by removing the last paragraph altogether, as we could have wished, but by changing the weak and meagre line—

"What matters? All is over. Fare thee well!"

for the characteristic line—

"Thy duty? *What is duty?* Fare thee well!"—P. 222.

The change is but small; but it gives the last paragraph a standing which it certainly had not before, by opening up a truly Lucretian issue and restoring the dramatic balance lost in the dry narrative supplemental to the great monologue.

The second dramatic piece is the *Northern Farmer* (*New Style*), which, though it has not the same unquestionable *raison d'être* as its predecessor of the "old style" has, yet forms an admirable *pendant* to the same. It carries a weight of satire against a sordid evil doubtless existing, but does not awaken the deep sympathy evoked by the first *Northern Farmer*,—a character conceived and executed with a singular depth of analysis and solidity of synthesis. We are sorry to note that a great number of alterations have been made in the Old *Northern Farmer*, as printed in the pocket edition: to those who collect all variations of Tennyson a verbal comparison of the new version of this poem with the old will amply compensate their trouble, though they may be no more pleased with the changes than we are. Most of these changes are merely orthographic; but one verbal one is particularly bad in our opinion, namely the substitution of

"A mowt 'a taän owd Joänes, as 'ant nor a 'aäpoth o' sense,
Or a mowt 'a taän young Robins—a niver mended a fence:"

for

"A mowt 'a taäken Joänes, as 'ant a 'aäpoth o' sense,
Or a mowt 'a taäken Robins—a niver mended a fence:"

Of the miscellaneous contents of *The Holy Grail and Other Poems* there is but one piece which we have not now named,

---

* *London Quarterly Review*, October, 1868.

† *Macmillan's Magazine*, May, 1868.

‡ *Every Saturday*, May 2, 1868 (Boston, Ticknor and Fields). *Lucretius* was printed in this periodical from advance sheets, so as to appear simultaneously with the English edition in *Macmillan*.

The Golden Supper, a poem founded upon one of Boccaccio's stories. The subject is one affording a fine opportunity for the prominent rendering of a piece of self-torture somewhat analogous to that depicted with such vivid horror in *Enoch Arden*, although the situation is entirely different from the state of things between the—"fisher*man*," we were about to write, but "fisher-*prodigy*" would be nearer the mark—between the fisher-prodigy and his wife. Instead of being cast away so long that his wife marries again, the hero of *The Golden Supper*, an unmarried and enamoured youth, loses his lady by her marrying his cousin and friend instead of himself: after marriage she dies, or seems to die, and is placed in the family-vault, and there, under the circumstances, the unfavoured lover deems it allowable to visit her and take his farewell before leaving his country, where he has lingered only on account of a fancy that he hears a whisper, "go not yet." On hearing of her death he says—

> "This, I stay'd for this;
> O love, I have not seen you for so long.
> Now, now, will I go down into the grave,
> I will be all alone with all I love,
> And kiss her on the lips. She is his no more:
> The dead returns to me, and I go down
> To kiss the dead."—P. 172.

What happens when he does go down is too beautifully depicted in verse for us to intrude upon the scene in prose, so we give it as it stands, thus:—

> "'It was my wish,' he said, 'to pass, to sleep,
> To rest, to be with her till the great day
> Peal'd on us with that music which rights all,
> And rais'd us hand in hand.' And kneeling there
> Down in the dreadful dust that once was man,
> Dust, as he said, that once was loving hearts,
> Hearts that had beat with such a love as mine—
> Not such as mine, no, nor for such as her'—
> He softly put his arm about her neck
> And kissed her more than once, till helpless death
> And silence made him bold—nay, but I wrong him,
> He reverenced his dear lady even in death;
> But, placing his true hand upon her heart,
> 'O, you warm heart,' he moan'd, 'not even death
> Can chill you all at once:' then starting, thought
> His dreams had come again. 'Do I wake or sleep?
> Or am I made immortal, or my love
> Mortal once more?' It beat—the heart—it beat:

Faint—but it beat: at which his own began
To pulse with such a vehemence that it drown'd
The feebler motion underneath his hand.
But when at last his doubts were satisfied,
He raised her softly from the sepulchre,
And, wrapping her all over with the cloak
He came in, and now striding fast, and now
Sitting awhile to rest, but evermore
Holding his golden burthen in his arms,
So bore her through the solitary land
Back to the mother's house where she was born."

Pp. 178-4.

Of course she recovers, having been merely in a trance; and shortly afterwards she gives birth to a boy. The "golden supper" is a solemn feast given by the lover, whereat he presents the wife, supposed to be dead, to her mourning husband, among numerous guests. It is, no doubt, the gorgeous scene-painting possible in such a *dénouement* that has allured the poet to treat this episode in his almost perfect blank verse; and, although the result can scarcely be called a *great* poem, it is a very charming one; while the closing scene is fully up to what would be expected on such ground.

Whatever be the nature of the Laureate's poems from time to time issued, there is one thing which we seem, so far, to be always, with trifling exceptions, safe in expecting; namely, samples of the English tongue which, regarded merely as terse, brilliant, crisp, and absolutely compact specimens of expression, almost no one can rival. Tennyson has reduced the combined clarity, brevity, and pithiness of our language to the lowest term yet attained; and probably there is hardly a keenly-observant writer of the day, whether he write in prose or in verse, but has largely benefited by the simple linguistic refinements of the Laureate. In his hands the language has become so highly tempered and at the same time so malleable that no condensation of much matter into a small space, no weaving of words into metres and rhythms supposed impracticable, seems to be beyond the reach of his cunning hand. The splendid results now and again attained, in exercising this power in fresh directions, render more poignant than it would otherwise be our chagrin at the Laureate's persistence in devoting his noble powers to work less than noble. Having got from him three relays of these overgrown idylls, we cannot but long—not for another *Maud:* that were too covetous—but, say, for an extension of that perfect marvel of harmonious work and conception printed in

modest little type at the end of *Enoch Arden, &c.*, and called *Boadicëa*, and "an experiment." Experiment or not, *Boadicëa*, even as she figures in this short fragment, outweighs in human truth and artistic value whole hosts of Enochs and Arthurs; and her terrible ferocity in revolt against a hideous ill is of greater price than twenty quests after the shadowy phantom of a sacramental cup. Another "experiment" in the same volume gives us a dire thirst for more of the same quality and style—the Catullian hendecasyllabics, addressed to an imaginary chorus of indolent reviewers,

"Irresponsible, indolent reviewers."

Most reviewers, we fear, were in effect too indolent to appraise fairly this delicious little gem, or to point out where it failed or fell short of its own ideal; and we desire to record here, in case of opportunity not again occurring, the very high estimate we place upon this "tiny poem," as its author calls it. The metre in which it is written is one of the most difficult for English hands. Some writers who have written small poems or fragments in it—and we recall no instance of a considerable English poem in it—some writers are contented to regard it as a quantitative metre alone, thus doing a certain violence to our tongue, and, consequently, to ordinary English ears: others regard accent alone, and disregard quantity; but the Laureate's specimen combines in a great degree both elements, and naturalises the metre thoroughly while keeping its classic ideal almost uninfringed. Mr. Swinburne's poem in this metre is one of the best from a technical point of view. It begins—

"In thĕ | mōnth ŏf thĕ | lōng dĕ | clīne ŏf | rōsĕs,"

and should, of course, be scanned throughout as above shown; but it makes a hazardous start, from the fact that almost any unclassical eye will read this line as consisting of two anapæsts, an iambic, and an amphibrach, thus—

"In thĕ mōnth | ŏf thĕ lōng | dĕcline | ŏf rōsĕs,"

ignoring the quantity given to the i of "in" by the position of that word before "the." No such line can be found in the Laureate's sample: most of the lines are quite perfect. Perhaps the best line in the language as a specimen of the metre is—

"Since I blush to belaud myself a moment;"

and none in the poem fall gravely away from this pattern, except one: we do not refer to

"Hard, hard, hard is it only not to tumble,"

because the initial spondee takes the place of a trochee with the evident purpose of creating an artistic hesitancy; but to

"O blĕ | tănt măg | ăzĭnes | rĕgărd | mĕ răthĕr,"

which is not a Catullian hendecasyllable at all, but the ordinary Italian hendecasyllable that cuts up the severity of so much of our truly great blank verse. The line would come right by a simple change—

"Blātănt | *dŭll măgă | zĭnes rĕ | gard mĕ | răthĕr,"

and it is surprising that the fault and its remedy have never occurred to the Laureate.

We must not close our notice without recording that an element has appeared in Tennyson's blank verse, not in it of old, and scarcely to be regarded either as accidental or as beneficial. We refer to the introduction, here and there, of absolutely formless lines into an otherwise finely woven fabric—such lines, for instance, as

"Tower after tower, spire beyond spire," (*Holy Grail*, p. 47.)

which can only be painfully scanned by making "tower" first a monosyllable and then a dissyllable, and subjecting "spire" to the inverse process. Almost the same sort of formlessness is in the line—

"Ulfius, and Brastias, and Bedivere," (p. 9.)

almost the same, because the line is to be iambified by an analogous inconsistency as regards the two letters "i" in "Ulfius" and "Brastias." Perhaps the most disagreeable and impracticable instance is the line—

"And the sword of the tourney across her throat" (p. 118.)

which can be read as a fine line by recklessly bestowing on the words "the" and "of" a weight which they could only carry ridiculously. We note these things in the Laureate's work, because his ideal of poetry includes immense perfection in the details, and because, feeling certain that these flaws have been made intentionally to give variety, we are bound to express the opinion that such variety is merely disfiguring.

Notwithstanding the beautiful additions to our poetic literature to be found in this new volume, the consideration uppermost, from the point of view we have adopted, is that the bulk of the contents is a contribution towards a would-be "Arthuriad," lacking in true, deep, vital humanity, and thrown together on an eminently unsatisfactory plan. An

* Any monosyllable of the same quantity will do as well.

"Arthuriad," to be anything at all in our literature, must at least possess unimpeachable greatness of form and indubitable flesh and blood; and any "Arthuriad" impoverished of these things must step more or less within reach of the pungent sarcasm of her who, discerning "character and glory" in her own times, wrote—

> "I do distrust the poet who discerns
> No character or glory in his times,
> And trundles back his soul five hundred years,
> Past moat and drawbridge, into a castle court,
> To sing—Oh, not of lizard or of toad
> Alive i' the ditch there,—'twere excusable,
> But of some black chief, half knight, half sheep-lifter,
> Some beauteous dame, half chattel and half queen,
> As dead as must be, for the greater part,
> The poems made on their chivalric bones."

An antiquarian theme may seize on a poet with a conviction so unrelenting as to carry with it every modern requirement in conception and craftsmanship; but it is superfluous to say that poetic preparations carefully—almost painfully—elaborated, piece by piece, and held half-crazily together by some abstruse significance glimmering dimly in the background, remain outside the order of these old themes galvanised into new life—revive no waning reputations—are no capital boon to the reading world—and bring no profit to the poet beyond what may be roundly and grossly told in terms of pounds, shillings, and pence.

ART. VII.—*A Treatise of the Grammar of Old Testament Greek regarded as the Basis of New Testament Exegesis.* By Dr. G. B. WINER. Translated from the German, with large Additions and full Indices, by Rev. W. F. MOULTON, M.A., Classical Tutor, Wesleyan Theological College, Richmond, and Prizeman in Hebrew and New Testament Greek in the University of London. Edinburgh: Clark. 1870.

MR. MOULTON'S annotated translation may be said to be a jubilee tribute to Winer, and a most worthy one. It is just fifty years ago that the author of this grammar—the founder, he may be called, of this department of Greek-Testament Literature—was correcting the proof-sheets of the first edition of his book, then in a comparatively immature form. This being the case it may not be inappropriate to lay before the reader a few brief notices of the man and his work. They will be only brief; for Winer passed away without leaving many biographical notices of himself. His uneventful life has not exercised the talent of many biographers.

George Benedict Winer was born at Leipzig in 1789. He lost his parents when very young, and passed his earliest years in poverty. His love of learning was early developed, however, notwithstanding the lack of books. At one of the public schools of Leipzig he received his elements; but it seems that the only Greek Grammar he had at his command and could always use, was one that he was driven to write out for himself, a circumstance to which the world may owe it is hard to say how much. When he left the gymnasium in his twentieth year, he was already eminent as a teacher—that is, as a private and unofficial teacher—both of Greek and Hebrew, and the usual testimonials of proficiency were accompanied by his tutor's prophetic intimations of what might be expected from Winer in his future years. Theology became the study of his life. Those who consult his works, including his grammar, cannot fail to perceive that he was a thorough theologian in his tastes; a mere grammarian or philologer he never was. He was lecturer in theology for nine years at Erlangen, from 1823 to 1832, but with the exception of these years his life was spent at Leipzig, either as private tutor in divinity or as professor. Traditions, and more than traditions, are

extant of his great success as a teacher. His lectures were amongst the most prized and sought after in the university. He handled in a profound manner both systematic and Biblical theology, and never without lively and distinct reference to the great questions of the day. Readers of his densely-packed Biblical Dictionary, and of his Grammar, will be prepared to find that, even amongst men of vast erudition, in a very erudite age and university, he was pre-eminently erudite; but it excites one's wonder to read the accounts of his free oratory, of his vivid expression of his thoughts, of his moral fervour, of his deep religious sentiment, and of the *unction* that attended his teaching. His students, many of whom still survive to bear witness, carried with them lasting impressions of the exhortations with which he was wont to preface and conclude his lectures; addresses in which he sometimes rose to true eloquence, especially when depicting the tendencies of the times, and commenting upon the events of the day as affecting theological interests. In this respect Winer was an honourable exception to what, at the outset of his career, was the rule. His piety and consecration of self to the study of the Bible, and zeal for the interests of Protestant truth, were in marked contrast with the supercilious contempt for religion manifested by one or two prominent names in modern Biblical criticism. In later years the old rule has been broken by so many brilliant exceptions that it is a rule no longer.

His main study, we have said, was the Bible. But he was not without representatives of his learning and zeal in other departments; his mark was set upon some of the ecclesiastical questions, and questions of *Symbolism*, or the confessions, that deeply stirred the Lutheran mind before the union. He wrote very early a *Comparative View of the Doctrinal Principles of the Various Church Parties*. This was one of the earliest contributions to a kind of literature that has since been rather abundant. It presents the different formularies and their deviations from each other, in a tabular form, with references to the original text, besides the exhibition of the creeds themselves. His object was twofold: on the one hand to vindicate the importance of concord and brotherly sympathy between those whose confessions in some measure differed, and on the other to insist upon it that the true faith of the Gospel should be firmly maintained. It is pleasing to meet the following extract:—"Both these—kindliness towards those who differ, and steadfast adherence to the truth—are most highly necessary in our time, when the seed of con-

troversy between the confessions is most industriously scattered, and that precious jewel of Protestantism, which we received as our inheritance, has lost all worth and significance in the eyes of many whose forefathers were prepared to sacrifice their worldly good to uphold its principles, which they had tested and found true." In 1825 he published an edition of the *Augsburg Confession*, with notes, and in 1852 two Dissertations on the idea of the Church exhibited in the Symbols. These all display, as we are told by those who know them better than we know them, an earnest devotion to the fundamental principles of the Gospel, with a certain tolerance that we need not be surprised to find verging on what we should call latitudinarianism, but what the latitudinarians of his time would have called the very superstition of orthodoxy. Among his works of a more purely literary character—though still lingering, as all his works do, in the outskirts of theology—was a *Handbook of Theological Literature*, which first appeared in 1821, and grew into two substantial volumes in 1840, with an appendix in 1842: a rare monument of industry, the chief value of which consists in the biographical notices of the various authors. This also is much esteemed by those who possess it; to German theologians especially, it is a work of very considerable value.

With these exceptions, and they can hardly be called exceptions, Winer spent his whole strength, the energies of a strong mind, and the resources of an almost universal learning, on the Scriptures. Two great and lasting monuments of this devotion we have to refer to: the Biblical Dictionary, or *Realwörterbuch*, and the Grammar. Not that these exhausted his efforts. The preparation of lectures never intermitted. He delivered an oral commentary on the whole of the New Testament and a great part of the Old. Tho Epistle to the Galatians was selected for a permanent exposition. This commentary, with a Latin translation and notes, has passed through four editions, but is chiefly used for consultation and that kind of venial plundering to which very many semi-Rationalist commentaries owe their chief value in later generations.

But Winer's forte in this department was the dissertation on the classical passages of theology; we ought rather to say, the obscurer places of Scripture. His bias was always to be exploring and illustrating with a boundless prodigality questions that escape the attention of most expositors, and are generally passed over in convenient silence. His Dictionary may be said to be a rich mosaic work of these; but many

dissertations, more ponderous even than those found in the Dictionary, are scattered amongst the treasures of that kind of *conglomerate*, or, better still, boulder theological literature which is more particularly a German formation.

The Biblical Dictionary came out in 1820, when the learned author was just thirty: a magnificent inauguration of his maturity. The work has been gradually expanded into two full bulky volumes—if the densely-packed letterpress is considered. Translated and printed in the ordinary English style, it would outweigh, in size at least, any that we have. But it has not been translated—that is, translated as a whole, for fragments of Winer are translated and embedded in multitudes of volumes in England and America, whose pages owe a debt to him that can be sued for in no earthly law court. When Winer's Dictionary first came out, Father Calmet ruled in this region. He has not been superseded in his own communion, perhaps never will be in ours; but Winer struck out a new track, and produced a work which Protestants might boast of as their own, and on the model of which many compilations of the same kind have been formed. It is an original work, but contains a mass of references to other writers, with their views and hypotheses, literally oppressive. It is original as to the manner in which the author has historically explored, *de novo*, almost every subject, and as to the thoroughly artistic way in which he presents every question as it arises. Suppose the subject of the article is a leading name, say *Paul*. His life is sketched in a very terse and condensed epitome, not without a certain charm of style that labours hard to preserve its grace under an infinite superincumbent load of learning. Then follows a series of disquisitions on the salient points of the history, with references to every opinion, theory, author, up to Winer's time, connected with the subject. It would be pleasant to be able to say that the summary and decision of the author is always pitched to the right key. That is far from being the case. He is as much behind our views of the dignity and absolute authority of Scripture as he was before those of the majority of the learned for whom his book was intended.

Winer is the father of the modern Biblical Dictionary; and, before we pass from this subject, it may be as well to warn the student against consulting him incautiously. His principles were lax as it respects inspiration; and there was nothing in his dogmatic theology that forbade his receiving the results of the scientific destructive criticism with a considerable degree of toleration. His anxiety to

keep from the sphere of Christian doctrine everything that goes against the mind of the natural man, or that offends what is called reason, is everywhere obvious. It is difficult sometimes to ascertain when Winer speaks his own sentiments, and when he is only the historian and critic of those of others. However, enough has been said to show that as a theologian and critic this great grammatical authority is not to be depended on. We mention this, and bring forward illustrations in proof—illustrations that might be multiplied, but these, taken almost at random from the opening of the Dictionary, are sufficient—not to detract from Winer's fame, but in the interest of truth, and to suggest a caution to those numberless compilers who betake themselves freely to the "judicious" Winer. Let him be consulted on the archæology and history of the Bible, and, indeed, everywhere; but let it be remembered that he is very far indeed from being a judicious guide to one who is exploring or seeking to solve the difficulties of Scripture.

It will suggest itself to the reader, probably, that the writer of such articles is no safe guide in anything that pertains to the interpretation of God's Word. That would not be an altogether mistaken idea. But as a most important helper to that interpretation, he may be thankfully accepted by those who do not make him a guide.

About the same time that Winer published his *Grammar of the Greek Testament*, it seems that he was vibrating between the Old and the New Testament as the sphere of his final specific research. In 1824 he published a *Grammar of Biblical and Targumic Chaldee*, to which was added, in the year following, a *Chaldee Reading Book*. He also sent forth the earnest of an immense *Hebrew Lexicon* in 1826, which, however, issued, 1828, in a re-casted edition of the *Hebrew and Chaldee Lexicon of Simonis*. None of these have taken the leading place which his *Grammar of the Greek Testament Dialect* assumed as its right from the very outset.

Perhaps there is no other example of a book at once forming an epoch, taking the highest place, and retaining that place so long. A few words may be appropriate on each of these points.

The views held of the language of the Greek Scriptures, whether of the Old or of the New Covenant, were, until the present century, of the vaguest character. It was too readily regarded as a barbarous, or, at least, an inexact and unregulated idiom, in which Greek of the lowest degeneracy was still further debased by being thought out in Hebrew minds and

expressed in a language cast in Aramaic moulds. Anything like a grammar of such a dialect was for a long time thought to be a thing impossible; and the number of works specially devoted to it from the Reformation downwards, whether Catholic or Protestant, might be counted on the fingers. The *Philologia Sacra* of Glass, in the middle of the sixteenth century, contained two books on the Grammatica Sacra. A hundred years afterwards, Pasor, a philologer of the Netherlands, and not a professed theologian, issued a *Greek Grammar of the New Testament*, or rather left the materials to be published after his death. This was soon followed by the *Dialectologia Sacra* of Caspar Wyss, of Zürich; and these bring us down to the present century. *Haab's Hebrew-Greek Grammar*, published in 1815, was a very poor inaugurator of the revival of Greek Testament literature: Hebraisms carried him away, as it carried away many before him, beyond the regions of common sense, and earned for his Grammar the critique of the Reviewer: "Seldom have we received a book which has proved so complete a failure, and against the use of which it has been necessary to give so emphatic a warning."

All these authors were Protestants. The Catholics had done nothing in this department: partly misled by the strong current of patristic exaggeration on the subject of the poverty of the Greek in the New Testament, and partly by the influence of the decree of the Council of Trent respecting the "Authentic" Vulgate. The early Fathers admitted freely enough the want of purity and the abundant solecisms in the writers of the New Testament; all the more freely because it gave them an argument of the Divine power of Christian truth. So Augustine says very often. But he was not in this question an authority. Chrysostom and Isidore are more to the point. The former master of Greek speaks thus: "When they assert that the Apostles were rustics, let us, for our own part, assent, and say that they were untaught, and unlearned, and poor, and low, and abject, and unwise, and obscure. These sayings are no blasphemy as uttered against the Apostles; rather their glory, inasmuch as, being such men as they were, they were all the more illustrious throughout the whole world. For these men, so rude, so rustic, so unlearned, vanquished the wise, and the mighty, and the rulers, and all who presented themselves with the abundance of their external advantages. Whence may be discerned by all how great is the power of the Cross, and that all the wonders of the Gospel were wrought by no human power." In the same strain Isidore of Pelusium speaks, as the representative of the sentiment of many

ages: "The Greeks do not consider that what they allege against the Christians turns to their own confusion. For they said that the Holy Scripture is of small account, as being composed in barbarous language and terms of foreign construction, destitute of necessary conjunctions, and, as it were, of the proper links of discourse, and disturbing the sense of the things written by the constant iteration of superfluities. But by these things let them learn the power of truth. For how has it come to pass that this rustic style of Scripture has overcome and persuaded the polished eloquence itself? Let the wise men tell us how it is that this same Scripture, labouring under its barbarisms and solecisms, yet has been able to vanquish error and falsehood, equipped with the perfection of Attic eloquence? Whence is it that Plato, that *facile princeps* of Gentile philosophers, was never able to overcome one potentate or win any power to his opinions; whilst this despised Word has subdued and made its own both land and sea?"

This incessant strain of depreciation, echoed from age to age, tended, doubtless, much to the neglect of the systematic grammatical study of New Testament Greek. Since the Council of Trent the authoritative sanction of the Vulgate has had something to do with the matter. It is true that Julius Ruggieri, the Secretary of Pope Gregory XIII., wrote as follows in his work on the Canonical Scriptures:—"Whose ears could bear to hear that the Hebrew edition was now exploded and condemned? But still less should we tolerate to be told that the Greek edition of the New Testament was condemned. We assert that the Canon of the Tridentine Council only gave the preference over all other Latin versions to the Vulgate, and that it makes no express mention of the Greek or Hebrew Bible. It did not, therefore, condemn or explode the Hebrew and Greek editions, which it is certain that all the older Councils had received, and, by their use and their testimony, commended to the Church. The Latin Vulgate was not preferred before these, only before the other Latin versions." This defence may be admitted by candid persons; but there is a certain ambiguity in the Canon that has allowed another interpretation, as has often happened with the decrees of Roman Councils; and, moreover, the general effect has been what has been stated—a very great torpor and indisposition on the part of Catholic divines to investigate the grammar of the language of the Holy Ghost.

The question once raised, however, among the Protestant inquirers, whether of Germany or England, the controversy

oscillated between two extremes. The Hebraists preponderated in this department of literature: that is, those who regarded the New Testament dialect as abounding in Hebraisms, Aramaisms, Latinisms, and as far as possible removed from the purity of Greek. But there were not wanting scholars who undertook to vindicate the Greek of the New Testament writers. These were termed Purists, and in their excessive zeal shut their eyes to a very important element in the character of the dialect, and threw away a very important instrument in its interpretation. But neither the Hebraists nor the Purists had much to do with the origination of the modern Greek Testament Grammar as founded by Winer. His zeal was provoked by neither of these, as such, but by the wild arbitrariness with which grammar was treated by the expositors of the day.

The grammarian fought for the restoration, or rather the assertion, of certain rational and simple principles that expositors had lost sight of in their interpretation of the language of the New Testament. The *pure* truth and the *full* truth he undoubtedly sought; but it was rather as a grammarian than as an expositor that he found it, so far as he found it. Had his dogmatic theology been entirely sound, his wonderful book, useful as it has been, would have been yet more abundantly useful. What Winer really did none has better expressed than himself; and after hearing him, it may not be inexpedient to say a little on the other side. We select only a few instances:

"When this Grammar first appeared, in 1822, the object proposed was to check the unbounded arbitrariness with which the language of the New Testament had so long been handled in commentaries and exegetical prelections, and, so far as the case admitted, to apply the results of the rational philology, as obtained and diffused by Hermann and his school, to the Greek of the New Testament. It was in truth needful that some voice should be raised which might call to account the deep-rooted empiricism of the expositors, and might strive to rescue the New Testament writers from the bondage of a perverted philology, which, while it styled itself sacred, showed not the slightest respect for the sacred authors and their well-considered phraseology. The fundamental error—the πρῶτον ψεῦδος—of this Biblical philology, and, consequently, of the exegesis which was based upon it, really consisted in this, that neither the Hebrew language nor the Greek of the New Testament was regarded as a *living* idiom, designed for a medium of living intercourse. Had they been so regarded, had scholars always asked themselves whether the deviations from the established laws of language which were assumed to exist in the Bible to so enormous an extent, were compatible with the destination of a human language for

the practical uses of life, they would not have so arbitrarily considered everything allowable, and taken pleasure in ascribing to the Apostles in nearly every verse an *enallage*, or use of the wrong form instead of the right. Whilst, however, this play with *pro* and *idem quod* has a laughable, it has also a serious, aspect. Does not Scripture —as a great philosopher remarked long ago—thus become like a waxen nose, which a man may twist any way he pleases, in proportion to the scantiness of his knowledge of language?"

Writing in 1855, the veteran author was able to congratulate himself on having been the instrument, or one of the instruments, in introducing a much more plain and straightforward method of interpreting the phrase and letter of Scripture. Not that we think the case was quite as bad as Winer suggests. Storr and Kuinoel, and many more, had allowed themselves to mould the meaning of the Apostles as they liked. But there were many expositors of the age which Winer so severely castigates who interpreted on better principles; and these older expositors, whom he admits to have been in a great degree free from the error he condemns, never entirely lost their influence. Still, it was his happiness to witness a vast improvement; and between his first edition and his sixth, an immense number of comments in his own country, and not a few in this, bore witness to the benefit of his labours.

Sometimes it has occurred to us that it would have been better if Winer had entirely limited himself to the application of grammatical rules to the text, leaving the theologian and the commentator to do the rest. But the more we read, or rather consult, the Grammar, the less disposed we feel to regret that Winer mingled so much of the theologian. But, whether or not, there was never a more baseless charge than that he neglected theological exposition. It enters very largely into almost every page of the Grammar, although in a furtive or rather unconscious manner. The following extracts will suffice to show the effect of both his rational innovations and his theological principles upon his Grammar. They have reference to the use of the prepositions, a department of the Greek Testament Grammar, Lexicon, and Concordance that cannot be too carefully studied. In quoting the passages, we shall take the liberty of abridging:—

"The prepositions are employed where the cases are insufficient to express a relation (for these relations are in the highest degree diversified), occasionally, also, where the simple case might have sufficed, but did not appear to the speaker sufficiently marked for his purpose, on

account of the great variety in its uses. Prepositions are proportionately used with greater frequency in the New Testament than in Greek prose, because the Apostles had not that inherent sensitiveness to the force of the cases in their extended applications which was possessed by educated native Greeks; and because the Oriental loves vividness of expression — as, indeed, the Hebrew-Aramaic languages use prepositions to express almost all the relations which were in Greek indicated by the case alone. In dealing with the New Testament language, it is only necessary further,—1. To consider how far the later Greek, particularly the popular spoken language, enlarged the use of the prepositions, obliterated the nicer distinctions, or even fell into a misuse of these particles. 2. To have constant regard to the Hebrew-Aramaic language, which delights in the use of prepositions, and which differs from Greek in the aspect under which it views a number of relations. 3. Lastly, not to neglect the peculiarly Christian mode of thought which lies at the root of the use of several prepositions."

After complaining severely of the abuse of the prepositions by New Testament philologers in lexicons and commentaries, which had its parallel, however, in the unphilosophical way in which, before Ewald's Grammar, the Hebrew prepositions were dealt with, the author goes on to say that, among other principles to be remembered, this one must not be forgotten, that, especially in Paul (and John) the use of several prepositions (*e.g.* ἐν) in a mode unknown to Greek writers, stood in a close relation to the language of *dogma*, and belongs to the apostolic (Christian) colouring of the New Testament diction. There is no feature in Winer's Grammar which has given us more satisfaction in the original—much heightened in the new edition—than the care with which the prepositions are discriminated, and each assigned its own function, meaning, and use. We all know how vital is this department of syntax. It is difficult to exaggerate the importance of the establishment of fixed principles as to the prepositions generally, and some few in particular. We are not now reviewing the Grammar, and shall not therefore give any further instances. Equally important, though not more so, is the stand made by Winer against the arbitrary interpretation of tenses. Here again his allegations against other grammarians and expositors are perhaps too sweeping; but as to the value of his own services there can be no question. He sets out with the assertion, that "in general these (the tenses—the present, the perfect, and the future being regarded by the Greeks as the principal ones) are used in the New Testament exactly as in Greek writers." "Strictly and properly speaking, no one of these tenses can ever stand for another, as the commentators have in so many

ways maintained; where such an interchange seems to exist, either it exists in appearance only, there being, in point of fact, some assignable reason (especially of a rhetorical kind) why this tense is used and no other; or else it must be ascribed to a certain inexactness belonging to the popular language, through which the relation of time was not conceived and expressed with perfect precision." Very striking is the application of this to the present tense, which involves some of the sublimest sayings of Our Lord—for instance, "Where *I am*"—and plays about the mysterious line that divides or unites grammar and dogma. The mere theological reader (knowing only enough of Greek to follow Winer intelligently) will be deeply interested in these sections. How far the perfect, for instance, is used as the present or future, is a question which brings out some delicate shades of exposition, and leads to the defence of many passages against perversion: *e.g. He is condemned* (Rom. xiv. 23); "the sentence of condemnation is pronounced (in the same moment) and remains pronounced over him, he lies under condemnation." "Hath passed from death unto life" is something that hath already taken place: the theological bearing of this is important, when the perfect is saved from the *enallage*. So with regard to the aorist. It stands for the future in many passages only in appearance: for instance—one out of many—in Romans viii. 30, "He glorified" is used because he in regard to whom God hath accomplished the "justified" has already obtained from Him the glorification also, though the reception of the glory as an actual possession belongs to the future. Many passages, in which the force of the aorist is lost in the common interpretation—that, namely, which is indifferent about its strict meaning—are given in the Grammar; but many, such as 2 Cor. v. 14, &c., are not given. On this tense and the perfect hang many very precious exhibitions of Divine truth.

This strain, however, would lead us too far. Into an examination of the theological results of Winer's Grammar we do not profess to enter; however fascinating the subject, it is beyond the scope of these pages. The reader has only to turn to the index of the work, and select passage after passage of controverted interpretation; he will find, on consulting the Grammar, that an immense amount of direct or indirect light is thrown on the exposition of the New Testament, and even on its doctrine. Here and there the author betrays a dogmatic laxity, against which his editors have to warn their readers. Take, for instance, the classical passage for the application of

the well-known canon as to the non-repetition of the article before the second of two nouns connected by "and." Granville Sharp's first rule—generally sound, but not always to be pressed—is as follows: "When the copulative *καί* connects two nouns of the same case (as nouns—either substantive, or adjective or participles, of personal description respecting office, dignity, affinity, or connection, and attributes, properties, or qualities good or ill), if the article *ὁ*, or any of its cases, precedes the first of the said nouns or participles, and it is not repeated before the second noun or participle, the latter always relates to the same person that is expressed or described by the first noun or participle: *i.e.* it denotes a further description of the first-named person." As to the controversy with respect to Winer's version of this rule, we have nothing here to do. The following extract from Beelen's Grammar—to be noticed by-and-by—will bring out Winer's relation to the grammatico-dogmatical exposition of Titus ii. 13:—

"To this place belongs that passage of Paul concerning the Divinity of Christ (Titus ii. 13). Jesus is called by Paul the *Great God*, and also *Saviour*. As he has not connected the article with *Saviour*, he did not intend to indicate two distinct persons, but terms the one and the same Jesus Christ both *Great God* and *Saviour*. This style of writing St. Paul continually observes. So to the Galatians, chap. i. 4, he wrote of *God and the Father* as one, without the article. Compare, further, Rom. xv. 6; 1 Cor. xv. 24; 2 Cor. i. 3, xi. 31; Ephes. i. 3, v. 5-20; Phil. iv. 20; 1 Thess. i. 3, iii. 11-13. But chiefly remarkable is 1 Thess. iii. 11. There *God and our Father* has no article before Father, because God and the Father are one; but the article is placed before *Lord*, because Our Lord is there distinguished from God and the Father. In the passage of Titus, Jesus Christ is called *the Great God* and *our Saviour*. This interpretation is required by the grammar of the phrase and by the context. For the subject matter is the *glorious appearance* of Jesus Christ or His *glorious coming*, and this word *appearance* is never used in Scripture of the Father or of the Holy Spirit, but only of Jesus Christ, the Son of God. Of Him it is frequently used, as in 1 Tim. vi. 14; 2 Tim. iv. 1-8, and elsewhere."

Against this interpretation (2 Thess. i. 12) is alleged: "According to the grace of *our God and Lord Jesus Christ*," where *the Lord* is distinguished from *our God*, and yet the article is wanting. But nothing is gained by this argument, for opponents cannot prove that the apostle purposed by the words *God* and *Lord* to designate two distinct subjects; nor, if they could prove it, would they advance their cause, inasmuch as the term *Lord*, used of Jesus Christ, pertains to that class of words which may be regarded as having the character of proper names, and as such are wont to be written

without the article, although they are spoken of some certain and definite thing or person. Moreover, the passage in Titus is not precisely similar to this one in 2 Thess. i. 12. For in Titus the whole phrase with both the nouns *Great God* and *Saviour*, is placed between the article and *our*; but in Thess. the *God* only is placed between the article and *our*. Winer admits that nothing in the laws of grammar forbids the idea that Jesus Christ is there called *the Great God* and *our Saviour*; but he denies that Paul meant by these words to say so. He says, in his note:—

"In the above remarks I had no intention to deny that, in point of *grammar*, 'our Saviour' may be regarded as a second predicate, jointly depending on the article τοῦ; but the dogmatic conviction derived from Paul's writings that this Apostle cannot have called Christ *the Great God* induced me to show that there is no grammatical obstacle to our taking the clause *and our Saviour Jesus Christ* by itself as referring to a second subject. Winer's judgment is, be it said with wonder, that such an opinion concerning the person of Christ could not possibly harmonise with the entire system of the Pauline doctrine; but Winer does not explain how it is impossible to harmonise the doctrine concerning the God-Man with the other elements of St. Paul's teaching. Perchance, we should not wander far from the truth if we suppose that Winer's real reason is that the doctrine does not harmonise with that of the *Rationalists*. But whether they will or not, Paul often and plainly calls Jesus Christ God (Rom. ix. 5, Phil. ii. 6, Col. i. 16, 11, 9, *alibi*); and that this dogma is at variance with his other doctrines no one ever thought until these petty men refused to be taught of God, and presumed to measure by their own small intellect what the infinite power of God could do. That St. Paul however, in this epistle calls Christ, not God simply, as elsewhere, but *the Great God*, perhaps may be ascribed to this, that the epistle was to be sent to the island of Crete, where ὁ μέγας Ζεύς, the *magnus Jupiter*, was worshipped."

Winer had the great satisfaction of seeing edition after edition of the Grammar called for; and each edition he largely improved. He received testimonies from all parts of the usefulness of his labours, and saw himself reproduced, after a fashion, both in England and America, by authors who only in part acknowledged their obligations. Much controversy also raged about sundry points in the book; and he held his mind open and alert to criticism from all quarters. He kept polishing the pages to the last. The edition which is now current in Germany has incorporated in it a few touches of no importance in themselves, but indications of the wonderful interest with which he followed the progress of critical inquiry. Directly or indirectly, by his own reading or by the aid of others' eyes, he made himself acquainted with the entire

range of current Biblical literature, in his own language and in other languages, more especially all that had to do with the Greek Testament. It would be too much to say that he maintained the first and undisputed place to the last. But he certainly never ceased to be regarded as the regenerator of Greek Testament literature and the founder of the Grammar of the New Testament dialect. His wonderful energy and alertness alone enabled him to keep his book abreast of the times, to save it from drifting behind, in consequence of the immense strides made in the criticism of the text by Lachmann and Tischendorf, and the general advancement of all branches of philological investigation. So successful was he in this, that at the time of his death no competitor had arisen. His wonderful skill had known how to assimilate everything of moment, and he bequeathed his Grammar, which had been the first, as the best then extant.

During the last five years of his life the eyes of this conscientious worker began to grow dim. But he continued his work, and used the aid of others around him in laying the final touches on his works, especially his chief work. In the winter of 1857 he delivered his last course of lectures on the dogmatic and ethical principles of Protestantism and Catholicism. In the spring of the following year he was a severe sufferer, and passed away with the tranquil confidence of a Christian on the eve of Ascension Day, May 12, 1865, profoundly lamented by the university and town of Leipzig, leaving his works, with their mingled good and evil—the good, however, largely preponderating—to claim the respect and gratitude of all Christendom and of coming generations.

This inadequate, but sincere, tribute to Winer on the jubilee of his first appearance in Greek Testament literature, has kept us too long from the translation which has given us our subject. It is well known to all students that the last edition of the Grammar, published during the author's lifetime, was, almost immediately after his death, translated by Mr. Masson, and published by Messrs. Clark. Another issue has been rendered necessary, and the enterprising publishers, who every year lay the theological public under fresh obligations, committed the task to the present translator and editor, who was before known to be, and has now proved himself, perfectly competent to act in both capacities. The translation is really a new one, and may be said to be all that a translation from the German should be—an adequate expression of the author's meaning in sentences that are not German but English in their construction. Mr. Moulton's most important

service, however, is the editing of the volume. This shows the hand of a comprehensive, industrious, judicious, and conscientious scholar, who has thought nothing too insignificant to demand his whole attention, and has found nothing beyond the range of his own reading and ability. The indexes are most admirable, and will command the gratitude of every student. The verifications of reference must have cost much labour: in this case labour which will not, as in the case of the tables, have its immediate reward. References to English grammarians and commentators are added, which in many cases will be found exceedingly useful.

Those who, like ourselves, have cherished a high regard for the older Buttmann and his Grammars, and who have consulted with advantage his adaptation of his system to the Greek Testament by his son, Alexander Buttmann, will be interested in the following observations on that work. The quotation will serve also to introduce Mr. Moulton's spirit and style very advantageously to our readers:—

"By far the most important work on the grammar of New Testament Greek which has appeared during the last fourteen years is the *Grammatik des Neutestamentlichen Sprachgebrauchs*, by Alexander Buttmann (Berlin, 1859). The form which the author has chosen for his work is that of an appendix to his father's (Philip Buttmann's) *Griechische Grammatik*. The theoretical advantages of this plan cannot be doubted, as the grammarian is no longer obliged to concern himself with the usages of ordinary Greek, but is at liberty to confine his attention to what is peculiar in Hellenistic usage. On the other hand, the inconveniences which beset the practical use of the book in the case of those who are unfamiliar with the particular grammar chosen as the standard, are sufficiently great to detract seriously from the usefulness of a most valuable work. As this peculiarity of plan seemed to render it unlikely that A. Buttmann's grammar would be translated, I have been the more anxious to place the most important of its contents within the reach of the English reader. There is a difference between the general tendencies shown by the writers of the two Grammars, which makes it especially useful to compare their treatment of the same subject. Winer, never perhaps entirely free from the influence of the period in which he began to write, when it was above all things necessary to convince the world that New Testament Greek had a right to claim scientific investigation, seems inclined at times to extenuate the difference between New Testament usage and that of classical writers. His successor, coming forward when on the main question the victory is already won, is able to concede much that once it seemed important to dispute; and indeed, unless I am mistaken, frequently goes to an extreme in this kind of generosity. For this and other reasons, I have sometimes exhibited in detail Buttmann's general treatment

of an important point, believing that a comparison of the two writers would do more than anything to illustrate the real character of the question. My notes will show that I have made great use of A. Buttmann's work; but I have frequently received suggestions when I have not had to acknowledge direct assistance. I am bound, however, in justice to myself, to say that, unless the writer's words are distinctly quoted, the statement made in my note rests on my own responsibility; Buttmann's observations having merely served as the basis of my own investigation."

We may be sanguine, but cannot help expressing an opinion that Mr. Moulton might produce a Greek Testament Grammar on a special principle which would, in half the compass, surpass any now extant. Were examples well chosen, controversy and controversial references avoided, parallels of classical Greek sparingly introduced, and the editor's exquisite tact brought to bear, hundreds of pages would be struck off the quantity, and the result be a handbook that every reader of the Greek Testament would soon come to regard as indispensable. Mr. Moulton knows some Hebrew Grammars that would furnish the type or the mould.

There is a sentence in the editor's preface which we must pause upon for a moment:—

"I should be sorry to lie under the imputation of indefiniteness of opinion when I have felt compelled to present conflicting views. I am convinced that clearly to state the amount of divergence which exists is to do something towards the removal of it. I have tried to bear in mind that this book may fall into the hands of different classes of readers; and have sometimes ventured to add an explanation, which to many will seem superfluous, for the sake of inexperienced students. Where the author makes a statement which appears to me erroneous, in regard to matters of greater importance than details of language, I have usually appended a reference to some standard work containing an adequate answer or correction."

This note refers, of course, to two kinds of dissent from his authorities. With regard to matters of detail and language, Mr. Moulton speaks very modestly. The reader would hardly expect to find, after such a deprecatory allusion, that he has actually, during the course of the work, given Winer's text, and Winer's critics, the benefit of many a clear page—supposing the notes to be collected into pages—of critical comment; but the section on the *Anacolutha* and incomplete structure bear witness. It is true that scarcely ever does the editor call attention, as on p. 712, to an opinion of his own; but there are not many pages which do not bear witness, not only to his wide reading, but also to his judicious critical faculty—a

much rarer attribute in writers. Again and again has it occurred to us to wish that the genial and grateful Winer—for such, notwithstanding some asperity, he was—could have seen and rejoiced over, as he assuredly would, the annotations of his latest editor.

There is another class of points with regard to which the editor and his author are sometimes at variance — those "matters of greater importance than details of language" to which the preface refers—and, referring to them, we cannot take the same complacent view of Mr. Moulton's practice. He refers to some standard work for the correction of an important point, when, as we think, a few clear, terse sentences would have been much better. Ellicott, Alford, Lightfoot, &c., are great names; but the names of Winer, Meyer, and De Wette are great also. To very many who will thumb this book Mr. Moulton's name will be, on certain questions of theological importance, more influential than any of them. We confess to a feeling of disappointment on finding how little the editor had asserted his own right to follow Winer wherever he allows his dogmatic bias in any degree to affect his grammatical judgment. Of course, it may be said that this was a matter of space and limit; but somehow or other room might have been made for this. There is not a single note added by the editor that we should wish to see removed; but we would have exchanged some even of these valuable notes for those corrections. Beelen, the Roman Catholic Professor at Louvain, solved the difficulty by issuing a Winer of his own—after a very arbitrary fashion. "Winer's book itself could not be used in our schools; not to speak of the fact that the non-Catholic Winer says many things that would offend Catholic ears, the language he used is one that shut it out from us; our students, coming from France, England, Ireland, for the most part know no German. Besides, I considered that Winer's exegesis was not altogether without flaw; there was in it much that would be useless to our studies, and some things in it would be found wanting. Therefore, I took great pains to reproduce Winer's book for them, supplying what it lacked, correcting what was more or less falsely said, and taking out what was useless." With this style of procedure we have no sympathy. Winer would do well to complain. For Beelen's purpose, of course, the process was effectual. We have given our readers a specimen of the result on the question of "The Great God and our Saviour." But, without desiring that that method had been adopted, we could have wished more of our editor's exegesis. It is

only right to add that our search among the notes since writing part of these strictures has been rewarded by finding several exegetical corrections of the editor, especially towards the close of the volume; still, they are the exception.

The introduction of the peculiarities of modern Greek, and the resemblance, or rather analogy, between it and the New Testament characteristics, is a very happy thought. A deeply interesting body of literature, small as yet, but increasing, has been created of late years. Mr. Moulton has evidently explored and appreciated its value; and will yet, as we trust, give the fruits in many ways to the public. This element of illustration does not enter into the notes as largely as we expected, or, it seems, as the editor wished.

It has forcibly struck us during the hasty review that the last fortnight has allowed, that Mr. Moulton has done more to set it in a clear light and make attractive—tolerable is a faint word—the works of our modern German exegetes. We can hardly explain our own impression. Meyer, De Wette, Van Hengel, Fritzsche, Rückert, Harless, Winer himself, and a dozen others, take their places in these notes as sensible and sometimes most profound commentators. In other writers they are quoted often enough, but generally to find fault with him. Mr. Moulton has read them, or is in the habit of consulting them, with a true appreciation: like one who knows that, with all their faults, they have had committed them a very important dispensation of truth, a function of no mean significance in modern exegesis. Meyer in particular plays a conspicuous and very creditable part from beginning to end, and, unless we mistake, will be more prized through Mr. Moulton's references than he has been. Winer never had his eye off Meyer; and few have thought or written on the New Testament of late years without deriving benefit from his, in some respects, unrivalled notes. If our translator and editor would give us an edition of Meyer's Acts, or Romans, or Corinthians, with such notes of his own as we have suggested above, the obligation would be no small addition to the heavy one he has imposed on us already.

Here and there also we have observed references to the recent lexicons of the Greek Testament, and once, though the note has now escaped us, an allusion to Grimm's recent edition of Wilke's Dictionary as vindicating the character of New Testament lexicography. Towards the close of the volume the work of Cremer, lately completed, begins to appear at the foot of the page. To these two books we desire to call our readers' attention for a moment.

The relation between the Grammar and the Lexicon is hard to exhibit, and still harder to preserve in practice. Even in Germany, where classification in these matters is carried to excess, the two glide into each other at many points. A. Buttmann remarks on this subject that "the two departments in many senses invade each other, and stand in reciprocally influencing relation;" but he shows emphatically that "the possession of a special lexicon is for the theologian, and everyone who would thoroughly investigate the New Testament writings, a matter of great moment." Winer seems to have had the intention of making his grammatical and his lexicographical labour keep pace through life. The year after the publication of his Grammar he issued a *Contribution towards the Improvement of New Testament Lexicography*, which gave evidence and promise of the collection of immense stores of preliminary labour to this end. We cannot tell what became of these preparations, but it has always seemed to us that the author of the Grammar was eminently fitted to be the author of the lexicon. Nothing can be more certain than that the language in which the Holy Ghost has given us the treasures of revelation is to a very important extent a new language, and demands an altogether new apparatus, or adaptation of the apparatus, of lexicology. Cremer's *Theological Dictionary of New Testament Greek* is the most recent and complete work on the subject, dealing especially with that portion of the language which has been created, so to speak, by its religious vocation, and leaving the rest to the ordinary classical lexicons. Cremer's preface complains of the want in former works of this character of a thorough and penetrating insight into what Schleiermacher calls the "speech-constructing energy of Christianity." The new religion, answering to all the presentiments of truth, would of necessity give new weight, a new stamp, and a new power to the old familiar speech. "We may," says Rothe, whom Cremer quotes, "speak with aptness and propriety of a language of the Holy Ghost. For it is most manifest to our eyes in the Bible how the Divine Spirit, working in revelation, has formed a peculiar and definite religious speech out of the languages respectively of the peoples which were the scene of that revelation. The elements of languages which He found, as also the ideas that were already current, He has translated into a form and character strictly appropriate to His purpose. The Greek of the New Testament most evidently reflects the process of this transformation." In that process we must needs see realised what

Nägelsbach (quoted also by Cremer) remarks on the Greek term *ὁ πέλας, πλησίον, the neighbour*: "It is with this expression, as with many others, in which the heathen and the Christian view seem to combine or touch each other: the ancient word has the sound of a Christian one, is, as it were, a vessel already prepared for the Christian idea, without, however, having as yet attained to its full depth of meaning."

The Hebrew-Aramaic colouring of the Greek Testament phraseology is nowhere treated so well as by Winer himself in the early part of his Grammar. But he dismisses the directly Christian formation of a department of the language with slight attention. "Many Greek words," he says, "are used by the New Testament writers in a special relation to the Christian religion (sometimes even in direct contrast to Judaism), as technical, religious, expressions. These constitute a third element of the New Testament diction—the peculiarly *Christian*." After giving a list of these words, the sacred mintage, as we should say, of the Holy Ghost—several of them never used before in anything like the same sense, and some omitted that should have been there—he says that most of them are found in the Old Testament and Rabbinical writings, and that, therefore, it will be difficult to prove that a word was brought into use by the Apostles. There are several words, of leading significance and importance, however, and new combinations of words, that contradict this dictum.

Cremer's work is just completed: a small and cheap volume, which has just reached our hands. The older work of Wilke, as edited by Grimm, is much more familiar to us, and doubtless to many of our readers. It is an admirable volume, packed with theology, as well as with the interpretation of the Greek words. The full title is "Lexicon Græco-Latinum in Libros Novi Testamenti, auctore C. L. W. Grimm." It is Grimm's Dictionary, in reality, though based upon the *Clavis Novi Testamenti Philologica* of C. G. Wilke. It is difficult to characterise this prodigious work, which gives almost a theological treatise on all the leading terms; its only fault being that of its publisher, Arnold of Leipzig, who has crowded too much into the double-columned page—a fault, however, which students with young eyes and light purses will think a very venial one. Professing to keep within those undefined limits that separate the philological lexicon on the one hand from the dogmatic, and on the other from the exegetical and grammatical province, Grimm has, nevertheless, with a rare simplicity of purpose and large charity of labour, in-

cluded more or less all. The student has only to follow him through his treatment of the words that cluster around the roots of reconciliation, faith, righteousness, to find out what a valuable theological instrument (with a somewhat Lutheran finish, however) this lexicon furnishes him.

But we must conclude. The young theological student of the present day may be congratulated on the variety, completeness, and, it may be added, perfection of the aids furnished him for the study of the Book that he must always reckon first of all books—the Greek Testament. Almost all the philological, grammatical, and critical studies of the century have been laid under contribution for the elucidation of a dialect which would, but for the inestimable documents it has preserved, have been suffered to lie hidden among the dialects and accidental variations of speech. The Aramaic-Greek of the New Testament is to us the centre of all study; and learning of every kind is brought to pay tribute to it, even by those who have no faith in the Divinity of the words it teaches. The best learning of the world is brought to this service, and the highest skill has been taxed to render its results available to the humbler student. Whether we look at the Grammar, or the Dictionary, or the Concordance, or the Commentary, or the Critical Study of the Text, the young theologian is amply provided. In all the five departments of a perfect Greek Testament study he may make safe and certain way. With his wide-margined Greek Testament ready for notes in each department, to be slowly filled with well-sifted results of thoughtful reading, he will make the spoils whether of Israel or the Egyptians tributary to such a knowledge of theology as can be gained in no other way.

Among all these helps Mr. Moulton's edition of Winer will hold the foremost place. It is, of course, the standard edition now; and will continue such for a long time. It is and will be surrounded by other works that derive much of their value from it, and will in individual sections improve on their master. But as a whole, and as the great comparative grammar of the New Testament Dialect, it will not be superseded in this generation. Winer we have been thanking virtually throughout this jubilee tribute; it only remains that we also heartily thank the publishers for their spirited enterprise, and, yet more warmly, Mr. Moulton for the new value he has given the old book by his thorough and conscientious editorial toil.

LITERARY NOTICES.

I. FRENCH, DUTCH, AND GERMAN.

Histoire des Trois Premiers Siècles de l'Eglise Chrétienne, par E. de Pressensé. Troisième Série: L'Histoire du Dogme. (History of the First Three Centuries of the Christian Church, by E. de Pressensé. Third Series: the History of Dogma.) Paris: Meyrueis.

By introducing this work thus early we forestall the translator, who is, undoubtedly, busy in preparing the English reproduction of this new instalment of de Pressensé's elaborate work. The translator's work will not be a difficult one, as the style is very simple and pure, the construction much more English than German, and the sentiment peculiarly French in its clearness. The title of this volume is scarcely the right one, as the author really gives little more than the theological history of the first centuries: that is, it is not so much a narration of the development of the special doctrines of the Christian confession seriatum, or in their central principles, as a narrative of the sects and opinions, orthodox and heterodox, of those times. In dealing with these de Pressensé does not present much that is new: certainly he does not add so much light to the subject as the preface would have led us to expect.

The first book takes up heresy. In a succession of chapters gnosticism, with its everlasting monotony of emanations of darkness, is depicted historically and analytically: certainly in a more intelligible manner than that with which the more profound Germans make us familiar. The chapter on the earliest enemies of the Divinity of Christ is most admirable, and will be very useful to the English reader. The apocryphal literature is rather sketchy: the writer seems to feel that it scarcely belongs to his subject or title.

Book the second, however, is the more substantial of the two. It treats of the development of Christian doctrine in the second and third century.

But we shall return to the volume when its English representative shall appear. Meanwhile, we do not find here any of those tokens of Pressensé's laxness of dogmatic faith that we have been obliged to comment on before.

De Theologie des Nieuwen Verbonds. Een Handboek voor Academisch Onderwijs en eigen Oefening, door J. J. van Oosterzee. [The Theology of the New Testament. By Dr. Van Oosterzee.] Utrecht: Kemink.

THE name of Dr. Oosterzee is pretty well known to the English reader, as one of the commentators whose works have been translated in the Foreign Theological Library. A valuable essay of his in defence of St. John has also been translated for Messrs. Clark, and deserves to be better known than it seems to be. Dr. Oosterzee is one of an increasing number of Dutch divines who are pre-eminently faithful to the cause of truth; lifting up a faithful and generally learned protest against the attacks of the Rationalist school, which bids fair to lead the van in free and destructive criticism.

The present volume has not been translated, though well deserving of translation. It presents a text-book on Biblical Theology, as distinguished from Systematic, which the learned and pious author prepared for his class. It is a model of what such a text-book should be; and the questions appended to every section tend to make the work useful to private students, whose benefit has evidently been consulted throughout.

In the Introduction we have a general view of the idea, history, and methods of the science of Biblical Theology as such. According to a classification with which we in England are not very familiar, it is placed at the head of Historical Theology.

The First Book treats of the foundation of New Testament theology in the Old Testament; namely, the Mosaic institute, the Prophets, the Judaism of the interval, and John the Baptist. Mosaism, as the continental expression is, separated Israel from the rest of the world as the bearer and guardian of a mission preparing the world for redemption; a revelation afforded to Abraham personally, which was in a great measure forgotten by his descendants in Egypt; then renewed to Moses, and enriched with new elements in the Mosaic institute. Its character was monotheistic, its form theocratic, its worship blended of symbolism and type, its tendency purely moral. The religion of the prophets was, in its theocratic individuality and universal significance, a continuation of Mosaism, and forerunner of the Gospel. This section is treated in a manner highly satisfactory. The author then passes to Judaism as developed after the Captivity; and shows that this, as a relapse and degeneracy, with its rigid externalism and formality, nevertheless looked forward to Christ and His Apostles, and helps much to explain the doctrines of the Gospel. The sources of information in this department are the latest books of the Old Testament, the Septuagint, the Apocryphal documents of the Jews, the most ancient Targums, the Talmud, Josephus and Philo. John the Baptist is then introduced as carrying Mosaism to its final goal, as expounding the meaning of the prophets, and correcting the errors of Judaism. The result is set forth carefully; Moses and the prophets laid the foundation of the doctrine

of Christ and His Apostles; and Judaism is shown to afford no real handle for the attacks of Rationalism.

Book II. presents the theology of Jesus Christ, which is exhibited in its character as a gospel of salvation, fulfilling and glorifying the word of Moses and the Prophets, and furnishing the everlasting text for all the variations and applications of the Prophets. The first section deals with the Synoptical Gospels. Their central exhibition of the teaching of Jesus is the kingdom of heaven, the spiritual, eternal, all-embracing kingdom of God. Revealed as new in the person of Jesus Himself, and to grow up around His sacred person, it was the direct antagonist of the kingdom of darkness and the consummated theocracy of olden time. The holy angels are ministers, and the fallen spirits enemies, of this kingdom; men are its subjects, and their salvation, obtained by faith, is chiefly regarded in its final realisation. The second section treats of St. John's Gospel; and, as might be expected from Dr. Oosterzee, considerable care is taken to do justice to the relations of St. John to the earlier Evangelists. The line is diligently drawn between the sayings of Christ and of John himself, the former being shown in their connection with the general type of the Master's doctrine; here the person of the Son of God is the centre. The Son of God in the flesh, in His relations to the Father, to the world, to His disciples, and to the great futurity, are the aspects under which the Johannæan theology concerning Christ is arranged. The third section attempts to exhibit the higher unity between the fourth and the earlier Gospels. So far from admitting that the undeniable differences are contradictory, he shows that they have a very deep significance; they attest the trustworthiness of the Evangelists, show the essential qualifications under which a verbal inspiration must be accepted, and manifest the freedom of the Holy Spirit as guiding the Apostles into various aspects of the one truth.

The Third Book enters upon the theology of the Apostles. The Petrine system comes first, because of the eminence of St. Peter and the simplicity of his doctrine as found in the First Epistle and the Acts. The Apostle of the Circumcision, in a good sense, and the Apostle also of Hope, he goes back to the Old Testament and forward to the bright future, in a manner peculiar to himself. The Second Epistle declares its genuineness by its fidelity to the same characteristics; and all St. Peter's writings are shown to harmonise well with the first two Evangelists and St. James and St. Jude. The second section enters on the Pauline theology. This embraces all that the Apostle was wont to call *his Gospel*, and felt himself bound to declare to the Gentiles. This great mass of truth is to be found in the Acts of the Apostles and the thirteen Epistles. Its fundamental doctrine is justification by faith; its form is that of antithesis and counterparts in all directions, and its method full of keenness and force. The theological views of St. Paul are classed under two heads. First, those which regard mankind as independent of Christ; not only the heathen world, but the Jews themselves, had fallen into a guilty depravity, and were exposed to the

wrath of God. The primary reason of this was the disobedience of the first pair, which, inherited in manifold forms, chastised by the law, and by the law increased, led all to death, the wages of sin. The consciousness of this, and the struggle between the old man and the new desire, leads to the experience of salvation. Secondly, man is regarded as in Christ; and in this part of the volume the plan of salvation is treated with remarkable clearness. The scheme of redemption was from eternity, was prepared for in the olden economy, and developed in its gradual fulness the glory of God. The Saviour Jesus Christ, as God-man and the second Adam, is its centre. All the teaching of St. Paul is shown to be the legitimate consequence of what is historically related in the Gospels. The work of redemption, as salvation from the guilt and bondage of sin, rests upon the voluntary incarnation and self-oblation and death of Christ. Faith is proclaimed in its simplicity and sufficiency as the only way of salvation into the new favour of God here and hereafter. Believers are the one body of Christ, a church sanctified to Him and hoping in Him. At the coming of Christ, always to be expected, the plan of salvation will be consummated in visible glory, amidst the attendant circumstances of judgment. The Pauline view of Christianity has its germ in the speech of Stephen, its fundamental tone in the writings of St. Luke, and its echo in the Epistle to the Hebrews. The unity in diversity of the Petrine and Pauline systems of theology is vividly set forth. What the original Judaic Christianity of St. Peter had promised, the doctrine of the Apostle of the Gentiles brought into its richest development; and that same ripe development paved the way for the profound theology of St. John.

Book the Third rises to the Johannæan system of doctrine. The Apostle of Love crowned the labours of his two predecessors; his writings are, as Dr. Oosterzee contends and proves, the Gospel, the Epistles, and the Apocalypse, written under Domitian. The Gospel and the Epistles are one in their sublime presentation of Christ. In them the invisible God is declared to reveal Himself only through the Son, or the Logos, the Divine Mediator of the creation and the universal enlightenment of mankind. Those who were susceptible to that Divine revelation of the Logos, which had been prepared for in Israel, formed the small minority of the world. The reception in faith of the supreme revelation of God leads to life in Christ and Sonship to God, manifested by walking in light and love, and thus eternally separating them from the world. The victory of Christ's people will be complete only when He returns. The Apocalypse differs much from the Gospel, but the difference is always to be accounted for, and is neutralised by many coincidences. With all its peculiarities and enigmas, the book is the strong echo of the apostolical and prophetical testimony, and worthily closes the New Testament Canon. Christ, the glorified Son of Man and King in this kingdom, is the centre of worship in heaven, conquers the earth according to the Father's counsel, converting it by His invisible presence, and in visible majesty sealing its destiny hereafter.

The fourth section winds up with the grand unity of the various strains of doctrine which the writers of the New Testament give forth. The Apostles are shown to agree one with another; they are proved to be one with their common Master; both Christ and His Apostles are brought into perfect harmony with the Old Testament. We have read this book through with much interest. Dr. Oosterzee is a noble-minded servant of Christ, who is doing a great work among the young men of Holland, where the Rationalism of modern Europe has its foremost seat. We have again and again called attention to his name and writings. Messrs. Clark have lately published his Essays in vindication of St. John; and they might, with credit to themselves and advantage to the English public, introduce this little volume—which condenses much matter into small space—to the theology of England.

Handbuch der Christlichen Kirchen-und Dogmengeschichte. Von Dr. J. H. A. Ebrard. [Handbook of Church History and Historical Theology.] Erlangen: Deichert.

Among a multitude of claimants these volumes have their special value, in a great measure arising from their peculiar character as combining the history of the Church and of its doctrine in one. The conception is a new one, and the execution is for the most part admirable. It may be interesting to run hastily through the contents of a work which some of our readers will be glad to study more fully.

The first volume extends to A.D. 800; it is divided into three books. The first treats of "The Founding of the Christian Church in the Apostolical age, under the extraordinary guidance of the Holy Spirit" (33—100); the second of "The Church in Tribulation" (100—323); the third of "The State-Church of the Eastern and Western Empire, and the Gospel among the Germans" (323—800).

There is a certain originality, freshness, and vigour about everything that Ebrard puts forth. The way in which St. John is introduced as following St. Paul is very striking. When the death of the Apostle of the Gentiles removed the great antagonist of Judaic perversion, the ruin of Judaism removed the danger also; but Gnostic Antinomianism then took its place. The spread of Christianity brought in great danger that the strong impulse to theoretic gnosis should tend to make the Christian faith a field of experiment. St. John vanquished the false gnosis by introducing the true. His education with Christ specially prepared him for this. Passing to matters of ecclesiastical polity, Ebrard thinks that we must assume, from the analogy of Acts xiv. 23 and Titus i. 5, that the Apostles chose the men best fitted for the office of presbyters. And he argues that even if they were, in those earlier days of persecution, purification, and fervour, elected by the congregation, it does not follow that the same should be done in such mingled and worldly congregations as modern Lutheranism presents. Moreover, he argues that he who is to exercise discipline in the congregation should not be a product of the same congregation and dependent upon it.

Passing from the apostolic times, Ebrard shows very forcibly what evidence the apostolical Fathers furnish in favour of the inspiration of the canon of the New Testament. It would be a sheer impossibility, he says, to write such commentaries on the best of these Fathers as are written on the Epistles of the New Testament. His description of Celsus arrests the attention. "Celsus collected into his *True Word* all the plain and all the subtle, all the superficial and all the profound, objections that had ever been urged against Christianity, and treated it with the arrogance with which our modern Pantheism treats it. His main position was in reality no other than this—that all that is, is intelligible, and that sin is a necessary thing; for he taught that the world is precisely as it came from the hand of God, and that its perfection consisted in the essential blending in it of good and evil. The Divinity he declared to be indifferent to evil, not disturbed by it, but incapable of *pathos*, or wrath against sin. Not in Jesus alone, but in many others also, powers and angels of the Godhead had appeared; and all men are like Christ, sons of God. The universe is infinite in space and time; and it is absurd to think that God produced the world for man's sake, or could possibly become man. With these Pantheistic and pseudo-philosophical objections, Celsus, the Strauss of his day, combined others of an historical and critical sort, sometimes spiritless and trivial, sometimes pointed and plausible. He showed that many histories in the Old Testament, such as the Flood, were found as legends among the barbarians, and hence argued that they are legends also in the Bible. The individual miracles he mocked. Contradictions he found everywhere; for instance, in this, that the Messiah is said in the Prophets to save the righteous, but Jesus came to save sinners. The history of our Lord's infancy"—but here we let Ebrard proceed alone.

There is something striking, at least, in the generalisation of Gnostic theories. Ebrard dismisses the classification of "Heathen, Jewish, Christian," and lays open only the Emanation and the Dualistic theories. The Emanation Gnosticism he distinguishes into systems with *metaphysical* problems (the origin of evil and its alliance or identity with matter), and systems with *historical* problems (how the Old and New Testaments are related), and systems with *ethical* problems (emancipation from law). At any rate, this analysis is new, and helps the reader to understand the subject, whether he accept it or not. Of Montanism Ebrard speaks with more respect than many of his coadjutors. He regards it historically as a reaction, on the one hand against episcopal high-church ideas, and on the other hand against a dead and worldly Christendom: a reaction that was as much justified, as much needed, and as useful as that of the prophets against the petrified legalism of the old economy. But here there is an element of rashness in the effort to be striking. Similarly the *State-Church* is dealt with. In one chapter we have the *Christianisation of the State*, a Samaritan conglomerate of Christianity and Heathenism; and in another the *Secularisation the Church*. Not that the connection was only for evil. Whilst much that was heathenish was received into the Church, the stamp impressed

upon the nation was very different from that which characterised it before; it was like the Israel after Joshua's death, stained with heathenism, in comparison with the old Canaanite nations.

Human reactions and Divine punishments, as against corruptions in the Church, form an impressive antithesis. Amongst the former Donatism was a human protest against relaxed discipline, that of Audius against clerical morals, that of Aerius againt Judaist ceremonialism in the Church, that of Jovinian against the merit of good works, that of Vigilantius against celibacy. The irruption of the nations was a Divine punishment, to chastise and correct; whilst Mahometanism was a Divine punishment of annihilation.

It would take us into too long a disquisition were we to enter upon Ebrard's chapters on the controversies on the Person of Christ. Here his Lutheranism comes out very strongly, and he has spent his whole strength. We are as much struck with the vigour and originality of his method of discussing the subject as we are revolted by the semi-Eutychian tendency of some of his illustrations. So also in his elaborate apology for the Arianism of the Gothic nations we cannot give him our approval. On his principles it would be hard to impose any but Arian doctrine on all the uncultivated tribes of the earth.

The Culdees have a large place in Ebrard's book, and a warm place in his heart. They were really an Evangelical Church, not only because they were free from Rome, and wherever Rome and they came in contact the appeal was to the Scripture alone, but because they were penetrated by the great principles of the Gospel. They read and understood the Scriptures in the original. In their home work in their Celtic country, and in their missions in France and Germany, they turned the Scripture into the native language. The Bible was to them the living Word of Christ. They preached the corruption and inability of human nature, the atoning death of Christ, justification without the deeds of the law, the worthlessness of all merely external works, the new birth as life in Him who died for us. They knew nothing of a carnal eating of the body and blood of Christ. They had no masses for the dead, no purgatory, no invocation of saints, no pictures in their churches (only the cross which they sometimes erected in the open air); and their psalmody was conducted in the vernacular tongue. They had only presbyters and brethren in their hierarchy. Hence Winfrid or Boniface was not the true apostle of Germany; he only bound the German Evangelical Church to Rome.

Moving to the second volume, which takes us from 800 to the Reformation, we have a most vigorous handling of questions which in our own day are of the highest importance. The rise, ascendency, and decline of the Romish See, might be said to be Ebrard's leading ideas. Passing by the favourite allusion to the fourth epistle in the Apocalypse, as the first three underlay the first volume, we enter upon this most troubled history under the guidance of an intelligent, candid, and earnest Protestant. The pseudo-Isidorian Decretals are treated with fulness and clearness. Their influence in making bishops in-

dependent of the State, and the Pope independent of the Church, is traced in a masterly way. The question, *Where was the Church of Christ in this age?* leads to a frank and unreserved expression of opinion on the current notion that the supremacy of the Romish system was a necessity in those days, and for barbarous nations. He shows that without Rome the nations were evangelical, and lost their purity and peace just in the proportion that they were connected with her. This introduces the Culdees again, and a multitude of proof of the prevalence, although restricted, of the Culdee spirit.

The contest of Rome with the Empire is a chapter of history that Ebrard makes very interesting. In 1046 the Roman See was a third time saved from depredation by the German emperor. But the reforming service that had been done to the Romish cause seemed to Gregory VII. as impious invasions of ecclesiastical authority. Gregory's double design while he lived—which in death he submitted to his successors—was to emancipate the Church from all supervision of the State, binding it, as an organism with no independent will, to the Romish chair; and then to subject the Empire absolutely to the Pontificate. Henry IV. seemed to conquer Gregory, but, as Ranke says, "When Gregory fled from Rome, the world was receiving his ideas." The grandeur and the falsehood of the idea that ruled in the air of that period are abundantly shown.

But we must close. The Crusades, the Religious Orders, the Decline of Papal Authority, the Mediæval Theology, "which began with the rejection of the Evangelical Doctrine of Salvation and ended with the Loss of Discernment in the Christian Mysterics," the growing and frightful disorders of the so-called Church, the Reformers before the Reformation, Humanism, and the full preparations for the Day—are successively treated in a lively and at the same time convincing style. But it must not be forgotten that the design is not simply ecclesiastical history, but that history as shaping Christian Doctrine. The volumes are printed in good type, and deserve the attention of all thoughtful students of the conflict between Rome and the most ancient truth.

Guillaume de Champeaux et les Ecoles de Paris au XII^e^ Siècle. Par M. le Abbé Michaud. [William of Champeaux and the Schools of Paris in the Twelfth Century.] Paris: Didier.

A work of singular interest, which throws a clear and far-reaching light upon the scholastic age in general, and the Realistic controversies in particular. The First Book gives a clear view of the schools and systems in France that preceded William. Philosophy and Theology are seen united and yet contending over the doctrine of Universals. The history of the great Realist is then given, and his philosophical system, so far as it can be, recovered from his fragments. Then we have a thoroughly complete view of the ever-memorable contest between the Realists, Nominalists, and Conceptualists, which surpasses

anything we remember in clearness. In this respect it is French, and that explains its singular luminousness as an exhibition of philosophy. We will translate a few sentences, and leave them as a strong recommendation of a work which presents, at a small cost, an immense amount of mediæval history, philosophy and theology.

"Porphyry asked these three questions:—'Do genera and species really exist, or do they consist simply of pure thoughts? As subsisting, are they corporeal or incorporeal? Are they, in short, separate from sensible objects, or in those objects, and forming with them something co-existent?' He regarded these as very grave questions; for he immediately adds: 'I decline to say; this matter is too difficult, and demands investigation too extensive.' The Doctors of the Middle Ages were of his opinion; according to Abelard himself, 'It seemed that science in its entirety resided in the doctrine of Universals.' The questions of Porphyry may be resolved into these: 'Is there anything real under all these phenomena that we see? In our conceptions are not the subject and object an imaginary duality and a real unity, a perfect identity? Or is one only real and the other fantastic; then which is the shadow?' What can be more serious and more worthy of our researches?"

If we consider the individuals which together form a species, we remark that these individuals, while differing from each other, have nevertheless a common element which characterises the species. This element is called the *Universal*. The Universal therefore is a unity in relation to many others, *unum versus alia*. It may be looked at in the grammatical order, in the logical, in the ontological, *in prædicando, in intelligendo, in essendo*. Now is the universal an ontological universal, that is a reality, only as it is a grammatical unity, or only as it is logical in the mind, or is it a reality beyond the grammatical and the logical range? In other words, is not the universal more than a word? If it is more than a word, is it really only a concept? If it is more than a word, and more than a concept, what is it, and what is the measure of its objective reality? This is something like the famous doctrine of Universals.

Three answers have been given to these questions. *Nominalism* asserts that the individual alone exists; that the universal is only a word, *flatus vocis*, which corresponds with no real thing. *Conceptualism* asserts that the universal is not a vain word; that it is a thing existing in the reason, a concept of our mind, an abstraction without a real object. *Realism*, on the contrary, asserts that the universal is an objective reality.

But there are three species of realism:—Realism *ante rem*, Realism *in re*, and Realism *post rem*. The first, that which precedes the thing, is idealist Realism, because on that theory the universal would be only ideal or typical. This kind of Realism may be formulated in two systems: that of Plato and that of Thomas Aquinas. Realism *post rem* is only conceptualism in another form. It is certain that reason makes universal concepts of objects, and that they are real in our spirit.

The real difficulty, however, of Realism is *in re*; this is Realism properly so called, in contradistinction to idealist and conceptualist Realism. The question to be resolved is this: Are there in the objects, formed according to Divine types and conceived in our intellect, universals sufficiently real to render certain the universal concepts that we form of them? How, says the Realist, can it be denied, without falling into scepticism, that our universal concepts have a real foundation in the objects conceived, that is, *in re*? What, then, is this foundation?

This little volume will do much towards helping the reader to approach, at least, an answer to this question. Meanwhile let us hear, in relation to this subject, two great representatives of Nominalism and Realism, that we may see a specimen of the manner in which mediæval philosophy touched the three doctrines of the Trinity and the person of Christ and original sin. Roscellinus, the Nominalist, was condemned by a council at Soissons in 1092 for teaching thus: "Just as a house, as such, is only a house, and has no parts, since unity alone is real, so God, as God, is only God, and cannot be Father, Son, and Holy Spirit. Either the Church must admit in the Trinity three distinct Gods, three individuals, or it must attribute reality to one God only, designated by three names, but without distinction of persons." Now let us hear M. Cousin, on a question that relates to the unity of the race, as a Universal: "It is impossible not to believe, with the common sense of the world, that there is a real genus, called the human race, composed of thousands upon thousands of individuals, all differing from each other, but which all have something in common. Now, that something which is common to them all, in the midst of all the differences that separate them, this common something cannot be also an individual; for all that is individual and particular must be necessarily unlike anything else. It must needs be, therefore, that this something common to all human beings, in themselves different and unlike, is something universal and one, which constitutes what we call the human race. Thus the human race is not a word; otherwise we must assume that there is nothing common and identical among men, that the brotherhood of the human family is a pure abstraction, and that, the only reality being individuality, the only reality is consequently difference, that is to say, enmity and war,—sad but necessary consequence which logic and history impose on Nominalism."

But we must refer the thoughtful reader to the book itself; whether Realist or Conceptualist he will be intensely interested in this chapter of mediæval history.

Lehrbuch der Dogmengeschichte. Von Dr. H. Schmid. [History of Christian Doctrine.] Nördlingen: Beck.

The design of Historical Theology is here shown to be the historical exhibition of the occasion and methods by which the Church in course of ages reached the doctrinal ideas which the present confessions avow.

It has, therefore, not to do with all the individual teachings of Christendom, only with those that have a history, and which have been stamped as permanent by the Church. So also it has not to do with dogmatic and systematic theology, or with exposition.

The subject falls into three periods. The first, extending to the end of the sixth century, divides into two parts. In the former theology attains a summary view of the whole substance of the doctrines of salvation; in the latter a more fundamental knowledge of the person of Christ, of freedom and of grace. During the former the conflict of Jews and heathens, of heretical Ebionites and Gnostics, led to the general unfolding of truth in the Apostles' Creed and the Rule of Faith. Even then, however, the dogma of the person of Christ had a history; first, a series of predicates were attributed to Christ which belong only to God; then He was regarded as the Logos; the Monarchians arose, and Christ's essential unity with the Father and personal distinction were firmly maintained. The second section begins with the first Œcumenical Council. The East clung to the doctrines that concerned the Trinity and the person of Christ; the West made prominent those which concerned sin, grace, and the freedom of the human spirit. The Western conflict between Augustinianism and Pelagianism is exhibited with great clearness.

The second period is divided by the beginning of Scholasticism into two departments, and reaches to the Reformation. A wrong method was adopted, and the foundations of the Tridentine theology were slowly, broadly, surely laid. The Eastern Church was afflicted by one peculiar error, Monothelitism; the Western was agitated by three great discussions: Adoptianism in reference to the person of Christ, Gottschalk's Predestination controversy, and the contentions concerning Transubstantiation. During the second sub-period the Greek Church had retired into insignificance; and the development of doctrine was confined to the Church of the West. Scholasticism introduced a gradual but sure transformation of dogma, in regard to Man, and Salvation, and the Sacraments. Augustinianism, never much sustained by the Church, was all but suppressed, and semi-Pelagianism guided the moulding of the creed; the way of salvation, which by neglect had not been systematically unfolded on Augustine's principles, took a more human form; the doctrine of the sacraments was entirely deranged by the *ex operato* theory, by the doctrine of penance, and by the sacrifice of the Mass; whilst the doctrine of the Church was modified into a perfectly new shape by the substitution of the priesthood, with the Pope at the head, for the Church, constituted now the Mistress of Faith and the mediator of all grace to the people.

The Reformation begins the third period. The Evangelical Churches of Germany and Switzerland were as one in their rejection of the doctrinal development that had taken place in the second period; but were not united in the idea of the building to be reared and the confession to be uttered. In Switzerland the hand of revolution laid on the Church went more thoroughly to work; the Scripture alone was

the umpire, being supposed to contain the perfect elements of an Ecclesiastian constitution. This elevation of the Word of God, as the form for all Church order, and the source of all theological principles, into a formal principle, without adding to it a material counterpart,—that is, without laying down what is the substance of Christianity, and defining the doctrines of the faith,—led to a certain spiritualism and undermining of the sacraments which, in their turn, led to a strong demarcation between the Reformed and the Lutheran communities. Our author gives the doctrinal development only of his own Lutheran creed. Justification by faith alone was the supreme principle with Luther. The three great controversies are traced: first, with the Synergists, on the question of grace and freedom; secondly, on justification, and the relation of Law and Gospel, with the Antinomians; thirdly, with the Reformed Church on the Eucharist, the person of Christ, and Election. The *Concordia* formed the close of this development. For the history of modern theology the time is scarcely ripe.

Schmid's book may be recommended for its clearness and adaptation to the use of a student, especially in its earlier part, where pure history is needed.

Marcellus von Ancyra. Von Theodor Zahn. [Marcellus of Ancyra. A Contribution to the History of Theology.] Gotha: Perthes.

This is an admirable specimen of those monographs in Ecclesiastical History which abound in German literature, and to which this learned author has already contributed. He tells us all that can be known of this semi-Heresiarch. It is probable that he presided at the Council of Ancyra, in 314; he was prominent in that of Nicæa, when his theological views were pretty fully established. The word *Homoousios* in itself signified, not equal quality or simultaneousness, or equal rank, so much as the common possession of the *Ousia*, which must be termed the substratum of more individual persons than one; and this formula was valuable as defending the Unity of God against Arianism. Those who maintained it asserted not merely a revelation of God through Christ, but also a participation of Christ in the Divine nature; whilst the greater part of the Eastern theologians were inclined, on the ground of Origen's theory, half understood, to recognise in Christ only a mediator between God and the world, albeit invested with that official relation before time was. This Eusebian doctrine acquired the preponderance in the East, and the second chapter of this work is devoted to it. It shows that the literary activity of this version of the creed was only limited: it was confined at first to letters, while the Sophist Asterius went up and down the country diffusing semi-Arianism. Marcellus exerted himself vigorously against this system; and his work was the first essay of the Nicene theologians to lay down the bearings of this profound theological problem. He took it with him to

the Council of Tyre in 335, opposed the condemnation of Athanasius, and, after protesting against the re-establishment of Arius, referred his doctrine and book to the emperor in Constantinople. The Eusebian synod demanded of Marcellus a retractation, displacing him when he refused. He was reinstated in his bishopric in 338; removed again the next year, he went to Rome and was acknowledged there by a synod, 341. The Eusebians and Marcellus hurled confessions of faith at each other; and it is hard to say which exhibited the worse spirit, or departed most from the purity of faith. He lived until 370, at least; congregations bearing his name lingered long in Galatia, and puzzled Epiphanius as much as Marcellus had puzzled the Arians or Athanasius.

The doctrine of Marcellus occupies the second part of the volume. The author shows that the rigid Arians, in their assault upon the orthodox doctrine, made great use of the terms used in the Gospels to exhibit the relations of the Incarnate Son to the Father during the course of His earthly development. Marcellus therefore rejected all these, and asserted that the term Logos alone referred to the eternal nature of our Lord. He then pursued a course of subtle argumentation to prove that the Logos had a double existence, one related to God and the other to the universe. He rejected the idea of any eternal generation: referring that notion only to the Incarnate Person. He laid down a distinction between the Monas and the Father. While the Father and the Logos were in some sense correlative terms, the Monas was the Divine substratum underlying and surrounding all. This Monas, turned towards the world, becomes Father, Son, and Spirit: Marcellus taught that there was an eternal mystery in the being of God which made it possible for Him to reveal Himself as Creator, Redeemer and Sanctifier; and that this revelation was the exhibition of the Three-one God. His doctrine followed hard after Sabellianism; his Logos returns back again at the end of the dispensation to God, whence it issued; but what should become then of the Redeemer's human nature is a question that he could not solve, and therefore rejected it as a useless one. There were, however, many points of difference between Sabellian Modalism and the doctrine of Marcellus. To him the threefold personality was in some mysterious sense a reality; but he discarded the ideas of eternal generation and procession. Moreover, he did not, like Sabellius, make his Trias a successive manifestation. The three persons were in the Holy Trinity before historical development; and in the historical development they were manifested simultaneously as well as in succession, the Logos being active in the creation and the Holy Spirit in His influence on the Prophets. It is this blending of truth and error that makes it so difficult to assign those eminent thinkers, Marcellus and Photinus, their place in the history of Christian doctrine.

The work to which we refer is an exhaustive monograph; and of course embraces a very considerable field of ecclesiastical history in its plan.

Neue Bibelstudien. Von Dr. H. G. Hölemann. Leipzig: Bredt.

Dr. Hölemann is one of a small band of men in Germany who are thoroughly faithful to the doctrine of inspiration and loyal to every word of Scripture. He is at the same time a man of immense learning and indefatigable diligence. His maxim is *Credo ut intelligam!* and to it he is always submissive. "In opposition to modern theology we avow our deference simple and pure to revelation, which is not an exalted natural production, but a direct voice and gift from heaven." Uniting this strong faith with his great learning, he has given the Church the fruit in two volumes of studies, the latter of which now lies before us and has impressed us with a deep respect for the author. The essays are nine in number, four on Old Testament subjects and five on passages of the New Testament.

The fifth essay is on *The Great Confession*, 1 Tim. iii. 16. "A glorious diadem of pure spiritual jewels, in a golden frame; introduced strikingly, mighty in meaning, exquisite in rhythm, precious in contents, mysterious in expression, profound in comprehensiveness: but on account of all these properties a much abused riddle for exposition." Hölemann insists upon an historical and substantial order in the connection of the six clauses of this primitive Christian confession. He shows that "pillar and foundation" in ver. 15 must not be referred to ver. 16, but should be taken as epexegesis of the preceding "Church of the living God," as inhabited by the Spirit of Truth. What that truth is, however, ver. 16 points out: "being the first œcumenical or catholic formula of faith, the oldest Christological symbolon." A mystery it is called because made known only by the higher revelation, and only to the Church in faith, known only and confessed by those to whom the mystery is revealed, Eph. iii. 6. Hence it is the "Law of Godliness." Six clauses exhibit its meaning: a chain returning into itself, from the entering of God into the sphere of sense and time (*God was manifest in the flesh*) to His return into the superterrestrial endless glory (*was received in glory*). 1. *God* was manifested: Hölemann urges critical, exegetical and dogmatic reasons for the reading *God*. 2. He was justified in the spirit (demonstrated righteous): this is, as it were, a euphemism for Christ's departure in death, through which indeed he was (compare John xvi. 10) translated out of the fleshly life into the life of invisible spirituality. All other interpretations he holds untenable, though he can scarcely prove them such. 3. He became visible or appeared to angels: this is to be understood of the resurrection, not of the ascension, nor of the descent, nor of any revelations to angels. 4. He was preached among the nations: this refers to the foundation of the mission to the Gentiles in the time between the resurrection and the ascension, Matt. xxviii. 19, &c. 5. He was believed in the world; this embraces the world embracing result of apostolical preaching, though proleptical to some extent. 6. Received up into glory: this finally forms the close of the apostolical testimony, as in the Apostles' Creed. So

says Oosterzee: "This confession of faith belongs to the one universal, holy Christian Church of all ages; as it were the oldest *Formula Concordiæ*, the standard of the true Church unfurled before the unbelieving world, on which the Supreme Hand has written *In hoc signo vinces.*"

The elaborate disquisition that sustains this rather forced exegesis well deserves to be carefully studied. No one can read it without feeling more strongly the inexpressible majesty of this great testimony of the early Faith. The other essays are almost equally valuable; though some of the subjects are more recondite, such as that on the *Early Giants*. With all his over-subtlety, Hölemann is one of those faithful children of wisdom who from the ground of their hearts *justify* the Word of God.

Die Drei Briefe des Apostel Johannes bearbeitet. Von Dr. J. W. Huther. [The Three Epistles of the Apostle John.] Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, Göttingen.

This work on St. John's Epistles is included in the series of Meyer's Commentaries on the New Testament. It has reached a third edition, and is among the best, if not the best, among the many expositions of these Epistles that have been lately published. The title itself shows that Huther holds the three Epistles to have been written by the Apostle; not that he denies the existence of a Presbyter John, but the first and second Epistles are shown to have proceeded from the same hand. *Kyria* he regards as not referring to any individual person, but to the Church; it is a designation appropriate to any Church, and the term sister, ver. 13, he thinks helps the theory. The third Epistle he supposes to have been connected with a general visitation of the aged Apostle which set out from Ephesus. Gaius and Diotrephes belonged to the same Church; and Baur's strange idea that that Church was Rome in Montanist times is thoroughly refuted.

The Epistle is divided into four sections, introduced by the Proœmium and followed by a specific conclusion, ch. v. 14—21. Each of these four is governed by one predominant line of thought; ch. i. 5—ii. 11, warning against indifferentism as endangering doctrine; ch. ii. 12—28, the love of the world and Antichrist; ch. ii. 29—iii. 22, the nature of the Christian requires a righteous life in brotherly love; ch. iii. 23, v. 17, faith in Jesus Christ, the Son of God, is the Divinely-sanctioned foundation of the Christian life. Not much is gained, however, by such a division as this. The error which St. John had in view was *Docetism*, in that form of which it consisted in distinguishing between the Son of God and the son of man, and which was represented by Cerinthus. Huther shows that the fourth Gospel was written by the same author about the same time, the last quarter of the first century. He expounds fully the terms that are common to the Gospel and the Epistle; and argues that there is no contradiction whatever in the fact that Christ is called *Paraclete* in the Epistle, whilst in John xiv. 16 he calls the Holy Ghost *another Paraclete*. It is more questionable when

we find him agreeing with Delitzsch that propitiate never has God for its object in Scriptural phraseology, notwithstanding Zech. vii. 2; a reconciliation within the Deity itself, however, he holds, against Delitzsch, to be unbiblical. The "water and the blood" he refers to the baptism and death of Christ, but not to the sacraments. The "sin unto death" he explains by Numb. xiv. 22. The world lying "in the wicked one" refers to the personal Satan, on account of the antithesis to God. The "true God," at the close, is the Father. We must not close without heartily recommending Huther in Meyer to the German scholar.

Apologische Beiträge. [Apologetic Essays. By Dr. Düsterdieck.] Göttingen: Vandenhoek.

EXCELLENT contributions, of which we condense one, on Sin. Scripture teaches that the original condition of man was one of purity, and that its loss through sin was the self-condemning act of man himself. Both these convictions are wrought into the traditions of all nations; and their truth is affirmed by the conscience of every man. The original likeness to God consisted not merely in the faculties of the understanding, but in these as filled and united with God. The original state of innocence was not negative; but the moral goodness, which was in itself perfect, was to reach its consummation through the practice of holiness. But there are difficulties here which our essayist does not grapple with, and which his statements do not meet.

The same may be said as to his views of the Fall. He thinks that the narrative of the Fall must not be regarded as strictly historical; because, if we so regard it, we must, contrary to all Scriptural analogy, attribute to the tree of life and the tree of knowledge a sacramental nature, an intrinsic element of life and death,—a thing inconceivable, especially in regard to death. Moreover, Dr. Düsterdieck thinks that, on such a theory, the speaking of the serpent must be set down as a Satanic miracle, a thing contrary to the Christian intelligence. We think that he needlessly strives to remove difficulties which should be left as they are. But he goes on to say what the history of the Fall is. It is a holy tradition, due to inspiration, and therefore rightly admitted into the Canon, as containing an essential revelation of God. Its main points are that sin is the act of man himself; but that it comes to him from without, that is, from the Devil. The devils, however, became what they are through their own sin; and in their case temptation is not from without, but from within,—a mystery admitted to be incomprehensible. Sin is the separation of the human will from the Divine; and, as it were, a contradiction that man with his sin should be happy in God. The doctrine of eternal separation from God cannot be termed unscriptural. The transmission of original sin is earnestly maintained, in opposition to an atomistic theory that would make every man a new beginning. Though personal guilt cannot be predicated as part of the original sin, yet the inheritance of sin in each

man who is flesh, born of flesh, separates from God. The case of the children unbaptized, and that of the heathen, have ample treatment, and give occasion to the introduction of those Lutheran views which extend the period of probation beyond the bounds of this world.

The volume is very interesting, in itself and as the production of an expositor to whom Germany is much indebted, and indirectly England also.

Das Zeugniss der H. Schrift über die ewige Verdammniss. [The Testimony of Scripture concerning Everlasting Punishment, in Opposition to the Doctrine of Universal Restoration.] Elberfeld: Langewiesche.

The first section of this essay treats of the argument based upon the love of God. This argument has not more force than "if one should say: God is perfectly righteous, therefore He cannot take pity upon a sinner." The second meets the objection derived from the righteousness of God, by showing that we cannot measure the Divine estimate of the evil of sin. Other objections are met, in the ordinary way, by a stern and unflinching exhibition of the plain sayings of Scripture. But the essay shows us that, in Germany as in England, the fascinating and spreading doctrines of Universalism need a deeper examination and more thorough refutation than is generally attempted.

Geschichte des Teufels. [History of the Devil.] Von Gustaf Roskoff. In Two Vols. Leipzig: Brockhaus.

These massive volumes are the production of a theological professor in Vienna. They are an exhaustive exhibition of the place occupied in the history of the world's religious thought, feeling, and life by that portion of the universe of which Satan is the centre. The greater part of it is pure history, and, as such, very valuable. The First Book is occupied with *Dualism*, traced through the systems of mythology, in the Old Testament representations of Satan, in those of the New Testament, and in the subsequent history of the Church. The Second Book treats of the history of the rise, consolidation, and spread of the notion of the Devil, as a great theological idea. The Third descends to the history of witchcraft, and the Fourth traces the slow but sure decline of the action of Satan's personal existence.

We cannot give a thorough account of the book, having read only detached passages. It appears to be no more than a very laborious collection of historical facts, arranged with a view to undermine the doctrine which the Church of Christ has always received as the doctrine of Scripture concerning sin. It is a marvel of research, and deserves a thorough examination and exposure. The title is a mistake, at least as translated for English ears.

II. ENGLISH THEOLOGY.

A Dictionary of Doctrinal and Historical Theology. Edited by the Rev. J. H. Blunt, M.A., F.S.A. A—K. Rivingtons.

THIS is the first instalment of a ponderous undertaking, which designs to provide for the English Church, or for a certain section of it, a complete repertory of dogmatic and historical and ecclesiastical theology. We have much to condemn in it, but something to approve. The writers who are at work on it are scholars and theologians, and earnest defenders of the Christian faith. They evidently hold fast the fundamental doctrines of Christianity, and have the religious instruction of the rising ministry at heart. Moreover, their scheme is a noble one; it does credit not only to their learning and zeal, but also to their tact and discretion; no better plan could be adopted for the furtherance of the object they have in view than the attempt to throw all their theological principles into an encyclopædic form.

The Continental divines have set the example. German Protestantism has its Herzog; German Catholicism has its similar one (the best form of which is the French translation). We were going on to say that the English Church had adopted the same plan. But that would not have been right; for this is not the project of the Church of England, but of that section of it which is seeking to efface every vestige of Protestantism, and bring back Anglicanism to strictly Catholic ideas. Hence the general tendency of this first volume is Ritualistic; that is, it seeks to lay a theological foundation for Ritualistic practices. Disposed to discern quickly and judge severely any such indications, we suspended our judgment, and hesitated before accepting the conclusion. But it at length forced itself upon us that this elaborate, scholarly, and earnest work, is no other than the theological manifesto of a party in England, and one the success of which we deprecate.

We do not read far before the word "Absolution" gives opportunity for some flowing pages. Take the following extract:—"Upon the authority of Morinus it is frequently asserted that the Church used no other form of absolution than that of a prayer for 1,200 years, and that the indicative form, *I absolve thee*, was first adopted in the twelfth century. St. Thomas Aquinas writes of the *indicative* form in the thirteenth century as if it had always been in use, and he certainly could not have so written if the change had been recently made. Goar also asserts his belief that it had been used from primitive ages. And, notwithstanding the learning of Morinus, other learned men consider that the evidence adduced by him is insufficient to prove the *precatory* form to have been the only one used for 1,200 years. Probably the truth is, that in the *public* services of the Church precatory forms were always used, and that an indicative form was used for the absolution of individual penitents, as is the case with the Church of England. The precatory form, *The Lord absolve thee*, is alone used in the Eastern

Church; but, notwithstanding the adherence of Orientals to ancient usages, this does not prove it to have been the primitive form, for they use an analogous form in baptizing—*N., the servant of God, is baptized;* instead of the ministerial form, *I baptize thee,* which is undoubtedly primitive." After some further remarks on the English form, we are referred to articles on *Confession* and *Penance.* These, when consulted, are found to be exhaustive, to a certain extent; but they refer again to *Contrition, Discipline Ecclesiastical.* Consulting these, we find at last a perfect view of the subject, which, however, would have been much better appreciated if presented fully and at once; appreciated both as to its value as a treatise, and as to its unevangelical character as a doctrine.

The work seems rather to be a Church Dictionary, with special pleading in abundance—such is that of which we have given an instance—what are called Catholic principles, than a theological dictionary, or dictionary of historical theology. Hence the theological articles proper are inferior in every respect; this may easily be verified by consulting such articles as *Atonement, Grace,* and *Justification.* These are viewed in a fragmentary manner; possibly before the book ends subsidiary articles may expand these into more full and worthy proportions; but the great doctrines of Christianity should, in a Dictionary of *Historical Theology,* be treated at once and in full. Everything depends on completeness of view. The article on *Councils* is a good one. So also is that on the *Divinity of Christ.* The *Creeds,* also, are well handled. In fact, the more we study the volume, the greater its value appears; and we find ourselves occasionally impressed with the conviction that this will be a noble theological dictionary before it ends. Then suddenly we light upon an article that makes us mourn, and proves that *History* is not the primary interest. For instance, *Benediction* thus ends:—

"The use of holy water, or water of aspersion (Numb. xix.), dates from the earliest days of the Jewish Church, and Baronius is probably right in assuming that, like many other Jewish ceremonies, it was adopted into the Christian ritual, for it is referred to by early Christian writers, and there is a form for blessing it in the *Apostolic Constitutions.* It has been customary to bless it for various special uses, as well as for the general purpose of remaining in the benatura, or holy-water stoup, at the entrance of the church. In mediæval times the font was not blessed at each separate service, but only on Easter Eve and Whitsun Eve, the ordinary times for baptism. A special office was used for this, and the water remained in the font, to be used again and again.

"Martene has printed a great number of benedictional offices of all kinds. The essential form is the use of certain appropriate words, which may be accompanied by suitable gestures. Such are imposition of hands, as in the patriarchal blessings; and as when Christ blessed little children; and signing with the cross, in token that through the cross of Christ all blessings flow from God to man. Holy water and chrism, which had themselves been previously blessed, were also used in the

more solemn benedictions, as in that of bells, which in these and other respects so resembled the office of baptism that it unfortunately acquired the name of the sacrament, a name frequently applied to it by Roman Catholic ritualists and theological writers. So we now hear people speak of the 'christening' of a ship, meaning the somewhat profane ceremony of naming it, which is a corruption of the old *benedictio navis*. The blessing of military ensigns is fortunately still a religious function. 'House warmings' are traditional observances connected with the *benedictio domus*. Buildings, other than churches, have been solemnly blessed by modern bishops, as have also church bells. Archbishops Laud and Sandcroft used to consecrate altars and the *instrumenta* of public worship, and other bishops have done the same from time to time. In the *Hierurgia Anglicana* is a form for such consecrations of the date 1703. The tradition of consecrating churches and churchyards has always been kept up by English bishops.

"A priest is competent to perform any benediction, although it is more proper that a bishop should officiate, if convenient. The less solemn benedictions, such as the *benedictio mensæ*, may be given by lay persons, but such benedictions are to be regarded rather as prayers for a blessing than the act of blessing itself. A woman cannot give solemn benediction under any circumstances. Abbesses claimed this power in the time of Charlemagne, but it was treated as an abuse. The same custom arose, and was repressed, in the Greek Church. Private benedictions, such as those of children by parents or aged persons, of relations and friends, by dying persons, &c., are acts of Christian charity which have always been sanctioned by the Church. The rite of 'benediction with the blessed sacrament,' now so common in the Roman Church, is one of very recent introduction, and consists in holding over the people the monstrance containing the sacred host.

"Although sacerdotal benediction has much analogy with the sacraments and sacramental ordinances, it is to be distinguished from them in respect of the special graces which they convey, of their necessity to salvation, and of their being administered to mankind alone. It is analogous to the sacraments in having 'an outward visible sign of an inward spiritual grace.' The sign may vary, as we have seen, and its effect is to set apart persons, places, or things for particular purposes. All things are, moreover, in virtue of benediction, especially fitted for their proper uses, 'sanctified by the word of God and prayer' (1 Tim. iv. 5). In the Holy Eucharist, however, we have a consecration quite distinct from any mere blessing of food, and in Ordination or Confirmation one quite different from any mere blessing of persons. The sacrament of Baptism is also quite distinct from the benediction of the water, which is by no means essential or always practised. The sacraments are either necessary to salvation or to the perpetuation and well-being of the Church, whereas benedictions are only accessory. Nor is the recipient of benediction necessarily a person, but it may be a place or a thing.

"The right appreciation of the Christian practice of various bene-

dictions is happily reviving among both clergy and people, and the bishop or priest who desires to exercise this function need not be at a loss for proper formula while the ancient offices are readily accessible in many printed books. Yet an Anglican Benedictional is one of our *desiderata*."

There is no instance of vast superstructure on very slender foundation more remarkable than this. Neither in the Old Testament nor in the New is there any such benediction as this hinted at. Invocation of Divine blessing we read of; and, as if to obviate perversion and abuse, the very forms are provided. The Bible has no benedictional, however.

Some of the articles are exceedingly good. A good deal of sound information is packed into those which are rather the property of an ecclesiastical than of a theological dictionary. We turn to *False Decretals*, and read:—

"This is the title commonly applied to a number of fictitious canons and canonical *dicta* contained in a collection, of which the authorship and the exact date are alike uncertain, but which was (at least partially, and for some time) received as a genuine body of canonical law. *Contents.*—The oldest edition of this collection of canons is divided into three parts, of which the *first* contains (after a preface extracted from the genuine collection of Isidore of Seville) the canons of the Apostles, followed by fifty forged briefs and decrees of the thirty earlier Popes, from Clemens, A.D. 91, to Melchiades, A.D. 313. The *second* part contains, after an introduction, the celebrated forged Donation of Constantine, more extracts from the preface to the Spanish collection, one extract from an old Gallic collection of the fifth century, and the canons of several Greek, African, Gallic, and Spanish Councils, also taken from the Spanish collection in its augmented edition, A.D. 683. The *third* part, after another extract from the Spanish preface, contains, in chronological order, the decrees of the Popes, from Sylvester, A.D. 335, to Gregory II., A.D. 731, amongst which are thirty-five forged decrees, and the canons of several doubtful councils, the genuine passages being from the Spanish and Gallic collections, and from that of Denis le Petit; many of these, however, falsified by interpolations. After the decree of Gregory II., which appears originally to have closed the manuscript, there follow (in the same handwriting) several pieces under the name of Symmachus, A.D. 498—514, notably two fictitious Roman councils; this supplement being followed by a second from the same hand. To the whole is prefixed the name of St. Isidore of Seville. The forged portions treat of dogmatical questions; of the dignity, advantages, and privileges of the Roman Church; of the prosecution of bishops and other clergy; of appeals to the Papal chair; and of the due performance of a multitude of church ceremonies."

The authorship and date of these infamous forgeries is treated in an unimpassioned style. The work was not Isidore's, by evidence internal and external. The oldest extant MS. contains Papal decrees of a date of at least 100 years subsequent to the death of Isidore. The decretals

were not even of Spanish origin. "Their locality has been fixed, with great semblance of probability, at Mayence, the place at which they appear to have been first promulgated, under the pretence that Riculphus, Bishop of Mayence, had received them from Isidore of Seville." Ample references are given to the voluminous literature on the subject, But not a word is said on the question of the complicity of the highest authorities of the time, of the influence these forgeries had on the increase of Papal power, of the extent to which they are interwoven with the entire fabric of the ecclesiastical assumptions of Rome. In other words, the bearing of these decretals on the doctrine and discipline of Christendom has not a single word expended upon it. Very different is the measure meted out, and that we suppose will be meted, to theological offences and offenders that do not come equally within the sphere of the sympathy of the compilers.

We should have been glad to extract some very good passages, but we must defer this until the remaining volume is issued. Meanwhile, we have accomplished our purpose, in showing that this is a repertory of theology, as far as may be, stripped of every Protestant and anti-Roman element.

The Gospel in the Law; A Critical Examination of the Citations from the Old Testament in the New. By Charles Taylor, M.A. Cambridge: Deighton, Bell and Co.

The title of this substantial volume is not well chosen: it does not suggest its contents, or stimulate anything like the curiosity and interest that would be excited by the promise of a new volume on the Quotations of the Old Testament in the New. A more important subject it is scarcely possible to mention. What questions of profound theological significance, as regards both the nature of inspiration and the contents of the inspired volume, does it raise! What are the general rules according to which the various quotations may be classified? What variations are permitted, and how far is the older Scripture only paraphrased in the New? What prerogative has the later organ of inspiration to vary the language of its earlier organs? How far are new Christian interpretations thrown into the cited passages? What are the distinctions observed by the various persons who quote Scripture? What are the kinds, degrees, and bearings of Messianic prediction? What is the relation of the Septuagint to the Hebrew, in this matter? How can the great anomalies that appear in this department of Biblical interpretation be solved? These are only a few of the questions that are at once elicited by the very suggestion of the subject of this volume.

It would be premature to characterise very confidently, or exactly to estimate the value of Mr. Taylor's volume. It is one that would take us more months to master than we have had it days in our hands. But we have consulted it here and there, and thoroughly studied it where we have consulted it; and have been deeply impressed with

its value. It is learned and exhaustive, and, in a remarkable degree, original. Original, we mean, in this sense: that the immense mass of matter pertaining to the subject is arranged in a manner of which we remember no parallel. Here, as well as in the title, the learned and conscientious author has done himself injustice. The table of contents presents a list of some fifteen topics, such as, "I will have mercy and not sacrifice," "The prophecy of Immanuel," "The sure mercies of David," and so on. It might be supposed that the volume would be occupied with some fifteen essays on these subjects. But it is better than this. We have the essays, but only in each case as the nucleus of a large amount of dissertation on the several quotations that revolve around these. It is refreshing to note that Mr. Taylor is one of that goodly company of students of the Old Testament who believe that *the Scripture cannot be broken.*

It has been remarked that the volume is an exhaustive one. It may not appear so at first, and, in a certain sense, it cannot lay claim to that character; there is no production of the human mind which can. But it is exhaustive in respect to its faithful and honest consideration of every question, or almost every question, that can arise. Preparing for Easter, we turned to "The Sure Mercies of David," and noted a passage that seemed to exhibit the qualities of the book in a fair example—one, also, that might be read with interest for its own sake:—

"An expression in Ps. xiv., quoted in Heb. i. 8, has given rise to much controversy, and is confessedly difficult, not from any peculiarity in the words themselves, or in their arrangement, but from the relations of the clause, in itself simple, to the context. If the original of the clause in question had occurred only as a fragment, and the remainder of the Psalm had not been preserved, there would have been no difficulty in accepting the words, *Thy throne, O God, is for ever and ever*, as a literal rendering of the passage cited; but, seeing that the original context diminishes the naturalness of the rendering, it may be well to state, first, some of the conjectures to which the passage has given rise; and, secondly, to examine the context of the citation, with a view to determining whether the argument depends upon the disputed word so exclusively as is now commonly supposed." Our space will not allow us to quote Mr. Taylor's statement, as we think, too concessive of the arguments that sustain the several hypotheses of translation. Admitting for the argument's sake, which we should be much more earnest than Mr. Taylor in refusing to do, that the direct vocative rendering, *Thy throne, O God*, were given up, it is shown well in what follows how little the passage thereby loses. We have the whole passage, Heb. i. 5-10, given with the vocative omitted. The conjectural Hebrew rendering, *Thy throne shall God establish*, has (as Mr. Taylor frankly says) nothing to support it; but, were it accepted, the argument would lose nothing, as it is embedded in that wonderful tribute to our Saviour's divinity, the first chapter of the Epistle to the Hebrews.

"The angels pass to and fro to do his bidding; the Son sits enthroned eternally. They are co-ordinated with the agencies of perishable nature; Thou art the unchanging LORD and Maker of all. The words *Thy throne is for ever*, sustain the argument, independently of the omitted parenthesis, and would seem, moreover, to appropriate the chief emphasis of the clause itself, when taken singly, and viewed without reference to the context; lastly, it may be asked,—Are not verses 13 and 14 a brief *résumé* of the argument thus expounded? To the Son—*Sit thou on My right hand;* to the angels—*Go forth and minister.* It is, doubtless, intended in Heb. i. 8 to address Christ as God; but it may be questioned, as above, whether the words, ὁ θεός, are the *characteristic* of the citation. If not, they may still, according to the common usage, have been retained, as appropriate in themselves, and in harmony with the special purpose of the citation, yet without furnishing 'a key to the interpretation of the whole Psalm.' All that could be implied by the form of address ὁ θεός, is implied unequivocally by verse 10, 'Thou Lord in the beginning,' &c. The word Lord does not, indeed, occur in the particular verse here cited, but, except as regards perspicuity, it is immaterial whether the word be expressed or understood, the significant fact being that Ps. cii. is addressed throughout to Jehovah, as the Redeemer of Israel, and is, in Heb. i. 10, transferred to Christ." This is a good instance of taking a Scriptural argument in its least exaggerated form; concession in this case, though we concede in order to meet an enemy, loses nothing.

The only fault we observe is, here and there, a want of symmetry and clearness—as, for instance, in the dissertations on Sacrifice and Covenant. Perhaps a second reading might show a more thorough and fundamental analysis than appears on a first glance. Finally, we could wish that every passage were quoted in Hebrew and Septuagint Greek, especially as such Hebrew and Greek type are used. It is a positive joy to look at the rich, massy, Hebrew letters, enriching the page here and there, after being wearied with the scanty type that has lately come into vogue. The Indexes are all that could be desired.

For ourselves, we intend to study this volume carefully, and recommend our theological readers to do the same.

A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Acts of the Apostles. By Paton J. Gloag, D.D. Two Vols. Edinburgh: Clark.

PERHAPS no book of the New Testament more needed an English monograph than the Acts. Dr. Gloag has given us one which goes very far towards realising all that could be desired in a text-book. He has taken the latest and best Greek text; has studied the whole round of foreign and English commentators; has marked out a clear and definite aim, avoiding the snare of making his commentary a vehicle

of dogmatic or practical theology; has taken some years of honest, conscientious, scholarly labour; and the result is a very admirable work. It does not altogether escape the common error, that of incorporating with his own thoughtful judgments an examination of the endless variations of opinion among other exegetes: this, however, we should not have alluded to had not some very ridiculous German speculations been dignified by his notice here and there. The new translation sometimes seems a failure; but then it is not *de fide*, and the student may improve on it if he can.

The volumes have just reached our hands, and we must speak cautiously. Suffice that a very careful reading of St. Stephen's speech—the crux of the Acts—convinces us that we have in Dr. Gloag's work a good text-book for the study of the Greek text of the Acts. It has not the prolixity and heaviness of Baumgarten, nor his one-sided Judaising; it has not the confusion of critical, dogmatic, and homiletic matter which mars Lange and some other recent German works; it is a concise, scholarly, and complete commentary, adapted pre-eminently for service in the ministerial study of that book which unites in itself almost all the elements of the New Testament revelation.

A Course of Lectures delivered to Candidates for Holy Orders: comprising a Summary of the whole System of Theology, Natural and Revealed. By John Randolph, D.D. Three Vols. Rivingtons.

This work is now complete. It justifies all that we said on announcing the first volume. Subject to two deductions—that the lectures were prepared for the last century, and that they are expressly designed for candidates for the ministry of the Church of England,—they are very excellent. Their style is good, and their ability in the condensation of much matter into small compass remarkable. Moreover, they are eminently Protestant, and true to the principles that are now-a-days contested and endangered. The present volume contains the conclusion of the doctrinal course, the doctrine of the sacraments—where transubstantiation is thoroughly well discussed—controversial theology, and those manifold topics connected with the Liturgy that require the attention of the candidate for episcopal ordination, and would repay the attention of any other theological student. On the whole, we think these three volumes a valuable addition to our theological literature, and wonder that they have been so slow in coming to the light.

Belief: What is It? or, The Nature of Faith as Determined by the Facts of Human Nature and Sacred History. William Blackwood and Sons. 1869.

It is the weight and merit of this volume which has prevented our noticing it earlier, and which now makes it impossible for us to do

justice to it. It deserves an article, for it is full of knowledge and of thought; it is equally able and devout. It will form a worthy companion volume to the works of Bishop O'Brien and of Vinet on the same great theme.

Prophecy: A Preparation for Christ. The Bampton Lectures for 1869. By R. Payne Smith, D.D., Regius Professor of Divinity and Canon of Christ Church, Oxford. London: Macmillan and Co. 1869.

We could wish that Dr. Smith's style were more perfect, more polished, and pointed, and impressive, but hardly that his matter were sounder or more excellent. The thoroughness of his learning is as remarkable as his entire freedom from pedantry or ambition. He might be a rustic scholar, learned, but quite unconscious of his learning. His views in respect to the prophetic office, its history and development, and the scope and substance of Old Testament prophecy are very instructive. His analysis of the hypotheses set up by Continental disintegrators of Isaiah is very searching and effective. His notes and many incidental remarks are full of suggestive information, archæological, historical, and exegetical, in regard to difficult passages in the ancient Scriptures. Every student of the Bible ought to have this volume on his shelves.

Commentary on the Gospel according to Matthew. By James Morison, D.D. Hamilton, Adams, and Co.

This is, on the whole, the most wise, exhaustive, and serviceable commentary on St. Matthew's Gospel which we have yet seen. Its most obvious fault is an occasional diffusiveness of style, evidently attributable to an over-anxiety to be clear and definite; we think, also, that in some instances a meaning is given to the text which it does not naturally bear. But as an example of earnestness of purpose to represent the true meaning of the sacred writer, and of the consecration to this task of uncommon natural ability, great powers of patient, painstaking and discriminative thought, and of exact and multifarious learning, the work is one of surpassing excellence. We give it the more cordial welcome, moreover, as eminently a book for the times. We have always held that the best safeguard against the distractions of modern speculations in matters of revealed truth, is a thorough and accurate knowledge of the very words of Scripture; and we believe that a young student of divinity who has mastered such a book as this, has taken the most effectual method of arming himself against the assaults of Rationalism, whether in the form of the bold destructive criticism of Strauss, the brilliant superciliousness of Renan, or, we may add, the more temperate, yet scarcely less gratuitous and misleading philosophical subtleties of Schenkel.

In a few matters of minor importance Dr. Morison has, we think, unnecessarily exposed himself to the charge of theorising on in-

sufficient data. Among the interesting topics which he has discussed in the Introduction, is the difficult yet comparatively unimportant question, Whether "our present Greek Gospel is a mere translation from a preceding Hebrew Gospel, or an original work"? This inquiry the learned commentator pursues at great length and with characteristic deliberateness and precision. We doubt, however, whether in one particular his argument is not more ingenious than sound and convincing. That St. Matthew "did write something in Hebrew for the Hebrews," Dr. Morison accepts "as an incontrovertible historical fact;" but he holds that "there is the best of reasons for supposing that this was a mere preliminary collection of the Saviour's Divine sayings, which he afterwards incorporated in his Gospel proper, his memoirs of our Saviour's birth, life, death, and resurrection." Now what is this "*best of reasons*"? It is the single testimony of Papias in a fragment which Eusebius has preserved of some lost work, to the effect that he had heard John the Presbyter say that "Matthew composed the declarations," discourses, or as Dr. Morison translates the term (τὰ λόγια) *the Oracles*, "in the Hebrew dialect." But is Dr. Morison sure that nothing more was comprehended under this term than the bare discourses of Christ? And does not the assumption of this as the meaning increase a well-known difficulty in regard to the numerous quotations from the Old Testament which are contained in St. Matthew's Gospel? These quotations are, as Biblical scholars are well aware, of two kinds; those introduced into the narrative portion of the Gospel being taken from the Hebrew, and those in the discourses of Our Lord from the version of the LXX. Is it, then, conceivable that if the sayings of Christ had been published by St. Matthew, in the first instance, as a separate work in Hebrew or Aramaic, he would, when he incorporated them in his Gospel, have given the citations from the Old Testament which they contained in the very words of the Septuagint, especially considering that "the Apostle would be at home, in his own unclassical way, in both the languages in which he wrote"? We regret that any theory should have been raised on so slender a foundation, though agreeing with Dr. Morison in his general conclusion that "there is not the shadow of a reason why we should doubt that Matthew himself composed our present Greek Gospel."

We commend this commentary as especially suggestive to ministers and students of theology.

The Sabbath and the Sabbath Law before and after Christ. By J. H. Rigg, D.D. London: Longmans. 1869. Pp. 53.

In the preface to this seasonable tractate Dr. Rigg says that he had "always felt there were two points which, by writers maintaining the sanctity of the Sabbath, had been left inconveniently obscure. Of these, one was the actual nature of the Sabbath observance which

prevailed among the Israelites under the Old Testament. The other was the period of transition between the Resurrection of Our Lord and the general spread of Christianity after the destruction of the Jewish Commonwealth." Accordingly, he has "endeavoured to bring both these points of inquiry into clear light, and to show their bearing on the argument."

In the first of his three chapters he states "the various views held by Christians" upon the question. Having described the Sunday obtaining in Romanist countries upon the theory "that the first day of the week is to be celebrated and kept holy as the Lord's Day, and in commemoration of His resurrection, because the Church, which 'has authority' in matters of faith and worship, has so decreed and required," he adds:—

"Such an ecclesiastical Sabbath may be sanctioned and guarded by the authority of the Church; but it may be questioned whether it is worth guarding. It is a Sabbath without rest, a Sabbath without authority in Scripture, a Sabbath without a Sabbath-law. Cut off from the primæval institute; resting on no higher authority than that of an ecclesiastical arrangement; denuded of all the historic grandeur and sanctity which belong to the moral law; able to claim no connection with the Christian lawgiver's word, 'the Sabbath was made for man,' standing in no organic relation to the family or family-life; there is left to it no Divinity or grace. There waits upon it no power from on high; neither has it any charm to win and hold the human heart. No Grahame could draw inspiration for his verse from such a Sabbath as this; nor could any such strains of exquisite feeling as those in which even Burns, the gifted but the reckless and misguided, has paid his tribute to the beauty and blessedness of the preparation for the Sabbath, have been suggested to any poet, however richly endowed, in a country where the Sunday is but an ecclesiastical festival."—P. 9.

In the second chapter, entitled, "The Old Testament Sabbath in Theory and in Practice," it is argued that the Fourth Commandment, like the rest of the Decalogue, embodies a *principle of morality*, adapted in its expression to the actual condition of the people of Israel. The manner in which this view is elaborated may be indicated, in part, by the following extracts:—

"The day is emphatically and solemnly claimed as sacred to God, and as commemorative of the Creator's glory and the serene providential supremacy of the Most High. As such it is a day to be remembered and kept holy. This is a moral injunction, essentially and exclusively such. . . .

"The three elements of Sabbath blessing are bodily and mental rest, family union and fellowship, and religious meditation and worship, including the highest moral culture and spiritual satisfaction. These elements must vary in their degree and character, their mutual proportions, their respective developments, according to differences in nations and individuals, and according to the different stages of

national and religious culture and development; but all three are essential. . . . It is manifest that the Sabbath is a priceless boon equally to the youth, the active man of business, and the aged matron, but that it must bear a different aspect to each of them. So again, to the Jew of the Pentateuch and to the Jew of the Maccabean age, the different elements of the day's blessing must have been differently proportioned and compounded; while, supposing the Sabbath law to be still virtually in force, to be in spirit still binding, it must be evident that the elements of the Sabbath refreshment and the aspects of Sabbath observance must have been very different in the unlettered Middle Ages, when there was neither a Bible for the people nor skill to read it, from what they are, or ought to be, in England at the present day; while the celebration in England at this day, again, could not but differ, at the least, as widely from the Jewish observance, especially before the times of the Captivity, as from that of the Middle Ages."

From the third chapter, on *The Christian Sabbath*, we may quote the following, as an example in which the latter of the two topics to be elucidated is handled by the writer:—

"In this, as in other things, the Jewish Christian occupied, of necessity, a territory of transition. The dilemma which I have been endeavouring to resolve does not apply to the case of the Sabbath only: the sacrifices, the Temple services, the Passover, circumcision, all are instances of a similar difficulty. The Jewish Christian kept the Passover, and yet he celebrated continually the Eucharist, which was destined and intended to supersede it. His children were circumcised and also baptised. He took part in the Temple sacrifices, and yet he knew that the sacrificial institute had found its fulfilment in the death of Christ, and he soon learnt that was in a few years to pass away. All these rites, the Sabbath included, *i.e.* as a seventh-day Sabbath, were among the number of those which were 'decaying and waxing old,' and which, as we are taught in the Epistle to the Hebrews, were accordingly 'ready to vanish away.' All, notwithstanding, were observed by the Jews, at least of Palestine, so long as the Temple stood. . . . In the meantime, there were doubtless Jewish Christians out of Palestine, who, before the destruction of the Jewish Commonwealth, learnt, in the spirit of St. Paul, to understand that the glory had passed from the Jewish seventh day, and had settled on the Christian first day; as, on the contrary, there were Gentile converts and converted Jewish proselytes who, out of respect for the Jewish law and the letter of the Old Testament, not only celebrated the Lord's Day after a Christian sort, but strictly kept the Jewish Sabbath. In regard to all such, the great Apostle of liberty and of tolerance taught, in his large-hearted way, that he that regardeth the day regardeth it unto the Lord; and he that regardeth not the day, to the Lord he doth not regard it." (Rom. xvi. 6.)

III.—MISCELLANEOUS.

Primæval Man. An Examination of some Recent Speculations. By the Duke of Argyll. London: Strahan and Co. 1869.

We are late in our notice of this able little work—originally a series of papers in *Good Words*, which attracted much attention while in course of publishing. The work is not gone down the stream, however. Indeed, it will always hold a place of honour in the history of the contemporary controversy which called it forth. It is a contribution to the argument touching the origin, antiquity, and primal condition of man, and is designed to serve the double purpose of defining the position which Christian wisdom and candour ought to take in the argument, and to lay under arrest of science the unscientific heedlessness and impetuosity with which it has been handled by certain writers, who, if they do not reject, at least are not concerned to disguise their entire independence of the testimony of Scripture on the questions involved in it. His Grace calls attention to the fact—a fact not seldom overlooked or ignored—that the inquiry as to man's beginning in the earth resolves itself into several distinct branches. The problem of his origin, that is to say, of "the method of his creation or introduction into the world," is quite different from that of his antiquity, or "the time in the geological history and preparation of the globe at which this creation or introduction took place." Whether the species man originally came of a single pair or of a hundred pairs, and whether by development from antecedent types of being, or by direct production through the Divine fiat, is one question. Whether this occurred seven thousand or seventy millions of years ago, is another. So again, as both these questions are independent of the question of man's primæval condition, we must distinguish the differences which lie within the limits of this last inquiry. Elements physical, intellectual, and moral, all enter into it, and they must not be jumbled and confounded. The antithesis of what is commonly known as "civilisation" is not necessarily a brutish intellect, still less is it a low *morale*, or a Pagan unacquainted with God, and with the obligations and blessings of religion. So far as we know, the Duke of Argyll has been the first to draw these logical lines across the subject of his volume; and he has laid the friends of Christianity and of science alike under obligation by doing so. We say logical lines, because nothing is stated dogmatically. There is not a touch of dogmatism throughout the work. Every main point is fairly and, as we think, conclusively argued; and if the illustration is not profuse, it is always apposite and adequate. On the question of the origin of man as a species, his Grace combats with much force and acuteness those various "theories of development, of which Mr. Darwin's hypothesis is only

the latest form." The "origin and genesis" of these theories he traces to the difficulty which man finds in conceiving of creation other than by birth. "Creation by birth is the only kind of creation he has ever seen; and from this kind of creation he has never seen a new species come." What more natural, then, than that those who have any hope of solving this question should take that supposition which seems the readiest—the supposition, namely, "that the agency by which new species are created is the same agency by which new individuals are born?" The Duke does not regard the development doctrine as, "in itself, inconsistent with the Theistic argument, or with belief in the ultimate agency and directing power of a creative mind." The objections to it are scientific. In the first place, it "ascribes to known causes unknown effects," and this alike in view of the past and of the present. Geologically, the *tertium quid* is wanting between the monkey and the man. And, as to the present, "organisms are known to reproduce life; but always life which is like their own." In the next place, the doctrine "involves difficulties of conception which are quite as great as those which it professes to remove," and so "is not entitled even to provisional acceptance." "In proportion as the difference between man and the lower animals is properly appreciated in the light of nature"—in other words, in proportion as the correlation which nature has established between the anatomical and physiological peculiarities of man, on the one hand, and his mental endowments on the other, are duly estimated—in the same proportion will the difficulty increase of conceiving how the chasm could be passed by any process of transmutation or development. Indeed, the smaller the physical difference between the gorilla and man, the heavier the pressure under which the development theory lies of accounting for the "immeasurable, practically infinite" gulf—to use the language of Professor Huxley—which sunders them in point of mind. Moreover, it is very observable that "the direction in which the human frame diverges from the structure of the brutes" is one of "greater physical helplessness and weakness. That is to say, it is a divergence which, of all others, it is most impossible to ascribe to mere *Natural Selection*." "Man must have had human proportions of mind before he could afford to lose bestial proportions of body." And where does the development theory obtain these? To crown all, his Grace argues, "Such as man now is, man, so far we yet know, has been from the beginning, the geological evidence, so far as it goes at present, being all on the side of the originality of man as a species—nay, even as a class by himself, separated by a gulf practically immeasurable from all the creatures that are, or that are known ever to have been, his contemporaries in the world."

On the question of the antiquity of the human race, the Duke of Argyll collects and weighs the respective testimonies of history, archæology, language, ethnology, and geology; and proceeding upon a purely scientific basis of argument, he contends that they

all favour the hypothesis of a much higher date for the birth of man than that which our common chronology assigns to it. And he is disposed, as a believer in the Bible, to welcome this conclusion, because while it is quite possible that our view of the early Scripture chronology may be in error, the theory which fixes a remote beginning in time for the human family, helps materially to establish the doctrine of its unity—a doctrine, which, as he well says, "is not easily separated from some principles which are of high value in an understanding both of moral duty and of religious truth." Had his Grace been addressing an audience made up of believers in miracle, he would probably have reminded them that the evidence of his scientific witnesses must be received subject to the possible action of causes of which science, in the nature of things, can take no cognisance. And, as it is, we could almost wish that the attention of those who still hold that the God of the Bible is the God of the Universe had been called to this important limitation. It can hardly be doubted, for example, that the Bible discredits the theory of a simply natural development of language. Originally language was one. Here Scripture and science agree. The original unity—so the Book of Genesis seems very plainly to teach—was broken by a miracle. Now Science is at a standstill; and if she does not take up arms against Scripture, she must either show that the miracle was not a miracle, or she must grant that her inductions as a whole, within the realm of language, are liable to such modifications as this and other conceivable cases of miraculous intervention may demand. And if it be so with language, why not with ethnology and geology also? One thing is certain, the Bible distinctly represents the historical development of man to have been again and again crossed by a miracle. And Christian science, at least, is bound to pursue its inquiries into such a question as that of the antiquity of man—and indeed all its inquiries—with the distinct understanding that its conclusions are valid only if no miracle has come in.

The last section of the Duke's volume is of great value. It is an incisive polemic against the savage theory of man's original condition in the world. Sir J. Lubbock, and a crowd of modern writers on this subject, assume that that condition was one of barbarism. His Grace demands of them what they mean by barbarism. No doubt primæval man was ignorant of much which enters essentially into our idea of civilisation. But it does not follow that he was a barbarian. Actual knowledge is one thing; capacity of knowledge is another. Intellectually and morally man, from the first, may have been as truly man as at any later period of his history. Indeed, "if man has himself invented all he now knows," as the savage theory itself teaches, "then the very earliest inventions of our race must have been the most wonderful of all, and the richest in the fruits they bore. The men who first discovered the use of fire, and the use of those grasses which we now know under the name of corn, were discoverers compared with whom, as regards the value

of their ideas to the world, Faraday and Wheatstone are but the inventors of ingenious toys." The traces of barbarism which are found among civilised men in our own day are no more proof that mankind was originally barbarous, than "the traces of feudalism in the laws of modern Europe prove that feudal principles were born with the human race. All such customs may have been .... probably have been not primæval but mediæval, that is to say, the result of time and of development, and that development a development of corruption." Again, the geographical position of the typically savage peoples of the earth, such as the Bushmans, the Patagonians, the Australians, and others, is, of itself, a strong presumption that their state is one of degradation. Plainly, they have been driven to the world's ends by the pressure of population, war, and other external causes, and with no reason can their condition be held to represent the original condition of the human race. And with respect to morals and religion, so far from its being inconceivable that men should grow corrupt with the progress of the ages, there is no one fact more emphatically taught by human history, experience, and consciousness than the fact of a mysterious but powerful tendency in man to religious and moral debasement. This is not a complete scheme of the Duke's argument; but it may serve to show the drift of a course of reasoning, which, at some points, wholly cuts away the ground from under the doctrine of man's original savageism, and where it does not do this, reduces it, to say the least, to the dimensions of an absurdly low probability. We trust his Grace may find opportunity hereafter to work out this section of his volume in greater detail; for it is to be feared there is a large and increasing body of quasi-scientific men, with whom it seems past all comprehension that a being who has never smelted iron or driven a plough can be other than a Pagan and a brute. We have not referred in the foregoing notice to the admirable chapter with which the Duke of Argyll introduces his work to his readers. In one part of this chapter he discusses the question of the legitimacy of inquiries such as those which he here institutes: and his remarks are at once so forcible in themselves, and so well worth the hearing both of the friends and the enemies of Divine revelation, that we cannot forbear transferring a passage or two to our pages. "The result is," he says, "that we should never be jealous of research, but always jealous of presumption—that on all subjects Reason should be warned to keep within the limits of her powers; but from none should Reason be warned away. Men who denounce any particular field of thought are always to be suspected. The presumption is, that valuable things which these men do not like are to be found there. There are many kinds of priestcraft. The same arts and the same delusions have been practised in many interests. . . . Constantly and habitually, men are now warned from many branches of inquiry, both physical and psychological, in the interests—real enough—of the Positive philosophy! '*Whatever*,' says Mr. Lewes, '*is inac-*

cessible to reason, should be strictly interdicted to research.' Here we have the true ring of the old sacerdotal interdicts. Who is to define, beforehand, what is, and what is not, inaccessible to reason? . . . In the highest interests of truth, we must resist any and every interdict against research. The strong presumption is, that every philosophy which assumes to issue such an interdict, must have reason to fear inquiry. On these principles it may be affirmed, generally, that all subjects are legitimate subjects of reasoning in proportion as they are accessible to research; and that the degree in which any given subject is accessible to research cannot be known until research has been attempted." Young men and old would do wisely to read this ably-reasoned and eloquent volume. It is the product of a highly-gifted mind, rich in the manifold culture of the age we live in, and moving freely in that lofty region of Christian thought, which men of little philosophies and little religions only see through a glass darkly.

History of England, from the Fall of Wolsey to the Defeat of the Spanish Armada. By James Anthony Froude, M.A., late Fellow of Exeter College, Oxford. Vols. XI. and XII. (Reign of Elizabeth. Vols. V. and VI.) London: Longmans and Co. 1870.

Mr. Froude stays his hand. He will pursue the history no further, at least, as a consecutive historian. He has brought the great story to its crisis, and now he leaves it. The Spanish Armada settled the English dynastic questions, and brought international difficulties and dangers, as affecting England, to an end. To have pursued the history after the ruin of the Armada to the close of the Queen's reign, would have been to eke out a chronicle with materials of far less exciting interest, and far less commanding importance; it would have been to append to a grand drama an epilogue of prolix and prosaic management and manœuvring. The last years of Elizabeth's reign would not afford a finale worthy of the powers of a great artist like Mr. Froude. Nothing, indeed, can be more melancholy than Elizabeth's latest years of administration, nothing more pitiful than the dark and chill solitude in which the old, faded, worn-out Queen, without lover or friend, slowly collapsed into stone-cold apathy and death. The close of Elizabeth's reign belongs rather to the period which followed, than to the era which preceded it. If Mr. Froude should ever undertake to write the history of England from the defeat of the Armada to the fall of James II., that is, the history of the Stuarts in England—and we heartily wish he would, no one could do the work so well—then the latter part of Elizabeth's reign would come in as introductory to the Stuart rule. As it is, we hardly wonder that he has declined the heavy task of pursuing the history further.

Mr. Froude has, in our judgment, greatly improved as an historian since he began his work. Infected, like so many more, with a certain

touch of Carlyleism, he must have a hero for his history, and Henry VIII. must be rehabilitated. There was a want of subtle truth and insight in his rendering of the character of Henry, as there had been in Carlyle's depiction of his great English hero, Cromwell. For Carlyle's one-sidedness and exaggeration, however, there was far more excuse than for Froude's. Mr. Froude's delineation of Henry will assuredly never be accepted by posterity. No doubt he has corrected many serious errors in the prevailing estimate of the acts and history, not only of Henry, but of some of his queens, and of a number of great personages. But he has not sufficiently understood the inconsistencies which belong even to strong characters, the mixture and contrariety of qualities in the same person, the nature of the struggle between old good habits or qualities and potent new passions, selfish passions, it may be utterly bad and vicious passions, nor the manner in which, in the course of such a struggle, the beset and vanquished conscience mystifies and deludes itself; neither has he understood how in Tudor, no less than in later and Stuart times, the guilty compliances of subjects, however highly placed, with the demands of sovereign power, were glossed over as necessary and right, and even Christian. Hence his estimate of the acts and his history of the reign of Henry are often at fault.

But as Mr. Froude pursued his task he of necessity gained experience as to all such points as we have noted, and there was a progressive improvement from reign to reign. His portraiture of Elizabeth, and his history of her reign, appear to be the best work that he has done. A critic in the *Times*, indeed, has stigmatised the historian for his partiality to Elizabeth, and his partisan unfairness to Mary Stuart. But then, in the same newspaper of late, the writings of the Rev. J. H. Blunt, in reference to the reign of Henry VIII. and the English Reformation, have been absolutely eulogised, praised without stint and without discrimination. We should not be surprised if the same critic who praised Blunt had obtained and used the opportunity of stigmatising Froude. It is almost a sufficient answer to say that in some other journals Mr. Froude has been found fault with for his severity against Elizabeth. We, for our part, accept his delineation of the character and history of the Queen as not only very able but as impartial, as by far the best, truest, and most searching that we know. We must say that Mr. Froude's portrait of "the Great Queen" is by no means flattering. But it is not on that account the less faithful.

Mr. Froude paints on a broad expanse of canvas. Perhaps his history may be too detailed. His details, however, are all highly interesting and instructive, and none are more valuable, especially at the present time, than those which relate to Ireland.

His view of the ecclesiastical history and policy of Elizabeth's reign is pre-eminently instructive, and bears directly on present controversies. That critics who admire such ultra-High Church writers as Mr. Blunt, and who have no sympathy with the Reformation, should dislike Mr. Froude's history, is only natural. But that is only the more reason

why free, Protestant Englishmen should rightly value such work as Mr. Froude's. Of the style, the noble power of terse and vivid word-painting, the admirable English writing of Mr. Froude, so simple, unaffected, scholarly, and strong, without ruggedness and without over-daintiness, we have no need to speak.

Ecclesiastical History. The Church of the Restoration. By John Stoughton, D.D. In Two Vols. London: Hodder and Stoughton. 1870.

Dr. Stoughton published about three years ago two volumes of Ecclesiastical History, in which the Church of the Commonwealth was his subject. Of these volumes we spoke at the time they were published, recognising their high merits. The present instalment is not of inferior quality. The dispassionateness, the fairness, the diligent research, the comprehensive plan of the history are no less admirable in these volumes than in those which preceded them. Without exception Dr. Stoughton's is the most candid and equitable history of the ecclesiastical controversies involved in the period he reviews which has ever been written; it must, also, we think, be admitted to be, on the whole, the most accurate, penetrating, and comprehensive. Of course the party histories, on each side, of the period, or of portions of the period, are fuller in many details than Dr. Stoughton's story can be, and are much more crowded with figures and actors. Dr. Stoughton's history begins with the proclamation of Richard Cromwell in succession to his father, and ends with the acquittal of the Seven Bishops. It includes intelligent summaries of all of most importance relating to the doctrinal views, the ecclesiastical discipline and development, and the family and Church-life of the times. The severe beauty of the Puritan life, at its best, is well set forth; perhaps justice is hardly done to the devotional life of the best of the Anglicans, such as Jeremy Taylor and Bishop Hall. Justice, however, is done to John Evelyn and Margaret Godolphin.

History of the Church in the Eighteenth and Nineteenth Centuries. By K. R. Hagenbach, D.D., Professor of Theology in the University of Basle. Translated from the last German Edition, with Additions. By the Rev. J. F. Hurst, D.D., in Two Volumes. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1870.

It is impossible in a notice for this department of our Review to pretend to give even a summary of the scope and contents of this most interesting and valuable history. Let us say, however, that it comprehends all Protestant Europe in its range, with some view also of the history of the Roman Catholic Church. As to Germany, it is minute, animated, comprehensive, and thorough; it exhibits the influence of literature and philosophy on theology, and brings its survey down to almost the present time. Some of the notices of English matters, in

particular of Methodism, are, as might be expected, more or less incorrect; but, on the whole, the accuracy as well as the extent of the historian's knowledge is remarkable. The translation is excellent. Messrs. Hodder and Stoughton have shown their characteristic enterprise and judgment in the publication of this English translation of so important a work.

Religious Thought in England. From the Reformation to the End of Last Century. A Contribution to the History of Theology. By the Rev. John Hunt, M.A., Author of "An Essay on Pantheism." Volume I. Strahan and Co. London: 1870.

This volume covers, for its subject, nearly the same area of space and time as Dr. Stoughton's four volumes of Ecclesiastical History; but this history is strictly confined to the intellectual and doctrinal development of religious opinion in England. The Reformers; the Elizabethan divines of both the Anglican and Puritan parties, including in this section a full notice of the Marprelate series of tracts; the divines of the earlier Stuart time, both Prelatist and anti-Prelatist, with the Hampton Court Conference; the Sabbath and tithe, the Arminian and Calvinist and the transubstantiation controversies; the Commonwealth theology and polemics, including notices of the Westminster Assembly and its divines, the Baptists and their uprising into note, the Untolerated Sects, including, besides the Quakers, the Family of Love, the Muggletonians, and others, the Independents, and a special study of Richard Baxter; the divines and controversies of the Restoration Period, from the Savoy Conference onwards, with a very extended study of Jeremy Taylor, among others and beyond others, and of Liberty of Conscience Literature, and notices also of Sir Thomas Browne and Sir Matthew Hale; a chapter on Rational Theologians (Hales and Chillingworth), on Hobbes, the Cambridge Platonists, and Lord Herbert of Cherbury. Such is, loosely stated, the scope and sum of this volume. Mr. Hunt is a very able thinker and critic, commands a terse and very serviceable style for his matter and purpose, is a laborious and conscientious reader and historian, and has accordingly produced a book of great value. His former work, though perhaps a little too confident, and almost supercilious in tone, is one of real merit; and his reputation will be enhanced by the present instalment of the important history which he has undertaken to write.

Science and the Gospel; or, The Church and the Nations. A Series of Essays on Great Catholic Questions. London: Macmillan and Co., and Anglican and International Christian Moral Science Association. 1870.

This is a volume consisting of four prize essays, for each of which the sum of fifty pounds was awarded by the council of the "Anglican and International Christian Moral Science Association," of which

association the volume is designed to be the basis and symbol. The essays respond severally to the questions, What is the Visible Church of Christ? What is the Unity of the Visible Church of Christ? What is the Science of Christian Morals? and What is National Religion? They are unequal in character; and we should hardly subscribe to the assertion of the preface, that "the adjudicators are a perfect guarantee for the impartial, scholarlike, and efficient treatment of the all-important questions which are discussed in the volume," for we presume the prizes would be awarded to the best essays sent in. Of the first and third essays, however, it may be affirmed they answer to this description. They embrace the two topics opening the widest field of inquiry—the Visible Church and Christian ethics.

The first, after an introduction written in a beautiful spirit, treats of the relation of form and matter in the Apostolic Church; the life and essence of the Church; the conditions of Church life; the Church as a world-community, such as she existed in the New Testament times; particular churches in relation to the Universal Church; the officers of the Apostolic Church and the Millennial Church. It is well and thoughtfully written; some of the topics we should like to see expanded, as they are here necessarily compressed, the whole extending only to one hundred and forty pages.

The second essay deals with the principles of Church union under the Old Testament dispensation; the relation of the Mosaic to the Christian economy, as regards the principles of their ecclesiastical constitution; principles of the government and rites of the New Testament Church, as expounded by Christ and His Apostles; the doctrinal basis of Christian Church union; visible Church union in action, and the Church of the future.

On a central subject, and as an example of the spirit and manner of this essay, we give the following, on the doctrinal basis of Church union. "However necessary creeds may be, then, to give definiteness to the teaching and provide against the introduction of error in any religious body, it will be seen at once that no creed of any of the Evangelical churches in Britain is so comprehensive, and so free from non-essential doctrines, as to be accepted by the other as a basis of visible Church union. For, while all contain more or less of the great doctrines of Scripture, there is not one of them but contains much more than is essential to salvation, and it is precisely about these minor doctrines that the various churches differ; while one regards infant baptism and baptism by sprinkling as Scriptural and proper, another rejects both and upholds the baptism of adults by immersion. Yet who will say that either one or the other is absolutely essential to salvation? While one holds it the duty of the civil magistrate 'to take order that unity and peace be preserved in the Church, that the truth of God be kept pure and entire, that all blasphemies and heresies be suppressed, all corruptions and abuses in worship and discipline prevented or reformed, and all the ordi-

nances of God duly settled, administered, and observed;' another denies the right of the civil magistrate to interfere in any way; but is there any one who will maintain that either the one view or the other is essential to salvation? While one holds as sanctioned and authorised by Scripture the three orders of clergy, others see in it authority for only one or two; while one holds as a matter of faith the lawfulness of an oath in a court of justice, another denies it; but who would stake his salvation on any such subordinate matter of Christian practice? Now from the very fact that so many of these non-essential, yet doubtless very important, doctrines being bound up in our creeds with those which are essential to salvation, we should find it impossible for all the Christian churches to accept the creed of any one of them as a basis of union, so as to unite them all under one external organisation. We must, therefore, look beyond any modern church creed for the basis of that Christian unity in behalf of which we are earnestly contending; ascend, indeed, much nearer the fountain-head of Christianity, to a time when there was not yet any division of the Christian Church into various sects, all holding the same fundamental truths; when the whole Church acknowledged and subscribed to one system of revealed truth. It is possible we may find here such a digest of Christian doctrine, such a creed containing the vital truths of Christianity and nothing more, as all the churches which are to compose this Christian congress shall be willing to subscribe to. If such a religious confession, embodying the saving doctrines of the Christian faith, and these only, can be found, to which all the members could adhere, then their common belief would be known to the world, and would stand out as a witness to their soundness in the faith, while all minor differences in reference to Church government, the administration of ordinances and the like, would be merged in one great Christian purpose." For the purpose the author names the Constantinopolitan, generally called the Nicene Creed. To this, however, he would add the Augustinian doctrine of free grace, and the Lutheran of faith as the means of appropriating the justifying righteousness of Christ. There are some practical advices in this essay, which might be acted upon at once by individual churches with great advantage.

The subject of the third essay, the essay of the book, is dealt with in a truly scientific spirit, and as exhaustively as the limits of space would permit. It is a valuable manual of Christian ethics.

The last is for the purposes of the Association the practical subject. From it we learn that, in the projected association, it is not proposed that uniformity in literal symbol, in ritual, or in organisation be sought. Nor is it required that the churches become amalgamated. "It is their recognition of each other as true churches of Christ; the mutual recognition of their members as Catholic fellow-Churchmen; and the union in the Christian Moral Science Association for common prayer, counsel, and work, under the guidance of the united wisdom, and with the aid of the combined resources of all the Evangelical churches."

The association "seeks *to create* and cultivate, develop and *apply* to mankind a *true moral science*, the science of Christian morals. In pursuing this object it seeks to *rouse and quicken the public conscience*, to inform, to elevate, and to guide it, not only in this country, but in other Protestant nations, in all matters affecting their moral and religious welfare. It holds that 'all Christians are in common responsible to their common Lord and Saviour for the recovery and elevation of the fallen masses of our great towns and cities. But the recognition of such common responsibility, and the Catholic combination of Christians of every name in this enterprise, is the special function of the association, and the work to be achieved will present a vast field for its labour.' The character of the association, whose basis is represented by this volume, does not come within the scope of our criticism; but if its future activities correspond to its first work, we may certainly augur a career of usefulness for it. The object contemplated by the association as variously stated and illustrated in this volume, is the promotion of the unity and usefulness of the churches of Christ, as the Divine institution for the salvation of the nations of the world. The association will do well to leave this volume to explain to the world this object. The value of an association, however, is to be estimated not by its programme, but by its work. If once there was need of a society for the reformation of manners, there is surely need now for a society, an associated effort to promote morals and unity of the churches in the Christian spirit. As the best service we can render the effort, we cordially recommend to our readers a careful perusal of *Science and the Gospel.*

Systems of Land Tenure in various Countries: a Series of Essays published under the Sanction of the Cobden Club. Macmillan and Co. 1870.

This is *the* book on the important subject to which it relates, full, condensed, exact, and recent. The essayists are Judge Longfield, who deals with Ireland; Mr. Wren Hoskyns, whose subject is the Land Laws of England; Mr. Campbell, late Chief Commissioner of the Central Provinces of India, who writes on the perplexed questions relating to the Tenure of Land in India; M. Emile de Lavelege, who treats of the Land System of Belgium and Holland; Mr. R. B. D. Morier, C.B., who writes on the Agrarian Legislation of Prussia during the Present Century; Mr. Cliffe Leslie, whose subject is the Land System of France; Dr. Julius Faucher, who explains the Russian Agrarian Legislation of 1861; and Mr. C. M. Fisher, an American barrister, who writes on the Farm, Land, and Land Laws of the United States.

Many years ago we opened up several of the questions treated in this volume, and some of the principles which stand in relation to them, in an article on "The Causes and Cure of Pauperism in England." Much more lately our accomplished writer in this Journal, now

alas! no more (the late Mr. Monsell, of Neufchatel), in an admirable article on the land question in Ireland, laid down views which have been in their general outline and scope freely borne out by the inquiries and reports in regard to Ireland of which we have heard so much in the newspapers. Positions which have been maintained in this Review for a dozen years past, but which the *Times* and superficially cultivated England in general misrepresented, denied, and denounced until of late, are now generally accepted, and are made the basis of legislation. There is much more, however, to be learnt yet. Mr. Gladstone's Bill will put matters right as between landlords and tenants; but the Irish farm labourer may be even worse off hereafter than heretofore. The Irish Land Bill at least will not do anything clear or definite towards the bettering of his condition, while it will probably widen the gulf between the farmer and himself. Perhaps, indeed, Mr. Bright's special item on the Government measure may afford some little help in the matter, but this is very doubtful. The truth undoubtedly is that there are depths in the land question both as relates to England and Ireland, which have not yet been bottomed. Further legislation will be needed for both countries with a view to reach and meet the case of the labourer on the land, after the case of the tenement farmer has been provided for. All who wish to fathom the principles involved in the whole question of landowning and occupancy will not fail to obtain the present volume, full as it is of science and knowledge, the fruit of trained ability and experienced judgment. The volume is worthy of the statesman's name which is inscribed upon its title-page.

The State, the Poor, and the Country; including Suggestions on the Irish Question. By R. H. Patterson, Author of "The Science of Finance," &c. Blackwood and Sons. 1870.

This book is able, Christian, and Tory. It fails to perceive that the great business of Parliament is to open up to all classes means of improvement, and inducements to save and invest, and that its first and most pressing duty is to remove obstructions which stand in the way of the poor man's rising, and the development of steady self-reliant providence, labour, and enterprise. Many of the schemes and expedients recommended by Mr. Patterson are very valuable, but altogether the paternal government is too much his ideal; the government which does away with preferences and restrictions, and secures to all classes and all men fair play in the fullest sense of a real relative equality, is the ideal which we prefer. Mr. Patterson, however, writes well, and his volume deserves our thanks and our commendation.

The Odyssey of Homer. Edited, with Marginal References, Various Readings, Notes, and Appendices, by Henry Hayman, B.D. Vol. I. Books I. to VI. London: D. Nutt and Co. 1866.

T. Lucretii Cari De Rerum Natura Libri Ser. With Notes and a Translation. By H. A. J. Munro, M.A. Second Edition. Cambridge: Deighton, Bell and Co. 1866.

These two works go far to redeem the contemporary scholarship of England from the opprobrium commonly cast upon it by foreigners of slovenliness and superficiality in the editing of Greek and Latin classics. For critical insight and exact learning they will both bear comparison with the best representatives of their class as furnished by the laborious mind of Germany; while in point of judgment, taste, and vigour of style and treatment, they are distinctively and happily English.

Mr. (now Dr.) Hayman's volume opens with an extended "Preface," in the first part of which he discusses with much freshness and mastery the great questions connected with the text and authorship of the Homeric Poems. He believes the poems to have originated about 1100, 1000 B.C., and to have "remained, at least, in Attica, until about 700, 600 B.C., *a depositum* of oral tradition. They may have assumed," he suggests, "a written form later in Attica than elsewhere, for instance, in Sparta; but it is through the Attic line of tradition among philosophers and grammarians that we trace them in writing, and during not only these four centuries, but for certainly two centuries later, they were still most popularly known by oral recitation. During this time, however, they had come under the influence of written texts. . . . Between the Peisistratic and the Ptolemæan periods, various persons busied themselves with explanations of the poems, on much of which a shadow of obscurity was then beginning to fall; and the text was, of course, recopied perpetually. The preparation of the text of the Iliad for Alexander by Aristotle is the culminating point of these Homeristic efforts before Zenodotus (300 B.C.), from whose time criticism is first continuously traceable."

On the question of the time when the poems of Homer were first committed to writing, Dr. Hayman makes some strong points in favour of their having originally existed in a purely unwritten form. "The love of iterative phrase, and the perpetual grafting of one set of words on another, the great tenacity for formulaic cast of diction and of thought, and the apparent determination to dwell in familiar cadences, and to run new matter in the same moulds, all seem to mark the purely recitative poet ever trading on his fund of memory." "The great number of oversights and smaller inconsistencies," too, "which the poems betray, is a further presumption in favour of purely oral composition and publication." Another phenomenon, of like significance, is "the variety of equivalent forms for the same word. Writing trains down the wild luxuriance of language. . . In Homer the healthy vigour

of the *gadding vine* is predominant." The circumstance that laws and other public monuments were in all likelihood written in different parts of Greece as early as the earliest date to which we can assign the Homeric poems, does not establish the probability of the writing of compositions of such bulk and quality as the Iliad and Odyssey. The use of writing in a community often exists for State purposes, while the general and literary use of it is unknown."

At the same time, Dr. Hayman thinks Mr. Grote in error "in lowering the age of written copies to that of the formation of an early class of readers." "It might be early discovered," he observes, "that written copies, used by a prompter, would be a great assistance to rhapsodists . . . . whose memory was treacherous. MSS. would also be very useful in teaching other rhapsodists. In such a way it seems likely that the habit of copying crept in, but it was doubtless for a long while a παράφγον merely, having no public importance, and carrying no authority. Yet still, as they multiplied individually, copies would in time acquire a subsidiary power of giving a consciousness of a text as an objective fact; and, on the whole, it seems more probable that the law of Solon, providing that recitation should be ἐξ ὑποβολῆς, i.e., probably, following a given cue, or in orderly succession, was passed after the power had been acquired than before it." "Those who approve this view," the author says, "will be content to regard the habit from which a written text was thus formed, as having grown up at Athens in the two centuries preceding Solon, viz., the seventh and eighth B.C., and to suppose that by the time of Solon, who closes the seventh century, that text was completed in its constituent elements, although probably these were in great disorder, and were charged with much adventitious matter." And, a fortuitous text having thus sprung up, Peisistratus, at Athens, endeavoured to give it shape and permanence. Dr. Hayman is of opinion, however, that the influence of Peisistratus on Homer has been rated too high.

The genuineness of the word-forms in Homer, the author argues, is certified to us by the poetic metre and by the traditional and conservative character of the rhapsodist's art; by the legislative control which the poems unquestionably exercised for centuries over Greek thought and diction; by "the national enthusiasm which the poet kept alive;" by the fact that the dialects of the Greek poets of the early lyric period and the epic [dialect] of Homer "mutually explain each other, on the supposition that his is considerably earlier than any, as shown by the example of the nearest to him, Archilochus;" and by the consideration, that, had not Homer's language from the first been substantially what it now is, since he was "equally popular among poets of all the dialects, not one corrupted text only but several would have arisen, and would have left their traces." To these arguments Dr. Hayman adds others drawn from the Homeric hymns, and from the poems commonly attributed to Hesiod. The passage occupied by this last discussion is one of great interest, and we reluctantly abstain from quoting some parts of it at length.

With respect to the text, Dr. Hayman holds that, in the nature of things, interpolations must have been less or more frequent so long as the period of recitation lasted; and some of these, perhaps "some of considerable size, may have inseparably adhered" to the poems. "The Homeric structure receives complementary sentences easily, and a sympathetic hand might escape detection." "It may be that there are several hundred" passages of one or a few lines scattered through the poems, which are not the work of the original bard. And there will always remain passages, whose authenticity, despite the keenest criticism, will always remain doubtful. We are glad to find that Dr. Hayman does not help to swell the ranks of those who maintain that the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* are by different hands; still less does he allow the doctrine that the two great Homeric poems are a cunning piece of ancient poetic patchwork. Whatever objections may be raised against the substantial oneness of the authorship, whether they refer to the language of the poems, to their mythology, or to the conditions of contemporary society and art, Dr. Hayman shows—and he considers them in detail—to be as nothing compared with the evidence of unity furnished by the marvellous consistency of the leading characters, human and divine, in both poems, and by the epic simplicity and grandeur which mark the whole conception of them. Dr. Hayman argues this last point, as it became him to do, and his argument is conclusive for those whom it can reach. But it is with Homer as it is—comparing great things and small—with the books of Moses. There are men, whose souls see nothing, except through the medium of the literary or scientific microscope. The grandest moral probabilities are hopelessly lost upon them. Genesis is a hotch-potch; for Elohim of the first chapter became Jehovah-Elohim in the second. And Homer—who will believe in him as long as θίσπις of the *Odyssey* is θεσπέσιος in the *Iliad*? We agree with Dr. Hayman, that if there is one question in literature less debatable than another on grounds of internal evidence, it is the substantial unity of those two marvellous and immortal creations of human genius, the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* of Homer.

The second part of Dr. Hayman's preface is devoted to an historical and critical survey of the ancient editors and commentators on Homer, and is followed by a briefer third part, containing an explanatory list of the MSS. of the *Odyssey* and the Scholia. Both these sections of the preface, particularly the former, are full of interest for the scholar and student; but we cannot dwell upon them. The preface closes with a statement of particulars relating to Dr. Hayman's own edition of the *Odyssey*.

Dr. Hayman's text is not built upon a personal collation of MSS. The printed editions on which it is based are, "Bekker's, Bonn, 1858; Dindorf's, Leipzig, 1852; Faesi's, 1849; Löwe's, Leipzig, 1828; Ernesti's, Leipzig, 1824; Wolf's, Leipzig, 1807; the Oxford edition of 1800; Barnes', Cambridge, 1811." It appears in his volume in a good, clear type; the ἅπαξ λεγόμενα being printed in spaced letter. Marginal references are given, on the excellent principle of making

Homer, "by means of parallel and illustrative passages," as much as possible, "his own scholiast." Notes, neither too few nor too many, are placed under the text, which we cannot praise too highly for their perspicuity, their appositeness, and the fine critical instinct which they exhibit. At the end of the text are a hundred and fifty closely printed pages of Appendices (A, B, C, D, E, F), which greatly enhance the value of the volume. A is philological. It discusses numerous points belonging to the orthography, forms, and syntax of Homeric grammar. The Homeric use of ἅλς, θάλασσα, πέλαγος and πόντος is the topic of B. C is occupied with questions of mythology, the legend of the oxen and sheep of the sun, Hercules, Atlas, Proteus, Ino, &c. The main features of Homer's geography come under review in D. In E "the principal characters of the poem, considered in their ethical bearing upon both the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*," are drawn with admirable discrimination and finish. Last of all, Appendix F relates to the structural details of the Homeric Gallery and Palace.

There is no English edition of the *Odyssey* to stand by the side of this very admirable work of Dr. Hayman's. It is precisely the book which a careful English student of Homer needs; and every such student will thank the learned editor at every step, as he follows him, for the skill with which difficulties are cleared out of his path, and for the ample light which is made to fall upon the dark places of this magical domain of primæval song. Now that Dr. Hayman has safely ridden through his stormy passage to Rugby, we not only wish him long and happy possession of the chair of Arnold and Temple, but trust, in the interest of classical learning, and of our native Homerists, young and old, that he may soon be able to publish the remaining two volumes in which he hopes to complete this important edition of the *Odyssey*.

Our limits forbid us to do more than offer a very brief and inadequate tribute to the merits of the second of the two works named at the head of this notice. Considering how profoundly theology, philosophy, physics, and language are all interested in the subtle and gorgeous creations of "the poet that beautified the sect that was otherwise inferior to the rest," it is passing strange how general the neglect of *Lucretius* has been on the part of educated Englishmen. No doubt this has arisen in great part from the want of worthy and easily accessible editions of his writings. Few classical authors impose a heavier tax upon the intellectual and literary resources of an editor; and as matter of fact few have had less justice done to them. If we do not mistake, *Lucretius* is destined to hold a very different place in the classical reading of the next fifty years in England, from that which the last fifty have assigned to him. Probably Mr. Munro's volumes are themselves, in part, the product of a growing appreciation of his genius. At least, it will not be his fault, if the coming generation does not learn to appraise the *De Rerum Naturâ* at its true value.

Mr. Munro's volumes—both charmingly printed—contain, first,

the text of *Lucretius* carefully edited from MSS. and the best printed editions, particularly that of Lachmann, together with various readings and a running critical commentary upon them. With this are connected two elaborate and critical *Introductions* on the formation of the text and on the character of the poem. Next come between three and four hundred pages of explanatory notes, full of learning and criticism of the highest order. The first volume closes with these. The second is occupied exclusively with a close but idiomatic English translation of the original. The entire work is one of which Englishmen may well be proud. As Mr. Munro truly says, "three centuries have elapsed since Lambinus published the first edition of his *Lucretius*, and from that day to this nothing new and systematical, nothing that displays pains and research has been done for the elucidation of our author." His labours constitute a new epoch in the historical criticism and literary exposition of the illustrious Sceptic; and we tender him our best thanks for the great ability and scholarly thoroughness with which he has executed his laborious and difficult work. The half-apology which Mr. Munro makes for the literal faithfulness of his translation is a homage to the tyranny of conventionalism, such as, we trust, a very few years more will render wholly superfluous. It is surely quite time that scholars were agreed that translation is one thing, original composition another, and that the translator—humble though the function may be deemed—is bound to be the mouthpiece of his author and nothing besides.

Institutes of the Jurisdiction and of the Equity Jurisprudence and Pleadings of the High Court of Chancery, with Forms used in Practice, and with a Concise View of the Equity Jurisdiction of the County Courts. By William Griffith, Esq., B.A., Barrister-at-Law. London: H. Sweet. 1868. 8vo., pp. 293.

We do not by any means affect such professional knowledge of jurisprudence as would enable us to pronounce a judgment upon the work before us as "a manual useful to the practitioner in chambers, in the County Courts, and in the High Court of Chancery," but content ourselves upon that by the commendatory testimonies of high legal authorities, among whom are several learned judges on the Bench. The aim of the author is to present to the student the leading doctrines and modes of procedure of the Court of Chancery in an attractive and compendious form. This is not the only work of the kind, but it attempts to combine in a single small hand-book the objects of the well-known text-books called *Smith's Manual of Equity Jurisprudence* and *Hunter's Suit in Equity*. Whether these familiar elementary guides will allow themselves to be cut out by a still bolder bid for brevity is very doubtful; but law students cannot suffer by reading their first principles twice over in different language.

We have more to do with the general reader. Nothing is more desirable for the improvement of English law than that a knowledge of its leading principles should be more widely known among the reading public, and we think that this little book is better than most others for an intelligent man to read. It makes pretensions to vivacity and arrangement which would have shocked an old-fashioned pleader. And, if non-professional persons are to know anything about law they must try equity, which, in spite of the bad reputation of the old Chancery procedure, is much more akin to plain common sense than the technical formalities and dog-Latin which still encumber the Common Law.

Mr. Griffith devotes his first part to the history of the Court of Chancery and its equity jurisdiction, and the law of trusts generally, which forms so large a portion of that jurisdiction. A special part then treats of what he somewhat affectedly calls "Connubium," meaning such part of the law relating to married women as falls within the duties of the equity courts—for example, jointures, dower, separate estate, and settlements; then of a title, "Commercium," in which he places contracts, administration of the property of deceased persons, mortgages, partnerships, &c.; next of some special personal relations, as infants and lunatics; and then of fraud.

We wish all success to the author, and all who with him endeavour to reduce the English law to an intelligible shape and compass.

Miscellanies: Chiefly Addresses, Academical and Historical. By F. W. Newman. London: Trübner.

Few living men are more distasteful to us than F. Newman as a theologian; there is a peculiarity in his treatment of Christianity that makes us single him out (and his class, so far as he is surrounded by a class) from all other opponents. They evoke a special feeling, and we have long since put them away as out of the pale.

But this is a very beautiful volume. Essays on logic, on poetry, on some characteristics of ancient nations, on mathematics and mathematical studies, on education, are here preserved which ought not to have been left to the oblivion of old reviews. The style is terse and stimulating; the criticism is thoroughly original, especially on the subject of poetry, and the "Defence of Carthage" is a masterpiece of good writing and pleading. In these departments of inquiry an opposition writer may make himself very interesting. Would that this writer and critic had tarried among them.

The Light of the World. An Essay. By Augustus S. Wilkins, M.A. Second Edition. Macmillan and Co.

We are not late in paying our attribute to this little volume; it might seem so from the announcement of the second edition, but in fact the essay has rapidly become popular, and placed itself beyond the necessity of any introduction on our part.

It deserves its success. Among the many questions that stir the present time is that of the *origines* of Christianity, as the word runs. On the one side the Jew would trace all its worthiest ethical principles and formulæ to the Rabbinical fountains accessible to Jesus; on the other the modern Gentile would parallel in ancient philosophy, or in the memorable Three in whom it reached its consummation and died, Seneca, Epictetus, and Marcus Aurelius. Germany and France have had some beautiful monographs on these questions. English literature has not rivalled them, although hints here and there have been given that some eminent minds were thinking that way. Mr. Wilkins has not only produced the Hulsean Dissertation of the year; he has also written the best essay we have on his subject, *The Distinctive Features of Christian as compared with Pagan Ethics.* The essay is beautifully written, abounds with the mosaic work of apt quotation from an unusual breadth of reading, and is as remarkable for reverence as for pure taste in other respects. The link between St. Paul's *Think on!* and *Do!* in Phil. iv. 9, might, perhaps, have had a chapter devoted to it; but, in a case like the Hulsean Essay, it is idle to speak of inserting additional chapters. Much as we admire the essay as it now stands, we think the writer might, with great advantage, treat the subject yet more comprehensively. This little book should be only the herald of a treatise that the English language needs, and Mr. Wilkins could write.

We observe that Mr. Wilkins is Professor of Latin in Owens College, Manchester; and cannot help expressing our satisfaction that Lucretius and Cicero will be the text-books of so accomplished and so Christian a lecturer.

Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar, as specially prepared and improved by E. Rœdiger, D.D., Ph.D. Translated by B. Davies, LL.D., with Reading Book and Exercises. London: Asher and Co.

Ewald's Introductory Hebrew Grammar. Translated from the Third German Edition, by J. F. Smith. London: Asher and Co.

A GREAT number of English Hebrew scholars owe their knowledge mainly to Rœdiger's Gesenius, as provided with Hebrew reading lessons and exercises, and published by Messrs. Bagster. This edition, however, makes no reference to that one; many years have elapsed, and with them have come many editions and many improvements. Dr. Rœdiger may claim the work for his own, whether in German or in English, for the twenty-first edition of the original is appearing simultaneously in Germany and England, through the enterprise of Messrs. Asher, and the editor has been himself much concerned in the correction of the sheets. It is a beautifully printed volume, and very cheap; its smaller type (that is, as compared with the unsurpassable Bagster) will be no real disadvantage to the young. The exercises

are admirable, and, on the whole, we can recommend no better book for the study of the elements of Hebrew; it takes its place side by side with Kalisch.

Ewald's Grammar is well worth having and reading, not indeed as a text-book, for which it is not adapted, but as an introduction to the author's larger work, which is unrivalled as a philosophical grammar. The student should have this cheap and elegant little volume, even if he does not study from it; he will greatly admire Ewald's analysis of the Hebrew verb and its tenses. If he thinks of getting the greater work of Ewald, he should pay attention to the hint given by the translator as to the coming edition.

Councils, Ancient and Modern: from the Apostolical Council of Jerusalem to the Œcumenical Council of Nicæa, and to the last Papal Council in the Vatican. By William Harris Rule, D.D., Author of "The History of the Inquisition." London: Hodder and Stoughton. 1870.

THAT this publication is timely all will see; but it is not on that account to be regarded as merely meant to meet a temporary demand; it is no makeshift, or hasty and ephemeral *collectaneum* of information about councils. It is condensed but complete, as a popular manual; it is simple and intelligible, but exact; it is the clear and accurate compendium which might have been looked for from the pen of so learned an ecclesiastical archæologist, and so accomplished a student of the development of Romanism, as the author of the *History of the Inquisition* has long been known to be.

John Wesley's Place in Church History. By R. Denny Urlin, of the Middle Temple, Barrister-at-Law. Rivingtons. 1870.

MR. URLIN has been already introduced to our readers. Having dropped from his name the final letter which belongs to the name of his father and his brother, he is in danger of not being recognised either by those who knew his family of old time in Methodism, or by those who are acquainted with the elegant fabric of courtly wear, formerly better known than of late, with which the same name was identified. Mr. Urlin, some years ago, found some old memoranda in the handwriting of John Wesley. These memoranda evidently belong to the period 1734—1738. They harmonise in all particulars with the situation and the views of Wesley at that period, while they are contrary to the views which Wesley held and published after he had become the head of the Methodist societies. Mr. Urlin, however, who is a High Churchman, with an amiable weakness for the Eastern Church, is determined to maintain for these fragments a later date. Moreover, whatever Wesley may have borrowed from the Moravians, Mr. Urlin makes him to have taken from the Eastern Church, if only he can find any resemblance to the usage or sentiment among the earlier ages of

the Church, or that Mr. Wesley has anywhere stated or implied its conformity with primitive Christianity. Furthermore, Mr. Urlin indiscriminately identifies the early Fathers, whether East or West, Greek or Latin, with the Greek Church. He is angry with Dr. Rigg because, in his pamphlet on the *Relations of John Wesley and Methodism with the Church of England*, originally published as an article in this Journal, he "misrepresents Anglican teaching." The misrepresentation consists in the statement that, according to high Anglican doctrine, "salvation is made to be dependent on the Apostolic succession." Mr. Urlin explains that this is an error, and that the sacraments are only held to be the "*usual* channels of grace." If Dr. Rigg needs to be informed by Mr. Urlin as to the doctrines of the Church of England, Mr. Urlin will hardly presume to correct Mr. Keble, who, in the preface to his well-known volume of *Sermons on National Subjects*, distinctly excludes Puritans from the class and category of Christians, including in this class only the members of the "Catholic churches," and classes together Puritans, Jews, and Mohammedans, as holding an intermediate place between Christians and heathens. Doubtless, indeed, salvation, in a certain sense, may be extended to those beyond the Church of England; the "uncovenanted mercies," which are not restrained to Jews, Mohammedans, or even heathens, reach Nonconformists also. But, understanding by "salvation," Christian grace and sanctification, Dr. Rigg is undeniably right. How far Mr. Urlin himself is competent to speak for the Church of England, may be understood from the fact, that he classes together Bishop Moberly, whose views are as extreme as Keble's were, and from whose recently published sermons we lately gave some exorbitant extracts in this Journal, with Bishop Magee, as belonging to the moderate section of the Church of England, Bishop Wilberforce being also classed with these two. Meantime, Dr. Rigg had described Wesley's views, at one time of his life, in much the same terms as Southey had used, as "semi-Popish asceticism;" he had also ventured to employ such a phrase as "servile ritualism." These expressions are selected by Mr. Urlin as shocking "weapons of controversy," as instances of calling "bad names." Surely, Mr. Urlin is very sensitive! Being a lawyer, however, and a resident in Ireland, he must at least be a good judge as to what is "libellous." Let us listen to his judgment. That Dr. Pusey was once inhibited from preaching by the authorities of his university is well known; and also that he is much farther advanced now in his Romanising than Newman was when he felt constrained to quit the Church of England. Now, in the preface to the separate publication of the article to which we have referred, Dr. Rigg has spoken of Dr. Pusey as "one who is equally eminent as a man of saintly character, and as an able and dangerous heresiarch." Mr. Urlin, quoting only the two words "dangerous heresiarch," stigmatises Dr. Rigg's writing as "libellous." That Mr. Urlin is extremely sensitive we have seen; but, after all, we would gently whisper to him the question whether his innocence is perfectly

honest. We hope in so doing we may not incur the responsibility of libel. Mr. Urlin imagines himself to have added much to the Wesleyan history; we do not find that he has added anything of importance. That Wesley held, at least till past middle age, the doctrine of baptismal regeneration, and that if he ever changed his views he never declared his change, has always been known. But this, of itself, will not avail to prove Mr. Urlin's point. Many Evangelical Nonconformists have held the same doctrine. Wesley neither held nor preached it as standing in the same relations to all other doctrine, and to all after life, in which such writers as Wilberforce and Moberly and J. H. Blunt make it stand. Nor did he ever require his preachers to hold the doctrine, or take any means to inculcate it upon them. Where is it to be found in his Minutes of Conference? Most of his preachers, there can be no doubt, altogether rejected the doctrine. And, as to the Lord's Supper, the treatise of Dr. Brevint and the hymns teach no higher doctrine than Calvin himself held. They are utterly incompatible with the High Anglican doctrine of "the extensions of the Incarnation," and of sacramental efficacy *ex opere operato*.

Teachings of Experience; or, Lessons I have Learned on My Way through Life. By Joseph Barker. London: James Beveridge, Fullwood's Rents, 34, High Holborn. London. 1869.

We opened this book with a decided prejudice against the writer, of whose course and history we have recollections extending over thirty years, from the time that he was a young preacher, counted heterodox, in the Methodist New Connexion. Since that time he has been many things: he became the leader of a rationalistic sect in this country; he became a Parkerite in America; he went farther still and gave up God and immortality; his daring and offensive infidelity provoked society in the United States to take up arms against him, and he was driven from spot to spot until he found himself among the Indians in Nebraska. There in the deep solitude of the utter wilderness, flying for refuge from men, he could not escape from himself, his heart, his conscience, irremediable sorrows, and boundless melancholy, dark and desperate questionings of himself and of the spaces, and the mysteries, amid which he found himself alone, without God and without hope. From this misery, his sorrows and his conscience, his solitude and his memories, the loss of children and friends, and the recollections of his mother, his mother's people, and his mother's God, brought him gradually round on his return towards faith, and Christ, and God. Other influences indeed seem to have concurred, for Mr. Barker, we judge, is now more or less of a spiritualist. He returned to England. After a while he united himself to the Primitive Methodists, and he is now a preacher in connection with that earnest and useful body of Christians. Such has been, in slight outline, the eccentric orbit described by Mr. Barker; and, as we have intimated, knowing something of the former part of his life until he went out of sight in America, we

opened this book with a prejudice against the writer. We are bound, however, to say that it is an instructive and touching book, and bears strong marks of authenticity. Whether Mr. Barker has done wisely or rightly in printing a history, from his own point of view, of some parts of his earlier controversies, we more than doubt. It appears to us, too, that vanity and self-confidence, the besetments of his youth, have not altogether ceased to be his besetments now; and that at times he, who of all men is most bound to overflow with charity to others, is wanting in such charity, and that, notwithstanding all his confessed and terrible errors, he has not even yet acquired a just diffidence in judging of the arguments and characters of others. We must also say that, throughout, Mr. Barker's judgment of himself, his eccentricities, and his errors, seems to us not to err at all on the side of severity. We are not sure, however, whether we should have thought much the better of his sincerity if he had made anything like a parade of self-condemnation. Meantime, his book is one which holds fast the attention of the reader. It appears to us to be evidently sincere and substantially true. It is fresh, strange, and often impressive. We recommend it as well worth a careful perusal.

The Resurrection: Twelve Expository Essays on the Fifteenth Chapter of St. Paul's First Epistle to the Corinthians. By Samuel Cox. London: Strahan and Co. 1869.

THESE Essays are written in a plain, practical style, with a view "to confirm the faith of the general Christian reader, and to comfort the sorrowful and bereaved." The philosophical questions connected with the resurrection, the author tells us, he has not attempted to argue out; nor is the exposition addressed to scholars. It is written "for intelligent Christian men and women whose education has been purely English."

As a specimen of thoughtful, earnest, practical writing, we can only speak approvingly of this volume.

The Resurrection of the Dead: Its Design, Manner, and Results. An Exposition of the Fifteenth Chapter of First Corinthians. By the Rev. James Cochrane, A.M. Manchester, London, and Edinburgh: Blackwood & Sons.

ANOTHER monograph on the inexhaustible chapter. This is evidently the work of an original thinker and graceful writer. Many of his speculations—if such they may be called—on the future destiny of the earth, and many of his expositions, will fail to command the assent of the reader, perhaps, but none of them go beyond the fair limits of exegesis. The new translations are aptly introduced, and altogether the volume will be found a healthy stimulant. It is hard to lay it down until the close is reached.

We cannot for the present say more. A thorough investigation of the author's points would lead us too far; and anything short of this would be unworthy of the subject.

Scenes and Incidents in the Life of the Apostle Paul, Viewed as Illustrating the Nature and Influence of the Christian Religion. By Albert Barnes. Hamilton, Adams and Co.

A WRITER on such a subject as this has a host of competitors of the highest order to encounter. The Apostle Paul has been, within the last few years, the centre of a very considerable literature; contributions have converged on him from almost all points in the range of theological opinion. The present volume is one of deep interest, and animated by a healthy practical purpose. It is what the author's name would lead us to expect: a comprehensive, and clear, and devout exhibition of that great life and work which the Church will never be weary of studying.

A Spiritual and Most Precious Pearl, Teaching all Men to Love and Embrace the Cross, as a most Sweet and Necessary Thing unto the Soul. By Otho Wermullerus. Translated into English by Miles Coverdale. London: William Tegg.

FOR how many spiritual and most precious pearls are we indebted to Master Miles Coverdale? 'Twas he who did for us bring up the Word of God from the deep waters of oblivion in which men had cast it; and, opening the hard shell of unknown tongues, made bare to view that pearl—most precious of all—our English Bible.

Pearl-diving is dangerous work, as Master Coverdale did find, when for it he was cast into prison in his own land, or forced to wander an exile in foreign ones. But he wanted not for comfort in the midst of his sorrows. What to him had been an excellent help he did into English for the profiting of others. Amongst the sources of consolation was this work of Wermullerus. He says of it, "This man, whosoever he be, that was the first author of this book, goeth the right way to work; he bringeth his ground from God's Word; he taketh with him the oil and wine of the Samaritan; he carrieth the hurt man from thence where he lay hurt, and bringeth him to his right host, where no doubt he may be cured, if he will apply himself thereto." "In our great trouble, which of late did happen unto us (as all the world doth know), when it pleased God for a time to attempt us with His courage, and to prove if we loved Him, in reading this book we did find great comfort, and an inward and godly-working power, much relieving the grief of our mind." He therefore translated and "set it forth in print," that "all that be afflicted may take profit and consolation if they will."

Many will thank Mr. Tegg for his careful and beautiful reprint of a book which three hundred years ago gave such great comfort to him who opened for the common people of England the truth and consolation of the whole Book of God, and who, by his good translation of the Psalms, used always in our churches, helps to-day with suitable words the multitudes of English worshippers.

The edition used is Singleton's, which had Coverdale's corrections,

and the publisher, while giving the present forms of English words, has not robbed the book of some choice old English terms. It is a good example in typography and other respects of the way in which old books should be reproduced. We hope it may be followed by others of a like kind.

Symbolism; or Mind—Matter—Language, as the Elements of Thinking and Reasoning, and as the necessary Facts of Human Knowledge. By James Haig, M.A. Edinburgh and London: William Blackwood and Sons. 1869.

The writer does not understand the difference between mysticism and metaphysical science. The book is quaint, strange, wild in portions, but not without originality and power.

The Gospel according to Saint Mark. A New Translation, with Critical Notes and Doctrinal Lessons. By John H. Goodwin. London: Hodder and Stoughton. 1869.

In this unpretending but useful book, designed for English readers, the author has availed himself of the labours of preceding writers, without parading their names on his pages. The aim to give, in the English of the present day, an exact representation of the original, if not always felicitous, is calculated to be of great use in helping the English reader to form a more accurate notion of the meaning of the Greek writing.

The explanatory notes are very good, and deserve careful reading. The brief reflections vary. Some are pithy and forcible, but many are simple and obvious enough.

A well-written introduction deals with the questions of authorship, date of composition, relation to St. Peter, object of the work, characteristics, plan, and mutual relation of the Gospels.

Life of the Rev. Daniel James Draper; with Historical Notices of Wesleyan Methodism in Australia. Chapters also on the Aborigines and Education in Victoria. By the Rev. John C. Symons. London: Hodder and Stoughton. 1870.

The earlier histories of the Churches must be histories of individuals. In harmony with the typical example, they are the small seeds from which great growths unfold. The interest of Mr. Draper's memoir arises mainly from his association with the early development of Methodism in the rising colonies of South Australia and Victoria, and the part he played in the thrilling scenes enacted on board the "London" steamship, the loss of which, in the Bay of Biscay, on January 11th, 1866, is vividly within the recollection of us all. The book will be chiefly attractive to Methodists, though all who desire to see colonial life in its first stages may find some instructive material here. We must, however, enter our protest against the

expansion of a book, by the insertion of so large a number of mere memoranda from what is called a diary. The appendix on the aborigines of Victoria contains some useful and interesting information. Mr. Draper was a good and laborious Christian minister, the closing hours of whose life, well depicted in this volume, revealed the utmost fortitude, faith, hope, and Christian love.

The Republic of Hayti and its Struggles. From Historical Notes. Issued under the Auspices of the Haytian Government. By M. B. Bird, Wesleyan Missionary. London: Elliot Stock.

A WELL-WRITTEN and deeply interesting volume, for the preparation of which Mr. Bird was especially qualified by his residence in the country for a period of nearly thirty years. Of the value of the book, as a faithful history of the Republic, no higher testimony could be given than that furnished by the Commission appointed by the Haytian Secretary of State to examine and report upon it. They say: "The entire history, as it is given, is in the spirit of a friend, and, at the same time, with perfect frankness; the details of domestic manners are evidently given in the sense of one greatly attached to our country. The Republican institutions of Hayti, and their political influence upon the masses, are given as facts, without entering into the supposed motives by which they may have been dictated. The Commission recommends and encourages the publication of this work." And so do we.

Cassandra, and Other Poems. By R. Whieldon Baddeley. London: Bell and Daldy.

THE principal poem of this graceful little volume is poetically conceived and written in melodious verse. It is severely beautiful as a whole, and abounds with touches that linger in the memory. It here and there, however, betrays a certain negligence both in the phrase and the rhythm. The following is the first passage we noted, and it illustrates both beauties and defects:—

"How weary of earth and earth's must he have been,
The hero doomed to labour vain as vast;
Or he, the greater Titan, whose proud lip
Æons of agony on Caucasus
Might blanch, but could not writhe. Upon my lips
Are only smiles, and in my soul delight;
And palace and not prison to me is earth,
Vivid with light and passionate with life;
From where, majestic, the great mountain soars,
Like its own eagles, almost to the sun,
To where the rivulet chafes around a stone.
And centuries may make loud cities dumb,
But still that rivulet chafes around the stone:
Yes; ever with me is the glory of
The soaring mountain and the rushing stream,
The restlessness of clouds that know all hues,
The rest of arching heaven that knows but one!"

Mr. Baddeley has a gift that is full of promise, his muse is well worth discipline, and only needs that to pour out good and lasting strains.

The Pulpit Analyst. Vol. IV. London: Hodder and Stoughton. 1869.

This serial sustains its character as a suggestive aid to young preachers. But disjointed and various advices are not to be mistaken for complete or scientific treatises; the utility of the book is in its drawing attention to matters which might easily escape observation. The sermons and outlines may be examined as specimens of a class with advantage; to follow them as patterns would be pernicious; to copy them would be ruinous.

Madam How and Lady Why; or, First Lessons in Earth Lore for Children. By the Rev. Charles Kingsley, M.A., Author of "Two Water Babies," &c. With numerous Illustrations. London: Bell and Daldy. 1870.

Let every parent who desires his child in understanding Nature to believe also in God, the God of the Bible, and who desires the best possible introduction to geology, procure this wise, humble, devout book. Here Mr. Kingsley is at his best. This lowly volume is a great book.

Ancient Classics for English Readers. A Series of Monthly Volumes. Volumes now Published—I. Homer: The Iliad. II. Homer: The Odyssey. Edited by the Rev. W. Lucas Collins, M.A. Blackwood and Sons. 1870.

These elegant volumes supply a real want, and cannot fail to be very popular. They furnish a pleasant and full analysis of the two famous poems, enlivened by quotations of the choicest passages as given in the best translations. Each volume has an excellent introduction.

BRIEF NOTES ON RECENT PUBLICATIONS.

The new edition of the Rev. Isaac Williams' *Devotional Commentary on the Gospel Narrative* (Rivingtons) is now complete in five volumes. It is a fine specimen of the thoroughly High Church exposition of the life of Christ, intelligent, learned, devout, often beautiful, often really instructive, but as deficient in modern exegetical scholarship as it is "supersaturated" with patristic quotations and ideas.

The Rev. Orby Shipley, who is the Panurge of the Romanising school, equally Jesuitical and daring, which is at present so huge a scandal and curse to the Church of England, appears now to have two publishing strings to his bow. He edits the *Examination of Conscience upon Special Subjects, Translated and Abridged from the French of Tronson*, which is published by Messrs. Rivington, and is a pious manual for confession of a discreet and restrained character. He edits also *The Ritual of the Altar: Containing*

the Office of Holy Communion, with Rubrical Directions, Private Prayers, and Ritual Music, according to the Office of the Church of England; and *The Spiritual Exercises of St. Ignatius of Loyola*, which two volumes are published by Messrs. Longman. The daring of these two publications is excessive, and they are well coupled, for the Jesuitry of the former of them is equal to its audacity. It could never be guessed from the title that it contains a full translation of the Roman Missal, the Latin and the English being placed side by side, and that it is with this, and not with the Anglican Office of Communion, that the book opens, after the preface, which is an exposition of the Roman Mass and Missal.

The Wesleyan Methodist Conference Office is publishing in small gilt-edged volumes, of great elegance and beauty, at a shilling each, *The Methodist Family Library*. The volumes already published are *Nelson's Journal; Mrs. Hester Ann Rogers' Experience and Letters; The Life of Mrs. Martin*, by the late Rev. B. Field (entitled *Sincere Devotion*); and *The Life of Silas Todd*. The sixth volume of Dr. Osborn's complete edition of *The Wesley Poetry* has also been published at the same office, including a large number of Charles Wesley's most remarkable hymns, *e.g.*, "For a Protestant," on "The Earthquake," the "Epistle" to his brother, "the Reverend Mr. John Wesley," and the "Epistle" addressed in like style to Mr. Whitefield, the "Hymns for the Preachers," the "Hymns of Intercession," the "Second and Third Series of Funeral Hymns," and the beautiful "Hymns for Children." In this connection we may refer to *The Methodist Hymn Book, and its Associations. By George J. Stevenson. With notes by the late Rev. W. M. Bunting*, of which Messrs. Hamilton and Adams are the publishers. A good deal of interesting matter will be found in this volume, the substance of which originally appeared in the columns of the *Methodist Recorder*.

Ancient Maxims for Modern Times is the title of a book by the Rev. Hugh Stowell Brown, which Mr. Stock publishes. It has all the characteristics of the racy, homely, practical Liverpool preacher and lecturer. Archdeacon Jones's volume of sermons, entitled *The Peace of God*, and published by Strahan and Co., is of more than common value. There is real thought, doctrine, and life, in this volume. Messrs. Strahan have also republished from *Good Words* Professor Plumptre's *Biblical Studies*, the high merits of which are well known, and which is excellent reading for intelligent young persons. Gorman's *The Athanasian Creed and Modern Thought* is the vigorous protest of a stout upholder of Evangelical orthodoxy against giving up the famous creed from ordinary use, and full acceptance as of old time. *Leaves from Australian Forests*, by Henry Kendall (Melbourne), is not amiss as poetry, and is really interesting because of the Australian tints, and odours, and life-touches, which give character to the verses. *The Rev. William Ellis's Martyr-Church; a Narrative of the Introduction, Progress, and Triumph of Christianity in Madagascar, with Notices of Personal Intercourse and Travel in that Island*, is published by Snow and Co., and cannot fail to command a large sale. The history itself is blessed and wonderful, while Mr. Ellis's merits as a writer need no word of praise from us.

REVERDOR, PRINTER, FULLWOOD'S RENTS, (34) HOLBORN.