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

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

THE

LONDON QUARTERLY REVIEW.

JANUARY, 1875.

ART. I.—*History, Essays, Orations, and other Documents of the Sixth General Conference of the Evangelical Alliance, held in New York, October* 2—12, 1873. Edited by Rev. PHILIP SCHAFF, D.D., and Rev. S. IRENÆUS PRIME, D.D. New York: Harpers. 1874.

THE Evangelical Alliance was organised nearly thirty years ago, and its early promise seemed to be great. During the generation, however, which has followed, it can hardly be said to have fulfilled that early promise. It has been more powerful abroad than at home. On the side of religious liberty, on behalf of oppressed sects in various countries, it has used its good offices and its influence with a success of which its leaders may fairly be proud. In Lutheran Germany, in Scandinavia, and in Russia; to some extent even in Italy during the days of Papal domination; and more recently, in Turkey, it has raised its voice, with good effect, against religious proscription and persecution. In 1857, the Alliance came into great prominence by its Berlin Conference, concerning which, at the time, we wrote in this Journal, and at which the Prussian king, and his friend, Baron Bunsen, both did public honour to the Alliance, in spite of the bitter antagonism of the *Kreuz Zeitung* party. Good permanent results for religious liberty in Germany doubtless followed this memorable meeting. But, with that exception, perhaps no general conference, or world-gathering, of the Alliance, has ever assumed such proportions in view of the Christian world, as that which was held in New York in October, 1873, or has produced a comparable impres-

sion. Thanks to the energy of Dr. Schaff, the American organising secretary of the Alliance, the history of that great meeting was carried through the press in much less time than has usually been required in similar cases, and has now been for several months in the hands of the subscribers in this country. It is contained in a noble volume, admirably printed and got up, and full of most interesting and important matter, which will form the text of our present article. All students of Church history, especially all who desire to know the actual condition of the Christian world, will find it to be an invaluable treasure, an authentic compendium of information and ideas, derived from the best sources, contributed by men among whom may be reckoned not a few of the leading minds of Christendom, and such as can nowhere else be found in one view. It contains nearly 800 pages of double columns and small, but clear, type, and of imperial octavo size.

The first meeting historically related to the organisation of the Evangelical Alliance, was held in the Wesleyan Centenary Hall, in February, 1845. This was followed by a public meeting on behalf of Christian union, in Exeter Hall, in June of the same year; by an important meeting in Edinburgh, in July, held in connection with the bi-centenary of the Westminster Assembly, at which the idea occurred to the late Mr. Henderson, of Park—afterwards carried into effect through his liberality—of a treatise or a volume of essays on the subject of Christian Union; and, after many sectional meetings had been held to prepare the way, by the first aggregate meeting—the true Constitutive Conference—of the Alliance, held at Liverpool, on the 19th of August, 1846, at which assembly the basis of the Alliance was agreed upon, and its essential organisation completed. The second great meeting, known as the First General Council of the Alliance, was held at London, in 1851, the first Exhibition year; the third aggregate meeting, or Second Council, at Paris, in 1855, the first Exposition year: the fourth meeting, or Third General Council, at Berlin, in 1857; the fifth meeting, or Fourth Council, at Geneva, in 1861; the sixth meeting, or Fifth Council, at Amsterdam, in 1867; the seventh meeting, or Sixth Council, at New York. This is spoken of as the Sixth General Conference. Strictly, however, it is the seventh, since the Constitutive Conference certainly cannot be left out of account. It is, however, rightly described as the

sixth meeting of the General Council of the Alliance. Those who desire to understand more in detail the history of the Alliance, and especially the manner in which it organised itself at Paris, in 1855, for the purpose of promoting the cause of religious liberty, must be referred to the sketch of the history of the Alliance given at New York, by the Rev. James Davis, one of the Secretaries of the Alliance, and contained in the volume under review. Two sentences on the special point are all that we can give. The intolerance which at that time prevailed on the Continent, not only in Popish, but, hardly less, in Protestant countries, was brought pointedly, and in detail, before the Alliance; and "a united committee was appointed, composed of members of the Alliance from France, Belgium, Switzerland, Holland, Prussia, Sweden, Turkey, Great Britain, Ireland, and America, to whom the subject was confided for their joint counsel as to the practical measures which might be adopted in relation to those countries where intolerance principally prevailed." That united committee, although, when it was first appointed, its purpose and pretensions were the subject of not a little ridicule, especially in England, has been the means of accomplishing great things for religious liberty throughout Europe, and even in the Turkish dominions. Let us be permitted to note, in connection with this subject, that among the most useful and influential members of that committee were two of the secretaries of the Alliance, neither of whom was able to be present at the New York meeting, the elder by reason of increasing infirmities, the younger from the pressure of disease, and of whom the younger has since died, while the older is now quite *hors de combat*, so far as all public life is concerned. We refer to the Rev. Dr. Steane, and the Rev. Dr. Schmettau. The former was a Baptist pastor in South London, a gentleman of singular administrative abilities and accomplishments; a man of the most perfect courtesy, and of admirable judgment; few could excel him in the faculty of drawing a resolution or preparing a report; and none could surpass him in tact, or in skill and sympathy to follow, and, while following, to influence, the moods of a meeting. Had he been a diplomatist or a politician, his qualifications must have placed him very high in either vocation. As a Baptist pastor, he became the leading spirit of the Evangelical Alliance, and was recognised as such by all, of whatever

Church, or whatever rank in life, who entered within its circle. At first, indeed, Dr. Bunting was acknowledged to be the master spirit of the Alliance. But after the difficulties attendant upon the constitution and earliest struggles of the Alliance were over, Dr. Bunting retired from any leading share in its management. From a very early period, Dr. Steane was the chief guide and power in the administrative history of the Alliance. Worthy to be a colleague of Dr. Steane, was Dr. Schmettau, a native of Hanover, and graduate of Göttingen, whose first appointment was in 1848 as chaplain to the Prussian Legation at Lisbon, but who came to this country in 1856, and having been introduced by the venerable Dr. Steinkopf to Sir Culling Eardley, was appointed foreign secretary to the Alliance. Dr. Schmettau was an accomplished man, and a Christian of the loveliest spirit. His knowledge, skill, and goodness, and the charm of his manners, were of very great value to the Alliance in all its operations, but especially in relation to its work on the Continent, and to its Continental Conferences. He died in London on the 12th October, 1873, the last day of the New York Conference, aged 51. The absence of Dr. Steane and Dr. Schmettau from the New York Assembly was, to all who had attended its former conferences, a great grief and loss.

The New York Assembly of the Evangelical Alliance was, as we have intimated, a great success. It was, in truth, a magnificent success. There may have been Alliance Conferences at which papers were read, in the aggregate, of higher value, although we doubt if there have been. There may have been assemblies at which decisions were arrived at, and influences set in motion, more important in their effects on Christian liberty and evangelical union in Europe than any transactions accomplished at New York. Such were probably, for example, the Paris Conference in 1855 and the Berlin Conference in 1857. But never did any assembly of the Alliance produce such an evident, immediate, and mighty impression in Europe or on any nation within whose territories it was gathered, as that which the New York Assembly produced on the United States and North America. All other assemblies of the Alliance have been insignificant in comparison. Nor was it possible, from such altogether inadequate reports as appeared in the English newspapers at the time, to form any conception as to the reality. Those

only who obtained the reports of the *New York Tribune*, which were, we believe, republished in this country, can at all understand what the Alliance gathering in New York really was.

The time indeed at which the visit to New York took place was peculiarly unfavourable. All well-to-do New Yorkers are absent from the city from the end of August till the end of October, or even till November is well advanced. The leading city pastors follow their flocks to fashionable watering places or to Europe. When three weeks of September were already passed, and less than a fortnight remained till the opening of the Conference, very much had still to be done, in subscription of funds, in finding of homes, and in all particulars of organisation, and it seemed as if it were hardly possible to be ready for the Alliance by the 2nd of October. As yet, moreover, the energetic and able Dr. Schaff, on whom so much depended, had not arrived from Europe, where he had been mustering the forces of the Alliance. To add to the perplexity, on Saturday, the 20th of September, came the most unexpected, the most sweeping, and the most complete financial cyclone that even the United States has ever known; it came upon Wall-street like thunder from a clear sky, it convulsed the Union, and paralysed credit and confidence everywhere. Purely financial in its origin, it laid an instant arrest on industry, and, for a while, seriously interrupted the great export trade of the Union. Between the 20th of September and the opening of the Alliance Conference on the 2nd of October the panic was at its worst, and during the ten days that the Conference lasted the commercial prospects of the country can scarcely be said to have in any degree improved. Nevertheless, although it was held during such a season of unparalleled financial havoc and distress, the meeting of the Alliance was one of unparalleled success. Perhaps in one respect the financial crisis may even have contributed to that success; it served to bring back to New York many who felt that, at the call of such dire alarm, it was fitter they and their families should return to the city than that they should remain away at extravagant watering places. But, in every other respect, the crisis was a great trouble and disturbance. It prevented some leading men from giving attention to the Alliance or its visitors, who would otherwise have occupied a foremost place in its hospitalities

and its public gatherings. It formed a gloomy background during all the services, and conferences, and celebrations. It was evident that it lay heavily on the minds and hearts of some of the generous Christian men who opened their houses to Alliance guests, and took part in the councils of the assemblage.

Notwithstanding, however, such disadvantages and difficulties as we have thus adverted to, the Alliance was such a success as we have described. On the 2nd of October all was ready. Dr. Schaff had been back a week; all the needful funds, in spite of the crisis, were guaranteed; homes or excellent lodgings had been provided for the foreign delegates; the places of meeting were ready for the sections of the Alliance; Association Building was beautifully decorated and prepared for the welcome and the service of the Alliance in its inaugural meetings; the programme of organisation was completed. From its opening on the evening of October the 2nd to its close on Sunday the 12th, the dimensions and impressiveness of the vast gathering, divided as it was into many powerful sections, continually increased. It was found necessary again and again to divide and subdivide the gatherings, and to distribute the forces of the Alliance. At first it was thought to have but two contemporary sections, as in other countries, on similar occasions, but it was found immediately necessary to organise three, and then four and more sections, until at length seven or eight were running at the same time. It was calculated that on the Sunday evening, when the farewell public meetings were held, not fewer than 20,000 persons were assembled. The largest and handsomest theatres and assembly halls that New York contains were all laid under requisition, and all crowded to the uttermost.

The New York press was equal to the occasion. All the papers gave extended reports daily, but the *Tribune* outdid all the rest. It printed triple sheets, and furnished wonderfully complete and correct reports of the papers read in the different sections, with good summaries of the discussions. Day by day, also, the newspapers contributed leading articles on the Alliance, its assemblies, the chief papers contributed, and the leading topics of discussion. The chief provincial journals, also, had their reporters, and gave reports, more or less complete, of what was done. The comments of some of these journals were very free;

the tone of criticism was not always orthodox; it was sometimes rationalistic and irreverent. The *Tribune*, in particular, while it paid practical homage to the Alliance, and consulted its own interests by providing excellent reports, indulged not seldom in editorial comments of a freethinking tendency. But all were profoundly impressed by the power of Christian feeling and purpose, as shown in the Alliance gatherings. The world was made to understand that there is a force in free Evangelical Christianity to which nothing else in public life can be compared.

The question cannot but here arise as to the reasons for the incomparably greater impression produced by the Evangelical Alliance in New York than in any other chief city of the world. Never were so few men of European distinction present as at the New York meeting. Time and distance, and the voyage, operated to prevent not a few from coming to New York who would have been present at Berlin, Geneva, Paris, or London. Nor was there anything in the topics dealt with by the various writers and speakers, or in the manner of handling them, so specially interesting as to account for the enthusiasm produced. The enthusiasm, indeed, was largely irrespective both of the men who constituted the *personnel* of the gathering, and of the particular subjects discussed. It was the enthusiasm of an idea. It was independent of details, which indeed could not have been studied at all by the great majority of those who crowded to the Alliance meetings. This enthusiasm lent overmastering importance to the gathering, and made it the theme of all circles. The financial crisis and the Alliance were the two matters which divided public attention in America during the first half of October, 1873. But the immaterial fairly eclipsed the material. Much as the journals could not but be occupied with the money panic, they were yet more taken up with the Alliance. From Maine to California, from New Hampshire to Georgia, from Minnesota to Florida, the Alliance was the theme of every intelligent family and every cultivated circle. Travel where you might in the States during the assembly, and even for weeks afterwards, the atmosphere was full of the Alliance, of criticisms on its proceedings, and of the echoes of such criticisms.

The explanation of this fact, although at the time it struck European visitors at least with surprise, and filled them, for the most part, with admiration, is not far to

seek. No country in the world can ever be so impressed by the visit of the Evangelical Alliance, or can give to it so impressive a welcome as the United States. To afford a parallel to the New York welcome, the Alliance must visit the States a second time. Perhaps a second visit soon to New York might be a failure. But if in six years' time the Alliance should decide to visit Philadelphia, it is probable that the effect might even surpass that of the visit to New York, especially as it would hardly be likely a second time to coincide with any commercial disturbance of importance.

The explanation is found in the character of the American people, taken in connection with the fact that the visit of the Alliance was a collective visit of Christian Europe to America, of free and Protestant Christian Europe, in its different nationalities, to free and Protestant America. The feelings to which such a visit appeals, are the sympathetic interest and intelligent curiosity of evangelical and non-hierarchical Protestantism. The public, which takes a deep interest in such a gathering as the Evangelical Alliance, must be intelligent, more or less cosmopolitan, opposed to all pseudo-Catholicism, in deep sympathy with civil and religious liberty, full of faith in the future of free Christianity. Nowhere out of America can such a public, within reach of one centre, be found, comparable in numbers and in general competency of social position and circumstances, to that of which New York is the centre. If American Christianity is almost destitute of our highest grades of cultured Christian intelligence and sympathy, neither is it everywhere and on all sides outflanked and kept down by vast masses and multitudes of inert unchristianised social and intellectual barbarism. Nor, again, is the frankness and breadth of general Christian sympathy with Protestant needs and Protestant progress interrupted and diminished by the dominance of a Church which is exclusive, because it is unduly hierarchical and sacramental, because as yet it has been but imperfectly reformed. For these reasons public, sympathetic, Protestant Christianity makes an appearance and produces an impression in New York which it could do nowhere in England, not even in Manchester, with all Lancashire to back it, because a cotton operative public would care little for such a gathering as the Alliance, would, indeed, be busy working at the mills, because the Church of England would largely stand

aloof, and because other denominations are apt to be critical and sceptical as to Continental connections and sympathies, and as to ideal projects in general; much less in London, which is too vast and too self-absorbed to be deeply stirred by any congress or conference whatever. The nearest approach this island could show to the New York gathering, would probably be at Glasgow—intelligent, cosmopolitan, Protestant Glasgow. Nowhere, however, in the Eastern Hemisphere, could there be the same aggregate of interest for a sympathetic public as was found in New York, when, for the first time, the whole free Protestant Christianity of Europe went over, by its representatives, to enter into personal union and alliance with the collective Christianity of the Western Continent. Some generous Christian fathers of America, who had taken part in the European gatherings of 1846 and some following years, must have hailed the visit of the Alliance with no ordinary feelings of interest and thankfulness; let us be permitted, among these, to name in particular Dr. Paton and Dr. Cox, of New York.

What we have now said will be illustrated, and at the same time the most recent information on the subject will be afforded to our readers, if we add here some statistics relating especially to the different Protestant Churches in the United States. The population of the Union was, at the last census (1871), taken to be 38,550,000. There are said to be in the States about two millions of Roman Catholics. There are the Mormonites, amounting to about 90,000. There are about 73,000 Jews. The Unitarians and Universalists are said to number together about 365,000. The various Evangelical Protestant Churches are estimated as including 7,400,000 communicants. Of these, the smallest Church of any chief importance—a Church, however, let us say, which has of late been increasing rapidly both in numbers and influence, especially in the more refined circles of the older States, and in the missionary pioneer grounds of the far Western States—is the Episcopalian, or Protestant Episcopal Church, which is said to number 239,218 communicants. The smallest but one of the larger denominations is the Congregationalist, numbering 318,916 communicants. In America the Congregationalists are distinguished for their intelligence and culture, and seem to be free from the bitterness and narrowness which are too often found among Churches of the same

name in this country. The Lutheran family of Churches, under various synods, conferences, or councils, count 487,195 communicants; Presbyterians, of various styles and sorts, count 971,765; Baptists, of all sorts—varieties innumerable—2,091,361; Methodists, of ten or eleven different varieties, 3,146,012, the Methodist Episcopal Church counting 1,468,683, and the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, 654,159; while the two "African" Methodist Episcopal Churches, "Bethel" and "Zion," number together 576,000. From these figures it is evident that the United States is a country of professing Christians and of communicants to an extent altogether unknown in this country; that, indeed, a profession of religion must be well-nigh universal. About one in three of the entire population of the States would appear to be communicants, the vast majority of these belonging to the free and non-hierarchical Protestant Churches, such as would welcome an Evangelical Alliance, and have no sympathy with episcopalian exclusiveness. Doubtless, also, many Lutherans would be strongly attracted towards the German element in the Alliance.*

The "History of the Sixth General Conference of the Evangelical Alliance" begins, after a Preface, with an Historical Sketch of the Conference, following which comes the "Table of Contents." The contents include "Reports on the State of Religion in various Christian Countries;" Papers and Addresses on "Christian Union;" Papers on "Christianity and its Antagonisms," divided into a *Theo-*

---

* We have taken the particulars given above from "A Statistical Exhibit of Evangelical Christianity in the United States," given in Appendix III. to the volume under review, and drawn up by the Rev. Daniel Dorchester, Lowell, Massachusetts. We have not given the number of Friends. We find Mr. Boyce, in his very useful *Missionary Statistics*, gives their total number of all ages as 224,000. It is steadily declining. (Boyce's *Statistics*, p. 144.) How the irreverence of American newspapers, and the confessed demoralisation, especially in certain respects, of which we cannot write particularly, that would appear to pervade the Eastern States, and to have infected most of the larger cities—how these things, and such things as these, are to be reconciled with the all but universal Christian profession of the States, it is not our business here to inquire. In not a few respects, America remains an enigma to the Englishman. The stranger supposes himself to understand the character of the people, and is apt to bless or to curse, to praise or to censure, wholesale. The man who has lived there long confesses himself at a loss to comprehend a people so different in different parts, so inconsistent often with themselves, so full of anomalies to an English judgment. Whoever knows America, will find many things to mourn over, not a little to censure, but many things also to admire, and many friends to love.

logical Section and a *Philosophical Section;* Papers on the "Christian Life," including (Section 1) *Personal and Family Religion,* (Section 2) *Education and Literature,* (Section 3) *The Pulpit of the Age,* (Section 4) *Sunday Schools,* (Section 5) *Christian Associations;* Papers on "Romanism and Protestantism," in three sections, viz., *Modern Romanism and Protestantism, The Old Catholics, The Evangelisation of Roman Catholic Countries;* "On Christianity and Civil Government," in three sections, viz., *Church and State, Christianity and Liberty, Ministerial Support;* "On Christian Missions," in two sections, first, the *Principles of Mission Work,* second, *Particular Mission Fields;* and "On Christianity and Social Progress."

Of these, the two most interesting and important divisions will probably, by general consent, be agreed to be, the 1st, "On the State of Religion in various Christian Countries;" the 3rd, on "Christianity and its Antagonisms;" the 4th, on "Christian Life," and the 5th, on "Romanism and Protestantism." The Report given by Pastor Prochet, of the Waldensian Church at Genoa, in regard to the prospects of the religious revival and of the spirit of Reformation in Italy is, on the whole, decidedly encouraging; so also, notwithstanding serious drawbacks and exceptions, is the view afforded of the religious prospect in France by Pastor Decoppet, of the National Reformed Church in Paris, and the well-known and much-respected Pastor Fisch, of the Free Church in Paris. Even in Belgium, as Pastor Anet informed the Alliance, "though it is the day of small things"—of things very small—yet a genuine and promising beginning has been made, a spirit of missionary zeal and a stream of converting influence and energy have gone forth, from which one cannot but hope important results in the future. The Protestantism of Belgium numbers but few Churches—twelve in receipt of State support, twenty-four free and self-supporting, these latter having, for the most part, been gathered from among Roman Catholics, and one of them (that at Charleroi) numbering 1,000 members, inclusive of children. But the Churches, with rare exceptions, are free from the leaven of rationalism. Pastor Anet, we may note, is of Brussels, and is himself the Secretary of the Free Evangelical Organisation of Churches of which we have been speaking. Thus, in the countries in which Roman Catholicism is predominant, there is almost everywhere

reason for encouragement. This would appear to be the case even in Spain, according to the report of the German missionary, Fliedner, son of the famous Pastor Fliedner, of the German Inner Mission, and of the lamented Carrasco, who was lost in the ill-fated *Ville de Havre*.

But when we turn to the countries in which, at the epoch of the Reformation, Protestantism, in one or other form, rose to the ascendant, we find the condition and prospect to be, in general, by no means encouraging to an Evangelical Christianism. Everywhere rationalism does its havoc—in Holland, in German Switzerland, most of all in Germany. It is true that there are not wanting powerful defenders of the truth, such as Von Osterzee in Holland, and in Germany Luthardt and Christlieb, worthy successors of the veteran Tholuck, Ebrard, Lange, Dorner, and their fellows. The cause of Christian faith and truth in Protestant countries has by no means retrograded to the position which it held on the Continent in the first decade of this century. But still the account given by Dr. Cohen Stuart, in his very able Report as to Holland, and by the Rev. Hermann Krummacher and Dr. Tholuck (who sent a paper to the Conference, although he could not himself be present), is very unsatisfactory. In Germany, in particular, the aspect of religion at the present moment is almost alarming. In 1870, especially during the war with France, it seemed as if the German faith in God and Christianity had risen in great might, and was likely to rise higher still: there was, to use Mr. Krummacher's words, "among the rich and the poor, upon the thrones and in the meanest cottages, in camps and hospitals, a religious susceptibility, a hunger for the Word of God, an eagerness to invoke God, and to serve Him by works of charity," which surprised not only Germany itself, but Europe at large. But the expectations of a religious revival to follow that great war have been grievously disappointed, a tide of irreligion and unbelief, cresting, as it were, the immense uprising of national power and pride, seems to have burst over the land. It is evident, indeed, everywhere on the Continent, that established Protestantism has suffered for want of free living organisations of Christian faith and worship to compete with and to supplement the State organisations. The Protestantism of the Continent has ages ago hardened into a matter of State prescription and mechanism. Even

where, as in Holland—in Holland alone—the character of a State establishment has in theory departed from it, the condition has still remained. Beyond the creed, the endowments, the ancient State provision, the time-honoured mechanism, there has been no new growth or life. In England the State Church is on all sides confronted and surrounded by active and powerful voluntary Churches, and the voluntary growth and increase of the State Church itself has become so vast as almost to have enclosed, and absorbed into the element of its own life, the mere State organisation. Hence, in this country all things live which belong to religious organisation and service. It is far otherwise on the Continent; and if Continental Protestantism is to be truly revived, and to be rescued from the death-taint of infidelity, it can only be by means of the vitalising power of voluntary Churches. Hence the immense value of the work which Methodism is doing in Germany, both British, and, still more, American Methodism. What has been said of Germany is equally true in general of Scandinavia. In Sweden, however, Methodism long ago, by the agency of the late Rev. George Scott, was enabled to begin a work of revival, the effects of which have not ceased, to increase and spread to the present day.

We may repeat here to-day what, in an article on the Berlin Conference, we wrote seventeen years ago.* The Reformation on the Continent, through the writings alike of Luther and of Calvin, gave an impulse to doctrinal speculation and reconstruction which could never afterwards be suppressed or annulled, and yet those who established and endowed the Churches of Protestantism, attempted, by fixed confessions and formularies, to suppress, if not to annul, this impulse. No latitude was allowed for dissent, no hope permitted of modification, no sphere provided for free and voluntary activity, for all that belongs to the great mission-life of Christianity. "Men's hands were tied and their hearts bound up, while their heads were left to work with an undue and unwholesome activity." Hence the result which we have to lament to-day.

Already, however, we can trace the beginnings of free Christian life in every part of Continental Protestantism,

* *London Quarterly Review*, January, 1858.

and we cannot doubt that the vital power will grow and spread. With the spread of such life pernicious speculation and paralysing scepticism will proportionately decline. The advantage possessed by Protestantism in countries where Roman Catholicism is in the ascendant is, that its life is more voluntary, more genuine, more truly spiritual. Even in France a salutary infection of spiritual reality and earnestness has spread from the voluntary and unendowed to the state-supported forms of Christianity. Rationalism has not, by far, the hold on the National Reformed Church of France which it had thirty years ago.

In no volume, perhaps in no number of volumes, accessible to the English public, can so true, so clear, so comprehensive a view of the actual condition of Christianity in all the Continental countries of Europe—including Greece and excepting only Russia—be obtained as in the volume before us.

In the Theological Section of the third division of this volume, that on "Christianity and its Antagonisms," we may refer particularly to the massive and masterly paper of Dr. Christlieb, Professor of Theology at Bonn, on "The Best Methods of Counteracting Modern Infidelity,"—a paper the reading of which occupied more than two hours, but which, nevertheless, so held and impressed a vast audience, that the author was constrained to read it a second time to a vaster and more distinguished audience in Dr. Adams's Church; to the timely and suggestive paper of Professor Leathes, of King's College, on the same subject; to Dr. Van Oosterzee's contribution on the subject of "The Gospel History and Modern Criticism;" to the fresh and interesting paper of Dr. Warren, President of the Boston University, on "American Infidelity, its Factors and Phases;" and to the beautiful paper on "Reason and Faith," by Dr. Washburn, of New York. Let us pause for a moment at the name of Dr. Warren.

Not many years ago, the American Methodist Episcopal Church, knowing itself to be by far the greatest and most influential Church in the States, and yet, in comparison of some smaller denominations—as, for example, the Presbyterians and Congregationalists—to be deficient in high theological scholarship, and in the means, as a Church, of affording the highest discipline, theological and general, to its adherents, determined to send to Europe, and especially into Germany, some young men of high and proved

capacity. Among these was Dr. Hurst, now the Principal and Theological Professor of Drew Seminary, near Madison, New Jersey, and well known as a philosophical historian of theology; and also Dr. Warren, the author of the paper to which we are referring, and the Principal of the new Boston University, which is a Methodist institution of the greatest promise, likely to be a wholesome rival in New England to the power and influence of the Unitarian Harvard. Unless we mistake, also, Professor Prentiss, an accomplished member of the staff of Middletown University, was another of the selected ministers.

The step was bold, spirited, and, as we cannot but think, wise. It is, in particular, very gratifying to mark that neither of the theological professors appears to have lost anything of the Evangelical spirit or creed by his residence for several years in Germany.

We are not sure that we agree with all that Professor Warren says on the subject of American infidelity; we almost doubt whether, on mature thought, he would desire us to rest in the estimate which he presents to us of his country's relations to unbelief. It seems to us as if he claimed, as a high merit for his country, indefinite receptivity of infidel ideas from abroad, especially from England and Germany, coupled with an entire incapacity to originate any form or principle of infidelity for itself. But no one can fail to acknowledge the freshness and force with which he presents his views. He begins by showing that the fervid and fusing force which, out of the heterogeneous elements of American colonial life, made one people, was Evangelical religion. "Shut in between the territories of France upon the North and West, and Spanish Florida on the South, bisected near the middle by large Dutch and Swedish populations in New York and Delaware, overdotted with settlements of every European nationality, the little British colonies of two hundred years ago presented, in most respects, the least hopeful aspect of all the European dependencies in the New World. No two existed under a common charter, scarce two had a like religion." "A soul was needed to organise the rich though motley elements into one living national body. That soul was communicated, as by a Divine afflatus, in the great Whitfieldian revival." "Again and again, through all these colonies, from New Hampshire to Georgia, the most famous evangelist of history moved in triumph. Puritan New

Englanders forgot that he was a gowned priest of the very Church from whose oppressions they had fled to the wilds of a new world. Dutch New York, and German Pennsylvania, almost unlearned their degenerating vernaculars as they listened to his celestial eloquence. The Quaker was delighted with his gospel simplicity, the Covenanter and Huguenot with his "doctrines of grace." The Episcopalians were his by rightful Church fellowship, and thus it came to pass that when, after crossing the ocean eighteen times in his flying ministry, he lay down to death at Newburyport, he was unconsciously, but in reality, the spiritual father of a great Christian nation."

Professor Warren proceeds to sum up the Evangelical forces which belonged to the American people at the period when it attained to political independence. His summary is worth quoting, if only because of its bearing upon a point to which we have already adverted, viz., the very general prevalence of religious profession in the States. We shall see that, in this respect, the fruit of American maturity has been according to the seed of her earliest youth.

"Almost the entire population belonged to Evangelical Churches, and, what was more important, to Evangelical churches with which they were identified by all the ties of education and long-standing tradition. In New England, Puritan Independency, or Congregationalism, was not only the religion established by law, but the real faith of almost the entire community. In the middle and southern States, with the exception of Pennsylvania, the Church of England had been the established Church, though in many sections the Reformed Church, including its three great branches, the Scotch, Dutch, and German, equalled or surpassed in numbers and influence, the communion established and favoured by law. Though the disruption of the new nation from the mother country left all communicants of the Church of England disorganised and churchless, they remained so for a very brief period only. In 1784 and 1789, they organised themselves into two new Episcopal Churches, the Methodist Episcopal, and the Protestant Episcopal, each retaining, with slight modifications, the Articles of Religion, the Liturgy, and many of the traditions of the great Anglican mother. Lutheranism, at this time, was not strong. Still it was not greatly disproportioned to the German population. To sum up, with a population of about three millions, there was very nearly an Evangelical minister to every two thousand souls."

The following is Professor Warren's summary of the

view which he had been giving, at some length, of the history of infidelity in America:—

"Glancing back over these successive waves of opposition to the kingdom of Christ, one is struck, first of all, by the fact that none of them were of American origin. The successive types of unbelief and misbelief which have arisen and prevailed in Europe, have, in every case, determined the successive types of unbelief and misbelief in America. In most cases, the first effectual introduction of a new type has been due to Europeans coming to our shores. Thus, our first popular infidelity was directly due to European soldiery, and to such immigrants as Thomas Paine. The great New England defection was, to a certain extent, pioneered by British Socinians, and decidedly aided by the coming of Joseph Priestley and John Murray. The Communistic crusade was preached by Owen in person, and seconded by scores of foreign-born adjutants. The phrenological revival of naturalism was introduced by a pupil of Gall, and disseminated by the labours of Prussian Spurzheim and Scotch Combe. Mother Ann Lee, whom England gave us, was the early forerunner of American spiritualism, while the ghost of Scandinavian Swedenborg appearing to Andrew Jackson Davies in a graveyard near Paughkeepsie, in 1832, so affected the deliria of that 'seer,' and the whole system of his followers, that the historian of American Socialisms* declares 'Spiritualism is Swedenborgianism Americanised.' Finally, the transition of the 'Free Religionists' from a professedly Scriptural Unitarianism to an open repudiation of all positive revelation, was an effect of German speculation and criticism, meditated (*query mediated*) partly by such men as Follen, more effectively by American students and tourists abroad, most potently of all by the writings of Germans, and of admirers of German literature. Thus all these threatening surges of anti-Christian thought and effort have come to us from European seas; not one arose in our hemisphere. Like other peoples, we have erred in the sphere of religion; but our admitted errors, as in the case of the wild excrescences of Mormonism, Millerism, and Shakerism, are all in the direction of superstition rather than that of unbelief. America has given the Old World valuable theological speculations, admirable defences of the faith, precious revival influences, memorable exhibitions of international charity, but she has never cursed humanity with a new form of infidelity. We have no Strauss, no Renan, not even a Carl Vogt. We never have had. The nearest approach to it we ever had was the forceful Unitarian preacher who ministered to the "Twenty-eighth Congregational Society," of Boston, from 1845 to 1859. Even he had not the requisite learning or genius

* J. H. Noyes.

to enable him to propound a solitary new difficulty to the Christian scholarship of his age. We have infidel *littérateurs* of respectable attainments and all too-wide influence, but, in all the ranks of American unbelievers, the Christian apologist of learning and ability can nowhere find a foeman worthy of his steel."

We have already intimated that the view presented in these extracts appears to us to be open to criticism. Professor Warren magnifies, as it seems to us, the credulity of his nation, and asserts their liability to gross superstition, that he may save them from the reproach of infidelity. But surely credulity and unbelief signally concur in some of the characteristic forms of American religious error. To us, for example, Mormonism is infidelity as well as gross credulity. American spiritualism, also, often unites superstition and infidelity within the embrace of its boundless credulity. What we have quoted is almost tantamount to an admission that American speculation is altogether destitute of originality. For it is simply impossible that a habit and character of original thought should be shut up, either in America or elsewhere, within the limits of Christian orthodoxy. National habits of mind cannot but extend throughout the whole breadth of cultured society. That many cultured people in America have a strong sceptical bias Professor Warren in effect admits. In truth irreverence and unbelief, it is notorious, largely infect the journalism and periodical literature of the States. To deny that infidel thought in the States possesses any originality or any incisive force, is to deny originality to the *littérateurs* of the nation.

That there is comparatively little power or outgrowth of original speculation in the States, is perhaps true; it is also probably true that the most distinguished and able thinkers, the most original and fruitful thinkers, have been and are orthodox Christians—and here the names occur to us of Dr. Hodge, of Princeton, and the accomplished and able critic and philosopher of Yale College, Newhaven, Dr. Noah Porter, author of one of the ablest and most comprehensive philosophical treatises of the age—on "The Human Intellect." But, on similar grounds to those assigned by Professor Warren, it might be argued that the modern infidelity, both of England and France, is derived from Germany, while that of Germany was originally derived from England.

The Second, or "Philosophical Section," under the head

"Christianity and Its Antagonisms," contains a number of valuable papers on the modern controversy of Christianity with Science and Philosophy, which we can only name. Dr. M'Cosh came first with his eloquent paper on the "Religious Aspects of the Doctrine of Development," and was immediately followed by a valuable scientific paper on "Primitive Man and Revelation," contributed by the able and well-known Principal of McGill College, Montreal, Dr. J. W. Dawson. Professor Guyot, of Princeton, contributed a paper on "Cosmogony and the Bible," which has attracted much attention; the accomplished Professor Naville, of Geneva, followed with one on "The Gospel and Philosophy," and there were still others, from the pens of able Americans, on "Idealism," on "Christianity and Humanity," and on "The Comparative Study of Religions."

The Fifth Division (on "Romanism and Protestantism") presents a great array of interesting and able papers. The "Vatican Council," handled by Dr. Dorner; "Popery in France," dealt with by Pastor Fisch; the recent anti-Ultramontane Legislation in Germany, explained, and rather excused than defended, by the Rev. Leopold Witte, himself a Prussian; and "The Appeal of Romanism to Educated Protestants," by Dr. Storrs, of Brooklyn, are some among the crowd of papers contributed on the general subject of "Modern Romanism and Protestantism." The Old Catholics had a section to themselves, and a very full and accurate account was given of their movements both in Germany and Switzerland. Dr. Schaff read to the section a remarkable "Letter from the Old Catholic Congress"—which Congress had met at Constance a month before—"to the Alliance." Other papers were read on Evangelical Mission Work among the Roman Catholics in France and Ireland.

Dr. Storrs' paper, named above, was a very remarkable paper—a paper of great philosophical grasp and force, and of superb eloquence. Perhaps no paper read before the Alliance produced so powerful an effect. Some thought it represented too favourably the attractions of Popery. Those who so judged failed to appreciate the scope or character of the paper. Dr. Storrs did a great service to his country. To answer men, or to counterwork their influence and the inducements they offer, it is necessary that the force of their arguments, and the full truth as to their attitude and position, should be understood. Even in England Evangelical Christians are often incapable

of understanding how sincere and devout men of unquestionable ability and culture can be drawn over to Popery as the Marquis of Ripon was so lately. But in the United States—where the *quasi*-Anglo-Catholic party is very small indeed, and altogether destitute of public respect or power—where no great Anglo-Catholic development, with an array of eminent and eloquent leaders, and a long catena of authorities coming down through past ages, such as exists in England, stands midway towards Romanism, and serves at once as interpreter and inspirer of "Catholic" tendencies and longings—it is much more difficult for people to understand how any honest man can go to Rome. And yet, from time to time, honest and able men have gone over and are going over, even in the United States, to Rome, while there is evidence enough that, despised and feeble as the *quasi* Anglican High Church movement has hitherto been, it is beginning to make way, even in the States. There is little doubt that, as in the particulars Professor Warren mentions, so in this also, the English ideas and movement have already more than touched the shores of the States, and are destined, for at least a few years to come, to exert a widening and deepening influence.

Of the men whose accession to the ranks of Romanism needs to be explained, Dr. Storrs speaks as follows:—

"They are serious, devout, conscientious persons, intent on learning, and then on doing, the will of the Almighty; of no peculiar turn of mind, with no marked predominance of imagination or emotional sensibility; many of them educated in the best and most liberal Protestant schools; some of them among the noblest of their time, whom it is a serious loss to us to lose.

"And it is to be distinctly observed that these men accept the system of Romanism with no languor or reserve, with no esoteric and half-Protestant interpretation of it, with no thought at all of modifying its dogmas for their personal use by the exercise of a private judgment upon them. They take the system as it stands. They take it altogether. They look with pity, not unmixed with contempt, on those who are eager to adopt its phraseology and to mimic its ceremonies, while declining to submit their minds to its mandates; and for themselves they confess doctrines which seem to us incredible, and conform themselves to practices which look to us like idolatrous mummery, with gladness and pride.

"Now, what moves these men? What is the attraction which the system presents to such as these, in Germany, England, this country?—an attraction which is strong enough to wholly detach

them from their early associations, and to make them devotees of a spiritual power which from childhood they were taught to dread and to detest?"

Having so put his questions, Dr. Storrs proceeds to answer them. We can only quote the summary which he gives towards the close of his paper of the reasons which he had assigned in answer to his own questions:—

"So it is, then, fathers and brethren, as I conceive it, and so far as the time allows me to state it, that Romanism appeals to educated Protestants; as offering them an authoritative teacher, always present, in which it claims that the mind of God resides and is revealed; as presenting what it affirms to be a solid, consistent, and satisfying theology; as claiming to bring the spiritual world more clearly and closely to their minds, and to show their relations to it more intimate; as professing to give them a security of salvation unattainable elsewhere; as offering them what it declares the only true sanctity of spirit and life; as showing a long and venerable history; as welcoming and cherishing all the fine arts, and making these its constant helpers; as promising to rebuild and purify society, and at last to possess and regenerate the earth.

"To those who are attracted by it, it seems to have all which other systems possess or claim, and to add vital elements which others lack, supplying their imperfections, surpassing their power, and meeting wants which they can neither interpret nor answer.

"It influences men by its immense mass, without their conscious discrimination of its separate attractions. Its bulk is so gigantic, its energy so incessant, that it seems to them to verify its claims without other argument, and to make a private judgment against it the most rash and reckless of spiritual acts. So it draws them to it with a moral momentum, which increases as they approach; with a force almost like that of the physical suction of a current or a whirlpool. Once started on their course to it, opposing argument becomes nearly powerless. The pull of this immense and consummate system is so strenuous and enveloping, that theological, philosophical, historical objections are evaded or overleaped by the yielding mind, as are rocks in a rapid by rushing timbers.

"Where it has once become firmly established, it impregnates everything with its mysterious and penetrant influence. It becomes a pervading spiritual presence, which has its voices not only in the pulpit, or in books of devotion, but in homes, and schools, and all places of concourse; which touches life at every point where that is sensitive and responsive; which is associated with ancestral memories and renown, and more vitally associated with the hopes of the future. It gives stability to rank, yet

makes the humblest at home amidst its more than royal pageants. It invites the scholar to a happy seclusion, yet lights the most laborious life with a gleam from the supernatural. It paints the story of Christ on windows, and carves it in lordly and delicate marbles, for the eager and wondering eyes of childhood, and for the fading sight of age. It occupies itself with imperial cares, yet connects itself intimately with the deepest aspirations which move the soul, and with its longing love for the dead. It is like displacing the atmosphere to remove it. Rebellion against it seems to dislocate the frame of society itself. Only a tremendous moral reaction, inspired and sustained by forces which are in their nature incompressible, and which have been gathering through successive generations, can break its hold on a nation which once it has firmly grasped.

"It is still too recent and too limited with us to have such a general sweep of power. But it is working, with unwearied resolution, to make itself supreme among us. Its very strangeness gives it prominence in our American or English society; as a palm-tree attracts more attention than an oak. It brings forces that have been disciplined for a thousand years to act on our plastic modern life; and converts to it may be expected from many quarters.

"Some have held its doctrine before, in the feebler, more fanciful, and more fragmentary form in which that is avowed by a section, for example, of the Anglican communion, in England and here. Their logical sense must carry them to its conclusion, if logical sense has been able to maintain itself through the enfeebling pettiness of their previous career.

"Some, holding the Evangelical doctrine of the Divinity of our Lord, and the present operation of the Holy Ghost, find here what seems to them the necessary complement, and the justifying reason, of these transcendent disclosures; the only exact and final antithesis to Socinianism, or even to Atheism. Some are drawn to it by the fervour of feeling, the energy of pathetic and admonishing eloquence, which mark the sermons of the Paulists, and of others who, like them, appear from their retreats to stir men's hearts as messengers from God. Some simply and gladly react into it from a restless, sad, and weary scepticism. But all are greatly in earnest when they go. They are true devotees, and they rarely return. They are usually Ultramontanists afterward. There is nothing languid, moderate, tepid, in their conviction or their feeling. They are resolute, enthusiastic, with a fire of zeal which works alike in brain and heart. And they have a tone of assurance in their words, and of certainty of victory. Bellarmine is their favourite theologian. De Maistre is widely popular with them. Hyacinthe and Döllinger are 'fallen angels.'

"They had no trouble with the dogma of Papal Infallibility. It was desired and welcomed by them, as articulating what had been latent for centuries in the unvoiced consciousness of the Church, and as bringing the whole system to its legitimate and prophesied climax. That Pope Honorius had been formally condemned by the Sixth Council, his dogmatic writings burned as heretical, and his name anathematised and stricken from the liturgy, was not even a hindrance to the eagerness of their faith.

"They make great sacrifices for their convictions, and do it joyfully. Indeed, the sacrifice becomes to them a fresh motive, an argument for the system which demands it. For, according to the cross shall be the crown, and they who have come out of great tribulation shall find their robes of a more lustrous white. Before the intensity of their aspiration the ties of friendship, the strongest bonds of earthly relationship, if tending to withhold them from the Church of their desire, yield and are severed as flaxen fibres in the flame. For they regard the system which they accept, not only as essential to the future of mankind, to the well-being of persons, to the safety and glory of peoples and States; they regard it as alone Divine in its nature, overwhelming in its authority, whose touch should properly shatter and consume whatever opposes it. Even the temporary toleration of a different faith is to them an unwelcome necessity. A system of popular education not pervaded by Roman Catholic influences is ensnaring and dangerous. They have the courage of their convictions; and they use without stint the instruments of Protestantism to further their system, and to make it universal.

"Even present failure does not dishearten them. That they expect; and they can wait, for the Church lives on. The ages are hers; and to her supreme incorporeal life, which time does not waste nor change impair, the final victory always is sure!

"If we are to resist the vast effort of these men, and to make the liberties which our fathers bequeathed to us, and the Gospel in which they surely trusted, supreme in the land, we must at least know more than we have known of the seductive and stimulating forces which operate against us, and which we are to encounter. To treat the cases of those who have gone from us to Rome as merely sporadic—the effect of accidental causes, or of personal eccentricity—one might as well treat thus the power which drives the Gulf Stream northward, or which hurls the monsoons of the Indian Ocean back and forth across the equator."

Able and comprehensive, however, as is Dr. Storrs' answer to his own questions, it is not complete. Dr. Storrs omits to take note of what, in this country at least, has been, perhaps, of all motives the most potent in leading

men of high character to join the Romish Church. That Church alone appears to many to satisfy the craving for visible organic and external unity and continuity in the Church of Christ, and to afford a literal fulfilment of what has been by so many regarded as the meaning of Christ's promise, spoken to Simon Peter, of the perpetuity and invincibility of his rock-founded Church. So long as that passage continues to be interpreted in a gross material sense, instead of according to the true beauty and glory of its real spiritual meaning, it will be a *crux* for Protestants and a stronghold for Romanisers. Connected with this consideration is that of an external ministerial succession and perpetuity of orders. This has always been one of the "eidola of" the clerical, or *quasi* clerical "chamber." We must not omit Dr. Storrs' presentation of the other side of the case, with which he closes his paper. Having spoken of the Roman system, and of its utter and essential unreality, he proceeds as follows:—

"Good men have lived under it, multitudes of them; saintly women, as pure and devout as ever brightened the earth with their presence; and such live in it now. But their goodness is wholly and constantly paralleled outside their communion, because it has come, not from what is peculiar to that, but from the quickening light of God's Word, and the transforming energy of His Spirit, which we as freely and consciously partake. In that which is peculiar to it—its hierarchy, its ritual, its efficacious sacraments, its indulgences to the sinner, its vast and complex organisation, the concentration of all authority in its 'Vice-God' at Rome—wherever the system has had its way it has wrought such mischiefs that the pen hesitates to recount them.

"It has been powerful to depress peoples, ineffectual to uplift them. It has, with sure instinct, discouraged and diminished secular enterprise. It has linked itself most naturally with the harshest and most tyrannous civil institutions. It has made religion a matter of rites, and a matter of locality; till the same man became a devotee in the chapel, and a bandit in the field. It has accepted a passionate zeal for the Church in place of the humility, the purity and charity, which Christ demanded; till the fierce Dominic becomes one of its saints; till forged decretals were made for centuries to bulwark its power; till its hottest anathemas have been launched at those who complained of its abuses; till all restraints of humanity or morality have been overleaped in many excesses to which its adherents have been prompted from the altar. Its most devoted and wide-spread order, the Society of Jesus, in spite of its invincible heroism and

its unequalled services to the Popes, by the monstrous maxims which Pascal exposed, and the practices which expressed them, so kindled against it the indignation of Christendom, that Clement XIV. was compelled to suppress it in all Christian States.

"The rage of this system against whatever would hinder its march—against its own subjects when they have conscientiously paused in their submission—has had something transcendent in its pitiless malignity. The fierceness of its persecutions has been precisely proportioned to its power. The hand which looks so full of blessing has opened the deep of *oubliettes*, has added tortures to the rack, has framed the frightful Iron Maiden, has set the torch to martyr fires. The breath which should have filled the air with sweeter than Sabæan odours, has blighted the bloom of many lives, and floated curses over the nations so frequent and so awful, that life itself was withered before them, till their very extravagance made them harmless.

"Instead of true wisdom, where this system has prevailed with an unquestioned supremacy, it has fostered and maintained wide popular ignorance. Instead of true sanctity, its fruit has been shown in peasantries debased, aristocracies corrupted, an arrogant and a profligate priesthood. It has honoured the vilest who would serve it, and crushed the purest who would not. It sent gifts and applause, and sang its most exulting *Te Deum*, for Philip the Second; while its poisoned bullet killed William of Orange. The medal which it struck in joyful commemoration of the bloody diabolism of St. Bartholomew's is one of its records. Its highest officials have sometimes lived lives which its own annalists have hated to touch. Alexander VI., cruel, crafty, avaricious, licentious, whom it were flattery to call a Tiberius in pontificals—who bribed his way to the highest dignity, who burned Savonarola, the traditional portrait of whose favourite mistress, profanely painted as the Mother of God, hangs yet in the Vatican, who probably died by the poisoned wine which he had prepared for his cardinals, and whose evil renown is scarcely matched by that of Cæsar Borgia his son—stands as one of its infallible Popes, holding the keys of heaven for men.

"If any system is doomed by its history, this is the one. Protestantism has now so checked it, the advancing moral development of mankind has set such limits to its power, that these are largely facts of the past. The Vatican Court is now free from scandal. The Church at present seeks strength through beneficence, not through control of the secular arm; by its helps to piety, not through appeals to physical fear. But its more spontaneous and self-revealing development has been in this more friendly Past. Therefore the nations whom once it has ruled, when they finally break from it, hate it with an intensity proportioned to the promises it has failed to fulfil, and the bitter

degradations it has made them undergo. Atheism itself—that moral suicide—seems better to them than to be again subjected to Rome.

"This is the system as realised in history, and there forever adjudged and sentenced. Of course this gives immense advantage to those who now resist its progress. It cannot fascinate the nations again till the long experience is forgotten. But such is not at all its appearance as presented to those whom it wins to its fold. And we must look at it, in a measure at least, as those who honour and love it look, if we would understand its power, if we would know how it is that it hopes a second time to conquer the world."

Our space fails us, and we can now say but a few words more, whether about the New York meeting or the Alliance in general. Yet many matters would press for notice if we had time. We had intended, in particular, to make special reference to some of the papers read under the "Christian Life" division. But we cannot do more than name even the beautiful papers in the section on "Education and Literature," contributed respectively by Dr. Simpson, of Derby, England, on "Modern Literature and Christianity," and by Dr. Noah Porter, of Yale College, on "Modern Literature in its Relation to Christianity." Dr. Porter is not only an able and sagacious philosopher, but an elegant and acute critic. Dr. Simpson, also, is a man of great ability and accomplishment, of whom England should hear more than as yet it has done. In the same section we note, as of special interest to some of our readers, that Dr. Rigg read a paper on the "Relations of the Secular and Religious Elements in Popular Education in England;" a paper of information, not of controversy. We further note, as probably likely to interest many of our ministerial readers, that under the third section of this division—"The Pulpit and the Age"—Dr. Parker, of London, Dr. Kidder, Professor of Homiletics at Drew Seminary, and author of a volume on the subject of "Homiletics," Mr. Ward Beecher, and Dr. John Hall, the eminent Baptist Minister of New York, contributed their ideas respectively, Dr. Hall dealing specifically with the proper matter in preaching—"What to Preach."

At Berlin, in 1857, the Rev. Henry Alford (afterwards Dean Alford) took part in a joint sacramental celebration, in the large hall of a noble hotel. For this Christian act he was proscribed at home by his fellow clergy generally,

and it is not improbable that it lost him a bishopric. At New York Dean Payne Smith, worthy successor at Canterbury of Dean Alford, did the like at a Presbyterian Church, the Church of Dr. Adams, one of the most influential among the New York clergy. It may be that this act, like that of his predecessor, may interfere with his promotion. If it should, Dean Smith is every whit too manly a Christian and too Christian a man to regret that, in the frankness of his heart, he did a thing so right as to take part in that joint communion. In America what he had done gave vast umbrage to the small but most exclusive *quasi* Anglo-Catholic party; in England it was for weeks the subject of solemn correspondence in the *Guardian*. But in his diocesan, the Primate, Dean Payne Smith has a powerful friend and ally, who will not, so far as he is concerned, allow him to suffer for his catholicity of spirit. The Dean carried to New York a letter of greeting from the Primate, excellent in tone and substance, which is printed in the appendix to this volume. Dr. Smith was well supported during the Alliance by several brother clergymen of distinction; in particular by Mr. Dallas Marston, Professor Stanley Leathes, and Mr. Fremantle. Altogether, Christian breadth and liberality of feeling has made a decided advance within the Church of England since 1857.

So we bid farewell to the New York Conference of the Evangelical Alliance. Those who had the privilege to be present will never forget it. All New York rose *en masse* to bid them welcome. All public places were thrown open to the Alliance, and the City Corporation, under the guidance of honest Mayor Havemeyer, one of the leaders in the great movement against the infamous rings which had so long bound the city in disgraceful and demoralising thraldom, led the Alliance round by steamer to show them the magnificent municipal institutions and charities of the corporation. Philadelphia and Washington vied with New York. The President delayed a military appointment to meet the Alliance at the White House. Hospitality was, on all sides, equally generous and courteous. The States showed in all points at their best. May the Christianity of the two continents hold them one!

ART. II.—1. *The Book of Daniel, with Notes and Introduction.* By CHR. WORDSWORTH, D.D., Bishop of Lincoln. Rivingtons. 1871.

2. *Biblical Commentary on the Old Testament. The Book of the Prophet Daniel.* By K. F. KEIL, D.D. Translated from the German by the Rev. M. G. EASTON, A.M. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark. 1872.

3. *Daniel the Prophet. Nine Lectures Delivered in the Divinity School of the University of Oxford. With Copious Notes.* By the Rev. E. B. PUSEY, D.D. Oxford: Jas. Parker and Co. Third Edition. 1869.

4. *Etudes Bibliques.* Par F. GODET, Docteur et Professeur en Théologie. Première Série: Ancien Testament. Paris: Sandoz et Fischbacher. Deuxième Edition. 1873.

5. *Manual of Historico-Critical Introduction to the Canonical Scriptures of the Old Testament.* By KARL FRIEDRICH KEIL. Translated from the Second Edition, with Supplementary Notes from Bleek and others, by GEORGE C. M. DOUGLAS, B.A., D.D. Vol. II. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark. 1870.

THE Book of Daniel has long been one of the high places of the field where the contest is waged for the faith once delivered unto the saints. With men to whom a miracle is a thing incredible, and prophecy an offence or an impossibility, it is not surprising to find the most inveterate opposition displayed towards a writing which contains a record of such miracles as those of the Babylonian exile, and a series of prophecies second to none in the Old Testament in the extent of their range and the minuteness of their details. If Daniel is numbered among the prophets, then the oracles of Tübingen are confounded like the magicians over whom he triumphed twenty-four centuries ago. It is a book, as Dr. Pusey says in his opening paragraph, which "admits of no half measures. It is either Divine or an imposture. The writer, were he not Daniel, must have lied on a most frightful scale, ascribing to God prophecies which were never uttered, and miracles which are assumed never to have been wrought."

In the case of this book, we have now nothing of the patchwork system advocated like the piecemeal authorship of the Pentateuch, and the so-called first and second Isaiahs of Rationalistic criticism. The whole book is relegated by its impugners to the Maccabean era, and its prophecies distorted to give them no later application than to the persecution of Antiochus Epiphanes and the war of independence, thus making them prophecies *post eventum*. Though the spuriousness of Daniel's book has come to be an axiom of the school which vaunts itself for its culture and its candour, theirs is not the joy of them that divide the spoil even after a century of attack. According to the highest authority in matters of Old Testament inspiration and canonicity, "Daniel the Prophet" spake of Him. All the theories which eliminate the Messianic and eschatological references from the book are beset with difficulties far exceeding that which recognises Daniel as a member of the "goodly fellowship of the prophets," and are based upon assumptions so cumbrous and arbitrary that they can be expected to find credence only where there was a foregone conclusion of disbelief.

Among the books called forth in answer to the *Essays and Reviews*, we question whether any is so likely to find a place among the standard works of English divinity a generation hence as the nine lectures of the Regius Professor of Hebrew at Oxford. Messrs. Clark have given us, as one of their recent and most valuable issues, the translation of Keil's *Commentary on Daniel*. Bishop Wordsworth reserved this book as the last published instalment of his Exposition, and prefixed to his Notes an unusually copious and interesting Introduction.

As to the person of the prophet, we learn that he was led captive into Babylon in the third year of King Jehoiakim (B.C. 606—5); hence his birth would seem almost to have coincided with the great reformation of religion in Judah under King Josiah. For one like Daniel, of noble, if not of royal birth, there was the promise of a prosperous career, until the nation was filled with mourning by the death of Josiah occasioned by the wound received at Megiddo. A younger son of Josiah (Shallum) was hastily proclaimed king in his father's stead under the name of Jehoahaz, but the Egyptian king Pharaoh Necho was the real master of the country. After a reign of only three months, the young monarch was carried off to the camp of

the conqueror at Riblah on the Orontes, and his elder brother was placed on the throne as a vassal of Pharaoh, taking the name of Jehoiakim. It was the twilight of the Jewish monarchy: Jeremiah's denunciations reveal to us a state of oppression wherein the degenerate princes of the house of David copied the examples of neighbouring despots. The chronicler sums up the record of Jehoiakim's reign in the brief and awful statement that "he did that which was evil in the sight of the Lord his God;" and the national archives are referred to as supplying the particulars of "the rest of the abominations which he did." The political situation in the nations around was far from promising. The empire of Nimrod and Sennacherib had collapsed a few years before, but another great world-power had risen on the Euphrates almost as suddenly as the city of the Tigris had fallen. Nabopolassar, the captor of Nineveh and the founder of Babylon, was at war with Pharaoh Necho, the lord paramount of the Jewish king. Necho had attacked the frontier fortress of Carchemish, but his army was driven back from the Euphrates to the Nile with such crushing defeat, that the Egyptian monarchy was shaken from its ancient centre at Memphis, and forced to take refuge at Thebes. Judæa lying between the two hostile powers—the Belgium of the East—and being a dependency of the conquered king, the whole land was filled with fear of invasion. So general was this dread that even the nomadic sons of Jonadab and Rechab forsook their tents for the security which the city was supposed to furnish. Soon the son of the King of Babylon, ere long to be his successor, came against the Holy City, which fell after a brief siege, and Nebuchadnezzar took Jehoiakim prisoner, but afterwards restored him as his vassal. Then began the removal of the vessels of the sanctuary to Babylon, and in the train led across the Syrian desert to the land of their conqueror were Daniel, Hananiah, Azariah, and Mishael of the royal seed of Judah, to be trained in the schools and to serve in the court of Babylon.

For the third time in the history of the Old Covenant the interests of the chosen nation were centred in a Hebrew youth surrounded by all the allurements and perils of a heathen court. But if, according to human ideas, the destinies of the covenant race seemed to tremble in the hands of a young captive, Babylon presented a counterpart

to the trials and triumphs of faith at Memphis centuries before; and Daniel, like Joseph and Moses, was found "faithful" as a servant of God even in the house of the conqueror of his country. It is not within the scope of the present paper to trace the process and to gather the lessons of his early trials, wherein royal luxuries and Chaldæan culture were alike powerless to corrupt the simplicity of his faith.

After three years' training there came the narrow escape from the massacre decreed against the baffled magicians. Our limits do not allow us to follow the sacred narrative as it reveals the future prophet desiring a knowledge of the king's dream as a mercy from the God of heaven. The vision being granted, he disclosed to Nebuchadnezzar the dream which had troubled him and its interpretation. The colossal image of terrible form, metallic throughout, descending in inferior succession from the head of gold to the legs of iron, mingled with clay in the feet, was declared to be the symbol of a series of world-powers springing from and following after the kingdom of Nebuchadnezzar, himself, as the impersonation of his realm and dynasty, "the head of gold." The great king heard from the young captive seer the intimation that the golden empire should soon have its splendour tarnished, and the silver breasts and arms announced the coming of the Medes and Persians, in that dread hour when his grandson heard from the same prophetic lips that he and his house were weighed in the balances and found wanting. The more remote brazen section of the dream-symbol indicated the rise of a third power, strong for a season, but ere long to be divided as the short-lived strength of Alexander should fall away from his successors. The power of Rome, not felt as yet beyond the seven hills, was revealed in the legs of iron, with kingdoms manifold rising from its ruins when in its turn it should have succumbed and been dissolved.

What Daniel expounded to Nebuchadnezzar out of his dream was repeated and more fully unfolded to himself in a revelation given some sixty years later. So the prediction concerning the powers which should successively rule over men will again call for our notice. But in this earliest apocalypse of the kingdoms of this world, the vista which the haughty monarch beheld starting from his own throne, and stretching through empires, some of them then scarcely beyond their germinant stage, found its vanishing point in

the glimpse of another kingdom "not of this world." If Daniel is the prophet of the times and seasons of Messiah's advent, filling up the scroll on which David had already inscribed His descent and dominion, and Isaiah His humiliation and sufferings, Nebuchadnezzar is added to the company of Balaam, and beheld Him, "but not nigh," in the sacred enclosure of the covenant promise and hope. The stone cut out of the mountain without hands was to him only a rock of offence as he discerned his own and the other kingdoms of this world giving way before the kingdom of our God and of His Christ.

Still the prophet who declared the whole counsel of God lost none of his earthly reward. The mightiest potentate of the world bowed before the Hebrew captive, and in the offering of incense there seems to have been more than an unusual tribute to the wisdom that was found in Daniel. The royal answer would rather explain it as an oblation made by Nebuchadnezzar to Daniel's God, whom the conqueror of many nations and the Pontifex Maximus of the Chaldæan Pantheon declared to be King of kings and God of gods. Then, like another Pharaoh, he determined that the youth who had revealed the Divine secret should be the chief councillor of the State; and the quondam prisoner of war was installed as ruler of the metropolitan province, president of the sacred college, and took his place "in the gate of the king," as—to borrow an etymology and an illustration in one from the unchanging East—Grand Vizier of the Sublime Porte of his age.

The epoch, however, has to us a far higher importance, inasmuch as all Israel of the captivity knew that Daniel was established a prophet of the Lord. A character assigned to him by our Lord in the most solemn period of His ministry, has nevertheless been denied by the unbelief of these latter days. At the outset of our review of his prophetic work we may pause awhile to glance at the objections raised by a gainsaying school against his claim to a place in the goodly fellowship of the prophets.

In ancient times the great opponent of the genuineness of Daniel's writings was the notorious adversary of Christianity, Porphyry. Staggered by the remarkably exact fulfilment of Daniel's prophecies in the subsequent history of the world, and pre-eminently in the Coming and Passion of the Messiah, he invented the theory that the book was the production of a Jew who lived in the times of the Mac-

cabees. His theory was nobly and triumphantly controverted by Eusebius, Jerome, Methodius of Tyre, and Apollinaris of Laodicea. So complete was his discomfiture, that even Spinoza did not venture to assail the genuineness of the prophecies in the later chapters. And it is only within the last hundred years or so that Porphyry has found advocates and disciples. For a brief summary of the literature of unbelieving criticism on this subject the reader is referred to Keil's *Introduction to the Old Testament*, translated in the *Foreign Theol. Library*. The principal points alleged by those who deny the genuineness of the book, are: (1) Its place in the Hebrew Canon among the books of the Hagiographa, and not with the rest of the prophets; (2) The corrupted language of the book; (3) The omission of Daniel's name in a catalogue of Jewish worthies enumerated by Jesus, the son of Sirach, in the 49th chapter of Ecclesiasticus, as well as the silence of the three last prophets concerning him; (4) The alleged romantic and self-laudatory character of the book; (5) Its dogmatic and ethical teaching is assumed to be out of agreement with the date of the Captivity.

In considering the first of these objections, it appears to us that no valid argument can be raised against the historical or prophetic character of the book, because in our Hebrew Bibles it stands among the "Writings," and not in conjunction with the greater and lesser prophets. Dr. Pusey has dealt with this subject in one of his lectures, from which we extract the following paragraph:—

"The arrangement of the Canon among the Jews, though different from that of the Christian Church, proceeded on definite and legitimate principles. (1) The Law, as the original fountain-head of revelation, stands at the head; (2) then all those books, believed to have been written by men exercising the prophetic office, whether those called the first prophets (the historical books from Joshua to the Kings), or what *we* call the prophets, *they* the later prophets; (3) then, a more miscellaneous class, "Scriptures," sacred writings, Hagiographa, written by persons who, whether endowed with the gift of prophecy or no, had not the pastoral office of the prophets. This last class consisted even chiefly of persons in high secular office. There were kings, as David, who, in that wider sense, was eminently a prophet; Solomon, who wrote at least one glorious Psalm, prophetic of Christ; Ezra, who had charge to lead his people back from their captivity, *the priest, the scribe*, yet who speaks of Haggai and Zecha-

riah as having an office of "prophets" distinct from his own;—Ezra, the author of the Chronicles, as well as of the book which bears his name; Nehemiah; probably Mordecai also, as the author of the book of Esther. The distribution is allowable, since plainly it is as permissible to class books according to the offices borne by their authors, as according to the subjects of the books themselves. But according to this distribution, the book of Daniel could occupy no other place than it does. Daniel had no immediate office of a practical teacher of his people. He was the statesman, the protector probably. The historical portion of his book contains some great dispensations of God, set down in the order ih which they took place, but with no account of the date of its composition. The prophetic portions of his book, in which he himself was the organ of prophecy, belong to the last years of a life beyond the common age of man. His first vision was probably not vouchsafed until he had reached the fourscore years, after which man's ordinary lot is suffering and sorrow. Even at this period those visions were but insulated events in his life, gifts vouchsafed to him in the midst of a secular life. . . . . His office was different from that of those whom God sent, *daily rising up early and sending them*, to speak in His Name the words which He gave them. *Theirs* was an abiding Spirit of prophecy resting upon them; to *him*, as far as we are told, insulated revelations only were disclosed."—*Pusey*, p. 351.

As to the corrupted language of the book, a more profound and candid investigation of the matter has only revealed in this case another example of the disingenuous deductions of the self-styled higher criticism. But granting, for the sake of argument, that the language is as corrupt as the baptized successors of Porphyry would have us admit, are the *à priori* considerations of the matter such as would cause us surprise, not to say dismay, at such a discovery? Keil puts the matter fairly and well when he asks: "Can we expect classic Hebrew expressions throughout from a man who received his education at the Chaldæan court, and who spent his whole life in Babylonia? Or can later Chaldee and Persian words in Daniel prove anything, when such are to be found in all the writers of the period of the Exile? Or has Ezekiel a purer or better style?"—P. 23. As to the *double* language employed in the book, even De Wette has acknowledged the uniformity of style to be such as to indicate a single authorship, "binding together the Chaldee and Hebrew portions, not only in themselves but with each other." The earlier modern adversaries of the book made much of certain

words occurring in it which they pronounced to be Greek words, and then assumed that they were unquestionable proofs of its spuriousness. Out of ten words which Bertholdt brought forward as Greek, the most recent Rationalist critics have surrendered six as availing them nothing, so the issue is confined to three or four, which, as names of musical instruments in the catalogue of Nebuchadnezzar's orchestra, belong to a category in which the language of any nation is most readily affected by mercantile or other intercourse with foreigners. As long as the Englishman drinks congou or cocoa, eats potatoes or curry, and wears calico or cambric, the names of these articles will help him to remember that his vocabulary, as well as his table and wardrobe, has been replenished from foreign sources through the agency of commerce. The Babylon of Nebuchadnezzar's age was far from being a sealed empire like the Japan of former days. The Euphrates formed a ready highway of intercourse with Armenia on the one hand and India on the other. In the former, if not the latter region, the venturesome Phœnician merchants plied their trade, and helped to transmit words while they exchanged merchandise. Tadmor in the wilderness had been built by the great patron of commerce, Solomon, as a midway station between his capital and the Chaldæan home of his ancestors as long prior to the Exile as the discovery of America antedates our own time. Five centuries earlier still, a "goodly Babylonish garment" was found among the spoils of Jericho. Two prophetic testimonies describe her as a "city of merchants" that "exulted in her ships." The rich Queen of the Euphrates was too luxurious to be a mere workshop for the nations. She bartered her own productions and the spoils of her conquests for the pleasures of other lands. In one of the most pathetic of the dirges of the Captivity, the exile Jew describes his conqueror as calling him to song. Not an ode to Belus or a ballad of Babylonia is demanded, but the oppressor asks for "one of the songs of Zion in a strange land." Mercantile intercourse with Greece or the Ionic cities of Asia Minor, carried on directly or indirectly through the ubiquitous Phœnician merchants, would be sufficient reason to account for the introduction of the three or four Greek names of musical instruments. But the Babylonian history of Berosus records a victory of Sennacherib over Greek invaders of Cilicia as early as the eighth century,

B.C. And Esarhaddon marched through Asia with Greek mercenaries following his standard, while Javan appears among other countries in an inscription of Sargon as a land that yielded him tribute.

We need spend but little time in considering the silence of the son of Sirach. The "praise of certain holy men," in Ecclesiasticus xliv.—l., is far from a complete celebration of departed worthies. Adam, Seth, and Enoch are those enumerated from the antediluvian patriarchs; Noah, Shem, Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, and Joseph from the Deluge to the Exodus; Moses, Aaron, Phinehas, Joshua, and Caleb represent the period of the Wilderness and the Conquest; the Judges are commemorated in a short passage of two verses; Samuel, Nathan, David, Solomon, Elijah, Elisha, Hezekiah, Josiah, and an incidental reference to Isaiah, cover the period of the Kingdoms; Jeremiah, Ezekiel, Nehemiah, Zerubbabel, and Joshua the son of Josedec the priest, represent the age of the Captivity. The twelve minor prophets are commemorated in a single verse, "And of the twelve prophets let the memorial be blessed, and let their bones flourish again out of their place: for they comforted Jacob, and delivered them by assured hope." Ecclus. xlix. 10. Pusey, p. 354, note, shows good cause for considering this verse an interpolation; if so, the wonder at the omission of the prophet Daniel from the list is lessened, and still further, when Isaiah's name occurs, not as the prophet whose writings exceed in quantity those of any of his brother seers in the Canon, but simply as the counsellor of Hezekiah in his pious course. But this *argumentum e silentio*, deduced from an obviously imperfect catalogue of worthies in an apocryphal book, is eagerly caught at by the very parties who find it convenient to ignore or explain away on the flimsiest hypothesis two distinct references by a contemporary prophet, whose place in the Canon they themselves acknowledge. And they seem to overlook the circumstance that the same argument would remove Joseph from the list of the patriarchs, Zadok from the priesthood, and Ezra from the leaders of the Return.

As to the alleged improbable and romantic character of its contents, when we consider the age, region, and important interests and bearings of the events recorded, a reader, unblinded by the prejudices which bias the opponents of the book, would be prepared to expect some things very different from the even course of our Western nine-

teenth-century life. Nebuchadnezzar's treatment of the magicians in the matter of his dream is not so unlike the cruel and arbitrary conduct displayed by many Oriental despots towards their dependants in much later times, for it to be seized upon as a strong presumption of Daniel's untruthfulness. The dimensions of the "golden image" on the plains of Dura are used against us by critics who, without any warrant from the text, assume that it was a well-proportioned human statue of solid gold, and then argue against the narrative on the ground that such an amount of the precious metal as would be required to construct it on their model was not likely to be available. Whereas, there is no reason why we should not suppose it to have been a slender pillar or pedestal, supporting a human or other symbolical figure. The term "golden," as applied in the Old Testament to the altar of incense, would fully warrant the hypothesis that gold was only used as the external plating of some inferior substance. The derangement of Nebuchadnezzar will be dealt with hereafter, and the decree of Darius has too many parallels in other heathen princes' attempts at self-deification to be any real stumbling-block to the reception of the narrative. The argument as to the purposeless waste of miraculous power is but the complaint of a school which never wearies in the attempt to resolve every miracle into a myth, and we shall have occasion subsequently to refer to the circumstance of the agents and the great interests involved, as furnishing a good answer to the murmuring of unbelief, "For what purpose was this waste?"

The assumed discrepancy in the dates given, i. 5, 18, and ii. 1; from which it appears that Daniel was carried away captive by Nebuchadnezzar in the *third* year of Jehoiakim, and was then entrusted to Ashpenaz for a three years' course of training; while we read that he interpreted the king's dream in the *second* year of Nebuchadnezzar's reign. From Jer. xxv. 1, we learn that the *fourth* year of Jehoiakim was the *first* of Nebuchadnezzar. From these independent dates of Scripture we arrive at the same conclusion as the statement of Berosus, viz., that the captivity of Daniel began in the year preceding Nebuchadnezzar's accession, and, consequently, his Babylonian curriculum may have been completed before the close of Nebuchadnezzar's second year in possession of the kingdom.

The dogmatic and ethical representations in the Book of

Daniel have been quoted as favouring the theory of a post-captivity date of composition. Keil (*Introd. to Old Test.* Vol. II. p. 37) shows that the whole range of apocryphal literature indicates no progress in the development of the Messianic idea, and knows nothing of a personal Messiah, while in the pages of our prophet we trace the unfolding of the doctrine of Christ's Divine-human person already revealed to Isaiah. The kingdom of Christ is also spoken of in its universality and its connection with the general resurrection, which is perfectly intelligible if we regard the prophecy as an expansion of the revelations made to earlier seers, but inexplicable if the book is a pious fraud of a period four centuries later, when narrow and exclusive views of Jewish privilege prevailed. The angelology of the book is another occasion of offence to Daniel's critics. The earliest books of the Bible teach the existence and ministry of angels. The principalities and powers in heavenly places appear in the visions vouchsafed to Isaiah and Ezekiel. The prophet who has not written a line of our Canon,—Micaiah, the son of Imla,—testified to Jehoshaphat and Ahab that he saw the host of heaven standing about the throne. The value of prayer, its repetition thrice a day, fasting and abstinence from unclean food, were all practices sanctioned by long usage, as we learn from many anterior Scriptures, so no inference of a later authorship can be based on the references to these observances in the face of positive or even probable evidence of its genuineness. And it is manifestly unfair to interpret its doctrine of angels by the hierarchical systems of the Rabbis, or to invent a theory of Parsee influence, and then to call Daniel in question for the errors and absurdities of the Rabbinical and Zoroastrian systems.

After his inauguration in the prophetic office, thirty years rolled by, during which Daniel continued to hold his high position in the government of the empire. Meanwhile his fame spread among the scattered tribes of his people, so that Ezekiel, writing among the exiles on the Chebar, spoke of his wisdom as proverbial (Ezek. xxviii. 3). And in another passage of the same prophet he is grouped with two eminent saints of patriarchal times as an eminent example of steadfast fidelity to God. The microscopic critics of the unbelieving class have boasted loudly over these references as if they were incontrovertible testimonies against the personality of the Daniel of the Exile and the

genuineness of his book. But Ezekiel's prophecies are both dated documents. The one in which Daniel's wisdom is celebrated was written eighteen years after the same gift had been rewarded by the king, and the other mention of his faithfulness was not till some fifteen years after the test of his fidelity in the matter of the king's meat; and, moreover, the commendation is not that of a man's praise resting on common report, however well founded, but it is the benison of the Searcher of hearts, who had attested the integrity of His servant. The weapons of the adversaries of the faith are well turned against them by one of the ablest expositors of the prophecy:—

"The mention of Daniel, then, by Ezekiel, in both cases has the more force from the fact that he was a contemporary; both corresponded with his actual character as stated in his book. Granted the historical truth of Daniel, no one would doubt that Ezekiel did refer to Daniel as described in his book. But then the objection is only the usual begging of the question. 'Ezekiel is not likely to have referred to Daniel, a contemporary, unless he was distinguished by extraordinary gifts or graces.' 'But his book not being genuine, there is no proof that he was so distinguished.' 'Therefore,' &c."—Pusey *On Daniel*, p. 108.

And with reference to the Rationalistic hypothesis that Ezekiel referred to some distinguished person of remote antiquity, like another Melchisedec, only with this difference, that Scripture is not sparing, but altogether silent in its testimony, the Oxford Professor continues:—

"This school is fond of the argument 'ex silentio.' They all (though, as we shall see, wrongly) use it as a palmary proof of the non-existence of the book of Daniel in the time of the Son of Sirach, that he does not name Daniel among the prophets. Yet, in the same breath, they assume the existence of one whom no one but themselves ever thought of, to disprove the existence of him who is known to history. . . Truly they give us a shadow for the substance."—*Pusey*, p. 109.

After this long pause the book resumes its history. Once more Nebuchadnezzar is troubled with night visions, and again the Chaldæan soothsayers (called in, perhaps, from reasons of mere state policy) are baffled. Then Daniel, hearing the dream which has made his master's sleep depart from him, unveiled the mystery. The tree whose height reached unto heaven, standing in the midst of the earth, its leaves fair, and its fruit much—giving

shelter to the beasts of the earth, affording habitations for the fowls of heaven, and yielding food for all flesh, was declared to be the symbol of himself. The vision of the holy watcher descending with the command to hew the tree down, and to leave its stump in the earth banded with iron and brass, to be wet with the dew of heaven, and having its portion with the beasts of the earth, was interpreted as the message of his coming visitation of judgment. The king's heart was to be changed from a man's to a beast's, till seven times pass over him. Daniel, however, exercised his prophetic office not only as a revealer of secrets, but as a messenger of God, making known His law to princes without fear. The sentence of doom was not pronounced without a call to repentance, if, perchance, the woe of Babylon might be turned away, as the Assyrian monarch had found mercy a few generations before, through humbling himself before God when Jonah prophesied in Nineveh. But Nebuchadnezzar had not learned the way to exaltation through self-abasement, and at the end of a year, while surveying the glories of the city he had adorned for his own honour and the aggrandisement of his dynasty, the decree came from heaven, no longer as a dream, but, with reason dethroned, the king was driven from his palace, and had his abode with the beasts. Then, when the prophetic "times" were expired, he lifted up his eyes unto heaven, and his understanding returned.

The madness of Nebuchadnezzar is copiously dealt with in Bishop Wordsworth's notes on the fourth chapter. He follows Hengstenberg, Pusey, and others, in regarding the king's malady as that form of mental disease known to medical science as Lycanthropy. He inserts the following communication from E. Palmer, Esq., M.D., of the Lincolnshire Asylum at Bracebridge:—

"It very commonly occurs that patients, on their recovery from insanity, have a full recollection of their sayings and doings, and of all that had happened to them during their attack. . . In the case of Nebuchadnezzar it was not until 'the *end* of the days'—or, as may be supposed, at the first dawn of intelligence, when partially lycanthropical and partially self-conscious, and in a state somewhat resembling that of a person awakening from a dream—that he lifted up his eyes unto heaven, being, probably, not yet rational enough to offer up a prayer in words, but still so far conscious as to be able dimly to perceive his identity. But when his understanding returned to him, there came back not only a

recollection of his sin and the decree of the Most High, but also a vivid reminiscence of all the circumstances of his abasement amongst the beasts of the field; and he at once acknowledged the power and dominion of God."—*Wordsworth*, p. 17.

Dr. Palmer's letter to the Bishop concludes with an extract from Esquirol's *Des Maladies Mentales*, giving an account of an epidemic outbreak of Lycanthropy in France some 300 years ago.

The Bishop deals with the objections raised by Hitzig and others against the authenticity of the events in the 4th chapter, because of the silence of heathen historians concerning Nebuchadnezzar's malady.

"The records now extant of the Babylonian empire are few and scanty. Nebuchadnezzar's name does not even once occur in the pages of the father of profane history, Herodotus. Of the writers mentioned by Josephus as dealing with Babylonish history, four treated of it in its relation to Tyre and Phœnicia; and one, Berosus, who was a priest of Bel at Babylon in the age of Alexander the Great, is known to us only from the fragments which are preserved of his writings by Josephus and Eusebius and later writers, and which passed into their hands through the confused compilation made by Alexander Polyhistor a little before the time of Julius Cæsar. And with such a slender supply of documents before us, we have no means of ascertaining whether the events related in this chapter were fully recorded by Babylonish annalists."—*Wordsworth*, p. 14.

The commentary also contains extracts from the fragments of history which have come down to us in this imperfect form in which Nebuchadnezzar is reported to imprecate a woe, singularly like his own visitation, upon his enemies. There is also added a translation of the inscription of the mighty king, found by Sir Hartford Jones at Hillah in 1862, which presents a striking parallel to the self-glorying soliloquy from his palace walls recorded by the prophet. But the silence of scanty and fragmentary documents is no contradiction to that more sure word of prophecy which we possess. To borrow the words of Mr. Philip Smith, "That lesson," of Nebuchadnezzar's humiliation, "is recorded *by himself* in a form not the less authentic because it is preserved for us in the Bible, and not in a cuneiform inscription."*

* *Student's Ancient History*, p. 319.

The part which Daniel took in the administration of the realm during the king's madness, would form an interesting subject of conjecture. There seems to be a trace, in one of the extant inscriptions, of a regency exercised by the father of the king's son-in-law, the Rab-Mag, or chief of the magicians, whose son, Neriglissar, gained the crown two years after Nebuchadnezzar's death, by a plot which deprived his brother-in-law Evil Merodach, Nebuchadnezzar's son and successor, of his throne, and of his life. With such a party of ambition and intrigue so near the succession, and with the regency vested in them, it may seem surprising that the great king found his place waiting for him on his recovery, and that his crown descended to his heir. But our history shows us one who, from his foreign birth, may have been precluded by Chaldæan etiquette, or jealousy, from holding the name of regent, who nevertheless exercised the real power of government. More than 30 years before he had been placed at the head of the order which furnished the *savans*, statesmen, and not unfrequently the generals of the nation. In the record of his second dream, Nebuchadnezzar, in the precise style of a royal degree, accords to Daniel the title which indicated sacerdotal and political primacy. So, if not in name, it is by no means improbable that in fact, Daniel, like his forerunner Joseph in the days of Egyptian calamity, guided the great empire of the Euphrates through the dark and troubled period while its master was absent from the helm, keeping his crown and dignity inviolate from open ambition or secret intrigue. Whether the seven prophetic "times" of his madness be interpreted as denoting years or shorter periods, a brief interval of life only remained for the recovered monarch. The one recorded act of the short reign of his son, Evil Merodach, the release of the King of Judah from his 37 years' imprisonment, with a precedence at the royal banquets above all the other captive monarchs, would seem to point to Daniel's continued influence in the state. His reign of two years being ended by the conspiracy of Neriglissar, the usurper's rule lasted only four years, and he was succeeded by his son, Laborosoarchod, a boy king, who, in the course of nine months, was tortured to death by the Chaldæan chiefs, who placed Nabonadius on the throne. During the earlier part of his reign of seventeen years he restored to some extent the waning glory of Babylon, but only to see it totally and finally

eclipsed. For while Cyrus was engaged in his war with Crœsus, Nabonadius entered into an alliance with the Lydian king. When Crœsus was vanquished the Persian turned his victorious arms towards the Queen of the Euphrates. Nabonadius headed the army in the plain before Babylon, leaving the defence of the city to his son Belshazzar, whom he had associated with himself in the government. The Babylonian army being routed in a single battle, Nabonadius took refuge in the neighbouring fortress of Borsippa. Then came the siege, and the brave but over-confident defence, and the laborious device of Cyrus, whereby "the great river, the river Euphrates," itself was diverted from its course, when "a sound of revelry by night" furnished the besiegers with a signal for opening the flood-gates for the great assault.

For a long time the impugners of the book's authenticity made great use of the absence of Belshazzar's name from the lists of Nebuchadnezzar's successors found in the fragments of Berosus and Abydenus. Even Keil is unsatisfactory in his dealings with the last who wore the Babylonian purple, and confounds the Belshazzar of Daniel with the Evil Merodach who had died twenty years before the city fell. It is true Nabonadius appears as the last king of Babylon, according to the old chroniclers in their extant fragments, and he was not of the family of Nebuchadnezzar, neither was he slain in the night of the city's capture, but, having surrendered himself to Cyrus, was relegated to a provincial governorship in Carmania, where he died. But the adversaries of the Holy Oracles have been put to silence by the mute but powerful evidence of the potter's clay.

"It appears, from extant monuments—namely, from cylinders of Nabonnedus discovered at Mugheir—that a prince called Bil-shar-uzur (Belshazzar) was his son, and was associated with him in the empire. In those cylinders the protection of the gods is desired "for Nabonadid and his son Bil-Sharuzur," and their names are coupled together in a way that implies the sovereignty of the latter. (*British Museum Series*, Plate 68, No. 1. Rawlinson, *Ancient Monarchies*, iii. 515, whose remarks are confirmed by *Oppert*, who, when in Babylonia in 1854, read and interpreted those cylinders at the same time, and in the same way, as Sir H. Rawlinson did in England. See Oppert's letter to Olshausen, dated Jan. 16th, 1864, in *Zeitschrift d. Deutsch. Morg. Ges.* viii. 598.) This opinion was further corroborated by another learned Orientalist, Dr. Hincks, who deciphered an inscription of Nabon-

nedus, in which he prays for Belshazzar, his eldest son, and in which he is represented as co-regent. See *Pusey*, pp. 402, 403."—*Wordsworth*, p. 20.

If Herodotus has preserved for us the story of the siege, the Book of Daniel gives us the graphic description of the scene within the massive walls. The king had turned a national festival into a time of licence and intoxication; the drunken revel was further degraded into a scene of sacrilegious defiance of Jehovah, as Belshazzar sent for the golden vessels which his father (i.e. grandfather, the Hebrew and Chaldee languages both being destitute of any word for grandsire or grandson) Nebuchadnezzar had brought from Jerusalem that he might defile them in his palace orgies. The mighty conqueror had shown in his way a kind of religious veneration for them, by placing them, probably only as trophies, in the temple of his god, but it was reserved for the young voluptuary to give the more grievous affront to Jehovah, by using the golden bowls of His ministry in his own deification, or for his inebrious shame. Then "over against *the* candlestick," in the light of those lamps which had been wont to shed their rays upon the path to the mercy-seat, the mysterious hand appeared tracing its strange and terrible writing upon the wall. In the confusion which followed, the queen (probably Nicotris, the queen-mother) called to remembrance the discoveries of her father's dreams made by Daniel, whose obscurity during recent reigns seems to be implied in the queen's words, "There is a man in thy kingdom," &c. (v. 11, 12). Once more the interpreter of secrets spoke out as the messenger of God's judgment to princes as fearlessly as Elijah to Ahab, or John the Baptist to Herod. The visitation of Nebuchadnezzar, known but unheeded by his descendant, was rehearsed, and the strange inscription of numbering, weighing, and dividing, was interpreted and applied to the case of the profligate prince, and to the immediate dissolution of his empire. "In that night was Belshazzar, the king of the Chaldæans, slain," but not before he had fulfilled his promise of investing the prophet with scarlet and gold, and proclaiming him third ruler of the vanishing kingdom. And in the degree of precedence accorded to Daniel we trace a corroboration of the history already given, not only as confirming his own recent retirement from state dignity and care as intimated in the queen's address, but as furnishing in the unusual nume-

rical order "third," an exact coincidence with the testimony of the cylinder as to Belshazzar's own place in the government as his father's co-regent.

But if thus, in the 67th year of his captivity, Daniel reappears suddenly upon the historic portion of his own pages, the prophetic portion of his book shows us a glimpse or two of him in the years immediately preceding the city's fall. In the first year of Belshazzar he received the vision of the four beasts, descriptive of the succession of earthly empires, and affording a fuller revelation of them than had been vouchsafed to Nebuchadnezzar in the dream which he had interpreted some sixty years previously. The four beasts were seen rising "up from the sea" and striving "upon the great sea," and when (in verse 17) the beasts are interpreted as four kings, the sea from whence they came is explained in accordance with the uniform symbolical application as denoting the world, "shall arise *from the earth*." Thus the interpretation is guarded against any limitation to the Mediterranean coasts or powers characterised by naval prowess or maritime enterprise. The first beast was "like a lion, and had eagle's wings," the king of beasts joined with the king of birds. We are all familiar through the Assyrian antiquities with the composite sculptured forms with which the mighty conquerors of the East adorned their palaces, and by which they designed to illustrate the characteristics of their dominion. So, like the parables of our Lord, the prophetic vision derives its imagery from objects which were familiar and easy of interpretation to the seer. What the gold is among metals, and the head among the members of the body, such is the lion among beasts, and the eagle among birds. And the empire of Nebuchadnezzar, with its glory somewhat revived under Nabonadius, and his co-regent son Belshazzar, has in the vision of the prophet, as in the dream of its founder, the precedence of honour. Its splendour, however, was only like that of the evening sun breaking from the clouded west, but just above the horizon.

"In the first year of Belshazzar, when Daniel saw this vision, the sun of the Babylonian empire was now setting. It was setting (as it seems) in its grandeur, like the tropic sun, with no twilight . . . Daniel sees it in its former nobility. As it had been exhibited to Nebuchadnezzar under the symbol of the richest metal gold, so now to Daniel, as combining qualities ordinarily incompatible, a lion with eagle's wings. It had the solid strength of

the king of beasts of prey, with the swiftness of the royal bird, the eagle. Jeremiah had likened Nebuchadnezzar both to the lion and the eagle. Ezekiel had compared the king, Habakkuk and Jeremiah his armies, for the rapidity of his conquests, to the eagle. So he beheld it for some time, as it had long been. Then he saw its decay. Its eagle-wings were plucked; its rapidity of conquest was stopped; itself was raised from the earth and set erect; its wild savage strength was taken away; it was made to stand on the feet of a man. In lieu of quickness of motion, like eagles' wings, 'is the slowness of human feet.' And the heart of mortal man (Ch. *enash* with the idea of weakness as in Heb. *enosh*) was given to it. It was weakened and humanised. It looks as if the history of its great founder was alluded to in the history of his empire. As *he* was chastened, weakened, subdued to know his inherent weakness, so should they. The beast's heart was given to him, then withdrawn, and he ended with praising God. His empire, from having the attribute of the noblest of beasts, yet still of a wild beast, is humanised."—*Pusey*, pp. 71, 72.

Keil (p. 224) refers the latter part of the vision to the madness and recovery of Nebuchadnezzar, when in his thanksgiving to Jehovah "for the first time he attained to the true dignity of a man, so also was his world-kingdom ennobled in him."

The next beast was a bear, or "like to a bear, and it raised itself on one side, and it had three ribs in the mouth of it, between the teeth of it." It answers to the brazen chest and arms of Nebuchadnezzar's statue. The animal denotes power, great and crushing in its destructiveness, but without the attributes of lightness and swiftness found in the former symbol. As the representative of the Medo-Persian empire, Pusey has shown the appropriateness of the symbol in an interesting enumeration of some of the expeditions organised by that power. "It never moved," he says, "except in ponderous masses, avalanches precipitated upon its enemy, sufficient to overwhelm him, if they could have been discharged at once, or had there been any one commanding mind to direct them." The lifting up of one side of the beast denotes the elevation of the Persian division of the double empire, whereby the other member was not dissolved, assimilated, or annexed, but, retaining its integrity in the united kingdom, remained quiescent under the more vigorous leadership of Cyrus. The three ribs between its teeth have often formed a subject of perplexity. Keil shows that the conquest of Babylon, Lydia, and Egypt, by the Medo-Persians,

satisfies the requirements of the symbolism, and, further, as conquests by the *united* power of the Medes *and* Persians, is an additional safeguard against the attempt of Rationalism to separate the component members of that empire into two of Daniel's kingdoms, and thus to make the fourth power's blasphemy against God coincide with the persecution under Antiochus Epiphanes.

The third was a leopard, or perhaps a panther. Insatiable in its thirst for blood, and its great agility increased by wings. If the wings are not those of the eagle, as in the first vision, what it loses in quality it gains in number, four. In this it corresponds with the rapid enterprises and thirst for conquest of the impetuous Alexander. And its four heads mentioned last, and thereby implying posteriority, point to the quartering of his empire after his death. The vision was a brief one, inasmuch as Daniel was ere long to have a fuller revelation of the coming of the great conqueror.

The last beast was unlike all the rest, so "dreadful, and terrible, and strong exceedingly," that Daniel had no name that could describe it. Its teeth were iron, with which it "devoured and brake in pieces" its prey, trampling underfoot in its fury what it had not time or inclination to devour. And it had ten horns. Such was the prophetic foreshadowing of the Roman power. If brief, the reason might be that the Spirit of Inspiration knew that another Daniel would be found after two-thirds of a millennium had passed away, who should take up the prophetic scroll and fill in the lineaments of the terrible beast in a final Apocalypse. St. John's predictions help to the understanding of the little horn that rose up among the ten, which had human eyes, and whose characteristic was "a mouth speaking great things." Here, for the first time in the Holy Book, is the mention of the Man of Sin, the last "great word" proceeding from whose mouth, on July 18th, 1870, in the assertion of the Papal Infallibility, is fresh in every man's memory. With reference to the vision of the four beasts, the heat of the controversy turns upon the application of the fourth to the Roman empire. If this be the true interpretation, then the Hebrew exile in the days of the Roman kings, or even the imaginary Daniel of a century prior to Julius Cæsar, would have to be credited with the spirit of prophecy. To avoid this application all kinds of combinations and divisions of the symbols and

empires have been attempted. The lion answering to the head of gold in ch. ii. has been applied to Nebuchadnezzar, and the bear to his successors, or individually (as by Hitzig) to Belshazzar, the last of the Babylonian kings. But it is clear that the beasts denote powers and not princes, and the emblem of the lion indicates the Babylonian empire in its integrity up to the moment of its dissolution. In the vision of the image it is not difficult to perceive that the head referred to Nebuchadnezzar, and the Chaldean monarchy personified in him. So Daniel explained it, "O King. . . . *Thou* art this head of gold. And after thee shall arise another kingdom inferior to thee" (ii. 38, 39). The second beast has been taken as referring to the Median monarchy; and the third (the leopard) to the Persian one. Delitzsch, to support a pet theory of the identity of the two horns in the 7th and 8th chapters, has advocated this severance of the joint-power which overthrew Babylon. All through the history the phraseology is uniformly that of an amalgamated power. Both sections were spoken of as the conquerors in Daniel's message to Belshazzar. "The law of the Medes and Persians" is an official phrase, denoting a single consolidated government as unmistakeably as our own realm is the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland. M. Godet says:—

"This distinction of two monarchies, Median and Persian, is a pure fiction. The first could have lasted but two years, because Darius, the Mede, who would have founded it, was dead two years after the capture of Babylon, and Cyrus, the Persian, succeeded him. The fact is that it did not exist a single instant in an independent form, for, from the commencement, it was Cyrus the Persian who commanded in the name of Darius the Mede, or Cyaxares. The latter only reigned in name, and that is exactly the sense of vi. 28, which speaks of one and the same empire with two sovereigns reigning simultaneously. What otherwise would signify the expression, 'Arise, devour much flesh,' addressed to the pretended Median empire which would have lasted but two years. Delitzsch replies it is the expression of a simple *conatus*, a desire of conquest which is not realised, as if a desire remaining impossible would have found a place in the prophetic picture in which history is traced with such clear lines! . . . The bear, therefore, represents undeniably the Medo-Persian monarchy. It raised itself on one side, i.e., that of the two nations which constituted the empire there was but one—the Persian people—on which reated the aggressive and conquering power of the

monarchy. The three pieces of flesh, which the bear held in his jaws, represent the principal conquests of this second great empire."—*Etudes Bibliques, Appendice*, 389.

The third beast, the leopard or panther, if not the emblem of the Persian empire, must refer to the kingdom of Alexander. The former supposition has been excluded by what has been already advanced; but if the successors of Nebuchadnezzar, or the Median monarchy alone, could be denoted by the bear, we should have to consider the appropriateness of the leopard with its four wings and four heads to the Persian monarchy. We will again quote M. Godet on this point:—

"The rapidity of the conquests shown by the four wings was not the distinguishing characteristic of the Medo-Persian empire, while it is the most prominent trait of the power of Alexander. As for the four heads, it is pretended that they represent the first four sovereigns of Persia. This application would be forced even if Persia had but four kings, for the four heads represent four simultaneous powers and not four successive sovereigns. They belong to the organisation of the beast ever since its appearance. But further, Persia has had more than four sovereigns. What of the two Artaxerxes, Longimanus and Mnemon? and the two Dariuses, Ochus and Codoman? If the author wrote as a prophet, how did he see so mistily in the future? we ask of Delitzsch. If he wrote as an historian, that is to say a prophet who wrote after the event, how could he ignore so completely the history which he wrote? we ask of the Rationalists. And how will you accommodate the eighth chapter with this view? The rough goat is the king of Græcia; and the great horn that is between his eyes is the first king. Now, that being broken; whereas four stood up for it, four kingdoms shall stand up out of the nation, but not in his power."—*Etudes Bibliques, Appendice*, 391.

The identity of the fourth beast and its ten horns with the legs and feet of the colossus of Chapter II. is apparent. Both are represented as trampling down and breaking in pieces everything that comes in their way. The last beast is the immediate precursor of Messiah's kingdom, as the statue is thrown down by the stone hewn without hands. Suppose, according to our opponents' hypothesis, Alexander and the Greek monarchy had not been already portrayed by the four-headed leopard, what would be the meaning of the ten horns? It has been answered that they denote the ten kings of Syria, from the death of Alexander to Antiochus Epiphanes, under whom the

pseudo-Daniel is supposed to have lived. M. Godet shows that there were but seven kings of Syria before Antiochus Epiphanes, viz.: 1. Seleucus Nicator; 2. Antiochus Soter; 3. Antiochus Theos; 4. Seleucus Callinicus; 5. Seleucus Ceraunus; 6. Antiochus the Great; 7. Seleucus Philopator. These seven are drawn out to the required ten, by the opponents of the Roman application of the fourth beast, by inserting three men who should have reigned, but whom Antiochus drove from the throne,—Heliodore, the poisoner of Antiochus's predecessor, and whose reign lasted but a moment; Demetrius, the legitimate successor, who was a hostage at Rome; and Ptolemy Philometor, king of Egypt, who had some pretensions to the throne. This insertion of kings *de jure* in a list of actual sovereigns is just as valid as any attempt, for a fanciful purpose, to make Queen Victoria the fortieth English monarch from the Conquest, which would stretch the roll of the Plantagenet princes from fourteen to eighteen by the insertion of Henry Plantagenet, the crowned Prince Royal, Arthur of Brittany, Edward of Lancaster, and Richard of York. This theory also lies open to the objection of confining Alexander's successors within the line of the Seleucide kings of Syria to the exclusion of the Macedonian, Thracian, and Egyptian dynasties. Does the number ten stand for the indefinite multitude of leaders of these four co-existing monarchies? To offer such an interpretation of a writing, where numbers are used with such singular exactness, is evidently the last effort of a hopeless assault upon the Messianic testimony of the prophet,—a "stroke of despair," as Godet well characterises it.

This failing to effect its propounders' design, it only remains that the fourth beast and the lower extremities of Nebuchadnezzar's image point to the Roman Empire and its subsequent divisions in the states of modern Europe, which should in turn give way to a kingdom not of this world. In this part of the Prophecy, as may be expected by all who are acquainted with his Notes on the Apocalypse, the high Anglican Bishop of Lincoln gives no quarter when he turns the weapons of exposition and controversy against the Papal power and its unholy pretensions.

If Daniel saw afar off the inveterate and implacable persecutor of the Church of these later times in the little horn which rose out of the ten which preceded it, the

vision closed with a far different scene. Nebuchadnezzar had only seen the stone hewn from its mountain quarry without hands, which wrecked in its advance the colossus of the kingdoms of this world. Daniel, however, beheld the Person of the King whose kingdom was to come and to prevail. The vision likewise embraced the "innumerable company of angels" witnessing the triumphs of the heavenly kingdom over the beast, and it found its glorious climax in the revelation of the Son of Man,—then first made known under that blessed name,—not as Isaiah had seen Him on the way to Golgotha, "a man of sorrows and acquainted with grief," but in the majesty of His heavenly coronation in our nature. His New Testament fellow-seer saw his Master on the earth again, His priestly robes encircled with the regal belt of gold, and also with many crowns upon His head. Daniel, rapt away in the spirit, beheld the heavenly side of the cloud which cast its shadow upon the temporarily-orphaned disciples at Olivet. And the dominion with which he saw the Son of Man invested was declared to be "everlasting," and "His kingdom that which shall not be destroyed."

Thus was the forsaken minister of Babylon comforted in his retirement, and prepared for the fall of the dynasty in whose service a great part of his long life had been passed. Though an angel had been the interpreter of his vision—a vision which was a sketch of the future rather than a perfectly-filled-up view of the coming ages—there was much reason left for him to ponder what all of it might be, and how it should come to pass. When we read his words, "As for me, Daniel, my cogitations much troubled me, and my countenance changed in me: but I kept the matter in my heart" (vii. 29), we need no lengthened description to help us mentally to sketch the daily life of the ex-minister of state. We know his religious manner of life from his youth up—the devout retirement three times a day, the frequent study of the holy oracles (ix. 2), the true religious patriotism which, in restored greatness and amidst cares of state, caused him to fast and weep in sackcloth because of the desolation of Jerusalem. All this would not be wanting in his private life under the princes who knew him not. Thus he mourned over the actual waste of his holy city, and the predicted fall of the realm he had helped to govern, and to guard, until two years had passed away. At the close of that period he is

seen again engaged in some royal commission. The scene of the vision is Shushan, the Persian capital. And for a while Rationalism, with its keen scent for Scriptural discrepancies and its strong *à priori* faith in its own deductions from fragmentary uninspired narratives, cried Error here. How, they asked, could Daniel, a well-known servant of the Babylonian crown, be at a place within a neighbour's territory? The assumption was a hasty one, like many formed in the same school, that the two powers were then engaged in hostilities. Again, it assumes that the prophet was there *in propriâ personâ*, whereas the more probable inference is that he was carried in prophetic ecstasy, and awoke to do "the king's business" in his own realm. Loud was its boasting when it proclaimed that Shushan had not then been built. Brief notices in Pliny and Ælian, who wrote six and eight centuries respectively after Daniel's time, have been eagerly caught up as proving its later foundation. If their testimony were more credible than that of the book, our antagonists would have the *onus probandi*, 1, that these words indicate the foundation of the city rather than of a royal residence; and, 2, that such was an entirely new foundation, and not an extension or restoration. The cuneiform inscriptions, however, have done good service here as well as elsewhere, for they mention Shushan as one of the two Elamitic capitals in the reign of Sennacherib's grandson.

In the vision, the ram with two horns, one higher than the other, is the equivalent of the side-raised bear of the former one. Its westward, northward, and southward pushing marking the exact geographical directions of the Medo-Persian conquests. There where learned doctors have long disputed over the application of the symbol, the seer has the interpretation made sure to him by the angel Gabriel. "The rough goat is the king of Græcia. The great horn between his eyes is the first king. Now that being broken, whereas four stood up for it, four kingdoms shall stand up *out of the nation, but not in his power*" (viii. 21, 22). As to the figure of the conqueror, the he-goat corresponds to the four-winged panther of the previous chapter, as he bounds "from the west on the face of the whole earth, and touched not the ground." No emblem could be more expressive of the rapid rush of conquest achieved by the young Macedonian leader. The great horn, broken in the day when it was strong, and succeeded

by four horns (kingdoms) out of his nation but not in his strength, can find no other page of history with which they agree than the death-scene of Alexander, and the fourfold partition of his monarchy. To make his the *fourth* and not the *third* prophetic empire, will require that "wresting" of the Scriptures which is only done to the "destruction" of the unstable operators. As to the view that the ten horns denote the successors of the Macedonian conqueror, we may well afford to postpone its serious consideration until the time when its supporters have arranged their conflicting and heterogeneous lists into one mutually accepted table.

The burden of this vision, however, was in its closing scene: the little horn which rose out of the four, "which waxed exceeding great toward the south, and toward the east, and toward the pleasant land." Thus the invasion of Egypt, Babylonia, and Daniel's native land—to him still in memory, and yet more in view of its future possession by his people, the "glory of all lands"—by Antiochus Epiphanes, was revealed. He sees in vision the foe of the Church of God waxing great, magnifying himself even to the Prince of Israel's host, casting down His sanctuary, and causing the daily sacrifice to cease. We know what an occasion of mourning, lamentation, and woe this must have been to the Old Covenant saint whose devotions were stimulated when he turned his face towards the wasted city and sanctuary of his race. Grievous indeed it was for him to have a view of the "abomination of desolation standing where it ought not," but more sad and heart-sickening was it to behold this, preceded and occasioned by the "transgression of desolation." Great as was the impiety of the persecutor Antiochus, far deeper was the sin, and heavier the curse, of the apostate and traitorous High Priests of that age. They renounced their covenant vows and privileges, teaching the Jews to repudiate their circumcision. Three successive heads of the sacerdotal order assumed new and heathen names. One of them, Onias, styled Menelaus, conducted the heathen tyrant into the holy place, where he desecrated the altar with a sacrifice of a sow, and defiled the whole sanctuary with the broth of its flesh.

What the heathen satirist complained of as a sign of Roman degeneracy (Juv. *Sat.* iii. 60)—

> "Non possum ferre, Quirites
> Græcam urbem"—

was far more bitterly felt by the faithful few who thought the highest honour of Jerusalem consisted in its being the "city of the Great King." They knew how little they had to gain, and how much they had to lose, if their "holy city" were to become a copy of Antioch, Alexandria, or even Athens itself.

"This process of secularisation was the source of the weakness and of the woes of the Jewish Church. Many of its priests renounced their belief in the religion of their forefathers, and apostatised from the faith of Moses and the Prophets. Thus they became the victims of the persecuting power of Infidelity. God withdrew His grace and protection from them. He punished them by taking away the spiritual privileges which they had scorned, and by giving them over to their enemies. He forsook the sanctuary which they had profaned, and abandoned the Jerusalem which they had heathenised. The Holy of Holies was no longer the shrine of the living God who had once revealed Himself on the mercy-seat. The temple on Moriah became a temple of Jupiter Olympius. The high priest himself sent a deputation to the Syrian games in honour of Hercules. The sacred procession of palm-bearers and singers, who once chanted sacred melodies in the streets of Sion at the festival of Tabernacles, was succeeded by bearers of the ivy-tufted thyrsus, who sang lyrical dithyrambs in honour of the Greek Dionysus, whose ivy leaf was branded upon the flesh of his votaries; and the effusion of the waters drawn forth in golden urns from the well of Siloam, and poured out upon the brazen altar of burnt sacrifices in the Temple was superseded by libations from the sacrifices of unclean animals immolated on the altar of Jehovah, surmounted by an idol altar, 'the abomination of desolation.'

"These desecrations were due, not to the power of the Persecutor, but to the cowardice, ambition, covetousness, mutual jealousy, treachery, and apostasy of the priests."—Wordsworth, *Introd.* p. xvii.

To Daniel it was graciously revealed that this desolation should not be permanent, and he was informed that in 2,800 days from its beginning the calamity should be overpast, and the sanctuary should be cleansed. It is no matter of astonishment that, with the knowledge of such evils to befall his Church and nation, "Daniel fainted and was sick certain days."

To suit the theories of those who wish to make the fourth beast signify the Grecian monarchy, diligent attempts have been made to identify the little horn of the seventh chapter (that which came up amidst the ten horns of the fourth

beast) with that of the eighth (that which grew out of one of the four horns that came up in the place of the great one on the he-goat, which was broken). There is no reason for their identification, but quite the reverse. The horn in each case is the emblem of evils which break out of an organised state, and assume the form of an excrescence. In the eighth chapter the application of the figure to Antiochus Epiphanes is obvious, from what has been already advanced as to the order and reference of the beasts, as well as from the minute exactness of the prediction concerning him; but widely different is the account of that in chapter seven. The duration of the one is to the time when the sanctuary shall be cleansed, of the other "Until the Ancient of Days came, and judgment was given to the saints of the Most High; and the time came that the saints possessed the kingdom."

"That which distinguishes it clearly from the other is that it comes out of the middle of the ten horns of the beast without name, while the preceding one comes out of the four horns of the he-goat which represents Javan (8, 9, 22). We should say then, if we would employ the language of the New Testament, that the little horn of the seventh chapter is the Antichrist, the man of sin (Paul), the beast of the Apocalypse. This power, hostile to God and to the Church, is one which will spring from the confederation of European States, issue of the fourth monarchy; while that of the eighth chapter represents Antiochus Epiphanes, issue of the Greek monarchy, and who made an analogous war against the kingdom of God under the Jewish theocracy. There are then two declared adversaries to the reign of God indicated in the Book of Daniel—the one proceeding from the third monarchy and attacking the people of the Ancient Covenant, and the other coming out of the fourth and making war upon the people of the New. Whoever reads the seventh and eighth chapters of the Book of Daniel from this point of view, will see the difficulties vanish which have led wise men to the forced explanations which we have just refuted."—Godet, *Etudes Bibliques, App.* 394.

Daniel emerged from his private life again, not only to complete his testimony to the last of the Babylonian princes, but to be ready as a "chosen vessel" for the carrying out of the Divine purpose concerning his people. When the Persian hosts came in to sack the city and to cut down the king, Daniel, though vested in the newly-conferred scarlet and gold, escaped the fearful massacre. One, mightier than Cyrus, had decreed concerning him,

"Touch not mine anointed, and do my prophets no harm." Babylon had fallen, and the walls of Sion were to be rebuilt. To Daniel there was committed no unimportant share in accomplishing the second event as a result of the first.

We need not pause to discuss the vexed question as to the internal relations of the two divisions of the Medo-Persian empire. The annotators upon Herodotus and Xenophon may balance the credibility of their records, both avowedly eclectic groups of traditions, and each written several generations after the events. Cyrus, however, left Babylon to the share of his uncle Darius (Cyaxares II.) while he pursued his course of conquest.

We get a glimpse of the reorganisation of the empire under 120 satraps, themselves in their turn directed by a council of three, of whom the now aged Daniel was the chief, while there was a purpose in the royal mind to exalt him to yet greater honour. In an Oriental court, where jealousy and intrigue have ever had a stronghold, one of the "children of the captivity of Judah" was not likely to be exempt from envious plottings. His proud and irritated satraps watched with lynx-eyed malice for some ground of charge. The religious creed was of little moment to them; they groaned under the precedency accorded to a foreigner, and he a prisoner of war. The treasury was under his control, and he doubtless had great influence in matters of petition and appeal. Concerning the kingdom, "they could find none occasion nor fault; forasmuch as he was faithful, neither was there any error or fault found in him."

Then, but only then, did they seek to accuse him concerning the law of his God. The conduct of Darius fully agrees with the character of Cyaxares as given on the pages of other historians. The decree of the monarch, by which he interdicted all worship except that which should be paid to himself, may seem to men of our generation the act of an imbecile or a madman, but it has to be interpreted in the dimness of an age 600 years before there came a "Light to lighten the Gentiles," and according to the Medo-Persian ideas of religion. The very usage which fettered the prince who arrogated Divine worship, sprang from the claim of his dynasty to be the earthly vicars or human shrines of Ormuzd. We know the snare which was set, but we know who were taken in their own craftiness. As to Daniel, his fidelity to God had not been shaken by

the vicissitudes of sixty-five eventful years since he refused the king's meat. To a timid hesitating Israelite the way would have been open to a variety of compromises. There was an extraordinary decree from his earthly liege lord, and was he, the first subject of the realm, to show an example of rebellion against authority? And then there was no positive command to pray written in the Decalogue. He was not bidden, as his companions had been half a century earlier, to bow down to a graven image, or even to a man. All that was required of him was to restrain prayer before his God. But that all meant everything of holy principle, sacred duty, and spiritual peace and power to Daniel. All kind of spiritual communion could not be included in such an edict, but only open and audible or outward devotion. For no inquisitor would have dared to ask him at the end of the month whether he had prayed or not. The way of escape from danger might have been found in a secret discipleship and unuttered prayers, but Daniel would not thus deny or dishonour the God whom he had publicly served from childhood unto hoary hairs. Neither did he court persecution by a new or ostentatious round of piety. He went on his own way. In the usual place, at the customary times, and with the wonted lattice open toward the setting sun, he called upon his God "as he did aforetime." And he found the fulfilment of the prayer offered by its royal founder at the dedication of the sanctuary to whose site he turned his face. We know the rest —the raging crowd of his enemies pressing in upon him as he prayed — the hasty charge—the discomfiture of the prince taken in his own trap—the triumph of faith in the den of beasts, and the troubled conscience in the palace—the perfect deliverance—the swift retribution—the new decree in the royal name, giving the glory to the God of Daniel. And when we behold the completion of the cycle of Divine interposition, we catch the murmur of the unbelieving throng, "Why was this waste" of miraculous power! We will content ourselves with the Regius Professor's answer:—

"'Objectless' they can only seem to those to whom all revelation of God seems to be objectless. I would that they who make the objection could say, what miracle they believed as having an adequate object. Unless they believed that some miracles are not 'objectless,' it is mere hypocrisy to object to any particular

miracle as 'objectless.' For they allege as a special ground against certain miracles, what they hold to be a ground against all miracles; and act the believer in miracles in the abstract, in order to enforce the disbelief in specific miracles. It was a grand theatre. On the one side was the world monarchy, irresistible, conquering, as the heathen thought, the God of the vanquished. On the other, a handful of the worshippers of the one only God, captives, scattered, with no visible centre or unity, without organisation or power to resist, save their indomitable faith, inwardly upheld by God, outwardly strengthened by the very calamities which almost ended their national existence; for they were the fulfilment of His word in Whom they believed. Thrice, during the seventy years, human power had put itself forth against the faith; twice in edicts which would, if obeyed, have extinguished the true faith on earth; once in direct insult to God. Faith, as we know, 'quenched the violence of fire,' 'stopped the mouths of lions.' In all these cases the assault was signally rolled back; the faith was triumphant in the face of all the representatives of the power and intelligence of the empire; in all, the truth of the one God was proclaimed by those who had assailed it. Unbelief, while it remains such, must deny all true miracles, and all superhuman prophecy. But if honest, it dare not designate as 'objectless,' miracles which decided the cause of truth on such battle-fields."—*Pusey*, p. 454.

But the year of his trial was also the season wherein Daniel's soul was strengthened for the test, or blessed for his endurance, by abundant revelations. He had pondered over the prophecies of Jeremiah concerning the length of the captivity, and he found that sixty-eight years out of the appointed three score and ten of their exile had elapsed. Moreover, Cyrus, the conqueror and the coming prince, had been named in a "scripture" which would certainly be received where Jeremiah was held as canonical. And while he was "speaking and praying and confessing" his sin and "the sin of his people," praying for the holy mountain of his God, at the time when, if that holy mountain had still been crowned with the beautiful sanctuary, the evening oblation would have been offered, Gabriel came to him with a message of still greater joy than the return to Sion. The seventy years of captivity were all but ended, but seventy prophetic weeks were to count from the edict for the city's restoration to Messiah the Prince, for to close up the transgression, to seal up the sins, to make atonement for iniquity, and to bring in everlasting righteousness, and to seal up the vision and prophecy, and to anoint a

Holy of Holies, i.e. an All Holy One in whom should dwell the fulness of the Godhead bodily.

The special purpose of this vision of the seventy weeks to Daniel and his fellow exiles is worthy of attention. To them the deliverance from captivity and the days of Messiah had seemed to coincide in point of time, but now that the first was near at hand they were told that they must wait a long period before the second promise was realised. Weary had seemed to them the three score and ten years during which God had afflicted them in the land of the stranger; but a period far exceeding that, at the ratio of a week for a day, was to elapse before the consummation of the hope of Israel. During that time the political changes and convulsions revealed in the seventh chapter would be in course of accomplishment. But during all these revolutions Israel was to complete its preparation for the coming of its Lord to His Temple. Well would it have been for them if Daniel's revelation of the time of their national training for Messiah's Advent had been discerned and followed.

The seventy prophetic weeks, or 490 years (understood as such by a key already furnished in God's revelation to Ezekiel c. iv. 5, 6), form the most distinct epoch ever vouchsafed respecting Messiah's promised Advent. Regarding the Crucifixion as settling the *terminus ad quem*, the paramount question is respecting the *terminus a quo*. Dr. Pusey has discussed in an exhaustive style the respective claims of four periods to this place of chronological honour. 1. The first year of Cyrus, B.C. 536. 2. The third year of Darius Hystaspes, B.C. 518, when the hindrance to the rebuilding of the temple interposed by Pseudo Smerdis (the Artaxerxes of Ezra iv. 7, &c.) were removed. 3. The commission to Ezra in the seventh year of Artaxerxes Longimanus, B.C. 457. 4. The commission of Nehemiah in the twentieth year of the same king, B.C. 444. The end of the whole period of 490 years, calculated from these different epochs, would bring us to the years B.C. 461, B.C. 281, A.D. 33, and A.D. 46 respectively. Looking back, from the knowledge we possess of the fulfilment in our redemption, we naturally regard the third epoch with the deepest interest. The second and the fourth epochs were those of decrees which merely confirmed others immediately preceding them, and consequently sink into a secondary position. The interest is apportioned between the first and the third dates. The

decree of Cyrus was for the building of the *Temple*, and its fulfilment, described in Ezra i. and ii., is confined to preparation for rebuilding the sanctuary. And the decree of Darius Hystaspes (Ezra vii.), based upon Cyrus's roll discovered in the Median palace, is limited to the same object. Daniel's weeks, however, were to be reckoned from "the commandment to restore and to build *Jerusalem*," which was precisely the task committed to Nehemiah by Artaxerxes. That the *city*, as distinguished from the *temple*, had yet to be "restored" and rebuilt is evident from the graphic account of Nehemiah's night ride round the broken walls of the city, its gateway still destitute of gates and their walls yet black from the Chaldæan burning, and the way of the king's pool impassable for his beast by reason of the rubbish from the breach. Nehemiah's commission, therefore, satisfies all the requirements of the prophecy, and comes nearest to the measure of 490 years from the Crucifixion. Again, the whole prophetic period is divided into three sections, seven weeks, three score and two weeks, and "*after* three score and two weeks shall Messiah be cut off," implies a residue of one week to make up the total already given, in the course of which Messiah's excision should take place. This is confirmed by the prediction immediately following, "And he shall confirm the covenant with many *for one week*, and *in the midst of the week* He shall cause the sacrifice and the oblation to cease, and for the overspreading of abominations He shall make it desolate, even until the consummation and that determined shall be poured upon the desolate." The first period of seven weeks or forty-nine years was to be spent in building the "street" and the wall, even in troublous times, with which chronological data found in the book of Nehemiah would substantially agree. The second and longest section was the interval from the completion of the city until the covenant should be "confirmed" in the ministry of Christ. Then one week of 7 years, in the midst of which he should be "cut off." Starting from B.C. 457, the first section would bring us to B.C. 408, the second to A.D. 26, and the midst of the last week would exactly coincide with the beginning of A.D. 30, the year of all years in which one was "cut off, but not for Himself," "to finish the transgression, to make an end of sins, and to make reconciliation for iniquity, and to bring in everlasting righteousness, and to seal up the vision and prophecy, and to anoint the Most Holy."

Keil, however, has followed the eschatological interpretation, the germs of which are found in Hippolytus and Apollinaris of Laodicea. He thus regards the seven weeks as defining the interval before the death of Christ, the sixty-two as pointing to the period from the time when redemption was accomplished until the eve of the end, and the last week as indicating the short but severe conflict with Antichrist. But no man having tasted old wine desireth new, for he saith the "old is better."

As to the Rationalist attempt to make the seventy weeks terminate with Antiochus Epiphanes, it may fairly be asked whether, if the conditions of the prophecy being the same, and the shorter period had been pleaded for in the interests of orthodoxy, they themselves would not have been found among the foremost opponents of such a computation? But not yet has "the offence of the cross ceased." Daniel's prophecy has its fulfilment in the events of redemption, and from the prophet's pen as from Apostle's lips we learn of a "reconciliation" made for iniquity by One who was "cut off *not for* Himself."

Our opponents urge that this passage relates to the murder of the high priest Onias about 170 B.C., accompanied by the slaughter of 4,000 Jews, and the pillage of the temple by Antiochus Epiphanes, which was followed some three years (the Rationalistic half week) afterwards by the defilement of the sanctuary, the inauguration of the worship of Jupiter Olympius in the house of God, and the abolition of the daily sacrifice. But the cutting off of the Lord's anointed was to be followed by the destruction and not the temporary profanation of the temple. Then the chronology needs a great deal of manipulation to make the end of the weeks coincide with the Maccabean age. Its *terminus a quo* has been fixed not at the date of any royal decree for the return, but at the period of Jeremiah's prophecy (Jer. XXV.), i.e. 605 B.C. Very like the old maxim of robbing Peter to pay Paul is this unusual tribute of honour to the era of Jeremiah's prediction. Even then, however, there are difficulties remaining to be settled. From B.C. 605 to 170 there are 435 years, just equal to the three score and two weeks which are mentioned in the text of Daniel, as the largest and middle factor of the divided seventy. The last division of one week is manifestly distinct from the rest, as the time of the fulfilment. The former seven, however, have yet to be accounted for. They

are not contemporaneous with the earlier portion of the sixty-two; but they were to precede the sixty-two, as the sixty-two were to precede the one in which Messiah should be cut off. To meet this difficulty it has been proposed to consider the seven weeks as belonging to the period before the decree of Cyrus, i.e. from 588 or 586 to 536, during which time the city and temple were desolate, then the 62 weeks from the return from captivity until 175. But 62 and 7 subtracted from 588 would point to B.C. 105, which is too late for the Maccabean theory. The erudite Ewald, however, has a plan to meet the case. Inasmuch as this period was a time of oppression, and the sabbatic idea among the Jews was always associated with joy, he deducts the sabbatic years from the series, and so brings it to the desired haven of B.C. 175. When with him the Messiah was cut off in the person, not of the priestly Onias, but the heathen Seleucus Philopator, who died just as he invaded Judæa. Thus the voice of a faithless school of criticism is but the echo of the cry of the unbelieving Passover mob, "Not this man but Barabbas," and a robber is preferred to Christ. Well does Godet ask at the close of his enumeration of these theories, "What shall we say to these exegetical monstrosities?"

Once more the "man greatly beloved" was filled with trouble on account of the "abundance of the revelations" given to him. For three full weeks he went mourning, eating neither flesh nor pleasant bread, drinking no wine, neither anointing himself as he was accustomed to do. While residing on the banks of the Hiddekel (Tigris) in the third year of Cyrus, he saw a vision—nearer resembling that vouchsafed to St. John in Patmos than any other granted to the Old Covenant seers. There is the same glorious appearance of a human form with countenance of transcendent brightness, wearing a priestly robe, girded with a royal belt of gold, having eyes as lamps of fire, arms and feet like to polished brass, and His voice like the voice of a multitude. Like the disciple in the Apocalypse the prophet sank faint and dumb, but, as there, the Angel of the Covenant touched him with His life-imparting touch. The vision was concerning what should befall his people in the latter days. The exact number and succession of the kings of Persia was revealed. The riches and pride of Xerxes were pointed out. His attack of "the realms of Græcia," then for the first and only time

to form a "realm" under one "mighty king." The breaking of Alexander's power and the scattering of his dominion to the four winds of heaven are all depicted with minutest accuracy in the vision on the Hiddekel. Then was disclosed the strife between the Egyptian kings of the south and their northern rivals the Seleucid kings of Syria. The marriage and divorce of an Egyptian princess by Antiochus Theos, and the avenging of her wrongs by her brother Ptolemy Euergetes are likewise foretold. But the vision is a "burden" of Israel, as it culminates in the description of a "vile person." Antiochus Epiphanes appeared in the prophet's view again as the oppressor of his people, the persecutor of the Church, and the defiler of the sanctuary. He saw the strength and exploits of the Maccabean patriots, and he beheld the final defeat and ruin of the man whose name is still a sign of execration to all the house of Israel. The vision continued to unfold the strange events of the future. The time of the sanctuary's desolation was sworn by the angel to be limited to "a time, times, and a half," and the mystic 1,260 days had added to them another short period of seventy-five days as the time from the beginning of the persecution until the peaceful enjoyment of religious privileges again under a complete toleration. The blessedness of those who should wait and come to that time of peace was made known to the prophet. But, like another Moses, he only saw what he was not to enter. Though his life lasted through the whole period of the Captivity, and probably the decree of Cyrus for the rebuilding of the temple was drawn up under his influence, Daniel never returned to the land of his birth, and which was still known to him in his later days as the "pleasant" or the "beautiful land." He was bidden to go on in his way, so various and yet so Divinely prepared, until the end, when his long life of toil for foreign prince or for most loved Israel should cease, and, if he lost the ancestral inheritance in Zion, his promised "lot" was one in the rest of the people of God.

By such defences as those named at the head of this article, the persecution of the prophet by the unbelieving party has fallen out rather unto the furtherance of his prophetic title. His foundation standeth sure, having the inscription, "Daniel the prophet," endorsed upon the very words of his predictions by Him who spake by the prophets, and whose glory he saw by the Hiddekel. Still,

while this is our surest ground of confidence in the inspiration of the prophet, his assailants must be met by weapons forged of like steel with their own, but of better temper and heavier calibre. If God's house is to be beautified, the Egyptians must be spoiled. Our prophet's case is an illustrious example of the sanctified use of the wisdom of the Chaldæans. In this book we learn how all history has its consecration in contact with the kingdom of God. And it is high time that, in scholastic institutions professedly conducted on Christian principles, the history of Israel should have at least an equal share of attention with what is given to that of Greece or Rome, or even that of modern Europe. Certainly the struggles of the Maccabees would afford as much thrilling interest to our youth as the campaign of Hannibal, or even the defence of Thermopylæ. And the records of sacred heroes will be none the less instructive and captivating because they "subdued kingdoms" while they "wrought righteousness," and were not only men of war and of statesmanship, but pre-eminently "men of faith."

Daniel is still read among the prophets by the faithful, because, though his work has been supplemented and his prophecies made more distinct in the fulfilment of some and in the expansion of others by the beloved disciple, his place in the canon is sanctioned by that Great Teacher who included his roll in the Scriptures, of which He said, "These are they which testify of Me." He was the prophet of deliverance to a Church and nation trodden down by the oppressor. His message was one which declared that the exile was but for an appointed time, and that a short one. But his greatest work is that which belongs to all time, to teach, as Godet has it, "that the realisation of the age of gold is not the work of man but of Christ. That the abolition of social miseries can only result from the suppression of sin. That the era of good will only date for humanity from the day when the Sun of Righteousness arises upon it. That the last glory is in the Divine order but the corollary of holiness."

ART. III.—*Ismailia.* By Sir SAMUEL W. BAKER, Pacha, M.A., F.R.S., F.R.G.S., &c. Macmillan and Co. 1874.

IN this work, which has been looked forward to with so much interest, we have an account of an expedition to Central Africa for the suppression of the slave trade and the establishment of legitimate commerce on the White Nile and the great N'Yanzas, organised by the Khedive of Egypt, and entrusted to the care of Sir Samuel Baker. Himself one of the great discoverers of the equatorial reservoirs of the Nile, he was specially fitted to undertake the hardships of the expedition. In his former work he had depicted the splendid country which there existed, and had spoken of its wondrous capabilities. At the same time, also, he had referred to the fearful depredations carried on there by the hardened and relentless slave traders, who were turning a terrestrial paradise into a wide-spread desolation. Moved by these representations, the Khedive resolved to annex this country, and to stop this destructive trade. To any one acquainted with the hardship and suffering experienced by Sir Samuel Baker and his intrepid wife during their former explorations, it seems a little strange that he should have been willing afresh to go to these distant regions upon an expedition which he knew would bring upon him intense hatred and opposition. But the manner in which he persevered, when unaided and at death's door, in spite of continued obstacles and almost insuperable difficulties, showed such a spirit of daring, and such a love of adventure, that perhaps, after all, it is not so strange that he should have responded to the Khedive's invitation, and accepted so responsible a position.

Ismailia is a splendidly-got-up work in two volumes, profusely illustrated, and accompanied by a useful map. The title is taken from the new name given by Baker to Gondokoro, the site of which was changed, in consequence of accumulated river obstructions. Nothing needs to be said as to the style of the narrative. Sir Samuel always has a sparkling pen.

In making the arrangements for the expedition, a vast amount of passive resistance from the subordinate Egyptian officials was encountered. Through their delay—the Khedive being in Europe—the flotilla, which was to have started from Cairo on the 10th of June, did not start until the 29th of August, so that the river had fallen too much to allow the vessels to ascend the second cataract. Thus twelve months were wasted, and Sir Samuel was deprived of the aid of six steamers. At Khartoum, notwithstanding the fact that positive instructions had been forwarded, none of the required vessels had been prepared, although an expedition to the frontier of Darfur had been fitted out, and eleven vessels gathered together; which expedition the Governor-General had entrusted to the care of Kutchuk Ali, one of the most notorious ruffians and slave-hunters on the White Nile.

There were many reasons to account for this stubborn opposition. The White Nile countries, though not under the jurisdiction of Egypt, had, nevertheless, been leased by the Governor-General of the Soudan for several thousand pounds sterling per annum, together with the monopoly of the ivory trade. The principal trader, named Agad, had a contract with the Government, which gave him the exclusive right of trading over a district comprising about 90,000 square miles. These lessees were thoroughly known as inveterate slave-hunters. So that Sir Samuel was sent to annex a country already leased out by the Government, and to carry out a reform which would be a death-blow to the operations of these men.

Seriously opposed by all parties, with nothing at hand which had been entrusted to the care of the native authorities, and with the season far advancing, energetic measures were necessary. Strong pressure was put upon the Governor-General, Djiaffer Pacha (the Dyafer Pacha of Schweinfurth), and soon thirty-three vessels of fifty or sixty tons each were obtained, caulked, rigged, and made ready for the voyage to Gondokoro. Previous to starting, Sir Samuel reviewed his irregular cavalry. Apparently they were *very* irregular. This will appear from the description of their horses:—

"There were lank, half-starved horses; round, short horses; very small ponies; horses that were all legs; others that were all heads; horses that had been groomed; horses that had never gone through that operation."—Vol. I. p. 29.

Besides which, each had armed himself as he thought best. Thinking he could do better without them than with them, the annoyed chief sent them all home. The main-stay of the expedition consisted of forty-eight men picked from two Egyptian regiments. Of equal numbers, black and white, and armed with Snider rifles, they formed an efficient body-guard, going by the name of "the Forty Thieves." According to a note, they owed their name to their light-fingered capability; but eventually they became the pink of morality. The name of their commander was Abd-el-Kader. He was an excellent officer, and, an exception to the general rule, he took a great interest in the expedition, and always served his chief faithfully and well.

Thus, through the provoking delay of the Egyptian officials, Sir Samuel left Khartoum with a mutilated expedition and without a single transport animal. In a little over a week the junction of the Sobat was reached. It was then found that 684 miles had been traversed since leaving Khartoum. Beyond the junction of this river the Nile winds away, in a labyrinth-like course, for about 750 miles, through a region of barren flats and boundless marsh, until Gondokoro is reached. The White Nile being absolutely blocked by the accumulated masses of vegetation, an effort was made to pass through one of its branches, called the Bahr-Giraffe. Soon, however, the passage became completely choked, through the drift vegetation. Efforts were made to cut a canal through the vast mass, and for long weary days was the work carried on, until fever laid many of the soldiers prostrate. So slow was the progress made that, on one occasion, during thirteen days, with a thousand men hard at work, there was only a clearance made of twelve miles long. The traveller declares that the country was fearful, and far beyond his worst experience. At length, after a lapse of fifty-one days from the time of leaving Khartoum, the order for retreat was given. During this fearful journey twelve men and a boy died. It was resolved at once to return to the Shillook country, and to establish a station there. The officers and men were delighted at the thought of retracing their steps, for, thereby, they hoped the expedition would be terminated. They did not, however, know the character of their leader, and, reckoning without their host, were doomed to disappointment. Returning, the Bahr-Giraffe was found to be materially altered in its conformation, through the alteration in

the state of the vegetation-rafts. In his disgust the traveller writes:—

"No dependence can be placed upon this accursed river. The fabulous Styx must be a sweet rippling brook compared to this horrible creation."—Vol. I. p. 79.

The first special act of Sir Samuel Baker towards the suppression of the slave trade took place about this time. Halting eleven miles from the White Nile junction, he heard that the Governor of Fashoda was making a razzia on the Shillooks. Unexpectedly he visited the Governor's vessels. Inviting him on board, he inquired whether he captured women and children in the same way as he captured cattle. Assuming an expression of horror at the very idea, he replied by a distinct negative. Sir Samuel's aide-de-camp—the trusty Abd-el-Kader—at once visited the ships lying a few yards astern, and discovered a crowd of unfortunate captives, whilst Sir Samuel himself landing, came suddenly upon a mass of slaves, guarded by a number of soldiers; many of the women being secured to each other by ropes passed from neck to neck. The total number come upon was 155, made up of sixty-five girls and women, eighty children, and ten men. Sir Samuel at once insisted upon the liberation of every slave. At first the Governor refused to acknowledge his authority, but he soon submitted, and the intrepid Englishman had the happiness of explaining to the poor unfortunate ones the intentions of the Khedive, and then, to their great joy, of sending them back to their old homes. Of course this act did not add to the popularity of the expedition.

Selecting a spot about forty minutes' run down stream, beyond the junction of the Sobat, a camp was established and called Tewfikeeyah. The whole country on the side of the river occupied by the camp was found to be uninhabited. Formerly there was a large population belonging to the Dinka family, but through razzias made by the former and the then governor of Fashoda, that tribe was almost exterminated. Shortly after Sir Samuel's arrival, he was visited by Quat Kare, the King of the Shillooks, who told a most pitiful tale of the gross plundering and massacring which had gone on under Egyptian rule. Sir Samuel arranged an audience between this much wronged man and the Koordi Governor of Fashoda, the account of which is full of amusement and interest. The Shillooks

soon became the fast friends of the expedition, and carried on a considerable trade with the camp, and Sir Samuel thinks they only require an assurance of good faith and protection to become a valuable race.

At the station commanding the river, a good look-out was kept for slavers. Shortly after its establishment, a passing ship was boarded. Everything seemed in order, and the agent loudly declared she was simply laden with corn, beneath which was ivory for purposes of trade. Abd-el-Kader, drawing a steel ramrod from a soldier's rifle, probed it sharply through the corn. There was a smothered cry. Thrusting his long arm into the grain, he dragged forth by the wrist a negro woman. The corn was removed, the planks which boarded up the forecastle and stern were broken down, and there, packed like herrings in a barrel, was a mass of humanity—boys, girls, and women. One hundred and fifty slaves were there stowed away, in a most inconceivably small area. The sail attaching to the main-yard, appearing full and heavy in the lower part, was examined, and there was a young woman who had been thus sewn up to avoid discovery. Immediately the agent and captain were put in irons, and the ship was sent to Khartoum to be confiscated as a slaver. After the release of the negroes, there was found great difficulty in providing for them. Most of the women, however, were resolved to marry, and selections having been made amongst the soldiers, a process of matrimony went on upon a wholesale scale. During the maintenance of the station, many boats were seized, and the slaves on board liberated.

Prior to a general start, Baker determined to explore the "sudd," or obstructions of the main Nile, in the hope of discovering some new passage which the stream had forced through the vegetation. He, however, found that the Nile itself was entirely lost, and had become a swamp. Only by a special expedition from Khartoum could this formerly beautiful river be again opened up to navigation.

Tewfikeeyah was left on the 11th December, the station was dismantled, and a general advance was made. The English party had been reduced, and the Egyptian troops were greatly disappointed at having again to proceed to the south. Soon the Bahr-Giraffe was entered, and, after fearful work, extending over sixty days, the White Nile was reached — the ingenuity and perseverance displayed throughout the whole of this most trying journey

well illustrating the extraordinary qualification possessed by Sir Samuel Baker for African travel. Gondokoro (since named "Ismailia") was reached on April 15th, 1871. A careful computation showed this place to be 1,409 miles from Khartoum.

Sir Samuel found a great change had taken place in the condition of the river since his former visit. The old channel, which formerly had been of considerable depth, was now choked with sand-banks, and he was compelled to drop further down the river, where the traders had formed a new settlement. The country also was sadly changed. The Loquia had overrun it and reduced it to desolation, being enraged through depredations committed upon them by the Baris, who were in alliance with the traders. Allorron, the chief of the Baris, the worst tribe of the Nile basin, gave the expedition a sullen and morose welcome. The fact was, Abou Saood, Agad's vakeel, had prepared him for Sir Samuel's arrival, and now, he was ready to do his utmost to thwart the undertaken work. Thus brigand was united with brigand, villain with villain, and Gondokoro was the centre where the spoil was gathered. A station was soon formed, and cultivation was commenced; and on May 26th, Sir Samuel Baker officially annexed the territory to Egypt, amidst considerable ceremony.

The Bari country stretches about ninety miles from North to South, and is about seventy miles in width. The population is very dense, and is split up into small chiefdoms, over each of which is a sheik, or head-man. They are a warlike race, and also give great attention to cattle. At night time they confine them within "zareebas." A cattle zareeba is a formidable defence. It consists of a circular stockade, made of an intensely hard black wood, resembling ebony.

"Piles as thick as a man's thigh are sunk in the earth, so as to leave a fence or stockade of about eight feet high above the surface; these piles are placed as close as possible together, and interlaced by tough hooked thorns, which, when dry and contracted, bind the stockade into a very compact defence."—Vol. I. pp. 240, 241.

The weapons of the Baris are finely wrought lances and bows, with horribly barbed arrows. They seldom carry shields. The men are generally tall and powerful, and the women are not absolutely bad-looking.

These Baris Sir Samuel soon found absolutely hostile. Those around Gondokoro joined with those of Belinian, and continually attacked the station. Accordingly, he resolved to attack Belinian. Starting for the place at night, he took "the Forty Thieves," and coming to the native stockades, he captured, after some severe fighting, 600 cows, which, with some difficulty, were driven to Gondokoro by sunset. Whilst these complications were taking place, Abou Saood, who, consequent on the death of Agad, had succeeded that merchant in his business, arrived. This man, a villain of the deepest dye, brought 1,400 cattle, which he had stolen from the Shir tribe, whom he had wantonly attacked. These were at once confiscated, and notice was served upon him to quit the territory under Baker's command, immediately on the expiration of his contract with the Government. This leniency Sir Samuel had much cause to regret. Such a man should immediately have been sent to Khartoum in irons. Mole-like he worked, fraternising secretly with the Baris, and undermining the faithfulness of the Government troops. The consequence was, the natives became increasingly active in annoying the camp, and discontent became general among the soldiers. "The Forty Thieves," however, maintained their discipline, and were marked by irresistible activity. Being unable to obtain necessary corn, an expedition into the Belinian country was arranged for the purpose of securing the native harvests. After severe fighting, the Baris were driven off. The Government men, however, made but little effort to gather the grain, they being tired of the expedition, and anxious to give it up, whilst the native women carried it off with great rapidity. Not only so, but they purposely burnt several granaries, full of corn, pretending the fire to be accidental. The Baris now entered upon negotiations. Their purpose, however, was treachery, which, being found out, hostilities were again renewed; but at length, by occupying the country with sharpshooters, Baker cleared them out of the neighbourhood.

Having given orders for the vessels to return to Khartoum, the river being full, a conspiracy was entered into by the officers of the Government troops. A petition was drawn up and signed by all, excepting those belonging to "the Forty Thieves." It was at once traced to the Colonel of the Egyptian troops, who was a friend of Abou Saood.

In the petition it was declared there was no corn, and the troops would perish. Disgusted, Sir Samuel said nothing, but ordered Raouf Bey, the Colonel, and six companies to get under arms. Immediately an expedition was started to that part of the Bari country which was to the south of Regiaf. When reached, it was found to be literally overflowing with grain. "The Forty" were in ecstasies. The officers who had signed the petition were delighted. Sir Samuel was relieved. He then told them that he knew the country, that not a man should return to Khartoum, and that they must avail themselves of the opportunity afforded them of gathering in the grain.

At this time, through the return of the boats, Sir Samuel's force became reduced to 502 men, exclusive of fifty-two sailors. Leaving a sufficient garrison at head-quarters, he started southward, on the 22nd of January, 1872, on his journey of annexation, with 212 officers and men. Reaching another part of the Bari country, he found himself again confronted by a hostile people. Although the cattle were placed within a kraal, and sentries were posted, the expedition was nevertheless attacked that night. Immediately Sir Samuel set himself to clear the neighbourhood. Unable to obtain bearers, he resolved to march with all the stores to Loboré, sixty miles distant, the soldiers dragging the carts; but their mutinous opposition compelled him to change his plans. Accordingly, it was arranged for the Englishmen to return to Gondokoro, and there put one of the steamers together and open up communication with Khartoum, whilst Sir Samuel should push on to Loboré, with 100 men, in heavy marching order, if only he could secure a few natives to carry the necessaries for the road. At Loboré he hoped to be able to engage some hundred porters, who, under escort, should return and relieve the vessels and bring up sufficient ammunition and material for an advance south. On the 8th of February a new start was made, under the guidance of an old rain-maker, named Lokko, whose friendship had been secured. The country was found thickly populated, but no opposition was encountered, and in due time Loboré was reached, and the natives found to be very friendly. The supplies having been brought up, a further advance was made. After travelling through a beautiful country, the grand White Nile was struck above the last cataracts, and an encampment was made on a lovely plain, to which Sir Samuel

gave the name "Ibrahiméyah," after the father of the Khedive.

"This point is destined to become the capital of Central Africa.

* * * * *

"The trade of Central Africa, when developed by the steamers on the Albert N'Yanza, will concentrate at this spot, whence it must be conveyed by camels for 120 miles to Gondokoro, until at some future time a railway may perhaps continue the line of steam communication.

"It is a curious fact that a short line of 120 miles of railway would open up the very heart of Africa to steam transport between the Mediterranean and the equator, when the line from Cairo to Khartoum shall be completed.

* * * * *

"The native name for this part of the country is Afuddo."—Vol. II. pp. 75, 77.

There were no inhabitants, the villages having been destroyed by the slave-hunters. At length Fatiko, the principal station of Abou Saood, was reached. Confusion at once seized the camp, immense numbers of slaves were quickly driven out, and hurried away to the south, and everywhere there was the intensest excitement. The arrival of the Pacha, with his hardy force of 212 disciplined men, and a sufficient stock of cattle and merchandise to carry the expedition in any direction that might be desired, was a fatal blow to the hopes and intrigues of Abou Saood. Indeed, Sir Samuel found, soon after his arrival at Fatiko, that the villain had sent one of his vakeels, on the very morning of his arrival, to invade the Koshi country on the west side of the White Nile, close to its exit from the Albert N'Yanza. Thus was Sir Samuel in the very nest and hot-bed of the slavers. Recognised by the natives as an old friend, he received a hearty welcome, and when he explained the purpose of his visit, they assured him they would all rally round a good Government, for the country had been ruined by the traders' party.

Preparations were now made for a still further advance southward. A site was chosen for a station, and Major Abdullah was left in charge with 100 men. Carriers were obtained, and a start was made for Unyoro on the 18th of March. The grand Victoria Nile was soon reached, flowing beneath cliffs of seventy or eighty feet in height, through magnificent forests. But alas! alas! how changed the country since Sir Samuel's former visit.

"It was then a perfect garden, thickly populated, and producing all that man could desire. The villages were numerous; groves of plantains fringed the steep cliffs on the river's bank, and the natives were neatly dressed in the bark-cloth of the country.

"The scene has changed!

"All is wilderness! The population has fled. Not a village is to be seen!

"This is the certain result of the settlement of Khartoum traders. They kidnap the women and children for slaves, and plunder and destroy wherever they set their foot."—Vol. II. pp. 136, 137.

Kamrasi had died two years before, and the succession disputes had greatly helped forward the schemes of the traders. Having given notice at all the stations, that on the expiration of the Government contract with Abou Saood all his retainers would have to quit the country, many offered to enlist under Baker, and accordingly he began at once to form a corps of irregulars, but in a little time it was broken up.

About to continue his journey, he discovered treachery on the part of Abou Saood's agents, who joined with native chiefs to destroy the Government authority, and, in spite of positive prohibition, to enter upon an expedition against a neighbouring tribe. He at once sentenced Suleiman, the head vakeel, to receive 200 lashes, and Eddrees, the next in position, to receive 100. Having thus established his authority, he started for Masindi.

"This large town is situated on high undulating land, with an extensive view, bounded on the west by the range of mountains bordering the Albert N'Yanza, about fifty miles distant. The country is open, but covered with high grass. A succession of knolls, all more or less ornamented with park-like trees, characterise the landscape, which slopes gradually down to the west. . . The town is composed of some thousand large beehive-shaped straw huts, without any arrangement or plan."—Vol. II. pp. 180, 181.

The reports circulated concerning Sir Samuel Baker were of a remarkable description. Abou Saood had told Kabba Réga, the Unyoro king, that he was a very different person to the white man who had been so friendly with his father, Kamrasi, some years before.

"'You have been deceived,' said Abou Saood. 'The Pacha is not like the traveller or any other man. He is a monster, with

three separate heads, in each of which are six eyes—three upon each side. Thus, with eighteen eyes, he can see everything and every country at once. He has three enormous mouths, which are furnished with teeth like those of a crocodile, and he devours human flesh. He has already killed and eaten the Bari people, and destroyed their country. Should he arrive here, he will pull you from the throne and seize your kingdom.'"—Vol. II. pp. 194, 195.

The country having been ravaged by civil war, there were no granaries, and the corn was buried in deep holes, specially arranged for the purpose. To get at these stores, the slavers practised the most frightful atrocities.

"When the slave-hunters sought for corn, they were in the habit of catching the villagers and roasting their posteriors by holding them down on the mouth of a large earthen water-jar, filled with glowing embers. If this torture of roasting alive did not extract the secret, they generally cut the sufferer's throat, to terrify his companions, who would then divulge the position of the hidden stores, to avoid a similar fate."—Vol. II. p. 199.

On the 14th of May, 1872, Unyoro was formally taken possession of in the name of the Khedive of Egypt, and in the presence of King Kabba Réga and a large number of his people.

About this time, envoys arrived from M'tésé, King of Uganda, with a letter of welcome written in Arabic. This M'tésé is well known, from the accounts given by Speke and Grant, who resided for some time at his court. Since that time he had embraced Mohammedanism, had established commerce in the country, and a general improvement had taken place.

Suspecting foul play, Sir Samuel built a circular stockade, and surrounded it by a ditch and earthen parapet. Nor was the precaution needless. Poisoned plaintain cider having been sent into the station, and those who drank it only being saved from death by a prompt application of remedies, which fortunately were at hand, Baker sought to find out who was responsible for the treachery. Walking up and down outside the station with Lady Baker, talking over the matter, they were suddenly placed in the utmost danger. The savage yells of some thousand voices broke upon their ears. These were succeeded by gunshots. A sergeant standing close by was shot to the heart. The Government men, however, at once fell into position and

poured a heavy fire into the masses of the enemy, which, however, was returned from behind the castor oil bushes and the densely thronged houses. The town was immediately fired by Baker's orders, and the conflagration covering both flanks, the troops dashed forward, drove the enemy out of the town, and in about an hour and a quarter the battle of Masindi was won; but four of the best of "the Forty Thieves" fell to rise no more. In spite of pretended repentance and submission, further attacks were made, and Sir Samuel found it necessary to destroy the whole neighbourhood.

It was now resolved to break up the camp and to march to Rionga, a chief living on the Victoria Nile, who was at enmity with Kabba Réga. In ten days Fowerae was reached, during which time there was incessant fighting, for the enemy followed up the whole line of retreat, persistently attacking the party from out the long grass, killing ten of it, and wounding eleven others. Sending up canoes for their use, they made for the large island where Rionga lived, who accorded them a hearty welcome, and would exchange blood with the Pacha, as a sign that they were made friends for ever. Sir Samuel proclaimed Rionga as the vakeel of the Government, who would rule Unyoro in the place of Kabba Réga, whom he formally deposed.

Hearing of further treachery on the part of Abou Saood, Sir Samuel at once started for Fatiko, where he was most gladly received by the little detachment under Abdullah, which he had left there. The slave-hunters, however, immediately fiercely attacked the camp, and at the first discharge of fire-arms struck seven of the Government troops. Calling together "the Forty Thieves," Baker led them at full speed with fixed bayonets. Before the charge the enemy fled, and, in the end, more than half of them were killed, amongst whom was the greatest villain in the district, Ali Hussein. Abou Saood escaped to Khartoum, from which place, after spreading every conceivable false report, he travelled to Cairo, expressly to complain to the Khedive's Government of the gross treatment which he said he had experienced at the hands of its representative in Central Africa. As Baker truly says:—

"The fact of this renowned slave-hunter having the audacity to appeal to the Egyptian authorities for assistance, at once exhibits the confidence that the slave-traders felt in the moral

support of certain official personages, who represented public opinion in their hatred to the principal object of the expedition." —Vol. II. pp. 411—12.

With great energy and great diplomacy the whole region was cleared of these traders, so that slave-hunting was made to cease south of Gondokoro. The following is the short entry in Sir Samuel's Journal for 31 Dec., 1872:—

"The close of the year finds us, thank God, at peace in this country, with every prospect of prosperity."—Vol. II. p. 460.

Reinforcements arriving, the various stations were strengthened, and everything being put in perfect order in the new central territory, Sir Samuel started for Gondokoro, which place he reached on the 1st April, 1873, the very day on which his term of service expired, according to his original agreement with the Khedive.

Throughout the whole of his undertaking Sir Samuel Baker displayed the utmost courage, fortitude, and resource. He undertook an exceedingly difficult work, and he completed it, in spite of the intensest opposition, which often threatened completely to overwhelm. His personal bravery, his ready tact, his unfailing endurance, were marvellous. Nevertheless, there are those who think it a pity that these qualities were not displayed in another cause. What right had he to penetrate, for purposes of annexation, lands which in no ways belonged to Egypt, and, in order to establish the authority of the Khedive, to be the means, indirectly at least, of the destruction of so many defenceless negroes? Such views may not be hastily set aside. Indeed, we must confess to considerable sympathy with them. Every plan of annexation is an infringement upon the rights of others. Sir Samuel considers the end justifies the means. That, however, is a Jesuitical doctrine from which we absolutely dissent. The Apostolic teaching is, we are not to do evil that good may come. But still, if any end could justify unlawful means employed to reach it, it would undoubtedly be the punishment of villains such as those Nubian merchants, whose gross robberies and fearful cruelties Sir Samuel so vividly brings before us; the suppression of the inhuman traffic in that living ebony which is bone of our bone and flesh of our flesh; and the establishment of an orderly and protective government over populous tribes living in continual

anarchy, and exposed to incessant attacks. And in doing this, it is only fair to say, Sir Samuel never wantonly provoked, and did his utmost to avoid anything calculated to enrage. He was always ready for peace, and even under greatest provocation eagerly listened to every proposal which might lead to a cessation of hostilities.

No doubt Sir Samuel did a great work. That careful observer, Dr. Schweinfurth, bears testimony to the effect his mission had, both upon the subjects of Egypt and the negro tribes. All honour to him. But though the slave trade be put down on the White Nile, Egypt still leaves the chief sources of supply under her control untouched. The principal traffic, after all, is overland along the caravan roads which traverse the deserts some little distance to the west of the great river, and those which, passing through Abyssinia, find their outlet on the Red Sea. Even now a vast traffic is being carried on in Darfur, where all the criminals of the Soudan find a place of refuge, and every Khartoum outlaw has a retreat. In Kordofân also, the Egyptian Governor, only a short time back, allowed 2,700 slave-dealers to make their way to Dar-Ferteet, and himself became practically engaged in the trade. The Khedive, however, seems in earnest, and it must not be forgotten that he has to contend against the full strength of public opinion; for, as Sir Samuel emphatically wrote in 1866, and repeats in 1874—"Egypt is in favour of slavery." He is seeking to set right the fearful effects of the misgovernment of the Soudan, of which, it appears, he was quite ignorant, by dividing the country into provinces, and placing over each a responsible and independent official. Ismaïl Yagoob Pacha, the new governor of Khartoum, has set himself in right earnest to put down the whole system of bribery and corruption which was the ruin of the country, to remove the "sudd" or vegetable obstructions which completely blocked up the main Nile, and to suppress the slave traffic upon the river. Besides which, the Khedive has appointed an Englishman, Colonel Gordon, R.E., to carry on the work begun by Sir Samuel Baker.

The slave traffic, however, cannot cease until there come to be a change in the whole social life of Egypt. There every house of any pretensions is full of slaves. With attendants over whom he has absolute control, and who watch his every movement in order to carry out his bid-

ding, the Egyptian master grows up fearfully apathetic, and with all respect for his subordinates destroyed. Free paid labour needs to be introduced and self-help taught. Then, the demand being cut off, the supply will cease, and as a result legitimate trade will speedily develop. When slavery was abolished in the Southern States of America, the West African slave trade at once lost its main impulse, and the consequence was, as the returns of the British possessions testify, the extension of commerce. It is not, however, to commerce that we are to look for the uplifting of the poor degraded, hunted negro tribes, as Sir Samuel Baker would try to make out. Such a theory is in strange contradiction to the whole teaching of experience. Mere commerce has never yet achieved a single conquest over barbarism. It has helped forward a people raised by other means, and shown them how to develope their powers. But that is its utmost achievement. By Christianity alone can the moral regeneration of the world be accomplished. And by Christianity we do not mean the propagation of forms and superstitions, such as unfortunately are only too frequently taught by the adherents of the Roman Catholic Communion, to the failure of whose mission at Gondokoro Sir Samuel points, in order to substantiate his position; but we mean the simple preaching of faith in Jesus, and obedience to His law. The process may seem slow, but it is the only sure one. That it can uplift, even the most degraded and debased, its history shows. The inhabitants of the Fijis, which islands lately have occupied so much public attention, are an unmistakable illustration in point. Commerce can refer us to no such example. Religion is not the child of civilisation. Civilisation is the child of religion. Nor can there be any hope for Africa, until, throughout the entire continent, the Gospel of Jesus shall be diffused.

ART. IV.—*The Church and the Empires: Historical Periods.* By HENRY WILLIAM WILBERFORCE; Preceded by a Memoir of the Author by J. H. NEWMAN, D.D., of the Oratory, with a Portrait. King and Co. 1874.

THE Bishop of Peterborough was right, from his point of view, when he propounded the famous dilemma about England drunk and free, or sober and enslaved; so, too, were the Oblate Fathers who the other day at Palles, in County Limerick, made two "factions" shake hands before the altar and swear, each man holding a taper, against all kinds of drink entirely. We should not object to two tapers if the oath would thereby be made more binding. What justifies the Bishop is, that those whom the Oblates have made teetotallers to order, would deny the worth of any other kind of teetotalism, nay, hold all outside their pale as such hopeless "miscreants," that it is really no matter whether they drink themselves into the grave or not. This exclusiveness, which is of the essence of Romanism, and which we fear is also an inseparable accident of some kinds of Protestantism, is something that disestablishment will not get rid of; nay, that it may rather strengthen. It has certainly of late years come into very unpleasant prominence. People even boast of their intolerance, and accuse of lukewarmness and Erastianism any who venture to think that the final peril of those who differ from them is not quite certain. If you happened some five and twenty years ago to make a visit to Stonyhurst during the vacation, the wild beauty of the Hodder Valley would have delighted you; so would the excellent moor-mutton, and the genial hospitality of the brothers, and yet more, their free conversation on all sorts of topics. Walking in the gallery, and looking at the little Vandyck —Christ on the Cross—by which the college sets such store, you would naturally fall to talking about Christianity as it was and as it is. "You of the Roman obedience, unless you are sadly misrepresented, condemn to endless woe all who refuse to enter the one true fold." "But we are so sadly misrepresented," would have replied that gentlest and most persuasive of voices—the voice of

the guest-master, while his eyes turned appealingly from you to the face on which the great painter has stamped the sublimest expression of human woe. And then you would be initiated into all the subtleties of vincible and invincible ignorance, until it actually seemed as if Romanism was latitudinarian to a fault, and as if the poor Irish,—with whom perhaps you had been accustomed to discuss, and who always wound up by politely assuring you that it was little use saving money or keeping themselves clean now, inasmuch as all these things were but for a day, while they were safe for eternity, and you, and all who thought as you did, must unhappily, but inevitably, fall into destruction,—were as ignorant of their Church's real teaching as they were bigoted in their own opinions. At Stonyhurst, some quarter of a century ago, Romanism would have seemed the most tolerant, not to say expansive, of creeds. So it would a little later, had you talked things over with one of those ermine-coped canons at Tournay who looked so imposing at matins. But now, Dr. Newman says, that "What must I do to be saved? is the grand question with all serious minds, and to this there is but one answer: Get into the Ark of Salvation, the Oracle of Truth, the Fold of Christ, of which the Anglican communion is no part." This argument led Henry Wilberforce to cut short a useful life at East Farleigh, and to put himself into the anomalous position of a lay cleric, who, "with so many heartstrings broken," as he says in a touching letter to Archbishop Bird Sumner, was glad to accept the secretaryship of the Dublin Catholic Defence Association, and the editorship of the *Weekly Register*, and other inferior and precarious work, in order to escape what his biographer calls "dull listless inactivity."

It is but one instance more of the sad results which must follow from the necessary narrowness of an infallible Church; it is intolerance pushed to its logical conclusions. Protestants are often intolerant enough, but they seldom, at any rate, categorically condemn all outsiders in the summary way in which Rome must condemn them. She, if those Stonyhurst priests were fair exponents of her earlier views, has in twenty-five years gone back at least five centuries. For her "the world" is now what Nero's Rome was to the early Christians, what "the wicked" were to Orcagna, when he drew those awful jaws (as of one whose whole body would be far too

terrible to look upon) down which are hurried popes and monks as well as worldlings of all kinds. But the early Christians had some reason for threatening with punishment hereafter those whose cruelty they were powerless to resist on earth. Their doing so was, in some sort, a wriggle of the crushed worm. Orcagna, too, and Dante, and the men of their day, were at least impartial; "miscreants" would burn no doubt, but so would evil livers, and in an age when nearly all in Christendom were of one creed, their concern was rather with morals than with doctrine. So, again, those Hindoos who see all created being streaming into the burning throat of Siva the destroyer, are not only impartial but really gentle compared with some Romanists. With them the fiery death is but the prelude to a new life; Siva, after all, is but another form of Vishnu. But the Romanist creed is systematised, unmitigated severity, as logical in its way as so-called Calvinism, and at least as incomprehensible. To many minds even the most iron-bound Calvinism has its strong points; and they have argued that if we often bow with absolute submission in regard to this world, why not in regard to the after world. If the Potter has made vessels of wrath fitted for destruction, those vessels can at any rate acquiesce in their lot; for that lot is fixed by something adequate to such a result. But if men's faith is bound up in their coming under Catholic influence; if their eternal doom absolutely depends on their being baptized, and absolved, and fed by priestly hands, they surely have a right to complain. The hyper-Calvinist's God is stern in His attributes, the hyper-Romanist's is capricious as well as stern; in neither case do we behold the administrator of a Gospel of grace offered to man on conditions adapted to the misery and the needs of human nature as it is. What a creed is that of Rome! and yet we talk of Dr. J. H. Newman's logical mind and wonderfully subtle powers; not seeing that the possession of such powers by one so warped may easily become a snare; not realising that extremes meet here as always, and that the intolerance of the Oratory is but another form, an exaggeration, of that other intolerance in which the *Apologia* tells us he was reared.

What wonder that Guizot could find no satisfactory answer to the question: Can we accord full toleration to Romanism? is it possible to deal with it on the "live and

let live" principle? The question is one of the hardest that comes before the modern statesman; and in the growing development of religious thought it is becoming a burning question. It has caused the Falk laws; it has just led Mr. Gladstone to put forth his pamphlet. The *non possumus* of Rome is as impracticable in its way as the tenets of "the peculiar people," and it has, and must long have, millions at its back. Wild theorists are fond of talking of "the religion of the future;" what can be the use of speculating on such a matter when the fact of Romanism is there, and when that strange faith enthrals not only Irish hop-pickers, but men like Henry Wilberforce and his biographer? In fact, just now, the prospect for those who care for the world's true spiritual progress, as well as for their own individual "salvation," is not over cheering. With America what it is, the land where justice is bought and sold, and where thousands are the deluded votaries of "Spiritualism;" with Germany split into two camps; with France no longer "the home of ideas," but a land of stunted growths and miserable makeshifts, where rich and poor are alike content *incedere per ignes suppositos cineri doloso*, each party waiting till some slight upheaval seems to give it a chance of thrusting the other down into the gulf; with England caring as much about the wretchedest political trifle as about National Education, higher or lower; the most sanguine Christian is fain at times to wait as patiently as he can for the dawn of the Second Advent, even if he is not tempted to cry with Mr. Carlyle—"It is the night of the world." It puzzles him that the English lower middle class should be so blind as to let much of the higher education of the country pass unchallenged into the hands of the rich—eleemosynary foundations becoming more and more, through so-called "liberal" reforms, the prize of the longest purse. It puzzles him, when he takes a wider view, that the world at large should not see how much wiser it is to try to mend people now than lazily to condemn them to destruction hereafter, that it should not awaken to that divorce between faith and action, so general through a great part of Christian society, which makes books like *Modern Christianity a Practical Heathenism* something more than a bitter satire, and should not see that (as it is carried out by the mass of nominal Christians) the sublime creed of the Gospel has almost ceased to be a creed "whereby a man can live." But the English artisan

is too content with beer and wages, and the English middle classes with their comforts, and the world, as a whole, steadily declines to recognise the hollowness of its belief.

A book like this is like an intellectual "revival;" it brings us to our bearings, and forces us to feel how very little way man has yet made in realising the spirit of Christianity. It is melancholy reading from every point of view. Sad that such a man should have changed his creed at the cost of "trials to which time brought no relief;" sad, too, that minds far above the common should hold that the whole course of the earth was spècially ordered by Providence—the empire of the Antonines broken up, and succeeded by so many periods of which humanity is ashamed, by such a chaos, for instance, as that of Merovingian France—in order that a personally amiable Pontiff (who, by the way, was markedly attentive to Mr. H. W. Wilberforce, when the latter was at Rome) might go wrong upon the subject of his own infallibility, and might thus strengthen the hands of all the enemies of freedom and progress throughout the world.

It would be sad indeed for us could we not be certain that God rules all things, guiding them to a good end; life would be little worth had we not faith that (as the Laureate sings), "through the ages an increasing purpose runs;" but it were the saddest thing of all to be driven to believe that that purpose is the one indicated by our author. How he came to be satisfied with such a very poor ideal is detailed in that Memoir which is far the most interesting part of the book.

Mr. Henry Wilberforce, youngest son of William Wilberforce, was, like the rest of his class, a hearty Englishman of Canon Kingsley's "hard" race, with just that tendency to look to the main chance which marks the class. With him its direction in worldly things was wholly benevolent and unselfish. His parsonage, while he was a clergyman of the Establishment, was the home at once of simple frugality and mediæval almsgiving. His more than simple dress, and the general self-neglect of which his biographer speaks, bespoke self-sacrifice carried to extremes. Yet he had his full share of shrewdness, as he showed at Walmer, where, by looking over the parish-books, he recovered for the Church the old glebe together with a house which had been built on it. It was in spiritual matters alone that his

"hardness" showed itself uncomfortably. It would be wrong to say that he became selfish in spiritual things; anyhow, when the outbreak of cholera among a gang of Irish hop-pickers in his village had brought him into contact with the Fathers of the London Oratory, he began to feel that salvation could alone be obtained in "the Church universally called Catholic. This was the Fold of Christ, the Ark of Salvation, the Oracle of Truth, and the Anglican Communion formed no part of it."

That is, substantially, all that we are told; so that, though (as we said) the Memoir is deeply interesting, it is at the same time most unsatisfactory. It does not in the least help us to solve that perplexing mystery, one of the deep things of providence, how it comes to pass that great intellectual power, combined with great moral earnestness are not enough to preserve their possessor from falling under "strong delusion, that he should believe a lie." It is a painful subject, in regard to which we can do little more than accept the fact, as we are obliged to accept many other unpleasant facts. How sad it is those only know who have lost a friend in this way; who have watched the gradual fascination which seemed to harden the heart while it unnerved the reason; who have lamented, how bitterly they alone know, the growing estrangement which sundered hearts hitherto beating as one on almost all the questions on which men act in concert; hearts that were content to leave some things, insoluble by man, to Him to Whom, as Master each one standeth or falleth. This is what other Christians are content to do; they can work together, because they are content to differ in things non-essential, and in things which can never be finally and absolutely settled by man. But Rome is not satisfied with this; logically she exacts complete obedience, an obedience running into the minutest details of life and conduct. And this minute logical obedience is just what her new converts are of all men the most anxious to give. A hereditary Romanist can afford to smile at a good deal, to leave much in abeyance, to be as illogical, as practically and happily inconsistent, as Englishmen usually are; the recent letters of Lord Acton, and Lord Camoys, and the O'Donoghue, and others, show us that he can go a great deal further than this. But the pervert feels bound to prove his belief by the most scrupulous attention to every small precept. Perhaps he hopes that the sense of disappointment, which

he must often feel when he has made the fatal step, may be removed if he carries out to the full that surrender of reason and affections which he is called on to make. Anyhow, he sets his face like a flint, and to all your fond reminders of the good you and he did and planned together in time past, he answers, "Ah, but I see things differently now." It is the same everywhere. In America, Protestants of all denominations — Methodist, Quaker, Presbyterian, Episcopalian—work together on the committees of ragged schools and refuges; to save children and young people from present misery and certain ruin is supposed to be an undoubtedly good work, a work the crying need of which silences any whisper about small differences of creed or of Church government. Romanists alone stubbornly stand aloof—stubbornly prefer leaving their nominal little ones on the streets rather than allow them to run the risk of contamination from the occasional presence of heretic teachers.

But we need not go over to America for instances of such practical intolerance. In effect every Romanist says:—"There is a residuum which we cannot, or will not look after; but we take good care (and the modern notions of toleration enable us to do so) that you, at any rate, shall not be allowed to stir a finger in assisting us." You may test the thing for yourself. You see, in London or Liverpool, a bright little girl, daughter of some poor Irish family living in a back court. "What a pity," you think, "not to have her trained as a servant;" and, as your good wishes try, if possible, to work themselves out practically, you at once propose to send her to a training establishment. The mother is delighted; her mother's instinct sees what is best for the child, and she is full of blessings on the heart that had such kind thought for a stranger. But the father, who during the colloquy has come in from work, looks suspicious; perhaps he has some little office at his chapel; anyhow, he and the priest understand each other, so he respectfully submits that he must consult his reverence before making up his mind. His reverence says "No!" but you will not take "No" for an answer; you call at the sacristy and plead, in the vain hope that Rome may relent. As well expect that the railway train would swerve out of its course to spare the head of the poor cripple who has fallen across the line. His reverence listens graciously—nay, with the most perfect courtesy;

somehow it seems to you all the harder that he is an Englishman. You explain:—it is not a proselytising place to which you would send the child. The head of it, indeed, is the sister of a colonial bishop; but children of all sects are admitted, and arrangements might be made whereby a young Romanist would be allowed to go occasionally to mass under certain regulations. "That's just it," he replies. "I used to think as you do; but God has opened my eyes, and now I see that these mixed schools are the ruin of souls. . . No, I've given much thought to the matter; and I regret to say that I can't advise her parents to take a step which would imperil the girl's eternal welfare. It is very kind of you." You stop him short; the mention of your kindness seems so horribly out of place. You are sorely tempted to say, "Very well. I, as district visitor, know Gin Court better than you do. If the girl stays there she'll be ruined, and her blood will be on your head." But you put constraint on yourself, and reply: "Well, if it must be so, at least do you commend her to some sisterhood of your own. A girl like that, gentle and engaging, is in sad danger in such a neighbourhood." Of course, he will do what he can; but nothing is done; and six months more, amid such surroundings, do their inevitable work. The girl who came over so pure and hopeful is a moral and physical wreck. Some ruffian in the same miserable tenement has ruined her; before long, she is in the county gaol for theft; and next time you see her, selling oranges at a street corner, you can scarcely believe it is the same being. But the priest and the father have this satisfaction—she is still sound in the faith; she presses into chapel with the rest of the worshippers, and is, at least, attentive enough to her "duties" to keep herself within the pale of salvation. Indeed, who knows but that, like the East Farleigh hop-pickers, she may be instrumental in bringing another Wilberforce into the one true fold. This, unhappily, a case taken from life, is also a typical case. It shows us the working of Romanism, and explains a great deal of the so-called want of charity with which Protestants are sometimes charged towards their "elder sister." How is it possible to "get on" where there is not, and on "infallible" principles cannot be, the least trace of reciprocity? Kindly feeling can scarcely thrive if it is all on one side. The matter is one for legislation. The community must not suffer because one section of it is so narrow as to object to all

training which is not wholly managed by its own accredited teachers. The corollary of compulsory education is the power to insist on sending Romanist boys and girls to such training places as may be suitable for them, whether or not such places are exclusively Romanist. If this is not done, we shall always have a "residuum," a dangerous class; and from the circumstances of immigration, overcrowding, and poverty, not to speak of the sad want in the religious education which they get, far more than the due percentage of this class will continue to be Romanist. We have no wish to put out of sight the good side of Romanist training; kindness, and patience, and gentle courtesy must tell, even when sadly mingled with error. But we do say that such training, at its best, fails to give backbone to the character; and that the Irish immigrant, cut adrift from the strong local sanctions, which at home held him or her to virtue, drifts into evil from which the same nature, otherwise moulded, would probably have escaped. England never can be as Prussia is; but still the police courts of Liverpool, and Glasgow, and London, prove a state of things which would not be suffered to go on except among a people who have pushed non-interference to the limits of absurdity.

As we said, Dr. Newman does not vouchsafe any explanation of the mental process by which Mr. H. W. Wilberforce was drawn to Rome. It would almost seem as if he thought that every earnest man who does not forcibly hold back must be guided in the same direction. To give reasons, to argue publicly, are not now the tactics of Rome. For her the age of controversy is past; she stands apart, and prefers pointing to one and another of the "great minds" who have "found rest" in her communion, while her gesture implies something almost like a taunt: "they came and inquired, and did not go back; and what satisfied them is not likely to disappoint you." Nor can we pretend to enter fully into the various reasons which lead to perversions. There are those who have almost certainly been influenced by love of power;—they were unappreciated, as they thought, in their own communion. There are some who have given way through sheer weakness of mind and inability to withstand the pressure put upon them by shrewd and able tacticians, eager to secure desirable converts. Others, again, are led over by an undue fondness for the externals of worship, a

fondness for which the bare unsightly buildings and the cold meagreness in all accompaniments which have too often gone along with Protestant truth have certainly not made allowance enough. It is well that at last all Protestant communions have awaked to the truth that man engaged in worship is still man, and that as such he needs provision for other faculties besides the intellectual and the inwardly emotional. When the New York Romanist priest was asked to account for the great increase in the number of his congregation—"it is the blessing of God on good music," he replied; and, happily, we have also come to see that good music, good architecture, good externals, in fact, are not to be despised; nay, that under due subjection to all important conditions, they may be most valuable. Certain it is that the proverbial dulness of a good deal of the old unimproved Establishment worship, which, while wholly lacking the emotional element, lacked also that appeal to the senses which is made in the gorgeous ritual of Rome, accounts for some at least of the perversions. Then there is the longing for rest, which is for one class of minds a veritable soul's hunger. To them the insoluble questions, "the riddle of this painful earth," present themselves, not now and then but always, with the same distracting power with which they come at times to most of those who think at all. But on them such questions force themselves for answer. Their peculiar mental constitution prevents them from putting aside what man can never hope to unravel. Instead of saying, as most of us do, "I cannot understand, but I can trust God for it, even as I can for the origin of evil and for all such like mysteries," their cry is for certainty: "Give us certainty, or we die." And this Rome, after her own fashion, gives, whatever else she takes away.

There is another form of certainty—the certainty that Lucretius had, that whatever the Divine may be (if, indeed, there be any Divine), it has nothing whatsoever to do with human thought, is wholly cut off from human sympathy; *nec bene promeritis capitur nec tangitur irâ.* And for some minds that is the most captivating form which certainty can assume; they seem to revel in the idea that we are here alone and helpless, and that nothing is so sure as the "fact" of our being thus helpless. But not all minds that crave for certainty are of this strange calibre. The *Apologia pro Vita Sua* shows the working of this strong

desire in one, in whose brother we see the same desire working in a very different direction.

Connected, too, with this craving for another certainty than that which God has provided in the answer of a good conscience unto Him, in the assurance which lays hold of that which is within the veil, and grasps it more firmly than any one can grasp mere dogma or bare intellectual reasoning, is the way in which some are moved by the current views of Biblical criticism. They have built on the letter of the book, apart from that Spirit which beareth witness to our spirits so that we who believe have the witness within us; and when their baseless faith is undermined they have no support within themselves, and, in their dread of what is coming, fall back on the authority of "the Church." Hence (though this is not the place to enlarge on it) the value of spiritual religion; he who has a true and practical faith in Christ will not be moved because a text here and a text there are cavilled at with more or less reason; he knows in whom he has believed, and he comes to the Bible, partly, indeed, for intellectual certainty, but for the satisfaction of something in addition to that, and of very much greater importance. And such a man is safe from any fear of perversion to Romanism. But perhaps the largest class of perverts are those who begin with exaggerated notions of Apostolical Succession, and such ideas as are fostered by some ways of interpreting the baptismal service of the Established Church. In all this there are pretensions which may easily be made to seem to need infallibility: and when the urgency of such pretensions is skilfully presented to minds which have never been accustomed to reason on the subject, no wonder it should sometimes become overpowering. They have accepted certain doctrines without question, and in a certain sense; and, when they are brought to face the matter, they find that such doctrines, so accepted, must carry them further than they fancied. Anglicanism, of course, claims to offer a way out of the dilemma; but most people think that it only does so at the cost of consistency. However, it is futile to draw out a list of causes for what is in almost every single case the result, not of one, but of a complicity of causes. There is the deplorable fact, and there is no use in discussing it.

All we can do is to trust that greater light as to the political tendency of Romanism will make men more chary

of admitting its spiritual pretensions; and it is in this way that such manifestoes as Mr. Gladstone's are valuable. They tell us, not what rival theologians assert, but what broad-minded statesmen—men eminently of "Catholic principles"—have been unwillingly obliged to admit.

So much for the thoughts suggested by Dr. Newman's Memoir of the youngest of the Wilberforce family—not the only one of them (we believe) who sought peace "in the one fold." A very different man he must have been from his brother the Anglican bishop, and, in some things, we should fancy, a more sterling and lovable man. Some might plausibly argue that the eagerness with which he threw up work, friends, all, is but another form of that spirit which seeks in some form of self-satisfaction the mainspring of all its many-sided activity. But to this we should not consent.

Now for a very brief glance at the essays (chiefly from the *Dublin Review*) which make up the volume. The object seems to be to show that every empire which has opposed itself to the Roman Church has been broken in pieces in the conflict. For this purpose Mr. Wilberforce analyses, with much laudation, Mr. T. W. Allies' book on "The Formation of Christendom"—based, strangely enough, in great part on the *Christenthum und die Kirche* of that Dr. Döllinger who has since got on such a different groove from that on which his translator and adapter ran. The Count of Champigny's books on the Church and the Roman Empire are then reviewed in two essays; and thus the victory of Christianity over imperial Rome is set forth according to Romish ideas.

That is one triumph; the next is in quite an unexpected quarter. It is not the crushing out of Hussism, or the Cadmean victory of the thirty-years' war, with all its bloody episodes, but the *fiasco* of Gallicanism, which Dr. Newman chooses as the next triumph. Never was "No surrender" more emphatically pronounced, than in making such a choice. We have, in our ignorance, been accustomed to look on Gallicanism as the redeeming feature in the French Romanist Church, to hail it as an effort after freedom, an evidence of hearty determination to withstand at least one form of spiritual thraldom. Nay, we have sometimes regretted that the overtures between the French and English Churches should have led to nothing. Good might have come to France, we fancied, from the resulting enlightenment—good which might possibly have given the

Revolution an altogether milder form; while in England the infusion of a little Gallic fervour and piety—of the spirit of St. Francis de Sales and Madame Guyon—might have anticipated by many years that revival which in God's Providence was destined to await the coming of John Wesley.

M. Gérin and his reviewer, Mr. Wilberforce, on the contrary, hold Gallicanism to have been merely an expression of the imperious will of Louis XIV.—an attempt to add *l'église c'est moi* to that other dictum, *l'état c'est moi*, of which his whole system of government proved the truth. This is such an audacious way of reading history, that the *ignoratio elenchi*, which in the earlier essays assumes that the Papal Church and the Church of God are convertible terms, that the one covers just the same ground as the other, seems quite matter of course for one who can so write of the Gallicanism of 1682. M. Gérin's book, published towards the close of the Second Empire, was not without an object. Napoleon III. was to be taught that it is in vain, even for princes so favourably circumstanced as the Grand Monarque, to enter the lists against the successor of St. Peter. Whether or not this teaching had its effect in hurrying on the war of 1870 we cannot tell; those who are best informed believe that not dynastic considerations alone, but pressure from the Ultramontane party, led the Emperor into that disastrous struggle.

The remaining essays are devoted to Count d'Haussonville's *Napoléon 1^er^ et la Sainte Siége*, which first appeared in the *Revue des Deux Mondes*. Nothing can be keener than the Count's satire, nothing more damaging than his statement of facts. The Napoleon family must have writhed under the exposure of details which its founder had always carefully suppressed. The book must have materially helped Lanfrey and his fellows in destroying the Napoleonic legend. A dispassionate spectator, a native of another planet for instance, would say that the Pope was very trying, and that the Emperor was very mean and tricky. The struggle between them would be amusing but for the issues involved in it. We can fancy a larger-minded Pontiff taking up a better position, and winning his way without losing his dignity. How that dignity was served by a good deal of Pope Pius's conduct—by his breaking, for instance, the *annulus piscatoris* before surrendering it to the Emperor, we fail to perceive. The only

person who comes well out of the business is the upright-minded Abbé Emery. As we said, the issues involved were most important; and the conduct at that crisis of all whom the Pope could influence is in itself a justification of Mr. Gladstone's remarks about divided allegiance; it is an abuse of words to say that the Pontiff, with whom Napoleon I. had to deal, stood only on his spiritual rights.

Of Mr. Wilberforce's own part in these essays, we need not say much; they were "reviews," and it is best for a reviewer to put himself out of sight, to be content to tell us succinctly what his author says, unless he has something very well worth hearing of his own. With Macaulay, indeed, and Carlyle, the title of a book is sometimes but a peg, on which hangs a masterly piece of historical philosophy, a brilliant invective, or a soul-stirring picture of social wrongs. But Mr. Wilberforce is not a Macaulay nor a Carlyle; and he is mostly content to give us a summary rather than a criticism. He takes care as he goes on to show us that he is at one with his authors; and he shows, too (as when he quotes the *Saturday Review*, to the effect that the Count of Champigny is a learned and picturesque writer, though credulous and over judicial), that he is by no means insensible to the opinion of the men of this world.

With very much in the essays about heathen Rome and early Christianity we thoroughly agree; just as we are free to confess the great benefits which were conferred on mankind by the Papal Church of the earlier Middle Ages, in His Providence who works His wise purposes through and by means of His own agents. It is quite true, for instance, "that no man can understand the first three centuries whose eyes are not opened by the gift of faith." No one can imagine a more marvellous change than that the society of whose views Cæsar (in the unbeliever's plea which Sallust makes him put forth for lenity to Catiline's associates) was the exponent should, within three centuries of that time, have become so thoroughly saturated with Christianity, that the "establishment" of the new religion was a political necessity. Truly, it may be said, that Christianity proves itself by its existence. That, being what it is, it made its way as it did, must certify its origin to every candid mind. The author of *Supernatural Religion* may quibble as to whether Justin Martyr used our Gospels or others like them, because he

often quotes the sense and not the actual words; he may speak slightingly of miracles, because "the Jewish mind looked on miracles as a regular accompaniment of daily life." But the fact is there; Justin died for his faith despite the verbal inaccuracy of his quotations, and the faith of Christ soon sent its roots deep down into the heart of humanity, while all the Jewish miracle-mongers, with their strange creeds and their cunning fables, their Cabbala, their Gnostic dreams, withered away and left no trace. Christianity began so humbly, and under such disadvantages (humanly speaking), that "it would have seemed" (in the eloquent words of Dr. Farrar, *Witness of History to Christ*) "the very fanaticism of credulity to prophesy for it such a future as it attained to." What Mr. Wilberforce's authors (especially Count Champigny) aim at is showing how Christianity grew during the first ages of the Church. And this, since we have little or no notice of it in the heathen writers, resolves itself into an endeavour to depict the state of society in the then Roman world, combined with a summary of what the Christian writers have said on the subject. It is only in very modern times that *the people* and their ways have begun to be interesting to the historian; and, accordingly, there is some truth in Mr. Wilberforce's remark, that "the Acts of the Apostles tells us more than any heathen writer of the social working of Roman society." He seems to forget the satirists; for, though we may put Juvenal aside as the Veuillot of his day—the man whose imagination ran riot in evil—and though Martial is the poet of a class, we cannot read Horace without learning a great deal about the ways of Romans of all ranks. Still, no one would go to Livy for a picture of manners; his "picturesqueness" never leads him to forget "the dignity of history." Suetonius, that Greville of the first emperors, never even mentions Christianity; we cannot expect him to do so any more than we expect Horace Walpole to estimate the value of Methodism as a spiritual force, or to draw an elaborate comparison between Wesley and Whitefield. Except the very brief notice in Tacitus, the few lines in Juvenal, and the well-known letter of the younger Pliny, "the classics" give us no help at all. *Crescit occulto velut arbor ævo* may well be applied to the growth of that tree which sprang from the grain of mustard-seed. Hallam notices the common failing of historians, who

make so much of an obscure royal marriage, and are wholly silent about matters of the greatest importance, e.g. about the introduction of standing armies; and certainly Christianity came in silently as far as the Roman historians are concerned. There was nothing grand to tell: "*Non eloquimur magna sed vivimus*," was truly said by an apologist (Minucius Felix) of what began to be contemptuously called a *tertium genus* (a set of nondescripts), when it could no longer be confounded with the Jewish sects.

Of other writers on the subject Mr. Wilberforce much prefers Gibbon to Merivale. Gibbon's book (he says) may almost be called ecclesiastical; it never ignores Christianity, "for the writer's hatred made him *feel* Christianity as some people feel a cat in the room." Merivale he accuses of keeping Christianity out of sight—of "reserving his religion for Sundays." Of Dr. Farrar's book he takes no notice, though there are passages in it as eloquent as any which he quotes from Champigny. The Count labours to set forth the wonderful completeness of Roman civilisation, and the harmonious dovetailing together of all the parts of which it was composed, and then to show how it all fell as by the touch of enchantment. His pictures of how the Romans lived are no doubt too highly coloured, but they have not the lubricity which mars a good deal of Renan's last work (St. Paul—e g. the Dirce passages and others referring to Nero's persecution). For him, of course, Antichrist (who for Renan is Nero) is imperial Rome; and we are to suppose that Rome fell to secure the independence of the Papacy—to pave the way for the establishment of the temporal power. The fearful persecutions carried on by some, and the persistent hostility shown by all the emperors up to Constantine, are indeed brought in to account for the visitation which befell the imperial city; but as that visitation came long after the empire had become Christian, these can only be meant as additional reasons; for those who read history through Mr. Wilberforce's glass, the reason which we have assigned above must seem quite adequate to overthrow the world's empire. It certainly was a complete overthrow. "For many weeks," says Mr. Wilberforce, "the very ruins of Rome were deserted. He who now visits her, instead of singing with the godless poet: alas, the lofty city! and alas, the trebly hundred triumphs! should rather recall those words in the Apocalypse: Rejoice over her, O heaven,

for in Rome, when she fell, the crimes as well as the civilisation of a thousand years were accumulated." But then for nearly 600 of these thousand years Christianity had been at work in Rome, and for nearly half that time it had been the established religion under those Popes from whom Pius IX. traces his descent. It seems rather hard, therefore, to say that "the empire was removed not to give place to desolation, but to the throne on which Christ should visibly sit in the person of His Vicar." The Vicar was there before; all that removal of the empire did for him was to lead to his establishment as a temporal prince.

The fact is that considerable exaggeration prevails both as to the morals of imperial Rome and as to the effects of Christianity in breaking up the empire. On the first point it is certain that the debauchery of the capital produced no more effect on the empire at large than the orgies of the Second Empire did on the peasants of Brittany or Lorraine; nor must we trust the picture drawn by Juvenal and Apuleius any more than we should accept Paul Féval as a correct delineator of French society. As to the second point, Christianity was one of many solvents; some few Christians were at times not unfairly accused of bad citizenship; moreover, by smoothing away the differences between Roman and barbarian, they made the final conquest easier; it seemed far less terrible that Rome should succumb to a Christian Goth than to a heathen Hun, and this feeling no doubt blunted the edge of resistance. But Rome fell, not only because the empire was opposed to Christianity, but also because it was the most wasteful system of government that ever existed. It is useless to boast (as Mr. Allies does) of the smallness of the Roman armies, while her centralisation sucked the life out of all her provinces, and gradually reduced them to the state to which the almost total destruction of the small farmers had reduced Italy. *Latifundia*, resulting from the *vastitatem Italiæ* brought about by the Punic and other wars, ruined the empire; and when it fell, Christianity was there, by God's providence, to give life to what succeeded it. Thoughtful men felt what was coming, though they did not see how to apply a remedy, and the feeling accounts for the gloomy view which every writer, from Cicero to Tacitus, takes of the world's progres. The Roman world was neither so morally bad nor so politically as Mr. Wilberforce and his friends would have us believe. They are brilliant advo-

cates, and what we want is calm statements of facts. It is a fact that when Gaul was left to itself, A.D. 68, the chiefs of the nation met at Trèves, and agreed to remain under the Roman rule; but this does not prove the perfection of that rule, it rather proves the faith of the Gauls in the vitality of that empire which had several times taught them that it had a long arm and a heavy hand. M. de Champigny's contrast between Cicero and St. Augustine (he chooses them because each has told us so much of his own character) is clear, but it is certainly unfair.

Of course there is a good deal which we eschew as matter of course: "The Protestant falling away, whereby the supernatural is displaced, is just now restoring the characteristics of heathenism," is a passage of this kind. So is the following: "The salt by which Christianity acts on the world is martyrdom and holy virginity, which last (says Chrysostom) the Jews hate, but the Greeks marvel at." There are, too, occasional specimens of what we may call Roman reasoning; e.g. Cardinal Wiseman had been speaking of the Virgin Mary's robe at Chartres and of St. Ursula and her 1,100 virgins, and some reviewer, naturally enough, understands him to undertake to prove that the robe is really her robe, and that the virgins had a substantial existence, and have left their bones in Cologne for the edification of the faithful. "No such thing," says Mr. Wilberforce; "his Eminence never meant to prove this as one would prove a prisoner guilty of murder. He only undertook to show that the common objections against the relics are of no force. He and the reviewer are like knights who looked at opposite sides of the gold and silver shields in the way in which they approach the traditions of a thousand years."

But, on the whole, there is far less of this kind of writing than we might expect. There are even concessions—as where we are told (p. 40) that "in France and elsewhere certain degraded castes, despite the absorbing power of the Church, left proscribed remnants till the time of the Revolution;" we fear the poor *cagots* were indeed proscribed, though, if they were the descendants of Albigeois, we certainly demur to their having been originally inferior to those who degraded them. There are many shrewd observations. It is quite true, for instance, that there is far less liberty of locomotion and of many other kinds of action to a modern European, trammelled

with passports, &c., than to a citizen of the Roman Empire. It is also true that the Roman system was based on slavery, and that one great glory of Christianity is that its spirit is everywhere the death of slavery. We cannot, however, convert the proposition and assert (as Mr. Wilberforce does) that no land is free from slavery which has never been Christian, for we cannot believe that the spread of Nestorianism into China, and the fact that the insignificant sect of St. Thomas's Christians was discovered in India, had anything to do with the non-existence of slavery in those countries.

Another shrewd remark is, that Christianity is in one sense anti-national; it tends to draw nations together, while patriotism often sunders them. Our national idol, we are told, is the will of the nation (as that of our neighbours is the glory of France); and it is the stubbornness of this national will which has so long kept us as a nation out of "the one fold."

Now and then, by the way, our author is haunted by a suspicion that things in the Middle Ages were not altogether so well as they ought to have been under the almost undisputed sway of the one true Church. For instance, he thus explains the backwardness of Christian countries in the arts of peace:—"We must consider that their public men had almost every year to head armies and engage in wars, while those in heathen lands were sometimes free from this necessity. What (he adds) could be expected from our legislators now-a-days if Mr. Gladstone and Sir Roundell Palmer had to take the field almost yearly, as mediæval statesmen had?" What a confession! We "modern heathens" have at least got rid of this necessity.

But we have said enough about a book which is chiefly remarkable because Mr. Wilberforce wrote it. His brother, the bishop, was certainly rather a man of action than of literary power. What capacity for action our author might have had his perversion prevented him from displaying. His death last year was little noticed, for he had passed out of sight more completely than might have been expected. We could wish that Dr. Newman had told, or had allowed him to tell, something about the mental process which led him over to Rome. As it is, we can only say again, that the perversion of such men is a mystery.

ART. V.—1. *Iliad of Homer in English Blank Verse.* By EDWARD EARL OF DERBY. London: Revised Edition. Murray. 1865.

2. *The Iliad of Homer in the Spenserian Stanza.* By Rev. T. S. WORSLEY, and Professor CONINGTON. London: Blackwood. 1866.

3. *The Iliad in English Verse.* By E. DART. Longmans. 1866.

4. *The Iliad of Homer in English Accentuated Hexameter.* By Sir JOHN HERSCHEL, Bart. London: Macmillan. 1866.

5. *The Iliad of Homer Translated into English Blank Verse.* By WILLIAM CULLEN BRYANT. Boston: Osgood. 1870.

6. *Ilias Traduite en Vers Français.* Par P. Q. THOMSON. Paris. 1870.

7. *The Iliad of Homer Translated into English Blank Verse.* By I. G. CORDERY. London: Rivingtons. 1871.

8. *Omero, dalla Rapsodia IX. dell'Iliade: La Reposta de Achille.* Nella Versione inedita di AGO HINTO. Livorno. 1872.

9. *Homer, Translation from the Iliad.* By Right Hon. W.E. GLADSTONE. London: Strahan. 1865—1873.

10. *Iliade Traduite en Français.* Par le Prince LEBRUN. Limoges. 1874.

To Greece alone was it given that her first poet should be her greatest, if not the greatest of all poets. From the brain of Homer Greek poetry leaped into life at one bound, full-featured, perfect in form, and mature in strength, even as Athênê is fabled to have leaped from the teeming brain of Jupiter into the fulness and perfection of being. The poetry of other nations was born after many throes and many abortions, and their noontide splendours were the slow and struggling growth of dim and repeated dawnings. But the sun of Homer, as it has had no setting, so it has had no dawning. It burst upon the world in the full blaze

of its meridian splendour when it rose to fill the poetic firmament with its glory, and the mind of mankind with astonishment and admiration; and so vivid are its beams, and so strong its power of attraction even now, when the shadows of thirty centuries have diminished nothing of its original brightness, that we come to look upon Homer, as we look upon our Bible (to compare the "lesser light" with the "greater light"), as an inspiration created for all ages and for all generations of men; which time touches only to quicken with new life, and man has criticised only to endorse its transcendent excellences and echo the proclamation of its early fame.

There is something unspeakably marvellous in the enduring fame of Homer. Three thousand years have slipped away since "the blind old man of Scio's rocky isle" sang the song of the *Iliad*, and its reputation, so far from declining, is on the increase. Successive races have been employed in celebrating the singer's glory, and generation after generation of civilised humanity has paid him the homage due to the sovereign prince of singers. Epic poets have acknowledged his supremacy by imitating his machinery, by adopting his characters, by copying his similes, by seeking to catch the spirit of his muse. Critics have founded the laws of epic poetry on the characteristic and constituent principles of the *Iliad;* the painter's pencil, and the statuary's chisel, for more than two thousand years, have sought to body forth to the eye his yet breathing conceptions. There is one poet, and one poet only, throned by the side of Homer on the sublimest height of Parnassus—and that poet is Shakespeare. These two poets have the highest gifts in common. To none other has it been given amongst the innumerable sons of men to draw characters by the strength of their own individual hands in lines of such clearness and vigour as to become for ever the inheritance and the glory of civilised mankind. To none other has it been given to touch the universal heart of man with those sympathies of a kindred nature which appeal to all with a force and an interest that never grows old. From all other poets are they distinguished in that their genius is as universal as our race, as individual as ourselves, instinct as it is with the spirit of humanity, and not with the prejudices or passions of particular races, or religions, or climes, but "wide and genial as the casing air." Above all other poets Homer and Shakespeare are

gifted with the highest gifts of invention; they have traversed a wider range of character, they have gone deeper down into the recesses of the human heart, and have sung as none others have sung of its terrors and its tendernesses, of the joy of sorrow, of what is manliest in manhood, of what is most womanly in womanhood, of the dignity and power of conscience, of the sweetness and sanctity of love and its potent spell on the haughtiest heart, as a passion or a sentiment.* Of all dramatic poets Shakespeare is incomparably the most epic; and of all epic poets Homer is the most dramatic, and as the dramatist and the epic poet each seeks, after his own fashion, "by the vision and the faculty divine," to see Nature with his own eyes, and to present it so idealised to the eyes of others, so in Homer and in Shakespeare, as nowhere else in poetry, we find every

---

* A careful comparison of Shakespeare's forms of thought, his similes, and his language, with those of Homer, will supply the critical reader with many striking resemblances hitherto unnoticed. With Homer's fondness of representing the *joy of sorrow*—as when Achilles (*Iliad* xxiv. 799) cries—

"Come near, stand by me, let us but this once
Embrace, and *take our fill* of heavy woe"—

we may compare Constance's cry of consolation in King John—

"Then have I reason to be *fond of grief*."

In Achilles' thought of his father softening his heart towards old Priam, pleading for his son, we are reminded of Lady Macbeth's heart softened into the same mood, and by the same touch of filial affection—

"Had he not resembled
My father as he slept, I had done it."

Paris, made a coward by his conscience, and starting back, "as a man that sees a serpent in his path," at the sight of Menelaus, is the very type of Macbeth as he quails and trembles with a guilty conscience before Macduff—"Of all men else have I avoided thee." The following simile is a very remarkable resemblance between the imagery of Homer and Shakespeare—

"Her foes shake like a *field of beaten corn*,
And *hang their heads* with sorrow."—*King Henry VIII.*

"As Zephyrus descends on rich wide-wavy corn,
And all the ears are bowed before the blast."
Iliad ii. 110 (Wright).

Compare also Shakespeare's "The other lads like lions wanting food," with *Iliad* iii. 21; "The labouring spider *weaves tedious snares*," with *Iliad* iii. 295; "Contention like a horse full of high feeding" (*Henry IV.*), with *Iliad* vi. 527. It is curious, too, to note such verbal parallels as ἐπιτροχάδην—"this tongue that *runs so roundly* in thy head" (*Richard II.*); ἕρκος ὀδόντων—

"Within my mouth you have *enjailed* my tongue
Doubly portcullised with my lips and teeth."—*Rich. III.*

With Shakespeare's "*human mortals*" (*Midsummer Night's Dream*), we may compare θνητῶν ἀνθρώπων—Chapman's "Mortal Humans."

epithet given to a natural object and every image taken from one is the faithful though idealised transcript of the truth. "The peculiar excellence of Homer," writes Colonel Muir, "is the combination of epic and dramatic management, a faculty which he possesses in a degree far surpassing any other poet. . . . The characters are never formally described, but made to develope themselves by their own language and conduct. It is among his many great qualities which chiefly raises Homer above all other poets of his own class; nor, with the single exception perhaps of the great British dramatist, has any poet ever produced so numerous and spirited a variety of original characters of different ages, ranks, and sexes."

That Homer has lost nothing of his hold upon the cultivated intellect of this country is clear from the number of translations which have appeared within the last dozen years from men of culture, whose labour has been a labour of love, and the strongest evidence of their sincere homage to the genius of the poet. For nearly three centuries (from Chapman to the present day) we have gone on translating Homer, and Homer is yet, unhappily, untranslated in English. Three distinguished poets—Pope, Cowper, and Bryant—who were not Greek scholars, have tried to give us Homer, but have failed. Three accomplished scholars, who were not poets, Professor Newman, Mr. Worsley, and Mr. Cordery, have made the same attempt, almost with the same results. Two statesmen, of the highest rank and culture, the foremost orators of their time—the late Lord Derby and Mr. Gladstone (the latter only partially)—have sought, with different degrees of success, to bring the winged words of Homer to the ear and eye, of the English reader. "For my own part," writes our latest translator, Mr. Gladstone, "with reference to this business of rendering Homer in another tongue, I have involuntarily conceived of the poem as a fortress high-walled and impregnable, and of the open space around as *covered with the dead bodies of his translators, who have perished in their gallant but unsuccessful efforts to scale the walls.*" In this conviction we have long shared, and the main purpose of this paper is to demonstrate its truth; and we fear that Mr. Gladstone's measure of success in scaling "the impregnable fortress" bears no proportion whatever to the high talents and the fine scholarship he has brought to bear on the attempt.

The causes of failure in these translators are to our mind not far to seek. In most cases the Greek original has been misunderstood, and, consequently, misinterpreted. In some cases, and notably in the case of Mr. Dart, who adopts English hexameters, a metrical form of presentation has been used, incapable of reproducing the measured ease and sweetness and strength of Homer. In others the failure is owing to a want of mastery over the language into which the translator renders the original; and in no single instance has a thorough knowledge of the Greek of Homer been combined with a thorough knowledge of the English tongue, and this again with a thorough mastery over the music of our metrical forms, hence the absence in our language of a worthy rendering of Homer. Pope's rendering—*splendide mendax*, as it is from beginning to end—is the only version that has in any great measure won the ear and the heart of the English nation, partly because it is not without much of the magical inspiration of Homer, and partly because of the consummate charms of its stately and sonorous versification. Each of the versions now before us has special merit and special demerit of its own, although all fail, albeit in different degrees, in some of the qualities we hold essential to a perfect presentation of the original.

Much may be said, and with justice, of Lord Derby's brilliant and spirited version. In the battle scenes and the speeches his lines are full of healthy life, and quiver with the movement and the emotions of the original hexameters. It is, undoubtedly, the only version in blank verse that reads with the fluency, and ease, and naturalness of an original poem; the only one that at all approaches to the directness of diction, the fulness of style, and the rich and varied cadences that mark the measured music of the Homeric epic. Had Lord Derby been as consummate a master of Greek as he was of English, we believe he would have given us a version of the *Iliad* worthy of taking high rank at once in our literature as the nearest possible approach in English to Homer's *Iliad*.

In dealing with the Homeric epithets, Lord Derby has been occasionally most felicitous in his renderings. "The mighty daughter of a mighty sire" is both a splendid and adequate equivalent to ὀβριμοπάτρη, and "Hector of the glancing helm" and "the gloom-haunting goddess" are true transcripts of κορυθαίολος Ἕκτωρ and ἠεροφοῖτις.

But his "many-dashing" and "stag-eyed" for "many-sounding" and "ox-eyed" are alike unpoetical and un-Homeric. More than once or twice Lord Derby has made mistakes school-boys dare not perpetrate. Take for example his version of Book ix. 332:—

> "He, *safe on board* his ships, my spoils received."

Here the Greek is *παρὰ νηυσὶ—beside* "his ships"—a manifest reference to the practice described by Homer himself of hauling ships on the beach, and *camping with the stores beside the ship.*

Nothing can be more magnificently grand, nothing more Homeric in the whole of Lord Derby's version, than his rendering of Hector's assault at the close of the Twelfth *Iliad*, when every line preserves to us the torrent-like sweep of the original.

> "Close to the gate he stood, and planting firm
> His foot, to give his arm its utmost pow'r,
> Full on the middle dash'd the mighty mass.
> The hinges both gave way; the pond'rous stone
> Fell inwards; widely gap'd the op'ning gates;
> Nor might the bars within the blow sustain:
> This way and that the severed portals flew
> Before the crashing missile; dark as night
> His low'ring brow, great Hector sprang within.
> Bright flash'd the brazen armour on his breast,
> As through the gates, two jav'lins in his hand,
> He sprang; the gods except, no pow'r might meet
> That onset; blazed his eyes with lurid fire."

One fault and one fault only we find here. Lord Derby misses altogether the Homeric epithet for night—"swift"—as do almost all the translators, and with it the full significance of the suggested comparison of Hector's dark brow to the darkness of night, and the hero's swift and irresistible onset to the swift and irresistible onset of the night. Lord Derby has well sustained Homer's picturesque contrast between the gloom of Hector's "lowering brow" and the lightning blaze of his armour, and, with equal fidelity, he has followed Homer, and not Pope, in reserving the terrific fire that burns from Hector's eye to crown the climax of the description.

In the Fourth *Iliad*, 558—566, Homer presents to us Juno telling Jupiter what she *thought* of the affair of

Thetis' visit, and, playing on the word *thought* (ὀτω), Jupiter replies, catching her up: "*Think*, madam, you are always *thinking thoughts of your own*" (mere fancies). Such is the force here of the contrast marked by the poet by his use of the middle voice of the verb. This Lord Derby, with almost all our translators, has altogether missed. Pope, finely and falsely as usual, gives the passage:—

"Oh, restless, full of pride,
That strives to learn what Heaven resolves to hide."

Cowper is much closer to Homer:—

"Ah, subtle, *ever teeming with surmise*."

Wright has:—

"*Suspicion* in thy bosom ever lurks."

Lord Derby simply paraphrases it, and skulks out of the difficulty:—

"Presumptuous to thy busy thought thou givest
Too free a range."

Mr. Cordery does better:—

"Thou makest, my wife, *conjecture* without end."

Mr. Bryant has:—

"Harsh-tongued, thou ever dost *suspect* me thus."

Le Prince Lebrun writes:—

"Déesse inquiète, le soupçon t'agète sans cesse."

But Mr. Gladstone carries off the palm by coming closest of all:—

"Moonstruck, thou art ever *trowing*, never can I scape thy ken."

Two of the translations before us, those of Sir John Herschel and Rev. E. Dart, adopt as their metrical form what Lord Derby well described as "the pestilent heresy of the so-called English hexameter." Even in the hands of such a master of metrical music as Longfellow, the English hexameter proved a failure, and became monotonous, though handled with consummate art, and made the vehicle of a tender tale of surpassing interest; and yet Sir John Herschel most unaccountably vindicates its claims as "that of all metres it is the one in which a long poem can be written or translated without being monotonous."

Now, in the Greek or German languages, where a compound vocabulary predominates, the hexameter may be well sustained, through a long poem, without producing monotony, but certainly not in English, with its prevailing monosyllabic element.

Blank verse, on the other hand, with its unlimited powers of expression, which may be "all things to all men," if we may so speak, is bounded in its range only by the poet's skill in using it; and it is well known that Dryden held it to be the only worthy metrical form of purest epic poetry, though he sacrificed his better opinion to the fashion of a rhyme-loving age. The best, and by far the most Homeric lines of Sir John's version, are those descriptive of Hector's charge. (*Iliad* xiii. 136.)

"On came Troy to the charge, and Hector in front of the Trojans,
Rushing amain: like a boulder crag from the brow of a mountain,
Torn by the wintry floods when the rain comes down in a torrent,
Mining its base, and loosing its hold on the cliff; and, in ruin,
Bounding along it flies, and the forest crashes beneath it."

Sir John's sins of omission and commission are literally legion in number. His most besetting sin is that of *addition* to the original. For example, we read in *Iliad* xvi. how Meriones reminds Æneas, "Thou too art mortal"—words few, but with a world of meaning in them.

These Sir John renders:—

"Thou art mortal,
Then remember, and wait thine hour, which sure will overtake thee."

"Son of a virgin" (v. 179) is the astounding rendering he gives for παρθένιος (one born out of *wedlock*). Mr. Dart's version is most inferior in form and in matter to Sir John's. He is at his very best in the Homeric similes, though bad, indeed, is his best rendering. Take for example this specimen from *Iliad* xvi. (the battle scene):—

"As with opposing blasts, when the fury of Eurus and Notus
Falls upon some dense wood, in a glen deep down on a hill-side,
Beech or *tough-grained* ash, or the long-leaved boughs of the cornels;
And, as the blast drives over, the *tall* trees mingle their branches,
Rasping and grating together, or breaking perchance with a great crash;
So, and with *equal* din, did the *armies* of Troy and Achaia
Seek each other's breasts, and *fear* was forgotten among them."

Mr. Dart renders *φήγος*, which he evidently mistakes for the Latin *fagus*, by "*beech* tree," instead of *oak* (the esculent oak), an error into which almost all the translators have fallen. Again he mistakes here *τανύφλοιον* for *ταναύφυλλον*, extensively *barked* for extensively leaved; to pass by such impertinences and amplifications as "tough-grained," "tall," "with equal din," and "the armies of Troy."

The versions of Mr. Cullen Bryant (the distinguished American poet) and of Mr. Cordery, known as an elegant classical scholar, come to us in the form of Shakesperian blank verse—with its free licenses and its dramatic cadences, and the flexibility of its construction. The touching appeal of Thetis to Jupiter, on behalf of her darling Achilles, at the close of the first *Iliad*, is thus given by these two translators:—

MR. CULLEN BRYANT.

"She spake, but cloud-compelling Jupiter
Answered her not; in silence long he sat.
But Thetis, who had clasped his knees at first,
Clung to them still, and prayed him yet again:—
'O promise me, and grant my suit, or else
Deny it—for thou need'st not fear—and I
Shall know how far below the other gods
Thou holdest me in honour.'"

MR. CORDERY.

"She ceased, to whom the Ruler of the clouds
Gave not one word, but long in silence sate;
Till Thetis closer clasped his knee, and clung
About him, and besought once more, and spake:—
'Promise me true; confirm it by thy nod,
Or else deny me—what hast thou to fear?
Speak then, that I may learn, and lay to heart
How far below all gods I lie disgraced!'"

Mr. Bryant's special excellence as a translator consists in his simplicity of style, his closeness of diction, his ease and elegance of movement. This makes his translation read with much of the naturalness of an original poem. He evidently owes much to his long and loving familiarity with the best models, and his life-long cultivation of the art of poetry. Wisely, too, does he follow the natural

order of Homer's words. He sins much from his ignorance, in many passages, of Homeric idioms, and from his constant inclination to paraphrase, as when he renders μυχῷ Ἄργεος ἱπποβότοιο by—

> "Lapped in the pasture-grounds where graze the steeds of Argos."

Though Mr. Cordery brings to his labour of love more of Greek scholarship, yet for an accomplished Oxford scholar, as he is, he makes some very singular mistakes. "Gentle sleep," for example, is given by him for Homer's νήδυμος ὕπνος—"*deep* sleep;" and for παρελεύσεαι he gives "pass me by," instead of "*overreach*"—in vulgar slang, "*get over*." With which we may compare Shakespeare (*Henry VIII.*):—

> "O Cromwell, the king has *gone beyond me*."

What can Mr. Cordery mean by such lines as—

> "Beholding this
> Hippocrates, as *twin Hebes* in their halls?"

One great and practical merit in Mr. Cordery's version is peculiar to himself—it is that he translates every *significant proper name* where the force of the context calls for it. After this fashion he renders *Iliad*, vi. 512:—

> "But all the people called him Astyanax,
> *Prince of the city*."

Mr. Gladstone's translations are unfortunately fragmentary and detached passages, published at various times. Mr. Gladstone adopts the ballad measures of Sir Walter Scott, and much of his tone and style is, to our mind, much more after the manner of Scott than of Homer, but without any approach to the sweetness and strength of Scott's versification. From the "Reply of Achilles," recently published in the *Contemporary Review*, we take this random specimen:—

> "Should the kindly gods deliver,
> And my safe returning grant,
> Peleus will be there, to find me,
> And to give the wife I want;
> *Bevies* of Achaian maidens
> Hellas, ay and Phthia, bear,

Sprung from chiefs the best and bravest,
Maidens of their cities fair.
I can surely, if so please me,
Make a loving bridal there."

Passing by many minor faults in Mr. Gladstone's translation, we may note that where the Greek in this passage means "*whom* I would," Mr. Gladstone has rendered it by "*if* so please me," evidently confusing the Greek relative ἥν for the conditional particle ἐάν. His "Shield of Achilles" is, however, his most signal failure, not merely because of its un-Homeric sing-song—the ballad measure—but for its sins of omission and commission against the Greek, which occur almost in every line. Here is a specimen:—

"There he wrought Earth, Sea, and Heaven,
There he set the unwearying Sun,
And the waxing Moon, and stars that
Crown the blue vault every one;
Pleiads, Hyads, strong Orion,
Arctos, hight to boot the Wain.
He upon Orion waiting,
Only he of all the train
Shunning still the baths of Ocean,
Wheels and wheels his round again.

"There he carved two goodly Cities
Thick with swarms of speaking men.

"Weddings were in one, and Banquets,
Torches blazing overhead,
Nuptial hymns, and from their chambers
Brides about the city led.
Here to pipe and harp resounding
Young men wildly whirling danced;
While the women, each one standing
By their porches, gaze entranced."

Of all foreign translations of the *Iliad*, that of Voss, a German, is incomparably the best and most perfect, though we may note that none of them have, evidently, had a greater influence on Mr. Gladstone's recent attempt than the Italian version of one bit of the "Reply of Achilles." Of the more recent Continental versions we cannot altogether pass over the admired and spirited free version of Le Prince Lebrun, which has been

revised by a learned and scholarly ecclesiastic. It is rapid, simple, and full of Homeric fire, though it dilutes much of the force and fire of the original by amplification and paraphrase. We give the struggle around the body of Cebriones in the Sixteenth *Iliad* as a specimen of the splendid and spirited paraphrase of the French translator:—

"Hector se précipite de son char, et vient disputer à Patrocle les restes de Cébrion. Acharnés sur ce malheureux cadavre, tous deux ils brûlent de s'immoler. Tels, au sommet d'une montagne, deux lions en proie à la faim dévorante, tous deux animés d'une fureur pareille, s'arrachent les lambeaux encore palpitants d'une biche égorgée.

"Hector saisit la tête; Patrocle s'attache aux pieds; tous deux ils luttent avec une vigueur égale. Autour d'eux combattent les Troyens et les Grecs. Les traits sifflent; les javelots volent dans les airs; les boucliers gémissent sous les pierres qui les frappent; la terre est jonchée de cadavres. Ainsi, quand, resserrés dans un vallon, les vents du nord et du midi se livrent de bruyants combats, les forêts mugissent, les hêtres, les peupliers, les chênes, ploient, éclatent, tombent, et du bruit de leur chute font gémir les échos. Tels, autour Cébrion, les deux peuples déploient leur fureur et leur rage. Aucun ne fuit, aucun ne cède: environné d'un nuage de traits, l'infortuné guerrier presse la terre de son poids, et son adresse, avec lui, est ensevelie dans la poussière."

We may here note that Pope has twice translated the closing portion of this remarkable passage, but in two widely different versions. In the *Iliad* (xvi. 776) he gives us:—

> "But when the rising whirlwind clouds the plains,
> Sunk in soft death the mighty chief remains,
> And stretched in death forgets his guiding reins."

In the *Odyssey* (Book xxiv. 90) he goes far from this version, and does much better when he writes:—

> "In clouds of smoke, raised by the noble fray,
> Great and terrific even in death you lay;
> And deluges of blood flowed round you every way."

Certainly "sunk in soft death" is anything but a vigorous and faithful rendering of μέγας μεγαλωστί. Here we prefer the Odyssian rendering—"great and terrific even in death." How truly and beautifully has Virgil, the most faithful of Homer's followers, caught the spirit of the passage in his—

"Ingentem, atque ingenti vulnere victum."—*Æn.* x. 842.

There is a translation of this passage quoted by Gilbert Wakefield from Ogilby's forgotten translation, which perished under the sneers of Pope, well worthy of notice. It runs thus:—

> "When in a dusty whirlwind thou didst lie,
> Thy valour lost, *forgot thy chivalry.*"

The most amusing of all Continental translations of this passage, however, is the Dutch, where the forgetfulness of chivalry is rendered by Ver Van as "leger-wagen"—"Far indeed from thy *baggage-wagon!*" as if the last thought of the warrior was about his baggage.

The subject of Homeric translation is one of national importance to a highly civilised country such as our own. Few can read Homer to enjoy him in the original, but we have all an interest in not being made the dupes of Homer's unsuccessful translators. For their want of success it is easy to account. It is not difficult to reproduce the *matter* of the *Iliad*, but it is extremely difficult to reproduce its *manner*—which is the unfailing charm—the characteristic glory of the poem. It is hard, too, to reproduce Homer's music without Homer's tongue, as difficult as it is to build a marble Pantheon out of brick. But Homer's language is not only Greek—the most perfect and poetical of all languages—it is Greek specially moulded by the skill of the workman for his special work, to represent to the ear by the very sound the meaning he intended. Again, the structure of the Homeric verse is constructed with a skill so consummate and inimitable, that every phase of passion, every form of action, every object in itself and in its effect on the beholder, is so pictured to the mind, so echoed to the ear, at times by the mere sound, at times by the mere mechanical collocation of the words, that the appreciative translator must often feel himself utterly incapable of reproducing Homer's verse without Homer's Greek, and without his genius. On these grounds a translator worthy of Homer needs such a mastery of the English language and its musical resources as Homer himself wielded over Greek; and of all who have attempted to translate Homer, Tennyson alone has shown himself adequate to the task, in the short and sole translation he has attempted—the night scene at the close of the Eighth *Iliad*, which is too well known to be quoted. It is equally requisite that a worthy translator of Homer should be a

gifted and thorough Homeric scholar; and not one of his translators hitherto has been so gifted, for they have all failed, though in different degrees, in dealing with the text of the original Greek.

Few of Homer's translators seem to appreciate the marvellous effect produced by his skill in collocation, and none of them have done justice to it by adequate reproduction. Mr. Bryant professes to follow the Homeric collocation, but his practice is certainly not consistent with his theory. The most remarkable case of this occurs in the First *Iliad*, in the description, a few lines beginning with ἐκ, in the Disembarkation at Chrysa's Isle, which Mr. Bryant thus renders:—

> "They cast the anchors, and secured the prow
> With fastenings. Next they disembarked and stood
> Upon the land, and placed the hecatombs
> In sight of Phœbus, the great archer. Last,
> Chryseis left the deck, and, leading her
> Up to the altar, wise Ulysses gave
> The maid to her dear father, speaking thus:"

Literally these lines run as follows—keeping to Homer's collocation of the words, which Mr. Bryant, significant though it is, utterly ignores:—

> "Out were the anchors cast, and down the cables bound,
> Out did the sailors leap upon the sea's rough margin,
> Out was the hecatomb brought for the archer-god Apollo,
> Out Chryseis came forth from the ship that sped through the sea."

All Homer's translators have shown a like disregard to the *metaphorical* language of the poet—which is oftentimes the very essence of his poetry, as in it the imagination often speaks out its highest utterances. In the Third *Iliad*, for example, at verse 140, Homer writes—"Then spoke the goddess, and *shot* within the soul (of Helen) a longing delicious for her former spouse," thus the great beauty and the full force of the metaphor, here and elsewhere (see *Iliad* xiii. 383), is diluted or ignored after this fashion by the translators:—

> "This said, the many-coloured maid *inspires*
> Her husband's love."—*Pope.*
>
> "So saying, the goddess into Helen's soul
> Sweetest desire *infused*."—*Cowper.*

"So saying, she a soft desire *awoke*
Of husband lost."—*Brandreth.*

"Then as she spoke, in Helen's heart *arose*
Fond recollections of her former lord."—*Lord Derby.*

"In Helen's heart the thrilling words divine
Woke a sweet longing for her former spouse."—*Wright.*

"Speaking, the goddess in her heart *instilled*
A strong fond yearning for her olden lord."—*Cordery.*

"Then spoke the goddess, and within the heart of Helen *wafted*
Sweet longings for her ancient."—*Professor Newman.*

"She said, and in the heart of Helen *woke*
Dear recollections of her former spouse."—*Bryant.*

All translators too have failed to reproduce the alliterative style of Homer, the full force of his particles, often very significant, and the distinctive force of his tenses, and above all his use of the aorist imperative in the sense of rapidity of action. Now, in the whole of the cases of gross ignorance of Homeric Greek, against the many translators of Homer, home and foreign, except the German, Voss, the formula in *Iliad* i. 360, "she *thought* the word, and out she uttered it," is of common occurrence in the *Iliad* and is never once correctly given by his translators. Some translate it by "called by *name*," even when the *name* of the person is not *named*. The simple and obvious meaning of ἔφατο here is "*spoke with herself*," and so *thought*, a sense the past has sometimes in the active, and therefore much more in the *middle* voice. We should remember that the analogy between *thought* and the expression of thought, between the word in the mind and on the tongue, is a thoroughly Greek conception, which found its complete development latterly in the word λόγος, the thought *unexpressed*, and the thought *expressed*, combining both forms.

In nothing have the Homeric translators failed so deplorably and so persistently as in rendering the Homeric epithets, which are for the most part poems in miniature and essentially characteristic of the Homeric poetry, and the failure generally arises from a shrinking from literal translation. "The purple sea" does not give us Homer's οἶνοπα πόντον (the wine-dark sea). By γλαυκῶπις Homer meant to describe the fierce and stern expression of Minerva's eyes, and not their colour, which his translators

have rendered "*blue-eyed.*" Nor is this all. Homer abounds with such personal epithets as ἀντίθεος (a *match* for a god), θεοειδής (*beautiful* as a god), δῖον (*descended* from a god), θεοείκελος (*like* to a god). These distinctive epithets are merged for the most part into one, "godlike," by his translators, who either do not see Homer's distinctions, or, seeing them, sin against the light that is in them; and the consequence is, that though Homer calls Polyphemus "a *match* for a god," and Paris "*beautiful* as a god," his translators call them both "godlike," forgetful of the fact, that Paris was anything but "godlike" in his actions, and Polyphemus was anything but "godlike" in his person or in his actions.

In proving Mr. Gladstone's assertion that Homeric translation into English has been a signal failure, we have dealt with this question in detail with the sole view that future translators may be warned by the signals we have given from the rocks on which their predecessors were made shipwreck.

As we have found fault with all our English translations of the *Iliad*, and not the least with Mr. Gladstone's recent version of the "Shield of Achilles," we venture to submit to the shafts of criticism the following version of our own of that celebrated episode.

I.

And there he wrought the world, the sea, the sky,
The unreposing sun, the full-faced moon,
With all the starry signs that crown the heavens,
The Pleiads, and the Hyads, and Orion's might,
And Arctos, named the Wain by name, who wheels
His restless round, to watch Orion's ways,
Sole star that never shares the ocean's baths.

II.

And there two cities beautiful, and full
Of men he made, with language on their lips.
In one were feasts and bridal banquetings,
And brides borne from their bowers from street to street,
Beneath the blazing torch, to Hymen's hymns;
And many a merry strain, from lute and lyre,
Made music as the dancers danced their rounds;
And women from their thresholds gazed entranced.

III.

And in the market-place trooped multitudes,
For there two suitors held a suit of blood,
Touching the were-geld of a murdered man;
One vowed to heaven he paid the fine in full,
So moved the multitude; and one made oath
He naught received, asserting each to leave
The issue to the judgment of the judge.
Crowds clamouring for each, and helping each,
The heralds curbing down the crowd, the while
The elders sate in holy synod, throned
On polished marble. In their hands they take
The herald's sceptre-staff; the air still full
Of heraldings; and rising one by one
Delivered doom; two golden talents set
Before their sight, the guerdon of the judge,
Whose upright doom was deemed most just of all.

IV.

Around the second city sate two hosts,
Shining in arms, divided in desire
To dash it into dust, or harry half
The lovely city held within her walls;
Surrender scorned, for ambush silently
They arm. Upon the walls their sweet wives stand,
Their children, and their sires of years infirm,
To guard their homes. On marched the men led forth
By Mars and by Minerva, each in gold,
And each in golden garments garmented,
Divinely beautiful and tall. In arms
Far off they shone, and dwarfed the mortal host.
And when the haunt for ambush seemliest
Was won, a river running near, where flocks and herds
Were wont to drink, they hid them in that haunt,
Armoured in shining bronze. Two scouts apart
Were set to watch the coming sheep and kine,
Of crumpled horn; and when with shepherds twain,
Who piped their pleasure, heedless of all guile,
They came, intent to intercept the kine
And sheep in silver fleeced, the ambush sprang
And did to death the feeders of the flocks.
When by the band before the battlements
A thousand tumults from amongst the flocks
Were heard, they mount their fiery-footed steeds
And break upon the pillagers. Each host

Made halt beside the river's bank and fought
The fight, each smiting with the bronze-bound spear.
Tumult and Strife and Fate raged there—
Destroying Fate—one with his gash still green
She grasped a captive, and one without a wound,
And one in death she dragged forth by his feet
From out the battle. Bright with blood the robe
Upon her shoulders blazed. Like mortal men
Ranging the field, and mingling in the fight,
They slew, and haled from either host the slain.

V.

And there he wrought a fat and fallow field
With softest soil, thrice-turned, and broad, wherein
Went many a ploughman driving to and fro
His yoke of oxen, and when on each return
They touched the limit of the lea, ever
One came with cup of wine as honey sweet;
Then back they turned, athwart the furrowed field,
To gain the fronting limit of the lea.
So from behind the lea grew black, as black
As tilth new turned, though graven all in gold;
So marvellous this miracle of art.

VI.

A park was there, with meadows deep in corn,
Where reapers reaped, sharp sickles in their hands.
Here falls the grain upon the ground; hard by
The binders stand to bind it into sheaves.
Three binders bind, and to their hands those boys
Behind bring gathered handfuls in their hands
Without one pause; midmost their monarch stands,
In silence, holding his sceptre-staff in hand,
And happy in his heart beside his sheaves.
Apart beneath the oak his seneschals
Set forth the feast, and slay the stately steer
For sacrifice, while there the maidens dress
The reaper's mess, made thick with barley meal.

VII.

Thereon he graved a vineyard all in gold
Most beautiful, and burdened to the ground with grapes.
Black were the branches, stayed on silver stakes
In rows, dark-blue the fosse around, and white
With tin the fence. One only path was made
For vintagers to pass to gather grapes.
Young men and maidens in their merriest mood
The fruit, as honey sweet, in baskets bore.
Midmost a boy harped on his shrill-stringed harp

Deliciously, and sang the Linos lay
In tones of tenderness. Around they danced,
Beating true measure to the melody
With feet that flew to follow all his song.

VIII.

Thereon he wrought a herd of beeves high-horned,
In gold were some, and some in tin. Forth from
Their stall they sprang lowing, to browse beside
The rapid and the roaring river, fringed
With many a rushy reed; four herdsmen, graved
In gold, and at their heels were hounds of speed.
A leash of grisly lions seized a bull
In front, and dragged him, bellowing bitterly.
To rescue rushed the hounds and herdsmen swift.
The lions tore the big bull's hide in twain,
And lapped his bowels and his purple blood.
In vain the herdsmen hounded on the hounds,
Shouting, to take the lion by the teeth,
Yelping around, but holding all aloof.

IX.

And these the lame-limbed god in pasture placed
With silver sheep in a delicious dale,
With folds and sheltering stalls and creeping cots.

X.

And there in quaint device a dance he wrought,
Like to the dance that Dædalus designed
Of yore in spacious Cnossus to delight
The fair-tressed Ariadne. Many a maid
Worthy to win the wooer's gift of kine,
Of countless kine, danced with their partners there,
Wrist upon wrist, and hand on hand, the maids
Mantled in tender-tissued gauze, the men
In tunics glossy, as the gloss of oil;
Those crowned with crowns of beauty, these
With swords of gold from belts of silver swung.
They whirled the dance with fleet and practised feet,
With ease, as when the working potter whirls
His wheel, to gauge his gear, and spins it round,
To rule its circling speed; so, with all ease,
These wheeled around, and crossed from side to side,
While crowds delighted stood around the dance
Of joy. The holy minstrel, in their midst,
Sang meanwhile to his harp; and tumblers twain
His song took up, and tumbled as they sang.
And for the margin of that matchless shield,
The mighty strength of ocean's stream he made.

ART. IV.—1. *A Chapter of Autobiography.* By the Right Honourable W. E. GLADSTONE, M.P. 1868.

2. *Ritualism and Ritual.* By the Right Honourable W. E. GLADSTONE, M.P. (*Contemporary Review*, Oct. 1874.)

3. *The Vatican Decrees in their Bearing on Civil Allegiance.* A Political Expostulation. By the Right Honourable W. E. GLADSTONE, M.P. 1874.

IT is some years since, in reviewing *Lothair*, we did our endeavour to present a dispassionate view of the career of its eminent author, such as an impartial historian in the next age, not a partisan in this age, might be expected to give. In so doing, we avoided all evil construction of ambiguous passages in his history. To-day the occasion seems to demand that we should do in respect of the renowned statesman who at present towers pre-eminent over the ranks of "Her Majesty's Opposition" what we then attempted in regard to his rival. Those who expect us, in so doing, to write an ungenerous or unkindly criticism on such a man, will certainly be disappointed. Our article will, we hope, be discriminating, but hostile it will not be. It is necessary that we should in the first place deal with the man himself in his early prime and his later developments, as he stands revealed to us in his autobiography and other records, or else we shall not be able adequately or truly to understand and estimate his recent manifestoes on Ritualism and Vatican Romanism, or his actual position and opinions.

Glimpses—most interesting glimpses—of the future statesman are caught in Bunsen's letters, as published in his memoirs by his wife. There we are enabled to mark him as he was in his youthful fervour and promise, at the very period when he published his work on *The State in its Relations to the Church*. "Last night, at eleven," says Bunsen, under date December 18, 1838, "when I came from the Duke [of Lucca], Gladstone's book was on my table. It is the book of the time, a great event —the first book since Burke that goes to the bottom of the vital question; far above his party and the time. . . . Glad-

stone is the first man in England as to intellectual power, and he has heard higher tones than any one else in this island." "Gladstone is the first living intellectual power on that side," writes Bunsen to Arnold a few days later. "He has left his schoolmasters far behind him, but we must not wonder if he still walks in their trammels; his genius will soon free itself entirely, and fly toward heaven with its own wings." "Still," he writes again, a few days later (26th December), to another correspondent, "he walks sadly in the trammels of his Oxford friends in some points, e.g. the Apostolical Succession as identical with the continued series of bishops. . . . I wonder Gladstone should not have the feeling of moving on an *inclined plane*, or that of sitting down among ruins." On February 19th, 1839, the sagacious and generous Prussian writes as follows:—"On Sunday, I went at eleven with Gladstone to his own parish church, after which we began our conference, closeted in his room. . . . This led to my *declaration of love* to him for having consciously thrown a stumbling-block in his own way, as a statesman, because he came conscientiously to those consequences for which he was so violently attacked. This morning I found a note from Gladstone, with three copies of his work. This man's humility and modesty make me ashamed; I hope and trust I shall profit by it; but in his kindness I delight." On the 23rd October, writing to his wife, the same distinguished witness tells of his driving with Gladstone to Richmond, to a dinner in celebration of the constitution of the Jerusalem bishopric. As to his return home he says, "We drove back to town in the clearest starlight; Gladstone continuing with unabated animation to pour forth his harmonious thoughts in melodious tone."

Such is Bunsen's picture of Mr. Gladstone in his early prime; such was the forecast as to his character and career by one who, whilst rightly prognosticating and predicting as to the man and his future position and power, not less truly, at the same time, discerned and estimated the stumbling-block which his special form of High Churchmanship was destined to place in his way. One other extract we will give from the same memoir, referring to a considerably later date, and exhibiting another phase of Mr. Gladstone's character, now as a statesman and a party politician. The extract occurs in a "Contemporary Notice," in the nature of a journal, kept by one of Bunsen's

children, and the date is December 19th, 1852. It is as follows:—"My father's excitement on the fall of the Ministry was redoubled when he read the debates and found that it was Mr. Gladstone who had virtually turned out Mr. Disraeli, by a speech in which he went through the Budget, and showed it to be impracticable. This is the second time only that Gladstone has spoken; he was asked one day by my father why he did not speak oftener, when he replied that he was withheld by mistrust in himself, lest he should find too much difficulty in keeping within Christian bounds of moderation, in endeavouring to utter faithfully the truth, and yet avoid all that might be construed into personality."

The extracts we have given are not only interesting but valuable, as showing what manner of man Mr. Gladstone appeared to be in his earlier life, not merely or chiefly as a politician or a statesman, but in his private and personal relations, in his confidential intimacies, and in respect of his conscientious convictions and aims as a Christian man having public responsibilities. The insight into character and the historical foresight of the German diplomatist and scholar, are very remarkable. We shall be better able to appreciate, with these passages in recollection, the three publications, the titles of which stand at the head of this article, and the view of Mr. Gladstone's character and history, and of the development of his opinions, which may be gathered from a study of them.

Mr. Gladstone's is by no means a character hard to read. There is nothing about him inscrutable or mysterious. He is a man of many sympathies, and with many sides to his character. On this account he is, indeed, liable to be misunderstood and misconstrued. But he has never shrouded in deliberate concealment or in immovable reticence either the nature or the reasons of his opinions. It is a common judgment that he would have done well to have practised more reticence than he has done. Besides the many-sidedness of his smypathies and his culture, moreover, it is undoubtedly true that his later opinions traverse at several points of public importance his early principles. Bunsen foresaw that his first book would stand in the way of his progress and of his inevitable life-work; he foresaw that the force of facts and of the world's life-current must break up the young theorist's ideal, and spoil all his conclusions. In fact, Mr. Gladstone has had

through all his practical course as a statesman to contend against his own early ideal as one of his great hindrances, prejudicing his position, and throwing obstacles in his course at several critical periods of his political career, and affording a pretext to those whose aim it was to bring into question not only his wisdom and foresight, but his sincerity. It was this very fact which extorted from him nearly seven years ago his *Autobiography*, the object of which was to explain the nature and reasons of his change from the ideal Toryism of his early youth to the wide Liberalism and, as to matters ecclesiastical, the plastic *quasi*-secularism—for, after all, Gladstone does not in principle take his stand on secularism proper in any sphere—of his later years. In this explanation he seeks to show that, beneath whatever apparent inconsistency, there is a deeper ground of consistency in his principles and judgments; and, indeed, that he could hardly be said, with justice, to have deserted his principles, so much as to have been driven by the concurrent action of all parties, abandoning, as they did, the ground of principle for that of compromise and expediency, into a region of practical politics to which his ideal principles, as set forth six-and-thirty years ago, could have no relation, and in which any application of them was simply impossible. Doubtless, such an apology as this is tantamount to a confession that the principles set forth in his famous early work were mere *eidola specûs*, mere student-dreams, theories woven out in complete and almost ludicrous ignorance of the actual facts of English history and life in their broader and more popular aspects, the speculations of a recluse idealist, pacing his cloister, amid pastoral meadows and placid waters, silent and almost somnolent in their gentle flow, far away from the stir of national life and the mighty and gathering tide of modern thought and of awakening popular want and will. We imagine that Mr. Gladstone himself would be forward to confess the ignorance of all but the rising elements of life and power in the Church of England, which is one of the characteristics of his book. He does, indeed, confess and explain this ignorance of his in one of the passages of his *Autobiography*.

It is the peculiarity, indeed, of Mr. Gladstone that he combines, in an extraordinary manner, in his intellectual character, the ideal and the practical, possessing each quality in a very eminent degree, and with these qualities

unites an exceedingly sanguine disposition, and a bodily frame lean, lithe, and sinewy, which no excess, save at times that of mental toil or official fatigue, has ever wasted or exhausted. From this rare, and, in its degree as formed in him, perhaps unexampled, combination, arise most of the peculiarities of his career. If we add to the characteristics we have noted the influence of Oxford training and Oxford High Churchmanship, and the after influence of official discipline and Parliamentary life, we have all the elements necessary to understand the character of Mr. Gladstone. His early illusions and his later abandonment of these illusions; his remarkable power at once of grasping and keeping clearly in view principles, and of mastering and explaining details; his vast natural impetuosity, ever ready to flash out or pour along, and yet, along with this, his very great power of self-control, holding his immense force of onset or impulse ordinarily within the limits of a studied moderation, especially in all matters of personal criticism; the sweep of his eloquence when fully fired by political purpose and passion, or when a sentiment inspires him, or a bright vision of the future rises before his sanguine spirit, and, at the same time, the intense and very evident delight with which he revels in all the intricacies of a financial statement or a business calculation; his power as a Parliamentary expositor, and his greater power as a debater, especially in swift and crushing reply; his triumphs, that is to say, equally in oratory and in finance, his high ecclesiastical sympathies, combined with a Broad Churchmanship which undertook the vindication of *Ecce Homo*, and an ecclesiastical Liberalism which has drawn towards him the sympathies of many of the most influential Nonconformists, and which sustained him in the heavy task of disestablishing the Irish Church; finally, his sympathy, so long maintained, with the Catholicism of the Latin Communion, and yet his final breach, in the end, with the Roman Curia and its consummated policy; all are intelligible when once the composite and complex character of his mind and temperament are understood. In such a man there cannot but be many tendencies more or less conflicting or divergent. But when all his energies and faculties are once combined in full harmony for any particular purpose, the resultant force of the whole cannot but be overwhelming.

Mr. Gladstone, in his *Autobiography*, does, in effect, classify himself with men of "impressible and sanguine minds." The phrase occurs in the eloquent description of the change which began to come over the English Church, and which was felt at first, especially in Oxford, soon after the year 1830 :—

"An extraordinary change," he says, "appeared to pass upon the spirit of the place. I believe it would be a moderate estimate to say, that much beyond one-half of the very flower of its youth chose the profession of Holy Orders, while an impression scarcely less deep seemed to be stamped upon a large portion of its lay pupils. I doubt whether at any period of its existence, either since the Reformation or perhaps before it, the Church of England had reaped from either University so rich a harvest in so short a time. At Cambridge a similar lifting up of hearts and minds seems to have been going on, and numbers of persons of my own generation, who at their public schools had been careless and thoughtless like the rest, appeared in their early manhood as soldiers of Christ, and ministers to the wants of His people, worthy, I believe, as far as man can be worthy, through their zeal, devotion, power of mind, and attainments, of their high vocation. It was not then foreseen what storms were about to arise. Not only in Oxford, but in England, during the years to which I refer, party spirit within the Church was reduced to a low ebb. Indiscretions there might be, but authority did not take the alarm; it smiled rather, on the contrary, on what was thought to be, in the main, a recurrence both to first principles and to forgotten obligations. Purity, unity, and energy, seemed as three fair sisters, hand in hand, to advance together. Such a state of things was eminently suited to act on impressible and sanguine minds. I, for one, formed a completely false estimate of what was about to happen; and believed that the Church of England, through the medium of a regenerated clergy, and an intelligent and attached laity, would not only hold her ground, but would probably, in great part revive the love and the allegiance both of the masses who were wholly falling away from religious observances, and of those large and powerful Nonconforming bodies, the existence of which was supposed to have no other cause than the neglect of its duties by the National Church, which had long left the people as sheep without a shepherd."

The quotation just given not only shows that, according to Mr. Gladstone's estimate of himself, he is a man of "sanguine and impulsive mind;" it also explains the nature of the illusive appearances which suggested to him

his dream, his theory, his ideal, as to the relations of Church and State, as given to the world in his first book. It would not be difficult to show that the picture which is contained in the extract we have quoted is, in some respects, a surcharged and delusively coloured picture. The effects at Oxford of which he speaks were produced quite as much by the Tory reaction, following the epoch of the Reform Bill, by the gathering of the clans of Anglicanism to the rescue of their Church and its ascendency, following the abolition of Dissenters' disabilities and the Anglican Church's hour of seeming humiliation and peril, as by the real religious revival, which at this time was just beginning at last deeply to stir the hitherto lethargic pulses of the life of Anglicanism proper, as distinguished from Anglican *quasi*-Puritanism or Evangelical Churchmanship. Political influences and feelings of caste, to put the same truth in other words, contributed quite as much as genuine feelings of religious conviction and zeal, to the result which the quotation describes. No better illustration, however, could be afforded of the sanguine idealism of the writer.

Mr. Gladstone had, indeed, two cherished ideals, both of which were to be shattered to fragments by the course of events—to be broken to pieces on the wheel of revolving destiny—one very soon, the other at a much later period. The first of these was his theory of Church Establishments, the second was his dream of Catholic Union, as visibly approaching, and to be realised in after days, if not in this generation—the union of the Latin and the Anglo-Catholic communions in one great Western Catholic Church, or intercommunity of Churches, and, through the Anglican Church and its good offices, the ultimate reunion, into a Catholic confederation and sisterhood of Churches, of the Roman, the Greek, and the Anglican "Catholic" Churches. This latter was his most fondly cherished dream, a peculiarly Oxford ideal; nor does he seem to have relinquished his hopes of at least a sisterly concordat being established between these Churches, and first between the Roman Catholic and the Anglican Churches, until the summer of 1870, when, according to his view, the Vatican Decrees placed an impassable gulf of division between the Latin Communion and the Anglo-Catholic Church. It is necessary to bear in mind these two ideals, in order to understand Mr. Gladstone's course, his consistency in the midst

of his inconsistencies, his illusions and the means and process of his disillusionising; the way of change and the line of advance in which only, if in any, it was possible for him to move.

When he first started in life, Mr. Gladstone knew as little about the living realities of English religious life and thought, beyond the line of his own immediate ecclesiastical and collegiate horizon, as other Oxford students and theorists, who, until very recently, have been distinguished as a class for an ignorance of all belonging to English Nonconformity as profound as if they were divided from it by planetary spaces. "There was an error," he himself says, "not less serious" (than his expectations and claims in regard to the Church of England) "in my estimate of English Nonconformity. I remember the astonishment with which at some period—I think in 1851-2—after ascertaining the vast addition which had been made to the number of churches in the country, I discovered that the multiplication of chapels, among those not belonging to the Church of England, had been more rapid still." When once his eyes had been opened, however, he was not the man to shut them again, and since the period to which he thus refers he has taken care to keep himself informed as to the life and growth of Nonconformity. It is not an altogether insignificant point, that, in the course of this auto-biographical narrative and explanation, he quotes John Foster from memory, with a familiarity which shows that although the name of this Nonconformist author is probably still little known to Anglican University men, and though not very long ago he was sneered at, by the *Saturday Review*, as an undercultured, or, at least, underbred Dissenting writer, he is, notwithstanding, familiarly known to Mr. Gladstone, as one of England's standard essayists.

We have referred to Mr. Gladstone's Tory and Anglican immunity, as an Oxford ecclesiastical idealist, from all consciousness of the great realities of Nonconformist life and power and claims, that we might render more intelligible the illusion, as to the prospects and possibilities belonging to his beloved Anglicanism, which in 1838 had captivated his imagination and spell-bound his intellect. The dream must indeed have been a dazzling and fascinating one, which could have maintained its hold upon him, notwithstanding the apprenticeship to real life which he had already begun to serve. More than six years had

elapsed since he had taken his degree as double-first. In the meantime he had not only visited the Continent, where he was not likely to learn what he needed to know as to his own country, but had held office as Junior Lord and as Under Secretary for the Colonies, under a Tory Government (Sir Robert Peel's), for a few months in 1834 and 1835, and had afterwards sat in Parliament for three years as a member of the Tory opposition. We can only conclude that, as yet, he had been either shut up in his private studies, or entirely surrounded by party associations and suggestions as to questions both of Church and State. He had enough general knowledge and enough originality, to feel that no existing theory of Church and State was adequate to the conditions of the problem, even so far as he then apprehended it, or to the demands of modern thought, but he had no true ideas whatever as to the actual realities of religious conviction and life in England, as existing especially in the middle ranks of society and among the more independent operative classes. Perhaps his Scottish parentage may in part help us to understand this. Religious conditions in Scotland furnish no analogy whatever to religious conditions in England; and the scion of a Scottish Episcopalian family, transplanted to England, and nurtured in the University of Oxford, would be little likely to enter into the realities of English Nonconformity, with its characteristic spontaneity, its energetic independence, and—how unlike Scotland, especially the Scotland of forty-years ago in this respect!—its manifold varieties of creed and government and forms of worship. It seems necessary to take these matters into account, in order to understand the absolute unreality, the prodigious sort of merely individual speculation, of adventurous assumption as to the ecclesiastical possibilities, nay, probabilities and duties, of the near future, which distinguish the volume of which we have been speaking—a volume which might well have been written by one who had seen nothing whatever of life, who knew nothing whatever, even by book study, of the most active and energetic religious organisations of England, who was a speculative philosopher from another world, knowing England only by her history before 1688, and theorising from afar.

The state of his eyesight obliged Mr. Gladstone to take a tour in Europe during the autumn of 1838. During this period his book was printed, the product doubtless of

many previous months of meditation. It was as absolute a speculative ideal as Plato's *Republic*; it was the fruit of a mind much more Platonising than Aristotelian in its general cast, or at least in the tone which dominated it at this time; of a mind, however, which was destined soon to be reduced to obedience to the claims and laws of reality by the breaking up of its idols, and by familiar converse with the business of life at its very centre, the centre of England's manifold living activities. The talent and eloquence of the treatise, added to the rising fame of its author, as the most distinguished and gifted young politician in the House of Commons, and in combination with the newly kindled enthusiasm and glow of Anglican zeal and fervour, carried it rapidly through three editions. A fourth, carefully revised and much enlarged, was published in 1841. By this time, however, the hollowness and unreality of the whole speculation had come to be generally felt. Macaulay's masterly review in the *Edinburgh* had smitten it to the heart; but, yet more, the test of time and thought had shown all sober thinkers that the whole was but a dream. With the manly frankness, characteristic of the whole *Autobiography*, Mr. Gladstone himself says, "all interest in it had gone by, and it lived for nearly thirty years only in the vigorous and brilliant, though not (in my opinion) entirely faithful picture, drawn by the accomplished hand of Lord Macaulay."

The leading principle of this treatise was that the State was in duty bound to maintain a Church-Establishment as a witness to Christian truth; the State was bound to maintain the teaching of the true religion. Such a theory could not be maintained in this country, even thirty years ago, as unconditionally and absolutely binding. We do not say that it has no foundation of truth; we do say that, as a theory of law or government for England, it has, by force of circumstances, come, ages since, to be quite impracticable; and that any attempt to carry fairly and fully out its meaning and actual application throughout all the legislation of this country could not but violate those principles of practical equity, which are a much more direct and evident dictate and demand of Christianity, as applied to administration and government, than any abstract theory whatever could possibly be. This had already come to be felt, if not always frankly acknowledged, by statesmen of every class and colour, even at the time when the book was

published. Already the men of highest practical sagacity in the Tory no less than the Whig party had abandoned the idea of practically asserting, on behalf of the Church by law established, "those exclusive claims, which become positively unjust in a divided country governed on popular principles."

Mr. Gladstone believed fervently in his own theory at the time, but he very soon discovered that no one else did. "Scarcely," he says, "had my work issued from the press when I became aware that there was no party, no section of a party, no individual person probably in the House of Commons, who was prepared to act upon it. I found myself the last man on the sinking ship." "The condition of our poor, of our criminals, of our military and naval services, and the backward state of popular education, forced on us a group of questions, before the moral pressure of which the old rules"—the old exclusive principle—"gave way." In respect to none of these cases was it any longer possible to act on the principle that the Church of England alone was to be the legally appointed and recognised instructress of the people. The failure of the education clauses in Sir James Graham's Factories' Bill was a signal illustration of this truth. At this time Mr. Gladstone was a member of the Tory Cabinet, and he tells us that "the very first opinion he was ever called upon to give in Cabinet was an opinion in favour of the withdrawal of that measure." The case of Maynooth came on in a very few more years (in 1845) to test still more severely Mr. Gladstone's theory. He felt that the author of such a work as his treatise ought not to be a member of the Ministry that proposed permanently to endow Maynooth, and he resigned his office. Nevertheless he held that, in the actual circumstances of the case, it was impossible to resist the arguments in favour of the endowment, and, although he had resigned, he both voted and spoke on behalf of the proposal. How false, however, he felt the situation to be which seemed to demand such a legislative vote, may be judged by the sequel, a quarter of a century later. Mr. Gladstone's resignation, and subsequent vote, in 1845, may be said to have brought after them as a direct, though distant, consequence, the Disestablishment of the Irish Church.

"My work," he says "had used none of the stock arguments for maintaining the Church of Ireland. I did not say, 'Maintain it lest you should disturb the settlement of property.' I did not

say, "Maintain it, lest you should be driven to repeal the Union.' I did not say, 'Maintain it, lest you should offend and exasperate the Protestants.' I did not say, 'Maintain it, because the body known as the Irish Church has an indefeasible right to its property.' I did not say, 'Maintain it for the spiritual benefit of a small minority.' Least of all did I say, 'Maintain it, but establish religious equality, setting up at the public charge other Establishments along with it; or, by distributing a sop here, and a sop there, to coax Roman Catholics and Presbyterians into a sort of acquiescence in its being maintained.' My ground, right or wrong, was this: 'the Church of Ireland must be maintained for the benefit of the whole people of Ireland, and must be maintained as the truth, or it cannot be maintained at all.' The moment I admitted the validity of a claim by the Church of Rome for the gift of new funds for the education of its clergy, the true basis of the Established Church of Ireland was for me cut away."

The consequences of the practical refutation thus given to Mr. Gladstone's ideal theory may be easily traced. Too logical to rest content with a position of compromise, assailable on every side; too earnest and conscientious to accept as a permanent settlement of so grave and fundamental a question any arrangement of mere expediency; he could not find any resting-place short of the disestablishment of the Irish Church, and the reduction of all Christian organisations in the sister island to a basis of voluntary organisation and independent self-government. This was a conclusion limited, indeed, to Ireland, and growing out of the special circumstances of Ireland. It did not follow that he was to be committed to the principle of disestablishment for England. But it did follow, and, indeed, had become for him an evidently necessary conclusion at an earlier period, flowing from the proved impracticability of his own *à priori* theory—that the question of the maintenance of the Established Church of England could thenceforth only be for him one of practical equity and of Christian expediency, as regarded in the light of moral and political considerations of the highest and largest kind, and was no longer a question of necessary abstract principle. The following facts mark the position in which he stood at the corresponding dates.

In 1847, when he succeeded Mr. Estcourt in the representation of Oxford University, Mr. Gladstone having been challenged as to his views respecting the disestablishment

of the Irish Church, refused to give any pledge to "stand by that Church," as Lord Coleridge, the secretary, at the time, of his election committee, has distinctly testified. In 1851 he voted against the Ecclesiastical Titles Bill, and at the same time declared the impossibility of changing "the profound and resistless tendencies of the age towards religious liberty." In 1863, as Lord Selborne has declared, Mr. Gladstone "told him privately that he had made up his mind on the subject of the Irish Church, and should not be able to keep himself from giving public expression to his feelings," and that he was anxious, accordingly, that "his friends connected with the University" should "consider whether or not they would desire, for that reason, a change in the representation of the University." In 1865, on the motion of Mr. Dillwyn, he made a speech in which he declared that, as to the Irish Church, present action was impossible, and at any time immense difficulties would have to be encountered; but yet that this was "the question of the future." This speech brought his seat for the University in peril. Dr. Hannah wrote to him respecting it, to whom Mr. Gladstone replied in a now somewhat famous letter. He stated strongly his views as to the abstract question, but, at the same time, said that, as a practical question, the subject was remote, and had no bearing on the actual politics of the day, excusing himself on this ground from entering into details respecting it, or committing himself, even in general outline, to any sketch or statement of a plan for the disestablishment. It is obvious to remark that there is some apparent inconsistency between his saying, on Mr. Dillwyn's motion, that this was "*the* question of the future," and his writing to Dr. Hannah that the question was so remote as to be "out of all bearing on the practical politics of the day." The discrepancy, however, is not important. Perhaps an easy explanation might show that there is hardly any real inconsistency whatever.

In 1868, as is well known, Mr. Gladstone announced the question of the Irish Church as the first of all matters to be dealt with in the new chapter of reform and progress which was to be opened. How it was that in three years a question which he had not regarded in any sense as a "burning question," or one of present and pressing policy, came to be, in his judgment, by a sudden turn of political affairs, by an unexpectedly rapid development of political progress, and by a

new "reform" in the representation, a living question, Mr. Gladstone has explained in his *Autobiography*. He may well have expected that a gradual work of political advance and reconstruction in England would have been his final work as a statesman. He found, as by a vast landslip, the whole prospect changed before him; and Irish questions, with the Irish Church question in advance, when the intervening questions were suddenly disposed of and moved away, seemed to confront him close at hand. All this he had not foreseen. As he says himself, the question of Parliamentary Reform, though settled (for the first time) in 1832, seemed to be a remote question in the first half of 1830. "For my part," he also says, "I have never been so happy, at any time of my life, as to be able sufficiently to adjust the proper conditions of handling any difficult question until the question itself was at the door." "I referred to my own political life-time. A man who, in 1865, completed his thirty-third year of a laborious career, who had already followed to the grave the remains of almost all the friends, abreast of whom he had started from the University in the career of public life; and who had observed that, excepting two recent cases, it was hard to find in our whole history a single man who had been permitted to reach the fortieth year of a course of labour similar to his own within the House of Commons; such a man might surely be excused if he did not venture to reckon for himself on an exemption from the lot of greater and better men, and if he formed a less sanguine estimate of the fraction of space yet remaining to him, than seems to have been the case with his critics."

Before we leave this matter—the question of Mr. Gladstone's first great illusion, and how it has been disposed of—it is necessary to show where and how he stands as to the subject of Church Disestablishment at the present time. He has not given up one set of abstract and doctrinaire principles, one ideal, simply to be driven into a contrary position of *à priori* idealism. He is no doctrinaire adherent of the disestablishment theory, nor does he even accept the position of his masterly critic Macaulay, whom, however, he admits not only to have refuted his theory, but to have held a more reasonable theory than his own, and one which had at least the merit of being adapted to the circumstances of the times. He stands on an intermediate ground, which, holding on in some measure to the

spirit of his early ideal, yet admits of being practically adapted to the complex conditions and divided claims of our modern life.

"It seems to me," he says, "that in every function of life, and in every combination with his fellow-creatures for whatever purpose, the duties of man are limited only by his powers. It is easy to separate, in the case of a gas company or a chess club, the primary end for which it exists from everything extraneous to that end. It is not so easy in the case of the State or of the family. If the primary end of the State is to protect life and property, so the primary end of the family is to propagate the race. But around these ends there cluster, in both cases, a group of moral purposes, variable indeed with varying circumstances, but yet inhering in the relation, and not external or merely incidental to it. The action of man in the State is moral, as truly as it is in the individual sphere; although it be limited by the fact that, as he is combined with others whose views and wills may may differ from his own, the sphere of the common operations must be limited, first, to the things in which all are agreed; secondly, to the things in which, though they may not be agreed, yet equity points out, and the public sense acknowledges, that the whole should be bound by the sense of the majority."

"I can hardly believe that even those, including as they do so many men both upright and able, who now contend on principle for the separation of the Church from the State, are so determined to exalt their theorem to the place of an universal truth, that they ask us to condemn the whole of that process, by which, as the Gospel spread itself through the civilised world, Christianity became incorporated with the action of civil authority, and with the framework of public law. In the course of human history, indeed, we perceive little of unmixed evil, and far less of universal good. It is not difficult to discern that (in the language of Bishop Heber), as the world became Christian, Christianity became worldly; that the average tone of a system which embraces in its wide-spreading arms the entire community, is almost, of necessity, lower than that of a society which, if large, is still private, and into which no man enters except by his own deliberate choice, very possibly even at the cost of much personal and temporal detriment. But Christ died for the race, and those who notice the limited progress of conversion in the world until alliance with the civil authority gave to His religion a wider access to the attention of mankind, may be inclined to doubt whether, without that alliance, its immeasurable and inestimable social results would ever have been attained. Allowing for all that may be justly urged against the danger of mixing secular motives with religious administration, and above all against the

intrusion of force into the domain of thought, I for one cannot desire that Constantine in the government of the Empire, that Justinian in the formation of its code of laws, or that Charlemagne in refounding society, or that Elizabeth in the crisis of the English Reformation, should have acted on the principle that the State and the Church in themselves are separate or alien powers, incapable of coalition."

"But there are two causes, the combined operation of which, upon reaching a certain point of development, relaxes or dissolves their union by a process as normal (if it be less beneficial) as that by which the union was originally brought about. One of these is the establishment of the principle of popular self-government as the basis of political constitutions. The other is the disintegration of Christendom from one into many communions. As long as the Church at large, or the Church within the limits of the nation, is substantially one, I do not see why the religious care of the subject, through a body properly constituted for the purpose, should cease to be a function of the State, with the whole action and life of which it has, throughout Europe, been so long and so closely associated. As long as the State holds, by descent, by the intellectual superiority of the governing classes, and by the good will of the people, a position of original and underived authority, there is no absolute impropriety, but the reverse, in its commending to the nation the greatest of all boons. But when, either by some revolution of institutions from their summit to their base, or by a silent and surer process, analogous to that which incessantly removes and replaces the constituent parts of the human body, the State has come to be the organ of the deliberate and ascertained will of the community, expressed through legal channels—then the inculcation of a religion can no longer rest in full or permanent force upon its authority. When, in adition to this, the community itself is split and severed into opinions and communions which, whatever their concurrence in the basis of Christian belief, are hostile in regard to the point at issue, so that what was meant for the nation dwindles into the private estate as it were of a comparative handful—the attempt to maintain an Established Church becomes an error fatal to the peace, dangerous perhaps even to the life of civil society.

"It is then by a practical, rather than a theoretic test that our Establishments of religion should be tried. In applying this practical test, we must be careful to do it with those allowances which are as necessary for the reasoner in moral subjects, as it is for the reasoner in mechanics to allow for friction, or for the resistance of air. An Establishment that does its work in much, and has the hope and likelihood of doing it in more; an Establishment that has a broad and living way open to it into the hearts

of the people; an Establishment that can command the services of the present by the recollections and traditions of a far-reaching past; an Establishment able to appeal to the active zeal of the greater portion of the people, and to the respect or scruples of almost the whole, whose children dwell chiefly on her actual living work and service, and whose adversaries, if she has them, are, in the main, content to believe that there will be a future for them and their opinions, such an Establishment should surely be maintained."

We have thus dealt with one of the two ecclesiastical illusions which have been the great stumbling-blocks and snares in Mr. Gladstone's pathway as a statesman; we have traced the steps by which he was constrained to retreat from his original position; and have shown what is his present position. We propose now to deal with the other illusion of which we have spoken, his Anglo-Catholic illusion, with which has been of necessity connected his over-great sympathy and indulgence towards the Roman Catholic Church, with all its errors and usurpations and superstitions. From this illusion we apprehend that he is as yet but half emancipated. We fear, indeed, that his radical error still remains. Politically he now altogether revolts from Popery, he has quarrelled definitively with the Papal Curia, but we fear that he still clings to those Anglican errors and superstitions which are the root of all hierarchical superstition and usurpation, which, in good sooth, not only bind the Anglo-Catholic in sympathy to the great Latin organisation, but have power even to sanction subserviency to the hierarchy of Rome.

Let us briefly explain our meaning. We fear that Mr. Gladstone still adheres to Oxford sacramental superstitions, and to that view of Church organisation and unity which regards the visible and external as necessary to the true integrity, continuity, and unity of the Church of Christ. He has never, so far as we know, said a word to imply that, as to these points, he has abandoned the principles of his early treatise, or the creed and doctrines which have been held by all his most intimate Oxford friends, and which dominate in the ecclesiastical school with which himself and his family have been always identified. If this be so, Mr. Gladstone's is as yet but a very imperfect enlightenment, but a very partial conversion, so far as regards the great ground of jealousy and suspicion which

lies between himself and the Protestant heart of his country.

The theurgic superstition which underlies the doctrines of necessary sacramental efficacy, which invests the episcopally ordained priest with the awful attribute of sacramental "conversion," or transubstantiation, makes necessary the maintenance of the "fable" of Apostolic Succession, affords a sufficient basis for all hierarchical assumptions and usurpations, and binds the Anglo-Catholic Church to that of Rome, historically and doctrinally, as her mother and mistress, her perpetual superior, her head by Divine and undeniable right. So also the claim of external continuity and visible unity, which is parallel with the postulates of sacramental superstition, which ultimately, indeed, coalesces with them, can only be maintained for the Anglican Church by identifying that Church with the communion of Rome. Mr. Gladstone fastens a quarrel on Rome because of the Syllabus and the Infallibility Decree, because of the Vatican Council of 1870. If the effect of these decrees be to lead him to abandon the whole ground of his allegiance to Rome, it is well; but unless they detach him from the old Oxford moorings he remains in an utterly untenable and unsatisfactory position.

We need hardly say that we can well sympathise with that yearning after Christian visible Church unity which has possessed the mind of Mr. Gladstone, and so many devout and superior men. We understand the fascination of that vision of Catholic unity, as of the visible city of God, the New Jerusalem, descending from heaven, of which we spoke in the earlier pages of this article. But yet we must insist on the hard truth we have now stated. If we turn to Mr. Gladstone's Essay on Ritualism, in the *Contemporary Review*, we find no evidence that he has yet recognised what is the fundamental question between him and the Protestantism of this land. It is very singular indeed how, in that essay, he ignores the very essential point of the real controversy. This omission, very serious in its meaning, if deliberately and consciously made, most surprising and significant, if altogether unconscious, renders the whole essay, in which doubtless are many good and true things excellently said, irrelevant and unsatisfactory. The one objection to Ritualism is the eucharistic doctrine and the hierarchical assumptions which its sym-

bolism is intended to teach, and which all its recognised heads and leaders affirm it is their supreme object to enforce. Mr. Gladstone quite ignores the purpose of Ritualism. He reduces the whole question to one of taste and mode. He indeed intimates that corresponding ritualistic displays may be found in Protestant countries on the Continent. Suppose we grant this—although, in a full sense, we are far from granting it—what is this to the purpose? In this country the ritualistic displays are confessedly intended to teach symbolically the doctrines to which we have referred. If in other countries they were used without any such reference, the same objection would not there apply. As a matter of fact, however, two things are to be noted. One, that "histrionic" and "symbolical" displays and performances to any similar extent are seldom, if ever, to be seen in the Churches of Continental Protestantism, the other, that the Churches of Continental Protestantism, in which ritualistic displays, in any degree similar to these, are to be found, are themselves Churches corrupted by semi-Popish superstitions, superstitions from which Lutheranism, like Anglicanism, has never been purged, and which, of late years, have been carried to great lengths. Students of Continental Protestantism have long been aware of this; and it is many years since, in an article in this Journal, entitled *Religion in Germany*, the extent of sacramental superstition in High Lutheranism, and the parallelism between the doctrines and designs of the *Kreuz Zeitung* party and those of our own Tractarian and Ritualising school, were pointed out.

No doubt Mr. Gladstone himself is averse from extreme ritualising displays. We mark in his *Autobiography* a sentence which contains the germ of his essay on Ritualism:—"There is no reason to doubt," he says, referring to the period 1830—1840, "that at that time at least, and before such changes had become too decidedly the fashion, the outward embellishment of churches, and the greater decency and order of services, answered to, and sprang from, a call within, and proved a less unworthy conception of the sublime idea of Christian worship." Nevertheless, it would seem that Mr. Gladstone holds those doctrines which constitute the essential poison of all extreme Anglican Ritualism and of all Popery. For which reason we do not rate his last pamphlet—his *Expostulation*—as of as high importance as, for the present,

the public seems disposed to rate it. We do not indeed question the sincerity of the writer, but we do for the present doubt the depth of his insight, and the thoroughness of his conversion.

We do not, we say, question the sincerity of the writer. We could not do so for reasons to ourselves altogether conclusive. Since July, 1870, we have had decisive information that Mr. Gladstone's views in regard to the Roman Catholic Church have been greatly modified. It is well known that from the very date of the Vatican Decrees, from the month of July, 1870, to which he himself refers in his *Expostulation*, Mr. Gladstone has been frank and ready in the expression of his views as to the effect of those decrees, the effect of tho consummated policy and legislation of the Roman Catholic hierarchy as embodied in the decisions of the Vatican Council—as placing an impassable gulf between the Latin Communion and English Christianity, between the Church of Rome, as its position was defined by those decrees, and all that belongs to Christian freedom and modern progress. Mr. Gladstone expressed these views freely to politicians, and to clergymen of different schools, to English Churchmen and to Dissenters. From that date, accordingly, many have understood, whilst a considerable number have known, that Mr. Gladstone had come to identify modern Romanism, viewed as a system, with Ultramontanism, and had decided that the public policy and the public men of England could thenceforth keep no terms, and be in no sort of compromise or understanding, more or less, with the authorities, whether ecclesiastical or quasi-political, of the Papacy.

So long as Mr. Gladstone was Premier, it was difficult for him, without saying what in Parliament would have been either irrelevant and out of place or rash and dangerous, to give any Parliamentary or political expression to these feelings. But he embraced, more than two years ago, a convenient non-political opportunity of giving public expression to his views. At a meeting held at Willis's Rooms, on May 14, 1872, on behalf of the Special Endowment Fund of King's College, he used the following language, addressing the Archbishop of Canterbury, who presided at the meeting. "Indeed, my Lord Archbishop, when we look abroad we cannot conceal from ourselves that in that which is the greatest Christian communion, events have of late taken place of portentous significance. I must own

that, admitting the incapacity of my understanding to grasp fully what has occurred, the aspect of the recent decrees at Rome appears to me too much to resemble the proclamation of a perpetual war against the progress and the movement of the human mind." Such are his words as reported in the *Guardian* newspaper, words which his audience greeted with "loud cheers." When he spoke them he was Prime Minister of England, and he must have known how deeply such words could not but offend his Irish supporters in the House of Commons. Nothing but a profound conviction on his part, coupled also with a deliberate intention of marking his sense of the political, as well as intellectual, defiance, which the Papacy had launched against national progress and true human liberty, can account for his utterance of such words on such an occasion. They were at once flashed by the telegraph to Rome, to America, to Germany, to France, and all round the world.

Nor was there any conscious inconsistency on the part of Mr. Gladstone, after having spoken these words, in the introduction of the Irish University Bill. The principles of that measure, as intended by Mr. Gladstone, and as apprehended at first by the House of Commons and the public press, were in harmony with the modern educational policy of Parliament, and seemed to be obvious principles of equity. The deep mischief of that proposal was not revealed until it was examined in its details. The working of the measure would have been to hand over the rule in the higher education of Ireland, as it has long ago been handed over in Irish primary education, to the Roman Catholic bishops. But this was far from apparent on the face of the Bill. In its general outline, and in the spirit which governed its form and shaping, so far as its main purpose was concerned, it was a Bill not only of statesmanlike comprehensiveness and scope, but of equitable and altogether unsectarian intent. But the minor provisions and detailed arrangements and proportions seemed to be skilfully contrived for the purpose of playing into the hands of Rome. Mr. Gladstone ought to be acquitted of all personal complicity in the mischievous intent of these clauses. Before the vote was taken on the second reading, he had signified his willingness to sacrifice them all, and, retaining only the most general principles of the Bill, to make changes which would have removed all danger in its working of Roman Catholic predominance. But these

concessions came too late to stay the tide of English antagonism to the Bill—indeed, the effect of the promised concessions had hardly been appreciated by the Protestant opponents of the measure when the division came—while they were instantly comprehended by the Romanists as fatal to all their hopes of making great capital out of the Bill, and as essentially opposed to the daring demands of their Church. The consequence was that whilst the concessions saved not many votes on the one side, they lost for the measure all the Roman Catholic votes. So ended Mr. Gladstone's final attempt to make a settlement, at once satisfactory and equitable, of the question of Roman Catholic higher education for Ireland. Since that time the O'Keeffe controversy, in and out of Parliament, must have taught him how perilous are all dealings with public education where Rome is concerned, and how thoroughly unsatisfactory is the present condition of primary education in Ireland. We imagine he will be wary about coming near any of these questions again; and that, if he should undertake them, it will hardly be in a sense favourable to the pretensions of Rome. So far, however, as regards the Irish University Bill, with which alone we are now properly concerned, our remarks are intended to show that Mr. Gladstone's proposals were not, so far as his purpose and their general principle were concerned, inconsistent with that anti-Papal feeling and intent which, since 1870, had become so strongly defined within him, and which he utters so impressively in his *Expostulation*. On the contrary, Mr. Gladstone would no doubt contend that, so far as his Bill was equitable in its spirit, it would have strengthened the State and strengthened Protestantism in maintaining their rights against Romanism—since equity in dealing with dissidents or enemies must always strengthen those who stand in a position at once of power and of right—and, besides, that the spread of modern science and knowledge, to the utmost possible extent, by means of national University culture, was likely to prove the best antidote, in a Roman Catholic country and among Roman Catholics themselves, to the spread of Ultramontane bigotry and bondage.

If, however, prior to the defeat of the Irish University Bill—if, nearly three years before that date, as we have seen—the Vatican Decrees had convinced Mr. Gladstone that, in the interests of truth and freedom in the widest

sense, there could be no Concordat with Rome, there can be no doubt that his impressions to that effect were not only deepened, but received a special point and confirmation, by his experience in connection with that Bill. The Pope spoke, and, as one man, the Irish Representatives voted against the Bill, against a Bill which had been meant to do justice to the educational claims of Irish Roman Catholics, in the sphere of higher education, and as to which Bill the universal report seems to be more probable than the representations of public rumour often are, to the effect that it had received the approval at least of Archbishop Manning, if not also of the leading minds among the Irish Roman Catholic hierarchy. It is true that the Bill these authorities approved was by no means the Bill which would have been carried, after Mr. Gladstone's concessions, and after the debate on the second reading, if the Roman Catholic members had not turned and voted against it. But yet Mr. Gladstone, conscious of his own equitable meaning, painfully aware that, for the sake of doing generous justice to the Irish Roman Catholics, he had exposed himself to suspicion and misrepresentation, and that, at any rate, no one could either intend more fairly, or operate more favourably, in the interests of Roman Catholic higher education than himself, felt very keenly his desertion at the final hour of decision by the Roman Catholics obeying the command of Rome. In this he seemed to see a pregnant illustration of the meaning and spirit, and an immediate instance of the effects, of the Vatican Decrees. Here he recognised at once their antagonism to true higher education and to national liberty and progress. Here he saw how the Papal prerogative and power stands in necessary antagonism alike to the rights of sovereigns and to the independence and liberty of nations, how they are incompatible with loyalty as with enlightenment on the part of submissive Roman Catholics.

The experience of the past has borne its fruit. A sentence in Mr. Gladstone's Essay on Ritualism, contained, in a single paragraph, a pointed and eloquent expression of the convictions which the reflection and experience of four years had wrought into the mind of the writer. This paragraph having excited the anger and animosity of the Roman Catholic press in England and Ireland, Mr. Gladstone had a fair opportunity of explaining and justifying it, and in so doing of explaining himself fully as to the

present position of Rome and as to his understanding of the Vatican Decrees. Mr. Gladstone knew, of course, that so to explain himself would be an advantage to himself with his countrymen, would tend to remove misapprehensions, and to reinstate him, both as a Protestant Christian and as a politician, with multitudes who had, on ecclesiastical or religious grounds, disliked, or, at least, suspected him. His *Expostulation*, we have no doubt, is sincere and true; but quite as little do we doubt that, in sending it forth, Mr. Gladstone anticipated, or, at least, hoped, that it might prove to be politically opportune, and might be accepted by many of his alienated countrymen as an effective defence of his own genuineness as an English Protestant and Churchman.

As such, rather than as contributing anything essentially valuable or permanently important to the controversy with Rome, are we prepared to welcome Mr. Gladstone's last pamphlet. It has also a secondary, but by no means unimportant value, as having served to elicit from such men as Lords Acton and Camoys, Mr. Henry Petre, Mr. Delisle, and Serjeant Shee, disclaimers of all sympathy with the Vatican Decrees, and from Bishop Clifford a renewed statement of the Old English Roman Catholic position—heresy perhaps it might be called by Dr. Manning—that the Pope can have no right or power to interfere with the civil allegiance of English subjects.

The chief gist of Mr. Gladstone's contention is that, by the Vatican Decrees, an essential change has been effected in the relations of the Roman Catholic Church towards the State in this country, and towards the civil power generally, and that whereas before there was no essential incompatibility between the allegiance owed by a Roman Catholic to his sovereign and that which he owed to his Church, now there is such an incompatibility. We confess that we cannot altogether agree with this conclusion. One important question to be asked is, whether a Roman Catholic is to be understood to be bound by all that his Church, or the authorities which claim authority over his Church, require or decree. If the answer is in the affirmative, then we think it to be most certain that at no period for many centuries past has the duty of the Roman Catholic to his Church been compatible with the loyal performance of his duties to his sovereign. If the answer be in the negative, then it is obvious that Roman Catholics cannot be held to

be personally responsible for decrees to the passing of which they were no parties, and that it ought not to be assumed that all of them will, as a matter of course, yield obedience to such decrees. It is impossible to understand past ages in a truly historical and philosophic spirit, without continually bearing in mind that the Papal Curia has never been co-extensive in its influence, or in its real representative character, with the Latin Communion. The yoke has been made by the Pope and his counsellors, has been forged and completed by a succession of Popes and Popish counsellors, and (so-called) General Councils, working ever through the ages towards a system of fatal and fated results, arising necessarily out of the false principles which the hierarchical government of the Church implies as its postulates; but all the while the nations of the Latin Communion have but partially accepted, often they have passively rejected, or resisted, those results.

In other words, the members of the Church have often been better than the system of the Church. This has been true very often even of the priesthood and the monastic orders; it might well, therefore, as to civil affairs and relations, be true of the laity. In different countries, also, different degrees of religious enlightenment, or of civil light and liberty, have prevailed. When Rome in part reconquered Germany it was obliged, notwithstanding, to concede something to the spirit of the Reformation. Hence German Catholicism has, at least since the Reformation, been always comparatively liberal and enlightened, altogether different from the Catholicism of Italy and Spain, or, which is the same thing as of Spain, of Belgium, so long under Spanish influence. The same is in some sort true as to France, which, although it cast out cruelly the Puritans, has never ceased to retain memories of Henri Quatre, and, if not of religious liberty, at least of "the Gallican liberties." So also the Catholics of England defied the Pope (at least some of them), and fought for their country and Queen Elizabeth, and have for the most part retained loyalty to the Queen as a part of their religious duty. Nor can it be imagined that even Ireland has been beyond the reach of similar influences, unhappy as were for ages her relations with this country. At the present day, in the case of not a few Irishmen, especially among the barristers and judges of the island, we have striking illustrations of the possibility of combining fidelity

to the Roman profession with allegiance to the laws and sovereignty of the empire.

All this, however, by no means proves, in our judgment, that up to the year 1870 firm and assured, let us say supreme and religious, loyalty to the throne was any more compatible with thorough-going obedience to the Church of Rome than it is now that the Vatican Decrees have passed. Those decrees declare the Infallibility of the Pope, and claim for him universal obedience and authority. The latter claim, however, is really the one which strictly and directly concerns the allegiance of Roman Catholics to the laws and government of the country in which they claim citizenship. And surely the Pope's claim to be King of kings and Lord of lords, is almost as ancient as the very name of Pope, and has never been suspended. It is a claim which requires no General Council to sanction it; the Vatican has but reaffirmed what has always been a Papal assertion, and what, in the Middle Ages, as we know, was no idle pretension. A Pope could, and can now, in virtue of his undoubted ecclesiastical prerogative and authority, enforce this claim by the most stringent spiritual penalties, even by an Interdict. Such ecclesiastical authority seems almost of itself to imply, to confer, a civil power superior to that of any monarch or potentate. If, in the present age, such authority has become a mere name, it is certain that by the Vatican Decree it will not be galvanised into new vitality, or even into spasmodic activity for a season. Read in the light of these considerations, Lord Acton's enumeration in his calm and learned letters to the *Times* of the claims, and effrontories, and monstrous misdeeds of Popes in the past, is full of instruction. Such power have Popes in the past not only claimed but exercised, such deeds have they done: and yet in those very ages ecclesiastics in this country set the laity the example in defying the Pope and all his anathemas, the Pope and all his spiritual powers; in those very ages Englishmen retained their allegiance to their sovereign and to the laws of their country. It may well be believed, accordingly, that in this age no Vatican Decree will avail to terrorise the Roman Catholic gentlemen of England, or even of Ireland, into the renunciation of their allegiance to the throne and laws of the land.

If Mr. Gladstone points to the conduct of the Irish Romanist members about his Bill, it is obvious to reply that

Irish votes had been given in mass on former occasions in obedience to Papal influence; and also that, on this occasion at least, no question of loyalty was involved. What we do not see as yet is—that matters have been made by the Vatican Decrees radically or essentially different from what they were before. Bad may have been made worse, but there has been no revolutionary change. English Roman Catholic gentlemen will find some means to escape from the pressure of the Infallibility Decree as they have done from former claims of the Papacy. Serjeant Shee, indeed, and others, have been showing the way. Vulgar Romanists, no doubt, will maintain the Infallibility of the Pope in the future; but so, for the most part, they have done in the past; or, if they have not, the priest has been virtually an infallible religious referee and authority, an absolute authority and guide for them; and so, we apprehend, it will be in future.

No doubt some German and English, and perhaps also some French catechisms, in which heretofore the Infallibility of the Pope has been denied, will have to be altered —at least for the present. At this moment, also, there is, in consequence of the Vatican Council, a high pressure put upon bishops everywhere to maintain in words and as a dogma the Infallibility of the Pope. But, so far as any practical assertion of that prerogative, or of the Papal claim to obedience, in connection with civil allegiance and every-day life, is concerned, we do not see that the present Pope or his successor—whose turn cannot but come soon—will be at all more likely to succeed in its enforcement than the feeblest of his predecessors. Never were the times so little favourable, indeed, as now to ecclesiastical usurpations. The Vatican Council has put the last touch to the fabric of Papal usurpation; words can hardly go further than the Vatican Council has pushed them, but those claims were never less likely to take practical effect than now. Archbishop Manning, before he left for Rome, published a Missive, in which he virtually pronounced excommunication on all who did not accept the dogma of Papal Infallibility. That desperate resort of ecclesiastical authority has already recoiled on the Archbishop and his Church.

Doubtless the claim of Infallibility set up for the Pope is monstrous, but not more monstrous than the hierarchical and theurgic superstitions on which all his pretensions

rest; not more monstrous than the assumption of priestly prerogative in transubstantiation, which is virtually claimed by our own High Churchmen, by Mr. Gladstone's intimate friends and co-workers, in England to-day. Indeed, the Papal Decree—a decree sent forth and promulgated on the authority of the present Pope, and not of any Œcumenical Council—by which the Immaculate Conception was erected into an article of faith, was, as we have ever felt, a much more revolting and awful act of spiritual usurpation than the claim and Decree of Infallibility, and, moreover, implied the infallibility of the spiritual potentate who sent it forth. Nevertheless Dr. Newman professed, in his *Apologia*, his submission to that decree, and, both in his *Apologia* and also in his Essay on Development, has used language in regard to the Church's claim of infallibility, and the decisions of the "Infallible Chair," incompatible with any other view but that of the Infallibility of the Pope, as apart from Councils. Indeed, the Church must have been for centuries practically denuded of its boasted attribute of infallibility if the Pope were not infallible. No council had assembled since that of Trent. Had the infallible Church been through all the interval bereft of infallible guidance? For an out and out Romanist there could be but one answer to the question. To deny the Papal Infallibility in view of such an alternative was to abandon the Church's highest claims, and to prove the denier to be by no means an implicitly obedient or perfectly orthodox son of the Church.

The dogma of Papal Infallibility is a logical necessity in the Roman system: we regard it as a *reductio ad absurdum* of the system, but not as one whit more absurd, or impious, or awful a claim than many others which have for some ages been a part of the system. It is our comfort to reflect that, notwithstanding, there are Catholics and Catholics; that the Latin Communion is not throughout and in the persons of all its votaries absolutely identified with the Roman system of dogmas and usurpations, that, in spite of the Vatican Decrees and the Syllabus, light must and will continue to spread more and more through "Catholic" nations; that civil liberty as well as general enlightenment is spreading and working; that nation after nation must begin, before long, to emancipate itself from spiritual thraldom by the sword of civil liberty severing its bonds, and by the uprising power of national liberty and life: and that, even in the Vatican Council itself may be

recognised the crisis of the contention, from which a visible and growing defeat must be dated.

It is true, no doubt, that the Vatican Council was intended not only to revive, but to consolidate and to extend, the impious and audacious claims of the Papacy to temporal supremacy, as well as spiritual absolutism throughout the world. The Council was a deeply laid conspiracy against the liberties and progress of the nations, and was connected with political manœuvres and influences of a subtle and powerful kind, such as Count von Arnim described at the time to his principals at Berlin, and as Bismark has lately denounced in the German Parliament. But, politically, the Council has been detected, exposed, defeated. The Papacy, borrowing courage from despair, has never perhaps for centuries past been so insolent, so daring, so full of political purpose and activity, as now; but, at the same time, it has never had arrayed against it convictions so deep and so wide-spread, political intelligence and influence so powerful and so far-reaching, so wide a common consent of nations, so vast and mighty a movement of the popular will.

Thirty years ago Mr. Disraeli, in marrying his heroine, Sybil, the daughter of "two nations,"—viz. the aristocracy and the working people—with an English nobleman, made the factory manager's daughter to be not only of the old blood of England but of the "old faith," thus symbolising in his own way the union of rank and labour, of the landlords and the land-workmen, of the old Catholic and the modern Catholic faith. That was his "Young England" creed of thirty years ago, when Lord John Manners was the poet and one of the rising hopes of the party which aspired to new-model the Toryism of England, but had not as yet duly learned its *métier*. *Lothair* shows how many years have passed since then, and how well its author has learnt the lesson of the times as to the ambition and craft of Popery. It is satisfactory to find that Mr. Gladstone has now learnt, at least in part, the same lesson, and that neither leader is in danger of attempting to mislead Parliament into fostering an influence which, if left to itself, will be comparatively powerless, at least in England, but which has derived great and mischievous power from political bids for its influence, and from a false indulgence of its anti-civil and anti-social demands and pretensions.

ART. VII.—*Forgiveness and Law. Grounded on Principles Interpreted by Human Analogies.* By HORACE BUSHNELL, D.D. London: Hodder and Stoughton. 1874.

DR. BUSHNELL has won for himself the distinction of being the chief American representative of a theory of the atonement which renounces the notion of expiated guilt. As such he has been much read and admired in England. He is quoted by all historians of the doctrine, and extolled for his boldness, vigour, and eloquence by both the friends and the foes of his views. His place has been assigned in the class of which Robertson, Young, Jowett, and McLeod Campbell are brilliant expositors. He must often have seen himself ranked with them as an advocate of what is commonly called, though without any special propriety, the moral theory of redemption. But he seems now desirous of emancipating himself from the yoke of any particular theory, and of setting up a new one of his own. Since the publication of his well-known book on *The Vicarious Sacrifice*, he has received fresh light, and comes forward now with a partial recantation and revision. As we have made our readers familiar, by more than one notice, with his ancient views, it is only right to let them know the fact and the value of the change that has come over the author, or which he supposes to have come over himself. The little book we have to notice evidently calculates on a wide circulation in England; we therefore feel bound to offer our comments as soon as possible. They will be simply comments on the book, not entering fully into the great subject to the right understanding of which it professes to be a contribution.

It is only bare justice, both to the author and his readers, that the circumstances of the change should be noticed. They will be given in his own words, and speak for themselves. If we mistake not, the statement will itself go very far to undermine the foundation of any doctrine that Dr. Bushnell may have to teach, and to neutralise any influence he may have already exerted. The age is impatient, especially on this subject, of new

views which are loose, indefinite, and avowedly not amenable to formula.

"It will be understood, I presume, that I suppose the two revised statements or solutions of doctrine I am now going to propound, to be really new. I frankly allow that I do, and also as frankly confess that on this simple fact my courage and confidence are most weakened by misgivings. For who can expect a great subject like this, which has engaged so many of the most gigantic minds of so many past ages, to be now, in these last times, more sufficiently apprehended and better expounded by an ordinary teacher, at his common level of standing. It is difficult, I allow, not to be greatly appalled when confronted by this objection. But it must not be forgotten that now and then some person will be stronger in his accidents than other and greater people have been in their powers; also, that God himself sometimes makes accidents for minds by His own private touch, when He will unfold some needed lesson; also, that God has a way of preparing sometimes for the uncovering of truth, and that as He would not have His Son appear till the fulness of time should come, so He will not expect His Son's Gospel to be duly conceived till the times are ready, and all the suggestive conditions ripe that may set us in upon it. No greatest man or champion is going to conquer a truth before its time, and no least competent man, we may also dare to say, need miss of a truth when its time has come, and the flags of right suggestion are all out before him. How easy a thing it is, in fact, to think what the times have got ready to be thought, and are even whispering to us from behind all curtains of discovery, and out of all the most secret nooks and chambers of experience. That now the clock has finally struck, and the day has fully come for some new and different thinking of this great subject, I most verily believe."—P. 14.

We have no disposition, when treating a theme like this, and judging a writer who has laboured hard to understand it and make others understand it, to be satirical. But we are bound to say that there never was a more ambitious flourish before a slight achievement than this. Let us examine the points on which it has been the author's privilege, as he thinks, to catch the last breath of the spirit of true development in the doctrine of the atonement.

The former treatise held firmly to the theory of "the work of Christ as a reconciling power on man." This was declared to be the whole import and effect of it. The thought of any propitiation of the Divine displeasure, or expiation of the guilt of sin, by a satisfaction of God's

justice, was denounced with the utmost energy, and, sometimes, as we shall hereafter have to show, with what in England would be called irreverence. But a keen eye might detect in that former work the signs of discontent with his own views. Reading some parts of it we could not help feeling that Dr. Bushnell was a secret traitor to his theory, and a secret half-unconscious adherent of the truth. On what principle could such sentences as the following be interpreted?—"How shall we come to God by the help of this martyrdom? How shall we turn it, or turn ourselves under it, so as to be justified and set in peace with God? Plainly there is a want here, and this want is met by giving a *thought-form to the facts which is not in the facts themselves.* They are put directly into the moulds of the altar, and we are called to accept the crucified God-man as our sacrifice, an offering or oblation for us, our propitiation, so as to be sprinkled from our evil conscience,—washed, purged, and cleansed from our sin. . . . We want to use these altar terms just as freely as they are used by those who accept the formula of expiation or judicial satisfaction for sin. . . . . The most cultivated and intellectual disciple wants them now, and will get his dearest approaches to God in their use. We can do without them, it may be, for a little while; but after a while we seem to be in a Gospel that has no atmosphere, and our breathing is a gasping state. Our very repentances are hampered by too great subjectivity, becoming, as it were, a pulling at our own shoulders." These sentences of the older work are not among the recantations of the present one. They were, and still are, evidence that the writer's heart is better than his theory. How comes it that the *thought-form* put into the facts by the feeling of awakened Christians should so universally commend itself to the penitent soul? Moreover, how comes it that the expression of that thought-form cannot be explained, even by one who thinks that they are not in the facts themselves, but in the very language which is current in Scripture? Surely this is paradox, inexcusable paradox. Argument takes refuge in desperation. It amounts to this, that the doctrine of the atonement, in which is the life of men's souls, and the unfolding of which is most certainly the central object of the entire Scriptures of truth, is so set forth as not only to permit but to demand a wholly erroneous interpretation on the part of those most

vitally interested in understanding it aright, and at the very time when it is felt to be the one thing needful. Remembering that former confession, we naturally look in the present volume for some explanation. Taking it up, and finding in its preface the promise of amended views, we eagerly look for some tokens of concession. But in vain. Dr. Bushnell has modified some views and statements. But we look in vain for any decided indication of an approach to the faith once delivered to the saints. There is the same satirical contempt for the "jail-delivery" theory, for the "paymaster scheme of justification," the same preference for a Gospel "not bolted in by the legal majesty of Sinai, but melted in by the suffering goodness of Christ," and the same feverish anxiety to get rid of all "summation of doctrine" and all "hard-pan justice" hypothesis, and to "recover the living ideas we have killed by the dry timber words in which we put them, and, finally, to recover the living and flexible senses of the words themselves." In short, our author has grown almost reckless; and among his last sayings in this professed improvement are these:—"The speculating, over-dogmatising habit that has been pressing us into the literal method, has also, for the same reason, been making our Gospel narrow and close, and a more nearly choking bondage than either it could afford to be, or we to make it. And thus again, for a double reason, we are to have our account in almost any variety of Gospel version, that will take us clear of the nearly fatal syncope of our literal tethers, and give us a more easy play in the figures and poetic liberties of the truth."

These words give us fair warning what to expect. There is to be no mercy for dogmatic statements of any kind—that is, of dogmatic statements that are too faithful to the language of Scripture itself. Some kind of formal statement of Divine revelations Dr. Bushnell admits to be necessary. In his Introduction, he says:—"The supposition is, that, being given to intelligence, intelligence will fall at work upon them, and that human thought, labouring in the outward images of things, will generate modes of speech and laws of experience that compose a kind of second language on the bare level of nature. And so it will, by-and-by, begin to be the problem how to get the simple indicative matter of revelation into the forms of thought prepared in the thought-language of the mere

understanding." We venture to assert that the forms of thought are already provided in Scripture itself. The enmity to systematised dogma goes higher than the dogmatic divines of the Reformation, or the Scholastics, or the early Fathers; it assails the New Testament generally, and St. Paul in particular. Nor does it leave the great Teacher Himself untouched. For the very best dogmatic statements of the doctrine of the atonement we receive from His lips.

Dr. Bushnell is feeling his dim way onwards, but it is not towards the light, and a matter of reasonable complaint is that he should come with such ingenious simplicity before the public with his transitional mood. It were better to wait until the ripe product can be given, be it what it may prove to be. Evidence of the groping and restless state of his mind, we think we see in the strictures upon the work of McLeod Campbell, a work of our author's former school of thought, and incomparably the best of the kind. After paying its last edition a generous tribute, he gives a slight but vigorous sketch of Dr. Campbell's views; and, as this is highly interesting as coming from a writer of the same school, a few sentences from it may be extracted:—

"He maintains, in this negative criticism, a spirit of candour and deference that will so far incline almost any reader to acquiesce in the conclusion at which he arrives: viz. that the world is waiting still for a doctrine of the Cross that has not yet been taught in a way to satisfy the rational doubts of inquiry. This now he undertakes in the more positive way to supply; beginning at the vicarious relation into which Christ is entered by the love that brings Him into the world, and the personal identification He acknowledges with us in our human nature. It does not set Him legally in our place, or make Him a partaker in any of the liabilities of our guilt, it does not allow any such identification with us as permits any claim of justice or any right of punishment against Him on our account; but He is so drawn to us in His feeling that He has all our burdens upon Him. So that, spiritually speaking, He *is* the human race, made sin for the race, and acting for it in a way so inclusively total, that all mortal confessions, repentances, sorrows, are fitly acted by Him on our behalf. His Divine Sonship in our humanity is charged in the offering thus to God of all which the guilty world itself should offer. And so 'his confession of sin is *a perfect Amen in humanity to the judgment of God on the sin of man.*' 'He responds in it also to the Divine wrath against sin, with a perfect response—a response from the depths of that Divine humanity, and *in*

that perfect response He absorbs it. For that response has all the elements of a perfect repentance in humanity for all the sins of man . . . and by that perfect response in Amen to the mind of God in relation to sin is the wrath of God rightly met, and that is accorded to Divine justice which is its due, and could alone satisfy it.'"

This is a fair statement of the views propounded in the work of Dr. Campbell, successive editions of which have come before the public, exerting, as we think, a wider and more subtle influence than any other book of the class. It will be useful now to summarise Dr. Bushnell's criticism on his former coadjutor: partly for the sake of the racy style in which he executes the task and the satisfactory issue of most of his criticism, and partly for the sake of the glimpses it gives of the change for the worse which is surely coming over the mind of the critic. First, he discharges his missile at Dr. Campbell's "rather peculiar untheological modes of expression;" and this is grotesque, as a charge coming from one whose mintage is one of the most peculiar that it has ever been our lot to encounter. Perhaps, however, there is a touch of slyness about the mock charge; so let that pass. Next we have a critique of Professor Park on Campbell in the *Bibliotheca Sacra*, who says, "After having implied that Christ repented of the sins of the race, we do not see why Mr. Campbell need object to the theory that He was punished for those sins." Quoting this critique our author remarks, "He certainly need not, and what is more should not." And then he proceeds as follows:—

"But is it clear, when Mr. C. speaks of repentance in this manner, that he means any such thing as we commonly understand by the word? Does he mean that Christ forsakes the sin of the world as being in the guilt of it, and casting it off with a hard and heavy struggle that amounts to a moral revolution of His nature? That would scarcely be a reverent imputation. He speaks, we observe, more than once in a way that magnifies 'the sorrow' of the repentance. He also calls the supposed repentance 'an expiation for sin' several times over. As if the superstitious ideas of penance had disfigured a little his conception of the wholly joyful and free nature of repentance; counting that the godly sorrow that worketh it stays by as sorrow, after it is worked, dragging heavily in it to the end. And yet we are in about the same doubt concerning the meaning of Edwards in the passage on which, as we may say, Dr. Campbell hangs, in a sense,

his whole theory. Thus, arguing for the necessity of an infinite suffering or sorrow, Edwards says that 'God could not be just to Himself without this vindication;' 'for there must needs be either an equivalent punishment or an equivalent sorrow and repentance.' This, too, he calls 'an adequate sorrow'; as if the pain, the sufferer's sorrow, of the repentance were its chief significance. Can it be that the religious apprehensions of Edwards were so far let down as to allow his putting the alternative thus between the pains of repentance and of punishment? Does he really imagine that some possible amount of repentance will even the reckoning of sin, requiring after that no other atonement? or is he only using the alternative as a by-play in argument, without any consideration of its merit or possibility?"—P. 31.

Dr. Bushnell does not give a fair account of President Edwards' views, which by no means entertain the thought of the possibility of a sufficient suffering penalty in repentance. The "adequate repentance" he speaks of is what he regards as a thing impossible: it never entered into his theological view that any amount of sorrow for sin could be an expiation. What Edwards says is this: "God would be unjust to Himself without this vindication, unless there could be such a thing as a repentance, humiliation, and sorrow for this, proportionable to the greatness of the majesty despised." And this he regards as utterly inconceivable. Therefore, as there must needs be either an equivalent punishment, or a sorrow and repentance equal to the offence, "sin must be punished with an infinite punishment." In his remark on Dr. Campbell, it seems to us that he gives an example of the use of terms, "as a by-play on argument, without any consideration of their merit or possibility. The Scotch divine speaks often of an expiatory repentance; the sorrow of our Representative for the sin of the race He represents having, in his theory, precisely the effect on the Father that orthodox theology expresses by the word propitiation. Now Dr. Bushnell delights in the word propitiation, and in the idea it conveys. But he has a strong disrelish for the word expiation, and therefore he charges the theory of expiatory repentance with forgetting that repentance is not a feeling of profound sorrow, but something "of a wholly joyful and free nature." Where, we would ask, is the propriety of violating in this manner the most universal instincts of the soul, and overturning the most established theological phraseology? That repentance leads to a free and joyful submis-

sion to a new law and discipline of life, and that evangelical sorrow for sin is the gift of the same Spirit who imparts new life for new obedience, is certainly true. But that conviction of sin, contrition of spirit, repentance proper, is not a feeling of sorrow, that is, of pure suffering in the spirit, cannot be asserted by any who soberly consider what they say. Dr. Campbell is not wrong when he uses the term "expiatory repentance:" that is, the collocation of the two terms is not inconsistent with the meaning he assigns to each. With him our Lord's repentance is an immeasurable sorrow; and the sorrow, being that of One who is perfectly righteous while he feels it and offers it to God, is expiatory, that is, has the effect of undoing the sin, making it as if it had not been. The theory is unsound; but the words are consistently used.

At this point, Bushnell fairly joins issue with Campbell. His charge—or, rather, the charge brought against him by Dr. Park—cannot possibly be repelled. If the Redeemer was so one with mankind, so "identified with sinners" as to feel the burden of human sin as a burden on His own spirit, a burden under which He died, His death cannot have been other than an expiatory satisfaction of Divine justice as well as of Divine love. "By offering up to God a perfect confession of them, and an adequate repentance for them, with which Divine justice is satisfied, and a full expiation is made for human guilt," Dr. Campbell argues, Christ may be said to have atoned for the sins of men. He goes so far as to admit that Christ's "*perfect amen* in humanity to the judgment of God on the sin of man" was no other than His "meeting the Divine wrath against sin with a perfect response out of the depths of His Divine Humanity—a response which (excepting the personal consciousness of sin) has all the elements of a perfect contrition and repentance." By this "the wrath of God is rightly met, and Divine justice duly satisfied;" for the Redeemer's confession may be regarded as "absorbing and exhausting the Divine wrath against our sins, in that adequate confession and perfect response on the part of man, which was possible only to the infinite and eternal righteousness in humanity." Against this "absorbing of the wrath of God," Dr. Bushnell protests.

"What is absorbed is taken on to be retentively held: is the wrath of God so taken on by Christ? This he certainly does not mean. Is it, then, simply quelled? That would be a very

remarkable consequence, to follow a mere representative repentance for sins, still and always going on, not quelled themselves. It is even more difficult still to find what is meant by the satisfying of God's justice, the repentance offered being that response to God's mind in relation to sin on which the wrath of God is rightly sent, and that is accorded to Divine justice, which is its due, and 'could alone satisfy it.' Is it, then, a satisfaction of God's justice that it is acknowledged to be just? This would be a new conception both of justice and the satisfaction. Besides, Dr. Campbell discards all the satisfaction theories, because they are *legal*, and the satisfaction here proposed in the pains of repentance is itself altogether legal, and gives a legal title to salvation if it gives anything. On the whole, it does not seem likely to me, as these brief strictures will indicate, that his positive doctrine is or can be sufficiently established."—P. 32.

We come to the same conclusion, but not for the same reason. Dr. Campbell's theory is not our present subject. But a remark or two upon it may not be out of place. It seems to us to involve two errors of an opposite kind: one of them overstating and exaggerating the Scriptural doctrine of penal expiation and the other understating and diluting it: a theory against which both these charges may be substantiated must be wrong.

The exaggeration is this, that it makes the Holy One of God, separate from sinners, into whose consciousness sin could not enter, experience, in sympathy with man, all the anguish of contrition and a broken spirit: His heart was broken, not by God's rebuke on the sinful race which He represented, but by His Divine-human adequate repentance, containing "all the elements of a human contrition." No amount of special pleading can reconcile us to this thought. It is utterly inconsistent with the first principles of the Biblical doctrine of our Lord's relation to mankind; it cannot be reconciled with any intelligible theory of the union of the two natures in the Incarnate Person; it is not supported by a single passage of the New Testament; and finally, it is no more nor less than a contradiction in terms. A fair consideration of this last would render the other arguments needless. A sorrow for sin that expiates by its bitterness must have in it the element of guilt, conscious guilt. However the theorist may recoil from including this in the passion of Christ, his theory demands it, if the repentance of Christ is the atonement, and if His atonement is His repentance. A mere sorrow

for the evil of sin, and sympathy with the race as miserable in consequence, and profound lamentation over the woes of mankind, do not make up atonement to the justice of God. All these are in the Divine mind apart from the incarnation, and have their abundant expression independently of the work of Christ. Our Lord Himself utters all these emotions towards men unsaved, whom He addresses as rejectors, and on the supposition of their being final rejectors, of His atonement. Such pitying sympathy we may suppose holy angels to feel, knowing as we do that they rejoice in human repentance. But the repentance of Christ for man in Dr. Campbell's theory is really the expiatory sorrow that absorbs the wrath of God against sin. He cannot help using these very words, and so declaring that he holds the doctrine of a vicarious satisfaction for mankind in reality while in words he rejects it. In his theory we have the active and the passive righteousness of Christ exhibited in a new form, and both of them exaggerated. The vicarious satisfaction to Divine justice is in his theory as certainly as it is in any; but the anguish of personal repentance on behalf of the race is an additional element which counterbalances the absence of the element of substitutionary endurance of the suffering due to sin. There is also the perfect righteousness of the atonement, the active obedience; which, as "the Divine righteousness in Christ, appearing on the part of man and in humanity, met the Divine righteousness in God condemning man's sin, by the true and righteous confession of its sinfulness uttered in humanity; and righteousness as in God was satisfied, and demanded no more than righteousness as in Christ thus presented." Expiation, in Dr. Campbell's theory, is the annulling of the sinful relation of man by a sorrowful confession of One who at once feels all the anguish of sin and presents the perfection of holiness on behalf of mankind. It is the orthodox doctrine; disguising, however, the endurance of the grief inflicted on the sinner by the justice of God, and adding the unimaginable and unscriptural sorrow and confession of the sin itself. Dr. Bushnell may well ask what is meant by "absorbing and exhausting the Divine wrath against our sins in that adequate confession and perfect response on the part of man, which was possible only to the infinite and eternal righteousness in humanity." The endless variety of special

pleading in Dr. Campbell's beautiful and gentle volume fails to convince us that he himself had any definite notion of the doctrine by which he endeavoured to displace the older tradition.

The other charge against it comes from another quarter. Dr. Campbell's theory requires a human supplement of the atonement, which is fatal to its acceptance. No one can have this benefit of Christ's intervention who is not by faith brought so into connection with it as to make it his own. But how can he do this? The theory supposes that Christ had no personal experience of sin: no sinner, therefore, can present the Great Repentance as his own. He must add his own personal sorrow, which is supposed to derive its atoning value, that is, to have adequacy imputed to it, through its union with the Saviour's grief. But is not this adding the satisfaction of the penitent to the Redeemer's satisfaction? Dr. Campbell refers to this point in an elaborate note appended to his second edition, in which he meets another objection urged against his theory. He says that the word repentance, as he uses it, "will have its full meaning in the personal experience of every one who accepts in faith the atonement (as now represented); for every such individual sinner will add the 'excepted' element of 'personal consciousness of sin.' But, if the consciousness of such repentant sinner be analysed, it will be found that all that is morally true and spiritual and acceptable to God in his repentance is an amen to Christ's condemnation of his sin, and that all the hope towards God, because of which his repentance is free and pure, and imbued with the spirit of worship, is equally traceable to the revelation of the heart of the Father in His acceptance of the Son's confession and intercession on man's behalf." Look how we may at this human amen to Christ's amen, we cannot find in it the union by faith with Christ's atoning person and work which St. Paul teaches us. It seems, on the other hand, perilously like the Romanist theory of contrition in the sacrament of penance.

But we have been forgetting Dr. Bushnell. What is the doctrine of propitiation that he wishes to substitute for the theory of Dr. Campbell, which he condemns in common with every other that is more avowedly orthodox? It would be exceedingly difficult to answer that question: indeed, utterly hopeless. But our object will be gained by showing that he, like Dr. Campbell, whom he criticises,

really holds even to exaggeration the doctrine that he rejects, and is orthodox *malgré lui*. He professes to discard and abolish the heathenish word expiation; but it is refreshing to find that he unconsciously pays it full homage under the disguise of propitiation; which, well considered, ought to be much the harder saying of the two for such a theological taste as his. It is almost amusing, in fact, to find how he delights in this sterner word as applied to God, and what an animosity he cherishes to the more innocent form of the same Scriptural word. Again, he resists with keen resentment the notion that the atonement, or the reconciliation, includes any change in the Divine sentiment toward man: "indeed, a great part of the texts cited for atonement, so called, conceiving it as a conciliation of God, have their whole meaning, if rightly understood, at the other side of the subject." But, if his favourite word propitiation is used, he will very strenuously insist that the very selfsame thing which theologians mean by reconciliation is altogether and only on the part of God, a "mitigation" of God's sentiments towards mankind in Christ, that is, in Himself, before the foundation of the world. We have no space in these few comments to examine the chapter at length: suffice that we make good these general charges.

It is rather startling to find Dr. Bushnell so far departing from the traditions of his school of thought as to explain propitiation altogether by human analogies. Generally, the dogmatics of the atonement are condemned for applying these analogies to the ways of God with man. Our author, however, not only permits the use of them, but goes so far as to say that "one great principle or fundamental fact" is "the universal solvent of it," and that is "the grand analogy or almost identity that subsists between our moral nature and that of God; so that our moral pathologies and those of God make faithful answer to each other, and He is brought so close to us that almost anything that occurs in the workings or exigences of our moral instincts may even be expected in His." Applying this to the relation between the offended God and the sinner, Dr. Bushnell elaborately but confusedly shows that in our best moods, when "we forgive as God for Christ's sake has forgiven us," we seek identity with the offender by entering into his unhappy state, and by acts of cost and sacrifice, "which are, in proper verity, propitiations

of our moral nature itself," tone ourselves to a completely forgiving state. Now this is precisely as God forgives. In Christ, acting on His behalf, He makes great sacrifice for man and wins him thus, or seeks to win him. At least, "there is a propitiation accomplished in Christ's life, and especially in His very tragic death, which prepares a way of forgiveness for the sins of the world." Faith "beholds in it that sublime act of cost, in which God has bent Himself downward, in loss and sorrow, over the hard face of sin, to say, and saying to make good, 'Thy sins are forgiven thee.'"

It is a great and fundamental mistake which this theory makes when it establishes an analogy between the Divine propitiation of Himself and man's, between the Divine forgiveness and man's. When it said that we must forgive even as we are forgiven, the commandment means no more than that we must forgive because we are forgiven, or as we hope to be forgiven. There is not a solitary passage of Scripture which establishes the analogy which this author establishes. Man cannot, strictly speaking, sin against man. Against God and God alone is sin committed. The human forgiveness is an imitation of the Divine as it is the expression of grateful love taking the form of mercy, and as it is the exercise of emotions awakened by God Himself in the soul that has been forgiven. But human forgiveness is not the removal of guilt from the object of it; it remits no sentence; it takes away no sin; it imparts no grace. It does, indeed, recede from pressing certain righteous claims. It copies the Divine as far as it can. But its highest object in the Christian ethics is to bring the offender into a higher court, into the presence of God Himself, to be by Him forgiven. It in short seeks to gain the brother not to self but to God.

Supposing, however, that the analogy is accepted, and human forgiveness is made the perfect reflection of the Divine; does the author intend to say that the dispenser of human pardon ever forgives merely on the ground of the wretchedness of the object of his forgiveness? A careful consideration of the workings of the human mind in the act of compassion will effectually prove the contrary. Mercy may abstain from pressing its claims, and let the offender go, either leaving him to himself or seeking to reclaim him to a sense of his wrong. But it does not forgive him, without some reparation or attempt at reparation

on his part. He must "turn again and say, I repent." Now that repentance is the admission of wrong, and therefore the propitiation in the injured party of his sense of injury done to himself. The offender is regarded as expiating his offence by feeling it and acknowledging it, and declaring his wish that it were undone. The very instinct of mankind protests against forgiveness on any other terms. It knows nothing of forgiveness springing from pure mercy looking upon pure misery. It has an altogether different class of terms to express the mutual relations of wretchedness and compassion. When forgiveness is in question, the notion of expiation of some sort invariably and necessarily enters. And as mercy in man is the faint reflection of mercy in God, and justice in man the faint reflection of justice in God, so expiation in human relations is the faint reflection of expiation in the relations between God and His creatures.

What that expiation which God demands, and which God has provided, is, He Himself must tell us. We cannot, with all deference to our teachers of this school, accept their conclusions drawn from human analogy. If we accept the teaching of human analogy, we accept it as indicated by God Himself in His Word. And He points us, by a thousand tokens, to the lessons we are to learn from that human government which is a reflection of His own government of the moral universe. The powers that be are ordained of God; and, though there is an eternal difference between the distributive justice of the human lawgiver and His own, there is also some similarity; enough, at least, to make us wonder that writers who, like Dr. Bushnell, start from the fundamental principle of human analogies, can talk in such a reckless manner against the doctrine of expiation as the human counterpart of propitiation in God.

We pass over many rhapsodical pages on the heathenish notion of expiation. It is admitted that "the Pagan religions were corruptions, plainly enough in this view, of the original ante-Mosaic *cultus*, superstitions of degenerate brood, such as guilt and fear and the spurious motherhood of ignorance have it for their law to propagate. As repentance settles into penance under this regimen of superstition, so the sacrifices settled into expiation under the same." Much might be said as to the wholesale injustice done to the great idea of propitiation in

the Gentile world. We do not believe that the sacrifices of heathenism had "no respect to the character of the gods." We do not believe that "everyone, at all versed in the classics, perfectly well knows that getting beforehand with the gods is the main thing in expiations." We have a very different idea of the sacred principle which even the abominations of heathen worship, at its worst, could not entirely suppress. As the evils of that worship were a "degeneration" from early and holy tradition, so the good in it was the prophecy of something better to come. Unless we are much mistaken, it aimed to propitiate something in the gods besides their "envious and bloody" wrath. The very derivation of the Latin term indicates this. Dr. Bushnell makes philology do him considerable service in his exhibition of theological truth. He should look at this word among the rest. Propitiating the gods was not merely paying homage to their malignant wrath, but entreating from them their favour and bringing them near. It is idle to speak of these inhuman and irrational "stratagems" of devotees as the whole of their religion. It had a fairer side also. On the basis of a great corruption of the expiatory institute there was upreared a system of corrupted peace offerings, thank offerings, and more genial oblations. Besides all this, the schools of philosophy were hard by the temples of sacrifice.

Dr. Bushnell carries the same sweeping and reckless manner of assertion into the Old Testament Scriptures. He has resolved to find in them no trace whatever of the idea of expiation: "Happily there is not a single case of expiation in the whole Christian Scriptures, or anything in the Scripture sacrifices which bears a look that way significant enough to support an argument." Now we quite agree with him, if expiation must needs mean what it means in the following passage:—

"At the same time it is not to be denied that, drawing back from the field of the classics into the field of Scripture, it is possible there to hold a severer and more nearly moral view of sacrifices, which still classes them as expiations. Sin, being a violation of the law of God, incurs, in that manner, a dread liability of pain or punishment, and sacrifices, it is conceived, make satisfaction to God for the offence and consequent bad liability, obtaining in that manner a just release. Thus a third party, Christ Himself, comes in to offer the suffering of pain as an evil, which is accepted as being a good enough match for

the evil that is due. In this manner He makes amends for the sin by evil paid for evil due, and that is expiation. But the scheme if not immoral, is fairly unmoral, as it ought to be under that word; showing that God accepts the pains of the good in payment for the pains of the bad, and is more intent on getting His modicum of pains than He is on having proper justice done—taking clean away the word and fact of forgiveness; for, if the debt of sin is paid, there is no longer anything to forgive; substituting government also by a kind of proceeding that has no relation whatever to conscience and right. Happily there is not a single case of expiation in the whole Christian Scriptures, or anything in the Scripture sacrifices which bears a look that way significant enough to support an argument. To verify this fact, I would go over a complete revision, if I had the time, as I did in my former treatise; but I think it will suffice just to recapitulate the points which anyone may establish by a very brief examination."—P. 86.

We freely grant that expiation, as Dr. Bushnell understands it, is not in Scripture; nor is it in any such theology as we accept. Those systems of theology which have given him this notion we renounce as readily as he does. But we complain of the onesidedness which is disposed to represent this caricature as the ordinary presentment of orthodox faith. Our Lord does not, in Scripture, "offer the suffering of pain as an evil which is a good enough match for the evil that is due." He offered a great obedience, and not a great suffering: in His great obedience He suffered, but it was not the amount or "modicum" of His suffering that was set against the guilt of man. We are not writing doctrine in these notes; and it is enough now to protest against such words as these. We take the opportunity also of protesting generally against the indiscriminate way in which our author, and many others of his school, impute to the orthodox generally the exaggerations and excesses of a doctrine which they repudiate almost as vehemently as they repudiate Dr. Bushnell's. It would only be fair if he made a difference where there is a difference. There may be a few to be found who hold the commercial theory of the atonement which our author is always disputing with. But they are not many. The great majority of believers in the expiatory atonement of Christ regard the virtue of the great obedience as something very different from the virtue of certain agonies and sufferings culminating in death.

But if Dr. Bushnell would fairly examine the few words which carry with them the notion of expiation, he would find that his censure is quite misplaced. His anger against the word expiation is altogether irrational. It is a beautiful and most needful word; if he would only look at it steadily he would find it so. It is the translation of a word which undeniably has sin primarily for its object, or the sinner. Sin or the sinner is expiated; and by an act which effects that the man ceases to be an object of the Divine displeasure. Its effect is to turn away the wrath that rests upon him on account of sin, and to turn towards him instead the grace of God. Expiation is the cancelling of guilt as punishment. Dr. Bushnell gives us a catena of passages of the Old Testament, in which his purged vision sees no trace of that expiation which others find there. But he should not have omitted, for instance, the case of Numbers xvi. When the people, after the judgment upon the two hundred and fifty rebels, murmured against Moses and Aaron, and Jehovah would consume the people who took the side of these rebels, Moses said to Aaron: "Take a censer, and put fire therein from off the altar, and put on incense, and go quickly unto the congregation, and make an *atonement* for them: for there is wrath gone out from the Lord; the plague is begun." Who can fail to see that the act of atonement came between the Divine wrath and human sin, to cover the sinner from its effects? Nor that of Phinehas, who atoned for Israel by his unsparing zeal. Though the term, the one common term, *Hilaskesthai*, has primarily sin for its object, it must needs refer also to God, especially when connected with sacrifice; nor has it its full rights until it is made to include this double reference; in this being like the word Reconciliation. Now what other term than expiation can be used as the counterpart of propitiation? The word atonement would perfectly suffice; but that is more appropriately the effect of the expiation, or reconciliation between God and man. Dr. Bushnell raises a pitiful and needless clamour against this most unoffending word. He takes its mother Greek term and appropriates it to the propitiation of God, forgetting that it must have reference to sin and the sinner as well; forgetting, in fact, that this latter is its first claim. The conventional language of theology takes the word Atonement as a more general term; otherwise he would be welcome to that. But he would gain nothing. Whatever

excites his fear or displeasure in expiation would excite it in the term atonement. We think he had better be at peace with the word.

It is impossible to revise the theological language of the original Scriptures: that is established by the Holy Ghost. It is, perhaps, impossible to make any considerable change in the theological language of the Church. It may be granted that there is room for improvement; but it is too late to effect it. The ambiguity in the use of the terms atonement and reconciliation is an instance in point. The two words are used interchangeably in our translations: atonement is used in the Epistle to the Romans for the translation of what is translated in the Epistle to the Corinthians by reconciliation. Perhaps it would be better to retain, in all cases, the latter word. Atonement has now generally forsaken its original sense of the reconciliation of God and man through the mediation of Christ, and is employed to signify the expiatory value of the death of Christ as based upon the merit of His sacrificial obedience. Now, this very meaning is, in the Epistle to the Hebrews, signified by the word reconciliation: "to make reconciliation for the sins of the people." So far as the translation of the Scriptures is concerned, this anomaly might be easily rectified. But it is impossible to restore the word atonement to its original signification in the language of dogmatic theology: it is now thoroughly established as meaning the universal virtue of the obedience of Christ. As to some other conventional terms—such as obedience, sacrifice, satisfaction—there is room for considerable rectification; and it should be the aim of systematic theology to define more exactly their relations. Were that object accomplished, the ground of the objections of the school of theology which we now consider would be absolutely taken away. Every such instance of destructive criticism as this is would be rendered nugatory by a fair statement of the exact sense in which these and some other terms are used.

Dr. Bushnell carries his polemic against the terminology of the atonement into the department of justification, where he has the same kind of fault to find with theological language. He challenges the attention of the revisers of our version to the signal wrong done by the Latin-born terms which are made to represent righteousness and its cognate ideas. In fact, he would have us believe that

whatever of declaratory or forensic there may be in the theological use of these words is due to the fatality of our adopting two sets of terms for the one set of terms in the Greek. He thinks that these words never have a forensic or judicial significance, but that they are invariably moral in their meaning. Now it is perfectly legitimate that Dr. Bushnell, or any man like-minded, should strive to frame theories to reconcile the righteousness of God with His acceptance of the guilty for Christ's sake. It is very possible that some improvement may yet be effected in the way of stating this truth, and that the last word has not been said as to its scientific statement. But to assert that there is no judicial and merely declaratory meaning in these terms, whether in the Old Testament or the New, is to speak as a "foolish and unlearned" person. It would not be very difficult to prove that this family of terms in all their branches have never any other than a judicial meaning; that even when they are seemingly most "moral" in their application,—that is, most intimately connected with internal moral character—there is an undertone of judicial and even forensic meaning in them. They belong to that aspect of the Gospel which is purely and throughout related to the law of right. The acceptance of sinful man is and must ever be, in time and in eternity, matter of imputation to faith resting on the ground of the meritorious righteousness of Christ. In whatever sense and to whatever degree the believer may fulfil the righteousness of the law, his righteousness must be for ever accepted for the sake of Another's: as his own it would be for ever invalidated by the fact of past transgression. There is the profound presupposition of an imputation of faith for righteousness always and for ever. The works of righteousness are the works of justifying faith, which derive their value from their connection with the righteousness of Christ. At the very best the righteousness of a sinner saved by Christ is only his being pronounced righteous. If his intrinsic, internal, and real character is referred to, there are other words which express that. It is so with the righteousness of Christ. Whenever our Lord is spoken of as righteous or righteousness the word has reference to His vicarious satisfaction of the demands of the law. Other terms are applied to Him in other relations—indeed the whole vocabulary of excellence is at His command and made poor by His virtue—but when He is called righteous

He is in a mediatorial court where Law is enforcing its claims on Him as the representative of others. So, finally, whenever the word is referred to God there is the same reference to the judicial meaning of the word. Other names of perfection are His elsewhere, but when His righteousness is mentioned He is the Lawgiver whose most glorious revelation is seen in the provision of a new method of making men righteous: by pronouncing them righteous for Christ's sake. He gives them new life, and sanctifies them wholly to Himself; but the perfected life of their holiness is accepted only by grace when it is presented at the bar of judgment. It must for ever belong to one whose past sin would neutralise all were it not forgiven. Thus, while in one sense faultless in sanctity, in another sense he is only in the eye of law reckoned righteous by imputation.

All this Dr. Bushnell seems to fight against most strenuously. But he sums up by a sentence which proves that he holds the true doctrine without knowing it. We have seen that in his secret heart he holds the true doctrine of propitiatory expiation or expiatory propitiation; but that he is pledged to maintain some views that shall correct the old-fashioned orthodoxy of which the times are weary. It will be seen by the following words that he also accepts the doctrine of the justification by faith which is the non-imputation of sin. But he is desperately bent upon introducing something that shall clear up the views and settle the doubts of these latter days: in fact, upon establishing a rational doctrine of justification. The result is a confused mass of statements which it requires much study to arrange into anything like coherency; which, when arranged, proves to be a register of Antinomian errors and a rhapsodical assertion of what is generally termed the Arminian doctrine:—

"The experimental, never-to-be antiquated Scripture truth of imputed righteousness, on the other hand is this:—That the soul, when it is joined to faith, is brought back, according to the degree of faith, into its original normal relation to God; to be invested in God's right, feeling, character — in one word, righteousness—and live derivatively from Him. It is not made righteous, in the sense of being set in a state of self-centred righteousness, to be maintained by an ability complete in the person, but it is made righteous in the sense of being always to be made righteous; just as the day is made luminous, not by the

light of sunrise staying in it, or held fast by it, but by the ceaseless outflow of the solar effulgence. Considered in this view, the sinning man justified is never thought of as being, or to be, just in himself; but he is to be counted so—be so by imputation—because his faith holds him to a relation with God, where the Sun of his righteousness will be for ever gilding him with its fresh radiations. Thus Abraham believed God enough to become the friend of God,—saying nothing of justice satisfied, nothing of surplus merit, nothing of Christ whatever—and it was imputed to him for righteousness. No soul comes into such a relation of trust, without having God's investment upon it; and whatever there may be in God's righteousness,—love, truth, sacrifice—will be rightfully imputed or counted to be in it, because, being united to Him, it will have them coming over derivatively from Him. Precisely here, therefore, in this most sublimely practical of all truths,—imputed righteousness,—Christianity culminates. Here we have coming upon us, or upon our faith, all that we most want, whether for our confidence, or the complete deliverance and upraising of our guilty and dreadfully enthralled nature. Here we triumph. There is therefore now no condemnation, the law of the spirit of life in Christ Jesus hath made us free. If we had a righteousness of the law to work out, we should feel a dreadful captivity upon us. If we were put into the key of righteous living, and then, being so started, were left to keep the key ourselves, by manipulating our own thoughts, affections, actions, in a way of self-superintendence, the practice would be so artificial, so inherently weak, as to pitch us into utter despair in a single day. Nothing meets our want, but to have our life and righteousness in God, thus to be kept in liberty and victory. Always by our trust in Him. Calling this imputed righteousness, it is no conceit of theology, no fiction, but the grandest and most life-giving of all the Christian truths."—P. 215.

We are puzzled to understand how one who could write this paragraph should so entirely loathe all such uses of the term righteousness, or justify, as should be limited to a judicial, forensic, external, or declaratory relation. We see gleaming feebly through the mist the very doctrine we hold, and which St. Paul teaches. There it is striving to utter its meaning, but afraid of the conventional terms of orthodoxy. We feel sure that Dr. Bushnell has mistaken an Antinomian doctrine of imputed righteousness, exaggerating the distinction between the active and the passive righteousness of Christ, for the orthodox faith of the Church. He seems to be altogether ignorant that there

is a clear, consistent doctrine of the Righteousness of Faith, which is not vitiated by the "jail-delivery" and the "eternal justification" theories. He really has nothing to say but what we have in many Christian Churches been saying much better for ages. "Normal relation to God," "invested in righteousness," "always to be made righteous," "faith holds him to a relation with God," "kept in liberty by our trust in Him," all these are phrases which belong to Dr. Bushnell's disguised orthodoxy. We can see through their Carlylian mask, and read their meaning. They are obscure, and impracticable, and worthless in the every-day language of theology; but they have a sound sense in them somewhere. Such as they are, however, they are in flagrant contradiction to every principle laid down by the author in his *Disquisitions on New Testament Righteousness*.

If in the light of this last paragraph we place some other sentences, how strangely do they read. Dr. Bushnell cannot avoid speaking of our relations to God, of our freedom from condemnation, of our righteousness from without. But he quarrels with the words that express it in Scripture. "I really wish it were possible to be rid of these Latin-born terms; for that syllable *jus* puts us thinking inevitably of something done for law and justice." Not more, however, than the word *right*, which is nothing without the justice of Him who administers it, and the law according to which He administers it. It cannot be denied that the word which we translate "justify" means, literally, "to make one a just person." But in what sense and in what way just must be determined by the context; and that the word has a forensic and declaratory signification in most of the instances of its occurrence, whether in the Old or in the New Testament, needs no proof for those who use their Lexicon and Concordance. And we may safely defy Dr. Bushnell, or anyone else, to express that idea in any better way than our translators have adopted. His own efforts in that way are grotesque in the extreme. It is too late to revise the phraseology of the whole theological world. Moreover, the doctrine of justification, as taught by the bulk of Protestant formularies, is beyond the impeachment of this author. It does not teach that man is absolved from his sin without any provision for the establishment of a righteous character. Man is regarded as righteous for Christ's sake, but he is also

made righteous. The one is never without the other in the theology of the Church, even as both are united in the contemplation of God, in the design of Christ, in the exhortations of Scripture, and in the experience of the Christian life. Almost every word alleged against the doctrine proceeds on the insufferable assumption that the method of God in making men righteous includes imputation only without the actual impartation of holiness.

There is one element of satisfaction in the sentiment with which we encounter Dr. Bushnell, and that is the good faith we perceive in him towards the authority of Scripture. He is very familiar with the Word of God, though he makes strange mistakes in expounding it. He is at home in its more hidden recesses, and some of his most beautiful argumentative points are recondite Scriptural allusions. But, above all, he makes the Scripture his final appeal. We are speaking of the present volume, which may be an improvement on the former in this respect, and leaves little to be desired. This fact, however, must be turned against our theologian. For the weakness of some of his interpretations of Scripture is quite on a par with the simplicity of his submission to it. Were this merely matter of occasional slip, or shown only in a paradoxical comment, here or there, we should not make any reference to it. But it is exemplified in the discussion of those salient passages which are the very foundation of the amended theology of this volume. When a writer stakes everything on his interpretation of Scripture, and writes dogmatically and positively because he is so strong in the warranty of God's Word, we respect his principle, and give diligent attention to what he has to say in support of his positions. When, as in the present case, he introduces views almost entirely new, and supports them by exposition peculiar, avowedly peculiar, to himself, we examine what he writes with a certain amount of prejudice, which it is hard to overcome, which, however, as honest critics, we are bound to strive against.

Our only illustration will be taken from the fourth chapter, which justifies the remarks just made, and exhibits a superficial theology, based on a wrong interpretation. Our author evidently designed that his readers and reviewers should take special notice of this chapter. His whole strength is in it; and he has directed attention to it in a most extraordinary manner. As follows:—

"My Chapter IV. occupies a ground by itself. How it came it will not be difficult to see, only it may be difficult to find why it did not come sooner, and to some, at least, of the great interpreters. It has to me the nature rather of an occurrence than a discovery; for how can that be called a discovery which the Master's words have been plainly teaching for eighteen hundred years, and which we, His disciples, have by some unaccountable dulness missed, even down to a particular day of accident within the last six months? an oversight all the more humiliating that the doctrine we have missed has been the doctrine of our Lord by Christ Himself; an operative doctrine indeed, and not a formulating, giving the outfit of the Spirit and the implemental forces by which He is to work. And, again, let it be the more valuable to us that it comes in after the formulating history is done, to be a Gospel by Christ's own authority, not inwoven with any of the old textures of the schools, but set in by an intercalation, to have its own footing, and its regulative sway in the respectful deference of the ages to come."—P. 12.

In showing how the Spirit was equipped with this threefold outfit of doctrine, our author elaborately examines the names given to the Spirit and His work, discovers that the one office of the Holy Ghost is to present Christ and His Gospel to the world as a testimony of sin and righteousness and judgment, examines and analyses these terms respectively, shows how they are to be interpreted so as "the first lessons of atonement from the lips of Christ Himself." Now there is some basis of truth in all this, and what truth there is is presented with some skill and force; but as an exhibition of the Gospel as finally given by Christ, as our Lord's "complete and explicit summation of the results He will have accomplished by His life and death," it is one-sided, mingled with much error, and therefore as a whole to be rejected.

First, both the name and the office of the Spirit are glaringly misconceived and misstated. According to our Lord's testimony, He is supremely "the Spirit of the truth;" the interpreter and administrator of "the truth as it is in Jesus," of the person and work of the Christ. As such He is the reprover of the world, the Paraclete within the Church: to the world an unsought spontaneous pleader of the cause and claims of the Redeemer; to the Church an advocate called in, invoked and received by the prayer of penitent faith. To the disciples He was to reveal and apply the things of Christ, which to the world He was only

to proclaim and offer. Certainly, the whole mystery of the atoning work was to be set before the world in the threefold conviction; but only in a negative manner, as convincing sinners of their state and need. The full revelation of the mystery was to be given only to those who believe; to them alone should the Spirit show the things of Christ. Altogether forgetting this distinction, Dr. Bushnell gives the name Paraclete to the Spirit only in His relation to the world, and as a preacher of the Gospel to mankind. The passage in which he perpetrates this exegetical violence is one that we must not withhold; it is an instructive example of the bad effect of superficial exposition.

"There really appears to be no word of Scripture which has fared so badly at the hands of preachers and commentators as this word *Comforter*, of which I now speak. I say this considering the difficulty of finding any word in English that will fitly represent the Greek word, Paraclete. It is once translated, Advocate (1 John ii. 1). The commentators suggest other words, such as *helper*, *counsel*, *teacher*, *intercessor*. The very poorest representation ever proposed or adopted is our English name, Comforter. And it is all the worse that it is evidently intended to be taken as being naturally descriptive; for another word is even palpably mistranslated to conform to it: 'I will not leave you comfortless' (John xiv. 18), where the word 'comfortless' represents the word *orphans* in the original, the Saviour's design being in that word to say that He will not leave His disciples deserted, robbed of company and counsel; a very different matter from uncomforted. As if their being uncomfortable, or not sufficiently comforted, were a principal or prominent concern of the Master; a friend whose dignity it was to hold the rational and manly view of all experience, and have it as a matter conceded, that the best thing for them will sometimes be a fall out of condition, and be as grandly superior to all self-sympathy in the loss of earthly comforts as He has been Himself. No, there is no such feeble, over-soft sympathy in the Saviour's mind in His parting hour, that He should be contriving how especially to put His disciples in comfort and leave them so. Besides, His concern here is not for His disciples, but specially for such as He calls 'the world;' for it is the world that He is going to convince and bring to righteousness. And if the Spirit to be given is to be a gift having special reference to this, which appears in the manner of the language, the name Comforter is a name wholly inappropriate. To be comforted is just the thing the world as such does not want. And the Saviour has a much heavier and nobler

concern; viz. the organising of a grace for the world, such as He is just now bringing to completion. He is planning to unlocalise, universalise, and make victorious, the great salvation He has undertaken for mankind. And His idea stands on the face of the word He adopts for the designation of the promised ministry, whether we can find an English name for it or not. It is Paraclete—*para, near; kletos, call.* The *near-caller*, the *bringer-in*, for salvation; a word in no soft, soothing key, but a bugle-note of summons rather, such as the work of the Spirit, in the ingathering and organising of the everlasting Kingdom, fitly requires."—P. 221.

This paragraph is full of error. Without absolutely defending the translation Comforter, we may plead that as originally used by our translators the word had not the soft soothing sense above attributed to it; it meant, and still means, that invigoration and strengthening with might in the inner man which is the only comfort of the human soul. But we may confidently prefer the meaning derived from the passive participle; one called in as an advocate or helper, with a judicial application. St. John, who alone uses the word, never uses the common Greek verb from which the participle comes, a verb which the other writers often employ to signify encouragement and consolation. But by no artifice can the passive participle *kletos* be made to mean *caller, call, bringer-in.* The older Greek expositors, who sometimes gave it an active signification, only meant to imply that He who was called in was an active consoler and comforter. No one, until a new light dawned on Dr. Bushnell, ever dreamt of the interpretation he gives us. The Paraclete is an active advocate and helper of the Church, because as passively called in He actively discharges His function. So our Lord in the heavens is our advocate with the Father; not calling us, but called upon as such; and taking care of our interests in heaven, even as His representative takes care of our interests below. In the Church, and through the Church, and as the representative of Christ, He pleads as advocate the cause of the Redeemer and His redemption; but who Christ is, and what His redemption, He reveals more fully to believers as their Paraclete.

Before closing these miscellaneous remarks we must discharge our critical duty by protesting against the irreverence—or what we should call irreverence—which tinges the phraseology of this eloquent writer. This would not

be mentioned here, in the same pages which have treated so solemn a subject, were it not that flippancy of style is on the increase in England as in America, and we should be glad to contribute ever so little towards arresting it, at least within the circle of our own readers. It would be easy to collect a goodly list of offences against taste and theological decorum; but we forbear. Suffice that the reader of Dr. Bushnell, whom any remarks of ours might influence, is warned against the influence which his phraseological pleasantries might exert. For ourselves, we cannot understand how anyone who meditates upon the mystery of our Saviour's work—a mystery confessedly great, on any theory—can write about it in any other style than that of the utmost solemnity.

LITERARY NOTICES.

I. THEOLOGICAL.

CHRISTLIEB ON MODERN DOUBT.

Modern Doubt and Christian Belief. A Series of Apologetic Lectures addressed to Earnest Seekers after Truth. By Theodore Christlieb, D.D., University Preacher and Professor of Theology at Bonn. Translated, with the Author's Sanction, chiefly by the Rev. H. U. Weitbrecht, Ph.D., and Edited by the Rev. T. L. Kingsbury, M.A., Vicar of Easton Royal, and Rural Dean. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark. 1874.

No words that we might employ could adequately represent the magnitude of the crisis through which the cultivated European mind is passing in reference to the fundamental verities of the Christian faith. Unbelief, which, in the so-called Dark Ages, was not to be found upon this continent, and, when it threatened invasion from another, was repulsed by the united energies of new-born nations, then first made conscious of their strength, has now gained conquests in the very heart of Christendom, and is leading captive cultured men who, of all others, should be the most potent defenders of the faith. Very different indeed, in both principles and tactics, are the forces now arrayed against the truth, from those on which the olden chivalry employed their prowess, and very different are the methods by which they must be met. The Saracen could only in a very metaphorical sense be counted as one of our "ghostly enemies:" he was a creature of flesh and blood, wielded a weapon, and carried a standard of recognised shape and form, offered the intelligible alternative of submission or the sword, and, when once beaten, fell to rise no more. Where he conquered, he did not simply destroy: the infidel himself proclaimed one primary truth, and by the very vociferousness of its utterance, seemed to drown every whisper of doubt. So successfully, indeed, did he impose his yoke, that the nations which accepted it are still the slowest to exchange it for a better. But the scepticism of the present day is a subtler thing; a universal solvent that corrodes the bonds which bind

humanity together no less than those which link it to the throne of God—a weird and lawless opium fiend, that momentarily mitigates the pains inflicted by the original curse, only, by a necessary reaction, to multiply them a thousandfold, and to superadd the stings of a self-originated despair. Its forms are protean as the offspring of human fancy. The men who begin by interpreting the Divine within them to be but the workings of human consciousness are ultimately, by a just retribution, abandoned to the chase of the chimeras of their own imagination, "and find no end in wandering mazes lost;" just as Israel of old, refusing the worship of the true and living God in the land which He had given them, were driven out to serve other gods in a land that was not theirs. The beginnings of this evil are generally slow and unsuspected. Too often they coincide in living experience with that critical period, the most momentous in its issues for each individual, when emancipation from the restraints of boyhood is conjoined with the awakening of the passions and the presentation of those opportunities and temptations which, according as they are used or abused, either make or mar the man. In such cases arguments for infidelity are frequently too much for the voice of conscience: the intellect, whose constitution bears the best witness for the existence of a God, forswears the principles that underlie it, and the heart, divided against itself, breaks away from the bondage of early convictions, and surrenders its defences to the factious clamour of its own unbridled lusts. Who can estimate the responsibility of older men if, so far from surrounding such with safeguards, and pointing out the perils to which they are exposed, they applaud the boldness of their speculations, and even lead the van of their assault upon the truth? For—and we sorrowfully concede the fact—there are men who have passed their meridian, men for whom the illusions of youth can no longer be pleaded, who have known something of the conflicts and disappointments as well as of the successes of life, who, during an occasional lull in the storm, must sometimes have heard within them a still small voice prophetic of the end that is approaching, upon whom, nevertheless, no chill of the opening tomb has fallen, and no questionings of the great hereafter have been enforced, men who are as busy when their strength fails them in disproving the existence of a rest that remaineth, as they were in the heyday of their blood in denying any supernatural authority to the conscience that kept them in check. Such men are to be found in all the walks of literature, science, and art. They are to be recognised by the eagerness with which they seize any argument against revealed religion, their obvious unfairness in criticising its claims, their insensibility to the grandeur of its mission and destiny, as exhibited, despite all drawbacks, in the magnitude of its moral

achievements, their supercilious treatment of its adherents, as if proved *ipso facto* incapable of refined taste and impartial judgment, their evident desire to interpret the signs of human progress in a sense favourable only to the pretensions of science or industry, or of their own particular panacea for the world's ills, and their self-willed rejection of all that transcends the bounds of finite reason and of sensuous facts.

While this state of things meets us in the higher circles of society, we have but to descend to the lower to find grosser manifestations of the evil. Multitudes of working men are not so much opposed to the truth as sundered from it by a wide gulf of ignorance and indifference. The social estrangement of these classes from those above them, arising from supposed antagonistic interests, has engendered suspicions of the religion professed by the latter, which the cheap newspaper, the poor man's oracle, has hastened to confirm. The alliance between the parson and the squire has been thought to be founded on a secret confederacy against the rights of the sons of toil, and all the zeal of philanthropy has failed to dispel the delusion. The disputes of the *savants* have also been brought to the ears of the unlearned, who, without being able to decide on the merits of the question, have shrewdly guessed that with so much smoke there must be some fire. A sullen attitude of defiance, repelling all overtures, thus characterises those whom we are accustomed to speak of as constituting the base of the social fabric; and the fact is one of grave significance for the future.

But besides all these forms of unbelief—the creations of passion, or prejudice, or social disquiet, there are others of a totally different order. Many candid and thoughtful men, whose motives are absolutely unquestionable, have had their faith shaken or retarded in its growth by the influences that surround them. Not all the objections urged against the Christian faith are captious: not all of them, in their mode of presentation at least, are to be identified with the dingy scarecrows which Leslie and Lardner, Paley and Whately so successfully overthrew. The new criticism of the physical and mental sciences has been applied unsparingly to the sacred records themselves, as well as to the human deductions thought to be most surely grounded on them. New axioms of philosophy and rules of interpretation have been employed, and it is no wonder if, through the unskilful or the over-subtle use of them, some things have seemed to be displaced that were regarded as immoveable, much less that, in the sober and legitimate use of them, some things have been overthrown that were too easily assumed to be true. Hence arise important questions, and such as all sincere seekers of truth are pondering with the deepest solicitude. Does the faith handed down from our forefathers repose upon a sufficiently solid basis to withstand

the assaults made upon it by the destructive criticism of the age? Are the facts of Scripture, hitherto unhesitatingly accepted by the reverent Christian, not only in spite of, but even by reason of their marvellous character, doomed henceforth to sink to the level of unhistoric stories like that of the Anthropophagi, or prehistoric myths like the wars of the giants? Is the supernatural to be excluded from all influence upon human affairs, the kingdom of providence to be exchanged for the blind dominion of natural law, and the kingdom of grace for a mere instinct of fellow feeling and conviction of the necessity of order in the government of men? Or, if all is not thus lawlessly sacrificed, is there any principle by which to regulate the concessions to be made, and to preserve the nucleus of truth from further disintegration? and is there any criterion by which that nucleus is to be distinguished from sordid accretions? What authority is to replace the consent of Christian antiquity as to the canonical books? What meaning is to be attached to the term canonical? How much deference is to be paid to the plain letter of Scripture, and what oracle of interpretation is there to be found more infallible than the harmony of Scripture with itself?

In reference to these and many kindred inquiries, a better guide can scarcely be found than Dr. Theodore Christlieb. The work he has here presented to the English public through the medium of an excellent translation is, as the title-page shows, "addressed to earnest seekers after truth." With any other class of inquirers reasoning is out of place. In a subject so vast there must, of necessity, be difficulties serious enough and numerous enough to occupy the whole field of view, if only they be diligently collected and crowded together before the eye so as to shut out all that lies beyond. But in the process the relative size of the objects is of necessity distorted, and the smallest pea, placed near enough, will suffice to eclipse the orbs of light. The balancing of moral probabilities taxes, not the skill of the logical understanding, but the strength of the upright heart; and where the latter is so vitiated as to recoil from unwelcome conclusions, the premises which lead to them will not be allowed due weight. To the candid inquirer, however, the work before us will be a treasury of positive truth as well as an armoury of defence against error. It consists of eight lectures, the substance of which was, in the first instance, orally addressed to the educated Germans of London about ten years ago, when the lecturer held the pastorate of the German congregation in Islington. The various forms of modern doubt are here traced to their sources in "some of the vaunted principles and assumed results of metaphysical philosophy, historical criticism, and natural science. With the first," says the author "(Lect. I.—V.), and, in part, with the second of these sources (e.g. the modern critical theories of the Gospel

history and the origin of early Christianity, (Lect. VI.—VIII.), I have dealt in such a way that the whole argument is made to turn on one main central point, the Scriptural and Christian conceptions of the Divine nature. It has been my chief endeavour, by treating, first, of the fundamental relations between Reason and Revelation (in Lect. II.), and discussing the non-Scriptural conceptions of modern Speculative Theology (Lect. III.), to lead on the inquirer's mind to this one great central idea (as carefully developed in Lect. IV.), and then to avail myself of the positions so obtained in dealing with the question of miraculous agency (Lect. V.), and other points made matters of dispute by our modern negative historical criticism." Comprehensive as is the range of subjects treated of in this closely-printed volume of 549 pages, it does not exhaust the author's plan. A second series of Apologetic Lectures is in course of preparation, intended to deal "with the general question of the Inspiration of Scripture, and special points therewith connected (e.g. the genesis and credibility of particular books), as well as with the objections raised by the votaries of natural science to Scripture teaching on such points as the Creation, the Deluge, the Descent of Man, &c." From this sketch of the topics actually discussed and to be discussed by the Bonn professor of theology, it will be seen that the enemies of the faith meet here with an antagonist who has, at least, "the courage of his opinions." No vital truth is surrendered by Dr. Christlieb to his assailants, no doubtful principle of interpretation is admitted. He holds "the Catholic faith whole and undefiled," and comes forward in its defence, armed with weapons supposed to belong, of right, to unbelievers alone. Philosophy is confronted with philosophy, learning is met by learning, and science called forth to confute the too hastily formed conclusions of science. We wish it were possible, within the limits assigned us, to give some idea of the variety and fulness of the contents of this book, and of its value to all prepared by some previous acquaintance with the deeper problems here unfolded to appreciate the thoroughness of the discussion. As it is, we must content ourselves with gleaning a few ears from the rich harvest-field, and recommending our readers to compare the sample with the stock.

Having, in the first Lecture, examined the causes and extent of the breach between modern culture and Christianity, and established, both historically and from the nature of both, the unity of Christianity and true culture, the author proceeds, in the second Lecture, to define the provinces of Natural and Revealed Theology, and the relations that subsist between them. In the third Lecture he presents us with the various non-Biblical conceptions of God, arranging them under the heads of Atheism, Materialism, Pantheism, Deism, and Rationalism. Tho weak-

nesses of Pantheism are exhibited from four points of view, viz., from logic, from a consideration of the world, from the history of religions, and from moral and religious consciousness and life. "Let us first ask," says Dr. Christlieb, "philosophy and logic. Just as Atheism proceeds on the monstrous assumption that we are acquainted with all the forces in the world; just as Materialism presupposes that the matter of which the world is constituted is eternal, and has always existed; so, also, Pantheism depends on *assumptions which are unproved, and incapable of proof.* Let us take up Spinoza's *Ethics*, the classical text-book of modern Pantheists, which, to some extent, forms the groundwork of all their systems. Its fundamental assumption is the existence of an universal substance. This substance, with its attributes—i.e., in fact, this idea of God—is presupposed as a thing, of course, and from this the further conclusions are deduced with mathematical precision. The thing itself is, however, simply presupposed or assumed to exist, and its acceptance, therefore, requires as much faith as the utterances of the Scriptures about God. Spinoza does not attempt to investigate whether this idea of God be correct and true. Had he done so, he might have discovered that this universal substance, besides which nothing at all exists, which includes all actual objects as its individual qualifications, is, in truth, nothing but the highest logical *conception of universality*, in which all individual notions are blended into an undivided unity, and hence that it is a mere subjective idea, but not a real objective existence. But our philosopher immediately assumes, in the most uncritical manner, *that this merely subjective idea is an objective reality*, and that the merely imagined unity of notions in our consciousness is the actually existing unity of all things. Here, then, we see the same confusion of thought with existence which we meet with almost at every turn in modern philosophy. . . . We do not fare much better under the guidance of Hegel. He teaches us to regard God as the *absolute Idea* which, from endless ages, realises, inspires, and orders the whole phenomenal world; in other words, as the system of those conceptions in which all thought is necessarily based (e.g. being and becoming, force and effect, &c.), and which are supposed to possess reality, since without them all our thought would be null and void. But whence proceeds this absolute Idea? It is not conceived by a personal God, for none such exists. Neither can it conceive itself; for if it did, it would become self-conscious, and thus God would again become personal. How does Hegel get out of the difficulty? He says that the absolute Idea *posits itself* by means of the eternal position and organisation of the world. If we inquire, Whence proceeds the world? we are met by the reply, It exists, and is continually posited by the absolute Idea. And if we ask, Whence comes the

absolute Idea, from what is it derived, and in what does its actuality consist? we are told, It is posited in and with the world, and has none but a mundane actuality. Do you see how we are being mocked with a shadow? The world is supposed to be posited by the absolute Idea, and yet the absolute Idea itself has an actual existence only in the world. How, then, can this absolute Idea posit itself? and how can it be looked upon as the principle which posits the world, if itself attains actuality only in the world? . . . Besides this, the Pantheistic idea of God labours under two other great difficulties. In the first place, it cannot be understood how *personality* can proceed from an *impersonal* principle. We ourselves are persons, that is, we can conceive and determine ourselves; for in this personality consists. And although Spinoza denies the self-determination and freewill of man, still he does not deny his self-consciousness. Whence, then, is this self-consciousness supposed to proceed, if the soul of the world, from which we ourselves have emanated, has no consciousness? Can God communicate that which He does not Himself possess, and create forms of existence which transcend His own? Can the effect contain anything which does not exist in the cause? To this one simple question no Pantheist has as yet been able to give a satisfactory answer. Moreover, the idea of an *endless and aimless process of development* is illogical and self-contradictory. An endless development, an infinite process, which is for ever approaching its aim, but eternally remains infinitely far from it, is a contradiction with which our intellect cannot be satisfied. The chief argument which Pantheists bring forward against the existence of a personal God is, that *personality cannot be conceived without finite limitations.* Personality, they say, consists in the contraposition of self to another object, a non-ego, which forms an insuperable limit to the ego; and hence the conception of absolute, limitless personality involves a direct contradiction. In short, the infinite greatness of God is supposed to be incompatible with His personality. To this we first reply by a question: Is it in our own case the limitation of self by the cosmical non-ego which is the *cause* of our consciousness reflecting upon itself, and thus becoming *self*-conscious or personal, so that without the non-ego our personality would cease to exist? No, this limitation is merely the *occasion;* the original cause of the self-reflection consists in the peculiar constitution of the human subject as a spirit, which points to a primal Spirit-subject as its Creator? . . . If, then, even in the finite subject self-consciousness is the result of *its own* action, based upon an *esse per se* which is not dependent on the world, how much less can the absolute Subject, God, by reason of His personality, be considered to be entirely dependent upon, and limited by, externals? Doubtless, in the case of the *finite* spirit as such, the development of personal

consciousness can only take place under external influences proceeding from the non-ego; not, however, because it needed the contraposition to an alien object in order to be self-existent, but simply because it does not in this nor in any other respect possess in itself the conditions of its existence. But we do not meet with *this* limitation in the nature of the *Infinite*. . . . And why should the idea of an eternal absolute Personality be self-contradictory? For the very reason that we are finite, our personality is imperfect. To none but the Infinite can we ascribe perfect personality. But more than this, we are *compelled* to do so. Or, is not a personality superior to an impersonal object? Is it not a matter of fact that the greater and higher a being is, the more perfect is his personality? Do we not see the creation struggling toward personality, and mounting step by step through the preliminary stages of the vegetable and animal world, until in man it naturally attains to individual personality, and becomes a self-conscious mind? And if personality constitutes the pre-eminence of man over the inferior creation, can this pre-eminence be wanting in the highest Being of all? Can God, the most perfect Being imaginable, be devoid of personality, the most perfect form of Being? Is God, indeed, the absolute and entirely perfect One, if He be wanting in any one excellence?"

These words are worthy of being pondered by those who, fascinated by the seeming breadth and profundity of the Hegelian method, have sacrificed the thousand manifestations of real being to the purely negative necessities of formal thought.

In the fourth lecture Dr. Christlieb places over against the denials of scepticism the assertions of Biblical Theism. On the Trinitarian conception of the Divine nature he has some passages which set this great doctrine in a new and glorious light. In all that he says upon the subject we cannot perfectly concur. Holding with him that a distinction must be made between the absolute or immanent, and the economical or redemptional Trinity, we are nevertheless among the number of those who shrink from any speculations concerning the mysteries which the former must involve. Yet we cannot but admire the manner in which, while allowing that no definitions can bridge over the chasm which here yawns between Faith and Reason, he illustrates the advantages afforded by the Trinitarian conception in respect of our theological and cosmological knowledge, and derives arguments in favour of the doctrine from considerations of the nature of God and of man, and the testimonies of modern philosophy. He proves plainly that the doctrine of the Trinity is the consummation and the only perfect protection of Theism; that because God is love, there must be distinctions in Him, which by love are again brought into unity again; and that the conceptions of philosophy, when they are most profound, come nearest to the

Christian doctrine. Some of the analogies adduced appear to be scarcely worthy of such application, such as the triplicity in unity of the fundamental form of Syntax—subject, predicate and union of both—the three fundamental colours, red, yellow, and blue, dissolving into the unity of white light, and yet preserving their own separate functions, viz., the caloric, luminous, and chemical properties respectively.

A bold stand is made on behalf of miracles, although here also we think too much is made of certain experiences that might as well have been classed with the natural and ordinary as with the miraculous, in so far at least as the ordinary supernatural operations of the kingdoms of providence and grace are to be distinguished from the properly miraculous. Yet they serve as a link of connection, whose importance is too often overlooked. We refer, of course, to answers to prayer, special interpositions, and the like.

A very exhaustive account is rendered of the Strauss and Renan views of the Life of Christ, as well as of the modern critical theory of Primitive Christianity in general. But upon these we have no space to dwell. We will conclude this notice of one of the most important bulwarks of the Christian faith lately reared by the skill of her defenders in the words of the author's preface:—"We all know too well how much injury German Rationalism and Infidelity have done to the cause of Christ in other lands. It seems, therefore, to be a special obligation resting on faithful orthodox theologians in Germany, to endeavour to extend their influence beyond the limits of their Fatherland, and to show to Christian students in other countries what weapons and tactics they have found useful in repelling the assaults of unbelief among themselves." We are glad to believe that the evangelical school in Germany are winning their way to a position and range of influence upon the modern thought of Europe which such works as the one before us must tend to strengthen and extend.

The Image of Christ as presented in Scripture: An Inquiry concerning the Person and Work of the Redeemer. By J. J. Van Oosterzee, D.D., Professor of Theology in the University of Utrecht. Translated from the Dutch by Maurice J. Evans, B.A. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 27, Paternoster Row. 1874.

In his former two volumes on the Christology of the Old and New Testaments, Dr. Oosterzee has analytically examined the various inspired utterances which shed any light on the person and work of Christ: in this he synthesises the results of that process, and presents in its totality the image of Christ as reflected in Holy Scripture. And the manner in which he has accom-

plished his task is such as to render quite needless such a concession to "scientists" as we find in the preface. "Willingly will we allow ourselves to be deprived of the glittering crown of exact science, if we can at this price win for the gospel a mightier influence upon the practical life of our nation." Dr. Oosterzee cannot mean by this that theology in itself is not a science, and even an "exact science." It is as much so as any of those creations of modern thought which compete with the mathematical sciences for that honourable designation. There is, undoubtedly, a difference in the material of any moral science as compared with the physical, and one that necessitates some difference in the method. The phenomena of the moral world are not so easily discriminated as those of the material, and the estimation of their relative value makes demands on the moral nature of the observer unknown in that domain. But after making due allowance on this score we must hold that induction and deduction are as applicable to these as to any other. We see the two combined in political economy, as well as in that which is called mental science pre-eminently, and we see them in theology too. Dr. Oosterzee's own works form a good illustration. In his Christology we have the inductive method, and in the present volume the deductive, and he may justly claim to have exercised this twofold method as accurately and skilfully as any of those scientists who arrogate to themselves the dignity of the name. It is no invalidation of this claim to say that the theological inquirer needs qualifications which elsewhere may be dispensed with; the reverence, the spiritual insight and sympathy, the consciousness of God in short, without which the lights of this science become as darkness, are absolutely essential to a proper appreciation of spiritual verities. They are such as all may acquire, however; and their attainableness appears in an equally vivid light with their importance in the requirement made by the great Teacher of all his hearers to become as little children that they may enter into the kingdom of God.

To those possessed of such qualifications, Dr. Oosterzee's work will be a precious boon, especially if their confidence has been in any degree shaken by the rationalising views of the present day. So complete a portraiture of Christ, breathing throughout such subdued and yet fervid sympathy, gathering up the minutest traits of the perfect One, and combining them into so harmonious a whole, we do not remember to have seen. There is a vein of controversy and argument running through the book, but its temper is manly and confident, as of one who, far from fearing, rather invites impartial scrutiny both of his limnings and of the original they strive to represent; and all is strictly subordinate to the purposes of edification which the simplicity and purity of the style tend also so eminently to subserve. The comprehensive-

ness of its range will be seen from the three parts into which the work is divided, viz.:—The Son of God before His Incarnation, Christ in the Flesh, and the God-man in Glory. Under the first the Son of God is regarded in His relation to the Divine nature, the creation, the human race, and the people of Israel. The second and largest division embraces the voluntary incarnation, the earthly appearing, the deep humiliation, and the beginning of the exaltation. The third completes the cycle with the God-man in Heaven, the God-man in the Heart, the God-man in the World, and the God-man in the Future.

The following passage from the chapter on the Voluntary Incarnation well exemplifies the character of the volume, and will be welcome to our readers fresh from the celebration of the great event it refers to:—

"Even though we saw every day of the year the arrival of a Job's messenger, there is yet *one* day which to the most unhappy among us brings glad tidings. It is the day on which the words of the first preacher of the Gospel, on Bethlehem's Plains, are repeated. 'Unto you is born a Saviour.' What fairer festival than that of which Chrysostom testified even in his day, 'that, though yet young, it was, nevertheless, observed with enthusiasm as great as though it had been in use from time immemorial!' Now so many centuries old, it is ever afresh hailed with new joy, and, once more to use the language of the same Father, 'as a good and noble shoot when it is planted, in a short time rises on high and brings forth much fruit,' not otherwise has been the experience of Christendom with regard to this festival. The child hardly becomes weary of looking at the Child in the manger. The man exhausts not the thought, 'God's good pleasure in men.' The devout old man even feels his breast glow with higher emotion at the joyful message that God has had towards him also thoughts of peace. Yea, we cannot even conceive the possibility that in the course of centuries this festival too should grow obsolete or be abolished; it stands there resplendent with everlasting youth and unfading beauty, at the very threshold of the Christian festivals! . . . But then what a *wondrous* incarnation, which has already for eighteen centuries afforded to Christendom an inexhaustible subject for thanking and thinking! Every measure is wanting to us, to determine—even in some degree—the distance which separates the divine from the human. It is true the opposition between divine and human is not absolute but relative. Yea, truly, man was created after the image and likeness of God—spirit of His spirit, life of His life. God made him a little lower than the angels, crowned him with glory and honour, set him over all the works of His hands. The Logos assumes the nature, not of the irrational animal or the inanimate plant, but of the firstfruits of the creation of God. There

existed, as we have before seen, even from the morning of the creation, a direct relation between Him and humanity, which even by sin was not entirely broken. But yet, notwithstanding all the affinity between the divine and the human nature, there existed an original difference; and the distance, already so great in itself, became through sin a wide, and apparently insuperable, gulf. What is this poor earth for Him who, as Mediate Cause, called all things into existence? What is, on this earth, the equally transitory as sinful and lost man? And yet this distance was bridged over, in the moment when the Word was made flesh; and, O wonder of wonders! the divine and human nature in Christ blends together into one divine human personality. Do we mean by this confession merely that the Logos *reveals* Himself in an harmonious, spotless human life, as in less degree He is revealed in every particle of the creation? We should in that case arrive at no other conception than this: Christ the pure embodiment of humanity, and, *as such*, the visible image and the highest revelation of the Godhead; and we have already observed how far this conception falls short of the depth and fulness of the Gospel utterances. Not that the man who has humanly developed himself is, as such, the Son of God, but that the eternal Son of God appeared as faultless man, is the doctrine of Scripture and of the Church. Have we then to understand the matter in this wise, that He, who according to His divine nature filled heaven and earth, *confined* and, as it were, *imprisoned* Himself within the narrow limits of a human body, and even the body of a child? It is well known with what thoughtless and unworthy mockery this idea has been hailed, even in our own day, and how some of the mouthpieces of modern science have not been ashamed to compare the highest miracle of omnipotence and love as conceived of in this form, with the tales of Eastern magic. Precisely this we deem the ever unfathomable miracle, that the Logos, as such, is, and remains truly and everlastingly, God; that, even in the fulness of time, He did not cease to be one with the Father, and to uphold all things by the word of His power; that, as Son, He may be truly said to be in heaven while in the form of a servant He appears upon this mean earth. But He, who was truly and eternally God, *assumed the true human nature* of the flesh and blood of the Virgin Mary, through the operation of the Holy Ghost. He continues to be God and becomes man. He does not give up the supreme *possession*, but only the unlimited *exercise* of His divine nature and attributes. He, the exalted, divine *person*, very God, even as the Father, voluntarily unites Himself to the human *nature*, and from this peerless union arises nothing less than the highest object earth has ever witnessed, a Divine-human personality."

While expressing our admiration of the fidelity with which Dr.

Oosterzee places before our eyes the image which in every age has been the object of adoring contemplation to the most unlettered searcher of the Scriptures, we must also express our dissent from him in respect of some points on which, as it appears to us, his desire to realise the perfect humanity of our Lord has betrayed him, in common with many others, into an error of some magnitude. We refer more particularly to his views of the sinlessness of Jesus. Dr. Oosterzee says:—

"Become truly man, the Son of God can, if He will, sin, and suffer, and die. We have no thought, in thus speaking, of asserting that for the incarnate Son of God *either* sin, *or* suffering, *or* death, was in itself something inevitably necessary. . . . Born of the power of the Holy Ghost, He is free from the preponderating inclination to evil which animates us from our birth. Though manifold injury is done to Him by others, He merits it not, any more than He carries about in Himself the fountain of sufferings. His body, polluted by no sin, bears in itself no seeds of death; and His spirit is weakened by no violent tearing from its impure prison-house of matter. But though the necessity for all this does not in the least exist for Him, the *possibility* thereof is involved in His true incarnation itself. The Logos, *before* His incarnation, can no more transgress, or suffer, or die, than can the Father; the Logos, become very man, sees the possibility of the one and the other present itself to Him. Not a few Christians secretly doubt the *possibility* that Christ could sin. To such an extent justly, in so far as sinning must ever become for Him less *morally* possible in proportion as He more deeply felt His oneness with the Father, and in the midst of the most severe temptations more powerfully maintained it. But the *natural* possibility of sinning must surely be ascribed to the God-man, or we make of His temptation an empty display, of His victory a deceptive appearance, of His crowning an idolatrous homage. If His perfect obedience was simply an inevitable consequence—we had almost said a mechanical product—of His true Godhead, this is deprived of all merits, properly so-called, and the well-known words, '*Wherefore* God also hath (exceedingly) highly exalted Him,' cease to have an intelligible meaning."

If this last passage is all that can be quoted against the natural impeccability of Christ, we cannot see that it is at all disproved. Does not the Father Himself receive additional glory from the work of redemption? And yet that there might possibly be failure in the performance of it is not necessary at all to the intelligibility of His being glorified by the Son, neither is it to that of the Son's being glorified by Him. Dr. Oosterzee, as a Calvinist, should be the last to hold this opinion. But it is not with his Calvinism alone that this doctrine is inconsistent: it is at war with what he has plainly asserted but a few pages before of

the consciousness of Christ as not being twofold, but one. His illustration of this is the familiar one of two concentric circles, "a smaller and a greater, each perfect in itself, and existing the one outside the other." The incarnation, he says rightly, is "no mere *manifestation* in a life simply human; no *imprisonment* or *indwelling* in a human body, in the sense that during three-and-thirty years the Logos dwelt and exerted His power nowhere else than in the man Jesus; but *union* of the personal Logos, not with a human *individual* (in this way two personalities would arise), but with the human *nature*, which as such is designed for, and capable of, entering into communion with the Divine. No incarnation in which the Son ceases to be a sharer of the Divine nature, but one in which He henceforth shares it in communion with the human; no mutation of the Son of God *into* a man, but a manifestation of the Son of God *as* a man; no merely external connection of the two natures, but also no fusion, from which a new third nature arises." With all this we perfectly agree, but wonder that the inference should not, in Dr. Oosterzee's eyes, be inevitable that a Being so constituted *cannot* sin. Sin involves guilt as attaching to the personality of the transgressor: now as only one personality is to be ascribed to the Mediator, and that a Divine one, we cannot suppose a possibility of sin in the human nature without attributing a possibility of guilt to a Divine Person. If it be asked how impeccability is secured, we answer, Not by virtue of the conception by the Holy Ghost—that only guaranteed the production of the sinless nature as a fact: the impossibility of its ceasing to be such is guaranteed by the still deeper mystery of the hypostatic union. The sinlessness of the man Christ Jesus was thus placed on a level with the sinlessness of God, and in the one, as in the other, absolute necessity and absolute freedom are identical. The possibility of sin follows in neither from the possession of a moral nature. This involves, of course, the question of the possibility of temptation. But the pain of the temptation might be felt apart from the contingency of succumbing to it. We do not rob the words "tempted in all points like as we are" of any of their sympathetic potency by putting the strongest meaning conceivable into the accompanying "yet without sin:" nor is any of the preceptive potency of the injunction "as ye have therefore received Christ Jesus the Lord, so walk ye in Him," sacrificed by the hypothesis of an impassable interval between His righteousness and ours. The spiritual life of Jesus is nowhere spoken of in Scripture as inspired and sustained by the Holy Ghost, who nevertheless replenishes Him for the performance of His offices as our Redeemer: the Father has given unto the Son to have life in Himself. Were it otherwise, we cannot see how the interval between Christ and every spiritual man should be regarded as infinite,

and His character an ideal to which, while continually approximating, we may never hope to attain. The conception of the reality of a temptation which is not only actually but necessarily certain to fail, undoubtedly constitutes a mental difficulty for believers in a true Incarnation. But, on the other hand, if this be obviated by the supposition of a natural peccability, how vastly do the moral difficulties multiply upon our hands. The Incarnation becomes an experiment! The Second Head of the human race may share the fate of the first! The eternal counsel may be for ever frustrated, and the very Person selected for an unprecedented display of the Divine perfections may fall off from his allegiance, and become a co-partner with the arch enemy in the conspiracy against the very kingdom he was destined to set up! The tenor of our Saviour's utterances in the deepest gloom of His humiliation bears no traces of such apprehensions as these. Neither in His "thus it becometh," nor in His "thus it behoved," nor in His "I must work the works of Him that sent Me while it is day," do we mark any of the tremulousness which must have attended such a consciousness. On the contrary, under the very shadow of the cross we find His composure the most complete, and His assurance the most perfect, that "the things concerning Him have an end."

Nothing is easier, as Dr. Oosterzee says, than to attach to others the stigma of either Nestorianism on the one side, or of Eutychianism on the other, but it is hard to see how those who hold only a moral impossibility of sin can be acquitted of leaning too much to the former error, that of acknowledging only an outward union between the Divine and human natures.

Closely connected with the above subject is that of a supposed development of the Divine consciousness within the Holy Child. "He who there lies in swaddling clothes," says Dr. Oosterzee, "Himself at that moment possesses absolutely *no consciousness* of that which He unchangeably *is*. The Divine power of life slumbers within Him, only later to become known to Himself." He quotes also with approval from Gess's *Doctrine of the Person of Christ*, a passage in which this unconsciousness is set over against that of Luther in his cradle, with the forces of the Reformation slumbering within him,—a purely human and irreverent analogy, and therefore utterly inadequate to explain the mystery of the Incarnation. We agree with our author that in becoming man the Son of God entirely renounces the *unlimited use* of His Divine nature and properties, though not their personal possession; but we cannot conceive of the Divine nature in Him sharing the unconsciousnes of the human, as the above seems to imply. We think the author's own words well describe the reticence which, by its own silence, Scripture imposes on those who contemplate its greatest mystery. "Not seldom has the reproach been brought, and not

always unmerited, against the defenders of the orthodox confession, that in treating of the deep things of God they have lost sight of the rule to be 'wise unto soberness.' But may it not be recalled to mind, on the other hand, that often, in the contemplation of the Lord's earthly life, points are raised and notes are struck, in connnection with which it seems to be entirely forgotten that He was not merely true man, but *God* man in all the force of the word? Here one gives the rein to the imagination in connection with the Lord's childhood and youth, as to all that may have passed in His soul during the days of preparation and development, concerning the fair expectations and dreams of His earlier years. Is it not as though men would be wiser than Scripture, in which a veil is cast over a period of eighteen years, a veil that even wholly remains untouched in most of the Apocryphal Gospels; and would it be possible to become so greatly absorbed in questions of such nature, if reverence for the Son of God always kept equal pace with curiosity as to that which befell the son of man?"

We are not quite at one with Dr. Oosterzee on another point, viz., the character and purpose of our Lord's Second Advent. Of course we believe that the Second Advent is to resemble the first in its being a bodily manifestation, though not for the purpose of establishing a carnal millennial kingdom. But that the millennial reign is to follow such advent, and to supersede the present economy of grace, appears scarcely satisfactorily proved, neither do we see how the Lord's personal presence on earth is to make up for the necessary termination of His intercession in heaven and continual donation of the Holy Ghost. Neither in respect of that intercession itself can we accept, without a certain qualification, the limitation implied in the following words:—"He who, turning away from Christ, still belongs to the unbelieving world, cannot console himself with the thought that he has an Advocate on high." St. John says, "If any man sin;" nor the limitation of the Spirit's work, as taking place "*only* where the Word is proclaimed;" for this is a light that "enlighteneth every man that cometh into the world." But notwithstanding these deductions, Dr. Oosterzee's book must be regarded as a rich treasury of profitable truth for all who aspire to an acquaintance with "the mind which was in Christ Jesus."

Leathes' Bampton Lectures.

The Religion of the Christ: its Historic and Literary Development considered as an Evidence of its Origin. The Bampton Lectures for 1874. By the Rev. Stanley Leathes, M.A. Rivingtons. 1874.

These lectures are a noble contribution to the evidences of the Christian faith; and to those who have made themselves

acquainted with the author's previous works on the witness to Christ borne by the Old Testament, by St. Paul, and by St. John, they will have a special value, as consummating a cumulative line of argument which a very logical and a very reverent mind has exhibited with irresistible force. These lectures treat first of the anticipation of Christ in heathen nations. Here the lecturer has done good service by putting in a fair and true light the relation of Gentile religions to Christianity, with special reference to Max Müller and some other recent exponents of heathen myths. We cannot forbear inserting a quotation, which contains a fine vindication:—"May we not say, then, that the witness of mythology is clear, not only to the moral fall in itself, but also to the reality of that fallen condition of which it was at once the proof and the result? Why is there a tendency in human nature to deteriorate, an inability to rescue and restore itself, as the development of mythology and as practical experience alike testify, unless because of an original twist or wrench in our nature, from the effects of which we cannot recover ourselves? All things bear witness to this fact wherever we turn. All societies, religions, institutions, experience the effects, and bear witness to the truth of it. Is it not as useless to deny, as it is impossible to explain it? We may find it difficult to say what we mean by the fall, and may not care too narrowly to define; but the evidence of facts for the reality and truth of a fall is irresistible. And if the natural growth of mythology is itself a witness to this tendency to decline, how much more is the mythology full grown? Can anything afford more conclusive evidence of the depravity of the human heart than the ultimate form assumed by many of the legends of Greece, to say nothing of those of India? Is it possible to excuse or to condone the practices which were the immediate outcome of the cultus associated with those legends, and the deities to whom they referred? We may try to believe that their origin was more innocent than their result, but there can be no mistake about their result. The Pauline account of the heathen world in the Epistle to the Romans, is too vivid not to be true, and is too true to be disputed. And that was the actual outcome of mythology, for of religion, properly speaking, there was none.

"And can we believe that this was the method adopted by God for developing the growth of Christianity? Was Christianity the natural flower and fruit of such a seed and such a plant as this? Is Christianity what this developed into? Because, if we are to eliminate all but purely natural causes, we shall be constrained to confess that the Gospel, as it appeared at first, was the direct outcome, the spontaneous production of germs and forces such as these. The hideous and the impure originated the lovely and the pure. The unholy generated the holy. If my-

thology was but the progressive development of religious ideas spontaneously conceived in man, it must have been a direct link in that chain of which the pure Gospel of Christ was the ultimate result. And when we bear in mind the yet grosser and more openly revolting interpretation, which by some has been unhesitatingly assigned to universal mythology, construing its ever-varying development in the east, and the west, and the north, and the south, as but the unvarying repetition of the same ever-recurrent foul idea, one shudders to think of the awful blasphemy that is involved in any position which implies, or seems to imply, that the very life-blood of Christianity has been deduced through channels such as these, and owes its natural origin to the same ultimate causes. We may indeed say it may be science so-called, but it cannot be truth. Or rather, we may boldly say, this manifestly is not true, and therefore it cannot be science, for science is the handmaid of truth, and leads to truth."

This is straightforward and true, and contains a gentle but severe rebuke, administered by one who has a right to assume the tone of a judge to the whole company of enthusiasts who are endeavouring to place Christianity among the world's religions, and Christ literally among the masters of the human race. Equally true and important are the words which close the discussion:—"The all-important questions, of course, arise: How can such a Divine revelation be brought home to the minds of men? How can we recognise it when presented to us? How shall we know it when we see it, and be sure that we are not deceived? In answer to these questions, we may say that the mind is prepared for the reception of a professedly Divine revelation, by the combined weight of many convergent indications, and the accumulated force of many independent testimonies. It is notorious that several religions appeal to a professedly Divine revelation. The Vedas of the Brahmins, the Zend-Avesta of the Parsees, the Tripitaka of the Buddhists, the Kuran of the Muhammadans, all claim to be regarded, and are regarded by their respective followers, as divine. Are we called upon to admit the claim? Undoubtedly not. Every one of these collections of sacred writings rests upon a totally different basis from the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments. No man in his senses can compare them and not perceive their essential and intrinsic difference. We have no desire to exalt our own religion at the expense of others, or to depreciate others that our own may be exalted; but our allegiance to our own religion, if we believe in it, forbids us for one moment to place it on the same level with others, as it prevents us from being blind to its generic difference and its immeasurable superiority."

The lecture on "The Christ of Jewish History," with those that follow, are an original and striking view of the Christ idea

of the Old Testament. One could hardly expect to find the Messiah of the ancient records—Prophet, Priest, and King—exhibited with anything like novelty. But Mr. Leathes has shown how an old subject may be made new. After having read in a variety of treatises the growth of the Messianic idea among the Jews, we confess to a refreshing sense of surprise at finding how much there is in the Old Testament that had escaped our attention. We would advise the student to weigh this lecture well, and carefully to master the argument. Especially, we would advise him to note some of those more recondite points which Mr. Leathes so skilfully brings into prominence. When we reach the New Testament, we find ourselves still under the guidance of a master, though on perhaps more familiar ground. The lecture on "The Christ of the Pauline Epistles," is one of the best essays on the subject that has ever fallen under our notice.

Mr. Leathes watches the current of theological thought and speculation with deep solicitude. His preface shows this. The topics which it discusses might have been expanded into another volume, and will deserve it. The strictures on some of the books that are now fascinating the spirit of free thought among us are valuable; though it may be thought that the censor is rather too lenient and tolerant. His tolerance is not, however, the result of fear; he knows the strength of his cause, and has a manly confidence in his own ability. And, perhaps, on the whole, it is more advantageous to a good cause to defend it temperately, than to indulge in the severities of declamation, or useless and irritating personalities.

We must quote another passage from the preface, the force of which, however, is impaired by separation from the context: "To what then, is this faith of the disciples traceable? To suppose that they were intentional deceivers is impossible; we can only imagine they were the victims of delusion. How did they themselves become possessed of the conviction that Jesus was the Christ? Two causes are at once apparent—the actual teaching of Jesus and His personal character. They could not have been for any considerable time in His society and have arrived at the conclusion that He was the Christ, unless His personal character had been in accordance with His claims. Nor would they have been very likely to adopt the notion of His being the Messiah unless it had been encouraged by Him. When, however, they had seen their Master expire on the Cross, there must have been an end to all their anticipations about Him, for it was precisely this death of His which was the least likely to convince them of His Messiahship. We are constrained, therefore, to postulate the occurrence of something after His death which had the effect, not only of reviving their hopes, but of establishing

on a secure basis their conviction that He was the Christ, in which they never afterwards wavered. If this was not His resurrection, it was at all events the belief common to all of them that He had actually risen. His resurrection, however, does not appear to have been an event for which they were prepared; on the contrary, it took them one and all by surprise; they were not, it seems, without difficulty brought to believe in it. To what, then, was this belief owing? The fact of the resurrection would at once account for it. Can it be otherwise accounted for? In their case, also, therefore, we have certain known results produced, which point us to a particular cause, but are not easily to be explained by the supposition of any other cause. And when to these results we add the others equally patent—of the peculiar life the disciples forthwith adopted of going about preaching the story of the resurrection, and of the remarkable consequences which followed their preaching, it becomes by no means easy to accept the answer that the belief of the disciples is a sufficient explanation of all the phenomena, on the hypothesis that the resurrection was not a fact, when it is absolutely certain that had it been a fact there would remain nothing which required to be accounted for. We are able, then, to determine how far a critical life of Christ is an indispensable preliminary to our belief in Him. Even on the assumption that we had no materials for such a life, it would not follow that belief in Him was an impossibility; for it is certain that the results which actually followed the first proclamation of Jesus as the Christ are such as to lead us up to a few broad and definite facts as their necessary cause, and to make us virtually independent of all others. Whether one blind man was healed at Jericho or two, may be more or less uncertain; but the uncertainty attaching to that event is no measure at all of the degree of positive knowledge we possess as to the death of Jesus, and the prevalence of belief in His resurrection."

We have not purposed to review this book at length. The passages selected will prompt our readers to study it for themselves, and we may promise them that they will not lose their labour. The work is worthy of its place among the *Bampton Lectures*, and that itself is high praise. We trust the lecturer will apply his skill in the sacred languages, and his large acquaintance with systematic theology, to the further prosecution of the subject which is entered upon, but not exhausted, in his previous volumes. Notwithstanding all that has been done by English theologians to place on its true foundation "the Science of Religions," there is room for another work on the subject. Indeed there is a crying demand for such a work; and Mr. Leathes is one of a very select number whom we would challenge to the task.

Delivery and Development of Christian Doctrine. The Fifth Series of the Cunningham Lectures. By Robert Rainy, DD., Professor of Divinity and Church History, New College. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark. 1874.

THIS series will tend to keep up the high reputation of the Cunningham Lectures. The subject is one of the most important that can engage the theologian. Dr. Rainy has dealt with it in a masterly manner. His first and second lectures, in particular, are an admirable statement of the bearings of the subject, and its application to the Old Testament. In the remainder we miss something of systematic analysis; the several fundamental doctrines of Christianity are not exhibited in their germ with much precision. The scope of the author did not lead him to examine the New Testament from this point of view; but an additional lecture on this subject would have much enriched the work.

The following extract will give a clear idea of the author's design:—

"Ought we to recognise development of doctrine as a legitimate function of the Church of Christ? and if in any sense it is to be so recognised, then in what sense? This was pointed out in the opening lecture as a question lying before us, and it must now be more carefully examined. Development there certainly was under the Old Testament, the light shining more and more as the rising of the sun of righteousness drew nearer. But this was provided for in those days by a progressive revelation, which guaranteed what it gave. Development also may certainly be traced in the writings of the New Testament, brief as the period was during which they were given forth; but here, too, the inspiring Spirit, who guided the human element while He supplied the divine one, is to be confessed; and development becomes merely a new illustration of the way in which human conditions and processes can be made vehicles for the conveyance of the divine message. But ought we to admit that, under the New Testament economy, and after the removal of inspired teachers, doctrines are unfolded and elaborated as the ages pass,—doctrines which were not unfolded at the first, and which yet deserve a place in the system of the Church's faith? There need be no difficulty in admitting it on the part of those to whom the Scriptures are not completely authoritative, nor on the part of those who hold that they were intended to be supplemented by revelation reaching us through other channels, and to be interpreted by an ever-present and infallible judge. But by those who accept the Scriptures as the sole, complete, and adequate rule of faith, difficulty has been felt. For if revelation was completed, once for all, when the canonical writings were given forth; and if the record of revelation is

sufficient to make the man of God perfect; and if it be clear, so that the sense in necessary things can be discerned by prayerful readers, where can the room be, not to say the need, for development? What more of Christian truth can men have than the Apostles delivered by word and writ to the early Christians? Or, if more be asserted, does not the assertion imply, first, that the Scriptures are by themselves insufficient; and, second, that valid additions from other quarters (whatever these may be) have been made to the teaching which they contain?"

It seems to us that there can be no assured ground of certitude, no infallible regulator of truth, if we forsake the principle that with the revelation of Jesus Christ in the flesh development of doctrine ceased. Development was the law of a revelation that was given through the forerunners of the eternal oracle. But when He came all truth came with Him. He was *full of grace and truth*. As He accomplished the salvation of grace, leaving nothing to be done by any other instrumentality for the salvation of man, so He completed the disclosure of the Divine will. Hence He is the sole Revealer in the New Testament. There is, indeed, a development of His doctrine by the Apostles through the Spirit. But the Spirit was Himself; the Holy Ghost glorified the Divine teacher by bringing His words to the Apostles' remembrance, by expanding their meaning or glorifying His words, and by revealing the fuller and more ample meaning of His predictions. Development, therefore, ceased when the personal agents of our Lord's teaching ended their preaching and their teaching. It is fatal to the great theory of revelation to suppose that doctrine was to be developed afterwards. Any subsequent development was only that of dogma.

"Development has been powerfully asserted (as was noticed before) both by Rationalists and by some Romanists. Rationalists commonly regard and represent Christian doctrine as one branch of the general progress of the human mind. The Scriptures are, with them, not properly a rule of faith, much less a complete rule, but are rather the record of certain movements of the human mind, due to natural causes, or, as some of them would admit, due partly to causes which are in some sense supernatural. Those movements, with Scripture as the record which prolongs and perpetuates their influence, have communicated an extraordinary impulse to the religious thought and feeling of men, and have impressed on it a definite bent. Hence come forms of religious consciousness highly interesting and important, which, however, were destined to be elaborated in the furnace of history, in the reflections and discussions of many minds and many ages. They were to combine with all the elements of human thought, and with the lessons of human experience; and all along the process they were to be freely acted on by human reason, and by human

unreason too. This process has often gone on under conditions which hampered and impeded it, but the process itself was inevitable, and, through whatever difficulties, it did and does work itself out. Development, therefore, was natural and valid. It could not be dispensed with, and it could not be arrested."

This theory, of course, reduces the Redeemer to the level of human teachers. He was only a more highly educated spiritual instructor of mankind; bringing a keener intuition and a higher range of knowledge than others, but no more. The New Testament is only a stage in the religious consciousness of mankind; and the march of the religious intellect has long since transcended its views and apprehensions. This theory seems indeed to do honour to the principle of development; but is, in reality, fatal to its true idea. There must be a germ to be developed. Whence came it? From heaven or of men? If of men—that is, if it is merely the innate or connate idea that man brings with him into the world, Christianity is not a development of that; for Christianity asserts its total independence of any human instinct. It refuses to be regarded as a stage of human self-education. If of heaven—that is, if there has been a revelation from above to direct the instincts of human nature—then Christianity has no meaning unless it be supreme and final. It is, by its own testimony, the last word of the Eternal Word. Every attempt to make it a stage of revelation is self-convicted of denying the very foundation of Christianity itself. It is all or it is nothing.

"A companion theory has been brought out by some of the defenders of Rome. They have asserted, as necessary and valid, a development very like that of the Rationalists, in so far as the human forces are concerned, which urge on the process; but they represent it as superintended by the infallible Church, which sifts the results, and guarantees them (those which are authentic) to the faith of Catholic Christians. The most brilliant and ingenious expounder of this theory has unquestionably been Dr. Newman. His singular combination of speculation and faith, with equal degrees of courage in both, and his peculiar style—or flavour, as one may say—of learning, which goes through antiquity, attracting like a magnet what it finds congenial, and passing all the rest as irrelevant matters—these gifts and peculiarities perfectly fitted him for the task. The theory of development, not advanced by him alone, but by him more elaborately unfolded, stands unrebuked, as the more adventurous form of the Romish doctrine regarding the office of the Church as the keeper of traditions, and as the judge of controversies.

"On the other hand, development, as thus explained, was not the old Romish doctrine of tradition, and it is regarded with dislike and suspicion by many influential persons in the Church of Rome. Neither was it the original Anglican or High Church doctrine.

Indeed, that party, both in its ancient and in its recent or Tractarian form, proceeded on views totally inconsistent with any such theory. They relied on an alleged consent of the Fathers, as the explicit warrant for all they taught, and a sufficient ground of sentence against any later doctrines. Newman has told us how the break-down of this *via media* led him to embrace Romanism and the development theory both at once. What the High Church party, as a party, hold upon the subject now, I shall not undertake to say; but several of their writers seem to proceed on the notion of development, without explaining the principle or the limits of the development which they admit."

Not only here, but in other parts of his volume, Dr. Rainy has shown the baselessness of the modern theory of development in the Church. It is simply, in its later form, the refuge of despair. We can understand, while we reject, the old theory of a co-ordinate authority in the Church: a tradition running parallel with the Bible, and infallibly interpreting it, more especially in regard to its subordinate doctrines, and the usages and ordinances of the Church. But a theory which requires us to believe that the most vital doctrines of Christianity were left in uncertainty when the Bible was closed can never be accepted. That there was no doctrine of the Trinity until the Nicene age came; that there was no doctrine of the Person of Christ until the post-Nicene controversies determined it; that there was no doctrine of the Holy Ghost until the Macedonian heresy was condemned; that there was no doctrine of the Eucharist until the twelfth century; all this is intolerable. On such a supposition we know not what unknown doctrines await the hour for their development. Germs of new teaching may be in the New Testament which future decisions may elaborate into doctrines subversive of the Gospel. The Christian instinct is afraid of such a theory: it is fatal to the tranquillity of faith; and in fact transfers the ground of certitude from the saving and eternal Oracle to the shifting decisions of mortal men. But we must repeat the remark made above. There is unlimited development of dogma and arrangement of truth: no development of doctrine. The doctrine is of God; the dogma is also of God; but constructed in the Church from age to age.

Dr. Rainy's meaning is the same in this remarkable sentence: "But the truth is, that the development does not start from the completed Revelation; that would be a lofty starting-point indeed. It starts from the measures of understanding which the Church had of the Revelation at the time when Apostolic guidance ended; it starts from the measure of attainment in knowledge of the meaning, scope, and connection of the truth; from the thoughts, and especially the clear thoughts, which the Church then had of the truth set forth in Apostolic teaching, and em-

bodied with other elements in the Scriptures. There is a connection between these two—the completed Revelation, and the Church's attainment in knowledge by the means of it; but there is a very great difference between them, which it is quite wonderful to see so little appreciated by some who write on these subjects. Do men really suppose that the early Church, as it passed out of the Apostles' hands, had actually received into its mind the doctrinal fulness of the Scriptures? The difference between the completed Revelation and the Church's apprehension of it, was as great as that between the brightness of the sun and the reflection of it on some imperfectly polished surface, that gives it back again really, constantly, but with a diminished, imperfect, wavering lustre."

Now, the development of Christian dogma in the historical theology of the Churches of Christendom is simply the gradual exhibition of the way in which the perfect truth has been received and reflected from age to age. It has been adapted to the capacities of the catechumens of heathenism, and of the children of Christians. It has been systematised into definitions to repel the assaults of heresy. It has been moulded into conformity with the various confessions of faith which the development of the Church has required, and it has been modified, always in the way of improvement, by the increase of light which has been shed upon the original text, and its grammatical interpretation. But the doctrine abides for ever the same in the infallible word which is the final appeal, the unerring standard, and the firm foundation of all Christian theology.

We have read this volume with much satisfaction; and we believe that, if carefully pondered, it will repay, beyond most books on the subject, the student's attention. It requires earnest reading, and some parts of it more readings than one. The notes are exceedingly good. Take for instance the following exceedingly suggestive one:—

"The view of sin presented in the New Testament, e.g. in the writings of the Apostle Paul, is stern and dark, and has always been resented as exaggerated by a certain class of thinkers. It is anticipated, however, and the rudiments of it clearly furnished in the Biblical representation of the early world. Sin appears as, first of all, a free decision, beginning with unbelief and disregard of God's word and will. It causes a fall, and thenceforth the race appears in an exiled and perverted state. From time to time special instances of sin in particular men and races rise into portentous prominence, and an intense energy of divine displeasure is seen breaking through the patience and goodness of God, so as to write out His sentence on sin in large letters, for the world to read. But the whole Old Testament history is of such a character as to bring into special prominence this aspect of all

sin, that it is a forsaking of God, and imply that it is to be judged with special reference to that aspect of it.

"So, also, the hold which sin has upon man in his present state, its power over him, the strength with which it tends to its results, are everywhere made visible. This appears, not more from the dominion it exerts over evil men, than from the energy with which it rises up in men who are, on the whole, servants of God. In this connection it is interesting to notice how the significant word flesh begins as early as Gen. vi. to be charged with its peculiar weight of meaning. Notice how the word is harped upon and recurred to throughout that chapter. It is not maintained that the full sense of it is here already presupposed; but some sad divorce of 'flesh' and 'spirit,'—at the least, some mysterious weakening of the previous connection between them,—is implied throughout.

"If no doctrine is here dogmatically set forth, a mode of view and a mode of feeling are formed which are perfectly definite, and which are fitted to operate in receptive minds with an energy and a precision not a whit inferior to any that can be ascribed to dogmatic statements."

Luthardt on St. John's Gospel.

Der Johanneische Ursprung des vierten Evangeliums. [*St. John the Author of the Fourth Gospel.* By Dr. C. E. Luthardt]. Leipzig. 1874.

No commentator on St. John has done more service than Dr. Luthardt, and he here crowns his contribution to that important literature by an exhaustive review of all theories, and, as we think, triumphant vindication of St. John's authorship. He examines every tradition, every adverse theory, all the various testimonies from every quarter, and weighs the whole with a sound judgment. In the course of his examination, he takes occasion to consider many contested points that have their interest apart from his immediate subject; and the whole is a work which we should be glad to see translated, notwithstanding the comparative richness of our present literature on the subject. We shall give a few condensed statements as to one topic that has been brought into special prominence, both on the Continent and in England.

It has become an established axiom of modern criticism that both the language and the doctrine, and indeed the whole style, of the Gospel and the Apocalypse are different: so different, that these writings could not have proceeded from one and the same author. Either the Apocalypse is the Apostle's, and not the Gospel; or the Gospel, and not the Apocalypse. The most

recent of the theories on the subject decline to receive St. John as the author of either. There are not many bold enough to regard him as the author of both.

The question as to the relation of the Apocalypse to the Gospel is of importance as to the latter only on the supposition that the Johannæan authorship of the Apocalypse is established, or at least more certain than that of the Gospel. But that is not the case. The oldest witness for his authorship is that of Justin, in his *Dialogue*. Justin quotes the passage concerning regeneration from the Gospel, though without mentioning St. John's name. But the Gospel existed under no other name than his; and even Papias, living under the influences of the Apocalypse, gives his testimony to the first Epistle, which is really a testimony to the Gospel. Indeed, the argument as between the two books goes for nothing. If they are inconsistent, that does not defeat the Johannæan authorship of one of them. But this alleged inconsistency must be examined.

Even the Tübingen critics called the Gospel the "spiritualised Apocalypse." But the language is certainly very different. The differences, however, may be explained away, or very much softened, by considering, first, the different objects contemplated by the two books; and secondly, the difference of the spirit and tone of the author's mind when engaged in the two compositions. It is true that the Gospel is correct in grammar, and the Apocalypse incorrect. But it seems to be a designed accommodation, in many instances, to the ancient prophetic style. The character of the Gospel is the calm and tranquil reproduction of remembrances of the long past, which have become the very being of St. John's inner life; that of the Apocalypse is the excitement and elevation of tone stimulated by the wonderful vision of the great futurity. The reader must be referred to the work itself for a luminous exhibition of the evidence on which this distinction is based, and by which it is justified.

The Apocalyptic system of doctrine is shown to be far from inconsistent with that of the Gospel. Of the several points, we may consider the notion of God, the Christology, and the Eschatology. In the Gospel God is Light, Life, and Love; these are the three fundamental words of St. John. Now they are found in the Apocalypse, but under symbols and prophetical representations. Throughout the first chapter God is the essential Life, the Beginning and the End, the First and the Last. God is Light throughout its visions; a temple that needs not the light of the sun. Love suggests more difficulty. But the issue of all its prophecies is the tabernacle of God with man, no other than the consummated fellowship of love between God and man. The Apocalypse is no less a revelation of Divine love than the Gospel; even as the Gospel displays the wrath of God against those who

belong to the prince of this world. But the Apocalypse is more expressly a revelation of the wrath of God against the enemies of Christ and the Gospel.

As to the Christology, the two documents are at one. The Gospel elevates Christ into the sphere of divinity,—makes that its starting-point. And the writer of the Revelation was called *the Divine* by the ancient Church, because He so expressly taught the Divinity of the Logos. The heavenly spirits "honour the Father even as they honour the Son." Christ is united with God throughout all the visions. Salvation, both now and eternally, springs from the One as from the Other. The government of the world belongs equally to Both. They receive the homage and service of the saints equally and without distinction. It is true that the Lamb is on the throne, as it were on its steps; but He is also seated on it. And the four living creatures, the representatives of the whole creation, pay Him divine honour. In a variety of figurative forms, the Redeemer sustains the same relation to the Father as in the Gospels: one with Him, yet in the mediatorial work, for a time, subordinate. If He is called, "the beginning of the creation of God," *beginning* means not *initium*, but *principium;* through Him all creation has its origin and existence. He is here also "before all things," and "all things were made by Him." When the victory of Christ over His enemies at His appearance is spoken of, "His name is the Word of God;" not *is* called, but *was* called; not a future name, but an earlier name. As in the Gospel, Christ is the Word, as the absolute revelation of God, so it is in the Apocalypse. It is remarkable that *Lamb* is His name nine and twenty times in the Revelation; and sometimes with the addition that He was slain. Now in the Gospel the Forerunner announces Him as the Lamb of God, and the Crucified is the fulfilment of the Passover emblem. But the word is *Arnion* and not *Amnos*. This, however, is only a change of the word, not of the idea in the word; and the reason is obvious: the one refers to His historical humiliation, the other to His glorified estate. Nor must that remarkable citation of Zechariah xii. 10 be omitted: common to the two documents, and in both according to the Septuagint.

Much stress has been laid upon the supposed condemnation of the Apostle Paul and Pauline Christianity in the second chapter. Now if those liars who gave themselves out to be apostles, and were not, included Paul, and Paul especially, and if the Nicolaitanes were the Pauline Christians, then we should mark in this document a spirit which is utterly inconsistent with that of the Gospel. But it is time that this most ridiculous notion should be exploded.

As to the Eschatology, there is no real contradiction. It is true that the Gospel does not speak of Antichrist, and leaves the

visible return of Christ more in the background. His coming is primarily that of the Spirit; and is permanent in the Christian Church. This was required by the problem of the Gospel. But no one doubts that the first Epistle was written by the author of the Gospel, and that speaks of Antichrist. The elements of the Antichrist are in the Gospel; they are in the Jews and in Judas, whereas the Apocalypse transcends this limited view, and looks at the final consummation in the Person in whom will be concentred all elements on a final historical exhibition. The theme of the Apocalypse is "I come." This coming has its stages down to the final personal return of Christ for resurrection and judgment. In the Gospel the stage is the presence of Christ through His Spirit. But the Spirit's presence is also the coming of Christ. Yet the personal return is not wanting to the Gospel, as the fifth chapter shows, verse 28. And the Apocalypse has its spiritual return of Christ also. We must not in a one-sided manner spiritualise the Gospel and carnalise the Apocalypse. The one has its stand-point in the spiritual manifestation, the other in the historical manifestation.

"How could a disciple who walked with his Master on earth, who stood in daily relations of common life with Him, attain to such a view of that Master as to invest Him with the Divine nature and attributes, and describe Him as an historical manifestation of the Divinity? Does not this glorification of the historical into the eternal, and of the human into the Divine, demand a greater distance, both in person and in time, than can be predicated of an actual disciple of Christ? Now, when the Tübingen school makes the Apocalypse a monument of judaising early Christianity, and of the proper Johannæan spirit in it, it has the same difficulty to encounter. It is not relieved by denying the Johannæan origin of the Gospel. The two are one in this, and the mystery remains unsolved." But there is a solution of the difficulty which these critics will not accept, which, however, is the solution of our Lord Himself. He chose His servant John to be the medium for His final revelation of Himself. He manifested His glory to all alike; but He chose one to be the special organ of His final teaching concerning His own person; and the Holy Ghost revealed to him again the earlier revelation.

Before leaving this little volume to our readers, we cannot help remarking that it does not do full justice to the great question of the union of the trilogy of documents on the authorship of St. John. We find it proved that there is no absolute impossibility that the same author should have produced the Gospel, the Epistle, and the Revelation. But it is not the writer's aim to establish this fact positively. We should hail from his pen, or from any other competent author, a work on the unity of authorship. To us there is no room for doubt that in the distribution

of gifts this was the prerogative of the beloved Apostle. It was his special honour to give the final memoirs of the Saviour's life on earth as a revelation of God in humanity, to give the final exhibition of His life in heaven which will end in His return to earth, and in his Epistle to unite the two, so to speak, in a final and perfect exhibition of that Christian life which His people receive from His Spirit, and which prepares for His coming.

In the Gospel and Apocalypse St. John is only or mainly the recorder. The Redeemer Himself speaks and acts, and His Apostle notes His words and works, only in a few words giving his own reverent comment. But in the Epistle he mediates between the two, being himself the expositor of perfect Christian doctrine. In it all truth puts on perfection. The Person of Christ has its most glorious exhibition. His atonement is nowhere in the New Testament so perfectly set forth; and the sanctifying power of the love of God in the human heart has its highest and most glorious delineation. In these three departments his writings are the consummation of the New Testament and of all Scripture. This is the bond of their unity; and we hope yet to see that unity more fully established externally by criticism, as it is internally demonstrated to the eye and the heart of faith.

Etudes Bibliques. Par F. Godet. ["Biblical Studies." Second Series.] Paris. 1874.

THESE are the remarkable words with which this new series of Dr. Godet's Studies is introduced:—

"The assemblage of the Sacred Writings resembles an edifice containing sixty-six apartments, in each of which there shines brightly a ray of the celestial light. The greater part of Christian people content themselves with contemplating it from without, like simple tourists. Are they hindered from entering by the fear of meeting inside with nothing but closed doors? This is the sentiment of very many, no doubt. We are about to offer to them the key of some of these mysterious apartments. If they consent to make use of them, they will soon extend their visits to all the chambers of this Divine abode, and will not fail to adopt the aspiration of David: 'One thing have I desired of the Lord; that will I seek after: that I may dwell in the house of the Lord all the days of my life, to behold the beauty of the Lord, and to inquire in His temple.'"—Ps. xxvii. 4.

This is a homage to the organic unity and perfection of the Holy Writings which is very refreshing; coming, as it does, from a corner of Europe where as much has been done as in almost any other quarter to disintegrate those Scriptures, and rob them of their inspiration, and of the special providence of the Holy

Spirit to which their internal cohesion and their external preservation are to be ascribed. The writer's modest but elevated conception of the influence and effect of his own labours is amply justified by his books themselves. He is a most conscientious, reverent, and careful expositor; as his commentaries on St. Luke and St. John bear witness. But his miscellaneous essays are still more interesting than his more elaborate works. We have already noticed some of them. Here are a few specimens of a new series. Speaking of St. Matthew's Gospel: "The end of this composition is not for a moment doubtful. The author, recording a history, aims to produce faith in the person who is its Object. With this design he makes Him the Messiah promised *to the Jews*, and brings out everywhere the accordance between the facts and the predictions, an accordance which proves that Jesus is the Christ. This tendency appears everywhere from the first word, 'The genealogy of Jesus, the Christ, the Son of David, the Son of Abraham.' He is the descendant of Abraham, 'in whom should be blessed all the families of the earth.' He is the Son of David, who, according to Isaiah, would establish for ever his kingdom. He is the expected Messiah, the sovereign of Israel, and, therefore, also the Saviour of the world. The last words of the Gospel correspond to this preamble, and show this programme accomplished in Jesus at the end of all His struggles and apparent defeats: 'all power is given unto Me.' The entire history leading to this last word is stamped with the same Messianic seal. The formula, 'that it might be accomplished,' is like a refrain repeated on every page of the book. The thought which presides over it is evident. This Gospel is the demonstration of the right of Jesus to sovereignty over Israel, as their Messiah. It is first of all, therefore, a treatise addressed to the ancient people of God. And if Israel does not understand and appreciate it, it is for the world: for the King of Israel is the King also of all mankind."

But we cannot altogether accept the author's graphic account of the probable method of construction adopted by the first Evangelist. He regards him as the *redacteur* of certain masses of discourses simply, on these five great subjects: the New Law, the Apostolate, the Kingdom of Heaven, the Church, the Consummation of all things. The historical groundwork was to him of comparatively small importance. The author, in order to render with more clearness and plenitude the thoughts of the Saviour on these five subjects, unites the words spoken by Him at different times, and groups together His parables after a manner which the Redeemer's own wisdom would not have adopted in speaking to the people. Hence some of them are found in St. Luke dispersed in five or six, or even ten, different positions. "It seems to me," says Dr. Godet, "that in the greater

part of them a profound study will not refuse the preference to the place assigned them by the third Evangelist. Luke seems on each occasion like a botanist who loves to contemplate a flower in the place where it had its birth, and in the midst of its natural surroundings. Matthew is like the gardener who, with a certain particular end in view, composes great and magnificent bouquets. There was certainly a sermon on the Mount: Luke confirms it. There was an instruction given to the Twelve: Mark and Luke bear witness. There was a time in the ministry of Jesus when He inaugurated His method of teaching in parables. But, to the discourses pronounced on these particular occasions, Matthew has attached many other words really spoken by the Lord on other occasions on the same subject. Nothing hinders the propriety of considering that he did so; for his book was not ordered by historical sequence, but by the law of progressive discourses. It is in virtue of this legitimate procedure that he was able to reproduce in so astonishing a manner the unique impression produced on the crowds by the preachings of the Master." Here we must demur. There are surely better methods of solving what is an undeniable difficulty than that of supposing the Evangelist to have packed together isolated sayings, and prefaced them by words which imply that they were then and there spoken. It seems more probable that St. Luke would give excerpts, than that St. Matthew would thus aggregate his materials. The theory has always been distasteful to our minds. Dr. Godet has done all that could be done to render it palatable; but we feel persuaded that the theory of the construction of the synoptical gospels has not been discovered by him. At the same time we must needs admit that no other theory altogether meets the exigencies of the case. The Divine Spirit has not given us the key to His method in the creation of the Gospels.

We turn to another subject of great importance:—

"The Epistle of James belongs then, in common with the writings of Paul, to that sacred Viaticum which the Lord has left to His Church for all the ages of its development and of its earthly activity: to the authentic Canon of the New Testament. And it is not inappropriate here to render our homage to the largeness of view, to the liberty of spirit, to the boldness of faith with which the churches at the close of the fourth century, at the very time when they proclaimed most vigorously the divinity of the Scriptures, dared without hesitation to give a place in their infallible Canon to writings which contained, as it regards salvation, formulas literally contradictory. How far was Luther, with his judgments little tempered, and dictated by a too exclusive preoccupation with the struggles of his own time, below the level of those courageous Synodal decisions which presided over the settlement of the Christian Canon!

"In the presence of this fact are we not justified in speaking of a *Providential Canon*, and in recognising the result of a superior and supreme direction in the formation of the Collection of Sacred Writings sanctioned by the Church?"—P. 271.

That the Divine Spirit presided over the decisions of the Churches and provinces that had the final settlement of the Canon we firmly believe. But it is, perhaps, better to say that He watched over the ordinary course of things which necessarily tended to the definite acceptance of the writings of inspiration. There needed no positive direction, nor inspiring suggestion. The divinity of the books must necessarily assert itself. Their origin and authority could not be hid. If we could suppose the Divine Spirit to have altogether withdrawn His special control, and left the writings of evangelists and apostles to make their own way, it may be regarded as certain that they would by degrees have taken the place they now hold, as distinct and separated, and sacred books. The law of the credentials of things Divine is that their evidence is mainly from within. This holds good of the holy books. But we do not deny, we rather assert strongly, the direct influence of the Spirit in the settlement of the Canon; only we hold fast the human element here also, and regard the Spirit's agency as having simply controlled the natural process of events. Just as His inspiring influence did not supersede the action of the human mind, retaining in each case its own individuality, so His vindication of the Bible, as a whole, did not take the form of a despotic decree, but simply directed and overruled the current of opinions and decisions which inevitably must lead, and did lead, to the permanent severance between the uninspired and the inspired books of Christianity.

Dr. Godet's remarkable comparison between Luther and the men of the fourth century has in it much truth, and is very suggestive. It may be asserted that the reason why the ante-Nicene Churches so readily accepted the Epistle of St. James was that they were lax as to the doctrine of justification by faith. Indeed, some would say that their general bias towards a doctrine that linked justification and moral character very closely together, was the reason of the favour that that Epistle found in their eyes. But against this, it may be alleged that St. James has some other peculiarities that would have operated to exclude him, if dogmatic principles had governed the decisions of the early Churches. The Epistle is very far from being as pronounced and emphatic on the divinity of our Lord, and the personality of the Holy Ghost, and the hypostatic distinctions of the Trinity generally, as the Nicene theologians might be presumed to have desired, supposing them to have been governed only by dogmatic prepossessions. In other words, if they had dealt with the Epistle on the same principle that Luther did, they would have rejected it as Luther

did, though not for the same reason. To him it was an epistle of straw, because it seemed unfaithful to Christ's finished work; they would have regarded it as an epistle of straw, because it was unfaithful to Christ's person. But they were not governed by Luther's principle. They accepted the apostolical epistle, and reverently sought for that harmony between it and the other writings which they perfectly well knew they should find. It would have been a good thing for the cause of truth if Luther had done the same. It is impossible to estimate the evil effect of the rash expression of his arbitrary principle. In his hands, and with the evangelical applications he gave it, it was comparatively innoxious; but it has been otherwise with his followers. A hundred vague and destructive theories of inspiration claim affinity with Luther's canon that the test of the divinity of a book is the way in which it deals with Christ. Those who are so fond of appealing to the great reformer's authority as demolishing the authority of St. James, forget that he was not himself always of the same mind, and that the theologians who followed him shared not his opinion. As to the question itself, we think there is no book of the New Testament which has on it a more evident stamp of Divine authentication than the Epistle of St. James. It watches over the purity of religion with a godly jealousy, and keeps guard over the doctrines of grace as with the flaming sword of the Cherubim. It would have been a sad loss had the early Church failed to do honour to it and expelled it from the canon. But there was never any fear of this. The Holy Spirit knoweth His own handiwork.

"The teaching of Paul has had for its result to condemn for ever, in the Church of Christ, *dead works*, exterior observances devoid of interior life; that of James is the permanent condemnation of *dead faith*, of the belief of the head isolated from moral activity. These two truths, like flowers which blossom at different points in the sea, but which, under the surface, are blended on one and the same root, belong both to the same religious principle, Pharisaism always reviving; which sometimes *knows* without *doing*, sometimes *does* without *feeling*. The writings of Paul are indispensable in epochs of formalism; they unfurl the standard of that spirituality which must characterise all true obedience worthy of God, who is a Spirit. The Epistle of James is especially appropriate to times of intellectual dogmatism and dead orthodoxy: it utters the protest, then, of that moral principle on which Divine salvation rests."

Here, again, we feel that our author is making too great a sacrifice to a fine generalisation. The Epistles of St. Paul and St. James are united in Scripture as adapted to all ages, and all Churches, and all Christian men at all times. The seeming contradiction between them has given rise to a whole library of con-

troversial divinity, which has not been altogether valueless. It has kept alive for ever the protest of the Christian Church against Antinomianism. But it has done still more to preserve thousands of Christians from the perversion of the vital doctrine of justification by faith.

"In all ages there have been, and there will be, natures straightforward, strongly tempered, and severe towards themselves, who seek in the Gospel a means of sanctification rather than pardon, and in Christ a model and a power rather than an expiatory victim. Pardon appears to them to be of necessity the accompaniment of a solemn labour, accomplished in view of moral amelioration. These natures seem to us to have the right to seek themselves in that of James. The corruption of salvation which results from this tendency needs rather to be complemented than rectified. It does not involve any error. But the truth does not, as yet, shine clearly in it. If any reader is surprised at this, he should remember, with regard to James as with regard to Jude, that these two men were never invested by Jesus with the apostolical dignity."

This seems a needless concession, and one the consequences of which have been so disastrous in past times, and are so obvious in the present day, as to make it matter of surprise to us that men of Dr. Godet's school should be betrayed into it. If once we begin to make distinctions of this kind, the doctrine of inspiration vanishes, with all its attendant blessings. Moreover, the concession is needless. Strike out the last sentence, and our author has said all that need be said. Notwithstanding a few flaws of the kind we have indicated, this little volume, like those which have preceded, may be recommended to our readers, with much confidence. They are beautiful French, and beautiful theological essays.

Jewish History and Politics in the Times of Sargon and Sennacherib: an Inquiry into the Historical Meaning and Purpose of the Prophecies of Isaiah. By Sir E. Strachey, Bart. Second Edition, Revised, with Additions. London: Isbister and Co. 1874.

If, as the writer states, it was by the advice of Mr. Maurice that he began, many years ago, to make the science of politics his study, we could imagine that it was a passage in Coleridge's *Statesman's Manual* that suggested to him the study of Jewish history and politics, or at least the method in which to pursue it. The passage we refer to is so wise and noble a one that it is a pleasure to find room for it here: "Not the less on this account will you have looked back with a proportionate interest on the temporal

destinies of men and nations, stored up for our instruction in the archives of the Old Testament: not the less will you delight to retrace the paths by which Providence has led the kingdoms of this world through the valley of mortal life—paths engraved with the footmarks of captains sent forth from the God of armies! Nations in whose guidance or chastisement the arm of Omnipotence itself was made bare. . . . Thucydides, Tacitus, Machiavel, Bacon, Harrington: these are red-letter names even in the almanacs of worldly wisdom: and yet I dare challenge all the critical benches of infidelity to point out any one important truth, any one efficient, practical direction or warning, which did not pre-exist, and for the most part in a sounder, more intelligible, and more comprehensive form, in the Bible."

To a considerable extent, as it seems to us, Coleridge's words have borne fruit in the writings of Arnold and Milman, of Hare, Maurice, and Stanley, and, with every reservation we may be inclined to make, there can be but one opinion as to the great benefit that the historical study of the Old Testament has received from these distinguished writers. Sir Edward Strachey's interesting and instructive volume is an important contribution to this branch of Biblical literature. He has selected a period of Jewish history—the last half of the eighth century B.C.—when the national life, then at its highest point of civilization, and coming into most critical contact with foreign powers, presents its most numerous, complex, and important features. With the increase of the power and security of the realm, there had been a great advance in arts and commerce, in wealth and luxury, and along with these the social and moral evils that thrive most readily under such circumstances. The intercourse with foreign nations brought in many elements of heathen life by which the upper classes of the country in particular were greatly demoralised. Even amidst her abounding prosperity the decline of the Kingdom of Judah had begun, and Isaiah was the prophet of the earlier stages of that decline, as Jeremiah was of the latter years immediately preceding the national overthrow. Leaving for a moment those highest strains of religious teaching into which Isaiah rises more frequently and more gloriously than any other prophet, his writings contain the deepest interpretations of the phenomena of national life. They show, as no writers outside the circle of the Jewish prophets have shown, the nature and causes of national growth and decay:—

> "What makes a nation happy, and keeps it so,
> What ruins kingdoms, and lays cities flat."

From this point of view they will be best studied by those who, in addition to the ordinary qualifications of the biblical student, possess a wide knowledge of history and politics. Sir

Edward Strachey's competence in these respects is indisputable, and the result is that he is able to connect the history of Judah under Ahaz and Hezekiah with that of other peoples in other ages, by showing similar causes working towards similar results. The frequent and apposite illustrations from history show that there is no great difference in kind between the events of sacred and secular history, but that the former are recorded in their relation to the Divine government, and constantly interpreted in their relation to man's moral and religious responsibility.

There are other aspects of this volume that are not so satisfactory. The author's discussion of the nature of prophecy, and the prophetic faculty of prediction and inspiration, strikes us as vague, and in some respects inconsistent. There is a curious wavering of his tone on the subject that makes his meaning difficult to get at. He contends for the objective reality of the revelation made to the prophet; "*how* this could be, *how* God reveals His mind and will to men, *how* the poetic or other human faculty gives form and expression to truths not imagined nor discovered, but communicated from on high,—this can never be *explained*: an explanation is a contradiction in terms, an assertion that the infinite is definable, that the superhuman is subject to the laws, and expressible in terms, of the human." Half-a-dozen pages further on he explains the prophetic formula, "Thus saith Jehovah;"—"not by some miraculous communication, alien from all human experience, and of which neither the reality nor the worth is proved by saying that Isaiah's writings are a part of the Bible; but by that inward and spiritual command which is daily and hourly telling each of us what is our work and how we are to do it. . . . A Luther, or even a Cromwell, would have shrunk from dishonouring the spirit of God within him, by supposing that it was not by the same wisdom and the same power as inspired Isaiah, that he spoke and acted in the Diet of Worms, or on the field of Dunbar."

This latter passage appears to us to diminish considerably the value of the former. Writers whose spirit is very different from that of Sir Edward Strachey, are fond of associating the names of Socrates, Seneca, Mohammed, and Shakespeare with those of Moses, Paul, and Jesus; nor is it difficult to see why. Nothing more effectually neutralises inspiration than to make it universal or at least to call by that term the genius of the philosopher, statesman, and poet, as well as the Spirit of the apostle and prophet. In this style Strauss writes, "Let it not be deemed that Lessing's Nathan, or Goethe's Hermann and Dorothea contain fewer 'saving truths' than an Epistle of Paul, or a Discourse of Christ, as reported by John." If Sir Edward Strachey admits the objective reality of the revelation communicated to the prophet, we do not understand the force of the comparison with Luther and Cromwell quoted above. The comparison is one that

tacitly merges the special function of the prophet with his "Thus saith the Lord," in the ordinary life and activity of the human spirit. In this way the proper characteristics of both are destroyed. When once we admit the inspiration of all who are strong, or wise, or good, it is but a little step to the denial of inspiration altogether. Logically speaking, as we increase the extension of the term we diminish its intention, and from meaning very much it comes to mean little or nothing at all.

The treatment of the latter part of the book, from Chapter xl. onwards, is not so detailed and careful as that of the earlier and more historical part. He briefly discusses the question of the genuineness of the last chapters of Isaiah, and adopts a middle ground between the two opposite views that are held, namely, that which attributes them to the prophet whose name they bear, and that which ascribes them to an unknown prophet living towards the end of the Captivity. His suggestion is, that these chapters, though in the main by Isaiah himself, have come to us re-edited with interpolations, and, perhaps, other changes, dating from the Captivity. Sir Edward Strachey admits, with his usual candour, that no argument for the separate authorship of the last twenty-six chapters can be drawn from differences of ideas, sentiments, and style. He considers that the only argument of any real strength is drawn from their apparently contemporary tone and atmosphere in relation to the events described, and that the word Cyrus is its main source and support. But this argument has little force except with those whose theory of prophetic inspiration does not admit the gift or power of prediction. We fully admit the misconception of the prophetic office which made prediction its chief characteristic; but we are as strongly persuaded of the erroneous nature of that opposite view which denies that the prophets ever predicted future events, but confined themselves solely to enunciating great general principles. To say nothing of the argument from prophecies fulfilled, an argument which it has become the fashion to disparage, the Book of Isaiah contains many allusions to the gift of prediction possessed by Jehovah's prophets, especially as shown by their predicting Cyrus, and even naming him (xli. 26; xliv. 8; 24—26; xlv. 4, 19–21; xlvi. 8—11; xlviii. 3—8, 15). The power of foretelling the future is insisted upon as a test of divine authority, and it would be very difficult to account for a challenge that could be so easily and effectually answered, if it were put forth after, or at the same time as, the events described.

But the great value of Sir Edward Strachey's work lies, as we have already said, in the way he grasps the real meaning of Jewish history, and throws upon its various incidents the light derived from a wide and careful study of politics and statesmanship. The twenty-second chapter, pp. 330—344, is an admirable

example of his method, and of the deeply religious spirit in which it is pursued. The subject is the later policy of Hezekiah, when, according to the writer of the Chronicles, "he rendered not again according to the benefit done unto him; for his heart was lifted up: therefore there was wrath upon Judah and Jerusalem . . . and God left him to try him, that he might know all that was in his heart."

"Here was the old, deep-seated vice re-appearing in a form adapted to the new circumstances of the time. The Hebrew nation—as, indeed, every other, now, not less than then—could only stand by faith in its unseen, yet ever-present King, and conscientious obedience to His laws; they had quite forgotten this, not for the first time, during the prosperous reign of Uzziah, and had ceased to trust in anything but their own power and wealth, and the settledness of their institutions; when these failed them during the long years of Assyrian supremacy and invasion, they tried, with no better success, their system of political alliances, intrigues, and counterpoises, in which Hebrew craft was to outwit barbarian force: and now, when it might have been hoped that all this severe discipline had taught them how vain was their trust in either the one or the other, it needed but an opportunity—'God's leaving them to try them, that they might know all that was in their heart'—to prove that both king and people were ready to fall back upon the old courses, so superficially had the lesson been learnt, and so immediately forgotten. Instead of keeping steadily in view the fact that their deliverance from Assyria was wrought by God, after all their own schemes had completely failed, and adhering to the simple, straightforward conduct which that fact pointed to, they were taking credit to themselves for the deliverance, and proposing, or accepting the proposal of, a new system of heathen alliances. . . . With hesitation I suggest that we may find a counterpart of Hezekiah's want of faith in the future guidance of God who had led him through the past, in the repressive policy which our statesmen adopted, and so many of our patriots approved, after the peace of 1815. A large part of the best men of that day seem to have lost all clear belief that the God who had just delivered Europe from a mightier incarnation of sheer, arbitrary force than Sennacherib's, had any further work for 'His Englishmen,' and that He only required them still to work and follow the method of His counsels. They retained their faith in the ideal beauty of freedom and progress,—just as Hezekiah no doubt retained his faith; but, in a temper essentially analogous, though different in form, to that which prompted the alliance of Judah with Merodach-Baladan, they renounced, for all practical purposes, both their youthful love of freedom, and their maturer reverence for constitutional rights; and they avowed that while their hopes

for the future were utterly dim, their present trust was in the vulgarest expedients of police-craft; and in resistance to the reforms which, in the abstract, they admitted to be desirable, but in the demand for which they would see nothing but man's sedition, instead of the signs by which God was pointing to the forward road. . . . We, too, like Hezekiah and his people, have exceeding much riches and honour, cities and treasures, and storehouses; corn, and wine, and oil, and possessions of flocks and herds in abundance; for God has given us substance very much: and we, too, are exposed to the same temptations as they; and our nation, like theirs, may at any time fall under its power, and become obnoxious to its consequences and punishment. The warning example should never be absent from our thoughts; for there is no one, even the humblest of us, who is not taking a real part in the workings of our commonwealth, and influencing its destiny for good or evil, and that whether he will or not. There is much to fear for England; yet much to hope also from the increasing spirit of wisdom and understanding, of counsel and might in the fear of the Lord, which God has given to our public men."

We have no space for further extracts from this volume. It presents almost equal attractions to the student of theology and the student of history, nor is it easy to say which of the two it places under greater obligations. If it is well that the one should be taught that the God who governed Israel governed Greece and Rome, and at this day rules England, France, and Germany with merciful but righteous judgment: it is well that the other should learn to look upon human history in the light of religion, and see what are the ultimate foundations of wise statesmanship, and the true conditions of a nation's prosperity.

A Sermon on Priestly Absolution, preached before the University of Oxford in St. Mary's Church, on Sunday, November 24th, 1793, by the Rev. Henry Digby Beste, M.A., Fellow of St. Mary Magdalen College, Oxford. Third Edition. With Notes and other Autobiographical Writings. London: Longmans, Green, and Co. 1874.

In the mania for archæological research that at present prevails, it is no wonder if some things should be disinterred which might as well have been suffered to remain in the dust of oblivion. The question whether the existence of semi-Popery in the Church of England can be traced back beyond the date of the Tractarian outbreak is not one of such consequence as to interest more than a limited section of the public. However, such as it is, the subject has some light cast upon it by the above-named reprint. A

sermon, advocating the right of the Christian, i.e. the Anglican "priesthood" to pronounce not a mere general and declaratory, but a real and particular absolution on all penitents who may come to them confessing their sins, was preached in the year 1793 at St. Mary's, Oxford, in the presence of the assembled heads of houses; and so far was it from provoking indignation,—as did John Wesley's sermon on Justification by Faith, preached under similar circumstances in the same place fifty years before, and which resulted in his exclusion from the pulpit,—that it drew down upon the preacher warm encomiums, and was deemed worthy of being printed at the Clarendon press. The sermon itself, based upon the literal interpretation of John xx. 23, starts from the usual assumptions respecting the powers inherent in the pastoral office, and the unbroken succession of the clergy, and, while admitting errors in the Romish Church, roundly rebukes the Anglicans for not imitating her zeal and fidelity in the maintenance of this most precious instrument of discipline, and means of salvation. It is no great discovery to find that the interpretation thus put upon a solitary passage in the New Testament, and some obscurely worded directions in the Book of Common Prayer, was acceptable at Oxford some forty years before Pusey and Newman were heard of. The Scripture quoted in defence of absolution will bear, as is too well known to need repeating, the ordinary evangelical sense, and even requires it in order to harmonise with the multitude of passages which establish the individual responsibility of men to their Maker alone. And as for the rubrics, if they do not harmonise with the obvious tenor of the New Testament Scriptures, it is high time they were revised, and all suspicion of a compromise with Popish tenets swept away.

The sermon itself forms but a small portion of the book. It is inserted in its chronological place in an autobiographic sketch of the preacher's history up to the time of his perversion to the Roman communion—for in him the proclivities adverted to had their logical issue. This narrative has a painful interest as exhibiting the fatal facility with which some minds, not chargeable with the ignorance usually attendant upon superstition, may, through lack of moral earnestness and mental strength, shirk the responsibilities of freedom, and accept the chains of spiritual despotism. There is manifest throughout the volume a desire to justify the step, and to recommend it to others who may be at all bewildered by the eddies of conflicting religious opinion. How silken the chains are, how easy the bondage, is a theme on which the autobiographer delights to dwell. The self-anatomy is very simple; we should add very superficial, if we were sure there was anything deeper to be laid bare. We cannot go into details. An hereditary predisposition to Popery was derived from an ancestry

that counted among its heroes Sir Everard Digby, of Gunpowder Plot notoriety. The discovery of an annotated copy of the Douay Testament was the match that ignited the tinder; the notes being evidently prized above the text. For a while the flame smouldered, the Oxford High Church influence of those days tending rather to dull it than otherwise, much on the same principle as vaccination keeps off the small-pox.

But an accidental *rencontre* with a certain Father Beaumont, one of the *émigrés* of the French Revolution, disposed of the transubstantiation difficulty, the only obstacle that had ever seriously barred the road to Rome; an appeal to the virtual consent, through silence, of all the Christian centuries being evidently quite sufficient for a mind only too wishful to believe in it; the silence itself being all the while taken for granted rather than proved. A rhetorical passage from Chrysostom settled the sense of "This is My body," and the conversion was complete. Of any agonising doubt, of any spiritual crisis, of any resulting peace of conscience, as connected with this momentous change in religious belief, the record bears no trace. Indeed, there are traces enough of a merry-making spirit that seems strangely at variance with the professed purport of the book. The hits at supposed Protestant inconsistency and disunion are plentiful enough, but seldom fail to admit of a *tu quoque* reply. "What is the creed of the Church of England?" We may ask in reply, "What is the creed of the Church of Rome? Who knows whether it will be to-morrow what it is to-day?" "Whether the Church of England allow the exercise of private judgment or claims infallibility, disputes are endless?" Here, likewise, we may assert, "The Church of Rome claims infallibility, and disputes are endless." The unfairness of some of the arguments is, however, palpable. All heretics must believe that those belonging to the body from which they parted are in danger of damnation, because on no other ground could they have ever determined to leave it! The Anglican catechism says that only two sacraments have been ordained as generally necessary to salvation; therefore it means that there may be four or five others not generally necessary! This is of a piece with the argument that because Christ said the sin against the Holy Ghost shall not be forgiven, "neither in this world nor in the world that is to come," therefore some sins may be forgiven in the next world that are not in this; therefore there may be a purgatory. Or with the stale, flat, and unprofitable inference that because there is joy in the presence of the angels of God over one sinner that repenteth, therefore we may pray to saints.

The common sense of the book appears to be confined to the concluding note by the editor, in which he seeks to demonstrate the utter untenableness of the Anglo-Catholic position. Of the rest

we may say, as the Romish priest said of penance, "If it does not do much good, it will not do much harm."

A Few Facts and Testimonies Touching Ritualism. By Oxoniensis. London: Longmans, Green and Co. 1874.

THIS is a summary of the views and principles of the Ritualists, principally gathered from their own writings, and will be useful to those, if any such remain, who need to be enlightened as to their true character and tendency. The statements here quoted from Mr. Gresley, the Revs. O. Shipley, W. J. E. Bennett, W. Maskell, W. Dodsworth, &c., plainly establish the position with which the compiler sets out, and confirm the current opinion concerning Ritualism, that "the aim of its advocates is not to lead to the Church of Rome, *per se*, but to Romanise the Church of England. Should they succeed in this, they hope to go a step further, and effect the reunion of the Church, in its corporate character, with Rome at least, if not with the Greek Church also." The instincts of the Evangelicals were right when, on the first blossoming of Ritualism, they pronounced it to be naught, and declared that only apples of Sodom could be expected from such a tree. Who will say now that the words of the Bishop of Calcutta, uttered many years ago, were at all too strong: "My firm persuasion is that if this system should go on, we are lost as a Protestant Church, that is, *we are lost altogether?*" One hopeful feature of the case is that the danger is now on all hands acknowledged. The bishops, who at first appeared to temporise, are to a man convinced of the peril to which the Church is exposed, and have spoken out with a manliness which is reassuring. The Romanisers themselves have felt this so keenly that, from having at the outset adopted as their motto "*οὐδὲν ἄγαν ἐπισκόπου*," they have come latterly to indulge in an unmeasured vituperation of those who are over them in the Lord. The law-courts have also pronounced against the system. And now Parliament is taking up the matter. The firm Protestant attitude of Mr. Disraeli is being imitated by Mr. Gladstone; and while some appear to doubt the sincerity of either, we would on our part gladly credit both statesmen with a good conscience in taking steps towards which, as far as we can see, no selfish political considerations need be supposed to have impelled them. Yet the danger is not past. It must not be forgotten that learning, zeal, ability, material resources and the vantage-ground of a prominent ecclesiastical position are to be found on the side of these men; nor that all the frivolity, sentimentality, and worldliness of the age, if we may not indeed say all the propensities of unsanctified human nature, favour the form of religion which they are bent on

bringing in. The following remarks of the Rev. J. M. Capes, in his *To Rome and Back*, are well worth attention: "I attribute the diminution of the old anti-Roman bitterness of the English middle and higher ranks, to a certain extent, to that interest in the Mass music of the great composers which has now become general with almost all persons of musical cultivation. . . . In every case the idea of the Roman sacrifice of the Mass is associated with conceptions of purity and beauty; and a very marked lessening in the fervid Protestantism of both singers and audience is the inevitable result. . . . Once come to love the music, and the mind insensibly ceases to think of the doctrines it expresses with any controversial fierceness." Not, of course, that musical tastes should be neglected: it is not by going to the opposite extreme of Puritanical contempt for God's good gifts that any headway can be made against the seductive misuse of them. The worship of God should be so conducted as not to offend the most refined taste, but elaborate choral services which appeal only to the ear and effectually stifle the sense of devotion in the effort to produce fine artistic effects, should be avoided everywhere, in the Establishment and out of it. In so far as it is lawful, and only so far, the Ritualists should be met with their own weapons. They must be outdone in all the good they strive to do, and it must be admitted that many of them do strive to do good according to their light, if the evil they are doing is to be "put down." Legislation may do much, but it cannot lay a spirit so subtle as this, if once the nation be infected with it. The new court will be as inoperative against Romanism inside the Church of England as the Ecclesiastical Titles Bill was against Romanism outside it, unless the heart of the nation be soundly Protestant, that is Christianly spiritual. Let us hope that such may be the issue of the present crisis!

Two notes we must make in conclusion. The compiler calls attention to the distinction that should be made between the genuine old High Church party, of which there are still many representatives, and the Ritualists, who would willingly number them as belonging to their party. Though we do not sympathise with the views of the High Church section, we recognise their standpoint as essentially different from that of the Anglo-Catholics, and cannot but express the hope that, seeing the extravagant conclusions deducible from their own tenets, the holders of them may draw back farther from the edge of the gulf, and approach nearer to those who are really their brethren, whether of their own communion or not.

A statement, quoted on the thirty-eighth page, as reflecting on a Christian body with which this review stands closely connected, must not be passed over without notice, although the error contained in it is one that has been pointed out a hundred times.

The passage in question is from Gresley on Confession, in which, acknowledging the evils that have sprung therefrom, he says, "profligate priests have made the confessional the means of pandering to their passions, and artful women have beguiled unwary confessors. All this, I fear, is most true. Satan has contrived to poison the uses of this most important ordinance, as he has done many others. But I do not know that scandalous cases are more common amongst Roman Catholic priests who hear confession than they are with Wesleyan preachers or ministers of other denominations, perhaps rather less so!" When will it be understood that there is absolutely no resemblance between the Wesleyan class-meeting and the confessional? The class-meeting is not a private but a social means of grace; its business is not therefore and cannot be confession; neither, indeed, are its regular conductors Wesleyan ministers, who only exercise an occasional supervision, but godly laymen, themselves following the ordinary avocations of life. We believe it is customary for females to make their confession veiled; how many of them could a "Wesleyan preacher," even if he tried, prevail upon to make the same confession with unveiled faces in the presence of a dozen or more of their own friends and relatives of either sex? And what scandalous cases does Mr. Gresley remember to have heard of, as arising from a form of Christian fellowship he knows so little of, which will surpass in number and magnitude those he freely admits to have occurred in connection with the confessional? It is strange he cannot see that the vice is in the system, not a rare accident, but a necessary consequence of secret conversation on topics which, according to real apostolic authority, "ought not to be so much as named." Certain it is that should a scandalous case be proved in connection with any Wesleyan preacher, he would instantly be suspended from all his functions, and, unless he retired of his own accord, be publicly and ignominiously expelled by his brethren: whereas the priest, similarly offending, might only be removed to some distant place, because his orders are indelible! But outsiders must not complain of misrepresentation, when the bishops themselves are treated with scurrility.

Biblical Expositions: or Brief Essays on Obscure or Misread Scriptures. By Samuel Cox, Author of "The Expositor's Note-Book," &c. Hodder and Stoughton. 1874.

We are glad to give our welcome to Mr. Cox's new volume of Expositions. It may seem ungracious to criticise the title, but we cannot help thinking that the description "Brief Essays on Obscure or Misread Scriptures," is hardly justified in this interesting volume; inasmuch as the Scriptures commented on

are often not those specially obscure or misread, the comments on them are rather sermons than essays, and sermons often anything but brief. For example, the twenty-third Psalm, the text of the Christian's Homily, and the passage 2 Cor. v. 19, are hardly obscure, and the sermon on the last verse is elaborate to a degree. But it were not worth while to make this comment did we not hasten to add that what we most prize from Mr. Cox, and most look for in a new volume from him, is just these same "Brief Essays on Obscure Scriptures;" and we would fain exchange some of the longer sermons on texts often expounded for his instructive and happy elucidations of difficult passages. There were more of these to be found in the earlier volume, such as are represented in this by notes on verses from the Epistle of St. James, and one or two passages from Jeremiah. Mr. Cox's knowledge of the Bible, derived from long and patient study, is combined with so great a felicity and variety of illustration, that his flashes of light on dark corners of interpretation are doubly valuable.

We would not be understood to depreciate the sermons (more strictly so called) before us, though here our author is not on the ground where he especially excels. That on the twenty-third Psalm is so thoroughly expository in its character; is enlivened by so many fresh and original touches; and above all is so thoroughly practical in its contrast of the calm confidence of the Psalmist with the anxious harassed spirit of our modern life, that none can read it without profit.

"Think what our life should be if God is in very deed the Shepherd of men. With what quiet, loving confidence, with what cheerful constancy of spirit ought we to eat our daily bread, and go about our daily tasks, looking up indeed if the road be steep and bare, or if we scent danger in the wind, to be quite sure that our Shepherd is with us, and that we are following Him, but utterly refusing to murmur or fear because He is with us, and His rod and His staff they comfort us. If all things are in His hands and He is with us and for us, what can harm us, what can really be against us?

"Contrast with what our life should be what it is. What a race against time! What a selfish competition with each other for what we account the safest place and the sweetest grass, and the purest water! How fretted and tormented with fears—fears for to-morrow, if not for to-day; fears lest our fellows should injure us, or we should injure ourselves, nay, fears of the very Shepherd who goes before us, lest He should abandon us to the wolf, or lest the crook with which He guides and defends us should be turned into a rod of judgment. Oh, it is pitiful to see how, all for want of a little faith in God, or a little more faith, we mar and waste our lives, exchange the peace and security of well-

ordered days for feverish anxieties which exhaust our strength, and will take to our hearts the fear that hath torment in lieu of the love which casts out fear!"

So in a sermon on "Freedom by the Truth," a subject so often unfolded that originality, both in conception and illustration is needed, if the treatment is to be fresh and interesting. Our space forbids anything like an analysis of the whole, suffice it to say that the exposition is both comprehensive and minute; but for one illustration we must find room. Our author is speaking of intellectual freedom, and after dwelling on the rights and responsibilities of private judgment says—

"Free from other men, we may be in bondage to *ourselves*. No one can have attentively considered himself, without having discovered that he runs some risk of becoming his own slave. I do not now speak of that servitude to physical lusts and to the baser passions to which many a man, once free, has sunk; but of a servitude much more subtle, and, therefore, in some respects, much more perilous. Whether derived by inheritance from our fathers, or from habits formed before we have reached mental maturity, we all know or may know, that there are certain qualities, tendencies, leanings, in our nature, which largely affect, which go far to constitute our individual character, and to make us unlike the one to the other. By virtue of these individnal peculiarities of mental structure, we are prepared to welcome one view of truth and duty rather than another. One man is a born Platonist, another a born Aristotelian. One man is naturally of a conservative, another of a progressive spirit. One man is of a hard, rigid temperament, the love of order, authority, rule, is strong within him, and whatever in the truth accords with his temper—as for instance the strict government of God, the virtue of an orderly obedience, the righteousness of punishment—is eagerly received and dwelt on with a disproportionate fervour and intensity; while, on the other hand, he is in danger of overlooking or undervaluing such aspects of truth as reveal a mercy, a generous allowance for human weakness, a breadth of charity, a compassion for the vile and lost, alien to his temper. Another is a good, easy man, who loves to have everybody about him happy and comfortable, who is not strict to mark defects, who is very ready to forgive; to him all those aspects of the Gospel which set forth the fatherly tenderness and unbounded compassion of God are very welcome; while all sterner views, all that speaks of love as taking the forms of a just severity, he passes lightly by, or altogether avoids. . . . Does it never occur to us that our temperament has much, or may have much to do with our creed? That instead of taking full, and rounded, and well-balanced views of truth, we may be taking partial views, disproportionate views? That what we really hold and believe may be, probably is, the

truth *as it is in us*, rather than the truth *as it is in Jesus?* No thoughtful, candid man will deny that. Even when the truth has made him free from men, it has still to set him free from himself."—P. 238, f.

How this is effected, we must leave our readers to gather from a perusal of the sermon itself.

While enjoying the rich and thorough style of Mr. Cox's expositions, we cannot help regretting the occasional adoption of fanciful and somewhat unwarrantable treatment of texts, the more so because in our author it is so rare, and his example is generally so nobly set in contradiction to a vicious style of interpretation and comment. Examples of such blemishes may be found in No. IV. of this volume,—"The Sea and the Sanctuary," a strained and far-fetched commentary on some verses from Psalm lxxvii.; in the last section of the chapter entitled "The Reed and the Wind," and perhaps more especially in "The Echoes of the Gospel in Nature," p. 168, where the connection between the appearance of Christ, after His resurrection, to the disciples on the way to Emmaus, and the thoughts suggested by a walk in North Wales, is by no means apparent, the use made of the expression "in another form," being indeed more of the nature of a play on the words than anything else. Mr. Cox, too, makes no allusion to the criticisms passed on the authenticity of the paragraph Mark xvi. 9—20, an allusion which might be out of place in an address to a miscellaneous audience, but should not be entirely omitted in a volume of Biblical expositions.

But a truce to objections. The series of books of which this is but one have been of so much service to Biblical students generally, that to give prominence to criticisms on minor points would savour of cavilling. The excellences for which Mr. Cox has acquired deserved popularity, are the freshness with which he illustrates the words of writers separated from us by many centuries, so as to make plain what the words meant to them, and the equal freshness with which he makes the most commonplace occurrences and habits of our lives serve as anything but commonplace illustrations. One subject there is to which Mr. Cox makes useful reference more than once in this volume—the tendency of the present generation to make light of forms and ordinances, in thought and practice. He shows the truth which is represented by this tendency, but at the same time insists most usefully and seasonably on the complementary truth which is in danger of being forgotten. He quotes the German proverb, "By all means empty the bath down the gutter, but try to save the baby," and adds, "But there is such a general and energetic emptying out of the slops of formalism, and cant, and hypocritical pretence just now, that one cannot but fear a little lest baby piety should come to harm, or quietly float down the stream till it be lost to sight.'

This passage occurs in an admirable little dissertation on "Grace before Meat," and the subject is treated more at large in "Ordinances and Obedience," from which we extract the following. Speaking of the ordinances of public worship, Baptism and the Lord's Supper, the preacher says:—

"But nevertheless you may have a feeling that these forms are not of any great moment after all, that it lies very much at your option or convenience whether you observe them or not; that your non-observance of them is of no importance, so long as you try to do your duty, and live a good life. It is this obscure persuasion, this unavowed feeling, I believe, which is fast emptying our sanctuaries, and in every way weakening our Churches. Good Christian men, or men who are sincerely endeavouring to be good on the Christian rule, are influenced by it, and under its influence are relaxing their use of the means of grace. On all hands we hear the complaint that those who were wont to be punctual as the hour, are growing irregular and infrequent in their attendance on public worship; that men are so steeped in worldly business, and so wearied by it, that they have neither time nor energy for the service of the Church. This, the non-observance of religious forms by religious persons, is the danger and sin of the present time. And, in great measure, probably, it springs from the broader and more generous views of truth which have, of late, found acceptance among us. We have learned to hold that obedience is better than sacrifice, till at last we have come to think that there need be no sacrifice in our obedience, that God demands no service of us which entails personal inconvenience or worldly loss. And therefore we need to be reminded of the real meaning of one of the first principles of the faith. 'Obedience better than sacrifice' *is* a principle, a fundamental principle of the faith of Christ. It cuts sheer through hypocrisy and formalism. But the keener the principle, the more deeply we may wound ourselves with it, if we mis-handle it; and we are mis-handling this principle if we use it to justify any neglect of any divine command. We are not obeying God's voice so long as we refuse to 'hearken and do' in respect to any of His commandments. We are not living so good a life as we might and ought to live, so long as we turn away from any means of grace He offers us."—Pp. 89, 90.

In closing, we heartily commend this volume to our readers, and hope that such books, such authors, may be multiplied, that the words of the sacred Scriptures may not only be perfectly understood by all, but kept fresh, interesting, *real* to all.

Law and God. By W. Page Roberts, M.A., Vicar of Eye, Suffolk. Smith and Elder. 1874.

THE above is a volume of sermons, preached for the most part at the author's own parish church, some few elsewhere; one on "Law and Prayer," for example, at Norwich Cathedral, and that on "Worship a Sight of God," in Westminster Abbey. The sermons are for the most part above the average of such compositions; they are thoughtful, clear, and practical, without any pretentiousness of style, though slight in construction, and each (of necessity on account of its brevity) dealing but superficially with the difficulties of the subject entered upon. The topics chosen are not such as evangelical theology is wont to dwell on, and the mode of treating current questions is not that of a man encumbered with much theological wrapping; on this account, therefore, to many the more attractive and the more effective. At the same time the author guards expressly in his preface against the assumption that "because he only treats of primitive strata he must be an unbeliever in later formations," and pleads that, inasmuch as he has not intended to write "a compendium of theology, therefore it does not deal with many doctrines commonly held by Christians." There can be no question but that the style of preaching here adopted is particularly suited to many minds, and if it were more generally adopted, the pulpit would exercise greater influence on current thought. A large part of its work is, as most know and many regret, assumed by the daily press. At the same time we cannot but think that in what we may suppose is a representative volume of sermons, many subjects more distinctive of Christian thought should have been handled, that the full light of the teaching of Christ and His Apostles is not brought to bear as it might on some of the subjects chosen; and that without giving up the direct and practical character of the sermons, the help and comfort of our earnestly Christian ministry might have been more richly afforded. To offer such food might not attract some, who are not prepared to receive it; to withhold it is to starve men who cannot live without it. That this negative characteristic is not accidental, seems suggested by the following passage from the sermon on "Do we make men unbelievers?"

"But why is it so many men are becoming infidels? Is it that too many things, things which were incapable of proof, and of little practical utility, have been forced upon them as necessary to salvation? It is often said that children who have been educated in the strictest way, and have had small liberty allowed them, when they grow up, often abuse their new freedom, and turn out badly. Would it have been better if the few simple facts of God and Christ and immortality, and the duties of daily life, had alone been insisted on, and the inferences and doctrines

which have been deduced from these facts, left free for each individual soul to adopt according to its need? I cannot tell. But it is a fact of human unreason that when something which the churches or the sects have insisted upon, is shown to be untrue or unprofitable, men too often throw overboard, in their desperation, the very necessaries of existence, the faith by which a man may live."—P. 77.

Surely, however, a preacher who is wise to win souls will know how rightly to present distinctively Christian doctrine so as not to repel those who have hardly persuaded themselves of the being of God at all, and are but emerging from the dim borderland of modern Agnosticism, without regulating the style of his pulpit utterances as a whole by the needs of such as these.

The sermon on "A Law of Sacrifice" may stand as a fair sample of the whole. The text is Hebrews x. 4—10, and the subject "the transformations through which the doctrine of sacrifice in successive ages has passed." "Christ's sacrifice is the type; His sacrifice consisted in doing the will of God; by a sacrifice like His, even by the sacrifice of our will to God, we are sanctified." "The history of religions is like the history of civilisations, and, on the whole, of advancement and improvement, but each period holding within itself remains of earlier periods—broken fragments whose inscriptions even yet may be deciphered." The first religious power, when we come in contact with barbarous races is fear. We may note, as broad distinctions, three stages in the history of sacrifice; the first that in which one human being is offered in sacrifice by another; the second, the general substitution of an inferior animal for the man; and the last and highest, that of Christ and Christianity, the sacrifice of the man himself to the will of God. After slightly sketching these, is given the following, as "practical conclusion," p. 49:—

"It is said that the characteristic principle of the ethics of Christianity is self-sacrifice. I think this is scarcely correct. It is not characteristic of Christianity, for it is not confined to Christianity. Self-sacrifice was taught by the Stoics, and it has been insisted upon by the Buddhists. If by self-sacrifice be meant stamping under our feet and destroying as best we can, all the affections and appetencies of our nature, then we are involved in a strange riddle indeed; we are sent into the world to mutilate and to destroy the handiwork of the Almighty; the office of religion is but a revived iconoclasm, and instead of beating down Satan, we are called upon to beat down human nature under our feet. This is but a recurrence to the old form of human sacrifice, if, indeed, it be not something worse, for it is easier to die than to kill the affections of our souls. But the sacrifice of our sanctification is something different from this. It is the sacrifice of Christ, 'to do Thy will, O God;' not the mere sacrifice of self,

terminating in itself, but the devotion of self to the very intention of our existence to the will of Him who made us, and made us for Himself. . . . 'Father, not My will, but Thine be done;' this is the very summit of sacrifice, the very topstone of human capability, and this is our Gospel and prophecy."

We could wish that more sermons evinced as thorough an acquaintance with the difficulties of reading and thinking men of our generation as do these; we could wish that these and all evinced more thorough power to deal with them on the truest Christian basis.

Strivings for the Faith. A Series of Lectures Delivered in the New Hall of Science, Old-street, City-road, under the Auspices of the Christian Evidence Society. London: Hodder and Stoughton. 1874.

THESE lectures were delivered with a view to meet some of the difficulties and objections that are raised at the present day in reference to Christianity; especially such points as are insisted upon by the "Secularists."

The lectures are independent of each other, but form together a small body of evidence of no mean value, and illustrating, on a small scale, how effectually every point of attack may be defended. In the first lecture it is shown, with a succinctness approaching to severity, how great are the difficulties on the side of unbelief in accounting for historical Christianity. In the second an argument for the truth of Christianity is deduced from the variations in the Gospel records. This topic is treated with skill and ingenuity. The lecture on the apocryphal Gospels in a few pages gives a clear view of these singular writings and the grounds for rejecting them from the level of the Canonical Gospels. The evidential value of St. Paul's early Epistles, viewed simply as historical documents, is too large a subject to be fully treated in a single lecture; but it is well, if briefly, illustrated. The conversion of St. Paul; the alleged difficulties in the moral teaching of the New Testament; and the combination of unity with progressiveness of thought in the books of Holy Scripture, are successively dealt with. The final lecture is on the autobiography of John Stuart Mill. These lectures, though differing in merit as they do in form, are worthy of careful reading alike by those who are disturbed in mind by the many perplexing questions which unfriendly criticism so lavishly expends on the Christian Faith, and by those who, rejecting Christianity, are in their own interests bound to ponder carefully the consequences of that rejection. The difficulties of their position are here shown to be far greater and more serious than those of the Christian believer.

Scripture Proverbs. Illustrated, Annotated, and Applied. By Francis Jacox. London: Hodder and Stoughton. 1874.

MR. JACOX still continues to add to the remarkable series of works with which his name is associated. As in his previous volumes, the plan adopted is to take a text, and to bring to it illustrations, anecdotes, and parallel passages from all likely and unlikely corners in the field of general literature. We have, by this time, almost ceased to wonder at his resources, and accept a new volume every six months as a matter of course. None the less must we acknowledge the skill with which Mr. Jacox pursues his method, and the inexhaustible ease and readiness with which he crowds the margin of a subject with comments gathered from a hundred authors.

The Pilgrim Psalms: an Exposition of the Songs of Degrees. By Rev. Samuel Cox, Nottingham. Daldy, Isbister & Co. 1874.

WE rejoice in the multiplication of books of this kind, which tend to make the Bible in all its parts a living book, and hope that their appearance testifies to a demand as well as a supply, a demand which Mr. Cox and many others are well qualified to meet. We are glad to believe that there is a revived interest in the study of the Bible in the present generation, a study to which defenders of the faith have to some extent been driven by fresh attacks upon it from new quarters, and to which many have been drawn by the fuller and more general acquaintance with sources of illustration and confirmation unknown to our fathers. The opening up of Talmudical research, and the knowledge acquired from deciphering ancient inscriptions, may be mentioned as two only among many of these sources of illustration; and to those lines of investigation which seemed at the outset most hostile to our commonly received notions about parts of the Bible, we have been indebted in many cases for the most valuable elucidation of the real meaning. We rejoice, above all, in the *popularising* of this knowledge. The comments, as well as the text, should be "understanded in the vulgar tongue," and by that is meant a great deal more than their being written in the English language. Every book which gives clearly and simply, without failure in accuracy, although stripped of technical phraseology, the later results of science, is an unspeakable boon to thousands; and assuredly, therefore, such a boon is every book which enables the thousands rightly to understand the Book of books. For its words, while intelligible to the "wayfaring man" in such sense that he cannot mistake from them God's will

concerning himself, nevertheless abound in difficulties which do often cause him to stumble, if not to fall; and every generation has its own difficulties, which require new interpreters and fresh elucidation.

These remarks have been suggested rather by the work Mr. Cox is doing in the mass, than by the book before us itself. As he says in his preface, the qualities required to write such a book are not rare, and the work, though admirably done, is not of a particularly difficult kind. Almost all the materials necessary are found in such books as *Delitzsch* and *Perowne*, and to these the scholar and the minister will refer for all they want. Inasmuch, then, as this volume is for English readers, and for the many rather than the few of these, we regret that it should have appeared in such a shape, and at such a price, as is likely to prevent its having the circulation it otherwise would have had. Mr. Cox suggests its use as a text-book in schools; but a volume dealing only with fifteen psalms, the price of which is nine shillings, is hardly likely to find its way into such channels.

The work Mr. Cox sets before him is neatly, thoroughly, and pleasantly done. To each of the psalms he gives a title, "Song of the Start," "Song of the Arrival," "Of the Return," "Of the Redemption," and the unity preserved in each lyric, as well as the unity which pervades the whole series of psalms, is well pointed out. We find admirably combined in Mr. Cox the imagination necessary to conceive and pourtray the pictures that were present before the mind of the Jewish singer, and the moral insight and force necessary to impress the teaching which we of later days may gather in each individual case. Two extracts may suffice to bring out these characteristics of our author's expository style, and with them we close, heartily commending the volume itself to our readers.

The writer of the "Song of the Farm," Psalm cxxix., seeks a figure to describe those contemptible foes of his country, Sanballat, Tobiah, and the Samarian freebooters:—

"No image of terror like that of the fierce Babylonian ploughman scoring the back of Israel with the keen share will serve his turn. He looks for an image of that which is mean, worthless, transitory, and he finds it in the grass which springs and withers on the village roofs. But though his fine scorn for the Samaritans moves him to select this figure, when once he has got it he falls in love with it, and the angry heat dies out of his mind as he recalls the pleasant scenes of rural life which it suggests. *Rural* life; for though grass might spring up even on the flat roofs of an Eastern city, and does spring up in the cracks and crevices even now, when the roofs are plastered with a composition of mortar, tar, ashes, and sand, yet it grows but sparsely, and is soon trodden down; whereas then, as now, the peasants' houses

in the country hamlets were roofed with a plaster of mud and straw, in which the grass would grow as freely as in the fields. Obviously it is such a rustic roof that the poet has in his eye—a roof all covered, after the rains, with long waving grass, which, however, for lack of moisture, soon withers beneath the burning rays of an Eastern sun. 'Let the base plundering Samaritans be like that worthless grass on the village housetops, which withers before men have leisure to tread it down, or to pluck it up.' This is the Psalmist's first thought; an angry thought, no doubt, but perhaps we should be angry if our crops were ridden over by robbers, and our homesteads plundered by them. . . . As he thinks of the grass withering on the roof, the pleasant avocations of country life crowd in upon his thoughts, and crowd out his anger. He sees the mower swinging his sickle in the rich cornfield, gathering the wheat or barley in his hands; he sees the reaper gathering behind the mower, taking the corn into his arms, filling his bosom with it, that he may bind it into sheaves. The field lies slumbering in the sultry heat. A broad pathway runs through it. The passers by stop to look on at the bright, busy scene, and, in the courteous and pious Eastern fashion, they greet the reapers with the salutation, 'The blessing of Jehovah be upon you!' And the reapers, glad to pause, straighten themselves from their work amid the sheaves, look up, and shout back, 'We bless you in the name of Jehovah.'"—Pp. 208—210.

And here is a paragraph from the close of the exposition of that most exquisite little Psalm cxxxi.:—

"Never was the gift of humility more needed than now. For how many of us do habitually busy ourselves in great things and wonderful, which are beyond us! If we do not attack the loftiest themes and the insoluble problems which have exercised the minds of men ever since they began to think, yet how little humility and patience do we show in forming the conclusions we reach, and the judgments we are so ready to pronounce! Even in the Church of Christ, where one might hope to find a little modesty and lowliness of spirit, how often do we who are at home in it frame opinions without thought, and impose them without charity! Ask almost any man you meet what the constitution of a Church should be, or what the contents of a creed, or what the forms of service, and lo! he has a confident and authoritative reply at your service, and thinks you but a heretic or a fool if you differ from him, although these are points on which the holiest and wisest men have differed for centuries, and are likely to differ for centuries to come. . . . Our hearts *are* haughty, and our eyes lifted up; we do, too, commonly busy ourselves with things too great and wonderful for us; and hence it is that we are so restless and perturbed. There is no peace but in the humility which leans on God, which trusts in Him, which con-

fesses weakness, and ignorance, and guilt, which is not ashamed to say, 'I do not know, I cannot tell;' which rejoices not in the faults and defects of others, but rejoices in whatever is true in them, and good and kind. Only as we recover the spirit of a little child, of a weaned child, and rest in simple, lowly faith in God, shall we enter into the peace which passeth all understanding."

Lux e Tenebris; or, the Testimony of Consciousness. Trübner and Co. 1874.

WHAT this title means we have found ourselves utterly at a loss to explain. In the crude, metaphysical farrago that this book contains is so much darkness, so little light, that the title is inexplicable as descriptive of the subject matter, unless the writer has emerged from Stygian shades indeed. A somewhat prolonged study of the mysterious chart at the beginning failed to clear up the subject; for whatever in it is new has no meaning, and whatever has meaning is not new. At length, towards the close of the book, we came across this passage, which threw a faint gleam of light on the matter. It occurs amidst some pages of declamation describing the present state of woman amongst us, a state ascribed to two causes, "man's greater physical strength and his selfishness," making her "a household chattel, a marketable commodity, by turns his idol, his toy, his victim, his slave."

"There exists for her a yet more inexorable enslaver—himself enslaved—the theologian. Bound fast to a creed which has long been dead, the theologian holds in the same bonds woman also. .... Thus woman is held enslaved, both hands bound, and were she left to her own efforts alone, there would be but scant hopes of her freedom."

Nevertheless, the author of *Lux e Tenebris* and others are at work, and—

"When their work has been accomplished, and the theologian has become free, then his fellow-slave, woman, will be freed also. Then will the theologian resort for truth direct to the same sources which inspired of old the great Master in his science, nature and the human heart, and in lieu of the worthless refuse which now goes under the name of theology—the metaphysical moonshine which has been transmitted from the past through intellectual channels of constantly diminishing calibre, ... he will be able to offer to us a nutritious, invigorating reality .... an art which men may profess without a blush, and practise without degradation."—P. 342.

So, then, if we will leave the "metaphysical moonshine," the "worthless refuse," which, at present, is all that the Christian theologian can boast of, and sit at the feet of the author of this

wonderful book, we may stand some chance of being able "*to profess the art of religion without a blush*," and at last reach *Lucem e Tenebris*. Those who feel their deficiencies in this respect, and are very hard put to for a remedy, we would recommend to buy this book.

Natural Science, Religious Creeds and Scripture Truth; what they Teach concerning the Mystery of God. By Daniel Reid, Author of "The Divine Footsteps in Human History," and other Works. Edinburgh and London: William Blackwood and Sons. 1874.

MR. REID should first ascertain for us what the facts of natural science, religious creeds, and Scripture truth are, before he begins to philosophise upon them in their relations to the mystery of God. In proceeding to philosophise upon them he should lay down a few simple rules, which might save him and his readers much trouble. Such are, to affix a definite meaning to every term he employs, never to use twenty words when ten will serve the purpose, not to affix a mystical meaning to Scriptures that will bear a good literal sense, always to proceed toward some well-marked goal, such as the illustration of an old truth or the establishment of a new. These rules are plain and obviously necessary, if the smallest success is to be hoped for in an undertaking so vast as that which Mr. Reid proposes to himself. His meaning is good, but despite the prepossessions inspired in us by the name of the author, the title of the book, and the excellent print and paper which form the vehicle of his thoughts, we fail to see that he is any nearer to his purpose at the end than at the beginning of his lucubrations. Take the following specimen, which we lighted upon at random. "Before the world was, there were at least two laws in operation. One was the law of eternity, which was the habitation of the high and lofty One; the other was the law of the form of God, which form was the first-begotten high and holy habitation of the high and lofty One, whose name is Holy. Of each law there was a spirit. The spirit of the law of eternity was the Eternal Spirit. The spirit of the law of the form of God was the Holy Spirit. The law of eternity was the law of self. The law of the form of God was the law of God. The law of eternity and its spirit, and the law of the form of God and its spirit, were therefore contrary the one to the other. The natural antagonism of the two laws and their spirits each towards the other was such that co-existence or voluntary co-operation in one state of being, before the foundation of the world, was impossible. The law of eternity ruled therein, to the entire exclusion therefrom of the law of the form of God. And the law of the form of God ruled therein to the entire exclusion therefrom of

the law of eternity. Eternity and the form of God, however, were both habitations of the high and lofty One, whose name is Holy." Here we would ask Mr. Reid a few questions. How did he learn what took place before the world was? How does he know there were two laws? What is the law of eternity and what the law of the form of God? How can a law become a habitation? What is the spirit of a law, and why does he distinguish the Holy Spirit from the Eternal Spirit?

What does he mean by the law of eternity being the law of self, and the law of the form of God being the law of God? What necessity was there for a natural antagonism between the two laws and the two spirits, and how does co-existence come to mean co-operation? And, finally, if the law of eternity ruled therein (it is fair to ask, in what?) to the exclusion of the law of the form of God, and the law of the form of God to the exclusion of the law of self, then how could they both be habitations of the high and lofty One whose name is Holy? But we fear it is too late in the day for Mr. Daniel Reid to commence elementary lessons in logical method. There are one hundred and forty-four octavo pages of such stuff as the above in the first part of Mr. Reid's work, and there are two hundred and nineteen more in the second, and the only reply they give to any question, is a particular affirmative reply to the question which Mr. Reid prefixes to the above extract,—"Are the actual contents of the state of chaos ascertainable?"

Philosophy, Science, and Revelation. By Rev. Charles B. Gibson, M.R.S.A., Lecturer of St. John's, Hoxton. Longmans. 1874.

THE following interesting anecdote is retailed by the author of this book, in his preface:—

"I was once asked by a clever young man of the modern school of thought—or, more correctly, of theory—if I really believed in the Mosaic account of the creation. As a clergyman, I might have appeared indignant at such a reflection on my honesty, but I merely replied, 'I really do.' The shrug of contempt with which the neophyte received my reply was positively overwhelming. I found that I had fallen in the estimation of that young philosopher many more degrees than I shall venture to record. When those young men grow older they will know better, and be less demonstrative in support of new theories."—P. viii.

Whether any of "those young men" have perused Mr. Gibson's book we cannot say, but we doubt whether they will be taught either modesty or careful thought by reading, under the

pretentious title of *Philosophy, Science, and Revelation*, such writing as this:—

"Very poetical and beautiful indeed [the account of the creation of woman], but not the less true on this account. Perhaps you would have preferred that your ancestors had been developed from Medusæ, or sea-nettles which assumed in the course of 850,000 years the appearance of a pair of shell-fish, furnished with antennæ, busily engaged in the process of natural selection, commonly styled courtship. Well, you have before you the Mosaic and Darwinian account of the creation of man and his wife, and the way in which they were brought together, so you can take your choice. To 'natural selection,' or the courtship of the lower animals, or even of man, we have nothing to say one way or the other. It seems very natural and amusing; but we feel disposed, after reading Darwin's account of it, to ask, as the Scotchman asked after reading Milton's *Paradise Lost*, 'What does it prove?'"

Little, indeed, is "proved" by the few superficial pages in which the author endeavours to settle in off-hand style such slight questions as "the history of creation," "the origin of man," "the antiquity of man," "varieties of race," and relation of the Bible narrative to modern discoveries, as well as other sundry questions as to Satan and the inhabitants of the angelic world, which scientific men would not trouble to discuss with him. Here and there is a parade of quotations, but we regret that the author, in entering upon an important and difficult subject, has not given more thought and consideration to it, and produced a book more likely to succeed in the end he sets before himself,—the right interpretation and vindication of the Mosaic account of creation.

II. BIOGRAPHY AND GENERAL LITERATURE.

Autobiography and other Memorials of Mrs. Gilbert (formerly Ann Taylor). Edited by Josiah Gilbert. Two Vols. H. S. King and Co.

In literary merit, and in the character portrayed, this book may take rank with the *Hare Memorials*, and, like them, should find a place in every cultured and pious English home. Yet the two books are, in most respects, an extreme and suggestive contrast; suggestive, among other things, of the curious way in which distinct worlds lie side by side in our English society, each unknown to the other to an extent, we suspect, impossible in any land but our own. Mrs. Hare had relations, more or less intimate with men like the late Mr. Maurice and Archbishop Manning; Mrs. Gilbert, or, as she is better known, Ann Taylor, throughout her long life was singularly isolated from the literary society of her day, with the exception of that of her own gifted relatives. But the contrast is by no means altogether in favour of Mrs. Hare, nor even in those particulars in which she seemed to have an undoubted advantage. Strange to say, Mrs. Gilbert's piety strikes us as the more catholic, and her culture as much the broader of the two. With all its charm, the Hare book is simply a monologue of piety—a piety, too, which had its life within very marked, not to say narrow limits. Ann Taylor, on the other hand, has a word to say on most public questions: Free Trade, Disestablishment, Women's Rights, Broad Church Theology, the Morals of Romanism; each has its turn. However much some of us may think that hers was not the decisive word on many of these questions, it may be willingly allowed that she always said a genial and a shrewd one. As in the case of Mrs. Hare, outward surroundings somewhat limited her point of view, as they eventually deprived her of the opportunity of winning that place in literature to which her gifts entitled her.

The two volumes of Mrs. Gilbert's *Memorials* tell of a life such as one is apt to think was never realised outside the pages of a German story. In one way they have a special interest; they are a consistent attempt to apply to biography the principles that have made pre-raphaelite art, one main element of which is an uncompromising realism. Macaulay abolished for us, long since, "the dignity of history;" and if history does not fear homely

detail, still less need biography. Much more life and variety has been one result of this change in the very principles of art. Writers like George Eliot and Mrs. Gaskell have gathered up for us in their most popular creations the poetry and the pathos that lie about everyday life and everyday people, and it is a closely similar faculty which is the best literary quality of Ann Taylor's mind. The little knot of folk at the Lavenham Meeting-house, their primitive surroundings, and their funny ways, were precisely the material that suited her. We learn what sort of England our great grandmothers lived in, when the French were looked for any night at Colchester, and those who could sent their families out of the town; when an umbrella "with a stick like the 'mast of a yacht" was the latest achievement of civilisation; and when the ladies and gentlemen of Lavenham walked to their evening parties in pattens! The *Autobiography* is a perfectly charming fragment: a series of portraits wonderfully real, very quaint, but very tenderly drawn, by a memory that, all her life through, lingered with loving regret over every relic of the past. So strong is the spell, that before we have done with her we are quite ready to look at Mr. Stribbling, the blacksmith, and Mr. Meeking, the baker, through her eyes, and feel towards them as humble friends quite worthy of the regard she gave them. The editor has wisely retained this domestic character throughout.

Ann Taylor's father Isaac (second of the name) contrived to solve in his own family most of the problems which vex the souls of educators to this hour. Mr. Taylor brought up, not only his sons, but also his daughters, to earn their own livings, if need were; and in her old age Ann explains, with professional accuracy, the process known technically to engravers as "biting." The girls shared all their brothers' studies, and though some knowledge of "fortification," or, rather, the principles of it, might even yet be deemed superfluous in the "higher education of women," no harm came of this "equality of the sexes," if the Taylor method is to be judged by its results. Something, too, very like mixed classes was allowed by this father, who was so greatly in advance of his own day, as well as, perhaps, somewhat of our own. The "apprentices formed part of the family," and of course shared the workroom life with the Taylors. The best element in all this is not its picturesqueness, though that is very charming, but its healthy homeliness, so different from what one catches glimpses of now-a-days, when homely families are apt to be stupid, and new-fashioned clever ones, full of out-door excitements, in which homeliness is impossible. One longs to see the best points of the two combined, as in the old Taylor life, which, by the way, would not have been half as charming if they had been wealthy.

But this time of work, art, narrow means, and family life of

the closest and most loving sort came to an end. The household was transferred to Ongar, not, however, before Ann and Jane had deserted art for literature, with quite enough success to give zest and promise to the future, but scarcely with their father's full consent, who "did not want his girls to be authors," in which wish, Ann slyly adds, "he was not entirely gratified."

The poems of Ann and Jane Taylor have become classics in their way, and have been the best loved literature of each generation of English children since they were written. It is needless to refer to them here, further than to say, that in the chapter in which Mr. Gilbert deals with his mother's literary career, he enters a strong protest against the modern notion which would keep children as far as possible from all sights "of the hard and ugly realities of life." He also vindicates the poems from the charge of a narrow and gloomy theology, which has been brought against them in common with many of the hymns of that day. It is true, nevertheless, that Mrs. Gilbert did modify some expressions, and it is probable, were she now living, a few others might not have been retained.

Very soon after the family arrival at Ongar comes Ann's love story, a very appropriate bit of romance, ending in her marriage with Mr. Gilbert, who is justly regarded by Nonconformists as one of their ablest theologians. His book on the Atonement, within its own limits, has never been superseded. Through her husband, Mrs. Gilbert was brought into some connection with Methodism, for Mr. Gilbert's Lincolnshire relatives were all of them Wesleyans. His father "had allowed a barn to be used by Mr. Wesley," and this schismatic proceeding being visited in a fashion not infrequent in those days, the "victim" left the church altogether, built a chapel, and became a Methodist. But intercourse with these relatives was rare in Mrs. Gilbert's busy life, nor do their Church relationships appear to have arrested her attention. It would be very unjust to charge her with narrowness, but circumstances shut her up very much to that section of the Christian Church with which her husband was connected. The way in which she fulfilled her duties is a noble lesson of self-denial, practical wisdom, and untiring effort for all whom she could help. The characteristics of her piety were many and marked; one phase of it will not be passed over. Thoughtful, earnest, all but morbidly self-distrustful, teaching and practising a submission to the Divine will which knew no reserves, this large-hearted woman and wise Christian, whose words of counsel and comfort will be precious to many a weary soul, yet passed through life with comparatively little of the "joy of salvation" for her portion. Physical and mental idiosyncrasies had considerably more to do with this than any religious "views," but in all such experiences there is much we must reverently leave with Him whose "ways,"

even with His saints, "are not as our ways." But this undercurrent of sombre feeling seldom came to the surface. Her letters are full of bright sayings as well as hints of wisdom, which her shrewd wits had gathered from the experiences of a long life, and which she put into excellent English. Aphorisms such as the following abound:—

"We are never responsible to-day for to-morrow's light."

"Do the duty of to-day, and you will be better able to do that of to-morrow."

"God finds sorrow for us; we make regrets for ourselves."

"We need time and thought for our eternal interests. To do otherwise is as if when stopping in a long journey at a railway station for refreshments, we were to employ our ten minutes in counting the people or the dishes—not wrong in itself, but very foolish, for we shall find no food elsewhere."

For her, as for most of us, life gathered store of sorrow in its course, and some of hers found touching expression in lines which deserve to live. The deaths of children, of her husband, and in the last years of her life, of her brother Isaac Taylor, from whose letters to her a few passages of great interest are given, were all strokes which left their mark. But she kept a brave heart till the end, the few details of which her son has given with much simplicity and tenderness. There was little to tell, for to her the messenger came in gentle guise. She was found one morning in a slumber, from which all effort to rouse her failed, and after a couple of days she passed to her rest.

The editor has performed his task with much grace and feeling, and the literary workmanship is throughout careful and finished. There is no slipshod English, nor carelessness of any sort, but he has, perhaps, not escaped the besetment of all biographers of the day. With the majority of readers the book might have been more effective if it had been somewhat shorter, but it deserves to be widely known, and very especially to be read by all who desire to fashion their own lives after a rare pattern of "plain living and high thinking."

Ulrich von Hutten: his Life and Times. By David Friedrich Strauss. Translated from the Second German Edition by Mrs. Sturge. London: Daldy, Isbister & Co. 1874.

We have seldom seen a biography more entirely satisfactory than this picturesque little volume, for which we are indebted to Mrs. Sturge. In the space of four hundred pages we have a wonderfully life-like picture of the indomitable German knight and poet, with no concealment of his many defects, and, what is more surprising, with no exaggeration of his historical importance. So

many and various were the phases of his character, and so numerous were the contests in the front rank of which he fought, that new light is thrown upon almost all the great movements which were progressing during the thirty-four momentous years of his short life.

We are constantly finding unexpected side-lights thrown upon the progress of the Reformation, and upon the development of national feeling, and of the Renaissance spirit in Germany, with numberless personal traits of the many great men whom Hutten counted among his friends, and a most pleasing picture of the strong bond of union and affection which bound them together.

We have little inclination to look for the faults of the book. We sometimes feel that deficiency in warmth of colouring which is almost inseparable from a translation, even though Mrs. Sturge be the translator. We should have preferred to have seen the epigrams, from which extracts are given, in the original rather than translated, and the omissions that have been made in translating will detract from the value of the work as an authority for reference, although they will probably secure a wider circle of readers, and a more immediate success.

The interest of the book is exclusively literary and historical—it cannot be said to have any theological or religious aspect. In the earlier part the Renaissance is the force that governs Hutten's mind. After escaping from the monastery to which his father had confined him, he successively studies at one after another of the leading universities in Germany and Italy, and makes the acquaintance of most of the great scholars of Europe. The central event of the period was the struggle of the united brotherhood of letters against the Dominicans and Obscurantists of Cologne, who were trying to procure the condemnation of Reuchlin for his attempts to preserve the learned books of the Jews from destruction. The "Epistolæ Obscurorum Virorum," a series of fictitious letters, supposed to be interchanged between Reuchlin's enemies—written by Hutten and his friends, is, to Englishmen, the best known of Hutten's works, and forms the subject of the raciest of all the chapters in the book.

Indignation was the nurse of Hutten's genius. Hitherto his denunciations had been directed chiefly against his own personal foes, or the foes of his family; but the "Epistolæ" are written against the enemies of universal culture, and his powers increase with the greater dignity of the theme. At the same time the other feeling, which was to have yet more power over him than humanism, the intense feeling of his German nationality, was beginning to take hold upon him, and to make itself appear in his writings. At the close of the fifteenth century, the Germans were beginning to have a very keen sense of their individuality as a nation. The Holy Roman Empire—"no longer holy, nor

Roman, nor an empire"—had so hopelessly lost all life and meaning, that it could not any more divert patriotism from its natural channels.

The severance of Italy and Arles, and the independence of Poland and Denmark had relieved the empire of its chief non-German relations, and the advance of the Turks, and the growth of power and national spirit in the other European kingdoms, had made it necessary for the Germans to bind themselves more closely together for purposes of self-defence. Hence arose that suspicion of foreigners and strong national spirit, which finds its intensest expression in the works of Hutten. At first it is chiefly the Venetians against whom he directs his pen; but it is not long before he turns upon Pope Julius. The position of the papacy, as the centre and eventual support of all the efforts to check inquiry and reform, was the universal ground of the hate borne to it by scholars and politicians; but the long alliance of the popes with France, and the peculiarly exorbitant nature of their political claims on Germany, still further embittered the German soul of Hutten; and he gradually diverts all his energies from personal and even literary objects, into the channel of political opposition to Rome.

Thus, though with different objects, and under different influences—political in one case and religious in the other—Hutten and Luther found themselves fighting side by side in the great contest of the day, for individual freedom of thought against authority. At first Hutten regarded the monk of Wittenberg with contemptuous indifference, but after Luther had boldly accepted the position of Huss, and denied the infallibility of Pope and Councils, he seems to have been quite fascinated by the grand personality of the Reformer; and it shows the greatness of the man's soul that he, the aristocratic poet, could write to the Thuringian peasant and monk, learned only in the Fathers and the Scriptures, "I will renounce all my poetic fame, O monk, and will follow thee as thy shield-bearer." When Luther stood abashed before the great assembly of the empire at Worms, but yet declared that he would not retract, all Germany was vibrating with the intense feeling which found expression in Hutten's works, now no longer written in choice Latin to the learned few who could understand it, but appealing to the whole German people, in their native tongue. From the letters of the time that remain to us, we know how much was expected by the Reformers from his power over his fellow-nobles, and how great was the influence which he wielded—an influence which Strauss would certainly not seem to have over-estimated. Hutten's great hope was for a united and free kingdom, under the vigorous direction of the Emperor, and in a succession of publications he tried to persuade Charles to tread with firmer steps in the track of his

ancestor, Sigismund. But Charles was cautious and exclusive, was encumbered by an Italian policy, and was quite unable even to understand the aspirations of the Germans, who were thus forced to look around for other leaders; and Hutten was safe only in the castles of his knightly friends.

The tendency to centralisation, universal throughout Europe in the sixteenth century, was felt not less strongly in Germany than elsewhere, and, limited as were the prerogatives of the Emperor, and distracted as were his efforts, there was yet a possibility that he might attain a regal authority as great as that of other sovereigns. Napoleon has said that Charles V. was but a fool, or he would have put himself (as Hutten had hoped) at the head of the Reformation movement, and have so directed its course as to be able to crush both princes and pope. Even as it was, he succeeded for a time in rendering himself all but absolute, till in 1552, the Reformation, arraying against him forces yet stronger than the tendency to centralisation, swept away the Imperial authority for ever. But the centralising influences worked with all their force in favour of the greater princes, whose policy was to dismember Germany into a vast number of almost independent states. By the end of the century their policy had triumphed—they had set limits to the imperial power, had reduced the nobles to subjection, had obtained possession of many of the imperial cities, and had crushed any appearance of popular influence in their dominions. But in 1522 the struggle was not yet decided in their favour, and all the other forces in the nation were watching their progress with alarm. Though their numbers and importance were much diminished, the lesser German nobles were still powerful in the West. From Strauss, we have a very full description of the successful struggle which they carried on with Duke Ulrich, of Wurtemberg, and now in 1522 they entered into a great league for mutual support; and Hutten, always proud of his noble blood, was the soul of the movement. He was chiefly urged on by the hope of being able to further the cause of the Reformation by joint action on the part of the knights, but there were many others who were actuated mainly by hostility to the princes, and by the hope of advancing the interests of their own order. It was this that ruined the movement; it rendered joint action with the cities and the people impossible, and Hutten was alone in advocating the alliance. The more moderate Reformers saw with alarm that reform was turning into revolution, and they stood aloof while the risings of the knights and the peasants were successively crushed, by the united power of the greater princes. It was by these last alone that the Reformation could be, and was saved, so that one of Hutten's aspirations—freedom from foreign influences—triumphed at the expense of the other,—political unity. The movement of the nobles had more than

failed; the alarm which it caused first created a strong party in Germany zealously opposed to all reform.

Hutten fled for safety into Switzerland, not yet disheartened by failure, sickness, and distress, by estrangement from the best loved of his friends, or by the suspicious distrust of the Reformers. He was kindly received by Zwingli, who, as a Republican and Humanist, had more sympathy with him than the leaders of the German Reformation. But before he could engage in any new attempt, he was carried off by the disease which had for years been wasting his frame. The last two chapters are among the most interesting in the book, and are full of pathos. They describe the anxious misgivings and the severed friendships of the noble band of scholars whom Hutten had numbered among his friends. In 1519 they had been as firmly united in support of Luther as formerly for Reuchlin, but most of them had not the rough strength which times of revolution require, and few of them could follow Hutten in all the lengths to which he had gone. His violent attack on Erasmus seemed to have alienated many of them from him for ever, but over his grave they forgot his faults, and one of them declared him to have been "Altogether loveable."

We heartily commend the book to all readers, and more especially to the historical student.

Life and Correspondence of Samuel Johnson, D.D., Missionary of the Church of England in Connecticut, and First President of King's College, New York. By E. Edwards Beardsley, D.D., Rector of St. Thomas's Church, New Haven. Second Edition. New York: Hurd and Houghton. London: Rivingtons. 1874.

BEYOND the fact that the Propagation Society sent a few Missionaries to America, who, on the conclusion of the War of Independence, generally returned to England, very little is known in this country of the position of the Episcopacy in the States during the last century. Of Episcopacy proper indeed there was none: that is, there were no bishops, and the origin of the New England settlements at least did not favour their introduction. The whole bent of the people's mind was against the principle of an establishment. Hence it is with some surprise we learn that, in the year 1722, Samuel Johnson, a genuine son of the soil, educated at Yale College, and ordained a minister among the Presbyterians, being persuaded, after much reading and reflection, of the superiority of the episcopal form of church-government, together with four or five others, set sail for England, was introduced to some of the chief Church dignitaries, and received ordination at the hands of the then Bishop of Norwich. Returning to America, Samuel Johnson settled as a Missionary in

Stratford, Connecticut, there being at that time no Episcopalian place of worship in the colony, nor any clergyman except himself. His position was a highly influential one, however, among the members of the Church of England throughout New England, while of course it exposed him to much animadversion on the part of his quondam friends. Not the least interesting part of the story is his friendship with Dean Berkeley, which commenced during the residence of the latter in Rhode Island, and only closed with his life. An early acquaintance with Bacon's *Advancement of Learning* had led Johnson into the wide fields of philosophy, and developed in him a taste for metaphysical pursuits. Before Berkeley's arrival in America he had formed a high estimate of his ability as a thinker, and become a convert to his opinions. He subsequently published an original work of some pretensions, entitled "*Elementa Philosophica:* containing chiefly Noetica, or Things relating to the Mind or Understanding; and Ethica, or Things relating to the Moral Behaviour." It was printed by Benjamin Franklin, and dedicated to the Bishop of Cloyne.

His relations with Whitefield, or rather with Whitefield's followers, were of a less amicable kind. "Probably no period of his life was filled with greater anxiety than that which immediately followed the itinerancy of Whitefield, and witnessed the result of his disorderly proceedings." In so far as the controversy was theological we should, of course, be disposed to side with Johnson in his reclamation against the system that merges all God's perfections in sovereignty, and all His gracious purposes in unconditional decrees. As to the disorders arising from Whitefield's publication of those doctrines we can say nothing, as the nature of them is not described. If such a work is to be judged by its fruits, and those fruits the ecclesiastical statistics of a century later, no very adverse judgment would be passed by a candid mind upon a spiritual movement which communicated such an impulse to all non-conforming Churches that at this day each of the leading denominations numbers several millions of adherents, while Episcopacy barely reaches half a million.

Johnson was in frequent communication with other leading members of the Anglican Church: the name of Archbishop Secker, in particular, occurs in connection with the scheme for providing bishops for the colonies, which however the disturbed state of affairs rendered at that time abortive. Johnson's correspondence, together with the records preserved of his visit to England, and of his son's visit for a similar purpose in 1756, affords some curious glimpses of the upper ranks of English society in the earlier half of the eighteenth century. Clergymen gathered at clubs and coffee-houses just as readily as now they crowd to a congress or convocation: an infidel ecclesiastic is seen

grasping at one bishopric, and, though thwarted in that by the vigilance of his brethren, obtaining an Irish one of three times its value through the influence of Sir Robert Walpole, who in his turn is actuated by a desire to please the chancellor. The ravages wrought by the small-pox among Johnson's friends were such as ought to make us more thankful for Dr. Jenner than of late some appear to be. One of his companions sickened of it while in London, and another died; his son, who went to England for holy orders, fell a victim to the same disease, as also did Johnson's wife about the same time. So terrible were its ravages that Johnson was obliged more than once to suspend his ministrations and retire to a distance from his charge through fear of the infection.

As years rolled on Johnson's character and influence became more and more appreciated. His doctor's degree was conferred in 1748 by the University of Oxford. In 1749 he was invited by Franklin to assume the presidency of a college established under his auspices at Philadelphia; and in 1754 he actually accepted a similar position in connection with King's College, New York, together with a lectureship in Trinity Church of the same city. In 1763, at the age of 67, he relinquished his connection with the college, and retired to his former place of abode, where he died in 1772. He appears to have been a man of great energy and original genius, and to have laboured hard for the spiritual and intellectual interests of his country under great and sometimes almost overwhelming disadvantages. Altogether, Dr. Beardsley has produced a readable volume, in which he makes his readers acquainted with a man of no ordinary capacity, and one who would have been an ornament to any Church in any age.

The Life and Correspondence of the Rev. John Clowes, M.A., Rector for Sixty-two Years of St. John's Church, Manchester. London: Longmans and Co. 1874.

THE subject of this memoir was a native of Manchester, born in 1743, and, as stated in the title-page, was rector of St. John's church for sixty-two years. But this record of his long life gives us little insight into the history of Manchester, or of such of its more eminent citizens as were his contemporaries.

Mr. Clowes was educated at the Salford Grammar School, and at Trinity College, Cambridge, of which he afterwards became a fellow. Under a strong religious conviction he exchanged the life of a Fellow and Tutor for that of a parish clergyman, and at twenty-six years of age accepted the incumbency of the church of St. John, Manchester, which was offered to him by its founder, Mr. Edward Byrom. He states that at that time "his theological researches had been very limited, and his religious views were

accordingly very imperfect. He had, indeed, read the Thirty-nine Articles, which form the code of doctrine peculiar to the Established Church, and he had perused some of the more distinguished authors who endeavour to explain and confirm that code of doctrine. But this was all: he had no clear and distinct views of the eternal truth in his own mind, and his ideas on the subject were rather those of others than his own." By-and-by, however, he met with and read Law's *Christian Perfection*, and was deeply impressed by it. The writings of Law led to the perusal of such authors as Fénelon, Madame Guion, Böhme, Tauler, and other mystics. These writers, he conceived, did him good service in preparing the way for a clearer unfolding of Divine truth. But the determining event of his life was his becoming acquainted with the writings of Emanuel Swedenborg. Soon after looking into the *Vera Christiana Religio*, he records that he had a vision, or manifestation of a Divine glory, by which he was led "to read diligently, and receive affectionately, the heavenly doctrines of the New Jerusalem, and thus to bear his glad testimony to the second glorious advent of his God." Mr. Clowes soon became an ardent disciple of Swedenborg, and devoted himself throughout the remainder of his long life to the diffusion of the "new doctrines." It will not surprise those who are aware of the difficulty of showing what views may *not* be held by a clergyman of the Church of England, to know that Mr. Clowes remained undisturbed in his cure, though cited once before Bishop Porteus, to answer the charge, amongst others, of denying the doctrine of the Trinity. This citation is referred to by Mr. Clowes and his biographer as persecution, another instance of the misuse to which this term is continually subject. It is hardly fair to brand as persecution the appeal to the proper authority of a people puzzled beyond measure by "new doctrines," to determine whether these "new doctrines" were compatible with the standards of the Church of England. In any other relation of human life than that of parson and people, some effort would be made to restrain departure from a well-understood agreement, and even if it affected matters less important than religious teaching; and such an effort would not be called persecution.

Although to our mind a teacher of the New Jerusalem theology is entirely out of his place in a pulpit of the Church of England, we have nothing to say against the honesty of Mr. Clowes. He was evidently a very sincere believer in the doctrines he adopted; he was supported in them by many of his friends; and he succeeded in explaining them to his ecclesiastical superiors so as to secure, if not their approval, their protection. His greatest defence, however, lay in the beauty of his character, to which there is a wide range of consenting testimony.

The most interesting description of Mr. Clowes to be met with,

occurs in De Quincey's Autobiographic Sketches. We extract the following passage: "He was the most spiritual-looking, the most saintly in outward aspect of all human beings whom I have known throughout life. He was rather tall, pale, and thin; the most unfleshly, the most of a sublimated spirit dwelling already more than half in some purer world, that a poet could have imagined. He was already aged when I first knew him, a clergyman of the Church of England, which may seem strange in connection with his Swedenborgianism; but he was however so. He was rector of a large parish in a large town, the more active duties of which parish were discharged by his curate; but much of the duties within the church were still discharged by himself, and with such exemplary zeal, that his parishioners afterwards celebrating the 50th anniversary or golden jubilee of his appointment to the living, went further than is usual in giving a public expression and a permanent shape to their sentiments of love and veneration. I am surprised, on reflection, that this venerable clergyman should have been unvisited by episcopal censures. . . . However, my friend continued unvexed for a good deal more than fifty years, enjoying that peace, external as well as internal, which, by so eminent a title, belonged to a spirit so evangelically meek and dove-like."

Of Mr. Clowes's ministrations among the Swedenborgian Societies little need be said here. We have no wish to ridicule the ideas and phraseology of his sect. As to critical refutation, it is entirely out of the question. We look in vain for principles of interpretation held in common, or for points of contact between our way of thinking and that of a genuine expositor of the "New Doctrines." Let the reader judge of our wisdom in declining the office of a critic from the following specimen of Mr. Clowes's style, taken from the close of a sermon on regeneration: "Man's spiritual body is formed as to every *organ* and *sense* from the Grand Man, in Heaven, and the Grand Man, in Heaven, is formed from the Divine Humanity of Jesus Christ—each part and sense is quickened (as in natural birth) from its corresponding part in the Grand Man, by reception of influx from those societies of angels; for man is a centre of all influxes from the Grand Man." It is of little use to object to anything in particular when we understand nothing at all.

An anecdote of Wesley appears in this biography on which there rests the stamp of manifest improbability. "The Rev. John Wesley, when he visited Liverpool, frequently stayed with Mr. Houghton, who related to Mr. Clowes that when Wesley was with him shortly after the death of Swedenborg, he declared in the most solemn manner, that we might burn all the old books of theology, for God had sent a teacher from heaven, and in the writings of Swedenborg we might learn all that is necessary for

us to know." Swedenborg died in March 1772. Just two years before that Wesley writes in his journal: "I sat down to read and seriously consider some of the writings of Baron Swedenborg. I began with huge prejudice in his favour, knowing him to be a pious man, one of a strong understanding, of much learning, and one who thoroughly believed himself. But I could not hold out long. Any one of his visions puts his real character out of doubt. He is one of the most ingenious, lively, entertaining madmen that ever set pen to paper." Seven years later Wesley's opinion remained unchanged, and he writes: "I wish those pious men, Mr. Clowes and Clotworthy, would calmly consider these things, before they usher into the world any more of this madman's dreams." But it is not necessary further to disprove the most apocryphal story told above. Wesley's deliberately recorded opinion of Swedenborg and his doctrines will be found in his works by those who care to know it.

Memorials of Thomas T. Lynch. Edited by William White. London: W. Isbister. 1874.

With only scanty materials at his command, Mr. White has succeeded in preparing a well-executed and pleasing memoir of his friend. With artistic skill he has carefully wrought the "eye" of his picture without permitting the accessories unduly to attract attention, preserving with true tact that only which was effective in the delineation of Mr. Lynch's character. This is the record of a life of suffering, of patient endurance, of hard work and simple faith. With a delicately sensitive nervous system, and an enfeebled body, suffering for years from an affliction which prevented him from taking solid food, he struggled bravely both to gain and impart knowledge. Commencing to preach in a very humble way, he poured forth tender, touching, forcible words, with "an authentic voice from the depths of spiritual experience;" though his congregation is described as consisting of about six men and twelve grown women. A tutored ear accidentally heard and appreciated; others were drawn to listen, and he gradually became known and loved. Spending much of his time in enforced solitude "his mind was more and more engrossed with the seriousness of life and the interior relations of God and man." He found recreation in the study of botany and music, and so chastened and attuned a poetic taste, the chief fruits of which he has left in his one volume of spiritual songs, a rill quiet if not profound; if not perfect, pure.

The interest of Mr. Lynch's life to all beyond his friends and congregation, centres in the celebrated "Rivulet Controversy," into the merits of which we need not enter, save to say, that he

patiently bore the attacks directed against him in the name of evangelical truth because his free spirit spoke its deep experiences in words which offended ears quicker to detect verbal defection than to discern the true evangelical spirit. His defence in the *Review of the Rivulet Controversy* is not wanting in keenness of criticism, wit, pungency of satire, quaint retort, or spiritual fidelity. Far more was made of the matter than the little rill of song called for.

In reading this memoir we have had no thought of the writer; he has not obtruded himself upon our attention, but with grace has receded from view, that his subject only might be apparent. No formal estimate of Mr. Lynch's work or his character is attempted. This is a rare quality in memoirs.

Elementary History of Art. An Introduction to Ancient and Modern Architecture, Sculpture, Painting, Music. By N. D'Anvers. With a Preface by T. Roger Smith, F.R.I.B.A. Illustrated with One Hundred and Twenty Woodcuts. London: Asher and Co., 13, Bedford-street, Covent-garden. 1874.

We have long advocated a systematic and rational arrangement of the fine arts as a basis for text-books dealing with this complex subject; and we consider the arrangement of the *Elementary History of Art*, fully described above, a decided advance on any similar work that has yet appeared in England. The arrangement of the arts which we have advocated on former occasions is that based on the historic order of their birth and development,—an order which yields an æsthetic scale of decreasing generality, and increasing technicality in the modes of expression. This æsthetic scale gives the first place to poetry as the parent of all the other arts; and music, painting, sculpture, and architecture follow, each being less general and more technical than the preceding one,—and each being also more national than the preceding one. We have protested, and we still protest, against the exclusion of poetry and music from works professing to deal with art generally; and we welcome this book as the first *Elementary History of Art* published in England, as far as we know, with even music recognised in its right place. Poetry will come in time to be regarded as the basis of all art, and dealt with accordingly in elementary text-books; and when that is the case the need of making the poetic section the first in such a work as this of Mr. D'Anvers will probably be recognised. In the meantime, as that work deals with the four children-arts only, and not with the parent-art at all, there is something to be said in favour of the inversion of the æsthetic scale which alone, of all proposed æsthetic scales, is tenable. This inversion is simple and direct, and does not mix

the arts up anyhow; instead of dealing with music first as the most general and least technical of the four arts included in the book, Mr. D'Anvers places the most special and technical art, architecture, first, and comes strictly down the scale, through sculpture and painting, to music. Now the great point in favour of this arrangement in a book for young students is that it engages the attention first on what is most material, and passes from stage to stage into regions more and more widely separated from material interests and material beauty, and more and more intimately connected with philosophic interests and spiritual beauty. Thus, in following out Mr. D'Anvers's programme of æsthetic instruction, the young student has a greater proportion of technical difficulties to contend with at first than at last, a less exacting demand on the higher nature which it is the mission of art to cultivate, and a more palpable series of facts and forms on which to engage the attention: his higher, or emotional, nature is educated gradually, while his intelligence is being well exercised from the first.

The want which the compiler of the present volume claims to supply for all who are engaged in education in England, is that of "a simple introductory text-book;" and it is needless to add that a profusely illustrated volume of between six and seven hundred pages, dealing with four of the fine arts historically, cannot well be more than introductory. It is, however, at the outset that the student most requires just direction in matters relating to the arts; so that the importance of a work such as the present is designed to be cannot easily be exaggerated. The compiler tells us that "the framework and the greater number of the illustrations are borrowed, with the permission of the publishers, from a small *Guide to the History of Art* which has long been in use in German schools; but this framework has been filled in by reference to standard English, German, and French authorities, and each division of the book has been supplemented by a chapter on art in England." This indicates that the Germans are considerably in advance of us in systematic cultivation of the history of art as a part of ordinary education; while it would seem, from the necessity to add a chapter, in each section, on English art, that they think as little of our artistic attainments as we, and the rest of the civilised world, think of their unhappy attempts at poetry before Goethe, and painting and sculpture since.

The woodcut illustrations vary considerably in merit, as well as in the condition of the blocks; but they are, on the whole, good; and even when not artistically fine, they are useful as diagrams. There has been a strange misadventure with the cut of Raphael's "Madonna della Sedia," at page 877: it will be remembered that, in this circular picture, the Virgin is represented sitting, with the infant Christ on her knee, and leaning towards Him,—the back of the chair being perpendicular; but in this instance, the cut, which

is a very bad one, is set in the page so that the chair's back is a long way out of the perpendicular, and looks as if the Virgin had tilted her seat backwards into the most perilous position. Again, in Michael Angelo's "Moses," facing page 248, not the slightest idea is conveyed of the expression of that grand statue; while many of the representations of earlier work, both sculpture and painting, are excellent. The musical section of the work, which is very useful as an introduction to the intelligent study of music, is illustrated with portraits of nine German composers and one Italian, Rossini; the best of these are the portraits of Glück, Beethoven, and Schubert,—the worst, those of Mendelssohn and Rossini.

Arlon Grange, and a Christmas Legend. Critics' Edition. By William Alfred Gibbs, Author of "The Story of a Life," "Harold Erle," &c., &c. To the Above is now Added some Contributions by the Author's Friends. London: Provost and Co., 36, Henrietta-street, Covent-garden.

As far as we can make out from a handbill pasted on the cover of the volume whose title-page is transcribed above, Mr. W. A. Gibbs issued some little time since a volume of verse called *Arlon Grange*, and had it handsomely bound, "chiefly to please a lady's eye." If we understand the handbill aright, the critics reviewed the binding favourably, and wisely left the inside of the book alone. The author did not perceive that, except for the gorgeous get-up, the book would never have been reviewed at all, and seems to have deemed that the reviewers were so taken up with the binding that they could not get further. Finding that, notwithstanding the cover, the book did not sell (we still interpret the handbill, with the aid of a little observation as to the book now issued), the author determined to have a critics' edition; and so,—

> "Now, white and gold and grand array
> Is changed to hodden, sodden grey,"—

that is to say, the same sheets are stitched up in a limp cover, with a new title-page, the edges ploughed down ruthlessly, and a doggerel address to reviewers stuck outside. Now it is not conciliatory to critics to say "white and gold and grand array *is*," or to talk of a colour being "sodden," or to say, as the author does in the title-page, "to the above *is* now added some contributions." When the author prophesies (*vide* handbill) that the ugly "sodden grey" book will find its way to the smoking-rooms and studies of men who

> "Will score its leaves with praise or blame;
> 'Indifferent,' 'good,' or 'bad,' will vote it,
> Or cut a passage out and quote it,"

he is simply puerile and impertinent; and when he goes on to promise another gorgeous edition, illustrated, one suspects him of being insane. We have looked into the book, just to see what all this fuss is about; and we find no reason to do as prophesied in the author's doggerel. It is utterly commonplace; and we decline to criticise it more closely, or make extracts from it, "upon compulsion." The author has told its story for it:—it *had* a handsome cover; it *has* a hideous cover; and, we may add, it is not worth any cover at all.

Wordsworth, Shelley, Keats, and other Essays. By David Masson, M.A., LL.D., Professor of Rhetoric and English Literature in the University of Edinburgh. London: Macmillan and Co. 1874.

PROFESSOR MASSON is one of the most thoughtful of contemporary critics; and he has done well in reprinting, with additions and revisions, some admirable essays which have long been out of print. The present volume is the first of a series of three, and it contains six essays; four of these were included in a volume entitled, *Essays, Biographical and Critical: chiefly on English Poets*, published in 1856, and vainly sought after, since it has been out of print, on account of a very beautiful contribution to Chatterton literature, which was the largest and most elaborate thing in the volume. This work, entitled, *Chatterton: A Story of the Year* 1770, is now wisely separated for independent publication; while two most interesting essays on the lives and poetry of Shelley and Keats, which originally appeared in *Macmillan's Magazine*, are now judiciously grouped with the four reprinted from the 1856 volume, namely, those on Wordsworth, De Quincey, Theories of Poetry, and Scottish Influence in British Literature. The two last named are not of nearly equal value with the three which give the volume its title, each of which three is a successful attempt to treat the personality and the poetry of a great man, without separating the one from the other. The essay on Shelley is the most interesting, probably because Shelley was himself a more interesting person (even if not, as we think, absolutely a far greater man) than either the exquisite and unfortunate poet Keats, or the noble and toweringly intellectual poet Wordsworth. We doubt whether Professor Masson appreciates Shelley at his *full* worth; but his essay is full of fine feeling and perception, though hardly enthusiastic.

Songs of Two Worlds. Second Series. By a New Writer. Henry S. King and Co., 65, Cornhill, and 12, Paternoster-row, London. 1874.

THIS volume is commonplace without being either vulgar or ungrammatical like that of Mr. Gibbs. If the "new writer" is a

young writer, it is all very well; he may do something worth doing some day; but in the meantime, on the evidence of this volume, we cannot concede the presence of a new poet, or, indeed, of anything more than ordinary cultivation. The book is thoughtful and free from affectation; but the thoughts have no depth, and no particular originality; while the style is colourless, the rhythm, generally, thin, and the lyric impulse of the meagrest quality.

The Tragedy of Israel. Part II. King David. By G. F. Armstrong, M.A. London: Longmans and Co. 1874.

THE first part of this work, "King Saul" was noticed, with favourable recognition of its high poetic qualities, in a former number of this Review. It now comes before us in this second stage of its progress, with no diminution of power, and certainly with a large addition of elements of interest. Mr. Armstrong deserves credit for the extent to which he has preserved fidelity to his Bible originals, and for his thoughtful and reverential handling of sacred subjects; while at the same time we cannot but admire the skill with which he contrives to infuse into his work a dash of modern thought, sentiment, and motive, which, without painfully disturbing our sense of historic propriety, adds vastly to the interest of the story. His personages are very lifelike, and possess a distinct individuality, which they retain throughout.

The subtle mischief-making Jonadab is an especially interesting study, with his sharp insight into men's characters and motives, and his clear apprehension of what is good and noble, and perfect satisfaction with his own conscious want of anything of this sort. He does not shrink from guilt itself, but from painful recollections connected with it. After Amnon's death, he is seized with a momentary disgust of life, and thinks that he will kill himself, but sheathes his sword with the reflection that, after all, he might still find pleasure if he could get away into some other land for a time, returning only when all this trouble had blown over. Thus he soliloquises:—

> "It is the trouble of this realm that wounds me,
> The pain of neighbourhood, local suggestion;
> The evil done, of which I am a part;
> Pain of the many weighing on my soul;
> The dread anticipation of the end:
> These I can brook not; better death than these.
> Yet elsewhere may delight not dawn for me?
> Then I will out into the alien lands—
> Hath Tyre no sweet? Hath Egypt nothing strange?
> There roam, and wear the teeth of conscience down,
> And soften the painful hues of memory,
> Drink palatable wines, renew the sense,

Learn much, see out this curious road of life,
And haply, after many rounds of years,
And when this evil is an olden tale,
Return in calmer hours another soul.
So, farewell, friends, and welcome ways unworn."

The principal character of this drama is, of course, King David; around him the interest of the story gathers. The author's conception of him is very noble and striking; and as he brings him before us—Israel's poet king, so rich in bodily and mental gifts, with his noble, far-sighted desires for his country's welfare, the deep fount of tenderness in his heart, his vast capacity of passion—we feel we are in the presence of a worthy ideal of the great Hebrew monarch. We see why Jonathan loved him, and the hearts of men were drawn to him, and the strongest and wisest were proud to serve him; we feel the presence of the lofty thought and aspiration, the fervid imagination, the strength of emotion, the sincere religiousness, which, touched and hallowed by the Spirit, found voice in psalms that sound the depths of human sadness and soar to all the glorious heights of prophetic hope.

The subject of this drama is David's fall and repentance. The king is represented as at the summit of his power and popularity. But his soul has not yet found its true mate—the one without whose intelligent sympathy and loving co-operation he lacked the incitement which his emotional nature required for carrying out the grand designs he cherished for the welfare and glory of his beloved people. In Bathsheba he thinks he sees the promise of all he has longed for, but never yet found. And then commences the mighty conflict of duty and passion. The subtle working of David's mind in the stress of temptation is drawn with truth and power. He tries hard to sophisticate reason and conscience, and to reconcile crime and duty. Absorbed in this weary strife he has neither eyes nor heart for anything else. He neglects the oversight of his family and the affairs of his kingdom, and thus disorder and trouble creep into both. His inconsiderateness yields Tamar to ruin, and his people to the misgovernment that breeds rebellion. Passion prevails at last. The double crime is consummated. The drugged conscience slumbers. Ambition and energy revive at the trumpet-call of war. But just then the prophet Nathan appears and in a moment David sees his crime in its true colours, and shame and remorse sink him to the dust. This scene between the prophet and the king is one of the finest in the book. We take from it the following passage:—

NATHAN.

Now the dark worst
And deadliest sorrow of my life is over.
I go away—go as the spiritual storm
Drives me across the spaces of the world.
Lift up thine eyes that I may go in peace.

DAVID.

I cannot lift my face to thine again,
Or gaze upon the scornful brows of men;
I am mated with the earth, and in the dust
I will lie down for ever.

NATHAN.

Nay, my king.
Look up, and speak. This sight is hard to bear.

DAVID.

My people! O my people! O my realm!

NATHAN.

Thou art not all rejected, though so fallen
Arise, and live, and let thy people live.

DAVID.

Into my heart's dark cavern thou hast flashed
An awful beam, and I behold my ways
All loathsome; and the thoughts, the purposes,
That guide me or incite, clear to their springs,
Fountains of ill discern; and all my soul
Crawled over with broods born of long decay.
Let rise another king, for I am none.

NATHAN.

Tread back the mazy paths to Him whose love
Led thee so long in glory. Call aloud,
And He will answer from the lonely heights.

DAVID.

To Him, to Him! All unfamiliar now
The too familiar name, and powerless
My lips to shape. Repent! How can the soul
Repent at impulse the deliberate sin?
And I—O God!—for every question asked
Of conscience, rendered answer, answerless;
With strong premeditated aim, trod out
The light divine of reason, man's one guide,
Heaven's sacred emissary; with free hand
Crowning the monster evil in my heart;
And, shameless, all my faculties awake,
As righteous men choose virtue, chose my sin,
And smiled upon my choice. Where the remorse?
All gentle thoughts and gentle impulses,
Fair ministers of virtue, I have slain,
To make a happy tranquil field of growth
And nursery of my darling weed of sin,
And nought abides to lift me or impel.

The judgment which had been gathering now breaks upon him. In Amnon's murder he sees the bitter fruit of his own sin, and the beginning of troubles henceforward to darken his life and kingdom. A touching scene here takes place between the

king and Bathsheba, which is broken in upon by the tidings of Absalom's rebellion, and the desertion to the rebel cause of his trusted friends. Astonished and dismayed by the sad and unlooked-for events, he prepares with heavy heart to leave the city of his choice, and in whose loyal love he had so entirely trusted. The tragic interest of the scene is heightened by the sudden appearance of the unhappy Tamar who comes in to gratify the resentment she cherishes against the king and his party, whom she regards as the authors of her crushing woe.

Our limits will not permit us to pursue this notice further. We have said enough to show our high appreciation of this work. We still think it would have been every way better for Mr. Armstrong to have employed his poetic talent on themes in the treatment of which he would not have been trammelled by the conditions and limitations necessarily attaching to those drawn from the sacred records. But we are bound to say that few in our judgment could, out of such materials, have produced a drama of absorbing interest, and clear high purpose, admirable alike in conception and execution, such as is the one it has been a pleasure to deal with in this notice.

Through Normandy. By Katharine S. Macquoid. Illustrated by Thomas R. Macquoid. W. Isbister and Co. London. 1874.

It happens sometimes, when one has "been long in city pent," and is thinking only of its labours and activities, that a sudden whiff, it may be, of burning wood, or, still better, of peat, will carry the spirit away to very different scenes, and evoke all kinds of holiday associations among Welsh valleys, or Connemara cabins, or any of the hundred-and-one out-of-the-way pleasant places where coal is unknown. And there are books that have a similar power, a kind of natural magic of their own, due partly to subject, partly to treatment, partly, perhaps, in some cases, to the individual recollections of the reader, but with a result, however obtained, that is altogether sunny and delightful. Of such books *Through Normandy* is one.

Far be it from us to endeavour to analyse what is here so happily blended, and discriminate too coldly and critically between the charms of subject and setting. Both contribute to the effect of relaxation and enjoyment. Doubtless Normandy, like all other places that are under the sway of civilisation, possesses "hungry generations" that "tread one another down." Its manufactures, as we might learn from commercial directories if we took the trouble to consult them, are important; its agricultural wealth considerable; and the inhabitant himself is acute and industrious, a keen hand at a bargain. But which of

us who has travelled through the land, with its sunny, natural beauties, its innumerable hoar relics of elder time, its thousand memories, has not been a Gallio as regards these work-a-day things? Which of us has given a thought to Rouen as the "Manchester of France," when he was wandering over the cathedral's multitudinous west front, or pacing the nave of Saint Ouen, or exploring the many picturesque nooks of that most beautiful city? Possibly the new spire of the cathedral may have reminded us, for a moment, that this is an age of iron, and not of beauty, and the new streets, with which the natives are so pleased, may have struck us as an impertinence. But still, both here and elsewhere, the prevailing impression left upon the tourist's mind is one, not of nineteenth-century work and effort, but of harmony with his own brief respite from toil.

And of Mrs. Macquoid's work what shall we say? We would liken it to the pleasant companion of our summer ramble: a companion well-read and well-informed; who knows the history of the district, and can quote with *à propos* from the *Roman de Rose*, or Mr. Freeman's *History of the Norman Conquest*, or Lord Lytton's *Harold*, and other more recondite works; who lingers lovingly over the many relics of the great Duke whose successful expedition changed the course of English history; who collects local legends and traditions with a loving hand, has a keen eye for the picturesque in building, for salient architectural points, and for the beauty of long river reaches, wooded dales, and coast scenery; a keen eye, too, but kindly and tolerant withal, as becomes one who has made France the scene of pleasant fiction and story, for what we may call the *social picturesque*,—those peculiarities of custom and manners and dress which must always seem strange to people of foreign race and creed. Indeed our companion is not a mere silent observer of such peculiarities, but will enter into ready and genial intercourse with natives of every degree, receiving here a nosegay, and there a confidential communication, in sign of amity. Nor is this all. Though full of interest in the things of the mind and imagination, he does not unduly despise the things of the body,—maintaining, in fact, the traveller's golden mean in this matter, and being able to give the best advice as regards inns, stopping-places, routes, &c., without habitually making the excellence of the dinner the test of enjoyment.

With such a model companion should we ever quarrel? Not seriously, most certainly. Occasionally, perhaps, as all companions will, he makes some remarks that jar with our mood at the moment, as when he seems to complain of the Normans too habitually calling their great Duke "Guillaume *le Conquérant*," as though the title were unknown on this side of the Channel, or when he describes the pictures in the Bayeux Tapestry as

"extremely comic;" and again we might occasionally think him a trifle too enthusiastic. But these are very, very small matters,—to be mentioned almost with shame.

We have used the image of a companion advisedly, for, in order to be thoroughly enjoyed, this book should accompany the tourist in his wanderings through Normandy, or, at any rate, be read—as if one were chatting over old memories with a former fellow-traveller—by a tourist who has reminiscences of the country to revive. Failing any such previous knowledge, we may doubt how far it would bear perusal from end to end, for though partly a pleasant record of travel, it is also a superior kind of practical guide-book, and guide-books must be taken homœopathically, in small quantities, and by those who really require them. Still, even for those to whom that pleasant corner of old France may be unknown, there are many interesting pages of history and legend. Nor, among other attractions, should we forget Mr. Macquoid's illustrations. The subject could not but be congenial to a painter who, if we are not mistaken, has had, in former years, some training as an architect.

Epochs of History. The Houses of Lancaster and York, with the Conquest and Loss of France, by James Gairdner. London: Longmans and Co. 1874.

THE volumes of this admirable series are designed principally for use in schools, for which purpose the period treated by Mr. Gairdner is peculiarly fitted. It coincides throughout with the great succession of Shakespeare's historical plays. From Richard II. to Richard III. all the more striking events are there dramatised, so that the invaluable aid of literary illustration never fails the teacher and the student. It has another advantage, that for great part of the time the history of France and England is the same, and thus almost without effort the connection of English and Continental history is kept before our eyes. The period is unfortunately very obscure, and the sequence of facts difficult to retain in the memory. Dynastic quarrels make up the whole story with but a few unconnected episodes, such as the rebellions of Tyler and Cade, which reveal the social life of the nation underneath. We own to a little disappointment that Mr. Gairdner, who has studied all the original and some fresh evidence, has not succeeded in making clearer the principles and moral causes which decided the course of events. The book, however, though detail is necessarily excluded, is far from dry, and gives a better insight into the character of the epoch than the chapters which larger works devote to it. The five maps are a very valuable help both to the understanding of the narrative and to that interesting but neglected branch of study, historical

geography. If the other volumes devoted to English history are as well executed, the whole will be a great advance upon even the best school books now in use.

The Philosophy of History in Europe. By Robert Flint, Professor of Moral Philosophy and Political Economy in the University of St. Andrew's. Vol. I. France and Germany. Wm. Blackwood and Sons. 1874.

SINCE the revival of learning a philosophical spirit has shown itself continually more and more in the study of history. It is the great distinction of modern from ancient work in that field that the views taken of human life and fortune are more widely comprehensive, and the insight of the writers into the causes that have determined the world's course deeper and clearer. In these respects the writings of Gibbon, Mommsen, or Thierry, are as much more valuable than those of Marcellinus, Livy, or Tacitus, as the accumulated experience and remote impartiality of the more recent historians would lead us to anticipate. Nor is it only in the understanding of ancient times that this advance has been made. Taught mainly by the history of Rome, or of the Christian Church, we have come to demand from all who deal with any great period an analysis not merely of individual motive, but of cause and effect, on a large scale. They must show how the whole epoch was directed by general influences, whose genesis and operation it is the principal business of the historian to exhibit. We have, in short, arrived at the conviction, more or less vividly realised, that our race in its parts, and as a whole, is moving on a definite plan, the principles, and possibly the object of which, we may hope to discover. This is the problem of the philosophy of history, a problem which has been uninterruptedly discussed for three hundred years, and seems still to be growing in interest. From the time of the French Revolution the writers on the subject have been very numerous. Mr. Flint passes in review about fifty from France and Germany alone, and of these only six in the former and four in the latter country are earlier than that great crisis in recent history. Previous speculations form a thin, though connected line; but subsequent to the quickening of intellectual and political life which then took place, we have to treat not single works, but schools of thought in this pre-eminently modern branch of philosophy. This rapid multiplication of treatises, essays, and systems makes such a book as Mr. Flint's very welcome. It is not a fresh contribution of original opinions, though there are not wanting hints that they may in time be given to the world; its pretensions are only to show what has already been done for the new science, what conceptions have been formed of its matter,

scope, and method, and what attempts have been made to reduce the vast mass of materials to logical order. The volume consists principally of analysis and criticisms, intended to guide the student in forming the acquaintance and estimating the position of the chief authors who have philosophised on history. We are left to gather Mr. Flint's own conclusions from incidental remarks upon the character of those men whom he regards most favourably. There is, indeed, an Introduction of his own, but it is historical rather than dogmatic. We are not unfrequently referred to the end of the work for fuller information on these and kindred points; but till the next volume appears we can only guess at the principles on which the somewhat brusque and unargued decisions are based. It would perhaps have been better to publish the two volumes together; it would certainly have been more satisfactory to deal with the whole than with a fragment. The book is made easier for reference, but more provokingly incomplete by the geographical arrangement which is followed. It is not conducive to a clear comprehension of the course of European thought to have to read about all the French labours before we come to any of the German, and to have to delay altogether our comparison of Italian or English writers. In such a cosmopolitan subject, speculations should have been grouped by chronological and intellectual succession rather than by the language in which they may happen to have been written. It is awkward to judge Cousin before Hegel, Quinet before Herder, and Michelet before Vico. It would have added completeness to the system adopted if each division had been concluded with an estimate of progress made in the country considered, and an acknowledgement of foreign influence.

No one nation can claim this department of thought as its own special province; the thinkers of all lands have worked together under the common condition of modern life, to which essentially, and not to the genius of individuals, the philosophy of history owes its rise. Before men could speculate on the plan which underlies the progress of our race as a whole, it was necessary that they should learn to look upon the multitude of peoples and generations as forming one connected humanity, and on the vicissitudes of national fortune as the unfolding of a regular plot in the universal drama. The Empire of Rome was needed to teach the first lesson, and it is in Polybius that we find the first recognition of the fact that the history of different nations tends to a single point; Christianity, with its revelation of a Divine plan for the restoration of the world, taught the second, and Augustine is the first who marks out history into epochs according as the ages stand to the fulfilment of one general design. Through the long Mediæval period of dissolution and reorganisation the ideas thus brought into the world retained their life;

and when at last the Renaissance came, and Europe began to reflect upon its own condition, a more varied and elastic civilisation was found to have sprung up, expanding men's conceptions of order and of progress, and leading to a deeper and more comprehensive theory of the process by which all this had been reached. It is then that historical philosophy begins to be written. It is, as was only natural, strongly influenced at first by the laws and history of Rome and by the teaching of the Church. Principles and traditions drawn from these sources are mixed up and often struggling with ideas, the product of freer modern thought and larger recent experience. Bodin and Bossuet, the forerunners of historical science, especially illustrate this. The former has to argue elaborately that the dream of Nebuchadnezzar does not contain all we need to know about the course of history, while at the same time he writes as a Roman Jurist only, pleading that the laws of other nations deserve to be studied as well. Bossuet follows the imperfect principles of Augustine, making the progress of the Church the history of the world, and drawing his facts mainly from the Bible and the classical writers. Montesquieu, too, finds in Rome great part of his materials, but he reveals also the scientific spirit, the advance of which was another necessary condition of the growth of the study. Bacon had given the hint that laws analogous to those of the inanimate world might be found directing human activity; Bodin had endeavoured to point out some of them, and the *esprit des lois* attempts to exhibit the natural causes which manifest their effects in political constitutions. But it is to an earlier writer that historical inquiry, like almost all other branches of thought, owes its impregnation with the ideas of modern science. Leibnitz wrote nothing directly on the subject, but he was here the great combiner of history and philosophy, the great mediator between France and Germany, and, most important of all, the principal mind to introduce into speculation the ideas of the unity of knowledge, the intimate connection of all forms of existence, the fundamental identity of the laws that govern all phenomena, whether of matter or of life. The conceptions of universal development, the solidarity of the sciences, and the necessity of historical method in their study, received from him their currency, and to him, therefore, the philosophy of history is most deeply indebted.

The new science, which as yet only struggled to the birth, was born in Turgot, whose two discourses at the Sorbonne contain the the first historical proof of the reality and certainty of progress, the first acknowledgment of the vast complexity of the problem, the first realisation that humanity is an organic whole, whose evolution is guided by internal forces, and strangely enough the first indication of that invaluable half-truth respecting the law of

development, which has since become celebrated as Comte's law of the three stages. The epoch of the Revolution was now drawing near, and under the stimulus of that approaching crisis of thought and history, speculations on the course of the world rapidly multiply. With Voltaire to champion free and rebellious criticism, with Rousseau to shock complacency by his bold preaching of degradation, and the threatening aspect of political life to excite reflection, there is no wonder that this should be the case. Wegelin, Lessing, Herder, and Kant, show the awakening attention in Germany, which, when Napoleon carries the Revolution there, hopes to take its place at the head of European thought.

One other influence has to be taken into account as leading to a wider and more accurate view of history, and that is the increased knowledge of the East which has been gained in recent years. The British conquest of India, and the opening of China and Japan to European commerce have largely added to our conceptions of what is meant by universal progress. A complete philosophy of history must explain both Western and Eastern civilisation, and exhibit their connections and contrasts while showing that they both tend to a common goal. The Oriental side of the question has been practically ignored, or very superficially treated by every writer who as yet has tried to reduce historical phenomena throughout the world to the exemplification of a few general laws, that can be connected into a single scheme, or expressed by one formula. Indeed, the impression left most prominent, after reading such a book as Mr. Flint's, is the utterly inadequate treatment yet bestowed on the most complex problem that can be considered. The *à priori* systems of Germany, and the political generalisations of France alike fail when confronted with the infinite mass and variety of the facts. Fichte, Schelling, and to a great extent Cousin, do but play with words in an ideal sphere that never touches, and only occasionally sheds light on the real world. Hegel, rich in detail, and abounding in suggestive thought, falls far short of establishing his rigid theory. The idea of freedom, taken by several thinkers as the thread upon which all history is strung, is too narrow and thin to bear the weight of a development that clearly moves along many lines at once, whether we make freedom with Kant a political, with Quinet a spiritual, or with Michelet a general conception. Scarcely more satisfactory are the attempts of Schlegel and Bunsen to make human history simply the progress and realisation of men's relation to God. The discussion of the problem has been fertile in results, and has greatly helped us to appreciate special parts and aspects; but perhaps the wisest things that have been said on the subject as a whole are Quinet's protest against attempting to bring its entirety under one idea, and Comte's

warning that the social science is the most complex and difficult of all, which cannot advance far till the earlier sciences approach completion. Wiser than any words is the refusal of Guizot to try and deal with more than a fraction even of European civilization. History must look rather to the scientific students who explore special fields, and detect the laws which have ruled there, than to the speculative philosophers who build up systems to embrace and explain the whole. Detailed criticism of Mr. Flint's own workmanship will be more in place when he brings out his second volume: at present it would be unfair to judge from a fragmentary specimen.

Some Leading Principles of Political Economy Newly Expounded. By J. E. Cairnes, M.A. London: Macmillan and Co. 1874.

THE volume before us embraces the discussion of some of the most profound and difficult questions in the whole field of economic inquiry, and it is not possible to treat these subjects in a simple or easy manner. In the beginning of his interesting chapter on "International Values," Mr. Mill says, "I must give notice that we are now in the region of the most complicated questions which political economy affords, and the subject is one which cannot possibly be made elementary." This observation of Mr. Mill may, with propriety, be applied to all the subjects discussed in the present volume, and to the mode in which they are treated. In this work we have a re-examination and a fresh exposition of most of those knotty points in the science that have, in recent years, engaged the minds of the ablest writers on the subject, as Mill, Thornton, Jevons, and others. The work consists of three parts:—I. Value; II. Labour and Capital; III. International Trade. It would not be possible, in our space, to give the reader an intelligible outline of the course of reasoning pursued by Professor Cairnes on these subjects, or even to furnish a satisfactory account of the conclusions he reaches, but we may briefly notice one or two points in these discussions in a way that will indicate the general nature of the inquiries. In the first chapter of Part I. the author aims to elucidate the meaning of the terms "Value" and "Utility," and to show the relation of value to utility. He effectually disposes of the doctrine of M. Say, which has recently been revived by Prof. Jevons, that "value depends entirely upon utility." He makes it clear that Jevons' theory fails to explain the ordinary phenomena of the subject. The second chapter is on that vexed question, "Supply and Demand;" and here the explanations of Prof. Cairnes are at once novel and important. Everybody thinks he understands what is meant by "supply and demand," but our author says, "I

believe there is no doctrine of political economy more generally misunderstood, or, to speak plainly, respecting which a more complete absence of all clear understanding of any kind prevails, than this very doctrine. The terms are used, and the supposed 'law' is appealed to, for the most part, without any distinct ideas being attached to the phrases employed." He holds that supply and demand are not separable or independent phenomena, but are "strictly connected and mutually dependent." He says—

"Aggregate demand cannot increase or diminish without entailing a corresponding increase or diminution of aggregate supply; nor can aggregate supply undergo a change without involving a corresponding change in aggregate demand. . . . Let us suppose a *régime* of barter; under such circumstances supply would consist in the commodities offered in exchange for other commodities. In what would demand in such case consist? We can only give the same reply: in the commodities offered in exchange for other commodities."

He shows that this simple character is only very slightly modified by the introduction of a medium of exchange. Hence he says—

"I would, therefore, define the terms as follows: demand, as the desire for commodities or service, seeking its end by an offer of general purchasing power; and supply, as the desire for general purchasing power, seeking its end by the offer of specific commodities or services."

The illustrations given of this doctrine are very striking, and by its application several controverted points may, we think, be cleared and settled. The two following chapters, "Normal Value" and "Market Value," supply views and criticisms on received theories, of peculiar interest and value. Some grave errors in current notions are forcibly exposed, and the influence of "cost of production" and "reciprocal demand," in determining normal value, are admirably brought out. In these chapters the doctrines propounded by Mill and Thornton are shown to be either erroneous or defective, and important modifications of accepted conclusions as to "cost of production," "competition," and "market prices," are advanced by Prof. Cairnes.

In the last chapter of the first part, "On some Derivative Laws of Value" we have capital illustrations of the working of the law of "Diminishing Productiveness" in both new and old countries, and of the influence of this working on "cost of production," "normal value," and "market prices." Here Professor Cairnes deals with the fluctuations in the market prices of different commodities, and in a masterly way clears up several points that have hitherto been in controversy.

The second part of the work, entitled Labour and Capital, consists of five chapters, all dealing with grave questions of

economic science. The titles of the chapters are—"The Rate of Wages;" "Demand for Commodities;" "Trades Unionism, No. 1;" "Trades Unionism, No. 2;" "Practical Deductions from the Foregoing Principles." It must suffice to say that in each of these sections Professor Cairnes examines the subjects named in a calm, scientific spirit, and by the new views he propounds he does much satisfactorily to elucidate some of the most controverted points in both theoretical and practical economics. These chapters are in the main expository, but they are necessarily to some extent controversial. For instance, the objections to the wages-fund doctrine urged by Mr. Longe and Mr. Thornton, are examined at length, and, we must think, conclusively shown to be unfounded. Valuable as we have always deemed many things in Mr. Thornton's book on Labour, his notions respecting supply and demand, competition, and the wages-fund, seem to us superficial and unscientific. In his able work on the *Theory of Political Economy* Professor Jevons had said, "For my own part, I think that most of Mr. Thornton's arguments are beside the question," but it was left to Professor Cairnes fully to demonstrate how vague and unsound are most of Mr. Thornton's doctrines on these subjects. The two chapters on Trades Unionism well deserve the attention of all interested in the economic and social condition of the working classes, and they are particularly worthy of the study of such writers as Mr. Thornton, Mr. Frederic Harrison, and Mr. Longe. The last chapter of this part—"Practical Deductions from the Foregoing Principles,"—is marked by that candour, breadth, and thoroughness which distinguish the productions of Mr. Cairnes. In reference to the permanent improvement of the condition of the workers, the Professor is not sanguine; but the means he advocates for securing their elevation appear to us the only legitimate and reliable grounds of hope.

The last part of the treatise, on "International Trade" is fully as valuable as those portions we have briefly noticed. It consists of five chapters with these headings:—"Doctrine of Comparative Cost;" "International Trade in its Relation to the Rate of Wages;" "International Values;" "Free Trade and Protection;" "On Some Minor Topics." These chapters contain some notable modifications of Mill's well-known doctrine of International Value and International Trade, which he first put forth in his volume entitled, *Some Unsettled Questions in Political Economy.* We can heartily recommend Professor Cairnes' volume to the students of Political Economy, and to all readers that desire a searching examination of economic questions. It deals with the great theoretical principles of the science, with the applications of these principles to the moot questions of the day, and it discusses all points raised with singular ability and fairness. It appears to us to be the most original and most important work

on political economy that has appeared since the publication of Mill's Principles, about a quarter of a century ago. There are some reasonings in this volume that we cannot think are altogether conclusive, and some few conclusions that we cannot entirely accept, but where there is so much to approve and commend—so much to be thankful for—we have no disposition to dwell on insignificant faults.

English School Classics. Edited, with Introduction and Notes, by Francis Storr, B.A.
Goldsmith's Traveller and the Deserted Village. Edited by C. Sankey, M.A.
Selections from the Spectator. Edited by O. Airy, M.A.
Browne's Religio Medici. Edited by W. P. Smith, M.A.
Macaulay's Essay—Moore's Life of Lord Byron. Edited by Francis Storr, B.A. London: Rivingtons. 1874.

THE appearance of a new series of selections from our English classics for the use of schools, may be taken as a welcome indication of the place that the study of our own literature is beginning to take in education. But that it may be of a value in any way comparable to the study of the Greek and Latin classics as hitherto pursued, the text-books must be very different from those we have now to notice. It has seldom been our fortune to come across such slovenly and unskilful workmanship in any school series appearing under respectable auspices. Mr. Smith's edition of the *Religio Medici* is much better than the companion books. There are more misprints than there should be. It is doubtful whether the proper way to edit a school-book is to save the pupil all use of the dictionary as far as possible; some of the derivations given are quite exploded, and we are at a loss to understand what kind of pupils for whom the *Religio Medici* would be fit reading, could need a note like the following: "*Themistocles.*—A celebrated Athenian general, by whom the fleet of Xerxes was defeated at Salamis (B.C. 480)." But it is a great boon to have a work of such value in a convenient shape; and although it is little likely that school-boys will have time for Sir Thomas Browne, without neglecting their Spenser, Bacon, Hooker, and Milton, it may possibly be useful to others who have leisure for a further study of the seventeenth-century literature.

Mr. Sankey's edition of Goldsmith's more important poems is distinguished from that of Mr. Hales mainly by the fact that his notes have a larger accumulation of those details which a boy ought to be expected to look up for himself, and much less suggestiveness. Is it really advisable to write a note to save a lazy school-boy the trouble of looking in his atlas for the Scheld or even the Po? It may be worth while to remind him, as Mr.

Hales does, that in class he will be required to point these out; but anything more than this is purely mischievous. On the other hand, it is useless to say that "*pomp* is used in a sense very far removed from its original one of 'sending'" (we wonder, by the way, if Mr. Sankey translates it so in Homer), without a word to explain the process of transition.

Mr. Storr's edition of *Macaulay's Essay* is wholly unsatisfactory. It teems with misprints and blunders. To the printer we may ascribe "Horace's *calliola junctura*," but can he also be responsible for "M. Tellegius (Tigellius !) Hermogenes," or for transforming the *ambubaiarum collegia* into girls' schools (!) "The pupil" who is referred to Bontell's (Bowtell's) heraldry for an account of Portcullis and Rouge Dragon, and who "should look out Gray, Goldsmith, Beattie, Collins, and Mason in Aikins' or Chambers' *British Poets*, and "try to discover for himself the masterpieces," is supposed to need the information that Culloden was fought in the year 1745, a blunder by the way, which shows strange ignorance of the history of the Rebellion.

But the worst book of the series, and about the worst edited volume we have had the misfortune to come across, is Mr. Airy's *Selections from the Spectator*. Its blunders are literally countless, and on almost every subject. Derivations, of course, furnish a fertile source: we are told that Sibyl "is from Σιός, Doric from Διός (!) and βούλη will. The Sibyl is she who embodies the will of Zeus." (!) Brachet is apparently as unknown to Mr. Airy as Curtius, for "batchelor is derived from bas-chevalier, a *knight* of *low* degree." We are remitted to Charicles for a graphic account of a Roman (!) symposium, "too long to be inserted here;" and are told that the Elzevirs were distinguished printers of Venice (!). We have such specimens of English as "Scott or Macaulay are *polite* authors." We have a note like this: "*Artchitecture*; for other instances of bad spelling, see landskip, sir-name,' without anything either in Mr. Airy's text, or in any other, that we can discover to justify such a monstrosity. And, finally, according to Mr. Airy, Fielding, "a celebrated novelist of the period, whose chief work was *Tom Jones*," had won himself such fame at the age of four years, that his works were to be found in the library of a lady of fashion. He adds that Smollett (born 1721) was also a popular author in 1711.

It is fortunate for the cause of our English literature in schools that it is not left to depend for its success on crude and ignorant compilations such as these.

END OF VOL. XLIII.

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

INDEX

TO

VOLUME XLIII.

'Älteste Texte des Todtenbuchs,' Lepsius's, 1.
'Ägyptische Gräberwelt, Die,' Brugsch's, 1.
Airy's 'Preparatory Arrangements for observing the Transits of Venus in 1874, 1882,' 93.
Airy's 'Selections from the *Spectator*,' 527.
'Arlon Grange,' Gibbs's, 512.
Armstrong's 'Tragedy of Israel,' 514.
'Autobiography of Mrs. Gilbert,' 497.

Baker's 'Ismailia,' 329.
Baldwin Brown's 'Higher Life,' 222.
Beste's 'Sermons on Priestly Absolution,' 477.
'Bible Educator,' Plumptre's, 243.
'Bishop Asbury,' Briggs', 230.
Bonnier's 'Traveller's Guide in Sweden,' 60.
'Book of Daniel,' Wordsworth's, 292.
'Browne's Religio Medici,' 527.
Brugsch's 'Sai und Sinsin,' 1.
Bryant's 'Iliad,' 363.
Buchanan's Poetical Works, 213.
Bunsen's 'Egypt's place in Universal History,' 1.
Bushnell's 'Forgiveness and Law,' 411.

Cairnes's 'Leading Principles of Political Economy,' 524.
'Chapter of Autobiography, A,' Gladstone's, 382.
Christlieb's 'Modern Doubt, and Christian Belief,' 488.
'Church and the Empires, The,' 344; burning questions, 347; Mr. Wilberforce, 349; craving for certainty, 353; heathen Rome and early Christianity, 357; the fall of Imperial Rome, 359; Roman reasoning, 361.
Colline's 'Ancient Classics,' 211.
'Comedies of George Chapman,' Pearson's, 32.
Cordery's 'Iliad,' 363.
Cox's 'Biblical Expositions,' 482.
Cox's 'Crusades,' 239.

'Daniel the Prophet, 292; personal history of the Prophet, 293; Nebuchadnezzar's dream, 295; rationalist objections, 297; Daniel and Ezekiel, 303; Belshazzar's place among the kings, 307; the Fourth Beast, 311; the Son of Man, 315; the little horn, 317; the seventy weeks, 323; last visions, 327.
D'Anver's 'Elementary History of Art,' 510.
Dart's 'Iliad,' 363.
'Delivery and Development of Christian Doctrine,' Rainy's, 456.

'Ecclesiastical History of England,' Stoughton's, 219.
'Egyptian Book of the Dead, The,' 1; the evidences of primeval faith, 3; Assyrian tablets, 5; reason for mummifying corpses, 7; earlier and later texts, 9; doctrine of immortality, 13; deterioration of primeval faith, 19; description of the book, 23; book of migration, 29.
'English Readers,' 263.
'English School Classics,' 527.
'Etudes Bibliques,' Godet's, 467.
'Evangelical Alliance, The,' 265.

Farrar's 'Life of Christ,' 241.
'Few facts touching Ritualism, A,' by Oxoniensis, 480.
Flint's 'Philosophy of History in Europe,' 520.
Forbiger's 'Hellas and Rom,' 123.
'Forgiveness and Law,' 411; change of views, 413; President Edwards, 417; the amen in humanity, 419; expiation and propitiation, 423; justification, 429; Scripture, the final appeal, 433; the paraclete, 435; flippancy of style, 437.

Gairdner's 'Epochs of History, 519.
Gardiner's 'Thirty Years' War, 1618–1648,' 239.
Geyer's 'Histoire de Suède,' 60.
Gibson's 'Philosophy, Science, and Revelation,' 495.
Gladstone's 'Ecclesiastical Opinions,' 382; Bunsen on Gladstone, 383; the ideal of 1838, 389; Gladstone's first book, 391; the disestablishment of the Irish Church, 395; his recent manifestoes, 401; the Irish University Bill, 403; his "political expostulation," 405.
Gladstone's 'Iliad,' 363.
Godet's 'Etudes Bibliques,' 292.
Goldsmith's 'Traveller,' and 'Deserted Village,' 527.
'Greek Anthology,' Neaves's, 211.

Haweis's 'Speech in Season,' 263.
Herschell's 'Iliad,' 363.
'Heterodox London,' Davies', 195.
'Higher Life, The,' Baldwin Brown's, 222.
History, Essays, and Documents of the Sixth General Conference of the Evangelical Alliance, 265; New York prepares for the Alliance, 269; reasons of the success, 273; continental religion, 275; American students in Europe, 279; Professor Warren, 281; Dr. Storrs on modern Romanism, 285; Dean Payne Smith at New York, 291.
'History of the Welsh in America,' Thomas', 246.
Hole's 'Young Christian armed,' 234.
Homer's Iliad in Translations, 363 Homer and Shakespeare, 365; Lord Derby, 367; English Hexameter, 367; Mr. Bryant, 371; Voss, 373; alliteration, 377; the shield, 379.
'Iliad of Homer, Lord Derby's, 363.
'Image of Christ,' Oosterzee's, 446.
'Islam,' Arnold's, 261.
Ismailia, 329; a fearful journey, 331; wholesale matrimony, 333; a conspiracy, 335; foul play, 339; end of the campaign, 341.

Jacox's 'Scripture Proverbs,' 490.
'Jewish History,' Strachey's, 472.

Keil's 'Biblical Commentary,' 292.
Kingsley's 'Health and Education,' 199.

Lamb's 'Specimens of English Dramatic Poets,' 32.
'Law and God,' Roberts's, 487.
Leathes' 'Bampton Lectures,' 453.
Lebrun's 'Iliade traduite en Français,' 363.
'Lectures on the Geography of Greece,' Tozer's, 209.
Lewis's 'Life of John Thomas,' 255.
'Life and Correspondence of S. Johnson,' 504.
'Life and Correspondence of the Rev. John Clowes,' 506.
'Life of Dean Alford,' 263.
'Lyra Christi,' Ford's, 260.
Luthardt on St. John's Gospel, 463.
'Lux e Tenebris,' 493.

'Macaulay's Essays—Moore's Life of Lord Byron,' 527.
'Manual of Introduction to the Old Testament,' Keil's, 292.
Maudsley's 'Responsibility in Mental Disease,' 204.
McFarlane's 'Story of the Lifu Mission,' 249.
'Memorials of Rev. William Toase,' Arthur's, 228.
'Memorials of Thomas Lynch,' 509.
'Ministry and Character of R. H. Hare,' Hare's, 244.
'Missionary Enterprise in the East,' Collins', 248.
Morris' 'Epochs of History,' 239.
Murray's 'Handbook for Denmark, Norway, and Sweden,' 60.

'Natural Science,' Reid's, 494.
'New Companion to the Bible, 264.
New's 'Life and Wanderings in Eastern Africa,' 231.

Old Catholic Church, The, 177; latent and definite belief, 179; Döllinger, 181; inconsistency of the position, 185; Congress of Constance, 189; recent progress, 198.
'Omero; La Reposta di Achille,' Ago Hinto, 363.
Oosterzee's 'Christian Dogmatics,' 250.

'Pilgrim Psalms,' Cox's, 490.
Plays of George Chapman, The, 32; Lamb's estimate of him, 33; the gentleman usher, 39; the widow's tears, 41; Bussy d'Ambois, 43; Byron's conspiracy, 47; Alphonsus, 49; Mr. Pearson's editor, 55; specimens of original text, 57.
'Poems,' by Hunter Dodds, 215.
'Poetical works of David Gray,' 212.
Proctor's 'Universe,' 93.
'Protestant Revolution, The,' Seebohm's, 239.
Pusey's 'Daniel the Prophet,' 262.

'Reports of the Old Catholic Congresses,' 177.
'Ritualism and Ritual,' Gladstone's, 382.
Rome in the time of the Antonines, 123; Marcus Aurelius, 127; the old Latin gods, 129; Greek deities, 131; sacrifices, 135; temples, 137; vestals, 141; Isis, 147; superstitions, 151.

Society for the Promotion of Scientific Industry, 245.
'Songs of Two Worlds,' 513.
St. Clair's 'Darwinism and Design,' 210.
'Spirit and the Word of Christ, The,' Vance Smith's, 226.
Stokes' 'Poems of later years,' 237.
'Strivings for Faith,' 489.
Study of Philosophy, 153; definitions, 155; philosophy and theology, 159; misconceptions, 163; ancient and modern schools of thought, 169; influence of Christianity, 171; originality of Christ's teaching, 173; Bacon's scheme, 175.
'Suckling's Poems, Plays, and other Remains, 284.
Sweden—Past and Present, 60; relics of paganism, 61; Gustavus Vasa, 65; Thirty Years' War, 67; resources of Sweden, 71; railways, 73; the approach to Stockholm, 79; game in Sweden, 83; natural disinfectants, 87; Swedish poetry, 91.

'Texts and Thoughts for Christian ministers,' Harding's, 284.
'Theologisches Literaturblatt,' Reusch's 177.
Thomson's 'Ilias, traduite en vers français,' 363.
'Through Normandy,' Macquoid's, 517.
Transit of the planet Venus in 1874, 93; methods employed to measure parallax of the sun, 97; Horrocks and Crabtree, 103; Halley's method, 107; Mr. Proctor and the Astronomer Royal, 111; finding longitudes—the 'Black Drop,' 115; the English expeditions, 119.

Ueberweg's 'History of Philosophy,' 153.
'Ulrich von Hutten,' Strauss', 500.

'Vatican Council, The,' Kafft's, 177.
'Vatican Decrees,' Gladstone's, 382.
Vizcaya, 263.

Waddington's 'Constitutional History, 1567—1700,' 216.
'Wayside Wells,' Lamont's, 263.
'What is Darwinism?' Hodge's, 210.
Wilberforce's 'Church and the Empires,' 233.
'Wordsworth, Shelley, Keats, and other Essays,' Masson's, 513.
Worsley's 'Iliad,' 363.