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

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

THE

LONDON QUARTERLY REVIEW.

OCTOBER, 1873.

ART. I.—1. *Lives of the Archbishops of Canterbury.* Vols. I. and II. New Series. Reformation Period. By WALTER FARQUHAR HOOK, D.D., F.R.S., Dean of Chichester. London: 1868.

2. *Memorials of Archbishop Cranmer.* By JOHN STRYPE, M.A. Oxford: 1812.

3. *The Life of Archbishop Cranmer.* By CHARLES WEBB LE BAS, M.A. London: 1833.

4. *The Remains of Archbishop Cranmer.* Collected and Arranged by HENRY JENKYNS, M.A. Oxford: 1833.

"THE Reformation in England was begun by the King, in consequence of his desire to put away his wife and marry another." This is the *dictum* of Earl Russell,* who ought to know better; and this is the second-hand opinion of not a few English people, who need to be taught better. It is a part of that hoary heresy which ought to be mercilessly strangled, that the course of English history and the growth of the national life depend upon the foibles, mistakes, weaknesses, and crimes of any one man, even though his dignity be that of a king. Grave movements in the history of the race spring, not from human pride, passion, weakness, or folly, but from that all-wise and all-beneficent control which the devout and thoughtful in every age have recognised as Providence. Henry the Eighth's wishes and plans helped to bring about a crisis for which the nation had long been undergoing an education; but, personally, his design was merely to depose the ecclesiastical pope and to set up a royal pope. His influence came in the train of other and greater influences, without which mere personal inclinations would never have led to such consequences as are comprised in

* *History of the English Government*, p. 61.

history under the phrase, "The English Reformation." Some writers have over-estimated Henry's share in this great change, and have claimed for him opinions greatly in advance of his actual position. In a loose sense, he may be said to have favoured the Reformers, but only so far as they suited and were likely to serve him. They were useful in the divorce question, in his controversy with the Pope as to supremacy, and in the settlement of the monastic question; but there is no evidence to show that he sympathised with the Reformed Faith; indeed, all existing evidence tends to the opposite conclusion. If to be anti-papal was to be a Protestant, then the King was one indeed; but none would have been more surprised than Henry himself to hear that he had any heretical misgivings about Transubstantiation, or Purgatory, or the Invocation of Saints, or any other of the doctrines of the Church of Rome. Undoubtedly he died a Catholic.

About a century after the rising of the Council of Constance, that great ecclesiastical and religious change began which is known as the Reformation. The fulness of time had arrived. Learning was no longer the exclusive possession of the clergy, and the art of printing had furnished their assailants with a new and irresistible weapon. The revival of letters, the study of the ancient classics, the Greek Testament issued by Erasmus, the rapid development of a new literature, the activity displayed in every department of human thought, the political state of Europe, the establishment of new and powerful monarchies, the vices and exactions of the clergy, a natural jealousy of their swollen power and wealth,—all these events and conditions gave an immense advantage to the teachers of the new theology. That some were carried on by the force of growing convictions and by the sweep of circumstances to assert opinions and to advocate changes which they did not anticipate at the outset, can be admitted without impeaching their sincerity or their wisdom; and it proves that there were deep under-currents of religious feeling and belief, and a momentum traceable only to a Divine source. It is not often that men perceive at the outset of a great movement the extent to which consistency will require them to go. Just as mountain travellers, slowly and toilsomely ascending one peak which they had imagined to be the highest, find on gaining its summit that another has to be climbed, and after having scaled that one, discover, perchance, that the labour has to be resumed ere the royal crest is reached whence they can look down upon the grand and silent pano-

rama, so are the pioneers of human progress led on from one phase of truth to another, from one logical consequence to another, from victory to renewed battle, until their position comes to be greatly in advance of the one from which they started, and such as they could not have anticipated. Yet this is only the inevitable sequence of ideas and of events, working after an eternal and perfect law. When the early Reformers affirmed that the Scriptures alone should form the ground of public teaching and the rule of personal life, Church authority was, in effect, set below conscience; but this was not at first perceived, because the human mind does not intuitively detect all the logical issues of a newly-applied doctrine. It is thus that great revolutions are accomplished. Men learn to do gradually what they would shrink from attempting at once. As successive stages of the process are reached, some draw back in fear and dismay, but others are convinced that the present work is as clearly demanded of them as the work already accomplished, and hence they advance, to conquer or to die.

The Church of Rome had grown into a vast organised commonwealth of priests; with separate and exclusive interests, inimical to those of the nations at large; and enforcing their claims by mysterious official threats and censures. This spiritual aristocracy interposed a claim of Divinely-ordained power between God and His children; claiming to be the sole expositors of revealed truth, the sole dispensers of heavenly blessings, and the sole arbiters of the future destiny of man. Out of the pale of the Church there was no salvation; and apart from the priesthood there was no Church. It was inevitable, in the nature of things, that fallible men, assuming such enormous powers, should sometimes wield them for personal and ignoble ends; and that Church authority should, in process of time, become a ready instrument for crushing all who were opposed to these official and dogmatic representations of Christianity. Thus the Romish Church became a universal and absolute despotism, partly spiritual, partly temporal; rendered great and mighty by the traditions of the past, but insufficient for the present, and without vigour for the future; obstructive to civil progress and to national developments in commerce, literature, science, and morality; oppressive to the soul in attempting to follow out its highest impulses; indulgent to the sinner who was willing to bribe, but inexorably severe even to the pious who disturbed its lethargy; and always on the watch for

secular power and wealth, without giving in return benefits of a spiritual kind.

This overgrown Papal power, that had ruled so large a portion of mankind for ten centuries, was trembling to its foundations. The guidance of the Church, with its boasted infallibility, was no longer accepted without a question. Men's faith had been rudely shocked and staggered by the notorious corruptions and venality of the priesthood, from its lowest and meanest members up through successive gradations of dignity to the very pinnacle of supreme headship. The climax was reached early in the sixteenth century, when the condition of the Church had become a crying sin and disgrace, and it is constantly referred to by all the writers of that day, whether friends or foes. Though Wycliffe and his followers had detected many of the unscriptural teachings of the Church, and had exposed many of its superstitions and carnal practices, the clergy obstinately refused to abandon any of them, and persecuted with relentless cruelty all who attempted the smallest reformation. This priestly hierarchy, with its far-reaching terrorism over the conscience, was perilous to national life and freedom; and this gigantic conspiracy of the priesthood against human rights and liberties had attained to such alarming proportions that the vital question had to be decided, which should predominate, a limited and official hierarchy, or the body politic? and this question must have been met and answered in some way. No man could stand alone. The priest was lord of the conscience. The witness of the Spirit within was nothing unless avouched by the priest. And, by a strange anomaly, the sacredness of his office was declared indelible, irrespective of the personal holiness of the man. There might be secret murmurs at his avarice, pride, and licentiousness; public opinion might even in some cases hold him up to shame and obloquy; yet he was still a priest; the sacraments lost none of their efficacy; his verdict of condemnation or absolution was equally valid; and all the priestly functions and acts even of one like Pope John XXIII. or of Alexander VI. were declared to be efficacious. On his behalf the monstrous claim was put forth that the keys were in his hands, not merely to unlock the hidden treasures of Divine wisdom in the Bible, or solely to confer grace by the administration of the sacraments, but to open or shut the unseen world.

Of the corruptions of the Romish Church just before the Reformation period we need not stay to speak. Unfortu-

nately, they are notorious, Romanists themselves being witnesses and judges. Still, even this undeniable fact must not blind us to truth and justice. All were not corrupt. The world has never been wholly given over to the devil. In every age there have been some who feared God and worked righteousness; and these have been as leaven, preventing the entire mass from becoming putrefied. It is important to remember this, for the mind is apt to be carried away upon a storm of indignation at beholding so much of gross and atrocious wickedness, and to conclude that all men at such times were given over to strong delusions, to believe a lie, and to work all uncleanness with greediness. Yet the Lamp of Truth was not suffered to expire, even in what are called the Dark Ages,—times which have been unduly decried and excessively lauded, according to the creed or the temper of various writers. Men were never wanting, even within the Romish Church, to protest against its misdeeds and to rebuke evil-doers by the silent power of holy living. In England, from the time of Wycliffe, who died in full communion with that Church, there is traceable a continuous protest against growing corruptions; not so much in the form of doctrinal opposition as in that of a testimony against practical abuses. The theological controversy was to arise in due course. The labours of the Rector of Lutterworth produced fruit more than a century after his death; for not a few who suffered in the early part of the reign of Henry VIII. were involved in trouble through the possession of highly-prized, well-read, but forbidden manuscript portions of his translation of the Scriptures. The names of many of these humble confessors have perished from the earth, but their lives were a daily and an eloquent protest against ecclesiastical corruptions, although they died and left no sign, nor had they any distinctive following. That their number was not inconsiderable is manifest from penal enactments, and from the records of procedure against them. By the commencement of the sixteenth century the commonalty of England had become largely receptive of a purer faith than the great body of the priesthood insisted upon. Accusations of heresy brought against great numbers were based on their unlawful possession of such books as the Four Evangelists, the Epistles of St. Paul and St. James, Wycliffe's *Wicket*, and the Ten Commandments in English. Thus, long before Henry began to profess scruples respecting his marriage with Catherine, and long before he entered the arena of theological disputation with

Luther, the mind of England had been preparing to participate in the work of religious reformation. This great spiritual and political revolution cannot be ascribed to the King's passion for Anne Boleyn, to the revival of Greek learning, or to the stirring utterances of Luther, either singly or collectively. The origin of the English movement was antecedent to any of these. In like manner, resistance to Papal encroachments arose not first or alone in Germany. While Luther was being made ready for the great combat there, in which he was so ably seconded by Melanchthon and other devoted labourers, a similar contest had been begun in various Swiss cantons by Zwingle, Œcolampadius, and others, and in France by Le Fevre and Farel: each of these movements being at first independent of the others, the respective agents working for a time in ignorance of what was being done in like manner elsewhere. This fact is important and significant, as showing that the Reformation did not originate in an accident, and was not the result of individual passion or weakness. A change was required and foreboded by the condition of the political world, of theology and ecclesiasticism, and of the social and literary world. For everything there is a time. There was a time for the influence quietly exercised by the forerunners of the Reformation; and there was a time for the heroic action of the Reformers themselves. Without the former, the great change could not possibly have become the common cause of the people. Without the latter, it must have continued in its mere rudiments, and would never have issued in a new and purified state of the Church.

The English Government, though it permitted religious persecution, had never deviated from the policy begun by Edward I., for limiting the Papal authority and checking its extortions. Full efficacy to what he and his Parliament intended was given by the famous Statute of Præmunire, in the reign of Richard II. The clergy could never obtain a repeal of this measure, which they called an "execrable statute" against the Church and its head. Even the Lancastrian kings, while endeavouring to extirpate Lollardism by fire, adhered to the course of their predecessors in maintaining the rights of the Crown. This was a sore point with the hierarchy, and repeated attempts were made to escape from the curb thus imposed; but these were always resisted by the Legislature, and sometimes led to yet greater restraints, as in the Statute of 1513, which subjected the lower grades of ecclesiastics to the action of the civil courts on charges of

murder and robbery. Wolsey fell on his knees before the King and besought him not to execute this Act, but Henry resisted all entreaties, admonitions, and blandishments, declaring that he would uphold the ancient rights of the Crown, and that the clergy should not set themselves above the Law. The entire course of English history exhibits a uniform testimony upon this point, and shows that successive monarchs, statesmen, and legislators had instinctive sagacity to resist the dangerous pretensions set up by the clergy in claiming exemption from the ordinary laws of the realm and in submitting only to the Pope. After the fall of Wolsey, in 1529, the Commons presented to the King a formal "Act of Accusation" against the clergy, containing a summary of the wrongs of which the people complained, from the iniquitous procedure of the Consistory Courts, from the terrors of excommunication, from the encroachments and abuses of the Church, and from false charges of heresy. The bishops attempted a reply, the gist of which was that, if any variance existed between the civil and ecclesiastical laws, the former should be changed so as to harmonise with the latter. In the existing temper of the King and the Commons this was impossible; and one immediate result was the passing of various stringent measures for curtailing clerical power and wealth. In the following year the clergy were declared to have incurred the terrible penalties of Præmunire for having recognised the authority of Wolsey's legatine court, which was pronounced by the King's Bench to be an infraction of the Statute of Provisors; and they only redeemed their property and their liberty by an immediate payment of the enormous sum of £118,000, equal to at least a million and a half in the present day. Nor was even this fine accepted until the clergy had been forced to acknowledge the King as "Protector and only Supreme Head" of the Church of England. Again, in 1532, another check was given by an Act of Parliament which deprived of benefit of clergy all ecclesiastical officers below the office of sub-deacon, making them henceforth to be amenable to the ordinary tribunals.

The proceedings connected with the royal divorce had been pending since 1528. Henry professed to have scruples respecting the validity of his marriage with his deceased brother's widow, and sought to have it annulled. Cardinal Campeggio had been sent into England with Wolsey to try the case, merely on canonical grounds, but Pope Clement VII. had reserved to himself the final decision, which he was

in no hurry to pronounce for fear of offending either Henry or the Emperor Charles, Catherine's nephew. Into the personal question it is needless to enter. The divorce was the immediate occasion of a contest which had been long imminent, and which must have broken out ere long on some other point. It is necessary to discriminate between the causes and the occasions of great events. Those seldom spring from simple causes: still less from evil causes. A reformation was inevitable, apart from Henry and his divorce; and it is puerile folly and an impertinent injustice to ascribe the English Reformation to the passions or the perfidy of the King. It needs to be reiterated that Henry remained a Romanist in belief and practice, merely substituting the royal supremacy in matters of religious opinion and conduct for the supremacy of the Pope. To the day of his death, Henry was as rigid a sacramentarian as the most inflexible cardinal.

In connection with the divorce, the name of Thomas Cranmer first appears upon the historic page. He was born at Aslacton, Notts, July 2, 1489. At the age of fourteen he was sent to Cambridge, where he remained, as student, fellow, and tutor, for twenty-five years. In 1528, during the prevalence of the Sweating Sickness, he retired with two pupils to Waltham Abbey, and while there the King and Court arrived on a royal progress. Cranmer, conversing with Fox and Gardiner on the topic which then excited universal interest, expressed surprise that there should be so much difficulty about the King's marriage, and suggested that the best divines in Europe should examine the subject, and decide according to the Word of God; adding, that the King could then proceed without reference to the Pope. This being reported to Henry, he uttered his usual oath, "By the Mother of God," and declared, "that man hath the right sow by the ear." This was the turning point in Cranmer's life. He was speedily appointed a member of an embassy to obtain the opinions of the Continental Universities, and was sent to Rome on a mission to Pope Clement VII., and subsequently on another mission to the Emperor. During this prolonged absence, Archbishop Warham died, and the King determined that Cranmer should succeed to the primacy. His constitutional timidity led him to shrink from the proffered honour, with its inevitable risks, and he delayed his return as long as possible in order to avoid the dangerous elevation; but the King was peremptory, and on March 30, 1533, the consecration took place. Two facts are noteworthy in connection with this high appoint-

ment: the first is, that at the time, and for some period subsequently, Cranmer was not otherwise opposed to Romanism than as regarded the subject of the ecclesiastical power of the Pope in this country. His dogmatic theology accorded with that of Rome, and he regarded as heretics all who denied it. From constitutional mildness of disposition he was not forward in originating proceedings against such persons, but he did not shrink from any duty in this matter which his office imposed, and he beheld without disapprobation the severities which some of the bishops exercised. The cases of John Frith, of Lambert, and others, sufficiently prove this. Frith, the friend and coadjutor of Tyndale, being condemned to be burned as a heretic, Cranmer thus referred to him in a letter to a friend: "His said opinion is of such nature that he thought it not necessary as an article of our faith that there is the very corporeal presence of Christ within the host and sacrament of the altar. And surely I sent for him three or four times to persuade him to leave that imagination." Twenty years later the hand that wrote the above words was being charred in a similar fire at Oxford, for Cranmer was eventually burned for entertaining the same "imagination" which he had condemned in Frith. It is also a remarkable coincidence that the Order of the Communion Service in the First Book of Common Prayer (which was mainly compiled by Cranmer during the reign of Edward VI.), concludes with the argument maintained by Frith even unto death, and expressed in his own words: "The natural body and blood of our Saviour Christ are in heaven, and not here; it being against the truth for Christ's natural body to be at one time in more places than one."

The other fact is, that Cranmer's appointment was ratified by the Pope, who sent him the usual bulls and the pallium, thus affording sufficient evidence that no such rupture was contemplated between England and Rome as took place in the following year. At his consecration, the new Archbishop, before taking the customary oath of canonical obedience, made a formal protest that he did not intend thereby to restrain himself from doing what he thought to be his duty to God, to his King, and to his country. This reservation, taken in connection with his secret marriage to the daughter of Osiander, a leading German Protestant, and with subsequent politico-religious events in which he played so conspicuous a part, has led to his candour and honesty being gravely questioned. If Cranmer was justified in the course taken by him, what

can be said against the doctrine of the notorious "Tract No. 90," which pleads for subscription to the Thirty-nine Articles in a non-natural sense? This feature in his character will have to be considered subsequently; but the point to be especially observed is that on his appointment to the archbishopric, and for some time afterwards, he and the nation at large were Catholic in doctrine and in practice. It is easy to account for Cranmer's elevation to the primacy. Henry VIII. read his character aright, and discerned in him a fitting instrument for his own purposes. Nor is it difficult to account for the favour shown to Cranmer, even when he opposed the royal will, as he felt bound to do on some occasions. It was a matter of policy to uphold the primate. If he were removed, a new archbishop, appointed solely by Henry, would not have possessed the authority over the priesthood which Cranmer had by virtue of his bulls of consecration from Rome; and then Tunstal or Gardiner would have expected the vacant see, but neither of these prelates was trusted by the King. Thus Cranmer was necessary to Henry, and it was his official position that enabled him to outride the storm. His first official act was the holding of a sham court at Dunstable for the trial of the royal marriage, which was declared to have been null and void from the beginning. Nine days later he officiated at the coronation of Anne Boleyn in Westminster Abbey. Three years afterwards he pronounced a divorce in her case also. Indeed, Cranmer's official relations to the King's matrimonial affairs are among the most perplexing and discreditable acts in his career. The news of the proceedings at Dunstable created much consternation at Rome; but the Pope still temporised, being wishful to avoid offending any of the parties. He issued a brief, declaring Cranmer's judgment illegal, and that Henry had incurred the penalties of excommunication, which, however, were to be suspended for two months. Henry appealed from the Pope to a General Council, but the appeal was rejected, and at length, in December 1533, the King, Anne Boleyn, and Cranmer were declared to have incurred the threatened censure.

Parliament met in the following month, and among other measures of retaliation for this procedure they instantly abolished the payment of first-fruits, Peter's pence, and a variety of other exactions hitherto made by the Popes, forbade any pallium or bull to be received in future from Rome, and enacted that all the powers claimed within the realm by the Pope should be transferred to the Crown, unless within three

months Clement decided on a just and straightforward course as to the marriage. At the same time, the statute enacting these measures asserted that there was no desire to separate from Christendom in anything concerning the Articles of the Christian faith. Parliament also passed the Statute of Succession, declaring the King's first marriage to have been void, and devolving the crown upon children by the second marriage. Whoever impugned the legitimacy of this was to be accounted guilty of high treason, and a commission was to be issued at the royal pleasure to administer to all the subjects an oath according to this statute. Bishop Fisher and Sir Thomas More refused to take this oath on conscientious grounds, and were sent to the Tower, whence they emerged a year later, only to be beheaded, as they still declined the oath, and would not admit the royal supremacy in matters ecclesiastical. The King had been declared by the Statute against Appeals to Rome, and by the one subjecting the clergy to the authority of the Crown, to be head alike of Church and State. But the conclusive settlement of this theory dates from the Act of Supremacy, passed in the Session which commenced in November 1534. It recites that the clergy in Convocation had recognised the King as being justly and rightfully Head of the Church of England, and proceeds to enact, for the confirmation of this, and to repress all errors and heresies, that the King and his successors shall be accepted as the only supreme head on earth of the Church of England, and shall enjoy all the honours, authorities, immunities, and profits belonging to the dignity, and shall have power to visit, repress, redress, reform, order, and amend all errors, heresies, abuses, contempts, and enormities; any usage, custom, foreign laws or authority, or anything to the contrary notwithstanding. This Act, it must be observed, was passed by a Catholic Parliament, and was designed only to check and curb the power of Rome. Whatever may be the opinion now held by many wise and excellent persons as to the abstract right or wrong of such an assertion of spiritual supremacy, it must always be remembered that the country was then in the throes of a crisis. The Popes claimed the right of excommunicating sovereigns, and of absolving subjects from their allegiance; and it was known that such a measure was actually being prepared against England. Ireland was in a state of insurrection, the Emperor was watching to do England a mischief, and Scotland was persisting in her old jealous policy. An immense proportion of

the clergy, and a section of the nobility, were ill-disposed towards the recent measures, and there was known to be much latent disaffection in the northern and western counties. The King and his advisers had to face no imaginary danger, for there was a threatened invasion from Flanders, likely to be followed by risings at home, under the pretext of the threatened excommunication, declaring Henry to be no longer sovereign of the realm. The challenge thus thrown down was instantly accepted. The insolent pretensions of Rome were met and curbed.

This led to that strange persecution when Romanists were proscribed and hanged or beheaded as traitors, for their adherence to the Pope, and when Protestants were also proscribed and burned as heretics for their adherence to the Reformed Faith. The Catholic martyrs of 1535 and of subsequent years are entitled to respectful remembrance for their fidelity and heroism, and none the less that some of them were only reaping as they had sown, and were receiving the measure which they had meted out to others. They would not, as they judged, perjure themselves by renouncing the authority of the Pope and substituting the supremacy of the King in matters ecclesiastical, and hence they went to prison and to death rather than betray their cause. However mistaken they were, and although it was well for the future of English liberties that their views did not prevail, yet their sincerity and courage demand respect. The consistent Romanist regarded all who separated from the communion of the one indivisible Church as schismatics, outcasts, and reprobates, doomed to irremediable perdition. During Henry's reign there were many, besides the Catholic martyrs above referred to, who secretly hated the royal supremacy but were awed into apparent submission. They bided their time; meanwhile plotting against the Anglicans, who differed from themselves mainly in abjuring the Pope; being nearly identical in their dogmatic creed and in their ceremonial worship, and having no thought of breaking away from the Catholic Church. This was the great middle party, which clung to traditional and venerated observances, and yet detested the abuses that had crept in, and especially abhorred the assumptions of the Popedom. This middle party embraced that great number of persons, multitudes of whom are to be found in every age, who exercised no independent thought, or did not wish to be troubled with vexed theological questions, but were willing to obey the stern dogmatism that

told them what to believe and how to worship. The Church of England, down to the close of the reign of Henry VIII., and a large part of it far on into that of Elizabeth, continued to be in the main rigidly Catholic in doctrine; belief in transubstantiation, the mass, confession, purgatory, all the sacraments, and the sacredness of religious vows, remaining as before. Against all this, however, there were protests by a third party, whose exact numbers are not known, who were drawn chiefly from the humbler classes; but who, judged by the results of the movement with which they were identified, were playing a most important part in the historical drama, albeit unconsciously. These were the true descendants of the Lollards, among whom Wycliffe's teaching had been germinating. To these, Romanists and Anglicans alike denied salvation; and all such had scant mercy to expect either from the clergy or from the government. The former branded them off hand as depraved heretics, and incited the latter against them as anarchists. As has been remarked, the number of these persons is not known, but the importance of such movements depends not upon a mere census. They had to force their way through gigantic difficulties, and had to pass along a scorched and blackened path of suffering; bearing their testimony amid contempt and hatred, and leaving to their successors, under quieter scenes, the recognition which was denied to themselves. This was inevitable, and as it has ever been with all changes and reforms, whether political, social, ecclesiastical, or religious. But the record of these noble confessors is on high.

The civil and religious liberty now happily enjoyed by Englishmen renders it difficult to realise the actual condition of ecclesiastical affairs during the sixteenth century. At the present time, men have learned for the most part to respect honest differences, and to recognise vital identity amidst outward divergences. The graces of the Christian life are not restricted to any one denomination, however venerable its history, however numerous its adherents, however Scriptural its creed. The Great Father of mankind is not a respecter of persons, neither is He a respecter of sects. A devout spirit, a holy life, self-denying affection towards God, and towards all men, are surer evidences of nearness to the Divine, and are infinitely nobler than the most rigid of verbal creeds. During the Tudor period all this was unknown. In the then existing condition of the national mind, even the most ardent advocate of toleration would find it difficult to

say what should have been done. No party, not even the Reformers, understood the doctrine of toleration: that lesson had to be burned into them during subsequent years of agony. Then, and for a long time afterwards, Protestants were as ready to persecute Catholics, and also to persecute one another, when they had the power, as Catholics were to persecute Protestants. This is a most unpalatable truth, but it is abundantly proved by the history of the last three centuries. Yet so long as a man's belief and religious practice do not interfere with citizen duties, it is manifestly unjust and inconsistent to punish him for the former. Truth needs not the earthworks of human legislation for its defence. It stands upon a rock, more firm than the everlasting hills. The storms of time, of human passion, ignorance, fear, prejudice, and ambition have raged around it, but the fair and noble edifice remains, and it shall abide for ever.

The leaven of Protestantism was working in the public mind, although the King, the majority of his Council, and perhaps the whole Legislature, were Catholics in sentiment, and indulged in the dream of a doctrinal unity. To shake off the Papal yoke was one thing; to be regarded as schismatics by Christians was a very different thing. When the English bishops returned answers to the royal interrogations as to the number of the sacraments, they were divided in opinion, but all agreed in asserting the doctrine of the Real Presence, about which there was then no hesitancy even on the part of Cranmer and Latimer. A theological code was issued in 1537, under the title of, *The Institution of a Christian Man:* a work drawn up by the bishops and revised by the King, whose alterations and comments may be seen in the works of Cranmer published by the Parker Society. This book comprised four commentaries, on the Creed, the Sacraments, the Ten Commandments, and the Lord's Prayer; and it is interesting to the student of theological development as containing a curious amalgamation of doctrinal statements, in which, however, the old Catholic standards were maintained. The mystic number of seven was adhered to in the sacraments, and the nature of sacramental grace was expressed in the old manner. Cromwell announced, in 1540, the appointment of two committees of prelates and theologians to compose a new code of doctrines and ceremonies. Certain questions were proposed to each, and their answers (still preserved in the British Museum among the Cotton MSS., Cleop. E. v.) were collated and laid before the

King. The result was seen in the publication, in 1543, of *A Necessary Doctrine and Erudition for any Christian Man;* and to distinguish this from *The Institution* of 1537, it was called "The King's Book." It is more full, but it teaches the same doctrines, with the addition of the sufficiency of the communion under one kind. This publication was approved by both Houses of Convocation; all books or writings in opposition to it were prohibited; and it was ordered by Cranmer to be circulated in every diocese and to be followed by every preacher. From that time until the accession of Edward VI., the "King's Book" continued to be the authorised standard of English orthodoxy; but it is still needful to observe that the accepted Parliamentary creed differed from that of Rome only on the question of Papal supremacy, and in a modified permission to read the Scriptures in the mother tongue. The latter, however, was effectually preparing the way for a wide and true Reformation, and this demands special notice.

Wycliffe's translation had served an important purpose; but during the interval of one hundred and forty years the English language had undergone considerable changes, and it was desirable that a new translation should be made, not from the Latin Vulgate, but from the original Hebrew and Greek. William Tyndale was the instrument raised up for accomplishing this great work. On leaving the University, he returned to his Gloucestershire home, and addressed himself to the undertaking. He was worried by ignorant priests and was cited before the Bishop's chancellor at Bristol, but the plots against him failed, owing to his powerful lay friends. To one of his opponents, who had declared, "It were better to be without God's laws than the Pope's," he made his memorable reply, "I defy the Pope and all his laws," and then added, "If God spares my life, I will take care that a ploughboy shall know more of the Scriptures than you do." He then withdrew to London, and afterwards to Hamburg, living very sparingly and exercising much self-denial in order to complete his cherished work. His first translation of the New Testament was printed and sent on to England in 1526. Other editions speedily followed, and the copies were widely circulated, though at great risk, owing to the enmity of the bishops and the watchfulness of their officers. Now and then a seizure was made, the books were burned, and their possessors imprisoned. By such means, it was thought that the progress of the "New Learning" was effectually stayed. The

result speedily showed how mistaken was the supposition. Tyndale pursued his heroic labours at Antwerp, in exile and in poverty, until 1535, when he was seized at the instigation of Gardiner and other Popish bishops, and, after an imprisonment of fourteen months (spent in a final revision of his work), he was executed by order of the Emperor. His warfare was accomplished. His life-task had been performed. His memory is amply vindicated by the fact that in less than a year after his death Cranmer was induced to obtain the royal license for the very translation which had been proscribed, for Tyndale's version forms the basis of all subsequent translations, and is, in the main, preserved in our existing Authorised Version. Another labourer in the same field, but at a later date and under happier auspices, was Coverdale, under the sanction and protection of Cromwell, who, with Cranmer, obtained the issue of a royal order to the parson of every parish to provide a copy of the Great Bible (first issued in 1539) for public reading. Soon afterwards, the Archbishop himself brought out what is known among bibliographers as Cranmer's Bible, of which there were three editions issued in 1540 and three others in 1541. With the injunctions respecting the setting up of the Bible in parish churches for perusal by all who might so desire, Cromwell issued another for the guidance of clergymen, who were ordered to instruct the people in the principles of religion by teaching the Creed, the Lord's Prayer, and the Ten Commandments in English. In every church also a sermon was to be preached at least once in three months, declaring the true Gospel of Christ, and exhorting the people to works of charity, mercy, and faith, and not to trust in other men's works, or pilgrimages, or beads.

These incidents reveal the condition of the public mind, but it is historically incorrect to regard them as the actual legislative commencement of the English Reformation. In reality its advance during the reign of Henry was very imperfect and uncertain. Two points only were decided,—the Supremacy of the King and the Dissolution of the Monasteries. With regard to the first it was passed by a Catholic Legislature with remarkable unanimity, and few refused to subscribe. It is not unlikely that Pole himself was among the number as Dean of Exeter ; and among the most vigorous defenders of the doctrine at that time was Gardiner, whose work, *On True Obedience*, was accompanied with a preface by Bonner, in which the Pope was assailed with the

coarsest acrimony, and called a "ravening wolf." In the Dissolution of the Monasteries many tyrannical acts were undoubtedly committed, and the rapacity with which the enormous plunder was seized by Henry and his courtiers covers their memory with shame. But apart from all questions as to personal motives on the part of the King and of his responsible agents, it is indisputable that the matter pressed for a settlement, and must have been decided ere long on grounds of political and social economy. The monastic system had long before become effete, and it was not conducive to the national well-being that so large a body of men and women should be living in enforced idleness, and many of them in something worse; nor that so vast an amount of property left for various beneficiary purposes should be used for purposes of clerical aggrandisement. Exaggerated statements are sometimes made respecting monastic charity, and unfounded assertions are hazarded respecting the condition of the poor after the fall of the abbeys. As a matter of historical accuracy it should be stated that beggars had greatly increased long before, and measures had been taken to meet the difficulty. Many laws and ordinances had been devised in former reigns, but the number of beggars and vagabonds had augmented. Nor was this a matter for surprise when thousands of idle louts could obtain abundant alms for the asking. Thus a social wrong was perpetrated, in violation of a Divine command as old as the human race—"If any man will not work, neither let him eat;" for this is only the New Testament form of expressing a law that is coeval with man's existence. Moreover, the services of the later monks to literature have been vastly overrated. Indeed, many of the ancient classics which their predecessors had copied were effaced in order to find material for perpetuating the lying legends and pretended miracles of the saints. Many of the works of Greek and Roman antiquity were thus irrecoverably lost, as Petrarch has lamented, before the Dissolution of the Monasteries.

Although the formal work of religious reformation had not been entered upon by the Legislature, the actual work was progressing among the nation at large. The course of the movement is to be traced, not in the high places of the land, but among the trading and artisan classes; its true leaders were not nobles, or even prelates, but men unknown in the annals of earthly fame, who feared God and sought to frame their lives after the image of His Son. Copies of the Bible

in English had been spread over the country in tens of thousands, and men had eagerly accepted the Word of life. Children were being taught to lisp in their own tongue the Lord's Prayer, and utter with intelligence the Creed and the Ten Commandments. The truth of God, long hidden and obscured, was silently but swiftly making way, men knew not how; for the spiritual and vital Reformation was going on, not with observation or outward show, but irrespective of priestly wishes and of legislative enactment, yet to be revealed in the appointed season. As in the original promulgation of Christianity, the work was carried on by a Divine hand, not from the apex to the base of the social pyramid as regarded by men, but by an inverse process. Not many wise, not many mighty, not many noble were called. Even as to Henry VIII. himself, as has been already remarked, if his opinions were modified in some slight particulars, there can be no doubt that he died a Catholic. Cranmer himself was by no means so far removed at this part of his career from the old opinions as is commonly supposed by indiscriminating admirers; and the great body of the clergy were loose and easy on all matters of creed and ceremony, readily adapting themselves to the varying politico-religious standards of the Legislature, being more or less of Romanists, as circumstances dictated, under Henry VIII.; becoming mongrel Protestants under the nominal reign of his son Edward; reverting to the pronounced type of Romanism under Mary; and describing a corresponding arc of ecclesiastical variation under Elizabeth, a period of less than thirty years.

Henry VIII. died and was buried, and his youthful son, Edward VI., nominally reigned in his stead. During the next six years and a half Cranmer's hand is chiefly seen in ecclesiastical legislation. Parliament assembled on November 24, 1548, to sanction the changes of creed and ritual which he was now ready to bring forward. The Archbishop had collected opinions from all parts of Europe, "to build up," as he said, "a body of doctrine which should be agreeable to Scripture." Extreme views on either side had neutralised each other, and the result was the first imperfect draft of the Book of Common Prayer. Of the strange features of the change, the strangest was, perhaps, that the official opinion of Convocation was only asked in form. Parliament discussed what should be the national faith, and decided on what the clergy should teach, by means of an Act of Uniformity. The alleged change of substance in the ele-

ments at the Eucharist was and is the central doctrine of the Catholic Church, and this was also believed by the Lutherans, more vaguely yet not less positively. The opinion of Cranmer himself was still uncertain. He was in the position of the blind man in the parable, who saw "men as trees walking." In his argument with Lambert, who was burnt for heresy, he had maintained the dogma of transubstantiation; in his Catechism, published in 1548, he avowed the doctrine of the Real Presence; while in his book on the Sacraments he now asserted a Spiritual Presence. The Common Prayer-book was the production of unsettled times, and of men of diverse opinions and tastes, and cannot therefore be expected to furnish an example of consistency. Some of the compilers wished to retain as much of the Mediæval element as possible, while others regarded not so much the Fathers or the Schoolmen as the primitive doctrines and practices set forth by the advanced Reformers on the Continent. The result was a piece of liturgical mosaic, in which the shapes and colours of the fragments are not conducive to an harmonious whole. Hoary fragments from the past were placed beside startling novelties of the present. Especially is this the case with the Sacramental doctrine and rite, which some think Roman, some Lutheran, some as partaking of the nature of both. Its theology is largely taken from Augustine, but prominence is given to the Lutheran form of the doctrine of justification by faith; while other points of doctrine are stated so guardedly, and restricted by such explanations, as to avoid the extremes alike of Calvinism and Arminianism. Cranmer's object was to discover a middle way, and to make the best possible compromise. His own views on some vital questions were unsettled, and they continued so until he stood face to face, seven years later, with degradation and death. The estimate to be formed of him and of his ecclesiastical work will vary with personal opinions and tendencies. Some laud and honour him for holding to a middle course between ultra-Romanists and ultra-Protestants; others regard him as the author of a schism; while others, again, ascribe to him views on doctrine and polity which are opposed to the whole tenour of his life. What appears to be the only character attributable to Cranmer, in accordance with historical facts, will have to be shown; but with regard to the Book of Common Prayer, in the compilation of which he took such a leading part, there can be no doubt that it was carried on designedly with a view to a compromise. As Mr. Hallam remarks, "It was always

held out by our Church, when the object was conciliation, that the Liturgy was essentially the same with the Mass-book." It may be said, in a form less extreme than this, that the Book of Common Prayer was substantially, and with necessary modifications to meet the altered theology, a condensed reproduction, in English, of the *Sarum Use*, and of other Latin service-books which had been compiled for centuries.

The aimings after the impossible, represented by the Uniformity Act of 1549, failed, as it was inevitable in the nature of things that they would fail; and legislative action was therefore made more stringent. The Second Act of Uniformity, with the Revised Prayer-book, was passed on April 6, 1552. The young King died in the following year, and it is uncertain whether this second book was taken into common use, but it became the basis for future revisions, and at length resulted in the Liturgical form which for more than two centuries has been the authorised form of public worship. This Act was especially designed to coerce and punish those persons who, "following their own sensuality, and living either without knowledge or due fear of God," neglected to come to church. Such neglect was to be visited with spiritual censures, and, these failing, with imprisonment: six months for the first offence; twelve for the second; and perpetual for the third. This may be regarded as the earliest instance to be found on the Statute-book of penal legislation directed against Nonconformists; but, unhappily, it is only the first of a series far too long. Another matter to which Cranmer had devoted much time and attention was the improvement of the Canon Law, and the result is seen in his *Reformatio Legum Ecclesiasticarum*, a work that was not confirmed or promulgated, owing to the death of Edward VI. In the year 1536, "Articles of Religion," nine in number, had been proposed by the Archbishop in Convocation. Fifteen years later, these were expanded to forty-two, and the royal mandate to procure adhesion to them by subscription is dated only a fortnight before the King's death. The printer had just finished the book, when all the labour was in vain. It had not been ratified by Parliament, nor does it appear to have been sanctioned by Convocation, and the matter dropped until the reign of Elizabeth. But how, it may be asked, could Cranmer thus proceed with the slightest hope of success? Did he not perceive that the youthful prince was rapidly descending to the grave? Doubtless; but he was

bent upon what was styled "politic handling." He was using temporal weapons for the accomplishment of spiritual ends; rearing upon a shifting foundation an edifice of unhewn stones and of untempered mortar. His conceptions of the spiritual nature of Christ's Kingdom were dim and imperfect, and he acted the part of a statesman or a politician as much as that of a religious teacher and guide. The model upon which Cranmer's Articles are founded is the Confession of Augsburg, and their general spirit is Lutheran, not Calvinistic. Their avowed purpose was "for the avoiding of controversy in opinions, and the establishment of a godly concord in certain matters of religion." The utter inutility of all such attempts is shown when they are subjected to the severe test of experience; and the history of England during the last three centuries demonstrates that it is no more possible to fix and crystallise speculative belief, or to compel an official ministry to abide by the common-sense meaning of the most positive terms, than it is to chain the winds of heaven, or to control the action of the tides. Clerical subscription may be made as positive, solemn, and emphatic as legal ingenuity can devise, and yet, as history shows, even an outward uniformity cannot be secured. The condition of the Church of England at the present day is the crowning illustration of this. We see a body of nearly 20,000 clergymen, who have sworn assent to the very same documents, yet exhibiting almost every shade of theological opinion, from the mere ethical declaimer who has successfully laboured to omit from his discourse every distinctive trace of Christianity, to the broadest type of thought and expression; from the most lax Arminianism to the most rigid Calvinism; from High Churchism like that of Laud to Low Churchism like that of Hoadley; from a theory of the sacraments like that of Dean Hook to a theory like that of Canon Ryle; and this great body of clergymen is split up into a variety of antagonistic sections, represented, *inter alia*, by such very diverse teachers as Archbishop Thomson, Bishop Temple, Bishop Wordsworth, Bishop Ellicott, Dean Stanley, Dean Close, Archdeacon Denison, Canon Kingsley, Canon Liddon, Dr. Irons, Mr. Bennett, and Dr. Pusey.

The futile attempt to set aside the Princess Mary in favour of Lady Jane Grey involved its authors in ruin. As soon as Mary was proclaimed Queen, and before waiting for legal authority, the old services were restored. Compliant pastors led back obedient flocks to ancient customs and observances.

Vestments, chalices, roods, relics, images, and breviaries were revived in all their glory. It was, indeed, one of the most vigorous attempts at retrogression ever made, and it was made for several years with scrupulous perseverance, until the insane cruelty of the bigots recoiled upon themselves. The work of ecclesiastical reaction can be traced in successive Statutes passed in the first assembly of the Legislature. Various Acts of the past reign and of that of Henry VIII. were repealed. Among them were the Acts of Uniformity, those allowing of priests' marriages, those which abolished certain festivals and fasts, those regulating the appointment of bishops, and all Statutes, Articles, and Provisions made against the Apostolic See since 1529; but with the important reservation of all Church lands, &c., which had been granted to the laity, and which they were not disposed to relinquish. Among the revived Acts were the old Statutes against heretics. It was also enjoined that after December 20, 1553, only such forms of public worship and of the administration of the sacraments should be observed as were commonly used in the last year of Henry VIII. Thus easily were Cranmer's ecclesiastical fabric and his policy of *Via Media* swept away. Of the prelates, about one-half conformed to the restored order of things; the others were ejected, and some of them were imprisoned. The order to restore the old ritual was very generally obeyed; a proof that the majority of the nation were still favourable to the Catholic creed and ceremonies, and that the Protestantism of the country was then only skin-deep. The proceedings of the Parliament of 1554 mark the flood-tide of ecclesiastical reaction. It remained at this point for three years, and then the ebb set in, never more to be reversed in English history. During those three years, scenes occurred in many counties which have earned for Queen Mary the epithet of "Bloody;" scenes upon which it is impossible to look back without shuddering and indignation, and which Englishmen will never forget. Yet all this was part of the moral education of England; a rough and painful discipline through which she passed towards a nobler intellectual and religious life. Ere the year 1555 was five weeks old the proto-martyr of that reign had ascended to heaven in his fiery chariot, to be followed in the short space of forty-five months by nearly three hundred more. It is impossible not to connect with the beginning and the progress of these atrocities the name of Gardiner; in a greater degree that of King Philip; but in the greatest degree of all that of

Cardinal Pole; for Mary was only a plastic instrument in their hands. This by no means absolves her from the guilt and infamy attaching to this fiery persecution, but the measure of condemnation to be dealt out must be regulated by the strict justice of the case.

Cranmer was urged by his friends to fly, but refused, saying that if he had committed treason or any civil crime, he might be deemed likely to abscond; but that as he, more than any others, had been the instrument in effecting the changes in religion, he would remain. When it was rumoured that mass had been restored in Canterbury Cathedral by his orders, and that he had offered to sing a requiem for the late King, he wrote a letter to a friend, indignantly denying the statements. The issue was a committal of the Archbishop to the Tower, on September 8, 1553, where Ridley and Latimer were already confined. He was tried and found guilty on a charge of high treason, in common with the Dudleys and others who were implicated in the matter of Lady Jane Grey; but as he had received the pallium from Rome he could not, according to the Canon Law, be condemned by a secular tribunal until he had been degraded by competent ecclesiastical authority. He was therefore left a prisoner in the Tower during the winter of 1553, but in the following March he was removed to Oxford, with Ridley and Latimer, and for four days underwent an informal trial before a committee of Convocation, the only design of which must have been to involve them in theological and metaphysical subtleties, and so to ensure their condemnation as heretics. After this was done, the three bishops were taken back to their respective places of confinement in Oxford, and in October 1555 Ridley and Latimer, still refusing to recant, were burned at one stake in front of Baliol College. In the preceding month Cranmer had been examined at Oxford before a commission appointed by Pole, whose authority as Legate he steadily refused to acknowledge. He was charged with having married a wife; with having written heretical books; with having publicly maintained various heresies in the so-called "Disputation" in 1554; with having violated his consecration oaths; with having lent himself to Henry's divorce; with perjury, schism, apostasy, and treason. He was formally cited to appear before the Pope at Rome within eighty days, and was then remitted to prison. At the expiration of the eighty days, the mockery was gone through at Rome of pronouncing him contumacious and of condemning him as a heretic in his enforced

absence. The Papal decree was received in London early in February 1556, and on the fourteenth of that month the Archbishop was brought to Christ Church to be deprived, degraded, excommunicated, and delivered over to the secular power. After this, he was conducted back to prison, but was shortly removed to the house of the Dean of Christ Church, where he was treated with much kindness and gentleness, the first act in a diabolical plot formed with a design of securing his recantation. In an evil hour he yielded, and is said to have signed several declarations, which are all printed in Strype's *Memorials*, from the copies issued by Bonner; but there is no evidence that Cranmer signed the whole of them, excepting the testimony of his persecutors, and this is the more suspicious as they issued an account of the address given by him just before his death, which is known to be unblushingly mendacious. They knew not how to use their triumph. No greater benefit to their cause could possibly have accrued, and no greater damage to the name and influence of Cranmer could have been inflicted, than by suffering him to live on in retirement, or in prison, after his recantation, with no opportunity of producing a signal reaction in his favour. But they resolved on his death, notwithstanding the promises which had been held out to him; and ever since they have reaped the reward of their perfidy. Thus they overreached themselves, and by goading their victim to desperation they gave him an opportunity of thwarting them and of redeeming his own fame.

Here the crucial question arises,—Was Cranmer sincere in his final retractation, or did he make it to spite his enemies when he found that, Catholic or Protestant, he would be burned? Mr. Hallam has been severely criticised for saying, with his usual placid severity: "If we weigh the character of this prelate in an even balance, he will appear far indeed removed from the turpitude imputed to him by his enemies; yet not entitled to any extraordinary veneration." Lord Macaulay has expanded this sentence, and has pronounced an unfavourable judgment in terms of strong censure, representing Cranmer as a mere trimmer; changeable because unprincipled, "equally false to political and to religious obligations;" the ready tool of bad men; adjusting himself to altered circumstances on system and from habit; a persecutor, but reluctant to submit to persecution; dying, "solely because he could not help it;" and "never retracting his recantation till he found he had made it in vain." "If Mary

had suffered him to live, we suspect that he would have heard mass and received absolution, like a good Catholic, till the accession of Elizabeth; and that he would then have purchased, by another apostasy, the power of burning men better and braver than himself." This judgment is very severe, and even harsh. The difficulty of deciding arises from an invasion of the sacred domain of motive. It is needless to ask what actuated Cranmer in suddenly changing at the last moment; but much mitigation of human censure arises from a consideration of all the circumstances. It is one thing to sit calmly down and pronounce condemnation three centuries afterwards, when there is no fear of the censor having to submit to such an awful test as "turn, or burn;" it is a widely different thing to have to act when surrounded by deadly foes, self-condemned for shameful recantation, abandoned of men, and, apparently, forsaken by God. On Cranmer's general character and career an opinion may be formed, but it is impossible to determine the precise reason for his final change of conduct. Let him be left to "Him who judgeth righteously," and let those who are tempted to cast the first stone remember that Cranmer would not fly when he might have done so, in 1553, and that long imprisonment and protracted anxiety had operated on a nature exquisitely sensitive and timid.

Up to the twentieth of March, the day previous to that fixed for his execution, he had received no notice of it, but he was visited on that evening by Dr. Cole, who indirectly announced his approaching doom. On the following morning, St. Mary's Church was crowded. Dr. Cole preached a sermon, to vindicate the execution, and exhorting Cranmer publicly to declare his faith, little anticipating the result. The Archbishop stood on a high platform in front of the pulpit, "with sorrowful countenance; heavy cheer; his face bedewed with tears; sometimes lifting his eyes to heaven in hope; sometimes casting them down to earth for shame; an image of sorrow; the dolour of his heart bursting out of his eyes; retaining ever a quiet and grave behaviour, which increased the pity in men's hearts." To Cole's appeal, he responded, after a few moments spent in prayer, by drawing out of his bosom a paper which he proceeded to read. After sundry general statements, he wholly and positively renounced his late recantations, declaring "the fear of death alone induced me to this ignominious action; it hath cost me many bitter tears: and in

my heart I totally reject the doctrines of the Church of Rome. As for the Pope I refuse him, as Christ's enemy and Antichrist, with all his false doctrine." This was heard at first with speechless astonishment, which soon gave place to howlings and execrations. The whole assembly was in an uproar, and, at a signal from Cole, he was hurried out to the place of burning: the same spot where Ridley and Latimer had suffered. All the preparations had been made, and in a few minutes he was chained to the stake, with the fagots piled around him. When the torch was applied, and as the fire spread, he was seen to thrust his right hand into the flames and hold it there, exclaiming, "This hand hath offended." Soon, all was over. The flames rose rapidly, and a thick smoke enveloped him; so that life must have been speedily extinct.*

Of Cranmer's general conduct it may be said that if he was not always faithful in rebuking vice, he encouraged and rewarded the virtuous; if his weakness and indecision prevented him from rallying many partisans, yet his personal friends were numerous, being charmed by his gentleness and suavity. The moral virtues of his character must be sought among the amiable and the attractive; not among the heroic and the imposing. Yet he was capable, as gentle natures often are, of being provoked to a burst of feeling as fierce as it was transient. A well-meaning, sincerely religious man, bent upon accomplishing what he deemed a good work, he lacked decision, firmness, and the high courage needful for promptly choosing the right, and for steadily braving the consequences. In literature he had no originality, and he would never have been impelled to authorship by the promptings of genius. It is not easy to determine where he stood with respect to theology. He drifted from Erasmus towards Luther; yet he never became a Lutheran. Modern evangelical and orthodox theologians generally claim him as on their side, though without sufficient evidence. The construction now put upon some of his utterances would probably surprise no one more than himself. His eminent position will continue to attract attention to him among the crowd of Marian martyrs; but, apart from the tragical circumstances of his end, his place in the hagiography of the Church is

* These particulars of Cranmer's last retractation and of his death are drawn from an account written two days afterwards by a bystander, who, though a Romanist, was moved to compassion at the sight of what he so touchingly records. (*Harl. MSS.* No. 422, fol. 48. Printed in Strype's *Memorials of Cranmer*.)

really much below that assignable to Tyndale, Rogers, Ridley, Latimer, and many others less known to human fame. Before he can be spoken of as a hero or a saint, the standard of the heroic and the saintly character must be lowered. That he was time-serving as a politician, his warmest admirers must admit. Henry VIII. found an instrument for some of his worst actions in Cranmer, whose conduct sometimes displayed a culpable weakness of principle. In his career as an ecclesiastical statesman, he sought a *Via Media*, abandoning the grosser corruptions of the Romish Church while retaining much of her distinguishing doctrines and polity; but, at the same time, making such concessions to the civil power in the new hierarchy, that even his High-Church admirers are constrained to admit that he has bequeathed a system so charged with Erastianism as to render it difficult to extricate the religious from the political element. Many of the troubles and dangers that have since befallen the Church of England are traceable to the false spirit of compromise to which Cranmer was a party. He did not discriminate between principle and expediency; between things spiritual and earthly; between the policy of men and unswerving allegiance to Christ.

ART. II.—*The Catacombs of Rome, and their Testimony Relative to Primitive Christianity.* By the Rev. W. H. WITHROW, M.A., Niagara, Canada. Methodist Book Concern, New York. 1872.

FEW phenomena in history are of more painful interest than the development of the pernicious system of Monachism. Born in the East, it was the natural product of the mystic doctrines of the antagonistic principles of light and darkness, of good and evil,—of Ormuzd and Ahriman. A thousand years before the Christian era Zoroaster promulgated these doctrines, with which thereafter all Eastern philosophy was deeply imbued. The indolent and contemplative Oriental disposition furnished a genial soil for the growth of this dreamy and mystical theosophy. The repose and silence and solitude of the desert, shutting out the distractions and temptations of life, were considered eminently favourable to communion of the soul with the Deity and its final absorption into His essence. This notion was common to the Chinese Boodhist, the Indian fakir, and the Persian dervise. The Essenes among the Jews and the Therapeutæ of Egypt shared the same ideas, and presented the leading features of the conventual orders of later days. The Gnostic and Manichæan heretics endeavoured to graft these fantastic tenets on the vine of orthodox Christianity; from which unhallowed union sprang, in after times, a crop of bitter fruit.

We shall endeavour briefly to trace the progress of this system of error and to indicate some of its degrading and ignoble results.

One of the earliest manifestations of the ascetic spirit which lies at the root of the Monastic system was the exaggerated commendation of the supposed sanctity of single life. This, in course of time, led to the enforced celibacy of the clergy, on the Procrustean rack of which iron rule the tenderest and most sacred affections of the human heart were ruthlessly tortured. But this custom was only gradually introduced. During the first three centuries, according to the judicious Bingham, there is no trace of a celibate clergy.* There is also

* *Orig. Eccl.* lib. iv. c. 5. Although St. Paul's prudential counsels concerning marriage in times of persecution were subsequently erroneously interpreted

abundant evidence of the marriage of ecclesiastics of every order. Cyprian of Carthage, Demetrian of Antioch, Spyridion of Cyprus, Synesius of Cyrene, Eustathius of Sebastia, and Phileas of Thmuis, were all married bishops.* Novatus, Cæcilius, and Numidicus, of Carthage, were married Presbyters. Tertullian, stern ascetic though he was, was married. So also were Gregory of Nyssa, Hilary of Poictiers, Valens of Philippi, and numerous others of greater or less distinction whose names have been transmitted to our times.

The epigraphic testimony of the Roman Catacombs distinctly shows that in the earlier and purer ages of the Church the compulsory celibacy of the clergy was unknown. In numerous inscriptions, even of a comparatively late period, ecclesiastics of various ranks lament the death of their wives, "chaste, just, and holy." "Would to God," exclaims a writer in the *Revue Chrétienne*, "that all their successors had such!"

The following are characteristic examples:—

"HVNC MIHI COMPOSVIT TVMVLVM LAVRENTIA CONIUX
MORIBVS APTA MEIS SEMPER VENERANDA FIDELIS
INVIDIA INFELIX TANDEM COMPRESSA QVIESCIT
OCTAGINTA LEO TRANSCENDIT EPISCOPVS ANNOS." †

"My wife Laurentia made me this tomb; she was ever suited to my disposition, venerable and faithful. At length disappointed envy lies crushed; the Bishop Leo survived his eightieth year."

"GAVDENTIVS PRESB. SIBI ET CONIVGI SVAE
SEVERAE CASTAE ET SANCTISSIMAE FEMINAE." ‡

"Gaudentius, a presbyter, for himself and his wife Severa, a chaste and most holy woman.

"LOCVS BASILI PRESB. ET FELICITATIS EIVS,
SIBI FECERVNT." §

"The place of Basil the Presbyter, and his Felicitas. They made it for themselves."

---

as a general exaltation of celibacy, yet many of the Fathers assert that he, in common with most of the Apostles, was married.—See Clem. Alex. *Strom.*; Euseb. iii. 20; Orig. *Com. in Rom.* i.

* Indeed the primitive interpretation of the Apostolic injunction that a bishop must be the husband of one wife, regarded marriage as essential before ordination to that office. In this sense the Greek Church still regards it, and requires the marriage of priests and deacons before admission to holy orders. Primitive sentiment, however, tolerated only one marriage, stigmatising all who married twice as bigamists, a word of greatest opprobrium.

† Gruter, *Inscrip. Antiq.* p. 1173.

‡ De Rossi, *Inscrip. Christ.* No. 376, A.D. 389.

§ Aringhi, *Roma Subterranea*, lib. i. c. 3.—Reinesius suggested that Aringhi

" LEVITAE CONIVNX PETRONIA FORMA PVDORIS
HIS MEA DEPONENS SEDIBVS OSSA LOCO
PARCITE VOS LACRIMIS DVLCES CVM CONJVGE NATAE
VIVENTEMQVE DEO CREDITE FLERE NEFAS." *

"I, Petronia, the wife of a deacon, the type of modesty, lay down my bones in this resting-place. Refrain from tears, my sweet daughters and husband, and believe that it is forbidden to weep for one who lives in God."

" LEVITAE CONJVX SEMPER MIHI GRATA MARCIA
CASTA GRAVIS SAPIENS SIMPLEX VENERANDA FIDELIS." †

"Marcia, the wife of a deacon, ever well-pleasing to me, chaste, grave, wise, sincere, venerable, faithful."

" CLAVDIVS ATTICIANVS LECTOR
ET CLAVDIA FELICISSIMA CONIVX."

"Claudius Atticianus, the Reader, and Claudia Felicissima, his wife."

" JANVARIVS . EXORCISTA .
SIBI . ET . CONIVGI . FECIT."

"Januarius, the exorcist, made this for himself and his wife."

It was not till the fourth century that this ordinance of "forbidding to marry," which has been fraught with such appalling moral evils to society, was authoritatively formulated in a canon of the Church. At the Council of Nicæa, "it seemed fit to the bishops," writes the historian Socrates, "to introduce a *new* law into the Church, that the clergy should have no conjugal intercourse with their wives married before ordination." ‡ But the venerable confessor Paphnutius inveighed against placing a yoke on their necks that God had not imposed, and they were left at liberty.§ This principle was also asserted by the previous Councils of Ancyra and Gangra: that of Neocæsarea, indeed (A.D. 314), prohibited marriage after ordination, but allowed those previously married to continue without censure. The decrees of the Spanish Council of Elvira were still more rigorous, but these canons were only of local authority, and were evaded by the scandalous subterfuge of *mulieres subintroductæ*, too often only another name for the concubines of the clergy.

---

had suppressed the word wife in this epitaph; but Fabretti has well observed that to none other than a wife can the expression "his Felicitas" be applied.

* De Rossi, *Inscrip. Christ.* No. 843, A.D. 472.

† *Ib.* No. 753, A.D. 451.

‡ Socrat. i. 11. § *Ib.*; Sozomen, i. 23.

This enforced celibacy has been the secret of much of the power of the Romish priesthood. The suppression of the domestic affections only intensified their devotion to the cause of the Church. It took the place of both wife and child, and engrossed all their thoughts and energies. This social isolation developed also an especial *esprit de corps* in the clergy, who became thus a priestly caste, a great hierarchical phalanx, inspired by a common enthusiasm, and knit together by common interests.*

The conception of the superior sanctity of celibacy thus rapidly spread. Marriage was tolerated as a necessary evil on account of the infirmity of the weak; the higher exaltation was that of single life. At first women, rather than men, probably embraced this vocation, for the greater leisure and freedom it gave in an unquiet age for religious service. We find in the Catacombs frequent evidence of the existence of a female diaconate, and the employment of widows and virgins in offices of charity.† This fact is confirmed by ecclesiastical history: the order of *ministræ* is recognised by the Councils of Ancyra, Chalcedon, and Valence. At first, only those over forty years of age were admitted, and neither conventual residence, costume, nor discipline was required, nor the vow of perpetual virginity. The age of admission to this order was afterwards reduced to twenty-five or even sixteen years, and the abandonment of the lofty vantage-ground of virginhood evoked severe ecclesiastical censure. Thus the primitive deaconesses gradually faded into modern nuns.

The vehement Jerome writes with enthusiasm in praise of single life. The community of virgins, he says, are the vessels of gold and silver, that of the married only those of wood and earthenware.‡ Marriage replenishes the earth, virginity heaven.§ I praise marriage, he adds, only because it gives us virgins.‖ In expounding the parable of the Sower, he writes, "The thirty-fold refers to marriage; the sixty-fold

---

* As late as A.D. 692, the Council of Trullo allowed all ecclesiastics but bishops to live in wedlock, and even after that period many African bishops were married.

† Thus we find such epitaphs as the following:—"OC.TA.VI.AE., MA.TRO.NAE., VI.DU.AE. DE I.," "To Octavia, a matron, widow of God;" "ANCILLA DEI," "a handmaid of God;" "VIRGO DEVOTA," "a consecrated virgin."

‡ Hieron. *Adv. Jovin.* i.

§ *Nuptiæ terram replent, virginitas Paradisum.—Ib.*

‖ *Laudo conjugium sed quia mihi virgines generat.—Ad Eustoch.*

to widowhood; but the hundred-fold expresses the crowning of virginity."*

In this revolt against the Divinely-ordained institution of marriage many of the Fathers denounce woman as a pernicious evil, a deadly poison, the work of the devil, and the door of hell, as the mother of all human ills, and the fountain of original sin. Her very presence was a continual temptation and snare. She should be ashamed of the thought that she was a woman. In their vituperation of womanhood they seem to have forgotten their own mothers.†

The monastic spirit only gradually pervaded Christianity; in the period of its primitive purity it was unknown. In the first flush of its youthful zeal, Christianity aspired to the complete regeneration of society, to the conquest of the world. It withdrew not from the stern conflict of life, but sought to hallow its daily avocations and lowly toils by consecrating all to God. "We are no Brahmins, nor Indian devotees," exclaimed Tertullian, "living naked in the woods, self-exiled from civilised life."‡

But as the years glide on iniquity abounds, the love of many grows cold, and Christianity herself becomes corrupt. The political aspect of the times becomes chaotic, hope grows dim in the hearts of patient watchers for the dawn, and, despairing of the regeneration of society, they seek in spiritual selfishness to save their own souls alive by fleeing from a doomed world and hiding in the clefts of the rock and caves of the earth till the indignation be overpast.

The doubtful honour of originating monastic life is claimed for the rival saints, Antony and Paul of Egypt.§ Of these the former is the more celebrated through the account of his life written by Athanasius, the reading of which led to the conversion of St. Augustine, the great Doctor of the West. Antony, the youthful heir of great possessions, hearing the

---

* Cyprian ascribes the hundred-fold to martyrs, the sixty-fold to virgins. But when the two dignities are united, "the hundred-fold," he says, "is added to the sixty-fold."

† Primitive Christianity owes much to its godly women. The mothers of Augustine, Chrysostom, Basil, Gregory Nazianzen, and Theodoret aided in the conversion of their sons. St. Helena, Pulcheria, sister of Theodosius the Younger, Flacilla, wife of Theodosius the Great, and Placidia, wife of Valentinian III., were conspicuous defenders of the faith. The lofty virtues, charity, and zeal of Marcella, Paula, Furia, and Fabiola will never be forgotten.

‡ *Neque enim Brachmanæ, aut Indorum gymnosophistæ sumus, sylvicolæ et exules vitæ.—Apol.* 44.

§ Socrates attributes their origin to an ascetic Egyptian named Ammon.—*Eccl. Hist.* iv. 23.

words read, "If thou wilt be perfect, go sell all that thou hast, and give to the poor," they came like a voice from heaven, and irresistibly led him to literal obedience. He immediately withdrew into the wilderness, and underwent the most extreme austerities. He fasted for days, dwelt in caves or among the tombs, slept on the bare ground, and scourged his frame with frequent and unsparing flagellation. His morbid and gloomy imagination dwelt much on the terrors of the quenchless fire, on the torment of the undying worm. He fancied himself the object of demoniacal assault. Loathsome, bestial forms, doubtless the creatures of delirium, haunted his lonely cell; or, more terrible still, beings of unearthly beauty sought to allure him to perdition. But he fought valiantly against them, "chasing them with holy words as with whips," and was succoured in his extremity by the direct interposition of Christ. In consequence of his superior sanctity he became endued with thaumaturgic power, and many were the miracles of healing and beneficence that spread his fame abroad. Multitudes of devout ascetics followed him to the wilderness, till, lo! writes his biographer, "The cells in the mountains were like tents, filled with divine choirs, singing, discoursing, fasting, praying, rejoicing, over the hope of the future, working that they might give alms thereof, and having love and concord with each other, so that one seeing would have said, 'How goodly are thy tents, O Jacob, and thy tabernacles, O Israel!'"

In the Galerian persecution, A.D. 311, he hastened to the arena of suffering in Alexandria, to cheer and succour the noble wrestlers of God, and eagerly sought the crown of martyrdom. Failing to obtain it, he plunged still deeper into the desert,* and became the oracle of the whole valley of the Nile, foretelling the future, casting out devils, and healing all manner of sickness and disease at the sign of the cross. He was also the zealous champion of orthodoxy in the virulent Arian controversy. He died at the venerable age of a hundred and five, leaving his two sheepskins, all his earthly possessions, to Bishops Athanasius and Serapion, a legacy more precious in their estimation than treasures of silver and gold.

More extravagant still are the tales told of St. Antony by Jerome in his life of St. Paul. "These things," the narrator

* "As a fish out of water, so is a monk in the city," is his characteristic remark.

naively remarks, "will seem incredible to those who do not believe, but to those who do believe all things are possible." According to this "holy romance," Antony in his old age had a revelation of a monk holier and better than himself, and set out to seek him. A hippocentaur, a monstrous birth of the desert, pointed out the way. Then a satyr, with goat-like horns and legs, besought Antony to pray for his tribe.* Finally a she-wolf led him to the cave of the blessed Paul. A raven which for sixty years had brought half a loaf daily to the holy man now brought a whole one; but neither of the saints would break it, Paul declining because he was the host, Antony because he was the younger man. After a day's dispute they compromised the matter by each talking hold of an end of the loaf and pulling till it broke. In three days Paul was found dead upon his knees. Two lions dug his grave, and Antony, with many prayers and pious hymns, laid the First Hermit to his dreamless rest. With such puerilities is the legend of the Rise of Monachism disfigured and its historic value invalidated.

The practice of monastic retirement spread like an epidemic throughout Christendom. Soon no lonely island, no desert shore, no gloomy vale was without its laura or monastery. At the close of the fourth century, Jerome declares that there existed an innumerable multitude of monks,† and bursting into poetical enthusiasm, exclaims, "O wilderness, blooming with the flowers of Christ! O desert, rejoicing in communion with the Deity!" The Thebaid swarmed with anchorets, who were seemingly spawned, it was contemptuously said, like the ancient plague of frogs, from the mud of the Nile. They became a mighty nation, soon rivalling in number the population of the cities.‡ All classes of society shared the contagion. Men, weary of the ignoble life and petty ambitions of cities, left the palace§ and the forum for the solemn silence of the desert, and forsook the babbling strife of tongues for solitary communion with God. Women, sated and sickened with fashionable folly and tawdry vanity, with something

* "Lest this should seem incredible to any," Jerome asserts that one of this species was brought alive to Alexandria, and, when dead, salted and taken to Antioch for the Emperor's inspection.

† "Monachorum innumerabilis multitudo."

‡ Quanti populi habentur in urbibus tantæ pæne habentur in desertis multitudines monachorum. *Rufin* 7.—Pachomius, the first disciple of St. Antony, had 7,000 followers.

§ Arsenius, the tutor of Arcadius and Honorius, fled to the Thebaid and wept his life away. Constans, the son of Constantine, and the Emperor Julian, at one time wore the monastic habit.—Oros. *Hist.* vii., 40; Soc. iii. 1.

of the old Roman spirit flashing in their eyes, turned from the frivolous enjoyments of the world to a life of stern asceticism. With hearts aching for a spiritual sympathy which they found not in their often loveless homes, they yearned for the Divine perfection, and poured the precious ointment of their lives on the feet of the Celestial Bridegroom. Worldly wise mothers had to shut up their daughters to prevent their yielding to the persuasive eloquence of Jerome, the great apostle of monachism.

Incapable of sympathising with these profound convictions, Gibbon sneeringly remarks, that, "impelled by a dark and implacable superstition, men embraced a life of misery as the price of eternal happiness." Nevertheless much of error and of wrong was mixed with these spiritual aspirations. The tenderest affections of the human heart were relentlessly crushed, and the holiest domestic duties neglected, as an acceptable offering to God. The fanatical enthusiast often abandoned the wife of his bosom, became deaf to the cry of his famishing child, and refused to look on the face of the mother that bore him.* And this merciless severity was eulogised as the highest Christian heroism.†

But these deluded beings were as savagely austere to themselves as to others. They regarded pleasure as synonymous with sin, cleanliness of body as pollution of soul, and even undisturbed slumber as a guilty indulgence.‡ They tortured themselves by wearing heavy weights and chains, iron girdles that ate into the flesh, and hair shirts, and rivalled the ingenuity of the Indian fakir in their distorted posture and agonising penances. They often dwelt, like the demoniacs, among the tombs, amid the ghastly gloom of the sepulchre, and surrounded by the mouldering dead; or, usurping the den of some wild animal, whose savage aspect they imitated, they became degraded to the level of the brutes.§ Sordid and filthy, clad in rags or skins, or only with their unkempt and matted hair, they lived outwardly the life of a beast, that,

* See the case of St. Simeon Stylites *postea*, and the following epitaph of Paula:—

"Fratrem, cognatos, Romani, patriamque relinquens,
Divitias, sobolem, Bethlehemite conditur antro."

† "Pietatem in filios, pietate in Deum superans nesciebat se matrem ut Christi probaret ancillam."—Hieron. *Epitaph. Paulæ.*

‡ Many of them never lay down. The *Acœmetæ*, or sleepless, maintained perpetual service night and day. St. Simeon Stylites is *said* to have fasted forty days: another spake no word for forty years.

§ Hilarion lived in a tomb-like cell four feet long and five feet high, in which he could neither stand nor lie.

they said, they might live inwardly the life of an angel.* The anchorets of Mesopotamia seemed to have inherited the awful doom of Nebuchadnezzar. Self-exiled from mankind, they had their dwelling-place with the beasts of the field, and ate grass like the oxen.†

Faint from fasting, and almost maniacal from solitude and long-continued austerities, the monk often mistook for palpable realities the phantoms of his own delirious brain. All hideous sounds and scenes of horror and affright haunted his midnight vigils in his desert cave. Furious and malignant fiends, whose demoniac laughter curdled his blood,‡ contending for his soul, assailed him with their most subtle and terrible temptations; and forms of unearthly beauty beguiling him to sin, awoke to morbid intensity the appetites of the rebel flesh. He could fly from the abodes of men, but not from the passions of his own heart. Cries and tears, and agonies of prayer, alternated with the ecstasies of beatific visions and paroxysms of despair.§

The records of these monkish austerities, as given by Theodoret, Evagrius, Socrates, Sozomen, and other contemporary writers, is a painful chapter in the history of fanaticism. The once beautiful Mary of Egypt became sordid and emaciated. By constant genuflexion and prayer the knees of the Roman damsel Asella became hard as a camel's.‖ Arsenius wept himself blind for his sins. Hilarion, unable to find solitude in the desert, fled to a distant island, "that the sea might hide what the land would not."¶ The fiery zeal of Basil early consumed his frame by the extraordinary penances it imposed. "For twenty years," said Macarius, "I have neither eaten, drunk, nor slept, as nature craved. My bread has been weighed, my water measured, and my sleep has been stolen while reclining against a wall."**

But in the discipline of the pillar-saints the ingenuity of

---

* The following is a Pagan opinion of these pious ascetics:—"There is a race," says Eunapius, "called monks—men, indeed, in form, but hogs in life, who practise and allow abominable things. Whoever wears a sordid robe, and is not ashamed of filthy garments, and presents a dirty face to public view, obtains tyrannical power."

† These Βόσκοι, or grazing monks, are the subject of a panegyric by St. Ephrem, and are described by Sozomen, vi. 33.

‡ Hilarion dwelt near an ancient demon-haunted temple, and heard ever on the night wind wailing voices sob around his lonely cell, doubtless the cry of wild fowls and beasts of prey.

§ "Monachus autem non doctoris habet sit plangentis."—Hieron. *Contra Vigilant.* xv.

‖ Ib. *Epis.* xxi.

¶ Hieron. *Vit. Hilar.*

** Socrat. iv. 23.

self-torture seems to have culminated. St. Simeon Stylites, the first of these enthusiasts, according to Theodoret, spent thirty-seven years on the top of four pillars respectively six, twelve, twenty, and forty cubits high, twenty years being spent on the last,

> "In coughs, aches, stitches, ulcerous throes, and cramps,
> In rain, wind, frost, heat, hail, damp, sleet, and snow." *

He had previously dwelt in a tank haunted by unclean spirits, and chained for years to a crag. He bound a well-rope round his body till it ate into his flesh. He frequently fasted for forty days. He spent his time in prayer, with outstretched arms, or with ceaseless bowings and genuflections.† "His mighty works," says his panegyrist, "were as ineffable as the depth of the Atlantic sea. He wrought miracles of healing, uttered prophecies, received embassies, adjudged disputes, and stirred up the Emperor and kings to pious zeal. Pilgrims by the thousand sought his benediction, and multitudes of Pagans renounced their idols at his preaching. So holy was he that no woman, not even his mother, might draw near him. The latter, wishing to see him before she died, came and, standing afar off, besought him, by the birth-pangs she had suffered, by her mother's milk, and kiss, and care, to let her see his face. But hiding his features, he exclaimed, 'Lady mother, wait a little while, and we shall see each other in eternal rest.' And though she besought three days he refused to look upon her. He himself—was it a Divine retribution?—lay bowed three days upon the column before it was known that he was dead."‡ The loathsome and ulcered condition of this "all-holy martyr of the air"§ was the highest ideal of the Christian heroism of the age, and became the model of numerous imitators.

But these solitary ascetics were harmless compared with the bands of fierce and bigoted monks who prowled around the country,‖ or swarmed in the great cities of the Empire, often filling their streets with violence and bloodshed.

---

* See Tennyson's noble poem, which treats this strange theme with intense power and subtle mental analysis.

† One observer counted 1,244 prostrations, and then lost computation.—Theodoret, *Philotheus*.

‡ The wailing of the birds, and beasts, and people on this occasion, says Theodoret, was heard seven miles off.

§ Παναγίος καὶ αἰρίος μάρτυρος, is the title given him by the Emperor Theodosius.

‖ "Gyrovagi," they were called, which may be translated "vagabonds."

Alexandria stood more in awe of the mob of bare-legged, black-cowled fanatics by which it was infested, than of a hostile army. Their savage turbulence culminated in the barbarous murder of the noble and beautiful Hypatia, the finest representative of Attic culture in that last refuge of the muses, where "the leaden mace of monkish bigotry shivered the tempered steel of Greek philosophy."*

The Western monk, however, never exhibited the delirious fanaticism which characterised the Eastern confraternities. He was more amenable to control and more industrious in life. "Beware of idleness," wrote St. Benedict, "as the greatest enemy of the soul." *Qui laborat orat*, was the motto of his order. Under the inspiration of this principle, work, before degraded as the task of slaves and serfs, was ennobled and dignified, and many of the Latin confraternities became the pioneers of agriculture and civilisation among rude and barbarous European tribes. They were also less austere and ascetic than the Eastern orders. They exhibited less spiritual selfishness and clearer conceptions of Christian duty. "I serve God that I may save my lost soul," exclaimed the Stylite, and, fakir-like, cursed the world as a scene of baleful enchantment. The gentle heart of St. Francis of Assisi, the flower of the Western monks, went forth in affection to all created things,† and inculcated boundless beneficence as the essence of Christianity.

While fraught with much of error and of evil, this system was not without noble compensations. It asserted the dignity of humanity, rebuked wrong in high places, smote the yoke from the neck of the slave,‡ maintained the sanctity of human life,§ and in an age of violence and blood exhibited the superiority of moral influence to brute force. It furnished an organisation of charity for the relief of poverty and suffering when hospitals and asylums were unknown,‖

* "They mangled her body with shells and then burned it."—Socrat. vii. 15; Philostorg. viii. 9.

† In his "Song of the Creatures," he gives thanks for his brother the sun, his sister the moon, his mother the earth, for the water, the fire, and even for his sister Death. "Laudato sia Dio mio Signore . . . messer le frate sole . . . per suor luna . . . per nostra madre terra . . . nostra morte corporale." St. Antony preached to the birds and fishes, and the whole monkish brotherhood possessed wondrous power over the fiercest beasts.

‡ "The neck of man," said the pious Syrian hymnist, St. Ephraim, of Edessa, "should bear no yoke but that of Christ."

§ The zeal of an Eastern monk Telemachus put an end for ever to the human sacrifices of the amphitheatre by the offering of his own life in a saintly martyrdom of humanity.—Theodor. v. 26, A.D. 398.

‖ In the terrible Black Death of the 14th century, 124,000 Franciscans fell

and offered a quiet refuge for gentle souls, who, throughout the long dark night of the Middle Ages, trimmed the lamp of learning flickering well-nigh to extinction. With the Christian Church, it was almost the only institution that survived the wreck of the old Roman world.* The monks became the apostles of Mediæval Europe. St. Guthlac in Lincoln's fens and on Yorkshire wolds; St. Columba in lone Iona and on storm-swept Lindisfarne; St. Boniface amid Thuringian forests; St. Columbanus in Helvetian vales; Methodius and Cyril amid the recesses of Bulgaria and Bohemia; and Anskar amid Norwegian fjords raised the voice of prayer and hymn of praise, and planted the germs of the new life of Christendom.

But this system, however clear in the spring, became miry in the stream. It shared an inveterate taint from which sprang frightful corruptions invoking its destruction. It lies not within our scope to describe the fall of Monachism. The picturesque ruins of the English abbeys and priories are the monument of an institution out of harmony with the spirit of the age, and to be remembered without regret. In lands where it still exists it is an anachronism and an incubus—a belated ghost of midnight walking in the light of day.

---

victims to their zeal in their temporal and spiritual ministrations to the sick and dying.

* In the libraries of the Benedictine order the Arethusan spring of ancient learning sprang up afresh. In the fourteenth century it had 37,000 monasteries. They were the ark of classic literature, and no order has contributed such a galaxy of illustrious names to the world.

ART. III.—1. *A Life's Labours in South Africa. The Story of the Life-work of Robert Moffat, Apostle to the Bechuana Tribes.* London: John Snow and Co., Paternoster Row.

2. *The Past and Future of the Kaffir Races.* By the Rev. W. C. HOLDEN, Wesleyan Methodist Missionary Twenty-seven Years in South Africa. Sold at 66, Paternoster Row.

"IN October 1816 a meeting of deep interest to the cause of Missions was held at Surrey Chapel, London. Nine young men were, on that occasion, ordained as Missionaries under the auspices of the London Missionary Society. Their names were Bourne, Darling, Platt, and John Williams, who were set apart for the South Sea Islands; and Evans, Kitchingman, Taylor, John Brownlee, the father of the Kaffir missions, and Robert Moffat, the Apostle of the Bechuana Tribes, appointed to South Africa. Of that chivalrous band, two survivors alone remain—John Brownlee and Robert Moffat. The former of these two still abides in the land of his adoption, where, in Kaffir phraseology, 'he has fixed a pole, like the Kaffir Boom (Broom ?) and the wild plum, which, wherever they are planted, take root, bring forth leaves and flowers, and bear fruit, although he who planted them may in time become unknown to anyone.' The latter, in the month of June 1870, came out from the far African interior, where he had so long exerted an influence for good, failing health having necessitated a return to his native land. On that occasion, colonists of every class assembled to do him honour; and public meetings, comprising representatives of all denominations, were convened to welcome and thank the devoted Christian Missionary."

Such is the opening passage of the work which gives an account of the salient points in the 52 years of the Missionary life of Robert Moffat, justly termed the "Apostle of the Bechuanas." As the successor of the pioneers, Van der Kemp and Evans, who had pushed on into Kaffraria, and under the two stimulants of necessity and a conviction of its being the surest and, in fact, only method of acquiring a knowledge of the manners, customs, policy, &c., &c., of the natives, he took up his abode in the miserable huts in

which they existed. Thus he became acquainted with the language, and subsequently, by dint of intense labour and study, was at length enabled to give them the entire Bible "in their own tongue in which they were born." When we take into account the fact that there was no written language, or character to indicate it, no knowledge whatever of a literature, however barbarous, that work alone would warrant the highest estimate of the life of any man, as a decided step towards the conversion of the myriads of the heathens of Africa to Christianity. There are two maxims, to the truth of which every Christian will at once subscribe, and which we have reason to hope are gradually forcing themselves upon the conviction of our statesmen. The first is, that Christianity is the highest style of civilisation; the second, that the highest test of civilisation is the value attached to human life. It is not too much to assume, that on the prevalence of the principles involved in these two propositions depends in a great measure the prosperity, the security, and the permanence of all social institutions. We shall see in the work before us illustrations gathered from both conditions of society indicated in the above sentence.

On arrival at the Cape the missionaries found that they were interdicted from proceeding beyond the boundaries of the Colony, and could only obtain permission to preach and teach to those Boers and Hottentots who resided there. Mr. Moffat was therefore deterred for the present from proceeding to Kaffirland, which was his destination; but his time in the bounds of the Colony was not thrown away; for by his preaching to the Boers, who at first ridiculed the idea of teaching the Hottentots, he wholly reconciled the masters to the admission of the Hottentots their servants. He learned the languages—both Dutch and Hottentot—by a residence with a pious Hollander; at length obtained permission to go up the country; and immediately began his campaign by begging a night's lodging of one of the settlers.

"The burly farmer roared out his reply like a beast of the forest, and the negative put upon the young stranger's request was less terrible to him than the stern tone in which it was conveyed. Not frightened out of his 'mother-wit,' the young Scot thought to himself, 'I'll try the "quiet wife."' Far away from his 'ain mither,' he met with a different reception from her. 'To be sure, you shall have both bed and board, but whither are you bound and what is your errand?' Well, he was bound for Orange River, to teach the native tribes the way of salvation. 'What! to Namaqua land, that hot in-

hospitable region? And will the people there, think you, listen to the Gospel, or understand it if they do?' Be that as it will, when asked by the kind-hearted frau to preach it to her and her husband, the latter seconded it with promptly returning, 'Oh aye; nought else would give him greater delight.' The farmer had a hundred Hottentot servants, but those were not at first admitted to the service. 'May some of your servants come in?' said Moffat to the Boer. 'Eh!' roared the man; 'Hottentots! Are you come to preach to Hottentots? Go to the mountains and preach to the baboons; or, if you like, I'll fetch my dogs, and you may preach to them!' Moffat had intended to take for his text 'the neglect of so great salvation,' but taking the word out of his rough entertainer's lips, he read as a text, 'Truth, Lord; yet *the dogs* eat the crumbs that fall from their master's table.' The repeated text was fastened as a nail in a sure place as thoroughly as if it had been driven home by the Master of assemblies. 'No more of that,' cried the Boer, like the man in the play; 'I'll bring you all the Hottentots in the place.' He was as good as his word, the sermon was preached and the congregation dispersed. 'Who,' said the farmer, in a more musical voice, 'who hardened your hammer to deal my head such a blow? I'll never object to preaching the Gospel to Hottentots again.'"—Pp. 11—13.

Mr. Moffat's destination was the Kaffir tribes beyond the Orange River as well as those within the boundaries of the Colony. It is very remarkable that his first convert to Christianity was a Kaffir chief of the name of Africaner. We shall have occasion to refer to this man at some length presently, but shall now first give some account of the Kaffir race, which in both physical and intellectual powers appear to be far superior to either the Hottentots or the Negroes.

The origin and history of the Kaffirs forms a blank page in that of the world of mankind at large. All attempts of those best acquainted with that people have only led to conjectures and plausible theories which in the face of facts admit of very slender proofs. Holden, who resided amongst them as a missionary from the Wesleyan Society for twenty-seven years, and made the question his study, has not been able to go beyond conjecture. Appleyard, who wrote a grammar of the Kaffir language, goes no farther than to divide the Kaffirs into classes, namely, the *Click class* and the *Alliteral class*, signifying the different modes of pronunciation. The recent researches of Dr. Livingstone in the South, and of Speke in the North, have elicited little or nothing satisfactory on the subject. One fact alone remains undisputed, namely, the

antiquity of the race and the entire absence of the most remote or simple indication of their ever having possessed a written language or any method by which to perpetuate the memory of striking events in their history. All the *past* with them is confined to the events that have occurred during their own lives, or, at most, the lives of their immediate ancestors. Mr. Holden, in his work on *The Past and Future of the Kaffir Races*, is inclined to ascribe their origin to dispersion at the confusion of tongues, and thinks they emigrated from Havilah on the banks of the Euphrates to the wilderness of Shin, and from thence they spread themselves south and west in Arabia. This, however, is, like every other theory on the subject, confessedly mere conjecture, and, in the entire absence of any traditionary or documentary evidence, is only the most probable theory that can be given. The question, therefore, will remain a mystery; and when the white man, by his superiority in war, has driven the Kaffir off the face of the earth (as has generally been the case when barbarism has had to dispute possession of the soil with civilisation), what is known of them will sink into oblivion.

As soon as the prohibition to proceed into the interior was removed, Mr. Moffat resolved to go at once across the Orange River to visit that murderous chief Africaner, who was, at that period, the terror of the colony, and under ban for the murder of a colonist in the presence of his wife and family. He was accompanied by the Rev. Mr. Ebner, another missionary, who had, however, unfortunately had a dispute with another chief, which eventually led him to abandon that sphere of labour to Mr. Moffat. The journey to Namaqua Land was painful and dangerous. "A dry and thirsty land, where no water is," is a literally correct description of the waste, howling wilderness through which the travellers passed. But we cannot dwell upon the horrors of this "middle passage;" at the end of it he reached the kraal at which the formidable object of his journey resided, and was very coolly received by Africaner, probably on account of his being accompanied by his brother missionary, who was not on friendly terms with the chiefs. This, no doubt, determined Mr. Ebner to proceed alone to another part of the country. The result proved the wisdom of this change; it withdrew a second obstacle to success, the presence of a missionary who, from whatever cause, was not in favour with the chiefs, and Mr. Moffat was thus left alone to do his best to accomplish his mission.

Under the circumstances this was no easy work. Without any knowledge whatever of God or of His worship, and with few or no favourable specimens of the influence of Christianity upon the conduct of the Boers in their intercourse with the natives, the chiefs were naturally enough suspicious of the motives of the Missionaries. They could not understand why a civilised man should leave his country to settle among savages, unless he was fleeing from justice for some crime he had committed. As to his message of love and mercy from Jesus, they pronounced it "*maca-héla*," "all lies;" this was the only answer they gave to it.

But after long years of waiting and watching a signal triumph awaited him that proved its truth. This was the conversion of the terrible chief *Africaner*, the outlawed Hottentot, the man of blood, whose former life had been one continued scene of murder and desolating hostility to both the Colonists and the native tribes. This formidable chief was the first-fruits of Moffat's instruction, and in his immediately subsequent conduct he exhibited a noble illustration of the aphorisms we have ventured to cite above.

"'As I was standing,' said Moffat, 'with a Namaqua chief, gazing at Africaner, in a supplicating posture, intreating parties ripe for a battle to live at peace, "Look!" said the chief, "there is the man, once the lion at whose roar even the dwellers in far distant hamlets fled in terror from their homes."' This also was the man at whose mild command the women about the kraal collected bundles of mats, and sticks like fishing-rods, to make for the missionary appointed by the Directors in London, in half-an-hour, a house that sufficed him for six months, though sometimes invaded by a duel between two bulls, and more frequently by hungry curs, or hissing serpents." —P. 21.

The conversion of Africaner was like that of a host in point of influence. His mental powers were far above those of his compeers; and, when quickened by the enlightening influence of the Gospel, he gave his whole heart and soul to the study of the Scriptures, of which, though a moderate reader, he soon, with Mr. Moffat's instructions, understood the purport. What must have been the young missionary's feelings to see, after nine years of anxious working and waiting, this man of blood "sitting at the feet of Jesus, clothed, and in his right mind!" The trials he necessarily underwent in that waste, howling wilderness, were of no ordinary character. "I had no friend or brother with

whom I could participate in the Communion of the Saints—none to whom I could look for counsel or advice. A barren and miserable country, a small salary of £25 a year, no grain, and consequently no bread, and no prospect of getting any for want of water to cultivate the ground, and destitute of all means of sending to the Colony."* This description is rather under than over the truth; for, from the Fish river to St. Helena Bay, a distance of 15 degrees or 1,000 miles, the whole country is a burning sand without a continuous stream of fresh water,—those which exist there being sometimes dry for years together. In such seasons the only resource is digging holes in the rivers' beds or in the sands, sometimes to the depth of twenty feet. Thunderstorms, when accompanied by rain, are a blessing, but they frequently occur without a drop of rain. The young missionary's food was milk and meat; frequently, however, having recourse to the "fasting girdle," to allay, in some measure, the pangs of hunger. But his faith never failed. His trials at this period, and the success that followed his perseverance and courage, were a good preparation for his subsequent course.

Great was his encouragement in the conversion of Africaner, whose character was thenceforth *sans peur et sans reproche*, his missionary friend having never after had to remind him of his failure in morals or Christian conduct. Watts' well-known description was literally exemplified in him. He was perhaps the most remarkable instance which the history of modern missions furnishes of the power of Christianity suddenly to transform the character of a finished savage into that of a gentle and simple-hearted disciple of Christ.

"One day," says the Missionary, "when seated together, I happened in absence of mind to be gazing steadfastly on him. It arrested his attention, and he modestly inquired the cause. I replied, 'I was trying to picture to myself your carrying fire and sword through the country, and I could not think how eyes like yours could smile at human woe.' He answered not, but shed a flood of tears."† Such was the influence of the Gospel wrought by Divine grace in this "Lion" of Namaqua land. "He wept with those who wept," was the friend of the fatherless and widow, relieved his missionary friend's necessities by gifts of cattle which saved him many a supperless night; and the love of war gave place to the spirit of peace.

---

* P. 167. † P. 24.

Circumstances required Mr. Moffat's presence at Cape Town, and Africaner accompanied him there: at great risk too —for the reward of a thousand rix-dollars for his apprehension was still offered. Nothing was known of the chief's conversion, and reports had reached Cape Town that Mr. Moffat had been murdered by him, and that Mr. Ebner had narrowly escaped the same fate. On their way thither they had to ask food and shelter from one of the Boers.

"This man was a good man, in the best sense of the word, and he and his wife had shown me kindness on my way to Namaqua-land. On approaching the house, which was on an eminence, I directed my men to take the waggon to the valley below, while I walked toward the house. The farmer, seeing a stranger, came slowly down the descent to meet me. When within a few yards, I addressed him in the usual way, and, stretching out my hand, expressed the pleasure at seeing him again. He put his hand behind him, and asked rather wildly who I was? I replied that I was Moffat, expressing my wonder that he should have forgotten me. 'Moffat!' he rejoined, in a faltering voice; 'it is your ghost!' and moved backward. 'I am no ghost,' I replied. 'Don't come near me!' he exclaimed. 'You have been long murdered by Africaner.' 'But I am no ghost,' I said, feeling my hands, as if to convince him and myself, too, of my materiality; but his alarm only increased. 'Everybody says you were murdered, and a man told me he had seen your bones;' and he continued to gaze at me to the no small astonishment of the good wife and children, who were standing at the door, as also to that of my people, who were looking on from the waggon below. At length he extended his trembling hand, saying, 'When did you rise from the dead?' As he feared my presence would alarm his wife, we bent our steps toward the waggon, and Africaner was the subject of our conversation. I gave him, in a few words, my views of his present character, saying, 'He is now a truly good man;' to which he replied, 'I can believe almost anything you say, but *that* I cannot credit. There are seven wonders in the world, *that* would be the eighth.' . . . By this time we were standing near to Africaner, on whose countenance sat a smile, for he well knew the prejudices of some of the farmers. The farmer closed the conversation by saying, with much earnestness, 'Well, if what you assert be true respecting that man, I have only one wish, and that is, to see him before I die; and when you return, as sure as the sun is over our heads, I will go with you to see him, though he killed my own uncle.' I was not before aware of this fact, and now felt some hesitation whether to discover to him the object of his wonder. But knowing the sincerity of the farmer and the goodness of his disposition, I said, 'This, then, is Africaner!' He started back, looking intensely at the man, as if he had just dropped from the clouds. 'Are you Africaner?' he

exclaimed. The chief arose, doffed his old hat, and, making a polite bow, answered, 'I am!' . . . 'Oh, God,' exclaimed the farmer, lifting up his eyes, 'what a miracle of Thy power! What cannot Thy grace accomplish!'"—Pp. 27—29.

It appears the foundation of Africaner's conversion was laid under the ministry and teaching of Christian Albrecht and the guidance of the Holy Spirit. His faith was not confined to the abstract knowledge of the truth, but was carried out in every department of life, and specially in his perseverance in his endeavours to prevent war amongst the tribes hostile towards each other. After the removal of Moffat to the station of the Bechuanas, under the direction of the Rev. John Campbell and Dr. Philip, the deputies of the London Missionary Society, Africaner placed himself under the teaching of the Methodist Missionaries, of whom there were a number of zealous and pious men. One of them, the Rev. J. Archbell, in a letter to Dr. Philip, thus describes the death of this once terrible chief:—

"When he found his end approaching he called his people together after the example of Joshua, and gave them directions as to their future conduct. 'We are not,' said he, 'what we were—*savages*, but men professing to be taught according to the Gospel. Let us, then, do accordingly. Live peaceably, if possible, with all men; and if impossible, consult those who are placed over you before you engage in anything. Remain together as you have done since I knew you; then, when the directors think fit to send you a missionary, you may be ready to receive him. Behave to any teacher you may have sent as one sent of God, as I have great hopes that God will bless you in this respect when I am gone to heaven. I feel that I love God, and that He has done much for me, of which I am totally unworthy. My former life is stained with blood, but Jesus Christ has pardoned me, and I am going to heaven. Oh, beware of falling into the same evils into which I have led you frequently, but seek God, and He will be found of you to direct you.'"—P. 32.

The visit of Messrs. Campbell and Philip to the Cape Colony was for the purpose of re-arranging the localities of the Society's missionaries, who were summoned to meet them at Cape Town. Mr. Moffat, on this occasion, met the lady, Miss Smith, to whom he had long been engaged before leaving England, and who, as his future wife, proved an able and willing helpmeet in all his arduous efforts, his heavy discouragements, and most wonderful success. The deputies, in their

journeys to examine the several stations, took him with them preparatory to his appointment to the Bechuana Station. His own wish was to remain at his post in Namaqua-land, where his efforts were beginning, under God, to produce their effect upon the people, and he did not consent until Africaner himself acquiesced in the step, under the impression that he and his people would remove to the same neighbourhood, which, however, did not take place. The station he was to occupy among the Bechuanas, "was one of the foremost posts in heathen soil, and beyond it were regions thickly populated by races who had never seen the face of a white man, and to whom Christianity and its attendant blessings were as yet unknown."* An attempt had been made in 1800 by Messrs. Edwards and Kok, of the Dutch Missionary Society, to establish a mission among the Bechuanas, but it proved a failure, and the parties became traders. Edwards accumulated property, and retired to Cape Town. Kok turned farmer, and was shot by two of his men at the Kuruman fountain. At the request of the Chief Mothibi, the London Missionary Society sent Messrs. Evans and Hamilton to Lithakoo in 1816. But, as the missionaries had nothing but the Gospel to give the people, and could neither make presents nor trade with them, they declined to receive them, reyoked their oxen to the waggon, and ordered them away. In 1821 Mr. Hamilton and Mr. and Mrs. Moffat were settled there as missionaries.

For five years they laboured without any apparent success. Ignorant even of the existence of a God or of a future state, the natives were callous and indifferent to their instructions unless accompanied with some material benefit.

"'Mary,' said Mr. Moffat, one day to his wife, 'this is hard work.' 'It *is* hard work, my love,' she replied, 'but take courage; our lives shall be given us for a prey.' 'But think, my dear,' he replied, 'how long we have been preaching to this people, and no fruits yet appear.' The wise woman, it is said, rejoined after this manner: 'The Gospel has not yet been preached to them *in their own tongues wherein they were born*; they have heard it only through interpreters who have themselves no just understanding, no real love of its truth. We must not expect the blessing till you be able, from *your own lips* and in *their own languages*, to bring it through their ears into their hearts.' 'From that hour,' said Mr. Moffat, 'I gave myself with untiring diligence to the acquisition of the language.' Ten long and anxious years he lived alone amongst the ignorance, the filth,

* P. 347.

the ferocity of these barbarous people, until he had acquired their equally barbarous language, and then he preached to them 'in their own tongue' the wondrous love of God and the mysteries of redemption by the Cross of Christ. 'At length they listened, and at last began to tremble, and finally wept; the heart of stone was broken, was melted; repenting of sin, they forsook it, and hearing the Gospel, they believed it."

The removal of Mr. Moffat from Namaqua-land, however painful, was a judicious decision on the part of the deputation. On the one hand, the Wesleyan Methodists had already possession of the ground, which has now become a flourishing Mission, with upwards of thirty stations, where the Gospel is preached to attentive and willing hearers. The Episcopal Church also has Missionaries in Kaffraria; and, although that Church is not established as a Government institution, it receives from the Government, according to Mr. Holden, £14,000 a year, whilst the Wesleyan Mission, which expends thousands annually, receives only £150. This inequality and partiality reflects discredit upon the spirit of what ought to be a Christian Government.*

The Directors of the London Missionary Society could not have selected a more efficient agent than Mr. Moffat for the Bechuana tribes. He applied himself to learning the Sechuana language, which was spoken; but the number of dialects of that tongue was large, and rendered its acquisition tedious and difficult. He mastered it so completely as to be "able to compose and print a volume of hymns, being the first ever composed in a native barbarous language. Probably there were errors in these, but they were preferable to a dependence on the interpreters." A Missionary who commences giving *direct* instruction to the natives, though far from competent in the language, is proceeding on safer ground than if he were employing an interpreter, who is not a proficient in both languages, and has not a tolerable understanding of the doctrines of the Gospel. "The salvation of the soul," said Mr. Moffat, "is a great *subject*." "The salvation of the soul," said the interpreter, "is a very great *sack!*"

The Missionaries had many discouragements, but they held on their way perseveringly. One of the greatest was the occurrence of a severe drought, which destroyed the cattle and rendered the land barren. The native rain-makers, for

* Holden, p. 443.

want of some better plea, pronounced the Missionaries the cause of the drought, and they were consequently ordered to quit the country.

"The chief who conveyed this message, stood at their cottage door, spear in hand, in presence of Mr. Moffat, who was watching the crisis, for such it was. Mild though he was, Moffat was, in courage and nerve, a match for the sternest and bravest of them. Before the deputed chief and his twelve attendants, he presented himself as fearlessly as David before Goliath and the Philistines. . . . There, too, stood his intrepid wife, an infant in her arms. With a steadfast gaze the tall Missionary looked the spear-bearing chief straight in the eyes, and thus, or to this effect, calmly and slowly replied, 'We were unwilling to leave you. We are now resolved to stay at our post. As for your threats, we pity you, for you know not what you do. We have suffered, it is true, and the Master whom we serve has said in His Word, "When they persecute you in one city flee ye to another." . . . If resolved to get rid of us, you must take stronger measures to succeed, for our hearts are with you. You may shed my blood, or you may burn my dwelling, but I know that you will not touch my wife and children, and you will surely reverence the grey head of my venerable friend (pointing to Mr. Hamilton). As for me, my decision is made. I do not leave your country.' Then throwing open his waistcoat, he stood erect and fearless. 'Now, then,' said he, 'if you will, drive your spears to my heart; and when you have slain me, my companions will know that the hour is come for them to depart.' 'These men,' said the chief, turning to his attendants, 'must have two lives. When they are so fearless of death, there must be something in immortality.' From that time, though his perils and trials were frequent, he found he had gained the hearts of the people."—P. 43.

Whilst the change in the disposition of the chiefs towards the Mission had rendered Mr. Moffat's residence and work more encouraging, events from without caused great alarm; but, as with the Apostle, the result was "to the furtherance of the Gospel." This was an invasion of an army of the Mantatees, "numerous as the locusts, and destroying, as they advanced, everything before them." Mr. Moffat, who had gone to learn the truth of the reports and other objects, was soon satisfied of the danger, and rode back to warn the Bechuanas of the impending destruction; thence he went to Griqua Town, to request the assistance of the friends there. A strong command was at once formed by the Griquas, which, uniting with the Bechuanas, advanced against the invaders and put them to flight. The custom of killing men, women, and children in one fell massacre on such occasions was then the order of the day. Mr. Moffat

galloped in amongst the Bechuanas and saved the lives of many of the helpless in age and sex.

"It was distressing to see mothers and infants rolled in blood, and the living baby in the arms of a dead mother. All ages and both sexes lay prostrate on the ground. Shortly after the Mantatees began to retreat, their women, on seeing that mercy was shown them, instead of fleeing generally sat down and, baring their bosoms, exclaimed, 'I am a woman! I am a woman!'"—P. 47.

The disinterested conduct of the Missionaries in this affair made a deep impression on the Bechuana chief Mothibi in their favour. Of this they availed themselves to obtain a new site for the Mission, and they selected the village of Kuruman, which was enriched with a fountain issuing, "full and flowing," from caverns in a hill, rendering it a most desirable spot for the purpose in that "dry and thirsty land where no water is," generally speaking. When settled in this new station, Mr. Moffat cast his eyes around and determined to pay a visit to Macaba, King of the Banangketsi, by whom he was favourably received. But when, at the audience, the King was told that religion was to be the sole subject of discourse, and had reference to God, of whom he declared he knew nothing, he refused to listen, until the Missionary spoke of a resurrection, which startled him.

"'What!' he exclaimed with astonishment, 'What are these words about? The dead, shall they arise?' 'Yes,' was the reply, 'all the dead shall arise.' 'Will my father arise?' 'Yes, your father will arise.' 'Will all the slain in battle arise?' 'Yes.' . . After looking at the Missionary for a few moments, he turned to his people, with a stentorious voice: 'Hark, ye wise men, whoever is among you, the wisest of past generations, did ever your ears hear such strange news?' Then turning to Moffat, 'Father,' he said, 'I love you much. Your visit and your presence has made my heart as white as milk, the words of your mouth are as sweet as honey, but the words of a resurrection are too great to be heard. I do not wish to hear again about the dead rising; the dead cannot rise; the dead must not arise!' . . . Never before had the light of Divine Revelation dawned upon his savage mind, nor his conscience accused him for one of the thousand deeds of rapine and murder which had marked his course through a long career."—P. 50.

Years were spent by Mr. Moffat and his colleague before the fruits of their labours and trials began to appear. In 1828 the natives cheerfully assisted in the building of a church and school-house, and a great improvement was seen in the social

habits of the people. The forge and the printing-press, at both of which the Missionary worked, were special objects of their admiration. To see a blank sheet of white paper covered, by a sort of sleight-of-hand movement, with letters and words in their own language, was past their comprehension. But the satisfaction of the Missionaries was equal to the astonishment of the natives. The latter now attended at worship, sitting in the new church, "clothed and in their right mind."

By this time the Missionaries had mastered the Sechuana language sufficiently to preach and pray in it; moreover, printed hymns and lessons out of the Scriptures were used, all in the native Sechuana. The formation, too, of a Christian Church, consisting of natives, with the exception of their teachers, has given a high place to Mr. Moffat in the Mission muster-roll. It must have struck the native strangers with awe as well as surprise, to hear the candidates for communion examined, and the previous service conducted, in the language of the country, or tribe, and to witness the serious and orderly conduct of the attendants. The death of the first native Christian took place about this time, the disease—*Kutsi*—being communicated through eating the flesh of animals infected with it. "Weep not," she said, "because I am about to leave you, but weep for your own sins and your own souls. With me all is well. Do not suppose that I die like a beast, to sleep for ever in the grave. No; Jesus has died for my sins; He has promised to save me, and I am going to be with Him."*

The Bechuana women, indeed, were far superior to the Bastaard women in character and intelligence, and when they had received the Gospel, threw their whole heart and soul into teaching it to their children. At the time of the visit of the Rev. J. J. Freeman to the settlement at the Kuruman, he was much struck with the advance of civilisation exhibited in a long street of houses of European character and construction, instead of the kraals of mud huts they formerly resided in. Mr. Freeman's visit to the station afforded the Directors of the Society in London a speaking and striking evidence of the fruitful labours of the Missionaries. Comfortable houses, with well-stocked gardens, watered by a cut from the Kuruman fountain; a chapel spacious and lofty, with a school-house; a Sunday-school-house, attendance being enjoined both morning and afternoon, and the

* P. 56.

chapel filled with men and women, mostly decently dressed; in fact a state of social life well calculated to attract the attention and promote the imitation of the tribes in the interior. Mr. Freeman was able to take with him to the Mission-house "in Bloomfield-street a strong impression of the value of the Station, as standing on the high road to the interior, and as a union and centre of influence to all around."*

That influence soon became felt through the medium of native newsmongers, who carried with them accounts of the Christian teachers: their kindness and purity of heart, their wonderful skill, their unflinching courage and noble bearing, conveying to the savage mind the idea that they were something more than ordinary men. It attracted the attention of Moselekatze, King of the Matabees, who lived in the country now known as the Transvaal Republic, a very Napoleon among the aborigines. Towards the close of 1829, this cruel despot despatched two of his trusted counsellors to visit the Kuruman and bring him an account of the proceedings of the teachers. These were kindly received by the Missionaries, who showed them marked attention. The men were savages pure and simple, but polite and dignified in their deportment, as persons of influence and authority at home, though not boasting of it. Their admiration also of the wonders they saw was expressed by the gravity and respect of their demeanour. "You are men," said they, "we are but children. Moselekatze must be taught all these things." When they had seen everything to their great astonishment and admiration, they prepared for their return home, when a rumour reached the Missionaries that some of the Sechuana tribes through whose country they had to pass, were preparing to destroy them. Mr. Moffat then resolved to accompany and protect them—a perilous undertaking, the distance being many hundred miles through a waste howling wilderness, filled with wild beasts and wild men. They were, however, by the good providence of God, preserved from all dangers, the lions' mouths being shut, and Mr. Moffat's good name and behaviour securing for him kindness and welcome from the natives.

When arrived at the borders of Moselekatze's country, it was his intention to have left the ambassadors and returned to the Kuruman; but, being earnestly pressed to visit

* P. 59.

the king, and assured by his companions that their appearance without him would be their death warrant, he consented, and proceeded with them to the residence of that potentate. They now passed through a district devastated by war; ruins of villages, heaps of stones mingled with human skulls. These were in part the bloody raids of Chaka, the ferocious Chief of the Zulus, who for fifty years made many an unpeopled desert where thousands had formerly resided in peace and plenty. Mr. Holden's work gives a graphic and fearful account of the times of this African Napoleon, who, unlike his prototype, never lost a battle, and was at length slain in cold blood by a near relative.

Mr. Moffat was desirous of knowing what had occasioned the desolation around him, and inquired of a Bacone, one of the tribe that had been exterminated, but could get nothing out of him about it. But—

"One Sabbath morning the Missionary ascended a hill to gain a view of the surrounding country. He had scarcely reached the summit and sat down, when his Bacone companion appeared, having stolen away from the party to answer some questions asked the day before, to which he could not then reply, because of the presence of his superiors. Seeing before him a large extent of ground covered with ruins, Moffat inquired what had become of the inhabitants. The man had just sat down, but he immediately arose, and stretching forth his arm in the direction of the ruins, said, 'I, even I, beheld it;' and then followed a graphic burst of eloquence descriptive of the utter ruin and desolation perpetrated by Chaka and his savage horde of barbarians. Every living thing was destroyed except the cattle, which were reserved alive for the purpose of feasting; and Mr. Moffat found that the poetic account of his Bacone friend was true to the letter, and no exaggeration.

"The barbarian monarch—styled by his equally barbarous sycophants, the 'Great Elephant,' 'Lion's Paw,' 'God of Cattle and Men,' &c.—received Moffat in a friendly way, shook hands, and invited him to an entertainment. He also pointed out a spot for his encampment. 'The land is before you,' said he; 'you are come to your son. You must sleep where you please.' He displayed great astonishment when the waggons, or 'moving houses,' appeared, and closely examined the vehicles in every part. The felloes of the wheels attracted his special wonder, being, as usual, in one piece. This was explained by Umbate, one of the men who accompanied Mr. Moffat, who, taking Moffat's hand, said, "My eyes saw that very hand cut these bars of iron, take a piece off one end, and then join them as you now see them.' 'Does he give medicine to the iron?' inquired the king. 'No,' said Umbate, 'nothing is used but fire, a hammer, and a chisel.'"—P. 70.

Mr. Moffat acquired a vast deal of knowledge of the country and its inhabitants, the Matabele, during the ten days he remained there; and he gave Moselekatze some wholesome lessons on the wickedness of the wars in which lay the monarch's chief delight and employment. Heathenism never appeared to the Missionary more repulsive than in the ferocious, horrid, and cruel practices which he heard of, and sometimes witnessed, among them. Although showing more attention to his warriors and his cattle than to the lessons of the Missionary, he still showed great friendship, and expressed gratitude to him for the advice he gave. Placing his hand on Mr. Moffat's shoulder one day, he addressed him by the title of "Father," saying, "you have made my heart as white as milk. I cease not to wonder at the love of a stranger. You never saw me before, but you love me more than my own people. You fed me when I was hungry, you clothed me when I was naked, you carried me in your bosom, and your arm shielded me from my enemies." On Mr. Moffat's replying that he was unconscious of having done him any such service, the king pointed to the two ambassadors who were standing by, saying,—

"'These are great men: Umbate is my right hand. When I sent them from my presence to see the land of the white man I sent my ears, my eyes, my mouth, &c.' . . . To the untutored mind of the savage chieftain, the generous conduct of the Missionary came as a new revelation. Himself an Ishmaelite of the Ishmaelites, constantly at war with the neighbouring tribes, he was unacquainted with acts of mercy or deeds of kindness, &c."—P. 72.

The visit to Moselekatze was well timed and judicious. Central Africa was, at that period, a *terra incognita* to European civilisation. Few travellers had attempted to explore it, and those few were taken off by fever or other disorders incident to the climate. But Mr. Moffat's successful journey excited great attention at the Cape as well as in Europe and America; and the Missionary Society, at his suggestion, sent three of their missionaries, Messrs. Lindley, Wilson, and Venables, in 1836, to establish a station at Mosega. Mr. Moffat accompanied and introduced them to the Matabele monarch, but the effort proved a failure. First, the whole party were prostrated by fever, of which Dr. Wilson's wife died. Soon after the Boers came in contact with Moselekatze and his warriors, when scenes of bloodshed and cruelty were enacted on both sides; but the superior skill and armament of

the Boers gave them an advantage, and the Matabeles were driven out with the loss of 400 of their numbers, with an immense number of cattle, and their kraals and other establishments reduced to ashes. Under these circumstances the three Missionaries withdrew with the victors, dreading the vengeance of the Matabele Chief. This latter, however, was himself driven out of the country by a powerful commander of the Natal Zulus, under the command of Dingaan, the bloody successor of Chaka, who came upon him from the East. Weakened as he was by his conflict with the Boers, Moselekatze fled northward to avoid a collision with a fresh enemy who carried blood and devastation wherever he went.

In Mr. Moffat's absence with the American Missionaries the work of his own mission was carried on by Mr. Hamilton, Mr. and Mrs. Edwards, and Mrs. Moffat, "his own faithful helpmate." Christianity and civilisation, hand-in-hand, made rapid progress. Many natives were added to the Church, and the schools were well attended. A trader was invited to open a store for the sale of British articles of commerce. Other Churches were also formed, and natives who could read and teach were stationed at the new Churches to instruct the candidates for Church fellowship. Mr. Moffat himself, whilst travelling in his waggon, translated the Assembly's Catechism and a portion of the Scriptures. This important work had been attempted at the beginning of the present century by Dr. Carlisle, Professor of Arabic at Cambridge; after the death of that learned man it was taken up by his successor, by the Oxford Professor of Arabic, and the Bishops of Durham and London. The subject being brought before the Bible Society, it was adopted by that institution, but on so small a scale as 300 copies, printed from the Polyglott, only a dozen of which were distributed amongst the Mohammedan natives at a part of the coast where a missionary of the Episcopal Church Society was shipwrecked. But in the year 1832 the London Missionary Society learned that Mr. Moffat had, amidst his numerous labours, effected a translation of the Gospel according to St. Luke in the Sechuana tongue, and had engaged to set the type himself, assisted by his colleagues, and under the superintendence of the official printer. He also printed his own hymns in Sechuana; and, with this commencement of his great work of translation, returned to his charge at the Kuruman Fountain Station. By 1840 he had completed the translation of the New Testament, and was gratified to find that the reading and hearing of its con-

tents had begun to take hold of the attention and consciences of the people. It was, however, deemed prudent to have the work printed in London under the auspices of the Bible Society, in Earl Street; and accordingly, he and Mrs. Moffat returned to England, leaving however evidence of the fruitfulness of his labour in hundreds of converted natives. "Does your book require you to talk to it?" inquired an unconverted of a converted native. "No," was the reply, "it talks to us, for it is the Word of God." "What, then! does it *speak?*" "Yes," rejoined the Christian, "it speaks to the heart!" Could any Christian men have expressed themselves in more correct or appropriate language?

On Mr. Moffat's return to Africa he was accompanied by Livingstone (his future son-in-law), Ross, Inglis, and Ashton, a reinforcement of the Mission that enabled him to prosecute the work of translation with proportionate energy. Six thousand copies of the New Testament had been printed under his own eye whilst in London, and the Psalms had before been printed. To these he first added the books of Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, and Isaiah, and 200 copies of these were printed for immediate circulation. In 1851 he had completed the rough draft of the whole Bible; and in 1854 he wrote to the Society that he was making it as perfect as he could. At that time Sechele, a powerful chief, had placed five of his children under his care for eighteen months, and on the expiry of that term he came to take them away. Instructed as they were by Mr. and Mrs. Moffat, the father could not fail to be both delighted and edified by his children on hearing them repeat the Scriptural lessons they had received out of the sacred books in his own language.

In the meantime, multiplied converts afforded much encouragement to the Missionaries. Fifty members were added to the Church at the Kuruman, and at the outlying stations the work of conversion under the native instructors went on satisfactorily. Not all these converts sustained their Christian profession, but certainly a large majority did so, and many of those who had lapsed and been suspended, were, upon evident signs of repentance, readmitted to Church fellowship. A season of great drought in 1851 rendered the country "harvestless, grassless, milkless." Mr. Moffat prayed, like Elijah, for rain, and soon after it fell in torrents. With what feelings he dwelt, at such a time, upon the words of Habakkuk's faith, the reader must learn from his own pathetic

words. In 1852, died Mr. Hamilton, the faithful coadjutor of Mr. Moffat for thirty-four years. Incapacitated by age and infirmity from taking an active part in the work, he was allowed to depart in peace, having seen the salvation of God gradually following his labours and those of his colleagues.

At this time, the Boers were at war with the native tribes around; but it is remarkable that they never attacked the Bechuanas at the Kuruman, and the work of conversion progressed without any interruption from without. The natives, too, were advancing in civilisation, and in those arts which add to the comfort, the happiness, and the duration of life. The most remarkable instances of this were the working of the fountains by means of canals for watering their fields, and the erection of dwellings after the models of the Missionary houses. It was equally true that the adoption of these and others of the arts of civilisation were the fruits of Christianity alone, and the cessation of aggressive warfare was also ascribed to the ameliorating influence of the same principles.

At length, in 1857, the work of the translation of the whole Bible was completed. Jeremiah was in the press, Ezekiel far advanced, and Daniel and the minor prophets ready for the compositor; and then the Old Testament would be complete.

"What Moffat's emotions were on this completion of his labours of so many years he himself thus describes. 'I could hardly believe myself in the world, so different was it for me to realise that my work of so many years was completed. Whether it was from weakness or overstrained exertion, I cannot tell; but a feeling came over me as if I should die, and I felt perfectly resigned. To overcome this, I went back again to my manuscript still to be printed, read it over and re-examined it, till at length I got back again to my right mind. . . . My feelings found vent by falling upon my knees, and thanking God for His grace and goodness in giving me strength to accomplish my task.'"—P. 91.

We think the compiler has scarcely done justice to Moffat in comparing him with Morrison in China, and Carey and Marshman in India. Without in the least detracting from the valuable labours of these men, who translated the whole of the Scriptures—the one into the Chinese, the other into the Indian language—we may observe, that in each of these cases, the Missionaries had a written and printed language, and a literature, with means at hand for ascertaining the

truth of their own rendering, besides the invaluable assistance of learned converts, who were as anxious as themselves to promote the work and render it as perfect as possible. But what was the case with Mr. Moffat? He was far from possessing all or any one of these advantages; there was no written or printed language—not even an alphabet, in the native tongue; and those natives to whom he applied to give him the true sense of words or sentences, took a delight in giving false and ludicrous renderings, which compelled him at length to take up his residence in the miserable, dirty, and degraded wigwams of the natives for months and years, thereby to become acquainted with the idioms of a language as barbarous as the people themselves. So far as that language is concerned, he may be justly said to have created it; for certainly, a language without the elements of literature to work upon in its arrangement is nothing but a jargon until it is brought into form. This was effected by Mr. Moffat, and the Sacred Scriptures translated and placed in the hands of a people taught by the same agency to read them. We may therefore say, with the compiler of the work: "If his life-labours had only attained the accomplishment of this great task, it alone would entitle him to the lasting gratitude of universal Christendom."*

The mental and bodily labour undergone by Mr. Moffat in the translation, added to his other Missionary employments, began to tell heavily on his health, and he determined to seek recreation and fresh air by a visit to his old acquaintance Moselekatze. For that purpose he joined a hunting and trading party, Messrs. Chapman and Edwards, in 1854, who were going in the same direction—a journey of six or seven hundred miles—to the capital of the old chief, through a desert country, without roads or other guides than the compass. By the occasional assistance of natives, he threaded his way through the desert, and also learned that Moselekatze had not forgotten him, and, what was more satisfactory to Mr. Moffat, had, to a certain extent, practised the lessons he had taught him, by which the condition of his subjects was materially improved. Twenty years had elapsed since his former visit, and the chief, who was afflicted with a dropsical affection from excessive drinking of beer, could not realise the presence of his old friend, and thought he saw a vision, and not "the man of a pure heart," as he called him.

* P. 92.

The Missionary, mindful of the body as well as the soul of his old friend, prescribed for him, and in a short time, under his treatment, he recovered so as to be able to walk. From the officers and other subjects of the chief, Mr. Moffat received a warm reception, so much had their condition been ameliorated by the change wrought by his instructions. On this occasion he, after some persuasion, obtained leave to preach to the people, which he commenced on Sept. 24th, 1854, and continued during his visit. Another benefit he derived from this journey and visit was the forwarding supplies to Dr. Livingstone, who had been compelled to advance in a northerly direction, in consequence of the hostility of the Transvaal farmers. The supplies, in bags, boxes, &c., were carried on the heads of trustworthy natives, to be delivered on an island near the Zambezi Falls. This was faithfully accomplished, and Dr. Livingstone found and received them there a year after.

Mr. Moffat took leave of Moselekatze in October. The king pressed him to prolong his visit, pleading that he had not seen enough of him, and not shown him sufficient kindness. "Kindness," he replied, "you have overwhelmed me with kindness, and I shall now return with a heart overflowing with thanks." By this journey his health was much improved, his intercourse and friendship with people of the interior were cemented and extended, and he looked forward with assurance to the early extension of Christianity to those distant regions.*

Dr. Livingstone returned to England in 1856, and his presence and appeals on behalf of the natives of Africa produced a powerful sensation amongst the religious bodies in England. The Universities sent out their representatives, whilst the London Missionary Society redoubled their exertions by extending their operations amongst the Matabele and the Makololo. This occasioned Mr. Moffat's again visiting Moselekatze, in order to obtain the old chief's consent to the establishing a Missionary settlement amongst his people. When he proposed this, the chief replied, "You must come also; I love you; you are my father." But though he objected to anything that lessened his power as a king, he had perception enough to admire the principles taught in the Gospel. On one occasion he remarked: "If all would think and act as that book teaches" (pointing to the Bible), "how sweetly

* P. 98.

could I sleep." Mr. Moffat therefore found that it was necessary for him to give the proposed Mission the full weight of his authority; in fact, to obtain for it the fiat of the king and his people. He also proposed an intermediate station between Kuruman and the Matabele country, the distance being seven hundred miles. The king gave his consent to every proposal of the Missionary, and the people, including the officers of the army, were only too glad to promote a new system from which they had already received so much good, in the amelioration of their condition. The king himself gave a proof of the influence produced on his own mind, by the liberation of a young chief, Macheng, the son of Sechele. This lad of ten years old had previously no prospect but that of being a prisoner for life; but at Moffat's request, Moselekatze gave up to him the young lad, and ordering him into his presence, said, half laughing, "Macheng, man of Moffat, go with your father. We have arranged respecting you. Moffat will take you back to Sechele; that is my wish, as well as his, that you should, in the first instance, be restored to the chief from whom you were taken in war." The return of this youth was hailed by 10,000 warriors, with all their warlike equipments. Sechele himself made a stirring speech on the unique occasion, in which he distinctly ascribed the event to "the Word of God" preached by Moffat and other Missionaries. "If," said he, "Moffat were not of God, he would not have espoused the cause of Sechele in receiving his words. . . . We talk of love. . . . Is it not through the love of God that Macheng is among us to-day?" We should be glad to give the whole account of this unparalleled meeting, but our extracts have already absorbed a large portion of the space allotted to us, and we must hasten to a close.

Before returning to Kuruman, after a completely successful meeting with Moselekatze, Mr. Moffat visited Cape Town, where he met with Dr. Livingstone on his way to the Zambezi. A few months after this occasion, John Moffat arrived, with Messrs. Price, Thomas, Sykes, and Makensie, from England, to labour among the Makololo and Matabele. On arriving at Kuruman, they separated: one party, under the direction of Mr. Helmore, a veteran who had for many years been stationed at Lekatlong, proceeded north to the Makololo; the other to the Matabele, under the guidance of Mr. Moffat himself, to whom a warm reception was accorded by the old chief. An incident occurred on this journey which still more convinced him of

the disinterested anxiety of Mr. Moffat for his welfare. An epidemic disease broke out amongst the cattle purchased for draught and food, and Mr. Moffat sent a messenger to Moselekatze expressing his fears that if he proceeded to the journey's end the disease would be communicated to his thousands of cattle. The king saw no fear of it, and begged him to proceed. Not satisfied, he sent another messenger with a more pressing description of the danger. Thoroughly convinced of the imprudence of introducing such a contagious disease among his innumerable herds, the king then directed Mr. Moffat to send back his own cattle to a village, to be cared for by some of the natives, while he would send more to draw the waggons and cattle for the commissariat. Shortly after, a band of soldiers arrived with the cattle, and the former, after performing some military evolutions, took the waggons in tow, and scampered off with them over hill and dale, through thickets and swamps, to the delight and amusement of the newly-arrived English Missionaries, and the satisfaction of Mr. Moffat himself, who dreaded, with good reason, his presence being followed by disease among the native cattle. The Mission thus auspiciously opened is, next to that to the Zulus of Natal, planted amongst the most important nations of South Africa. Mr. John Moffat continued there until about the year 1869, when he removed to Kuruman, to succeed his father in charge of that station.

The other party, under the guidance of Mr. Helmore, arrived at their destination, but there "a calamity the most terrible" overtook them. The chief cause of this was the want of water for themselves and their oxen. The distance they had to travel was not much short of a thousand miles, and the difficulties attending the journey to Linganti were trying enough, as they were sometimes obliged to remain for weeks in the neighbourhood of a fountain, not knowing how distant the next might be. The sufferings of the party—especially the poor children—from thirst, is graphically described by Mrs. Helmore, who with her husband and two of their children were taken off by fever, the consequence of swamps around the only spot allowed them to reside on. Mr. and Mrs. Price, who had also lost a child, were now all left of the party, and prepared to leave the country as the only means of saving their lives. The barbarous treatment they received from the natives, when they found they were about to leave, was fully in accordance with heathenism. They robbed them of everything, even of the clothes they took off

at night, and the new waggon that was to carry them away, and every grain of corn they had prepared for the men. Mrs. Price succumbed to the fever which had destroyed the Helmores and her own babe, and the Missionary was thus left with the two children of his late colleague to prosecute his dismal journey. No blame is attached either to Mr. Helmore or Mr. Moffat for the failure of this attempt to establish the Makololo Mission. The Chief alone was the cause of it, and possibly, if Dr. Livingstone, at whose suggestion it was undertaken, had been on the spot, as was expected, a more favourable result would have ensued.

As soon as the new Missionaries were fairly settled at the Court of Moselekatze, Mr. Moffat returned to the Kuruman, which he found at peace and exempt from the attacks of the Boers. But the country was not exempt from drought, which, in 1862 and the following year, was very severe. And, in addition, measles and small-pox broke out at Kuruman and the vicinity. On the other hand, the Church and congregations and the schools were all in a flourishing state. During that year 1862, Mr. and Mrs. Moffat "were called to mourn the death of their daughter, Mrs. Livingstone, and of Mr. Robert Moffat, their eldest son, each of whom left a weeping partner and a family of four children." The following year Mr. Moffat lost his right-hand man, Mr. Ashton, who had been an able and willing helper to him in the preparation of the Bible for distribution, as well as in its translation. But Moffat himself was fast advancing in age, having nearly reached his seventieth year, and was beginning to feel the effects of the unceasing labour of both body and mind that a period of fifty years had involved. In 1866, his son, John Moffat, arrived to supply the place of Mr. Ashton, who had been removed to Lekatlong. In a letter from John Moffat to the Directors in 1863, he gives a description of the work of the Mission, and truly every moment of the time of the Missionaries must be taken up in its performance. It was well for the band to have young blood and young energy thrown into the arena; and in his son the veteran must have felt something like a revival in his spirits. Besides the work at the Kuruman Station, there were several out-stations to visit occasionally. The printing office also occupied the son three days of the week, and in addition he was called upon to practise medicine-dispensing: an unwelcome office it appears, but indispensable to the missionary's progress.

He also ought to have a notion of surgery. For instance, the two wives of a chief having quarrelled, one threw a large stick at the other, which pierced her hand. It swelled to four times its ordinary size, but the woman would not apply to Mr. Moffat until assured that "he was *tamé!* He made the requisite incision and removed the cause of the rankling sore, telling the sufferer to go home and behave better."*

Mr. John Moffat's account of the religious condition of the natives is satisfactory to those who knew them before the residence of his father amongst them. "Heathenism is weak; in many places, nowhere. Christianity, too, meets with little opposition. The people generally are prodigious Bible-readers, church-goers, and psalm-singers, I fear to a large extent without knowledge. Religion to them consists in the above operations, and in giving a sum to the Auxiliary. I speak of the *generality*."

The great want at this time was schools, and good *native* schoolmasters well qualified to undertake the important work. This want the Directors proposed to supply by the institution of a kind of college, and a period fixed for the pupils to receive instruction in the branch of teaching others, and, in addition, a medical missionary.

After the mission to the Makololo had received the support of Moselekatze, the old Chief was removed by death. Mr. W. Sykes, one of the missionaries stationed there, visited him just before his death. The only words that created any interest in his mind were those of a message from Moffat that he was still praying for him and his people. "The moment I uttered the name, his countenance beamed, but he said nothing." The moral influence of Moffat on the mind of the old Chief appears rather to have increased than otherwise. When informed that the son had been appointed to the Kuruman, to comfort his father in his old age, he signified his approbation by a gentle nod.

Mr. Moffat closed his missionary labours at the commencement of 1870, having arrived at the age of 75 years, both his wife's and his own health beginning to fail, whilst the solicitations of the Directors determined him to return to England. Complete ovations awaited him wherever he came, and well they might. The following short summary of what those labours had produced will give the reader an idea of the

* P. 190.

change produced in the moral, social and intellectual condition of the people among whom he had resided :—

"The dark heathenism which enveloped the country on his first entering it was broken and lifted before the light of advancing Christianity. Kuruman itself, the creation of his own hands, is now, as it has always been, a bright oasis to any one visiting the far interior. Its gardens and vineyards yield supplies which often recruit the fever-stricken traveller and trader; its churches, its schools, its printing-office, its workshops, and its dwellings, all testify to the complete transformation of the community from savage to civilised life. The regions beyond, which no individual before dared to traverse, may now be passed without fear of molestation. European manufactures, to the amount of one hundred thousand pounds, are now annually interchanged with the natives, who previously knew not what commerce was. Above all, among the various tribes of Bechuanas, Bakwaries, Bamanguatos, and others, up to the distant Matabele, a goodly band of earnest, courageous men and women are preaching and living Christianity, setting an example of Christian moral conduct to the savages around, treating them with kindness, and relieving their wants: teaching them agriculture and the simple arts, imparting to them religious instruction, and inculcating the precepts of the Gospel of peace and good will."—P. 127.

When we add to all this good effected by the efforts of one man, the Herculean work of the formation of a language, and the translation of the Scriptures into that language, we may account for the warm reception Mr. and Mrs. Moffat received from the Directors and friends of the Society on his arrival in England. His return was quite contrary to his expectations or wishes, being bent upon finishing both his labours and his life amongst a people who had, under God, been brought out of the darkest heathenism known among men into the marvellous light of the Gospel. His wish, therefore, was to finish his course, and leave his bones among them, but it was not so ordered. The failing health of both Mr. and Mrs. Moffat fully justified their return, and the result has proved the correctness of the views of the Directors and friends of the Society. Mr. Moffat by his presence in England is enabled to promote the cause of Christianity in South Africa, where he has so successfully laid the foundation, in ways and channels which were otherwise closed; and in connection and concert with his son-in-law, Dr. Livingstone, the one at home and the other in the new field of labour, preparing the way and forming fresh openings for the introduction of the Gospel throughout the length and breadth of this vast continent.

We have referred, in the course of our observations, to the work of Mr. Holden, on *The Past and Future of the Kaffir Races*, a book which we have good reason to know is a faithful picture of the customs, manners, and habits of that people; and the graphic style in which he has described the bloody and barbarous warfare which constitutes the sole business in which the male portion of the population is engaged, imparts to the work a deep and fearful interest, contrasted as it is with the entire change of life, manners, and feelings of those amongst the natives who had yielded to the influence and claims of the Gospel. A striking specimen of this change was exhibited in the persons of the great savage warriors, Africaner and Berend (the latter another converted chief, not noticed in the work under review), the once deadly enemies to each other, meeting in the same tent, and conversing, not on war and how to prosecute it, but how to prevent it in future. Mr. Holden, by a residence of twenty-seven years amongst the Kaffirs, had ample time and opportunity of obtaining the fullest and most correct knowledge of the people, and of the wonderful change wrought amongst them by the introduction of Christianity,—the only real civilising agent, because the only one that aims to promote universal "peace on earth, and good will towards man." The branch of missionary labour, the Wesleyan, with which Mr. Holden is connected, is ever active and laborious in prosecuting their object—the salvation of souls, worthily carried out in friendly rivalry with the London Missionary Society. We wish them both God speed, and the fullest prosperity the cause deserves.

ART. IV.—*Santo Domingo, Past and Present; with a Glance at Hayti.* By SAMUEL HAZARD, Author of "Cuba with Pen and Pencil." Sampson Low. 1873.

CAPTAIN HAZARD'S book is dedicated to "the original of this" —a quaint sketch of the stiff back, short trowsers, shoes and spurs, big umbrella, and horse's hind-quarters of "the distinguished president of Cornell College, New York." But, though frequent "goaks" testify to the would-be funniness of the writer, he has a very serious purpose in view, viz., to recommend the speedy annexation of the Dominican Republic, leaving Hayti for the present to learn, from the rush of prosperity which will be the result to her neighbour at the east end of the island, what a blessing it will be for her when she, too, is absorbed into the American Union. That an island far finer than Cuba ("no spot on earth richer or more lovely"), as large as Ireland, and still bearing traces of an ancient prosperity, should be in such a wretched state, when great portions of it might be peopled "with our struggling millions," is certainly a sad thing. Men will not emigrate except where they have security for life and property; that is why Canada, with its climate of fierce extremes, and Minnesota, with its snowstorms, are preferred to Roumelia and to those parts of Asia Minor which were the cradles of European colonisation. That is why St. Domingo, where an estate of 1,000 acres, ready cleared, and often with the remains of fine buildings upon it, can be bought for 5,000 dollars, is shunned by those who are not daunted by the heat of Queensland or the droughts of Natal.

The present state of the island is but a natural consequence of the way in which it has been dealt with ever since its discovery. The Spaniards, after wasting its resources and extirpating its inhabitants, almost abandoned it for more tempting settlements on the continent. The buccaneers ravaged it again and again; and the French settlements had scarcely begun to thrive, when, with the Revolution, commenced a series of bloodthirsty struggles, which have lasted to the present day. Of pessimism we could scarcely find elsewhere a more complete illustration. Badly begun, "the cause of progress" in the island, which its discoverers called Little Spain

(Hispaniola), has gone from bad to worse; till what to do with it is a problem which the sharpest Americans find insoluble. The negro race, now in pretty full possession, seems as intractable as the Indian, and it has the disadvantage of opposing a tolerably successful resistance to any efforts to "improve it away." Negroes, indeed, are wanted; whatever Captain Hazard may say, white people cannot do regular field labour, even on hill farms, in the tropics. Since, then, the negro must remain, the question is, shall he be "regulated," like Mr. Carlyle's Quashee,—forced to prove his title to freedom by doing a fair amount of work? or shall we trust that good example, and the pressure of increasing population, will lead him to perform voluntarily what the Chelsea philosopher would compel him to do? In Hayti, the compulsion is out of the question without a conquest which would be almost as difficult as the conquest of Ashantee; and even in Dominica we cannot expect much result until the system which is slowly working incalculable good among the free coloured population of the United States has had more time for action. To cry out against negroes, because they are not able at once to take their part as full-fledged citizens of a republic and to meet every requirement of a very complex civilisation, is a narrow-minded absurdity. To stigmatise them as lazy, dissolute, ungrateful, is to forget that they, with their vices, are one of the products of this our modern civilisation. The street Arab is as lazy, as dissolute; all that we say of the negro may more truly be charged against him; but no one thinks of blaming our English race because such an unsatisfactory class seems necessarily developed where masses of English people are thrown together. When we read what was the average life of the French planter in St. Domingo; when we know how too many slave-owners lived in the Southern States, we cannot be astonished that the race which grew up under their control should be dissolute; we may well be thankful that it is not hopelessly vicious.

The problem of the gradual elevation of the blacks is a difficult one; but it is not different in kind, only in degree, from that which meets us at home at every turn—the problem which we strive to solve by ragged-schools, reformatories, and homes, and penitentiaries, and Chichester training-ships, and all the other machinery for turning roughs into rational human beings. If we believe in the power of religion as the mainstay of modern civilisation, we cannot doubt as to the

final result; and that result must be the same for blacks as for whites, for they, too, are men and women for whom Christ died, whom God, "Who made of one blood all nations that be upon the face of the earth," willed to come to the knowledge of His truth, and who have in countless instances shown that their grasp of the truth can be as firm, their love of it as warm, as that of the purest Aryan of us all. Still the work must be slow, and the dealings of whites with one another are too often calculated to hinder instead of to set it forward.

The island, which, divided into Dominica on the east and Hayti on the west, we shall call by its name of St. Domingo, has an evil past, for which we may well imagine its evil present to be a retribution. *Böses muss mit Bösem enden* was never more fully exemplified than in the history which begins with the landing of Columbus in 1492. An island full of happy people, whose numbers were variously estimated at from one to three millions, was so depopulated that, in 1508, there were not 60,000 Indians left, though some 40,000 had been brought in from the Bahamas, as we bring in Erromanga coolies into Queensland. In six years more, the wretched remnant was reduced to 14,000; and when Enrique, a chief who had broken away and gone to the mountains, was persuaded to submit in 1533, all the remaining Indians easily found room in one small village. There is now not one pure-blood descendant of this race left; and the quaint cuts, from De Bey (Frankfort, 1595), Benzoni (*la Historia del Mondo Novo:* Venetia, 1565), Oviedo (*Cronicas de las Indias*), &c., in the volume before us, sufficiently explain the process of extirpation. For a gentle-natured race, of feeble frame, and wholly unused to hard, constant toil, to be suddenly forced to dig and wash gold at the will of such men as the first Spanish settlers, must have been something of which we can form no conception. The modern European has been inured to toil through many generations; the selection of species has gradually, in almost every rank of life, weeded out those who could not bear continuous pressure of one kind or another. The negro, too, has tough fibre, and is in his own Africa not at all unused to labour. But the red man went down before mining, enforced by Spanish whips, more surely than he did before armed knights on horseback and arquebuses and blood-hounds, when he attempted to meet his oppressors in the field. It was a gaol-delivery which gave Columbus most of the additional settlers for whom he clamoured; but, whatever they might have been in their own country, all agreed in

barbarously ill-treating the wretched natives. Governor Ovando, who took upon himself to make Queen Isabella's humane decrees respecting the *repartimientos* (assignments of Indians to Spanish colonists) a dead letter, is as bad as those of whom an old writer bitterly says:—"Having in Spain never known even the luxury of a ride on a mule, they were not content unless they were carried about by Indians in a luxurious litter." That master giving orders from his hammock; that knight with plume and cloak, who, seated in his arm-chair, watches the gold-washing, while three halberdiers stand by to keep the labourers up to their work; that picture of a flogging, with the note that when their backs were deeply cut, the sufferers were buried in pits up to the chin, that so the earth might heal them;—all these are fit preludes to the most terrible engraving of all, the forms of suicide by which the miserable creatures put an end to their hopeless misery. Here are men leaping from rocks, men falling upon sharpened stakes, women hanging themselves, and (more fearful still) strangling their babes and beating their young children to death. We can understand how needful was the device of that Spaniard who, when he found his Indians killing themselves at a great rate, called together the survivors, and said, "If any more kill themselves, I will kill myself, and then I shall go with you to the after world, and there I'll torment you far worse than I am doing here." When we think of Tasmania, we cannot venture to be righteously indignant; and yet there is no doubt that the anti-Spanish feeling in Elizabethan England which Canon Kingsley so eloquently describes in *Westward Ho!* was due in part to horror at the wrongs of the native race. Yet, in later times, the Spaniards treated their negroes on the whole humanely; so much better than the French, that there seems to have been a constant influx eastward of runaway blacks from the French estates.

Naturally, Captain Hazard has not much to tell us about this native race. He deals with the St. Domingo of the present; and we must go either to some among the long list of books which he gives in his preface, and which he claims to have studied in the British Museum, or else to Washington Irving's well-known volume. The simplicity which regarded glass beads and such like trifles as gifts from heaven; the greed which cared for nothing but gold, and which soon made even the untutored Indians feel that their visitors were certainly not from a better world; the lust and cruelty; the fierce quarrels among the rival shipmates; and then the sad story

of Queen Anacaona and the bold cacique Caonabo, and of the heroic Quibian of Veragua, who slew Diego Tristan and his men, and so nearly cut off Columbus's brother Bartholomew —all this has been often told, and is always full of interest. What was this native race? is a question which earlier writers did not trouble themselves to ask. Enough for them that they used to fall to the earth in horror at the discharge of a gun, and that they believed the horse and his rider were some strange superhuman monster.

A recent work by a Buenos Ayres student "proves" that the old speech of Peru had many Aryan affinities. On the other hand, some of our polygenists assert that the West Indies, Central America, and Polynesia are remnants of a vast submerged continent, peopled by a race possibly kin to the old Egyptian and to the Basque. Certain it is that in some points—their preparation of "cava" by chewing, their love of dancing, their skill in managing their canoes, and their tracing descent along the female line—these islanders closely resembled the Polynesians. Like them, too, they were divided into fierce and gentle; the savage Carib was as unlike the mild Hispaniolan, as the Fijian is to the Samoan. However, in the West Indies, they are gone past recall; gone like the *guanches* of the Canaries; gone like the mound builders of Lake Superior, leaving nothing behind them but a few words, such as *d'amacha* (hammock), *d'uracane* (hurricane), and *canoa* (canoe).

Nor is there much existing record of the early years of Spanish occupation. The city of Isabella, destroyed by earthquakes, is now a mass of jungle-covered rubbish; and Diego Columbus's palace is the only building of that date of which any considerable part is standing.

Spanish colonies are a byword for mismanagement, and St. Domingo fared worse than most of them. The Council of the Indies was a woeful hindrance to progress; everything was taxed, even to the cassava, or native bread. The Inquisition was introduced in 1517; the fearful irony of bringing spiritual penalties among a people who had had twenty-five years' bitter experience of the tender mercies of lay Christians! Its revenue arose from confiscations and fines; hence its interest was to promote prosecutions. The Jesuits, too, were, as usual, keen in the pursuit of this world's wealth; they sent home gold (we are told) in rolls of chocolate, inside the bones of saints, &c. But most depressing of all were the trade restrictions, only equalled in absurdity by those which

Charles II.'s Government passed against Ireland. All colonial trade was strictly confined to Seville, till, in 1765, Charles III. allowed Cadiz to share in the trade. Thus, as Spain manufactured nothing, European products, only allowed to enter the colonies after passing through one or other port, were very dear; the colonists paid the commission both ways.

St. Domingo, in particular, soon fell back even from its first promise; the gold failed, and then "rushes" of inhabitants took place to Mexico and elsewhere; nor was the attempt to fill up the void with immigrants from the Canary Isles successful. Then Drake came down upon it, burning a third of St. Domingo city—"so solid it was, that we could not burn more, though all our men were at work for eleven days," and getting large ransom for the rest. By-and-by the buccaneers begin to settle on the island of Tortuga, at the end nearest Cuba. They are mostly French, though *boucan*, a cooking frame, seems to be a native word, and *filibuster* our author derives from *fleibote*, fly-boat, a swift, light vessel in use among them. Richelieu encourages them, and fosters the "compagnie des isles." By-and-by the dregs of the Paris courtesans are sent over as helpmates for them; the formula of wedlock being (A.D. 1662) "I take thee without knowing, or caring to know, who thou art. If anybody from whence thou comest would have had thee, thou wouldst not have come in quest of me.... Give me thy word for the future; I acquit thee of the past.... If thou shouldst prove false, this gun will surely prove true to my aim." In this way the buccaneers became *habitans*, and passed from Tortuga to the main island, which had been saved from the attempt of Penen and Venables (1655) by the noise of an army of land-crabs clattering over the dry leaves. These the English took for Spanish lancemen, whose onset had much galled them the day before. They therefore made off to their boats; and the Feast of Crabs was instituted, in which a land-crab of solid gold was carried about.

By-and-by many respectable families went over from Anjou and Brittany; but the settlements suffered terribly in the wars of the close of the seventeenth century, Spanish and English vying with one another in plundering them, and sweeping off the inhabitants. The peace of Ryswick gave France the western part of the island, and the French soon began to grow indigo, sugar, and cocoa with great success, while the Spanish part continued so poor, that even the clergy had no bread or wine for the sacraments, and the day

when the money came from Mexico to pay the official salaries was kept with ringing of bells and public feasting.

The French settlement increased in material prosperity perhaps quicker than any colony has ever done. "Rich as a Creole" became a Paris proverb, reminding us of the English joke about "*more curricles.*" The slaves were treated like mere animals; they were kept in heathenism. Cannibalism was reported to exist among them, and of course the marriage tie was unknown. The *Code Noir* of Louis XIV. tried in vain to stop all intercourse between white and black; one of its rules imposed a fine of 2,000 lbs. of sugar on a man who had a child by his slave. The Prince de Rohan, who went out as Governor in 1766, describes some of the orgies in which the planters used to indulge (resembling those laid to the charge of the Russian *noblesse*), and speaks of the place as having "attained the apogee of demoralisation."

At the same time the negroes, having to serve three years in the *maréchaussée*, and being regularly employed in maroon-hunting, were taught to feel their own strength; and, when the Revolution broke out, they at once cried *Vivé le roi*, and, taking *ancien régime* as their motto, fell upon their masters. It was a chaos of parties, "small whites" against planters, mulattos against whites, and both against blacks, and fearful horrors were perpetrated on both sides; the whites broke Ogé, the mulatto chief, on the wheel; they shot their own commander, Colonel Manduit, and treated his body as badly as if they had been Parisian patriots; the negroes sawed white men between planks, and marched with a white baby stuck on a spear-head as their banner, and when defeated were massacred by the whites with every circumstance of atrocious cruelty. Then appeared that wonderful man, Toussaint l'Ouverture, the only full-blood negro (say the books) who has ever proved himself a worthy match for Europeans.* He was said to be of royal ancestry, and had somehow learned Latin and mathematics on the estate of his master, the Count de Noe. Under Toussaint, the principles of '89 were carried to their logical conclusions; black and white were put on a complete equality. Quiet was restored; for he was all powerful, being looked up to as a god by the whole black population. With wonderful skill he baffled the duplicity of Commissioner Roume, getting his previous power

* An excellent life of Toussaint will be found, like almost everything else, in worthy Charles Knight's *Penny Magazine.*

confirmed by the title of General-in-chief of all the French troops in the island; he then forced the English, under General Maitland, to withdraw in 1798, after a struggle which Captain Hazard says cost us 20 millions (we suppose, of dollars) and 45,000 men, and made Governor Garcia give up the Spanish part of the island. Then it was that Columbus's bones were carried to the Havannah; and then, too, Cuba and Porto Rico received a large number of French immigrants, who brought with them improvements hitherto unknown in the Spanish islands. Toussaint next threw aside the French altogether, and made a treaty with England to remain neutral till the end of the war.

But when the peace of Amiens gave Bonaparte leisure to think of the West Indies, he at once sent his brother-in-law, Le Clerc, to conquer the island. Cruelties followed on both sides; but though Toussaint was very bitter against the Dominicans for at once going round to the French, and was generally suspicious of the mulattos, *he never broke his word*, while Bonaparte's commanders only too faithfully copied the habitual lying of their master. At length a treaty was made, within the first month of which Toussaint, who had retired to his little plantation, was treacherously seized, hurried on shipboard, and sent off to be starved to death in the dungeons of Besançon. Such was the treatment of "the first of the blacks" at the hands of "the first of the whites."

The war broke out anew; Le Clerc's proclamation that the negroes would be restored to their old owners or their representatives (attorneys is Captain Hazard's word) made it war to the knife. The French gave no quarter, shooting their prisoners in batches; and when this was too troublesome, introducing the fashion of *noyades*. Rochambeau, who commanded after Le Clerc's death, thus disposed of 500 prisoners at once; whereupon Dessalines (he and Cristophe had been Toussaint's lieutenants) hung all the French officers in his hands, and made up the number to 500 out of the rank and file of his prisoners. At last the French were beaten out, and had in November 1803 to surrender Cap François; though, treacherous to the last, they tried on the very day of signing the capitulation to persuade the commander of an English fleet to take possession of the place.

Dessalines, now sole chief, naturally fearing that Bonaparte would renew his attempt, made it his chief business to increase his army. He encouraged the immigration of blacks and mulattos, offering 40 dollars a head for every

coloured person put on the island. He then began that fearful massacre of whites, without distinction of age or sex, which went on till nearly all the French Creoles were exterminated. His cruelty raised the Dominicans against him, and they kept him at bay till 1806, when he was shot by his own troops, "upon whom he was charging fearlessly with only a walking stick for weapon." Then, with laws that no white man shall be able to acquire property, and that all the inhabitants, without distinction of colour, are to be called "blacks," and that every citizen shall learn some trade, Hayti began its career as a negro state; but not yet under one ruler. Cristophe in the north was opposed by Petion in the south: but when in 1820 Cristophe killed himself, Petion reigned undisputed master and transmitted his power to Boyer, who, in 1822, was invited to take possession of the Spanish portion of the island. Boyer, a dark mulatto, described as "a little man, fond of show, son of a tailor," continued to be ruler for more than 21 years. He is said to have allowed the people to fall into idleness, and he certainly made a mistake in sending to Paris and agreeing to pay 160 million francs as the price of the acknowledgment of that independence which had existed *de facto* more than 20 years. This led to the expedition of Baron Mackau in 1825, and gave France an excuse for interfering later in Haytian history. Boyer was deposed in 1843, apparently by a knot of dissolute young men, educated abroad, and proud of imitating French ways. Dominica at once broke away, resisting (under Santana) all the efforts of the Haytians to reconquer it, and Hayti, after six years of weltering confusion, fell into the hands of Soulouque, *alias* Faustin the First.

Even Dominica, however, though it seemed more promising than Hayti, had not the elements of stability: it had had fourteen revolutions between 1814, when the Congress of Vienna handed it to Spain, and 1821, when it declared its independence of the mother country only to put itself under Boyer's rule. After 1843, president succeeded president. Santana's victory (with 400 men he utterly defeated Soulouque's whole army) could not secure him in power; and at length, in 1861, worn out with factions, the eastern part of the island gave itself once more into the hands of Spain, the main condition stipulated for being that Dominica should have the full privileges of a province of Spain, and not be treated as "a province beyond sea." "It had been famous once under Spain, why not again?" Besides,

the existence of slavery in the United States prevented an annexation which was even then talked of; Santana, indeed, had actually given the first 'concession' to that Samana Bay Company which has since become so famous.

Spain, of course, broke her promises as soon as she had secured possession of Dominica. Instead of employing natives in positions of public authority, she filled the country with hordes of Cuban officials, who looked on the mass of the inhabitants as little better than slaves. Her expenditure was excessive; the budget for the year preceding annexation had been only 241,347 dollars; that for the next year was nearly 4½ millions of dollars, and this in a territory of 20,000 square miles, with a population of less than 150,000. Hence much discontent among all classes; besides which the negro population, fearing the re-establishment of slavery, listened readily to the protest of Geffrard, the ruler of Hayti, and began a series of revolts, which were put down with atrocious cruelty. Religion, too, became the occasion of great discontent; during the three quarters of a century of independence there had been complete toleration, and a considerable number of coloured immigrants from the United States, mostly Methodists, had formed Churches in the towns. The first act of the new Archbishop, Monejan, was to close all Protestant places of worship and to annul Protestant marriages, while at the same time he raised the fees to such an extent that, from 60 dollars, the cost of a burial was increased to 500 dollars.

The insurrection soon became general, and the struggle was carried on in that bloodthirsty manner which has marked the war in Cuba; and when, in 1865, Spain finally gave up her hold on the island, it seemed as if she had been anxious to make what she was obliged to relinquish as worthless as possible.

Then followed the usual series of revolutions. Cabral against Santana, Pimentel against Baez; anyone who could get together a few hundred people to shout "Vive" on the plaza of St. Domingo city thinking he had a right to the title of President and to the sweets of office. Baez, the present ruler, is supposed to be very anxious for annexation; General Grant, also, is strongly in favour of what was his pet project, though he declares in his message that he will not bring it forward again until the people of the United States have shown themselves desirous of it. The real drawback is the difficulty about Hayti; for some time the United States will have enough to do with the negroes of the South, and will

shrink from the task of humanising the Haytians; unless indeed the whole island is looked on as a place to which coloured people may be persuaded to "deport" themselves, thereby relieving the Union of the negro difficulty. This, we may be pretty sure, will not be the case, unless it is shown to be much more unhealthy than Capt. Hazard will allow it to be. Even St. Domingo city he asserts to be thoroughly healthy; and yellow fever, he says, is wholly unknown in this island, while the mountain districts have a delicious climate in which New Yorkers with weak lungs can reckon on certain cure from an air at once soft and bracing.

It is sad that a country so lovely and so wonderfully fertile should be little better as regards culture than it was in the days of the aborigines; while, as for population, the degraded-looking negroes and unsatisfactory mulattos are a poor exchange for those of whom Columbus wrote as follows:—"I swear to your Majesties there is not in the world a better nation nor a better land; they love their neighbours as themselves, and their discourse is ever sweet and gentle, and accompanied with a smile; and though it is true that they are naked, yet their manners are decorous and praiseworthy." No doubt every colonisation has been accompanied with hardship to the aborigines, and, unhappily, in modern times the art of colonising without "improving off" the natives seems to have been lost. The Redmen of America are going; the President's last message is a choice between complete extirpation and a civilisation which it is impossible for them to accept. The Tasmanians have wholly disappeared, and the Australian aborigines are rapidly following them. But in these, and many other sad cases, there is some compensation. The Redmen's hunting-grounds are studded with noble cities; their territory forms an empire which is second to none in the civilised world. That Melbourne, and Sydney, and Hobart Town should have grown up in place of the hut of the savage or the untouched "bush," is a distinct gain to humanity, the race is thereby helped on in its progress. But there is no such compensation in the case of St. Domingo or even of Hayti. The aborigines have perished; the Spaniard has left little but ruins and the memory of cruel misgovernment; and the coloured population is certainly not a credit to modern culture. "What's the use?" asked the owner of a tumble-down cottage in reply to Capt. Hazard's suggestion that he could easily mend his roof; "it would only be ruined by the next revolution." By the way, it is uncertain how far our

author's smaller illustrations are to be taken as authentic. Certainly a good many of them have already "done duty" in a children's periodical called *Little Folks*, where the object was rather to represent negroes in a comical light than to photograph them and their belongings with the grave accuracy befitting an United States' Commissioner.

But, whatever their shortcomings, the honesty of this people is very remarkable. Of the *regueros* (muleteers), who do the carrying trade between Santiago and Puerta Plata, we are told that a merchant thinks nothing of calling to one as he passes the door, and handing him a roll of money "for so and so at Santiago." "Write the direction," says the *reguero;* and the exact money never fails to be properly delivered. On the other hand, these thoroughly trustworthy muleteers ill-treat their beasts in quite an Italian manner—beat them almost to death when they flag under their heavy loads, and set their rude pack-saddles on backs so fearfully raw that a fresh palm-leaf must needs be laid on to make the process of saddling endurable.

Education is, naturally, little cared for. At one of the better schools our author sees a game-cock "tethered" between each pupil: "Oh, they belong to the master, who fights them on Sundays," is the explanation. In fact, the cockpit is a national institution, as indeed it was in our own country not so long ago, if it may not even still be said to be among the pitmen in South Staffordshire. Of the clergy we are told very little; we may imagine they oppose annexation, for the Vicar-General (when "interviewed") says, "Now there is only one Church; then there will be others." "Yes, but you'll have ample toleration," suggests our author. "But I'll have to tolerate others too," is the cynical reply.

Annexation, however, must come about. Captain Hazard felt it when he saw a young New Englander, who had been dying of consumption in Maine, planting bananas in rows, and living cheerily with his wife on his own location. "It is a very paradise for our negroes; those who have been here for years never care to go back, except just to 'see home;' and in this paradise you can buy, just outside the chief city, 150 acres for 600 dollars, with cocoa-trees enough on them to pay the purchase-money thrice over in a couple of years." Then it is a shame that such a country should produce tobacco so bad that it is all bought up at a low rate by the Hamburghers; and that such a city as St. Domingo, where they still build the famous *mamposteria* walls—a wooden

frame filled in with glutinous earth, wetted and mixed with lime and pounded stone—should have no trade except a little in mahogany and other woods.

Annexation will soon alter all this. Indeed, Captain Hazard's faith in it is immense. When he is sailing up the Ozana river to St. Domingo city his fancy peoples the ancient walls and turrets with "adventurers in 15th century costume, prepared to challenge us with 'Quein viva?' ... Would that we might truly answer to the challenge of the sentry—Here comes the spirit of American institutions, bringing peace and goodwill, progress, enlightenment, and improvement to this beautiful but impoverished and depopulated and hard-used land." Still he is not quite sure that the inhabitants will at once make worthy citizens of the great Republic. On the contrary, he is amusingly inconsistent in his descriptions of character. At one time he is in raptures over the disinterested hospitality of the people, and their courtesy and good-nature. Thus, a planter with whom he has sojourned, and who showed him the primitive sugar-mills which are the only ones now in operation, says (in answer to a polite request for "his bill"), "Senor, I am a plain man; I know nothing of the world's customs, and how a stranger should be treated as he deserves; but I do what I know and feel. I have no account against you. There, you see, is the public road. It comes very near my house, from which you can always see it. Whenever you come this way, and you want food and shelter, either for yourself or your horses, believe me, this house is yours just as much as it is mine, and you are welcome." A Castilian count could not have shaped his phrases better; and yet we know the Spanish proverb, that "the best day of a visit is that on which the visitor packs up and goes off." We fear our author was misled by the fine words and "God speeds" of his host, and by "the laughing good-byes from the eyes and lips of the bevy of women at the door." At his next station he has quite changed his note. His host has no food to offer but plantains and "slapjacks;" and, instead of something pleasant about eyes and lips, we are told "what perfectly helpless, useless people these women are, many of them. They seem to be so utterly ignorant of everything a woman should know. Their housekeeping amounts to nothing; their cooking, simple as are the viands, is vile; and they appear to do nothing but loll in hammocks and smoke cigars."

Further on, losing his way, our author almost loses his

temper at the good-natured fatuity of his would-be guides. "'How far is Puerto Plata from here?' 'Whew!' and a long whistle. 'Is it more than a league?' 'Yes, sir.' 'More than two leagues?' 'Oh, yes; more, sir.' 'Carajo! is it five, then?' 'Well, when you have travelled five you are pretty (cerquita) near it.' Then I get mad, perhaps, and say—'Is it one day or two days' journey from here?' 'Oh, no, sir, only three hours' ride." This must have been provoking from people who had been set down a few days before as models of natural intelligence; but, stupid or not, the Dominicans were always ready at giving that "lesson in quiet good breeding" which will be of infinite service to the average immigrant from the States, if only he can be got to learn it.

But, however they may feel about Dominica, Captain Hazard's "glance at Hayti" will certainly not tempt his countrymen to look lovingly at that portion of the island. There are difficulties in getting there; no vessel is cleared from the Dominican to the Haytian ports; "Everybody, indeed, understands where a ship is going; but her papers specify that she sails under the English flag for Turk's Island." Our author makes the voyage in a small fore-and-aft schooner, manned by a captain and three men, all Jamaica negroes, and carrying twelve oxen, which quite filled the small hold. He heard that only a few days before an American merchant had chartered a small boat to take him to Cape Haytien, and had carried along with him some United States' despatches. He was imprisoned for several days, and then sent back with the warning that the next time he brought American despatches he would be hanged. This was not encouraging; nor could the stories of his travelling companion, a cavalry colonel in the Cuban army of independence, have cheered him.

"When I came back from studying in Europe," said the Colonel, "I joined the insurrection. My father, a very old man, caring nothing for the cause, remained on the plantation. Months after, passing near our house, I halted my troop at a distance, went in and saw my father, and got his blessing. Scarcely had we reached our camping place when an old servant came to say that the Spaniards had come and accused my father of holding communication with the enemy. We rode back as fast as our horses could carry us, but only to find the outbuildings burnt and my father lying in the hall with his skull split open. We made oath never to lose sight of that party, and, after following them for days, now and then catching a straggler, we caught the whole fourteen of them, and hanged them on as many trees."

Such is war in Cuba; such it has often been in both portions of St. Domingo. Whether, supposing the Americans annex Dominica, the terror of their name will prevent the recurrence of such scenes—will gradually humanise the Haytians—remains to be seen. Meanwhile, the United States' representative was treated by them with anything but courtesy. He has to lie-to for hours in his wretched little schooner till the time of siesta is over; and when, after much "real, rightdown honest swearing" on board, he is allowed to land, he is taken from one official to another—variously described as "sallow, gaping fellows," and "mahogany-coloured, bald-headed, spectacled, wiry old cusses," and "coal-black negroes, clad in blue denims stiff with starch, who asked impertinent questions"—and is kept till nightfall without his breakfast, though he had eaten nothing since he got on board the schooner. The Consul at last gets his food and lodging; and, just as he has rolled himself up in his sleeping bag, his landlord bursts in with:—

"'Are you a United States' Commissioner?' 'Bother! no; good night.' 'Because the authorities think you are, and have doubled the guards to-night.' Next morning our 'Commissioner' calls for a 'cocktail;' I had no fault to find with it, for it certainly was well fabricated. 'Thirty dollars, monsieur.' I start back horror-struck. Clearly these barbarians want to swindle me. But the spirit of '76 comes strong upon me, and I get reckless. I vow I will not pay it, and, drawing from my pocket a silver coin of the realm of America, value ten cents, I declare it is all the money I have. To my amazement the mild barkeeper says, 'I haven't the change, sir.' Ah, I begin to see it; and, with a princely air, I say, 'Oh, keep the change;' but, once out, I walk, yea, I run to my bankers."

Here he finds that one dollar in gold is worth 400 in paper, and, therefore, instead of cashing his letter of credit at once, they beg him to wait a little. He walks about the plaza; many carts are gathering, drawn by donkeys and bullocks; there are horses with panniers; negroes of the guard, each with a club, a shirt, and part of a pair of pants; ditto of the mounted guard, on little donkeys with large ears, the first of whom our author respectfully salutes.

"A mighty warrior, in cocked hat, with befrogged and gilded swallow-tailed coat, cotton pants (nigger stripe), no shoes, and a spur. Therefore, I know he must be a general; I missed being a general once myself. 'What does all this mean?' I ask. After several unintelligible replies in Creole, he learns that 'it is the U.S.

Commissioner drawing a draft in Haytian money, and these carts are to load up with it. 'Now, what are you going to do with all this money?' ask the bankers when he gets back to them; 'because we have a large warehouse here, and will store it cheap for you.' 'Oh, oh!' I begin to think my mind is going, but yet gasp out, 'What does all this mean?' 'Don't you see? You present your draft and say you want the money. Now in our paper currency it will take all these mules and carts to carry it; if you'll be advised by us, leave your draft here, and draw the money as small as possible, as you want it. Let us, therefore, send these carts away, while you take a beer.' I took the beer."

But Captain Hazard is not always so Mark-Twainish as he is when he describes his first experience of "the Paris of St. Domingo." He can be pathetic over the traces of French civilisation; the narrow paths that once were stately streets, with arches, pillars, balconies, groined walls, and niches, over which is running the luxuriant vegetation of the tropics; the halls and saloons, finished in marble or solid stone, in which are growing the full-aged cocoa, banana, or palm; the public squares full of ruins of convents and churches, amid which "loafs" about a negro population, idle because of the uncertainty of being paid; while a few foreign merchants, protected by their flags, live in luxury and grandeur. Even the street-porter turns round to ask, "You *sure* you pay me for this trunk?" "Of course." "Well, pay me now, and I'll do it." Tradition and experience have led these people to suspect the white man; he is in their phrase always "*le méchant*"—a curious parallel to the "white devil" of certain African tribes.

Idle, however, the Haytians are, apart from any uncertainty as to payment; and his experience of officials could hardly have been more disgusting to the "spry" American than the way in which three men were building a house: one fellow seated on the scaffold received the bricks thrown to him one by one, and handed them in the same leisurely manner to the man who was laying them. Well might our author "decline to calculate" how long on this system it would take to build a three-storied brick house.

Anxious to see Milot, the place where Cristophe had his famous palace of Sans-souci, Captain Hazard gets a pass (nobody can travel in Hayti unprovided with one) "recommending him to the kindness of the authorities." He secures a guide for 2,000 dollars (currency); pays a dollar at the city-gate; passes a large field where diseased cattle are put

to die and rot, and where is placed the household furniture of those who are carried off by yellow fever.* Bones, therefore, and tables, chairs, and mattresses, lie heaped about, when a bonfire would both remove the revolting sight and do away with all danger of infection.

This prepares him for bridges with their parapets in ruins, for stately mansions in which squatters are housed like hermit-crabs in very big shells, for stone culverts getting choked up, and other remains of "the French." In fact, things look as melancholy as at the other end of the island; the only difference being that here Hayti swarms with inhabitants, while the struggle with Spain has left Dominica almost depopulated.

Our American, however, is not to go over the citadel; news has gone before him that he is coming up "to take it," and the Cape Haytien General of the province had sent private instructions that his permit is not to be accepted. Still Sans-souci must have been well worth a visit—a vast palace, like some great Roman remains, filling up the head of a lovely valley, and containing arsenals, mint, storehouses, barracks, &c. Above is the citadel, from a precipice under which offenders used to be thrown. It was easy to offend Cristophe. "How long will you be making a thing like this?" asked he of a mechanic, pointing to a carriage received from Europe. "Three months." "If in two weeks it is not ready you will be thrown from the rock." Here Cristophe killed himself when he heard that his guard, to whom he had just given a dollar each to go and fight the rebels, had deserted. His citadel, of which Prince Saunders, his agent in England, once gave such a wonderful account, has been ruined by an earthquake; but still the Haytians guard it as jealously as if it contained the palladium of their independence.

Whatever foreigners may think, Haytians are well content to be as they are, though Mr. Hazard is scarcely fair in speaking of "the vanity peculiar to the Haytians." This, however, could not easily be surpassed:—

"Republic of Hayti, 68th year of independence . . . Monsieur Hazard, member of the American Commission sent to the eastern part of the island, has been here some days. As we ought to prove

* The island is, then, not free from this pest of the West Indies, but our author repeatedly asserts, on good medical testimony, that the fever has never prevailed, *as an epidemic*, in the eastern (Dominican) part, except in the case of numbers of foreign troops crowded together.

our independence, preferring rather to bury ourselves in our ruins than to suffer the annexation of that country which we have won at the price of our forefathers' blood, and as we are at the level for which God has created us, men equal to any men in any part of the world, I have no need, General, to recommend for this stranger all the courtesy you should display towards him, in order that, on his return to his own country, he may be able to defend us from the savagery of which we have very often been accused."

What, indeed, but savagery can be expected from a country which, since Boyer was ousted in 1843 for "having remained stationary for twenty-five years," has been almost always in a state of revolution? From Boyer to Soulouque (who called himself, in 1849, the Emperor Faustin I.) there had been four presidents; and, after ten years, Soulouque, with his ridiculous *cortége* of Dukes of Lemonade, Marmalade, &c. (titles taken from the French names of certain districts), had to run off to Jamaica, making way for Geffrard, and he for Salnave, who, in 1870, was shot by his successor Saget, the actual President.

A poor experiment this in self-government, though it may fairly be said that Hayti is not worse than the South American republics; and when Captain Hazard adds, that "at least two-thirds of the population do not speak any language recognised by the civilised world," he is giving us comedy after tragedy; while that "the men exist upon the industry of the women," is true of parts of the world with more pretensions and inhabited by higher races.

"God forbid (says our author, p. 436) that the annexation of this part of the island should be thought of by us for one moment, even though Dominica becomes one of our States; for the people of that part, humble as they are, are years ahead of the mass of the Haytians, *and it will take years of missionary enterprise and instruction to prepare them for the blessings of civil liberty as enjoyed by us.*" Here Captain Hazard points to the only agency by which Hayti can be reclaimed. Happily, with all his faults, the negro has strong religious susceptibilities, and when these are rightly awakened there is hope of his development in other directions. Why is it that Jamaica, so long decaying, has made such marked advances of late? Because the seed sown is at last bearing fruit; the negro feels that he is a man because he has at last realised that he is a Christian. So was it of old with the slave populations which formed the bulk of those converts

whom St. Paul characterises as "not many great, not many noble." At Corinth and elsewhere they began with many strange excesses; but soon Christ's freedmen came to feel that it was their duty, not to believe only, but to adorn the doctrine of God their Saviour in all things. So we may hope it will be in Hayti, despite the very discouraging report of Messrs. B. F. Wade, Andrew D. White, and S. G. Howe, the U.S. Commissioners, who say that the gleam of prosperity which lighted up the first years of Haytian independence was solely due to "that secondary stage of forwardness in which the French left the country, and from which it has gradually declined." There is no safe tenure of land, consequently no culture; every Haytian aspires to be a general (is not every Kentuckian popularly supposed to do the same?), and every general will ruin his country for the chance of becoming dictator.

In Port-au-Prince, fever-stricken from the proximity of the noisome mangrove swamps, in which all the organic matter is caught and held among matted roots, there are the same signs of decay as in Cape Haytien. Captain Hazard is there during Holy Week, and has a long theological argument, ending in a "liquoring up," with the officer on guard at the wharf, about the non-observance of the religious holiday on board the Yankee ships. He sees the President, gorgeous in diamonds, feathers, and gold lace, and his troops dressed up in old American army-clothing, which was bought for a few dollars by Van Bokkelen, a New York government officer, and then sold dear to the Haytians. He interviews the Editor of *The Dominican Flag*, an anti-annexation paper, purporting to be printed in Dominican territory. "I know all the people of St. Domingo are for annexation," said this candid personage; "but I'm paid for what I say, you see." What strikes him most is the goodness of the roads, a contrast to roadless Dominica; while the "Plantain patch, wild coffee-field, and little unhoed sugar-cane brake, from whose produce little is made but the rum or tafia which so degrades the people," and the rude gardenless hut, seem ridiculous beside such magnificent highways.

If, then, "Give us peace and safety and good roads" is the cry of the Dominican patriot, the Haytians have one want less than their neighbours. On the other hand, there seems to be a marked difference in health between the two portions of the island. In the eastern (windward) end, the mountain chains run east and west, so that the valleys, swept by the

trade winds, are kept fresh; and even on the coast white people enjoy health, while on the upland farms they can work as hard as in their own countries." Hayti, on the other hand, walled off by a chain of high mountains running north and south, and fringed in many places with mangrove swamps, is not by any means so tempting a residence. Dominica Captain Hazard would "fill by mere international organisation with those masses who in London live utterly ignorant of pure air, light and warmth, the folks whom Canon Kingsley is anxious to transport to the Western Continent." But Hayti had better, he thinks, be left to itself until a good example has led its inhabitants to mend their manners. If, as he was told at Port-au-Prince, annexation would be the signal for the massacre of every white, and probably of most of the mulattos in the country, the measure had certainly better not be thought of until provision has been made for making it a success.

And now we must leave Captain Hazard and the island to which he has introduced us. His book is suggestive; it reminds us of the gloomy part of West Indian history, of the fearful misery wrought by the first conquerors, and of the Nemesis which since seems to have defeated all efforts at real civilisation. It also prompts several inquiries as to the future. What can be done with the negro race? Will the United States, before they have themselves broken up into two, or perhaps three separate republics, extend the Monro doctrine to the islands as well as to the American continent? If so, not only must St. Domingo be annexed, and Cuba and Jamaica and the rest follow, but even Prussia's recent purchase, Juan Fernandez, is scarcely safe.

But into these and like questions we have no wish to enter deeply. We have simply striven to follow Captain Hazard's own lead—to keep on the surface of things, and to call attention to what is just now a very interesting corner of the earth. Canon Kingsley's letters reminded us not long ago of what a wonderful world that West Indian world is; and some of the plates in this volume—notably the view of the Vega Real from the Widow's Pass—seem to prove that Columbus was right in placing the island, for richness and natural beauty, above even the fairest parts of Andalusia.

What was Captain Hazard doing there? Why, in 1869, the Dominicans declared for annexation; so, two years after, the Commission of which we have spoken was sent out, and our author went too, "for his own business, and as an inde-

pendent newspaper correspondent." Some of the most amusing parts of an always interesting book are those which describe Commissioner White "stumping" about the country, and taking the opinions of the Dominicans as to "joining a great nation, and becoming identified with the cause of progress." We heartily wish such an "identification" may speedily come about, not for a part only, but for the whole of this hitherto unhappy island.

ART. V.—1. *Handbook of Moral Philosophy.* By Rev. HENRY CALDERWOOD, LL.D., Professor of Moral Philosophy, University of Edinburgh. London: Macmillan and Co. 1872.

2. *Mental and Moral Science.* Part II. *Theory of Ethics and Ethical Systems.* By ALEXANDER BAIN, LL.D. London: Longmans, Green and Co. 1872.

3. *Utilitarianism.* By JOHN STUART MILL. 4th Edition. London: Longmans, Green and Co.

4. *Jouffroy's Introduction to Ethics.*

WITHIN the province of Moral Philosophy it lies to verify moral distinctions and trace them to their origin; to ascertain the fitness of man for moral rule with the liabilities of a responsible existence; in a word, to determine the questions of moral agency and moral government, with their correlated truths. It is thus charged with the task of examining the foundations of religion and morality; of accrediting their claims to the respect and submission of men, or of holding them up to scorn as superstitions outgrown by the intelligence of civilised nations. Vitally related to religion and morality, it essentially affects the whole sphere of human interests. It is, therefore, not a question merely for the few philosophic spirits who, like demi-gods, sit aloft and apart from the multitude in their own region of abstract speculation: it is one of equal interest for all classes. Moreover, the range of this branch of philosophy is universal, having to do no less with Him who is at the summit of being than with those to whom His good pleasure has given a rational existence. We are justified, therefore, in regarding with anxiety any new work on moral philosophy that makes its appearance. The principles contained in some which have during the last few years issued from the British press would lead to an immediate repudiation of all religion, and place morality upon so precarious a foundation that it could not long survive its ally. Professor Calderwood's *Handbook*, however, differs altogether from such works, and for that reason we have pleasure in calling to it the attention of our readers. Representing the Intuitional School of Philosophy, the author is entirely opposed to Mr. Bain, Professor of Logic in another of the Scotch Universities, who may be

regarded as one of the prominent representatives of the Extreme Sensational School.

Before proceeding, however, to call specific attention to the views of these two schools, we would observe that in prosecuting the study of Moral Philosophy, and assuming that man is a personal agent, we have in the first place to ascertain from the facts of consciousness whether he is a being fitted for moral rule. His nature indicates his destiny. Between these two things there must be an exact correspondence. Moral Philosophy must, therefore, rest on a psychological basis. "In the ethical department of mental science, psychology ascertains the nature of mental facts, only as a preliminary step for determining their moral significance."* Our business is thus with our own spiritual nature. Here, indeed, is the fountain of knowledge—the foundation of all philosophy. In harmony with these views Professor Calderwood remarks: "Consciousness (*conscientia*, Bewusstseyn) is the uniform condition of individual experience. To consciousness, therefore, must be our primary and ultimate appeal concerning the facts of personal experience. As here understood, 'individual experience' and the 'facts of consciousness' are identical." † "The term 'observation' has by some been unwarrantably applied to the recognition of external facts only. 'Observation' refers to the mental *exercise*, not to its *objects*. The mental sciences, as truly as the physical, are sciences of observation, though in their higher departments the mental sciences are speculative." ‡ For this reason, neither Spinoza's system, founded on a pure dialectical method, nor Hegel's, which starts from the highest abstraction, viz., pure being, can be admitted as a science, inasmuch as they both repudiate facts as their basis. Our appeal to consciousness is perfectly valid. Its testimony we are bound to accept. The veracity of consciousness admits of no more question than the truthfulness of God: the *vox naturæ* being in this case none other than the *vox Dei*. And, shy as some of the advocates of the sensational theory are of the psychological method, they are compelled to admit the validity of an appeal to the consciousness in regard to mental facts. The consequence of denying the truthfulness of consciousness would be to overthrow the foundation of all philosophy and knowledge, and to land ourselves in a dreary nihilism against which the united voice of mankind must

* *Handbook*, p. 2. † *Ibid.* p. 3. ‡ *Ibid.* p. 2.

ever protest. Thus a dark, barren nescience is the only fruit of rejecting the testimony of consciousness. For, if the veracity of our consciousness be doubted, how is even the existence of the doubt to be known? Are we not made aware of the doubt by our consciousness? So that, in spite of sophistry, this standard of truth will always be left us; and, so long as this is the case, we need never fear to confront positivism in the interests of a spiritualistic philosophy.

Comte, however, has endeavoured to bar the appeal to consciousness, on the ground that introspection is impracticable. His argument is, that you cannot observe your mind unless it pause from activity. But if it pause you have nothing to observe. Of what value, however, is an objection like this, contradicted as it is every moment by the universal experience of mankind? Contradicted no less by Comte's own words, in which he speaks of the mind as astonished at its own acts, "reflecting upon itself a speculative activity." If this is not a recognition of the introspective method, what is it? That Comte pursued substantially the same method with psychologists, has been clearly shown; it was only his hatred to their school that would not allow him to use their terms. What other course was open to him in dealing with the science of mind and morals? The argument, moreover, overlooks the office of memory, which enables us to recall our past consciousness, and submit it to observation. Further, the objection destroys itself, involving the admission of that which it seeks to deny. For if there be no appeal to consciousness, how came the author of this reasoning to know such a fact, or any other?

This is to obtain the basis of the argument from consciousness, and then to declare the consciousness an inaccessible source of information: to draw forth the response from the oracle and pronounce it dumb. Accepting, therefore, the testimony of consciousness, it reveals to us a "tri-unity of our mental powers:" Intelligence, Sensibility, and Will. All the phenomena of mind must be included in this threefold division. We are conscious of ourselves as thinking, feeling, willing, and beyond these we are conscious of no kind of mental activity or experience whatever. And, if our consciousness may be trusted, these phenomena are totally distinct, not only in degree, but in kind. Thought is not feeling, nor is thought or feeling volition. And yet, though thus distinct, they are intimately related. Feeling is ever attendant on thought, and on volition; and thought and feeling conjointly are the indispensable conditions of volition. Con-

sciousness reveals intelligence to us under a twofold form: in the highest form the intelligence presents itself as the *à priori* or Intuitive Reason, *nous;* in its inferior form as the empirical Intellect, *dianoia*. The former is the source of all our primary ideas, as space, time, cause, and God. These it gives to us with an authority which it is impossible to set aside. Hence they are marked by necessity and universality, forming the common and inevitable property of mankind. Simple and original, connate with the mind itself, they are not to be explained by any other ideas or facts more simple or original than themselves; they are reached by no process of logic, as they are the immediate affirmations of the reason; not due to the sensibility, for they represent no sensation; not the product of the empirical intellect, for they transcend the limits of all observed facts; or the result of experience, for all experience presupposes them. They are the necessary postulates of philosophy, the groundwork of science, giving to mathematics its axioms, to pure geometry its definitions and abstractions, to logic its laws and formulas: in one word, our primary ideas are the *fons et origo* of all the trustworthy beliefs and judgments of the human mind. And, were it possible to deny their authority, the structure of human knowledge could attain to no stability whatever. Reason, in its highest form, thus appears as the faculty which immediately perceives self-evident truths. The primary ideas of the reason are presupposed by the empirical intellect in all its operations, and, without the former, the latter would be impossible. For instance, no conception of the understanding is possible which is not presupposed by the ideas of time and space. For time, as necessary to events, and space, as necessary to existence, are absolutely independent of all conditions, and cannot be modified by the sovereign will of the Creator Himself, whose own existence must be regarded as supposing both the one and the other. Thus "the mind is not restricted merely to observation and logic for the discovery of truth. There is, in the nature of reason itself, provision for the recognition of higher truth."*

The sensibility is the seat of sensation, appetite, passion, emotion, and, therefore, of pleasure and pain, joy and sorrow; in fine, of all the various shades and degrees of human happiness and misery. Hence the sensibility forms a most important element in the character. Here is the home of

* *Handbook*, p. 228.

those instinctive tendencies which move the human creature to action in the early years which precede the exercise of reason; in fact, the spring head of all motives due to the desire for happiness. And it is impossible to conceive how an intelligent being, devoid of sensibility, could be susceptible of any motive to action. By depriving him of a capacity for happiness and misery, you impose upon him the necessity of a stagnant existence. Nor should this view be identified with that of the sensational school. For without sensibility we should have no experience; and, therefore, no idea of happiness or misery. Hence there could be no motive to benevolent action, as such action aims at the bestowment of happiness upon its objects. The experience of personal enjoyment gives us the idea of happiness, as an intrinsic and ultimate good. And this is the sole contribution of the sensibility to the structure of morality. The conviction, however, that we ought to defer our gratification to the higher claims of God and the universe, is due to the imperative dictate of the intelligence, in the form of reason and conscience. Reason immediately perceives that the welfare of the sentient universe is a good infinitely greater than self-enjoyment, and conscience interposes its authoritative command to postpone the lesser to the greater good.

Sensibility, we may remark, seems to be an essential property of mind. And the higher the order of life, the keener the sensibility; so that in the Deity it must exist in a degree surpassing all conception.

The phenomena of will are intention, resolution, choice, volition. It is scarcely possible to over-estimate the importance of this faculty. Conferring on man the mastership of his actions, it takes him out of the category of things, and raises him to the dignity of a person. To man, regarded as a moral agent, the will is as essential as the conscience. Without the former he would be rudderless, as, without the latter, he would lack a compass by which to steer. The clearest light on moral subjects would avail him nothing, without the voluntary faculty. Nor, in that case, would it be possible for him to affirm his obligation. For in its absence there could be no power to comform to any standard of conduct. And his fate would be to drift helplessly, as swayed to and fro by objective influences, destitute of moral ability, and incapable of achieving a moral destiny. We think Professor Calderwood right in attributing in the following passage our idea of cause to the exercise of our will:—"It

is in our consciousness of self-control, for the determination of activity, that we obtain our only knowledge of causality. Each one knows himself as the cause of his own actions. In the external world we continue ignorant of causes, and we are able only to trace uniform sequence as Hume and Comte have insisted. But in Consciousness, we distinguish between sequence and causality."*

And from hence we ascend to the notion of a personal God as the Great First Cause. The distinctive business of this faculty, however, is choice, decision, arbitration between opposing motives. In the exercise of his will, man may elect to obey or to disregard the dictates of his intelligence (that is, his reason and conscience). But it is important to observe that to the will pertains a twofold province—elective and executive. Its chief office is to decide as to the supreme end of life; whether it shall be benevolent or selfish; a life of consecration to God and goodness, or of self-gratification in one or more of its manifold forms. Its subordinate province, again, is the putting forth of executive volitions in pursuit of its object. It will be immediately apparent that the executive volitions must fall under the control of the supreme elective volition. This ultimate intention is that in which the essence of character exists, and is the immediate subject of responsibility. The omission of all reference to intention in Dr. Calderwood's book, we cannot but regard as a serious defect.

Closing these prefatory remarks, we proceed to consider the views of the intuitional and sensational schools respectively on questions of moral science. Our attention is claimed, in the first place, by the origin of our knowledge of moral distinctions. But this question is preceded by the larger one of the origin of all knowledge. Anything like an exhaustive treatment of this subject, however, in the space allotted us, cannot be attempted. All we can aim at is to indicate briefly the prominent differences which present themselves in the teaching of the two schools, and state our objections to views with which we cannot agree. The disagreement between the hostile theories, let it be observed, is not merely in terms or mode of statement, but in fundamental principles. So that between these schools there can be no truce. The one is destructive of the other. For though Professor Bain, and some of those who think with him are not avowedly com-

* *Handbook*, p. 184.

mitted to a materialistic theory, yet we wrong them not in saying that the tendency of their teaching is in support of materialism. To begin with, the difference between these opposite schools appears in the views held in regard to the mind itself. With the intuitionalist the mind is a sentient, percipient, intelligent personality. With the sensationalist "mind is," in Mr. J. S. Mill's words, "a series of feelings—a successive flow of sensations:" not quite so dignified a view as Spinoza's that the soul is constituted of its ideas, and scarcely equal to Hume's "bundle of perceptions." To Mill's definition, however, we oppose the inquiry, how, on the supposition that the mind is only a "series of feelings," is the mind able to recognise its own existence or make its own activity and experience the subject of reflection? Under the pressure of this felt difficulty Mr. Mill is obliged to make the following concession: "If we speak of the mind as a series of feelings we are obliged to complete the statement by calling it a series of feelings which is aware of itself as past and future," a concession evidently fatal to the foregoing definition. To think of feelings as aware of their own existence, may be possible to Mr. Mill. We are persuaded, however, that it surpasses the ability of ordinary mortals. It evidently demands that we ascribe to feeling an attribute of intelligence.

Again, according to the intuitional school we are gifted with original faculties, presupposed in all our knowledge, which experience may serve to develope but cannot create. With the opposite school, however, we have no such original endowments: intelligence, sensibility, and will being outgrowths of sensation in advanced forms, in which forms they must be acknowledged as ideas and memory. When these latter are obtained we have the all-sufficient condition of universal knowledge. But to this it must be objected that ideas are the property of intelligence, not of sensation, and that memory can be nothing but a mental faculty, and not the function of feeling. Thus again we have the theory postulating in fact what it denies in words.

Once more, we have the two schools at variance in regard to our knowledge of "self." The intuitionalist holds that the knowledge of the *ego* is given by an immediate and necessary judgment of the mind, and that no mental experience, active or passive, is possible in which the mind does not consciously distinguish itself from all other existences. The sensationalist, on the other hand, maintains

that the knowledge of our personality, like all other knowledge, is obtained by association, through the operation of memory. This explanation might be accepted, if our personal identity and not our personality *simpliciter* were the subject of consideration. As the case is, however, we reject it; for how is memory to associate the self of yesterday with the self of to-day, unless we first possess the knowledge of the self of the past and the self of the present? Identification supposes prior knowledge.

The consciousness, again, is another subject of difference between the two schools. For while with the intuitionalist the consciousness is a function of the intelligence, whereby the mind takes cognisance of all its own phenomena, the sensationalist holds the consciousness to be identical with sensation. This indeed is only a logical sequence of the position that mind is a "series of feelings." But that sensation is not consciousness is evident from the fact that the consciousness comprehends not only the passive experience of the sensation, but also the activities of the intellect and the will.

The fundamental principles of the development theory, as now laid before our readers, have doubtless led them to anticipate that the distinctions which characterise moral actions arise, according to that theory, from the sensations. And thus morality has only a subjective foundation assigned it. A simple change, therefore, in our sensations would change the very ground of morality. In harmony with this view Mr. J. S. Mill has supposed it possible that in other worlds benevolence might be sin, and selfishness might be virtue; that is, that to hate God and our neighbour, instead of loving them, might be a matter of obligation: a supposition which we are wholly unable to construe in thought, and which serves only to stultify its author.

It will now be seen that, according to Professor Bain and the school he represents, the grand and mighty structure of human knowledge, as embodied in the literature of the whole earth, rests upon the slender foundation of mere sensation. And as the grand and mighty fabric rises before us in all its stateliness and magnificence, we become justly alarmed for its stability, fearing lest it might wholly vanish and leave us amid the blank of universal scepticism. It will be hard, however, to bring our minds to acquiesce in the view that from the insignificant source of mere sensation, apart from any original faculty of intelligence, have sprung the discoveries

of philosophy, the achievements of science, the triumphs of art, the charms of oratory, the idealism of poetry, the ravishments of music, the abstractions of metaphysics, the power of logic, the doctrines of theology, the discriminations of casuistry, the aspirations of religion, and what else may be embraced within the wide sweep of human intelligence and experience.

It is only justice to acknowledge the conspicuous ability which Professor Bain has brought to the construction of his theory. And we hazard but little in saying that if the task of founding a system of moral philosophy on a sensational basis has proved a failure in his hands, there remains for it but slender hope of future success. But that even his able effort has proved a failure we rest convinced. The tribute we have just paid to Professor Bain's ability will be thought reduced in value when we remark that his seeming success is due to two things: (1) Assumptions surreptitiously introduced into the texture of the system, and (2) an unwarrantable method of investigation. 1. As an example of the former we refer to the Professor's ascribing to feeling a mental as well as a physical side; that is, in plain terms, feeling is not altogether feeling, but is partly thought as well as feeling. Howbeit feeling is feeling and nothing more, and thought is thought and nothing else, and neither can be other than feeling and thought world without end. Another instance of assumption we find in his coolly speaking of perceptions embodied in the optic muscle. Perception in a muscle? We are startled, and led to inquire how this fact came to be ascertained. Subjected to anatomical or chemical analysis, has the muscle ever yielded such a result? Have the perceptions ever been revealed on the point of the lancet, or found at the bottom of the crucible? We have still another example in the words "conscious centres of the brain;" a phrase the use of which may seem trifling, but which, if allowed to pass unchallenged, leads to all that is essential to the grossest materialism. "Conscious centres of the brain" can only mean "conscious matter," for the centres are parts of the brain, and the brain is matter. But conscious matter is a contradiction, matter being separated from consciousness by the whole diameter of being. 2. The other reason which we assign for the failure of Professor Bain is the intrusion of a physiological method of inquiry into psychological science. To one accustomed to Hamilton and psychologists of his order, the change on coming to read

Bain is most marked; for we are taken from amongst faculties, powers, and operations of mind, and placed amongst tendons, muscles, and nerves. We have no desire to uphold psychology at the expense of physiology. Their spheres are perfectly distinct, and confusion and error are the sole results of the misapplication of terms. Physiology is confined to what may be submitted to anatomical and chemical analysis; psychology to facts of consciousness.

But the point now before us is one of the highest importance, as it indicates the present battle-ground of the two philosophies—indeed, the key of the whole position—around which the strife is gathered. In this point of the controversy we have the secret of the attempts to substitute physiology for psychology; and it is with a view to this, doubtless, that cerebralists are now accustoming their readers to the word "cerebration" instead of thought or intelligence. Our concern for the result, however, may be reduced when we remember that it is not the first attempt of this kind. Hamilton refers to a similar one in the following passage:—

"After the philosophy of Descartes and Malebranche had sunk into oblivion, and from the time that Condillac, exaggerating the too partial principles of Locke, had analysed all knowledge into sensation, sensualism (or, more correctly, sensuism), as a psychological theory of the origin of our cognitions, became, in France, not only the dominant, but also the one exclusive opinion. It was believed that reality and truth were limited to experience, and experience was limited to the sphere of sense; while the very highest faculties of mind were deemed adequately explained when recalled to perceptions, elaborated, purified, sublimated, and transformed. From the mechanical relations of sense with its object, it was attempted to solve the mysteries of will and intelligence; the philosophy of mind was soon viewed as correlative to the physiology of organisation. The moral nature of man was at last formally abolished, in its identification with his physical; mind became a reflex of matter; thought a secretion of the brain. A doctrine so melancholy in its consequences, and founded on principles thus partial and exaggerated, could not be permanent: a reaction was inevitable."

No words could more accurately describe the character and tendency of the present movement than those in which Hamilton, in the foregoing admirable passage, depicts the sceptical philosophy of France in the eighteenth century. The movement we are witnessing, however, is a reaction in the opposite direction of the reaction noticed by Hamilton: a reverse swing of the philosophic pendulum. But we may

rest assured that the present reaction will not be of long duration. For the human consciousness will certainly rebel against any teaching which reduces man to a piece of mere material mechanism. Humanity must vindicate itself against a system which offers to it such indignity. The Duke of Argyll has said, in the February number of the *Contemporary Review* for this year, that thought in man is so intimately associated with physical conditions that they cannot be separated in the present world. With this we perfectly agree. But we further agree with the noble author, that physiologists have not been able to prove that thought originates in the physical organisation, and that such a proposition is incapable of proof. We take no exception to Dr. Carpenter's view, that we are to respect the teachings of physiology, so far as they may offer a clue to mental facts. We would, however, call attention to a physiological fact stated in the same article by Dr. Carpenter, which on any materialistic theory can never be reconciled with an undoubted fact of consciousness, viz., personal identity. Dr. Carpenter informs us that there goes on in our material frame a process of ceaseless pulling down and rebuilding; and that this is so great in the case of young persons that not one-hundredth part of the food consumed by them goes to increase the bulk,—so great is the amount of waste which has to be made up, before any development can take place. In this process of disintegration and rebuilding, every part of the body must be involved, the brain included. Now, on this supposition, every particle of matter in the body must be changed over and over again, during a life of ordinary length. If, therefore, we have nothing more than physiology to guide us, we must pronounce the same man to become many different men during one lifetime: in fact, never absolutely the same man, from one moment to another. Where, then, is the justice of holding a man responsible either to a Divine or human tribunal to-day, for sins or crime committed years ago? Clearly, physiology cannot help us out of the difficulty. But here psychology steps in, and, appealing to the consciousness, elicits the clear affirmation that we are the same persons now that we were at the beginning of life's journey. It is idle for the cerebralists to point to facts which show the dependence of mind on physical conditions in proof of their theory. For the psychologists are able to point to counter facts which as clearly prove the influence of mind over matter. In this dilemma, therefore, can any compromise between the conflict-

ing views be proposed? Such a compromise seems impossible, unless we can conceive something in man which is neither in mind nor matter, or some compound of both, which is inadmissible on all hands. That the brain is nothing else than matter, whose chemical properties have been accurately ascertained, is well known, and admitted by both sides. The question, therefore, seems to narrow itself down to this one point: Is it possible for us, with our present knowledge of matter, to form the conception, that any material organ is equal to mental functions? Is not this one of those things which are unthinkable? And if any man thinks himself capable of such a conception, does he not practise a delusion upon himself? We are therefore brought to this conclusion: That mind and matter are closely bound together in man's present mode of existence; but that the *nexus* which forms the bond of union is surrounded by a mystery that defies every attempt to penetrate it.

Our attention has been detained beyond our original purpose on the origin of knowledge. If apology be necessary, it will be found in the intrinsic importance of the subject, together with its intimate relation to any system of moral philosophy that we may have to consider. Proceeding now to matters more obviously germane to our article, we have in the first place to examine the views of the opposing schools in respect to the ground of morality, or the origin of moral distinctions. Professor Calderwood's *Handbook* contains but little that is positive and definite on this question, being almost exclusively confined to adverse criticism. It would have enhanced the value of the book had it explicitly dealt with the ground of moral government and obligation. What the author's views on the ultimate ground of moral government may be, we are scarcely able to gather. Whether the Professor regards right as the final aim of moral government, or whether he would regard right as a condition only, and the ultimate ground as the welfare of the universe, does not appear. These two things, it is true, cannot be separated in thought or in fact, as the good of universal being can only be subserved by conformity to the right on the part of intelligent agents. Nevertheless, it is of consequence in the construction of a moral theory, that the relative position of the two elements be definitely settled. If right be the supreme end, it seems to usurp the place of God and of the sentient universe, and make virtue to be love to the right, rather than love to God and our neighbour. For this, among other reasons, the

moral system that makes the welfare of the universe, rather than right, its ground, commands our conviction, and secures our adherence. It should be added, however, that our duty of supreme devotion to Him who is the source of our being and the ruler of our destiny, as the end of life, and our consequent responsibility to Him, are points on which Dr. Calderwood's teaching has left no doubt.

That the actions of moral agents are apprehended by all men as good and bad, praiseworthy and blameworthy, rewardable and punishable, is a fact apparent in universal literature, and attested by the languages of the whole earth. We are now called to trace these distinctions to their origin. The solution of the problem, according to Mr. Bain and Mr. J. S. Mill, is found in experience. "As the foundation of the intellectual theory is laid in sensation, the foundation of the moral theory is laid in the pleasurable and painful experience characteristic of our feelings."*

But if we would reach the root of the matter, we have, under the guidance of Professor Bain, to begin with spontaneity and self-preservation. Admitted that some actions arise spontaneously from the reflex activity of our organism, and that there is in us an instinctive tendency to self-conservation, we have the essential elements of a moral theory. Experience will account for the rest. We have now the key to Professor Bain's Moral Philosophy.

The principle of self-conservation extended to our social relations gives rise to laws, with their penal enactments. Conformity to these laws, with a view to escape penalty, is, according to Professor Bain, morality. Lest we should be suspected of misrepresentation, we present the reader with the very words employed by him:—"Morality is an institution of society, maintained by the authority and punishments of society. Morality is an institution of society, but not an arbitrary institution. Morality is utility made compulsory." We thus behold in the nineteenth century a revival of the philosophy of Hobbes, which we had thought to be defunct beyond all hope of a resurrection. The difference between Hobbes' notion of morality and Professor Bain's is simply political, the former making it rest on the authority of an absolute monarchy, the latter on the votes of the majority. This theory is suggestive of endless objections, a few only of which the space at our disposal will allow us to state. But

* *Handbook*, p. 123.

these we think of sufficient weight to prove the hopeless insufficiency of the theory in the estimation of every candid thinker. (1) It compels us to accept all laws as just, or else unjust laws as morally binding. (2) It would lead us to regard laws, opposite in character, as equal in moral rectitude. The oppressive law, so long as it is in force, and the equitable law, when adopted in its stead—an obvious absurdity. (3) It condemns all resistance to human governments, however superstitious, tyrannical, or iniquitous they may be. (4) It makes conscience, as it is held by Prof. Bain, to be a reflection of outward authority, which is a reversal of the true order. For no outward rule can have the character of moral law, which has not the sanction of reason and conscience, as it is unable to secure a conviction of obligation. Moreover, this account of the conscience is out of harmony with facts; for we find even the conscience of a child taking exception to parental authority on the score of injustice. And the grandest pages of our world's history are those whereon the conscience of the good and the true is seen in stubborn and triumphant array against outward authority. (5) Social laws presuppose the existence of rights. But rights imply obligation. Whence this obligation? Does it rest on human authority? Then human authority can release us from obligation. This, however, is what no one can be brought to believe. (6) The theory is built on the recognised fact that immoral actions tend to the misery of the individual and of society, while their opposites promote the well-being of both. We need to have this fact accounted for. Whence this constitution of things, which renders these results inevitable? Is this of human origin? And whence also that constitution of mind which harmonises with this external order, so that precepts founded on benevolence always command the assent of the reason, even when the passions rebel? Thus to love God supremely, and to do to others as we would that others should do to us, are precepts that ever commend themselves by an irresistible self-evidence to every man's conscience. (7) The theory restricts moral evil to the overt act, and takes no cognisance of intentional volition, which is the essential sphere of morality.

It may be presumed that the hardihood of Prof. Bain in committing himself to positions so manifestly untenable as the foregoing, will awaken surprise in those not familiar with him as an author. The positions, however, are not so obviously weak, provided the Professor is allowed to affix his

own meaning to words—a meaning, it must be confessed, often novel and unwarrantable. Thus morality is, in Prof. Bain's vocabulary, restricted to actions which mark the conduct of one citizen towards another, and for which they are amenable only to human courts of law. "A man does his duty and escapes punishment," the punishment by which society maintains its laws. And this is an exhaustive account of morality. For morality is not to be thought as co-extensive with virtue. Morality is a duty; virtue is optional, and beyond the sphere of duty. The former may be rendered compulsory by penal enactments; the latter, as being optional, is, moreover, meritorious, and meets with its reward in the approbation of our fellow-citizens. It is somewhat inconvenient to this theory that we have heard of men who, by doing their duty, have incurred rather than escaped punishment, and whose virtue has brought down upon them the frown and the crushing power of a hostile community. The distinction, however, between duty and virtue is purely fictitious; for obviously the duty of a moral agent is the consecration of all the energies and resources of his being for God and goodness. So that to rise above the measure of duty is impossible.

It will thus be seen that morality is by Professor Bain reduced to a function of civil society, a mere political institution, shifting as human opinion. We are also brought back to the views of Plato and Aristotle, with whom the moral centre was the State. Obligation, therefore, has no higher source than earthly senates, and responsibility terminates at the bar of the civil magistrate. With regard to anything beyond this, there is, alas, a sad and ominous silence.

For all these reasons, it is questionable whether Professor Bain's theory be entitled to the rank of a philosophy of morals, as it deals with sociological facts rather than with the facts of consciousness.

Mr. Mill agrees with Professor Bain in tracing the origin of moral distinctions to experience, and in founding morality on personal happiness. Thus, according to the former, exemption from pain and the possession of as much enjoyment as possible both in quality and quantity is the end of life and also the standard of morality. Here, however, we think Mr. Mill guilty of an inaccurate exposition of his own theory, by confounding the foundation with the standard of morality. Correctly stated, the foundation of the theory is happiness; the standard the verdict of "competent judges" in regard to

the quality of different kinds of pleasure. Bentham's utilitarian system seems to be accepted by Mr. Mill in its main principles. He claims for it the credit of a benevolence theory, in which attempt Dr. Calderwood clearly convicts him of inconsistency; for an hypothesis founded on personal enjoyment—the ultimate principle of Mr. Mill's theory—can never be in harmony with one based on "the greatest happiness of the greatest number." The one evidently differs as much from the other as selfishness differs from benevolence. The case is not essentially improved by making the pursuit of "the greatest happiness of the greatest number" the means of personal happiness. For this, as it still leaves personal happiness in its supreme and ultimate position in the theory, does not bring us to a foundation of benevolence. We have, however, to thank Mr. Mill, in the interests of humanity, for his endeavour to rescue the system he represents from the gross form in which it had been presented by Hobbes, with whom happiness is anything that will gratify desire. Mr. Mill remarks: "A beast's pleasures do not satisfy a human being's conception of happiness. Human beings have faculties more elevated than animal appetites." It may, however, be fairly questioned whether Hobbes, by recklessly accepting the logical consequences of a sensational theory, is not more consistent than Mr. Mill; and whether the latter, by the introduction of a redeeming, but foreign, element, has not wholly vitiated his theory. We are in entire harmony with Mr. Mill in regard to the existence of higher and lower faculties in man, and that in the government of human conduct the supremacy of the former should be recognised. But we are not able to perceive how, on the supposition that all our mental faculties are only developed forms of sensation, such a distinction is to be maintained. And now, admitting for a moment that the theory under examination is right in assigning to morality a foundation of personal happiness, the foundation, nevertheless, is not everything in a moral scheme; a standard of sufficient authority by which to judge of the character of actions is equally essential. We therefore still need a rule by which to distinguish those pleasures which, according to Mr. Mill, are more befitting the superior nature of man: and more than this, to know what forms of gratification are prohibitable, as being morally wrong. The provision by which Mr. Mill proposes to meet this necessity is the decision of "competent judges" or "witnesses," the manifest absurdity of which places it beyond the

pale of criticism, and reveals the complete failure of the theory.

But yet graver objections await us. This theory, as it is reduced to a selfish basis, is chargeable with corrupting the essential idea of virtue. Assigning to personal enjoyment the supreme position due to benevolent love, it sacrilegiously devotes to baseness the shrine of all excellence. Moreover, it is guilty of shifting the centre of the moral universe from God to self, and of contravening the royal law to which reason furnishes such ready response: "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and thy neighbour as thyself," and saying in effect: "Thou shalt love thyself with all thy heart, and make personal enjoyment the end of life;" thus reducing the Most High into a vassal of the creature, or else, indeed, what is equally probable, ignoring His very existence.

But in truth, on the foundation assigned to morality by Mr. Mill, it is superfluous to speak of moral good or evil. In the light of this theory, such distinctions vanish altogether. For as the essence of the moral act is in the intention of the agent—and no man can intend pain to himself as the end of life—so no man is capable of moral evil. The worst that can be affirmed of any man is that he has erred in judgment. Thus all men, it would seem, are alike in moral character, for all intentionally seek the same end, the only difference being that some seek their happiness more prudently than others. We must therefore cancel the ugly word "sin," and rejoice that we live, if not in a virtuous, at least in a sinless world. Indeed, if Mr. Mill's canon of morality be correct, the most virtuous, as being the most disinterested, alone fall under condemnation. So entirely has the light of this theory become darkness!

And to what now is Mr. Mill's failure to establish a benevolence theory attributable? We answer, to the omission of two essential elements. First, the glory of the Creator, intrinsically more valuable than the total enjoyment of the whole sentient universe besides; and, secondly, of the revealed will of God as the standard—not, be it carefully observed, the source—of morality. Without the former, the aims of the system are infinitely too narrow, and without the latter there is no adequate guidance and authority in seeking the objects contemplated by universal benevolence. But to advert again for a moment to the distinction hinted at between the will of God regarded as the source of morality, and regarded as its standard. For the want of a clear knowledge of this distinc-

tion, Christian orthodoxy has been made to present a weak side to its assailants, and has failed to do justice to the sublimity of its own teachings. For to represent the will of God as the origin of moral distinctions, is to impart to virtue an arbitrary character, and to convey that every precept of the moral law might have been the reverse of what it is, without loss to the rectitude and excellency of the code. This, however, would be to put ourselves in harmony with Mr. Mill's strange notion that what is virtue to us might possibly be sin in other worlds. We are therefore led to seek a source for morality behind the Divine will, and we find it in the Divine intelligence, which perceives that moral order is a necessary condition of the good of universal being, the will of God legislating accordingly. Thus virtue is an idea of the Divine reason, which God, in the exercise of His will, embodies into law, and enforces with appropriate sanctions. This distinction has not altogether escaped theologians. Dr. Harris points to it in the following words: "Morality is founded, not on the will of man, but on the will of God. But in the language of Aquinas, though God always wills what is just, nothing is just solely because He wills it." Charnock, in this department first of Puritan divines, has not only announced, but also most happily illustrated it.* This view enables us to vindicate to God a moral character, revealing to us the law of the Divine intelligence, as the self-imposed rule of the Creator's activity. The moral character of God is thus seen to be the harmony, free but invariable, existing between His will and His intelligence. In like manner, the image of God in man consists in the conformity of the will to the dictate of the reason or intelligence. Morality is thus placed on unassailable ground, as virtue becomes founded on the intrinsic value of the claims respectively of God and of His creatures: the regard demanded of us for those claims being regulated by their proportionate value, as revealed in the reason. Hence the possibility of objection to the moral government of God is wholly excluded, as we are compelled by our very mental make to affirm the rectitude of its foundation.

Specific attention must now be paid to the opposing views of the two schools on the subject of conscience or the moral faculty. Dr. Calderwood's definition of conscience is: "The reason, as that discovers to us absolute moral truth having

* See Charnock, *Divine Attributes*, Discourse ix., "Wisdom of God."

the authority of sovereign law." Thus the conscience is no distinct moral sense, sentiment or faculty, but the reason in its relation to moral truth: the reason beholding by a self-evidencing light the moral goodness of all actions arising from a benevolent intention, and the evil of those which arise from an intention of an opposite character. These are necessary judgments of the mind within the moral sphere. Along with these judgments, and springing out of them, we have also sentiments and impulses; as when beholding a noble deed we are conscious of admiration, or when directing our attention to a base or cruel instance of conduct our indignation is kindled. Moreover, when a duty is presented to us, we are conscious not only of a conviction of obligation, but also of an impulse in the direction of the duty. The conviction however is not inviolable, nor the impulse irresistible. The irresistible supremacy of conscience could only exist at the expense of moral agency. And again, the sentiment of admiration raised in us at the contemplation of actions morally excellent, is a sentiment essentially different from that experienced in beholding a fine landscape, a beautiful work of art, or in witnessing acts of dexterity and skill. Thus is the moral sphere marked off with definite sharpness from every other known to us.

Very different is the account which Professor Bain renders of the conscience. Denying to man original faculties of intelligence, he derives the conscience by development from the natural instincts of self-interest and sympathy. These, as they are associated with the emotions of prudence, resentment, affection, and the ethical sentiment, result in the conscience. The fundamental element of conscience, however, according to this theory, is the fear of punishment arising from self-interest. And by the association of the act with its punishment, we come to clothe the former with the aversion we hold to the later. Thus, by what we take the liberty of calling a mental delusion, we come to regard a punishable act as evil and wrong in itself, just as men come to substitute money for the enjoyment which money procures: in either case, the means being loved or condemned solely for the sake of the end. Afterwards, a sentiment of respect for teachers and governors arises, and forms an additional element of the conscience. And still another, when the reasonableness and necessity of the law on the ground of utility comes to be perceived.

With much of the foregoing, when viewed as an exposition

of the education and training of the conscience, we readily agree. When, however, it is offered as an hypothesis accounting for the creation of conscience, we reject it, as altogether untenable. In the first place, it manifestly assumes the pre-existence of a moral faculty, upon which educational and other social influences are brought to operate. Let the reader look, for example, at the emotions of prudence, resentment of wrong, and of affection if it be anything superior to the merest animal instinct, and pre-eminently the ethical sentiment, and will he not at once detect a conscience underlying each of these? The same remark holds good of the respect for superiors and teachers, for this very respect is grounded upon the appreciation of the supposed excellency of their moral character, necessarily implying a moral judgment.

Professor Bain, again, adjusting his theory of conscience to his ethical standard, represents the former as being first the fear of authority and then respect for it. While we admit that the fear of punishment may exist without a conscience, we contend that respect for the authority employed to uphold useful institutions indicates a conscience already existing, for it implies a conviction of the moral rightness and obligation of utility, as an aim of personal conduct. Moreover, if the conscience is a faculty developed from sensation and memory, as all our mental faculties by this theory are held to be, we would learn how it comes to pass that animals, gifted with both sensation and memory, as they confessedly are, and with self-preservation and sympathy to boot, can nevertheless by no system of development be brought to the possession of a conscience, its absence dooming them to a hopelessly lower level of existence? Further, as this theory has been shown to rest on a selfish basis, then we have the anomaly of selfishness giving rise to institutions whose design is the general good and to laws restrictive of self-gratification, which again, in their re-action, produce a conscience that becomes a raging lion in the pathway of men. And yet, this ceaseless source of terror is only the bugbear of men's own creation, as they have given existence to the laws, which gave existence to the conscience.

Again, if external authority has imparted to the conscience its existence, then may the same authority bring about its dissolution. Can any instance, however, be furnished, of the extinction of the conscience by human authority? A necessary function of the reason, its extinction would demand the abolition of our very intelligence.

Professor Bain's representation of the conscience clashes too with the well-known fact, that at different periods persons have sprung up in the bosom of corrupt communities, who, by a moral enlightenment and sublimity of character, superior to everything in their surroundings, have brought the laws of society into contempt, and raised their fellow citizens to a loftier region of moral conviction and practice.

Dr. Calderwood points out how the theory is contradicted by the fact, already noticed, that at an early stage children resent the injustice of their parents' commands. So that something beyond mere force and fear is required in their training. Moreover, human beings cannot always be retained in the leading-strings of bare authority. A time arrives when they discover within them a law by which they are enabled to judge of the rectitude of all external institutions, and thus to emancipate themselves from any human "standard which would over-ride the separate intelligence." This fact, inexplicable on Professor Bain's theory, forces him to maintain the monstrous notion that an ill-judged, i.e., an unjust moral precept, is still a moral precept, and that a bad law is a moral law: a most humiliating position, brought about by the exigencies of a false theory. "Professing themselves to be wise, they become fools;" and, "their folly becoming manifest to all men," they experience the doom of those who set themselves to sever mankind from the bonds which unite them to the central authority of the Divine Throne. If, now, Professor Bain had resolved the conscience into a reflection of the Divine character and authority, he would be far nearer the truth, for the ideas of conscience and of God are inseparable. Our moral judgments as surely lead to God as the stream to the springhead. And here is the goal of all inquiry, the ultimatum of thought; above and beyond God there is nothing.

We now come to the chief difficulty of the intuitionalist, which is, consistently to account for the diversity of moral judgments existing among men. In dealing with this subject, all we shall be able to do is to furnish bare hints as a guide to further thought. (1) This diversity may be much overrated, as there is unquestionably a general agreement among men on the cardinal principles of morality, such as justice, truthfulness, benevolence. (2) It is a most significant fact that no nation has been known to transpose moral distinctions; so that, though certain vices have been justified, their opposite virtues have never been condemned. (3) Absolute

uniformity marks the moral judgments within the sphere of volitional intention. The diversity appears in the practical application of the intention. Thus, to will good to God and man is felt by all to be a matter of obligation. The diversity is with regard to the means by which the honour of God and the welfare of mankind are to be promoted. (4) Much of the diversity is due to the influence of depraved sensibility, in warping the judgments of the mind. The abnormal development of the sensibility is, indeed, the source of all our moral disorders, showing itself both in thought and action. Hence arise the false moral standards which men have set up, and which, in their reflex action, strengthen the originating evil. (5) There is often a difficulty in deciding what is duty in particular circumstances, when there is none as to the principles which should guide us. Thus, there is no doubt as to the principle of benevolence, but there may be as to the relief of a given case of poverty. (6) That moral sentiment should attend upon a wrong judgment as upon a right one, cannot be regarded as a valid objection to the intuitional theory; for a wrong deed, viewed as right, will gather around it the same approval as if it were such in reality.

But, admitting the shortcomings of the conscience, we are not warranted to argue from them its worthlessness. The conscience is not the only faculty for which we cannot claim infallibility, whose value is, nevertheless, allowed. The memory and the understanding are guilty of many a *lapsus*, yet both hold essential place in the mental economy. Moreover, the conscience, as a faculty of the intelligence, is dependent for its efficiency upon the moral enlightenment of the intellect, which is often very imperfect in degree. For we differ on this point from Dr. Calderwood, who holds that the conscience is a faculty which, from its very nature, cannot be educated, any more than the eye or ear: unfortunate illustrations, we think, as both the eye and the ear are capable of indefinite improvement under training. It is, however, difficult to understand what is the precise meaning attached to conscience by Dr. Calderwood, as he hints at an unexplained distinction between conscience proper and the moral judgment. And now, from our foregoing consideration of the conscience, one conclusion seems to be clearly apparent, viz., the value and necessity of a Divinely revealed standard of morality as an infallible and authoritative rule of action.

Closing our remarks on the conscience, we pass, by an

easy and natural transition, to the question of the Divine existence, which will now briefly occupy our attention. Here we regret that we have nothing to cite from Professor Bain, as he has scarcely an allusion to the sacred Name—a parallel to Humboldt's *Cosmos;* there you have a material universe without God, and here a moral one. And while we cannot impute to Professor Bain a pronounced anti-theistic creed, we are compelled to report his theory as atheistic. If it is not said "There is no God," it is plainly implied—"It concerns us not to know," or "The subject is hopelessly beyond our knowledge."

Dr. Calderwood's treatment of this question is effective, and especially his refutation of the "Materialistic (Atheistic) Theory." And this on account both of the force of the arguments and of their suggestiveness. Now, atheism, as it is impotent to establish an affirmative position, is manifestly devoid of logical value. To prove that there is no God is obviously beyond human ability, and the mere assertion that we know not that there is, argues nothing. But it is when atheism, in its materialistic garb, undertakes to account for the existence of this varied universe, that its difficulties become insurmountable. It has now to show how unorganised, unintelligent matter, has come to assume the manifold forms of beauty and usefulness revealed in the surrounding creation; to explain what has imposed upon material objects their forms, imparted to them their motions, and continues to regulate their phenomena by unfailing laws; and more than all, to account for moral freedom and intelligence in man. Are we told that force, added to matter, is a solution of the difficulty? This, so far from being a competent explanation, needs itself to be explained. Whence this force? Is force the offspring of matter? How came matter to give existence to force? And if force has derived its origin from matter, then force itself must be material. Thus we still lie under the unconquerable difficulty of accounting for intelligence in ourselves, as well as for the manifestations of it in an universe that had nothing for its origin but unorganised material substance. Or if we are told that force is not the offspring of matter, but a principle co-eternal and co-ordinate with it, this representation only entangles us with other and apparently greater difficulties. For we are now called upon to conceive of a principle which is neither mind nor matter —an impossibility to us; moreover we have to admit two independent and eternal principles, diverse in nature, each limiting and restricting the action of the other. But on this

view we shall still want to know whence the power of matter to restrict force, or of force to coerce matter? To this, no answer has reached us. Thus in the fact of human intelligence it is that the atheistic theory meets its sure refutation. Here its cold and desolating waves are stayed, from this rampart are they triumphantly flung back, and every attempt of human reasoning to establish atheistic conclusions is seen to be self-destructive. Hence the vigour and astuteness of mind displayed in the endeavour to find a "physical basis for life;" and its phenomena—call them "protoplasms" or what you will—in their very existence refute the vain attempt. An intelligent effect must have for itself an intelligent and personal cause, or we have more in the effect than in the cause, "a plain reversal of all logic." In this way we ascend from the freedom and intelligence of our own minds to the Personal God, the Father of our spirits.

The question whether the existence of God is an intuitive or logical belief possesses sufficient interest to deserve cursory allusion. Dr. Calderwood holds the belief to be intuitive, remarking that "the reality of the Divine existence is a truth so plain that it needs no proof, as it is a truth so high that it admits of none. . . . It is the common original idea of a great Ruler, which is the explanation of the common features of belief and religious practice throughout the world."* And this seems the most satisfactory view; since, in every attempt to reach the fact of the Divine existence by a logical process, the conclusion must contain more than is warranted by the premisses; for in the latter we have only a finite effect, while in the former we have an Infinite Cause. The conclusion and premisses are thus separated by a gulf which logic cannot span. The argument from design, however, is not set aside by this view. Starting with the natural belief in a God, our acquaintance with the final causes of the universe comes to strengthen a belief which is the original dictate of the reason. The voice of God within, finding its echo in the works of God without, returns upon the soul with redoubled energy.

Professor Calderwood's chapter on the will is an effective handling of a difficult subject. "Will," in the language of the author, "is a power of control over the other faculties and capacities of our nature, by means of which we are able to determine personal activity." It is also represented as "a middle power," standing between the intelligence and the sensibility, open to influences from both, but controlled by

* *Handbook*, p. 229.

neither, owing allegiance and obedience, however, to the higher and rational faculties of the soul. Motives are thus presented as conditions but not causes of actions, having incentive but not necessitating power. And as our nature is correlated to the external world, the rise of motive is inevitable. But the control of motive is secured to us by the directive power we have over our attention, a power vouched for by our consciousness. Here is the citadel of our freedom, the guarantee of liberty. For by means of the power just indicated both the states of the sensibility and the decisions of the intellect become indirectly amenable to the will; and being thus brought under voluntary control, they are thereby brought within the sphere of responsibility. To the minute inquiry as to how the will puts forth its energy, the answer is that we know no more of the *quo modo* of its operation than we know of that of the memory, or understanding, or any other faculty or power of the mind.

The above philosophy of the will enables us to meet certain necessitarian sophistries. It admits, for instance, the power of motive as a condition of action, but denies its compelling power as a cause, a necessitarian exaggeration. Moreover, it makes a clear distinction between the states of the sensibility and acts of the will, the want of which distinction is a leading error in all necessitarian schemes. Again, in the influence which it assigns to attention it offers a satisfactory *rationale* of liberty, as it is a matter of experience that we are able to reduce the power of unlawful tendencies, when appearing in the sensibility, by directing the mind to the contemplation of God and of duty. The same remark applies to our beliefs, which are greatly influenced by the sensibility, and are morally wrong only as they are voluntarily cherished in obedience to depraved feeling.

Professor Bain comes before us as the advocate of the grossest of necessitarian schemes. The theory, however, has no features of novelty to recommend it, if we except the boldness and plausibility of its illustrations. In other respects it is the necessitarianism of Hobbes, Hume, and others of the same school. His "exposition of the will," he informs us, "proceeds on the uniformity of sequence between motive and action:" that is, the necessary connection between what common sense calls cause and effect, "as found to prevail in the physical world:" the terms of the sequence alone differing, inasmuch as, to put it plainly, you have mind in the one case and matter in the other. This is the sole difference.

The former is as truly under the reign of physical law as the latter. Circumstances give birth to motives, motives to actions, and we are under the absolute control of the strongest motive brought to bear upon our minds by our circumstances. So that, in any given circumstance of life no one could have acted otherwise than he did. Thus we are brought face to face with an unblushing necessitarianism which strips man of that sovereignty over his actions which essentially belongs to him as a moral agent, and makes him, through his motives, the slave of circumstances, a theory fatalistic in everything but in name. And if this view could be established, Spinoza, who made all moral distinctions vanish before the might of his logic, was right, and Diderot anything but wrong in concluding that "there is neither vice nor virtue," that "the doer of good is lucky, not virtuous," and that "we should reproach others for nothing, and repent of nothing." A fairer way of stating the conclusion to be logically drawn from Professor Bain's theory, we cannot conceive. All praise or blame bestowed upon the past in the history of nations or individuals is unjustifiable in the light of such teaching, as no bygone action could have been otherwise than it was, and Professor Bain's mode of justifying the bestowment of censure and the infliction of punishment upon wrongdoers is unwarrantable and deceptive. For it now comes to this, that as an unavoidable action cannot be righteously punished, and all actions are on his theory unavoidable, punishment must be limited to a prospective function. Consequently it expresses no displeasure with the offender for his past conduct; its sole purpose is to create a motive that shall act repressively upon the criminal tendencies of Society in the future. Thus, when you subject the garotter to a degrading and terrible punishment, in heart you hold him the victim of misfortune, but in fact you treat him as the author of an odious crime. Does not Professor Bain's heart recoil from such principles, when viewed apart from theory? Better philosophy may be learned from the lips of a child, when, uttering the language of nature, it pleads in bar of punishment, "I could not help it." And in this the child and the sage are in harmony; for Hamilton says: "That we are morally accountable, as we are morally free, is a dictate of common sense, and universally acknowledged." This is a true witness, and the necessitarian theorist himself would find it impossible to frame his ordinary speech, or direct his daily course among men, without practically acknowledging

the fact of man's moral freedom. In fairness the usual terminology of moral science should be discarded by the sensational school. Unless, however, those terms be arbitrary creations, and not the genuine coinage of the consciousness, the effect of such a procedure would be an embarrassment amounting to an arrest of human affairs. The terms are therefore retained, but subjected to a deceitful handling, which carefully rids them of every genuine idea of moral liberty. Thus, while duty, choice, self-determination, and responsibility are words that still meet the reader's eye, they are, in compliance with theoretical demands, all made to bear a factitious and non-natural sense. Obligation, we have observed, is a word wisely avoided by Professor Bain, and of which indeed the whole school is altogether chary. Bentham, in his posthumous work entitled *Deontology*, has said that "ought" is a word that "ought not" to be employed, an illustrious instance of the self-contradiction inevitably attendant on every effort to set aside words that represent facts of consciousness. By Mr. Darwin human obligation is gravely placed on a par with the fact that hounds "ought" to hunt, and retrievers to retrieve game, which is but a sample of the teaching of this scientist when he intrudes himself within the sphere of moral philosophy. If Mr. Darwin would but restrict himself to hounds and retrievers, and other animals, where he is confessedly great, though somewhat eccentric withal, it would be with no loss of credit to his fame, nor of advantage to science: *Ne sutor ultra crepidam.* But, in truth, obligation is an idea wholly alien to the sensational theory, expediency being the utmost that it can affirm. To pursue Professor Bain into every labyrinth of perversion and error, however, and point out and refute all his misleading notions on the subject of necessity, is a task which, though desirable, cannot be attempted on a page or two of a Review, as it demands and is worthy of an extended article.

And now as it regards the moral tendency of theories that negative human freedom, the testimony of Mr. J. S. Mill might surely be accepted; who, with an admirable and characteristic candour, avers from "personal experience," that "it tends to degrade our moral nature, and to paralyse the desire of excellence." Let Mr. Mill, therefore, purge himself of all connection with systems whose principles entail consequences so sad.*

* This Article was written before the death of Mr. Mill.

In considering the question of the freedom of the will, we have been impressed with the supreme importance of ascertaining for ourselves the right method of settling the subject. Does it fall within the province of logic in any form? Is it a question for the inductive philosophy? or can it be dealt with by the intellect in any of its empirical functions? With the fact before us that the great thinkers of the age have, by "demonstration," landed themselves in conclusions adverse to freedom, we are bound to answer these inquiries in the negative. And as this is the rock on which Spinoza, Leibnitz, Edwards, Chalmers, and many others have in succession been wrecked, we would plant upon it a beacon of warning. Kant says that "freedom, while a postulate of our practical reason, i.e. necessary to be assumed in order to moral action, is yet inconsistent with our theoretical reason, i.e. incapable of demonstration, and contrary to the conclusion at which the reflecting mind arrives." In other words, the subject of freedom, as settled by mere logic, is inconsistent with the dictate of consciousness. It is Hamilton's remark, "In thought we never escape determination and necessity." And he professes to solve the problem of freedom by means of his "Philosphy of the Conditioned," according to which both freedom and necessity are alike inconceivable, and which, therefore, forbids all recourse to any process of reasoning. But he adds: "Our freedom is an immediate datum of the consciousness, or given in an immediate datum of the consciousness." "How moral liberty is possible in man or God, we are utterly unable speculatively to understand. But practically the *fact* that we are free, is given to us in the consciousness of our moral accountability." In this matter, be it observed, we take not Hamilton's "Doctrine of the Conditioned" into the account at all. That may be true or false, valuable or worthless. It is, at any rate in this case, superfluous. For the final appeal is seen to be to the consciousness, and by the consciousness our freedom is clearly affirmed. In short, it is a fact necessarily taken for granted by all men, and is never the subject of doubt, until it is made the subject of reasoning. And then the doubt attaches, not to the subject itself, but to the validity of the reasoning. Thus as an ultimate fact of consciousness, it can only be mystified by explanation, and weakened by any logical support offered to it. Our moral liberty is a truth that shines in its own self-evidencing light, and by means of it are we enabled to rise to the knowledge and worship of the Personal God, as one who is holy, just, and good.

In bringing to a close our examination of the two schools of philosophy, whose claims have been placed respectively before the reader, we carry with us the conviction that a sensational theory is insufficient to furnish stable foundations to knowledge and morality; moreover, that by reducing man to a piece of material mechanism, the sacredness of human life is destroyed, and the just claims of virtue and religion are set at nought; and that should the poisonous elements supplied by the teaching of this school unhappily become largely mixed with the social atmosphere, it would result in the sure and utter destruction of "whatsoever things are true, whatsoever things are honest, whatsoever things are just, whatsoever things are pure, whatsoever things are lovely, whatsoever things are of good report." That we anticipate no such calamity to befall humanity, arises from the trust we have, under God, in the common-sense of mankind, and in the corrective influence of the incorruptible Word, which liveth and abideth for ever.

ART. VI.—1. *Short Studies on Great Subjects.* By JAMES ANTHONY FROUDE, M.A., late Fellow of Exeter College, Oxford. Second Series. London: Longman, Green, and Co. 1871.

2. *Biographical and Critical Essays.* Reprinted from Reviews, with Additions and Corrections. By A. HAYWARD, Esq., Q.C. Two Vols. Longman, Green, and Co. 1873.

3. *The Social Growths of the Nineteenth Century.* An Essay on the Science of Sociology, being the Substance of Four Lectures delivered in the Freemasons' Hall, Edinburgh, May 1872, by F. REGINALD STATHAM. Longman, Green, and Co. 1872.

WE have grouped together the books mentioned at the head of this paper because they illustrate two of the most marked intellectual tendencies of the day. The first of these is constructive, and displays itself in attempts to form a science of history. The other is destructive, and displays itself in the critical, or rather sceptical, spirit in which it deals with the facts of history, and so renders impossible the formation of such a science. Mr. Statham's essay is an illustration of the former tendency. The latter is illustrated by Mr. Froude's paper "On the Scientific Method applied to History,"* and Mr. Hayward's, on "The Pearls and Mock Pearls of History."†

Mr. Statham's pretentious little volume, alike dogmatic and flippant in tone and shallow and feeble in argument, is based upon the principle which Mr. Mill has thus expressed: "History is a progressive chain of causes and effects. The facts of each generation are only a complex phenomenon caused by those of the generation preceding, and causing in its turn those of the next in order."‡ Mr. Statham begins with making the noteworthy and significant admission that "as it is impossible to thread the whole labyrinth of history in our search after causes, so it is equally impossible to take into account the infinite number of facts existing around us."§

* *Small Studies*, p. 461.
† *Essays, &c.*, Vol. I. p. 1.
‡ *Discussions and Dissertations*, Vol. II. p. 128.
§ *Social Growths*, pp. 3, 4.

Nothing daunted, however, he sets about his sociological essay, selecting certain facts which he terms the social growths of our time, and classifies as Republicanism, Commercialism, Evangelicalism, Byronism, Humanitarianism. But it is only fair to let him state his theory in his own words:—

"These may be called the new shoots of society, and a brief justification of the use of this term will to a greater extent help to make my whole meaning plainer. Of what is a new shoot the result? the new shoots of wheat, for instance, that in spring-time begin to make their appearance above ground? They are the result of a decomposition of the old fruit. The grain rots away under ground; the solid useful part of it becomes corruption and dust; but from this corruption the new shoot springs up, forcing its way through the earth, acquiring more vigour the harder the resistance which it has to overcome; at last emerging to the light with a disturbance of the earth's crust as terrible to small ants and emmets as an earthquake or an eruption of Vesuvius. Now in a very similar manner have these new shoots of society and thought resulted from the decomposition of the old fruits. But when was the period of the decomposition? What were those fruits?"—*Social Growths*, p. 5.

Mr. Statham thus, in substance, answers his own questions. European society from the middle of the seventeenth to the end of the eighteenth centuries being describable by one word only, corruption, or, rather, unreality, there sprang from this unreality, as a necessary consequence, a desire for reality. This desire produced the following effects: 1. Republicanism, which is simply an assertion of the right of the many to live at the sacrifice, if necessary, of the few, in contradistinction to the formerly received dogma that the few had the right to live at the cost of the many. 2. Commercialism, which asserts that there are great natural laws at work in matters of trade and commerce which must have their sway; that no artificial restrictions can ever prevent those laws from having their sway ultimately, and that those who seek to violate them will assuredly be chastised by them. 3. The Church at the time we are considering was as much a social institution and quite as much an unreality as the Crown; certain revolutionisers arose to deal with theological and religious matters as others rose up to deal with matters political and social; hence arose Evangelicalism, which, starting with the acceptance of certain religious ideas which were then, says our author, "much more generally accepted than they are now," said to the individual, "Be sincere to yourself; be sure that you are

what you wish yourself to be." The founder of this school of personal religion was John Wesley, "A man, be it remarked," says Mr. Statham, "who would have been horrified beyond expression had he known that his name would ever be made the battle-flag of a narrow-minded sect." The fourth social development in Mr. Statham's series is Byronism, by which name he designates that reaction in art from the unreal to the real of which the poetry of Byron may be said to have been the earliest and most striking example, though on further reflection the author confesses to feeling a little doubt as to the propriety of regarding Byron as typical of the dawn of realism in art.* 5. The centre of gravity of all thought under the old system of thinking was undoubtedly God; a supreme Being, a superhuman Personality; the Creator of all things and Judge of all men. But the result of the reaction in philosophy from the unreal, the corrupt, towards the living and the real, is that Theism is regarded by most of those who take the trouble to think about it, who have the power of thinking, not as a reality but as a respectability, to profess doubt in which would be to lose caste in society. Thus arises the fifth and last of our author's social growths, viz. Humanitarianism, which he defines to be the result of the alteration which has occurred in the position of the centre of gravity in philosophy by which the subjective "will of God" has been exchanged as the supreme point of reference for "the good of mankind."

These five groups of facts are treated of by Mr. Statham as fully as they can be in 108 small pages, which space is sufficient for him to expose, to his own entire satisfaction, the inherent and irremediable evil of all institutions and systems, and to overthrow all the faiths of the world. This done, he substitutes for them the worship of the collective Humanity of Comte, although we must in justice to Mr. Statham notice that he violently protests he is no Comtist. Humanitarian though he is, and considering Theism a mere respectability, he seems to side with the Establishment and to be hostile to Dissent, for he goes out of his way to censure those who "under the name of Wesleyans preach so violently the dissidence of Dissent."† In dismissing this Apostle of Reality we commend to his careful consideration the saying put by Lord Lytton into the mouth of Kenelm Chillingly: "I have been educated in the Realistic School, and with Realism I am

* *Social Growths*, p. 109, note. † *Ibid.* p. 15, note.

discontented, because in Realism, as a school, there is no truth. It contains but a bit of truth, and that the coldest and hardest bit of it, and he who utters a bit of truth and suppresses the rest of it tells a lie."*

We do not examine Mr. Statham's essay in detail because we agree with Mr. Froude in thinking that, for want of complete and accurate knowledge of the facts, all such attempts are impossible, though we think Mr. Froude carries his principles so far as to leave us without any historical knowledge whatever. Mr. Froude scornfully refers to "a certain class of people who talk of a science of history," and from another passage in which he names M. Comte and Mr. Buckle he leaves us in no doubt as to who compose the class he refers to. He objects to all attempts to write history on their or any other special theories, because those theories are calculated to vitiate the careful observation of facts without which such speculations are not worth the paper on which they are written. "History," says Mr. Froude, "is concerned as much as science with external facts. . . . It depends on exact knowledge, on the same minute, impartial, discriminating observation and analysis of particulars which is equally the basis of science;"† but it is vain to attempt at present the task of constructing a science of history because "first one cause and then another has interfered from the beginning of time with a correct and authentic chronicling of events and actions. Superstition, hero worship, ignorance of the laws of probability, religious, political, or speculative prejudices, one or the other of these has tended from the beginning to give us distorted pictures."‡

We regret to see that the same scepticism as to the truth of commonly received history is shared by others of our greatest historians and writers. Mr. Mill, for instance, says: "Our conception of the past is not drawn from its own records, but from books written about it, containing not the facts but a view of the facts which has shaped itself in the mind of somebody of our own or a very recent time."§ Mr. Carlyle, also, told the Edinburgh students: "Upon the whole, I do not think that in general, out of common history books, you will ever get into the real history of this country or anything particular which it would beseem you to know. . . . You will find recorded in books a jumble of tumults, disastrous inepti-

* *Social Truths*, Vol. II. p. 111.
† *Small Studies, &c.* p. 461.
‡ *Ibid.* pp. 485, 486.
§ *Inaugural Address at St. Andrews*, p. 14.

tudes, and all that kind of thing. But to get what you want you will have to look into side sources and inquire in all directions."* Canon Kingsley is still more despairing, and resigns his Cambridge Professorship because history is so overlaid with lies that he can get no truth out of it.

If these authorities be right; if all histories—those of Mr. Froude and Mr. Carlyle included, for who so much as Mr. Carlyle has given us pictures distorted by hero worship and prejudice?—be nearly, if not quite, valueless; if from the beginning of time superstition, ignorance, and prejudice have prevented an authentic chronicling of events and actions; what means have we now or can we hope ever to possess of attaining the exact knowledge, of exercising the minute, impartial, discriminating observation and analysis of particulars which are necessary to discover that chain of causes and effects unwinding itself before our eyes which, if it be discoverable by the human mind, would be the science of history? It is clearly unattainable.

Again, while with Canon Kingsley we do not wish to discourage inductive thought or to undervalue exact science, we ask, with him, that "the moral world which is just as much the domain of inductive science as the physical one be not ignored and the tremendous difficulties of analysing its phenomena be fairly faced."† For instance, had moral causes nothing to do with the decay of Greek and Roman civilisation? How do those who, like Mr. Buckle, think that the improvement of mankind is due entirely under similar physical conditions to intellectual discovery, and is absolutely unaffected by moral and religious causes, deal with the influence of Christianity on the world? How will they account for the fact that the civilisation which intellect could not keep it was reserved for faith to win?

To construct a science of history being for the present, therefore, impossible, and for the future almost, if not quite, hopeless, it is yet possible to apply the scientific method to history, and in the paper before us Mr. Froude gives us his idea of the manner in which this should be done. We purpose briefly to analyse his method.

History, according to Mr. Froude, has passed through three stages:—1st. The mythological or poetic; 2nd. The semi-

---

* *On the Choice of Books.* Inaugural Address at Edinburgh, p. 151.

† *The Limits of Exact Science as applied to History.* Inaugural Lecture at Cambridge, p. 53.

mythological or heroic; 3rd. History proper. Mr. Hayward adopts a similar threefold division, naming the periods, however, the fabulous, the semi-fabulous, and the historic. Mr. Froude separates the facts of history into two kinds; the veritable outward fact, whatever it was, which took place in the order of things, and the account of it which has been brought down to us by more or less competent persons. The first we must set aside altogether. The eternal register of human actions is not open to inspection; we are concerned wholly with the second, which consists of combinations of reality and human thought. It is the business of the historian to analyse and separate these into their component parts; so far as he can distinguish successfully he is an historian of truth, so far as he fails he is the historian of opinion and tradition. When men began to observe and think they did not distinguish between the impressions and emotions produced by their senses on the one hand, and their imagination, fancy, reason, memory, on the other; they did not know why the one class of impressions and emotions should not be as true as the other; hence their cosmogonies, their philosophies, and their histories, are all alike imaginative. The idea of truth or fact, as distinguished from subjective conceptions, had not yet so much as been recognised. The original historian was the poet, and it is a mistake to require more of the poet than truth of nature and idea, to ask of him the truth of fact which we demand of the man of science and the modern historian. "The mythological poetry in the East and West alike," says Mr. Froude, "was the foundation of all national religions," including, we presume, that of the Hebrews. This is one of the many passages in this book remarkable for what the writer does *not* say, and for the illustrations they afford of the French proverb, *souvent le silence dit plus que les paroles.* History in this stage, the mythic or fabulous, is a record not of facts but of beliefs. It belongs to a time when men had not yet learned to analyse their convictions, or to distinguish between images vividly present in their own minds, and an outward reality which might or might not correspond with them; but we must remind Mr. Froude that if we would do justice to the historians of this primeval period, we must bear in mind what was said by a great modern historian, the late venerable Dean Milman: "That history, to be true, must condescend to speak the language of legend; the belief of the times is part of the record of the times, and though there may occur what may

baffle its more calm and searching philosophy, it must not disdain that which was the primal, almost universal, motive of humanity."*

In the second, or semi-mythic period, history has to do with real persons, but persons still seen through an imaginative halo. Mr. Froude thus describes the process which goes on in this period.

"Every one who has been at an English public school must remember the traditions current of the famous boys of a generation or two past. . . . The boys in question were really at the school, for their names are cut in the desks or painted on the school walls. But examine closely and you will find the same story told of half a dozen boys at different schools; each school has its heroes. The air contains a certain number of traditional heroic school exploits, and the boys and the exploits are brought together. We have here the forces at work which created the legends of Theodoric and Charlemagne, of Attila or our own Alfred."—*Small Studies*, 467.

Again:

"This is the process which built up the so-called histories of the early lawgivers, of Solon and Lycurgus, and Numa, of Confucius and Menu, of Socrates and Pythagoras, and Solomon, of every statesman and philosopher who committed his teaching to the memory of his disciples, and left posterity to construct his image after its own pleasure."—*Ibid.* p. 469.

Here again is one of Mr. Froude's remarkable silences. It is impossible not to see that the process here said to be universal by which legends grow around the history of every teacher who leaves his teaching to the memory of his disciples and to posterity, to construct his image after its own pleasure, would extend to and include the Founder of Christianity Himself; and it is hardly possible to doubt that Mr. Froude intends to include Him amongst the teachers he refers to. As the whole passage is a mere assertion unsupported by argument or proof, we do not feel called on to enter into discussion on the subject.

Mr. Froude then notices the enormous literature of ecclesiastical miracles which for fifteen hundred years was poured out in perfect good faith over Europe, and which in some countries continues vigorous to the present hour.

"You can watch (he says) such stories as they grew in the congenial soil of belief. The great saints of the fifth, sixth, and seventh centuries, who converted Europe to Christianity, were as modest and

* *History of Latin Christianity*, Vol. I. p. 338.

unpretending as true genuine men always are. They claim no miraculous powers for themselves; miracles might have been worked in the days of their fathers. They for their own parts relied on nothing but the natural powers of persuasion and example. Their companions who knew them personally in life were only a little more extravagant. St. Patrick is absolutely silent about his own conjuring performances. He told his own followers, perhaps, that he had been moved by his good angel to devote himself to the conversion of Ireland. The angel of metaphor becomes in the next generation an actual seraph. . . . Another hundred years pass and legends from Hegesippus are imported into the life of the Irish Apostle. . . Again a century and we are in a world of wonders where every human lineament is lost. . . St. Patrick restores dead men to life not once or twice but twenty times. The wonders with which the atmosphere is charged gravitate towards the largest concrete figure which is moving in the middle of them, . . . and yet of conscious lying there was very little, and, perhaps, nothing at all. The biographers wrote in good faith and were industrious collectors of material, only their notions of probability were radically different from ours."—*Ibid.* pp. 472-3.

Elsewhere in this volume of Studies we have an illustration of Mr. Froude's application of the scientific method to the miraculous element in history. It occurs in his review of Dr. Newman's *Grammar of Assent*. Dr. Newman is writing of certitude. We must bear in mind that in his terminology certitude denotes our state of mind when we are certain of anything—the more commonly used word certainty denotes the thing known, the matter of knowledge. "Certitude," says Dr. Newman, "ought to stand all trials, or it is not certitude," and he takes an example, and it is an extremely significant one.

"Let us suppose (he continues) we are told on an unimpeachable authority that a man whom we saw die is now alive again and at his work, as it was his wont to be; let us suppose we actually see him and converse with him, what will become of our certitude of his death? I do not think we should give it up; how could we, when we actually saw him die? At first, indeed, we should be thrown into an astonishment and confusion so great that the world would seem to reel around us, and we should be ready to give up the use of our senses, and of our memory, of our reflective powers, and of our reason, and even to deny our power of thinking, and our existence itself. Such a confidence have we in the doctrine that when life goes it never returns. Nor would our bewilderment be less when the first shock was over; but our reason would rally, and with our reason our certitude would come back to us. Whatever came of it

we should never cease to know and to confess to ourselves both of the contrary facts, that we saw him die, and that after dying we saw him alive again. The overpowering strangeness of our experience would have no power to shake our certitude in the facts which created it."—*Grammar of Assent*, pp. 105-6.

Not so, says Mr. Froude, if we possess "a mind trained to careful and precise observation," and he proceeds to apply the scientific method to the case Dr. Newman supposes.

"A jury of modern physicians would indisputably conclude that life had never been really extinct, that the symptoms had been mistaken, and the phenomena of catalepsy had been confounded with the phenomena of death. If catalepsy was impossible, if the man had appeared for instance to lose his head on the scaffold, they would assume that there had been a substitution of persons, or that the observers had been taken in by some skilful optical trick. Dr. Newman may, perhaps, go further, and suppose they had themselves seen the man tied to a gun and blown to pieces beyond possibility of deception. But a man of science would reply that such a case could not occur; that men once dead do not return to life again, has been revealed by an experience too uniform to allow its opposite to be entertained even as an hypothesis."—*Small Studies*, p. 106.

This is the argument of Hume's *Essay of Miracles*—viz. "that no human testimony can have such force as to prove a miracle, and make it a just foundation for any religion." Mr. Froude proceeds to uphold it against Dr. Newman, and deals, we think, unanswerably with his attempted reply. "I will accept the general proposition," says Dr. Newman, "but I resist its general application. . . . What is abstract reasoning to a question of concrete fact?" "But," replies Mr. Froude, "after a man has accepted the general proposition, how, in reason, can he ask what it has to do with concrete fact? What else should it have to do with? It is not an axiom of pure mathematics, or a formula made up of symbols. It professes to be, and it is, a generalisation from concrete experience. It calls itself, rightly or wrongly, an expression of an universal truth, and, being such, must, therefore, govern every particular instance which can be brought under it."* Of course, *if* it be a universal truth, it includes every particular instance, not only the cases of the men revived by St. Patrick, but those of Lazarus, of the daughter of Jairus, and of our Lord Himself, although Mr.

* *Small Studies*, pp. 107, 108.

Froude, with the reticence common to him on such topics, does not say so.

We would remind Mr. Froude of what is said by Mr. Mill on the subject of Hume's argument:—

"In order that any alleged fact should be contradictory to a law of causation, the allegation must be not simply that the cause existed without being followed by the effect, for that would be no uncommon occurrence, but that this happened in the absence of any adequate counteracting cause. Now, in the case of an alleged miracle, the assertion is the exact opposite of this. It is that the effect was defeated, not in the absence but in consequence of a counteracting cause, namely, a direct interposition of the will of some being who has power over nature; and in particular of a being whose will having originally endowed all the causes with the powers by which they produce their effects, may well be supposed able to counteract them—a miracle, as was justly remarked by Brown, is no contradiction to the law of cause and effect; it is a new effect, supposed to be produced by the introduction of a new cause. Of the adequacy of that cause, if it exist, there can be no doubt; and the only antecedent improbability which can be ascribed to the miracle, is the improbability that any such cause had existence in the case.

"All, therefore, which Hume has made out, and this he must be considered to have made out, is that no evidence can be sufficient to prove a miracle to any one who did not previously believe the existence of a being or beings with supernatural power; or who believed himself to have full proof that the character of the being whom he recognises is inconsistent with his having seen fit to interfere on the occasion in question.

"It appears from what has been said that the assertion that a cause has been defeated of an effect which is connected with it by a completely ascertained law of causation, is to be disbelieved or not, according to the probability or improbability that there existed in the particular instance an adequate counteracting cause. To form an estimate of this is not more difficult than of any other probability."—*Logic*, Vol. II., pp. 185—7, first edition.

According to this great leader of the sceptical school, therefore, the *à priori* argument against miracles is not tenable except by Atheists, or merely nominal Theists, such as Matthew Arnold.

To return to our analysis of Mr. Froude's method. History having passed through the first, or mythological period, in which there is no historical groundwork at all, and the second, where we have accounts of real persons, but handed down to us by writers whose object was to elevate into superhuman proportions the figures of the illustrious men who had dis-

tinguished themselves as apostles or warriors; at the next stage we pass with the chroniclers into history proper. The chronicler is not a poet like his predecessor; he does not shape out consistent pictures with a beginning, a middle, and an end. He is a narrator of events, and he connects them together in a chronological string. He professes to be relating facts. He is not idealising; he means to be true, "in the literal and commonplace sense of that ambiguous word."* The chronicler, however, though aiming to be true, is—at any rate in his earliest phases—unsuccessful in his aim. He never moralises, he never speculates about causes; but, on the other hand, he is uncritical; his materials are the national ballads, the romances, the biographies. He transfers to his pages whatever catches his fancy, so that the chronicle, however charming, is often nothing but poetry taken literally and translated into prose.

"We are not yet clear of portents and prodigies; superstition clings to us as our shadow, and is to be found in the wisest as well as in the weakest."—*Small Studies*, p. 475.

This estimate is affirmed by Mr. Froude to be universally true of all chroniclers of all nations, of all ages, of Greece, of Rome, of the best of the late European chroniclers. As time goes on, and with it the human intellect expands, new obstacles to historical accuracy arise; life becomes complicated; political constitutions are on their trial, and sometimes break down; parties form representing opposite principles: some are for popular forms of government, some are for aristocratical or monarchical; some are in favour of change or progress, some look back wistfully to a golden age in the past, and are for abiding in the old ways. Each sees the history of their country through the haze no longer of imagination, but of passion; and when they study its records it is not to learn, for their minds are made up, but to call up witnesses into the historical court who shall maintain the truth of their particular opinions. In our own age and with matters passing under our own eyes, it scarcely fares any better.

Let us hear the conclusion of the whole matter. As far as we have at present gone nothing can be more unfavourable to our prospect of attaining an accurate and scientific knowledge of the facts of history, but a worse state of things follows.

* *Small Studies*, p. 474.

"So much (says Mr. Froude) for historical facts and the value of human testimony. Nor are patriots, or politicians, or divines the loosest or the worst manipulators. . . . Besides these, and even more troublesome, are the philosophers giving us views of history corresponding to the theories of which so many have sprung up in these late days purporting to explain the origin and destiny of human creatures on this planet. There is the philosophy of the German idealists. There is the traditionary and religious philosophy of history, of which Mr. Gladstone is the latest and most distinguished exponent; and the positive or materialistic associated with the name of M. Comte, and more particularly among ourselves with the name of Mr. Buckle."—*Ibid.* p. 484.

The most perfect English history which exists is to be found, in Mr. Froude's opinion, in the historical plays of Shakspeare; and only as the historian attains Shakspeare's attitude towards human life is he likely to attain the same directness of insight, the same breadth of sympathy which the great dramatist applied to the writing of English history. Shakspeare's attitude towards human life will become again attainable by us only when the common-sense of the wisest and the best among us has superseded the theorising of factions and parties, when the few but all-important truths of our moral condition (which can be certainly known) have become the exclusive rule of our judgments and actions, and speculative formulas consigned to the place already thronged with the ghosts of like delusions which have had their day and perished.

Elsewhere and earlier, Mr. Froude has written in terms which show a juster appreciation of the situation of historical writers, of their difficulties and of their fidelity, than we find in the paper before us; and to this we refer our readers for the complement of Mr. Froude's thoughts on this subject.*

Mr. Hayward's *Pearls and Mock Pearls of History* is not a formal statement of the scientific principles on which historical investigation should be conducted, but an application of them in the spirit of Mr. Froude's method to concrete facts, and we rise from the perusal of his paper to find many of the old familiar stories of ancient and modern history condemned "to live no longer in the faith of reason." King Arthur and his Round Table are pronounced indisputably fabulous. Charlemagne is permitted to exist, although with greatly diminished glories, but his twelve Paladins or Peers are

* *Small Studies on Great Subjects.* First Series, Vol. I. Art. "The Lives of the Saints."

declared to be as imaginary as Arthur's Knights, and their ideal existence arose merely from the supposition that every man of might ought to be attended by certain followers of commensurate renown, the number twelve having probably been suggested by the Gospel history. The origin of the name, symbol, and motto of the Order of the Garter is declared to be involved in obscurity, the popular story being unhistorical, and first mentioned by one who wrote nearly two centuries after the date of its supposed occurrence. Coming to modern times, the famous invocation to Louis XVI., on the scaffold, *Fils de S. Louis montez au ciel*, is as fabulous as the legendary *Et tu Brute* of Cæsar. It was the invention of a newspaper editor who described the execution. The celebrated speech of Beckford to George III., preserved in gold letters on the pedestal of his statue, in the Guildhall, was never spoken, but is supposed to be the composition of Horne Tooke. The stories of the sudden rise at the bar of Mansfield and Erskine disappear before the acute professional criticism of Mr. Hayward. These, of course, are only illustrations taken at random of his treatment of facts, but they are sufficient to enable our readers to see that his collection of "mock pearls" is tolerably large. In one particular Mr. Hayward shows a more conservative tendency; he adopts and defends M. Suard's theory respecting the causes of the similarity between striking sayings and doings, which is too frequently accepted as a proof of plagiarism in the later speaker or actor, or as affording a presumption of pure fiction.

"We agree with M. Suard [says Mr. Hayward, and we cordially assent], and an apt analogy is supplied by the history of invention. The honour of almost every important discovery from the printing press to the electric telegraph has been vehemently contested by rival claimants; and the obvious reason is that whenever the attention of the scientific world has been long and earnestly fixed upon a subject, it is as if so many heaps of combustible material had been accumulated, or so many trains laid, any two or three of which may be simultaneously exploded by a spark. The results resemble each other, because each projector is influenced by the same laws of progress; and as the human heart and mind retain their essential features, unaltered by time and space, there is nothing surprising in the fact of two or more persons similarly situated, acting on similar impulses, or hitting on similar relations of ideas."

"This theory, which we believe to be sound in the main, has one great recommendation. It is productive not destructive. It doubles or trebles the accumulated stock of originality; and whenever we light upon a fresh coincidence, in nobility of feeling, depth of reflection,

readiness or terseness of expression, we may exclaim, Behold a fresh instance of a quality that does honour to mankind."—*Essays, &c.* Vol. I., pp. 21, 22.

In another of his essays Mr. Hayward points out a glaring error in a matter of contemporary history, committed by a man who has obtained world-wide reputation for his historical researches, and especially by his skill in separating the true from the fabulous. This man was Niebuhr, the restorer of Roman history, who prided himself on his knowledge of England. Many of our readers will remember the play of *The Rovers, or the Double Arrangement*, written to ridicule the German drama. It is now principally remembered by Rogero's song, the joint composition of Pitt and Canning. Niebuhr, in his *History of the Period of the Revolution*, in the course of a violent diatribe against Canning, whom he calls "a sort of political Cossack," wrote, "Canning published in *The Anti-Jacobin* the most shameful pasquinade against Germany which was ever written, under the title of 'Matilda Pottingen.' Gottingen is described in it as the sink of all infamy; professors and students as a gang of miscreants; licentiousness, incest, and atheism as the character of the German people." In fact, Canning never published in *The Anti-Jacobin* or elsewhere anything under the title of Matilda Pottingen, but the name occurs in the song we have referred to. It is clear, therefore, that Niebuhr never saw this pasquinade which he professes to describe, and confuses it with the play of *The Rovers*, which, also, it is equally clear, he had heard of but never seen, for the scene of it is not laid at Gottingen but in Weimar. When such a man so errs on a matter of fact, occurring in his own day, and relating to his own country, we may well pause before—as some would have us—we accept as final and infallible his judgment on the truth and falsehood of certain portions of Roman history. We commend to the critical or destructive school of historians and their followers Cromwell's advice to an assembly of divines, "I beseech you, my beloved brethren, in the bowels of Jesus Christ to believe that you may be mistaken."

The effect produced by the study of these papers, both of Mr. Froude and Mr. Hayward, is depressing. Accurate historical knowledge, Mr. Froude teaches us, is impossible, and a science of history a dream. Ignorance and credulity mastered the minds and guided the pens of earlier historians. Passion and theory are equally powerful with those of a more

recent and of the present time. If it be the fact, as Mr. Froude has elsewhere written, "that on no historical subject is the conclusion so clear that it can be enunciated in a definite form, the utmost which can safely be hazarded with history is to relate honestly ascertained facts with only such indications of a judicial sentence upon them as may be suggested in the form in which the story is arranged."* And ordinary students, with this statement, and Canon Kingsley's resignation, before their eyes, will ask of what use then can be the study of history?

For our own part, we think that if Mr. Froude himself does not underrate "the immortal power of history in the education of mankind," the tendency of his views is to lead to its being underrated by those who take him for their guide. "History," said Dean Stanley, in his funeral sermon for Mr. Grote, "may be fallible and uncertain, but it is our only guide to the great things that God has wrought for man in former ages, it is the only means through which we can hear, and through which our fathers can declare to us the noble works which He has done in their days, and in the old time before them."

As we come to the history of times nearer our own, we have a means of acquainting ourselves with the facts, which no previous generation has possessed, at any rate to the same extent as ourselves. On this subject the late Sir George Cornewall Lewis has expressed himself with his usual accuracy and clearness, and in a manner so far surpassing anything we could hope to say ourselves, that we venture without scruple to recall what he says to our readers' memory.

"The actors in events who have lived in this age of writing may be converted into historians without having intended it. Their private letters and public despatches or other documents prepared for official purposes may be collected and published, and thus, having been originally designed for the information of friends or the transaction of business, may become materials for history; a historical memoir may be compared with a medal which is intended as a reminiscence, while an official despatch is like a coin which is intended for currency in mercantile dealings. Nevertheless a coin not less than a medal may be used as historical testimony. Several authentic collections of this kind—as the correspondence of the Duke of Wellington, Lord Wellesley, Lord Castlereagh, Lord Nelson, and others have been of late

* *Small Studies, &c.* First Series. Vol. I. p. 68. Art. "Dissolution of the Monasteries."

years published in this country; the correspondence of Joseph Buonaparte is of a similar character, and a collection of the despatches of Napoleon has been commenced. The most ancient example is the collection of Cicero's epistles. Letters and despatches, like journals entered day by day, have this advantage over memoirs that they exhibit faithfully the impressions of the moment, and are written without knowledge of the ultimate result. They are, therefore, more trustworthy than any narrative composed after the whole series of events has been worked out at a time when the narrator is tempted to suppress or has learnt to forget the proofs of his own want of foresight. In confidential correspondence written without any expectation of publicity weaknesses and minor defects of the writer will be disclosed, many transient feelings or thoughts will appear which his deliberate judgment would have rejected; but where there is a genuine ability and true integrity these qualities will be more apparent from their evidence being undesigned."—*Essays on Administrations from* 1783 *to* 1830, pp. 157, 158.

There is abundance of such materials for the history of the times subsequent to the accession of the House of Brunswick, and they increase as we come nearer to our own day. The historian who writes of this period, if he possesses the needful ability, and can divest himself of passion and prejudice, is unpardonable if he does not accurately reproduce the facts. The diaries of Lord Hervey and Lady Cowper, the letters of Horace Walpole, and in more recent times the journals and letters of Madame D'Arblay, of Wilberforce, of Romilly, of Eldon, bring faithfully before us the impression produced by the events of their times on the minds of those who were actors or spectators. The published correspondence of George III. and Lord North must needs affect the judgments of any future historian of that time, and correct the impressions he would otherwise form from previous historians of that reign. The general opinion of Lord North has been that he was the willing and obsequious tool of George III. in his attempts to govern, if not by prerogative, yet by influence; but we must revise that opinion since we know, on the testimony of Mr. Fox, that when, in 1783, Mr. Fox urged that the King should not be suffered to be his own minister, Lord North replied, the King ought to be treated with all sort of respect, but the appearance of power is all that a King of this country ought to have.* What different opinions we form of the events and persons connected with

* Earl Russell's *Memorials of Fox*, Vol. II. p. 37.

the history of the first Reform Act to those we should have formed if left only to the histories of Dr. Molesworth and Mr. Roebuck now that the correspondence of William IV. and Earl Grey, and the King's *pièce justificatif*, so improperly given to the world by M. Ernest von Stockmar, are published. The traditional William the Reformer now appears as an elderly fussy gentleman, most unwillingly playing the part of a patriot king, and extremely anxious, not to say fidgetty, about the result of his performance of that character. The idealised democratic Chancellor is now revealed in his true character as the leading conservative influence in the Grey Cabinet, and one's previously formed ideas of the aristocratic Reformers of 1832 are revolutionised by reading in a published letter of Lord Durham's:—"I wished to enfranchise the people and protect the voter, but they [i.e. the Whig aristocracy] did not wish it, and they never forgave me for wishing it."* Again the *Memoirs of Baron Stockmar* will afford to the historian of the last three reigns the means of correcting many popular, but erroneous, beliefs as to the events of those times, and the influences at work in the Court and the Cabinet. It is startling to ordinary readers to find that for the greater part of the present reign there was a secret irresponsible minister thwarting, checking, and even directly opposing the known constitutional advisers of the Crown, and that the policy of England in no less important a matter than the recognition of the Government of Louis Napoleon was dictated to the Cabinet after having been settled in a matrimonial *tête-a-tête* between the Queen and Prince Albert.†

We may add that the Essays of Sir George Lewis, from which we quoted above, afford an excellent example of the skilful use of these materials for history, and exhibit an amount of exact knowledge, of minute, impartial, discriminating observation, and an analysis of particulars sufficient to satisfy Mr. Froude himself.

Along with the security for greater accuracy in modern history provided in the abundance of authentic materials of the kinds we have referred to, another guarantee for more exact knowledge is afforded by the change in the method of writing which marks our more recent historians. The poetic charm of Lord Macaulay's mind and style has rather overclouded his reputation for accuracy as an historian. On the

* Vide *Athenæum*, Feb. 1865.

† See the Article "Irresponsible Ministers, Baron Stockmar," in the *Westminster Review* (New Series), April 1873.

other hand, the style of Mr. Grote's great history has been severely censured; but, to quote again Dean Stanley's sermon, Mr. Grote, "for the sake of preserving the exact balance of truth, resisted what to minds like his in an age like ours is an inducement stronger than love, or honour, or wealth—he restrained a fervent imagination, he sacrificed the graces of style, and the desire of effect; he never gave way to the constantly recurring temptation to break loose from the unseen spell by which a conscientious criticism bound him down." In fact, as Mr. Mill remarked to the students of St. Andrew's, "The most recent historians . . . fill their pages with extracts from the original materials, feeling that these extracts are the real history, and their comments and thread of narrative are only helps towards understanding it."*

We cannot part with Mr. Froude without noticing the likeness in tone and spirit between his *Studies* and the *Remains* of his brother, Richard Hurrell Froude. To both brothers may be applied the description given of John Stuart Mill by the Principal of Manchester New College: "Out of sympathy with society as it is, and with languid hopes of what it is to be, our author seems to sit apart, with genial pity for the multitudes below him, and with disdain of whatever is around him."† In the writings of both brothers there is cynicism which produces on their readers a melancholy and depressing effect. The younger brother in the paper we have reviewed tersely expresses the ruling idea of his theory of human life, which was also that of the elder Froude, "After all man is a great fool." We have reason to believe that Carlyle, Froude, and Matthew Arnold, are the favourite authors of the younger students amongst us, and there is every reason to fear that a too devoted and exclusive study of these writers can only end in making their students useless cynics.

* Inaugural Address at St. Andrew's, p. 14.

† *Essays, Philosophical and Theological.* By James Martineau. P. 70.

ART. VII.—*L'Antechrist.* Par ERNEST RENAN, Membre de l'Institut. Paris: Michel Levy. 1873.

HAVING followed M. Renan's labours on the origin of Christianity from the beginning, we feel bound to continue. As the work goes on, the signs of the author's zeal, diligence, learning and artistic skill, become rather more evident than otherwise; and, alas, the tokens of the same merely critical estimate of our holy religion, uncontrolled by any respect for the supernatural element, appear. We discern the same obvious points of difference between the Frenchman and his German fellow-labourers, and we retain the opinion, formerly expressed, that there are certain qualities of style which make M. Renan's work much more perilous to a certain class of readers than the ponderous German works that have been translated and are in course of translation. Those qualities are more conspicuous than ever; nothing can surpass the dramatic skill, picturesqueness of narration, subtlety of illustration, transparency of diction, and faultless clearness, which appear on every page. With these views of the work, we need not apologise for a rather prolonged examination of this penultimate volume of the series.

It is a remarkable coincidence that M. Renan has been engaged on this volume, which enters on the first fearful tragedy that Christianity had to do with, during the solemn years of his country's "slow agony." He touchingly vindicates himself from the charge of indulging his "taste for history, the incomparable enjoyment that one experiences in beholding the evolution of the spectacle of humanity," which has "especially fascinated him in this volume," during so frightful a period. With his defence of his patriotism we need not concern ourselves. Nor need we dwell on the many indications noticeable in this work of a silent comparison between the despotism of Rome and the ruin of Jerusalem and the despotism of Imperialism and the ruin of Paris. It is of more importance to note that the calamities of his country seem to have in some degree touched the religious sensibilities of his nature. Not that much value is to be attached to his sentimental tributes to spiritual truth. It is vain for him to allege his profound conviction that religion is not a subjective

deception, but has an external reality corresponding to it, and that he who surrenders himself to its inspirations is the truly inspired man. Throughout the entire volume there is no gleam of a simple and real acceptance of the essential verities of Christianity. It is not without a feeling of deep compassion that we say this of one who is devoting year after year of most laborious study to all the documents that record the advent of Christianity on earth. Should his last volume follow in due course, and under the influence of the same tranquil and philosophical indifference to the Divine element of power in the Christian faith, his enormous work will be the most remarkable monument extant of an unbeliever's study of Christianity.

This instalment of the history of the Christian *Origines* is professedly devoted to the relations of Nero, the Antichrist, to the Church. But it is really a series of dissertations on all the scenes, documents, and actions in the development of the later New Testament. There is a sense in which Nero is the centre of the drama; and the unity of the whole is preserved with considerable skill. But we shall not be careful to observe that unity in our miscellaneous observations. To deal with the topic suggested by the title would involve us in interminable controversies concerning Antichrist, which would carry us far beyond the limits of the volume reviewed, as also far beyond our own and our readers' patience. The various subordinate discussions of the volume will suggest some subjects both of interest and importance, especially in connection with the Apocalypse and the three great Apostles. Some of them are set before us in a new light by the brilliant French sceptic; and it is exceedingly profitable to observe, however cursorily, the various currents that set in from every quarter and feebly dash against the firm foundations of the faith. It is, moreover, no small reinforcement of our Christian evidences to note how often these currents tend to neutralise each other's force.

M. Renan's plan requires him to determine the authenticity and value of the materials for this portion of history. And here, as we had occasion to show in the former volume, our author renders us good service as against those who in other respects are his allies. He has no sympathy with the sweeping criticism that robs us, on subjective grounds, of three-fourths of the New Testament Canon; his canons would take from us only one-third. He holds the Epistles to the Philippians and Colossians to have been St. Paul's; and, in

defending the latter, makes the following seasonable remarks, which obviously may be turned against his own scepticism as to the books he gives up.

"The interpolations which able critics have thought they discerned in it are not evident. The system of M. Holtzmann, in this respect, is worthy of its learned author; but how dangerous is the method, too much accredited in Germany, which sets up a type *à priori*, which must serve as the absolute criterion for the authenticity of the works of a writer! It cannot be denied that interpolations and suppositious writings were frequent in the first two centuries of Christianity. But to discern between the true and the false, the apocryphal and the authentic, is an impossible task."—P. 4.

But it is to what follows that we would direct particular attention, as showing how strangely sceptic deals with sceptic, and how effectually M. Renan explodes by one argument both the Tübingen theory and his own. The school of Baur gives up many books because they contain doctrines which do not square with the fixed teaching it assigns to each Apostle. M. Renan would retain these books for the precise reason that they exhibit natural and legitimate variations in doctrine. We stand between both, and adopt the premises of both. They are in our view consistent with each other; while the conclusion from both is to us the same. The Apostles had each a fixed type of doctrine, but each taught it with variations; whether we look at their fixed teachings or their variations, we see in each good argument for the genuineness of these books. But the point is well worthy of consideration; and M. Renan will exhibit it with sufficient clearness.

"The great school of Christian Baur labours under this main defect, that it figures to itself the Jews of the first century as complete characters, nourished by dialectics, and obstinate in their reasoning. Peter, Paul, Jesus Himself, resemble, in the writings of this school, Protestant theologians of a German university, all having one doctrine, and only one, which they always preserve unchanged. Now, what is true is this, that the admirable men who are the heroes of this history, changed, and sometimes contradicted themselves; during their life they had three or four theories; they borrowed occasionally from those of the adversaries against whom at another epoch they would have been most severe and inflexible. These men, looked at from one point of view, were susceptible, personal, irritable; science or rationalism, which gives fixedness to opinions, was quite strange to them. They had, like the Jews in all times, their violent contentions: and yet they made up one very solid body."—P. 6.

Nothing is more certain than this last observation, and nothing so effectually tends to confirm us in the assurance of it as the mutual polemics of the different branches of the destructive school. One sees in the Epistle to the Colossians a deviation from St. Paul's fixed type of doctrine, as if the Apostle must needs exhaust himself in one epistle, reserving no new aspects of the truth for any future emergency. Another retains the Epistle to the Colossians, because it contains so fresh a picture of the versatile Apostle; but then he rejects the Pastoral Epistles for some private reasons of his own. Now, we make bold to affirm that a combination of the arguments used by M. Renan and by Baur would issue in the vindication of every canonical book of the New Testament. But we cannot pursue the subject; suffice that the dissensions of the rival theories set up for the construction of the New Testament furnish a strong body of proofs in favour of the orthodox and traditional view of the canon. We must now occupy ourselves with the book that occupies the prominent place in M. Renan's present volume. A brief examination of the latest speculations about it will not be without interest. It will serve to show what are the straits to which men of learning and genius are reduced in their endeavours to wrest the prophetic book of the New Testament from St. John. M. Renan's position is a rather irregular one. He is honest in his semi-philosophical, semi-poetical, account of the origin of Christianity; and there is no stronger proof of his honesty than the exposure of his own folly in the grotesque theory that he has put forth in this volume.

The question generally takes this alternative in the writings of the opponents of St. John's authorship. Either a man of the same name, but altogether independent of the Apostle, wrote it; or an unknown author, who gave a false dignity to his strange book by attaching to it the Apostle's name, or, in other words, forged that name. The French terminology calls the former the *homonymous* theory, the latter the *pseudonymous*. Before giving his own, M. Renan describes with great clearness both these sides of the question.

Against the supposition that another John was the writer, our author argues with force the following considerations. The John of the Apocalypse asserts his high apostolical dignity by the vigour of his language; by the assurance he shows that he is well-known; by his intimate familiarity with the secrets of the Churches. As to John Mark, whom Hitzig suggests, he had no such relations with the Churches of Asia as

warrants the shadow of a claim for him. There remains a doubtful personage, the Presbyter John, "a kind of Sosia of the Apostle, who troubles like a spectre the history of the Church of Ephesus, and gives the critics so much trouble." M. Renan does not admit that he was an imaginary shadow of the Apostle; he even allows that he may have something to do with the Gospel and first Epistles of John, as a kind of amanuensis of the greater John, while the second and third Epistles were avowedly his. Firmly convinced that the Apocalypse and the Gospel could not have been written by the same hand, M. Renan claims the former for the Apostle rather than for the Presbyter. The opinions of some of the Greek Fathers, who took the opposite view, sprang, he thinks, from a worthless *à priori* estimate of the style and sentiments of the book.

Now for the Pseudonym theory. Granted that it was of the essence of apocalyptic writings to pass under feigned names, —an assertion that is more easily made than proved—our author thinks the Johannæan Apocalypse an exception to the rule, inasmuch as the false attribution of the Apostle's name must have otherwise taken place during his life, or immediately after his death. Now, that might have been possible if the first three chapters did not exist. But no forger would have dared to address his apocryphal work to the Seven Churches which had been in direct relation with the Apostle. M. Scholten denies that John had been in such relations with them; but that vain supposition only renders the absurdity more glaring. Would the Churches which knew that John had never been in Asia have received a document that declared him to have been in Patmos, near to Ephesus, to have been intimate with all their secrets, and invested with full authority?

Of course, we agree with M. Renan that the Revelation was not the work of the Presbyter, and not the work of a pious and well-meaning forger of the Apostle's name. But some of the arguments by which he supports his conclusion are baseless, and demand exposure. To pass by many others, let us notice one or two which are current in England as well as in France and Germany. It is said, for instance, that John was, next to James, the most ardent of the Jewish Christians; and that, in harmony with this, the Apocalypse breathes out a terrible hatred against Paul and those who relaxed the observance of the Jewish law, while it everywhere displays the most vehement devotion to the "holy city" and the Temple service. Now, it appears to us that the endless dis-

sertations that have been written in proof of these positions are not worthy a thought. John was certainly in his youth one of the Boanerges and a zealot among the disciples; he retained his vehemence to the end; but that his ardent zeal was inspired to the last by devotion to Judaic Christianity admits of no proof. It is, on the contrary, disproved by the other writings, whatever part he may be assumed to have had in them. In the Apocalypse itself there is no latent Judaism. The blessed Apostle of the Gentiles was not the false apostle and liar against whom the Apostle in the Apocalypse denounces judgment. It is true that there is abundance of Judaism in the book, but it is a Judaism sanctified, Christianised, glorified, and brought to perfection. The City of God "is not made with hands." Those who enter by its wider gates are more than the children of Abraham, more than the proselytes of Judaism: even the innumerable company of the Gentiles. But it is needless to pursue this subject. Let us see M. Renan's theory, the way for which is paved by this passage:—

"Lastly, a circumstance which we must not neglect is this, that the Apocalypse presents certain traits which have a relation to the fourth Gospel and the Epistles attributed to John. Thus the expression *the Word of God*, so characteristic of the fourth Gospel, is found for the first time in the Apocalypse. The image of the *Living Waters* is common to the two works. The expression, *Lamb of God*, in the fourth Gospel, recalls the Lamb which is common in the Apocalypse as the designation of Christ. Both books apply to the Messiah the passage of Zechariah xii. 10, and translate it in the same manner. Far from us to conclude from these facts that the same pen wrote the Gospel and the Apocalypse; but it is not immaterial that the fourth Gospel, whose author could not have been without some connection with the Apostle, offers in its style and its images some affinities with a book attributed for serious ends to the Apostle John."—P. xxxiii.

These words are noteworthy as showing how irresistibly the conviction forces itself on honest criticism that there is a link between Gospel and Apocalypse that cannot be broken. The reasons for the difference in style are to some extent hidden from us; to some extent they are plain enough. But the resemblances, or rather the identity, of general theological doctrine and phraseology, which are as marked in the Johannæan writings as in the Pauline, involve the theory of diverse authorship in inextricable difficulty. And the more

diligently the two possible authors are sought for in the early history, the more hopeless does the difficulty become.

M. Renan advocates a notion, popular with most sceptics, that the modern ideas of authorship are not to be applied to the works under consideration. "Did the Apostle John write the manifesto of the year 69? We may doubt this. It suffices for our thesis that he had knowledge of it, and that, having approved it, he saw it without displeasure circulate under his name." Here then is his theory: the Evangelist was the author, but used the instrumentality of an amanuensis, whose work, left much to himself, was accepted by St. John and allowed to go out under his sanction. The inventor of this hypothesis rejoices over it greatly; he thinks that it solves many a difficulty. For instance, it explains why the first verses are apparently by another hand than that of the seer; as, also, the anomaly of the "holy apostles" being mentioned in the earlier chapters. It accounts for many views of Jesus which could not have been given by one of His immediate disciples; as, for instance, the scenes in which the "ancient friend" of John is seen seated on a throne of glory, and so different from the Christ of Galilee that the seer falls before Him as one dead. It gives the reason why the "evangelical idyll" has become transformed into "an artificial composition, a cold imitation of the visions of the ancient prophets." It tells us why the work was so little diffused during the three-quarters of a century that followed its composition. "It is probable that the author, after the year 70, seeing Jerusalem taken, the Flavii firmly established, the Roman Empire reconstituted, and the world obstinately bent on continuing, notwithstanding the term of three years and a-half which he had assigned it, himself arrested the publicity of his work."

It is not waste of time to consider what all this means. It is simply the honest and transparent expression of the utter confusion into which the enemies of revelation fall when they strive to torture the evidence of facts. M. Renan has ably shown—more ably than our brief notice would indicate—the untenableness of two theories, that of another John and that of a forger of his name. He then invents a theory which is worse than either of them. According to this hypothesis, the latest on the Johannean question generally, the holy Apostle read, approved, and sent out with the sanction of His name a work which contradicted in many places the truth which was dearer to him than his life. He

allowed himself to be the teacher of a new Gospel; a Gospel which seated Jesus on a throne of judgment and invested Him with attributes which, on this theory, John had never beheld in Him. Not only does it reduce the Apostle to the infatuation of allowing his secretary to insert whatever he pleased; it, moreover, makes the witness of Him who was the truth to leave to the world a legacy of falsehood stamped with his name. It is well to note what is the issue of the popular theory of supposititious writings in the Apostolic age. Let it once be admitted that it was a not unholy thing to use the names of Christ's Apostles for the sanction and spread of pious writings, and the New Testament loses its virtue for ever. The theory is fatal in every form. But it will hardly tolerate further exhibition. Let us turn to another topic suggested in our next extract, which contains an able defence of the Apocalypse, but is pervaded with a gross perversion of the Christian faith as originally delivered to the saints.

"What motive actuated, in the third century, the adversaries of Montanism, and, in the tenth century, the Christians trained in the Hellenic schools of Alexandria, Cæsarea, and Antioch, for denying that the author of the Apocalypse was really the Apostle John? A tradition, a memory, preserved in the Churches? Assuredly not. Their motives were those of an *à priori* theology. At first, the ascription of the Apocalypse to the Apostle rendered it almost impossible for an intelligent man to admit the authenticity of the fourth Gospel; and it was thought that the foundation of Christianity would be shaken if the authenticity of this document was doubted. Besides, the vision attributed to John appeared a source of errors ceaselessly reappearing: there sprang from it the perpetual renewals of Jewish-Christianity, intemperate prophetism, and of audacious millenarianism. What response could be given to the Montanists and mystics of a like kind, consistent disciples of the Apocalypse, to those troops of enthusiasts who ran to their martyrdom, intoxicated by the strange poetry of the old book of the year 69? Only one: proving that the book which served as the line for their chimeras was not of Apostolic origin. The reasons which determined Caius, Dionysius of Alexandria, and so many others to deny that the Apocalypse was the work of the Apostle John, is that which conducts us to the opposite conclusion. The book is Judæo-Christian, Ebionite; it is the work of an enthusiast, carried away with hatred to the Roman Empire and the profane world; it excludes every reconciliation between Christianity on the one side, and the Empire, or the world, on the other; its Messianic doctrine is altogether material; the reign of the martyrs for a thousand years is affirmed in it; the end of the world is declared to be very near.

These motives, in which rational Christians, trained under the direction of Paul, men of the Alexandrian school, saw insurmountable difficulties, are to us marks of antiquity and Apostolic authenticity. Ebionism and Montanism inspire no fear in us; simple historians, we affirm that the adherents of these sects, rejected by orthodoxy, were the true successors of Jesus, of the Twelve, and of the family of the Master. The rational direction which a tempered Gnosticism, the slow triumph of the school of Paul, and especially the ascendancy of such men as Clement of Alexandria and Origen, gave to Christianity, ought not to make us forget its true original. The chimeras, the impossibilities, the materialist conceptions, the paradoxes, the enormities, which made Eusebius impatient when he read these ancient Ebionite and Millenarian authors, like Papias, were the veritable primitive Christianity. . . . The founders of the house were ejected by new comers; the true successors of the just Fathers became soon suspected and heretical. Hence the fact that the favourite Ebionite and Millenarian books of Judæo-Christianity are better preserved in the Latin and Oriental texts than in the original Greek: the orthodox Greek Church always showed itself intolerant towards those books, and systematically repressed them."—P. 39.

This long extract is well worthy of the study of the theological student. It touches a most vital question in the defence of the Christian faith. If these positions are true, we are mistaken in supposing that any body of Christian doctrine was left by the Apostles. The Christianity which our Lord, and those who "companied with Him," left, was a compromise with Judaism, which James and John, and perhaps Peter, vainly essayed to retain after the Master was gone, but which was overpowered and effaced by Paul and the schools that owed to him their life. We are now speaking of early Christianity, and not of the corrupt forms of it which have since dishonoured the Christian name. Now, against this favourite theory of modern times, in which German, and Dutch, and French sceptics unite, how enormous is the multitude of arguments that arise at once to urge their protest! In the first place there is the plain, broad, evident fact that from the day of Pentecost downwards there is no form of Christianity taught which bears any resemblance to the semi-Judaic Christianity here described. Ebionism, the doctrine that Christ was only man, and Millenarianism, which taught His immediate coming to reign upon earth, are not found in the Acts, in James, in Peter, or even in the Apocalypse. By one inspired teaching, and with one consent, the spiritual reign of Christ in the heavens was the accepted faith of Christianity. The doctrine of Paul, if it may be called his

doctrine, prevailed from the beginning, because it was the true doctrine; not against that of James, or that of Peter, or that of John, but in harmony with them and as their standard and guide. That the Gnostic, Montanist, and other extravagant perversions of Christianity represented its true spirit, is a notion wilder than any to which even those fantastic systems ever gave birth.

Rome is the first scene of the history of this volume. Its Christianity has been connected from the beginning with the names of St. Peter and St. Paul, the latter having had really the most vital connexion with it, but the former having had the historical honours. M. Renan opens his drama with the presence of the two Apostles in the imperial city. The imprisonment of St. Paul comes first, but the sketch of this contains nothing that demands special notice. Nero, the real hero of the volume, is very early introduced, and the picture of him is, on the whole, drawn with a masterly hand. In his four-and-twentieth year at the time of St. Paul's first imprisonment, there was nothing wanting in his infamous character to fit him for the part he was destined to play.

"The head of this unhappy young man, placed at seventeen by an abandoned mother at the head of the world, had begun to wander. Long had the tokens caused alarm to those who witnessed them. His spirit was prodigiously declamatory, with a bad, and hypocritical, and inconstant nature; an incredible composite of false intelligence, profound malignity, atrocious selfishness, combined with unheard of refinements in subtlety. To make this man into a monster without a second in history, whose analogue can be found only in the pathological annals of the scaffold, certain special circumstances were needful. The school of crime in which he had grown up, the execrable influence of his mother, the obligation laid on him by this abominable woman to begin life by a parricide, made him very soon regard the world as a horrible comedy, in which he was the principal actor. At this time he had detached himself entirely from the philosophers, his masters; he had killed nearly all his near relatives, and made fashionable the most shameful vices; part of Roman society, through his example, had descended to the lowest degree of degradation."—P. 1.

The Church in Rome was already subject to frightful indignities, and the advent of St. Paul took place at a remarkable crisis. The state of things which he found soon showed him that his coming to Rome was an event almost as critical as his conversion. It was the summit of his Apostolical career. M. Renan devotes many pages to the description of the Apostle's work in Rome; but there is nothing in it that calls for notice, save the false light that

the author's fantasy throws over St. Paul's prison-house. "Few years in his life were more happy than these. Immense consolations found him out from time to time; he had nothing to fear from the malevolence of the Jews. The poor lodging of the prisoner was the centre of an astonishing activity. The follies of profane Rome, its spectacles, its scandals, its crimes, the ignominies of Tigellinus, the courage of Thrasea, the miserable destiny of the virtuous Octavia, the death of Pallas, only lightly touched our pious children of light. 'The fashion of this world passeth,' was their language. The grand image of a Divine future made them close their eyes to the bloody furrows in the midst of which their feet were planted." All this is most unreal, and more so is what follows. But the sketch of St. Paul's ripening theology is better, and shows that M. Renan is not without a certain appreciation of the true development of Apostolical doctrine. "Jesus day by day grew larger in the consciousness of Paul. If Paul does not admit as yet His entire equality with God the Father, he believes in His Divinity, and presents (in his Epistles of the imprisonment) His entire terrestrial life as the accomplishment of a Divine plan realised by an Incarnation." It is curious to find that the prison-house, producing the effect that it always produces on great souls, had something to do with the elevation or revolution of his thoughts. But that seems to be M. Renan's idea. And, as this is far more interesting to us than the history of the Roman persecutions, we shall dwell upon the Apostle's final development of doctrine as it appears to our author.

The influences of Rome, "the centre and confluent of all ideas," rendered the writings of the Apostle different from those of any other period. The internal development of Christian doctrine proceeded rapidly. In a few months of these fruitful years theology went more swiftly forward than in some centuries afterwards. M. Renan does not explain what were the literary influences which moulded the new developments; nor what minds, living or dead, the Apostle consorted with for the stimulant of his faculties. We, of course, have our own explanation. The Spirit of revelation was with him, and made these silent years fruitful; and this assurance saves us from the necessity of the theory thus vigorously sketched of Christian doctrinal development. "The new dogma searched for its equilibrium; and, to strengthen its feeble parts, made for itself on all sides supports and stays. We might think of it as of an animal in the genetic

crisis, thrusting out a member, transforming an organ, cutting off an appendage, in order to reach the perfection and harmony of its life,—that is to say, the state in which all in the living creature responds to its functions and is complete." We do not doubt that reflection played its part in the thoughts of St. Paul, and that the body of truth in his mind assumed perpetually new and glorious aspects, perhaps surpassing any that he has communicated to us. His thirteen Epistles were not the limit of his theology. But we cannot suppose that his two years' imprisonment operated an entire revolution in his thoughts. We cannot believe, for instance, that "his dream was less of the Son of Man, appearing in the clouds, and presiding at the general resurrection, than of a Christ established in His Divinity, incorporated in it, acting in it, and with it." We need only appeal to the Epistle to the Philippians, written during the imprisonment, which contains a precise and perfect combination of those sundry elements which M. Renan regards as separated in St. Paul's theology. There is the high doctrine of Christ's Divinity, which is assigned to the period of late reflection, and there are the doctrines of the Second Advent, Literal Resurrection, and Uncertain Coming which he assigns to the early and immature stage.

St. Paul, according to this theory, profoundly elaborated his theology, and rapidly advanced towards the high Logos doctrine of St. John, during his tranquil reflections in Rome. But it would be unjust to M. Renan to represent him as assigning the Pauline development in doctrine solely to the influences of the Roman imprisonment. He takes pains to show that the Apostle only worked out ideas that his Rabbinical education had given him. After a luminous and generally faithful sketch of the meaning of the Epistle to the Colossians,—a sketch which puts to shame the exposition of many a more orthodox expositor, and which no English Unitarian would accept,—he proceeds to show that such doctrines were not entirely original. They were in part those of the Jewish school of Egypt, and especially of Philo. He forcibly points out that to relegate systematically to the second century all the documents in which traces of such doctrines are found is very rash. But he fails to indicate that the Apostle has restored the words *Logos*, *Fulness*, and others that savour of the Alexandrian Jewish philosophy, to their rightful place, and sanctified them in the person of Christ to higher uses than ever they served before,

or rather appropriated them to the Being for whom they had been prepared in the dark and groping anticipations of the theology of His people. In this part of his treatment there is nothing that calls for special notice. It is otherwise, however, with what follows. We present our readers with one more of the Renan peculiarities:—

"With Paul, who had not known Jesus, this metamorphosis of the idea of the Christ was in some sort inevitable. Whilst the school that possessed the living tradition of the Master created the Jesus of the Synoptic Gospels, the exalted man who had not seen the Founder of Christianity, save in his dreams, translated Him more and more into a superhuman being, into a sort of metaphysical authority that one would say had never lived. Nor was this transformation only operative on the mind of Paul. The Churches that sprang from him went in the same track. Those of Asia Minor especially were driven by a kind of secret working to the more exaggerated idea concerning the Divinity of Jesus. It is easy to understand this. For the fragment of Christianity which sprang from the familiar converse of the Lake of Tiberias, Jesus might well remain always the amiable Son of God, who had been seen moving among men with so charming an attitude and a smile so tender. But when Jesus was preached in some outcast canton of Phrygia, when the preacher declared that he had never seen Him, and almost affected to know nothing of His earthly life, what could these good and artless auditors think of Him who was preached to them? How could they picture Him to their minds? As a sage? As a master full of attraction? But this was not the part which Paul assigned to Jesus: he was ignorant, or affected to be ignorant, of the historical Jesus. As the Messiah, as the Son of Man who should appear in the clouds at the great day of the Lord? These ideas were strange to the Gentiles, and supposed an acquaintance with the Jewish books. Evidently the image which would oftenest present itself to these good provincials was that of an incarnation, of a God clothed in human form, and walking on the earth. This idea was familiar in Asia Minor; Apollonius of Tyana would soon make his profit out of it. To reconcile such a manner of conception with Monotheism, one thing was necessary: to conceive Jesus as a Divine, incarnate hypostasis, as a sort of duplicate of the only God, having taken the human form for the purpose of accomplishing a Divine plan. We must remember that we are no longer in Syria. Christianity has passed from the Semitic land into the hands of races intoxicated with imagination and mythology. The prophet Mahomet, the legend of whom is so purely human among the Arabs, has become among the Shiites of Persia and the Indus a being completely supernatural, a sort of Vishnu and Buddha."—P. 84.

It is unfortunate for all these fancies that precisely the same elevated conceptions of Christ which the extra-Syrian

countries demanded, had been announced by St. Paul and by others within the borders of the Semitic Monotheism. Moreover, it is hard to believe that so earnest an Israelite as the Apostle Paul would deliberately leave his Jewish sentiments and instincts behind him, and preach a second God because the people would have it so. Granted that "for Christians without an anterior tradition, who had not passed through the same apprenticeship to Monotheism as the Jews, the temptation was very strong to associate the Christian dogma with their ancient symbols, which seemed to them a legacy from the most respectable antiquity;" it is, nevertheless, hard to suppose that St. Paul would accommodate himself to these Heathen traditions and conform his Christian teaching to such models. Moreover, the theory assumes that only in the Colossian Epistle is found the doctrine of a Being who presents the fulness of the Godhead in humanity. It forgets that among these same descendants and representatives of ancient Heathenism, the Epistle to the Galatians for instance was read, which contains the doctrine of an eternal Son sent forth from God to be born of a woman. The Epistles to the Ephesians and Colossians do certainly contain in some respects the perfection of St. Paul's theology. But these Epistles are not the preached discourses adapted to the Gentile traditions of these cities. They are the ripe produce of the mind of the teacher under the influence of the Holy Spirit, who dispensed to him His teaching by measure. Remembering this, we may admit a certain truth in the remark that follows: "This Epistle, called to the Ephesians, forms, with that to the Colossians, the best exposition of the theories of Paul towards the end of his career. They have, for the last period of the Apostle's life, the same value which the Epistle to the Romans has for the age of his vigorous Apostolate. The ideas of the founder of Christian theology have reached in them their highest degree of purification. We are sensible of the last labour of spiritualisation to which great souls subject their thought before extinction, beyond which there is only death."

Before leaving the subject of the Pauline theology, we must find space for a few comments on the Renan tribute to another fundamental doctrine of the Gospel:—

"Strange thing! The death of Christ thus assumed, in the school of Paul, a much more important place than His life. The precepts of the Lake of Gennesareth had little interest for this school; it seems, indeed, that they hardly knew it; that which it beheld everywhere

was the sacrifice of the Son of God, immolating Himself for the expiation of the sins of the world. Frightful ideas, which, brought out afterwards in all their vigour by Calvinism, were to lead Christian theology widely astray from the primitive Apostolical idea! The Synoptic Gospels, which are the really Divine portion of Christianity, are not the work of the school of Paul. We shall see them soon issuing from the pleasant little family which yet preserved in Judæa the true traditions on the life and person of Christ."—P. 222.

It may seem needless to expose the fallacy of such superficial remarks as these. But it serves a good purpose to consider all that is said, or can be said, by the several schools which set themselves against the fundamental idea of the atonement in the Christian system. The theory assumed in the above quotation gives artless expression to a notion that is very prevalent in our days: to wit, that the original documents of the life of Jesus contain a view of the Redeemer's mission altogether different from that of the later New Testament. It is a great gain to the Christian cause to disprove this; and the disproof is easy. Not one of the Synoptical Gospels is without express and repeated reference to the sacrificial design of the death of Christ. Nor is this reference less emphatic because it is incidental, and deposited like germs, as it were, in the narrative. Before the Passion itself all allusions to it, whether on the part of the Lord Himself or on that of His recorders, had the nature of anticipatory hints. But these are as distinct and clear as they could be; so perfect indeed that they needed only the sun of Pentecost to develope them into the full atoning doctrine. "The Son of Man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to give His life a ransom for many." This one Synoptical saying contains the germ of the entire doctrine of the Epistles. St. Luke's Gospel is full of the doctrine of self-sacrifice for Christ, based on the imitation of His self-sacrifice for us; its account of the institution of the Supper leaves nothing to be desired; and its history of the days after the resurrection makes the Redeemer Himself expound the necessity and reality of His death as the foundation of His kingdom. It is strange to find this Evangelist numbered among those who had no affinity with the school of Paul. M. Renan elsewhere, forgetting this favourite theory, shows with remarkable faithfulness the influence of St. Paul on his companion; nor does he deny what the unanimous tradition of the Church affirms, that the third Evangelist wrote both Gospel and Acts as it were at the feet of the Apostle of the Gentiles. How then could his

Gospel be alien from the school of Paul? But apart from this, the entire theory which makes the Pauline school turn from the life to the death of Jesus is false in its foundation, and at every stage of its superstructure. St. Paul's doctrine does perfect justice to the precepts of the Galilæan teaching, and to the virtue of the Divine-human life of the Son of God. Certainly, the last Apostle does not dwell upon the incidents of the Saviour's history; that was not his province. He had not literally "known Christ after the flesh;" and he left to others to record what it had been their privilege to see and hear and "handle" of the Word of Life. But which of the Apostles has more abundantly referred to the incarnation and servant-estate and obedience through life unto death of the Christ before the Cross? It was the peculiarity of his mission that he had not companied with the Lord from the beginning. His own account—an account which constrains our belief, if we believe anything he ever said—is, that he received by direct visitation such views of the life, death, and resurrection of his Master as he should incorporate in his teaching. And every allusion he makes is in perfect keeping with this explanation. He does indeed concentrate his thought and doctrine on the death of Christ; but only as the end of a preceding life, and the beginning of a life that followed. And every member of the Pauline school was faithful to the theology of the master.

This leads, however, to a more general idea of the relation of Christianity to sacrifice. The following passage will be found very suggestive. It proceeds on the supposition that Barnabas, one of St. Paul's school, but with mediating tendencies as between that school and the Judaizers, wrote the Epistle to the Hebrews to the Church at Rome:—

"This Epistle marks definitively, in the history of the religious evolution of humanity, the disappearance of sacrifice, that is to say, of what had hitherto been the essence of religion. For the primitive man God was a mighty being whom it was necessary to appease or to corrupt. Sacrifice sprang either from fear or from interest. To win his god he offered him a present capable of touching him—a sweet morsel of food, of the richest fat, a cup of *soma* or of wine. Scourges and maladies were considered as the strokes of an angry god; and it was thought that by substituting another person instead of the persons menaced, they would turn away the wrath of the superior being; the god would be contented even with an animal, if the beast was good, useful, and innocent. They judged their god after the pattern of man; and, just as at the present day in certain parts of the East and of Africa

the aborigines think to win the favour of a stranger by killing a sheep before him, the blood of which flows on his feet, and its flesh serves for his nourishment, so it was supposed that the supernatural being would be sensible to the offering of an object, especially if by this offering the author of the sacrifice deprived himself of something. Down to the great transformation of Prophetism in the eighth century before Christ, the idea of sacrifices was not among the Israelites much more exalted than among other nations. A new era commences with Isaiah, crying in the name of Jehovah, 'I am weary of your sacrifices.' The day when he wrote this admirable page (B.C. 740) Isaiah was the real founder of Christianity. It was decided then that of the two supernatural functions which disputed for the respect of the ancient tribes, that of the hereditary sacrificer and the soothsayer, who was the inspired depository of Divine secrets, it was the second who should decide the future of religion. The soothsayer of the Semitic tribes, the *nabi*, became the 'prophet,' a sacred tribune, devoted to the progress of social equity; and, whilst the sacrificer, the priest, continued to boast the efficacy of the slaughters by which he profited, the prophet dared to proclaim that the true God cared more for justice and mercy than for all the slain beasts in the world. Established, however, in ancient rituals with which it was not easy to dispense, and maintained by the interest of the priests, sacrifices remained as a law of ancient Israel. Towards the time we have reached, and even before the destruction of the third temple, the importance of these rites diminished. The dispersion of the Jews caused those functions which could only be accomplished at Jerusalem to be regarded as secondary. Philo had proclaimed that worship consists especially in pious hymns which should be chanted rather with the heart than with the lips; he dared to say that such prayers were of more value than sacrifices. The Essenes professed the same doctrine. St. Paul, in the Epistle to the Romans, declares that religion is a worship of the pure reason. The Epistle to the Hebrews, developing this theory that Jesus is the true High Priest, and that His death was a sacrifice abrogating all others, struck the last blow at sanguinary immolations. Christians, even those of Jewish origin, ceased more and more to regard themselves as bound by legal sacrifices, or practised them only in condescension. The generating idea of the mass, the belief that Christ's sacrifice is renewed by the Eucharistic act, appeared already, but in the obscure distance."—P. 223.

Here lies the secret—it might be said, the one and central secret—of opposition to the Christian system: it is based upon an eternal ordinance of sacrifice, which was gradually revealed, prefigured in the Levitical ceremony, and consummated in the oblation of Christ. Rationalism, so called, rejects all these three propositions. The notion that the nature of God can receive propitiation being discarded, the

volume of Revelation is reduced at once to a record of the development of one of the greatest delusions of our race. The Old Testament is no other than the exhibition of a struggle between reason and superstition, Isaiah at length striking the key-note of deliverance. Then Christ came to complete the disenchantment. He destroyed the law of sacrifice by seeming to submit to it; and the New Testament proclaims a redemption, not from sin, but from the vain notion of a necessary sacrifice for sin. This is not the place to defend the true doctrine. The duty which this extract from Renan suggests is simply that of vindicating the Scriptures from such a perverted and altogether unjustified use of them. And even this we should not be anxious to do were the error confined to open assailants of the Christian faith. It is not confined to them. Many teachers of Christianity in the public ministries of the Church more or less avowedly side with Renan and his school. They also represent the sacrifices of the Old Testament as a transitory compromise with the superstition of mankind, and Christ as the teacher of a spiritual religion, purified not by blood but from blood. Our most melancholy reflection on reading M. Renan's words is this, that they so amply express the thoughts of many hearts among our English defenders of Christianity. All we can do is to protest against the elimination of eternal sacrifice from the Word of God. They who receive the Scriptures must receive with them their mystery of death for sin; renouncing this they must renounce the Bible itself. If anything in it is sure, it is the Divine sanction of typical expiation throughout the Old Testament, and the Divine acceptance of One Offering for man in the New. The words of Isaiah do not mean what in a thousand glosses they are made to mean. God did not reject sacrifices because they were inconsistent with true religion, but because they were unaccompanied by true religion. St. Paul did not teach that the service of God is a rational service as opposed to a service based upon sacrificial mediation. The whole of the preceding part of the Epistle to the Romans rises up in protest against this perversion of chap. xii. 1. And it is the simple fact that the entire Apostolical theory teaches the abiding continuance of sacrifice, as always offered, not on earth, but in heaven, for man. With these remarks we close the theological comments which this book suggests, and turn to some points in its history.

Returning to St. Paul, completing his theology in Rome, we

are startled to find that in M. Renan's drama St. Peter has followed him thither, not indeed as his beloved brother, but for a season at least as his enemy, though in an opposition of principles quite consistent with the common love of Jesus. Taking the lead of the Jewish party in Rome, Simon Peter became really the head of the Roman Church, and the Papacy was already founded. This imagination of a contact and a contest between the two Apostles in Rome is supported by nothing but a few obscure allusions in doubtful writers; it is contradicted by the whole tenor of the New Testament. M. Renan is not the first who has substituted the name of Paul for that of Simon Magus in the apocryphal legends which served as bases for the pseudo-Clementine Homilies. This is a remarkable instance of the process of development which has been as active in Rationalist as in Romish error. The collision between Peter and Paul, the whole history of the beginning and end of which is given in a few words of the inspired narrative, has expanded into an enormous tissue of inventions which would represent the two Apostles as tracking each other up and down the world, undoing each other's special teaching, while heartily united all the while in the spread of the true Gospel. On this theory, or some modification of it, rests the account of the origin of Christianity which many besides M. Renan adopt and defend.

Passing over the graphic though horrible account of the Neronian persecution, and the state of factions in Jerusalem, and keeping in our hands the thread of the Apostles' lives, we take up M. Renan's chapter on the end of the great pillar Apostles. The names of John, Peter, and Paul have a strong fascination for this writer. Had it been his happiness to be nurtured in the true faith of Christianity, and had the Apostolic inspiration been an article in his creed, he would have been one of the noblest exponents of their character and doctrine. No one can read his minute and appreciative comments on St. Paul especially without feeling that the great Apostle has lost in Renan a powerful advocate and interpreter. The pages devoted to an examination of the traditions concerning the end of the chief Apostles are well worthy attentive study. But, as we shall see, they betray the virus that blights all this enthusiast's labours.

M. Renan finds no difficulty in believing that both St. Peter and St. Paul suffered in Rome during the Neronian persecution, A.D. 64. But he must needs indulge his flippant and satirical humour:—

"Thus was cemented by suffering the reconciliation of these two souls, the one so strong the other so gentle and good; thus was established by legendary authority (that is, by Divine authority) the touching fraternity of two men whom parties opposed one to the other, but who, we may suppose, were superior to parties and always loved each other. The great legend of Peter and Paul, parallel to that of Romulus and Remus, founding by a sort of opposed collaboration the grandeur of Rome, a legend which has after a manner the same importance in history as that of Jesus, dates from the day which, according to tradition, saw them die together. Nero, without knowing it, was in this also the most effectual agent in the creation of Christianity, the man who laid the corner-stone of the city of the saints. . . . We shall show in the next volume in what way the Church consummated between Peter and Paul a reconciliation which death had as it were sketched. Success demanded this price. In appearance irreconcilable, the Judæo-Christianity of Peter and the Hellenism of Paul were equally necessary to the success of the future work. Jewish Christianity represented the conservative spirit, without which there is nothing solid; Hellenism represented progress, without which nothing truly exists. Life is the result of a conflict between these two contrary forces. Death comes as much by the absence of all revolutionary breath as by the excess of revolution."—P. 201.

This is the Frenchman's lively and spiritual way of putting a theory which the Germans elaborate with the semblance of stolid learning. We must not pass on without making a remark upon it; for it is one of the strongholds of modern warfare against the absolutely Divine origin of Christianity. In this warfare Christ must decrease and Peter and Paul must increase. These latter, first in their division and afterwards in their union, were the real founders of Christianity. Orthodox writers on historical theology sometimes give too much encouragement to this way of thinking by their careful distinctions between the Pauline and the Petrine theology. Sometimes the Petrine is regarded as issuing in the externalism of Rome, and the Pauline is claimed for the characteristic of Protestantism. It is well for us continually to remind ourselves that the New Testament gives no hint of such distinctions save to condemn them. The Epistles of the two Apostles do not vary a hair's breadth, however much they may have differed at the outset in their preaching. We should suffer no differences between the inspired teachers of the Church to survive the New Testament. And, while we reject the theory mentioned above, that the second century brought about a harmony between two opposite tendencies, and gave birth to a large part of the New Testament to sig-

nalise that harmony, we must be careful not to retain the theory in another form, to the great detriment of the unity, simplicity, and perfection of the Christian faith, which is the ministration of one and the self-same Spirit.

For St. Peter's martyrdom in Rome there is very slender evidence, so slender as to be practically worthless. From the current of his observations we might have supposed that M. Renan was convinced of the truth of the stronger traditions which assigned Rome as the scene of the Apostle Paul's death. But he only used the tradition for his purpose, that of introducing the dramatic effect of the dying reconciliation of the two great Apostles. We cannot resist the temptation to quote the following remarkable specimen of M. Renan's taste:—

"A jealous destiny has ordered it that, on many points which vividly appeal to our curiosity, we can never separate ourselves from the penumbra in which legend lives. Let us repeat it; the questions relative to the death of the Apostles Peter and Paul lend themselves only to probable hypothesis. The death of Paul, in particular, is enveloped in great mystery. Certain expressions of the Apocalypse, composed at the end of 68 or beginning of 69, might incline us to think that the author of this book believed Paul to be alive when he wrote (Rev. ii. 2—9; iii. 9). It is by no means impossible that the end of the great Apostle was altogether wrapt in obscurity. In the course westward, which certain texts attribute to him, a shipwreck, a sickness, an accident of some kind, might have taken him away. As he had not around him at that time his brilliant circle of disciples, the details of his departure would remain unknown; later legend would supply them, keeping in mind, on the one hand, the Roman citizenship assigned to him in the Acts, and, on the other, the desire which the Christian feeling had to effect a reconciliation between him and Peter. Certainly, an obscure death for the stormy Apostle has something in it which pleases us. We might like to think of Paul sceptical, shipwrecked, abandoned, betrayed by his own, alone, smitten with the disenchantment of old age; it might please us to think that the scales had fallen a second time from his eyes; our gentle incredulity would have its small revenge in knowing that the most dogmatic of men had died in sadness and despairing (rather, let us say, tranquil), on some river-bank or some byway in Spain, saying, even he, at last, *Ergo erravi!* But all this would be abandonment to too much conjecture. It is certain that the two Apostles were gone in 70; they saw not the ruin of Jerusalem, which would have made upon Paul so profound an impression. We still admit then as probable, in the course of this history, that the two champions of the Christian idea disappeared in Rome during the terrible storm of the year 64. James had been dead more than two years. Of the 'pillar-Apostles' John alone remained.

Other friends of Jesus doubtless lived still in Jerusalem; but forgotten, and as it were lost in the gloomy whirlpool in which Judæa had been plunged for many years."—P. 199.

It is hard to determine whether such sentences as these were penned in seriousness or in pleasantry. At any rate the revulsion of feeling they produce in our mind is very wholesome. They set us thinking upon the strength of the argument which may be drawn from the exact opposite of the picture that M. Renan sketches to his own and his readers' imagination. We firmly believe that the New Testament records bring us much nearer to the Apostle's end than M. Renan approaches. He rejects the Pastoral Epistles, and closes St. Paul's known career when he turns his face westwards according to his own intimation. We do not believe that the Epistles to Timothy were written by an imaginary author to an imaginary person,—the names of Timothy and Paul being used only as the vehicle of pious pastoral instruction. This theory of pious forgery has been alluded to already: we cannot refrain from referring to it once more. When the numberless notes of time, place, and circumstance contained in these letters is taken into account, how is it possible to reconcile the invention of such documents with any standard of honesty or truth? Was this kind of veiled but transparent falsehood in very deed the earliest fruit of Christian teaching and evidence of Christian discipline! But, taking the Pastoral Epistles as we must take them for the Apostle's final legacy, how sublime in its tranquillity is the answer he gives to the volatile Frenchman. M. Renan seems to resent very keenly the Apostle's desperate simplicity and resolution of faith. Again and again he betrays a disposition to take his revenge upon it. We can hardly without irreverence give instances of this. M. Renan in one passage admires our Lord because sometimes He wavered, and "His Divine *rôle* weighed on Him." "Surely it was not so with St. Paul; he had not his agony in Gethsemane, and that is one of the reasons which make him less amiable to us." He feels it hard that St. Paul should have "believed so stoutly." It would have been pleasant to see him sometimes more like Marcus Aurelius, "the most glorious representative of our race," who, while yielding to none in virtue, knew not the meaning of fanaticism. M. Renan thinks it the vice of the East that it cannot realise virtue without faith, that it cannot unite doubt with hope. "Without

doubt to the very last Paul saw before him the imperishable crown that was prepared for him, and, like a racer, redoubled his efforts the nearer he approached it." Though our author uses the Epistle to Timothy only as a "romance which aimed to reflect the Apostle's state of mind," he admits that the reflection was faithful to all that was known of his former life. This is a grand tribute from an enemy. The foremost teacher of Christian truth, a calm thinker, and logical reasoner, and exquisitely sensitive throughout his nature, lived and died without a moment's wavering as to the truth of the doctrines that he preached. Such a sublime testimony is too overpowering for the susceptibilities of scepticism. M. Renan would have had it otherwise. He takes his revenge by imagining what he knows full well never took place, never could have taken place, the final abandonment of the Christian delusion by the most strenuous enthusiast who had propagated it. But we rejoice to know that the "romance" to Timothy was St. Paul's own dying testament, "I have kept the faith."

We must not delay any longer a few remarks on the main subject of the book: Nero or Antichrist; and the Apocalypse, or the manifesto of Christian defiance and consolation. When the persecution in Rome filled the world with the horrors of the name of Nero, the few Christians who escaped betook themselves to Asia Minor, and Ephesus became the headquarters of Christianity. Another exodus from Jerusalem, after its first calamities, took the same direction. John, whom M. Renan brings from the scene of massacre that inspired the Apocalypse, became the leader of the Jewish Christian Church, and of the Church at large. From Ephesus Barnabas wrote the conciliatory Epistle to the Hebrews for the benefit of the Christians in Rome. But the Apocalypse was already beginning to exist in the imaginations of the faithful, excited to the uttermost by the fall of Nero, by hatred of Rome and the world, and by the strange presentiment, haunting all minds, that the monster, who was already called Antichrist, was not really dead but would soon reappear. Just at the moment when this excitement was at its highest pitch, the rumour flew around that Nero was almost in their midst, that all would be obliged to sacrifice before his statue, and that money was coined with the "mark of the beast" upon it. John, or some other whose work he sanctioned, inspired with the old Apocalyptic spirit that had produced so many glowing visions in the history of

Israel, sent forth suddenly a vision the grandeur and glory of which should eclipse them all. It confronts Nero with Christ, the two antipodes for ever; its cry over Rome is "Babylon is Fallen;" and its vindication of Jerusalem is that the throne of God shall be in it for ever.

M. Renan, seldom baffled, and long practised in the analysis of Scripture, is baffled by some parts of this wonderful work. Leaving them therefore in their inscrutableness, as the mere fantastic embellishment of the vision, he proceeds with great care to represent the theory that explains all with reference to the history of the time then present. Not once does he venture to approach the awful manifestation of the first chapter, a restraint of which he is scarcely conscious withholds him from it. All the rest he squares with actual history in the most exact, and, to himself, satisfactory manner. Rome is the harlot who has corrupted the world, employed its power to propagate and strengthen idolatry, persecuted the saints, and made the blood of the martyrs flow. The beast is Nero, who was believed to be dead, who will return, but whose second reign will be ephemeral, and followed by a decisive ruin. The seven heads have two meanings; they are the seven hills on which Rome sate; but they are especially the seven emperors—Julius Cæsar, Augustus, Tiberius, Caligula, Claudius, Nero, Galba. The first five were dead; Galba reigned for the time, but old and feeble; the sixth, Nero, at once the beast and one of the seven kings, is not really dead, but will reign again for a short time and will perish as the eighth king. As to the ten horns they are the proconsuls and the imperial legates of the ten principal provinces which are not true kings, but receive their power from the emperor for a limited time, "one horn," govern according to the authority received only from Rome, and are entirely submissive to the empire whose power they hold. These partial kings are all as malevolent towards the Christians as Nero himself. Representatives of provincial interests, they will humble Rome, will take from her that right of disposing of the Empire which she hitherto held, will maltreat her, will set her on fire, will divide her spoils. Nevertheless, God does not will yet the dismemberment of the empire; He inspires the generals commanding the provincial army, and all those personages who held by turns the Empire in their hands (from Vindex to Vespasian), with the purpose of agreeing to reconstitute the Empire, and, instead of establishing themselves as independent sovereigns, which

seemed most natural to the Jewish author, to offer their homage to the royalty of the beast.

But we cannot proceed, though the author's sketch of the application of the Apocalypse to history has much in it that provokes remark. The criticism to which it is subjected is of more importance. The attempt to locate the great visions in the few years between Nero and Vespasian, and the limitation of their meaning to the encouragement of the victims of early persecution, appears to us inexpressibly grovelling. But it has found advocates in every age and in almost all Churches. Nothing could more effectually discredit such an interpretation than the aspect under which the following words place it:—

"The Apocalypse, however, occupies in the Sacred Canon a place which many considerations tend to legitimate. Book of threatenings and terror, it gave a body to the sombre antithesis which the Christian consciousness, moved by a profound dramatic feeling, would fain set over against Jesus. If the Gospel is the book of Jesus the Apocalypse is the book of Nero. Thanks to the Apocalypse Nero has for Christianity the importance of a second founder. His odious face has ever been inseparable from that of Christ. Enlarging from age to age, the monster of 64 has become the bugbear of the Christian consciousness, the gloomy grave of the world's evening."—P. 477.

We cannot allow that the awful figure is that of the first persecuting enemy of Christianity. The instinct of the Christian world has discerned in it something that eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, nor the heart of man yet conceived. Granting that Nero's number was the mystic 666, and that the symbols were based upon him as a reality, they must obviously expand to immeasurably greater dimensions, as the process of ages will show. But there is another kind of criticism to which the book is here subjected which must not be passed by:—

"A more frightful trait was its sombre hatred of the profane world, a hatred common to our author and to all the framers of Apocalypse, particularly that of the Book of Enoch. Its rudeness, its passionate and unjust judgments on the Roman society, shock us, and justify to a certain extent those who summed up the character of the new doctrine as *odium humani generis*. The virtuous poor man is always somewhat led to regard the world which he knows not as more wicked than the world is in reality. The crimes of the rich and of the people at Court appear to him singularly exaggerated. That kind of virtuous fury which certain barbarians, such as the Vandals, would exhibit four centuries afterwards against civilisation, the Jews of the prophetic and

Apocalyptic school displayed in a very high degree. We feel in them a certain trace of the ancient spirit of the nomades, whose ideal was the patriarchal life, a profound aversion for great towns which are regarded as the centres of corruption. This is what makes the Apocalypse a book in many respects dangerous. It is the book *par excellence* of Jewish pride. According to the author the distinction between Jews and Pagans will continue into the kingdom of God. While the twelve tribes eat of the fruits of the tree of life, the Gentiles must be content with a medicinal concoction of its leaves. The author regards the Gentiles, even believers in Jesus, even the martyrs of Jesus, as the children of adoption, as strangers introduced into the family of Israel, as plebeians admitted by grace to approach an aristocracy. His Messiah is essentially the Jewish Messiah; Jesus is for him before all the Son of David, a product of the Church of Israel, a member of the holy family that God chose; it is the Church of Israel which performs the work of salvation through this Elect One that issued out of its bosom. All practices capable of establishing a bond between the pure race and the heathen (such as eating common food, practising marriage under the ordinary conditions) appeared to him an abomination. The Gentiles as a whole are in his eyes miserable, polluted by all crimes, and to be governed only by terror. The real world is the kingdom of the demons. The disciples of Paul are the disciples of Balaam and Jezebel. Paul himself has no place among "the twelve Apostles of the Lamb," the only basis of the Church of God; and the Church of Ephesus, the creation of Paul, is praised for having 'tried those who called themselves Apostles and were not, and having found that they were liars.'"—P. 475.

There is truth enough underlying the exaggerations of this statement to justify our quoting it, and making it the basis of some comment. The writer of the Apocalypse, most undoubtedly John the Evangelist, and probably at an earlier stage of his life, and before the destruction of Jerusalem, was in some respects as one of the prophets risen again. He was brought under the ancient prophetic inspiration, and endued, not indeed with the spirit of Elias, but with the spirit of Daniel. Hence the essentially Jewish colouring of the whole. The only prophetic book of the New Testament proved by its structure, phrase, and general cast, that the "testimony of Jesus," the "Spirit of prophecy" was one throughout the Bible. On that supposition all is perfectly harmonious. The revelation is precisely what it might have been expected to be. In the foreground of the visions is the historical form that represents the Roman power to be broken, and then they swell out into the ever-widening future in prophetic disclosures which time only can explain. So the Church is

Jerusalem and the Temple still; the Apostles are the Twelve; and the Gentiles are represented as brought in. The coming of Christ is depicted as having its concomitants of terror to the reprobate, as of endless joy to the saved. The earthly enemies of Christ's kingdom are spoken of precisely as they were spoken of in the ancient prophets; neither more gently nor more severely. We are content for our own part to rest everything on this simple theory; the book is a reproduction of ancient prophecy, faithful at all points to its type. The Seer was in a condition peculiar to himself in the apostolical company; "in the Spirit" in a sense in which only the prophet was in the Spirit; under the same plenary inspiration, indeed, but with its specific prophetic character. How this affected his thoughts, diction, and even choice of words, it is not for us to say; it is one of those mysteries of inspiration that will probably not be solved in this world. But in this fact lies the solution of every difficulty that besets the authorship of this book. Many of these difficulties spring from the notion that at the extreme of life, with the pen still wet with the Gospel and the Epistles, St. John writes the Apocalypse, as the perfect expression of Christian revelation. Prophecy might have been the perfect expression of revelation in the Old Testament. It is not such in the New. The Gospel and the first Epistle are the higher stage, the holy of holies.

So far for concession. On the other hand, how much may be said for the catholicity and breadth of the spirit of this prophetic book. As founded on the Theocratic view of the Kingdom of Christ, St. Paul's name could not be mentioned; not that it is excluded, however, since the expression Twelve was only the conventional term, meaning as well eleven in some cases, as thirteen in others. That in his own Ephesian Church his apostleship was denied, is a very favourite but very ridiculous delusion. The Jerusalem of the book is never the old and holy city, built with hands, save once, where it is branded with eternal displeasure as the place where the Lord was crucified. The atmosphere of the Apocalypse is as free and catholic and fresh as that of heaven itself. M. Renan and others are mistaken when they speak of the rabid hatred of this world pervading its chapters; the only human society condemned is that of the idolatrous, Pagan, and persecuting world. When our critic winds up by saying, "All this is very far from the Gospel of Jesus," the sentence falters as he writes it, and he cannot pursue the topic to its proofs. No reader of the New Testament can doubt that, on the whole,

and in its broad outlines, the Apocalypse is exactly, thought for thought, doctrine for doctrine, word for word, faithful to the rest of the New Testament. It has no Second Coming which is not in the Gospel and Epistles. It has the same doctrine of Atonement, though the Lamb is in the throne instead of on the cross. It has the very same jealous separation between the Church and the world. All that is said about disparity between Jesus of Galilee and the Jesus of the Apocalyptic visions simply goes for nothing. The prophetic and eschatological sayings of Christ in the Synoptic Gospels are, in fact, the most perfect prelude of the final Revelation.

M. Renan dismisses the subject by some characteristic remarks, which give us a suggestive glimpse into the secret thoughts of the modern Positive-Pantheist school. "Antichrist," he says, "has ceased to frighten us;" the possibility of the appearance of a man of sin, combining in himself all the attributes of enmity to Christ that have in the course of Christian history put forth their fainter energies, interests neither his curiosity nor his fear. "We know," he goes on, with the calmness of philosophic certitude, "that the end of the world is not as near as the illuminati of the first century thought it, and that this end will not be a sudden catastrophe. It will take place through cold in the course of long ages, when our system shall no longer sufficiently repair its losses, and the earth shall have used up the treasure of the old sun magazined in its depths as the provision for its journey." Modern science, we venture to think, does not sanction this flat contradiction of the Biblical prophecy; it is constantly detecting new secrets of reparation, both in the system and in its central sun, which turn this theory of the gradual refrigoration of all things into a figment of distempered imagination. But the question then arises: "Before this exhaustion of the planetary capital, will humanity have reached the perfect science, which is no other than the power of controlling the forces of the world; or will the earth, this experience failing among millions of others, be frozen before the problem that will destroy death shall have been solved? We know not." Here vain philosophy admits its ignorance, and here the Word of God, confirming the experience of mankind and the forecastings of the universal thought, tells us that the secret which vanquishes death shall never be found in nature.

But even out of this darkness light arises. The infidel must needs pay his tribute to the glorious ideal which the Apocalypse

presents. "With the Seer of Patmos, beyond these changing alternatives, we discover the ideal, and we affirm that that ideal will be realised one day through the mists of a universe in a state of embryo; we perceive the laws of the progress of life, the consciousness of being incessantly enlarged, and the possibility of a state in which all shall be in one definite Being (God) what the innumerable buds of the tree are in the tree, what the myriads of cellules of animated being are in animated being, of a state, I say, in which the life of all shall be complete, and in which the individuals who have lived shall live again in the life of God, shall see Him, shall rejoice in Him, shall sing in Him an eternal hallelujah." Who does not note here the struggle between an irrational Pantheism and the true doctrine which familiarity with the Scriptures will not let the writer shake off; not indeed a struggle between them, but their combination in what, because of that combination, becomes a hopeless jargon. The hallelujah is sung by beings who have risen again to a Personal God; this is the strain that the Bible has taught the writer. But the expanding consciousness of being, and the organised totality of the great whole of life, are conceptions he has acquired from a very different source. With all its unfathomable mystery there is a unity, consistency, and, if the word may be used, a reasonableness, about the New Testament exhibition of the future which makes it the sole and supreme director of men's thoughts concerning what is to come. Though he spoils the admission by his unconscious blasphemy, M. Renan admits this in his closing words: "Whatever may be the form under which each of us conceives this future coming of the absolute, the Apocalypse can never fail to give us satisfaction. It expresses symbolically the fundamental thought that God is, but especially that He will be. The picture is uncouth; it is the unpractised colouring of a child, tracing with a pencil that he cannot manage the drawing of a city that he has not seen. Its naïve description of the city of God, great toy of gold and pearls, remains nevertheless always an element of our dreams. Paul said doubtless better when he sums up the final end of the universe in these words, 'that God may be all in all.' But for a long time yet humanity will have need of a God who dwells with it, compassionates its trials, takes account of its struggles, and 'wipes all tears from its eyes.'" But St. Paul knows no other "all in all" than that which is consistent with the eternal dwelling of God with His people; his "all in all" is not the absorption of being into God, for

he declares it in the very midst of a strain that describes the suppression of all rebellious authority and the admission of a portion of mankind into the city of God.

Here the subject of the volume ends. We shall make no apology for having taken pains to give the English readers, our English readers, some notion of M. Renan's views. We are not among those who think everything written by this writer unworthy of notice. He is a learned, laborious, and sometimes profound, investigator of his subject; and he represents a kind of thought and speculation that is silently insinuating itself into the literature amidst which we move. Nor need we apologise for declining to notice at length the merely historical part of the volume. It is only just, however, to say that there cannot be found anywhere a more dramatic, harrowing, and generally faithful description of the origin and growth of the calamitous events which issued in the destruction of Jerusalem than M. Renan has given in this fourth instalment of his *Origin of Christianity*.

ART. VIII.—*Minutes of Several Conversations between the Methodist Ministers in the Connexion Established by the Late John Wesley, A.M., at their Hundred and Thirtieth Annual Conference, begun in Newcastle-on-Tyne, July 30, 1873.* Wesleyan Conference Office. 1873.

METHODISM in England has once more passed through its annual ordeal. The sessions of its Conference have been watched with more than the ordinary keenness of scrutiny; and the organs of public opinion have been more than usually observant and ample in their reports. Many reasons have conspired to bring the Connexion more prominently than of old before the attention of the several parties in the country. All classes of journals, representing all classes of sentiment, have delivered their thoughts. Before the season of comment passes away, we would like to join the rest with a few reflections suggested by our own independent position.

And we have the advantage of making these *Minutes* our text. Almost all the essays and articles written in innumerable serials during the course of the Newcastle gathering were written on the basis of information gathered from partial reports. All reports of the proceedings of this body must needs be partial. Those which are found in the Connexional organs are full enough—only too full—and as accurate as they can in the nature of things be. But they are not authoritative, and they are so far under control as to keep silence, when silence ought to be kept. Hence much of the essence of the thought and action of the Conference never transpires. As to the reports sent abroad into all parts of the country, they are of course limited to mere summary; and it is almost impossible fairly to summarise such proceedings as are here concerned. Moreover, as each reporter is necessarily a member of the Conference, and has his own opinion or party to represent—the public press is sometimes at the mercy of one-sided statements. This is a necessity, and implies no reflection on either the papers or their purveyors. The work could not, generally speaking, be done more ably or more honourably than it is; but in the nature of things it must be partial and fragmentary. It cannot be wondered at that collisions sometimes occur; such as that which has extorted

from the leading Journal the threat with which we have lately been made familiar. The evil might to some extent be remedied by the publication of official reports from day to day, or week to week, during the sessions. But the fact is, that the Conference thinks more of its own work than of telling the world what it is doing, and its own *Minutes* are its sufficient report.

Only in these *Minutes* can be found anything like an adequate view of what this ecclesiastical convention does. Those who form their impressions from the public papers or public rumours, make the strangest mistakes: there is hardly an assembly in the world the meaning and issues of which are more misapprehended. The constitution and working of the Conference almost makes it necessary that it should be so; at least they amply explain why it is so. It is at once public and private; privileged and unprivileged; before the world, and at the same time impenetrably shut in. Now and then the reports of a session or of a debate may perfectly reflect the truth; but on the whole, and taking the full business of the Conference into account, it may be safely said that none outside can ever be sure that they have a true account of it. Hence we would advise all who care to follow our example, to abstain from all fragmentary reports; to study carefully an occasional good discussion; and, for the rest, to take this little volume as a sufficient guide. This may be said with the more confidence, because from year to year these *Minutes* become more full and satisfactory, as embodying the results of the annual legislation and review. As a book, it still allows room for considerable improvement. It might omit some things that have forced their way into it; and some details and statistics, and historical notices, might with advantage be introduced. But it is in good hands; and those who have the responsible editorship are not without suggestions and advices coming in from all sides. We have no wish to add to their embarrassments: rather to acknowledge the remarkable industry and skill which this annual labour demands, and to wish them success in making the volume a still more perfect representation of Methodism.

Whoever takes up these *Minutes* and glances over them, will be convinced of one thing, that the Conference is a real power, in all places and in all causes and over all persons within its jurisdiction supreme. Whatever its enemies may say as to the origin of its power, such as it is there is nothing hollow or unreal in its exercise. It might be easy to draw

the contrast between it and the far greater number of ecclesiastical conclaves, convocations, and assemblies that annually assemble in England, Protestant Europe, and America. But this could serve no good purpose, as it respects our neighbours; some of them would only be stimulated to a bootless envy of what they sigh for but cannot get, and others provoked to wrath against what is called hierarchical pretension and government inconsistent with New Testament liberty. Looking on from without, we see in this compact strength and ruling energy of the Methodist Conference one of the guarantees of its continuance and usefulness in the world. The centralisation it exhibits is of the best and purest kind; without those inherent vices which have in some systems of another order made the word odious. We were going to add, let not the Conference surrender any of its power, whatever changes it may introduce into its constitution, and whatever rights it may confer on other courts. But there is no need to say this. That power cannot be given up without giving up all that constitutes the speciality of the vocation of Methodism. It would require a revolution which would ruin the community as such. Not, indeed, that the spiritual forces which keep in action the Methodist economy, or carry on in more modern forms the old Methodist Revival, would be dissipated and spent by any such relaxation of the central authority of the old Conference. Dissipated they might be, but not spent. They would be diffused irregularly through new and unthought of combinations of religious life, and add perhaps a few more to the Denominations; but one of the finest forms of ecclesiastical organisation known in the modern Church would be lost.

With all this it cannot be denied that there is much in the constitution and practical working of the Annual Conference that is anomalous, and demands reformation of some kind. Every one feels that it has grown to be so large as to be unwieldy; that the proportion of the hangers-on, who are mere spectators until the votes are taken, is too great; that, in short, its character as a grave, deliberative body, is seriously more and more imperilled from year to year, and that its work would be better done if its constitution were more compact and its limits more definite. It is felt also, that it is very hard to justify the withdrawal of so large a number of ministers from their pastoral work for so long a time; involving, as this does, so considerable an amount of derangement and irregularity, not to say dissipation, in the

circuits thus left. Much may be said, on the other hand, as to the effect of this large gathering in keeping up the *esprit de corps* among the ministers, and the maintenance of the organic family feeling among ministers and people as forming one connexion. But what may be said on this side has been exaggerated. This kind of influence is best provided for by the briefer and more pervasive union of the district meetings. These have all the advantage of the Conference in bringing ministers into close contact with each other; and they have, moreover, their own special advantage in making that fellowship and intercourse universal. All meet, through the medium of these distributed annual meetings, for communion and counsel and mutual supervision. And certainly there is no reason why, so soon after the district meetings, there should be so abundant a confluence of the same brethren. In fact, there is no reason why any more should visit the Conference than are necessary for a fair representation of the various interests of the Connexion. Now, whatever view may be taken of this representation, certain it is that it would be fairly met by a gathering of little more than one-half the number usually found congregated at this season. But this word representation suggests another kindred subject.

The *Minutes*, which furnish our text, will not be found to contain any reference to the question of the admission of laymen to the Conference. But it is a question which has occupied some measure of attention, and bids fair to arise again and again until some definite issue upon it is raised. At present, however, it is surrounded with difficulties, and perhaps with more obscurity than difficulty. There seems to be no clear idea in the general mind of what is meant; no express proposition comes from the laity themselves, and none from any class of the ministry. The matter being in this indeterminate position, it would be premature and superfluous to offer any suggestions concerning it; but it may not be inappropriate to subject the mass of conflicting opinions to something like a sifting process.

And, first, it may be presumed that there are none who entertain the idea of so remodelling the Conference as to change its fundamental basis. Whatever changes might be introduced in favour of a strict representation of all classes, ministers and people, the final authority of that body must remain the same. It must in every argument be supposed to be fixed and unchangeable. Then what is the precise meaning of a Representative Conference? Is there to be a distinction, as it

were, between a lower and an upper house, the upper having its veto, and, in fact, confirming all that is valid in the lower? But then comes in the anomaly, that in this case the upper house is of itself part of the lower, and thus has a double preponderance. In fact, many of the terms introduced into this discussion have no real application to the question. Laymen may be admitted into the Conference, but the Conference will not really and finally be the more representative on that account. By the will of God, and the constitution given to it, Methodism is Christianity administered and governed by its pastorate. Nor is this likely to be changed, without such changes at least as would make the whole matter a thing indifferent. The people of Methodism have long understood this, and they love to have it so.

When the time shall come for a fuller consideration of this question, it is very possible that some compromise may be arrived at that shall satisfy all parties, and remove many evils and anomalies that at present exist. The Preliminary Committees, with their unrealities and want of direct action, would be swept away; the influence exerted by the laity indirectly in a thousand ways would become visible and real; all classes of the community would be in some way or other represented in the Conference, without making the Conference representative. That body would be then, of course, more precisely defined. Its limits would be fixed. Its miscellaneous adjuncts would be cut off. Its number would, of course, be reduced to the lowest estimate consistent with its relation to the Connexion, and the work it has to do. No doubt such a Conference would be popular, and maintain the place at the head of the people that the old one has earned. It would be, or at any rate seem to be, more in harmony with the usages of Christendom and the customs of the Churches around. But there will be many and great difficulties, which it will be time enough to point out more at large when the nebulous scheme begins to reveal its nucleus. The lay members would not enter in virtue of lay-eldership and ordination; they would be laymen and nothing more; and a wide range of questions pertaining to ministerial soundness in faith and morals, and other things which Methodism has always conceded to the ministry, would belong to sessions of the Conference in which they would have no part. Then the nature of the election, with its qualifications and prerogatives, would involve a great and many-sided difficulty. In fact, to a superficial view, the difficulties that at once arise seem more than enough to counterbalance any

supposed advantages which might be reaped. But, as this subject appears in no form in these *Minutes*, it need not detain us any longer.

Another point occurs in direct connection with what precedes. There is nothing on which the Conference may be more justly congratulated than on its vigorous determination —shown in a variety of movements and schemes—to rid itself of a large quantity of superfluous discussions and details of business. We wish we could say that there is under consideration some masterly policy of organisation which would assign to the District Meetings much of the work that is done in Conference: thus practically multiplying Conferences, and making the whole body of ministers members of them. That being yet in the future, the propositions lately brought forward to relegate to a fixed committee all cases of discipline, and to shut out of the open Conference the tumultuous tournament of the stations, with some others of a like kind, look in the right direction. There is abundance of scope for improvement, even beyond this. Much might be "taken as read" that is now read; many things that seem like simple repetition of what is done elsewhere might be omitted; and the business of the Conference proper be limited to what belongs to it of necessity as the final court. The saving of time is not here the only, or the chief consideration: it is scarcely desirable that such an assembly should congregate for a less number of days than it now occupies. But the dignity of the Conference would gain considerably, and that in ways which it is needless to specify. And, what is of the highest importance, additional opportunity would be secured of attending to the highest function of this ecclesiastical congress—the consideration of the progress of the work of God over which it presides. Looking back to the earlier *Minutes*, we cannot fail to see that a main element of the business of Conference at the outset was the discussion of theological, disciplinary, and economical questions that affected the relations of the community, both internal and external. Now that ancient function seems to be sometimes almost forgotten; that is to say, the formal and set time for the consideration of these questions has almost vanished. Such questions do arise, of course, but they enter in the course of business, or in the form of suggestions and memorials which may or may not be discussed, according to the residuary time at the disposal of the Conference. Suggestions and memorials are well, but there ought to be a protracted time allowed for con-

versation, in the strictest sense of the term, on things of vital interest that are constantly emerging. The relations of Methodism to other communities—to the Church of England, and to the other Nonconformist bodies—might be profitably discussed under better influences than those which attend a set debate on some hotly contested point. The theology of Methodism ought to be thought under occasional review. Its methods of action, its style of preaching and conduct of special services, with a multitude of topics that arise out of these, should occupy a day where they now occupy an hour. In this respect the modern Conference contrasts unfavourably, not only with its own predecessors, but with some other ecclesiastical convocations which in other respects are not to be compared with it.

An hour or two is generally assigned to such conversation, following generally the reading of the statistics of the Societies. This suggests at once a question of great difficulty, which is among those that ought to be fully and exhaustively discussed in the Conference. Indeed, its discussion is appropriate only there; and, as we find in the *Minutes* that a committee is appointed to examine the matter, it would be wrong to do more than indicate the gravity of the issue pending. We refer, of course, to "the recognition, if any, which is to be given to the members of the Methodist community who are not members of the Society Class." This subject has been referred to in our pages; we have only now a few confirmatory remarks to make.

It is universally felt and acknowledged that the present relations of the Methodist Connexion to its communicants who are not enrolled among its class-members require some adjustment. What modifications that adjustment may render necessary, this is not the place or the time to indicate. We have no doubt that the same practical wisdom that has been equal to the emergency of many other necessary adaptations will be found adequate to the task. All we can now venture upon is to lay down a few general principles that must be maintained, and doubtless will be maintained, in any new legislation on the subject.

The first is, obviously, that the Society character of the Connexion must be preserved inviolable. Among all the forms of voluntary association for Christian fellowship, mutual edification, and disciplinary supervision that have been known in the history of the Christian Church, the Class-meeting, as it has long been tested among this people, is, in our judg-

ment, the best. But it is not matter of our judgment, or of any private judgment: it has approved itself by the experience of a century; it is interwoven with the very life of the community; it is bound up with its organisation, and may be said to have long outlived the necessity of defence. Regarded as a sacred privilege, this kind of weekly fellowship is endeared to many myriads of Christian men and women throughout the world. It answers to a profound instinct of the renewed nature, and is in perfect harmony with the principles of the New Testament, which are adapted to the instincts of the new nature. They are needlessly timorous who think that any such legislation as the time seems to call for would injure this essential branch of the Methodist economy. We cannot think that possible. It is true that something might be done that would weaken the sentiment of the absolute necessity of such meetings; and many names that are now formally enrolled—names of such as do not value and use their privilege—might be dropped; and generally the notion that the Class-meeting is the sole badge or test of membership in the Christian Church might be dislodged from any minds in which it may have taken root. But we have no fear that a generous and catholic recognition of those who love the doctrines, ordinances, and work of Methodism, but, for various reasons, decline to meet in the weekly class, would really operate to the injury of the old form of Christian fellowship. We have too strong a faith in the solidity of its foundation. It would only require certain very slight modifications in the Class-meeting itself, or rather a certain possible improvement in its leadership and enlargement of its scope, to make it still the universal refuge and home of those who come under the influence of Methodism.

Again, it is only following out the same idea when we indicate that any legislation on the question should aim at preserving the Society character of Methodism, by enrolling all who approve themselves worthy of the Lord's Supper in the Society-class, modified to meet their case. The number of such communicants is never very large; but, even were it larger, or were it likely to be larger than it is, there seems no valid reason why they should not be brought under the leadership, or special pastoral charge under the form of leadership, of the ministers themselves. Surely this burden might be borne by those whose labours bring such souls to that knowledge and experience of religion which is implied in their desiring the full communion of the Church. Whether they

together meet their minister weekly, or meet him at certain other set times, or are visited by him in their own homes, or visit him in his, in all and every case the end of pastoral supervision would be attained, and all the obligations of the Society discipline insured. Difficulties there would doubtless be; and it would require much skill to secure the perfect parity in all respects between this branch of the Society and the more Methodistically sound majority. But difficulties ought not to appal those who have a plain duty to perform.

The Founder of Methodism was not daunted by any such difficulties as these. Were he presiding over the system of Methodism, in its present more fully developed Church character, he would have acknowledged the necessity of the case and acted accordingly. And that there is a necessity is the last principle that need be mentioned as obviously to be borne in mind. The tendency of assaults from without combines with the growth of sentiment within to enforce upon the community the propriety of asserting its Church character, its right to all the prerogatives of the Church, and its willingness to meet all the obligations arising from that character. As representing the Methodist Churches or the Methodist Church, the Conference must needs be faithful to its principles and uphold at all points the New Testament constitution of the Christian Church. It has always done so. It has never failed to aim at making provision for the Christian nurture of those who are received by baptism into the visible Church; and it has always recognised those who comply with the Christian conditions of the Communion as receiving the seal of perfect Christian fellowship. Those who have asserted that Methodism knows no other test or condition of membership in the Christian Church, or even in the Methodist branch of it, than its Class-meeting, have recklessly asserted what is not true, what indeed has been disavowed again and again.

But we shall not pursue this subject. It will be considered on all sides by wise men, and doubtless what is right will be done. The many Christian men and women who love Methodism, and know no other Christianity from beginning to end but that which it teaches, who have however failed as yet to approve the value and usefulness of one of its peculiar institutions, will find that they are not disavowed. If they will not take all that the Society would give them, the loss is theirs. But they will not on that account be denied what belongs to them as members of a Christian Church. And the result of the present movement will be sooner or later a

full vindication of Methodism as at once one of the straitest and one of the most catholic forms of Christianity known among men.

Allusion has been made to the assaults from without that force upon Methodism the vindication of its right to the name and privileges of a Christian Church. The same hard Mother that drove the Methodist preachers and Methodist societies into a separate existence has never ceased to follow up the original wrong. Many noble exceptions there have been, and many there are still; but the great mass of the dignitaries and clergy of the Anglican Church have been and continue to be actuated by a rooted dislike of the fabric of Methodism. Even those who feel most sympathy with its labours, and thankfulness for its support against the common foes of Christianity, scarcely conceal or affect to conceal their judgment that its independent existence is a great evil, entailing upon it more or less of the sin of schism. There are few clergymen of the strictest evangelical type who are above this feeling; it exhibits itself in many ways, and by tokens too evident to escape detection. If there are any exceptions to this sentiment of alienation it is to be found among the clergy of the Latitudinarian type; but they also regard the independent action of Methodism as a great mistake, as an offence against the breadth and comprehensiveness of the free national Church of England. The High Church party proper, however, are of course the most pronounced and the most honest in their opposition. To them the presence of this Connexion, in common with all other forms of unepiscopal and, as they think, uncatholic Christianity, is a perpetual offence. And, on their principles, it is not to be wondered at. But their reading of Church history—and they live by the great traditions of the past—ought to teach them that there must be a fallacy in their principles. They cannot maintain their own independence of Rome, or of the Oriental Church, on the principles that deny the Christian character to the Bodies that have been forced into separation from themselves. So far from being catholic, their theory would, if honestly carried out, prove the most uncatholic that can be conceived: it would introduce utter confusion into the past annals of Christendom. It would reduce the true Church of all ages to a very scanty fragment of such Churches as could legitimate their claims to a succession and lineage from the Apostles. It would cut the Presbyterian bodies off; but the same pruninghook would cut themselves off too; and it would

leave but little Christianity that could be verified upon earth.

The effects of this undying animosity are variously felt among the ministers of the Body, and give rise to various expressions of resentment in its Conference. Some evidences will be found in their *Minutes* of a fixed determination to maintain the honest rivalry in every corner of the land with more energy than ever. The able, manly, and effective Charge of the ex-President was—and is, for its publication may be expected—the official reply to expressed and unexpressed opposition on the part of the Church. But it cannot be said that the spirit of enmity to that Church is growing in the Conference. There is a profound suspicion of its Romanising tendencies, and a disposition to join heartily in every form of protest against them; but the sentiment of ancient love, and of a good hope that waits for better things, still more or less pervades the Methodist ministry. They feel, for the rest, that their best defence is continuance in their steadfastness to cardinal principles and in their zeal for the diffusion of the Gospel. They have no doubt that the Holy Spirit, who is still the Lord and Giver of life—of life whether individual or corporate—has given them a name and a place among the visible Churches that carry on the work of the great kingdom. They cannot be so blind as not to see that the fruit of their labours approves the divinity of their commission throughout the land, and indeed throughout the world. That those who rudely challenge them do not see it also is one among the minor mysteries of iniquity working always in the Church. It is well, perhaps, that competent pens should be employed in replying to the attacks of episcopal and other assailants. But after all there is not much use in this Polemic. It is a kind of controversy that has never resulted in much. Rome defies the pretensions of the East, and the East with equal strength and more tranquillity defies Rome; neither convinces the other that it is out of the pale of Christendom. Again, Rome attacks the Church of England and the Church of England attacks Rome: the three centuries of this warfare of mutual recrimination have not done anything save in the decision of individual cases. So the High Anglicans attack Dissent; and Dissent knows well how to return the attack. But their mutual relations are on the whole as they were. Methodism may as well decline the controversy; not so much, not at all, because of any feeling of doubt as to its power of waging the war-

fare successfully, but simply because it has other and better work to do.

Meanwhile, the Methodist Connexion has a place among the Churches of Britain that is its own; and its wisdom is to preserve as much as possible its mediate, if not mediating, character. It retains, after all is said against it, the very purest elements of the doctrine, and ritual, and traditions, of the Church of England, while it appears to the observer precisely as one of the Nonconformist bodies of England. The noblest and the wisest estimate of Methodism is that which regards it as designed by the Head of the Church to occupy a middle position among these direct opposites. That was certainly its early peculiarity, and has continued to mark it down to the present time. There may be some who would desire to strengthen its affinity with the Church of England: a hopeless and a thankless task, as things now are. There are still men who would ally it with the denominations that make the downfall of the English Church one object of their existence, and, to cement the alliance, would strip the Connexion of everything in worship and discipline that leans rather to the Establishment than to Dissent. These are equally wrong and shortsighted in their policy. There is a good work committed to Methodism, which it will most effectually do as combining all the best elements of both Church and Dissent. But this leads to another and kindred subject.

When last we made the Methodist Conference our subject, the Fernley Lecture had just been instituted. The Founder's design was to give an annual opportunity for the delivery of a Connexional manifesto on some important article of the faith. The sagacity of his judgment has in most respects been vindicated from the beginning. The eve of the Conference has been proved to be an excellent time; after the bulk of the ministers has arrived, before the laymen have gone home, and just as it were in the lull between two excitements. It has been found on each occasion that an intelligent and appreciating audience has been ready; and ready to hear something more than a popular address. It has been proved that a worthy congregation may be calculated on. And it becomes matter of some importance to consider whether the Lecture is fulfilling, or is likely to fulfil, the founder's design as it ought. That design was, as we have said, to secure an annual pronunciation of Methodist theology on some subject of vital importance. There is a Methodist theology, and there is a

Methodist way of arranging and stating the doctrines of the Christian faith. It would be a great service if some vital topic were exhaustively handled every year in the style of this specifically Methodist theology. We are not sure that this has been done as yet by any one of the four who have delivered the Lecture. One would not say of any of their productions that it gives the world the doctrine of the Connexion on its subject. But they have all, more or less nearly, approached the idea. What the Fernley Lecture of the present year may be it is premature to say. It is yet to appear in the form the lecturer will desire to give it. We only hope that the portion to be added will present more directly than the rest did the specific Methodist idea of the Church; or, at any rate, that the book of which the Lecture was only a fine fragment, or rather introduction, will do justice to it.

The founder of this Lectureship did not survive to hear the last Lecture. His name is one among several which the year now gone has withdrawn from the ranks of the laity of Methodism; it is one that will be always remembered. Mr. Fernley seems to have spent the last decade of his life in projecting and completing plans for the future benefit of the Connexion. Not, indeed, that he limited his generosity to his own denomination; a considerable number of independent philanthropic institutions bear his name, either alone or in company with others. But he seems to have conceived a determination to strike out for himself a new course in the disposal of his large wealth. He built a noble chapel, established in it the Liturgy, and made it over to the body, as the realisation of his ideal of a Methodist place of worship. He founded a college for the education of the daughters of ministers; and showed his beneficence in a variety of other ways. When the approach of death rendered it improbable that he would survive to accomplish some other plans that were in his thoughts, he made testamentary arrangements for a very large endowment of the fund for building chapels; and, more than that, for the permanent usufruct of an enormous sum, the annual application of which will make him an abiding benefactor. It is the Fernley Lecture, however, that introduced him to these pages, and it is that which will more than anything else make it a familiar name in the future. Would that he had lived to witness its prosperity for a few years! We venture to think that he would then have seen the importance of making some change in the conditions of the

Lecture. He would have made arrangements for the possible enlargement into a volume of any lecture that was delivered. And he would have sanctioned the return of the lecturer to his post after fit interval; thus giving him the opportunity of making his subject complete.

It is not our intention to review the proceedings of this Conference, or to make any remarks upon the many important questions which have occupied it. Some few of these details are such as would involve discussion to which we have special columns assigned. Others, of very great moment, are at present in a stage which forbids further observations: it would be premature to pronounce upon them. To one of them, the Establishment of a Children's Home, conducted on a scale which justifies the setting apart to it of an active minister, we shall soon more particularly refer. It would be difficult to exaggerate the importance of the step that has been taken in the Declaration of the Independence of the American Colonies of the Connexion. No transaction of the Conference was more full of dignity, attesting as it does the grandeur of the Mission of the Methodist Community in the world; while the manner in which it was done shows to those who study the documents that sound statesmanship has not deserted the Body. The Missions have not for a long time been more prominent; but to them also we shall soon take occasion to refer. The Temperance Question—whether in its more general and worthy form, or under an aspect that does not command general respect—was by no means neglected. It was treated with the regard due to one of the most profoundly solemn and urgent subjects of the day; and we cordially hope that the deliberations of the interim Committee will issue in the origination of some plan by which the immense strength of the Connexion may be safely engaged, in concert with most other religious bodies, in the warfare against intemperance. But we must not pursue the catalogue any further into its miscellaneous topics. There is a subject, however, that has all the interest of novelty, and deserves, even at this stage, some comment.

Among the new regulations which may be regarded as subordinate there is one of considerable importance: that which provides for a more effectual examination of the reading of ministers during their probation. The theory of this examination is based on the principle that the Conference maintains a strict supervision of the studies of candidates for its full ministry down to the time of their

ordination. In old times it was thought sufficient that their list of books should be handed in at the District Meeting, to be made there the basis of comment and advice. For some years past a course of reading has been prescribed, appropriate to each year; papers have been drawn up to test the result; and examiners appointed in every district to value and report upon the written answers. Many and obvious inconveniences have attended this plan: sometimes adequate examiners have been wanting, and always there has been the anomaly occasioned by the absence of a fixed standard of judgment. A Central Board of Examiners has been now appointed; all papers on the same subject from every corner of the Connexion will be submitted to the same examiner; and the results, with appropriate comments, will be forwarded in good time to every district, to be used at the discretion of the meeting.

The experiment has yet to be made; but there can be little doubt of its perfect success. And its perfect success would involve an incalculable gain in many ways. Nothing can be more important to a young minister than the early formation of good habits of study: it is not too much to say that the entire course of his future is generally dependent upon this. In the case of many who leave our colleges there is no danger. They have learned the value of mental discipline; they have acquired the elements of theology and the sacred tongues; they have had the key to their subsequent studies put into their hands, and know how to use it. They might be safely trusted to take care of themselves; and their final ordeal would justify the trust reposed in them. But with many it is otherwise. Some there are—though happily the number is lessening every year—who are thrust out into the work without any preparatory training; and, when they find themselves in the midst of the new and pressing duties of their circuits, they are in great danger of falling into the fatal snare of desultory reading. Whatever may be called study is confined to the preparation of their sermons; and they lose, or never acquire, the precious habit of systematic and earnest study. But the danger is not confined to them. Some there are who leave their colleges without having learned thoroughly the secret that they should learn there; with their college life they throw off its restraints, and drop entirely, or are tempted to drop, sundry lines of study upon which they had been as it were forced. Now the tendency of this annual examination, in which now for the first time

the entire body of the probationers of each year will form one body of united competitors, must needs be to place a check upon those who are disposed to be careless and much to encourage those who are in earnest. Supposing the books to be well chosen—and there is every guarantee of that—a course of study will be prescribed which will ensure to every man full work. During the two or three years of his probation that remain the probationer will have marked out for him precisely the line that he should take. He has only to master thoroughly the books prescribed, and his year's work will be well done. He need not trouble himself much about any list of reading independent of that. Indeed, if he does justice to the appointed course, it will be impossible that he should hand in a long supplementary catalogue. But the experiment of this examination in its new form has itself yet to be tested, and we must wait for the results.

Meanwhile, it is part of our legitimate function to give these observations a hortatory character, for the sake of many of our younger readers for whom these pages are designed. No system of examination, however skilfully framed and diligently administered, will infallibly ensure what is the common desire of all who care for the prosperity of Methodism. The necessity of sound Biblical and theological study is not peculiar to any age: it is of the very essence of the Christian ministry. They who expound the Scriptures should understand what they expound; and they who learn Christian doctrine should understand what they teach. The knowledge of theological science is not and cannot be unfriendly to the manifestation of any Christian zeal that is pure. On the contrary, they who most habitually and earnestly meditate on the mysteries of the Christian faith will be sure most fervently to unfold and impress them. The day is gone, if there ever was such a day, when this principle might need vindication. We need not spend another sentence in asserting it. But there is much in the present aspect of the times, and in the relations of the Methodist ministry to the times, which tends to enforce upon the young men of that ministry the importance of a comprehensive study of theology in all its branches, Biblical, Historical, and Systematic. Those who are now entering on this vocation will find themselves called upon to defend Christianity and its holy records against a kind of attack peculiar to the present age, and in some respects unknown to their fathers. And they will be brought into contact with scepticism, not only

under new forms, but as approaching in new fields. Time was when infidelity had its leaders and notorious books and distant approaches; now it is everywhere hovering over the Churches and diffusing its influence through popular writings among the young of all our congregations. There is hardly a minister in town or country who does not know what it is to be assailed by the young people of his flock with questions which sorely tax his knowledge and his skill. Moreover, there is a new kind of scepticism growing rife at the present time: a scepticism as to the importance of fixed dogma of any sort; the scepticism of Latitudinarianism, which would limit fundamental doctrines to the scantiest possible elements of truth. Now, the Methodist theology has always been faithful to the round of what we call the essential verities of Christianity, and has also been diligent in maintaining certain special doctrines of experimental Christianity which others have too much neglected. Those who occupy in Methodist places of instruction during the next generation will need to be well versed in the defences of dogma: not only versed as others are, but with a special exactitude proportioned to the special relation they bear to Christian orthodoxy. And, finally, the disguised approaches of Roman doctrine and ritual through the avenues of the Anglican Church will demand a thorough knowledge of the arguments by which that kind of error is best to be met. In nothing is exact knowledge more necessary than in the contest with Rome, and with all that has in it the stamp of Rome. The platform and the public meeting are no longer the battle-field. It is now transferred to historical theology. But there is scarcely any limit to the arguments that might be brought forward in support of our earnest assertion of the necessity that our young ministers should give themselves wholly to the study of their vocation.

The urgency of the Conference in this matter reflects honour upon that body. It is an effectual answer to the ignorant aspersions sometimes cast upon Methodism as preferring for its service the ignorant zeal of those who are stigmatised as mere Revivalists. Revivalists have been and are used by the Methodist community, as often as God sends them; and it does not refuse to employ many who are comparatively ignorant to do a work that otherwise would not be done at all. But its best revivalists are those who are best instructed; and so it has been in every branch and in all ages of the Church. Everything that legislation and supervision can do is done to

secure an instructed and studious and trustworthy ministry, such as shall take rank with the best in the land. In some respects there can be no doubt that the young preachers of Methodism have been and still are at a disadvantage. We do not refer to the defect of early theological training. That is generally supplied by the training of their colleges, and it may be said that their probationers go out with as much special theological instruction as most others; but we refer to the peculiar nature of the work to which they are at once introduced. It is very often emphatically Circuit work; an introduction to the Christian pastorate which has very many advantages, but also very many drawbacks. In the majority of cases it may be safely affirmed that everything is against the formation of settled habits of study. In fact, very few indeed of those who have laid but a light hand on their studies before begin in good earnest in their first Circuits. Hence, the importance of these years of probationary inquisition. The thought of the ordeal of next May acts as a wholesome discipline. The young Hebraist, who might be tempted to give up a language never truly loved, sees the Genesis and the Daniel staring him in the face, and knows that his Hebrew teacher will certainly be on the board of examiners and look after what he has done. And there is no evading the chapters of Greek Testament; at least with anything like propriety. These are but subordinate safeguards, undoubtedly, and extending over only a very few years. But then, these are the most important years of all. A young man who thoroughly works up the examination of these years will probably establish a good habit. He will have found out that it is quite possible to meet every requirement of the most exacting Circuit, and to move about freely among the people at all points of it without really neglecting the regular course of study. The hours of the morning are almost always and everywhere the minister's own; his own, at any rate, if he is earnest to secure them.

It will be obvious that this scheme, which has no parallel outside of this community, must be thoughtfully and patiently tested for a few years. Very much of its success will depend upon the exact medium being hit in the prescription of the year's work between a too facile course and a too severe one. The books must not be too simple—the error has been in that direction sometimes of late—lest the examination be disparaged; but they must not be too exacting, lest the student be discouraged. At any rate this should be made a guiding

principle, that the books prescribed should be, and should be counted for, a thoroughly good year's work.

There is no portion of these *Minutes* which appeals so affectingly to the common heart as its obituary sketches. While the Conference superintends, and directs, and controls, the energies of its living members, it never forgets to sanctify and enshrine the memory of those who annually drop from its ranks. Its memorials of the departed are generally models of brief and true characterisation, such tributes as good men read with reverence while they live, and hope to receive for themselves when they die. There is no page in the journal of Methodism so sacred and so interesting; viewed even in its merely literary form, it is something unique in the Church; but when viewed as the constantly accumulating register of the men who have served their generation in this one province of the kingdom of Christ, how profoundly impressive it becomes! The obituary of this year has been enriched by many names of prominent worth; but there are two that claim brief notice in these pages, one representing, so to speak, the past of Methodism, and the other its present development.

The memorial of the venerable Thomas Jackson will be read, wherever the English language is spoken by Methodists, with one common and perfectly unanimous feeling. It is the record of a man whose high and almost peculiar happiness it was to have inspired during a long life in all hearts only reverence, respect, and love. Looking back upon his career, we cannot but be struck with the sublime simplicity and rounded integrity of his life. In everything he was, according to the measure of his gifts, perfect and complete. As a Christian minister, as an administrator in the Church, as a man of letters, in each and in all, he used his talent to the utmost advantage. And, after spending a long day in the service of the Gospel, with scarcely a single interval of infirmity, he has lingered through a calm eventide in the midst of those who loved him, and that without paying the usual penalty of impaired intellect or weakened powers. A life that has more entirely exhausted the possibilities of usefulness and happiness, it is scarcely possible to conceive. But there will soon appear some extended memorial which will give us the opportunity of doing ampler justice to his memory. Meanwhile, the Conference record remains, and will remain, the most effectual tribute that Mr. Jackson will have; in its faultless delineation and severe beauty leaving nothing to be desired.

The other name, that of John Moore, we allude to here, because of his connection with this *Review*. We should fail in our duty to ourselves if we omitted to spend a few sentences upon it. Mr. Moore was endowed with fine faculties, which in early life took the direction of metaphysics. Under the care of Sir William Hamilton he acquired a discipline which prepared him for high service in that border land where theology and philosophy melt into each and other, and adopt each other's thoughts and phraseology. Had his training in mathematics and physical science been equal to his psychological, Mr. Moore's services would have been greater than they were. This he himself felt, and, with the ardour and simplicity of a noble spirit, he planned for himself, even after life had passed its meridian, a thorough course of study in things that he had too much neglected. As it was, his papers in this Journal were very useful in the detection of some fallacies that infect modern philosophy in its methods of treating theological truth. His essays will, it may be hoped, be republished; but the book upon which he was engaged at the time of his decease cannot now be reproduced. We have lost a valuable contributor, and the Connexion one of the noblest of a small band capable of representing it worthily in the arena of philosophical polemics.

These tributes have exhausted the space allotted to this paper. We must abruptly conclude. But not without expressing our confidence that the auguries of the coming year are favourable. The Methodist Connexion is at peace; it never had more concentration of purpose on the spread of religion and the conservation of the faith than it seems to have now. Under the guidance of its wise and earnest President, whose happiness it is to be as much reverenced as he is loved by his people, it has every human encouragement. Nor will what is higher than all human encouragement be wanting.

LITERARY NOTICES.

I. THEOLOGICAL.—ENGLISH AND CONTINENTAL.

Meyer on the Galatians.

Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament. By Heinrich August Wilhelm Meyer, M.D. Hanover. *Part VII.—The Epistle to the Galatians.* Translated from the Fifth Edition of the German by G. H. Venables. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark. 1873.

We received this volume simultaneously with the announcement of Dr. Meyer's death, and shall do little more now than pay our tribute to his memory: a memory that ought to be had in honour throughout the Christian world. Services of the best kind have been rendered by this great divine, whose remarkable distinction it was to do his work better the older he grew. Almost every new year brought out a new edition of some of his exegetical works, and every new edition was an improvement in some respect on its predecessor. Meyer's *Commentary* on the greater part of the New Testament was commenced precisely forty years ago; and for some qualities, and combination of qualities, it has taken the lead of all others in Germany, and kept it. Its characteristics will be more fully described as the work proceeds. Suffice to say now that it is at once critical, grammatical, exegetical, practical, and theological: in fact, its thorough grammatical accuracy and keen theological insight are unrivalled. We must sometimes take exception to the doctrine, though not often, for Dr. Meyer's Lutheranism is of a type very much after our own. Somewhat oftener we must demur to the freedom of the author's views as to the integrity and authority of the text, though the last edition leaves not quite so much to complain of in this respect. As to the grammar and grammatical exegesis, no fault can be found, save with those minor blemishes that are necessary to the best human work. This *Commentary*, we repeat, is better, in a greater variety of good qualities, than any other we know. It may be surpassed in some directions; but, taken altogether, it is unsurpassed. It will not soon be displaced, even in these days of swift production.

Dr. Heinrich Wilhelm Meyer was born at Gotha, in the year 1800. Thus he was one of that remarkable band of men who came in with the century, and are consequently now rapidly going off the scene one after another, having exhausted their three score years and ten. We have had to record the decease of nearly a score of these during the last few years; and now one of the noblest of them is gathered to his fathers and to his brethren. Meyer's studies were conducted in Jena, and he passed directly, in his twenty-third year, into the ministry. That ministry was exercised in a country village for seven years, vigorously and earnestly, as some of his sermons show; but in harmony with a close application to the work of the study and preparation for authorship. In 1830, he came to Hanover; and, after another seven years of service, became Superintendent in Hoya. Soon afterwards he was promoted to be *Pastor Primarius* and Consistorial Councillor in Hanover: all the functions of these high offices he discharged diligently down to 1865, when he fell back into comparative retirement, though still taking part in the theological examinations of the university. His first literary work was a valuable edition of the Lutheran Symbolical Books. But he soon concentrated his energies on the New Testament, and gave forth book after book with steady regularity. His *Commentary* showed that he was thoroughly acquainted with all that had been written, whether more anciently, or among his own contemporaries; in fact, that his keen eye was upon almost every movement of theological thought throughout the land. He worked on, becoming more and more penetrated with evangelical truth the longer he laboured. If anyone would take the trouble to compare the first edition of his *Epistle to the Romans* with that fifth which has been translated, and is almost ready to appear, he would find a wonderful advancement. Some might think this a disadvantage to the work. We think otherwise. It is a noble testimony to the value of evangelical doctrine—so far as it needs the testimony of man—when a German divine of deep learning, but free tendencies, is found working his way nearer and nearer to the light, by the mere study of the Word itself. This was the case with Meyer. He was a perfectly fearless and perfectly honest man. If his opponents convinced him, he admitted his mistake; and whatever light the Holy Spirit brought him through his own private study, he gladly received, following it reverently and submissively whithersoever it might lead him. His reward was therefore great. He not only attained a firm and satisfactory hold on the great principles of the Gospel for himself, but he was the instrument of guiding very many others. It may be questioned whether any man has lately lived whose influence on the exposition of the day has been so deep and so extensive as Meyer's. His name constantly occurs in larger commentaries, which, whomsoever they may neglect, never neglect him. And, since the time of Alford's commencement—indeed, long before that—the name of Meyer has been a very familiar one on the pages

of our English expositors. He has been a much plundered man; how much may now fully appear.

It would be premature to speak of the translation. So far as we have been able to examine, it is good, though the English seems to us to bear more of the stamp and impress of the German idiom than we think strictly necessary. It seems also a needless thing to encumber the page with all Meyer's references to other authorities. Of course, it is perilous to begin with excisions of this kind; the distrust of the reader once excited, he might never be sure that he had his author in his integrity. But with so accomplished an editor presiding over the whole, the guarantee would be sufficient, and the page would be much easier and much more pleasantly read, if some of the innumerable names, which have no value on this side of the Channel, were expunged. But these are matters that never will be fully agreed upon. The editors and translators may be trusted. Messrs. Clark have done well to give this book to the English public. It will win its way, defend its own excellences, and explain its own errors. We cannot but thank them, in common with all students of the Word of God, for the zeal with which they have redeemed their pledge. There can be no doubt that the public will liberally reward them. Before closing, we will give a sentence of exposition, which will do more than anything we could say, to show those who are ignorant of the book, of what kind it is. The names of authors are omitted, save in the case of those which are essential. Some of the Greek is omitted; but in other respects, we make a faithful transcript from notes on Gal. v. 16, 17.

"Ver. 16. With the words, '*But I mean*' (iii. 17; iv. 1), the Apostle introduces, not something new, but a deeper and more comprehensive exhibition and discussion of that which, in ver. 13—15, he had brought home to his readers by way of admonition and warning, down to ver. 26. Hofmann is wrong in restricting the illustration merely to what follows after 'but'—a view which is in itself arbitrary, and is opposed to the manifest correlation existing between the contrast of flesh and Spirit, and the 'occasion,' which the free Christian is not to afford to the flesh (ver. 13).—Πνεύματι περιπατεῖτε, *dative* of the *norma* ('after the spirit,' Rom. viii. 4). Comp. vi. 16; Phil. iii. 16; Rom. iv. 12; Hom. *Il.* xv. 194. The subsequent πνεύματι ἄγεσθε, in ver. 18, is more favourable to this view than to that of Fritzsche, who makes it the *dativus commodi* (spiritui divino vitam consecrare), or to that of Wieseler, who makes it *instrumental*, so that the spirit is conceived as *path*, or of Hofmann, who renders 'by virtue of the Spirit.' Calovius well remarks: 'Juxta instinctum et impulsum.' The *spirit* is not, however, the *moral nature of man* ('the inner man,' 'the mind,' Rom. vii. 22, 23), which is sanctified by the Divine Spirit, in behalf of which appeal is made erroneously to the contrast of 'flesh,' since the Divine 'Spirit' is, in fact, the power that overcomes the 'flesh;" but it is *the Holy Spirit*. This Spirit is given to

believers as the Divine principle of the Christian life (iii. 2, 5; iv. 6), and they are to obey it, and not the ungodly desires of their 'flesh.' The absence of the article is not at variance with this rule; but it is not to be explained in a *qualitative* sense, any more than in the case of 'God,' 'Lord,' and the like: on the contrary, 'spirit' has the nature of a proper noun, and, even when dwelling and ruling in the human spirit, remains always *objective*, as the *Divine Spirit*, specifically different from the human (Rom. viii. 16)."

All this is good, and deserves, for its own sake, to be pondered. But it is better when connected with what follows:—

"Καὶ ἐπιθυμίαν σαρκὸς οὐ μὴ τελέσητε is taken as consequence by Vulg. and most expositors; but by others in the sense of the imperative. Either view is well adapted to the context, since afterwards, for the illustration of what is said in ver. 16, the relation between 'flesh' and 'spirit' is set forth. But the view which takes it as consequence is the only one which corresponds with the usage in other passages of the New Testament, in which οὐ μή, with the aorist subjunctive, is always used in the sense of confident assurance, and not *imperatively*, like οὐ with the future, although in classical authors οὐ μὴ is so employed. '*Ye will certainly not fulfil the lust of the flesh*,—this is the moral, blessed consequence which is *promised* to them, if they walk according to the Spirit.'"

This also is satisfactory, but it leads to one of the most important verses in the New Testament, the relation of which to the doctrine of Christian sanctification cannot be too carefully studied. On the interpretation of this passage very much depends. If we cannot do the things we would, then the limits of our attainment, and of our responsibility, too, are fixed, and fixed at a low point. If that interpretation be withdrawn, there is no limit to the possibilities of Christian deliverance from sin. In fact, we have chosen this passage purposely, that one of the profoundest exegetes of the day may be seen to sanction what we call a sound view of this most momentous saying of the Word of God. We shall suppose the reader to have his Greek Testament before him, and for every quotation take the original.

"Verse 17.—'For the flesh lusteth against the spirit,' &c. The foregoing exhortation, with its pronoun, is elucidated by the remark *that the flesh and the spirit are contrary to one another in their desires*, so that the two cannot together influence the conduct. As here also τὸ πνεῦμα is not the *moral nature of man, but the Holy Spirit*, a comparison has to some extent incorrectly been made with the variance between the νοῦς and the σάρξ (Rom. vii. 18), in the still unregenerate man, in whom the moral will is subject to the flesh, along with its parallels in Greek and Roman authors and Rabbins. *Here* the subject spoken of is the conflict between the fleshly and the *Divine* principle in the *regenerate*. The relation is therefore different, although the conflict in itself has some similarity. Bengel, in the comparison, cautiously adds *quodammodo*. 'These are contrary one

to the other.' It introduces a *pertinent further illustration* of what has just been said. In order to obviate an alleged tautology, Rückert and Schott have placed these words in a parenthesis, and taken it in the verse: 'for they are *in their nature* opposed to one another.' A gratuitous insertion; in that case, Paul must have written 'by nature,' &c., for the bare 'are opposite,' after what precedes, can only be understood as referring to the actually existing conflict. 'That ye may not do the things that ye would:' not to be joined to the first half of the first—a connection which is forbidden by the right view of the clause as not parenthetical—but to the latter. ἵνα expresses the *purpose*, and that not the purpose *of God* in the conflict mentioned, which, when the will is directed towards that which is good, would amount to an ungodly (immoral) purpose; but the purpose of those *powers contending* with one another in this conflict, in their mutual relation to the moral attitude of man's will, which, even in the regenerate, may receive a twofold determination. In this conflict both have the purpose that the man should not do *that very thing* (ταῦτα, with emphasis) which in the respective case (ἄν) he *would*. *If he would do what is good*, the flesh, striving against the spirit, is *opposed to this; if he would do what is evil, the spirit*, striving against the flesh, *is opposed to that*. All the one-sided explanations of 'the things that ye would,' whether the words be referred to the *moral* will, which is hindered by the flesh, or to the *sensual* will, which is hindered by the spirit, are set aside by the fact that 'in order that ye may not,' &c., is connected with the preceding 'these are contrary one to the other,' and this comprehends the mutual conflict of *two* powers."

We should have been glad to give a continuation of this. The exposition of the crucifixion of the flesh in ver. 24, 25, is very admirable; and we have no hesitation in thinking that our readers, in particular, will be highly satisfied with Meyer's *Commentary*. Were a young student, going through the Galatians, to ask an opinion as to the one book that he should for a season make his guide, we should point to this. But we must forbear. The volume on the Romans is the finest of Meyer's commentaries, and that which had his last finishing touches. We have just been reading the German edition, and shall be glad to welcome the English. Something like a hint is given that the succeeding volumes will be free from certain blemishes that cling to the first one. We think there is some room for improvement. The extract above will convince the reader of that. But this does not impeach the correctness of the translation, which is faultless on that point. The English reader has Meyer before him: almost too literally; for many a sentence would bear rearrangement. Once more we congratulate Messrs. Clark on the success of this project, and the public on their receiving this first instalment of it.

The Holy Catholic Church; its Divine Ideal, Ministry, and Institutions. A Short Treatise, with a Catechism on each Chapter, forming a Course of Methodical Information on the Subject. By Edward Meyrick Goulburn, D.D., Dean of Norwich. Rivington.

The Dean of Norwich has contributed much to the devotional and practical theology of the Anglican Church. Many thousands owe him a great debt on that account. He has been a powerful agent in imparting a religious impulse to many minds, and in spiritually directing many whose religious tendencies were in danger of taking a too ritualistic course. For this, all who value vital godliness must thank him. But the present volume is of another type. Its aim is to present such a view of the visible Church as shall confirm the theory of exclusiveness, and widen the breach, already too wide, between the Anglican Church and the other Churches of England. It is not our present purpose to examine at length this important treatise. There may be another opportunity of doing this. At present we shall make an observation or two on passages miscellaneously selected. And first as to the religious bodies of England.

"The only Reformed Communion in England that can found any claim to the ministerial succession from Christ and His Apostles is our own Church of England at present by law established, but which would be the only true Church of Christ in England if she were disestablished (as for the Roman Church in England, while we do not deny it the succession, yet we may truly say that it is an intruder, foisted by the Bishop of Rome, contrary to the first principles of Church discipline, upon dioceses the bishops and clergy of which, at the Reformation, threw off the yoke which he had imposed upon Christendom, and rejected the superstitions which he still countenanced). She, and she alone, is the ancient tower of Christ's foundation. . . . And while we never presume to judge other communions, nor forget what our Lord said in reference to the man who cast out devils in His name, and yet followed not with the Apostles, 'He that is not against us is on our part'—let us maintain our own connection with the foundation of Christ's laying as being unassailable, through whatever storms our Church may be destined to pass." For ourselves, we cannot understand the charity that refuses to pass judgment on other communions, and yet condemns them in the severest form that condemnation can possibly assume. All the doctrine, and worship, and holy work of innumerable Churches in England and, indeed, throughout the world, which have not been connected with the succession of the Anglican ministry, is consigned by one stroke of merciless argument to invalidity and spuriousness. All has been, and still is, one enormous defiance of Christ's law. Such awful consequences flow from this theory that it might be supposed a thing

impossible for an honest reader of the New Testament to hold it. Its inconsistencies are as patent as its uncharitableness. If the succession is the supreme test of legitimacy in the Christian Church, how can the presence of Rome in England rob it of a character that it has elsewhere? If Romanism is a schism in England, what is the Anglican Church in Papal countries but a schism? If lineal descent from the Apostles in an unbroken episcopacy is the test, then many portions of the Anglican Church itself would be unchurched by the fact of well-known flaws in the descent; and what becomes of the entire Christian world under the regimen of a Presbyterian discipline? One might suppose that godly men would be most thankful to adopt any other theory of ministerial succession that might include the ministerial validity and save the ministerial rights of the blessed men who in Lutheranism, the Reformed Church, and English Presbyterianism have for generations carried on the work of Christianity in the world. There is not one reference in Scripture to a lineal succession of bishops from the Apostles; nor is there a word spoken of any such lineal descent of the ministry in any form. But, if there were, the consideration of the universal estate of Christendom, as it now exists in the world, should constrain every right thinking divine to adopt a theory more in accordance with the phenomena and facts of the Christian world. There is not a word in the New Testament concerning the future ministry of the Church that may not be interpreted in perfect consistency with the principles on which unepiscopal Churches are conducted. But Dean Goulburn finds this difficulty always present, and in another part of his volume he deals with it as we shall see.

Dwelling on the unity of the Church, he meets the plea which we have just expressed—the plea, that is, that the real unity existing among Christians is something real—in the following way:—"It is true, no doubt, perfectly true, and it is a beautiful, consolatory, and edifying truth, that all the true servants of God have this unity of the spirit, this community of hopes, interest and prayers." He admits that this is what the Creed means by the communion of saints which we "believe in." "But what was St. Paul's view of the unity which was intended to subsist among Christians? He speaks, indeed, of there being 'one Spirit;' but does he speak of nothing else? These are his words: 'There is one body, and one Spirit, even as ye are called in one hope of your calling,'—not 'one Spirit' only, knitting together the elect in one hidden communion and fellowship, but 'one body' also; yea, one body primarily and in the first instance; for the body (or community) of Christ's disciples existed before the Spirit came down at Pentecost to inhabit and organise it, just as the body of Adam was first framed before the breath of life was inbreathed into his nostrils. Now, a body, observe, is something visible and external, something which may be handled and seen, something which has locality, which takes up a definite room and space." We have

no hesitation in declaring this interpretation, which runs the eternal round of the books written on this false theory of unity, to be entirely unsound. The opposition between body and spirit is not, in St. Paul's mind, between the organised form visible to the world and the life which inhabits it. If that had been his meaning, he would have said so. There is no use of the term "body" as designating the Church which does not require us to enlarge its meaning very much beyond this. There is one body, one organised community of all ages of which the Divine-human Saviour is the Head, and there is one Spirit who in the Divine economy works to the construction and perfecting of that body. Doubtless, there ought to be more visible unity than there is; the signs of disunion ought not to be exhibited before the world; they ought not to exist. But the Lord's prayer for unity, which is appealed to by the Dean, means something more than any external uniformity could possibly indicate. It means something which is evident enough to the outside world, and to the powers of infidelity, and to their head, even now. It cannot, even on his showing, mean what he dwells on so much. For he admits it to belong, and to have always belonged, to the body of Christian communions which under some aspects he denies to have a place in that body. In his heart, and in his confession too, he does not deny the Oriental and Roman communions their place in the Christian body. But he knows very well, and deeply feels it, that they do not accept each other, and both pour utter contempt on the Dean's Church, upon him, and all who use the arguments he uses. Granting the lineal Church to be what he makes it, it has never been one from the earliest centuries. These theorists cannot point to a century since the ninth or seventh when the Body of Christ, understood as they understand it, has been one.

But the most remarkable part of the argument is derived from the analogy of the Old Testament. As ecclesiastical ambition in Christendom produced its reaction, separation and dissent, so was it in the ancient Theocracy. God was angry with the request for a king, but He sanctioned it, and gave the people a king. "The whole narrative exhibits a great law of the Divine administration, which is, that *when a primitive ideal is hopelessly frustrated, and the first best theory made impracticable by human sin and perversion, God introduces a second best thing, and endows it with (at all events) a temporary sanction.* That second best thing is not *constituted according to the original design;* the unruly wills and affections of sinful men have prevented its being so; but its constitution seems taken up into the grand, comprehensive scheme of Divine Providence, and made 'to work together for good' to those who live under it." This argument, it may be observed, is used more particularly with regard to the schism of the tribes, and violation of the unity of the Divine ideal in the case of the one King David. It is not denied that the kingdom of Israel had many wonderful tokens of the Divine presence and power in its midst.

But then it was a great error, which, nevertheless, the Eternal used for the accomplishment of His purposes. And with remarkable skill the analogy is brought to bear against the Dissenting communities: the Lecture exhibits it with considerable fulness, and the Catechism confirms it. But the analogy ought to include the establishment of the monarchy: it does so indirectly, but the argument and the catechising always omit that. The analogy, including the monarchy, is one that we are quite content to rest upon. If the divided and diversified forms of the Christian commonwealth are accepted of God, interwoven with His purposes, and made subordinate to His plans, as the establishment of the kingdom which boasted David as its king was, we are content. We are quite willing then to accept Dean Goulburn's argument. But he must put himself on the same level with us. It reduces us all to the same level. The only community on earth that can afford to decline it must be the Oriental lineal descendants of the ancient Patriarchates. We are quite willing to admit that in the Saviour's ideal the Church was to be more visibly one than it is. We are content to allow that the present condition of things is not "the first best thing." We are thankful to think that we are, in common with Dean Goulburn's Church, an illustration of "the next best thing." If God is using us as He used the ancient kingdom of David, and as He used the institution of prophetism in Israel, we are content. We need nothing more than that. The Head of the Church is not entirely pleased with the diversities of Christendom; but He has provided for them, and taken them up into His counsels.

The author of our Catechism ought to see what a sad unreality there is in his vehement denunciations of all other communions. He is too good a man to be entirely satisfied with his theory. Every now and then there glimmers on his page a better light, which, however, is soon swallowed up. For instance, the catechumen is taught his duty to those who are outside of the pale of Catholic unity: "Never to refuse a hearty acknowledgment to the working of the Spirit of God in communities originally schismatical, and wanting a regularly ordained ministry; but to admit, and render thanks to God for, the extensive good which has often been done by the ministers of these communions, and the brilliant examples of piety which many of the people in such communions have exhibited." Lest this great concession should be carried too far in its inferences, the catechumen is warned in the next question and answer to avoid the conclusion that such "ministers of man's erection are regular and legitimate." "God may have had but one regular channel for His grace, just as the river Jordan had only one bed. But, as 'Jordan overflowed all her banks all the time of harvest,' so God's grace may overflow the channel of His own appointment, and inundate and fertilise the country without any channel at all." The unreality of all this is most obvious. The most effectual service of the Jordan,

agriculturally speaking, is the type of the Dissenters' ordinances: the channel of its bed, which had nothing to do with either seed-time or harvest, is the one true Church. This analogy is nought. But it makes a vast concession. Again, we say, we are quite content to be the overflowings of Jordan in harvest time.

If Dean Goulburn, and others like him, would boldly face their own principles, they would, however reluctantly, admit that the Spirit is using a number of instrumentalities that men would never perhaps have devised or preferred. They would come to see that, even supposing a body like that of Methodism was schismatical in its origin, God has forgotten the offence, and is using it for the accomplishment of His purposes. There is not a Christian community on earth that is unimpeachable at all points. The Church of England cannot bear the kind of inquisition to which the Dean subjects the denominations around, any more than they can bear it: perhaps cannot bear it so well. He knows this very well, and is as uneasy in his defence of Anglicanism before Rome, as he is confident in the condemnation of Dissent.

The same kind of unreality appears in the following sentence:—"Without daring to deny to Presbyterian and other communities a ministry and sacraments (on the ground that God's grace is so abounding as often to overflow the regular channels of His own appointment), we yet should be loth indeed to exchange a regular for an irregular channel. There is always the possibility and the hope, which we may charitably cherish, that long centuries of irregular usage may more or less have sanctioned that usage in the sight of God (as long inheritance of a crown must be held to give a title, even though long ages back it was gained by usurpation); but whoever he was in the history of the Church who first of all sought to confer or receive orders out of the apostolic line, 'illi robur et æs triplex circa pectus erat,'—he had a superhuman hardihood to face out so boldly the story of Korah and his company; and the great blot on the escutcheon of Wesley—an escutcheon otherwise of eminent sanctity and widespread usefulness—is, that in his latter days (when we may believe that his faculties were somewhat on the wane) he took upon him to communicate a power which he had never received, and to consecrate a bishop."

Here it will be observed that the aboundings of the Divine grace are supposed to flow from generation to generation, through channels that are not only not according to His will, but absolutely in opposition to it. When the controversialists of Rome use this very language about the Church of England, we think it very offensive, and very irreverent, and very irrational. That God should denounce most vehemently a sin which He nevertheless honours and maintains, as if it were no sin, is, to us, an absurdity. Now here is Dean Goulburn bestowing the same argument on us all! God might, on some rare occasion, honour an unworthy instrument. But that He should

acknowledge and view these heretical and schismatical communions so much with a peculiar measure of His grace that to no rival on earth has been surpassed or equalled, is a thing incredible. As to John Wesley, his "triple brass" was a breastplate something different from what our Dean condescends to give him: in fact, he needs no defence for his venerable old age against such vain words as we have been obliged to copy.

We have not reviewed the book as a whole; but we have carefully read it, and some parts more than once. It is an able manifesto on the irrational High Church theory. But it is not a thoroughly learned or original work. The exposition is very loose, and the pleading is very special.

Bernard's Progress of Doctrine.

The Progress of Doctrine in the New Testament. By T. D. Bernard, M.A. Third Edition. Macmillan. 1873.

We are glad to see this valuable work in a cheap form, and recommend it to the attention of every theological student. As the Bampton Lectures of 1864, it did not perhaps excite the attention that was due to it; but its solid worth is now extensively acknowledged. Perhaps if the word "Development" had occurred in the title, it would have drawn to the book many an inquirer, to whom that word has a profound interest. Probably some such inquirers may be disappointed when they find that the subject of development, and the perversion of it, is not more thoroughly dealt with. And others may search in vain for a sketch of the development and growth of some individual doctrines in the New Testament. We cannot but think that these two omissions might be repaired by adding one-third to the bulk of the volume, and the addition would immensely increase its value. However, the subject which lay before the lecturer has been discussed in a scholarly, able, and—with the exceptions just named—exhaustive manner.

In the first lecture, we soon light upon such sentences as these, which enunciate a principle of profound importance. "What then is it which draws the line of separation between the apostolic period and all the subsequent periods of this history? It is this: That the apostolic period is *not only* a part of the history of *the apprehension of truth by many*: it is *also* a part of the history of *the communication of truth by God*. It is the first stage of the one, and the last stage of the other. The aspect which the Gospel bears in the writings of the Apostles is a communication from God of what really is, a revelation of what He intended that it should be in the minds of men for ever. This character of the apostolic writings has, without variation of testimony, been acknowledged by the Church from the beginning; but this acknowledgment has been *confined* to these writings, and has never been extended to subsequent expositions or decrees. Councils

and doctors have claimed a right to be heard, only as assertors and witnesses of apostolic teaching. No later communications from heaven are supposed or alleged.' What has been handed down, what is collected out of the writings of the Apostles, is the professed authority for all definition and decrees; and all reference to (what may appear to be) other authority is based upon the fact asserted or implied, that in the quarters appealed to there was reason to recognise some special connection with the apostolic teaching. This fact, moreover, comes out most clearly at those moments in which (what might be called) an advance of doctrine is seen most evidently to take place. If the doctrine of the nature of Christ shows a new distinctness and firmness of outline after Nice and Constantinople, yet that form of the doctrine professes to be, and when examined, proves to be, only a formal definition of the original truth. Nothing new has been imported into it; only fresh verbal barriers have excluded importations which were really new. If the doctrine of Justification by Faith seems, at the era of the Reformation, like a new apparition on the scene, yet it is advanced, and is received, only as the old Pauline doctrine reasserting its forgotten claims."

This leads, of course, to the relation of Romish development to this fixed and final apostolical authority. A more important subject cannot ever occupy the attention of the student, for his defence whether against Rome or against Rationalism. Standing in the pulpit in which Dr. Newman first broached his own theory of development—a theory which he completed in Rome, and has been obliged by public opinion to modify—Mr. Bernard must needs give some space to its examination. Both in the text and in the notes, he discusses the subject of that "infallible authority in Rome," which really inspires the Church with the knowledge, not of a new doctrine, strictly speaking, but of the fact that the doctrine was held by the Apostles, though the tradition has been lost. The confusion in the Romish theory between definition of new doctrine, development of new germs, revelation of tradition that had been hidden, is very great. Mr. Bernard's few references are very masterly, but they are only too few.

The fact of progress in the teaching of Divine truth, and the laws which regulate that progress in the Bible generally, in the Old Testament, and in the New, are admirably treated. In the third lecture there is a most useful discussion of what is called "Our Lord's anticipatory teaching," and a subject is brought prominently forward which, in the writings of some sceptics, plays a considerable part. Mr. Bernard takes the two doctrines of the Forgiveness of Sin and the Success of Prayer; both intimately connected with the personal agency of the Redeemer, the one with His atoning sacrifice, the other with His priestly mediation. But it is certain that in His own teaching on earth they are *not* so treated. Other truths concerning them are brought forward when these are absent. "Take such examples as

these: '*Forgive*, and ye shall be forgiven;' 'For she loved much;' 'I forgave thee *because thou desiredst me*;' and the 'sinner' going down to his house 'justified;' and the prodigal simply *returning* and being pardoned. There is no mention of any intercessor, no typical hint of sacrifice or other atonement, no condition anywhere supposed, but what is included in 'because thou desiredst me,' or in the presence of penitence and tenderness of heart, and the absence of an unforgiving spirit towards others." We all know how much has been made of this fact; how constantly this kind of representation in the Gospels is made to fight against the cross and the apostolical doctrine concerning it in the Epistles. There is nothing new in the treatment here; but what is said, is exceedingly well put, and very suggestive. "Yet at other times there fall from the Lord's own lips some few words at least which reveal *Himself* as the channel, and *His blood* as the purchase, of the forgiveness which He preaches so freely. 'The Son of Man has power on earth to forgive sin;' 'My blood shed for the remission of sins.' These sayings give a momentary insight into the depths of the subject, and disclose something of the mysterious *means* by which forgiveness has been procured, and through which, when once revealed, it must be sought. It is evidence that such a revelation cannot remain as a mere associated idea; that it must become *fundamental*, and give a peculiar and distinctive character to the Christian doctrine of the forgiveness of sins. But we see that it is not wrought out in the Gospels. Must we not expect then that this will be done? and that, in some future stage of Divine teaching, we shall find the word, 'Forgive and ye shall be forgiven,' elevated and opened into 'Forgive one another, as God, *for Christ's sake*, hath forgiven you,' and the hope of forgiveness placed for ever on its true basis of faith in Him, 'in whom we have redemption *through His blood*, even the forgiveness of sins.'"

But we must forbear. It would be easy to select other passages in abundance to illustrate the soundness, thoroughness, and suggestiveness of this volume. The student must find them for himself. The lectures, as we have hinted, are somewhat marred by the stamp they receive from pulpit delivery: they tarry rather too much on general principles. A volume supplementary, or very copious notes, might be almost expected by the reader. The notes which are appended are, as usual with these lectures, exceedingly valuable: such notes as only the rich reading of a thorough scholar could have furnished.

The Peculiarities of Methodist Doctrine. An Address Delivered in the Open Session of the Irish Wesleyan Methodist Conference, June 19th, 1873. By the Rev. W. B. Pope, Theological Tutor, Didsbury College. London: Wesleyan Conference Office. 1873.

The nature of the task here undertaken will be at once perceived by theological readers, and may be explained to others in

very few words. It is an attempt to express, with precision, the doctrinal attitude of Methodism in relation to sister Churches and the general faith of Christendom. Methodists themselves will recognise the doctrines with which they are familiar exhibited in a scientific and comparative manner, and to members of other communities we recommend the short statement as containing more information on the subject than they are likely to find very easily elsewhere. Perhaps the general impression entertained concerning Methodist doctrine is tolerably accurate; yet on some points, at least, curious misapprehensions exist. In the first place, it must be borne in mind that the doctrinal standards ordinarily adduced do not cover the whole ground of religious belief as it has always existed in Methodism. The standards presuppose the great creeds, and the general confession of Evangelical Christendom. The Methodists have never formulated their theology as a whole. They have never been called upon to do so, seeing that, without any breach of continuity, they possess the faith of the reformed Catholic Church, and are under no necessity of laying again the foundation of doctrine. And as they claim to share that common inheritance, so do they repudiate the charge of having added to it.

"Not that Methodism has received a new dispensation of the Christian Faith. We are not modern Montanists, deeming ourselves the peculiar instruments of the Holy Ghost, who has seen fit to impart to us a new Pentecostal manifestation of truth. We have not founded any Catholic and Apostolic Church, charged with the mission of reviving doctrines and usages lost through long intervening ages. We do not believe that any cardinal doctrines have ever been lost; and as to the miraculous gifts and effusions of the Holy Ghost which glorified the first days, we believe that, like the sheet which Peter saw, they served their purpose for a season, and were taken up again into heaven. We do not claim to have added a solitary tenet to the Christian confession, or to have revived one practice which would otherwise have been forgotten."

Where then are the "peculiarities" of Methodist doctrine to be found? In the special prominence given to some aspects of the faith; in the emphasis laid upon certain doctrines; in the relation they occupy to the whole scheme, and, perhaps, beyond all, in the practical comment and interpretation they have always received from religious experience. "The practical character of Methodist theology is that with which the world is most familiar, and which has been the chief cause of its extension and influence. At the same time that theology is not an afterthought, as many seem to suppose, grafted on a system that owed its existence only to religious emotion. Its doctrine is, and always has been, systematic and complete; embracing the Catholic verities of the Christian faith, but exhibiting in certain departments a stamp that marks it as unique among the confessions of Christendom." After calling attention to the fact then that there

is a wide round of doctrine in which Methodism has no peculiarities, the shades of difference that may be found in Redemptional Theology are next referred to.

"For instance, marking the relations of the systems around us, there are two from which we widely differ. The one is that of those who hold the vicarious sacrifice of Christ, but limit it in its sovereign and sole efficacy to the original sin of the race, washed away in baptism through the application of the Saviour's merits. For all subsequent transgressions, man's own satisfaction must be added to the Saviour's merit. Moreover, the one eternal offering is continued on altars which man has raised, and not God; in a tabernacle which God has not pitched, but man. From these errors that defeat the atonement we, of course, turn away. On the other side, there is the error of those who limit the great propitiation in another manner. They make the oblation of Christ an offering in the stead of the individual objects of electing love, in whose place the Redeemer stands, satisfying every demand of justice and law for them alone, and as individuals. In opposition to these, we maintain that the Saviour assumed the place of mankind; that it was the sin of the race laid upon Him that He voluntarily bore in His own body to the cross; and that His death was the reconciliation of the world as such to God.

"Between these opposite errors, as we must hold them to be, there is another against which we equally protest: that of those who make the atoning sufferings of the Redeemer an expedient to work upon the human heart by a display of the Divine attributes. With some it is the justice of God, as the moral Ruler of the universe, that is displayed: in no other manner could the Eternal more impressively declare His righteousness in the forgiveness of human sin than by first visiting it upon the soul of His Son, the voluntary representative of the race. With some it is the love of God which, in the person of the Son, sympathised with the misery of human sin, and by the might and sorrow of self-sacrifice would win man's soul from evil. Now we must needs agree with both these, for the Scripture asserts both. But they are harmonised in another, and still deeper truth. These attributes, before they were displayed in the cross, were reconciled in God Himself, whose love provided the sacrifice which His justice demanded: both love and justice making the atonement an absolute necessity. If we hold any peculiarity here, it is perhaps that, while we firmly maintain this last truth, we give more full scope to the former two than most other advocates of the central doctrine permit themselves."

It will be observed that the doctrinal position here defined cannot be called peculiar to Methodism, except in the sense already indicated. Here, as elsewhere, the characteristic "note" is not the doctrine itself, but the unanimity with which it is maintained, and the prominence given to it in the general system of doctrine. If theories of

the atonement be broadly divided into those which assign the first place respectively to its objective and subjective nature, the Methodist Churches throughout the world maintain the former; not being, of course, alone in this, but prominent amongst those who do so.

The doctrine of the witness of the Spirit is undoubtedly among those generally considered as peculiar to Methodism; but here, again, it is not the doctrine, but the prominence given to it, that is characteristic.

"It is more important to justify the prominence which our theology gives to the witness of the Holy Spirit as the privilege of the believer. We give it that prominence because the Scripture gives it. Any unprejudiced reader, who opens the New Testament, and studies the descriptions of Christian experience, and marks the examples living there before his eyes, must come to the conclusion that all Christian people are supposed to be assured of their personal relation to God, knowing the things they freely receive. They are in the Lord, and they are conscious of it. So plain is this, that no Christian confession of faith has ever denied it; on the contrary, all make provision for it in some way or other. Methodist theology has no desire to appropriate this doctrine as its own in any sense."

As a doctrine it is, so to speak, latent in the theology of the Churches generally; but Methodist preaching has always given it emphatic expression. It has been a working doctrine in Methodism from the first, and has had much to do in forming the religious life of the people. The Wesleyan hymn-book and numberless biographies might be quoted in illustration of this.

The doctrine is further defined in relation to certain differences on the subject that exist within the Christian Church.

"There is a widespread theory of assurance which makes it dependent on priestly absolution, either with or without a new sacrament devised for the purpose. . . . Our doctrine does not depend on any sacrament or human absolving word; it is the direct witness of the Spirit, as alone having in His power the things of Christ—the supreme and only Confessor, the supreme and only Absolver. . . . Our peculiarities do not end here. We do not believe, as many around us do, that this assurance is ordinarily separated from the living conviction of a perfect faith: though faith is not itself assurance, the one follows so hard upon the other, that they are in the supreme blessedness of appropriating trust indistinguishable. 'Who loved me, and gave Himself for me,' is a solitary expression in St. Paul's writings concerning finished faith as to its object, exercise, and prerogative of assurance. We do not hold that the privilege of assurance is bestowed as a special blessing, vouchsafed to God's elect as the fruit of long discipline, and the Divine seal of long perseverance. In this our doctrine goes immeasurably beyond the teaching of some confessions of faith. But these same confessions go beyond us in another respect. When they teach assurance, it is an assurance

made too sure; it is all embracing and eternal, including past, present, and future in one transcendent confidence which nothing in the future, the present, or the past, can ever avail to disturb. Our doctrine of assurance makes it no more than the assurance *of faith*, for the time that now is; all that concerns the future belongs to assurance, indeed, but only the assurance *of hope*. Probation governs all our theology. We do not believe that God has taken man from under that original law of test in which he was originally created. Final perseverance is a grace, an ethical privilege, the result of probationary diligence under grace; but not an assured provision of the covenant of redemption."

The doctrine of Entire Sanctification does not receive as ample treatment as we could have wished, even in a sketch that is necessarily brief. Some practical cautions are suggested.

"We must be careful to learn from our enemies what those evils are in our teaching that fairly expose the doctrine to misconstruction. We must preach what we find in the Scripture on this subject, and as we find it there. There is no one point on which we ought to be more careful of that precise fidelity to the Word of God which is our safeguard. Where a tenet is disputed, let us adhere to Scriptural phraseology; then we are safe. And in this case the Bible is our strength. Let us not establish peculiarities beyond those which are forced upon us. Let us not erect the means of attainment, the instantaneousness or otherwise, the evidences which seal it, into doctrines of our faith. Suffice that we know that the body of sin is to be destroyed; that the perfected operation of the love of God within us may enkindle perfect love in return; and that the Word of God acknowledges a state of perfect holiness as the result. The most exact New-Testament exposition will defend us at all points; and we need not be afraid of any argument that may be brought against us. Entire sanctification from sin, perfect consecration to God, and Christian or evangelical perfection of holiness, are terms we need not be afraid boldly to maintain. The word 'perfect' is not one that any Christian would use of himself; but the term 'perfection' we need not shrink from, when protected by those two adjectives."

The peculiarities both of doctrine and Church order are, of course, stated from the Methodist point of view, but in no narrow spirit.

"Much as we value what we are constrained to call our peculiarities, we value our heritage in Christ and His kingdom upon earth infinitely more. We trace our doctrine to the holy Apostles, or, higher than that, to the Voice of eternal truth. Our traditions go up to the most sacred of all antiquity. Our specific teachings, and usages, and discipline, we believe to have been general in the days where alone authority in these matters reigns. At all points, and in all respects, we are one with the true Church of all ages. We hold communion in heart, and as occasion offers in act also, with all who

have kept the faith; nor do we close our communion against any whom the Lord accepts. Our theology reaps in almost all fields; and, such as it is, has been from the beginning under obligation to almost all schools. We freely use the practical and expository writings of other Churches for our edification. Perhaps no men set more value on their own type of doctrine than the ministers of Methodism; but I am sure that there are no men whose libraries generally are better supplied with representative authors of all classes. And, on the whole, it may be said that there is as much of the truly Catholic sentiment among this people as can be found anywhere in the Christian world."

Wuttke's Ethics.

Christian Ethics. By Dr. Adolf Wuttke, late Professor of Theology at Halle. Translated by John P. Lacroix. Vol. I., History. Vol. II., Pure Ethics. Edinburgh: Clark.

This work has been extensively read in Germany, and, in fact, has been long the most valued text-book on Christian Ethics. It was the great and only theological work of a divine who spent a life, only too short, in combating Rationalism. He died at Halle, in 1870, in his fifty-first year, after having taught theology in Berlin, and, before that, philosophy in Breslau. His system of ethics differs from those which preceded and have followed his. Rothe's vast work is philosophical and speculative, almost more than Christian: it does not base its labours on the Bible directly, but on the Christian consciousness, following the guidance in this of Schleiermacher. Hence it is not linked with any particular system of dogmatics, and therefore misses its mark. Doctrine and morals cannot for a moment be disjoined in a true Christian system. Harless is known to our readers by Clark's translation, and as much esteemed as known. His system is thoroughly evangelical, derived from Scripture, and wonderfully interweaves the dogmas and the ethics of the Christian faith. Wuttke is more distinctively Lutheran, and his plan is more thoroughly scientific; indeed, so scientific that it will never be popular in any school but that which Germany has trained. Its value is greatly increased by the elaborate history of the science of Ethics, whether outside of Christianity or as unfolded in Christian ages.

This history is contained in the first volume of the present translation; and no student will ever regret the trouble he may spend upon a careful mastery of it. Indeed, for the sake of that alone, he should place the work upon his shelves, and lodge it in his mind. As to the second volume, we rather demur. No student should make it a text-book, though it may be studied here and there to great advantage. Dr. Warren has given, in his manly Introduction, a good reason why the student should include it among his books, but none

why he should make it the basis of his ethical studies:—"The same thing may be said of systems of Christian ethics written from different confessional standpoints. Their value, too, is usually in proportion to their logical consistency. One of their most important uses is to throw light upon the necessary ethical consequences of their respective types of doctrine. In this respect the most strictly confessional are the most useful. In the interest of universal Christian theology, therefore, we greatly desiderate a thorough and active confessional cultivation of this field. The more clearly and constantly conscious of his distinctive doctrinal standpoint, the better service the author will render. Nothing is gained, much lost, by mixing up essentially Romish and essentially Protestant definitions. In like manner, Augustinian ethics are as eternally distinct from Pelagian as are the theological systems so named. If Methodist theology be true, no consistent Calvinist can ever write a system of ethics acceptable to a Methodist, and *vice versâ*. Romanism, Calvinism, Lutheranism and Methodism as much need distinctive treatises upon Ethics as upon Christian doctrine. Each has the same right to the one as to the other. Nor will they thus aggravate and prolong the dissensions and divisions of the universal Church; they will rather accelerate the coming of the day when each great branch of Christendom will have matured its distinctive thought and perfected its distinctive life, preparatory to a higher and grander synthesis. Even before that day comes, each type of ethical inculcation will have its essential and characteristic excellences, and so effectively supplement all other types."

It is only justice to Wuttke to set before the reader the fundamental principle of his treatment. And the extract is valuable for its own sake:—"Theological Christian ethics, as distinguished from philosophical ethics, have an historical presupposition—the redemption accomplished in Christ. But redemption presupposes sin, from the power of which it delivers man; and sin presupposes the moral idea *per se* of which it is the actual negation. Hence, the knowledge of Christian ethics, as resting on the accomplished redemption, presupposes a knowledge of the moral state of man while as yet unredeemed, as, in turn, this knowledge presupposes a knowledge of that ideal state of being from which man turned aside in sin. Christian ethics has, therefore, a threefold state of things to present: (1) The ethical, or moral *per se*, irrespectively of sin,—the moral in its ideal form, the proto-ethical, that which God, as holy, wills. (2) The *fall* from the truly moral, namely, *sin*, or the guilty perversion of the moral idea in the actual world,—that which man, as unholy, wills. (3) The moral in its *restoration* by redemption, that is, the regeneration of moral truth out of sinful corruption,—that which is willed by God as gracious, and by man as repentant.

"These three forms of the moral, or ethical, stand, in relation to humanity, not *beside*, but *before* and *after* each other, and constitute a

moral *history* of humanity. The first stage is *pre*-historical; the second is the substance of the history of humanity up to Christ; the third is the substance of that stream of history which proceeds from Christ, and is embodied in, and carried forward by, those who belong to Christ."

But, as we go on, we come to such a section as this. The uncouthness of the German has not been relieved in the translation, which generally retains a style of phraseology which will go far to hinder the usefulness of this work in England, whatever it may do in America:—"Man is a *willing*, a volitionating spirit; the goal of his life-movement is for him a conscious *end*. He is not impelled unconsciously and by extraneous force toward that to which he is to attain, but he knows the end, and himself directs himself toward it,—he *chooses* the known goal by virtue of a personal will-determination,—that is, in his willing he is free. The end of rational willing is the *good*, and, in so far as this is to be realised by freedom, the *morally-good*. That which in nature-objects takes place by necessity, becomes, in the sphere of the moral will, a '*should*;' that which in the former case is natural law, becomes here a moral precept; that which is there natural development, becomes here *moral life*. But the will of the created spirit differs from the prototypal will of God, by the fact that its development in time is not unconditioned, but is always conditioned on free self-determination, so that, consequently, there exists the possibility of another self-determination than that toward the true end,—that is, in a word, by the fact that man's freedom of will, as distinguished from the Divine (which is, at the same time, Eternal Necessity), is *freedom of choice—liberum arbitrium*. The finite spirit can, and should, attain to the good as the purpose of its life, but it can also—what it should not do—turn away from this good; and it attains to the good only when it freely *wills* to attain to it. Man, as created good, has this freedom in the highest degree, so that it is not limited or trammelled by any *tendency* to evil inherent in his natural non-perfectness, as, for example, by his sensuousness. It is incumbent upon ethics to describe and explain the development of the natural freedom of the, as yet, undetermined will, into the moral freedom of the holy will."

We need add no more to establish our position, that Wuttke's *Ethics* ought to be in the possession of every theologian, but to be used as a text-book by none.

Rigg's National Education.

National Education, in its Social Conditions and Aspects, and Public Elementary School Education, English and Foreign. By J. H. Rigg, D.D. Strahan and Co.

There is no man in England better entitled than Dr. Rigg to be heard on this question of national education. He has long and carefully studied it; he has written on it extensively, and with reference to every phase of legislation and controversy as it has arisen; and, moreover, he has been for some years practically interested in the question as the Principal of an important training college. This work is the ripe result of his studies. It meets an urgent need for some such general views of the entire question. For ourselves, we are most thankful for such a book; one which is very near perfection, so far as its object goes, and will be brought still nearer, we judge, when other editions are called for.

Having devoted many pages of our Journal to this question, we shall not make Dr. Rigg's volume the basis of any new discussion. Indeed, it would be scarcely decorous to do so, as many valuable passages in it have already enriched our columns. But we must glance at the contents, that our readers may know what to expect, and to justify our own earnest recommendation of this text-book to the student. Text-book we call it, for it is a manual adapted to the inquirer who feels it his duty to acquaint himself with the lights and shades, the plain principles and the intricate applications, the simplicity and the confusion, of the subject of national education; and every lover of his country, certainly every Christian minister, should feel this to be his duty. No question is, in some respects, more vital. Many are repelled from it by the perplexity in which discussion and dispute, and various prejudices, have involved it. If they read and re-read this volume, we venture to think that they will be perplexed no longer. They will be carried away by an earnest guide, talking to them in thoroughly good English, and, above all, thoroughly sound in his apprehension of the religious bearings of the question.

The first chapter well defines what education is, and what are the elements that work together in the promotion or in the retardation of national education. The writer takes the widest possible view of the subject; a view almost too wide, when we consider that the term education has a technical and conventional meaning that limits it. We must quote the following fine passage for our readers' sake.

"I have said in this chapter about the influences of Christian truth and teaching as one of the great factors of national education—as, in a true sense, by far the greatest factor of all. It will be remembered, however, that I have not left it out of account at the point

where the influence of Christian truth and training was evidently and especially needed. But I have a specific object in view, and there is no need that I should here attempt to argue what my readers, for the most part, will assume throughout, that the best inspiration, and by far the most commanding forces in the education of the modern world, have been derived from Christianity. It is more to my purpose to point out that Christianity cannot even be brought into contact with a large proportion of the people of England—is scarcely less aloof from them, and is shut away from them by a much more invincible barrier, than from the outlying heathen, so long as they remain surrounded by the hostile, anti-Christian, demoralising causes and conditions of things which determine at present their social position. I must repeat what I said at the beginning of this chapter. The home, the street, the workshop, the pit and factory, the stakes and prizes of life, cheap newspapers and periodicals, the laws and institutions of the country—these, and not schools and churches only, or even chiefly, form the effectual means and incentives of our national education; *these* train up men and women, the citizens and parents of our land. The school and pulpit have done much in the past, and will do more in the future. But the same principle which leads Christians to insist that the pulpit is not sufficient for national education, nor even the pulpit and the Sunday-school together, but that the daily school must be a place of Christian education, because it is the daily school, should lead Christians also to understand that the social and business sphere in which parents and children alike continually live, and which is, in a yet deeper, truer, more emphatic sense, their daily school, needs to be penetrated with Christian influences, if the people are to grow up Christian. How great are the multitudes who come very slightly and irregularly, if at all, within the range of Christian school-training; while still larger numbers never go near church or chapel, after, as children, they have been released from attendance as Sunday scholars. Christianity cannot get at the people it most wants to reach, except through the avenue of social philanthropy, and active equital aid. It is emphatically true to its Divine original when it proposes the way for spiritual influence by means of temporal aid and social sympathy and fellowship. Unless our national Christianity can prevail to reach those social habits and institutions, those civil or political conditions, and those moral influences which have combined to give form and character to the operative commonalty of England, its great work must be left, to a great extent, undone. If Jesus had been a Christ who never healed the sick, or ate with the publican, but merely preached self-denial and spiritual truth, rebuking and dining with the Pharisee, and taking sweet but separate counsel with his disciples, He would neither have suffered on the cross, nor have been the Saviour of the world. School education, then, is a great thing, and an absolutely needful thing; it must occupy its place as one of the

most potent among many co-ordinate and co-operative agencies for the elevation of the nation; it is second in importance to none, except home influence; it is the foundation on which all the work of elevating the pauperised classes must be built. But yet, single-handed, it cannot accomplish all, nor, indeed, very much. If condemned by a stagnant policy in matters of sanitary, social, and economical legislation to remain alone, it must be comparatively powerless and valueless. It cannot in reality be applied in a large proportion of cases; and if it were applied, its efficiency would be largely neutralised."

The following passage gives expression to a very important sentiment, which we commend to those who are at present led away by a popular fallacy: "I do not, indeed, expect that merely to open the way of the English peasant to real property in land, or to the easy, advantageous, and secure tenancy of a piece of land, on such conditions that he may expect to be able, in due time, to purchase and make it his own, would of itself effect a social transformation in England, nor have I any idea that the general subdivision of the land among a peasant-like proprietary would prove a boon to this country. As I have intimated, the very reverse is my conviction. A small proprietary will be thrifty and diligent, but too little educated, too prejudiced, and too poor, to carry forward great improvements, or to make the best of their land. For minute, painstaking husbandry, and for careful and saving personal habits, a peasantry proprietary are not to be equalled; but, as a rule, they must needs lack science, capital, and enterprise. In France the greater part of the land is subdivided among a peasant proprietary. The effect has been that this proprietary has become saving and diligent to a proverb, and that the land which they till is cultivated like a garden. In English farming there is far less economy of ground, and of what are called natural manures, than in France; but yet England yields twice as much produce from her land, on an average, as France. Science, capital, and manufacturing enterprise, applied to the soil on a large scale, have made the difference. It is notorious, moreover, that, as a rule, the wonderful advance of English agriculture is due as much to the energy, enlightenment, and wealth of the great landowners as even to the skill and enterprise of large farmers, and that small farmers and petty proprietors have equally lagged in the rear of modern improvements."

Dr. Rigg takes a survey of the educational systems of other lands. Obliged, of course, to depend very much on the observation and statistics of others, it is not impossible that some of his generalisations and statements may be imperfect. But, after a careful reading, we are bound to say—speaking, too, not without some experience—that no better view of the educational systems, with their advantages and defects, of the Continent can be found in the English language. We commend the chapter on "The Development of Popular Education

in England" and that on "The Religious Difficulty" to our readers, as containing some of the best writing we know on the subject. But, as our object is to recommend the reader to get the book and *study it*, we shall do no more now than enforce the advice we gave at the outset. No preacher should be ignorant, or loosely instructed, on this question; and, if he would avoid this, he must study some such books as this. It is the best in the English language on the subject. Not that it is perfect. The arrangement is without that analytical and artistic order which the subject admits. There ought to be summaries or résumés of results more frequently than we find them. Here and there we discern also a few traces of haste; not to be wondered at, considering the eagerness of the world in clamouring for the last on this question. We hope a second edition will soon give our respected Principal the opportunity of making his book all that his ideal aimed at and the times require.

Introduction to the Science of Religion. By F. Max Müller, M.A. London: Longmans, Green, and Co. 1873.

THERE is very little that is new in the volume that bears this magnificent and attractive title. The Royal Institution, *Fraser's Magazine*, and the *Contemporary Review* have already enabled Professor Max Müller to lay his views before the public. He urges the plea of necessity for using an authorised English edition of a work anticipated by the forwardness of Continental and American publishers. The book is indeed too slight and popular fully to justify its name, and shows many traces of its original form where they jar upon the reader, but it is, as its author's writings cannot fail to be, eminently interesting and suggestive. The bewildering copiousness of illustration which often runs away with, and sometimes completely crushes, the argument, is still not to be regretted, for Mr. Max Müller is generally better in his digressions than in the direct course of his theme. The lecturer opens with a congratulatory reference to the change in English and even European, thought that has come about since he delivered, in the place where he is now speaking, the famous Lectures on the Science of Language. He even ventures to anticipate at least as great a revolution from the spread of the new science he has now to advocate. "I feel certain," he says, "that the time will come when all that is now written on theology, whether from an ecclesiastical or philosophical point of view, will seem as antiquated, as strange, as unaccountable as the works of Vossius, Hemsterhuys, Valckenaer and Lennep, by the side of Bopp's *Comparative Grammar*." The startling assurance of such words from an amateur and inexperienced theologian is somewhat mitigated by the distinction which he has drawn between Comparative and Theoretic Theology. He is speaking, it appears, of the former only, "which has to deal with the historical forms of religion;" the latter—"which has to explain the conditions under which religion, whether in its highest or lowest forms, is possible"—is put on one side. The only concern which the scientific student of religion has with it, is to show that the problems which chiefly occupy theoretic theology ought not to be taken up until the comparative study of the historical religions of the world has finished its inquiries and formulated its results. Mr. Max Müller recognises no other branch of theology than these two. One is completely at a loss to conjecture to which division he would assign the bulk of those writings which have hitherto passed for theological. Throughout these lectures there is a perpetual incongruity between frequent promises to maintain a purely scientific impartiality amid a reverent discussion of religious phenomena, and as frequent betrayal of theological preferences, hasty adoption of controverted theories, and contempt for opponents who are evidently little understood. We heartily believe, however, that the former element in the discord,

comes from the Professor's calm judgment of what is fitting, the latter from the Lecturer's inability to preserve his calmness.

Mr. Max Müller maintains, justly enough, that it is only in our own time that anything like a thorough study of the religions of the world, considered simply as historical facts, has been possible. It is only of late that the sacred books of India and China have become known to us, or the meagre faith of savage tribes been thought worthy of investigation. We have learnt the use and value of comparative inquiry, and above all we have acquired in the science of language at once a new instrument, and a new witness, without which it would be hopeless to undertake the study. He acknowledges, too, that Christianity, in its reverence for Judaism, in its early controversy with Pagan beliefs, and, more recently, in its wide-spread missionary experience, has given an unconscious, but inestimable training in comparative theology. He overrates, however, we are sure, the dislike of modern orthodox Christians for the science he offers to introduce us to. Certainly, there are many who would be shocked by the book before us, and probably far worse by other writers; but we believe that by far the greater part of the ablest and most influential living Christian thinkers will gladly welcome fresh light on the relations of human nature and human history to God and to the larger world that surrounds our earth. And they will not object, either, to their own most cherished faith being set on a simple equality with the beliefs of other men before the view of a science, which asks not after the truth but only the historic existence of the various religions of mankind. They will reserve their protest for those departures from the scientific spirit which mar even Mr. Max Müller's writings with passing sarcasm on beliefs he does not hold and parenthetical decision of ancient and intricate controversies.

A considerable part of these lectures is taken up in reviewing the different theories as to the origin and proper classification of the multiform religions of men. The commonest view, as the professor ungroundedly thinks, is that all religions but one are a mass of unrelieved falsehood explicable only as corruptions of one primitive body of truth. Such may be the opinion of the most ignorant Mahometans or even Christians, but scarcely any one duly informed as to facts seriously maintains such a position. The prominence here given to it is only one of many signs how imperfectly Mr. Max Müller comprehends the attitude of modern theology towards his favourite studies. We cannot see either why he should be contemptuous towards any theological theory of degradation, when he himself holds that, in process of time, the simple faith of the early world became so grossly materialised through that "disease of language" which we call mythology. It is curious that one who professes to account for degeneration, should be so indignant at men who believe the fact but do not attempt to explain it.

Everyone familiar with the writings of the Oxford Professor

of Comparative Philology anticipates from the beginning the conclusion to which, at the end of the third lecture, we are brought as to the true basis of classification. Aryan, Semitic, Turanian, the well-known divisions of language, furnish the only scientific guide in the reduction to order of the vast chaos of material which bewilders the beginner. In the old pleasant diffuse style, with easy mastery of endless linguistic knowledge, we are shown that all the Aryan peoples had substantially the same ancient names for their objects of worship. In like manner Phœnician and Hebrew, Moabite and Arab, all united in reverence of El, Baal, and other divine names expressive of moral or spiritual qualities, and were thus preserved in great measure from the mythological corruption that befell the Aryan worshippers of bright beings in the sky. So, too, Chinese, Tartar, and Finn, addressed the great Father in heaven by common titles; and without doubt these three groups of nations had primitive religions, like their languages, common to all the scattered members of each group, distinct from those of the other families.

Such is the main conclusion of the book, which cannot claim to have gone more than a very little way indeed towards solving the vast problem it discusses. At the best this applies only to the remote prehistoric past. If it be true, that these religions followed without crossing the dividing lines of nationality, it has long ceased to be so. Aryan, Turanian Europe holds a faith of Semitic origin. Another Semitic creed has propagated itself by conquest and conversion far into the Aryan territory, and among the unclassified tribes of Africa; while the most powerful Aryan religion, Buddhism, wins its followers mainly from Turanian races.

Even in itself, however, Mr. Max Müller's theory is not logically established. Unity of language does not necessarily prove unity of nationality, especially among the Semitic tongues; it is full of difficulty to assume that Hebrews and Phœnicians, for instance, were of the same race. On the other hand, it is quite possible that where nations speaking the same language believe also the same religion, this may be due rather to their descent from common ancestors than to any origin of the religion in the language.

Besides, the three groups of religions are not distinct enough. The belief of the Chinaman and of the Hindoo have far more resemblance than their language. Certain ideas are found in all religions. There are no words found in all languages. A common influence, the same through countless modifications at different epochs and places, is required to explain this deep-lying similarity amid such diversity of detail. A tendency working in three and only three distinct lines accounts neither for the likeness nor the variety of the phenomena.

The Old Faith and the New. A Confession. By David Friedrich Strauss. Authorised Translation from the Sixth Edition. By Mathilde Blind. London: Asher and Co. 1873.

In our January number we reviewed this volume at considerable length. It had not then appeared in an English form, but, as it now comes before us in an authorised translation, we take the opportunity of briefly referring to it again. Although a work of remarkable interest, it is not likely to rank permanently amongst the "volumes paramount" of the literature of scepticism. It has sent no such shock through the circle of European thought as has been produced from time to time by books that might be mentioned; it inaugurates no fresh era of attack and defence, nor does it give a new turn to existing controversies. We do not disparage the author in saying that nothing can well be expected from him that has not been anticipated either by himself or by others. His career as a critic and theologian extends over forty years, and he now adopts the language of one about to retire from the arena. In that arena his achievements have been those of a protagonist of religious unbelief; but his range is known, his strength and weakness have been fairly measured, and it is more than certain that it is not by his hand Christianity will die. But the *Confession* in which he sums up the results of a life's labours has a certain pathetic interest from its subjective and personal character. A man's philosophising may be ever so dreary, but his autobiography seldom fails to be interesting. Let us feel that he is really portraying himself, whether consciously or unconsciously—laying open to us his heart and brain with the images that filled them—and, whether it be Augustine or Rousseau that speaks, whether love, or pity, or contempt be stirred in us, we cannot be indifferent to what we hear. Even if he does not describe the growth and formation of his opinions, giving us an insight into the mental processes by which they were arrived at, we are interested in his conclusions, for his sake if not for their own, knowing that nothing is more profoundly important to a man than the resting-place for faith which he succeeds in finding. With this natural and human interest we read Strauss's *Confession of Faith*. He has travelled a long way to come at his conclusions respecting the foundation questions of religion and philosophy, and he now announces them, not without the sense, as he himself expresses it, of "giving an account of his stewardship." The world is already aware what these conclusions are. His line of advance has been, not "from faith to faith," but from unbelief to unbelief. One after another the objects of faith and worship have disappeared from his horizon, until it is clear all the way round. Not a cloud suggestive of another world now rests upon it. God is clean gone, and death, instead of being "swallowed up in victory," itself victo-

riously swallows up all things. Like the Christ in Richter's vision, he sees the empty, black, bottomless *Eye-socket*, instead of the Divine Eye; but the loss is announced with scientific calmness, unlike that other, who 'answered with streaming tears, We are all orphans, I and you: we are without a Father.'"

It will be remembered, that in the first part of his volume he asks the question, "Are we still Christians?" The answer is soon found. After briefly traversing the doctrines of the Trinity, the Incarnation, the Atonement, and the Resurrection, and finding them all impossible, he says, "And now methinks we have reached the end. And the result? Our answer to the question with which we have headed this section of our account? Shall I still give a distinct statement, and place the sum-total of the foregoing in round numbers under the account? Most unnecessary, I should say; but I would not, on any consideration, appear to shirk even the most unpalatable word. My conviction, therefore, is—if we would not evade difficulties or put forced constructions upon them—if we would have our yea, yea, and our nay, nay—in short, if we would speak as honest, upright men—we must acknowledge we are no longer Christians." This acknowledgment made, a second question is propounded. "We might still be religious, even if we were so no longer in the form of Christianity. We therefore put our second question thus: 'Have we still a religion?'" From the nature of the case Strauss cannot satisfy himself quite so readily here. He has now to deal with the religious instinct in man, with the intuitions of the race, with principles and phenomena extremely difficult to subdue to his hypothesis. The origin and development of religion in humanity must be accounted for; and here he has little that is new to tell us. Following Hume's definition, Dr. Strauss ascribes the genesis of religion to man's fear and desire. These, the former more particularly, deified the forces of nature, and, having created his gods, furnished the motives of worship. The hazard and insecurity in mortal life, and the circumstances affecting man's welfare that lie beyond his control, lead him "to postulate powers akin to his own nature, accessible to his wishes and prayers." Thus does man create gods "in his own image and likeness." But, by-and-by, with accumulated knowledge and closer observation, he perceives the regularity of natural phenomena, and, becoming self-possessed before the heavens at which he once trembled, learns to re-adjust both thoughts and language, and gives up the conception of God for that of a "Primal Substance immanent in the Universe." Taking courage to look behind the veil, he finds there is nothing there after all. "Some natural tears," perhaps, may be allowed:—

> "The lonely mountains o'er,
> And the resounding shore,
> A voice of weeping heard, and loud lament."

But the future, though it lack something that sustained the past, will more than repay us with its larger "Cosmic Conception."

That "Cosmic Conception" is the subject of Part III. of the *Confession*. We shall not describe at length the Conception of the Universe which, according to Dr. Strauss, makes it quite impossible to believe in God and the immortality of the soul. The reader will perhaps know what to expect here. But he will be struck with the remarkable eagerness with which the author hails Darwin as the world's deliverer from superstition. He becomes almost lyrical in his rapture of welcome, and sings a sort of *Nunc dimittis* after greeting him. That Strauss ascribes to Darwin what the latter would disavow is more than probable, for, as Wilkes was by no means a Wilkesite, so it may be that Darwin is not such a Darwinian as some of his followers. We recall the closing sentence of the *Origin of Species*:—"There is grandeur in this view of life, with its several powers, having been originally breathed by the Creator into a few forms, or into one," &c.; and cherish the hope, that to Dr. Darwin himself the eulogy of his distinguished admirer is wholly distasteful. "Vainly did we philosophers and critical theologians over and over again decree the extermination of miracles; our ineffectual sentence died away, because we could neither dispense with miraculous agency, nor point to any natural force able to supply it, where it had hitherto seemed most indispensable. Darwin has demonstrated this force, this process of Nature; *he has opened the door by which a happier coming race will cast out miracles, never to return.* Every one who knows what miracles imply will praise him, in consequence, as one of the greatest benefactors of the human race."

There are many of the straitly orthodox who will find their estimate of Darwinism curiously confirmed by an ally so unexpected as Dr. Strauss. The latter says—"Do they realise that the choice only lies between the miracle—the Divine Artificer—and Darwin?" This is just the alternative, for the framing of which the slow-moving believers in revelation have been reproached with narrowness, bigotry, and superstition. It may be a fair question, how far both he and they are correct in their inferences; but it is worthy of remark, that the boldest and the timidest of those who have studied the Darwinian theory agree in the consequences they deduce from it.

We may now pass on to those constructive suggestions which, in the end, this most destructive philosopher feels himself free to offer. Not that he admits any responsibility in this direction—"For I have already pointed out that it never lay in my intention to construct anything external at present, simply because I do not judge the time for such action to have arrived." This is rather dreary for us of the transition-period, compelled to see crow-bar and lever bringing down the dwelling-place of the *Old Faith*, and then to be told that the time is not come to build the temple of the *New*. But there is a certain human kindliness in Dr. Strauss, in virtue of which he goes

beyond the letter of his obligations, and discusses for awhile the question—"What are we to do now that a Personal God, a future life, and Divine worship are abolished?" He admits that this will be asked, and the coldest philosophy cannot quite ignore what is, after all, a reasonable demand. Something between an apology and an explanation is due to those who have been dispossessed of beliefs that were not without dignity and spiritual elevation, and habits of inner life that gave undeniable strength to character. What is to compensate man for having nothing left to worship? And let us say here that Strauss is much more thoroughgoing and consistent than those who in our own country are playing with the edge-tools of Rationalism. He does not for a moment sanction that compromise between scientific truth and spiritual instinct recommended by the advanced thinkers who occupy certain English pulpits:—"Pray by all means, for it will do you good, although you know prayer cannot be answered." Upon this Strauss remarks with perfect truth:—"If I entreat, for example, the preservation of a life precious to me, while, nevertheless, I clearly perceive that my prayer cannot produce the smallest objective result—that, supposing even the subject of it to recover, my supplication has had no more influence on the course of the malady than the lifting of my finger on the course of the moon,—if with this conviction, and in spite of it, I still go on praying, I am playing a game with myself, excusable indeed, in view of its momentary effect, but neither consistent with dignity nor devoid of danger."

If, then, prayer be renounced in this logical and thoroughgoing manner, as it should be if renounced at all, something must surely be done for the former worshipper. He has gained, let us say, in accurate estimation of the conditions of the universe, but his heart, his imagination, his instincts of worship, have undoubtedly lost something. To our mind it is very significant that the most sceptical teachers become a little uneasy at their own success when just on the point of emancipating man from his belief in God. Comte, in his later life, endeavoured to elaborate a kind of ritual for his followers, and, sooner than worship nothing, would have them worship that "immense, eternal Being, Humanity." Strauss confesses that the *New Faith* demands from its believers considerable sacrifice. "In mitigation of the pain which the qualms of conscience prepare for us, Christianity offers the Atonement; it opens the sheltering arms of a belief in Providence to the timorous feeling of abandonment to the rude chances of this world; while at the same time illuminating the dimness of this terrestrial night by the prospect of an immortal life in heaven. We have seen that the sum-total of these consolations must irretrievably vanish on our standpoint, and this must be perceived by everyone who has placed himself on it, though but with one foot." There is something affecting to our mind in this calm statement of losses to be incurred in breaking away from Christianity. Plainly

the author has felt what he describes:—"The loss of the belief in Providence belongs, indeed, to the most sensible deprivations which are connected with a renunciation of Christianity. . . . This sense of abandonment is at first something awful." Will the *New Faith* yield the materials of faith and worship? Can it give a man "songs in the house of his pilgrimage?" Not as yet, it appears. Dr. Strauss is very frank:—"I have attended several services of the Free Congregation in Berlin, and found them terribly dry and unedifying. I quite thirsted for an allusion to the Biblical legend, or the Christian calendar, in order to get at least something for the heart and imagination, but nothing of the kind was forthcoming. No; this is not the way either." To the question, "What have we on our side to offer him instead?" Dr. Strauss's reply is, "After all the foregoing, should he not be able to answer this question for himself? In place of the Christian belief in immortality, let him revive within himself the eternal ideas of the Cosmos, of the progress and the destinies of mankind; let him, within his own heart, render the dead he loved and worshipped immortal in the truest sense; let him become conscious that he himself is only called to participate in these things for a span of time, and prevail upon himself finally to depart this life in gratitude for all that it was given him for a time to perform, enjoy, and suffer, with others, yet, nevertheless, glad also to be freed from the toil of the long day's work that must at last exhaust."

This is new lamps for old ones, with a vengeance. Still, if it be any help to the neophyte, standing disconsolate on the threshold of this new household of faith, to know how the author and his friends make up to themselves for what they have renounced, he is welcome. "We would but indicate how we act, how we have acted these many years. . . . We are eagerly accessible to all the higher interests of humanity; we have taken a vivid interest in the great national war and the reconstruction of the German State; we study history; we endeavour to enlarge our knowledge of the natural sciences; and, lastly, in the writings of our great poets, in the performances of our great musicians, we find a stimulus for the intellect and heart, for wit and imagination, which leaves nothing to be desired. Thus we live, and hold on our way in joy."

We have scarcely the heart to add another word. Christianity renounced for *this!* In place of its great doctrines of redemption and eternal life, a "cosmical conception;" instead of its merciful resources of prayer and praise, the employment of crushing within oneself hopes that cannot be realised; and for the communion of saints, the stimulus of Sunday *soirées*, where "Shakespeare, taste, and the musical glasses," are at once a recreation and a worship for the highly educated ladies and gentlemen who have learnt to say "No" to the two questions, "Are we still Christians?" and "Have we yet a religion?"

Some Elements of Religion. Lent Lectures, 1870. By H. P. Liddon, D.D., Canon of St. Paul's. Rivingtons. 1872.

Dr. Liddon deals, in his six lectures, with the following subjects: —The Idea of Religion; God, the Object of Religion; the Soul, the Subject of Religion; Sin, the Obstacle to Religion; Prayer, the Characteristic Action of Religion; The Mediator, the Guarantee of Religious Life; and in each he deals not with the thrice-slain adversaries of centuries ago, but with the living assailants of Christian truth. And if those living assailants be often but old adversaries revived in new forms, with the new form he deals; and deals in such a way, as to show he has sufficient sympathy with the error he combats to find out the truth that underlies it. Hence his treatment of such questions as the phases of modern Pantheism and Materialism in the second lecture, the nature of sin in the fourth, and the efficacy of prayer in the fifth, will affect for good many who would never open a polemical treatise which merely undertook from without to expose (say) the moral contradictions of Pantheism, or to demonstrate the abstract possibility of God's being a hearer and answerer of prayer.

His definition of religion in the first lecture, partly negative, showing what it is not, partly positive, as "consisting fundamentally in the practical recognition of a constraining bond between the inward life of man and an unseen person" (p. 16), contains nothing particularly striking or calling for comment here, unless it be for the passage in which, condemning the tendency to resolve religion into feeling, he says:—

"Such in England is, or has been at times, the practical instinct, if not the decision of Wesleyanism and kindred systems. Feeling, not knowledge; feeling, not morality; feeling, not even conscience, is the test of acceptance, that is to say, of satisfactory religion. Acceptance is warranted by the sense of acceptance; religious progress is measured by the sense of enjoying more and more the raptures of religious life."—P. 9.

Accepting his modified terms, "is, or has been at times," "practical instinct, if not decision," "Wesleyanism" may perhaps with profit take the lesson, remembering at the same time how important a part of religion are the "love, joy, peace," which, as fruits of the Spirit, precede "meekness, temperance, &c.," and that there is no religion at all in that semi-sensuous gratification of æsthetic tastes, which, because connected with the externals of duly regulated services, is by so many, nowadays, made to do duty for the "practical recognition of a constraining bond," on which the lecturer so well insists.

Perhaps the most satisfactory lecture, most successful in dealing with a great subject in a small space, is the second, where the importance of having a true idea of God and the contrast of the

truth with the most plausible prevailing heresies is shown in a manner that will help to clear away the inconsistent errors many have caught up, they know not where, and adopted, they know not how. Take as an example of the light cast on a difficult subject, in few words, the following on miracle :—

"Miracle is an innovation upon physical law; or, at least, a suspension of some lower physical law by the intervention of a higher one—in the interests of moral law. The historical fact that Jesus Christ rose from the dead, identifies the Lord of physical life and death with the Legislator of the Sermon on the Mount. Miracle is the certificate of identity between the Lord of nature and the Lord of conscience—the proof that He is really a moral Being who subordinates physical to moral interests. Miracle is the meeting-point between intellect and the moral sense, because it announces the answer to the efforts and yearnings alike of the moral sense and the intellect,—because it announces revelation."—Pp. 74, 75.

Most important, too, to many minds just now, is the subject of Dr. Liddon's fifth lecture—Prayer. He knows where the difficulty lies, and while doing justice to the subjective blessings of prayer, of prayer as an activity, a putting the whole nature in motion, understanding, affections, and will, he knows that the stress of the difficulty is elsewhere. Is prayer answered?

"We cannot practise any intricate trickery upon ourselves with a view to our moral edification. We cannot pray if we believe in our hearts that in prayer we are only holding communion with an ideal world of our own creation. . . . We cannot fall into the ranks of the Christian Church, lifting up the holy hands of sacrifice and intercession on all the mountains of the world, if in our hearts we see in her only a new company of Baal-worshippers gathering upon the slopes of some modern Carmel, and vainly endeavouring to rouse her idol into an impossible animation; while the Elijahs of materialistic science stand by to mock her fruitless efforts with the playful scorn of that tranquil irony to which their higher knowledge presumably entitles them."—Pp. 182, 183.

And the objections now chiefly urged as barriers against the efficacy of prayer—the scientific idea of law, the predestinating will of God, a false idea of the Divine dignity, an inadequate conception of the interests of human beings as a whole—are well stated, and fairly met. The first is no doubt the most important at the present time; and with Canon Liddon's protest we may well compare the kindred teaching of Dr. Carpenter, in his address to the British Association. "What do we mean by law?" asks the theologian (p. 188), and "What do we mean by law?" asks, too, the man of science; and it is cheering to the theologian to hear such words as these from a scientific chair :—"To set up these 'laws' as self-acting, excluding or rendering unnecessary the power which gives them effect, is arrogant and unphilosophical. Law only 'governs' phenomena as

the *modus operandi* of a governing power." And that power a personal will, and the will of One who has promised to listen to the prayers of His toiling and suffering children when offered in the spirit of His Son, as He answered the prayer of that Son, "as may be most expedient for them." All who are reading such articles and letters as have lately abounded on the question of prayer, will do well to read this lecture.

The subject of the last lecture—The Mediator, the Guarantee of Religious Life—reminds us how many subjects there are we could wish to see dealt with in a similar way—Inspiration, Atonement, and others among the "Elements" of Christianity, yet needing now to be re-taught, re-inforced in such a style as will reach those who hastily catch up objections, but not so hastily catch up answers. The style of these lectures is, like that of Dr. Liddon's former volumes, at the same time clear and flowing; the language chosen with sufficient care to give the effect of lucid exposition, yet the attempt lucidly to expound not interfering with the emotional power with which he carries his readers (or hearers) with him. We trust that this volume will be read as widely as the reputation of its author and its intrinsic merits deserve.

The Gospels according to Matthew and Mark. Revised Translation. By Robert Young, LL.D. Edinburgh: George Adam Young. 1873.

Dr. Young is announced on his title page as the "author of numerous Biblical and Oriental works." He has published a new translation of the entire Bible, and is now issuing his version of the New Testament, in parts, two of which are before us. The Authorised Version and Dr. Young's are printed in parallel columns, an arrangement that would be useful to the reader if Dr. Young's version were of the slightest value. We cannot see, however, that this is the case, as he appears to be destitute of every qualification that a translator should possess. His aim, so far as it can be gathered, is a minute and rigid literalness of rendering. This is pursued without the slightest discretion, and with a total disregard of the requirements of idiom; while in the end, the object for which everything besides is sacrificed is not secured. A translator must be loyal at the same time to the language of his author and to his own language. He may not favour the one at the expense of the other. Bad, unintelligible English can never represent good Greek, and as a rule those little accuracies of rendering which come out harshly and horribly in a translation turn out to be no accuracies at all. It is the Nemesis of translation, that a cramped literalness, untempered by discretion, defeats itself. For instance, Dr. Young tries to give the force of the imperfect tenses by a free use of participial forms, with such results as this: "And having gone forth, they were proclaiming that men

might have a new mind, and were casting forth many demons, and were anointing with oil many infirm, and were healing them" (Mark vi. 12). "And He charged them thoroughly, that they might tell no one, but as much as He was charging them thoroughly, the more abundantly they were proclaiming it" (Mark vii. 36). "Now, at every feast he was releasing to them one prisoner, whomsoever they were asking" (Mark xv. 6). In each of these instances the translation is positively misleading, as the reader may see for himself. Dr. Young deals with subjunctive moods in the same way that he does with imperfect tenses, rendering them by favourite formulas, not only unidiomatic, but, as often as not, tending to obscure the meaning. "And He said to them, Whenever ye may enter into a house, there remain till ye may go forth thence" (Mark vii. 10). Does Dr. Young suppose that he has really brought out the meaning of the subjunctives here better than the Authorised Version does, and can he not see that, in addition to making an uncouth sentence of it, he has really made the latter clause ambiguous? Under no circumstances will Dr. Young consent to render a participle of an ordinary historical tense as the English idiom requires, and in consequence we have expressions like the following: "Now they going away to buy, the bridegroom came" (Matt. xxv. 10). "And having been afraid, having gone away, I hid thy talent in the earth" (Matt. xxv. 25).

The lexical peculiarities of this version are about on a par with the grammatical. The word "messenger" is used throughout instead of "angel," as for instance, "the messenger Gabriel," "the reapers are the messengers," "twelve legions of messengers." Turning, however, to Matt. xviii. 10, we found an outrageously bold rendering in place of the usual cautious literalness, "their *disembodied spirits* do always behold the face of My Father." In place of "If thy hand offend thee," we have, "If thy hand stumble thee;" for the word "penny" we have "denary," which is neither Greek nor English, and for "pieces of silver" Dr. Young gives us "silverlings." We notice a curious instance of increased etymological rigour as his labours advance. In Matt. xxii. 23, we have, "the Sadducees, that are saying there is not to be resurrection;" but in the parallel passage, Mark xii. 18, it is, "And the Sadducees came unto Him, that say, there is to be no *uprising*." Still worse, if possible, is Mark xv. 20, where instead of, "When they had mocked Him," Dr. Young is not ashamed to put, "And when they had *treated him as a child*." Of course this points to the etymology of ἐνέπαιξαν, but the rendering is as much opposed to common-sense as to the actual use of the word. But for utter absurdity, the revised version of Mark iv. 38 goes beyond all: "He Himself was upon the stern, sleeping upon the *forecastle!*" We leave it with Dr. Young to look again at the meaning of προσκεφάλαιον, and also to explain how being in the *stern* of a vessel, one could sleep on the *forecastle*.

Present Issues; or, Facts Observable in the Consciousness of the Age. By Robert Withers Memminger, Protestant Episcopal Church, Diocese of South Carolina, U.S., Author of "What is Religion?" London: Hodder and Stoughton. Philadelphia: Claxton, Remsen and Haffelfinger. 1873.

The object of this volume is "to expose certain errors, which, like so many noxious influences, are at work within society, poisoning, corrupting, distracting, and dissolving it." In this work of exposition the errors are to be traced to their sources, even to "the parent error or principle from which the subordinate error naturally issues." "These primal, fundamental, false principles," our author proposes to exhibit, expose, and subvert; and that "both negatively and affirmatively; negatively, by showing how and wherein they are false; affirmatively, by substituting in their place what is positively the truth." This is a benevolent, if a presumptuous aim. In the exposition of evil, one half of the task undertaken, the author chiefly displays his skill. But the picture is certainly drawn in sufficiently deep shadow. The world is hurrying on towards evils which are truly appalling, and which Churches, philosophies, and governments are unable to avert. "Everything that has in it the element of the human, must soon find within itself the seeds of decay. The human brings with it the evil. Things, institutions which were good originally, gradually become corrupt, and finally absolutely rotten. They must, therefore, be overturned, and the good freed again must take a new form." "Abuses cluster around everything that is good in this world. The Christian Church, at its beginning, was an excellent institution; but what did it finally become? The most absolute, grinding, tyrannical despotism that has ever been invented. Holding the consciences of men in its grasp, it had them absolutely in its power, and in its day has verily ruled the world with a rod of iron. All human institutions become corrupt—a very den for evil spirits to dwell in." Happily the gloomy outlook is partially relieved. "Perhaps the end is not yet; or perhaps we have before us the prelude of the second coming of the Son of Man. And even though it be not His final advent, still He must come. The good must be set free; the kingdom of heaven must in the end emerge victorious. Perhaps soon a new era is to begin, and we are but in the throes of its parturition." We are not without hope for the world, though the tones of this wail of deepening sadness are sounding in our ears; and we must give our author credit for directing our attention to some available sources of help. Much of the writing in these six chapters on the Church, Sacerdotalism, the Christian Cultus, the Pulpit, Universalism, and Civilisation, is immature and uninformed, diffuse, full of repetitions, and wanting in exactness and accuracy. There is,

too, a leaven of dogmatism beneath a philosophical cast of expression. These are faults not wholly redeemed by the strong current of earnest thought which runs through the book, or by the evidently sincere desire to expose powerful but subtle evils that mar the blessedness of the human race.

The Life of Temptation. A Course of Lectures delivered in Substance at St. Peter's, Eaton-square, in Lent, 1872; also at All Saints', Margaret-street, in Lent, 1869. By the Rev. George Body, B.A., Rector of Kirby Misperton, Yorkshire. Rivingtons: London, Oxford, and Cambridge. 1873.

THIS is another volume of simple, earnest, soul-stirring words, dealing with the mysteries of Christian experience, such as would suit the lips of the most fervent Methodist preacher of present or past days. E.g. "There are days of revival through the outpouring of the Holy Ghost. On every hand we hear of many conversions to Christ. Those who were 'dead in trespasses and sins' are being made 'alive unto God, through Jesus Christ.' This moving of men, under the power of the Holy Ghost, is not confined to any one class in our land. The ignorant are rescued from darkness, the degraded are raised from the mire. The man of action, wearied with the restlessness of time, is attracted by the repose of Jesus. The lovers of refinement and of beauty, an ever-increasing multitude in days of a high civilisation, are attracted to the altogether Lovely One. Thanks be to God, day by day many are being led to His feet in penitence, and made to rejoice in His pardon and His peace. The number, therefore, of those who live to God is ever increasing; and so there are many 'babes in Christ,' to whom it will be, through God's blessing, a real help to consider some of the features of that wilderness way through which they must pass to the Canaan of God."

If there be no great depth of thought in the volume, there is one pure and practical aim; and if we detect references to sacramental efficacy, and perhaps other insidious errors, the marvel to us is how they can consist with the great spiritual attainments which are manifest, and side by side with which they seem to us almost as innocuous as they are unnecessary. Mr. Body is a representative of a number of earnest Christian clergymen, whose efforts to awaken the slumbering conscience, and lead men from sin to righteousness, we approve as heartily as we condemn some of their views of doctrine and ritual.

The Light of All Ages. By the Rev. Gavin Carlyle, M.A. London: Strahan and Co. 1873.

ANOTHER study of that great Life on which theology is more and more concentrating its regard. The writer sees that there is peril alike in

a one-sided contemplation of Christ's Divinity, and in the exclusive study of His Humanity. At present the danger lies rather in the latter direction, for our very estimate of the human character of Jesus must depend upon our first deciding the question whether He was the Son of God or not. He endeavours, therefore, throughout to contemplate our Lord in His Divine-human Person, the only true method, we are persuaded, of rightly approaching the great subject. A further aim is "to work out an idea presented to us constantly in Scripture, and of great importance to the strengthening of faith, viz., the relation of Christ to the history of all ages and nations. The few years of His life on earth are not to be viewed apart from His relation to all ages." We cannot say that there is any thing very fresh or original in the way the idea is worked out, but the tone and spirit of the volume are admirable, and its arguments based on a reverent study of the Scriptures.

The Perfect Man; *or, Jesus an Example of Godly Life.*
Life in the World; being a Selection from Sermons Preached at St. Luke's, Berwick-street. By the Rev. Henry Jones, M.A., Incumbent of St. Luke's, Berwick-street, Soho. Second Edition. Rivingtons: London, Oxford, and Cambridge. 1878.

We should gladly welcome anything that promised to help us to understand that life which passeth all understanding. This compact little volume, the former of the two named, confines itself to that which is easy to be understood, the human life of Jesus, which the common human eye can see. Within its own self-appointed limits this is a very satisfactory performance. There is much tender yet manly and thoughtful writing; and there is also a delicate and sustained beauty in the reverent delineation of a sacred subject. It is a purely practical treatise; and the more recondite questions relating to the person of Christ are studiously kept out of view. The work is likely to be as useful as it is beautiful. It should not be forgotten, however, that there are many important practical lessons which cannot be learnt in the absence of a right apprehension of the Divine nature of Christ.

The second volume has neither the coherence nor the completeness of the first; but it is full of good and wise counsels on common Christian duties, and faithful condemnation of common sins. The language is both simple and forcible, and well clothes the vigorous and useful thoughts with which the volume abounds. The proper conduct of life presented in such a light, and divested of philosophical speculations concerning origin, method, and end, seems a very simple matter, and quite within the reach of possible accomplishment.

Sermons Preached in Manchester. By Alexander Maclaren. Third Series. London: Macmillan and Co. 1873.

Mr. Maclaren ranks deservedly amongst the very best preachers of the day, and this new volume of sermons is in every way worthy of his reputation. He is a strong and manly thinker; an admirable expositor of Scripture; and possesses a powerful imagination, disciplined by sober sense.

Few living preachers have greater power in handling the legitimate weapons of the pulpit. He is fair in argument, accurate in analysis, and ardent and eager in appeal. The intellectual strength of Mr. Maclaren's sermons is equalled, if not surpassed, by their spiritual force. We have read them with pleasure, and recommend them with confidence.

Pulpit Notes. With an Introductory Essay on the Preaching of Jesus Christ. By Joseph Parker, D.D. London: Strahan and Co. 1873.

A preacher who publishes pulpit notes does more to invite criticism than if he published sermons proper. His thoughts, being set before the reader in compressed form, may be more readily weighed and measured than if they had to be sought through the length and breadth of the ordinary sermon. Dr. Parker is unmistakably clever and ingenious—any one can see as much from the evidence of these *Pulpit Notes* alone—but we cannot say much beyond that. He carries a good deal to his texts, if he does not get much out of them; and whether his subjects be "Birds'-nests" or "Battlements," "Ehud the left-handed," or "Shamgar and the ox-goad," he is never at a loss. It is difficult to avoid the impression that his style is spoiled by a continual straining after effect. We may be wrong in this; but we hope that Dr. Parker will not found a school of preaching. His style is a tempting one to copy, but would become intolerable in the hands of imitators.

A Compendium of Evangelical Theology, given in the Words of Holy Scripture. By Rev. William Passmore. London: Longmans. 1873.

The author of this work began with the intention of making it a *Companion* to Dr. Hodge's *Outlines of Theology*. It grew, however, in his hand to large dimensions, and is a very full and carefully arranged manual of Christian doctrine, given in the words of Scripture. It would be a mistake to suppose that doctrinal preference cannot be detected in a work of this sort. The selection and collocation of Scripture passages will show the compiler's theological tendencies almost as clearly as exposition itself. And why not? Unless knowledge is to remain fragmentary and inharmonious, it must be combined and classified. Through facts we seek theory,

through analysis of Scripture we arrive at doctrine. That *reductio ad absurdum* of a spurious liberalism in religious matters, the reading of the Scriptures "without note or comment," is as little possible as it is to be desired. Mr. Passmore's array and distribution of Scripture evidence on the doctrine of "The Decrees of God in General" are those of a Calvinist, as they could not fail to be. We mention this, not as detracting from the value of a good book, but to describe it. The student of Dr. Hodges' *Outlines* will find this *Compendium* almost necessary, and any theological student whatever will find it useful.

Little Books by John Bunyan. The Pharisee and the Publican, &c. Edited by George Offer. London: Blackie and Son. 1873.

THE publishers are issuing in a neat form and at a low price the principal practical, doctrinal, and experimental treatises of John Bunyan. They will put these writings within the reach of many persons otherwise not likely to meet with them, and this will be good service done. Comparing, however, these sermons with the *Pilgrim's Progress*, we cannot but think that Bunyan had, to use Milton's words, "in this manner of writing but the use of his left hand." There were, say, fifty Puritans who might have preached these sermons, but there was only one man in the seventeenth century capable of writing the *Pilgrim's Progress*.

The School and Children's Bible. Prepared under the Superintendence of the Rev. William Rogers, M.A. London: Longmans and Co. 1873.

"THE intention of this volume is to present the Bible in a form which shall be shorter, and at the same time better adapted for the use of children or young persons." Whether this is or is not a thing worth attempting we are not quite sure. If it be, the editor deserves thanks, for his work is well done. He omits on the whole what any parent or teacher would at first pass by in teaching a child. The Psalms and the three first Gospels are arranged according to their subjects, and the Prophets according to their dates—Daniel, by-the-bye, being put after Malachi, which in a children's Bible is somewhat misleading. The books of Chronicles and Esther are omitted altogether.

Golden Candlesticks; or Sketches of the Rise of some Early Methodist Churches. By John Bond. London: Elliot Stock. 1873.

A SERIES of short studies from the heroic age of Methodism, which first appeared in the pages of a popular religious periodical, are presented here in the shape of a small readable volume. They afford good samples of the manner in which Methodism first extended itself both among the denser and the more scattered of our populations, and will be useful to numbers of our youths as an introduction to the

larger histories of our Church. The writer's aim is to stir up the modern generation of Methodists to an imitation of the "first works" of their spiritual ancestry, and, despite a certain quaintness of style which a severe criticism might condemn, the spirit of earnestness that pervades the book will secure the sympathy and attention of those for whom he writes. We wish this little volume a large circulation.

The Methodist Class-meeting: an Essay on Christian Fellowship. By Elizabeth Sophia Fletcher, Author of "Miriam's Choice," "Adam's Argument," &c., &c. With an Introduction by John H. James, D.D. London: Elliot Stock. 1873.

This little work is one of a number of essays that competed recently for two prizes of £100 and £50 each on "The Class-meeting Essential to the Prosperity of Methodism." In the opinion of the adjudicators none came up to the standard of merit, and no prize was awarded. The essay before us was considered, however, the best, and it has been published by the authoress that the public may judge for themselves. It is not for us to adjudicate upon the adjudicators. If their object was to secure two essays—one worthy to be regarded as a sort of denominational manifesto, and another calculated to represent the popular aspects of the question—we think we can detect in the style and matter of the present volume some of the reasons that may have led to its rejection. It is a mixture, and not a perfect one, of the two diverse elements; the philosophical strain is not evenly maintained, and the popular pictures are not natural enough and not sufficiently filled out to be greatly attractive. Apart from the circumstances of its production, we can, however, recommend the book, especially to those whose views and convictions of the privilege of Church-fellowship may need broadening and deepening.

Catherine; or, a Daughter in Heaven. By the Author of "Agnes and the Little Key." London: Hamilton, Adams, and Co.

This is a book for those that mourn. Others may wonder why it was written, but for such as have passed through similar bereavements it will be found to overflow with consolation. Of its five chapters, the first touchingly narrates the circumstances attending the departure of a beloved and pious daughter just budding into womanhood; the second points out considerations that may tend to alleviate the dread of dissolution; the third rebukes excessive grief, and the fourth unhallowed curiosity, respecting the departed; while the fifth holds forth the great hope of Christianity in the redemption of the body. Throughout it breathes the spirit of true devotion and chastened submission to the will of God. To all who are placed in like circumstances of sorrow we would say, get this little book, and read it, and strive to reach the stand-point from which it has been written.

II. GENERAL LITERATURE.

The Life of John Milton: Narrated in Connection with the Political, Ecclesiastical, and Literary History of his Time. By David Masson, M.A., LL.D., Professor of Rhetoric and English Literature in the University of Edinburgh. Vol. III. 1643—1649. London: Macmillan and Co. 1873.

It is fifteen years since the first volume of this work appeared, and the author announced his intention of "exhibiting Milton's life in its connections with all the more notable phenomena of the period in British history in which it was cast; its state politics, its ecclesiastical variations; its literature, and speculative thought." With the view that Dr. Masson has taken of his task it has proved a most laborious undertaking, and opinion will still be divided as to the wisdom of the plan adopted. No life of Milton could, of course, be written without large and frequent reference to the times in which he lived; but such reference might have been more strictly proportioned to the requirements of a biography. Otherwise the perspective of the work is endangered, and Milton runs the risk of appearing no larger on the canvas than some others who figure in the crowded, stormy drama of the time. It is not surprising that this work has outgrown the scale on which it was projected. Three volumes were to have brought it to a close, and here is the third, containing more than 700 pages, and the Commonwealth and the Restoration are yet to come, besides that last and mightiest period of the poet's life, the era of *Paradise Lost* and *Paradise Regained* and *Samson Agonistes*. We would suggest that, at some future time, Dr. Masson should publish the Life of Milton apart from the history of his times, moved by the reasonable complaint of students of literature that the best modern life of Milton is embedded in a historical work which, from its size and costliness, is comparatively inaccessible. This is not said in disparagement, but in hearty appreciation of Dr. Masson's labours; they are worthy of the years devoted to them, and we sincerely wish him success in bringing them to a close.

The present volume carries us through the six years of civil war from 1643 to 1649, beginning with the first session of the Westminster Assembly, and ending with the execution of the King. Milton, now about thirty-five years of age, had entered upon that second part of his literary life, the twenty years given to politics and ecclesiastical controversy, which may be called his prose period, lying between the rich spring-time and still more wonderful autumn of his

poetic genius. During this time, including the best years of his life, Milton laid aside his high ambition as a poet, and devoted himself to the less congenial tasks to which his sense of duty called him. How far this was an interruption of the solemn purpose of his life may be gathered from his writings. Few things in literary history are more remarkable than the way in which Milton seems from the first to have been conscious of a high vocation. He was "called" in early youth, and henceforward religiously counts himself set apart for some great task, to be revealed in due time, for which he must prepare by "industrious and select reading, steady observation, and insight into all seemly and generous arts and affairs, not without devout prayer to that Eternal Spirit who can enrich with all utterance and knowledge, and sends out His seraphim with the hallowed fire of His altar, to touch and purify the lips of whom He pleases." In the "Vacation Exercise," written in his nineteenth year, he thus addresses his native language :—

> "I have some naked thoughts that rove about,
> And loudly knock to have their passage out;
> * * * * *
> Yet I had rather, if I were to choose,
> Thy service in some graver subject use,
> Such as may make thee search thy coffers round,
> Before thou clothe my fancy in fit sound."

This was indeed giving early notice of a claim that was to lie in abeyance forty years, though steadily kept in mind.

On arriving at the age of twenty-three he solemnly pledges himself—

> "To that same lot, however mean or high,
> Toward which time leads me, and the will of Heaven."

And this pledge is not forgotten or revoked amid the stern occupations of many following years. He never did more than postpone his hope, and in doing so he speaks of it thus:—"Neither do I think it shame to covenant with any knowing reader, that for some years yet I may go on trust with him toward the payment of what I am now indebted, as being a work not to be raised from the heat of youth, or the vapours of wine; like that which flows at waste from the pen of some vulgar amourist, or the trencher fury of a rhyming parasite; nor to be obtained by the invocation of Dame Memory and her syren daughters; . . . till which in some measure be compassed at mine own peril and cost, I refuse not to sustain this expectation from as many as are not loath to hazard so much credulity upon the best pledges that I can give them." These pledges were redeemed when, in 1667, he gave to the world his *Paradise Lost*.

To one who had thus recognised from the first his high vocation, the interruption of the Civil War, and the years of strife which it brought him, was a most serious disturbance of plans and purposes. But why should it be so? Why could not a scholar and poet seek shelter in these rough times, and, hiding himself from the strife of

tongues, build the slow fabric of an immortal poem in peace? He would have been more than forgiven had he done so, but it lay not in his power. The very air was charged with controversy; the conflict of opinion on religion and laws was to the full as strenuous as the actual hostilities of the field. The same stirring of men's minds that brought about the one produced the other, and the summons to take sides could not be refused. When all that was counted highest truth seemed to be crying, "He that is not with me, is against me," John Milton, of all men living, was least likely to remain unmoved. The time was "out of joint," but he did not, could not say—

"O cursed spite,
That ever I was born to set it right."

The key-note to his polemical writings may be found in the following words: "For, surely, to every good and peaceable man, it must in nature needs be a hateful thing to be the displeaser and molester of thousands, much better would it like him, doubtless, to be the messenger of gladness and contentment, which is his chief intended business to all mankind, but that they resist and oppose their own true happiness. But when God commands to take the trumpet and blow a dolorous or jarring blast, it lies not in man's will what he shall conceal."

At the opening of the volume before us, July 1643, Milton is keeping school in Aldersgate Street, from whence he afterwards removed to a larger house in Barbican. Dr. Johnson's sneer is well-known,—a sneer which, perhaps, he would have withheld had he remembered that at the same time Jeremy Taylor was similarly engaged in the remote Welsh village of Llanvihangel. Johnson had been a teacher himself, and should have felt a certain pride in the fact that a schoolmaster in London published the *Areopagitica* in 1644, and a schoolmaster in Carmarthenshire the *Liberty of Prophesying* three years later. From such retreats and in such honourable employment did England's best and greatest sons, while waiting for better times, serve the great cause of liberty. Milton's nephew, Edward Phillips, says of his uncle living at the house in Barbican in 1671, "And now the house looked again like a house of the Muses only, though the accession of scholars was not great. Possibly his proceeding thus far in the education of youth may have been the occasion of some of his adversaries calling him pedagogue and schoolmaster; whereas it is well known he never set up for a public school to teach all the young fry of a parish, but only was willing to impart his learning and knowledge to relations, and the sons of some gentlemen that were his intimate friends." Dr. Masson reckons that the honour of being Milton's pupils may have been shared by as many as twenty or thirty youths in all, of whom, however, he is only able to trace eight.

The list of Milton's writings during the period contained in this volume includes the *Treatises on Divorce*, the *Tract on Education*,

and the immortal *Areopagitica*. This latter is likely to keep its place in general esteem as the flower and crown of his prose works. It is the finest specimen of his eloquence, and breathes throughout a noble love of truth and freedom. The theme does not, as in the *Treatises on Divorce*, prevent the reader's full enjoyment. As a plea for liberty of thought and utterance it is as irresistible in argument as it is rich in intellectual splendour. It has been well said that Milton, who broke the ground on this great theme, has exhausted it. He opened the subject, and he closed it.

If the times had done nothing more than call Milton to such strife as this, posterity, compensated by the rich harvest of his prose, would hardly grudge the suspension of his poetic labours. But controversy sharpened into combat with various antagonists, worthy and unworthy, and the laws of intellectual war not being as yet adjusted to modern notions of decorum, the mode of fighting appears to us savage, not to say brutal. We have not yet, perhaps, ourselves come to the virtuous pitch of arguing with philosophical precision and perfect command of temper; but something has been gained in this matter since Milton's time. How he and Salmasius banged and abused each other in lumbering Latin is known to most readers. The *Colasterion*, published in 1645, shows Milton administering punishment in English to one of the numerous critics of his *Doctrine and Discipline of Divorce*. Here is Dr. Masson's account:—"Never was poor wretch so mauled, so tumbled and rolled, and kept on tumbling and rolling in ignominious mire. Milton indeed pays him the compliment of following his reasonings, restating them in their order, and quoting his words; but it is only, as it were, to wrap up the reasoner in the rags of his own bringing, and then kick him along as a foot-ball through a mile of mud. We need not trouble ourselves with the reasonings, or with the incidental repetitions of Milton's doctrine to which they give rise; it will be enough to exhibit the emphasis of Milton's foot, administered at intervals to the human bundle it is propelling. 'I mean not to dispute philosophy with this Pork,' he says, near the beginning; 'this clod of an antagonist,' he calls him at the next kick; 'a serving-man both by nature and function, an idiot by breeding, and a solicitor by presumption,' is the third propulsion; after which we lose reckoning of the number of kicks, they come sometimes so ingeniously fast. 'Basest and hungriest inditer,' 'groom,' 'rank pettifogger,' 'mere and arrant pettifogger,' 'no antic hobnail at a morrice but is more handsomely facetious;' 'a boar in a vineyard,' 'a snout in this pickle,' 'the serving-man at Addlegate' (suggested by the "Maids at Aldgate"), 'this odious fool,' 'the noisome stench of his rude slot,' 'the hide of a varlet,' 'such an unswilled hogshead,' 'such a cock-brained solicitor,' 'not a golden but a brazen ass,' 'barbarian, the shame of all honest attorneys, why do they not hoist him over the bar and blanket him?' Such are a few of the varied elegancies. Two or three of them break the bounds within which modern taste permits

quotation. 'I may be driven,' he says in the end, 'to curl up this gliding prose into a rough stodaic that shall rime him into such a condition as, instead of judging good books to be burnt by the executioner, he shall be readier to be his own hangman. So much for this nuisance.' After which, as if feeling that he had gone too far, he begs any person dissenting from his *Doctrine*, and willing to argue it fairly, not to infer from this *Colasterion* that he was displeased at being contradicted in print, or that he did not know how to receive a fair antagonist with civility. Practically, however, I should fancy that, after the *Colasterion*, most people would be indisposed to try the experiment of knowing what Milton meant by being civil to an antagonist."

We feel as though it were hardly fair to quote Milton in this vein. It can be no pleasure to any one to pick out the specks that disfigure the magnificence of his prose. And let it be remembered that he who gripped his antagonists thus roughly, wrestled according to the fashion of his times, while far in advance of his times as the opponent of all pains and penalties for matters of opinion. In the age of the Star Chamber and the Long Parliament, Milton could say of himself that "in all his writing he spake not that any man's skin should be rased," The great demand of the *Areopagitica* is not for the suppression of error, but for the freedom of truth:—"Though all the winds of doctrine were let loose to play upon the earth, so Truth be in the field, we do injudiciously by licensing and prohibiting to misdoubt her strength. Let her and falsehood grapple; who ever knew Truth put to the worst in a free and open encounter?"

Although this period of Milton's life yielded no new poems except a few sonnets and a metrical version of nine of the Psalms, yet in 1645—the year of Naseby—he published the first edition of his poems. "Except his lines *On Shakespeare*, written in 1630, and prefixed anonymously to the Second Folio Shakespeare in 1632; his *Comus*, written and acted in 1634, and sent to the press also without the author's name, by his friend Henry Lawes, in 1637; and his *Lycidas*, written in 1637, and printed in 1638, in the Cambridge University volume of *Verses on Edward King's Death*, but only with the initials J. M."—except these, and perhaps another scrap or two of Latin or English verse that had been printed in a semi-private manner, all Milton's poems, written at intervals over a period of more than twenty years, had remained in his own keeping in manuscript, and had been communicated to friends only in that form. In consequence of what had been thus printed, or privately circulated, a certain reputation for Milton as a poet had, indeed, been established; but the voice of this reputation was hardly heard amid the much louder uproar caused by his eleven prose pamphlets between 1641 and 1645."

For many years to come Milton's reputation as a poet was to rest upon this volume, and it is curious to reflect how different would have

been his position in English, in universal literature, had he died, say, at fifty years of age, leaving the great idea of his life unrealised. The Milton whom we know holds *Paradise Lost* in his hand, but to his own generation he was not thus known; his fame rested upon other achievements. Meanwhile the calm and silent preparation for his great work must be thought of as occupying the inner life of his spirit through those years when he seemed to have foresworn poetry; and when at length he set himself to accomplish the purpose of his lifetime, it was not merely that age and blindness had given him leisure, but that he felt himself endued with that "inward ripeness" after which he had so long and devoutly aspired. But Dr. Masson is far from having brought the story of Milton's life to its close, and that he may do so within a reasonable period we are tempted to hope that he will abridge the *History*, lest, by any of the chances to which time gives rise, his great work be left a fragment after all.

Calderon's Dramas. The Wonder-working Magician: Life is a Dream: The Purgatory of Saint Patrick. Now first translated fully from the Spanish in the Metre of the Original. By Denis Florence Mac-Carthy. London: Henry S. King and Co., 65, Cornhill, and 12, Paternoster Row. 1873.

Translations may be broadly divided into two classes,—those that have an absolute value of their own as independent works of art, and those that have literary value of varying qualities, permanent only so long as they remain unsuperseded. Translations of the first order are extremely rare in our literature, and yet there are many attempts in this branch of literature, which, although very likely to be superseded so far as artistic qualities are concerned, are not likely to be thrown on one side, inasmuch as there are often valuable critical qualities to be found in a translation without any high value of a kind properly artistic. Poetic translations with an absolute value as independent works of art have invariably been the work of men who are themselves poets of a high order,—except in one instance, in which a *woman*-poet of a high order (Mrs. Browning) gave us a beautiful version of the *Prometheus Bound:* and of this class of work it were unreasonable to expect many examples in a generation, as poets can generally employ themselves more profitably than in translation. To which order a new translation belongs is the first question we ask about it; and when we apply that question to Mr. Denis Florence Mac-Carthy's volume of Dramas from Calderon, we do not hesitate for a moment in pronouncing them *not* of the first order,—not works of art with an absolute value of their own, independent of the value of the originals.

It must not be understood that we wish to speak slightingly of this volume: on the contrary, we think the public have good reason to be grateful for it. Mr. Mac-Carthy's is the first attempt to render these

plays of Calderon, so remarkable in form, in the metres of the originals; and, where form is so important a consideration in the whole result as it is in the case of Calderon, it is a great thing for English readers to get an opportunity of judging of that form, even if rendered without that sustained afflatus which marks out the true poet from the scholarly or critical student.

Mr. Mac-Carthy is a man of much enthusiasm, as he has previously shown in his researches on Shelley; and he has evidently made the works of the great Spanish dramatist a subject of most loving and enthusiastic study. He has also some natural gift of lyric instinct that stands him in good stead in the rendering of numerous passages of his great original into a language little adapted by nature as ours is to represent the peculiar melodies and harmonies of Spanish verse. It is, however, in the short trochaic metre that forms the principal fabric of the plays that we feel most pointedly the want of sustained poetic instinct in the rendering. In the originals the lyric character of the dramas is maintained in these trochaic passages by that system of assonances peculiar to Spanish poetry; but it is probably quite beyond the resources of the English language to reproduce the effect of these assonances even in giving the technical equivalent of them; and any failure or deficiency in this respect must necessarily make itself felt in voluminous dramas like these. Thus to say that the form of the dramas is preserved is not much more expressive than it would be to say of a German translation of the last act of Shelley's *Prometheus* that the form was retained, because none of the rhymes were omitted, although all the subtler effects might be (as they certainly would be) allowed to escape in the passage from one tongue to the other. Still this attempt, like every able and creditable attempt to transplant difficult forms into the English language, has, besides the special value of the accomplished work, this great general value, that it helps in the development of the lyric resources of our tongue, even if the result be not itself a great lyrical outpouring.

The three dramas selected by Mr. Mac-Carthy are all eminently interesting, and of high dramatic rank; and we will not spoil the pleasure of any intending reader by analysing either of the plots, but content ourselves with a specimen of the workmanship of the present translator. Some of the opening speeches of Calderon are magnificent pieces of strong impulsive versification. We select the speech of Cyprian at the commencement of the great shipwreck scene in the *Magico Prodigioso* as a favourable specimen of Mr. Mac-Carthy's work, and one available for comparison with work of a higher poetic impulse, as it is already familiar to English readers in Shelley's translation.

> "What's this, ye heavens so pure?
> Clear but a moment hence and now obscure,
> Ye fright the gentle day!
> The thunder-balls, the lightning's forkèd ray,
> Leap from its risen breast—
> Terrific shapes it cannot keep at rest;

All the whole heaven a crown of clouds doth wear,
And with the curling mist, like streaming hair,
This mountain's brow is bound.
Outspread below, the whole horizon round
Is one volcanic pyre.
The sun is dead, the air is smoke, heaven fire.
Philosophy, how far from thee I stray,
When I cannot explain the marvels of this day!
And now the sea, upborne on clouds the while,
Seems like some ruined pile,
That crumbling down the wind as 'twere a wall,
In dust not foam doth fall.
And struggling through the gloom,
Facing the storm, a mighty ship seeks room
On the open sea, whose rage it seems to court,
Flying the dangerous pity of the port.
The noise, the terror, and that fearful cry,
Give fatal augury
Of the impending stroke. Death hesitates,
For each already dies who death awaits.
With portents the whole atmosphere is rife,
Nor is it all the effect of elemental strife.
The ship is rigged with tempest as it flies.
It rushes on the lee,
The war is now no longer of the sea;
Upon a hidden rock
It strikes: it breaks as with a thunder shock.
Blood flakes the foam where helpless it is tost."—Pp. 164—5.

Oulita the Serf. A Tragedy. By the Author of "Friends in Council." Second Edition. Strahan and Co., 56, Ludgate-hill, London. 1873.

The tragic drama is not exactly the *forte* of Sir Arthur Helps; and we presume it is in the confidence that *Oulita the Serf* had been as completely lost sight of as *Henry II.* and *Catherine Douglas*, in this busy reading world, overstocked as it is with good as well as bad dramatic work, that the publishers have tried to give this new edition the challenging air of a book published for the first time. This has been done by printing the words "second edition" in extremely small italics within brackets, below the imprint,—a point usually occupied by the uninteresting words "all rights reserved," if occupied at all, and certainly a point at which none but the most inveterate book-worms ever glance. We confess that, though we have long known of the existence of this tragedy, we had not read it until now, and that we have read this new edition with great satisfaction. If the workmanship, dramatic and poetic, is not first-rate, the plot is extremely interesting, and ably carried out. We recommend the book strongly to the notice of serious readers.

Plutarch: His Life, His Lives, and His Morals. Four Lectures. By Richard Chenevix Trench, D.D., Archbishop of Dublin. London: Macmillan and Co. 1873.

The germ of this volume was a lecture which the author delivered

some time ago to a small literary society in Dublin. In preparing it for the press, the one lecture developed by a very natural process of expansion into four, and the result is a study of the life and writings of Plutarch with some pretensions to completeness, at least in outline. Dr. Trench half apologises for publishing so much about one with whom everybody assumes himself familiar; but those who know what this kind of universal familiarity amounts to will not think much of the objection. A Greek or Latin author who is not included in the usual course of school and university reading may, for some reason or other, be pretty well known by name, but that will be about all, so far as people generally are concerned. In the case of Plutarch, too, such reputation as he has is almost solely in connection with one work—his incomparable *Lives*, his other writings being little known. Dr. Trench may hold himself more than justified in offering a short account of Plutarch's life and writings, together with a sketch of his times, sufficient to throw light upon his position as a man and an author.

The popularity of the *Lives* is one of the phenomena of literary history. In almost all ages and countries they have been among the favourite reading of learned and unlearned, of kings and statesmen, of students, poets, and men of the world. To use the words of Madame Roland, they have been "the pasture of great souls" (la pâture des grandes âmes), while they have equally belonged to the class of simple readers who seek but to be interested and amused. Dr. Trench says: "In answer to the question, What is the secret of his popularity? a popularity which, if not quite equal now to what it was at the Renaissance, has yet stood the test of ages,—I should be disposed to ascribe it, first and chiefly, to the clear insight which he had into the distinction between history, which he did *not* write, and biography, which he *did*. . . . Vivid moral portraiture; this is what he aimed at, and this is what he achieved. It is not too much to affirm that his leading purpose in writing these lives was not historical but ethical. More or less of historical background he was obliged to give to the portraits which he drew; but always and altogether in subordination to the portrait itself." This is perhaps a sufficient reply. Not all men can understand history, but all can appreciate biography. And as a biographer Plutarch is unrivalled among the ancients, perhaps not surpassed among the moderns. He is certainly master of his art, grasps the character as a whole, subordinates details to the general conception, and makes a portrait complete, not by the number of his strokes, but by their harmony. "Whatever displayed character, served in any way to interpret the man, brought out his mental and moral features,—this, however small it may seem, was precious to him, was carefully recorded by him; whatever was not characteristic, however large, he foreshortened, if he could not let go altogether; passed wholly by it if he could, as something with which he had no concern. He has, in more places than one, expressed himself on this point. Thus, in his Life of Alexander, he desires his readers not to blame him if

he omits many things, and these of great importance; for, he goes on to say: 'The noblest deeds do not always show virtues and vices; but oftentimes a light occasion, a word, or some sport, makes men's natural dispositions and manners appear more plain than the famous battles won, wherein are slain ten thousand men.'"

Most modern readers will, we imagine, be of opinion that Plutarch gained nothing by arranging his *Lives* in pairs, in each case a Greek and a Roman, followed by a comparison of the two men. Human characters do not admit this kind of comparison, and even where the incidents of two lives do bear some kind of resemblance, we shall seldom, by bringing them together, gain anything towards the better understanding either of one or the other. In the majority of his parallels, it is easy to see the points of resemblance, as, for instance, when he pairs Demosthenes and Cicero, and Alexander with Cæsar; but it is almost easier to see the points of non-resemblance, the circumstances that prevent comparison being at least as numerous as those that favour it. Unsatisfactory, however, as this arrangement is to us, it would have more meaning for him, as Dr. Trench points out in his second chapter.

Plutarch was a Greek, but—a Greek of the Roman Empire. Living Greece was no more. She had lost her political independence, and something beside. The decline of the Greek character was almost as complete as the decay of the Greek power. A certain intellectual ascendency belonged to Greece,—the Greece of literature, art, and philosophy, in her lowest estate; but there were aspects of this superiority which, to a Greek like Plutarch, would be more of a humiliation than anything else. The loss of a noble national existence could not be compensated by the fact that everywhere throughout the Empire the "hungry Greekling" managed to make a living out of his conquerors as artist, grammarian, or adventurer.

"I cannot doubt that, patriot as Plutarch was, this spectacle of the political nullity of the Greek nation, of the utter decadence and decay of that land which he loved so well, was a motive which wrought mightily with him, urging him to show what manner and breed of men she once had borne; men that could be matched and paired with the best and greatest among that other people which, having passed her in the race, was now marching in the forefront of the world. He was fain to show that Greece had worthies, whom she could set man for man over against the later breed of Rome, and not fear a comparison with them."

Dr. Trench pays a high tribute to Sir Thomas North's translation of the *Lives*, which appeared in 1579, and is still of interest to the student as marking a particular stage of the English language, and some of the best aspects of the language at that time. But the use which Shakespeare made of it is, perhaps, its chief title to honour. "Nor do I think it too much to affirm that his three great Roman plays, reproducing the ancient Roman world as no other modern poetry

has ever done—I refer to *Coriolanus*, *Julius Cæsar*, and *Antony and Cleopatra*—would never have existed, or, had Shakespeare lighted by chance on these arguments, would have existed in forms altogether different from those in which they now appear, if Plutarch had not written, and Sir Thomas North, or some other in his place, had not translated." It is not merely that Shakespeare found the suggestion of these great dramas in North's "Plutarch," but he was content to transfer to his own page existing characters, and often, without any pretence of concealing the fact, to adopt the very words of Sir Thomas North, with such slight alteration as might be necessary for his verse. The rule that governs such appropriations is, it should be remembered, that the rich may borrow, but not the poor; the strong may help themselves, the weak must not. If all those to whom Shakespeare was indebted took back their own, they would not impoverish him: whether he built with other men's materials or his own, it is the incommunicable secret of his genius that gives his work its value.

More than half of this little volume is devoted to the other writings of Plutarch. They are very numerous, though it is likely enough that several of the essays included in the *Moralia* are not really by him. For the most part his writings are practical,—contributions towards a working philosophy of human life, reflections on conduct and character, and suggestions concerning religion and morals in which the philosopher is, in fact, what the vocabulary of a later age has called a "Spiritual Director." Plutarch was not a speculative thinker of much force or originality; his strength lay in that ethical region where a man's best qualifications are right feeling, good sense, knowledge of men and their affairs, and, perhaps more than anything else, genuine sympathy. Abundantly possessing these qualities, and exercising them through life, upon the whole, on the side of truth and goodness, Plutarch did, beyond doubt, serve his generation. Hardly any writer of antiquity comes nearer to the Christian standard of moral judgment. The age in which he lived—the second half of the first century—witnessed the beginning of a moral reaction within the heathen world, a "revival," in which whatever of good that old world possessed seemed quickened to make one last effort to arrest the utter corruption that was setting in. Under Trajan, Hadrian, and the Antonines, there seemed to be some slight hope for the morals of the Roman world. But the disease lay too deep; no remedies issuing from the heathen schools of ethics could reach it. Other fountains were to be opened, were already opened in Plutarch's time, at which the exhausted world was to renew its life. But it would be entirely wrong to disparage the labour of those nobler souls, who, knowing nothing of Christianity, strove to regenerate in their own way a world whose misery they deeply felt. The period which witnessed throughout the Roman Empire the twofold contrary movements of Christianity and heathenism—the one rising into life, the other falling into utter feebleness and death—presents some features of the greatest interest. In looking back upon the

early progress of Christianity, and tracing the process of its gradual recognition in the world which it was to form anew, few things strike us as more notable than the fact that the choicest spirits of the age were not foremost in discerning its true nature. That men like Pliny and Tacitus, like Seneca, and Plutarch, and Marcus Aurelius were not Christians is among the disappointments of history. One thinks with regret of their living in the same world with the Christian religion, and seeing "no form or comeliness in it," while it was discovering its power and beauty to multitudes around them. Plutarch, who was educated at Athens, might almost have heard Paul preach on Mars' Hill, while as a man he might easily have conversed with John at Ephesus. During the greater part of his life he must have been in the immediate neighbourhood of Christian Churches, and yet not a single allusion in his writings shows that he was aware of their existence, or had the slightest acquaintance with the Christian body. If he ever came across them, they awakened no curiosity, and exercised no influence upon him. In this there is a moral which we shall not stay to point out, so readily will it occur to a thoughtful reader. But the virtues of the great heathen light up the gloomy times in which they lived, and forbid us to be wholly despondent about even the darkest age. With this reflection Dr. Trench brings his pleasant little volume to a close:—

"All acknowledge that the age was one in which there were at least some efforts made, and those not wholly ineffectual, to arrest the progress of the world's corruption, the terrible swiftness with which it had been travelling to its doom. Certainly, the sum-total impression which Plutarch's own moral writings leave upon the mind is not that of a society so poisoned and infected through and through with an evil leaven, that there was no hope of mingling a nobler leaven in the lump. He does not speak as one crying in the wilderness, but as confident that he will find many hearts, a circle of sympathetic hearers, to answer to his appeals. . . And here we part with him, glad to think, in the midst of that sad perplexity with which oftentimes we contemplate the world before Christ, or out of Christ, that it has had such men; glad to believe, and surely this is no amiable delusion, that their work and witness, with all its weaknesses and shortcomings, was not in their own time altogether in vain; and that even in times long after the value of it has not wholly passed away."

Catena Classicorum: Herodotus. Books I. and II. With English Notes and Introduction, by Henry George Woods, M.A., Fellow and Tutor of Trinity College, Oxford. 2 Vols. Rivingtons. 1873.

There is nothing to indicate whether Mr. Woods designs his two volumes as an instalment of a complete edition of Herodotus, or as a school-book claiming only to be a fragment. On the latter supposition, the Introduction is enormously out of proportion to the rest of the

work. It is plain that great care has been spent upon it, and consequently it is of very much higher value than the Notes, which are devoted to elucidating grammatical difficulties in the text. The essays on the style and dialect of Herodotus are excellent; that on his life fairly written, but necessarily with little to distinguish it from similar lives by former editors. The essay on the text of Herodotus, and the list of editions and commentaries, raise again the question for whom Mr. Woods intends his volumes. If it is to be a school edition, such matter as this is purely superfluous; if it aspires to a higher class of readers, the information given is such as every fairly read scholar is already possessed of. It is, indeed, only as a school-book that Herodotus requires editing in English. Mr. Blakesley and Professor Rawlinson have done the work so thoroughly that little remains except to bring their large and costly editions within the reach of school-boys. Dr. Curtius has thrown some additional light upon the early Greek history which ought to have been utilised more than Mr. Woods has thought fit, but, with this exception, very little material for the elucidator of Herodotus has been discovered of late years. The notes before us do little more than comment, not very brilliantly, on the language and style of our author's writings, which do not seem to us to call for very elaborate treatment. The matter, which requires far more commentary, is to a great extent disregarded. Mr. Woods contents himself, for the most part, with references to Mr. Grote's *History*, attaching far too little importance to the annotations of Professor Rawlinson and his coadjutors. The opening of Greek History is certainly the weakest portion of Mr. Grote's noble work, and throughout he shows almost complete inability to understand the East. Professor and Sir Henry Rawlinson, on the other hand, are expert specialists in all that concerns the Asiatic nations, and so is Sir Gardner Wilkinson as respects Egypt. They may without hesitation be acknowledged as better guides to the understanding of Herodotus than even Mr. Grote himself. If Mr. Woods intends to issue further volumes of this edition, it is to be hoped he will pay more attention to such eminently qualified commentators, especially where they differ from the great historian of Greece. We should be sorry to see the Camden Professor's admirable defence of the Scythian Expedition, as described by Herodotus, ignored in the way in which his vindication of the interview between Solon and Crœsus is here silently passed over.

Words and Places; or, Etymological Illustrations of History, Ethnology, and Geography. By the Rev. Isaac Taylor. London: Macmillan and Co. 1873.

Mr. Isaac Taylor's *Words and Places* appears in a new edition, revised and adapted, by compression, to the use of schools. The work has deservedly found so much favour, that it is almost needless to commend it. The subject is one of great and general interest,

and many teachers have found Mr. Taylor's book supply them with a very helpful aid in their lessons on geography and history. Nothing could be better adapted to fix on the minds, even of careless pupils, the locality and range of the Danish and Norwegian settlements in England than the admirable map, coloured according to the derivation of the prevalent local names, which Mr. Taylor gives us in this, as in previous editions. The compression consists mainly in the omission of all references to authorities, except so far as they are generally indicated at the close of each chapter. In some cases, we think, this excision has been carried a little too far. For instance, in the earlier editions of the work the statements—"the road which the Saxons afterwards called WATLING STREET, the 'pilgrims' road,' went to Canterbury and London; and London and Lincoln were joined by the ERMIN STREET, or 'paupers' road,'" were supplemented by the notes, indispensable to every boy, and to the great majority of teachers, "probably from *vadla* a mendicant pilgrim," and "probably from *earm*, a pauper." Their omission is much to be regretted. Mr. Taylor's classical philology is sometimes rather deficient in judgment; he repeats without hesitation obsolete and erratic derivations of words like *oppidum* and *pontifex*, ignoring the light which recent scholarship has thrown upon them; and in many details he has followed too truthfully the fascinating but unsound work of Pictet, *Les Origines Indo-Européennes*. The surprising statement that "*bad* originally meant good, just as *black* originally meant white" (added for the first time in the new edition) is based upon a purely arbitrary identification of *bad* with the positive form of *better*, and a common, but quite inaccurate confusion of the Anglo-Saxon *blac*, from which we get *black*, with the *blaec* or *blác*, originally "pale" or "wan," from which we have *bleak*. The compression, which has been considered necessary, gives a tone of dogmatism to many statements which Mr. Taylor himself would probably admit to be open to grave doubt. Thus it is very rash to assert in defiance of Professor G. Curtius that the ARGIVES lived in the "tilled" plains of Argos, and the LATINS are the men of the "broad plain of Latium." The latter of these statements shows a defiance of the laws of prosody, which is a serious fault in a philologer. A root with a short vowel might have presented a long vowel in a derivative form; but the reverse process is surely unprecedented. But we are not going to dwell on *egregio sparsos in corpore nævos*. We are much too thankful for the service which Mr. Taylor has done in giving us such an excellent popular book to enlarge on its few defects. It is the only book of the kind, so far as we are aware, that is based upon diligent and scholarly research; and it ought to be well known by every teacher of history and geography.

Memorials of the Rev. Francis A. West. Being a Selection from his Sermons and Lectures, with a Memorial Sketch by One of his Sons, and Personal Recollections by the Rev. B. Gregory. London: Wesleyan Conference Office. 1878.

"FEW men in the long roll of Methodist worthies have attained to such an equable efficiency as Francis A. West. We have had ministers of more towering eminence, of more brilliant or commanding pulpit power, of a more palpable and direct success in winning souls to Christ, more formidable in debate, more conspicuously marked out for leadership; we could point to here and there one of a broader, richer, deeper scholarship; but Methodism can boast of few sons who have filled so worthily every post from the humblest to the highest, and have in every department of our multifarious and talent-taxing system, evinced such a uniform and calculable capability." In this opening sentence of his short contribution to the memorial volume before us, Mr. Gregory does not, at all events, err on the side of eulogy. The besetting sin of biographers is equally avoided by the son, who furnishes an admirable sketch of Mr. West's life and character. It is, perhaps, a fair question whether, generally speaking, a son is his father's best biographer. As many instances might be quoted on the one side as on the other. But where the proper qualifications exist, particularly where, without any affectation of impartiality, there is a moderate amount of self-restraint, a son can write his father's life as no one else can. It is among the rewards of a good man to be appreciated by his sons. In return for that which he imparts to them he secures, perhaps the best recognition of his own character he will ever meet with. A son who has lived to be his father's friend is the natural guardian of his memory, and may claim the office of biographer, not as a mere concession to filial piety, but by right of acquaintance. The memorial sketch of Mr. West written by his eldest son appears to us, in its way, almost perfect. We could have wished it fuller—in particular it might have been enriched from his correspondence—but it could hardly have been more accurate and discriminating. It does justice, without exaggeration, to the various qualities of a character complex and not easy to describe, and shows just that kind of emotional reserve which belonged to Mr. West himself. To the moral and intellectual portrait here given it would be difficult to add anything save by way of expansion. The true lines of character are there, to be recognised with pleasure by many who cherish his memory. And how the memory of Methodist preachers is cherished can hardly be understood outside the Methodist family. The Methodist people have a wonderful power, almost peculiar to themselves, of keeping their ministers alive in affectionate and familiar tradition. Their names linger in the circuits where they have travelled; their characteristic sayings are repeated: particular sermons are remembered and referred to years afterward, and scraps of anecdote preserve from oblivion the wit and wisdom, the

pulpit power and personal influence of men long since passed away. These unwritten biographies are but fragmentary, and exposed to the uncertain chances of oral tradition, but they are part of the Church's possessions, and have had no small share in fostering the good feeling with which the people generally regard their ministers. Perhaps it is among the compensations of that itinerant life which demands a life-long sacrifice from those who follow it, that it should secure to a good man this kind of fame. It is, at least, certain that personal recollections of every minister of note are preserved throughout the Methodist societies to an extent not paralleled elsewhere. But remembrances of this sort are not in any case a substitute for biography proper; in Mr. West's case they would have been more than usually inadequate. His personality was strongly marked, but not in a way to become matter of popular tradition. He was not easily understood, and had not the gifts that create enthusiasm for their possessor. His mind was reflective, critical, analytic; his manner approached, at times, the cynical, and, if there lay beneath a depth and power of emotion not readily perceived, they who did not see it were not wholly to blame. As we have already said, Mr. F. H. West has sketched his father's character with remarkable discrimination. We venture upon a few quotations. "As a preacher, Mr. West was eminently practical. Having a clear perception himself, he succeeded in putting Scriptural truths with great distinctness before his hearers; discarding all ornament, very sparing in illustration, and expressing his ideas in good, homely, forcible English. The atonement was his favourite theme, and the Epistle to the Romans his favourite text-book. He believed in an *intelligent* Christianity, and always appealed to the reason first, though he had a great dread of stopping there. It was the heart he aimed at, and he *must* carry it, either by sap or by storm. There were times when it seemed impossible to withstand his appeals, so powerfully did they lay hold both on the reason and the conscience. If resisted, his words were like barbed arrows, which rankled long. 'Probe the heart, cut deep, follow sin into every possible hiding-place, and expose it; but be sure you take the sinner to the Cross,' was the advice he gave to a young minister."

The sermons contained in this volume are fair specimens of Mr. West's pulpit style, that on "The Delay of Conversion" finely illustrating his power of appeal; but, thoughtful, clear, and vigorous as they are, it should be borne in mind that Mr. West was a preacher, not a writer of sermons, and, like all of his order who have risen to eminence, possessed in preaching that spiritual power, inseparable from the occasion and the man, of which the printed sermon gives but little idea. Though not a popular preacher, in the ordinary sense of the term, it is well remembered by many that there were times when Mr. West's influence over a congregation was almost overwhelming. Like most Methodist preachers, entering at an early age upon a laborious life, Mr. West was thrown upon his own energies for the acquire-

ment of intellectual culture. He had the mind and formed the habits of a student; was an ardent lover of books; read deeply on the subjects immediately concerning him, and widely from his general love of knowledge. He keenly enjoyed intellectual discussion, and had a firm grasp of the chief controversies of his time. His orthodoxy was not timid, or narrow, or unsympathetic; but few men had less patience with intellectual conceit or religious affectation. This lack of patience would express itself at times in sarcasm—naturally a ready weapon of his—and one which, if it occasionally gave pain where he did not wish it, often did good service in clearing away shams and unrealities.

"It must be conceded that there was a harsh side to his character. A nervous irritability, increased by neuralgic pains, often made him impatient and testy in manner, with an occasional sharpness of speech, which was doubtless often attributed to mistaken causes. He required to be known, as is the case with most men who have any individuality of character. But, once known, there was no room for further doubt. What had seemed a frosty barrier proved to be only a film which the first warm breath of friendship thawed away, and, once gone, it was gone for ever. His heart knit firmly to a friend, and there was to him a peculiar sacredness in the tie. The interval of absence, or even of communication, might have been long—as in busy lives it must often be—but the intercourse was renewed, just as though interrupted yesterday. And his friendships included many of other Churches. While holding strictly to Methodist doctrine, he was liberal in his religious views and catholic in his sympathies. He left very much to the individual conscience; and with regard to diversities of creed, he preferred rather to look at the points of agreement than of difference."

As a man of business Mr. West rendered great services to the Connexion, and, in 1857, came deservedly to the chair of the Conference. He will be officially remembered as the Secretary to the Chapel Fund in the early days of financial embarrassment and anxiety; as Clerical Secretary of the Centenary Fund in 1838; and, more recently, for his able and far-seeing plans in connection with chapel affairs in Liverpool. The great peril of official life—the peril of narrowing down into a mere man of business—Mr. West avoided. His intellectual and religious nature never succumbed beneath the burden of affairs devolving on him; pulpit work was his chief joy, and he clung to it as long as his strength made it at all possible. A delicate man through life, he suffered much during his last few years, and died in the spring 1869, in the 69th year of his age.

The name of Francis Athow West will live in the records of the Church he served so long and well; and this short, modest, tender memorial sketch by his son will take its place among the biographies in which Methodism is already rich.

A Man of God; or, Providence and Grace Exemplified in a Memoir of the Rev. Peter McOwan. Compiled chiefly from his Letters and Papers. By the Rev. John McOwan. Edited by G. Osborn, D.D. Wesleyan Conference Office. 1873.

This is a novelty in literature; a first attempt in authorship by a man eighty years old; a memoir of one of the most remarkable preachers of his time, written by a brother, and also, in a sense well understood, the father of its subject. Here, surely, is enough to attract attention, and the reader will be amply repaid for all the attention he may give it. The book, as stated in its title-page, is chiefly a compilation; but what is strictly the author's is sensible, mellow, and tender; and the contributions of Dr. Osborn and others,—notably that of the late venerable Thomas Jackson—give additional charm and impressiveness to the volume. If there be a defect in the portraiture, it is, perhaps, a certain insensibility to the romance of the story—the old Methodist kind of romance—the tale never to grow old, about obscurely born, and plainly bred, and imperfectly educated craftsmen "raised to newness of life," and so—every faculty receiving a new impulse by its new direction—resolutely encountering natural disadvantages and social discouragements, taking the first rank amongst the effective orators of their time, and swaying with dignity and ease the fortunes of Churches and of nations.

Peter McOwan was one of these men, and of his particular epoch, perhaps, the most powerful. In one respect he had some advantage of most of the great worthies to whom we have just alluded. He was a Scotchman; was early taught how to educate himself; was religiously brought up, and received that simple but systematic theological instruction which is still the pride and the power of his native land. Calvinism, in its most distinctive and rigid form, yet because it preserved and presented in their awful simplicity the truths of man's original sin and hereditary sinfulness, was the schoolmaster that brought this young man to Christ, so soon as a corrector, because completer, doctrinal system set Him forth as the Universal Atonement. Even after his religious life commenced, it was for some time fed and nurtured by the preaching of a godly minister of the Church of Scotland, "a Calvinist in principles," but whose "sermons," he records, "were always enriched with the peculiar glories of the Gospel." Ultimately, the insensible, if not the necessary, effect of this teaching, as a whole, went to enervate rather than to strengthen his personal religion, and he discovered that the Christian "walk," in order to be safe and happy, must be "*in the conscious light* of the Lord." The entire narrative of this part of his history is very pleasant to the charitable and Catholic, and equally suggestive to the wise and cautious.

Of one thing there can be no doubt. Peter McOwan's earliest reli-

gious views gave to his life-long ministry much of its awakening power and of its thorough practical bearing. No man ever preached more impressively, and with more present and obvious results, "the exceeding sinfulness of sin." On the other hand, his own escape, hardly won, from other teachings of the system in which he had been trained, gave him the feeling and the air of one jubilantly proclaiming his emancipation from their restraints. And so he became as a flame of fire, when denouncing sin or any measure or degree of necessary sinfulness in heart or life, but also the most confident, imperative, persuading, and impassioned of "preachers of the Gospel." Herein, probably, was one source of his special usefulness. But there were others. He had a clear, good style, specimens of which, very like his mode of speech in the pulpit, are preserved in some of the letters now published. He very carefully prepared for all his public exercises, and adhered with some strictness to his prescribed course; but, leaving himself open to the inspiration of the moment, and having discovered his native power of earnest, impetuous and forceful eloquence, he trusted, as the occasion served, not himself, but the Divine Spirit, and spake with the power of a great natural oratory and the unction of an Evangelical Apostle. After all it was in his own possession of the truth, and in the truth's possession of him, that his great strength lay.

And this strength was his to the last. In the midst of his days he was smitten down, and at one time there was but little hope of further service from him. But he longed and panted to work much longer, and, with the prudence and habitual self-control which were among his more remarkable characteristics, he set himself to adopt a quieter manner in the pulpit, and to check all dangerous excitements. Then less popular, he was probably not less useful. He began at once to learn and practise the lessons which only old age teaches most of us. Firm, fearless, assured, and daily diligent as before-time, now his wisdom, humility, and lovingness shone out. If he ever had prejudices, antipathies, narrownesses, they melted away. And so, every leaf yet green, and every fruit fair to look upon, he ripened into the blessedness and perfection of the life to come.

Let every Methodist read this good book. And let those without the pale of Methodism, who are so widely speculating as to the causes and nature of its phenomena, enlighten themselves by the study of this one instance of a man, every inch and every jot and tittle of him "a Methodist preacher."

Life of the Rev. William Anderson, LL.D., Glasgow. By George Gilfillan, Author of "Bards of the Bible," &c. London: Hodder and Stoughton. 1873.

Dr. Anderson, so much better known on the northern than the southern side of the border, is characterised as "one of the most remarkable men and ministers in Scotland during the nineteenth

century." His biographer never loses sight of the high position he has assigned to him, striving throughout to prove his worthiness of it. The estimate of Dr. Anderson, frequently expressed in no measured terms, is not quite warranted by the account which is given of him. That he may have been worthy of all the loving words that are so freely lavished upon him we do not pretend to doubt, but the memoir does not show him to have been. It is less on account of his works than of judgments upon them; less a record of events than of opinions. This, however, is not altogether an impropriety. Dr. Anderson's life was less distinguished by the brilliancy of a few exploits than by the sustained brightness of the whole. If it be true that "he struck Glasgow 'like a planet,'" the figure is inapt. His was the steady light of day. If by his splendid abilities he suddenly arrested attention, his chief power lay in the firmness with which for so long a course of years he held that attention.

He was no ordinary man who could speedily rise into notice and popularity in a city where Chalmers and Edward Irving were still preaching, where Dr. Wardlaw was "in the prime of his life and his pulpit utterances;" where Dr. John Dick, the author of the *Lectures on Divinity* and the well-known book on inspiration, "stood high as a divine and sagacious man," if not a popular preacher; where Dr. Mitchell and Dr. Muter held large audiences; and where "other men of mark" occupied the city pulpits. Yet there Anderson's evening lectures were crowded to suffocation, and hundreds unable to gain admission turned disappointed away. But we need not tell the story the course of which is here so well preserved. The memoir is altogether interestingly written. It is free from wearisome iterations of incidents, which so often mar biographical accounts, and whose only recommendation is their chronological accuracy. We do not want a written record of every blow by which the figure has been chiselled from the rude block.

The personal character, the writings, the preaching, and other public labours of Dr. Anderson are amply illustrated by the pen of his biographer, by numerous reminiscences of admiring friends, and by copious extracts from his correspondence, speeches, and sermons. It is impossible to read the book without gaining a very high estimate of the brave man who for half a century was the advocate of every good and noble movement; and who deserves to be respected so long as men respect "moral worth, sterling honesty, indomitable courage, public spirit, and true Christianity."

Political Women. By Sutherland Menzies, Author of "Royal Favourites," &c. Two Volumes. London: Henry S. King and Co. 1873.

Mr. Sutherland Menzies appears to be much stirred in spirit by the question of women's rights. He is in favour of home-life for women, and sweet domestic ways, and the lawful influence upon

society of their good sense and right feeling, but has no patience with ladies who want a share in public life, more particularly those who turn to politics for a career. Read in the light of his Introduction, the political women here portrayed are meant as awful warnings—"The untoward results of the lives thus devoted—dazzling and heroic as some passages in their dramatic vicissitudes may appear—point the moral of the futility of such pursuit on the part of the gentler sex, and indicate the certainty of the penalty to be paid by those who, by venturing into the fervid, exhausting struggle, and rashly courting exposure to the rough blows of the battle of political life, with its coarse and noisy passions, have discovered too late that the strife has done them irreparable injury." This sentence may serve as an example of the author's style. He is difficult to understand by reason of a certain abundance of words which has the effect of clothing his meaning in a slight haze. The meaning of the above passage we can guess at, though it is certainly not expressed, but the following quite escapes us: "Sarah, Duchess of Marlborough, is the strongest example, perhaps in the history of the world—certainly in the history of this empire—of the abuse of female favouritism, and the most flagrant instance of household familiarity on the destinies of mankind." In spite of the author's style these volumes will interest many readers. The history is not much to our taste which is little else than anecdotes, whose characters are kings and courtiers, and whose main incidents are *amours*, intrigues, and duels; but it has its value for all that. We must remember that formerly things went much more by personal influence than they do in our own times, so that the chronicles of the back-stairs are needed if we would know the true cause of a good deal that has happened. It is very melancholy to read how the world has suffered for the games of political whist played by such ladies as the Duchess de Longueville, the Duchess de Chevreuse, and the Princess Palatine, each of whom, according to Mazarin, was capable of upsetting three kingdoms.

The only English women included by Mr. Menzies in his series of sketches are Queen Anne's two "favourites," the Duchess of Marlborough and Mrs. Masham. There is nothing pleasant to think of in the history of that time, scarcely a man or woman on whom one's eyes can rest a moment without utter weariness. The contests lack dignity of motive, and the actors worth of character. Selfishness is the particular vice which, whatever comes or goes, remains consistent and unchanged. There is a tone of sincerity, however, in the Duchess of Marlborough's language after her disgrace and retirement from Court: "After what has passed, I do solemnly protest that if it were in my power I would not be a favourite, which few will believe; and since I shall never be able to give any demonstration of that truth, I had as good say no more of it. But as fond as people are of power, I fancy that anybody that has been shut up so many tedious hours as I have been with a person that had no conversation, and yet must be treated

with respect, would feel something of what I did, and be very glad, when their circumstances did not want it, to be freed from such a slavery, which must be uneasy at all times; though I do protest, that upon the account of her loving me, and trusting me so entirely as she did, I had a concern for her, which is more than you will easily believe, and I would have served her with the hazard of my life upon any occasion; but after she put me at liberty by using me very ill, I was very easy, and liked better that anybody should have her favour than myself, at the price of flattery, without which I believe nobody can be well with a king or queen, unless the world should come to be less corrupt, or they wiser than any I have seen since I was born."

So far as concerns the moral which these volumes are meant to convey, it strikes us that an advocate of women's rights might fairly argue, that the mischief arising in time past from women meddling with politics was in great part due to the fact that they were engaging indirectly in concerns from which they were unjustly excluded; and that with a lawful share of political power they would come under restraints and responsibilities that would most effectually prevent the recurrence of such evils. For ourselves, we do not desire the "liberation of women" in the sense that Miss Becker, say, understands that phrase; but we must confess that it is somewhat wide of the question to make the wicked ways of Madame de Chevreuse or Louise de Quérouaille an argument against the extension of the franchise to women.

Essays in Political Economy. Theoretical and Applied. By J. E. Cairnes, M.A. London: Macmillan and Co. 1873.

Political Essays. By J. E. Cairnes, M.A., Emeritus Professor of Political Economy in University College, London. London: Macmillan and Co. 1873.

In these volumes Mr. Cairnes has brought together a number of essays, lectures, and papers, that he has written at intervals during the last fourteen years. They include sixteen separate pieces, which discuss a variety of questions connected with the principles of economic science and with theoretical and practical politics. We think Professor Cairnes has acted wisely in bringing these compositions together, and in thus issuing them in a collected form we feel confident he has taken a step for which the students of political philosophy and economic science will feel greatly obliged. We have peculiar satisfaction in directing the attention of our readers to these volumes as works of singular ability and sterling value. Thoughtful inquirers in these departments have, for many years, been familiar with Professor Cairnes as a vigorous thinker, and as one of our best writers on economic subjects. Since 1856 he has filled with high reputation chairs of political economy in Dublin University, the Queen's College, Galway, and more recently, in University College, London. As the early fruit

of his appointment to the Whately Professorship, he published, in 1857, his *Logical Method of Political Economy*, a capital little work, which well deserves to be expanded and reproduced. In 1862 appeared *The Slave Power: its Character, Career, and Probable Designs*, a calm historico-economic examination of the causes and issues of the American controversy, which probably contributed more than anything else to assist Englishmen to understand aright the questions raised in that dispute. These works were marked by independent thinking, and a rare power of dealing with political and economic subjects in a thoroughly broad, philosophical method. The same qualities and temper are admirably exemplified in the discussions of the subjects treated in the volumes before us. The first are styled, *Essays in Political Economy*, and the second *Political Essays*, but in all the pieces Professor Cairnes appears as the enlightened economist and the sound political philosopher. When he treats political subjects we always find in his reasoning the scientific economist, and when he discusses economical questions it is in the light of a broad political philosophy. The first volume contains nine papers; the first four relate to "a solution of the gold question." These essays contain the most satisfactory examination of this subject in the language. In his three lectures on "The Transmission of the Precious Metals," Mr. Senior presented an able disquisition on some points of this complicated matter, but he wrote long before the gold discoveries in Australia and California. M. Chevalier's book translated by Mr. Cobden dealt succinctly with one aspect of the subject. In the volume under notice Professor Cairnes takes a more comprehensive view of the whole matter, and treating it in the light of the facts supplied by the recent gold discoveries, he is able to furnish a more exhaustive examination than previous writers could do. He first traces the immediate effect of the increase of gold on the industrial and commercial phenomena of Australia; he then shows how the depreciation spread through other countries, points out the results of this depreciation on prices, and finally, he examines at length the views of M. Chevalier. Considering the ignorance and misapprehension that prevail among us as to the true bearing of the increased supply of gold on prices, some such able elucidation of the question as this by Professor Cairnes was much needed. The fifth essay—"Co-operation in the Slate Quarries of North Wales"—is an interesting account of a form of co-operation and of its good effects among the labourers in the quarries of North Wales. The sixth, "Political Economy and Land," effectually disposes of the fallacy propounded by certain writers that, according to the doctrines of political economy, the State should make no special regulations respecting land. In the papers now mentioned Professor Cairnes has treated of the applications of political economy to important social questions; the remaining papers, "Political Economy and *Laissez-Faire*;" "M. Comte and Political Economy;" and "Bastiat," deal more directly with some theoretical points of the science.

In the first of these our author shows that political economy is not simply *laissez-faire*, but that it unfolds distinct and positive scientific principles. The opponents of this science should read what is here said as to its nature and functions. It has always appeared to us that the remarks of M. Comte on political economy proceeded from a man wholly unacquainted with the science, and we have often wondered that no competent writer has replied to his absurd objections. Prof. Cairnes has here satisfactorily dealt with Comte's notions. The concluding essay in this volume, "Bastiat," is a fine specimen of critical composition: in a friendly tone Mr. Cairnes points out the defects in the economic theories of this gifted Frenchman. Valuable as we regard the first volume, the *Political Essays* are equally deserving of attention, and may perhaps be more acceptable to general readers. The subjects are: "Colonisation and Colonial Government," "The Revolution in America," "International Law," "Fragments on Ireland," "A National or a Standing Army," and "Thoughts on University Reform, and on the Irish University Question." The lecture on the American Revolution is a *resumé* of the Professor's book, *The Slave Power*, and is, to some extent, out of date. The precious "Fragments on Ireland" make us regret that our author has not been able to complete his project of a work on the Industrial Conditions of Ireland. He is so master of the subject that what he advances here is invaluable, and his reasonings are entirely free from party prejudice. The paper on the "National Army" appears to us the least satisfactory in the volume, although the case for an English army on the principles of that of Prussia is very forcibly argued. The changes in our modes of thinking and acting in reference to the establishment and government of colonies are well explained in the paper on this subject. The nature of these changes is examined with reference to emigration, and their bearing on the political, commercial, and social interests of the mother country. The proposed discussion in the essay on International Law has not been completed. The first part only is given, which abounds in enlightened views and useful suggestions. The two concluding papers supply a dispassionate and comprehensive treatment of the Irish University Question, and are well worthy of the perusal of all, and especially so, in prospect of any further attempt to deal with this vexed question. While we cannot regard the reasonings of Prof. Cairnes on all the points raised in these sixteen essays as conclusive, we have a strong conviction that they are admirably calculated to promote healthy thinking; and we therefore hope they may be widely read.

The Election of Representatives, Parliamentary and Municipal. A Treatise. By Thomas Hare. Fourth Edition. London: Longmans and Co. 1873.

It is now about fifteen years since Mr. Hare's *Treatise on Representation* was originally published. On its first appearance the work

attracted the notice of several eminent political thinkers, as Mr. J. S. Mill, Professor Fawcett, and others. From that period to the present time the characteristic principles of Mr. Hare's plan have engaged the minds of able politicians in this country, in France, Germany, Switzerland, America, and some of our Colonies. Not only have these views been keenly discussed as matters of speculative inquiry, but, in some places, attempts have been made to embody in institutions either the general system, or some parts or modifications of it. If Mr. Hare is unable to report cases of the adoption of his plan in the election of legislative bodies, it must be gratifying to him to know that facts abound which prove that the thinking of many communities is gradually, if not rapidly, tending in the direction of his principles. He has started politicians in a new line of thought in reference to the modes of election. Our author is warranted by these facts in believing that the adoption of his plan, or of modes of election analogous to his, will eventually follow the changes of thought which his book has originated and determined. The English are a practical race, with little love of what is speculative and theoretical. This is strikingly the case in all matters connected with political and social inquiries. In spite of themselves, however, Englishmen are often obliged to take hold of theoretical principles, even in politics, and endeavour to embody them in laws and institutions. They of course complain that their representative institutions are full of inconsistencies, anomalies, and evils; they seek to remedy these faults, and in labouring for this end they try to get rid of what is wrong by appealing to equity and justice, by invoking the principles of right and of the equality of citizenship. What is this but reasoning on general or theoretical principles? Is not all progress a fuller embodiment of such principles? All our reforms in the representative system are steps towards the realisation of a plan based on more scientific principles. In as far then as Mr. Hare's plan is founded on scientific principles, so far is it sure to be considerate, and more or less completely realised in our efforts to perfect our representative institutions. Our author's plan would do away with all the controversy and difficulty about electoral districts, the distribution of seats, inequality of representation, the representation of minorities, the inequalities of votes in boroughs and counties, and the unequal weight of votes in different places; it would give to every vote a due and a proportional weight, enable every elector to vote for the man that most effectually represents his views, and would provide a sure remedy for bribery and corruption. Besides theoretical objections to it, it has often been said that it is complex and unworkable. We believe its alleged complexity is only apparent; it disappears on a closer examination, and we cannot but think the practical working of the plan would be found far more easy than many may think on a first examination. Without attaching any great importance to some of the details, which indeed might be modified, we regard the leading principles of representation

unfolded by Mr. Hare as sound and just. We rejoice to find that the book has reached a fourth edition, with its valuable revisions and adaptations, and will only add that this work must be studied by all interested in the improvement of our political and civil institutions.

Short Lectures Explanatory of our Land Laws. Delivered at the Working Men's College by Thomas Lean Wilkinson, of the Inner Temple, &c. London: H. S. King and Co. 1873.

This little volume brings before us a question which is beginning to engage public attention, and which, it is very probable, is destined to engross the public mind more and more. Mr. Wilkinson opens his first lecture with a remark that all will endorse who have looked into the subject. He says: "The law relating to the land of this country cannot be rightly understood without some previous knowledge of its history." It is certainly impossible to get an intelligible insight into the nature and working of English land laws without some knowledge of their origin and history, and yet, as a rule, Englishmen are deplorably ignorant of these matters. Popular works designed to explain the history of these laws are therefore very desirable, and particularly so in view of the interest recently shown in the subject. Feeling this, we opened Mr. Wilkinson's lectures in the hope of finding in them a useful contribution to the elucidation of the subject, and although these lectures do not fully answer our expectations, we have not been altogether disappointed in their perusal. The truth is, Mr. Wilkinson's little book is very good as far as it goes, but it by no means covers the ground that should be occupied by a discussion of the subject that is intended to instruct and interest either workingmen or the general public. These lectures contain an interesting sketch of the leading changes that have taken place in our laws affecting land, with a clear explanation of their technical peculiarities and special provisions. They may be said to supply a popular exposition of these matters from the standpoint of a lawyer; and in giving such expositions Mr. Wilkinson has rendered a needful service to the comprehension of the land question. On this score his lectures will be useful, and we trust they will be extensively read. But if the land question is to be understood in its full nature and bearings, its consideration must embrace a wider field of inquiry—must comprise a fuller account of the modes in which land was held in the early times of our history, as well as some information respecting the land systems of other countries; and the effects of these land laws on the condition and happiness of the peoples should be shown. Mr. Wilkinson's legal explanations do not touch the question as to the influence of our land laws on the cultivation of land and the production of food, or the numerous other social and economic points which are so inseparably connected with the right discussion of land

laws. On the general history of this subject the labours of Mr. Kemble, Professor Maine, Professor Bund, Professor Nasse, and others, have thrown a flood of light, and have invested these inquiries with the deepest interest. As to the effects of modes of land tenure on the material interests of a community, recent writers on economic subjects have shown that this point is vital to a satisfactory elucidation of the matter. No history of English land laws can lead to broad and sound thinking on the subject if it does not embrace these investigations.

Stein and his Reforms in Prussia, with Reference to the Land Question in England. By Colonel H. A. Ouvry, C.B. London: Kerby and Endean. 1873.

Colonel Ouvry says: "The object of this small volume is to furnish a trustworthy account of the real nature of the Stein-Hardenberg Reforms, concerning which much misapprehension exists in England." It is certainly a fact that, up to a recent date, the crudest and vaguest notions prevailed in this country as to the nature of the changes in the land laws of Prussia, effected by Stein and Hardenberg. Within the last few years, however, several attempts have been made to explain these reforms. Among other works on the subject, we may mention the pamphlet by Mr. H. D. Hutton,—*The Prussian Land Tenure Reforms*, 1867, and the essay by Mr. Morier, *The Agrarian Legislation of Prussia during the Present Century*, in the volume published by the Cobden Club, 1870. Both these writers have dealt with the subject in an instructive and masterly manner; but in view of the interest now taken in the land question in England, we do not hesitate to say that a more popular account of these celebrated Prussian land-law reforms was needed. While we do not admit that Colonel Ouvry's exposition is more "trustworthy" than those of Mr. Hutton and Mr. Morier, we regard it as better adapted for the general reader than either of the others, and thus think Colonel Ouvry's little volume an acceptable and useful contribution to the discussion. It presents a succinct and readable account of the measures carried into effect by Stein and Hardenberg for the destruction of serfdom, and for the abolition of feudal land-tenure in Prussia. Although England is not in the condition that Prussia was when Stein entered upon his work in 1807, still his labours, and the results of his efforts, deserve to be carefully studied by Englishmen, and especially by English land-law reformers. Colonel Ouvry has not limited his work to an account of the changes effected in Prussia, but has also included a section on the "Land Question in England;" and in the appendix he gives the views of Mr. Mill, Mr. Cobden, and others on the subject. Perhaps the book would have been more acceptable to some classes of readers, if our author had restricted himself to his primary object—"a trustworthy account of the Stein-Hardenberg Reforms.

The Gaol Cradle; Who Rocks It? London: Strahan and Co. 1873.

Here is a little work that we can, without any hesitation, heartily recommend all classes to read. We do this without being understood to endorse every view or suggestion of the anonymous author. The treatment of our criminals, and emphatically of our juvenile criminals, has hitherto been so unsatisfactory, that all who have seriously thought on the question will thankfully welcome any criticisms on our present practice, or proposals for its amendment that are presented in an earnest spirit, and with any degree of feasibility. The book before us is evidently the production of one who is practically acquainted with the working of our existing means of punishment—of one, we should say, that has personally watched the operations of our police-courts, that has personally inquired into the antecedents of young criminals, and that has traced, in numerous cases, the consequences of our modes of dealing with young offenders. He has manifestly examined into the causes of these youngsters being brought into police-courts, and has followed their subsequent lives to ascertain the effects of their treatment by these courts. Hence our author is able to present us with details of some most affecting cases, with facts that must go to the heart of every Christian patriot that will calmly read the narratives. The drift of his reflections and reasonings upon the facts, goes to show that our mode of dealing with the offences of most juveniles is radically irrational and wrong. Whatever may be thought of our author's proposals, or rather, perhaps we should say, his suggestions, we apprehend all right-minded people will admit that he has successfully established the position that the present mode of dealing with juvenile offenders tends directly and inevitably to promote crime. We think he demonstrates that this treatment fosters the criminal propensity, and perpetuates the criminal class. He makes it clear that our criminal laws and our institutions for the suppression of crime, "rock the gaol-cradle." The facts here brought under notice imperatively demand the earnest attention of all classes, and the author's suggestions for remedying the evils of the system—"The New Tribunal," "The Employment of the Idle," and the "New Mode of Relieving Paupers"—are equally deserving of a frank and full examination.

Gregory's British Metric System: a Complete Non-Decimal Assimilation of the British to the Metric System of Weights and Measures, Retaining Their Present English Names. By Isaac Gregory, Principal of Merchants' College. London: Cassell, Petter, and Galpin. Paris: Hachette et Cie.

The exigences of our world-wide commerce, according to the writer of this book, plainly demand two things: 1. A uniform system of

weights and measures throughout the British Empire, and (2) an assimilation to the system that prevails in most other civilised countries. In proof of the former position it is stated, on the authority of a Parliamentary Committee, that there is scarcely an article of merchandise for which there are not many different kinds of weights and measures—in the case of wheat as many as sixty-one—and that besides all these there are, or were at the time of the inquiry, one hundred and fifty-four weights and measures not known to the law in actual use in this country. In proof of the latter point Mr. Gregory cites the fact that while our aggregate yearly business with nations using the metric system falls little short of four hundred millions sterling, yet not one in a hundred of those engaged in the transaction of it can without the aid of a "ready reckoner" quote an equivalent in metric measure and metric money for a foot, yard, gallon, pound, or hundredweight, of anything he sells to or buys from his foreign *clientèle*.

The remedy proposed by Mr. Gregory is, in brief, as follows:—For lineal, square, and cubic measure, instead of the present yard, to employ as the standard the French *mètre*, or meter, as he would call it, which equals 39.371 of our present inches. This new yard he would divide into forty inches, each of which would vary but a hair's breadth from the present one. The inch he would subdivide into twenty-five parts, each of which would be exactly equivalent to the French millimètre. He would not abolish the foot, nor yet the universally used "two-foot rule," but metricise them, which would only require a reduction by one sixty-fourth of their length. The advantages of this plan, in addition to uniformity with the Continental system, would be these: 1. The *mental* standards of length—the inch and foot—would not be appreciably disturbed; 2. The old names would be retained; 3. The number forty admits of a three-fold division by two without a fraction; 4. The twenty-fifths of an inch, replacing the present eighths of an inch, would tend to foster greater accuracy in cases where exact admeasurement is required; 5. The conversion from old to new measure, and from old to new prices consequent on the change, would be easy, the difference in value for the foot only amounting to a penny in five shillings, and for the yard to ten per cent.

Similar advantages are offered by the metricising of the liquid and dry measure and the standard of weight. For the former the litre would take the place of the quart; it equals the solid content of a cube whose side is one-tenth of a mètre: this is only a reduction of one-eighth upon the old quart, and would only require a corresponding reduction in price on the old quart, pint, and half-pint. For the latter the kilogramme would be the standard, i.e. the weight of a metric quart of water at its greatest density: it only exceeds in weight two of our present pounds by one-tenth. After the kilogramme there comes the pound with its twenty ounces, and the grain or

twenty-fifth of an ounce, answering exactly to the metric yard, inch, and millimètre; above it are the cwt., equal to 100 metric lbs., and the ton, equal to 20 metric cwt. or 1,000 kilogrammes.

It will be seen from the above that Mr. Gregory does *not* recommend the decimalising of our system. For scientific purposes and for wholesale trade the centesimals and millesimals are advantageous and perhaps necessary, but for popular use they are practically worthless. Imagine a poor French peasant at a butcher's stall purchasing 4 livres 275 grammes of meat at 85 centimes per livre! Neither is it proposed to touch our coinage. The sovereign, which is worth 2,522 centimes, is a better standard at its present value than it would be if reduced a grain in weight, so as exactly to equal 25 francs or 2,500 centimes. For, dividing the 2,522 centimes by 240, and neglecting the remainder, we get 10½ centimes as the value of the penny, which is correct within $\frac{1}{480}$ of a centime. Thus we obtain an easy rule for the conversion of pence into centimes and *vice versâ*, an advantage that would be wholly lost if, as some suggest, the 25 franc standard were adopted.

For a full discussion of the scheme, with its manifold applications, we must refer those who may be interested in it to the volume itself. Whether the plan is likely to come into operation at any future time we cannot say: certainly its simplicity and practicableness, as well as the many benefits it would secure to commerce, commend it strongly to our minds, and we cannot but admire the ingenuity displayed by the author in the invention and elaboration of it.

The Religious History of Ireland, Primitive, Papal, and Protestant: including the Evangelical Missions, Catholic Agitations, and Church Progress of the last Half-century. By James Godkin, Author of "Ireland and Her Churches," &c. London: Henry S. King and Co. 1873.

The religious history of Ireland falls appropriately and conveniently into three parts. The first embraces the period prior to the Reformation, extending as far back as trustworthy records will carry us, with a subdivision, distinctly traceable, on the inroad of Christianity upon the existing heathenism. The second period, which marks a very great change in Irish religious history, commences with the Reformation, and continues to the beginning of the present century, from which the third period dates. Each portion is distinguished by definitely marked features, and each has its own sources alike of difficulty and interest. The first rises in obscurity and uncertainty, and is beclouded with legends, myths, and miracles, and much disturbed by the contending forces of heathenism and Christianity. Here the historian is compelled to thread his careful way through the diverse accounts of interested writers, in which the dangers of prejudice and misrepresentation are very great and perplexing. Yet Ireland, even in this period, is not without a genuine

history, affirmed by Sir James Mackintosh to be several centuries more ancient than any other European nation possesses, in its present spoken language. Nor is the period, either in its earlier or later portion, without distinction, as the testimonies here collected sufficiently affirm. A single extract may suffice to indicate the interesting nature of the inquiries pursued in this part of the volume.

"It is an unquestionable fact, of which Mr. Keane has produced an irresistible array of historic proofs and illustrations, that the early Celtic saints became the actual inheritors of the glory and *prestige* of the heathen gods, while several Christian festivals observed at the present day were in reality, so far as the popular feeling is concerned, a continuation of Pagan worship. 'The Maypole ceremony, with its dancing and rejoicing, was, in fact, a common mode of keeping the feast of Baal at a distance from the Round Tower, or real May Pole, and it was continued among the peasantry as a harmless custom long after the Round Tower worship was interdicted, and after the knowledge of its real origin was lost by lapse of time. The Irish name of May-day at present is *La Baal Thinna*, "the day of Baal's Fire." The name of Baltinglass, the fire of the Green Baal, may be also traced to the same source, and it is probable that the name of the Green God Snake (Gad il glass) may have given rise to Ireland being first called "The Green Island," the Green God having been a name of the primeval Budh in Hindoo mythology.' I may add here that the Shamrock was the Persian emblem of the Trinity. The magi divided the victim in three parts, and laid them on a species of *trefoil*. The rod of Mercury was called the 'Three-leaved Rod.' Shamrock composed the 'Melilot garland,' which, in Egypt, was the crown of universal dominion. In later times the miracles of saints who were the patrons of certain places and churches were referred invariably to the fifth and sixth centuries; for the obvious reason that no celebrated saint could have been supposed to exist before the time of St. Patrick, the Apostle of Ireland. Hence the two or three centuries after him came to be celebrated as 'the golden age' of the Church in the Irish Hagiology, which began to be composed about the tenth century. The literature of the heathens seems to have been as far as possible destroyed by the Celts when they became Christians, as we read that St. Patrick caused more than 180 volumes to be burned. But heathen monuments and customs were not destroyed in Ireland at all to the same extent as in other countries which formed part of the Roman Empire. While the Irish language and the ancient landmarks remain, it will be impossible to obliterate from the minds of the peasantry the traditions of Paganism; and even in the present day they preserve in their own tongue the primitive pronunciation of the names of the divinities, which, by varying the spelling and the pronunciation, have been converted into the names of celebrated ancient saints."

Concerning the remains of towers, temples, and richly sculptured crosses, all having a religious significance, Mr. Godkin conducts a

patient and very interesting inquiry, and leads us to the following conclusion of their origin:—"Now, as the Celtic invaders of Ireland were completely an illiterate people, who had always evinced an innate dislike to the industrial arts, who learned the use of letters from the Pagans they subdued—to whom labour was a degradation—who were always content to dwell in huts made of wood; whose places of worship, even the most ancient and celebrated, were constructed of the same material; whose chiefs deemed it a degradation to be lodged in stone castles, who never thought of building a stone-walled palace, even where the best materials lay thick about them; who neither quarried nor mined, nor cut stones, nor forged weapons of war, though war was their sole profession; and as these men must be put out of the question as the builders of the ancient towers, and temples, and crosses, of which so much has been written, who could these builders have been? Certainly not the Anglo-Normans, although Irish antiquaries have preposterously applied to them the term 'Norman.' Before the Celtic colony arrived, there existed in Ireland, for more than a thousand years, a mighty people, who came from the East, and who were renowned for intellectual power and unrivalled skill in the arts and sciences. The evidence of history seems to be conclusive that it was by that race the whole island was covered with temples, towers, crosses, and other monuments that have excited the wonder of posterity. This race was called the Tuath-da-Damaans, whom Dr. Petrie himself acknowledges to have been always referred to as superior to the Scoti or Celts in the knowledge of the arts. 'We learn,' he says, 'that in the traditions of the Irish, the Tuath-da-Damaans were no less distinguished from their conquerors in their personal than in their mental characteristics.' These colonists were preceded by the Fomœrians and the Emedians, supposed to belong to the same Cuthic race. To that race belonged the primitive Irish language, which, intermixed with the language of their Celtic conquerors, formed the tongue which was spoken by 3,000,000 of the people half a century ago, though it is now fast dying out, even in the rudest districts of the country."

The representation of the introduction of Christianity into the island is imperfect, though some points of interest are well discussed. One inquiry is made into the confused histories of St. Patrick and St. Columba. The former a name never to be dissociated from Irish Church history; the latter deserving a place amongst the most heroic and devoted benefactors of the race; the man who was the principal agent in the conversion of the northern nations to Christianity, concerning which event the estimate formed by the Duke of Argyll, in his choice little work on *Iona*, is not excessive, when he describes it as "one of the greatest events the world has ever seen." No wonder that amongst an enthusiastic people, and in a credulous age, legends alike poetical and rude sprang quickly up from his cherished memory.

The Reformation period introduces us to entirely new scenes in

Irish Church history; scenes over which we can linger only in pain. This part of the work is best done, and should be read carefully by those who would know some of the deep-seated causes of Ireland's disaffection. Little sympathy as we have for Popery, there are chapters of Protestant rule in Ireland for which we find no justification, and which we cannot read without a blush of shame.

More recent times bring us into contact with Evangelical Missions and Catholic Agitations, Church Temporalities and Presbyterianism, Education, the recent Irish Church Act, and many other momentous questions, which are discussed with tolerable fairness, though a strong Protestant bias is not disguised.

It would be impossible in a single volume to give more than a glance at many important features of the religious history of any country, extending over many centuries. But these are not careless glances; and while the reader is furnished with a general view of the whole field, he is directed to authorities and sources of inquiry, from which his information relating to any particular portion may be widely extended. The volume is characterised by fairness, clearness, and general accuracy: it is wanting in methodical arrangement, especially in the earlier part, and in a clear discernment of the great forces which underlie incidents, and the great issues towards which those incidents point, a philosophic treatment of history without which mere records are insufficient. We commend the book to all who desire to trace the sinuous course of religious thought in Ireland.

The Fayoum; or, Artists in Egypt. By Paul Lenoir. London: Henry S. King and Co.

The author of this pleasant readable book says at once that he and his friends did not go to Egypt for scientific or archæological purposes, but "to look out for subjects for pictures, and to paint them." The desire to enjoy themselves appears also to have had a good deal to do with the expedition, and, in spite of a few perilous adventures, it was fully realised. From Cairo the travellers set out for Fayoum, a province in Central Egypt, and made acquaintance with the pleasures and miseries of a journey through the desert. Their initiation was complete, for it included a genuine sand-storm. "We were just taking hold of our forks, when, quicker than lightning, an immense sheet of sand fell upon us, the sand-hill against which we were seated was dispersed by the tempest, and rushed like a cascade over everything, ourselves and our breakfast included. Waves of sand, lifted from the earth, struck us in the face and blinded us. The bottles, the plates and dishes, the eatables, were all buried in sand, and we had to dig vigorously to prevent our furniture and ourselves from disappearing in the cataclysm. The Arabs, after giving us a little help in our distress, lay down in the sand, thus avoiding the painful contact of the wind, which struck us in the face like blows from

a whip. The temperature had suddenly changed: icy cold had replaced the heat which we had been feeling since the morning; and, like the currents of hot and cold water in the sea or in rivers, this layer of cold air seemed to fall from some celestial glacier. Our wretched asses suffered horribly; notwithstanding their strong instinct of self-preservation, and the devoted exertions of the Arabs, the unfortunate animals were seized with actual convulsions, and they struggled and rolled about in frantic efforts to escape from the invading sand. The blood streamed from their eyes and nostrils, and in the midst of the uproar we thought of the army of King Cambyses, &c."

On their way to Medinet, the chief city of Fayoum, they traversed, however, a country very different from that in which the whole party had been nearly buried in the sand. The district which lies near the great canal, called the "Canal of Joseph," contains the most luxuriant vegetation. In many places they passed under actual arches of verdure, formed by the enormous branches of trees and shrubs. Orange and lemon trees grow to the size of oaks, and forests of cactus and aloes were to be seen as far as the eye could reach. There is much uncertainty as to the origin of the great canal, which, with the innumerable smaller canals, gives life and fruitfulness to the country. Tradition assigns it to Joseph as its engineer and constructor, but scientific men are not even agreed whether it is a work of man at all, some holding it to be a derivative of the Nile. The town of Medinet, situated on this canal, is a thriving and important place; in fact, one of the very few large provincial towns of Egypt. It is largely populated by Copts, those poor relations of the great Christian family. They found also an Italian monk, the last remaining member of a community which had existed at Medinet. The poor man was overjoyed to meet with Europeans, and was affected almost to tears when spoken to in Italian. Like all observant travellers, they were struck with the wonderful fertility of the soil. ' "It surpasses all that we could have imagined; several harvests are reaped every year; clover, for instance, is cut three times, and grows to a height unknown in the richest European soil. The arable land, fertilised by the deposit from the Nile, does not need the repose which is so necessary to our cultivated soil. Hardly has the corn been reaped before the plough prepares the ground for a new seed-sowing." Egypt possesses indeed enormous sources of wealth, and the material progress of the last few years has been very great. The last trade report of the British Consul at Cairo presents some very striking facts in relation to this subject. In the year 1867 the extent of land under cultivation was about 4,000,000 acres, now it is 5,400,000. The Government has of late years directed its attention especially to the production of sugar, and with excellent results. During the last nine years the production has increased nearly fivefold. The least satisfactory part of this is that *the sugar mills are all the property of the Viceroy*, who last year exported nearly 1,800,000 tons of sugar.

There are about 750 miles of railway now working in Egypt, and most of the principal towns and villages in the Delta are in railway communication with each other. Nearly 4,000 miles of telegraph are in operation, and 3,000 more are projected. All this is, of course, very satisfactory as far as it goes. One may, perhaps, feel hopeful with regard to the results, in some time to come, of the "modern progress" which Egypt is beginning to share with the rest of the world; but so far it does not mean so much as some suppose. The single fact that the Viceroy is the sole sugar producer in the country (and this is not the only monopoly he enjoys) shows how artificial a good deal of this quickened prosperity is. A country may yield enormous wealth to the rulers who farm it, without any real improvement in the condition of its inhabitants. The British Consul, in the report referred to, points out that taxation bears very oppressively upon the greater part of the agricultural community, and that while the productive sources of the country are being developed at an extraordinary rate, fiscal and monetary reform are as much needed in Egypt as ever they were. While the bulk of a people are politically ground down, and remain wretchedly ignorant, a thin veneer of European civilisation at Alexandria and Cairo is worth very little. Looking at the direction in which things are moving in Egypt, Japan, Persia, and elsewhere, a very curious question meets us. What is to be the effect upon Oriental populations of the rapid introduction amongst them of new modes of locomotion, scientific and mechanical appliances, and generally, of European ideas to which they have not been "led up" in any natural way? We in Europe, for instance, have worked our way to the railroad and steamboat era, coming to it gradually by stages that were preparatory. But everywhere throughout the East the appliances of our civilisation are being set down ready-made amongst people that are not *en rapport* with them, and who, consequently, enter upon the *rôle* of modern life without having caught the modern spirit. Can this be done without shock or dislocation somewhere? Can a nation long retain the spirit and traditions of one civilisation while availing itself of the material and intellectual resources of another which is in reality profoundly antagonistic to it? The Viceroy of Egypt, for example, seems more than willing to use the arts and industries of Europe in the development of the country's wealth; but if he will make money like a European, can he continue to rule like an Asiatic? He may buy rifled ordnance at Birmingham, and hire opera singers from Paris, but how will these new and foreign elements work in with those already existing? It seems to us that there is a certain consistency in national life that cannot be destroyed without serious consequences, and as we feel sure that the East cannot eat of the Western Tree of Knowledge and remain what it has been, we wait with much interest for the direction in which changes must occur. Leaving, then, the statistics of material progress in Egypt, we hold that its real progress

must be sought in the condition of its people, and it is here that we have doubts, not to be relieved by any accounts of railway extension and the like. They must be read at least side by side with statements like the following: "Ophthalmia has become a veritable pestilence in this country. It disfigures half the population, and so multiplies blindness, either total or of one eye, that there is a proverbial saying that among three Arabs there are only four eyes. Uncleanliness and incorrigible carelessness second the ravages of this melancholy infirmity; flies, from which children are in no way protected, settle in clusters upon the unfortunate little beings, and turn their heads into hives. Their mothers will not touch them, because, though Mahomed enjoined ablutions upon true believers, he also interdicted the killing of flies."

After returning from Fayoum to Cairo, M. Lenoir and his friends—among whom, by-the-bye, was Edmond About—visited the peninsula of Sinai, and then entered Palestine, not without some risk, by Petra and the *Wady Arabah*. On the whole this is a very pleasant book of travel, written with much sprightliness, while its general tone strikes us as sensible and good.

A History of Jamaica, from its Discovery by Christopher Columbus to the Present Time, &c. By W. J. Gardner. London: Elliot Stock. 1873.

The history of Jamaica is divided by the writer into five periods. The first is the period of the Spanish occupation, ending in 1655, when, under the administration of Cromwell, it became a British possession. The second period comes down to the great earthquake of 1692, and the third to the beginning of the anti-slavery struggle in 1782. That struggle lasted more than fifty years, and the fourth period ends with the emancipation of 1838. Mr. Gardner's narrative is well arranged and clear, based upon the public records of the colony, and other trustworthy sources of information. The development of commerce and agriculture is carefully traced, and the manners and customs of the inhabitants are sketched in a way to illustrate the progress which has taken place in the social life of the island; while the history of religion and education is written with much discernment, and in a spirit of sympathy with all earnest Christian workers. The painful events of 1865 are not yet perhaps sufficiently distant to be judged with perfect impartiality. The writer refrains from discussing them at any great length, contenting himself with a careful statement of facts. Perhaps the chapter of greatest interest is that in which he reviews the religious and social progress of the people from the emancipation to 1865. The religious history of this period does not present such striking features as at an earlier time. With the passing away of slavery, and its accompanying persecutions, the work of the Churches assumed a more ordinary character. The great difficulty encountered by all denominations arises from the

impressible negro nature, readily inclining to superstition, and trained with difficulty to habits of self-restraint. But, with all drawbacks, the history of Christian work in Jamaica is full of encouragement. The Churches have little need to be ashamed of it.

An Autumn Tour in the United States and Canada. By Julius George Medley, Lieut.-Col., Royal Engineers. London: Henry S. King and Co. 1873.

Colonel Medley is a practical traveller, and thoroughly competent to report upon scientific and engineering matters. The latter, very naturally, engaged a good deal of his attention while in the States; and the reader will find interesting notes on railways, bridges and waterworks. His remarks upon American society, institutions and habits appear to us to be candid and discriminating. The book is somewhat slight, but good as far as it goes, and may be read with pleasure. The author says, in conclusion:—"In setting down these brief notes of what to me was a most interesting tour, I do not think I can give serious offence to any but those very thin-skinned individuals who think no foreigner should presume to speak of their country except in terms of unqualified praise. If I have extenuated nothing, I have most certainly not set down aught in malice, and, so far from depreciating America, have no hesitation in saying that, were I not an Englishman, I should be proud to be an American citizen."

The Paradise of Martyrs: a Faith Rhyme. Part First. In Five Books. By Thomas Cooper, Author of "The Purgatory of Suicides: a Prison Rhyme," &c., &c., &c. London: Hodder and Stoughton. 1873.

If this book had no intrinsic merits, it would yet find readers. Those acquainted with the former works and the remarkable career of Thomas Cooper would be certainly attracted to a perusal of it. And such could hardly read without emotion the following stanza:—

> "Almighty and All-glorious Lord of all!
> Eternal Source of life, and Fount of light!
> A poor, dark wanderer, at Thy feet I fall—
> Forgiving Father, at Thy feet! Thy bright
> Pervading Presence in the darksome night
> Of wandering watched me. Thou wert ever near,
> Although I owned Thee not, and from Thy sight
> Afar I fled, soul-palsied with the fear
> That there was nought beyond the tomb: that dread so drear."

The book has merits, of which this stanza is an indication, while its faults are few and superficial. Now and then the rhythm is broken, the numbers faulty, and a few quaint, obsolete terms are used, suggesting the need, almost, of a glossary. But the volume is rich in sentiment and full of food for thoughtful minds. In the former part of these five books, respectively, Mr. Cooper is found "pondering

the change of earthly things," and then in a dream, or on the wings of imagination, he enters the "Paradise of Martyrs," and sees martyrs of all past ages and of almost every land. They are represented as visitors to earth, and, indeed, as actors in its affairs. They converse about the lands from which they severally came; they praise God for the favourable changes wrought; they mourn over the slow progress of the truth; and pray God to "disclose the morn when rays of love shall subdue all Thy foes." The spirit of faith and hope reigns within them supremely. We commend our readers to the book itself. We thank Mr. Cooper for this moiety, and hope he will live to present the other "half of his purposed Faith Rhyme to the world."

Tent Life with English Gipsies in Norway. By Hubert Smith. London: Henry S. King and Co. 1873.

Mr. Hubert Smith struck out for himself a mode of travelling in Norway which was worthy of the bold inventiveness of a member of the Alpine Club. He engaged the services of three genuine English Gipsies, Noah, Zacharia, and Esmeralda, and taking tents, cooking apparatus, and three good donkeys to carry the baggage, travelled leisurely through the best parts of Norway, with such pains and pleasures as belong to Gipsy life. The volume before us is a sumptuous memorial of this journey; somewhat too big, perhaps, and the narrative capable of being condensed with advantage, but pleasantly written, and charmingly illustrated. The engravings are by Mr. Edward Whymper, a sufficient guarantee of their excellence.

The Tasmanian Lily. By James Bonwick, F.R.G.S. London: Henry S. King and Co. 1873.

This is a tale written with an object. The writer seeks to recommend the opportunities and advantages of colonial life to those who, in this country, find themselves straitened by the increased cost of living. Possibly he thought a story would be read where nothing else would be, and so we have a course of true love with all its perils and pleasures, crowned at last with a double marriage. We don't care very much about all this, but the author gives a good deal of useful information about Tasmania, which may be consulted with advantage by those whose thoughts turn toward emigration.

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