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

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

THE

LONDON QUARTERLY REVIEW.

APRIL, 1876.

ART. I.—1. *A View of the History, Literature, and Mythology of the Hindus.* By W. WARD. Two Vols. Second Edition. Serampore, 1818.

2. *Indian Wisdom.* By MONIER WILLIAMS, M.A., Boden Professor of Sanskrit, Oxford. W. H. Allen & Co. 1875.

3. *Chips from a German Workshop.* By MAX MÜLLER. Vol. I. Longmans & Co.

4. *History of Ancient Sanscrit Literature.* By MAX MÜLLER. Williams and Norgate, 1860.

5. *Christ and Other Masters.* By ARCHDEACON HARDWICK. Third Edition. Macmillan & Co. 1874.

6. *Ancient and Mediæval India.* By MRS. MANNING. Two Vols. W. H. Allen & Co.

THE extraordinary interest manifested of late years in the West in Sanscrit studies is easily explained. The relation of the sacred language of India to the great family of languages of which our own is one, the complex character of the language itself, the influence of the literature which it enshrines on the lives of generation after generation of uncounted millions, the stake of England in the Indian empire, fully explain and justify any amount of attention to the subject. Of the relation of Sanscrit to Western tongues, Müller goes so far as to say "Sanscrit and English are but varieties of one and the same language." Hindus maintain that it is the mother of all other tongues, just as they hold that it is the language of the gods; but the conclusion of Western scholars is that it is the elder sister of the Aryan,* as distinguished from the Semitic and Turanian

* â = a in father, ê = a in mate, î = ee in meet, û = oo in loot.

families, the other Aryan sisters being the Teutonic, Celtic, Slavonic, Greek, Latin languages and their modern offspring. The importance of Sanscrit to the comparative philologist is thus apparent. To the student of Hindu thought and life, to the Indian missionary, its value is still greater, as the only key to the explanation of the India of to-day.

It is fitting that England should lead the van in this line of exploration. The English Government in the East, the Asiatic Society, English missionaries, professors and civil servants have done much to make the subject known in the West. An extensive literature of translations and essays has grown up. Jones, Colebrooke, Wilson, Williams, Müller whom we may at least claim in part, are teachers who have many worthy disciples. The excellent metrical translation of the Râmâyana, now being published by Mr. Griffith, Principal of a Sanscrit College at Benâres, should remind us of the translation begun, though never completed, by Dr. Carey, at Serampore, in days when facilities were fewer. Professor Wilson's version of the Vishnu Purâna, the most valuable of the Purânas, and his *Hindu Theatre*, in which he translates six of the best plays, represent work which will never be superseded. Colebrooke's solid, masterly essays have just appeared in a second edition. Professor Williams's Sanscrit Dictionaries, and *Indian Wisdom*, are worthy of the Oxford Sanscrit chair. And most herculean task of all, Max Müller, after issuing a complete edition of the Vêdic text, has given up his professorship in order to devote himself to the work of translating the Vêdas.

It is to the Vêdas we wish now to devote a few pages. We do so because while these are not the most interesting they are the most ancient, and in India the most authoritative and sacred, of all works. After such a statement it may sound startling, and seem a contradiction, to say that the sacred Scriptures of Brahmanism are little known in India itself. Yet this is the fact. It is true that the mental repetition of a particular Vêdic verse is part of a Brahman's daily devotions; but this is generally the limit of his knowledge of his most holy books. We do not question that there are a few native scholars who know something of the subject, but the overwhelming majority of Brahmans have no knowledge worthy of the name. The Vêdas are far more accessible, more studied, and better

known in Europe than in India. Should Max Müller live to complete his task, he will be in no little danger of undergoing Hindu canonisation along with Vyâsa, Vishwâmitra, and the other Vêdic saints. One cause of this ignorance is the archaic form of the Sanscrit in which the Vêdas are written, rendering it a sealed book even to accomplished students of the classical Sanscrit of the epics, and requiring special training. But the principal cause is the fact that the simple natural religion of the Vêdas is not the religion of India now, and has not been for ages. Of the mountains of Purânic mythology, of the ten Vishnu incarnations with their endless legends, the Vêdas contain nothing. Transmigration is not even hinted at. The allusions to the Divine Triad and caste are doubtful in meaning or date. Pantheism is indeed more prominent, but not in the full-blown form of Vêdantism. The source and authority for all these things are the Purânas and Epics, far more modern works, which have taken the place of the ancient Scriptures, and are sometimes spoken of as "a fifth Vêda." Hence the books which lie at the foundation of India's religious thought and life have fallen into utter neglect, and are little more than a name and magic charm. The nominal reverence of Hindus for their ancient canon is indeed unbounded. All Hindu science and law are linked on to the Vêdas. Thus the six systems of philosophy are said to be developed from the Upanishad portion of the Vêdas. The sciences of grammar, astronomy, &c., are called Vêdângas, limbs of the Vêda. But the real amount of connection is very slight. The idea looks like a device of subsequent writers to gain Divine authority for their works.

The Hindu Vêdas (Greek, οἶδα; English, wit, wisdom, &c.) are four, the Rig, Yajur, Sâma, and Atharvana. But it would be a great mistake to regard these as of equal importance. The first is the Vêda in chief; the other three being subordinate in many respects, and often largely reproducing the first. The last has been disputed even in India. In the following passage of Manu's *Code of Law* it does not occur: "The Rig-Vêda has the gods for its deities, the Yajur-Vêda has men for its objects, the Sâma-Vêda has the Pitris (ancestors)."* So an Indian commentator, quoted by Adelung, says, "The Rig-Vêda originated from

* Williams, p. 9.

fire, the Yajur-Vêda from air, and the Sâma-Vêda from the sun." Their compiler is Vyâsa (from a root signifying arrangement, division). We say compiler, not author. The most probable theory is that the various portions of the Vêda existed previously as separate fragments, and were brought together by Vyâsa. The Hindu belief is that Vyâsa received them direct from the Supreme Deity, and communicated them to different sages, who again taught them to their pupils. These are the authors to whom the various hymns and stories are assigned by name. The accounts of the origin of the Vêdas indeed are not easily reconciled. According to one view they were "seen" by their authors, who were hence called Seers, Rishis (from a root, to see). The Vêdas are often spoken of as themselves Divine and eternal. But the technical term applied to them is Shruti, that which is heard, *i.e.*, directly from Deity. All post-Vêdic works are called Smriti, that which is remembered, tradition. The story of the Vêdas issuing from the four mouths of the Brahma of the Triad is of course mythological. Vyâsa is also called Vêda-Vyâsa, Bâdarâyana, Dwaipâyana. As though the Vêdas were not work enough for one man, he is also credited with the compilation of the eighteen Purânas, the Mahâ-Bhârata, a Code of Laws, and the Vêdânta philosophy. Certainly legend prolongs his life indefinitely.

As to the age of the Vêdas, the lowest limit assigned by Western scholars is 1000 B.C., the highest 1500, the mean being the most probable, though Dr. Haug would throw them back to 2000 or 2500 B.C. Hindu ideas of this antiquity are fabulous. The dates are only inferential, and are gathered from the primitive type of life disclosed, the form of language, and comparison with other works. The social life pictured is thoroughly patriarchal; first of wandering shepherds, then of village cultivators. Organisation there is none. The art of writing is unknown. There are no cities, temples, or images. "But rude and simple though he be, the Aryan of the Vêda is no savage. He begins to manifest his aptitude for intellectual culture; he is earnest, thoughtful, interesting; he learns to speak of ships and commerce; he is not entirely ignorant of astronomical science. A worker in the precious metals, and a manufacturer of musical instruments, he has already given proofs of his perception both of the conveniences and amenities of social life. He has moreover learned in some

degree the power, the richness, and the flexibility of his native language, and from time to time there rises up a bard or rishi, whose poetic genius gives expression to the varied feelings that are working in the breast of the community. This rishi is the oracle of the village; in the songs and prayers which he composes lie the elements of common worship, and the germs of that far mightier system, which on its development is destined to unite all Indo-Aryan tribes together, and diffuse its humanising influence to the southernmost point of Hindustan."* Vêdic Sanscrit bears much the same relation to classical Sanscrit which Anglo-Saxon bears to modern English. Müller says:

"The difference between the grammar of the Vêda and that of the epic poems would be sufficient of itself to fix the distance between these two periods of language and literature. Many words have preserved in these early hymns a more primitive form, and therefore agree more closely with cognate words in Greek and Latin. Night, for instance, in the later Sanscrit is nishâ, which is a form peculiarly Sanscritic, and agrees in its derivation neither with nox nor νύξ. The Vêdic nash or nak (night) is as near to Latin as can be. Thus mouse in the common Sanscrit is mûshas, or mûshikâ, both derivative forms if compared with the Latin mus, muris. The Vêdic Sanscrit has preserved the same primitive noun in the plural mûsh-as = Latin mures. There are other words in the Vêda which were lost altogether in the later Sanscrit, while they were preserved in Greek and Latin. Dyaus (sky) does not occur as a masculine in the ordinary Sanscrit; it occurs in the Vêda, and thus bears witness to the early Aryan worship of Dyaus, the Greek Zeûs. Ushas (dawn), again, in the later Sanscrit is neuter. In the Vêda it is feminine; and even the secondary Vêdic form, Ushâsâ, is proved to be of high antiquity by the nearly corresponding Latin form, Aurora. Declension and conjugation are richer in forms and more unsettled in their usage. It was a curious fact, for instance, that no subjunctive mood existed in the common Sanscrit. The Greeks and Romans had it, and even the language of the Avesta showed clear traces of it. There could be no doubt that the Sanscrit also once possessed this mood, and, at last, it was discovered in the hymns of the Rig-Vêda." †

"As early as about 600 B.C., we find that in the theological schools of India every verse, every word, every syllable of the Rig-Vêda had been carefully counted. The number of verses, as

* Hardwick, p. 123. † *Chips*, i. 79.

computed in treatises of that date, varies from 10,402 to 10,662; that of the words is 153,826; that of the syllables is 432,000. With these numbers, and with the description given in these early treatises of each hymn, of its metre, its deity, its number of verses, our modern MSS. of the Vêda correspond as closely as could be expected. . . . Now in the works of that period the Vêda is already considered, not only as an ancient, but as a sacred book, and, more than this, its language had ceased to be generally intelligible. The language of India had changed since the Vêda was composed, and learned commentaries were necessary in order to explain to the people then living the true purport, nay, the proper pronunciation of their sacred hymns. But more than this. In certain exegetical compositions, which are generally comprised under the name of Sûtras, and which are contemporary with or even anterior to the treatises on theological statistics just mentioned, not only are the ancient hymns represented as invested with sacred authority, but that other class of writings, the Brâhmanas, standing half-way between the hymns and the Sûtras, have likewise been raised to the dignity of a revealed literature. These Brâhmanas are prose treatises, written in illustration of the ancient sacrifices and of the hymns employed at them. Such treatises would only spring up when some kind of explanation began to be wanted, both for the ceremonial and for the hymns to be recited at certain sacrifices; and we find, in consequence, that in many cases the authors of the Brâhmanas had already lost the power of understanding the text of the ancient hymns in its natural and grammatical meaning, and that they suggested the most absurd explanations of the various sacrificial acts, most of which, we may charitably suppose, had some rational purpose. Thus it becomes evident that the period during which the hymns were composed must have been separated by some centuries at least from the period that gave birth to the Brâhmanas, in order to allow time for the hymns growing unintelligible and becoming invested with a sacred character. Secondly, the period during which the Brâhmanas were composed must be separated by some centuries from the authors of the Sûtras, in order to allow time for further changes in the language, and more particularly for the growth of a new theology, which ascribed to the Brâhmanas the same exceptional and revealed character which the Brâhmanas themselves ascribed to the hymns. So that we want, previously to 600 B.C., at least two strata of intellectual and literary growth, of two or three centuries each; and are thus brought to 1100 or 1200 B.C. as the earliest time when we may suppose the collection of the Vêdic hymns to have been finished. This collection, again, contains, by its own showing, ancient and modern hymns, the hymns of the sons together with those of their fathers and earlier ancestors; so that we

cannot well assign a date more recent than 1200 or 1500 B.C. for the original composition." *

Beyond this point another question arises. If the oldest portions of the Vêdas existed twelve or thirteen centuries B.C., what length of time was necessary for the growth of the language as we there find it, and of the religious forms and institutions described? This is a question which we have no means of answering. We see only the full-grown fruit. The preparation of the soil, the planting and growth of the tree belong to ages which lie beyond the vision of history. If analogy rule, the tract of antecedent time must have been great. The language and social life of the earliest Vêdic period, though comparatively simple and primitive, are far above barbarism.

We may now glance at the general structure and contents of the Vêdas. Their substance includes three elements: Mantras, prayers in verse; Brâhmanas, precepts and directions bearing on ritual in prose; and Upanishads, secret, mystic doctrine, the well-head of Hindu theology and philosophy. As intimated by Müller in the extract given above, internal evidence makes it probable that these three elements are of different dates, the Mantras being the most ancient, the Vêda proper, the Vêda of the Vêdas, and the Upanishads as the most speculative, the most recent. These parts may be compared to three deposits in geology. To the three taken together in each case is given the title of Samhitâ (collection). When the two latter parts were admitted into the canon it is impossible to conjecture. The Hindus make no difference in date or authority between one part and another. The titles are a very slight index to the contents. Rik (in composition Rig) is from a root "to praise," and the Vêda bearing this name is filled with hymns and prayers, and all that relates to worship in the strict sense. Yaju (in composition Yajur) is from a root "to sacrifice" (yagna, a sacrifice), and accordingly this is the Vêda of oblation and sacrifice. Sâma is derived variously from a root "to destroy" sin and a root "to chant." This Vêda relates to man's duties to God and his fellow-creatures, and is chanted. It is said to contain much repetition of the first. Atharvana (if we mistake not) is from a root "to destroy," this Vêda

* *Chips*, I. 10, 12. Some good passages on this point occur in Hardwick's volume.

containing imprecations against enemies and prayers for safety. The Mantra portion of the Rig-Vêda is marked by a twofold division, first into eight parts (chanda) and sixty-four lectures (adhyâya), and secondly into ten books (mandala) and upwards of 100 chapters (anuvâka). It contains 1,017 hymns. The Yajur-Vêda is divided into the White and Black Yaju, otherwise Vâjasanêya and Taittiriya. The Mantra portion of the first contains forty lectures (adhyâya) and 286 chapters (anuvâka) of the second seven parts (Kanda) of five to eight chapters each, and more than 650 sections. The other two Vêdas are equally extensive. The last is especially rich in appended Upanishads to the number of fifty-two, several of which are very celebrated. According to Colebrooke's analysis of the Yajur-Vêda it contains elaborate directions for the sacrifices at the change of the moon, consecration of sacrificial fire, offerings to the manes of ancestors, and certain great sacrifices called Agnishtôma, Soutrâmani, Ashwamêdha, Râjasûya, Purushamêdha, Vâjapêya.

However, these are but the bones and skeleton. What of the doctrines which constitute the flesh and blood of these ancient books? Stated briefly the religion inculcated is a system of nature-worship. The deities invoked are sky, earth, sun, moon, fire, water, winds, time, death. Dyan-pitru (dyau = sky, pitru = father) is the elder brother etymologically of Ju-piter, as Aditi is the Indian Juno. Yama, death, is the Indian Pluto. Vâyu stands both for wind and the god of wind, Æolus. He was multiplied into the Maruts, storm-gods. Varuna (*οὐρανός*), at first "the expanse, firmament," seems to have filled a double office as Neptune, and one of the twelve Adityas, rulers of the points of the compass. Agni (ignis) is fire. Usha was the goddess of Dawn. Her precursors were the two twin Ashwinis (ashwa, horse), models of beauty. Sôma is the Moon. Dêva (deus, *θεός*), the generic name for God, is from a root, "to shine." But greater and more worshipped than all these were, first the Sun, under his different names of Sûrya, Mitra, Aditya, Savitru, and secondly Indra, the god of rain. No one who has lived in India and seen how dependent country and people are on these two great elements, will wonder that Sûrya and Indra have overshadowed all their peers. Really Indra fills the place in India which Jupiter filled in Greece and Rome.

Let us first take from the Rig-Veda the verse known as

the Gâyatri, which every one of the millions of Brahmans in India repeats mentally (compare the Jewish Tetragrammaton) every day in his worship. Perhaps the reader would be glad to see the original in Roman characters. The preface to it is Om (a mystical word of reverence), Bhûr, Bhuvaha, Swaha, Earth, Sky, Heaven! Then follows the prayer. Tat savitur varênyam bhargò dèvasya dhîmahi dhiyò yò naha prachòdayât. "Let us muse on that excellent glory of the divine sun which stimulates our mind."

The following hymn of the same Vèda is the one used at the funeral pyre:

"To Yama, mighty king, be gifts and homage paid.
He was the first of men that died, the first to brave
Death's rapid rushing stream, the first to point the road
To heaven, and welcome others to that bright abode.
No power can rob us of the home thus won by thee.
O King, we come; the born must die, must tread the path
That thou hast trod—the path by which each race of men,
In long succession, and our fathers too have passed.
Soul of the dead, depart! Fear not to take the road—
The ancient road—by which thy ancestors have gone;
Ascend to meet the god—to meet thy happy fathers,
Who dwell in bliss with him. Fear not to pass the guards—
The four-eyed brindled dogs—that watch for the departed.
Return unto thy home, O soul! Thy sin and shame
Leave thou behind on earth; assume a shining form—
Thy ancient shape—refined and from all taint set free." *

Whatever the deity addressed, Time, Fire, Indra, &c., he is spoken of as if he were the only or chief deity. Thus the Atharvana-Vèda speaks of Time.

"He is the first of gods.
He draws forth and encompasses the worlds;
He is all future worlds; he is their father;
He is their son; there is no power like him.
The past and future issue out of Time,
All sacred knowledge and austerity.
From Time the earth and waters were produced;
From Time the rising, setting, burning Sun;
From Time the wind; through Time the earth is vast;
Through Time the earth perceives; mind, breath and name
In him are comprehended. All rejoice
When Time arrives—the monarch who has conquered
This world, the highest world, the holy worlds,
Yea, all the worlds—and ever marches on." †

* Williams, p. 22. † Ibid., p. 23.

The sacrificial Agni, Fire, is one of the main Vêdic deities. Professor Williams thus "paraphrases" some verses relating to him.

"Agni, thou art a priest, a sage, a king,
Protector, father of the sacrifice;
Commissioned by us men, thou dost ascend
A messenger, conveying to the sky
Our hymns and offerings. Though thy origin
Be threefold, now from air and now from water,
Now from the mystic, double Arani,*
Thou art thyself a mighty god, a lord,
Giver of light and immortality,
One in thy essence, but to mortals three;
Displaying thine eternal triple form,
As fire on earth, as lightning in the air,
As sun in heaven. Thou art a cherished guest
In every household—father, brother, son,
Friend, benefactor, guardian, all in one.
Deliver, mighty lord, thy worshippers,
Purge us from taint of sin; and when we die,
Deal mercifully with us on the pyre,
Burning our bodies with their load of guilt,
But bearing our eternal part on high
To luminous abodes and realms of bliss,
For ever there to dwell with righteous men."

Müller thus renders from the Rig-Vêda a litany to Varuna (*Chips*, i. 39). "Let me not yet, O Varuna, enter into the house of clay; have mercy, almighty, have mercy! 2. If I go along trembling, like a cloud driven by the wind; have mercy, almighty, have mercy! 3. Through want of strength, thou strong and bright god, have I gone wrong; have mercy, almighty, have mercy! 4. Thirst came upon the worshipper, though he stood in the midst of the waters; have mercy, almighty, have mercy! 5. Whenever we men, O Varuna, commit an offence before the heavenly host, whenever we break the law through thoughtlessness; have mercy, almighty, have mercy!" The following from the same Vêda is to Sôma, the moon or the juice of the moon-plant used in oblation, probably here the latter. "1. Where there is eternal light, in the world where the sun is placed, in that immortal, imperishable world place me, O Sôma. 2. Where king Vaivaswata

* Sacrificial fire might only be kindled by friction of chips of the *ficus religiosa*.

reigns, where the secret place of heaven is, where these mighty waters are, there make me immortal. 3. Where life is free, in the third heaven of heavens, where the worlds are radiant, there make me immortal. 4. Where wishes and desires are, where the place of the bright sun is, where there is freedom and delight, there make me immortal. 5. Where there is happiness and delight, where joy and pleasure dwell, where the desires of our desire are attained, there make me immortal."

An important question here emerges. In this system of nature-worship were these natural forces and objects themselves worshipped, or were they mere symbols of something beyond themselves? Many single hymns and expressions seem to favour the first view, but all taken together point to the second. Undoubtedly Vêdic writers and worshippers had conceptions of deities apart from and beyond what they saw. The whole strain of their words suggests that they conceived of the different parts of creation as under the delegated rule of subordinate deities who again held of the Supreme Creator. The following is from the Rig-Vêda. Prof. Williams's version (p. 23), which we quote, differs only in form from Müller's literal version (i. 29).

"What god shall we adore with sacrifice?*
Him let us praise, the golden child that rose
In the beginning, who was born the lord—
The one sole lord of all that is—who made
The earth, and formed the sky, who giveth life,
Who giveth strength, whose bidding gods revere,
Whose hiding-place is immortality,
Whose shadow, death; who by his might is king
Of all the breathing, sleeping, waking world—
Who governs men and beasts, whose majesty
These snowy hills, this ocean with its rivers
Declare; of whom these spreading regions form
The arms; by whom the firmament is strong,
Earth firmly planted, and the highest heavens
Supported, and the clouds that fill the air
Distributed and measured out; to whom
Both earth and heaven, established by his will,
Look up with trembling heart; in whom revealed
The rising sun shines forth above the world.
Where'er let loose in space, the mighty waters
Have gone, depositing a fruitful seed
And generating fire, there he arose

* Repeated at the end of every verse.

Who is the breath and life of all the gods,
Whose mighty glance looks round the vast expanse
Of watery vapour—source of energy,
Cause of the sacrifice—the only God
Above the gods. May he not injure us!
He the Creator of the earth—the righteous
Creator of the sky, Creator too
Of oceans bright, and far-extending waters."

One Rig-poet, though he only speaks for himself, says, "They call him Indra, Mitra, Varuna, Agni; then he is the beautiful-winged heavenly Garutmat; that which is one they call it in divers manners."

A still more striking evidence of this faith in a supreme power is quoted by Müller from the Rig-Vêda.

"Nor Aught nor Nought existed; yon bright sky
Was not, nor heaven's broad woof outstretched above.
What covered all? What sheltered? What concealed?
Was it the waters' fathomless abyss?
There was not death—yet there was nought immortal,
There was no confine betwixt day and night;
The only one breathed breathless by itself,
Other than it there nothing since has been.
Darkness there was, and all at first was veiled
In gloom profound—an ocean without light—
The germ that still lay covered in the husk.
Burst forth, one nature, from the fervent heat.
Then first came love upon it, the new spring
Of mind—yea, poets in their hearts discerned,
Pondering, this bond between created things
And uncreated. Comes this spark from earth,
Piercing and all-pervading, or from heaven?
Then seeds were sown, and mighty powers arose—
Nature below, and power and will above—
Who knows the secret? Who proclaimed it here,
Whence, whence this manifold creation sprang?
The gods themselves came later into being.
Who knows from whence this great creation sprang?
He from whom all this great creation came,
Whether His will created or was mute,
The Most High Seer, that is in highest heaven,
He knows it—or perchance even He knows not." *

In estimating the worth of the Vêdic hymns all depends on the standard of comparison adopted. If the standard be the mythology which is the substance of modern

* *Chips*, I. 78.

Hinduism, we have no difficulty in ascribing a vast superiority to the simple, if often indefinite and material, conceptions of the Vêdic period. Christianity would find far more congenial soil among a people familiar with the great ideas of prayer, sacrifice, sin, immortality, and little beyond, than among populations materialised and corrupted by the wild legends of Puránic mythology. The great and essential defect as compared with Christian revelation is the absence of deep spirituality of thought and feeling. Many prayers which might be quoted are mainly prayers for present, earthly good. But this, of course, is the characteristic of merely natural religion, which was all the early Hindus had. Their only light was that of nature and reason. They worshipped an unknown God. They were feeling after God, though they did not find Him.

What is the relation of the Vêdas to the Hindu religion of the present? Nominally they are the source and authority of all Brahmanical faith and worship. All later beliefs and institutions are regarded as developments of what is to be found in the Vêdas. But really this is far from the fact. The worship of images in any way, in themselves or as symbols, is unknown to the Vêdas. This alone is an immense gain. Indeed, how could there be symbols of the mighty forces of nature—fire, the winds? The other deities, too, were ever present and visible—sun, moon, sea. So transmigration does not occur. Incarnation is an idea not known, while Vishnu's ten incarnations supply the chief material of later Hinduism. The Divine Triad also is not mentioned, and it is doubtful whether the names of its separate members occur. It must be remembered that the four-faced Brahma of the Triad (Chartur-mukha Brahma) is different from the supreme Brahma of the Vêdas, and is regarded still, like Vishnu and Shiva, as an emanation of the supreme Brahma. Rudra, one of the thousand names of Shiva, occurs in the Vêdas, but, as it also means terrible, a personal reference is doubtful. Vishnu is mentioned, but only as a form of the sun. Yáska, an Indian writer, gives Indra, Agni, and Súrya as the Vêdic Triad of gods. The origin of caste is mentioned in a hymn of the Rig-Vêda, which Professor Williams and M. Müller regard as "one of the most recent" (p. 24). The hymn speaks of the Brahman as the mouth, the soldier (Kshatriya) as the arms, the husbandman (Vaishya) as the thighs, the servile Shudra as the feet of Brahma.

The full development of the caste system was reserved for Manu's *Code of Laws*. The pantheism of modern India may with more reason claim the Vêdas as an authority, but only the Upanishad portion, which European scholars regard as the most recent. To this we shall refer hereafter.

The absence from the Vêdas of all recognition, or even mention, of caste, has evidently been a thorn to Brahmans. Some of the great Vêdic sages were kings and warriors. Thus, the great Vishwâmitra, seer of forty Vêdic hymns, was a king. But in later books Brahman writers have inserted a story of his having been elevated by the merit of extraordinary penances to the rank of Râjarshi, or King-seer. But this is without doubt an explanation invented to overcome a difficulty, and contradicts the essential principles of caste. Vasishta was a rival of Vishwâmitra. There is a curious hymn in which Vasishta satirically compares his opponents at their studies and sacrifices to frogs croaking and leaping for joy at the opening of the rainy season.

It is time to refer to the Brâhmanas, the second factor in the composition of the Vêdas. These, as we have seen, are in prose, and probably more recent than the Mantra portion. They are full of minute directions as to the mode of offering sacrifices, the kind of victims, the qualifications and duties of priests, the mantras to be repeated; and these again are mixed up with innumerable digressions and speculations. To the Rig-Vêda belong the Aitareya and Kaushîtaki Brâhmanas, to the Yajur the Taittiriya and Shatapatha, to the Sâma eight Brâhmanas, and to the Atharvana the Go-patha.

In modern Hinduism proper there are no sacrifices. Brahmans, though the priestly order, are only teachers, not sacrificers. The Hinduism of the Vêdas and primitive India is full of sacrifice. Perhaps this is a greater contrast than any of the points mentioned before. The fact is as striking as it is undoubted. Perhaps a great part of the explanation is to be found in the growth of the entirely non-Vêdic dogma of transmigration, which has invested all life with a peculiar sanctity. All beasts, birds, and reptiles are simply former generations of men in other forms. Animals also play a large part in the Vishnu incarnations.

Sacrifices are arranged in five classes:—1. Agnihôtra, burnt offerings of clarified butter on sacred fire. 2.

Darsha-paurna-màsa, offerings at new and full moon. 3. Chaturmàsya, offerings every four months. 4. Pashu-yagna, animal sacrifices. 5. Sòma-yagna, offerings of the moon-plant (*asclepias acida*). Popularly sacrifices were regarded as the food of the gods. But strictly they were eucharistic, propitiatory, or to obtain particular blessings. Boundless efficacy was ascribed to the rite of sacrifice. There was nothing which might not thus be accomplished. One of the Brâhmanas tells a story of a sage Twashta—and Hindu legend is crowded with similar stories,—who tried by sacrifice to effect the destruction of the supreme Indra himself in revenge for the death of his sons, whom the King of heaven had slain. The gods only prevented his success by guile, stealing the sacrificial utensils and materials—pestles, water, rice, dishes, wood—and throwing him into such mental perplexity that, to the giant who was to destroy the god, instead of saying, "Be thou Indra's enemy," he said, "Let Indra be thy enemy," and thus missed his aim.

Among the other sacrificial ideas is found that of graduated value. There is no instance of actual human sacrifice. But the remarkable legend of Sunahsêpa in the Aitareya Brâhmana very nearly approaches this. The legend is this:—King Harishchandra asks the sage Nârada about the advantage of having sons. Nârada replies:—

> "A father by his son clears off his debt,
> In him a self is born from self. The pleasure
> A father has in his son exceeds
> All other pleasures. Food is life, apparel
> Is a protection, gold an ornament,
> A loving wife the best of friends, a daughter
> An object of compassion; but a son
> Is like a light sent from the highest heaven."

The king then vows to Varuna to sacrifice the son that he gives. A son, Rôhita, is born, who refuses to become a victim, and, while his father is punished with dropsy, goes to a forest life for six years. There he finds a Brahman, Ajigarta, dying of hunger, and offers him a hundred cows for one of his three sons to become his substitute. The father cannot spare the eldest, nor the mother the youngest; but the middle son, Sunahsêpa, volunteers to go. Rôhita brings him to his father, and the sacrifice is prepared. But no one will bind the willing victim to the sacrificial post. Then Ajigarta, who has followed his son, says:—

"'Give me a hundred cows, and I will bind him.'
They gave them to him, and he bound the boy.
But now no person would consent to kill him.
Then said the father, 'Give me yet again
Another hundred cows and I will slay him.'
Once more they gave a hundred, and the father
Whetted his knife to sacrifice his son.
Then said the child, 'Let me implore the gods,
Haply they will deliver me from death.'
So Sunahsêpa prayed to all the gods
With verses from the Vêda, and they heard him.
Thus was the boy released from sacrifice,
And Harishchandra was restored to health."

The sacrifice which is most prominent both in Vêdic times and epic mythology is the horse sacrifice, Ashwamêdha, which we may reasonably believe to have been observed, though not with all the fabulous incidents related. The object was obtaining a son, or universal conquest. Yudhisthira, in the Mahâ-Bhârata and Dasharatha, father of Râma, in the Râmâyana are said to have celebrated it. The horse was to be specially chosen for the purpose, a white one having the preference. Grandly caparisoned it was allowed to roam at will for twelve months, accompanied by guards. Then, brought back, it was sacrificed with an elaborate ritual, and at incredible cost. The offerings to Brahmans and all comers included tens of thousands of maidens, cows, elephants, and gold and precious stones without limit. A hundred such sacrifices entitled the offerer to the throne of Indra.

We find four classes of priests employed in the Vêdic sacrifices: 1. Adhwaryus, assistants, who prepared the ground and altar, slew the victims, poured out the libations, and repeated verses from the Yajur-Vêda. 2. Udgâtars, choristers, who sang the hymns of the Sâma-Vêda. 3. Hotars, reciters, who recited the prayers of the Rig-Vêda. 4. Brahmans, who presided over the whole ceremony.

Professor Williams gives the following curious extracts from the Aitareya-Brâhmana, edited by Dr. Haug, of Poona College:—

"The gods killed a man for their victim. But from him thus killed the part which was fit for a sacrifice went out and entered a horse. Thence the horse became an animal fit for being sacrificed. The gods then killed the horse, but the part fit for sacrifice went out of it and entered an ox. The gods then killed the ox,

but the part fit for sacrifice went out of it and entered a sheep. Thence it entered a goat. The sacrificial part remained for the longest time in the goat, whence it became pre-eminently fit for sacrifice.

"The gods went up to heaven by means of sacrifice. They were afraid that men and sages, after having seen their sacrifice, might inquire how they could obtain some knowledge of sacrificial rites, and follow them. They therefore debarred them by means of the post (Yûpa), turning its point downwards. Thereupon the men and sages dug the post out, and turned its point upwards. Thus they became aware of the sacrifice, and reached the heavenly world."

The same Brâhmana contains the following:—

"The sun never sets or rises. When people think the sun is setting, he only changes about after reaching the end of the day, and makes night below and day to what is on the other side. Then when people think he rises in the morning, he only shifts himself about after reaching the end of the night, and makes day below, and night to what is on the other side. In fact, he never does set at all. Whoever knows this that the sun never sets, enjoys union and sameness of nature with him, and abides in the same sphere."

The Shatapatah Brâhmana contains the first Hindu version of the Deluge. Manu, the Indian Adam and Noah in one, meets with a small fish which implores his protection and promises to preserve him in the Deluge which it foretells. Manu then, as instructed, preserves it in a jar, and when it has outgrown this, in a trench, and at last, when large enough to defend itself, in the ocean. He builds a ship, and when the flood comes takes refuge in it and offers homage to the fish. The ship is moored to the fish. Thus Manu is preserved, and descending from the mountains becomes the progenitor of a new race of mankind. Perhaps it will interest some readers to see the full Brâhmana legend, which is greatly embellished and exaggerated in subsequent works. Hardwick gives it as follows:—

"One morning the servants of Manu brought him water for ablutions, as the custom is to bring it in our day. As he proceeded to wash, he found a fish in the water which spoke to him saying, 'Protect me and I will be thy saviour.' 'From what wilt thou save me?' 'A deluge will ere long destroy all living creatures, but I can save thee from it.' 'What protection then dost thou ask of me?' 'So long as we are little,' replied the fish, 'a great danger threatens us, for one fish will not scruple to devour

another. At first then thou canst protect me by keeping me in a vase. When I grow bigger, dig me a pond, and when I become too large for the pond, throw me into the sea; for thenceforward I shall be able to protect myself against all evils.' The fish ere long became enormous, for it grew very fast, and one day it said to Manu, 'In such a year will come the deluge: call to mind the counsel I have given thee. Build a ship, and when the deluge comes embark on the vessel, and I will preserve thee.' Manu after feeding the fish at last threw it into the sea, and in the very year indicated prepared a ship, and had recourse (in spirit) to his benefactor. When the flood came Manu went on board. The fish then reappeared and swam up to him, and Manu passed the cable round its horn, by means of which he crossed the Northern Mountain. 'I have saved thee,' said the fish; 'now lash thy vessel to a tree, else the water may still carry thee away, though thy vessel be moored upon the mountain. When the water has receded, then also mayst thou disembark.' Manu obeyed implicitly, and hence the mountain is still called 'Manu's Descent.' The deluge swept away all living creatures. Manu alone survived. His life was then devoted to prayer and fasting to obtain posterity. He made the food-sacrifice, he offered to the waters clarified butter, cream, whey, and curdled milk. At the end of the year he got for himself a wife. She came dripping out of the butter; it trickled on her footsteps. Mitra and Varuna approached her and asked, 'Who art thou?' She answered, 'The daughter of Manu.' 'Wilt thou be our daughter?' 'No. My owner is the author of my being.' Their solicitations were in vain; for she moved straight on till she came to Manu. On seeing her he also asked her, 'Who art thou?' She said, 'Thy own daughter.' 'How so, beloved, art thou really my daughter?' 'Yes; thy offerings brought me into being. Approach me during the sacrifice. If so thou shalt be rich in posterity and in flocks.' Thus was Manu wedded to her in the midst of the sacrifice. With her he lived in prayer and fasting, and she became the mother of the present race of men, which even now is called the race of Manu."

The third part of the Vêdas consists of the Upanishads, mystic or secret doctrine, deeply interesting to us, and still exercising the greatest influence on Hindu thought. That they are the most recent portion is proved by their contents, which abound in speculation, and by their language, which still more than that of the Brâhmans approaches the form of the classical Sanscrit. These treatises are about 150 in number, though the important ones are few, and are attached to certain parts of the Brâhmanas called Aranyakas (aranya, a forest), intended to be read in the forest, or by hermits.

Their doctrine is the germ of the undisguised pantheism which finds full expression in the Bhagavad-gitâ and the Vêdânta philosophy, which underlies all Hinduism in its final analysis, and is the creed in different forms and degrees of all thoughtful and philosophical Hindus. Of course there is the usual mixture of extravagant fancies and conceits. Indian pantheism is not the doctrine that God is the Soul of the world, but that he is the world, the universe, body and soul, mind and matter alike. The countless forms of existence are simply modes or manifestations of His existence. The sum of knowledge, the goal of effort is the perception of this dogma:—God is everything, everything is God. Some of the chief Upanishads are the Aitareya and Kaushitaki belonging to the Rig, the Taittiriya, Brihad-âranyaka and Isha belonging to the Yajur, the Chândôgya and Kena belonging to the Sâma, the Prashna, Mundaka, Mândukya and Katha belonging to the Atharvana-Vêda.

The following is part of the Isha Upanishad* :—

"Whate'er exists within this universe
Is all to be regarded as enveloped
By the great Lord, as if wrapped in a vesture.
There is one only Being who exists
Unmoved, yet moving swifter than the wind;
Who far outstrips the senses, though as gods
They strive to reach him; who himself at rest
Transcends the fleetest flight of other beings,
Who like the air supports all vital action.
He moves, yet moves not; he is far, yet near.
He is within this universe, and yet
Outside this universe; whoe'er beholds
All living creatures, as in him, and him—
The universal spirit—as in all,
Henceforth regards no creature with contempt.
The man who understands that every creature
Exists in God alone, and thus perceives
The unity of being, has no grief
And no illusion. He, the all-pervading,
Is brilliant, without body, sinewless,
Invulnerable, pure and undefiled
By taint of sin. He also is all-wise,
The Ruler of the mind, above all beings
The self-existent. He created all things
Just as they are from all eternity."

* Williams, p. 38.

The two great divisions of Hinduism on this subject call themselves Dwaitas and Adwaitas, those who recognise two substances and those who hold but one. Vishnuites generally are the first, Shivites the second. The favourite formula of the latter and of all Vêdântists, Adwiti, occurs in the Chândôgya Upanishad. "In the beginning there was the mere state of being—one only, without a second.* Some, however, say that in the beginning there was the state of non-being—one only without a second. Hence, out of a state of non-being would proceed a state of being. But, indeed, how can this be? How can being proceed out of non-being? In the beginning then there was the mere state of being—one only without a second. It created heat. That heat willed, 'I shall multiply and be born.' It created water. The water willed, 'I shall multiply and be born.' It created food. Therefore, wherever rain falls much food is produced. That deity willed, 'Entering these three deities in a living form, I shall develope name and form.'"

The following is from the Mundaka, which professes to explain a mantra of the Rig-Vêda: "Two birds (Paramâtman and Jîvâtman, supreme soul and individual soul) always united, of the same name, occupy the same tree (dwell in the same body). One of them (Jîvâtman) enjoys the sweet fruit of the fig, the other looks on as a witness. Dwelling on the same tree (with Paramâtman), the deluded soul (Jîvâtman) immersed, is grieved by want of power; but when it perceives the ruler apart, and his glory, its grief ceases."

The same Upanishad contains the most popular illustrations of Hindu controversialists. "As the spider projects and draws in its web; as from a living man the hairs of the head and body spring forth; so from the indestructible spirit the universe is produced. As from a blazing fire unsubstantial sparks dart forth in a thousand ways; so from the unperishable one various living souls are produced, and to him also they return. As flowing rivers are resolved into the sea, losing name and form; so the wise, freed from name and form, pass into the divine spirit, which is greater than the great. He who knows that supreme spirit becomes spirit."

So the Brihad-Aranyaka Upanishad. "As the web issues from the spider, as little sparks issue from fire, so from

* Ekamêr adwiyam, one only without a second.

the soul proceed all breathing animals, all worlds, all gods, all beings. Those who know him as the life of life, the eye of the eye, the ear of the ear, the mind of the mind, have comprehended the eternal pre-existing spirit. 'I am Brahma.' Whoever knows this knows all. Even the gods are unable to prevent him from becoming Brahma. Man indeed is like a lofty tree, lord of the forest. His hair is like the leaves, his skin the outside bark. If a tree be cut down, it springs up anew from the root. From his skin flows blood as sap from the bark; it issues from his wounded body like sap from a stricken tree. From what root does mortal man grow, when hewn down by death? The root is Brahma, who is knowledge and bliss."

The Chândôgya exalts a knowledge of Brahma, the universal spirit, above knowledge of the Vêdas and Purânas. "The knowledge of these works is a mere name. Speech is greater than this, mind than speech, will than mind, sensation than mind, reflection than sensation, knowledge than reflection, power than knowledge, and highest of all is life. As the spokes of a wheel are jointed to the nave, so are all things to life."

The Katha Upanishad compares the soul to a rider, the body to a chariot, the intellect to a charioteer, the mind to the reins, the senses to horses, the objects of sense to roads. The ignorant give the reins to the horses and are hurried to ruin. The likeness to the Platonic simile will occur to every one. The same work contains the story of Nachiketas, who had been devoted to death by his father in a fit of anger. He goes to Yama, propitiates him, and is told to make three requests. He asks first to be restored to life and his father, secondly to be taught the fire by which heaven is gained, and puts the third thus: "Some say the soul exists after death; others say it does not exist. I request, as my third boon, that I may be instructed by thee in the true answer to this question." Yama at first tries to put him off; but at last yielding to his wish thus concludes an exhortation to prefer knowledge to pleasure:—

> "The highest aim of knowledge is the soul;
> This is a miracle beyond the ken
> Of common mortals, thought of though it be,
> And variously explained by skilful teachers.
> Who gains this knowledge is a marvel too.
> He lives above the cares, the griefs and joys
> Of time and sense, seeking to penetrate
> The fathomless unborn eternal essence.

The slayer thinks he slays, the slain
Believes himself destroyed. The thoughts of both
Are false: the soul survives, nor kills, nor dies;
'Tis subtler than the subtlest, greater than
The greatest, infinitely small, yet vast,
Asleep, yet restless, moving everywhere
Among the bodies, ever bodiless.
Think not to grasp it by the reasoning mind;
The wicked ne'er can know it; soul alone
Knows soul, to none but soul is soul revealed." *

We give these extracts, not as an epitome of the whole teaching of the Upanishads, but simply as a specimen of their teaching on a single point. The Upanishads are a chaos of opinions and speculations of anonymous authors, on all sorts of subjects, in some respects not unlike the Talmud, only that to Hindus they are Shruti, direct revelation, as much as the Mantras. Their contents and style, apart from the language, mark them as the latest in composition. Their teaching is so ambiguous and contradictory that all Hindu schools and sects appeal to them, Dwaitas and Adwaitas. But undoubtedly the above extracts justify the modern Adwaita Vêdântists in claiming their authority for pantheism. The god Krishna's teaching in the more recent Bhagavad-gîtâ is only a commentary on these texts. We give a few lines of this more advanced doctrine.

"Prop of this earthly frame,
Whither all creatures go, from whence they came,
I am the best; from me all beings spring,
And rest on me like pearls upon their string;
I am the moisture in the moving stream,
In Sun and Moon the bright essential Beam,
The mystic word in Scripture's holy page,
Sound in the air, Earth's fragrant scent am I,
Life of all living, Good men's Piety,
Seed of all being, Brightness in the flame,
In the wise Wisdom, in the famous Fame."

Much more might be quoted from the later books to the same effect. Hindu writers do not weakly shrink from any results of their principles. Enough has been said to show that the fully developed pantheism of later Hinduism is only the expansion of statements in the Vêdic Upanishads. But a greater contrast could hardly be conceived to the religion of the Hymns, the Mantras, that is, of the most

* Williams, *Indian Wisdom.*

ancient portion of the Vêdas. The two creeds belong to different stages of society and culture, and must have been separated by considerable tracts of time, one directed outward, the other inward; one satisfied with what it sees, the other digging down to the roots and causes of things; one the artless utterance of childhood, the other the reasoned conclusion of maturity and experience.

What we have written will show that we have no wish to disparage Indian writers. Instead of wounding Hindu pride by "barbarous" epithets, we do the fullest justice to the literature and history in which Hindus with good reason glory. Indeed, in one respect Indian thought is more interesting to us than any other: namely, because of its predominantly religious cast. More than any other people ancient or modern—more than Greek or Roman, more than European or American—Hindus have brooded over the deeper problems of existence, the nature of the soul and God and immortality. For ages, abandoning the practical and earthly, they have surrendered themselves to speculation about the spiritual world. Indian literature has no written history, such as ours: perhaps because there was no history to write. India has no political theories or parties, because it has no political life. The historical faculty, the power to appreciate historical evidence, seems wanting in the Hindu character, as every teacher in India knows. Max Müller well points out, that while the Aryan of the West has devoted himself to practical pursuits—perfecting art, government, war—the Aryan of India has remained in the region of abstract thought and philosophy. The picture of the contrast between the two brothers of the same family (and how often do brothers turn out differently!), and of the direction Hindu thought has taken, is as true as it is graphic, and will well repay study. "Left to themselves, in a world of their own, without a past, and without a future before them, these Aryan settlers had nothing but themselves to ponder on. Struggles there must have been in India also. Old dynasties were destroyed, whole families annihilated, and new empires founded. Yet the inward life of the Hindu was not changed by these convulsions. His mind was like the lotus-leaf after a shower of rain has passed over it; his character remained the same—passive, meditative, quiet, and thoughtful. A people of this peculiar stamp was never destined to act a prominent part in the history of the world; nay, the exhausting atmosphere of

transcendental ideas in which they lived could not but exercise a detrimental influence on the active and moral character of the Indians. Social and political virtues were little cultivated, and the ideas of the useful and the beautiful hardly known to them. With all this, however, they had what the Greek was as little capable of imagining as they were of realising the elements of Grecian life. They shut their eyes to this world of outward seeming and activity, to open them full on the world of thought and rest. The ancient Hindus were a nation of philosophers, such as could nowhere have existed except in India, and, even there, in early times alone. . . . . There never was a nation believing so firmly in another world, and so little concerned about this. Their condition on earth is to them a problem; their real and eternal life a simple fact. . . . . The only sphere in which the Indian mind finds itself at liberty to act, to create and to worship, is the sphere of religion and philosophy; and nowhere have metaphysical and religious ideas struck root so deep in the mind of nations as in India. . . . . Taken as a whole, history supplies no second instance where the inward life of the soul so completely absorbed all the other faculties of a people." *

But now in the interest of historical truth, we are constrained to ask, What has been the outcome of this intense earnestness directed to religious inquiry? If ever any people might dispense with revelation, and arrive at the same point by some other path, it was the Hindus. They supply, in our judgment, the most perfect crucial test of the ability of the religious faculty in man to discover truth for itself. And what is the result? In the Vêdas, first, nature-worship; secondly, vague conjectures of some power beyond; and, finally, incipient pantheism. And the Vedic creed is the purest form of Hinduism. The course since has been one of rapid and frightful degeneracy. We infinitely prefer the tenets and morality of the Vêdas to those of later and modern times. The result has been much as if we had agreed literally to substitute Homer, Virgil, Ovid, Dante, for the simple, lofty conceptions of Christianity; with this difference that, Homer, Virgil, Ovid, and Dante speak words of truth and soberness compared with the wild and too often most shameful legends of Purânic theogonies and cosmogonies. The simple forms and

* *Chips*, I., 66.

objects of Vêdic worship have been abandoned for deities of whose deeds in many cases it is a shame even to speak; the implicit, muffled pantheism of the first ages has grown into a system which, relentlessly carried out to its last consequence, cuts the nerve of all faith, earnestness, truth, hope, and purity. The one is the religion of the masses of India, the other that of the intelligent and studious. That the history of India since the days of the Vêdas has been one not of progress but retrogression is the confession of all Hindu religious reformers. Without exception they discard the present faith of their countrymen in a mass, and endeavour to return to the principles of their earliest religious teachers. We need not stay to argue that if the Vêdantism of the Brahma Samâj could take the place of modern Hinduism, which as a creed appealing to the philosophical few it is not likely to do, and if the authority of the ancient Scriptures could be restored, it would do nothing towards satisfying the wants of man's spiritual nature. The ideas of revelation, worship, prayer, sacrifice, immortality, and afterwards of incarnation, are there, however they came there; but the things themselves, where are they? What is the food offered to satisfy these cravings? It is not too much to say that the facts are a mere parody of the ideas. It is pitiable to see a great nation groping after truth and unable to find it, attacking problems which it was unable to solve, confessing wants and aspirations to which no answer came. India is another confirmation of the old belief in the necessity of a Divine revelation, a melancholy demonstration that "the world by wisdom knew not God." Its religious future is as enigmatical as its political. The disintegration of old ideas and faith and restraints is going on under a thousand influences with ever-increasing rapidity—at present, we fear, far more rapidly than the work of reconstruction on a better foundation. Mere intellectual and moral training, such as that to which British government, perhaps of necessity in great measure, restricts itself, can never fill the blank thus created. The destruction of Purânism is only a question of time, though it may be long. The reign of the Vêdas can never be restored. India's religious life depends on the energy with which Christianity is extended. Our only hope is that Christian missions, which have already accomplished much, may rise to the demand.

ART. II.—*Critical and Exegetical Handbook to the Epistle to the Galatians.* By H. A. W. MEYER, Th.D. Translated by G. H. VENABLES. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark. 1873.

IN the narrative of our Lord's Passion, it is said that two malefactors were "crucified with Him." St. Mark, borrowing as it were St. Matthew's pen, adds, "and the scripture was fulfilled, which saith, And He was numbered with the transgressors" (Mark xv. 28): as if He also was crucified with them. The time soon came when Christians began to rejoice in the mystery of being numbered or reckoned with the Crucified. Every writer, and every speaker, in the New Testament, has his own method of expressing the believer's fellowship with the cross. As a rule, however, they do not use the word "crucified" in such a connection. Christians are conformed to His death, armed with His suffering mind, suffer with Him, even die with Him; but are not said to be "crucified with Him." The obvious suggestion or precedent of the penitent whose cross was hard by the Lord's, and who, dying with Him, lived with Him also in Paradise, remained unused. Once, and once only, does one of the New Testament writers, St. Paul, adopt the very word, and that concerning himself: "I am crucified with Christ."

Was this the utterance of a bold paradox? Was it the effusion of a tender devotion? Was it the flash of an untheological sentiment, excited against the Judaizing disparagers of the cross; as sudden as the drawing of Simon Peter's sword, and as speedily revoked as his sword was put into its sheath again? Not so: the Apostle spoke his word very calmly, and, though he never repeated it literally, twice afterwards in the same epistle he returns to it, and each time with such a peculiar variation in the phrase as to show the cunning hand of the teacher. Still, there is some measure of truth in the idea of an outburst of resentment against the "enemies of the cross of Christ." The Epistle to the Galatians is throughout such an outburst. The writer is more than ordinarily "weighty and powerful;"

weighty with close and hard argument, powerful with the might of conviction and satire and passion. Its most affecting pathos, and its keenest conviction, is the way in which the cross is "evidently set forth" in it. The cross and crucifixion are introduced only into St. Paul's polemical letters; at least, are introduced in them with a special emphasis. Writing to the Corinthians, he takes refuge from his opponents in his death with Christ: "the love of Christ constraineth us, because we thus judge, that if One died for all, then all died with Him:" died to the world and to self, and to everything in the universe but Him. But in this epistle the feeling is still more seen. It is not that he is taking refuge for himself; the Galatians did indeed malign him, but that was a light matter. They sought to make the cross only an appendage to the law; partly from zeal for the law, but much more, as St. Paul says, to take away the reproach of Christianity as having only a cross as its foundation. Hence the epistle has, so to speak, the cross stamped upon it; "see with what large letters!" (ch. vi. 18.) It is written at the foot of the cross, and we might almost say with something more precious than tears or than ink. That is the reason of the three-fold, or rather three-one, doctrine of spiritual crucifixion which suggests the present essay.

But, before combining these three into their theological and experimental unity, we must examine each in itself as much as possible apart from the rest, and in its own context.

The first is an absolutely unique and solitary passage: one of those sayings in which the Apostle is "very bold"; uttering a plain statement for which many passages prepare us, but which had never before been spoken, and which, having been once spoken, is never repeated: "I am crucified with Christ." Travelling backwards and forwards through the brief context we find the meaning of this bold assertion of fellowship, amounting almost to identification. Christ "through the law" was crucified "to the law": that is, justice, guarding the claims of law, demanded His death; and love, guarding the purpose of redemption, offered it on the cross. Thus our Substitute "died to sin once" by "once offering Himself" to the law: law and sin being in this sense identified. But the faith of Paul made the death of Christ the death of Paul. This requires us to turn to the words which follow, words which are equally unique,

if not equally bold, with the other: "The life which I may be said to live in the flesh I live by faith in the Son of God, who loved me and gave Himself for me." Never before and never afterwards did he thus appropriate to himself the great atonement. "I was crucified when Christ was crucified," because "He offered His sacrifice for my substitutionary benefit: vicariously, though not without me, for I have made it my own by faith." Both the death and the life here spoken of have reference to the law and the method of a sinner's justification. In the Epistle to the Romans it is said of Christ: "in that He died He died unto sin once; but in that He liveth He liveth unto God." Now death and life as pertaining to Christ in relation to sin were only judicial death and life; and these were what the Apostle declares that he shared. His faith made Christ's judicial death and life his own: he had borne his penalty in his Representative, and lived with Him in the liberty of an acquitted and released delinquent. He had "through the law"—that is, according to the law's requirements—"died to the law"; the law and its penalty and its executioner were all alike satisfied. He, and all who are like him in Christ, have ended their relation to the doom of sin; have literally and for ever ended it: that is, so far and so long as they are in Christ. Here comes in the full meaning of the word, "I am and still continue to be crucified with Christ." The believer lives in a state of crucifixion to the law, and thus in the profoundest sense his judicial death and life are one "in Christ."

This is the doctrine of justification by faith, "not by the works of the law," but not without the concurrence and sanction of the law. The law is the voice of justice, and condemnation is the voice of the law. Justice, the law, and condemnation, are all honoured and satisfied in the death of Christ; and this death in its permanent effects is appropriated and kept in appropriation by the believer, whose faith makes that death his own as certainly if not in the same sense as it was Christ's. But the question arises as to the Apostle's motive in adopting this once so intense an expression, "I am crucified with Christ." For this two reasons may be given. First, it was to vindicate, through the Galatians, before all the world, the awful honours of the cross on the foundation of Christian hope; and, secondly, to testify that we do not share the benefits of Christ's passion without a certain fellowship, though not

an atoning fellowship, with His cross as the consummation of His passion. To both these points we shall return hereafter.

The second passage is, taken as a whole, equally unique with the first. In the fifth chapter the Apostle is again treating of liberty from the law, but now he is showing that love is the guardian of the commandment as well as its fulfilment as a rule of life. His argument is that those who are "not under the law" as a condemning power, "against whom there is no law," are such as are "led of the Spirit," who leads them inwardly to all obedience through love, which is "the law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus" (Rom. viii. 3). In their case "the law of sin in the members" is broken and abolished, but still "the flesh lusteth against the Spirit." A real and very important difference is here; in the unregenerate the flesh is a law, in the regenerate only a lust or concupiscence. Speaking to the latter, the Apostle describes the "works of the flesh" and the "fruit of the Spirit." Having begun by an earnest exhortation to "walk in the Spirit," he is about to wind up all with the same exhortation, "If we live in the Spirit, let us also walk in the Spirit." But precisely the same overpowering sympathy with the cross which burst forth before bursts forth again, and he interjects a saying which he had not used before and never repeats, "They that are Christ's have crucified the flesh, with its affections and lusts." And, just as before, life is connected with this death. That part of the one regenerate person which is called "the flesh" is—was, at conversion—in fellowship and sympathy with the design of Christ's death, nailed figuratively to His cross, that its passive "affections" and "active lusts" might die. "If ye live in the Spirit" follows, just as "Christ liveth in me" followed before. Here, again, there is death in life, or death and life combined; the virtue of the cross kills the "body of sin," but it is only as applied by the "Spirit of life."

Lastly, we have a third tribute to the cross, which is called out by the Apostle's final protest against the Judaizers, in which, however, they are very soon forgotten. These men, like those in the Philippians, did not reject the cross; but they evaded its reproach and persecution by combining with it circumcision. To the Apostle the addition of anything, even of an ordinance which had been of God

to the one foundation was an intolerable thorn in the spirit. It was this that haunted him throughout the epistle; and now that he has finished it, "Ye see how large letters I have written!"—he suddenly turns again upon those opponents, Christ's enemies and his. The crucifixion of the flesh still lingers in his thoughts. "These men," he says, "make a fair show in the flesh, and do not crucify it. Neither do they keep the law; for their motive is a carnal one when they would subject your flesh to the ancient rite. They would glory in your flesh, and not crucify their own." Then follows the immortal outburst, which forgets all circumstances; as high as the cross, as broad as the world. It is his first and grandest "God forbid!" "From me be it far to glory, save in the cross of our Lord Jesus Christ, by which the world is crucified unto me, and I unto the world." The cross is the symbol of a mutual death; the Christian has no life of desire for the world, the world has no life of influence upon the Christian. But this death is the life of the "new creature," in a new world.

We shall not go astray if we mark the points of difference in the statement of these three processes of spiritual crucifixion. In the first the sinner, as such, in his one personality dies with Christ, and in Christ to the demand of the law; in the second the new man, alive to Christ, himself crucifies his flesh, the remains of the carnal nature clinging to him; in the third, the saint, as such, in his one personality, is crucified to the world and the world to him. The crucified subject is progressively the sinner, the sinner in the saint, and the saint.

It is only the sinner who dies to the law; but it is the whole man as a sinner. There is no distinction here. Every believer may say that he was and is crucified with Christ: was, for as the race of Adam died to the sin of Adam in Christ, so when He died all actual transgression died in Him. Faith only lays hold of this blessed truth: those who believe not die for their sins though Christ died for them, and are thus "twice dead." Hence the justified penitent, though his faith is active, is passive as to this crucifixion with Christ. He accepts a benefit, in procuring which he had no share. The benefit of the Saviour's death is reckoned to him. He does not even offer up for himself the sacrifice of Christ: such language is never used in Scripture, however current in some theology. He steadfastly believes that when Christ was hanged on the

cross—"made a curse for us"—He was the substitute of all transgression, "numbered with the transgressors," and reckoned for them; that He was the representative of every soul united to Him by faith; and, therefore, that he himself, the penitent believer, was in Christ crucified on the cross. He can, therefore, always rejoice in freedom from condemnation. As to the demands of the law, he is always crucified, as the word signifies; so far as he is a sinner before God, he never comes down from that cross. But in the glorious mystery of the atonement this transgressor lives, through life in Christ, and can "live on in the flesh" as securely and peacefully as if he had never sinned before.

In the second passage there is a remarkable change. The hands that crucified are the holy hands of the regenerate; the crucifixion took place when they were visited with the new life, and as the first expression of it. It is evident, then, that this crucifixion refers to the effect of regeneration itself. Hence it is made parallel with "living in the Spirit," and "walking in the Spirit," both which follow the quickening spiritual life. The first act of the new life is to enter into the design of Christ to "put away sin," and deliberately, solemnly, once for all, to hang up on the vacant cross of Christ the "flesh with its affections and lusts." It is the I, as a "new man," consigning to death the Me, as the "old man." Sin was "condemned in the flesh," when Christ, "in the likeness of sinful flesh," died "for sin." But through the virtue of His atonement, obtaining for us the Spirit of life, the remains of "sin in the flesh" must perish. By a strong figure it is suspended on the cross, thus showing that the same virtue which released us from condemnation must take away the sin itself. That we ourselves did this signifies that we surrendered ourselves to the influence and example of Christ's cross: purposing to regard the gradual and sure mortification and death of our "body of sin," as endured in the "fellowship of His sufferings." It is obvious that this is an internal crucifixion, though the effects are openly seen. Like the kingdom of God, and the spiritual temple, this mystery of spiritual death is within. The Golgotha and the Calvary are in the soul; and there, according to the profound figure of the Apostle, the new man witnesses the gradual death of the old, crucified in order that it may perish. The flesh is the principle of evil still remaining; a principle which is

passive or active. As to the former, it is the affection, or bias, or sympathy with sin that is acted upon by the temptation from without; as to the latter, it is the positive and special lust which goes from within to meet temptation: thus the flesh is both courted by temptation and itself solicits. The Christian has once for all and for ever doomed this to extinction.* He lives in the consciousness of this internal secret, and under the operation of this internal law. This is the pith of our passage, which again stands alone. Afterwards, to the Romans, St. Paul says, "Our old man was crucified with him, that the body of sin might be destroyed, that henceforth we should not serve sin" (Rom. vi. 6). But there he is speaking of the "old man," both as condemned and as sinful, which was crucified with Christ, and freed from the doom and the power of sin. To that solitary parallel we may recur: meanwhile it is very different from the passage we now study, to which it serves as a foundation. If we may "reckon ourselves dead indeed unto sin, but alive unto God through Jesus Christ our Lord," it is because we "be dead with Christ," who died in every sense to sin, and broke its power for ever. That Roman verse unites, as it were, our two Galatian passages, but has not the salient point of either of them. Our present saying stands alone, as separating, so to speak, our internal sanctification from the death of Christ, viewed as purely vicarious: "they that are Christ's have themselves crucified the flesh." They did not with Christ crucify their flesh. With Him they did indeed die to sin and its guilt and dominion; but not with Him did they obtain deliverance from their indwelling sin. Without us He delivers us from the curse of the law; but not without us does He deliver from the body of sin.

In the third the crucifying subject is no longer the believer; the sanctified believer is rather the object. It is not the condemned sinner crucified to the law; it is not the sinful flesh in the regenerate person crucified to sin; but it is the saint as such crucified and sundered from the world and all things in it. It is the "cross of Our Lord Jesus Christ" the virtue of which effects a mutual death between the soul and the world. The cross is in the most solemn manner possible linked with the full name; and this unexampled combination gives the cross here the pre-eminence. It is not the Lord "in whom" the world was crucified to Him; but "the cross of our Lord Jesus

Christ by which." How to define "by which" must be left to the musing of the heart and to the experience of the life. Were it mere matter of meditation and not of close exposition, it might be said that it is the glorying in it which explains this mystery. The Apostle means more than to oppose his glorying in the cross to the Judaizers' glorying in the flesh. They give him the letter of his word; the spirit of it comes from Christ. Nor can the crucifixion here be understood without the glory: they are the same high experience in the negative and in the positive view. St. Paul—for he here returns to the first person—has found in Christ crucified all that he needs for time and for eternity. In the cross is the solution of every question, the supply of every want, the promise of every blessing. This glorying in the cross, as the ground and source of all "wisdom, righteousness and sanctification and redemption," was itself his crucifixion to the world. He was so absorbed by this supreme, eternal mystery of love that he became dead to all wisdom and goodness and pleasure in the world; in short, to all things belonging to the world as the sphere of unregenerate life. In Christ a "new creature," by His cross he was "crucified to the world." He did not crucify himself. There was no need of that. The habitual meditating on the cross, and living by it and glorying in it, insensibly and surely made all that is in the world superfluous and vain. St. John says that "the world passeth away, and the lust thereof" (1 John ii. 17); to St. Paul, fast bound to the cross of his Lord as his own cross, it is already as good as gone. He is dead to it, or dying; he "reckons himself" dead to it, as one may be said to be dead who is nailed to a cross. This, however, has been preceded by another clause, "the world is crucified unto me," which means the same thing. The glorying in Christ made all that in the world is opposed to the cross hateful, and to be rejected. He abhorred, renounced, and cast away—or rather the cross made him abhor, renounce, and cast away—everything that opposed the grace and reign of the cross in his work and in himself. The double clause does no more than stamp the mutual death and perfect separation between the crucified saint and everything in the worldly system of things that belongs not to the regeneration. Thus wide must be our interpretation of "the world." It is the whole world as, touching religion, made up of "circum-

cision" and "uncircumcision:" to all religion and religious rites, not based on the cross, he was dead as an apostle. As a man he was dead to the whole compass of human things outside of Christ; and the influence of all human things as contrary to Christ was neutralised and dead.

We may go a little further, and plead at least for the exposition which traces here the gradual process of the soul in its way to perfection; the first crucifixion is the entrance into the state of justification; the second crucifixion indicates the gradual growth of the regenerate life of the sons into whose hearts "God hath sent forth the Spirit of His Son" (Ch. iv. 6); the third crucifixion rejoices in the full sanctification of the spirit from "the world" and all that is not God. But this progression is not as from one stage to another; it is the continuance and glorification of each in that which follows; as will appear in another brief review.

The words "I am crucified with Christ" are in their strict significance, "I was and continue to be crucified with Christ": thus preserving the important characteristic of justification that it is a state into which an act introduces us. Of course the idea of a continuous death in fellowship with Christ's death of expiation will not endure to be much analysed or dwelt upon. The death is at once swallowed up of life: "I was purchased and released from death with my Surety, and live under that gracious release." Such is the full meaning of what follows. But it must be remembered that the whole estate of a redeemed believer is that of a sinner down to the crisis of his final redemption, which indeed is called a "salvation ready to be revealed" (1 Peter i.). He who said at the very gate of heaven, "to save sinners of whom I am chief," doubtless said in the perpetual consciousness of his inner man, "I am ever crucified with Christ." And we may add, "I shall be eternally crucified with Christ." The act of justification admits into a state of justification which will abide for ever. The one ground of acceptance before God as the Judge administering His own law is common to earth and to heaven. We have "access by faith into this grace wherein we stand" (Rom. v. 1), or, as the preacher proclaimed his doctrine in his first recorded sermon, "by Him all that believe are justified from all things;" they have been and are continually released from condemnation. So much for earth. And as to heaven, it is through a

forensic court and by a forensic sentence that we shall enter, "looking for the mercy of our Lord Jesus Christ into eternal life" (Jude 21), "that in the ages to come" as well as in this age, "He might show the exceeding riches of His grace in His kindness towards us through Jesus Christ" (Eph. ii. 7). We do not pass from a blessing of justification to a higher blessing; we carry that with us all through; the first "I am crucified" continues into those which follow; and indeed will be the glorying of eternity. We go from stage to stage, but losing nothing by the way.

The same holds good, though with some qualification, of the second crucifixion. This is the negative side of a work the positive side of which is the bringing forth in the life of all the fruits, or rather of all the one fruit, of the Spirit: love as the bond of an endless variety of perfectness. Here, as in the crucifixion to the law, the death is the life and the life is the death. Living in the Spirit is the crucifixion of the flesh; and the death of our affections and lusts is the secret of the life of the Spirit. Both make up the life of regeneration as it grows towards perfection. If the distinction may be allowed, the crucifixion of which we speak is the interior secret of this work, the exterior manifestation of which is the life of beautiful graces described by the Apostle as led in by love. It is a state of progressive increase of life in death. Crucifixion is not itself death; but it is unto death. Though the flesh crucified may "save itself and come down from the cross," and regain the ascendency, that is not the order of grace. "That the body of sin may be destroyed; that henceforth we should not serve sin:" is the Apostle's testimony in the Romans, and signifies that the dominion destroyed leads to the destruction of sin itself. The destruction is to be complete; but the Apostle does not here speak positively of that. What he teaches is that the child of God must habitually keep his evil nature on an internal cross; counting it an enemy, which must not when it is hungry be fed, nor when it is thirsty have drink given to it; but must be ruthlessly and with holy revenge reduced to death. "Make not provision for the flesh, to fulfil the lusts thereof." (Rom. xiii. 14.) Temptation assails the "body of sin," the spiritual and impalpable and as it were imaginary or figurative body, that hangs on the spiritual and figurative cross; but it is crucified and is supposed to be

tempted in vain. The active lusts would go out after their old but forbidden gratification; but they are in a body which is on the cross, and their desires must languish ungratified.

This process is therefore necessarily one of gradual advancement towards perfection. The actual perfection of the religious life, as it is the extinction of the original sin, or bias of our nature towards evil, or that mysterious sympathy with sin which makes natural concupiscence, in itself innocent, "evil concupiscence," is not expressly mentioned here. The Apostle goes no further at present than the notion of dying, which is involved in crucifixion. When dying becomes death he does not say; nor does he in the Epistle to the Romans speak of the actual destruction of the body of sin. In both cases the subjects of these processes are waiting "to see the end." And that end is certain, so far as the evil nature is supposed to be "crucified." Unless it "come down from the cross" it must die or be destroyed. The flesh, for which no provision is made, must perish. In the order of nature, which is the order of grace, there must be here a limit of endurance; and "It is finished!" is at hand. But it is not left to the mere process of exhaustion. The "sword of the Spirit" is ready for that which is not "dead already," and will never die of sheer inanition. It is His triumph, in the name of Jesus, to "destroy" this "work of the devil" in man. But of this the passage before us does not directly speak. It does, however, speak of it indirectly; and we must be on our guard against the notion that crucifixion has not the notion of death entering into it. It is not a lingering death which finds its extreme hour in the agony of bodily death. The flesh has been crucified to die and be abolished during the Christian probation.

When, however, we once more come round to the third crucifixion, we are constrained to accept that as the testimony of the Apostle to a state of perfect and entire separation from sin, and elevation of the soul above the creaturely life. It has been observed that the mutual crucifixion is intended to express the perfection of it. "The world is as dead, in its influence and power, to me as I am dead to the world." The consciousness of this is with the Apostle: nor can it be hid. But the glorying in it is reserved for the Lord: "God forbid that I should glory save in the cross." This tribute being given to Divine grace, and

every sentiment of self-complacency being dead in His holy nature crucified with Christ, why should it be thought a thing incredible that the Apostle should here signify the final triumph of the cross in his experience, the finished victory of the Saviour in his soul? When we examine the words carefully, we find that they all bear such a construction. If they do not positively require an interpretation which shall make them describe a state of advancement on the two former crucifixions, they at least give some warrant to the humble boldness of those who so interpret them. The "new creature," or the "new creation," of which the next verse speaks, is of this life; it does not belong to the age when it shall be said, "Behold, I make all things new!" But the new creature must lose all trace of the old. Its senses must die to the old sphere of things; and every element of its being belong to the new order. Or, rather, it is not the new creature in all its perfectness until the last vestige of the old is abolished; and, the "one new man" alone remains.

May not this be indicated in the double sentence—once more an entirely unique sentence: "I am crucified to the world, and the world is crucified unto me"? Leaving out the latter clause, the state of one is described who is dead or dying to the world, but to whom, alas! the world is not either dead or dying. So long as the "passion" remains in the flesh, the world will "love its own," and seek to find response to its claims. But if the passion is dead and the lust no longer stirs, the temptation from without ceases, and the world may be said to be crucified to the Christian. But, undoubtedly true as this is to those whose faith is strong to receive it, it is not the plain meaning of the Apostle's word. If, however, we adopt the rendering which reads "by Whom the world is crucified unto me," then the doctrine of an entire sanctification from sin and an absolute and total severance from the creaturely world may be most confidently ascribed to the Apostle. The cross has been prominent throughout the epistle; but now, at the close, the writer would show that it is not the cross, but the Lord Jesus Christ, whose glory dims to him all the beauty of the world and reduces to nothing, and less than nothing, all its power. We feel as we read this glowing tribute, that whatever may be the case with us and our fellows, to the Apostle, at least, the Lord Jesus was so entirely the light and

life of existence that the world around was as if it existed not.

Are we then pleading that this third crucifixion describes a state of entire consecration to God into which the regenerate struggle has passed? That is not strictly the teaching of the Apostle. As the act of justification introduces into a state of justification, so the crucifixion of the flesh remains an accomplished fact that abides to the end, together with its counterpart of being "led of the Spirit." Even the dead "body of sin" must hang there still that it may not be quickened into life again; just as the sanctified soul must be led at every stage right up to the bar of God by the Spirit. Only when probation ends will the crucifixion of the flesh end. In other words, the virtue of the cross will keep the sin dead which it has killed; and the "crucifixion of the flesh" remains as a state as long as the redeemed saint is still in the midst of earthly things, and surrounded by tempting influences, and within the possibility of falling. Let it be remembered, however, that the verb used by St. Paul does not say that the crucifixion, as a state of painful dying, not yet consummated in death, continues. It only says that they that are Christ's "once for all crucified their flesh," entered into an obligation to "reckon themselves dead indeed unto sin." The agony of crucifixion may be over, and the "body of sin" still be crucified.

This leads to a consideration, finally, of the one element common to these three distinct representations. They are one as exhibiting the believer's union with the passion of Christ as distinct from His glorification; and therefore as laying more than ordinary stress upon the cross as at the foundation of personal religion.

It is remarkable that throughout this epistle there is no reference to our union with the Redeemer otherwise than in His death. In every other epistle, when speaking of this great truth, the Apostle dilates upon our participation in the glorified life of the Redeemer as well as in His humiliation unto death. The "sufferings of Christ" as shared by us are closely connected with "the glory that should follow." We are "risen with Christ," "sit in heavenly places" with Him;" we know "the power of His resurrection" as well as "the fellowship of His death;" we "suffer with Him" that we may "reign with Him." So habitually does the strain connect the glory with the reproach that we are never allowed to disjoin

them. But in this epistle it pleases the Holy Ghost to teach us the awful lesson of the cross without this alleviation. It may be said, indeed, that the missing fellowship with the Lord's triumph appears in other ways. When St. Paul says "I am crucified with Christ," he goes on to say "Christ liveth in me." When he says that "they which are Christ's have crucified the flesh," he declares that they "live in the Spirit," and adds the exhortation to "walk in the Spirit," and that he triumphantly speaks of his "glorying in the cross." All this being granted the truth remains that it is the suffering and agony of the cross which is uppermost. That pervades the epistle, in which the cross is the symbol of all religion. Even after the outburst of glorying at the close, St. Paul subsides into the old strain, "I bear in my body the marks of the Lord Jesus," without the addition to the Corinthians, "always bearing about in the body the dying of the Lord Jesus, that the life also of Jesus might be made manifest in our body" (2 Cor. iv. 10). After allowing its force to the holy severity of the writer vindicating the cross before a people who had dishonoured it, we must still feel that the lesson taught is that in this life at least personal religion is in all its processes a deep sympathy with the passion of our Lord. Let us apply this to the three stages already described.

In what sense must a penitent sinner enter into the fellowship of our Lord's expiatory passion, in order to experience the benefit of its release from the law? This is a question which is best answered by describing two opposite extremes.

On the one hand, it is not right to say that the Redeemer so occupied our place, and His atonement was so purely vicarious, that the sinner has only to say: "His death was my death; I have paid my penalty; and between condemnation and me a gulf is fixed for ever." Whatever truth may be at the root of this, its fruit in the life is not likely to be wholesome. It is true that the dying Saviour admits no mortal into the fellowship of His atoning obedience. But it is equally true that His atoning obedience, or "the propitiation of His blood," is only "through faith" available for those who are taught by the cross how awful is the sinfulness of sin, and feel in their penitential distress that for that cross the Holy One was provided of God, "to declare His righteousness." Though the bare words "crucified with Christ" refer to a fellowship or union with

Christ in His death which is altogether of faith, and independent of our actual participation of His sorrow, yet the other words, "I through the law am dead to the law," plead for a certain sympathy with our Lord's infinite agony on account of sin. This is the virtue of the cross in our repentance. This is our going down into the waters of baptism unto repentance with Christ. As penitents we are "crucified with Christ," though not as believers. Our sorrow adds nothing to the virtue of the atonement; but it is an appropriate preparation for it.

On the other hand, it is equally wrong so to interpret the words as to make the Apostle a sharer of the propitiatory obedience unto death. This would have been a derogation from the cross of which he was incapable. If he once spoke of filling up "that which is behind of the afflictions of Christ," he was careful to add that it was "in his own flesh for His body's sake which is the Church;" meaning that his own personal afflictions on behalf, not of his own salvation, but of the Church, were united with the sufferings of Christ. His passion was that which "filleth up the fulness of all sufferings" in His kingdom. That a sinner is required to earn the benefit of the passion of Christ by adding his own "satisfaction" is a doctrine nowhere taught in Scripture. We are not "crucified with Christ" on a present cross of atonement; but our faith makes that once offered sacrifice its own for ever.

A right understanding of the sympathy with Christ's passion which the second of these crosses implies will further explain what has been said as to the first. A rigorous interpretation will deny that the crucifixion of the flesh connotes the agony by which the evil nature expires. It will plead that the word refers to a mystical crucifixion which began the regenerate life only, without any allusion to a continuous suffering. But the very tone of the words refutes this exposition as hard and cold. Moreover, the Apostle elsewhere speaks of the habitual mortifying in detail of the members of the body which is here said to be crucified; and generally he describes the establishment of the inward kingdom as not without "much tribulation," to apply his own words with another reference. In his doctrine, that inward religion is a "suffering with Christ," a "conformity with His death," and in this sense a "bearing about in the body the dying of the Lord Jesus," St. Paul and all the Apostles are at one, and all agree with

the Master's words, Who, in every variety of way, commended to us, in the imitation of Himself, both an inward and an outward cross. Here it is remarkable that the strongest and most vivid word on this subject is given by St. Peter, who makes reparation for his transient infidelity to the sole glory of the cross: "Arm yourselves likewise with the same mind, for he that hath suffered in the flesh hath ceased from sin" (1 Pet. iv. 1). Surely it is not enough to interpret the Saviour's cross, laid upon us His followers, as being only the burden of disciplinary external trials. True Christianity has in every age rejected that idea of fellowship with Christ. While anything of the nature of sin remains in the soul, it must be pain and grief, and only through pain and grief can it be destroyed. For "Every one shall be salted with fire, and every sacrifice shall be salted with salt" (Mark ix. 49).

Hence, finally, the doctrine of spiritual crucifixion in this epistle may be said to plead for the severity of religion as a present discipline of stern probation. Its teaching is for a time when the cross has lost its offence, and is made of none effect—when the disciples of Jesus have forgotten His fundamental conditions of discipleship, and do not "go forth unto Him without the camp, bearing His reproach." There are seasons in the history of the Church, and there are times in the experience of every true Christian, when the "glories that should follow" need to be dilated upon and made present to a realising faith. There are also times when it is good to remember that this world is the season of "suffering with Christ," and that, though the literal cross is removed, and the Lord's sepulchre is "not known to this day," the cross is still the sacred symbol of the Christian religion. We reign with the Lord even now; but our crowns are crowns of thorns. We shall "reign with Him" in the fullest sense hereafter. The recoil from that system of error which has brought back "the silver and gold" rejected by St. Peter into the place of atonement, and added other expiations to the one great sacrifice, and made the symbol of the cross an offence to multitudes who love it in their inmost heart, has caused too many to forget that the kingdom of Christ is one of "tribulation and patience in Jesus." To keep the cross, as the symbol of freedom from the curse of death to all sin, and of separation from the world, before the minds of all Christians for ever was the ultimate design of the Epistle to the Galatians.

ART. III.—*Critical and Exegetical Handbook to the Epistle to the Romans.* By H. A. W. MEYER, Th.D. Translated from the Fifth Edition of the German, by Rev. J. L. Moore, B.A. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark. 1875.

THE latter part of the seventh chapter of the Romans and the latter part of the fifth chapter of the Galatians give us a peculiarly vivid description of the internal spiritual conflict. These paragraphs are remarkable for the peculiar boldness and strength, in both cases verging on paradox, of the Apostle's language. They say nothing of the conflict that is waged between the militant Christian and the principalities and powers of Satan in the world; both are strictly limited to the interior struggles that win eternal life, or without which eternal life is not won. They are remarkable also for the difficulties which they raise, as it were, and do not effectually remove—leaving them, for the exercise of humility and faith. Lastly, they are peculiar in the circumstance that they are so worded as to imply a certain connection between them, though the precise relation is not indicated formally.

It may be affirmed that this last point—the relation between the two conflicts—is a test or touchstone of theological soundness on a large number of Christian doctrines. Original sin, prevenient grace, the nature of redemption, the offices of the Spirit, the use of the law, the bearing of repentance on faith, and of repentance and faith on justification, and of justification on the regenerate life, and of the regenerate life on finished salvation, are all topics of theology which are closely bound up with the sentiment held on this question. At the outset, we would lay down the position that, however indeterminate the Apostle's conclusion may seem, there ought to be no doubt as to his meaning. Further, we think that every apparent difficulty may be removed by interpreting Romans vii. and viii. as describing the unregenerate and the regenerate state respectively: in both cases, however, with special reference to the interior conflict involved.

It is assumed by many that the Roman and Galatian clauses are parallel, describing the same contest with a

slight variety of terms. Before considering their essential difference, let us mark what points they have in common. And these may be summed up in this, that generally they both depict a conflict in the inner man under the influence of the Holy Spirit and on the way to salvation.

The sphere of both conflicts is the "inner man": the interior personality which is the subject of moral consciousness. The "I" of Rom. vii., one person throughout—that of Paul as a representative man—becomes in Gal. v. "They that are Christ's." But the "I" might be substituted in the latter without any loss; and, indeed, it is virtually translated into the individual personality when the Apostle speaks of "the flesh lusting against the Spirit." The two conflicts rage on the same battle-ground of the "hidden man of the heart." However much the scene is changed, the original human nature remains in both: the same "I" which in the one case is a lineal descendant of the first Adam, is in the other an incorporate member of the stock of the second Adam. The same "I myself" passes from Rom. vii. to Rom. viii., as will hereafter be seen; and it is the same "I myself" who is the combatant in the two conflicts before and after regeneration. He becomes, indeed, in the latter case, a "new man;" for the Spirit of Christ within him is the agent of what may be called a "new creation," and "new" in another sense and defined by another word, as distinguished from the "old man" which has been "crucified with Christ" (Rom. vi.). Still, the "inner man" is essentially and naturally the same: the difference being of grace. Hence, and as it were to signify this, the Apostle speaks of his former self as being his present self, and his present self his former self, seemingly in utter unconsciousness of the conflicts that were in due time to rage around his meaning.

Again, the two contests are conducted under the influence of the same Holy Spirit, administering the redeeming work of Christ. In the Galatian description the Spirit is prominent as the "Captain of the Lord's host" in the warfare of Christians with sin. In the Roman description He is not directly named, for reasons hereafter to be assigned. But that He is to be regarded as moving, watching, and directing the issues of this struggle is evident from several reasons. Generally there is no impulse towards good, no resistance of evil, which may not be ascribed to Him; "the word profiteth nothing," whether for conviction of sin or

for the energy of holiness; "it is the Spirit that quickeneth." Again, our Lord in His final and full prediction and promise of the Holy Ghost declared that He should "reprove the world of sin, righteousness, and judgment;" and nowhere is this threefold conviction more impressively described than in this chapter. Finally, the Apostle, in the next chapter, where the previously veiled Spirit is fully revealed, says, "Ye have not received the Spirit of bondage again to fear; but ye have received the Spirit of adoption, whereby we cry Abba, Father," exchanging this cry of filial confidence for that exceeding bitter cry, "O, wretched man that I am!" However, that remarkable word "again" as connected in the sentence must refer to an effect of the Spirit's influence that they had already felt. "Ye received not the Spirit again to work in you that fear which He wrought when you were under the law, working wrath." That the Spirit so expressly mentioned in Gal. v. is not mentioned in Rom. vii. is, however, a difficulty which—if a difficulty at all—presses only upon those who make the two contests identical. Indeed, as against them it is a very formidable argument. But there is no necessity for controversy here. Let it be conceded that in both chapters the Spirit of Christ is the Redeemer's agent, using the law as a schoolmaster to bring souls to Him. If in the Roman chapter He is contending for the supremacy in the regenerate, then the Apostle for some unknown reason kept Him out of view, and thereby surrendered half the strength of his argument. But if he is describing a preliminary conflict of the Spirit of conviction in the awakened sinner, whom He has awakened to a profound consciousness of sin, there is a good account of his silence in the fact that he is describing a state in which the office of the Spirit is supposed to be not yet known. His name and full offices are reserved for His crowning demonstration of power in the regeneration of the spirit in man, in which He reigns and is enshrined as His temple. Certainly, on every theory the two contests are conducted under the influence of one and the self-same Spirit.

Lastly, the two conflicts are one in this, that they both belong to the personal process of salvation as the administration of the work of Christ in the redeemed soul. Here lies the secret of the controversy that has been carried on for ages concerning the nature and limits of this conflict; and the determination of this point would go far to still that con-

troversy. Let us lay down what we regard as the truth, and then consider its bearing on the different theories.

The conflict between the enlightened mind or troubled conscience of the penitent and the still victorious flesh is, according to our interpretation, the token of a state of grace, but not of the estate of regenerate grace, nor "this grace wherein we stand" (Rom. v. 1). It begins with the revelation of the law to the spirit in man by the Holy Ghost, given to that end by the Father as the fruit of redemption and the Saviour's prayers. This may be called preliminary or prevenient grace. It is the influence of the Spirit in the economy of redemption preparing the soul for regeneration, drawing it to Christ, and to that end ministering condemnation. Inverting the order of these phrases, we have in them the whole process of what is described in Rom. vii.; but without the name of the Holy Spirit. The Spirit of bondage begins His office where it is said that "I was alive without the law once; but, when the commandment came, sin revived and I died." But that former life was really death; and this latter death is the beginning of true life. It is the beginning of spiritual life, the quickening before the birth of regeneration: "repentance *unto* life," or penitential life leading to the life of true filial union with the Son. It is therefore preliminary to union with Christ: that is, "the drawing of the Father," without which none can come to the Son. The Saviour in John vi. did not mention the Holy Spirit as the Agent of that drawing; nor does St. Paul in the description of his own case; but it is self-understood, on the ground of the Saviour's promise, "He shall testify of Me:" and it is preparation for the regenerate life as well as its preliminary. There is a sense, of course, in which the "new creation" is the result of a sudden and omnipotent fiat. "God, who commanded the light to shine out of darkness, hath shined in our hearts, to give the light of the knowledge of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ" (2 Cor. iv. 6): where, however, it is not said that God "commanded the light into our hearts," but that "He shone in our hearts unto the enlightenment of the knowledge." There are the strivings of life that precede the birth; there is the life of the slave in bondage before the filial love which is the participation of the Spirit of the Son; and all the agony of despairing hope, springing from the feeling of impotence, and fed by it, in the human desire, longing for the love which is to be shed abroad in

the heart by the Spirit of regeneration. But this gift is of grace, and therefore the conflict is in a state of grace. Therefore we may with confidence make the concession that the two spiritual contests of the Romans and the Galatians both belong to the estate of redemption in Christ. Lest, however, this concession should be misunderstood, we must make it face the adversary, whom it will provoke from two different and opposite quarters.

First, it has no fellowship though much sympathy with the broad view that would make the conflict of Rom. vii. the natural state of man as having the remains of the law written on his "heart;" the standard by which his "conscience accuses or else excuses." The Apostle's "I" is hardly so broad and accommodating as to represent every man out of Christ whose better mind rebukes his sin. Some profound commentators have supposed that St. Paul is describing the history of the race. "Without the law sin was dead" in Adam, or in mankind: since the fall it has been one great struggle under the law. Others have supposed that the Apostle referred to his innocent childhood, before "sin revived, and deceived him and slew him." But this is inconsistent with any sound doctrine of original sin. Others, again, have so far carried the benefit of redemption as to obliterate altogether the state of nature. The ordinary resistance of the reason to a course of sin, which is nevertheless delighted in and pursued, is quite consistent with the utter absence of the Spirit of conviction as accompanying the Gospel. When He, through the evangelical preaching of the law, excites the struggle between the mind and the flesh, it is a very different matter. Two wonderful results appear: the respect for the law of God, which the inner man of every intelligent person must feel is deepened into "delight" or complacency, or the indescribable longing to be in harmony with it; and at the same time the enmity and vigour of the flesh is greatly provoked and increased. In describing both the effects of the Spirit of evangelical conviction, the Apostle uses very strong language—language which experience justifies, whatever formulas and confessions may say—"That which I do I allow not," or "I know not;" "It is no more I that do it, but sin that dwelleth in me;" "I find then a law;" "I see another law in my members;" all these strange sentences belong to that midway condition in which the soul "sees

men as trees walking." They are "the fruits meet for repentance:" not fruits of the tree made clean; nor fruits of the corrupt tree simply; but fruits pertaining to the transition process of grafting. Before, and in what may be called the state of nature—if there be such a state—the "inner man" was alive to the pleasures and dead to the sinfulness of sin. He was one and whole in his iniquity. But now he begins to discern a "body of sin and death" belonging to himself, yet his deadly enemy, and cries out for deliverance.

Then, secondly, this view is entirely opposed to that of those who find regeneration in this chapter, though, as yet, not fully developed. There are many very different schools of theology which unite in the general theory of a very wide variety of grades in the estate of regeneration. With some the whole race passed at once from death in Adam to regenerate life in Christ. The new birth is simultaneous with birth natural; and baptism is the sign of this. Of these we have spoken. With others regeneration is more limited: indeed, so limited that it is the spark of life kindled by the Spirit in individual units of the "mass of perdition" according to a fixed decree. Accordingly the first striving of good desire is the announcement of regeneration; and from regeneration springs repentance, faith, and all that belongs to evangelical righteousness. This kind of theology sometimes welds together the two chapters of the Romans without any pretence to harmonise them: sometimes it devises the most subtle theories to reconcile them. But we are persuaded that there is no other method of expounding them both, and in their sequence, as coming from St. Paul, but that which makes them respectively descriptions of the two contests before and after regeneration. To this we may now proceed; thus paving the way for a comparison of Rom. vii. with Gal. v.

A comparison of the seventh and eighth chapters of the Romans will show that the Apostle has varied his language in the latter chapter in such a manner as to introduce a complete series of antitheses. As a great change has passed over the convinced sinner, the man "under the law," so a great change passes over the phraseology; every word has put on Christ, and is quickened in the Spirit, like St. Paul himself. To mark emphatically the transition he drops the "transferred" form of speech (1 Cor. iv. 6) and merges

himself, as his manner is, into the general company; just as in the Galatian Epistle he passed from "I am crucified" to "they that are Christ's have crucified." This of itself is an illustration of the evidence which it introduces. It is necessary only to indicate the salient points, where almost every form of phrase might be pressed into the service. It may be observed that the great counterpart of the whole description in chapter vii. is summed up in the first two verses of the eighth chapter, and then illustrated at large down to verse 17; forming a paragraph similar in length and character to that with which it corresponds. But all is changed; almost every leading word is re-introduced with a new meaning.

First of all, the law of God has come to its rights. Before it was indeed "holy" as a revelation of God, "just" in its holy requirements, and "good" as having life for its aim. But it was "weak through the flesh:" only the revealer, stimulant and registrar of sin, by its "spiritual" nature for ever condemning and reducing to despair the "carnal" man or the man "of flesh." The law was deprived of its rights: for, though it was "found to be unto death," it had been "ordained to life." But now all this is reversed in one grand sentence: "That the righteousness of the law" —the requirements of the "just" law—"might be fulfilled in us who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit." Here is the sublime vindication of the law. In the former chapter it had indeed its praises sung; but no tribute in human obedience. Every homage was paid but that which it most desired. It had the lip service, the eye service, the desire, the consent, even the delight—all these words are there—but, alas! the true obedience it had not: not in one single least commandment was it purely submitted to. But now let the original question be put again. "What shall we say then? Is the law sin?" The answer had been "Not sin, yet in me only identified with sin." But now the answer is, "Sin is condemned or deprived of its dominion;" that the righteousness of the law might be fulfilled in us." The dishonoured law of God is restored to its dignity: as from God, so also in man, "holy, just and good;" anew "ordained to life." It had power, apart from Christ, to "condemn sin in the flesh;" by a condemnation, that is, which left the carnal sinner to his doom. But now the regenerate soul has "through Jesus Christ," and in union with Him, had sin in his flesh not only condemned

but abolished and put away. The law has been helped in its straits and impotence. The strength of the Gospel has reinforced the resources of the law: "being perfected in its weakness." It has taken the two functions of the law into its own hands, and executed both; it has condemned and punished sin, and seen to it that righteousness shall be fulfilled.

Now, in the light of this exposition let the last verse of the one chapter and the first of the other be united and studied. They form the duplicate bridge from the unregenerate state to the regenerate. The two Therefores are its two arches; each verse has its own influential Therefore, in the former looking back and in the latter looking forward. "So then"—thus it runs in our translation—"the same I, I myself, and apart from the Deliverer for whom I now thank my God, with my mind can do no more than serve the law of God with a fruitless homage, since with my flesh I more effectually serve the law of sin." Is this paraphrase not justified by all that precedes? Does it not expressly sum up all that the Apostle, personifying the convinced sinner, has said of himself as such? Thus summing up, it is an inference from the very thanksgiving itself, which is by no means an anticipatory outburst of joy, parenthetically uttered. "It is in Christ that I am delivered; out of Christ at the very best I have nothing beyond a mental conviction of duty which my flesh renders null and void." Then follows the second "so then" or therefore: "There is therefore no condemnation to them which are in Christ Jesus." It is an introduction to all that follows; the "I myself" is no longer "I myself," but "I in Christ," and consequently with no condemnation. Deliverance in Him has two results in the argument: it gives the ground of the condemnation before, and the ground of the freedom afterwards. That the Apostle drops the "me" and says "them" has its evident reason in his haste to blend himself with the Christian fellowship; this, however, immediately subsides, and we have the "me" again, though only for a single verse.

After this the special phrases may be compared in a general summary view. The "mind" of the former chapter disappears in the latter. There it belonged to the human "spirit," which, however, was unworthy to be named, being not yet quickened into its true dignity. Here the human "spirit" has its full regenerate rights; and with it

the Holy Spirit bears joint testimony in verse 21. Further on (chapter xii. 3) the Apostle combines the two, "being renewed in the spirit of your mind." The "law of sin in the members" has given place to the "law of the Spirit in Christ Jesus." As it was a "law of sin and death," it has become "the law of the Spirit of life:" a life the exact opposite of that death of condemnation which reigns in the previous chapter. The "captivity" has become "freedom:" freedom, not from the law, but from the law of sin and death; the inward power which gives deliverance from the necessity of sinning, and can make the members of the body minister to righteousness, no longer a "body of death." A new government is set up within; a new law by which the Holy Spirit ministers the discipline of religion in the spirit. Lastly, the deliverance is assigned to a special historical period: "made me free;" it is the answer to the question "who shall deliver me?" It disguises the sacred moment when he entered into rest in Christ, being united with Him by faith. The great foundation of that faith—the mission of Christ in the likeness of sinful flesh, in whose atoning sacrifice sin was condemned and cast out from our humanity—follows afterwards, but the process or transitional moment when the penitent became one with Him, "crucified with Christ," is not dwelt upon. The very term, however, "set me free," establishes all that has been said as to the great change by which chapter vii. passes into chapter viii.

It seems hard to conceive how the Apostle could more expressly have exhibited the two states of quickened conviction of sin and regenerate victory over sin than he has done. If he had written down these respectively as his themes, he could not have more clearly declared his object. The two spheres are marked off by a glorious change which transfigures the whole phraseology. Reading from one into the other is passing from darkness and slavery and death into light and liberty and life. Where is the "carnal" man, the man who was "of flesh," the Apostle's vigorous translation of his Lord's words, "that which is born of the flesh is flesh"? He is "born of the Spirit" and "is spirit." Where is he of whom it was said, "in me, that is, in my flesh, dwelleth no good thing"? The answer is, "Ye are not in the flesh," and, changing the "me" into "you," "If Christ be in you, the body indeed is dead because of sin; but the Spirit is life, because of righteousness."

Meanwhile, where is the flesh? It is "crucified with its affections and lusts," and so, in reality, no part of "me." The language might be changed without violence or irreverence: "in me, that is, my spirit, dwelleth all that is good," the very Spirit of Christ and of holiness Himself. Where is the abject serf "sold under sin?" The chapter we have passed into disdains to answer that, for the honour of the Great Deliverer. Surely no theory or doctrine of regeneration ought to tolerate Romans vii. as a description of that estate. The glimmerings of light and of hope that are there we can give a good account of: ample reason for them has already been exhibited and will be exhibited again. But it is not possible to give a good account of these manifest attributes of an unregenerate nature in an account of the regenerate life. These are not the spots of God's children. "What fellowship hath light with darkness?"

But it must not be forgotten that the pith of our discussion is the comparison with the contest in the Galatians. Now, this latter was the first written: the Epistle to the Romans was the great expansion of truths and principles which had been sketched previously in a controversy with the Judaizers. The normal passage therefore for the regenerate conflict is in Gal. v. It will be expedient now—and as easy as expedient—to show the difference between the terms of description used here and those used in the Romans.

First, there is the marked antithesis between "the mind and the flesh" and the "flesh and the Spirit." Never once in Romans vii. does the Apostle speak of the Spirit contending against the motions of the flesh: though it was indeed the Spirit of conviction moving upon the mind or the reason in man, it was not the Spirit of life or regeneration. The Holy Ghost is directing and watching the strife between the enlightened conviction of the higher principle in man and the flesh which leads him captive. The result is the groaning of the inner man himself: groaning not "unutterable," but heard in the bitter cry, "O, wretched man that I am!" That groaning is changed into thanksgiving, "I thank God through Jesus Christ," and then deepens into the inward intercessions of the Spirit, which are not to be distinguished from the sighing of the regenerate spirit itself. But in the Galatians the mutual strife or lusting is between the flesh and the Spirit: "the flesh lusteth against the Spirit, and the Spirit against the flesh,

and these are contrary one to the other." Here the human spirit is not mentioned, but presupposed as the sphere of the regenerate life of the Holy Ghost, of which sufficient proof—if any is needed—is found in Romans viii., "the Spirit is life, because of righteousness," "the Spirit beareth witness with our spirit."

Upon this, then, we may rest our case. The contest in the Romans is between the mind and the flesh, both belonging to the "inner man:" a contest in which the Spirit is moving ON the I of personality. The contest in the Galatians is between the Spirit and the flesh, both still belonging to the "inner man:" a contest in which the Spirit is IN the I of the personality. "He that is joined to the Lord is one spirit." But all the surroundings of the strife in the Galatians are in harmony with this. Two may be mentioned especially: the regenerate in this war are, first, not "under the law" as a condemnation; and, secondly, they are "led by the Spirit" into a complete victory over sin. In both these respects the failing combatants in Rom. vii. are clearly and broadly distinguished from the victorious combatants of Gal. v.

"Against such there is no law." "Ye are not under the law." Both these high predicates are alleged of the regenerate in whose hearts the Spirit contends. There is no other sense in which Christian men are "not under the law" than this, that there is "no condemnation to them that are in Christ Jesus." The higher law of Christ disarms the terrors of the law of commandments. He was crucified to the law, and believers are "crucified with Christ." The law is no longer against them: it is satisfied by the Redeeming Lord, and satisfied as to them in Him. "There is therefore NO condemnation." It is hardly needful to prove that in Rom. vii. it is ALL condemnation. The despairing penitent—saved from full despair only by the reserved and hidden grace of the Spirit who "knoweth what He will do"—puts himself "under the law:" his "inner man" is in captivity by reason of the "law of sin in his members" which turns every precept of obedience into disobedience, all that was "ordained unto life" to death. The whole compass of the law, as one great system of heavenly legislation, is "against" him: "for" him it has not one solitary word, not one solitary consolation does it breathe, nor suggest one solitary hope.

Exposition becomes rather more exciting on the second

point. The translation of our English Bible gives up the whole question, and virtually, though by a glaring inconsistency, conforms the Galatian contest to that of Romans vii.: "so that ye cannot do the things which ye would." This establishes a strict parallel with the gloomy words of the latter chapter, "the things which I would not, that I do:" the same impotent will, bound in its freedom, which "cannot" perform what it finds in its desire to accomplish. But the true state of the case may be seen by the following two paraphrases of the Galatian clause, either of which is strictly faithful to the original Greek, and between which we must try to decide. "I say, then, walk in the Spirit, and ye surely will not fulfil the lust of the flesh. For the flesh lusteth against the Spirit, and the Spirit lusteth against the flesh; for these are contrary the one to the other, in order that the things which ye would do in each case ye should not do." The only other legitimate rendering of the words would run as follows: "I say, then, walk in the Spirit, and fulfil not the lust of the flesh. For the flesh lusteth against the Spirit, and the Spirit striveth against the flesh (for these are contrary one to the other), so that as the result you do not the things that ye would according to the promptings of your better conscience." This latter seems to be recommended by its obviating the indecorum of making the Spirit "lust" or desire against the flesh. But it is essentially wrong. It forgets that the whole structure of the verse is antithetical; that the Apostle himself is responsible for introducing the Spirit as "against" the flesh; and that whatever semblance of impropriety there may be in applying the term "lust" to the Spirit is avoided by omitting the term itself, and swallowing it up, as it were, in the language of the next verse, "if ye be *led* of the Spirit." Moreover, the conflict is of two powers or principles, inhering in one person, so that the "would," or willing, at the close must not be limited to one or the other. It is not the carnal will that is hindered only, nor the better regenerate will, but the prompting of either is hindered in this struggle: the flesh opposes the will of the Spirit, and the Spirit the will of the flesh. Still, it cannot be denied that the Apostle closes the sentence by words which combine these two wills in the one personality of the Christian: "in order that ye may not do the things that ye would." And therefore we should plead strongly for an interpretation that bears this

in mind, running freely, though currently, thus: "These are contrary one to the other, so that ye, whose regenerate will is that of the Spirit, might not do what things ye as led by Him would do." In other words, the paragraph begins by asserting that Christians, walking in the Spirit, will not fulfil the lusts of the flesh; it goes on by saying that there is a conflict which would render that doubtful; and ends by implying that the true will of the regenerate Christian is altogether with the Spirit, forgetting, so to speak, the conflict of the flesh against the Spirit. It omits the thought of the Christian's "willing" things against the Divine Principle within. The Apostle does not say: "in order that ye may not do what your carnal mind would prompt, on the one hand, and what the spiritual mind would prompt, on the other." He treats the former as after all not belonging to the new man, and only says, "in order to hinder you from doing the good that ye would."

In any case there is no sanction for the mischievous rendering: "so that ye cannot do the things that ye would." That rendering adopts our last expedient, that the better will is the man, but spoils it by two interpolations: "in order that" becomes "so that;" and "cannot" is gratuitously forced upon the text. This last must be ejected as unceremoniously as it was introduced. To borrow the words of our epistle it is "unawares brought in," and has "come privily to spy out our liberty which we have in Christ Jesus." It is as much an alien in this context as it would be in the beginning of Rom. viii. "The carnal mind is enmity against God; for it is not subject to the law of God, neither indeed can be." So far the can is desperately appropriate. "So then they that are in the flesh cannot please God." "But ye are not in the flesh, but in the Spirit." The cannot is altogether gone. And here it is as much an alien as it is homeborn and a son, or rather a slave of the house, in Rom. vii. There the "cannot" reigns throughout and presses the "spirit of the mind" to the borders of despair. But here there is no "cannot;" impotence is unknown, and all is the liberty and strength of the Gospel. That which lets is nailed to the cross; for "they that are Christ's have crucified the flesh, with its affections and lusts." We are here "called unto liberty," and such a liberty as that "all the law is fulfilled in one word." There is no sympathy

between this contest, hard as it is, and that much harder one of the Romans. The "parallel" which some of our commentators find with Rom. vii. is not true, even with "*quodammodo.*" There is hardly an analogy, much less a parallel. The true parallel is with Rom. viii., with that holier war, that better warfare, which is in the heavenly places, if we may so speak: where the Captain of the Lord's host is the Holy Ghost in the regenerate spirit. And the law of it is this, "If we live in the Spirit, let us also walk in the Spirit:" words which are an echo of those in Rom. viii.: "Ye are not in the flesh, but in the Spirit, if so be that the Spirit of God dwell in you."

Again, while in both conflicts the assured and perfect victory is either declared or implied, the general character of the contest that leads to victory is very different.

The strife before regeneration is won, as it were, by failure. It is true universally, that until the Spirit take the man's case into His own hands, by becoming a new life and a new law of life within him, he must fail to win the victory. The "fruits meet for repentance" are in the sight of God of great price; but they never can weaken the strength of the sin that dwelleth in us. That "law in the members" cannot by any human effort, even though aided by the grace of God, be suppressed, nor ever effectually counteracted. Its deadly prerogative is that it "dwelleth in me:" the very same word which, after regeneration, will be used to denote the permanent sanctifying inhabitation of Christ by His Spirit. The real "indwelling sin," which we too often refer to the remains of the carnal mind in believers, is a thing which belongs solely to the old estate of life, and does not survive into the new. But the very weakness of the striving penitent—the true "wrestling Jacob"—is his strength: God's strength is perfected in that weakness. It is otherwise with the regenerate combatant. His efforts do not win the victory, but they directly tend to it. The conflict is in him a discipline of growing vigour, in which the Holy Ghost is training the Christian runner, or fighter, or soldier to a perfection which is both Divine and human.

This is an important element of difference between the two conflicts. But as the result both issue in perfect victory, though each in its own order. That of the Romans is brought to a complete end: a victory which is acknowledged by the Apostle's most solemn thanksgiving. According

to one reading, he renders "grace for grace," if such an application of the words may be allowed. Enough has been said on this subject. It needs no further evidence that the internal distraction and division are over; there is the blessed moment when it pleases God to reveal His Son in the soul; the eighth chapter shows us the inner man united and at peace. The bond of union is the Spirit of Christ, who is the author and finisher of the new man. But the other conflict, that set up in the new man himself, is not so summarily despatched. There is a sense in which it continues to the last. There is a sense also in which this is not the case. As to the former, there is no internal division any longer; and the warfare is simply the yielding perpetually to the guidance of the Holy Spirit who ensures the perpetual victory. Again, there can be little doubt that the warfare, as it is a resistance to active evil in the soul, determines and comes to an end when the evil of the nature is rooted out, and the energy of sin in the will reduced to its lowest point and reaches the limit where it virtually vanishes. So far, therefore, as the contest is between the Divine Spirit and the flesh, with its affections and lusts, the victory may be as complete as Divine power can make it. As to the latter, there can be no doubt that while there is probation there must be conflict; and that whilst the soldier of the cross is surrounded by countless enemies, who rage all the more furiously because their time is short, his perfect victory is only retained by continual war. Here is the difference between the Master and the disciple. We maintain our triumph only by keeping the flesh crucified to the world. St. Paul cries in his exulting song, "The world is crucified unto me:" this means that its glory and pleasure were nailed to the Saviour's cross, not that the enmity of the world was robbed of its activity. The final victory is not won until death ends probation; but he who wins that victory has already won, or the Spirit has won in him, the perfect victory over sin. Only the sinless soul can dare to die.

It will be observed that the Commentaries of Meyer, published in good translations by Messrs. Clark, have been placed at the head of this and the preceding paper. They stand almost alone among the better expositions in sanctioning the interpretations on which our Essays are based. To be able to appeal to Meyer with confidence allows us to be indifferent as to the concurrence of many others.

ART. IV.—1. *Bericht über die am* 14, 15, *und* 16 *September, zu Bonn gehaltenen Unions-Conferenzen im Auftrage des Vorsitzenden* DR. VON DÖLLINGER, *herausgegeben von* DR. FR. HEINRICH REUSCH, *Professor der Theologie.* Bonn: P. Neuszer. 1875.

2. *Bericht uber die von* 10 *bis* 16 *August,* 1875, *zu Bonn gehaltenen Unions-Conferenzen,* etc. etc. Bonn: P. Neuszer. 1875.

A GENERAL idea of the aim of the recent Bonn Conferences may be gathered from the invitation published by Dr. Döllinger in the German *Mercury* of July 24th last. From the text of this announcement it will be seen that this gathering, called the "International Conference of the Friends of Church Union," was to have been opened on the 12th of August and continued till the 14th. But many of the Greeks and others came earlier, in order to have some consultations with one another, and with the Old Catholics, especially Döllinger. On the 10th a meeting was held at Bishop Reinkens' house, and a still more important one on the 11th. Then, as the Orientals had come from so great a distance, it was natural that they should wish to have some results secured before returning home. It was therefore resolved to continue the meetings beyond the time mentioned in the invitation, so that instead of three days a whole week was given to the Conference. The invitation goes on to speak of the ends aimed at. The first was to restore and introduce a common confession of those fundamental Christian doctrines which form the sum of the articles of faith fixed by the original and undivided Church in its symbols, and which are still found in what is taught by the great religious bodies standing in the line of the former Christian Churches. On the foundation laid by this agreement in fundamental doctrine the Conference strives, in the second place, to establish an intercommunion and confederation of churches, that is, such a mutual recognition as, without going so far as to absorb all churches in one, or to prejudice and encroach on their national and traditional peculiarities in doctrine, constitution, and ritual, shall nevertheless allow each of them to admit the

members of the others to its pulpits or sacraments. It was further stated that the Conference did not wish to draw up ambiguous phrases which each party might explain as it chose, and by which only a union in appearance could be secured, but rather to prove and investigate the matter in all its bearings, and draw up forms which would simply and precisely express the substance of what the Bible teaches, and what had been handed down from the Fathers, and for this very reason would serve as bond and pledge of the fellowship aimed at. The notice, which was signed "J. von Döllinger," and dated July 20th, concluded with a statement, that without receiving a special communication every person of sufficient theological culture, who was favourable to the aims of the Conference, might, whether layman or cleric, look upon himself as invited.

Two other letters of invitation had already been written by Döllinger. The first is dated March 18th, and was addressed to the professors of theology at Constantinople. It referred to the Conference of 1874, in which the orthodox Churches of Russia and Greece united with the German Church and the Anglican, for the purpose already mentioned, and stated that the theologians representing Germany belonged to a part of the Catholic Church which does not recognise the Vatican Council, and the new dogmas of the infallibility and unlimited supremacy of the Pope, as there proclaimed. It adds that these Old Catholics are persuaded that the orthodox church of the Patriarchate of Constantinople is a true church, which has received the apostolical inheritance, and forms a part of the great ancient and apostolical fold. A curious change was made in the wording by several papers which translated and published the letter. Instead of saying as above "*a* true church," they make Döllinger say that the Old Catholic theologians considered the Church of the Patriarchate of Constantinople as "*the* true church." The report of the Conference, which has already appeared at Bonn, considers this a mere error in translation. Perhaps it was, but it coincides singularly with the general spirit and bearing of the Greek Church, and with the name ("the Orthodox Church") which it has assumed. Döllinger then passes on to the dogmatic dispute, and says, that it would be difficult to find declarations that would satisfy both sides, and restore the unity that formerly existed for more than twelve centuries. He asks that representatives might be

sent from Constantinople to the Bonn Conference, and says that to prevent any difficulty arising from the travelling expenses, Englishmen of rank had offered to defray them. No one who remembers how the Greeks tormented the Pope at the Council of Florence about their expenses will wonder that this offer should have been made. But, on the other hand, it is only fair to state that not one of the Oriental theologians, present at the Bonn Conference, availed himself of this offer, and this corroborates, in no slight degree, the opinion that the Greek Church enters heartily into the present union movement. The other letter was addressed to the Secretary of the Union of Friends of Spiritual Enlightenment in St. Petersburg. It speaks of the intelligence received from Constantinople that three representatives could be sent from that patriarchate, and expresses a hope that the friends in St. Petersburg would be able to secure representatives from the remaining Oriental churches. Döllinger states that the main subject of consideration would of course be the Procession of the Holy Ghost, and that he really hoped that both sides would come to an agreement, if two conditions were complied with. The first was that the indispensable difference between theology and doctrine should be kept in view; the second, that both sides should stand fast on the ground trodden by the Fathers, and not appeal to later theologians who were only eager to contend with and conquer their opponents. He further suggested that if any of the Greeks intended proposing any matter for consideration, they should give him notice of it, and, at the same time, stated that he intended presenting some statements with reference to the churches of England and America, of which the friends at St. Petersburg would, in due course, be informed.

One other letter may be noticed in this connexion, especially as it is the only one received from the Greek churches which has been published. It comes from Michail, Archbishop and Metropolitan of the Principality of Servia, is dated from Belgrade, June 27th, and addressed to Professor Langen, of Bonn, the chairman of the standing Old Catholic Committee of Union. Archbishop Michail declares in this letter that he has always lamented the separation of the East and West, as it has weakened the power of the Church to offer united resistance to infidelity, and that he therefore rejoices in the approach to union

now being made. Narrowly observing the proceedings in the West, he is delighted to find that the Old Catholics, after the late apostasy of Rome from the faith, had cast their eyes upon the "holy orthodox Church" of Christ, which, to quote the exact words, "joyfully embraces, beloved brethren, your wish directed to the welfare of all who believe on our Saviour, the Lord Christ." The most important part of the letter is that announcing that the Archimandrite Sabbas would attend the Conference at Bonn, as representative of the "Orthodox church in the Principality of Servia." The earnest prayers for the success of the movement, as well as the general spirit of the Metropolitan of the Greek Church in this prosperous and spirited principality, are admirable. He concludes with greetings to Bishop Reinkens and Dr. Döllinger.

It will be clear from this, that those who attended from the East came as representatives, and were therefore theologians in whom their Churches could repose confidence. Indeed it is probable that the East has never been so ably represented in the West as in this Conference at Bonn, not even at the Council of Florence.

One of these representatives must here be referred to especially, being the chief dignitary from the East, and perhaps the most ardent favourer of the Union, as well as remarkable for his kind and gentle spirit, who moreover has passed away (November 1st) since the Conference. We refer to Alexander Lykurgos, Archbishop of Syra and Tenos. In 1870 he came to England to consecrate a Greek church at Liverpool, and was brought in contact with the Ely clergy, with whom he discussed the points of difference between the Greek and Anglican Churches, Dr. Brown (then Bishop of Ely, now Bishop of Winchester) taking much interest in the relations between these two religious bodies. On the suggestion of English clergymen, and on the authority of the Cologne Central Committee, Professor Huber wrote to the Archbishop, inviting him to the second Old Catholic Congress to be held in 1872, at Cologne. He was a thorough master of German, having studied at the Universities of Leipsig, Halle, and Munich. Professors Christ and Huber wrote inviting him to the August (1875) Conference, when although suffering very much in health he undertook the long journey, and his presence contributed very much to the success of the effort.

There were in all above twenty from the Greek Churches present.

This latest attempt to secure a union with the Eastern Churches must be dated from shortly after the commencement of the Old Catholic movement. It was only natural that Döllinger and his friends, when cut off from Rome, viewing reconciliation impossible, and still opposed by the Papacy, should, in looking out for allies, have fixed their attention first on the Greek Churches as being most closely related to them. Accordingly, in 1871, at the first congress, which was held that year at Munich, in September, the latter part of the third resolution reads as follows:—"We hope for reunion with the Oriental, Greek, and Russian Churches—separation from these having been unnecessary and founded upon no irreconcilable differences. In contemplation of the reform at which we aim, and in the progress of science and increased Christian culture, we hope for a gradual understanding with the Protestant and the Episcopal Churches." Up till this date the Old Catholics accepted the decisions of the Council of Trent as binding; but soon after this Congress, Michaud (curate at the Madeleine, in Paris), who had joined the movement, advocated a more comprehensive policy. He called upon all Christian Communions (whether Eastern, Anglican, Protestant, or Roman) to unite in order to restore primitive faith. He showed that the authority of the canons of the Council of Trent could not long be maintained, that no Protestant would admit the œcumenicity of that Council, and further, that no Greek would admit any of the mediæval councils that followed the separation of the East and West to be œcumenical. If, then, Döllinger wished to succeed, he must shift his ground, and go back to that occupied by the undivided Church down to the end of the eighth century. If he took this ground (which he has already done), and rejected all mediæval innovations, his position would be intelligible. The Old Catholics had come into communication with the Anglo-Continental Society as early as April, 1872; and on Dec. 1, 1873, Prof. Von Schulte wrote to the president (now Bishop of Winchester) of that society, stating that a committee, consisting of Döllinger, Friedrich, and Messmer, had been appointed to open up communications with it touching union, and that Döllinger would be glad to receive any communications on the subject. At the same time another committee of

three professors was appointed to communicate with the Association of the Friends of Spiritual Enlightenment in Petersburg. The Old Catholics had, in the meantime, completed their organisation: Bishop Reinkens had been consecrated August 11, 1873, at Rotterdam, and recognised by the Prussian Government, and arrangements made to hold the first Old Catholic synod at Bonn, on May 27th-29th, 1874, which was henceforth to be the governing body in the movement. Döllinger declined to give any definite answer to many letters touching doctrine, &c., till after this synod had spoken, but he recommended that a conference should be held in Bonn in Sept. (1874) of Orientals, Old Catholics and Anglicans, to discuss the question involved in union. The Conference of 1874 was attended by but few Orientals. Janeschew, Kirejew, Sukhotin, and Tatschaloff were there for Russia, and Rhossis for Greece. There were present about the same number of Anglicans as in 1875 from America, and not so many Old Catholics. There was, however, this difference, that more non-Episcopal Protestants were there than in the following year. The results of this Conference are easily stated. At the very commencement Döllinger mentioned that he and his colleagues did not consider the Council of Trent to be œcumenical, nor its decrees binding upon them. After a great deal of discussion, the following resolution was proposed:—"We agree that the way in which the Filioque was inserted in the Nicene Creed was illegal, and that, with a view to future peace and unity, it is much to be desired that the whole Church should set itself to consider whether the creed could possibly be restored to its primitive form, without sacrifice of the truth which is expressed in the present Western form." The Old Catholics and most of the Americans would have accepted the resolution in the wording first proposed, that the original form of the creed with the Filioque "*ought to be restored;*" but the Bishop of Winchester, Canon Liddon, and the Bishop of Pittsburg strongly opposed this, and recommended the amended resolution. This took place in the English meeting of the Westerns; but when this amended resolution was handed in at the meeting when the Greeks were present, it was at once and promptly rejected, and the expunging of the Filioque insisted on. At last, however, the Greeks gave way, and consented to the proposition, the last clause to run thus:—"Without sacrifice of any true doctrine

which is expressed in the present Western form." This does not state, as the former resolution did, that the doctrine contained in the Filioque is true. Then followed a num'er of articles which were evidently intended to meet Protestant difficulties in associating with Old Catholics or Greeks. These were accepted with remarkable readiness. They are of such interest as showing the bearing of the Union towards Protestantism, that it may be well to state them in full; but as they were passed in English as well as German, it is not necessary to give the latter, the English being of equal authority. They are fourteen in number.

"1. We agree that the Apocryphal or deutero-Canonical books of the Old Testament are not of the same Canonicity as the books contained in the Hebrew Canon.

"2. We agree that no translation of Holy Scripture can claim an authority superior to that of the original text.

"3. We agree that the reading of Holy Scripture in the vulgar tongue cannot lawfully be forbidden.

"4. We agree that *in general*, it is more fitting and in accordance with the spirit of the Church, that the liturgy should be in the tongue understood by the people.

"5. We agree that faith working by love, and not faith alone, is the means and condition of man's justification before God.

"6. Salvation cannot be merited by 'merit of condignity,' because there is no proportion between the infinite worth of the salvation promised by God and the finite worth of man's works.

"7. We agree that the doctrine of *Opera Supererogationis*, and of a *thesaurus meritorum sanctorum*, *i.e.*, that the overflowing merits of the saints can be transferred to others, either by the rulers of the Church, or by the authors of the good works themselves, is untenable.

"8. We acknowledge that the number of sacraments was fixed at seven first in the 12th century, and then was received into the general teaching of the Church, not as a tradition coming down from the Apostles or from the earliest times, but as the result of theological speculation. Catholic theologians (*e.g.*, Bellarmine) acknowledge, and we acknowledge with them, that Baptism and the Eucharist are "*principalia, principia, eximia salutis nostræ sacramenta.*"

"9. The Holy Scriptures being recognised as the primary rule of faith, we agree that the genuine tradition, *i.e.*, the unbroken transmission, partly oral, partly in writing, of the doctrine delivered by Christ and the Apostles, is an authoritative source of teaching for all successive generations of Christians. This

tradition is partly to be found in the *consensus* of the great ecclesiastical bodies standing in historical continuity with the Primitive Church, partly to be gathered by scientific method from the written documents of all centuries.

"10. We reject the new Roman doctrine of the Immaculate Conception of the blessed Virgin Mary as being contrary to the tradition of the first thirteen centuries according to which Christ alone is conceived without sin.

"11. We agree that the practice of confession of sins before the congregation or a priest, together with the exercise of the power of the keys, has come down to us from the Primitive Church, and that, purged from abuses and free from constraint, it should be preserved in the Church.

"12. We agree that 'indulgences' can only refer to penalties actually imposed by the Church herself.

"13. We acknowledge that the practice of the commemoration of the faithful departed, *i.e.*, the calling down of a richer outpouring of Christ's grace upon them, has come down to us from the Primitive Church, and is to be preserved in the Church.

"14. The Eucharistic celebration in the Church is not a continuous repetition or renewal of the propitiatory sacrifice offered once for ever by Christ upon the cross; but its sacrificial character consists in this, that it is the permanent memorial of it, and a representation and presentation on earth of that one oblation of Christ for the salvation of redeemed mankind, which according to the Epistle to the Hebrews (ix. 11, 12) is continually presented in heaven by Christ, who now appears in the presence of God for us (ix. 24). While this is the character of the Eucharist in reference to the sacrifice of Christ, it is also a sacred feast, wherein the faithful, receiving the body and blood of our Lord, have communion one with another (1 Cor. x. 17)."

Two other articles were proposed, but the Easterns did not assent to them: "We acknowledge that the Church of England and the Churches derived through her have maintained unbroken the episcopal succession;" "We acknowledge that the invocation of saints is not commanded as a duty necessary to salvation for every Christian." The Easterns objected altogether to the latter, but hesitated to accept the former simply because they had not as yet sufficiently investigated the matter. A remarkable circumstance, connected with the discussion of Article 10, which condemns the immaculate conception, brought to light the strange fact that some English clergymen looked with favour upon this new dogma. Canon Liddon proposed a resolution so worded as to allow

of the Romish notion being entertained as a "pious opinion," while rejected as dogma, he himself declaring that he received it in neither sense, but Mr. Oxenham professed to believe in it, but would not make the belief of it binding. Against no notion did Dr. Döllinger protest with such energy as against this. Indeed, the Old Catholics were here perfectly unyielding, and his motion was accepted as standing in Article 10 by twenty-five against nine, who voted for Dr. Liddon's view. In addition to the two articles mentioned above, which were left unsettled, there were some others, the greater part of which had to do with points of canon law and difference in ritual; but none of these presented any great difficulty. The enforced celibacy of the clergy, which Döllinger did not seem quite willing to surrender, is no longer deemed by the Old Catholics to be necessary. They only ask whether the right time has come for doing away with it. There remained, therefore, for the Conference of 1875 only three great questions to discuss: the Procession of the Holy Ghost, English Orders, and the Invocation of Saints. The question of the invocation of saints was, however, not touched in the last Conference, and that of English orders only slightly. Indeed, the English and Americans manfully refused to have their orders called in question; so that Döllinger contented himself with an address, in which he stated his own belief and that of the Old Catholics that the English and their daughter Episcopal church were in the uninterrupted succession.

In the remaining question, which, after all, was the main business of the Conference, there was complete success. Ten articles were agreed on, the first four of which may be called preliminary ones, and the remaining six the real articles of union. The four were:—

"1. We agree together in receiving the œcumenical symbols and the doctrinal decisions of the undivided church."

"2. We agree together in the acknowledgment that the addition of the Filioque to the Creed did not take place in an ecclesiastically regular manner."

"3. We declare our complete adhesion to the doctrine of the Holy Ghost, as presented by the Fathers of the undivided church."

"4. We reject every conception and every method of expression in which in any way the acceptance of two principles or ἀρχαί or αἰτίαι might be contained in the Trinity."

The six were :—

"We accept the teaching of St. John of Damascus respecting the Holy Ghost, as the same is expressed in the following paragraphs, and in the sense of the teaching of the ancient undivided church :—

"1. The Holy Ghost proceeds out of the Father (ἐκ τοῦ πατρός) as the beginning (ἀρχή), the cause (αἰτία), the source (πηγή) of the Godhead.

"2. The Holy Ghost does not proceed out of the Son, there being in the Godhead but one beginning, one cause, through which all that is in the Godhead is produced.

"3. The Holy Ghost proceeds out of the Father, through the Son.

"4. The Holy Ghost is the image of the Son, who is the image of the Father, proceeding out of the Father and resting in the Son as the force beaming forth from Him.

"5. The Holy Ghost is the personal production out of the Father, belonging to the Son, but not out of the Son, because He is the Spirit of the mouth of the Godhead, which speaks forth the Word.

"6. The Holy Ghost forms the mediation between the Father and the Son, and is bound together to the Father through the Son."

If the doctrine of the Trinity is, as Baxter believed, "the very sum and kernel of the Christian religion," it may be that Dr. Waterland did not go too far when he wrote:—

"When we consider the doctrine of the Trinity as interwoven with the very frame and texture of the Christian religion, it appears to me natural to conceive that the whole scheme and economy of man's redemption was laid with a principal view to it, in order to bring mankind gradually into an acquaintance with the three Divine Persons, one God blessed for ever."

Pearson's view, with but a slight alteration, would describe that adopted at Bonn. It was that though God the Father is the Fountain of Deity, the whole divine nature is communicated from the Father to the Son, and from both to the Spirit; yet so as that the Father and Son are not separate nor separable from the Deity, but do still exist in it, and are most intimately united to it. The change that might be made would read thus: "... communicated from the Father to the Son, and from the Father through the Son to the Spirit ..." On the question of the procession there was a singular variety in the expressions used. Bishop Alexander Forbes (since then dead) in his letter to Döllinger says: "Is it not true that the Holy Ghost pro-

ceedeth from the *ousia* of the Father and of the Son by one spiration?" Mr. Gladstone in his Letter urged the view, "that procession from the Son is not intended to be asserted in the same sense and scope as from the Father." The Bishop of Winchester in his Letter said of the Easterns: "In truth the difference between us is one of words and not of truth." Malcolm MacColl (an English clergyman) puts it: "As the Divine Essence, which is one and indivisible in the Three Persons, was communicated to the Son in order, not in time, before it was communicated to the Holy Ghost, it is allowable to say that the Holy Ghost proceeds from the Father and the Son eternally, because He proceeds from the Father as the unconditional and unoriginated cause of the Trinity, but also from the Son, because He proceeds from the essence, which is one and indivisible in the Three Persons of the Trinity, but which is in the Father as the πηγὴ Θεότητος, and which the Spirit derives in point of order from the Father through the Son." The Bishop of Gibraltar urged that the words of Scripture should be kept to as closely as possible. Dr. Schaff, from America, made a long speech, in which he viewed the doctrine under its exegetical, historical, and dogmatical aspects, and urged that neither "from the Father *alone*" of the Greeks, nor "from the Father and the Son" of the Westerns, was Scriptural, and that the *Filioque* ought, as an act of historical justice, to be removed from the Creed. Janeschew, from St. Petersburg, said: "The special peculiarity of the Holy Ghost is that He proceeds, as regards His existence, from the Father, and as regards His working and appearing, whether in eternity or time, not only from the Father, but also from the Son." This was a most important statement, as it admitted an eternal relationship of the Holy Ghost to the Son. Previous to this Bishop Gennadios said: "The terms first, second, and third person have their ground in the order of revelation. The Father was the first to reveal Himself, after Him the Son, and then the Holy Ghost. But the eternal production of the Son and of the Holy Ghost so concur that the one cannot be put before the other, and that neither chronologically nor even logically." This was pretty plain. It was called forth by the statement which Döllinger had made of his own views, to which, indeed, he adhered all through, and which was substantially that adopted by the Conference:—

"If the question be put—Does the Spirit proceed from the Father *alone?* the answer must be affirmative or negative, according to the sense assigned to the word proceed. It must be answered with 'yes' if that power or activity is referred to which belongs to the Father alone, by which He is the fountain of Deity, and the πνεῦσις of the Spirit is altogether His work, whether executed by Him in person, or wrought by the Logos, who only through or from the Father possesses the power to outbeam or outbreathe the Spirit; it being remembered that this is a double operation, the immediate and mediate flow together into one common act of the will. It must be answered with 'no,' if the words would exclude all participation of the Son in the production of the Spirit. The production of the Holy Ghost by the Father must be looked upon as an act founded in the nature of God, but yet as also lying in the will, and as one that follows not in time, but logically, the begetting of the Son. And this is also the very reason why we call the Father the first, the Son the second, and the Holy Ghost the third Divine Person."

As soon as the Greeks admitted an eternal relationship between the Father and the Son, Döllinger said that the greater part of the difficulty was overcome. Their position was, however, this, that the Holy Ghost *proceeds from the Father, and this eternal procession shines forth through the Son.* And here lay one great difference between the Eastern and Western mode of presenting the doctrine. The Orientals distinguish between the ἐκπόρευσις of the Holy Ghost, which means His *proceeding as from a source*, and His ἔκλαμψις and ἔκφανσις or *shining forth*, and becoming manifest, whether in time or eternity. Westerns make, of course, no such distinction, but look upon these two as concurrent and, indeed, one event, with perhaps two sides—one lying towards the Father, the fountain of Deity, and the other towards creation. Englishmen think that Germans are great distinction-makers, but they are more than equalled by the Orientals, especially the Russians, while the Greeks are also in this respect not degenerate sons of their forefathers. Taking the ἐκπόρευσις as denoting a coming forth as from a source, they say that the Holy Ghost proceeds thus from the Father; but taking the ἔκλαμψις and ἔκφανσις to denote His becoming manifest, they were willing to admit that this might be eternally from the Son. They said the Holy Ghost ἐκπόρευεται from the Father, but would use προέρχεται to denote His temporal or eternal relationship to the Son.

The first thought that will occur to the mind on reading of the agreement come to, will be surprise at its success. Looking at history, and judging by its light, most would have said that a union, or understanding, or confederation of the East and West was a simple impossibility. Rome had always demanded submission, which, of course, did away at once with the desire of union, and resembled the pretended offers which Anglicans have, at different times, made to Presbyterians and Methodists. It meant that the Greek Church should enter the Church of Rome, and give up all that could not be reconciled with such a membership. Then, on the other hand, the Greeks stuck all the more tenaciously to their peculiar dogmas and usages.

The East and West were divided in other respects, and especially in political interests, for Italy was in the eighth century completely sundered from the Greek empire, under which the Greek Church stood in complete dependence. The Pope, instead of looking for political help from the East, united himself to the new German or Franco-Roman empire of Charlemagne. In addition to all this may be mentioned Oriental conservation or stagnation, which would be sure to complain that the West was going too fast. Indeed, the Greek Church has remained, to a great extent, stagnant since the time of Johannes Chrysorrhoas, of Damascus, A.D. 730. This has been, perhaps, to some extent providential, as it presented in Russia, and other countries, a barrier to the universal dominion of the Pope. Jealousy for the Unity of the Trinity always kept the Greeks aloof, for the opinion existed among them that the Latins had in Filioque established two fountains of Deity. But the great hindrance was the fact of the *Filioque* having been inserted in the Creed without authority, and its being associated in the Eastern mind with constant attempts to subdue the Eastern churches to Rome, so that they looked upon the formula "*From the Father alone*" of the *Confessio Orthodoxa* as a kind of palladium of their ecclesiastical independence. The doctrine of the Procession of the Holy Ghost was drawn into the struggle, in order to give Rome a plea for accusing the Orientals of heresy. After the doctrine was taught in the Athanasian Creed it came to be often added to the Nicene (credo in Spiritum Sanctum, qui procedit a patre *filioque*). It was only when the Spanish Church came over from Arianism to Orthodoxy that the addition was made at the Council of Toledo in A.D. 589.

Charlemagne secured its adoption at the Council of Aix-la-Chapelle in 809, but when he asked Pope Leo III. to order its general use in the Nicene Creed, the Pope refused, adding that he had no authority to change creeds. He approved of the doctrine, but to show his dissatisfaction with the addition he had the creed graven in brass, and hung up in St. Peter's without the Filioque. The separation of the East and West was not in reality caused by Photius, nor Cærularius, although the latter was formally excommunicated on July 24, 1054, in the church of St. Sophia, by the Pope's legates, and then in turn himself excommunicated a pope. Towards the end of the twelfth century popes had friendly communications with the Emperor, both sides being supposed to belong to one church. It was the erection of the Latin empire at Constantinople (1204—1261) that made the hatred and contempt of the Greeks for the Latins complete. The seizure of Constantinople, April 12, 1204, the robbery and desecration of Greek churches, the setting up of Baldwin, Count of Flanders, to be Emperor of the Greeks, and especially the part which Innocent III. took in this, by throwing the whole weight of his authority into these deeds of violence, and openly professing it as his intention to subdue the Greek Church to Rome, dug the great gulf which has since separated the two churches.

In the fourteenth century the Greek empire became smaller and smaller, till it was soon confined to a corner of Thrace, between the Sea of Marmora and the Euxine, scarcely 1,500 miles square, and at last the majesty of the Roman name was confined to the walls of Constantinople. John Palæologus II. was anxious to get help from the West against Mohammed II., and therefore attended the Councils of Ferrara (1438) and Florence (1439), where the Emperor and a few more, with the hope of obtaining help from the Pope against the Turks, agreed to a kind of union. But the Archbishop of Ephesus stirred up the East against it, and in 1443 the three patriarchs of Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem anathematised the whole cause with its partisans, while the latter, not finding the help they expected, became careless about the Union. When the Turks took Constantinople (May 29, 1453) they naturally put an end, for the time, to all negociations for union with foreign churches, as it was for their interest to continue the division. The enormous numbers of Greek

fugitives in Italy, Hungary, Poland, and Lithuania either joined fully and at once the Romish Church, or formed what were called United Greek Churches, which retained their old liturgy and constitution. Deceit, force, and bribery were the means used in connection with the Councils of Lyons and Florence, and all along there was only one supposition on the part of Rome, that the Oriental Church and her daughter, the Russian, would submit unconditionally to the Pope. The latter continued to ignore the occupants of Oriental Sees, and to give their titles to Latin ecclesiastics. It is true that he allowed those who submitted to him to retain their liturgy and constitution, but the treatment which the Greeks in South Italy and Poland received showed what the entire Oriental Church might have expected if the Pope could have done there what he wished.

If it be asked why this Conference was so very successful, while all previous efforts had been such conspicuous failures, an answer may easily be found to the question. It was owing in part to the commanding influence of Döllinger, who, from his great learning, advanced age (he is now 77), thorough self-command, remarkable open-heartedness, and complete faith in the movement, was well fitted to act as chairman, and hold all the threads of argument in his fingers. He was accessible to every one, granted the most perfect freedom of speech, and took particular pains not merely to meet an objection directly, but also and still more to trace it back to its source, and discover what caused the parties to form it. He had also an extraordinary faculty of detecting the essential point in a question, and also of leading the discussion safely through a mass of heterogeneous matter to the end aimed at. Very justly did the Bishop of Gibraltar ascribe the success of the Conference "in a large measure to the tact and judgment, courtesy and geniality, learning and wisdom of our illustrious president." A story was told us by a gentleman, which illustrated Döllinger's abstemiousness. He was staying at Munich, and invited Döllinger to meet him one evening at the hotel where he was living. The only hospitality that he consented to partake of was a glass of cold water. Thin-faced, with sharp piercing eyes, always standing, and that for hours together, walking up close to a speaker when he could not hear from his desk, he was the main figure in the

entire Conference. He is no doubt the most learned Catholic living, and it is remarkable how nearly alike in age he and the most learned of Protestant divines (Tholuck) are. Döllinger was born at Bamberg on Feb. 28th, 1799; and Tholuck at Breslau, on March 30th, 1799. Both were appointed professors in 1826, and have been the leading reformers in their churches: Tholuck, from Rationalism leading on to Atheism, and Döllinger, from Priestism which leads away to Heathenism. The skill, gentlemanly bearing, diplomatic tact, and learning of Prof. Ossinin, of Petersburg, who spoke for the Orientals, tended also greatly to the success. Nor must it be omitted that the dignitaries at the head of the three churches were men of peace and union. These were Archbishop Lykurgos (already mentioned), Bishop Reinkens, and the Bishop of Gibraltar. However great the services and influence of others may be, Reinkens is the real leader of Old Catholicism. Huber (born at Munich in 1830), now 45 years of age, from 1859 professor in the University of Munich, was the one who, in March 1867, gave in the *Allgemeine Zeitung* (Augsburg) the signal for conflict with Ultramontanism, and who has since made himself still better known by his great book against the Jesuits. Friedrich, another professor at Munich, now 39 years of age (born 1836, at Poxdorf, in Bavaria), was at first the leader of the movement, and with more decision than even Döllinger (along with whom he was excommunicated 17th April, 1871) refused to submit to the infallibility dogma. He attended the Vatican Council as theologian to Cardinal Hohenlohe, and published its proceedings. He is the leading theological defender of Old Catholicism: Huber being professor of philosophy. Von Schulte, professor of law at Bonn, and member of the Imperial Parliament (now in his forty-ninth year), is the leading layman, and presides at the annual Congress. But Reinkens, who is now 54 years of age (born March 1, 1821, near Aix-la-Chapelle), and was consecrated bishop on August 11, 1873, is the one whom the German Old Catholics love to look upon as their ecclesiastical head. At the Conference on Friday morning, when the battle was beginning to get hot, and there appeared from Ossinin's speech a danger lest evidence should be resisted, Reinkens rose and made an earnest, reasoning, expostulatory, and practical appeal to the Greeks, which commanded great attention, and

really became the turning-point in the discussion. On that morning Döllinger said that an agreement had been three-fourths arrived at, and that a committee might at once be formed to draw up articles of union, for Janeschew admitted immediately after this appeal that there was an eternal connection between the Holy Ghost and the Son, although not in the Western sense. The opening words of Reinkens' speech may here be quoted, the translation being condensed: "Not only the alarming situation just depicted by Döllinger, in which we find ourselves face to face with 180,000,000 of Christians, who, standing under the authority of a supreme head, endowed with pretended divine attributes, are governed by 9,000 Jesuits, with obedience as unresisting as a corpse, not only my heart, which beats for the oneness of all those who seek and hope for their justification and salvation in the one mediator between God and man, but also the position which I have as bishop of the Old Catholics of the German Empire, compels me to attach the greatest interest to these union efforts." His speech, which followed, was unique, and hit the nail right on the head. The first two grounds noted above are such as all Protestants would be willing to assume: union against the Jesuits, and union of all who rest alone on Christ for justification and full salvation—words worthy of being recorded! His prayer at the close, after the reading of the *Te Deum* and offering up of the Lord's Prayer, also shows his spirit. After *libera nos a malo*, he added: *Dabis autem nobis omne bonum, imprimis quod nunc maxime desideramus, pacis bonum inter ecclesias, pacis quidem in veritate. Confirma et sanctifica nos in veritate. Sermo tuus est veritas. Conserva nos quoque, sive ex Oriente, sive ex Occidente venientes, ad te caritatis vinculo semper conjunctos. Et benedicas nos, Deus omnipotens, Pater et Filius et Spiritus sanctus. Amen.* The Bishop of Gibraltar exerted a similar influence. Speaking on Friday afternoon on the question, he said:

"In framing any form to express our belief on this very mysterious point, we ought to keep as closely as possible to the words of Scripture. After the controversies which have divided Christendom on this question, it is perhaps not possible to confine ourselves quite to Biblical expressions, but there is nevertheless no better rule than that of an English reformer concerning predestination: 'In these matters I am so fearful that I cannot speak further, yea, almost otherwise, than the very text doth, as it were,

lead me by the hand.' If Christians had confined themselves to such a rule as this, if they had been satisfied to leave that undefined which is not defined in the Scriptures, if they had avoided speculation on what goes beyond the grasp of our faculties, the Church of Christ would have been saved from those divisions which we now almost despair of seeing healed."

Speaking at another time of points in which an agreement had not been arrived at, he said:—

"This is what must have been anticipated by any calm and reasonable mind in reflecting how great are the differences, independently of theology, which divide us, not only in language, nationality and outward circumstances, but also in mental disposition, mode of thought, and type of character. It must be remembered that the committee has been on the deep, dark, dangerous, and storm-swept sea of theological speculation; that they have come safe to land is due under God to the strong desire which filled all hearts for brotherly union, and for success in the mission with which they had been charged."

But it was more especially in a sermon which he preached in the English Church on Sunday evening, on the Spirituality, Catholicity, and Union of the Church of Christ, that his generous views were expressed. Another help was found in the exhaustive addresses which Döllinger delivered nearly every day at the commencement of the proceedings, and which were each nearly two hours in length. They were principally historical, and went to show that the doctrine of Papal supremacy was that which had originated the separation of the East and West, that those who rejected this supremacy could now more easily unite, that the strongest Greek Church expression was that contained in the Confessio Orthodoxa, "from the Father alone," while the Westerns could accept in the sense there used, that the Western Filioque was a development of Greek doctrines which the Greeks ought not to fight against, for by so doing they were fighting against their own daughter; that the Greeks have been from 1870 heretics in the eyes of Rome, like Old Catholics and Protestants; that it was now a Romish dogma to use force with heretics, and that the union of those present was natural and necessary, but would not have been possible but for the deplorable decision of July 18, 1870. Such addresses, it will be at once seen, could not but do much to predispose to union.

A further help was the mode of procedure: not by formal

resolutions in which persons would be committed to an issue, but by conversations in which all were supposed to be feeling their way after truth. It was especially agreed that modern theological systems in the churches concerned should be passed by, and the ancient, undivided church appealed to. An attempt was made once to take a modern proceeding as precedent, but it was quietly yet decidedly opposed. Döllinger, when it was urged to make Scripture the only appeal, said that if this were insisted on, the Greeks would not enter into the negociations, and the experience of the Württemberg divines a hundred years ago would seem to prove this. The only desire in the Conference was to find out what the Fathers of the undivided church said on the question. Another reason may be seen in what all will admit: the general wish of the churches concerned for union. It was very different at the time of the Council of Florence. The fact of the Greeks declining to have their expenses paid by some English friends of the Union speaks enough for these two parties, while the Old Catholics may be looked upon as the chief advocates of the scheme. In addition to all these reasons there must not be forgotten an important distinction which was insisted on: the great difference between dogma (which must be believed) and theology or theological speculation. Professor Ossinin's statement on this subject would no doubt be accepted by all the churches concerned in the Union. Dogmas, he said, are doctrines derived from and contained in divine revelation, whether as clearly stated in Holy Scripture, confirmed and defined by an Œcumenical Council, or supported by the unanimous testimony of the ancient church Fathers as coming from divine revelation: *quod semper, quod ubique, quod ab omnibus.* In opposition to dogma, heresy or heterodoxy is what clearly contradicts a dogma, or usurps authority. All that lies between these is free theological opinion. The immaculate conception of the Virgin would have been of this latter character had it contented itself with this position, but assuming to be dogma it makes itself a heresy. At the Conference the discussions had only to do with dogma, theological speculations being ignored; and this simplified the matter greatly.

The signs of the times contributed also their quota. Everyone can see in the distance the tide of infidelity and atheism rising, and in this there is call for the church to prepare for the life and death struggle approaching. Is

this then the time for churches to be kept asunder by mere words? The very circumstance of so many meeting and becoming acquainted with one another, with the modes of thought and views of each other, could not but help towards an understanding. It was thus different from the German and non-juror attempts of former days. Then in all such cases of separation there comes a time when the old causes of dissension die out, and union becomes possible. If the present is such a moment, then union, if sought, must be attainable. The Presbyterian and Methodist divisions may be judged of in the same way, and all differences arising out of local, occasional, or circumstantial grounds. The kind of union aimed at made the work easier. It was not absorption, which is all that Roman Catholics have ever offered Protestants, or Anglicans have offered Dissenters. No one here demanded submission; they offered the right hand of fraternal recognition, and only wished to have their offer accepted and reciprocated. It was a union entirely disconnected with politics; no secular aims were mixed up with it. Individual efforts, like those of Bossuet in his disputes with Claude in 1685, and the proposals of Leibnitz and Grotius, need not be more than mentioned here. Döllinger's idea was simple, daring, and sublime. He thought he saw an actual platform of agreement underneath the rubbish of the ages, and believed himself able to show both parties that they were standing on this all the while that they deemed themselves on irreconcilably different foundations. In other words he believed that the supposed difference was only a misunderstanding magnified into a difference. This applies, however, merely to essentials. Matters of detail, ritual, national peculiarity, &c., are not to be touched, for uniformity is not in the slightest degree aimed at, but only such fraternal recognition as would lead to intercommunion and interchange of pulpits. Among the plans for effecting this was that of Professor A. Menzel, which did not come to discussion, but which contained the views of many Old Catholics. It contains eight articles, the fifth of which is as follows: "Our hope of an agreement (I do not say unity) with the brethren from the East rests upon our belief that we can show that the complete exclusion of the Son from the foundation of the essence of the Holy Ghost is a doctrine of later theologians only, and not of Holy Scripture, nor of the Greek Fathers down till John of Damascus; that it is not demanded even by the

Symbolum Niceno-Constantinopolitanum, nor even by the *Confessio Orthodoxa*."

Professor Menzel did not wish the Greeks to change their creed, or even adopt the Filioque in theological opinion, but only to admit that the West might hold it without heresy, and without being thereby excluded from communion with the East. Several English or American plans were suggested. Rev. F. S. May proposed that the Nicene Creed as completed without the Filioque at the second Council should be the confession of faith required as condition of intercommunion among the churches. Rev. Chauncy Langdon proposed also that this should be the only creed binding on the whole church, and that the Filioque should be only regarded as an expression of Western or local theology, but yet as not inconsistent with the faith and teaching of the Fathers. Canon Liddon's resolution admitted that the Holy Ghost proceeded from the Father in the sense that the Father alone is the fountain of Deity, but He proceeds eternally through the Son. The Filioque should be retained subject to the decision of a truly œcumenical council, but only one principle or cause in the Godhead admitted.

Prebendary Meyrick proposed to say that the Holy Ghost issues eternally from the Father, but proceeds (*procedit*) eternally from the Son. He admitted that the Filioque ought not to have been inserted, but would retain it till a decision should be pronounced by competent authority. Dr. Schaff, of New York, proposed: "We believe and confess in agreement with the sacred Scriptures that the Holy Ghost 'proceeds from the Father' (John xv. 26), and is 'sent by the Father and the Son' (John xiv. 26; xv. 26; xvi. 7), and that this Scriptural truth is sufficient as the substance of a dogma, and a basis of church union." It will be seen that these rather avoid than grapple with the difficulty. Some would have been inclined, perhaps, to prove directly and sternly the Filioque from the Greek authorities, and so bring home upon the Greeks the charge of false doctrine, if not heresy, and then call upon them to recant. But this would have widened and deepened the separating gulf. Dean Howson's proposal was the best, and contained substantially the solution arrived at: "While the Orientals retain their customary formula 'from the Father,' and while the Westerns retain their larger formula 'from the Father and from the Son,' both agree that the formula

'from the Father through the Son' expresses accurately the theological truth held by both."

Deep interest has always been taken in the Greek church, lying as it does in the very lands where our Lord and His Apostles laboured. To the Greeks we may say as Döllinger did in 1874: "Your churches have been the mother and instructress of the Western churches. They possessed a Christian literature even before the first Latin book on Christian things was written. The six first Œcumenical Councils were altogether, or in great part, meetings of Greek bishops, their decrees were the production of Greek traditions. These churches have enjoyed the immense advantage of reading the writings of the Apostles, always in the original, and receiving those fresh, pure, and immediate impressions, which nothing but the original can be the means of conveying." The only uncertainty about success is to be found in the Eastern churches. Quite true, they do not in their books anathematise the Filioque, but when they call themselves the orthodox church, they mean all that is contained in that word. When the Princess Dagmar was received into the "Orthodox" Communion, previous to her marriage with the Crown Prince of Russia, she was obliged to use words which consigned all her relatives to perdition. Not only had she to renounce Lutheranism, but also to accept the "dogmas, traditions, and ordinances of our orthodox church," contained in ten Articles, among which is the following: "I believe and confess that the Holy Græco-Russian Church is the Bride of Christ, and that in her is true salvation to be found, and *that no one can possibly be saved in any other except her, I believe.*"* To see this church so largely represented in this union-work is proof sufficient that "we live in an age of surprises." There would be no difficulty with the Church of England. No permission would be needed from Parliament, as some opponents of the scheme have dreamed, for the Church of England could even now admit an Old Catholic or Greek to her communion, or even pulpits, without any new Parliamentary enactment. The Reformers seem intentionally, or unwittingly, to have avoided putting hindrances in the way of this union with the Patriarchate of Constantinople; for in Article xix., under

* See *Orthodox and Non-Jurors*, by Williams (Rivingtons, 1868), pp. 51 and 52 of Introduction.

the definition of the Church, it is said four of the five patriarchates have erred in life, ceremonial, and faith, but no condemnation is passed on the patriarchate of Constantinople: "As the churches of Jerusalem, Alexandria, and Antioch have erred; so also the Church of Rome hath erred, not only in their living and manner of ceremonies, but also in manner of faith." And then in the fifth Article the words *ab eterno* are rejected, while the rest of the Württemburg profession is retained: "The Holy Ghost *proceeding from the Father and the Son* is of one substance, etc." Now it makes a great difference whether we say that the Holy Ghost proceeds, or proceeds *eternally* from the Father and the Son, as is clear from the controversies on the eternal Sonship of Christ. The Greeks believe all in the temporal procession (mission) of the Spirit from the Son, and many in an eternal procession from the Son, yet not in the same sense in which He proceeds from the Father, but rather as stated in the formula: "*From* the Father *through* the Son."

The basis of the Conference is certainly the most intelligent, determined, and uncompromising protest against the Papacy that has been made since the Reformation. All engaged in it, with the exception of Canon Liddon, and perhaps two or three more Anglicans, look upon reconciliation with Rome as a simple impossibility, and none will perhaps be able to continue connected with the movement unless he take up this position. No doubt the Jesuits will endeavour to destroy this prospect of union with the Greek Church, but that proves all the more its Anti-Vatican spirit. Nothing could more effectually cut off from the Anglicans the possibility of union with Rome. It also gives a deadly blow to the pernicious notion of a union based on uniformity. It is equally opposed to all high sacerdotal notions. This Romeward longing is not found in any of the churches represented, except perhaps among the Anglicans. But very few of this Anglican type take much interest in the movement. On one of the days of the Conference, a gentleman, who was sitting at dinner next to an Old Catholic priest, got into conversation with the latter, when the topic happened to be the Old Catholic synod, which is the legislative and governing body in Old Catholicism. When asked if he had been at the last sittings, the priest said "No," and added: "Bishop Reinkens has so determined to prevent hierarchical influ-

ence from getting the upper hand among us, that he has ordered the expenses of the lay representatives to be paid, while the clerical representatives must pay their own expenses, for he is anxious to have as many lay representatives there as possible." This synod, it must be remembered, answers not so much to the full gathering at the Methodist Conference as rather to the legal hundred, and if such an arrangement really exists, proves that the good bishop is determined not to let high-priestly ideas find an entrance into his flock.

Bonn is noted in many respects. Its antiquity, beautiful situation, mementos of great men who have lived there, and its university, all endear it to tourists and visitors; but in years to come, when Döllinger and the rest who have led this movement shall, like Lykurgos, have passed away, these Conferences will perhaps be looked upon as one of its chief glories. Far more worthy to be called councils than any even of the first four, they were conducted calmly, under the guidance of kind, considerate regard to the opinion of all concerned, no party seeking victory, but only the means by which they might find an outlet for the love which dwelt in their hearts towards one another, but which ecclesiastical laws had kept them from openly expressing in acts. Such men are not conspirators against the civil and religious liberties of others. While Protestants cannot as yet identify themselves with the movement, and missionary churches dare not join it, even if the way were open, for it would rob them of the glory of feeling that the world is their parish, all may wish the movement hearty success. It is one of the most remarkable signs of the times, and, coming immediately after the fall of the Papal temporal power, and immediately before the probable fall of Mohammedanism, it has, no doubt, a significancy which will soon become increasingly apparent.

ART. V.—1. *The History of Servia and the Servian Revolution, with a Sketch of the Insurrection in Bosnia.* By LEOPOLD RANKE. Bohn. 1853.

2. *Travels in the Slavonic Provinces of Turkey in Europe.* By G. MUIR MACKENZIE and A. P. IRBY. Bell and Daldy. 1867.

3. *Consular Blue-Books.* 1867.

IN Herzegovina the harvest of 1874 was a bad one, and the peasantry foresaw a hard winter before them. The tax-collectors, agents of the officials who farm the taxes, require the agriculturists to keep the crops standing until it suits their convenience to come and levy the tithe due to the Sultan, estimating the crops as standing damaged there to be worth the highest Constantinople market prices. But in one district the tax-gatherer did not come till January, 1875, when hunger had compelled the sale and the eating of parts of the crops. The tax-gatherer estimated the tax at an enormous sum; the people resisted his demands; they were robbed, beaten, imprisoned, and their chiefs threatened with arrest when they complained. Some fled to the mountains of the neighbouring independent state of Montenegro, secure to find shelter among people of the same faith and race. They found the leading Montenegrins at the capital, Cettinje, consulting how to act with reference to a Turkish infraction of boundary rights, and were welcomed as fellow-sufferers. During their absence another district of Herzegovina was roused to discontent and resistance by the arbitrary conduct of the police and by the way in which forced labour was imposed by them. The district authorities reported to their superior, and gendarmes were sent to compel submission. Other neighbouring districts were quiet; but the clergy of some Roman Catholic districts, whose ancient privileges had never been confirmed by the present Sultan, stirred their flocks to support the dignity of their religion against threatened inroads on the part of the local authorities.

Just then the Emperor of Austria visited his province of

Dalmatia, which is peopled by Slavs, the near kinsmen of the Herzegovinians, and borders on Herzegovina to the south-west. His visit had a political significance in the eyes of the simple peasantry, who hoped that he had come to see how best to help them against their oppressors. He probably had no such aim, but his visit encouraged them nevertheless.

The gendarmes arrived in rebellious Nevesinje at the end of April; the Christians fled to the mountains, their chiefs to Montenegro. The gendarmes went on to Bilec; but here the peasantry offered only a passive resistance to their entering the villages, and refused to appear before the local authority. The flame broke out here on a Christian woman suffering insult at the hands of a gendarme. A Pasha, Vali Selim, had already been despatched by the Governor of Bosnia to inquire into the result of the Emperor of Austria's visit to Dalmatia, and was instructed to give the discontented population the alternative of returning submissively to their homes or of emigrating to Montenegro. They refused to deal with any but an envoy direct from the Sultan; being not rebellious against his authority, but compelled to defend themselves, their families, and their property, from his Mussulman officials of the same race as themselves.

It was as yet two small districts only that were involved; few were even interested in their affairs. But the refugee chieftains were inconvenient to Montenegro, and safe conducts were procured by Prince Nicholas for their return. The Turkish frontier guards attacked them in spite of their passports, and a second application was necessary to get them across the border. On their return home they were left comparatively unmolested, merely having some of their houses burned, one being assaulted in the bazaar, another killed as he left the court in which he had complained of the assault, another being murdered in his field, and an innkeeper who had entertained them paying for his hospitality with his life. The authorities made no sign of any intention to punish these outrages, but still there was no general outbreak. Isolated attacks were made on single Turks, and the matter became grave enough to attract the attention of the Porte. Accordingly the mufti of the Slavic Mussulmans was removed, but not punished, and a very obnoxious bishop, with Turkish leanings, was transferred to a better post. The neighbouring villagers armed them-

selves, but remained quiet, waiting to see what would happen, doing their ordinary work all day, but guarding the roads at night against any surprise on the part of Government. This was about midsummer. At last a conference was held between representatives of the Sultan and the people, who also insisted upon the presence of an envoy from Montenegro. The demands made by the peasants were for things promised them by the famous decree or Hattisherif of 1857: that Christian women and girls should be safe from Turkish insult; that they should have liberty to exercise their religion; that Christians and Mahometans should be equal before the law; that the excesses of the police should be restrained; that the taxes should be justly and seasonably levied. The Mahometans thought these demands exorbitant, and endeavoured to browbeat the Christians into some abatement of them, but in vain; and when Dervish Pasha, Governor of Bosnia, came to add his wisdom to the Council, the people demanded further the long-promised freedom from forced labour without payment. The Pasha promised to do his utmost to obtain for them their rights if they would lay down their arms, but they said that could only be if they and their Mussulman neighbours were meanwhile separated. The Pasha retired to Bosna Serai (or Serayevo), his capital, and the Christians fled with their families and goods to the mountains. The Mussulmans broke into the Government store, and armed themselves with breechloaders; the neighbouring districts still holding themselves quietly in readiness. On the 1st of July some Christians who had been driven from their rough mountain refuges by illness were killed at Nevesinje by the armed Mussulmans; the Christians revenged themselves, and then seized on a band of frontier guards escorting provisions. The small engagements were repeated, and in one of them a body of Turkish troops took part. This precipitated a general rising, because the people felt sure that the Porte would now consider them as rebellious against its authority rather than as discontented because its authority did not suffice to guarantee them security of life and property. They applied for help to Montenegro, but were told that it could not be afforded. The truth is that Montenegro cannot venture to help Herzegovina again as she did in 1862-3, unless she is sure that the stronger state of Free Servia will also take the field, and that the rising is more general than has fre-

quently proved to be the case of late years. Discontents and small rebellions are almost perennial, and have never yet been sufficiently carefully prepared to be successful.

The Mussulman inhabitants of the towns began to be alarmed when all the Herzegovina was in tumult, except one little district round Trebinje on the Montenegrin frontier, and set guards to prevent communication along the Austrian frontier. But the insurgents were not united; no leader had yet appeared among them; and an "advanced radical" agent of a Servian republican society who aspired to the leadership met with only scant courtesy from the native chiefs. The Roman Catholic districts, which had risen in obedience to the Franciscan monks domiciled among them, were persuaded to lay down their arms; the Government having been convinced of the power of the clergy, who here, as elsewhere, were anxious rather to maintain their own authority in obedience to Rome than to help forward any movement for the good of their people. Their quiescence divides Herzegovina along the course of the river Narenta into disturbed and pacified districts, the turbulent and larger portion being that towards Montenegro. Towards the end of the month of July it appeared that a Greek Church official was unwilling to allow his people to join the insurgents, and asked the Government for soldiers to help him; but the Mussulmans said that for them and Christians to fight, fall, and possibly be buried together, was an intolerable thing, and so the Christians of that district swelled the numbers of the insurgent army. This was a great blunder on the part of the Turks, as the Archimandrite had wide-spread influence, and his adhesion cemented the Christian forces into a union they would have failed to attain without him.

Help in the shape of ammunition and guns has been sent privately from Montenegro, and some four or five hundred men have come thence to volunteer in the Herzegovinian army, which has, at last, apparently found a head in Lazar Sochicha. But Montenegro has complied with the requirements of international law, and has given the Porte no pretext for the execution of its threat to invade the mountain principality, although it must be obvious to all spectators that a successful attack there would be the quickest way for the Porte to control Herzegovina. But Turkey is in no position to pursue vigorously

any object which requires money or good organisation, and in her times of greatest strength the Montenegrins have ever proved unconquerable foes to her.

America is said to have offered her cannon on credit, and France has negociated a loan which will suffice to provide the army with the arms yet wanting to them. Garibaldi has promised help to the Herzegovinians in the spring, and as the Turkish troops want long arrears of pay, and the barest necessaries of food and clothing, and are not accustomed to the rigour of a Herzegovinian winter, it is not improbable that in the early months of this year another Christian Slav province of Turkey will have freed itself from the terrible yoke of the Turk, and be either independent or joined to Servia or Montenegro.

It is true that the Porte has once more reiterated the empty promises with which its Christian subjects have been always familiar since, more than four centuries ago, they first were drowned in the flood of Mahometanism, and which have been thrown like dust in the eyes of Europe especially since 1857. But these "reforms" can come to nothing—they will always be like empty words. The idea of erecting Herzegovina into a separate province when the Sultan dares not put any but a Mahometan or a base and corrupt so-called Christian into any of the responsible offices of State there is quite nugatory. He dares not, because whatever pressure may be brought to bear upon the central government by financial distress and the public opinion of Europe is unfelt by the Mahometans throughout the Empire, who cling with furious determination to every privilege and power conferred on them in former times by a religion which treats all but Mahometans as the enemies of God and man, fit only for slavery and abuse.

At the same time, although theoretically it may be said —and it often has been said—that Turkey is peopled by Christians under the heel of Mahometans, it must be clearly remembered that that is by no means the whole of the truth. The truth is more nearly told by an author who says that all the evils which afflicted France before the Revolution must be doubled, and then aggravated by the bickerings and jealousies of Jews, Mahometans, Roman Catholics, members of the Greek Church, and renegades for lucre or safety, embittered as those bickerings and jealousies must be under such circumstances of intense

suffering,—all this must be imagined before any idea is reached of the condition of the inhabitants of some of the richest and fairest countries in Europe.

Once, in the fourteenth century, these provinces were the great Servian Empire, long united in fact by their common descent and common language, and still more by the common faith and by the precious possession of a Bible in the vulgar tongue which is even now intelligible to all the Slavonian populations in Turkey, Free Servia, and Montenegro, Austria, Russia, and Poland. One of the first printing presses was set up by a Montenegrin noble, who was made by Charles V. a Baron of the Holy Roman Empire for this good work, and who devoted it chiefly to the printing of the Bible and books of devotion. The traveller through those lands can take no more welcome gift in his hand than either the old Slavonic version or that more recently prepared by the American missionaries and distributed by colporteurs of the Bible Society under their superintendence.

The time of union under an emperor was short, for the first who held that name was also the last. The present Principality of Servia, Montenegro, Bosnia, Herzegovina, Croatia, Dalmatia, Bulgaria, Albania, Epirus, all the countries from the Adriatic to the Black Sea, acknowledged the headship of Dushan (A.D. 1333—1356), who codified their laws—like the Slavonian Emperor of Rome, Justinian—giving supreme legal authority to a national assembly, providing for incorrupt administration of justice, recognising the institution of trial by jury, regulating the heredicity of property, and equable taxation, and insisting on the necessity of free trade as indispensable for the material progress of the people. Unhappily ambition and the weakness of the Greek empire tempted Dushan to turn longing eyes on Constantinople and the Empire of the East. The Greek Emperor invited the Osmanli Turks to cross the Bosphorus and help him against probable attack. Just at that moment Dushan died, and the governors of the twelve provinces of the Servian Empire, though for a time they held together against the Turks under the leadership of Lazar, whom they elected to prevent the spread of dissensions among themselves, were without any sufficient connecting links to hold them together after Lazar was killed, and the Servian power was destroyed, at Kossova in 1389.

The genius of the Servs was such as to favour their separation into such portions as were easily conquered and absorbed by the Turks, who were firmly established on the Danube for some half century before the fall of Constantinople avenged on the Greek Empire its base introduction of savage allies to help it against its neighbours of like faith and related race. The Slavonian system of government had its root in the Sadrooga, or village community, which still flourishes as much as anything can flourish under Turkish rule among the Slavonian populations, and has been of priceless value to a people who, without some such tie to bind men together in country districts, to secure a home for the defenceless widow and orphan, and to preserve family order amidst State disorder, could scarcely have continued to hold apart and keep alive the burning memory of former freedom and greatness. It has been round the hearth of the village-family, numbering members often of five and six generations, that the history of the nation and the exploits of the national heroes, common to all the divided provinces and dear to Christian and to renegade Slav Mahometan alike, have been sung to the monotonous gusla and woven into the very being of each Slav from infancy. And it has been by the influence of the patient elders of the family that the hot indignation of the strong members has been restrained from time to time and reserved to take the best moment for hastening the dawn of better days for the nation.

As of one nation it is still necessary to speak of these people. For though we speak commonly of them as Bosnian, or Servian, or what not, they themselves feel that they are brethren, and do not perhaps sufficiently recognise that their quiet, patient, industrious, somewhat self-absorbed nature is not necessarily fitted to hold together under one head. It may be that they may learn that some form of Federation suits them best. One thing seems quite certain,—that though Austria or Russia may plan to absorb fresh Slavonian populations, and may therefore offer aid secretly or openly to insurgent provinces to get rid of the Turk, the Slavs themselves have a very definite idea that they are made, not to be governed, but to govern themselves, and would rise against fresh masters with all the more courage and persistence because they had already freed themselves from the more hopeless and long endured tyranny. They point with pride and look with the longing

rivalry of affection to the steady self-respect and patience of Free Servia and Montenegro, and aver freely that what Slavs have done already Slavs will do again. They remember that the heroes of Slavs have been not so much warriors as lawgivers and educators.

Austria has within her borders a considerable Slav population in Croatia, Dalmatia, Istria, Hungary, and Slavonia, and owes much to their support in the troublous times of 1848. At the time of the triumph of Madgiar statesmen and the establishment of dualism in the empire-kingdom, the interests of these Slav populations had to give way to the Madgiar influence, and it is a serious matter for Austria to see a Slav insurrection on her Turkish border just at the moment when matters are going, to say the least, not smoothly in her dual and divisible government. But her Slav populations, though they do not possess all the rights which Englishmen conceive to be necessaries of life, are chiefly Roman Catholics living under a government of the same religion and not without constitutional institutions. Their active sympathies with their kinsfolk in insurrection cannot be either quelled sufficiently to prevent their sheltering the crowds of hungry and naked women, children, and old men who fly across the borders of Herzegovina, nor does the Austrian Government fail to help the poor Montenegrin Government to feed those fugitives who are crowding into the little principality. There, Christian and Mahometan sufferers from the war are alike hospitably received, in numbers which sorely tax the resources of the country, and Austria gives about twopence-halfpenny a head per day towards feeding them. In some villages there are three or four times as many refugees as inhabitants, and, as the country might itself be attacked at any moment, help is much needed to save human life. Large numbers of the refugees are without clothing in the bitter winter weather in the mountains, having come from warm sunny plains, and are compelled to crouch together on the bare rocks without shelter and without clothing or sufficient food. The committees formed in London and in Austria for helping in this strait hope to rouse as much sympathy in England for these sufferers, who have none to help, as for the far less pitiable victims of the floods in wealthy France. It may well be kept in mind, too, that, although Turkey is not able to pay her creditors their dividends in full, it has been the strain to collect taxes to pay the half of the

coupons due in January that has produced perhaps greater misery throughout Turkey than ever was known. In Asia Minor,—whatever similar atrocities may have been committed in the European provinces,—where the agricultural and grazier population habitually pays sixty-two per cent. of profits in taxes, where droughts have killed off the flocks, and famine and pestilence halved the population, the taxes for these dividends have been gathered by taking from the people the food distributed by the relief committees and by compelling them to shear their few remaining miserable sheep in the middle of winter. Those who are free from the grief of having helped, by means of the Turkish Loan, to prop up such a Government as this, may also feel free to help the poor and needy driven by it from home and kindred in Herzegovina.

It is not, then, of the Slavs of Austria nor of the Slavs in Russia that there is question now, but of the Slav populations in Turkey who are in overwhelming majority Christian, belonging either to the Roman Catholic or to the Greek Church, the latter preponderating considerably.

And first as to those yet hidden from Western Europe under the name of Turkey. They are the Herzegovinians, the Bosnians, the Bulgarians, the Albanians, and some Greeks. Roumania and Wallachia, though nominally under the suzerainty of the Porte, are so entirely distinct from the Empire and from its struggling Christian populations that they may be left out of account.

The limits of Bulgaria and Albania, as now variously marked on the maps, by no means represent the confines of the districts inhabited by those populations, it having been the policy of the Turk to confuse national boundaries and destroy national associations and traditions as much as possible.

The Albanians, commonly called Arnaouts in Turkey, were hill tribes more or less bound up with the Servs in the time of Servian prosperity, and of allied race, who came down from the mountains, after the fall of that Power, to people the plains left desolate by fugitive Slavs. They were Roman Catholics, and the Turkish Government was willing to grant to them—as to others of that Church—privileges in the exercise of their religion which seemed unimportant because comparatively few in number. Those who remained in the mountains retained their religion; but those who settled in the plains sought

favour with the Sultan and gained permission to domineer over other Christians by professing Mahometanism. Among the apostate chieftains was the father of Scanderbeg, who gave his son to be educated by the Sultan. The son renounced the Mahometan faith and joined the standard of John Hunniades in Hungary and fought the Turks. After a long struggle at the head of Albanian warriors he succeeded in making himself independent; but his adherents were not strong enough to maintain the dignity of their religion or their nationality, and soon after his death no result of his efforts was left but a fame more widely spread than that of any other leader of the Christians in Turkey.

The descendants of so fickle and unprincipled a people, with the accumulated vices of an apostate race, are become a byword in the neighbouring countries. These are the inhabitants of the northern plains of Albania, and are to be numbered among the Christian populations only because they are near kinsfolk to the Roman Catholic tribes who live a very free and independent life in the mountains whither the Turkish authorities dare not follow them, and because there is a tendency among them to revert to the ancient faith sufficiently marked to make it an open question whether they would not join and materially help, while they morally embarrassed, any widespread rising of Christians in Turkey. Their hatred to the Turk is bitter, while they retain traces of sympathy with Servs even though they do not scruple to oppress them with a lawlessness almost unknown to any other Mussulman official,—if there are shades in that blackness. The southern Albanians have more in common with the Greeks, but are also professedly Mahometan. Both have done as much fighting for as against the Turks, and were, long ago, before their apostasy, the only Christians in the Turkish armies in the East. It may be well, *à propos* of the Albanians, to suggest, in few words, the two sides of the question of the Christians in Turkey in relation to the army. Favourers of Turkey remark upon the privilege enjoyed by Christians of immunity from military service, while the Turks and Mahometan populations have to furnish a certain contingent although they dislike military life. The Mahometans are represented as justly jealous of their Christian fellow-countrymen on this point. But the other side of the question is this: that, although military reclamations fall heavily upon the Mussulmans, the privilege of going about armed is one which would be gladly

purchased by the Christian population at the same price, while the Mussulmans are free from the heavy tax paid by all Christian males above three months old for exemption from military service, a tax which often serves as an excuse for extortion. The Sultan has now announced that Christians will be enrolled in the army, but unless it be in in separate regiments this promise cannot be fulfilled, since the daily life and habits and morals of Christians and Mahometans are irreconcilable. Perhaps the most cogent proof that Slavonian Christians and Mahometans can never peaceably share one country, is the fact that the former are without blame and irreproachable in the matter of chastity, while the Mussulman, and especially the Turk, allows and practises unbridled licence. Among the former women are intelligent, respected, and free, and among the latter are the degraded instruments of loathsome vice. Such light and such darkness cannot dwell together.

The Bulgarians come more completely than the Albanians under the description of Christians in Turkey. Originally brethren of the Servs, with whom they have in common a language which is harsh and rude in their mouths, and soft in the districts nearer to Italian influences, but which is easily mutually intelligible, and otherwise identical, *as far as vocabulary is concerned*, their period of prominence came earlier, but they fell at about the same time before the Turkish arms. They were only gradually subjugated, and were able to make good terms for themselves, as indeed most peoples could, the tyranny of the Turk having everywhere grown more and more grinding as lapse of time made him feel more at home, and privileged in his oppression. At first the Bulgarians preserved their autonomy, both in state and church, paying tribute to the Sultan; but some chieftains apostatised so as to share in the power which they found Mussulmans in neighbouring countries arrogated to themselves; some were driven into exile, some were disposed of, and the great blow to Bulgarian independence was dealt just a century ago, when the Sultan imposed upon the people a set of bishops belonging to the corrupt patriarchate of Constantinople, creatures of the Turkish government, who buy their sees and recoup themselves at the expense of their flocks. The story is the same for all the Greek Church communities under the power of the Porte. The Chris-

tians suffer as much from the religious superiors imposed upon them against their will as they do from the civil governors and their subordinates. But the subjection of the Bulgarians had not lasted long enough to deprive them of all courage when the resurrection of Greece, of the Moldo-Wallachian provinces, and of Free Servia, gave them spirit to bestir themselves. Early in this century a movement began among them for better education, and now the whole province possesses a most respectable number of schools for both boys and girls, in which the ancient Cyrillic alphabet, the old Bulgarian language, and the early version of the Bible, are carefully taught in order to help forward free intercourse with the neighbouring Servs. The policy of the Porte has been to harass the people by forced immigrations from wilder portions of the empire; but they have steadily held on their way, cultivating the marvellously fertile plains which fall to their lot, and which would make them wealthy under a good government, and with access to European markets. They grow cotton, silk, and corn, in what would be abundance but for oppressive taxation, and leave the Mussulmans to people the towns. In the towns, however, many shopkeepers are Christians, and the taxes are arranged so as to fall most heavily on the trades and industries usually engaged in by them, and not by Mahometans.

Within the last few years the Bulgarians have succeeded in insisting on the fulfilment of a clause in the Hattisherif of 1857, which promised the restoration of their ancient ecclesiastical privileges, and this is a great step towards regaining their civil freedom.

The Mahometan population of Bulgaria has diminished, partly because they are subject to military service, partly because the introduction of steam has well-nigh destroyed some of the industries practised in Bulgaria, such as silk-weaving. The result is that the Mahometans are poorer than even the Christians, only they are still in a position to bully and rob their wealthier neighbours with impunity. The taxes are now raised partially from the Mahometan population, and they resent the injury, and revenge themselves on the Christians, murdering them or taking their lands from them without fear of consequences. For all the professions of mixed tribunals, and the reception of the evidence of a Christian in the courts of law, nay even the device of peripatetic commissioners to see that these

provisions are carried out, have been tried and found utterly wanting. It is a point of faith with every Mahometan throughout Turkey, that every Christian is his appropriate victim, and the only Christians who obtain justice, or unjust sentences in their favour, are those who are wealthy and unscrupulous enough to buy the judge and not to be afraid of thus exposing their well-being to possible risks. Of such Christians there are many throughout Turkey, as must needs be after centuries of association with Mahometan morals, and of grinding misery. These Christians are those who dare complain and seek the help of Consuls against Turkish courts and officials, and it is they, too, who dare accept the empty dignity of place in the mixed courts. The natural result is that the representatives of foreign Powers, who are often men of business, with little time and attention to spare for those who do not obtrude themselves on their notice, send to Western Europe such pictures of the Turkish Christian as are enough to make anyone question whether such people are not better left to be ground out of existence. A more hopeful, and probably a truer idea is commonly given by those who either travel leisurely, or work among the outlying populations away from the corrupted towns. A whisper of hope and interest is passing now through Bulgaria, but it is not known that any preparation for revolt is being seriously made. There is a prevalent feeling among the Christians in Turkey, that the populations nearest Montenegro must decisively lead the way, for they can get help; while those bordering on Free Servia cannot reckon on the active sympathy of that Government. These down-trodden folk, whose whole thoughts are concentrated on the hope of successful fighting, are scarcely in a position to appreciate the service done to the race by a Power which by assiduous efforts to train its subjects in the self-restraint and industrious gradual progress of a constitutionally governed country, is preparing them to be the fit centre of a Servian federation, or kingdom,—a place pointed out for her by her geographical situation, her stedfast Christianity, and her political experience, combined, and a place more than generously conceded to her by warlike Montenegro. An understanding, if not an actual treaty, exists between the two Governments that Montenegro will be well content to fight for and with Servia, and then yield to her the resultant crown, for they are not

rival nations, but two brethren helping the rest of the family, and anxious only to do the best for all, without selfish ambition.

Herzegovina and Bosnia have commonly been spoken of together, and they have, as a matter of fact, been under one Turkish governor. The Sultan has now appointed a separate governor for Herzegovina, saying that the differences in the constituents of the populations of the two districts render this desirable, there being a larger proportion of Mussulmans to Christians in Bosnia than in Herzegovina. This is said to make it impossible for the Sultan to grant to Bosnians all the reforms possible for Herzegovina. But since Bosnia and Herzegovina have repeatedly demanded those reforms which were promised by the Hattisherif of 1857 to all the provinces of the Turkish empire alike, it is not easy to see what difference need now be made between these two provinces, one of which is in open organised revolt, while the other is as yet only waiting its opportunity. One great difference, however, there really is, arising chiefly from the greater number of Roman Catholics in Bosnia, who are inclined to direct their efforts towards the end of being absorbed into the Catholic empire of Austria. Herzegovina looks to the heads of her own race.

Herzegovina differed from other branches of the Slavs at the downfall of the Servian empire, inasmuch as it secured to itself, for a long time, rights of popular self-government, its population feeding cattle on the mountains, as far as possible from the towns where the Turks, here as elsewhere, kept each other in countenance. The Sultans, from time to time, confirmed their privileges, and even so late as ten years ago, a native chief was violently superseded in his post of authority by a Mussulman governor. Repeated efforts to destroy the bonds between the people of the province and their old and long-acknowledged native leaders, together with the rapacity of Turkish settlers, tax-gatherers, and officials have caused the reiterated insurrections which have earned for these populations a character for turbulence which the Western nations have been unable to conceive that a government could for so long be bad enough to justify. The typical stories told in the opening paragraphs of this paper show them to be the convulsions necessarily precedent to freedom.

The Bosnian nobles hold an ignobly prominent position

in the miserable story of Turkish acquisition in Europe. The common people of the country stood as staunchly to their faith as the rest of their brethren; but by some unhappy chance there was among them a class of privileged nobles who preferred apostasy to the loss of position and property, and who at once, when the struggle against the Turkish arms became finally hopeless, declared themselves Mussulmans, and thus, by the law of the Koran, secured fresh and novel rights to ride roughshod over the peasantry. But these shameless renegades did not at the same time learn to love their conquerors, and thus Bosnia has, within her borders, native Christians, groaning under Greek bishops and Mussulman officials; native Christians strongly attached to the Roman church, and yearning after Austrian rule; native nobility thirsting for the day to come when they may find the use of the carefully-kept title deeds and badges of nobility coming from ancient days; and genuine Osmanli Turks, who wonder, perhaps, that the people whom Allah long ago gave them as slaves and victims should not placidly submit to have their wives and daughters ravished, their goods plundered, and their kinsfolk murdered, by them in obedience to fate. This Bosnian nobility will, in spite of their tyranny, find it easy to rally round them the Slav people when they adopt the Slav cause as against the Turks; but the solution of the popular troubles in Bosnia would not be found were such a revolt to bring them success. A popular leader, even from another province, might attract them to his standard by the claim of kindred, and then many would probably profess themselves adherents of the old creed, and in doing so would have to give up many of the privileges which they now possess, simply in virtue of their Mahometanism, while the ancient bond between the hereditary chiefs and their peasantry would soon be enthusiastically renewed under the Christian banner. Of course their profession of faith would be worthless in most aspects; but it would be something gained for them to be merely called Christians, since that would make intercourse with Western Christianity natural and obvious, and our religious societies would know how to push their opportunities among them, as well as among the peasants, who, even now, amidst their political excitement, are eager purchasers of the books carried round by colporteurs.

And now the survey brings us to the principality of

Servia, which alone has kept the name of Servia in European geography. Other districts, commonly known as parts of Bulgaria and Albania, are known to the Slavs as "Old Servia," but that is not a name recognised by the Sublime Porte. This is the largest Slavonic province engulfed by Turkey, and numbers something like a population of 1,250,000. It is now, after four hundred years of a more utter subjection than any other Turkish province, and then after sixty years of gallant struggle, the free principality of Servia, governed by its hereditary prince, whose peasant ancestor, only two generations ago, headed an insurrection and won the title of Prince and a recognition of his right to reign, by the choice of the nation, from the Sultan.

In the fourteenth century Servia had already produced the ruling dynasty, and had given name to the empire. Some reason for this preponderance over the neighbouring tribes may probably make itself clear to those who learn that a very complete and typical example of the village community system overspread the whole of Servia, covering it with a well-ordered population, among whom no differences of rank existed to tempt the possessors into compromise with the invading Turk. These oppressors came and seized fortresses and towns. The people withdrew into the dense oak forests which clothe the undulating country, holding no converse with the Turks, and visited by them only when either plunder was wanted or gangs of labourers to execute unpaid tasks for the oppressor. Generation after generation here died without ever having seen a town, because the most abject humbling of themselves could not save them from insult and injury at the hands of the Turks, and because it was too bitter to them to see the strongholds of their nation in the hands of enemies from whom it seemed hopeless to try to wrest them. The peasant life was simple. The head of the Sadrooga apportioned the work among the men and women of the family, and the evenings served for the repetition or chanting of Servian poems, either handed down to keep the memory of empire and of heroes green, or newly composed by some of the many singers of the country, to commemorate more recent deeds of valour against the Turk among some neighbouring tribes. The life was simple, disciplined, and organised in a way which gave the people regulated coherence enough to suffer long,

and then, when opportunity came, to prove themselves strong. They did not give up their country without a struggle. The fatal battle of Kossova, now looked back upon as the last final field, did not at the time put an end to their hope and resolution. The young Lazarevitch, successor to Lazar who was killed in that battle, made a treaty with the Sultan by which he was to hold his crown in fief; but at his death the Turks declared it was impious to allow a Christian ruler to possess lands so fair, and a Turkish garrison was sent to assert the direct authority of the Sultan. The Servs allied themselves with Hungary, and Belgrade, the city of seven sieges, was strengthened, and a fortress built at Semendria, a little lower down the Danube. This great mass of grey stone walls, with its twenty-five towers, was built to command the junction of the Morava and the Danube, looking on the Danube in the direction from which the Turkish hosts must always approach it, and there was built through the whole thickness of the wall a red brick cross, which, the more furiously battered, has only shown the brighter in contrast to the gloomy strength of the stone. A fortress strangely typical of Servian, as of all other, persecuted Christianity, it still remains to remind the people by Whose aid and by the help of Whose arm they have now regained the freedom to worship God in Christ. For there can be no doubt that it has been the sobriety and patience of Christian faith, darkened and distorted though it has been, that has been the backbone of the people, and their eagerness now to learn the way of God more perfectly must not be hidden from our eyes by the stories we hear of political struggle and intrigue, nor of social disorder and impurity in Belgrade, whither people of all countries and opinions have flocked, eager to utilise the newly-risen power for their own ends. The heart of the people is sound and steady, and they are guided by a Prince who, though young and inexperienced, has already shown himself patriotic, discreet, and firm,—a true Servian. The Bible Society finds ready sale for its wares, and schools have been multiplied over the country ever since it became fairly safe for children to be away from the immediate protection of warlike households.

The alliance with Hungary would probably have been a permanent one, and the Servians might have had no worse a history than the Slavonian provinces of Austria, had

not Hunniades told the Servian leader that he should require them to acknowledge the supremacy of Rome—of which the Servians had an extreme horror—while the Sultan promised absolute religious toleration and ecclesiastical self-government should they submit to him. The choice seemed easy, and would have been the right one had they had to deal with any but a treacherous Power. They still struggled for civil liberty also, but in 1444 the battle of Varna made the Sultan master of all but Belgrade, which was held against him by the Hungarians till 1522. The confidence of the Servians in the liberality of the Turks was misplaced. Mahometanism alone was tolerated; the Christian churches, monuments of the piety and architectural skill of generations of princes and people, were used as stables; the peasants were heavily taxed for the support of the Spahis or military colonists of the Sultan, and were subjected to continual *corvées;* every fifth year conscription took their most promising boys to be brought up in the Mussulman faith and fight in the Sultan's armies; the land was used almost every year as the route for the Turkish armies in their wars with Western Europe, and neither man, woman, nor child, nor houses, nor goods, were safe.

The fall of Belgrade, which marked the triumph of the Turks over the Hungarians, was the signal for even increased extortion and violence on the part of the Spahis, committed not by virtue of law, but, as it was in the beginning and is now throughout Turkey, because the Turks are utterly lawless and no central authority can ever ensure liberty and justice in the provinces. For a hundred and sixty years thick darkness covered the land; but at the end of the seventeenth century Leopold of Germany attacked the Turks, and the Servians rose to help him, and in 1718 they were ceded, by the Treaty of Passarovitz, to Austria, under whom they had peace for twenty years. They lost no moment of this breathing space, but made roads, restored churches, and did all they could to repair the losses of former times. But the end came, and Austria, too weak to hold the country against the Turks, had to abandon them once more to their old exasperated foes the Spahis. In despair 37,000 families, headed by George Brankovitch, fled to Austrian territory, on a bargain that they were to have a large amount of freedom in self-government both civil and ecclesiastical, and were in return

to guard the Austrian boundaries. The Servs of Austria complain that this bargain was never kept; but with their grievances we have nothing at present to do. They certainly were never in such dismal case as those who remained on the national soil.

As the century grew older, however, the utter subjection of Servia to the Turks brought some good results. The rights of the Spahis were more clearly defined, feudal service was no longer forced from the peasantry, and many fought with willingness, if not with enthusiasm, in the Moslem armies. But the spirit of patriotism was not dead. When a reforming Sultan ascended the throne and resolved to introduce European tactics and discipline among his troops, the Janissaries rebelled, and among the most insubordinate were those who had long exercised authority in Servia. They set the civil representative of the Porte—the Pacha of Belgrade—at defiance, and the order-loving Servians answered to the appeal of the Sultan and drove the rebels from the country. At once all Turkey was in an uproar; the Sultan had employed "dogs of Christians" to defeat true believers. The Janissaries were at once reinstated, and rode roughshod over Servian and Spahi alike. They cried to the Sultan in vain, and the result of this falling out among thieves was that the honest Servians began to come by their rights. Belgrade fell into their hands, they claimed the right to garrison their own fortresses, and other rights, and would have received them in return for a yearly tribute had not the rise of Napoleon's fortunes emboldened his ally the Sultan. The leader of this period was Kara or Black George, a peasant of strong character, ruthless determination, and considerable military experience, able in civil matters too, up to the requirements of the people at that stage. He called together the National Assembly, or Skouptchina, appointed a Senate, and revived the laws of Dushan.

It is needless to follow the varying fortunes of the struggle, which lasted till Kara George and his Senate were forced to fly across the border into Austria, and the Sultan's troops set themselves to pacify the country by impaling the native leaders, throwing infants into boiling water and into cesspools in derision of baptism, and other similar modes. The Sultan then found in Milosch Obrenovitch, a well-known Servian, a mediator between him and the furious people. Terms were arranged, and in 1815 the Treaty of

Bucharest gave to Servia freedom of worship, of commerce, of self-administration, of self-taxation for the Imperial treasury, of garrisoning her towns, and of administering the estates of such Spahis as refused to sell the lands on which in future they were forbidden to live. But Milosch was not proof against the temptations of power. He abused his princely dignity, was driven from the country, and Kara George having been invited to return but having been murdered on the way, Milosch's son Michael was raised to the throne. He was young and untrained, and three years served to show that he could not govern the people. He abdicated, and went to Germany and France to study. The Servians chose as his successor Alexander, son of Kara George; but he also failed to satisfy either the Sultan or the people, and was compelled to abdicate in 1858. Milosch was then invited to return, and ruled about a year and a half with some vigour, organising a national militia almost equivalent to an arming of the entire nation.

On his death his son Michael, now older and wiser, succeeded to a difficulty caused by the remonstrances of the Sultan, Austria, and England, against the new militia. Then he was involved by an immigration of fugitives from Turkish oppression in Bulgaria and Bosnia; but he stood his ground, and succeeded in winning for his government the love of the kindred populations beyond his borders, and a steadily growing respect from the Great Powers. In June 1862 a storm burst over his head which brought him in the end perfect independence, except so far as concerned the retention of two Turkish garrisons in the country, and an acknowledgment of suzerainty and a tribute to the Sultan. This was the treacherous bombardment of the town by the fortress of Belgrade under pretext of a scuffle between a few Turkish soldiers and some youths. The exasperated Servians held themselves in perfect quietness, trusting to Michael's diplomacy and the good feeling of Europe to secure them against the repetition of such an outrage, and their hope was not in vain. Michael continued to develope the resources of the country; churches were rebuilt; schools, primary, and higher, and technical, and colleges and a university were opened; and mines and railways were projected. In 1867 the last Turkish garrison was withdrawn; and now a tribute of £23,000 per annum is the only link between the Porte and the Free Serfs of Servia.

In 1868 Prince Michael, who was struggling to keep the

balance between a somewhat strong Conservative Ministry and the Liberal, if not Radical, demands of his people, was shot down in his garden, as it was subsequently pretty clearly proved, by an agent of the party who wished to bring Alexander Kara Georgevitch back to the throne. His death left a successor who was a minor, but the Ministry vigorously held on in the path of improvement, and were able to give a good account when the present Prince Milan ascended the throne in 1871. He has established a firm hold on the affections of the people, and the internal resources of the country are being rapidly developed. A large army well trained and armed is ready to take the field whenever the united wisdom and prudence of the Government shall let the eager people fly to the assistance of the provinces still under the Turkish yoke. Servia is as yet restrained by the attitude of the Great Powers, and in the meanwhile, whether she is to be called upon for warlike activity or for the aid which a consolidated Government may give to populations weary after victorious struggle, she is making due preparation and will not be found wanting at the right time.

To Montenegro alone belongs the proud boast that it has never been under the dominion of the Turks, has never been inhabited by them, has never agreed to pay tribute to them, but has kept up a perennial struggle with them ever since the fall of the Servian Empire. It is but a little State, and perhaps it owes its independence scarcely more to the hardy vigour of its sons than to the fact that it consists just of a knot of the Balkans, a place where the native saying is that God, in sowing the earth with rocks, dropped the bag. Its bare rocks and severe climate have always been its strong allies against the Turk, and its inhabitants have never so aggregated wealth around them as to be unwilling to burn homes and crops rather than leave them as prey to the invading Turks when there was nothing left for it but flight to the roughest heights. At first, after the battle of Kossova, the chief of the province of Zeuta owned much of Herzegovina, and fought hand in hand with the Albanians. But Scanderbeg's death left him alone, and Ivo the Black retreated to the mountains which now are the whole of Montenegro. Even the sea coast had to be abandoned, though only a rifle-shot from the southern limit of the mountains is Bocche di Cattaro, the finest harbour in Europe, the natural outlet for Slav commerce, for which Slavs have longed and fought for four

centuries, but which still lies, well-nigh unused, before their tantalised eyes.

For a century the fugitives found their mountains a secure retreat, and their bravery and advantageous position made them desirable allies. Venice was not reluctant to give the right hand of fellowship to the highlanders, and many alliances were formed between the nobility of the two States. But such a friendship was not without its drawbacks; for the Venetian brides lured their husbands to the luxury of their own old homes; and finally, in 1516, the Prince of Montenegro left the government in the hands of German Petrovitch, Bishop (of the Greek Church) of Montenegro. In his family it has ever since been hereditary, descending first from uncle to nephew, and only in this century going in the usual order of descent, since, in 1852, Danilo resolved to abolish the law of celibacy as incumbent on the Prince, and married a Viennese lady whose life was one of farsighted benevolence, and who did more than perhaps any other to aid the cause of education throughout Slavonian lands, and to steady the course of Slav policy.

Throughout these centuries the story of Montenegro has been purely that of hard-won victory against the Turks. No instance of truce or treaty with the Turks has occurred without its following of treacherous betrayal. In 1703 Peter the Great thought it worth while to secure Montenegro as his ally, but he too betrayed the principality to its enemies. The Turks came and devastated the country. Venice refused her aid, and paid the penalty of the loss of her provinces from Bosnia to the Isthmus of Corinth, and the struggle ended with a siege of seven years sustained by Montenegro. In the end of last century Russia and Austria began to intrigue against each other for the friendship of the little State, and their rivalry has ever since been a valuable tool in the hands of the rulers of Montenegro. In 1813 Cattaro, which had submitted to Venice, when Ivo retired to the mountains, on the bargain that it was never to be given to any other power, found that Napoleon, as conqueror, had ceded it to Austria. Resenting this, it strove to join the mountaineers, but failed. Prince Daniel had done all he could to help it; and, on seeing that Austria had tightened her grasp on what should have been his seaport, he retired to his little capital of Cetigné, and devoted himself to the improvement of his people. His

successor, Peter II., obtained from European Powers a frontier treaty, which was the first formal recognition of his country by diplomatists. Under him rapid advance was made in the essentials, though not in the external comforts, of civilisation. It will not do to live a less rigorous life till the country is secure from Turkish inroads: but schools were multiplied, roads made, and some barbarous practices in war done away with. The custom of cutting off the heads of dead enemies has not yet been quite given up, because the Turks of the neighbouring lands would misconstrue such humanity as cowardice.

Danilo projected a code of laws, and disregarded all provocations to war with the Sultan till an actual invasion compelled him to take up arms; and the victory of Grahovo, in 1858, secured for him a Commission of the Great Powers to fix the boundaries between Montenegro and Turkey. Some fertile districts were awarded to him, but no seaport; and he was not required to acknowledge the suzerainty of the Porte. In 1859 he was murdered, when at Cattaro for his wife's health, and never was prince more deeply mourned. His people flocked down the precipitous zigzag road to Cattaro to demand vengeance when he lay dying; but his message was that they should go quietly home. It was a long time before gay dress or weapons or festive gatherings appeared in the mountains. His successor was the present reigning Prince Nicholas, who was only 18 years of age; but who has vindicated his fitness for the difficult post by great wisdom and prudence, and by a really ingenious tact in playing Russia, France, and the Porte off against each other when they try in turn to use him as a cat's-paw. He now appears to be waiting until some change in the political horizon shall show that it is time for him to help the rebelling provinces, whom as yet he dares only to help privately, and by receiving their refugees. His people, warriors every one of them, with wives and daughters ready and not unaccustomed to give warlike help at need, are eager for the fray, and it is not an undesirable thing that so simple, earnest, brave a people should extend their boundaries. Under Montenegrin skies education is fostered as in all other Servian communities, all forms of religion are free, and the knowledge of the truth is being spread as might be expected in a country the capital of which contains only a hundred houses,

which found purchasers for thirty-two copies of the Bible at one visit thither of a colporteur.

Whether Montenegro or Servia take temporarily or finally the foremost place, or whether there be formed a federation of the Slavonic populations of Turkey, there is at least, in the struggles of the crushed but resolute people fighting for freedom from gross outrage and the intolerable maladministration of an imbecile government, and for liberty to worship the God of their fathers in public—there is in this struggle a fit subject for the warmest sympathy of English men and women, a sympathy which will find no lack of outlets for its practical expression.

ART. VI. — *Statistics of Protestant Missionary Societies.* 1872—3. London: Printed for Private Circulation by W. NICHOLS, 1874.

THIS work supplies the place of a formal missionary census. Such a census taken periodically seems necessary on account of the present form of missionary organisation. Were the whole under one direction, we might get a view at once of the whole field of labour, the distribution of agencies, the districts occupied and vacant, and the results reaped; but as this is out of the question, and not on all accounts desirable, a census of some kind is the only means by which we can take a survey of all that is being done. It is greatly to be regretted that a census is not taken by the concerted action of the different missionary bodies themselves. Not only would it be done more easily and effectively by those who have access to all the information than by private individuals, but the report would come with greater authority, and be more widely known. The benefit of such a work would be great. At present we read our own Reports, and know the missions of our own Churches, while we know scarcely anything of what is being done by kindred bodies. The necessity of some general uniformity in statistics of returns would begin to be felt. At present it is the absence of this which is the main difficulty in the way of authors of works like the one before us. The principle of division of labour is, in the main, carried out, and it is strange that it should ever be set at nought when the greatness of the field is remembered. But if the facts of the case were better known, and the Churches accustomed to look, not only on their "own things, but also on the things of others," public opinion would enforce the observance of what may be called the international law and comity of Churches. In the absence of any official census, it is greatly to the credit of the Senior Secretary of the Wesleyan Missionary Society that he has twice essayed, with an interval of ten years, to analyse and tabulate the statistics of the Protestant missions of Great Britain, the Continent, and America. When the difficulties to be overcome are borne in mind, such as the number of

Reports to be collected over so wide a field, and the different methods on which returns are made, we can only wonder at the satisfactory results obtained, and the comparatively few omissions. Anyone who wishes, and will take the trouble, may form a judgment about the entire mission-field, which the unavoidable omissions cannot materially affect. As might be expected, it is the work of the American missionary societies of which the returns are least complete. In the first place, the compiler gives us particulars of the incomes of about one hundred and sixty distinct missionary organisations beside Bible and educational societies, and then in forty tables arranged geographically, and preceded by valuable general information respecting the moral condition of the countries under review, details of the Churches at work in the different parts of the world, the number of stations, of ministers, European and native, lay agents, hearers, members, schools, scholars, and expenditure. The figures are for 1872—3; but as the census is not likely to be repeated for some years to come, and the same years are taken for all, the comparison will be fair and trustworthy.

Let us first note some general financial facts. The total amount raised annually in Great Britain, America, and Continental Europe for missionary and kindred purposes is, in round numbers, £2,000,000. Of this considerably more than half comes from Great Britain, England contributing £778,371, Scotland £134,164, and Ireland £52,624. To this must be added, for Jews' Societies, Education, Bible Societies, though a few of the latter are American, £312,184. The chief American missionary societies receive £534,615, different Continental societies in Germany, France, Holland, &c., £129,513. In England it is to be remarked that the missionary incomes of the Established Church and the Nonconformists are about equal, the balance being slightly in favour of the latter, £414,597 against £363,774. It will also be observed that the largest missions belong to England and America. The German contingent is £94,000. This may seem a small sum to come from Germany, the fatherland of Protestantism, and peopled by our brethren in race. We do not know whether any of the difference arises from the religious history of Germany and England. We should be sorry to think that the difference in figures represents a like difference in missionary zeal. Probably the chief explanation

is to be found in the comparative wealth of the two nations.

As it would be impossible within the compass of a brief article to survey minutely the whole breadth of the field, we propose now to glance at a few of the principal districts. The West Indies are one of the oldest mission-grounds, one that has attracted most interest, and excited most hope and anxiety. Many of the Moravian missions date back to the middle, and many of the Wesleyan to the close of the last century. There is no part of the world in which in proportion to numbers education and religion have received so much help from Government, and none in which the friends of Christian missions have taken a deeper or more lasting interest. The total number of Church members returned is 105,000, of whom one-half belong to Jamaica. This cannot be said to be altogether unsatisfactory. The one point which has given great anxiety to all the Churches at work in these beautiful islands is the failure after so many years of labour to develope self-supporting power. The evidences of this are that there are nearly two European ministers to one native, and that the missions still cost £40,000 annually. This, again, indicates weakness in the native Churches. If there had been the right material in the Churches, a native ministry would have sprung up spontaneously. But the fault lies assuredly not in Christianity, or Christian missions, or even in the negro race alone, but ultimately in the negro race and character as weakened and demoralised by centuries of ignorance, neglect, and oppression. A European race, under the same training, would have yielded no better fruit. We must not allow vexation and impatience to master reason and justice. It will take more than one generation to undo the mischief wrought by centuries of wrong. A reasonable judgment of the facts of the case would rather lead us to thankfulness for the good we see. The only way in which a native ministry can be raised is by patiently endeavouring to improve and give tone to the Churches. On this account we regret that the educational returns of the missions in the West Indies are so incomplete. Effective, flourishing schools would afford the best grounds of hope. But from many places no returns are given. The number of scholars reported is 31,398. If the proportion is as good in the islands not reported, the compiler is justified in saying, "The missions in the West

Indies are now in a far healthier state than they have been since emancipation." The following are the returns of the chief missions :—

	Eur. Miss.	Nat. Miss.	Members.	Scholars.	Cost.
London Mission...	10	2	4,524	3,347	£7,221
Moravian	74	15	17,918	4,624	5,561
Baptist	9	61	5,284	...	3,712
Wesleyan	76	27	46,748	15,684	14,525

Crossing to South Africa, we do not find the missions there better off with respect to a native ministry, the number of European ministers being 453, and of native 87. The total number of Church members is 39,901, of scholars 21,464, the expenditure is £90,298. But it is not by these figures that the value of missionary work in South Africa is to be measured. There perhaps, more than anywhere else, is the moral and spiritual destiny of great populations and a great continent being determined, there the seed of future Churches, civilisations, states, literatures is being sown. The future of the great wandering tribes which swarm in the interior is in the hands of the English race and English Christianity of the south. Those tribes are at present without even the rudiments of civilisation, and will receive everything from us. Missionaries in South Africa are, not of choice but necessity, mediators between the strong and the weak, the first explorers, builders, geographers, teachers, writers, and printers the native has seen. They repeat the work which the earliest Christian missionaries did among our barbarous ancestors. A mission establishment there is what the monastery in its best days was to Europe in early ages. We need not add that a Christian family does what the best monk could not do. It is a noble account which is given at pages 139, 140, of the languages first reduced by missionaries to a written form, the grammars and dictionaries composed in Southern and Western Africa. Science and history owe no insignificant debt to these labourers, who receive and look for no recognition from scientific societies at home. Like the West Indian, the South African mission has had its apostles and martyrs, men who in learning and capacity rank with the proudest, in goodness and self-abnegation with the holiest the world has ever known. Livingstone, Moffat and Philip, of the London Mission, are names which would honour any Church or age. Wesleyans will not soon

forget Barnabas Shaw, William Shaw, and Threlfall. The latter have just sent out one of their Missionary Secretaries to inspect the missions, and prepare the way for placing them in a more independent position. The time cannot be far off when the Colonial Churches will assume the responsibility and direction of the work of evangelisation in the interior. We give some of the principal figures:—

	Eur. Miss.	Nat. Miss.	Members.	Scholars.	Cost.
Wealeyan	81	11	11,848	8,864	£17,323
London	27	44	4,969	3,238	8,635
Propagation Society	74	...	5,341	...	10,559
French Miss. Evang.	14	...	2,229	...	4,240
Moravian	32	...	1,872	...	...
Rhenish Society.....	16	...	5,120	3,400	15,000

Off the eastern coast of Africa is Madagascar, where Christianity has made such marvellous progress in our own days, and where to so many native Christians it has been "given in the behalf of Christ, not only to believe on Him, but also to suffer for His sake." The London Mission, honoured to be the instrument of this blessed work, has all the material of a fine Church in 26 European and 50 native ministers, 280,476 hearers, 67,385 members, 24,923 scholars. The cost of the mission is £16,540. We cannot do better than quote our author's succinct account:—

"Christianity was introduced by the missionaries of the London Society, 1819. The King Radama was favourable and the Mission had great success. On the death of Radama, 1828, the Queen, his successor, became a persecutor, and expelled the missionaries in 1835 and 1836; but not before they had furnished the country with the Scriptures in their own tongue. Persecution continued for more than twenty years: more than 10,000 persons suffered various punishments, and many of the converts died for Christ. All this time Christianity was not only preserved, but the number of Christians increased from one to three or four thousand. The persecution ceased on the death of the Queen in 1861. In 1869 Queen Ravolona II. embraced Christianity. The history of the progress of Christianity in Madagascar, as detailed by the Rev. W. Ellis in his work, *The Martyr Church*, and recently by Dr. Mullens in his *Visit to Madagascar*, is a painfully interesting yet cheering episode in the history of Christianity in the nineteenth century. Missions have since been established in Madagascar by the Society of Friends, who co-operate with the London Missionary Society in the maintenance of schools especially; also at the invitation of the London Missionary Society by the Church Mis-

sionary Society at Andovoranto on the east of the island, and at Vohiniar in the extreme north. The Society for the Propagation of the Gospel has established a Mission with three missionaries, not only on the coast, but in the capital Tamatave. A Bishop has been appointed, and as the British Government would not permit his being consecrated by bishops of the English Church (deeming the appointment unnecessary), the consecration was by the Bishops of the Scottish Episcopal Church. The Report of the Society states, in vindication of this step, 'The Society is bound in loyalty to its principles to carry to Madagascar, not merely a declaration of religious opinions, but a living branch of the Church of Christ, in which, from the Apostles' time, there have been three orders of ministers, bishops, priests, and deacons.'"

"A living branch!" If the evidence is in "much fruit," could there be better evidence than is furnished in the above figures? On the proceeding our author observes, "Entertaining such views, and looking forward to a time when, through the increase of episcopalian ministers, the want of a bishop would be felt, we cannot be surprised, though we may regret the action of the Propagation Society." Passing over the ambiguous wording of the regret, we cannot but be surprised at its extreme mildness. Our only regret is for a society which, rendering excellent service in other fields, in this has needlessly forgotten the claims of Christian charity and courtesy.

In Western Africa, again, the all-important question is that of a native ministry, and here the necessity is emphasised by the deadliness of the climate. When we are told that "in the first twelve years of the Church of England Mission in Sierra Leone thirty Europeans died," that the Wesleyan burial-ground contains the graves of above forty missionaries and their wives, that between 1827 and 1842 the Bible Society lost ten out of seventeen missionaries in one year, and two in the next three years, and three others became confirmed invalids, we must see the futility of hoping, if ever any one did hope, to evangelise Africa by European agents. Making all allowance for individual imprudence, and the sanitary neglect of which our author does not speak too strongly, we must believe that the climate is fatal to European constitutions. Christianity has made good its base on the coast. The coast missions employ 118 European and 115 native ministers, contain 23,945 members and 12,678 scholars, and cost £62,865. From the coast it must advance into

the interior. The numerous tribes present a fine field of labour. The only religion is one of violence and blood. War and slavery are rampant. One thing is certain that if Christianity does not lay hold of them, Mohammedanism will. Already it has made startling advance. We should agree with Mr. Boyce when he says, "In some respects pure Mohammedan theism would be an advance upon African fetishism, and the cruel superstitions prevalent in most of the African kingdoms; but while adopting the religion of Islam, the negro races retain their superstitions, and are not intellectually or morally benefited by the change. At present all the advantages of position and prestige are with the Mohammedan teachers, who have been pushing south and west for nearly a hundred years: they are already in possession of Africa north of the Kong Mountains: they carry their religion with their trade, and their doctrines demand no extraordinary sacrifice on the part of the negro convert. He can retain his polygamy, his concubines, and his slaves." Travellers, like Burton and Reade, speak of Mohammedanism as suited to the African races, and prefer its simple theism and polygamy to the doctrines and strict morality of Christ: but their views need no refutation from us.

The Church Mission has set an admirable example in putting a negro Bishop at the head of its operations. This is an example which other Churches will do well to follow as they are able. Of course most depends on the missionaries on the spot. They can do much by sympathy, encouragement, and training to develope native intelligence and enterprise. Most missionaries are fully alive to the importance of the matter, and see the wisdom of making the best of actual material instead of waiting till the Millennium brings material in every way to their mind. But unfortunately there are some of another spirit, and the hindrance they may be is indescribable. At first some risk must be run, some mistakes borne with, some patience exercised; but unless all that we hear on platforms of negro capacity is a mistake, there must be in our native Churches the means for gradually opening out ways into the interior. In the late military expedition a distinguished officer, Captain Glover, bears witness to the effect of Christianity. "Two companies of Christians, one of Akropong and the other of Christiansburgh, numbering about 100 each, under two captains, accompanied by Bible readers of

the Basle Mission, attended a morning and evening service daily, a bell ringing them regularly to prayers. In action with the enemy at Adidume on Christmas-day, they were in the advance, and behaved admirably, since which they have garrisoned the depôt of Blappah. Their conduct has been orderly and soldier-like, and they have proved themselves the only reliable men of the large native force lately assembled on the Volta."

In the Wesleyan Mission one of the most hopeful signs of late is the High School, established by the son of a worthy native minister, who received his training at Westminster. A cheering account of its progress is contained in last year's Report. We subjoin some figures relating to West Africa:—

	Eur. Miss.	Nat. Miss.	Members.	Scholars.	Cost.
Church	12	15	2,944	2,576	£17,230
Wesleyan	7	15	8,178	4,200	6,170
Basle.....	32	...	...	960	9,680
Unit. Presb.....	6	1	140	...	3,361

Passing on to China, we find there a total of 196 European and 28 native ministers, 8,869 members, 3,866 scholars, and a yearly expenditure of £117,414. The following are the chief agencies in the field:—

	Eur. Miss.	Nat. Miss.	Members.	Scholars.	Cost.
Church Miss. Society	14	2	523	188	£14,961
London „ „ ...	18	6	1,701	427	11,820
Eng. Presb.	13	...	1,632	12	8,207
China Inland Miss...	22	...	224	...	4,000
Amer. Board	19	...	238	...	13,000
Amer. Presb.	21	13	917	495	20,450
Amer. Meth. Epis....	17	...	1,061	148	13,500

We confess we often wonder what are the attractions of the Chinese Mission, with difficulties so formidable and encouragement so scant to so many of the finest spirits of the Church. Who can help sometimes feeling, however wrong it must be, that William Burns threw his splendid ardour away, like a high-bred steed rushing on a line of steel? The London Mission has had in China men as grand as ever set foot on mission soil. Morrison, Milne, Medhurst, and Legge are only the choicest of many choice spirits whom China has drawn with resistless force. Their literary work alone has brought them imperishable renown. We are glad to learn that the cheapness of paper and print-

ing in China is such that a Bible can be sold for tenpence, and a New Testament for fourpence. These and all other advantages which our Chinese brethren enjoy are not too many. The above table tells its own story. The saddening feature is the smallness of the mission-schools, showing that so few of the youth of China are under Christian influence. This is the grand disadvantage of Chinese missions as compared with Indian.

We are informed that Roman Catholics reckon 400,000 converts, with 12 bishops, 80 foreign missionaries, and 90 priests. They have four seminaries for training native priests. They are found in every province of China, while Protestant missions are found in nine out of eighteen provinces. We have no wish to question or carp at these facts. Our sympathies go thoroughly with Mr. Boyce when he says, "Our disapproval of the Romanist type of Christianity must not interfere to lessen our admiration of the zeal, perseverance, self-denial, and sufferings even unto death of many of these devoted men. The lesson to us Protestants, who enjoy the fuller and purer light of the Gospel is, 'Go and do likewise,' following them so far as they followed Christ. Protestant missionaries have some things to learn from their Romish predecessors in this field; some things to do, as well as many things to leave undone." We find an adequate explanation of the difference in numbers of converts in the 280 years of labour on the part of the Roman Church, the favour which it has received from the Government, and the lower standard of Christian attainment which it has required. The Rev. A. Williamson, agent of the Scotch National Bible Society, in his two excellent volumes of travels, says much that is good on this subject. We quote a sentence or two. "We look upon the work of the Romanist missionaries as an element of good in China. With all their paraphernalia, there is reason to believe that they teach the great cardinal truths of our common faith, and not unfrequently have I been rejoiced to find Christ and His Atonement set forth as the great basis of a sinner's hope. In many aspects they are preparing the way for a purer form of our religion, and no doubt their work will all be utilised and absorbed in the march of Christian progress."

The China Inland Mission is following a different course from that of the older societies. Its chosen agents are to be men of less culture and gifts, trusting to faith, piety,

and natural ability as means. Certainly this plan would not commend itself at first sight as the most likely to succeed among a cultivated people like the Chinese: but in so vast a field there must be work for all kinds of talent.

We can only mention that Japan is opening its doors to the Gospel as well as to Western art, and that the Indian Archipelago is fitly occupied by Dutch missions, save that the Propagation Society has a mission in Borneo.

We next approach the Indian mission-field, for which far more is done than for any other part of the world. This may be estimated from the fact that in 1872-3 £356,600 was spent in India and Ceylon by all the societies, *i.e.* twice the present income of the Wesleyan Missions, or one-third as much as is raised in Great Britain for missions. The Church Missionary Society spent on India and Ceylon more than half its income, the Propagation Society one-sixth, the London Society about one-fourth, the Baptist and Scotch Free Church more than one-third, the Wesleyan rather less than one-ninth. It should be stated that the Church Missionary Society professes to care specially for Africa and the East. Other statistics are 611 European and 525 native ministers, 64,915 members, 130,600 scholars. From other sources we learn the progress made in India, Burmah, and Ceylon, between 1852 and 1872:—

	Communicants.	Converts.
1852.....	22,400	128,000
1862.....	49,688	213,182
1872.....	78,494	318,363

We give the chief figures in 1872-3 for India and Ceylon:—

	Eur. Miss.	Nat. Miss.	Members.	Scholars.	Cost.
Church Miss. Society	126	89	14,402	41,003	£89,501
London „ „	43	26	3,698	12,139	30,713
Amer. Meth. Epis....	18	6	865	6,392	24,760
Propag. Society.....	45	35	8,491	11,622	22,972
Scotch Free Church	16	10	720	7,848	22,781
Baptist	43	63	3,480	4,215	19,331
Wesleyan	30	45	2,976	12,617	17,492
Church of Scotland.	7	8	383	4,244	12,968
Unit. Presb.	15	...	75	2,588	10,610
Gossner's Mission...	17	2	6,000	...	6,335
Beale	59	65	2,284	2,210	22,285

Several points need to be borne in mind in estimating the above figures. The Indian mission of the American Methodist Episcopal Church is only young. The Scotch missions have mainly devoted themselves to education, especially to education of Hindu youth in English, work which will most powerfully influence the mind of India, but the fruits of which are not seen in a great number of converts. We cannot help thinking also that the stricter test, or otherwise, adopted by different Churches makes a difference in the returns. Thus only is it possible to explain how in South India the Church Missionary Society, in a baptised constituency of 56,663, reckons 10,550 members or communicants, while the London Mission reckons only 3,391 in a constituency of 36,766.

One feature we would point out which is common to all the returns from the mission-field—the remarkable uniformity of the results reported. An inspection of the table given above will evince this. The apparent exception is in the Church and London Missions. But the numbers quoted belong mainly to the adjacent provinces of Tinnevelly and Travancore in Southern India, where these societies have been so successful among the tribe of Shanârs, who really lie outside the pale of Brahmanical Hinduism. Thus they are no exception to the fact pointed out. Enemies would call it uniformity of failure. Without staying to explain, the coincidence in the results brought together from independent bodies everywhere is at least conclusive evidence of the truth and accuracy of missionary facts and figures.

The two features which constitute the strength of Indian missions and which contrast so strongly with China are the native ministry and missionary education. It will be observed that the number of native ministers nearly equals that of European. Probably there is a connection between the school and the native pastorate. The place which education has always held among Indian missionary agencies partly explains the advanced position of the native ministry. The statistics of mission-schools fill two pages of the volume before us. First come 349 Anglo-vernacular schools, in which in 1871 (and the number has greatly increased since) 42,919 youths were studying English. In these schools Christianity reaches the higher classes, who are not reached in any other way. The character of the education given is indicated in the fact that

"between 1862 and 1872, 1,621 students matriculated in one or other of the three Indian Universities (which, like London University, are examining boards); 513 passed the first Arts Examination, 154 B.A., 18 M.A., and 6 B.L." 1,900 vernacular schools with 62,200 scholars reach a lower social grade. Female education is purely the fruit of missionary zeal. Ancient usage and prejudice forbad a woman to read or write. In 1871 there were 664 girls' schools with above 28,000 pupils. These are all exclusive of similar Government institutions, as large, probably larger, in which the teaching, though not religious, is fatal to Hindu faith. Altogether above 11,000 Hindu youth are learning English, and as this has been going on many years the number of Hindus who speak and read English, who have access to English literature, and are permeated by its spirit, is very large. The press is also a powerful mission-agent. In the same decade twenty-five mission presses issued 3,410 new works in thirty languages, more than two million school-books, and nearly nine million Christian books and tracts. The Christian Vernacular Education Society confines itself to work in this way. It has fifty depôts and fifty colporteurs scattered all over India, and has exercised a healthy, stimulating influence on literature. We dare not omit the noble work done for India by the British and Foreign Bible Society, as well as the Religious Tract Society. Without the Bible Society Indian missions would be without right hand and right eye at once. Highly successful missions have lately been established among the wild, aboriginal hill races, especially by German societies.

The amount of labour is great, but not disproportionate to the immense population of India. The census of 1872 gives 237,552,958 as the population, of whom 190,000,000 are under British rule, the rest under dependent native rule. The religious census gives 170,000,000 Brahmanical Hindus, native tribes 17,000,000, Mohammedans 40,000,000, Parsees 150,000, Jews 10,000. The English-born population is 64,000, Eurasians, half-castes, 90,000. The population of the natives tates is 46,000,000, revenue £6,000,000. The British revenue is above £50,000,000.

Our author well sums up the hindrances and auxiliaries to Indian missions. Among the first are, the absence of a national preparation for Christianity, such as the Apostles enjoyed, the compact, organised character of Hinduism, the terrible power of caste, the spread of in-

fidelity among the educated Hindus. The second are easily conceived.

No doubt it is the presence of the British Government which has concentrated so much Christian interest on India, and this Government again, in a thousand ways, is a powerful auxiliary of Christianity. Not more surely are railways and roads transforming the material condition of the country than are numberless intellectual and social forces transforming its moral condition. In national convulsions like the English Rebellion and French Revolution historians dwell on the final catastrophe: but what discussions and collisions, what minor revolutions, prepared the way for this! In nature all that we see is the storm or earthquake; but of what a long series of silent, invisible changes is this the manifestation. To those who have eyes to see, India is the scene of such a preparatory work on the largest scale. Before our eyes is passing away a form of faith and civilisation more ancient, more curious, more wonderful in its history than anything which Greece and Rome knew. The witnesses to the reality of this work are such as Lord Lawrence, Sir B. Frere, and others who know India almost as well as they. The fruit is now appearing of the seed sown by the goodly fellowship of Indian missionaries, who count in their number such names as Carey, Schwartz, Wilson, Duff, Ragland, Caldwell, Cryer.

From India to Polynesia is a great distance geographically, a still greater morally. The Brahman, who never touches animal food, and the cannibal Polynesian are at opposite poles of humanity, and not less so their social and religious state. We must not fall into the mistake of supposing that cannibalism and heathen grossness are extinguished throughout the three hundred beautiful islands which gem the Pacific waters. But certainly the results accomplished within the present century are marvellous. The Polynesian missions report 86 European and 238 native ministers, and 118,311 church-members, part of a still larger number baptized. These are not all perfect Christians, but they include very many far better Christians than the earls and doctors who condemn them. The division of labour and success in this part of the mission-field is worthy noting. Thus in the Sandwich Islands the result of American missions is the conversion of the whole population, with a self-supporting Church, itself missioning other islands. In Tahiti, the Society Islands, Samoa, Hervey

Loyalty, and other groups, the London Mission has achieved like signal results. The Friendly and Fiji islands under Wesleyan labour have undergone a similar blessed change. There has also been a correspondence in suffering. The English Church has its martyred Patteson, the London Society its Williams, Wesleyans their Baker, Presbyterians their Gordons. Surely if our own Church were in danger of losing the spirit of missionary sacrifice and consecration, the names of Thomas, Calvert, and Hunt, should suffice to revive it.

If Polynesian missions are not confronted by the gigantic difficulties of India and China, they have their troubles in Romish persecution under French influence, and in the kidnapping and vicious lives of European traders. But we trust Christianity has too strong a hold to be permanently disturbed by these hostile elements. It is of the very best omen that the native ministers outnumber European threefold, and that 80,000 scholars are found in Christian schools. Our author quotes the following from a London Mission Report: "The world holds these little communities of Polynesia in poor esteem. Some argue that missionary societies have wasted their strength on small communities. They overlook the fact that at the outset they were compelled to go to the small communities, because all the great communities peremptorily excluded them. They forget that almost all the great experiments and problems of humanity have been wrought out within small areas. During the seventy years' toil in the South Sea Islands, we have solved a great problem of missionary economics, and secured a vast store of efficient spiritual agencies for larger works awaiting us."

One advantage of a general conspectus of missions is, that work is brought before us of which we hear little in this country. This is the case with mission-work in the countries of the eastern Mediterranean, the birth-lands of Christianity and European civilisation. Missions in Greece, Turkey, Syria, Palestine, Persia, and Egypt are mainly in the hands of American Churches, which annually spend on this field upwards of £50,000. Their work is chiefly carried on among the corrupt Oriental Churches, and their incidental object is to present to the eyes of Mohammedans a better type of Christian life. The American Board of Foreign Missions reports in the different parts of Asiatic Turkey alone a total of 19,424 registered Protestants.

These will undoubtedly be a leavening influence from within. May they prove also "like a grain of mustard seed" in outward extension! Centuries ago Oriental Christianity fell through internal corruption. Its regeneration would be "life from the dead." We do not forget that Americans, like Robinson and Thomson, have been our best travellers in the Holy Land.

We note, in passing, that there are no missions directly to Mohammedans, who form fifteen per cent. of the world's population. This is sufficiently sad; but it is worse to be driven to the conclusion that no missions are possible at present. To attempt it would be certain death, without the slightest prospect of doing good. Many things which sound like apologies for Mohammedanism, or at least its founder, have been written of late; but those who know its spirit and actual working, know that it is the most perfect embodiment of religious bigotry, fanaticism, and intolerance the world has ever seen. Whether any political and social changes are probable, which would make its adherents accessible to argument and reason, it is needless here to speculate.

Space fails us to dwell on the interesting American Baptist missions in Burmah and Pegu, with their 100,000 Christians and 40,000 members, as well as the numerous missions in South America, among the Indian tribes of North America, in Greenland and Labrador, and continental Europe. The same consideration also forbids our pursuing other interesting comparisons for which the "Statistics" supply material, as the comparison of the principal societies in their distribution of labour, fields occupied, and results. We are also told that the income of the Romanist "De Propaganda Fide," for 1872, was £224,105 15s. 11d., of which £146,407 came from the dioceses of France, and from the obscure "British Isles" only £5,517 7s. 2¼d.

We are happy to believe that the notion of inferior agents being good enough for foreign work has long been an exploded fallacy. If ever societies sent out poor men whom home Churches would not have, in ships which Mr. Plimsoll would condemn, they will not do so again. The founders of Churches must not be English cast-offs. Societies will send out the best men they can get. The difficulty is with men and Churches.

In the characteristic preface, full of fence and thrust, there are opinions on which more than one lance might be

broken. We are surprised at an old missionary discouraging "the notion of life-service." He says, "Fresh blood, regularly introduced into the mission ranks, is perhaps more useful than the retaining of men with exhausted minds, and failing bodily health." Certainly, none would advocate service beyond this point; but one who has reached this point beyond power of recovery has rendered "life service." We are convinced that our excellent author would find the verdict of a jury of practical missionaries against him. In India, China, Polynesia, the men whose names stand highest are those who have given their lives to the work. Dr. Wilson, who has just passed away at Bombay, rich in years, experience, and honour, is a shining proof of this. Our great missions would never have attained their present state on any other principle, and undoubtedly would have been still more successful, if the exceptions had been fewer. Life service may not unfortunately be the practice; but it should be the rule, and all encouragement should be given to it. Many of the exceptions arise from domestic causes. We are thoroughly convinced of the immense advantage which marriage gives Protestant missionaries over Roman Catholic. One of the minor disadvantages of family life is that it sometimes removes a missionary from his field of toil. Family life remaining the rule, should individual missionaries see their way to be the exceptions, the term of labour might be prolonged, and special forms of service, such as itinerant evangelisation, better prosecuted. Life service as the law, we are satisfied, is the only condition on which missions like those of India or China, requiring long study and experience, can be successfully worked. There will always remain a number of contingencies to bring missionaries back, who may diffuse information, and fan zeal in the Churches at home. We wonder that there is not more eagerness on the part of consecrated Christian youth for foreign service, that mission work is not more an object of ambition. As an education of mind and character, as a field of distinction, as a teacher of the most precious lessons of Christian life, as a means of eliciting and exercising original power to the utmost, there is nothing like it. Men who would be lost in the crowded field at home will stand out in relief abroad. Nowhere else will the Christian worker be thrown so completely upon himself and God, nowhere learn so fully the simple grandeur of Christian truth and the reality of prayer.

ART. VII.—*Joseph and His Brethren: a Dramatic Poem.* By CHARLES WELLS. With an Introduction by ALGERNON CHARLES SWINBURNE. London: Chatto and Windus, Piccadilly. 1876.

MORE than half a century ago there issued from the press a dramatic poem, which has remained almost utterly unknown up to quite a recent date, but which, we are firmly convinced, is destined to live as long as many of those immortal productions for which the first quarter of this century is almost equally worthy of distinction with the Elizabethan age itself. The author, a young man studying for the legal profession, had already issued a small and crude, but very remarkable and powerful, volume of tales in poetic prose, under the title of *Stories after Nature*, when, in 1824, he published, or allowed to be published, a volume entitled *Joseph and His Brethren: a Scriptural Drama, in Two Acts.* This fell, as the saying is, "still-born from the press," to become, however, so dear to some few students of verse that it has not been allowed to sink into the oblivion into which its author was content for it to pass; and now, in a great measure through the good offices of Mr. Swinburne, it comes before the public a second time, much changed in appearance, and, we must say, much improved; for the author is still living, and has revised his work for this new appeal to the intellectual public.

Charles Wells, the friend of Keats to whom his sonnet on receiving some roses was addressed, was born in the year 1800, so that *Joseph and His Brethren* must have been written, at the latest, at the age of 23, and perhaps considerably earlier. It was not thought advisable, in the interests of his professional career, to issue this work with his signature; so it came forth with the august patronymic of Howard—H. L. Howard. But so little did the author concern himself about it, that he never even saw a proof of any one sheet, leaving the revision to hands more friendly in intention than in execution, and ensuring about as corrupt a text as it would be easy to find among those poems of Shelley vicariously seen through the press during his lifetime.

There is something so strange in the history of this poem, so much of romance in its vicissitudes, and such an air of

improbability in the fact of its being the work of one still among us in the flesh, that we have been at some pains to gather such fragments of fact as were attainable concerning both author and book. It has struck us as a poetic circumstance and a noteworthy coincidence that the noble Englishman who rescued the heart of Shelley from the fire should be still here to tell the tale, while the "young artist," alluded to by Shelley in the preface to *Adonais* as having nursed the dying Keats, still lives in Rome, where, from his own lips, we have heard the story repeated. It is as if some of the fiery vitality of those two poetic souls had passed into the very blood of these men so nearly concerned with them at the last, and replenished them with twofold vigour; but it would seem like a spectral illusion to meet with one of the actual band of poets of whom Shelley was the chief; and yet, as we said, the hero of the rose-sonnet has just revised a poem, unlike, it is true, to anything of that or of any other period, but with a large share of the vigour and earnestness, and true poetic feeling, which were then floating in the atmosphere of England. Trelawney, Severn, and Wells—it is a thing to be thankful for that they are still here; and let us hope that Wells will get at once, without stint, the dues of praise and appreciation only accorded to those two of his great companions in verse long after their death.

It may be worth while to transcribe in this place the sonnet of Keats which has been for so long the only well-known record of Wells's name and being:—

"As late I rambled in the happy fields,
What time the skylark shakes the tremulous dew
From his lush clover covert;—when anew
Adventurous knights take up their dinted shields:
I saw the sweetest flower wild Nature yields,
A fresh-blown musk-rose; 'twas the first that threw
Its sweets upon the summer: graceful it grew
As is the wand that Queen Titania wields.
And, as I feasted on its fragrancy,
I thought the garden-rose it far excell'd;
But when, O Wells! thy roses came to me,
My sense with their deliciousness was spell'd:
Soft voices had they, that with tender plea
Whisper'd of peace, and truth, and friendliness unquell'd."

What were the circumstances alluded to we have no knowledge beyond what the sonnet reveals; but it may be

referred with probability to a later time than that of Keats's apprenticeship to a surgeon, when he used to drive about Edmonton in the worthy man's open chaise. At that period Wells was a schoolboy at Edmonton; and at the same school was another distinguished poet still alive, Mr. R. H. Horne, and also Keats's younger brother, Tom.* Mr. Horne is one of the few who have helped to preserve the tradition of Wells's poetic doings, having noticed his friend's work in a critical, but favourably critical, spirit, both in *The Monthly Repository* and in *A New Spirit of the Age*. What Shelley and Keats would have thought of *Joseph and His Brethren* we shall never know, for both of them were at rest from their unappreciated labours some two years before the "Scriptural drama" was issued. Though the reading public simply ignored the book, as they did those of Shelley and Keats, the ablest contemporary notices were of a favourable kind; and we are told that Hazlitt, who received a copy from the author, said, though he did not criticise it publicly, "I do not see why you should not do the finest things." This was warm praise for Hazlitt; and why Wells has not had a great career in literature is a question that it would be almost bootless to discuss.

Truly, for any man who had the power, the will, and the opportunity, to suppress the poet in him, the reception of *Joseph and His Brethren*, beyond the limited circle of students and true critics, was not such as to encourage further literary adventure. The epoch was not very propitious. Already British Philistinism had succeeded in bringing back into its own penfold two such splendid spirits as Coleridge and Wordsworth—or if not into the very penfold, close enough about the precincts; already Byron had ended the troublous life inflicted on him by the hard-grained society of the day, but, be it confessed, with strong collusion on the part of his own passionate egotism; already that friend of Wells's, who had said of himself in sad irony that his "name was writ in water," had passed through the purgatory of contumely and neglect into that quiet land from which his spirit should have power to change water into blood; already Leigh Hunt had tasted that bitterness of persecution which had some weight in

* Edmonton is very full of poetic associations. Leigh Hunt mentions in his *Autobiography* that the author of *Orion* was born there, and also that one of the kings of song had been born there some centuries before—Kit Marlowe.

dictating the dedication of his translation of Tasso's *Amyntas* to Keats as to another poet "whose fate it was to be equally pestered by the critical and admired by the poetical;" and already the daring spirit of Shelley had been driven from his native land, and quenched in the treacherous waters of the Gulf of Spezzia. Truly these were not times for a man to encourage the inner poet, so to speak, if he could suppress it; and Wells, it should seem, *could* suppress it.

At all events, we can trace nothing substantive to his pen later than *Joseph and His Brethren;* and yet we have good reason to know that his poetic impulses and perceptions were as strong as ever—even rusted into maturity—at a much later period, and *are* as strong as ever now that he has seen three-quarters of this nineteenth century pass by; for he has twice revised his great poem so extensively as to leave no question as to the preservation and growth of his (as far as we know) unused poetic powers. Of this more anon: meanwhile, what little has come forth of his hand in the half century since the issue of *Joseph* may be set down with advantage.

First, we should notice a few lines of verse addressed to Chaucer, and signed "C. W., 1823." These seem to have lain somewhere till 1841, when they were published with the title, "Sonnet to Chaucer," in that charming book called *Chaucer Modernised*, edited by Mr. R. H. Horne, and produced by him in conjunction with Wordsworth, Elizabeth Barrett Browning, Leigh Hunt, and others. We give the verses as worth preserving in a new place (the book being long ago out of the currency of literature), but with due protest against their being regarded as a sonnet:—

"English Chaucer! oft to thy glory old—
Thy sire-ship in poesy, thy fame,
Dull'd not by dusty Time (which aye will hold
Thy name up, banner high, bright as a flame
That burns on holy altar), have my ears,
Like portals, wide been openèd. Great fears
And worldly cares were on me; but a hand,
Power-fraught with this rich gift, hath gently fann'd
My sorrow'd spirit to a ripe zeal fine.
Now gaze I like young Bacchus on his wine
And own no check from sorrow's hollow frown,
Full-hearted that the wrestler is down;
Strong as an eagle gone up to the sun,
Dull earth I quit, and stray with Chaucer on!"

In 1845 a short story called *Claribel* appeared in *The Illuminated Magazine*, then under the editorship of another excellent but little recognised poet, Mr. W. J. Linton, known well enough all the world over as a painter and wood-engraver. This story, of the same character as the *Stories After Nature* published anonymously in 1822, was by Wells; and in Mr. Linton's beautiful book, *Claribel and Other Poems*, he acknowledges his obligation to it in the following terms:—

"To my friend Charles Wells—the author of that most noble dramatic poem *Joseph and His Brethren*—I owe the story of *Claribel*; and not only the story, but also numerous passages (in the first, second, and fifth scenes of the second act), of which I have done little more than adapt the measure."

This obligation extends only to the second act of Mr. Linton's *Claribel*, a drama, in two acts; the first act is wholly Mr. Linton's; but for the second he has taken as much as was available of Wells's story, using the language when possible, only, as he has recently stated in a weekly newspaper, "altering the measure from his rythmical 'prose' to a more poetic form."

Add to the two short pieces already mentioned some papers on hunting in Brittany, contributed to *The People's Journal* about thirty years ago, and our list of published literary work traceable to Wells is complete, though we have reason to suspect the existence in manuscript of some works both in prose and in verse.

The first revision of *Joseph and His Brethren* was made some years ago, and the revised copy was entrusted to a friend, who died; but, on his death, no trace of the copy could be found. In the meantime, Mr. Swinburne had seen it, and on that copy his article on the poem, published in *The Fortnightly Review*, in February 1875, was based. To this article we are indebted for some very fine readings, saved from the revised copy which is not forthcoming; and it is impossible to estimate the loss to the lovers of poetry caused by the disappearance of the manuscript. However, the poet has worked with a will upon the second revision, undertaken last year; and for any one who can obtain the scarce original edition of *Joseph and His Brethren*, an excellent lesson of self-criticism and progressive power may be learnt by a careful collation. Should

the intermediate version ever come to light, it will be a literary treasure of no common interest.

It was by no means an unambitious undertaking for any young poet, of whatever genius, to set in a dramatic form the beautiful story of Joseph and his father, with the appallingly cruel relations between him and his brothers, and his strange experiences in Egypt, notably in the house of Potiphar. So complete was the inborn mastery of this young knight-errant in the field of dramatic poesy, that he not only did not lower by one tone the high pitch of pathos at which the sublime old record is set, so far as the pre-Egyptian part of the narrative is concerned, but, most astonishing feat of all feats, perhaps, ever performed in so immature a work, he actually dealt with the episode of Potiphar's wife in a spirit of such noble dramatic characterisation, and with so keen and Shakespearian an insight into the heights and depths of passion, whether good or evil, as to leave the wife of Joseph's first master so depicted, that she must rank with the most salient creations of female character to the end of time.

Mr. Swinburne, whose critical remarks introductory to this poem are temperate, full of light, and just as well as generous, rightly dwells upon the community existing in certain points between the Cleopatra of Shakespeare and the Phraxanor of the present work. Where Wells obtained this noble Hellenic name for his Egyptian lord's wife, it would be interesting to know; but such, at all events, is the name under which those who love English art will henceforth know the heretofore nameless woman of the Hebrew record, whose very title of "Potiphar's wife" has become "a coarse by-word." And such a creation as this wondrous, beautiful, imperious, and withal detestable woman, has not been put before English readers, on an average, above once in a century.

The leading personages in this drama, as now presented to us, are precisely those of the Biblical record,—Jacob and his twelve sons (of whom, by the way, Gad and Asher were for some unaccountable reason omitted in the original edition), Pharaoh, Potiphar, Phraxanor, the butler, and the baker. The minor personages, thrown in to fill the canvas and meet the exigencies of the tale's development in dramatic form, are a female attendant on Phraxanor, Joseph's steward, and the still more sketchy characters included under "Ishmaelites, Magicians, Officers, Atten-

dants, Ambassadors, Guards, Egyptians, Harvestmen, &c." The characters who, after Joseph and Phraxanor, stand out most clearly, are Jacob, Reuben, and Issachar: Judah and Simeon are a degree less sketchy than the other seven brothers, who are mere "walking gentlemen," while the trusting Potiphar has little more reality, and no more pains expended on him, than the seven minor brethren themselves; indeed, he is the least dignified figure in the book, and the most undramatic in his marvellous patience during those passages between his wife and Joseph, whereof he is a witness.

Formerly divided into two acts only, the poem is now separated into the four legitimate periods of Joseph's life. The First Act shows those domestic loves and jealousies which led to his sale into Egypt; and the curtain falls,—the mental curtain, for, rest assured, there never was meant to be, nor ever will be, any stage performance of this dramatic poem—on the sorrow of Jacob at the forged account of his son's death. In Act II. is depicted the life of Joseph in the house of Potiphar, the bulk of it being occupied by the wonderful elaboration of Phraxanor's character in the scene of temptation so briefly recorded in the Bible, and the end being Joseph's exit, "guarded." Act III. opens in prison, with the first interpretation scene, which leads naturally to the second, the interpretation of Pharaoh's dreams: these interpretations naturally involving the prosperity of Joseph in Egypt, the remainder of the act depicts a gorgeous triumphant pageant, wherein he is installed as governor of the land, and his occupation in laying up stores of grain for the coming famine. The Fourth and final Act deals with the visits of the brethren to Egypt during the famine, and the transfer of the Patriarch and his tribe from Canaan to Egypt.

That noble and impressive paternal affection of Jacob which makes the Bible story so full of tenderness, comes first before us in its other mood of wrath at its opposite. The speech with which the Patriarch breaks upon the presence of his wrangling sons, sets him before us at once as an old man of peculiarly fresh and strong impulses; and the following lines of severe rebuke come sharp upon an accusation of partiality preferred by Judah:—

> "A lie!—a lie!—you envy this young slip.
> Wilt thou teach me, thou climbing, scanty elm,

With joints unsettled, and with eye amaz'd,
Full of fantastic ignorance and youth;
Me, who have kept my brow upon men's deeds
More than six times thine observation
(Being so much more thine age, six times as wise,
Stricken in body, but mature in mind)—
Will you tell me your love degrades you thus?
Do I not know when favours are bestow'd
On young deservers, ye who lag behind
Make wings of envy, forkèd round with spleen;
And, like the foul and ugly bats of night,
Fan him to sleep, and from an artery
Directly channell'd from the heart, you suck
More valiant blood?—I have a fear of you;
For envy might lead men to cast poor stones
At Heaven while it thunders; death waits on it;
On hatred still it feeds and hideous dreams,
And, like a serpent, tracks its victim's heels.
In meanness it begins; proceeds to blood;
And dies of sallow horror by itself.
If it would take the glory that it kills,
It were more nobly bad; but bad indeed,
While it but sweeps it from before its eye,
And like a spider (but more like a flower)
Blends it to earth beneath a fretful foot."—(Pp. 13, 14.)

Had that clever impostor, W. H. Ireland, but had the luck to hit upon half-a-dozen such verses as that describing the death of envy—

"And dies of sallow horror by itself,"

his tragedy of *Vortigern* might have passed for Shakespeare's well enough to satisfy the scholars of his day, and perhaps some later ones.

The impetuous "love of love," and "hate of hate" discovered in Reuben, make him relish strongly of his father's blood; and the part he takes from the first is full of that blended tenderness and fierceness so admirable in Jacob; this father and son stand, indeed, in fine contrast with the harsher energies of Issachar, to whom are assigned some of the mightiest passages of savage rhetoric of which the English tongue has been made the instrument since the days of Marlowe, Shakespeare, and Webster. The strength of Issachar is that of a nature not merely more robust than Jacob's and Reuben's, but tainted with an inborn savour of bloodthirstiness; and

this conception is carried out in his lesser utterances as well as his more important speeches, while the words of Reuben, generally in the mellow key that earned for him from his brothers the style and title of "The May-born Reuben, whose low-song ever begnil'd his hearers of some tears,"—the words of this "gentle brother of our band," as Levi calls him, only rise into the fiercer key on strong provocation, such as that of his brethren's cruelty to the boy Joseph. Then, indeed, he is awful enough; but it is the terror of righteous wrath in him that serves to keep the ten at bay, notwithstanding suggestions to strike him down from Simeon, and to "let loose the dogs on him" from Levi. And it is greatly true to nature that the "May-born Reuben," roused by the discovery that Joseph is no longer in the safe pit, should break upon his brothers thus:—

"Oh, ye detested slaves; ye murderers!
Blood—blood, ye dogs! that is your precious food—
Nought less than the deep current of man's life
Can hiss your passions cool. Do you not fear
Lest you should grow proficient in your trade,
And murder men till men are scarce on earth,
That Heaven will cramp you with some sudden death?
Aye, raise your clubs and tarr your angry dogs;
For dogs or devils I will never budge
Till I have eas'd the spirit of my grief
By telling you with curses what ye are—
Nay, Simeon, flourish not your threatening staff:
You are too mean for fear. I defy all.
Oh! had I got you in a narrow pass,
So that a single coward at a time
Might use his wrath against my careless life,
I'd bring you low past kneeling. Child-killers!
I do so hate you that I have a mind
To strike thee, Issachar, unto my foot.
Bustle, and shift your stands—I will be heard:
And he that stirs a foot, or moves his staff,
Though but to wave it doubtful of offence,
I'll mar his manhood with so sure a blow
As deadly dealt as is the eye of fate,
And dangerously scuffle with the odds."—(Pp. 64-5.)

This is a mere prelude to the voluble expression of Reuben's indignation; and, though some pages are taken up in the business of cursing the supposed murderers, the pitch of impetuosity is sustained all through without

deflecting one moment in the direction of mere rhetoric. We know of nothing more forcible in this particular sort of poetic invective, unless it be the curse of Lear, and the curse of Count Cenci of which that other is the visible model. And the mastery over the keys of wrath which this astonishing young poet held is, as we said, still further proven in the fine contrast between the utterances of Jacob and Reuben and those of Issachar; while these again, as well as those, are wholly apart from the deadly malice of Phraxanor, when foiled by the integrity of Joseph. We can scarcely find a better example of Issachar's ferocious mood than that in which he is brought to bay, not by any human antagonist, but by the more inexorable assailant famine. The following dialogue is also less damaged by separation than most passages we could select:—

"*Judah.* Ah, Issachar, there is blood upon thy brow!
Issachar. Blood is more like to bead upon my brow
Than is a tear to tremble in my eye.
Oh! that this famine were incorporate,
That I might wrestle with him for the fall.
Levi. Where hast thou been these three hours, Issachar?
Issachar. Into the wilderness, o'er vale and mount,
To struggle with the panther for his heart.
Why do you blench? why do you stand at bay,
And tamely let this famine suck your blood?
Man hath a touch of the great elements,—
In fierce distress he should o'erleap himself,
And ravage like an angel that is chaf'd;
His spirit, being press'd as ours is now,
Should rage within him like a furnace clos'd:
Become rich fire to quench the wrath of fate,
Firm as the earth, like stubborn as the wind
That roars along the valley in the storm.
Yea, with repulsive power, like that which heaves
The sick leviathan league after league,
Bruis'd, on the mountain backs of forkèd waves,—
Let us but think our former life hath been
Idle and womanish, and now begin
To play with danger as an exercise
Fitting our manhood, and our labouring breath.
Oh, power and fortitude, I will have food!
Why faint? why die? the eagles and their young,
The lion and the cub, still—live as prey.
When not the bosom of the earth hath roots,
The trees bear bark to serve us for a need;

When there is nothing left us but the air
We can but die.
Dan. There is some comfort yet.
We are to go to Egypt to buy corn,
Which the chief ruler sells.
Issachar. Yea, anything
Rather than yield to this extremity.
Come to my tent, and browse upon the food."
(Pp. 221-2.)

For Phraxanor, it is hard indeed to give any idea of what has been accomplished, either in this one matter of contrast, or in any other particular, by any process of excision. The whole second act, in which begins and ends her part in the poem, is so splendidly compacted, so full of subtle transitions, so profound in the thoughtfulness of its asides, and so complete in the portraiture of its two characters, that we know not where to look in post-Shelleyan literature for anything so near the magnitude of the conceptions and treatment of Shakespeare. With so much else to dwell upon, we cannot, or must not, give our readers any considerable sample of that fiercely scornful invective which, in her angrier mood, she heaps upon him who has contemned her beauty; but for the unmitigated malice of evil womanhood, we know little in the whole range of literature more artistically deadly than these few words noted specially in the introduction :—

"I have a mind
You shall at once walk with those honest limbs
Into your grave."—(P. 131.)

This utterance comes sharp upon Phraxanor's persistent attempt on Joseph's virtue being foiled by his breaking away from her, and claiming to be let "pass out at door." Here, however, is but the beginning of the encounter; and when, some stages further on, Joseph exclaims :—

"Oh! dangerous woman, where will all this end?"—(P. 146).

the poet has found occasion for a touch of true dramatic genius of the highest order in interpolating a passage not found in the less mature book of 1824. Phraxanor replies thus :—

"Woman?—Woman to me!—
[*She loosens a little dagger at her waist.*
Assuredly I shall lay hands on you—

A common insult in a common name!
Sir, I am Phraxanor, of royal blood,
The beautiful, the courted, the ador'd,
Who, for the first and last time in her life,
Hath vail'd her pride before a slave—Ha! Woman!
A word thy blood shall wash away.—He comes!
An empty urn followeth in his train,
Whereon is writ, in crimson characters,
'Joseph the Canaanite, the slave of slaves,
The vilest of this country and his own.'
He comes! He comes! my injuries rejoice.
I turn my back on thee as on the dead."—(P. 146.)

The incident of the dagger is wholly new, and wholly great, we may add: indeed, of the whole passage, the original edition only contains a part of the last two lines.

Of the wealth of profound thought and isolated splendour of expression it were hopeless to attempt to convey any idea by extract. The whole poem abounds in detachable lines and sentences of rare beauty and worth, and which, if taken out and set before the reader in considerable bulk, would still only be samples of a greater mass of noble work unquoted. The speeches in which Phraxanor holds forth to her attendant on the relative merits of male and female mental characteristics are compact of poetry and philosophy blended in the most admirable way: those, however, are speeches to be pondered over as a whole; and we simply refer our readers to pages 113 to 119 for them. But the perfect poetic beauty of the passage on love, uttered by the same speaker a little further on, makes it a thing which it were, critically, almost criminal to keep back:—

"The sun of Love doth shine most goodly fair . . .
At Love's slight curtains, that are made of sighs,
Though e'er so dark, silence is seen to stand
Like to a flower closèd in the night;
Or, like a lovely image drooping down
With its fair head aslant and finger rais'd,
And mutely on its shoulder slumbering.
Pulses do sound quick music in Love's ear,
And blended fragrance in his startled breath
Doth hang the hair with drops of magic dew.
All outward thoughts, all common circumstance,
Are buried in the dimple of his smile:
And the great city like a vision sails
From out the closing doors of the hush'd mind;
His heart strikes audibly against his ribs

As a dove's wing doth break upon a cage,
Forcing the blood althro' the cramped veins
Faster than dolphins do o'ershoot the tide,
Cours'd by the yawning shark. Therefore, I say,
Night-blooming Ceres, and the star-flower sweet,
The honeysuckle and the eglantine,
And the ring'd vinous tree that yields red wine,
Together with all intertwining flowers,
Are plants most fit to ramble o'er each other,
And form the bower of all-precious Love,
Shrouding the sun with fragrant bloom and leaves
From jealous interception of Love's gaze."—(Pp. 129-30).

We have already hinted that Potiphar is not quite satisfactory; and it seems to us that he might, by so powerful a hand as that of Wells, have been made something more than a mere lay figure to serve for the development of Phraxanor's revenge. It is true he is the exponent of some few fine sentiments, and that Joseph, in his earliest attempt to awaken a sense of honour and responsibility in Phraxanor, draws a noble portrait of the man who came and saw him in the slave market, looked into his face, and bought him without asking his price, setting him at once in a place of trust. This portraiture by Joseph, and the revulsion of cynicism that comes upon Potiphar when he is made (tardily enough, be it noted) to believe in the depravity of the man he has so loved and trusted, show that the poet had a new and notable conception of a Potiphar; but, in dealing with the character in detail, he seems to have let his impulses to handle Phraxanor grandly carry him completely away, to the utter neglect of her lord; thus it comes about that Potiphar stands in the most astounding silence while Joseph delivers himself of enormous lengths of speech, and that the Egyptian gives vent to his mild wrath mostly in the mildest of terms. Indeed, even the savage words he utters on the departure of Phraxanor, victorious over the protesting Joseph—

"I have a mind to cut thee all to pieces"—(P. 163)

seem to us to ring wholly hollow and out of tune, and to be there merely because it seemed proper that some such thing should be there, and not to have grown up out of a thoroughly realised vision of the speaker's personality, as is the case with the tremendous utterances of Phraxanor, —as, for instance, when she has sued in vain on her knees to Joseph, and at last, stung to fury by his impenetrable

integrity of will and act, she springs to her feet with the exclamation :—

> "By all our altars and their leaping flames,
> The searching malice of our angry gods,
> But I will be reveng'd upon thee, slave!"—(P. 145)

and then aside—

> "Could I have wrung from him a tardy 'Yes,'
> The echo of my laughter had been heard
> Hence to the desert pyramids and back;
> For now I loathe him in my inmost soul."—(*Ibid.*)

These passages, and such imprecations as—

> "A plague and the pink fever fall on thee!"—(P. 142)

and—

> "May the huge snake
> That worships on the Nile, enring and crush thee!"—(*Ibid.*)

are thoroughly real and life-like coming from the mouth of such a character as Phraxanor, so consistently, subtly, and elaborately delineated in the whole second act; but Potiphar's mind to cut Joseph "all to pieces," we cannot believe in: it is not like the rest of him; and we can only regret that the poet did not see fit to work out the character from the sketch afforded by Joseph's portrait of him, taken in conjunction with his own last words at page 164—

> "ever from this hour
> I do divorce thee, *with the rest of men*,
> From my sore bosom,"

and so on, and with the reflection of nobility cast upon the retreating lay-figure by Joseph's beautiful sentiment of regret—

> "The love I bear thee, noble Potiphar,
> And loss of thine, doth grieve me far beyond
> This woman's witchcraft and my own disgrace."—(P. 164.)

There was no *later* opportunity of working out Potiphar, for neither he nor Phraxanor appears after the close of the second act.

It is a matter of no small triumph that, after the curtain falls on the more vivid encounter of varying human passions found in this second act, the poet still has strength of hand to maintain the interest thoroughly throughout the two remaining acts. In the passion act, he had all to create, the Bible record being of the briefest and barest

kind; but in the remaining acts he had to elaborate on an account already exactingly full of human pathos and vital interest. As a rule he has avoided both the pitfall of mere paraphrase and the precipice of groundless or improbable interpolation; and indeed, when he does hold closely to the very words of the Bible, it is in passages where he could scarcely have done otherwise and been artistic. It is to be noted, too, that the slightest additions made to the story or the speeches carry great weight and complete propriety. For example, in the scene of Joseph's brethren first coming to buy corn, the poet brings out very clearly an admirably dramatic reason for suddenly treating them as spies; Joseph has ascertained that his father is still alive, and he is obliged to get rid of his brothers in order to relieve the rush of filial emotion within him. Again, the meeting between Joseph and Jacob in the last scene is full-fraught with simple pathos, the few final lines peculiarly so: Jacob ends a speech with—

> "Come, let us go; and I will ride beside
> Thee in thy car.—Speak!—Let me hear thy voice.
> *Joseph.* So thou shalt, father.
> *Jacob.* Joseph, art thou ill?
> Thou lookest very pale.
> *Joseph.* Behold me smile.
> *Jacob.* Come, that is well.—Benjamin, take my staff;
> I'll lean upon thy brother: 'tis a bright day.
> I said I would come down into the land,
> See thee, and die.—I would fain live a little!"

This work is an exception to the pretty general rule that the best dramatic works are also the most actable. Utterly impracticable for the stage (and fortunately so), *Joseph and His Brethren* is still greatly dramatic; but, while we cannot regard it as any flaw that it should be dramatic in method and un-histrionic, we must admit that there are points of detail in which powers such as the author has shown both fifty years ago and now might be advantageously expended. There are many passages which need compacting, hammering, so to speak, into forms of more perfect strength and melody. The flow of golden speech from end to end of the poem is simply astonishing; but the poet has been in many cases too easily satisfied with what would have been to such a man as, say, Shelley, merely a first draft. There is a frequent looseness of texture and want of obvious rhythm that could be remedied with comparatively light and little

labour; and that the veteran poet who shares with but one living man the claim to be called the Nestor of English poets has still the vigour requisite for such revision as is needed, he who chooses can ascertain by comparison of the olda nd new versions of *Joseph and His Brethren*. How assiduously the other claimant to the Nestorian dignity (Sir Henry Taylor, born also in 1800) has worked upon those noble dramatic poems which are most like Wells's poem in solidity of thought of all contemporary work, and which were never greatly in need of revision, is well worth all men's observation. But the greater example, that of creating a work that shall last in men's minds while the English tongue is spoken, it can be given to few to follow; the lesser lesson of keeping an almost unbroken silence for fifty-two years, is learnable enough if those to whom it were valuable would but heed it; but we would fain that another than Charles Wells had set this "golden" example. "It is probable," says Mr. Swinburne in closing his excellent remarks prefatory to *Joseph and His Brethren*, "that the author, it is certain that the reader of this poem cannot say what fruit the genius which inspired it might have borne, had that genius ever found space to work in or students to work for. It remains only for those who are capable of serious regard for his art to pay, as I do here, the tardy thanks of a later generation to the veteran who, after winning his spurs so early in so high a field, retired, without further struggle or protest, to await for more than half a century, with 'the wise indifference of the wise,' the ultimate award which should concede or reject his claim to a crown worth many that have flourished and faded between the morning and the evening of his life."

ART. VIII.—1. *The Friend of China; the Organ of the Anglo-Oriental Society for the Suppression of the Opium Trade.* 1875. London: P. S. King, Camden-buildings, King-street, Westminster.

2. *The Opium Trade.* Report of the Proceedings of a Conference, held at the City of London Tavern, London, on Friday, Nov. 13th, 1874. P. S. King, Westminster.

3. *The Indian Opium Revenue, its Nature and Effects.* Illustrated by Extracts from Parliamentary Papers. Published for the Anglo-Oriental Society, by P. S. King, Westminster.

4. *The Debate in the House of Commons on Mr. Mark J. Stewart's Motion for the Abandonment of the Opium Monopoly.* June 25th, 1875. Published for the Society. P. S. King, Westminster.

5. *The Opium Revenue of India.* A Paper read before the Social Science Association at Brighton, Oct. 12th, 1875. By R. N. FOWLER, Esq., M.A., F.R.G.S. P. S. King.

ON the 13th of November, 1874, a Conference was held at the City of London Tavern, London, to inaugurate a movement for the suppression of the opium trade. The chair was occupied by Mr. Alderman McArthur, M.P., and addresses were delivered by merchants and missionaries from India and China, by a Chinese gentleman, and by others friendly to the object in view. The movement has since taken a definite shape, under the name of "The Anglo-Oriental Society for the Suppression of the Opium Trade." It has three Vice-Presidents, a General Council, an Executive Committee, and an organ, *The Friend of China*. Two months subsequent to the inaugural Conference, a number of ladies and gentlemen assembled, by invitation of the Committee, at Devonshire House, Bishopsgate-street Without, London, for the purpose of meeting Mr. Chan Laisun, of the Chinese Educational Mission,

who, having taken a third group of thirty Chinese youths to be educated in America, was passing through London on his way back home. In the Economy and Trade Department of the Social Science Association, which assembled in Brighton last October, a paper on *The Opium Revenue of India*, by Mr. R. N. Fowler, late M.P. for Falmouth, was read and discussed. Two days later, that is, on the evening of Thursday, October 14th, a public meeting was held in the Music Room at the Royal Pavilion, Brighton, to consider matters relating to the opium trade between India and China. This meeting was held under the auspices of the Anglo-Oriental Society, the chair being occupied by the Mayor of the borough.

So far as we are aware, these are the only meetings that have been held, of late years, to discuss the vastly important subject in question. No one, however, can make himself conversant with the facts brought out at these several meetings, and in the debate in the House of Commons last June, without coming to the conclusion that opium smoking is a source of untold misery to the Chinese; that England must be held, alike by Providence and the common sentiment of the nations, responsible for by far the greater part of this misery; and that it is the imperative duty, not to say interest, of Englishmen of all classes, no matter what their religious or political creed may be, to use their influence in bringing to a speedy end this opium trade—one of the greatest iniquities of modern times.

We propose, in the following pages, to put our readers in possession of such facts as will enable them to form a correct opinion on the whole subject, and to induce them, if possible, to take their stand on the right side in this matter. The facts which we shall submit for their consideration are vouched for by English Ambassadors, Ministers, and Consuls; by gentlemen who hold positions of eminence in the Indian, Chinese, and American Governments; by merchants, missionaries, travellers, and select committees of the House of Commons. Therefore, however startling, distressing, and humiliating these facts may be, we demand for such witnesses thereof the most implicit credence.

Our readers are aware, of course, that nearly all the foreign opium consumed by the Chinese reaches that country from India; but in what way and to what extent

it is financially beneficial to the Bengal Government, and at the same time deeply compromising to the honour of this country, they will not know unless they have made special inquiries about it. The opium leaving India for China is shipped at the two ports of Bombay and Calcutta. The former is grown in the states of the native princes, and the latter in British India. Our attention will be directed, in the first instance, to that produced in the soil subject to the rule of Queen Victoria. The manner in which a large revenue accrues from it to our Indian Government, and other matters connected with it, cannot be better set forth than in the evidence of Sir Cecil Beadon, K.C.I.S., who held successively the offices of Secretary to the Board of Revenue in India, Secretary to the Government of Bengal, and afterwards Lieutenant-Governor of Bengal. The evidence is contained in a Parliamentary Paper on East India Finance, and is as follows:—

"3195. *Chairman*—Has the existing mode of raising the revenue from opium been in force for a very long time in Bengal? —Yes; almost ever since the commencement of our rule in Bengal.

"3195. You know that the production of opium in Bengal has been gradually growing for a number of years?—Yes.

"3198. Will you state in the first instance, as the system has been the same, what is the system generally under which this revenue is collected, and the administration under which it is collected?—I will endeavour to be as brief as possible. The Government have established two agencies, one at Patna, and the other at Ghazeepore, which are usually called the Behar agency and the Benares agency; the head-quarters of the one being at Patna, and of the other at Ghazeepore. Each agency is divided into sub-agencies, which may be either co-terminus with the ordinary administrative districts, or sometimes there are two, three, or four sub-agencies in one district. The Behar agency includes all the districts of the province of Behar, and also a portion of Chota Nagpore; and the Benares agency includes the districts of the Benares division, part of the Allahabad division, and Oude. Under the sub-agents are native establishments, whose business it is to look after the cultivation.

"3199. In what mode is the land then selected for cultivation? —When any ryot wishes to cultivate opium, he goes to the sub-agent, and asks to have his name registered, his land measured, and to get a cultivation license, and the usual advance. The sub-agent makes inquiries, ascertains that the man is really *bonâ fide* an owner of land which he proposes to cultivate with opium, has the land measured, and then makes the advance upon the security

of the person himself, to whom the advance is made, and his fellow villagers.* The ryot then sows his land, and when the plant is above the ground, the land is then measured by one of the native establishments, and if the ryot has sown all that he engaged to sow, he gets a second advance; if he has not sown so much, he gets something less in proportion; or if more, he gets a little more. There is a sort of rough settlement at the second advance. Nothing further takes place until the crop is ripe for gathering, and when the ryot has gathered the crop he collects it in vessels and takes it to the sub-agent's office; there he delivers it to the sub-agent, as the agent of the Government, and receives the full price for it, subject to further adjustment when the opium has been weighed and tested and examined at the agent's factory. The opium is then collected at the sub-agency and forwarded to the factory; there it is exposed for a considerable time in large masonry tanks; it is reduced to a uniform consistency, and made fit for the market, some for home consumption, and some for sale in Calcutta—the greater quantity for exportation. It is then packed in cases and sent to Calcutta, and in Calcutta it is sold by auction at periodical sales, and exported by merchants for consumption abroad.

"3205. Is there any regulation by which the Government limit the extent of the land so cultivated, or do they always accede to every request?—It is limited according to the financial needs of the Government; it is limited entirely upon Imperial considerations. The Government of India, theoretically at least, if not practically, decide how much opium they will bring to market; and, of course, upon that depends the quantity of land that they will put under cultivation and make advances for.

"3243. Can you give the results of the operations for 1868-69?—Only in the price. In 1868-69, the total gross receipts for opium in Bengal were £6,622,225, and the total charges were £1,717,746, the net revenue being £4,904,500.

"3292. *Sir C. Wingfield*—Can you state what the total value of the opium sold in the districts, for what is called district consumption, is?—Yes, I can. I will take the year 1868-69; that is the latest I have. I cannot give you the number of chests, but I can tell you what the value of it is. The proceeds from the sale of Akbari opium in 1868-69 was 31 lacs and 25,000 rupees, and the cost of the opium and contingencies, and all other charges upon it, were 10 lacs and 25,000 rupees; so that the Government made a profit upon the sale of that Akbari opium of 21 lacs of rupees.

"3293. But after all, 30 lacs, £300,000, represents the value of all that proportion of the opium which is consumed by the people of India?—Yes.

* The advance is made shortly before the sowing season.

"3294. The rest all comes from a foreign people?—All the rest of the revenue comes entirely from the Chinese; it is paid by them.

"3329. *Mr. Fawcett*—I understand you to say that opium is grown in India simply for purposes of revenue; no moral considerations at all influence the Government?—The Government only regard opium as a means of obtaining revenue.

"3330. That if, for instance, they thought they could obtain more revenue by doubling the cultivation of opium in India, they would do so, and would not be deterred from adopting such a course by any considerations as to the deleterious effect which opium might produce on the people to whom it was sold?—Probably not.

"3331. I believe the opium revenue has realised, some years, as much as £9,000,000, has it not?—From the whole of India nearly £9,000,000, I think, in one year.

"3597. The sale of opium, I think, is conducted by private auctioneering firms in Calcutta?—For many years the Government employed an auctioneering firm in Calcutta to sell the opium, and they received a commission upon the sale of the opium.

"3598. Does not that prevail at present?—I think not. I think it has been changed, and it is now sold by a Government officer."

The points specially worthy of note in the above extracts, are the following:—The present mode of raising the revenue from opium has been in force almost ever since the commencement of English rule in Bengal, and that imperial considerations alone decide how much land shall be so cultivated; that the opium is produced for consumption chiefly by a heathen people, and that the Exchequer of a Christian country is largely replenished from this source. In confirmation of the two facts, that the production of opium in Bengal has been gradually increasing of late years, and that the Government of India decide, not *theoretically*, but *practically*, how much opium they will bring to the market, we insert the following two lists of sales, for 1845 and 1875 respectively.

The sales for the year 1845 were announced thus:—

	Patna. Chests.	Benares. Chests.	Total. Chests.
1st Sale Jan. 6	4,000	1,800	5,800
2nd „ Feb. 10.....	1,800	850	2,650
3rd „ April 21	3,600	1,500	5,100
4th „ May 26.....	1,800	850	2,650
5th „ June 29	3,685	1,641	5,326
			21,526

The sales for 1875 were advertised as follows:—

OPIUM SALES TO BE HELD IN 1875 AT CALCUTTA.

Sale on or about			Behar. Chests.	Benares. Chests.	Total. Chests.
1st Monday,	Jan.	4	2,150	1,600	3,750
2nd Thursday,	Feb.	4	2,150	1,600	3,750
3rd Thursday,	Mar.	4	2,150	1,600	3,750
4th Monday,	Apr.	5	2,150	1,600	3,750
5th Wednesday,	May	5	2,150	1,600	3,750
6th Friday,	June	4	2,150	1,600	3,750
7th Wednesday,	July	7	2,150	1,600	3,750
8th Thursday,	Aug.	5	2,150	1,600	3,750
9th Monday,	Sept.	6	2,150	1,600	3,750
10th Friday,	Oct.	1	2,150	1,600	3,750
11th Thursday,	Nov.	4	2,150	1,600	3,750
12th Friday,	Dec.	3	2,150	1,600	3,750
Total chests			25,800	19,200	45,000

The Government of India has nothing to do with the cultivation and manufacture of the opium exported from Bombay. This is grown in the free native states of Holkar, Scindia, Rewah, and some of the petty Rajpoot states. But the pages of the Report on East Indian Finance, 1871, quoted from already, furnish a clear statement of the relation we sustain to the opium thus produced, and the mode in which we derive a revenue from it. The evidence we shall adduce is that given by Sir R. N. C. Hamilton, Bart., K.C.B.

"4885. Were you not a long time at Indore?—Yes, I was Resident at Indore, and afterwards became also agent for the Governor-General in the Central Provinces; at that time Rewah, Scindia, Holkar, and many of the petty Rajpoot States were under my charge.

"4886. And you have given very special attention to the Malwa opium, I think?—Yes; the Malwa opium all went from Indore.

"4887. Would you be good enough to explain to the Committee how we raised our revenue from the Malwa opium, when you were at Indore.—We had nothing to do with the cultivation; we made no advances; the opium that was intended for exportation was brought in chests about 112 lbs. each; they were brought to the scales at Indore and paid the duty there. When I first went to Malwa the duty was 200 rupees a chest, but during the time I was there it was raised, at my suggestion, up to 500, and the export continued.

"4888. Now, where is this opium grown? Is it entirely in the Holkar States?—No.

"4889. Will you specify the district?—There is a great deal grown in Holkar's, and a great deal grown in Scindia's territory.

There is a great deal grown in Rutlam; and more or less in every petty state they grow opium.

"4890. And is all this opium brought to Indore?—All that was meant for exportation was.

"4891. Then what officer levies the duty on the part of the British Government?—The scales were established at Indore, and in former days there was an opium agent; but since my time, at all events, there was never a separate opium agent. There was an establishment there to weigh the opium, and having paid the duty it was sealed, and had a pass given 'to cover' it to Bombay.

"4981. It was 500, I think you stated, when you left India, and it is now 600?—Yes."

Our relation, as a country, to the opium grown in the two great producing regions of India will now be manifest, and we might at once follow it to China, and watch its fortunes there; but there are several matters connected with its production, with which we shall do well, in the first place, to acquaint ourselves. These refer to the amount of land cultivated with the poppy in British India, and its gradually extending area; the effects on the cultivators themselves, and other of our Eastern fellow subjects; the question whether, while nominally at liberty to cultivate it or not, the ryots are not, in some cases at least, compelled to do so; and the disasters this opium business has wrought in times of famine. On each of these points we shall be as brief as possible.

The Indian Opium Revenue, quoting from the Report of East India Finance, 1871, speaks thus:—"In the year 1856-7 there was an increase in the acreage of Central India devoted to opium. That year the amount devoted to opium was 275,784 acres, and in the next year the amount of land there devoted to opium was 289,062 acres. That increase was caused by the Government finding it necessary to bring a greater area under opium, in consequence of the fall of prices they had in the Bengal districts. In 1865-6 the acreage devoted to opium in Bengal was 700,000 acres, and next year, 1866-7, it was 750,000 acres."

Mr. Mark Stewart, in the debate in the House of Commons, quoted from the Indigo Commission the following words:—

"All the members of the Department are constantly engaged in using their best endeavours to extend the cultivation (of opium) with the consent of the parties engaging, and everything in the way of fair inducement and persuasion is not only permitted but encouraged." In the June number of *The Friend of China*, a

retired Indian civil servant points out that there has been a gradual increase in the number of chests of opium exported. He says:—"The number of chests exported during the latest six years—1867-8 to 1872-3—of which we have official returns, exceeded 84,000 annually on an average. As we go farther back these figures retrograde gradually to 70,000, 60,000, and 50,000 chests, and in 1840-41 the total number of chests—Malwa from Bombay, and Patna and Benares from Calcutta—stood at 29,432, and in 1830-31 it stood at only 11,726 chests."

Now, had this advance, from 11,726 chests in 1830-31 to 84,000 chests in 1867-68, and 86,385 chests in 1872, been in an article of legitimate commerce, that is one in which the producer and consumer are mutually benefited, it would have been a matter for satisfaction. But when the benefit is all on one side, and that the Christian, and instead of benefit there is only loss and misery on the other side, and that the pagan, we perceive abundance of ground for lamentation and mourning; none whatever for exultation. It will be obvious to all that the increase above noted in the number of chests exported implies a corresponding extension of the area cultivated.

In the House of Commons, Mr. Pease, who seconded Mr. Stewart's motion, said: "They found Indian governors telegraphing to their subordinates to grow more opium; it is only the growth of opium will make our revenue easy. On the 22nd of April, 1869, the Hon. W. Grey, Lieutenant-Governor of Bengal, writing from Barrackpore to Mr. C. H. Campbell, said: "I have a telegraphic message from Simla, urging that every possible expedient that you can approve should be used even now to extend the opium cultivation next season to the greatest possible extent." Sir Richard Temple, in a minute dated 27th April, 1869, wrote: "I am clear for extending the cultivation, and for insuring a plentiful supply. If we do not do this, the Chinese will do it for themselves. They had better have our good opium than their own indifferent opium. There is really no moral objection to the business." We shall see by-and-by what Sir Richard meant when he called Indian opium "good," if indeed he meant anything at all. Mr. Pease went on: "Mr. Grey, again, on the 29th of April, 1869, urged increasing cultivation, remarking, 'This would just suffice, and no more, to put us on smooth ground again.'"

What a terrible week that must have been for the Indian

Government! A week only to be paralleled by the pangs of the besotted Chinaman, when in his intense craving he pleads for more opium. "Extend the opium cultivation," says a telegram from Simla. "I am clear for extending the cultivation," says Sir Richard Temple. "This would just suffice, and no more," writes the Lieutenant-Governor of Bengal. It seems lamentable that the "faculty of administration and indefatigable energy" with which the *Times*, in its annual summary, 1874, credits Sir Richard Temple, conjointly with Sir George Campbell, should have been brought to bear on the extension of the cultivation of opium, rather than on its repression, and that in mercy to the human race.

As to the dire effects this opium business has produced on the natives of India, the pages of the *Friend of China* afford abundant proof. Let us take Assam in the first instance. One retired Indian Civil Servant observes: "It is well known that the Government's most important enterprise, the tea plantations in Assam, was in imminent danger of failure, solely through the undue use of opium by the labourers brought to the plantations. It was seen that unless the Government interfered directly, their ruin could not be arrested. The Indian Government did not hesitate to call in its legislative power, and passed acts to repress and discourage the growth and sale of opium, as creating and upholding this iniquitous and immoral trade." The effects of this interference are thus described. "The habit of consuming opium is losing its hold upon the people: the good effects are already to be seen, and it is to be be hoped that in the next generation they will be more marked." Previous to the passing of these acts, another authority tells us,—"the consumption was so universal, from the infant upwards, that the people would not work." Mr. C. A. Bruce, in a *Report on the Tea Plantations in Assam*, observes, when referring to the consumption of opium in that country, "it has degenerated the Assamese from a fine race of people to the most abject, servile, crafty, and demoralised race in India." This was written thirty years ago. *The Indian Opium Revenue* has culled from the *East India Finance Report* the following evidence of Mr. G. Smith, LL.D., about opium in Burmah:—

"5097. Does the Excise Department promote the consumption of opium in India as zealously as that of alcohol?—In the Indo-Chinese districts of British Burmah, the action of the depart-

ments in promoting the sale of opium has long been a public scandal. . . . Prior to the introduction of British rule into Aracan, the punishment for using opium was death. The people were hard-working, sober, and simple-minded. Unfortunately, one of the first measures of our administration was the introduction of the Akbari rules by the Bengal Board of Revenue. Mr. Hind, who had passed the greater part of his long life amongst the people of Aracan, described the progress of demoralisation. Organised efforts were made by Bengal agents to introduce the use of the drug, and to create a taste for it amongst the rising generation. The general plan was to open a shop with a few cakes of opium, and to invite the young men and distribute it gratuitously. Then, when the taste was established, the opium was sold at a low rate. Finally, as it spread through the neighbourhood, the price was raised, and large profits ensued. Sir Arthur Phayre's account of the demoralisation of Aracan by the Bengal Akbari rules is very graphic; but Mr. Hind's statements were more striking, as he entered more into detail." (Mr. Hind was at the time assistant commissioner. He had a large local experience dating back to 1835.) "He saw a fine healthy generation of strong men succeeded by a rising generation of haggard opium-smokers and eaters, who indulged to such an extent that their mental and physical powers were alike wasted. Then followed a fearful increase in gambling and dacoity."

So much for the ameliorating influences of British civilisation! The lesson to be learned from this extract is that the doings of Government agents abroad ought to be scrutinised carefully by an intelligent, God-fearing, patriotic, and philanthropic home population. Should this obvious duty be neglected, it is manifest that our Indian and Colonial Empire, which might be our glory, may prove our destruction. "It is impossible but that offences will come; but woe to that man [or nation] through whom they come."

Of its effects on the Rajpoot, Colonel James Todd, many years ago our political agent to the Rajpoot States, remarks: "This pernicious plant has robbed the Rajpoot of half of his virtues; and while it obscures these, it heightens his vices; giving to his natural bravery a character of insane ferocity, and to the countenance which would otherwise beam with intelligence, an air of imbecility." Afterwards the Colonel terms the poppy "an execrable and demoralising plant."

The next question on which we must remark is the following: Is the cultivation of the poppy perfectly voluntary on the part of the Ryot? *The Chinese Repository*, vol. v.

page 472, quoted in the *Middle Kingdom*, says: "The cultivation of the plant is compulsory, for if the ryot refuse the advance for the year's crop, the simple plan of throwing the rupees into his house is adopted; should he attempt to abscond, the agents seize him, tie the advance up in his clothes, and push him into his house. There being *no* remedy, he applies himself as he may to the fulfilment of his contract." It is now many years since these words were first printed, and the question arises if this statement was true at that time, would it apply to what obtains now? Let us see. Near the conclusion of his minute on the abolition of the Bengal monopoly, Sir W. Muir says: "A few years ago, when the Government of Bengal was straining every nerve to extend the cultivation of the poppy, I was witness to the discontent of the agricultural population in certain districts west of the Jumna, from which the crop was for the first time being raised. . . . The case to which I allude was that of new districts, where the poppy had not hitherto been grown, and into which the Bengal Board were endeavouring to extend the cultivation by the bait of large advances among an unwilling peasantry, and at the risk of inoculating them with a taste for a deleterious drug, and all this with the sole view of securing a wider area of poppy cultivation, and thus a firmer grasp on the Chinese market." The words "discontent of the agricultural population," and "an unwilling peasantry," are suggestive, if not of compulsion, of something very nearly allied to it.

And now what of the disastrous effects of opium production in famine times on the continent of India? We must have recourse again to the Report of East India Finance, 1871. The evidence is once more that of Mr. G. Smith.

"5103. [*Mr. R. Fowler.*] Does the poppy displace grain crops?—There have been two serious instances of that within the last few years. In Malwa, when the people of Northern Rajpootana streamed down to avoid the famine, they found no food, because Malwa is not a food-importing district, being so largely devoted to opium; and thousands perished from starvation along the high road on their return to their own districts. This has occurred in Western India in the case of every great famine. . . . The extension of the cultivation in totally new districts in the North-west provinces and Oude has called forth serious complaints from some of the high officials there who have not been consulted,

and who are opposed to the extension as *interfering with food crops and the contentment of the people.*"

In the same report the statement of the Rev. John Wilson, D.D., is as follows:—

"It is a fact that there was lately an inadequate supply of food for Rajpootana, so much so that, according to the Government accounts (if I have read them correctly) 1,200,000 *people died of famine and the diseases induced by it.* Now in ordinary circumstances the province of Malwa might have supplied the people of Rajpootana with cereals."

The only semblance of an apology that can be given in reply to these statements as to disasters in Western India is, that the opium in question is not grown in British territory, and that in fact we restrict its growth in Malwa by a heavy duty. Be it so, but if the British Government, by means of its military and naval power, had not compelled the Emperor of China to legalise the trade in opium, and did not our gun-boats even now continue the policy of compulsion, very little opium would be grown in the Native States of India, because there would be no market for it.

Now in case the evil of opium began and ended with India, we have seen enough to make every philanthropic mind amongst us desire, and that most ardently, that we could at once wash our hands of it. But we turn over a much darker page when we follow the drug to China, and trace its effects on the teeming multitudes of that Empire. For its ruinous properties change not by a few weeks spent at sea, nor does it become innocuous when its fumes are inhaled by the countrymen of Confucius.

The evidence we shall bring forward of the pernicious effects of opium on the Chinese constitution, and of other evils connected with it, may, for convenience sake, be divided into official, non-official, and Chinese. By official witnesses we refer, of course, to gentlemen who at different times and in different positions have been entrusted with high diplomatic and consular dignity in India and China. Their testimony, however, may be preceded by a declaration placed on record sixty years ago by the Directors of the East India Company. "If it were possible," say they, "we would gladly prevent the use of the drug altogether, except strictly for the purposes of medicine, out of compassion to mankind."

The first of the official class whose testimony we shall lay under contribution is H. B. M.'s late Minister at Pekin, Sir Rutherford Alcock. Before a Select Committee of East India Finance 1871, he was asked: "Can the evils, physical, moral, commercial, and political, as respects individuals, families, and the nation at large, of indulgence in this vice be exaggerated?" And his reply was as follows: "I have no doubt that when there is a great amount of evil there is always a certain danger of exaggeration; but looking to the universality of the belief among the Chinese, that whenever a man takes to smoking opium, it will be the impoverishment and ruin of the family—a popular feeling which is universal both amongst those who are addicted to it, who always consider themselves as moral criminals, and amongst those who abstain from it, and are merely endeavouring to prevent its consumption—it is difficult not to conclude that what we hear of it is essentially true, and that it is a source of impoverishment and ruin to families."

Sir Thomas Wade, K.C.B.—resident in China for thirty years—now the English Minister to the Chinese Government, in a memorandum respecting the Revision of the Treaty of Tientsin, says:—

"I cannot endorse the opinion of Messrs. Jardine, Matheson and Co. [foremost among English mercantile firms in China], that 'the use of opium is not a curse but a comfort and a benefit to the hard-working Chinese. . . .' It is to me vain to think otherwise of the use of the drug in China than as of a habit many times more pernicious, naturally speaking, than the gin and whisky drinking which we deplore at home. It takes possession more insidiously, and keeps its hold to the full as tenaciously. I know no case of radical cure. It has insured, in every case within my knowledge, the steady descent, moral and physical, of the smoker, and it is, so far, a greater mischief than drink, that it does not, by external evidence of its effect, expose its victim to the loss of repute which is the penalty of the habitual drunkard."

Dr. S. W. Williams, author of the *Middle Kingdom*, and formerly agent of the American Board for Foreign Missions at Canton, but for many years subsequently Secretary to the United States Legation at Peking, says:—

"Mr. Wade's experience of about thirty years is like mine, of more than forty years' residence among the Chinese, during which time I have known only one case of thorough reformation from the habit, that of a native preacher attached to one of the Pro-

testant missions, who brought to the aid of his determination to break off the habit the full persuasion that he was breaking the Sixth Commandment while he continued it, and would be accounted a murderer in the sight of God if he did not stop it. . . . His case is the only desperate one I know who succeeded in reforming himself. I have known one or two who stopped the use of the drug on finding how rapidly they were coming under its power; and I believe there may be many such. I hope, at least, that all the dreadful examples in the country, daily seen in the streets and shops, deter some from following their career."

Mr. Majoribanks, many years in the service of the East India Company, and president of their select committee in Canton, said: "The misery and demoralisation occasioned by opium are almost beyond belief." Consul Lay said, "It is hamstringing the nation." Mr. R. M. Martin, than whom a nobler specimen of an English Christian gentleman never resided in the East, and who many years ago was Her Majesty's Treasurer for the Colonial, Consular, and Diplomatic Service in China, and a member of the Legislative Council at Hong Kong, and who in the latter capacity addressed, in 1844, an earnest protest (dissent, he called it) to the Governor of the Colony against the licensing of opium-smoking shops, says:—

"No language would convey a description of the sufferings of those to whom opium has become a necessary of existence." Again, "There is no slavery so complete as that of the opium taker; once habituated to his dose as a factitious stimulant, everything will be endured rather than the privation; and the unhappy being endures all the mortification of a consciousness of his own degraded state, while ready to sell wife and children, body, and soul, for the continuation of his most wretched and transient delight. Transient indeed! for at length the utmost effect produced is a temporary suspension of agony; and, finally, no dose of the drug will remove or relieve a state of suffering which it is utterly impossible to describe." Again, "The slave trade ['execrable sum of all villanies,' John Wesley called it] was merciful compared with the opium trade. We did not destroy the bodies of the Africans, for it was our immediate interest to keep them alive—we did not *debase their natures, corrupt their minds, nor destroy their souls.*" But as to opium, "Every hour is bringing fresh victims to a Moloch who knows no satiety, where the English murderer and the Chinese suicide vie with each other in offering at his shrine."

These are strong words, but the man who penned them

deemed them simple fact, and his intense sincerity in the whole matter was seen in that he made a voluntary surrender of his office in order to place himself in a position to return to this country, and to press personally upon the home Government the adoption of a line of policy which he believed to be essential to the maintenance and extension of our commercial relations with the Chinese Empire.

Let but the reader remember that the statements of Messrs. Majoribanks and Martin were made thirty years ago, when the opium imported into China did not exceed 29,432 chests, and that in the years 1867-8 to 1872-3 it had swollen to the enormous average of 84,000 annually, and he will realise to some extent how it comes to pass that no Chinese patriot is in haste to fall in love with Western institutions, or to plead that Englishmen should be favoured with an extension of commercial privileges in the Middle Kingdom.

In the class termed non-official, whose testimony we now proceed to adduce, are included medical practitioners and travellers, missionaries and authors: these all unite, as we shall see, in asserting that beyond all question the practice of opium smoking is a degrading and ruinous vice. In 1843—the year in which Lord Shaftesbury (then Lord Ashley) raised the question of our opium trade with China, in the House of Commons—Sir B. Brodie and twenty-five others of the most eminent medical men of the day, said, in a written opinion, that they could not but regard those who promoted the use of opium as an article of luxury as inflicting the most serious injury on the human race. Dr. A. G. Reid, in a collection of medical reports furnished by the doctors of the Chinese Imperial Maritime Customs' Service to their Inspector-General Hart, and who was in charge of a mission dispensary, Hankow, writes as follows:—

"My own opportunities (of observing opium smokers) have amounted to over five hundred cases, and the condition of the smokers may be learnt from the occupation of one hundred seen during last year. They were divided as follows:—Shopkeepers, forty; yamên attendants, eighteen; coolies, twelve; street stall keepers or pedlars, nine; farmers, six; soldiers, five; teachers, three; tradesmen, two. In every instance the applicants came to me because they had *lost their means of subsistence through the use of the drug*. . . . . Their object in coming was merely to obtain a

remedy to appease their present craving, and restore their strength so as to enable them to resume their duties and earn wages to be again expended in opium..... Anæmia, emaciation, loss of appetite for good nourishment are sure to follow (the use of opium), and the accompanying loss of physical strength soon entails beggary for the labourer and his family.... *Opium differs from alcoholic indulgence by the absolute necessity of having a daily quantity.* A drunkard may abstain until means accumulate to enable him to purchase liquors, and may do his work efficiently in the intervals, but the opium smoker *must have* his daily stimulant, or he breaks down. To obtain it, there is no sacrifice he will not stoop to; even his wife is readily lent out for prostitution to provide means to buy the drug."—*Friend of China.*

The Rev. J. Hudson Taylor, originator and director of the China Inland Mission, in a letter read at the inaugural meeting of the "Anglo-Oriental Society," &c., says:—

"As a medical missionary I am but too familiar with the moral and physical evils wrought, directly and indirectly, by the use of opium..... Some years ago I had charge of a hospital for a time, one wing of which was devoted to the cure of opium smokers. They paid for their food, and some of them came ten, twelve, and even fifteen days' journey to the hospital, remaining a month or more, and then having the long journey home again. The labour and expense to which these poor men went speaks volumes as to their sufferings and the weight of their bondage."

In the second volume of the *Chinese Recorder*, Dr. Kerr, medical missionary at Canton for upwards of twenty years, writes as follows:—

"The effects of opium smoking are physical and moral. Acting through the body, it reaches the soul. While the one wastes away, the other is corrupted and degraded. While the appetite for the fascinating poison grows stronger and stronger, the moral perception becomes blunted, the sensibilities hardened, and finally the gratification of the morbid appetite becomes the controlling motive of every purpose and act."

Another medical missionary at Canton, Rev. R. H. Graves, M.D., whose testimony was brought forward in the debate in the House of Commons last June, says:—

"The effects of opium smoking are: 1st, *Physiologically*—excitement, evinced by nervous restlessness and talkativeness, and, as one becomes more and more addicted to the habit, loss of appetite, emaciation, a dull leaden hue, stiff movements and gait, obstinate constipation, and occasionally skin diseases; 2nd,

Socially—loss of time, resulting from the time required for smoking and the subsequent sleep; *expense*, gradually exhausting a man's means, and driving him to the greatest shifts to satisfy his craving; the gradual sapping of the strength and vigour, rendering a man more and more unfit for the duties of life; 3rd, *Morally*—manifestation of anger under provocation, and I may add that the Chinese say that, as the use of alcoholic stimulants tends to make men hot-tempered and violent, so that of opium makes them given to lying, duplicity, and trickery. The habit of opium smoking is more dangerous than that of taking alcohol, on account of the insidiousness of its approach, and the difficulty of escaping from its clutches. This vampire seems to suck all the moral courage out of a man; as to deeds of violence, opium must yield the palm to alcohol."

Reference must now be made to the *Indian Opium Revenue* for the testimony of a well-known traveller in the interior of China, Mr. T. T. Cooper. It is extracted from the Report of East Indian Finance, 1871, and is given below:—

"5522. Do you think, from your own experience in travelling over China, and investigating these matters, that the use of opium there causes as much public injury as the consumption of drink in England, as far as you can see?—Yes; I think that the effects of opium smoking in China are worse than the effects of drink in England, as far as my experience goes.

"5523. But it does not cause the amount of crime that we suffer from in this country as the result of drink?—No; a man when he commences to smoke lies down on his bed, and does not get up till it is finished. It is very costly, and very dangerous in this way—that if a man has been in the habit of smoking opium, and he has not money to supply himself with opium, his constitution then receives such a frightful shock that it shows very quickly; but as long as he takes his regular quantity of opium every day he does not feel anything. He must have it, but it does not destroy his health, because he eats and works; but if he loses his supply of opium on Monday morning or Tuesday morning, he will be ruined for work all the rest of the week; he will not pick up again—the system seems to fall so from want of opium.

"5524. And, probably, a man accustomed to it all his life would die?—*They do die in China from that cause.* In the more populous parts which I have gone through, generally after starting on my journey early in the morning through the suburbs of the town, before the watch have had time to go round, it is a very common thing to see half-naked men lying dead simply from want of opium.

"5525. I understand that you think the evils which arise from

the consumption of opium arise from the poverty which it causes, and not from any crime: that it does not lead to crime?—It leads to crime in this way: that men will do anything—they will sell their children, their wives, their mothers, and their fathers to get opium."

Mons. Huc, the Catholic missionary and traveller, gives the following account how opium operates on its victims. He says:—

"With the exception of some rare smokers, all others advance rapidly towards death, after having passed through successive stages of idleness, debauchery, poverty, the ruin of their physical strength, and the complete prostration of their intellectual and moral faculties. Nothing can stop a smoker who has made much progress in the habit."—*Friend of China.*

We shall find space for one only out of many testimonies borne by missionaries to the misery resulting from smoking the "foreign poison." As this writer appears to have been exceedingly careful in forming his opinion, and in inspecting the sad cases of which he writes, his judgment and facts alike commend themselves to the reader's attention. In the April number of the *Friend of China*, the following extracts are copied from the *Illustrated Missionary News*, and are from the pen of the Rev. G. Smith, Church missionary:—

"During my stay at Amory I made many inquiries respecting the prevalence and effects of opium smoking, and often visited, with a missionary friend, some of the shops in which the opium was sold. The first opium house which we entered was situated close to the entrance to the Taou-tai's palace . . . A little company of opium smokers, who had come thither to indulge in the expensive fumes . . . soon gathered around us, and entered into conversation. . . . They formed a motley group of sallow, sunken cheeks, and glassy, watery eyes, as, with idiotic look and vacant laugh, they readily volunteered items of information, and described the process of their own degradation. There was to be seen the youth, who, just emerging from boyhood, had only commenced the practice a little time before, and was now hastening to a premature old age. There was the man of middle age, who, for half his life a victim of this pernicious indulgence, was bearing with him to an early grave the wreck of his worn-out constitution. There was again the more elderly man, whose iron strength of frame could better ward off the slow but certain advances of decrepitude, but whose bloated cheek and vacant stare told of the struggle that was raging within. There was again the rarely seen spectacle of old age; and the man of sixty

lived yet to tell of forty years consumed in the seductions of this vice. They all assented to the evils and sufferings of their course, and professed a desire to be freed from its power. They all complained of the loss of appetite, of the agonising cravings of the early morning, of prostration of strength, and of increasing feebleness, but said they could not get firmness of resolution to overcome the habit. The oldest among their number, with a strange inconsistency and candour, expatiated on the misery of his course. . . . He enlarged on the evils of opium smoking, which he asserted to be six: 1. Loss of appetite; 2. Loss of strength; 3. Loss of money; 4. Loss of time; 5. Loss of longevity; 6. Loss of virtue, leading to profligacy and gambling. . . . On hearing that I was an English missionary, they exposed the inconsistency of my rebuking their habit of opium smoking, while my countrymen brought them the means of indulging it. Most of them seemed to labour under the delusion that the missionaries were all Americans, and the opium smugglers were all Englishmen—a mistake of which we of course took every means of disabusing their minds."

Further on, in the same paper, are given minute descriptions of ten cases of opium smokers, which our space will not allow us to copy, but we cannot forbear from giving one of them. Mr. Smith says:—

"No. 3 was twenty-five years old, and had smoked opium for three years. He began the practice with two or three candareens* a day, but, having gradually increased the dose, now smoked a mace. He complained of loss of appetite and decay of strength. He was formerly much stronger. He was the head man of a company of coolies. Out of between 200 and 300 cash (value about 1s. 4d.) his daily wages, he spent 190 in opium. His idiotic look and sunken eye made him appear a wretched object, overtaken in early youth by the decrepitudes and infirmities of old age."

Dr. Williams, author of the *Middle Kingdom*, wrote, in 1853, after spending twenty years in China:—

"The thirst and burning sensation in the throat, which the wretched sufferer feels, only to be removed by a repetition of the dose, proves one of the strongest links in the chain which drags him to his ruin. At this stage of the habit, his case is almost hopeless; if the pipe be delayed too long, vertigo, complete prostration, and discharge of water from the eyes, ensue; if entirely withheld, coldness and aching pains are felt over the body, an

* The Chinese weights *fan* or *candareen*, *tseen* or *mace*, *leang* or *tael*, run in a decimal scale. Ten fan = one tseen; ten tseen = one *leang*. The *leang* = $1\frac{1}{3}$ oz. av., or $579\frac{84}{100}$ grs.

obstinate diarrhœa supervenes, and death closes the scene. . . . . The evils suffered and crimes committed by the desperate victims of the opium pipe are dreadful and multiplied. Theft, arson, murder, and suicide, are perpetrated in order to obtain or escape its effects. . . . . Opium imparts no benefit to the smoker, impairs his bodily vigour, beclouds his mind, and unfits him for his station in society; he is miserable without it, and at last dies by what he lives upon."

Mr. Lay writes:—

"This great metropolis (London?) has a choice of wretched and degraded sights, but nothing that I ever see reminds me of an opium smoker. His lank and shrivelled limbs, tottering gait, sallow visage, feeble voice, and the death-boding glance of his eye, are so superlative in their degree, and so closely blended in their union, that they at once bespeak him to be the most forlorn creature that treads upon the ground. Such sights, however, are not very common, for the miserable beings generally hide themselves from public view, so that, amidst many thousands of healthy and happy faces, we only see here and there one of these prodigies of evil habit."—*The Chinese as They Are.*

Before passing on to consider what the Chinese themselves think and write about opium, we may suitably close this branch of our subject by reference to two celebrated victims of it in this country—Thomas De Quincey and S. T. Coleridge. Near the conclusion of his book, *Confessions of an Opium Eater*, De Quincey writes:—

"I paused seasonably (in opium eating), but with a difficulty that is past all description. Either way it seemed as though death had, in military language, 'thrown himself astride my path.' Nothing short of mortal anguish, in a physical sense, it seemed, to wean myself from opium; yet, on the other hand, death through overwhelming nervous terrors—death by brain fever or by lunacy—seemed too certainly to be the alternative course. . . . I resolved to break off opium, and I triumphed. But infer not, reader, from this word 'triumphed' a condition of joy or exultation. Think of me as of one, even when four months had passed, still agitated, writhing, throbbing, palpitating, shattered. . . . If the opium eater is taught to fear and tremble enough has been effected."

Coleridge says:—

"The moment, the direful moment, arrived when my pulse began to fluctuate, my heart to palpitate, and such a dreadful falling abroad, as it were, of my whole frame, such intolerable restlessness and incipient bewilderment, that in the

last of my several attempts to abandon the dire poison, I exclaimed in agony, which I now repeat in seriousness and solemnity, 'I am too poor to hazard this.' Had I but a few hundred pounds, but £200, half to send to Mrs. Coleridge, and half to place myself in a private madhouse, where I could procure nothing but what a physician thought proper, and where a medical attendant could be constantly with me for two or three months (in less than that time life or death would be determined), then there might be hope. But now there is none! O God! how willingly would I place myself under Dr. Fox, in his establishment, for my case is a species of madness, only that it is a derangement, an utter impotence of the volition, and not of the intellectual faculties. You bid me rouse myself! Go, bid a man paralytic in both arms, to rub them briskly together, and that will cure him. 'Alas!' he would reply 'that I cannot move my arms is my complaint and my misery.'"

We quote these two cases to illustrate the firmness of the clasp with which the monster embraces all those who resort to it in the first instance, perhaps, for the pleasurable excitement it produces.

When we turn to China, we find that men of all ranks, with talents of every kind, have been employed in depicting the horrors of opium smoking, in warning against its seductions, or in pleading for its discontinuance. Prose and poetry, argument and irony, illustrated handbill, pamphlet, and learned essay, have all been used to accomplish the end in view.

"A Chinese scholar," says Dr. Williams, "thus sums up the bad effects of opium, which he says is taken at first to raise the animal spirits and prevent lassitude. 'It exhausts the animal spirits, impedes the regular performance of business, wastes the flesh and blood, dissipates every kind of property, renders the person ill-favoured, promotes obscenity, discloses secrets, violates the laws, attacks the vitals, and destroys life.' Under each of these heads he lucidly shows the mode of the process, or gives examples to uphold his assertions. 'In comparison with arsenic, I pronounce it tenfold the greater poison; one swallows arsenic because he has lost his reputation, and is so involved that he cannot extricate himself. Thus driven to desperation, he takes the dose and is destroyed at once; but those who smoke the drug are injured in many ways. It may be compared to raising the wick of a lamp, which, while it increases the blaze, hastens the exhaustion of the oil and the extinction of the light. Hence the youth who smoke will shorten their own days, and cut off all hopes of posterity, leaving their parents and wives without any one on whom to depend. From the robust who smoke the flesh is gradually con-

sumed, and the skin hangs like a bag. Their faces become cadaverous and black, and their bones naked as billets of wood. The habitual smokers dose for days over their pipes, without appetite; when the desire for opium comes on they cannot resist its impulse. Mucus flows from their nostrils and tears from their eyes; their very bodies are rotten and putrid. From careless observers the sight of such objects is enough to excite loud peals of laughter. The poor smoker, who has pawned every article in his possession, still remains idle, and when the periodical thirst comes on will even pawn his wives and sell his daughters. In the province of Nganhwui I once saw a man named Chin, who being childless purchased a concubine, and afterwards when his money was expended, and other means all failed him, being unable to resist the desire for the pipe, he sold her in her pregnancy for several tens of dollars. This money expended, he went and hung himself. Alas, how painful was his end!"

On the 6th July last a Chinaman, resident in London, and member of Lincoln's Inn, wrote to the *Times* on the subject of opium. His letter took the form of question and answer. His questions were six, and were as follows:—

"1. Is the use of opium in China injurious or not, and should it be prohibited?

"2. Whether or not Great Britain is in any way to blame for the evils and miseries which opium has caused to China?

"3. What ought Great Britain to do in the matter?

"4. Will the Chinese Government be willing to prohibit the importation, cultivation, and use of opium?

"5. Supposing the Chinese Government be determined to put down the growth and consumption of opium in China, could their injunctions be carried into effect?

"6th, and lastly. If the cultivation of poppy should cease in India, by what means can the coffers of the Indian Government be supplied to the extent of six millions sterling, while no material benefit would thereby accrue to China, as the supply of opium may come from other nations?"

We shall have space, at present, for his reply to the first of these questions only.

"1. Is the use of opium in China injurious or not, and should it be prohibited? This question is a very important one, and upon it turn the other questions which follow. For if it should be proved that opium is, after all, a harmless drug, there will be an end to all the murmurings and outcries that have been raised against it. But is it harmless? I have not the least hesitation in at once recording my firm belief that, so far from being harmless, it is poisonous. This is not my individual belief, for all my

countrymen, whether opium smokers or not, believe it to be so, and call it by that name, and it appears to me that a similar opinion with regard to its quality is entertained by the English public, for I find that in an Imperial Act passed in the year 1868 for regulating the sale of poisons, opium is classed among them. No one, therefore, would for a moment think that opium used for any other purpose than as a medicine is harmless. As a Chinese, I can testify to the innumerable instances in which my poor countrymen have been entirely ruined through the use of the poisonous drug, and I fear I should weary your readers if I were to give a lengthy account of their misery. Suffice it to say, that opium undermines the health, saps the physical strength, and blights the moral sense of millions of my countrymen. For want of money to buy the drug—the price of which is very dear in my country—many of its victims have been led to commit thefts and other crimes. Its votaries are not the only sufferers, but their children, inheriting their blood, present the melancholy appearance of being pale and sickly, in great contrast with those healthy and robust youths whose parents are happily not its victims. ..... A beginner might commence with one pipe a day, but after one week or two you would find that he required two, and in about a month or six weeks he could not do, perhaps, without a daily allowance of five pipes. Thus it is difficult for an opium smoker to abide by his fixed allowance. I do not say that this is impossible, for there is a saying with us, 'Nothing is impossible in this world, only men's minds are not firm enough to achieve it.' This maxim applies exactly to the opium smoker. But show me one instance where a man had been adhering to a fixed allowance of opium with which he had commenced ten years ago, and I will show you a hundred cases where men began with a very moderate quantity, but within ten years they increased their allowance to such an extent that they were ruined. I hope I have said enough to show the evil effects of opium, which every sensible man deplores and should wish to see removed."

We have in our possession a Chinese book, containing sundry exhortations against the three vices most prevalent amongst the people, viz., fornication, opium smoking, and gambling. In it we had marked several passages on opium for translation, but space will not admit. Nor is it necessary. The juxtaposition of these vices will show to our readers the estimation in which the consumption of the great Indian product is held by the *literati* of the Middle Kingdom.

Reference has been made to the illustrated handbills, as one of the means employed to portray the evil of opium. A copy of one such handbill lies before us as we write, many thousands

of which have been given away, or posted on the walls, in the south of China. The illustrations are twelve in number, and they set forth the successive steps by which a man of affluence is reduced to want, and obliged to take up with the most menial employment, and all because he allowed himself to be victimised by the seductions of the opium pipe.

A more elaborate effort was made many years ago with the brush, in the same direction, and a series of six pictures, after the manner of Hogarth's "Rake's Progress," were painted. A Chinese scholar has given the following account of them. We forget the name of the book in which we met with the translation.

"The son of a gentleman of fortune, his father dying while he was yet but a youth, comes into possession of the whole family estate. The young man, however, having no inclination for business or books, gives himself to smoking opium and to profligacy. In a short time the whole patrimony is squandered, and he becomes entirely dependent upon the labour of his wife and child for his daily food. Their poverty and misery are extreme.

"No. 1. This picture represents the young man at home, richly attired, in perfect health and vigour of youth. An elegant foreign clock stands on a marble table behind him. On his right is a chest of treasure—gold and silver; on the left, close to his side, is his personal servant, and, at a little distance, a man whom he keeps constantly in his employ, preparing the drug for use from the crude article purchased and brought to the house.

"No. 2. In this he is reclining on a superb sofa, with a pipe in his mouth, surrounded by courtesans, two of whom are young, in the character of musicians. His money now goes without any regard to its amount.

"No. 3. After no very long period of indulgence, his appetite for the drug is insatiable, and his countenance is sallow and haggard. Emaciated, shoulders high, teeth naked, face black, dozing from morning till night, he becomes utterly inactive. In this state he sits moping on a very ordinary couch with his pipe and other apparatus for smoking lying by his side. At this moment his wives, or a wife and concubine, come in. The first finding the chest emptied of its treasure, stands frowning with astonishment, while the second gazes with wonder at what she sees spread upon the couch.

"No. 4. His lands and houses are now all gone; his couch exchanged for some rough boards and a ragged mattress; his shoes are off his feet, and his face half awry as he sits bending forward, breathing with great difficulty. His wife and child stand before him, poverty-stricken, suffering from hunger; the one, in anger, having dashed on the floor all his apparatus for

smoking, while the little son, unconscious of any harm, is clapping his hands, and laughing at the sport. But he heeds not either the one or the other.

"No. 5. His poverty and distress are now extreme, though his appetite for opium grows stronger than ever; he is as a dead man. In this plight he scrapes together a few cash (copper coins so called) and hurries away to one of the smoking houses, to buy a little of the scrapings of another smoker, to allay his insatiable cravings.

"No. 6. Here his character is fixed—a sot. Seated on a bamboo chair he is continually swallowing the fæces of the drug, so foul that tea is required to wash them down his throat. His wife and child are seated near him, with skeins of silk stretched on bamboo-reels, from which they are winding it off into balls; thus earning a mere pittance for his and their support, and dragging on from day to day a miserable existence."

In writing this paper we might have pursued the plan of giving the substance of these extracts instead of the extracts themselves, and of drawing largely upon our own observations; but this might not have answered our purpose, which has been so to present the subject as to put an end to all controversy, in the minds of our readers, on the two points especially dwelt upon, viz., that our Indian Government is responsible for the production of the drug, and that its consumption works terrible mischief in China. It seemed to us that the *ipsissima verba* of the various witnesses cited would secure this end better than any remarks of our own, as in that case any one not wishing to be convinced, say, of the complicity of the British Government in this nefarious business, might have disputed the justness of our opinions, or the accuracy of our observations.

We intend, in a second article, to show among other matters, that opium was *forced* upon China by England, that it has interfered with legitimate commerce, and that it is the Great Wall which keeps out the blessings of Christianity and Western civilisation.

ART. IX.—1. *Assyrian Discoveries.* By GEORGE SMITH, of the British Museum. Sampson Low, Marston, Low, and Searle. First Edition. 1875.

2. *Records of the Past: being English Translations of the Assyrian and Egyptian Monuments, Published under the Sanction of the Society of Biblical Archæology.* Vols. I., III., V., Assyrian Texts. Samuel Bagster and Sons.

THE field of ancient Oriental history has been almost indefinitely extended within the last five-and-thirty years. Nearly all we know of Assyria has been learnt during that time. In the year 1840 M. Botta, the French Consul at Mosul, in sinking a well at Khorsabad, found himself among the remains of one of the palaces of Sargon. The slabs and sculptures obtained were placed in the Louvre Museum. A few years later Layard followed, and exhumed monuments of greater importance, and of higher antiquity, in his explorations at Nimrud, Kouyunjik, and Nebbi-Yunas. At the entrance of the various chambers of the palaces or temples were found winged bulls or lion sphinxes; the walls were panelled with bas-reliefs, or covered with cuneiform, arrow-headed, or wedge-shaped characters. Most of the inscriptions brought to light, however, have been recovered from the royal libraries of Sennacherib and Assur-bani-pal. They are written on prepared bricks or cylinders of clay. Some have supposed that the Assyrians had *books* made of papyrus; we have found no reference warranting such a belief in these volumes, and the general opinion is that the whole of their literature was written on such tablets as we have referred to. Many of them, through the lapse of time and the various vicissitudes that have befallen the cities of Assyria, have become defaced and mutilated, and great care has had to be exercised in putting together and reading them. Of some, only fragments have been obtained, and even in these fragments *lacunæ* of greater or less extent still exist.

The discovery that led to the deciphering of these in-

scriptions was made by Grotefend. By hard and long-continued study of the tri-lingual inscription on the rock at Behistun he found a key to the "reading of the Persian cuneiform writing; but it was left to Sir Henry Rawlinson, in his great work on the Behistun inscription, to read the Record of Darius, and first decipher the accompanying Scythic and Assyrio-Babylonian texts, thus giving a clue to the reading of the thousands of inscriptions discovered in Assyria and Babylonia." Many other eminent men have entered the field, but, "beside the original discovery, the chief merit in deciphering the Assyrian inscriptions belongs to Sir Henry Rawlinson, who in 1851 published the discovery of the capture of Samaria by Sargon, the war against Hezekiah by Sennacherib, and the names of many persons and places mentioned in the Bible. In 1862 he published one of the most remarkable Assyrian documents yet discovered, the Assyrian Eponym Canon, a chronological document, giving the outlines of the Assyrian official chronology. The inscription is invaluable in the comparison of Assyrian and Scripture history." Translations by other Oriental scholars are given in the *Records of the Past*, some revised for the work, others now appearing for the first time.

In *Assyrian Discoveries* Mr. Smith gives an account of his two journeys to the East. He had, in 1872, found in the British Museum portions of the "Deluge Tablets" brought home by Layard. When this was made known, the proprietors of the *Daily Telegraph* offered a thousand guineas that further researches might be made in Assyria: Mr. Smith to conduct the expedition, and supply the *Telegraph* with letters giving an account of any discoveries he might make. In spite of opposition from some of the Turkish officials, he succeeded in bringing home many valuable inscriptions, including additional tablets of the Deluge series. Translations of some of them are given in the present volume.

Some matters of considerable interest in connection with the ancient Assyrians we can only notice incidentally. At a very early period they believed that man had a spiritual nature, and that the soul would live after the body died. They believed in two *states* in the future world—one of happiness, and one of woe: they held that there were two *places*, where the good and the bad respectively dwelt—one in the sky, and the other under the earth. The following,

from the *Legend of the Descent of Ishtar*, is their description of hell:—

"To the land of Hades, the region of (. . . .)
Ishtar daughter of the moon-god San turned her mind,
And the daughter of San fixed her mind (to go there):
to the House of Eternity: the dwelling of the God *Irkalla*:
to the House men enter—but cannot depart from:
to the road men go—but cannot return.
The abode of darkness and famine
where earth is their food: their nourishment Clay:
light is not seen: in darkness they dwell:
ghosts, like birds, flutter their wings there;
on the door and gate posts the dust lies undisturbed."
Vol. I. p. 143.

Heaven, according to the Izdubar Tablets, is—

"The place where water is abundant, drawn from perennial springs:
The place of Seers: the place of chiefs and unconquered ones:
The place of bards and great men:
The place of interpreters of the wisdom of the great gods:
The place of the mighty; the dwelling of the god Ner."
Ass. Disc. p. 203.

Some of their sacred poetry has been preserved and translated, and affords us still further proof of their belief in the immortality of the soul. Here are two short prayers for the soul of a dying man:—

"Like a bird may it fly to a lofty place!
To the holy hands of its god, may it ascend!

The man who is departing in *glory*,
may his soul shine radiant as brass.
To that man
may the Sun give life!
and Marduk, eldest Son of Heaven,
grant him an abode of happiness!"—Vol. III. p. 134.

We give one more specimen of their sacred poetry—a penitential psalm:—

"O my Lord! my sins are many, my trespasses are great;
and the wrath of the gods has plagued me with disease
and with sickness and sorrow.
I fainted: but no one stretched forth his hand!
I groaned: but no one drew nigh!
I cried aloud: but no one heard!

O Lord! do not abandon thy servant!
In the waters of the great storm, seize his hand!
The sins which he has committed, turn thou to righteousness."
Vol. III. p. 136.

No reader can fail to be struck with the religious spirit of the kings; it is manifested not only in their temple-building, but also in their wars. The latter are nearly always said to have been undertaken "by the command of the great gods." Sennacherib tells us that he himself was—

"The great king, the powerful king, the king of Assyria, the king unrivalled, *the pious monarch, the worshipper of the great gods, the protector of the just, the lover of the righteous* . . . the noble warrior, the valiant hero, the first of all kings, *the great punisher of unbelievers, who are breakers of the holy festivals.*"—Vol. I. p. 25.

Their undertakings were commenced with prayer; and to the gods they ascribed their success. One records that he gave to his god "a tenth part of the spoil." Like Mahomed in later times, they spread their religion with the sword. A vanquished foe (if his life was spared) had to swear to worship "the great gods of Assyria."

Wars naturally arose from the peculiar construction of the Empire. It was a confederation of kingdoms, held together, not by any common interest or aim, but by the iron hand of the ruling State. Conquered kings were allowed to retain their thrones, on condition that they paid homage and tribute to the King of Assyria, conformed to his religion, and provided troops for his wars. In the time of Assur-bani-pal (B.C. 668-626), the daughters of these subject princes were placed in the royal harem.

In an Empire made up of such heterogeneous elements, we can easily understand their being continually engaged in putting down rebellion. In their battles they used swords, arrows, and fiery darts; in sieges, battering-rams, and other similar appliances; on the level plains of their country they charged the enemy with those terrible chariots that spread dismay among the Israelites when they were oppressed by Jabin, King of Canaan—that staggered Cæsar's legions in their attacks on the Britons—chariots with "revolving blades." Sometimes we read of the soldiers being carried in wagons; at others a way was made for their advance by "iron axes" and "metal rollers." The army was generally led by the king in person. Sennacherib

rode with his men "in a two-horse chariot," or in a "travelling chair;" in hilly districts he "rode on horseback," and in still more difficult places he "clambered like a mountain goat."

We cannot leave this subject without remarking on the dreadful carnage caused by their wars, and the horrible cruelty they practised on those of the enemy who fell into their hands. What holocausts of victims were yearly demanded by the insatiable god of War! Surely these were the most desolating conflicts that have ever ensanguined the earth! Sometimes the fallen more than covered the ground: "the clefts and hollows of the mountains were filled with them." Perhaps some faint idea may be formed of the ghastly appearance of the field after one of their fearful fights from the closing words of the account of the Battle of Khaluli, in which Sennacherib defeated the revolted Babylonians:—

"My faultless horses yoked to my chariot
through the deep pools of blood stepped slowly.
Of my chariot as it swept away the slain and the fallen,
With blood and flesh its wheels were clogged.
The heads of the soldiers, like *urkîti*
I salted, and into great wicker-baskets I stuffed them."
Vol. I. p. 49.

Their trophies of victory did not consist, like those of the Greeks, of the armour and weapons of the enemy, but of the heads and bodies of the slain. Prisoners were frequently put to death, and mostly in a very cruel way. One monarch, for instance, says he consigned 3,000 to the flames at the same time! Assur-nasir-pal deserves the epithet of "the Cruel;" his annals reveal his character:—

"Many soldiers I captured alive: of some I chopped off the hands and feet: of others the noses and ears I cut off; of many soldiers I destroyed the eyes: one pile of bodies while yet alive, and one of heads I reared up on the heights within their town."
—Vol. III. p. 50.

"The rebellious nobles who had revolted against me, and whose skins I had stripped off, I made into a trophy: some in the middle of the pile I left to decay: some on the top of the pile on stakes I impaled: some by the side of the pile I placed in order on stakes: many within view of my land I flayed: their skins on the wall I arranged: of the officers of the king's officer, rebellious, the limbs I cut off: I brought Ahiyababa to Nineveh:

I flayed him and fastened his skin to the wall."—Vol. III. pp. 47, 48.

Pillage and destruction followed victory; all movables (gods included) were carried off; towns and cities were reduced to "heaps of rubbish" or "burnt with fire." Woods and groves were cut down, wells dried up and stopped, thistles sown in the corn-fields; the country became a desert.—2 Kings iii. 25.

The inhabitants of subjugated districts were generally taken away to other lands. Some had to serve in the army, others to make bricks and build palaces. Tiglath Pileser introduced a custom (which does not seem, however, to have been always followed) of placing the *men* in one district and the *women* in another, evidently hoping thereby to blend the various races of the empire into one. As an illustration of the Bible narrative of the removal of the people of Samaria, and the repeopling of their land, we give the following from the Annals of Sargon:—

"The cities of Ashdod and Gimzo of the Ashdodites I besieged, I captured. His gods, his wife, his sons, and his daughters, his furniture, his goods, and the treasures of his palace, with the people of his country as a spoil I counted; and those cities a second time I built: people the conquest of my hands from the midst of the countries of the rising sun within them I seated: and with the people of Assyria I placed them, and they performed my pleasure."—*Ass. Disc.* p. 292.

The architectural remains that have been found, as well as their "written records," show that the Assyrian kings also cultivated the arts of peace. An inscription of Khammurabi, who lived before the time of Moses, tells of his excavating a canal, "a stream of abundant waters for the people of Sumir and Accad." It may even have been dug by a *previous* king, for Khammurabi says he "heaped up *new* supporting walls. (Vol. I. p. 7.) Sennacherib gives a detailed and interesting account of his restoration of Nineveh. He says of the kings that went before him:—

"Not one among them all, though the central palace was too small to be their royal residence, had the knowledge, nor the wish to improve it. As to caring for the health of the city, by bringing streams of water into it, and the finding of new springs, none turned his thoughts to it, nor brought his heart to it."

What they neglected he determined to do. The old palace was pulled down, and a new one erected on its site.

The river that had damaged it was walled up within its proper bounds. In the new building were sculptured 180 fathoms of bas-reliefs, "the written records of his name." The trees in the garden of the old palace had been burnt for firewood "years ago;" a grove of "the finest of trees" was planted round the new one. The rest we must give in his own words:—

"By my care I caused the upriaing of springs in more than forty places in the plain: I divided them into irrigating canals for the people of Nineveh, and gave them to be their property. To obtain water to turn the flour mills I brought it in pipes from Kishri to Nineveh, and I skilfully constructed water-wheels. I brought down the perennial waters of the river Kutzuru, from the distance of half a *kasbu*, into those reservoirs, and I covered them well. Of Nineveh, my royal city, I greatly enlarged the dwellings. Its streets, I renovated the old ones, and I widened those which were too narrow. I made them as splendid as the sun."—Vol. I. pp. 30-32.

Esar-haddon tells us his palace doors were of cypress-wood "inlaid with work of silver and copper," and the roof of cedar beams. He also states:—

"Bulls and lions, carved in stone, which with their majestic mien deter wicked enemies from approaching, the guardians of the footsteps, the saviours of the path of the king who constructed them, right and left I placed them at the gates."—Vol. III. p. 121.

Rivers were crossed on bridges, in rafts, or in ships. The rafts were probably such as Mr. Smith saw still used, made of trunks of trees lashed together, supported by inflated skins. The bridges were made of wood; no mention is made of stone, and they do not seem to have been acquainted with the use of the arch. The "ships" were simply vessels of wickerwork or hardened skin. On one occasion these "ships" were used in battle. Assur-nasir-pal says:—

"In boats of wickerwork to the sea they proceeded; in boats of hardened skin after them I betook myself. A hard battle in the midst of the sea I fought. A destruction of them I made. The sea (with) their wrecks like chaff I strewed."—Vol. III. p. 98.

This was in the days of Ahab, the first naval engagement on record, having been fought 150 years before the one between the fleet of Corinth and that of her colony Corcyra. (B.C. 664.)

The historical inscriptions are most numerous, and of the greatest importance. We shall chiefly notice those which refer to what is called the "Assyrian" period of Jewish history, during which it is absolutely necessary, for a correct understanding of the various incidents narrated in the Sacred Annals, to have some knowledge of the affairs of the great Empire of the East.

Before this period come the Invasion of Chedor-laomer and that of Cushan-rishathaim. A note states that—

"Assur-ris-ilim . . . has been ingeniously identified by Sir H. Rawlinson with the Biblical Cushan-rishathaim, whose name, as it stands, is certainly corrupt," &c.—Vol. III. p. 32.

Considering the remote antiquity from which the sacred books have been handed down, and that during the greater part of that period copies have been multiplied by the pen, we can hardly wonder that errors have been made in the spelling of a name, *of the meaning of which the copyists knew nothing.* The name of Chedor-laomer has not been found in any inscription; but making allowance for the difficulty of expressing the sounds of one people by the letters of another, we cannot doubt that it has been correctly preserved. Kudur-mabuk and Kudur-nanhundi are given as names of kings of Elam: Kudur was, therefore, an Elamitic prefix, and we learn from another inscription that Lagomer was the name of one of their gods. Should the name be discovered, it will doubtless be Kudur-lagomer.

Nor is this the only light thrown on the history in Genesis (chap. xiv.) by *Assyrian Discoveries.* We have confirmation of the statement that Elam was at the time referred to an *independent kingdom* (which has been called in question), and a kingdom sufficiently powerful to wage successful war with Nineveh. Assur-bani-pal states (Vol. I. p. 8, and III. p. 88) that he recovered an image of the goddess Nana that had been carried off by Kudur-nanhundi, the Elamite, when "he oppressed Accad." He further states that she had been in captivity 1,635 years. Assur-bani-pal died B.C. 626: the date of Elam's ascendency in the East was, therefore, 2,260 years before Christ!—much earlier than the time when Moses says the King of Elam ruled the Cities of the Plain.

The names of the districts ruled by the Confederate Kings are also illustrated by the monuments. Amraphel

was King of Shinar—the Sumir of the inscriptions, i.e. Babylonia; Arioch, of Ellasar, or *Asnur*, the ancient capital of Chaldæa, which subsequently gave its name to the whole land of *Assyria*. Tidal ruled over *Goim*, not "nations," as in the Authorised Version, but over "a wide tract of country afterwards known as Assyria, but which was then designated by the vague title of Gutium, or Goim." *

The first Assyrian king who comes in contact with the Israelites is Shalmaneser II.: this we gather from his inscriptions, for he is neither mentioned nor referred to in the Bible. In extending his empire towards the West, he was opposed by a Syrian League, headed by Ben-hadad of Damascus. Though the latter had waged war against both Omri and Ahab, we find, from Shalmaneser's inscription, that Israel was enrolled in the League. The *fact* is recorded in the Assyrian Annals, *the circumstances that led to it*, in the Scripture narrative. Ben-hadad had been twice defeated by Ahab, and a peace very favourable to Syria had been concluded (1 Kings xx. 34). After that "they continued three years without war between Syria and Israel" (1 Kings xxii. 1), and during those years the forces of Ahab co-operated with those of the Syrian League. Shalmaneser says:—

"To the city of Karkara I approached . . . 1,200 chariots, 1,200 magazines (and) 20,000 men of Rimmon-hidri of Damascus, 700 chariots, 700 magazines (and) 10,000 men of Irkhuleni of Hamath, 2,000 chariots (and) 10,000 men of Ahab of the country of the Israelites, &c. &c. . . . . these twelve kings brought help to one another, (and to make) war and battle against me had come. Through the high powers which Assur the Lord gave, through the mighty weapons which Nergal (who goes before me) furnished, with them I fought. From the city of Karkara to the city Gilza'u a destruction of them I made. 14,000 men of their troops with weapons I slew, &c."—Vol. III. p. 99.

In another inscription we have a slightly different account of the battle of Karkar, which he places in his sixth year.

"In those days, Rimmon-idri of Damascus, Irkhulina of Hamath, and the kings of the Hittites, and of the sea-coasts to the forces of each other trusted, and to make war and battle against me came. By the command of Assur, the great Lord,

* Vol. III. p. 27.

my Lord, with them I fought. A destruction of them I made. Their chariots, their war-carriages, their war *matériel* I took from them. 20,500 of their fighting men with arrows I slew."—Vol. V. p. 32.

Here Ahab's name is not mentioned; he is one of the "kings of the sea coasts." There is a difference of six thousand in the recorded number of the slain. Shalmaneser claims the victory; but it is clear that his own army suffered severely, and the victory—if such it was—was fruitless. We afterwards read:—

"In my *eleventh* year, for the ninth time, the Euphrates I crossed. Cities to a countless number I captured. To the cities of the Hittites of the land of the Hamathites I went down. Eighty-nine cities I took. Rimmon-idri of Damascus (and) twelve of the kings of the Hittites with one another's forces strengthened themselves. A destruction of them I made."—Vol. V. p. 33.

Again, evidently referring to the same confederacy, he says:—

"In my fourteenth year the country I assembled: the Euphrates I crossed: twelve kings against me had come. I fought. A destruction of them I made."—Vol. V. p. 34.

Six years pass after the battle of Karkar before he again ventures into Syria; and though he then claims a victory, it is three years before he comes for the third time. And it is worthy of note that on this latter occasion he deems it necessary to "assemble the country;" the allies, in the confidence of their superiority, as at Karkar, are the attacking party. No details of the battle or its results are given, and we must, therefore, accept with some reserve the set terms in which he claims a victory.

We have two more records of wars in Syria:—

"In my eighteenth year, for the sixteenth time, the Euphrates I crossed. Hazael of Damascus to battle came. 1,221 of his chariots, 470 of his war-carriages, with his camp, I took from him."—Vol. V. 34.

"In my 21st campaign, for the 21st time, the Euphrates I crossed. To the cities of Hazael of Damascus I went. Four of his fortresses I took."—Vol. V. p. 35.

Hazael is now King of Syria; he appears without allies. At first he comes to battle, but afterwards awaits the inroads of Assyria in his own land. Details of the results of

the battles are stated, and this time we may fairly believe that the advantage was on the side of the Assyrians.

The Syrian League had been broken up by internal wars. Ahab left it soon after the battle of Karkar, and determined to take by force the cities that Ben-hadad would not willingly restore. In the war that ensued he was slain. Therefore, when five or six years after the battle of Karkar, Shalmaneser speaks of the Syrian League as still consisting of twelve princes, he is either not accurate, or another kingdom has been enrolled after the defection of Israel. We have seen that that League comprised the Kings of Damascus and Hamath, "of the Hittites" and "of the sea coasts." Ben-hadad carried on the war against Israel after Ahab's death. While he was besieging Samaria the Syrians heard a noise as of an advancing host, and feared lest the King of Israel had hired the "Kings of the Hittites" to come to his aid. By this time, therefore, the League must have been nearly broken up. When Hazael murdered his master and seized the throne, the remaining states fell away, unwilling to acknowledge the usurper, who thus had to meet the Assyrians alone.

Shortly after this change of dynasty in Syria, Israel, aided by Judah, made another attempt on Ramoth-Gilead. Jehoram, being wounded, retired to Jezreel: Ahaziah went to see him. In their absence Jehu was proclaimed king: he slew the members of the house of Ahab, and seized the throne. The war between Israel and Syria continued, but Jehu, the usurper, had not the aid of the Southern Kingdom, and "Hazael smote Israel in all its coasts" (2 Kings x. 32, 33). Like Ahaz, therefore, in after times, and under very similar circumstances, he made voluntary submission, and sought protection under the wing of Assyria. Hence, without any reference to war, Shalmaneser states:—

"The tribute of Yahua, son of Khumri: silver, gold, bowls of gold, vessels of gold, goblets of gold, pitchers of gold, lead, sceptres for the king's hand, (and) staves, I received."—(Vol. V. p. 41.)

Jehu is here called the "son of Khumri" (Omri): either because the Assyrians thought Omri was the founder of the dynasty of Israelitish kings, or because he reigned in Samaria, which they called Beth-Khumri (House of Omri): or, possibly, Jehu claimed to be, and perhaps was, descended from Omri on his mother's side.

During Shalmaneser's long reign of thirty-five years, there reigned then in Syria two kings—Ben-hadad and Hazael; in Israel, four—Ahab, Ahaziah, Jehoram, and Jehu. In both kingdoms there was a change of dynasty. They were united in their opposition to Shalmaneser at the commencement of his reign, but after these changes of dynasty, and some years of mutual warfare, they were both his vassals at its close.

A chronological question demands a brief notice. Mr. Smith places Shalmaneser's reign between B.C. 860 and B.C. 825: Mr. Sayce, B.C. 858-823. From Shalmaneser's Records we know that at whatever date he came to the throne, Ahab was still alive. And yet in the margin of our Bibles Ahab is said to have been slain in B.C. 897, nearly forty years before Shalmaneser began to reign! If, therefore, the Assyrian reckoning is correct, the other is considerably too high.

We are next introduced, and this time both by the Bible and the monuments, to Tiglath Pileser II. His inscriptions are translated by Mr. Smith (*Ass. Disc.* pp. 254-287); some of the fragments are also given in the *Records of the Past*.

The first part of the earliest fragment has been broken off, and the beginning of every line is wanting. It is supposed to refer to events that happened about B.C. 739. The second, relating to the affairs of B.C. 738-7, is not so dilapidated. Both of them narrate a war with Azariah, one of the most warlike and illustrious kings of the house of David. He seems to have been at the head of a powerful confederacy of Syrian States which Tiglath Pileser attacked and broke up (Vol. V. p. 46). Of this, however, there is no mention in the Bible.

The first fragment also gives a list of tributary kings; in it appear the names of Rezon, of Damascus, Menahem, of Samaria, and Hiram, of Tyre.

There was a certain Menahem who is said (2 Kings xv. 19) to have paid tribute to Pul, King of Assyria; and Professor Schrader believes that he is the one referred to in the inscription. For various reasons we consider this identification doubtful.

We shall hereafter show that at the time of Hezekiah's accession the Hebrew and Assyrian chronologies coincide; there cannot well, therefore, be very much difference between them less than fifty years before. Yet Menahem *died*, according to the former, B.C. 761 (2 Kings xv. 22), and

Tiglath Pileser, according to the latter, only came to the throne B.C. 745, and could not, therefore, receive tribute from a king who had been sixteen years in his grave! This argument is strengthened when we bear in mind that Tiglath Pileser is believed to have received Menahem's tribute, not in the year of his accession, but six years afterwards.

Or, again, we may proceed thus: Menahem began to reign in the thirty-ninth year of Azariah, and reigned ten years (2 Kings xv. 17). He thus died two years or more before the king of Judah. Jotham succeeded Azariah and reigned sixteen years; so from the death of Menahem to that of Jotham was a period of eighteen years. Now Tiglath Pileser reigned some time after Jotham's son Ahaz mounted the throne, for the latter went to Damascus to meet him, and *as he only reigned eighteen years in all* (B.C. 745-727), we cannot see how he could possibly have taken tribute from the Biblical Menahem. Unless, therefore, we can shorten this period of eighteen years by assuming that Jotham, during part of his *sixteen years' reign*,* was only regent for his father Azariah, we must conclude that the Menahem of Scripture was dead before Tiglath Pileser became king.

Besides, the king to whom the tribute was paid is called Pul. Why should he bear that name in one place, and in every other be called Tiglath Pileser?

If evidence should be hereafter forthcoming to show that the Menahem of the Bible *is* referred to, we should have to rearrange the dates in the margin of the Bible, in connection with the altered number of years allotted to the reigns of Azariah and Jotham. Another supposition is that Tiglath Pileser did not know the name of the tributary king, and caused his scribe to write "Menahem," instead of "Pekah." We are far from ascribing either infallibility or impartiality to the Assyrian inscriptions; but is it fair to assume that they are in error, without proof, just to get out of a difficulty? If it is clearly shown that Tiglath Pileser did not refer to the Biblical Menahem, and that no

* In 2 Kings xv. 30 we read "in the *twentieth year* of Jotham." Some Jewish critics maintain that he only reigned sixteen years, and we are to understand the expression as meaning "in the twentieth year after his accession," that is, fourth Ahaz. Or we may gather from it that he reigned as regent four years, and as sole king sixteen years. In the latter case the above interval could not be shortened, and our argument would be strengthened.

other king of that name ever occupied the throne of Israel, then, and only then, should this hypothesis meet with acceptance.

Dr. Oppert believes there was a *second Menahem*, whose reign of seven years interrupted that of Pekah;* that here the inscriptions supplement the Bible narrative. Pekah, as we shall see, was ever hostile to Assyria; may it not therefore be that one who was friendly to her, for a time, by her aid usurped the throne?

A third fragment narrates a war in Palestine; it is full of *lacunæ;* we can just gather from it that the King of Assyria took some places beside "the upper sea." Here is the mutilated record:—

"....the cities (on the coast of) the upper sea I mastered. Six officers (as my Viceroys) over them I appointed.... Asbunu which is beside the Upper Sea, the city Gaal.... Abil.... which is the boundary of the land of Khumri.... the spacious, its whole extent to the borders of Assyria I joined, (my officers) as Viceroys over them I appointed."—Vol. V. p. 51.

This is evidently parallel with the statement:—

"Tiglath Pileser took Ijon, and Abel-beth-Maachah, and Janoah, and Kedesh, and Hazor, and Gilead, and Galilee, all the land of Naphtali, and carried them captive to Assyria."—2 Kings xv. 29.

This was in the days of Pekah, and to discover the *cause* of the Assyrian inroad, we must turn for a moment to the affairs of Judah. Azariah, the former enemy of Tiglath Pileser was dead; Jotham, too, his son, had been gathered to his fathers, and Ahaz was on the throne. Pekah and Rezin had resolved to make by force a certain "son of Tabeal" king of Judah, hoping thus possibly to present a united front to the Assyrians. Ahaz, thus threatened, sent presents to the King of Assyria, and said:—

"I am thy servant and thy son: come up and save me out of the hand of the king of Syria, and out of the hand of the king of Israel, which rise up against me."—(2 Kings xvi. 7.)

Tiglath Pileser, glad to have Judah at last at his feet, acceded to his request. He took from Pekah cities both

* The Bible allows this. In 2 Kings xv. 27, Pekah is said to have reigned twenty years. From 2 Kings xv. 32, 33, compared with xvii. 1, we gather it was nearer 30 years. The latter period would *include the reign of Menahem II.*

beyond Jordan and in Western Palestine, depriving him, in fact, of the greater part of his territory. The inhabitants he carried away to Assyria. He also took Damascus, and slew Rezin.

Here, in the capital of Syria, he gathered together twenty-three kings to do him homage. Ahaz was one of the number. The *fact* of this visit to Damascus is stated in the Bible, though not the *cause* of it. We are, however, told that he had voluntarily assumed the position of a vassal of the King of Assyria. From the inscriptions we learn that he would have to furnish his contingent of troops for the army, as well as pay tribute, assume the religion of Assyria, and "kiss his suzerain's feet." The Records of Esar-haddon supply us with illustrations of the submission that Ahaz would have to make, and probably explain why he set up and used an Assyrian altar in Jerusalem.

"Layali, king of Yadihu, who had fled from before my arms, heard of the capture of his gods, and to Nineveh, my royal city, he came, to my royal presence, and kissed my feet. I took pity on him: I spoke to him kindly. His gods which I had captured, the emblem of Asshur my lord I wrote upon them, and gave them to him again. Those provinces of the land of Balsu I gave to him; tribute payable to my majesty I imposed upon him."—Vol. III. p. 117.

Pekah also was one of the twenty-three princes assembled at Damascus. But he was bent on rebellion: and as his former ally Rezin had been slain, he entered into a compact with Muthon of Tyre. About a year after the meeting at Damascus, they withheld their tribute. On the approach of an Assyrian army, sent to reduce them to subjection—

"Hoshea the son of Elah made a conspiracy against Pekah, and smote him, and slew him, and reigned in his stead."—2 Kings xv. 30.

The following is Tiglath Pileser's Record:—

"Pakaha their king they had slain ..... Husih to the kingdom over them I appointed. Ten talents of gold, 1000 of silver ..... I received from them as their (tri) bute, and to the land of Assyria I sent."—Vol. V. p. 52.

He here claims to have placed Hoshea on the throne. The latter was evidently at the head of a peace party in Samaria; the time for throwing off the yoke of Assyria was not yet come. As patriotic as Pekah, he thought

it best to bide his time, and for the present to pay the tribute that was claimed.

The next king of Assyria was Shalmaneser IV. (B.C. 727-722). His name occurs several times in Jewish history, and we are therefore sorry that none of his inscriptions were found by Mr. Smith.

In this reign, Hoshea, thinking the time had now arrived for regaining the independence of his country, and relying on the help of the King of Egypt, rebelled. Shalmaneser came up against him, and he was forced into submission; but scarcely had the victorious army retired, when Hoshea once more threw off the yoke. The King of Assyria then "came up against Samaria, and besieged it" (2 Kings xviii. 9): the writer continues—"and at the end of three years they took it." We are not to assume from the word "they," as some have done, that there were two or more kings reigning at Nineveh at this time, and engaged in the final capture of Samaria, for in the eleventh verse we read "the King of Assyria did carry away Israel into Assyria." It is taken by Canon Rawlinson as indicating that though Shalmaneser *began* the siege, he did not live to *finish* it; and that though a new king began to reign, the sacred historian did not consider the matter of sufficient importance to be directly stated, but shows that he was aware of it, by saying "they," that is, the Assyrians took it.

The new king was Sargon. He is mentioned by Isaiah, but is not named in the "Chronicles" or "Kings." The only event in his reign connected with Scripture history is the expedition against Gaza and Ashdod previously referred to. Azuri, King of Ashdod, rebelled, and Sargon sent an army under the Tartan to quell the insurrection. The Tartan fought against Ashdod and took it (Isaiah xx. 1). Relying on Egypt, "the strong city" a second time rebelled. It was reduced by the king in person, and the inhabitants sent into captivity. (See p. 167.)

Sennacherib was the next king. In addition to the two of his cylinders previously known, we have now a third (cylinder C.) discovered by Mr. Smith. In his third campaign he made an attack upon Jerusalem. There was a certain Padiah, King of Ekron, "who was faithful and stedfast to Assyria." The Ekronites rebelled, bound their king, and committed him to the custody of Hezekiah. Sennacherib defeated them, restored Padiah to his throne, and

then turned his arms against the King of Judah, who had assisted them. The record states :—

" And Hezekiah
" King of Judah, who did not submit to my yoke
" 46 of his strong cities, fortresses and small cities
" Which were round them, which were without number
" With the march of a host, and surrounding of a multitude,
" Attack of ranks, force of battering rams, mining and missiles,
" I besieged, I captured ; 200,150 people, small and great, male
" and female,
" horses, mules, asses, camels, oxen
" And sheep, which were without number, from the midst of
" them I brought out,
" And as a spoil I counted. Him like a caged bird within
" Jerusalem
" his royal city I had made: towers round him
" I raised, and the exit of the great gate of his city I shut,
" And he was conquered. His cities which I spoiled from the
" midst of his country
" I detached &c." (*Ass. Disc.* ; for a slightly different rendering see *Records of the Past*, Vol. I. p. 38.)

The inscription also states that Hezekiah sent his messenger to Nineveh to make submission and to pay tribute, and that the amount paid was thirty talents of gold, and 800 talents of silver.

We find in the Old Testament a very similar account (2 Kings xviii. 13, &c.; 2 Chron. xxxii., Isaiah xxxvi.); but on a careful comparison of the Hebrew and Assyrian records we find a difference in the amount of the tribute, and in the date ; and notice that the *cause* of the invasion is given only in the Assyrian records, its disastrous conclusion only in the Hebrew. Sennacherib in giving no hint of his overthrow only acted as Shalmaneser II. did. He, as we have seen, in set phrase claims victories over the forces of the Syrian League, when his own annals clearly show that he was unable to make any advance.

Then as to the tribute. The Scriptures mention only three hundred talents of silver as having been paid to Sennacherib, while he claims to have received eight hundred. This difference has been accounted for in many ways. The Hebrew text may have been corrupted ; the Assyrians may have exaggerated, or they may have included the value of the precious metal they took away, while the writer of the Kings only states what was paid *in money* ; or, as suggested by Canon Rawlinson, the Jewish

annals give only the amount to be paid *annually*, while the Assyrian record gives what was actually paid at the time; namely, one year's tribute, and five hundred talents of silver to appease Sennacherib, and that Hezekiah might be allowed to retain his throne.

But while it is clear that the account in the Book of Kings (2 Kings xviii. 13—16) is the same as that on Sennacherib's Cylinder, it may fairly be asked, does the narrative in the remainder of the eighteenth chapter, and continued throughout the nineteenth, belong to the same time, or is the miraculous overthrow to be considered as happening in a subsequent campaign?

In order to give a satisfactory answer to these questions we must ask (1.) What is the absolute date of the invasion referred to on Sennacherib's Cylinder? and (2.) In what year of Hezekiah's reign did it take place?

(1.) Sennacherib began to reign B.C. 705. His attack on Jerusalem was in his third campaign, that is, evidently between B.C. 702 and 700. Let us with Lenormant take the latter date for the sake of convenience. The Assyrian chronology of this period, having been verified by astronomical calculations, is (as far as the present writer is aware) considered correct; and we must therefore receive B.C. 702-700, and not B.C. 713 (as in the margin of our Bibles) as the proper date.

(2.) In what year of Hezekiah's reign was this invasion? The marginal date of his accession is "*circ.* 726," which we hold to be nearly correct. For, he began to reign in the third year of Hoshea (2 Kings xviii. 1), who was placed on the throne of Israel by Tiglath Pileser. Samaria was taken by Sargon in the ninth year of Hoshea (2 Kings xvii. 6), that is in the sixth year of Hezekiah. Now Sargon began to reign B.C. 722, and his first important act was the reduction of the capital of Israel. This event would thus be in B.C. 722 or 721; the Bible gives the latter date, and we may consider that here the two chronologies agree. If, then, Hezekiah's *sixth year* were in B.C. 721, his *first* must have been B.C. 727, and it *must therefore have been in his twenty-sixth or twenty-seventh year that Sennacherib besieged Jerusalem.*

We are now in a position to reply to the question with which we started. As Hezekiah only reigned twenty-nine years, Sennacherib's *second* invasion must have been within (at most) four or five years; but for a longer period

than that, according to his own annals, he was engaged elsewhere. We are therefore of opinion that the whole Scripture narrative refers but to one invasion, extending probably over two years.

Mr. Smith has stated* that there are under the mounds of Nebbi-Yunas records of an invasion by Sennacherib about B.C. 690, or later, and it has been doubted, both by himself and others, whether Tirhakah came to the throne of Ethiopia so early as B.C. 700. In a recent work† he still regards a second and later invasion possible, but if any dependence is to be placed on the notes of time in the "Kings," and on the dates of the Assyrian inscriptions, we think it can be shown that Hezekiah died about B.C. 698, and we cannot therefore believe that Sennacherib was in Judah so late as B.C. 690.

The marginal date of the one invasion is B.C. 713—Hezekiah's fourteenth year. We have given reasons for believing it to have been about B.C. 700, or Hezekiah's *twenty-seventh year*. How, then, are we to explain the discrepancy? The date B.C. 713 was evidently reckoned from the reading "in the fourteenth year," and the question thus becomes, Was this reading a part of the Book of Kings as first written? It is now generally held that it was *not*. Its presence is accounted for in various ways. (1.) It may be a corruption of some other reading; (2.) It may be an interpolation; or, (3.) The words may have been in the autograph, but intended to mark the time of an invasion by some other king.

(1.) Canon Rawlinson believes that the original reading was "in the twenty-seventh year"—the ordinal adjective being expressed by letters, as seems to have been the custom in the Hebrew Scriptures, though numbers were written in full, as words, on the Moabite Stone. As some of these letters are very much alike, he thinks that, having become indistinct, they were not correctly understood, and thus *twenty-seventh* got changed to *fourteenth*.

If this were so, there would be perfect accordance as to *date*: but we should still have to refer the time when Hezekiah was sick to his fourteenth year: for he only reigned twenty-nine years, and he lived fifteen after his recovery.

---

* *Trans. of Soc. of Bib. Archæology*, Vol. II. p. 327.
† *History of Assyria from the Monuments.*

(2.) The *Speaker's Commentary* holds that the original text gave no hint of the date of the expedition, and that some scribe, not seeing that two expeditions of Sennacherib were spoken of, and who considered chapters eighteen, nineteen, and twenty of the Second Book of Kings to be closely connected, compared the statement that Hezekiah reigned twenty-nine years with the fact that God added to his life fifteen years from the time of his illness, which the scribe understood to be the period of Sennacherib's miraculous defeat, and thus came to the conclusion that this invasion of Sennacherib was in the fourteenth year of Hezekiah. Wishing to attach a date to the event, he wrote this in the margin opposite the thirteenth verse of the eighteenth chapter, from which it has been by some other copyist incorporated with the text. This view also requires a new arrangement of this part of the Book of Kings. It is said that the *twentieth* chapter, giving the account of Hezekiah's illness and recovery, belongs to his *fourteenth* year; 2 Kings xviii. 13—16 to his *twenty-seventh;* the remaining part of the eighteenth chapter, with the whole of the nineteenth, to his twenty-eighth or twenty-ninth year.

As before stated, we must hold that Hezekiah's illness was in his *fourteenth* year (B.C. 713), and it is rather singular that in that year Sargon was fighting in the Philistine plain. Hezekiah's illness was at the time of some actual or threatened Assyrian invasion (2 Kings xx. 6). Is it not, therefore, probable that Sargon made some attempt on Jerusalem? May not the Jewish historian have made an allusion to this as occurring in Hezekiah's fourteenth year—an allusion which has since been mixed up with the account of Sennacherib's later invasion? Is it not possible, then, that the reading "in the fourteenth year, &c.," may have been in the original text, but that it referred to an attack on Jerusalem by *Sargon*, though of course Sennacherib, his son, may have been with him, and may even have led the assault against the capital of Judah (cf. 2 Chron. xxxii. 4)?

(3.) It is proposed by Dr. William Smith* to read thus:—"Now in the fourteenth year of King Hezekiah the King of Assyria came up against Judah," which we are to understand as referring to Sargon's expedition in B.C. 713. He then takes the rest as referring to Sennacherib's later invasion, thus:—"Sennacherib came up against all the

* *Student's Old Testament History*, p. 487.

fenced cities of Judah and took them, &c." (cf. 2 Kings xviii. 13 *et seq.*). Between these two statements we should have to place the account of the sickness and recovery of Hezekiah, and the message of Merodach-Baladan, contained in the twentieth chapter, an arrangement in substantial agreement with the one already referred to.

This embassy was *professedly* to congratulate Hezekiah on his recovery, and to inquire about "the wonder" that was done in the land—*really*, we believe, to engage him in a league with Babylon. This being known would certainly lead to war, and our proposed rearrangement is supported by the fact that we actually find the kings of Assyria engaged in war with Merodach-Baladan some years *before* Sennacherib's invasion of Judæa. We also know that Hezekiah exhibited a considerable amount of treasure to the ambassadors of Merodach-Baladan. How could he have done this *after* Sennacherib's invasion? Where there is room for various opinions (and on this subject there are more than we have cared to refer to) it is impossible to dogmatise; but, as far as any conclusion can be arrived at from the evidence in hand, we are inclined to hold that Sargon threatened or attacked Jerusalem in the fourteenth year of Hezekiah (B.C. 713), the year of his illness. That the invasion related in 2 Kings xviii. 13—16, and on Sennacherib's Cylinder was *about* B.C. 700 (probably a year or so earlier), and that the complete overthrow of the Assyrian army—of which the Cylinder makes no mention—happened in the following year, *during the same campaign*; but when, not wishing to leave such a powerful fortress as Jerusalem in the hands of a king on whose allegiance they could not depend, they threatened it again, demanding this time to have it placed entirely in their own hands.

Up to this time the Assyrian monarchs had chiefly resided at Calah. Sargon dwelt at Khorsabad; Esarhaddon frequently at Babylon. Sennacherib, as already related, renovated Nineveh, and was the first Assyrian king who resided there. He calls it his "royal city." With this we may compare the words of the Bible:—

"So Sennacherib . . . departed, and went, and returned, *and dwelt at Nineveh.*"

In the next verse we are told that—

"It came to pass that as he was worshipping in the house of Nisroch his god, that Adrammelech and Sharezer his sons smote

him with the sword, and they escaped into the land of Armenia, and Esar-haddon his son reigned in his stead."—2 Kings xix. 37.

"Several new and important texts" of this king (Esar-haddon) are in the "new collection," but most of them remain untranslated. Two of his inscriptions are given in the *Records of the Past* (Vol. III. p. 101), the first of which is of some importance in connection with the passage just quoted. The first part is broken off; possibly it contained some reference to the unnatural crime of the two brothers. Esar-haddon had evidently just heard of his father's death, and he writes:—

"From my heart I made a vow: my liver was inflamed with rage.
Immediately I wrote letters, saying, that I assumed the sovereignty of my father's house."—Vol. III. p. 103.

He then lifted up his hands in prayer to his gods, and marched upon Nineveh. He was opposed, but by whom is not certain, as the *end* of the tablet, as well as the *beginning*, has been broken off.

Somewhat interesting, in connection with sacred history, is the statement that he assembled "the kings of Syria and of the nations beyond the sea," among whom we find "Manasseh, King of Judah."

Some important contract-tablets of this reign, and an inscription on a prism of baked clay, show that he had proclaimed himself from the first "King of Sumir and Accad," that is, of Babylon and Nineveh. At a later period, his son, Assur-bani-pal, as joint king, governed Assyria, and Esar-haddon ruled in Babylon. This fact throws light on an otherwise inexplicable passage in the "Chronicles."

"The captains of the host of the King of Assyria took Manasseh and bound him with fetters and carried him to Babylon."—2 Chron. xxxiii. 11.

The king of Assyria referred to was doubtless Esar-haddon, to whom Manasseh had not long before paid homage. The statement that the captive king was carried to *Babylon* seems rather strange—Nineveh being the royal city of Assyria—but it is confirmed by the monuments, which inform us that Esar-haddon, and he alone of all the Assyrian kings, dwelt in the Chaldean capital.

Assur-bani-pal, "the greatest and most celebrated of

Assyrian monarchs," succeeded. He founded libraries both at Nineveh and Babylon, and "one of the finest Assyrian texts" we possess belongs to his reign. But none of his inscriptions refer to any intervention in the affairs of Judah, that country, for the time, quietly accepting its position as subject to Assyria. Manasseh, after his release, and Josiah, during his whole reign, were too intent upon the *reformation* of their people to trouble themselves about their *freedom*.

After this monarch's death, the Assyrian Empire, distracted by civil war, rapidly declined; but probably two or more kings reigned before it came to an end. The revolted Babylonians, under their governor Nabopolassar, aided by the Medes, finally overthrew it, and founded the Babylonian or Chaldean Empire in its stead.

The inscriptions of this latter empire are not nearly so interesting as those of the former. They—

"Refer mainly to the construction of temples, palaces, and other public buildings, and at the same time present especial difficulties in their numerous architectural terms which it is often impossible to translate with any certainty. They are, however, interesting as records of the piety and religious feelings of the sovereigns of Babylon, and as affording numerous topographical notices of that famous city: while the boastful language of the inscription will often remind the reader of Nebuchadnezzar's words in Dan. iv. 30—'Is not this great Babylon, that I have built for the house of the kingdom, by the might of my power, and for the honour of my majesty?'"—Vol. V. p. 111.

Daniel is thus vindicated from the charge of historical inaccuracy that has been brought against him in connection with the above passage. Nebuchadnezzar makes a similar claim in the inscription now under notice.

"Highly have I exalted their cities;
"(but) above Babylon and Borsippa
"I have not added a city
"in the realm of Babylonia
"as a city of my lofty foundation."—Vol. V. p. 130.

There was ground for the claim. Mr. Smith says, "Scarcely a ruin exists in the neighbourhood without bricks bearing his name;" a testimony which agrees with that of Sir Henry Rawlinson, who states:—

"I have examined the bricks *in situ*, belonging, perhaps, to a hundred different towns and cities in the neighbourhood of

Baghdad, and I never found any other legend (reading or inscription) than that of 'Nebuchadnezzar, son of Nabopolassar, King of Babylon.'"

The next king was Evil-Merodach, who was succeeded by Neriglissar (Nergal-Sharezer). In connection with a document of the reign of this king, it is pointed out by Mr. Smith, as a curious fact, that—

"The kings of Babylon and Assyria did not generally begin to count the years of their reign till the commencement of the new year following their accession. During the remainder of the year in which they ascended the throne, tablets were dated 'in the year of the accession to the kingdom of so-and-so.'"—Cf. 2 Kings xxv. 27 (*Ass. Disc.* p. 386).

He was succeeded by his son, but at the end of nine months Nabonedus usurped the throne. We have one inscription of this latter king. The translator in his introduction challenges the correctness of the opinion held by many concerning "Belshazzar, King of the Chaldeans," who appears in the fifth chapter of the Book of Daniel. The part of the inscription that has given rise to the opinion referred to is as follows :—

"My life unto distant days
abundantly prolong!
and of Bel-sar-ussur
my eldest son
the offspring of my body,
the awe of thy great divinity
fix thou firmly in his heart,
that he may never fall
into sin
and that his glory may endure."

Vol. V. p. 148.

According to the historians Berosus and Herodotus, the last king of Babylon was Nabonedus or Labynetus. Both refer to the same person, such an interchange of consonants not being uncommon. They both agree in stating that he was in no way related to Nebuchadnezzar, and that he survived the fall of Babylon. Daniel says the last king was Belshazzar, Nebuchadnezzar's son, and that he was slain when Babylon was taken. Here, then, the secular and sacred historians are at direct issue. But when it was discovered by Dr. Oppert, in 1854, that Nabonedus had a son named Bel-sar-ussur, what so natural

as to suppose that he might be the prince referred to by Daniel? If at the time of the Medo-Persian attack he was associated with his father on the throne, all is tolerably clear. Nabonedus meets the invading army in the field; is defeated and submits, experiencing the clemency of the conqueror. Belshazzar, in the meantime, is left to guard the city.

But, says Mr. Talbot, Bel-sar-ussur (Bel protect the King), like Nergal-sar-ussur (Nergal protect the King), is not an uncommon name in the cuneiform inscriptions, and proves nothing. Surely it proves *something*, that the Bel-sar-ussur in question was the son of Nabonedus, which makes his association on the throne more probable than if no such relationship had existed. "He may," says Mr. Talbot, "have been a mere child when it (the inscription) was written." Suppose he were, we presume the translator would admit the possibility of his coming to man's estate. He further remarks, "The Book of Daniel presents to us Belshazzar as a reigning king, and gives not the least hint of his having a father still on the throne." But this argument, *e silentio*, does not overthrow the hypothesis that Mr. Talbot is combating. Daniel mentions no king between Nebuchadnezzer and Belshazzar, yet we know there were *three* without counting Nabonedus. Besides, Daniel is not writing a history of the Chaldean Empire, but narrating the circumstances of its fall, an event intimately connected with his own prophecies, and the fortunes of his own nation. He was the less likely to make any reference to Nabonedus, as he does not seem to have had any connection with affairs of state after the death of Nebuchadnezzar or Evil-Merodach. Or there may have been a general belief in the city that Nabonedus had fallen in the fight, in which opinion Daniel shared.

True, Belshazzar is called Nebuchadnezzar's *son*, which we may fairly consider equal to *grandson;* and this he may have been on his mother's side. Nabonedus may have been married to Nebuchadnezzar's daughter before he came to the throne, or being a usurper may have sought to strengthen his position by such an alliance afterwards. Have we not evidence of this in Daniel's narrative? The queen referred to (Dan. v. 10) is not *Belshazzar's wife*, for his wives and his concubines were *with him in the feast* (v. 2). Was she not the queen-mother? Her knowledge of Daniel, and the respectful attention she commands, are

just what we should expect on the supposition of her being the daughter of the great king, Nebuchadnezzar. We admit the phrase "Nebuchadnezzar thy father" occurs rather frequently. But it can never be supposed to have been intended to guard us against the mistake into which, according to Mr. Talbot, "several writers" are falling. Is it not a way of speaking natural to both Daniel as the former minister, and to the queen-mother as the daughter of Nebuchadnezzar? Natural, too, because of the pride which Belshazzar might be supposed to have in such an ancestry! Mr. Talbot asserts that of Belshazzar's reigning along with his father, "there is not the slightest evidence in the inscription or elsewhere." In the inscription certainly not: but what are we to understand by Belshazzar's promising to make Daniel *third ruler* if there were not already two? That there were *two kings*, Nabonedus and his son Belshazzar, is, of course, in the absence of direct evidence, only an hypothesis: but it is a legitimate one: it explains the circumstances, and is capable of proof, or disproof. Mr. Talbot has not advanced anything to render it untenable; and what is *now* a probable hypothesis, may in future be regarded as an established fact.

The Medo-Persian Empire took the place of the Chaldean B.C. 540. We have but one inscription belonging to this period, the Behistun inscription of Darius Hystaspis. He was preceded on the throne by a certain Gomates, a Magian usurper. Whatever other names he had, he is evidently the Artaxerxes of the fourth chapter of Ezra. The enemies of the Jews succeeded in persuading him to cause the building of the Temple to cease. He was a *Pantheist*, and during his short reign of eight months he pulled down temples, and stopped the services. He was slain by Darius Hystaspis, who allowed the Temple at Jerusalem to be proceeded with. The character of the two kings in the inscription is quite in accordance with that attributed to them in the Book of Ezra.

"Says Darius the king . . . . the temples which Gomates the Magian had destroyed, I rebuilt: I reinstituted for the State the sacred chaunts and (sacrificial) worship, and confided them to the families which Gomates the Magian had deprived of those offices." —(Vol. I. p. 113.)

We cannot accept as true everything that this monarch had engraved on the rock, for among the

countries he mentions as belonging to him we find "Sparta and Ionia." This part of the inscription was probably cut on the rock before he sent his envoy to demand "earth and water"—the tokens of submission to "the great king"—from the cities of Greece, and which he never expected they would refuse to send. It must certainly have been written before the decisive battle of Marathon, in which his forces were defeated and driven from Greece. Sparta they never entered, and so far was she from submitting, that the officer sent to demand "earth and water" was thrown into a well, and told he might get what he wanted there.

The inscriptions also answer several geographical questions, one or two of which we must notice. Sennacherib in his boastful message to Hezekiah, speaks of Sepharvaim (2 Kings xix. 13); why is it in the dual? There were two Sipparas: "Sippara of the Sun, Sippara of Anunit," which "seem to have been on opposite sides of the river, like Buda-Pesth" (Vol. III. p. 33). Daniel mentions a certain Shushan, "which is in the province of Elam," and *one* argument that has been brought against the genuineness of the book bearing his name is this—that there was no city of Shushan till the time of the Persians. He also refers to a "Ulai," in the vicinity of Shushan, which in the Authorised Version is called "a river." It has been doubted by expositors whether "Ulai" is to be considered a river, or a gate. Dr. Rule takes the latter view, and through several pages of his *Historical Exposition of Daniel* endeavours to show that he is justified in coming to this conclusion. He says (p. 213):—

"So far as I can learn, no such river was known, although, by some accident, a somewhat similarly sounding name was, ages later, given to a river too distant at its nearest point to be identified with Ulai, even if Ulai was the name of a river anywhere, which I venture to disbelieve."

Assur-bani-pal, in relating the events of his fifth campaign, mentions both Shushan and Ulai, and in such a connection as to show *their nearness to each other*, and that one was a city and the other a river. He says:—

"Like the shock of a terrible storm
I overwhelmed *Elam*, through its extent.
I cut off the head of Teumman, their wicked king,
who devised evil. Beyond number I slew his soldiers;

alive, in hand, I captured his fighting men.
Their wives, like bows and arrows,
filled the vicinity of *Shushan*.
Their corpses *the Ulai* I caused to take,
its waters I made to consume like chaff."
Vol. I. p. 71, and *Ass. Disc.* p. 336.

This passage decides the question as to the existence of a "river Ulai," and an extract from the account of his eighth campaign is equally decisive in favour of the opinion that Shushan was a city, *at least a hundred years before the time of Daniel.*

"On my return, when Assur and Ishtar exalted me
over my enemies, Shushan, the great city,
the seat of their gods, the place of their oracle, I captured.
By the will of Assur and Ishtar, into its palaces I entered,
and sat with rejoicing."—Vol. I. p. 84.

Much has been learnt from the inscriptions thus far put before the public; more is expected, and indeed needed: for while some points have been decided, others have been raised, and only monumental evidence can decide them. These are chiefly chronological, and it is to be regretted that while Mr. Smith in his journeys found evidence to fix the date of the "Parthian Era" (long a disputed point), no further information was obtained on the comparative chronology of Israel and Assyria. There remain yet many valuable texts in the Museum untranslated. Some of these will doubtless be given in future volumes of the *Records of the Past.* Many inscriptions yet lie buried in the East. Mr. Smith says there are at Kouyunjik 20,000 fragments of Sennacherib's library, which treasure might be had for three years' work, and an expenditure of £5,000. We are happy to learn that he has, after much difficulty, obtained another *firman* from the Turkish Government, authorising him to carry on his explorations for two years. We trust he will meet with success, obtain the treasure he expects, and be enabled in future works to set at rest questions waiting for solution.

LITERARY NOTICES.

I. ENGLISH AND FOREIGN THEOLOGY.

Philippi's Doctrine of the Church.

Die Lehre von der Kirche. [The Doctrine of the Church.] Von Dr. F. A. Philippi. 1875.

This is an instalment of an extensive work which has been long in course of publication: a work which exhibits the Lutheran dogmatic system under the lights of modern science. During the present half-century there has been in Germany a decided reaction in favour of the old orthodoxy of the Confessions and Doctors of the Reformation. Dr. Philippi is one of the most earnest, and learned, and successful of its representatives. The work we now introduce occupies some three hundred pages; and, as it is not likely to appear in an English form, we shall translate a few passages which will give our theological readers a notion of the distinctive views of Lutheran, as to the ministry of the Church. But first let us take a sentence which gives the Lutheran view of the Church generally.

"It remains, therefore, that only Word and Sacrament are the proper and essential distinguishing marks of the Church, as born of God's Word and Sacrament, sustained by God's Word and Sacrament, confessing God's Word and Sacrament; the congregation is, therefore, the one holy, catholic, apostolic Church. It is the one as single and alone; holy, as bearer of the holy Word and the holy Sacraments; catholic, as not limited to a single people, but intended to embrace and absorb all mankind; apostolic, because built upon the foundation of the pure and unadulterated Apostolical Word. Thus viewed, these predicates belong to the Church of the called; but in a peculiar sense they belong to the Church of the called believers. This holds good especially of the predicate of holiness. For the Church of called believers is not only objectively sanctified as the holder of the holy Word and Sacrament, but it is also subjectively sanctified by means of the faith to which the holiness and righteousness of Christ are reckoned, and which brings with it the Holy Spirit as the principle of the renewal and sanctification of the inner life."

On this statement of principles very much might be said. But one objection is enough. The Church of Christ is by no means created by Word and Sacrament. Both these are given to the Church as already existing: that is, both these as they are united. In the Lutheran doctrine both constitute one Word; the Bible is the Word spoken, and the Sacrament is the Word acted; and in that sense we maintain that the Church of Christ exists before the Word and the Sacrament, and the ministry which they require for their administration, are bestowed upon it. If the Word is spoken of alone, we are willing to admit that it is the generating instrument to which the Church owes its existence, but it is not in that sense that the Word is here used. Dr. Philippi maintains, with the high Lutheranism of the Reformation and its modern revival, that the religious life is as dependent on the Sacrament as it is upon the Word: that is, that the new life in Christ is connected with Baptism in its beginning, and the Eucharist in its continuance. This false and limited notion runs through all the discussion of the volume. It affects, of course, the doctrine of the ministry, but not so much as might be expected.

The congregation of believers called into existence by God's Word and Sacrament is at the same time the holder of God's Word and Sacrament. The Greater Catechism calls it, as we have seen, the mother which bears and brings up every Christian through the Word of God; and it says that the Holy Ghost accomplishes the sanctification of men by the Church through which He preaches to us .... which brings to us absolution and the Sacrament .... and that, therefore, all the offices of Christianity belong to the Church; and so forth. Thus, to the Church as the congregation of saints the office of the keys is committed. But, assuredly, only to the collective Church as the one body of Christ, which was to propagate itself by the Word and Sacrament: and not to the individual believer as such. Then, further, it is not possible for the Church, receiving as a whole this great power, to administer it without separating and appointing definite persons to whom preaching and the Sacraments are to be entrusted. Thus, in the Lutheran theology, the ministers of the Word are at once ordained of Christ and appointed by the Church. The individual believer is not, in virtue of his spiritual priesthood, possessed of the office, and authorised to discharge functions which he abstains from only for the sake of order. But we must quote the author here, as there is a difficulty which his school of theology finds it very hard to escape from.

"Whether this human order is of direct Divine command, or only sanctioned mediately by Divine approval, the individual has no right to exercise the office because of his spiritual priesthood.

The spiritual priesthood gives the individual Christian only the fitness to the discharge of the office, after a spiritual manner, well pleasing to God, but not in and of itself the authorisation to its actual discharge. The idea of the spiritual priesthood is not in antithesis to the idea of a Divinely appointed office, but only in antithesis to the Roman Catholic idea of the external sacrificial priesthood after the type of the Old Testament. But, on the other hand, the office is not appointed before, independently of and over the church of believers, but it is as it were formed into the Church; so that, strictly speaking, it is not the individual believer as a spiritual priest that is the holder of the office, but the whole community as a spiritual priesthood; and, therefore, even when the individual community appoints definite persons to the actual discharge of the office, it performs this act as a member in the body of Christ, in the connection, in the name, and in the authority of the universal Church of the Lord."

It is difficult to understand all this. So much however is clear, that the authority is supposed to be vested in the universal Church of the Redeemer alone, and that the act of every community in setting apart individuals to office is, as it were, in that place and particular the act of the universal Church; and that whatever the person set apart does, is done by the community setting him apart. Now this may seem to save the rights of the universal priesthood, and at the same time protect the authority of the Christian ministry. But in reality it does neither. It really denies the universal priesthood to the individual, and assigns it to a vague abstraction, the Church. And it really robs the Christian ministry of its independent authority and function, which is not the delegation of the Church's authority, but charge given by the Holy Ghost over the flock of God. It leaves out entirely the specific qualities and characteristics of a Gospel minister as they are imparted by the same Spirit who demands them, and it resolves the Divine call to the ministry into a mere ecclesiastical regulation and appointment. Dr. Philippi may protest loudly that the Lutheran theory alone finds the happy medium between the Romish hierarchy and the "social Anabaptist" tendencies to abolish the ministry altogether. We are persuaded that the just medium is not in his system; and that, if it is such, it is such at the expense of a very important principle which is too hastily given up; that the Holy Ghost alone can choose, qualify, and appoint and sanction the ministers of the Gospel. The system which supposes that the Church has received the keys of the Word and Sacrament and puts them into the hands of certain men whom it appoints, is the hierarchy in another form. When thus appointed they are absolutely the dispensers of the only means of grace; and the Church is really under them in the most effectual sense. There is no spiritual despotism like that which is exercised

by those who think that the Church has delegated them to dispense her Word and Sacraments. The people have always thought it better to fall into the hands of God, the Divine ordainer; and to regard the Church as testifying, confirming, and submitting to the manifest token of a Divine call.

The following comments upon the Reformed theory—as distinguished from the Lutheran—will be found of interest.

"In the Reformed Church the doctrine of office stands in close connection with the doctrine of the Church. In it first of all there is by the side of the pastoral office, an office of elder-presbyters, or elders of the Church. Only the pastors are entrusted with the announcement of the Word and dispensation of the Sacraments; the lay-elders are joined with them as helpers in the care of morals and increase of discipline. Our Church would have no objection against this institution as to the principle of it; if the Reformed did not insist upon the necessity and immediate Divine appointment of this office of ruling eldership. In their maintenance of this we see reflected the legal character of Reformed religion and piety, for, if there is by the side of the Divinely appointed office for the means of grace a further special Divinely appointed office of Church discipline, then must this latter be, in common with the preaching of the Word and dispensation of the Sacraments, *nota ecclesiæ*; and these Reformed confessions which omit to introdnce it as such, show themselves to have fallen into a sin of omission; and it must therefore be assumed that in this case silence is by no means tantamount to denial."

Here we fail to see the difference indicated by the author. The office of ruling elder does not imply a more legal idea of the Church, since the disciplinary jurisdiction of that functionary is no other than one branch of the pastoral office which the Lutheran theory provides for in another way, namely, by the authority to dispense the Sacraments. Discipline in its extreme form must, of course, be exclusion from the Lord's Supper; and that is included in the Lutheran power of the keys. Certainly no Church can be called legal merely on account of its having a body of men charged to watch over the morals of the community. But the following passage takes yet another view of the subject:—

"But in the proper Reformed view of the pastoral office itself, there is a manifest difference from that of the Lutheran. As, according to the Reformed theory, Word and Sacrament are not in themselves means of grace with the power of conversion in them, so, in their theory, the Church it believes is itself not begotten and born of Word and Sacrament; and so because the Word of God is not immanent in her, she is not of herself the bearer of the means of grace; the office of the ministration of the means of grace is not Divinely incorporated into the

Church, but instituted of God before, independently of, and above her. Accordingly the Reformed Church lays down a Divinely appointed definite form of ecclesiastical constitution; not indeed an episcopal-papal, but yet a pastoral-presbyterial. To it the Church is, just as it is to the Roman Catholic, primarily this internal Divinely appointed institute; and that not as the congregation of believers bearing the means of grace, but as the Divinely organised Church of the called, whose kernel and centre is then the Church of the elect, being the Church in the deepest and fullest sense of the term. There meets us here again that combination of Romish externality and enthusiastic inwardness. A one-sided spiritualism seeks to bind itself into form by a one-sided literalism, and the one-sided literalism to supplement itself by a one-sided spiritualism: office and Scripture, and discipline made immovably secure, and imposed, as it were, as a restraint on the spirit from without."

All this means, being put into plainer language, just that the Reformed theory of the Church makes the internal and visible congregation as such a comparatively unholy organisation which is really governed by the elders as representatives of the true and elect Church within the Church; and this is, to a certain extent, true. The ministry are chosen by the people on account of their spiritual gifts, and as marked out by a Divine call. Hence the ministry are supposed to be members of the true Church. This is taken for granted, on the sure principles of Scripture. Then, of course, they must, in the nature of things, represent the true Church in the discipline by which it seeks to purge out everything that offends. This theory affects the Christian ministry also, as it is the Divine organ for the work of the Holy Ghost, who, by the Word in the mouths of His ministers, and not by the Sacraments, begets and adds children to the Church. Now we maintain that the Reformed theory is in this last point more in harmony with the character of the New Testament as that is distinguished from the Old. The Lutheran theory looks at the Church as a corporate body, which has in it all the powers of reproduction and increase from within and from without. There are the Word and Sacraments: the Word for teaching and the Sacraments for discipline; the Word and Sacraments combined for producing regenerate souls and for sustaining them. This allows of no distinction, even in thought, between the visible and invisible, the spiritual and carnal Churches. The virtue of the Word is not dependent on any specific Divine vocation in the minister, or on any specific religious experience: both Sacraments, at least, are comparatively independent of ministerial character, and they really sustain the Church. That has a much more Jewish and Old-Testament appearance than the Reformed theory, which makes the ministry a spiritual power,

created and endowed for the quickening of souls, and their edification unto holiness through the Word mainly.

We should feel entire complacency with the Reformed notion of the Church and pastoral office but for two deductions; one touching the Church, and the other touching the ministry. The notion of election complicates the former at all points; literally at all points, for there is not a question connected with preaching, sacraments, and administration of the Gospel, which is not deeply affected by the secret purposes of God. Indeed, the sovereign decree, when it is once thoroughly grasped and realised in ecclesiastical theory, turns the whole constitution of the Church into a more or less unreal apparatus for accomplishing the sure and inevitable purposes of God. The effect of this doctrine is very subtle but very sure; but it can hardly be demonstrated or formulated in words. And the theory of lay-eldership complicates the doctrine of the ministry. It tends to confuse our minds as to the interpretation of plain texts, which most certainly blend the teaching and ruling in the same office. It gives to men who are not supposed to be specially called of God, and who are not set apart entirely to the work, a share, and a prominent share, in what is the most important part of the direction of souls. In fact it goes far to neutralise and undo the high theory of the Divine appointment of a ministry; the most solemn part of the function is after all handed over to those who are not ordained of God to the ministry proper; or at least they are admitted to such a share in the responsible work of administering the discipline of Christ's Church as reduces the pastoral oversight as such to comparatively slight importance.

Dr. Philippi sums up the work of the ministry in the following passage:—"There is, accordingly, only one office immediately appointed by God through Christ—the office of preaching the Word and administering the Sacraments: which was as much the office of the Apostles with their helpers, the evangelists, as it was the office of the presbyters with their helpers, the teachers. Hence St. Paul (Rom. x. 15) calls all preachers of the Word men sent of God, or ambassadors. The Apostles also call themselves presbyters (2 John i. 3; 3 John 1); fellow-presbyters (1 Pet. v. 1). The same Apostles call others by their own title (Acts xiv. 4, 14; 1 Thess. ii. 6); the apostolical prerogative of inspiration remaining with them, however; so that all ministers of the Word are only propagators of the *Apostolical* Word. Other charisms, such as those of government and ministry, are given, as it were, to be the materials whence ecclesiastical offices should be more definitely formed, without being, as such, immediately instituted by God through Christ. Nor can the office of ruling the Church be said to be of immediate Divine institution; though it was certainly of mediate

Divine appointment, inasmuch as it was willed by the God of order, of order in all government, and therefore in ecclesiastical. Other miraculous charisms of the apostolical age, such as gifts of healing and miracles, prophecy and speaking with tongues, discerning of spirits and interpretation of tongues, were, like inspiration itself, only transitional charisms, and not to be regarded as proper and permanent offices; therefore the post-Apostolical Church retained only the offices of the pastorate (including missionary service), church government, and the diaconate."

Koelling's Jesus and Mary.

*Jesus und Maria.** An Exegetical-Christological Study. By H. Koelling. Gotha: Perthes. 1875.

The object of this monograph is to exhibit the relation between our Lord and His mother, as set forth in Scripture. It is a deeply interesting, but in some respects fanciful, exposition. The author is a very learned man, a thorough Lutheran, a firm adherent of the early Œcumenical decisions, a true Protestant, and a profound believer in the verity of inspiration. Thus he betrays his own standpoint, in "words which we quote for their own sake." "Dr. Luther says: 'To search out a single word in holy Scripture, and exhaust all its meaning, is a thing impossible, in spite of all learned critics and theologians; for they are the words of the Holy Ghost, and therefore they are too deep for all men: the new-born Christians have only the tithes. He who should take a single saying out of the Gospel, and weigh it in the balances, and find out how great riches are given to us in it, would call the kingdoms of earth light in comparison!' This great man of God talked of the glory of Scripture as no talker before him nor any man since has spoken. He saw in every single word of Scripture an inspired dictum 'written from above,' as Athanasius said; so long as the Church retains this position . . . an exegetical study upon a single short word or a group of words is justified."

Herr Koelling was a pupil of Steinmeyer, of Berlin, and has been taught to hold fast the narratives of our Saviour's infancy; no exegete of modern times has more elaborately than he expounded those portions of the New Testament which deal with the beginning and with the end of the Redeemer's history. The same professor has taught him to estimate rightly the bearings of Mariolatry on the doctrine of the Lord's Person: an aspect of the subject of very great importance. We have a fair

* This short notice was written independently of the larger review of Mr. Robinson's work, and by another hand. This will account for the appearance of repetition, should any be noticed.

sketch of the history of the doctrine which culminated in the decree of 1854. "Pope Pius IX. has at length established the legitimate consequences of the Mariology, which had been long enough a theme of discussion; but established them in a violent way, and without even the semblance of synodal legitimation of this heresy. The *immaculata conceptio beatæ virginis*, which, since the days of Paschasius Radbertus, had been an open theological question, which later in the scholastic times was matter of controversy between the Thomist Dominicans and the Scotist Franciscans, against which Bernard and Thomas Aquinas had energetically protested, and which even Trent left open to the theological schools, has been now proclaimed as a dogma."

A controversy has been raging in Prussia which has hardly reached us: one which has brought before the Protestant world the question of the verity of the incarnation in a manner which it is not pleasant even to think about. We need not follow our author into his elaborate exhibition of the Scriptural argument for the miraculous conception and birth of our Lord. This little book is occupied chiefly with an exhibition of the way in which our Lord separated in His life between the historical relation of sonship to Mary, and the metaphysical sonship in which she was not His mother. "Although He was truly her son, yet He must cease to be so; and she, although she bare Him, must learn to forget that she was His mother. The wonderful bond which united the Son as such to the mother as such must be dissolved, as much for His sake as for hers. For His own sake; after He had become man, He Himself came under the dominion of the word, 'that a man should leave father and mother,' &c. For her sake; that is, for her salvation. Mary was not redeemed simply because she had borne the Redeemer. Throughout the Scripture there is no trace that Mary had any pre-eminence; on the contrary, the words of Scripture do everything to render such a thought untenable. The loftiest word is 'Blessed or graced among women;' but the root of the term is charis, or grace."

The various sayings that connect our Lord with His mother are expounded in the light of this principle that all is intended to separate between Him and her. "The relation of Jesus to His mother is, from the manger to the cross, a marvellous process of severance; which is all the more interesting, and all the more deeply to be studied, because Scripture says so much on this unparalleled fact. The whole is set before us in three, or indeed five scenes. These, and the five passages which depict them, will be the matter of our investigation."

These, for a reason already given, we shall not now examine. But a few words may be spent on the strong point of this monograph: the author's new explanation of the passage (Luke ii. 35), which might be referred to as a fine example of exegetical

special pleading. The words, "And a sword shall pierce thine own soul also," are not to be referred to the sorrows which the mother of the Lord was to experience in sympathy with her Son, and as a witness of His woes, but to something very different. The author regards the brackets as arbitrary, needless, and to be rejected. He translates: "Behold, this one has been set for the fall and rising again of many in Israel, and a sign which will be spoken against, and also through thine own soul will He go like a sword, that the thoughts of many hearts may be revealed." That there is no parallel to such a construction is admitted, but then many such *unica* are to be found. "The New-Testament writers wrote in Greek, and to them all was permissible in saying and writing which a Greek mouth might have spoken;" a canon this which would allow us to make easy work with most of the difficulties of the Greek Testament. The display of learning which is brought into the service of this exposition is almost amazing, we were on the point of writing "amusing," and the issue is that the sword which pierced the soul of Mary was the dividing sword of the Lord's mouth, the Word which He again and again spoke separating between Him and her, showing her that she was a sinner like all other women, and must rise like all others through repentance and faith. "Here in Simeon's prophecy the whole result lies *in nuce*, in twelve years it will begin to be fulfilled, at the wedding in Cana it will be *in luce*, and then be finally confirmed on the cross."

The concluding words of this very striking production are worth translation: "We recognise in this verse, the final testament of the Lord, the truth of what is said in Jno. xiii. 1, 'having loved His own that were in the world, He loved them to the end;' yea, we mark in it a mighty evidence of His special love to Mary, which the agony of death and redemption could not hinder from marking His mother, and looking into her inmost heart and caring for her interests. But, indeed, we do not think of the external provision, nor of the external future of that mother: for she would not have been wholly uncared for even after the Lord's departure. If the brethren were not yet believing they would nevertheless have taken charge of Mary. Moreover there was a refuge for her in the house of Cleopas with her sister Mary, and in the house of Zebedee with her sister Salome. The disciple to whom the Lord commended her might indeed have been presupposed to be less able than they to take care of her; his apostolical vocation would often interfere with his attention to her, and his attention to her would sometimes interfere with his apostolical vocation. But the Lord did not say: 'Behold your provider and guardian!' Many other terms might have been employed for that. But the Lord chooses the words mother and son. The evangelist terms her 'his mother' still; but as before

the Lord she was only 'woman,' and hence 'behold thy son!' Mary beholds Him who had been her son. He addresses her with 'woman,' and once more reminds her that she has no longer a son in Him; but at the same time by glance and word He points to John and gives him to her as a son. And how are we to understand this? Here, as always, when He takes away aught from His own, He gives compensation; He gives Mary a son instead of Him whom she had lost. Of course we cannot speak of a perfect equivalent; but none can doubt that it was the best available. Grotius explains it rightly: 'Hic tibi pro me filii loco erit;' only that the future is wrong. . . . But not alone the negative result of Cana, the consummation of the division between mother and son; we see here also the positive side, the faith of the mother, brought into perfect light. Not that Mary gave, even here, any verbal or audible avowal of her faith. Down to the very last she remained faithful to her own rule of faith; she acted in harmony with the last words handed down in the Gospel: 'Whatsoever He shall say that do.' Until this last trying moment she had silently given that twofold demonstration of her believing which consisted in the 'patience' and in the 'obedience of faith.' Silently she remains under the cross, without making any pretension to a specific care on the part of the dying Lord; and we hold with Tholuck that the words spoken directly to herself were by her altogether unexpected. It was not indeed without the profoundest grief that she stood thus; for she saw Him whom she had borne, 'her consolation and Israel's,' scorned, set at nought, in agony, and dying on the accursed tree. 'She sees Him suspended and cannot touch Him; sees Him bound and cannot release Him; sees Him wounded throughout His frame and cannot bind Him up; hears Him cry "I thirst," and cannot give Him to drink' (Gerhard). Nevertheless she stood firm. Ambrose says on this: '*Stantem lego, flentem non lego.*' All that the Roman fathers have fabled of her anguish and despondencies, of her swoons and agonies, Lampe has sufficiently dismissed; but instead of them this expositor has pointed to the beautiful contrast between her confident beholding, when the ark of the Lord was dishonoured, and the death of terror which the wife of Phinehas suffered (1 Sam. iv. 19). Mary stood, like the other women, though the Crucified was the fruit of her body. She could stand and did stand, when the disciples fled. Thus she showed her patience or endurance. She receives the last 'Woman,' and notes the last look which consummates here the separation. She intently follows the disciple. That is her 'obedience of faith.'"

Thus our author, having thoroughly at the outset settled his principle, and made the great prophecy over the Infant signify that His words should separate between the human mother and

the Divine Son, is true to his thought throughout. The sermon is a good one, though the text is an invention. But we must give the last sentence, in which the Mother of Jesus is dismissed.

"Mary is supposed to have remained below some eleven years. Her future life is in keeping with that led since Cana. She retires altogether, and is merged in the congregation. She is not once mentioned in connection with the resurrection. It was not till the Middle Ages that the legend was found that the Risen One appeared to her first after she was warned by Gabriel; and it was not till then that the figure of the blessed among women was surrounded by a dense mass of myths. The Scripture says nothing of a special visit paid to her. Only once does she appear (Acts i. 14) as belonging to the little company of the disciples. In this circle, still and hidden, she waited in the faith of the Son of God for her dismissal from the body, and experienced the glorious power of God in her perfection, until the hour came when she went to the 'marriage of the Lamb,' where she still magnifies Him for that moment when at the 'marriage in Cana in Galilee' He had said to her, 'Woman, what have I to do with thee?'"

Dr. Drach on the First Epistle of St. John.

La Sainte Bible, avec Commentaires Théologiques, Moraux, Philologiques, Historiques, etc., rediges d'après les meilleurs Travaux Anciens et Contemporains, et Introduction Critique speciale pour chaque Libre. Par M. l'Abbé Drach, du Clergé de Paris, Docteur en Théologie. Texte Latin de la Vulgate, Traduction Française en Regard. Par M. l'Abbé A. Bayle, Docteur en Théologie. Epitres Catholiques. Paris: Lethellieux. 1873.

The volume before us is an instalment of a series of commentaries on Holy Scripture which bid fair to occupy a prominent place in Romanist exegetical literature. They have the imprimatur of the Archbishop of Paris, and are of course written in the spirit of the strictest submission to the Church. The Abbé Drach takes as his motto the beautiful words of St. Bernard, which express a sentiment which he supposed he held, but which can hardly be reconciled with some of his free utterances on more than one subject. Our editor thus speaks on his motto, "To give an idea of the spirit in which our work has been conceived and executed, we think we cannot do better than borrow from St. Bernard (Ep. clxxiv.) the following protestation: 'Romanæ præsertim Ecclesiæ auctoritati et examini totum hoc, sicut et cætera quæ ejusmodi sunt, universa reservo, ipsius, si quid aliter

sapio, paratus judicio emendare.'" How far this subjection to the censorship of Rome has tended to cramp Roman Catholic Biblical investigation needs no proof. But these volumes are proof that it does not altogether suppress the spirit of inquiry, however much it may fetter it. Be that as it may, it is well for us to see what the most recent exegetical fruits of Romanist research are worth. And we value these volumes as being, on the whole, a very fair exhibition of these results.

If any treatise or Epistle of the New Testament presents a hard text to the Romanist expositor, it is the Epistle of St. John. From beginning to end it seems to us to be a silent protest against most of the errors of the mediæval Church. It is written, as it were, with the set purpose of obviating beforehand the corruptions which so soon set in. It is an Epistle which furnishes no germs for Romish development. Hence we were curious to see how it would be treated by one who adopts the maxim above quoted. And we find how subtle and all-pervading is the influence of the ecclesiastical spirit, and the determination to force everything into conformity with later dogma. It is true that Dr. Drach has before him, and diligently uses, the latest commentaries on our Epistle which Germany has produced. But he is sublimely indifferent to their views, though perfectly fair in stating them. What he cannot reconcile with his system as the Greek text presents it, he finds in the version of the Vulgate, and, when that fails him, the tradition of the Church comes to his aid. If residual difficulties occur he is content to leave them unexplained; satisfied, where the Church has not pronounced, to keep silence himself. A few illustrations may not be inappropriate.

It is remarkable that our expositor not only abstains from giving his own particular opinion on passages of difficulty, but also leaves some of them hopelessly obscure. If this springs from the spirit of humility, overwhelmed by mystery, or submitting to the discipline of the concealing Spirit, it is most worthy of the expositor. But then it is hard to reconcile it with the theory of an infallible interpretation given by the same holy Spirit, abiding as an Expositor, who gave the Scriptures as an Inspirer. Whenever the text is to be wrested from the hands of a Protestant exegete, the authority of the Church comes in at once to give it a certain sound, and a most peremptory meaning. Whenever a text can be made to subserve the defence of any special tridentine dogma, there is no vacillation whatever about its meaning. But in all cases of difficulty which do not touch the subjects of controversy between Rome and the Reformation, there is everywhere a dreary submission to uncertainty, which, to say the least, is inconsistent with the Romanist theory. It may be said that it is not the will of the Spirit to clear up the mysteries of Scripture; though it is His will to defend it against the

attacks of heresy. But surely the course of the ages should gradually clear away the mists from the obscurer places, and give assurance to the perplexed students of God's Word as to the meaning of some such passages as we meet with in this little Epistle. They are passages of vital moment both to faith and practice; and it seems hard to be told by the expositors of a Church in which the infallible court of appeal is set up, that we must not expect to know what the writer meant in any particular passage. We dare not expect that the depths of mystery will be sounded, or that the unsearchable things of God will be made intelligible to the human understanding. But we should expect that the voice of Holy Scripture would be everywhere cleared from ambiguity.

Let us turn to the paragraph of the earthly and the Heavenly Witnesses. We find that where all the results of criticism, with its vast and compact mass of evidences, seems to contradict an assertion of the infallible Church, it is most ruthlessly despised and swept away, as if it were worth nothing: "We have proved that the verse of the Divine Witnesses in heaven is perfectly authentic. It furnishes in favour of the mystery of the holy Trinity a magnificent testimony." The expositor thinks he has proved this, though his main argument is simply the indirect dictum of the canon of Trent. Here there is no hesitation whatever. But of the previous verse, which deeply concerns the theology of redemption, and concerning which there has been attained a very general exegetical consent among Protestants at least, he has nothing determinate to say. "The readers whom the Apostle addressed were, without doubt, perfectly familiar with the meaning of the words contained in these verses. Unfortunately tradition has not preserved this meaning. Thus these two verses (6 and 8) have been in all ages classed among the special difficulties of the New Testament. It follows that the interpretations which have been proposed have been very various." We shall translate the commentary here in full: it will give an illustration of the fact that Catholic expositors have just the same uncertainty about Scriptures as that which they charge on heretics, as also of the honesty and simplicity with which some of them confess it. Moreover, it will show that the sacramental theory, which is by many Protestant expositors bound up with this text, is not forced upon it by the highest of all Sacramentarians.

"Hic est qui venit. The Greek participle with the article affirms that Jesus Christ is the Messiah come into the world, the Messiah whom at the time of the Passover the Jews were accustomed to speak of as *the Coming*. Per aquam et sanguinem. What are we to understand by these words of the Apostle, that He came *by water and blood?* The efforts of exegetes have not

yet succeeded in giving a clear and satisfactory exposition of them, such as can overcome objections urged against it. We have by no means any hope of succeeding where our predecessors have failed. All that we can do is to submit to the reader the interpretation which seems to us preferable to others: acknowledging that it is far from clearing away all difficulties, and giving repose to the inquiring mind. There are four principal opinions as to the meaning of water and blood in verses 6 and 8. The first, supported by many, following St. Augustine, thinks that the words refer to the water and the blood which flowed on the cross from the side of the Redeemer pierced with the lance. These authors remark on the Apostle's earnest exhibition of this fact as a support of faith (John xix. 34, 35). Let us remember, however, that as to this and other interpretations, we are bound to consider at one and the same moment verses 6 and 8. Then we see how much opposes the interpretation. 1. It gives no account of the insistance in these words on "not in water only, but, etc." 2. Nor does it explain how and why the adversaries, whom St. John here combats, admitted that Jesus Christ was come, and was manifested "in water only," and not "in water and blood." 3. The marvellous element in the fact related in the Gospel consists in the simultaneous issue of water and of blood from the body of our Saviour. But here St. John considers the water and the blood as rendering testimony, each apart from the other, and evidence admitted by the adversaries, one part of it without the other. 4. This interpretation supposes that the Epistle was composed after the Gospel, or conjointly. This hypotheais may be admitted; but it may be contested also, as we have contested it in our preface. It appears to us, therefore, preferable to consider the passage of the Epistle and that of the Gospel as independent of each other. Then in the Gospel St. John spoke of the water and blood, in order to prove the reality of the body of Jesus Christ; in the Epistle he would prove the divinity of the Saviour. In this case the words would not, in the two documents, refer to the same fact."

This seems a very cold and hard decision on the first theory. After reading it, let any one turn to the two passages severally, and ask himself if he can admit that the Apostle had not the same most solemn event in his thought? What St. John "saw" and "beheld"—to recall his first words,—still and for ever lingered in his mind. Its impression was ineffaceable, just as what St. Thomas saw was ineffaceable from his mind. But this does not involve the supposition that he makes no other use of the circumstance, if such it may be called. In the Gospel he simply records an event, and gave his most solemn authentication of it. In the Epistle he further explains what in the Gospel he only narrated. So that we may admit that the two allusions to the water and the

blood refer to the same event; but that in the Epistle only is its theological meaning unfolded. The distinction that in the Gospel the reality of our Lord's body is taught, and in the Epistle His Divinity, cannot be regarded as a valid one. It is the Messiahship and not the Divinity of Christ that is the object of the triple testimony.

The second theory is thus stated. "According to another view, the Epistle is referring to the sacraments of baptism and of the eucharist. But, first, this meaning given to the words *water and blood* appears to us unusual and arbitrary. Secondly, it allies itself with the expression *coming by*, only in a very forced manner." This seems a strange dictum for a Catholic expositor. Surely the Saviour might be said to come as the Messiah, introducing a new system of worship by, or accompanied by, the institution of water baptism, in conformity with His own baptism by water, and by the other sacrament which commemorated His blood for the remission of sins. However, we agree that this was not the Apostle's main intention. It was present to his mind; for every event in the Lord's life, His baptism and His death especially, has its reference to believers who are one with Him in His whole Messianic work. But here is not the exegetical solution.

The third theory is thus set forth, though it is remarkable to find our expositor of the infallible Church descending to give a "view" on so important a subject. "A third opinion maintained by Le Hir takes the expression in the same meaning as *coming in flesh*. In this case the words *water and blood* would be integrating parts of one unique idea. A simple reading of verses 6 and 8 declares this view untenable; though it was held by the learned and virtuous Sulpician, whose memory is blessed by all who knew him."

The last opinion refers the substantive *water*, in verses 6 and 8, to the baptism of St. John, and the substantive *blood* to the sacrificial baptism of Christ on the cross. Then the following is the thought of those who maintain it. It is known from the St. Irenæus and the Philosophumena that the heretics whom St. John combated taught, among other speculations, that Jesus Christ was indeed the Christ at the moment when He received baptism at the hands of the Baptist; but that at the moment when Jesus Christ was offered on the cross the Christ or the Saviour separated from Jesus, and that there was immolated only the gross flesh formed in the womb of Mary. The Saviour, or the heavenly and spiritual substance united to Jesus at the moment of His baptism, flew back to the heavens, and was not by any means subject to death. In opposition to this absurdity the Apostle affirms that Jesus ought to be regarded as the Christ, not only at His baptism, *not in water only*, but also at the moment of His immolation on the cross, *in water and blood:* so that the

Saviour really *came by water and blood.* This interpretation does not remove every difficulty, as we must freely acknowledge; nevertheless, it appears more acceptable than the others, and in this point of view we present it to our readers. It claims the authority of Tertullian, and of many modern authors."

It seems strange that our expositor should find much difficulty in accepting this interpretation. For ourselves, we should say that the heretics are not so much in the Apostle's mind as this theory supposes, that is, he was elevated to a higher consideration by the very refutation that he, as it were, incidentally makes. His argument is that the faith which overcometh the world is that which believes that "Jesus is the Son of God." Thence the glorious array of testimonies on which that faith rests: the general mission of Christ sealed in His baptism; the special mission of the Redeeming and dying Saviour; and both attested by the Holy Spirit. As to the witness of the Spirit, it is not co-ordinate with the water and the blood in the verse: the Spirit it is who witnesses to Christ who "it is that cometh." Hence appears the strangeness and unworthiness of the interpretation of the Spirit in ver. 8, given here on high authority, but only to be condemned. "St. Augustine, Pope Innocent III., Walafrid Strabo, and many others following them, understand by *Spirit*, in ver. 8, the breath of life which Jesus Christ expired at the moment of death. For our part, we think that here St. John would prove, not the real humanity, but the Divinity of our Saviour; and, consequently, the term *Spirit* has the same meaning in both verses."

We cannot but contrast with this vacillation and timidity the confidence of the comment on that glorious verse which follows, disabusing the internal evidence of the Spirit. The expositor finds no difficulty in giving a decided note where the Church is concerned, and even imports into the passage a thought that it does not contain. "*Hath the witness in himself.* For him who believes in Jesus Christ, and in the Church which He hath founded, and who makes this faith the principle and the rule of all his conduct, the witness of God touching His Son is not an exterior witness, but a witness interior, intimate, which has penetrated, animated, and vivified his intelligence and his will." Here faith in the Church is introduced, though of this there is not a gleam throughout the Epistle. Again, at a later verse: "*We know that we are of God.* If this proposition is understood of Christians in general, the verb indicates a certain knowledge. But the Catholic Church teaches us that the same verb only indicates a probable knowledge when the proposition is referred to particular Christians." Whatever the Catholic Church may teach, St. John does not teach this, on the contrary, he lays the emphasis everywhere on the personal conviction of a faith of

assurance, which is inwrought in every individual believer, testifying in himself all the Scripture through the Spirit externally testifies. The Apostles alone intermediate between the Spirit and us, and they only through the Scriptures they have written. Of the Church as the organ of this evidence he speaks nothing. But this leads to the consideration of the passage which teaches the personal *unction* of the Holy One, teaching all things.

"This passage is celebrated on account of the past and present perversion of it by Protestants, who make it prove that there is not in the Church a supreme authority instituted by Jesus to which all are obliged to submit: but that, in consequence of the interior inspiration of the Holy Spirit every believer is directed, in a certain manner, to judge for himself what he should believe and reject, and what is the meaning to be given to the sacred Scriptures of which each is the legitimate interpreter. But the Apostle says nothing here of that kind. He only says that he needs not to stay long on the instruction which he gives to the faithful, as to the dogmas which concern the one Person and the two natures of Jesus Christ, the Son of God made man. For they are sufficiently instructed on that subject. They have received, and they receive on this point, and on all others, the teaching of their pastors; but this instruction would be useless to them if it was not, at the same time, accompanied by the interior teaching, or the invisible unction from on high. See on this passage the fine commentary of St. Augustine, who draws up here the teaching of the Catholic Church." Now there is much imported here which the text says nothing about; and much is imputed to the Protestant theory with which it is not chargeable. It does teach that Jesus Christ has not set up in the Church an infallible authority to which every Christian is obliged to submit. What that infallible authority is another quotation will show: "It is not here a question of the sacramental unction which Christians receive in confirmation; but of a spiritual unction which consists in the graces by which the Spirit illuminates our spirits and touches our hearts." "When it is said that we *know all things*, it does not mean that nothing is hidden from believers, but that all, believers or pastors, know, though in a different measure, what it is necessary for them to know. The faithful know these truths through their pastors, and these learn it from the Holy Spirit, as long as they remain united to the Church and to the Pope, their infallible chief." Now it is this that the Protestant theory protests against. It denies that the truth is lodged in the Church as under the infallible teaching of the Pontiff. It believes that the body of the faithful must remain for ever united to the "Apostles' doctrine and fellowship." This St. John in our Epistle most plainly states, but nothing more than this. Of any distinction between the Spirit's teaching of pastors and His teach-

ing of the flock it has no trace. All are alike blessed with the unction which is here well described by our expositor. But we will translate St. Augustine's words, which will be found not to bear out the strong interpretation forced upon them. This is his language as quoted exactly by our expositor :—

"His unction teacheth you of all things. What therefore do we, brethren, in that we teach you? If His unction teacheth you of all things, as if we labour without reason. . . But now I ask myself a question, and ask it of the Apostle himself. . . Thou hast said that His unction teacheth you of all things. Then why hast thou written such an epistle? Why dost thou teach them? . . . Now here see a great sacrament, brethren : the sound of our words strikes the ear, the Teacher is within. . . If He is not within who teaches, our sound is altogether empty . . . He has His seat in heaven who teacheth the hearts. . . Therefore the interior Master it is who teacheth; Christ teacheth; His inspiration teacheth. Where His unction and His inspiration is not, empty and outside are all our words. . . This therefore we say to you : whether we plant, whether we water, by our words, we are nothing; but He who giveth the increase is God, that is, it is His unction which teacheth you of all things." Observe, *Cathedram in cælo habet qui corda docet.* Vain it is therefore to plead St. Augustine for the theory of a *Cathedra Petri infallibilis.* Vain it is to add, as our commentator does : "In the pastors as in the faithful, the interior unction teaches only what is in conformity with the Catholic tradition. What is contrary to that is not an unction coming from Jesus Christ, but a seduction coming from the spirit of error and of lying."

The Protestant theory does not impute to every believer the unrestrained license of interpreting all Scripture according to his own mind. It has its analogy of faith. It has its doctrine of submission to the general consent of the Christian Church, rightly interpreted. It acknowledges the difficulties of Scripture, and the importance of suspending judgment on individual passages. It allows that every one is responsible for the light that is in the Church : through its learning and continuous study, and, above all, through its permanent indwelling expositor the Holy Ghost. But it denies that the one body commonly called the Catholic Church, under an infallible Head, is the arbiter of all questions. And it asserts that in all things pertaining to the truth "as the truth is in Jesus," the believer, through the unction of the Holy One, shall be preserved in all truth.

It is hard to resist a temptation to give the editor's gallant defence of the verse of "the Heavenly Witnesses." This we shall do in abridgment and with a few comments of our own; only premising that it contains all that can be said on behalf of an interpretation which modern criticism almost unanimously has agreed

to reject; and therefore, that the discussion in his hands will have a certain interest for many who secretly look with regret on the state of the evidence against the passage.

"Among Protestant authors, from the beginning of this century, it has become an axiom that this verse does not belong to the primitive part of the Epistle, but is an interpolation subsequent to St. John. From the year 1522, Luther, after having attacked it in a public conference, omitted it in his German version of the sacred Scriptures. On the other hand Erasmus, after having eliminated it from his first two editions of the New Testament, recoiled before the indignation of the Catholics, and inserted it in his third edition of 1522. The learned and bold Cajetan, in his commentary on this Epistle, expressed doubts as to its authenticity. But he was less guilty than Richard Simon who, at the end of the century, and therefore soon after the Council of Trent, renewed the attack upon the verse. He mitigated the attack, however, by adding his confession, 'It is only the authority of the Church which makes us receive the verse as genuine.' At the beginning of the eighteenth century Mill, a learned Englishman, admitting the authenticity of the verse, maintained that it was not found in the fathers of the second and third centuries, who certainly would have cited it if it had been known to them. Mill threw this out as an objection to be answered, but Griesbach made it an irrefragable proof of the interpolation of the verse, which he therefore included within brackets. Michaelis was still stronger, and Cellerier did not hesitate to say: 'It is not worth while to return to the subject; it has been long decided by those who believe in criticism and understand it. If criticism is deceived in this case it must be deceived in everything.' When, in 1836, Scholz, a Catholic priest and professor in the university of Bonn, did not hesitate to scandalise the faithful, he went further than Griesbach, and eliminated the passage entirely from his edition. So Tischendorf and others. Catholics protested, in the name of science, against such pretensions. Without speaking of the labours of Noel Alexander, Martianay, Bianchini, and Bengel, who, though Protestant, was an ardent defender of the verse, we will content ourselves by mentioning Calmet, Perrone, Le Hir, and especially Father Franzelin. This last has gone beyond his predecessors, and by the solid and compact manner of his arguments has proved the baselessness of contrary arguments. This learned Jesuit's line of defence of the verse, so disdainfully rejected by contemporaneous criticisms, we will now follow.

"The first and the principal argument is the decree of the Council of Trent: 'Si quis autem libros ipsos integros cum omnibus suis partibus, prout in Ecclesia Catholica legi consueverunt, et in veteri vulgata latina editione habentur, pro sacris

et canonicis non susceperit . . . anathema sit.' Now, as these important words were found in the Vulgate at the time of the Council they are covered by the decree. We are bound to believe that the verse was always in the Vulgate, and in the primitive text of which it was the translation. The Vatican Council confirmed that of Trent, and thus the authenticity of the verse has been twice defined by the Church. The Catholic theologian, Bade, did not sufficiently consider this absolute authority for every Catholic when he asserted that the verse was altogether devoid of authenticity.

"The second proof is the public and uninterrupted use by the Church of the verse in question. This is admitted by our adversaries as from the ninth century. Now criticism, if dispassionate, should admit that the Roman Church would not have admitted into the sacred word a passage which had not been found there before. But we can prove that, before the ninth century, the verse was cited and known by churches which used the Vulgate. We may ask the writers of the African Church, where our Latin version originated, though retouched afterwards by Jerome on the invitation of Pope Damasus. In a profession of faith drawn up at Carthage, in the year 484, we read: 'Et ut adhuc luce clarius unius Divinitatis esse cum Patre et Filio Spiritum sanctum doceamus, Joannis Evangelistæ testimonio comprobatur. Ait namque: tres sunt qui testimonium perhibent in cœlo, Pater, Verbum, et Spiritus sanctus, et hi tres unum sunt.' St. Fulgentius cites our verse twice, and once quotes Cyprian of the second century: "Quod etiam beatus martyr Cyprianus in epistola de unitate ecclesiæ confitetur: dicit Dominus, ego et Pater unum sumus; et iterum de Patre et Filio et Spiritu scriptum est: et tres unum sunt.' Griesbach and others would make these words refer to the eighth and not to the seventh of 1 John v. That this objection holds good appears from the passage of Facundus, in the fifth century, which says: 'Tres sunt qui testimonium dant in terra, Spiritus, aqua, et sanquis et hi tres unum sunt; in Spiritu significans Patrem, &c.,' quoting Cyprian to the same effect, that the eighth verse, namely, taught mystically the doctrine of the Trinity." Tertullian's evidence does not show that he ever saw the verse, nor does all that is said about St. Augustine establish the fact that he had ever read it or ever uses it, and all the efforts that are put forth to make it appear that it was known before the testimony of the bishops at Carthage in the fifth century fail to carry any weight.

Thus the whole strength of our editor's cause is the authority of the Vulgate, and that in its present form; and the authority of the Vulgate is simply that which the recognition of the Western Church gives it. Against that the authority of the Eastern Church counts for nothing. "As it respects the Church

of the East, it furnishes us with few testimonies in favour of our verse. In a recent learned work the English Dr. Forster has thought that he can trace the citation of it in many passages where the Greek fathers speak of the unity of essence and trinity of hypostases in God. But his laborious researches have in our judgment failed. Nevertheless we think we can prove, though in an indirect way, the existence of the verse in Greek manuscripts." But the indirect proof is very indirect. It amounts to a quotation in Athanasius, which criticism rejects as spurious, and certain references in the eleventh and twelfth centuries. Three Greek MSS. of late date reproduce it. And, lastly, the liturgy of the Greeks and Russians has retained it. But all this weighs little against the absence of the text in the fundamental and original codices; against the fact that in the earliest manuscripts of the Vulgate itself it is wanting; against its absence in the Syriac and earlier Armenian and Slavonic versions; and, finally, against the neglect of any such cardinal proof in the Arian controversy.

Against the first and second arguments it is alleged that the earliest Greek manuscripts are of the fifth, or at best, of the fourth century, and that the earliest of the Vulgate are of the sixth century, while Cyprian and Tertullian are in evidence of a text anterior to all these. But it is plain enough to any one who reads the quotations from those fathers that they are referring rather to the eighth verse than to the seventh. And, as to the Vulgate, "in virtue of the Catholic principle of the infallibility of the Church, guardian and legitimate interpreter of the Holy Scriptures, what is given by her to us as an authentic portion of a canonical book cannot by any means be considered as the work of an interpolator; for, in that case, the Church would be deceiving herself in giving to us and in employing in her liturgy, as divinely inspired like the other canonical portions, a word which would be no more than a human word. If this verse, as we cannot doubt, has always been a part of the Vulgate, we must believe, in virtue of the decree of Trent as to its authenticity, that it was found in the Greek manuscripts on which it was composed in the second century." Recourse is had to the dictum of Michaelis that "we can less easily conceive of the insertion of a passage than of its omission, especially between two words which have the same termination." And then we are challenged, even in a scientific point of view, to admit the impossibility of the insertion into the text as authentic of a passage equally important with that which here is concerned. Reasons are found which will account for its omission in so many manuscripts, both Greek and Latin. It may have been from pure inadvertence, occasioned by the conformity between the first and last words of verses 7 and 8, a point which might have been put more strongly than it is, though, allowing it all its

force, it will not be sufficient to account for so general an omission. Then comes a striking argument which must be translated. "We know by the testimony of Eusebius himself that he was charged by Constantine to obtain the transcription of fifty copies of the sacred text destined to be sent to the principal churches of the empire. These served doubtless as models for a great number of manuscripts. The ideas of Eusebius, Le Hir observes, may have led him to omit this verse, notwithstanding that he found no pretext for the omission in any disagreement of manuscripts. Now, Michaelis remarks again, an error admitted into two or three ancient manuscripts is naturally transmitted to all the copies drawn from them. Thus the great number objected against us is greatly reduced, as they represent only a very limited number of originals." But, even supposing Eusebius and Constantine capable of this tremendous fraud, is it credible that the entire Church of the Nicene age, already so critical, could have been made the victims of it? As to the other versions referred to, our editor allows them no weight, as they were made from the fourth to the ninth century on the bases of Greek manuscripts which, for some reason or other, were without the verse; and also because they were posterior to our Latin version, which surpasses them all in antiquity and in authority.

The enormous power of the argument from the silence of the controversial fathers is thus dealt with. "Their silence proves nothing against the verse, because those fathers who have not cited it have also abstained from citing other authentic texts favourable to the mystery of the Holy Trinity. Again, the design of these fathers did not always demand the rigorous employment of this text. Moreover, they might through prudence have dismissed or concealed the verse, which was wanting in some manuscripts, its authority being open to challenge on the part of the heretics. The number of those disputants to whom this remark applies is in reality of slight importance; it is only a negative argument, which has no weight as counterbalancing the positive proofs which we have brought forward." Thus weakly ends a weak process of argumentation. Nothing in the writings of the great dogmatists and controversialists of that age warrants such an attack upon their simplicity, honesty, and directness. Their notions of "economy" or prudence were not those of a subsequent age and a degenerate church. The text in question, had it been genuine, had it been indeed in any Greek copies of that time, would have led the van of the controversy. But the dissertation we have abridged closes with words that we must give without abridgment: words which show how the spirit of deference to ecclesiastical authority blinds the eyes of those who are its slaves.

"Having reached the end of our discussion, we express the

hope that our readers will pardon its length, compressed as it is. Our object has been to defend against the attacks of modern Rationalism both this verse, as highly important in a dogmatic point of view, and at the same time the authority of the Catholic Church which presents it to us as canonical. There are scarcely any but enemies of the mystery of the Holy Trinity who make it the object of their attacks, always more numerous in proportion as faith in the mysteries of our holy religion disappears among Protestants. This is the reason that, among the adversaries of our verse, the Socinians and the Rationalists have always distinguished themselves by the persistency and the vigour of their assaults, as also by their pains in gathering together all that might seem more or less fit to destroy the authority of a passage which yields so strong and so overwhelming a testimony against their Antitrinitarian doctrine." This is exceedingly hard measure for the great host of orthodox defenders of the Trinity who have been constrained to give up this text. It ignores the considerable number also of Protestants who have pleaded far more ably for the genuineness of the passage than any Romanist critics, at least until very recent times. Moreover, it is unjust to the distinguished Romanist critics who have been among its foremost assailants, and who have actually erased the passage which their more moderate Protestant coadjutors were contented before their time to bracket. Again, it lays strange stress upon the value of the text in upholding the doctrine of the Trinity; seeing that it says no more than the uncontested baptismal formula of our Lord presents to our baptismal faith. Indeed, this kind of argumentation might seem more appropriate to a Protestant, who appeals to the evidence of Scripture, than to a Romanist whose faith in the mysteries of the Faith rests proximately on the decisions of the Church. Hence, lastly, the whole resolves itself into a most undue deference to the Church's authentication of a corrupt version, in more or less avowed disparagement of the sacred original which the Holy Ghost inspired and gave, and, we doubt not, preserves to the Church in its integrity.

It was our purpose to make some comments on the noble ethical strain of our commentary, which, on the whole, is worthy of the epistle it expounds. Space fails, and we can only refer to what seems to us a strange mass of inconsistencies in the Catholic doctrine of the necessary inherency of original sin as a rule. Instead of discussing the subject, we will quote a few passages of the notes on the text, "If we say that we have no sin," and the paragraph in which it occurs. "*Cleanseth us*, not in a way exterior and altogether imputative, as Protestants say; but it purifies us from our sins by effacing them, and causing the stain to disappear from our souls. Moreover, the blood of Jesus Christ does not purify us through an act of faith, but by the application

of His merits which Jesus Himself makes by means of the sacraments of the holy sacrifice of the mass. All sin, whether original or actual, is pardoned only in view of the merits of Jesus Christ, and by their application to us. So the Holy Virgin was preserved from all touch of sin whether actual or original. The blood purifies us from our present sins, and it alone can purify us from sins that we may commit. Catholic theologians use this text, 'If we say that we have no sin,' to prove that no one, without special privilege, like that of the Holy Virgin, can keep himself from slight fault." There is not only here an application of the virtue of Christ's blood to prevent original sin, such as Scripture denies, but also a remarkable inconsistency with the doctrine of Trent as to the nature of original sin itself as taken away by baptism. After quoting authorities ancient and modern to show that no man is without indwelling sin, the editor thus proceeds: "Nevertheless, we must guard against a grave error. The apostle teaches that we ought not, that we cannot, think or say that we are entirely impeccable in any degree whatever. But we may not infer from this that, as the pseudo-Reformers said, we sin at least venially in each of our good works." There is a true doctrine concerning the extinction of sin that is clear of both these extremes; which many Romanists have held, but which our commentator does not seem to understand. It does not plead for "impeccability," nor does it admit that all good works are tainted with sin. Writing on the conjunction of forgiving and cleansing in ver. 9, he says: "The second of these verbs shows that the first must be understood of a remission real and not imputative:" a singular confusion.

We cannot recommend this volume, and the large work of which it is a fragment, as containing a good independent commentary. But it is valuable as a book of reference, in which we may see the latest style of Romanist exposition in the presence of modern lights, and in defence of error which these lights make only too manifest.

Dean Mansel on the Gnostic Heresies.

The Gnostic Heresies of the First and Second Centuries. By the late H. C. Mansel, D.D., Dean of St. Paul's, sometime Professor of Ecclesiastical History at Oxford. With a Sketch of his Work, Life, and Character. By the Earl of Carnarvon. Edited by J. B. Lightfoot, D.D., Canon of St. Paul's. London: Murray. 1875.

On more than one occasion the name of the late Dean Mansel has been prominent in our pages: always mentioned with profound respect and admiration, even when the tendency of his religious philosophy has been matter of censure and warning.

We now have to speak of him as one who has been. The book before us is posthumous; and is prefaced, as it should be, by a sketch of his career. This introduction to the volume has somewhat disappointed our expectation. It is admirable so far as it goes; but does not reveal much that we should all like to know of a man who so much influenced the thoughts of his time. With the first paragraph of Earl Carnarvon's Introduction before us, it seems hardly fair to make any criticism on the scantiness of the information. But the ample promise of the title justifies the stricture.

The few sketches here given are, however, of great interest, and drawn up in perfect good taste. This is the general estimate of the intellectual character of the author of the "Limits of Religious Thought." "Dean Mansel's mind was one of the highest order. Its greatness perhaps, as was truly said by Canon Liddon, was not such as best commands immediate popular recognition or sympathy, but it was not on that account the less powerful. The intellect was of such a kind that some may have failed to appreciate it, and to understand that they 'were close to a mind—almost the only mind in England—to which all the heights and all the depths of the most recent speculation respecting the highest truth that can be grasped by the human understanding were perfectly familiar;' but now that death has intervened, a truer estimate, as so often happens, is possible; and both by those who knew him personally, and by those who can only know him in his writings, his very great power will perhaps be more fully acknowledged. I do not mean that his remarkable capacity was, or could be ignored. The honours that he had gained, and the position that he had achieved, would alone have rendered this impossible; and at Oxford there was no misapprehension, on this point, as to the man. There the wide range of his mind and attainments was correctly appreciated; but the outer world knew him chiefly as a great metaphysical thinker, and perhaps only a minority even of those few who have an acquaintance with metaphysical studies rated him at his true standard. Of his consummate gifts in the province of metaphysics none, indeed, but a professed metaphysician can with propriety speak; yet this an outsider and an old pupil may say—that for clear thought, full knowledge, and an unsurpassed gift of expression—qualities which give especial value to this branch of study—he was second to none. So singularly lucid was the language in which difficult and involved subjects were presented by him to the reader or hearer, that none had the excuse that Bishop Butler modestly suggests to those who may be perplexed with the hardness of style which is to be found in his own masterly works. If, indeed, from a different point of view, Dean Mansel's writings were open to criticism, it was that this extreme

lucidity and force of expression were such that in literary controversy he sometimes dealt out to his opponents heavier blows than he possibly intended. One of his antagonists, worthy of all respect—and all the more that, like Dean Mansel, he has passed away from the arena of earthly controversy to a scene where those higher questions of a future life on which he sometimes dwelt are now all solved—has left a proof of his candour and truthfulness in the admission that, although still adhering to his own view of a particular subject under dispute, he was over matched by the Dean in the actual dialectics of debate. It often occurred to me that his possession of this singularly transparent style, when dealing with the most abstract and complicated questions, was in a great measure due to a perfect familiarity with classical literature. He sought and mastered it in early life, and, unlike many who are inclined to disparage, for more modern studies, the learning which for so many generations gave to the world its greatest minds and its most humanizing gifts, he followed and delighted in it to the last. And, like a grateful mistress, classical learning rewarded his devotions with that style and skill of fence which lent him so formidable a superiority in the literary warfare of theological discussions."

When the Professor of Moral and Metaphysical Philosophy became Regius Professor of Ecclesiastical History it was feared that a mistake had been made. But the editor aptly remarks that there are provinces of the development of doctrine in the church which can be successfully occupied only by one who has a familiar acquaintance with ancient and modern philosophy. Dr. Mansel began by concentrating his attention on one of these tracts in ecclesiastical history, the region of Gnosticism. We have the result in the present volume; and, after carefully and with much advantage reading it, we cannot help mourning that the author was not permitted to follow the subject into the later development of Gnosticism in the Middle Ages and down to modern times. Canon Lightfoot's Preface to the volume contains a few sentences which must be quoted for their own sake, and as the starting-point of a few comments on the volume as a whole.

"I do not think that I need offer any apology for having recommended the publication of these lectures. The student will be grateful for the guidance of a singularly clear and well-trained thinker through the mazes of this intricate subject. Since the discovery of the work of Hippolytus, which has added largely to the materials for a history of Gnosticism, English literature has furnished no connected account of this important chapter in the progress of religious thought. Indeed, with the single exception of Lipsius' elaborate article in Ersch and Gruber, which was written subsequently to this discovery, all the French and German works (so far as I am aware), which treat of the subject as a

whole, labour under the same defect. Nor again, will the subject itself stand in need of any apology. The time is gone by when the Gnostic theories could be regarded as the mere ravings of religious lunatics. The problems which taxed the powers of a Basilides and a Valentinus are felt to be among the most profound and most difficult which can occupy the human mind. Even the Gnostic solutions of these problems are not altogether out of date in the second half of this nineteenth century, as the dualistic tendencies of Mr. John Stuart Mill's posthumous Three Essays will show. At such a time an exposition of the subject from a distinctly Christian point of view, written by one who apprehended with singular clearness the gravity of the issues involved, cannot be regarded as otherwise than opportune. It is only by the study of Gnostic aberrations that the true import of the teaching of Catholic Christianity, in its moral as well as theological bearings, can be fully appreciated."

Into the question of Gnosticism we do not purpose to enter at present; and any observations we shall make will have reference rather to the author than his subject. We have read a good deal on that wonderful system of error which the confluence of Oriental philosophers and Christianity threw up as mist. But nothing so clear has come before us as this. We think the student of theology and of ecclesiastical history will do well to master every word of it. Some parts of the volume which connect ancient and modern error are of particular value, as the two or three extracts we shall make will show.

Gnosticism in all its schools was a doctrine of redemption and of the Person of Christ, though in a perverted form. The name was derived from Christianity: what St. Paul denounced as false *Gnosis* the Gnostics regarded as the true Christian philosophy. To them the Christian revelation stood in the same relation to speculative philosophy which the Jewish religion bore to the Christian faith. It was therefore a third supplementary volume of revelation. Two great problems were derived from heathen philosophy: that of Absolute Existence, and that of the Origin of Evil. Those they generalised into one. The search after an absolute first principle, the inquiry how the absolute and unconditioned can give rise to the relative and conditioned, was as common in those ages as it is now; and led to the same practical issue, the denial of the personality of God. Then evil no longer appears in the form of sin, as a transgression on the part of a moral agent against the laws and will of a moral governor. Then goes the personality of man, who is but a portion of the universe, an atom in that system of derived existence which emanates from the one First Principle. His free will is swallowed up in the stream of evolution. Evil is not a moral but a natural phenomenon; it is the imperfect, the relative, the finite. Hence the

problem of the origin of evil is identified with that of the origin of finite and relative existence. Hence the detestation in which all Gnostic inquiry was held by the ancient fathers: they saw in it the denial of all religion. The following words connect this side of ancient Gnosticism with modern speculation.

"This feature of the controversy is not without interest to us in this present day; for, however different may be the premises of the popular philosophy of our own time, it conducts us to precisely the same conclusion. In this common error the most opposite extremes meet together; the transcendental metaphysics of the Gnostic philosophy, and the grovelling materialism of our own day join hands together in subjecting man's actions to a natural necessity, in declaring that he is the slave of the circumstances in which he is placed; his course of action being certainly determined by them as effect by cause and consequent by antecedent. Merged in the intelligible universe by the Gnostic of old, man is no less by modern 'science falsely so called' merged in the visible universe; his actions or volitions are moral effects which follow their moral causes "as certainly and invariably as physical effects follow their physical causes." Under this assumption the distinction between moral evil and physical entirely vanishes. A man, however inconvenient his actions may be to his neighbour, is no more to blame for committing them than is a fire for consuming his neighbour's house, or a sickness for destroying his life. Man cannot offend against any law of God; for his actions are the direct consequence of the laws which God (if there be a God) has established in the world; he is subject, to repeat the words of Clement, to a natural necessity derived from Him who is all powerful. The consciousness of freedom is a delusion; the consciousness of sin is a delusion; the personality of man disappears under the all-absorbing vortex of matter and its laws. How long, we may ask, will it be before the personality of God disappears also, and the vortex of matter becomes all in all?"

This is a valuable testimony from the author of the "Limits of Religious Thought." It appears to us that the relation of the personality of man to the Personality of God, as he so distinctly here and elsewhere asserts it, demands a much more clear and distinct conception of the Supreme than Dr. Mansel has allowed to be the prerogative of the finite intellect. But after all the question resolves itself into the revelation of God in His Son Jesus Christ. This is the mystery which really solves the much-contested question of the human comprehension or apprehension of the Divine, the finite conception of the Infinite. Whatever philosophy may say as to the impossibility of cognizing the unconditioned and Absolute Being, revelation points to Him in whom we behold the Father, and says, "Behold the Infinite

within your reach and within your study." Ancient Gnosticism felt the force of this, and strove to annul the grand argument by dissolving the verity of the incarnation. On this truth—the reality of the appearance of God in the flesh, the reality of the Infinite and the finite united in one Being—hangs all other truth. This is all truth as the truth is in Jesus. Admit that, and all is admitted: it is the end of all controversy. Deny that, and Antichrist is revealed in all its horror of negation and unbelief. The Bible closes in St. John's first Epistle by making this denial the sum of all unbelief. But instead of dilating on this topic, we shall insert one more extract from Dr. Mansel, which will say all we would have said, and, at the same time, give a good example of the clear and vigorous style in which he deals with the whole subject. The following is the close of his allusion to the germs of Gnosticism in the New Testament:—

"Other passages in St. John's First Epistle seem, from the terms in which they are expressed, to have a more direct reference to the heresy of Cerinthus, which we have already noticed in connection with the Gospel. The vehement language in the second chapter of this epistle, 'Who is a liar, but he that denieth that Jesus is the Christ?' and the corresponding expression in the fourth chapter, 'Whosoever shall confess that Jesus is the Son of God, God dwelleth in him, and he in God,' though capable of being referred to other forms of error, yet acquire an especial significance when we remember the existence at this very time of heretical teachers who maintained that Jesus and the Christ were two separate beings, and distinguished between Christ who descended from the Supreme God, and Jesus the man upon whom He descended.

"It is not without profit for us in these latter days to examine this record of the apostolic treatment of early, and, it might be thought, obsolete heresies. There are not wanting teachers at the present time who tell us, in the spirit of the Gnostics of old, that dogmas and historical facts are no part of the Christian religion; that there is a spiritual sense in which these things may be understood which is superior to the letter; that we may be Christian in spirit without troubling ourselves about the facts of Christ's earthly life, or the supernatural doctrines connected with His Person. How far this teaching is entitled to call itself by the name of Christian may be tested by the evidence of him who of all the first teachers of Christianity can least be accused of a harsh or narrow view of the terms of Christian communion; who loved to dwell, not on opinions about Christ, but on the hope and spirit of Christ Himself; who is never weary of enforcing the precept of love to our brethren; whose last breath passed away in the constant repetition of the one summary of his teaching, "Little children, love one another." Of all men he would surely

be the last to deny the claim of Christian brotherhood to any that could truly urge it. Yet it was a dogma—the Incarnation of the Divine Son a historical fact—the birth of Jesus Christ and His life as a man—which called forth from his lips the strong words of indignation and abhorrence against all gainsayers: "Who is a liar but he that denieth that Jesus is the Christ? . . . Every spirit that confesseth not that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh is not of God; and this is that spirit of antichrist."

Great as was the mischief wrought by Gnosticism in the first ages of Christian doctrine, there was some counterbalancing good. It stimulated the energies of Christian controversialists whose writings are of the utmost importance, not so much for the sake of their theology and exposition as for the light they throw on the sources and tendencies of this error. Moreover, it gave its valuable testimony to the current faith of the second century; especially as to fundamental points, such as the several hypostases in the Divine essence, the Divinity of the Son of God, and the Personality of the Holy Ghost. Whatever forms it assumed Gnosticism ever kept in view most steadily the Christian faith on these questions; but, not submitting to the clear testimony of Scripture and the teaching of the Spirit, its carnal gnosis—for carnal it was though under the guise of intense spirituality—explained the mystery after a fashion of its own. Not denying it absolutely, however. True humanitarianism, or unitarianism, is not found in any Gnostic theory. But a valuable passage on this subject presents itself, which will throw light upon the general subject of Gnosticism:

"The most noteworthy feature in the heresies described in this and in the two previous lectures, is the testimony which they indirectly bear to the universal belief of the Church in the Divine Nature of her blessed Lord. Had it not been that the Christian consciousness in the Apostolic age was penetrated and pervaded by this belief, it would have been hardly possible that the early heretics, who desired to retain a nominal Christianity as a cloak for their own speculations, should not have thought of the device, so simple and natural to the unbelievers of later times, of regarding the Saviour as a mere man, a wise philosopher, a great teacher of truth, a great moral example, as other wise and good men had been before Him. But this idea, so familiar to us in the present day, is nowhere to be found among the early heresies. It seemed to them more simple and obvious to deny that which was natural and human than that which was supernatural and Divine. The earliest form of Gnosticism, so far as we can trace its development in chronological order, seems to have been pure and simple Docetism. The Divine Being who came down from the Supreme God had no human body, but only the appearance of one. The modification of this belief, which manifested itself

in the Cerinthian and Ebionite theories, was probably due to the circulation of the first three Gospels, and to the testimony which they bore to the real humanity of Him of whom they wrote. Even then a purely humanitarian theory was felt to be impossible. The divine element must be retained in some form or other; and this was done by distinguishing between Jesus the man and Christ the spiritual being, regarding the former as merely the vessel or abode in which the latter for a short season condescended to dwell. The work of redemption was still Divine, though carried on by means of a human instrument; it was the work of Christ the Spirit, not of Jesus the man. Even Carpocrates, the most heathen of the early Gnostics, and the least conscious of the real nature of Christ's work and kingdom, cannot divest himself of the idea of some supernatural being, some Divine power, dwelling in and inspiring the human teacher. The testimony of the enemies of the faith is thus far at one with its apostles and evangelists. The whole world was groaning and travailing together, waiting for its redemption, and none but God could satisfy the universal yearning."

The most interesting chapter in Gnosticism is, perhaps, that in which Basilides, and the most important that in which Marcion figures. These men represented almost opposite poles, but in the same sphere of Gnosticism: the former that which made Judaism a stage in the development of truth, and the latter which placed a deep gulf—almost an eternal one—between the author of the Old Testament and the author of the New. The true faith united the two Testaments while establishing their difference, and thus exhibited in perfection what their systems distorted and perverted. Dr. Mansel's sketches of both are very valuable (p. 164):—

"We cannot trace in Basilides any of that hostility to the Jewish religion and the God of the Jews which distinguished some of the Gnostic sects. On the contrary, he seems to have regarded Judaism as a necessary stage in the development and education of the world; and he appears to have received and made use of the Jewish Scriptures, at least in part, as well as the New Testament, though he added to these sacred books certain apocryphal writings by pretended prophets of his own, called Barcabbas and Barcoph or Parchor, of which it is difficult to say whether they were real books of Eastern theosophy or forgeries of his own composition.

"The system of Basilides is of all the Gnostic systems the one which least recognises any break or distinction between the Christian revelation and the other religions of the world, heathen or Jewish. His leading thought is the continuity of the world's development, its gradual purification and enlightenment, we might almost say in modern language, the education of the world,

by means of a progressive series of movements, succeeding to one another by a fixed law of evolution. But while the system thus gains in philosophical unity, it loses in moral and political significance. No place is left for the special providence of God, nor the freewill of man. The scheme almost approaches to a stoical fatalism. The Supreme God is an impersonal being, capable of no religious relation to man, and introduced for no other purpose than to give the first impulse to the mechanical movement of the world's self-development; even this amount of activity being introduced as it were *per saltum*, by a gratuitous and inconsistent assumption. As a mere system of metaphysics the theory of Basilides contains the nearest approach to the conception of a logical philosophy of the absolute which the history of ancient thought can furnish, almost rivalling that of Hegel in modern times; but in the same degree in which it elevates God to the position of an absolute first principle, it strips him of those attributes which alone can make Him the object of moral obedience or religious worship."

Marcion is, however, the most influential of the names of Gnosticism. Though Dr. Mansel does not regard him as having penetrated the inmost shrine of Gnostic mysteries, he was, undoubtedly, after his contact with Cerdon, the Syrian, a true Gnostic. He was a man of high intellectual character; probably, also, of high moral aims, notwithstanding reports to the contrary. The son of a bishop in Pontus he understood Christianity well; but seems very early to have imbibed such principles of error as rendered his expulsion from the Church necessary. He went to Rome, where he matured his opinions, and determined to get up a church of his own with a perfect independent Christianity. Yet not perfectly independent, for he retained much of the Christian Scriptures, and has indeed rendered good service to its cause by devoting himself to the collection and study and arrangement of the writings of St. Paul, the apostle whom he patronised. Undoubtedly his earnest study of these writings kept him from many of the worst extremes of the system.

"The character of Marcion's own teaching may be described as a combination of rationalism proper with what is now commonly known as the 'higher criticism.' The first element was manifested in his rejection of the entire Old Testament, as well as all the evidences of natural religion derived from the constitution of the world, because in both alike he discovered phenomena which he considered to be different from what ought to be expected from a Being of perfect wisdom and goodness. The second was manifested in his rejection of a large portion of the New Testament, as a corruption of what he assumed to be the pure doctrines of Christianity. Among the Christian Scriptures, Marcion accepted only ten of the Epistles of St. Paul, whom he regarded as

the only preacher of the true revelation of Christ, together with a pretended original Gospel, which he asserted to be that used by St. Paul himself (so he interpreted the expression "according to my Gospel") and which was in reality a mutilated copy of the Gospel according to St. Luke. The other books of the New Testament he discarded, as the works of judaising teachers who corrupted the primitive truth. Marcion's gospel seems to have contained very few additions to the canonical text of St. Luke, but on the other hand very considerable portions of that text were omitted in his recension as not compatible with his theory of the person of Christ and the character of Christianity. All that relates to the birth and infancy of our Lord, together with the genealogy, was omitted. All appeals the writers of the Old Testament as bearing witness to Christ, and passages that did not tally with the ascetic teaching of the critic, such as the contrast between our Lord's way of life and that of John the Baptist, and the mention of those who shall *sit down* in the kingdom of God, were remorselessly excluded, as corruptions detected by the critical insight of the reformer. Other passages were retained in an amended form. The words, 'It is easier for heaven and earth and for the law and the prophets to fail, than one tittle of the words of the Lord.' 'When ye shall see Abraham and Isaac and Jacob and all the prophets in the kingdom of God' (Luke xiii. 23), was transformed into, 'When ye shall see the righteous in the kingdom of God.' The perverse criticism of the Tübingen school, whose mode of dealing with Holy Scriptures bears no small resemblance to Marcion's own, has endeavoured of late years to defend the paradox, in part suggested by Semler and others, that Marcion's recension was the original, the canonical text, the interpolated Gospel; though there is not a scrap of historical evidence to show that the mutilated recension was ever heard of before Marcion's time, and though there is positive evidence to show that Marcion must have possessed and made use of passages of St. Luke's original gospel which were omitted in his mutilated edition.

"Marcion's heretical opinions seem to have begun in a minute and captious criticism of the Old Testament, which he insisted on interpreting everywhere in the most literal manner, and consequently imagined to contain numerous self-contradictions and unworthy representations of God. He wrote a work entitled *Antitheses*, professing to point out contradictions between the Old Testament and the New, as well as to show that parts even of the latter were interpolated and corrupt. The following may be given as specimens of his mode of dealing with the Jewish Scriptures. 'The God whom these Scriptures reveal,' he says, 'cannot have been a God of wisdom, and goodness, and power; for after having created man in His own image He permitted him to

fall, being either ignorant that he would fall, or unwilling or unable to prevent him from falling. He is represented as calling to Adam in the garden, "Adam, where art thou?" Showing that He was ignorant where Adam was. He commanded the Israelites at the exodus to spoil the Egyptians. He forbade the making of graven images, and yet commanded Moses to raise up the brazen serpent in the wilderness, and cherubim to be placed over the mercy-seat. He chooses Saul to be king over Israel, and is afterwards said to have repented of His choice. He threatens to destroy the children of Israel, and is turned away from His purpose by the intercession of Moses.' On these and other accounts, Marcion censures the Old Testament representation of God, as being that of an imperfect being; but instead of adopting the hypothesis of the modern rationalists, and denying the fidelity of the representation and consequently the inspiration of the book, he finds an apparent solution of his doubts in the Gnostic hypothesis of a distinction between the Supreme God and the Demiurge. The Old Testament, he argued, represents God as imperfect, because the God of the Old Testament, the Creator of the world, the Author of the elder revelation, is, in truth, not the Supreme God, but an imperfect being. He did not however, with the majority of the Gnostics, regard the Demiurge as a derived and dependent being, whose imperfection is due to his remoteness from the highest cause; nor yet, according to the Persian doctrine, did he assume an eternal principle of pure malignity. His second principle is independent of, and co-eternal with the first; opposed to it, however, not as evil to good, but as imperfection to perfection, or, as Marcion expressed it, as a just to a good being."

But we must bring these notes to a close. Our extracts will be found useful as introductory to the study of a good book on a great subject. They will also tend to produce, in minds which may have been somewhat suspicious of Dr. Mansel's influences, a better impression of his theological soundness. The more his writings are studied the more convinced will be the student that in his departure the Church of Christ and Christian Divinity have lost one of the ablest of recent defenders of the faith.

Dean Howson on the Consecration Rubric in the Communion Service.

Before the Table. An Inquiry, Historical and Theological, into the True Meaning of the Consecration Rubric in the Communion Service of the Church of England. With Appendix and Supplement, containing Papers by the Right Rev. the Bishop of St. Andrew's, and the Rev. R. W. Kennion, M.A. By J. S. Howson, D.D., Dean of Chester. London: Macmillan and Co. 1875.

To many who are outside the pale of the Established Church, a controversy on the attitude of the officiating minister at the table of the Lord will seem puerile enough; while enemies of the Church may rejoice over the internal conflict which has now begun to be waged on so apparently trifling a subject. With either of these we have no sympathy. Whatever may be the effect of a first and hasty glance, a more careful investigation will show this question to be invested with a very high significance, and to involve issues of the gravest kind; and it is to us a sad and painful necessity to watch the grand old historic church of this country—the rock whence we were hewn—divided and weakened by this and other causes of strife. Yet the struggle is, perhaps, the natural outcome of the present refined religious life of the Church. In times of inertness doubtful questions may slumber; but the days of awakening are days of searching and testing. It was inevitable that at such a time the several schools of thought represented in a comprehensive, and therefore compromising, national church would bring into prominence each its own peculiar views, and urge them in proportion to its own inherent energy. In days gone by these same forces led to disruption, a repetition of which, however often threatened, is, we think, most earnestly to be deprecated.

With an evident touch of pain, Dean Howson alludes to the conflict in the following words: "There is much also to humiliate us, and to make us ashamed, in the form which this contest is, for the moment, assuming. Nothing more grave appears, at first sight, to be at issue than the vestment and the position of the officiating priest during the administration of the Lord's Supper; and these might well be said to be trivialities, unworthy of a Christian's serious thought and earnest zeal. The battle, however, must be fought out; for these outward things are the flags which represent great principles contradictory of one another. The uneasy feeling which has been for some time eddying round the Holy Eucharist has, for this obvious reason, concentrated itself

with extreme violence on these two points, because we are here brought in contact with the great question, whether a proper sacrificial priesthood is or is not a part of the religious system established by Christ on earth."

The last words in this extract carry us at once to the centre of a controversy as sad as it is sacred. There is a doctrinal significance in these acts which would make it traitorous to overlook them. That were a false charity which, under its cloke, could allow pretensions of so high an import to be made without the most strenuous exertions to rebut them, and to dislodge them from their lurking places. To this work the "evangelical" section of the Church has set itself, and it certainly deserves other treatment than that which it has sometimes received at the hands of "non-conforming brethren." Indifference, hindrance, or unfair criticism is not due to men who are patiently contending against opinions that are the common enemy of all the Protestant churches. The nation will owe it largely to this section if from our parish churches are excluded practices which, while they strikingly imitate those of the Romish communion, embody doctrinal teachings coincident with those against which our Reformers raised their protesting voice. Into the controversy on "the position of the celebrant," it is as foreign to our purpose as it is to our function to enter. The question does not, with us, admit of a moment's hesitation. To "orientate," even when the "lowest" view of the act is taken, is utterly alien to our conception of the fittest method of ordering the Holy Communion.

In the pages before us the question is fully treated, and with the utmost fairness and gravity. The argument is cumulative, and its several elements have been industriously gathered together. Chapters on the position of the Table, the meaning of the disputed expressions to the Rubric "the north-side," "before the table," and "before the people," are followed by an inquiry into the usage before and after the year 1662. These topics are discussed with a carefulness reflecting most creditably on the writer's patient research, and his fidelity and candour.

Then, wisely and effectively, the argument from Holy Scripture is brought forward. Although, as is justly remarked, this is not a question of the interpretation of Scripture, but of the meaning of church formularies; yet in cases of doubt surely it were wise to interpret the formularies themselves in the light of the Holy Word, forasmuch as "it is not lawful for the Church to ordain anything that is contrary to God's Word written." It is unnecessary for us to declare our entire sympathy with the view that is supported by this appeal to Holy Scripture, namely, that the sacrament of the Lord's Supper is a gift to man, not an offering to God. What obliquity of vision is it that prevents men from seeing that the presentation of a sacrifice to God *in any way*

by man, is a detraction from the sufficiency and efficacy of the one sacrifice for sin once—once for ever—offered by our One and Only Priest, who is passed into the heavens? Then the teaching of the other formularies is adduced, and Rubrics, Ordination-Service, Catechism, Articles, Homilies, and Canons are all appealed to in confirmation of that doctrine of the Eucharist which excludes alike the need and the meaning of the eastward position.

The strength of the book lies in its central argument drawn from the teachings of the Communion-service itself, to which the Rubric in dispute belongs. The views of the Lord's Supper here given find their support not merely in the general tenor of the service, but in its precise words; whilst the eastward position is observed in deference to opinions that not only lack the warrant of a single expression in the service, but are directly opposed both to its spirit and its positive statements.

With much satisfaction we quote the following remarks, bearing on the essential question: "It is a policy, more diplomatic than candid, with some writers, to throw into the shade the great fact that from 1552 to that year (1662), the ecclesiastical battle, swaying this way and that, till finally it was decided, was between the principles represented by the two words "Altar" and "Table." The worst course of all is the contention that the two terms are synonymous. I could not write with any honest sincerity if I did not repudiate this as utterly untenable. This theory is an absolute contradiction, alike to correct etymology and to the facts of English church history during its most exciting time. The argument derived from a comparison of our Prayer-book of 1662 with that of 1549 is so decisive that I need not dwell on it further. The historical truth of the case comes down on this whole controversy with the force of a hammer.

"But it is urged that the word 'Priest' and the word 'Altar' are correlative; that the one implies the other; and that having priests recognised in our Prayer-book, we have literally 'altars' in our churches. If this were really a just and full statement of the case, it would be one of the strangest occurrences in history that the word 'Altar' should have been utterly and finally excluded from the Book of Common Prayer, and that the very thing which was intended by our last revisers to be clear should have been made obscure. It is quite true, indeed, in a certain sense, that the words 'altar' and 'priest' are correlative. The latter term is ambiguous, and may denote either, according to its derivation, the Christian Presbyter of the New Testament, or according to the usage of our Authorized Version, the Sacrificing Minister under the Jewish system. If a doubt were to arise as to the meaning of the word in any particular instance, the doubt would naturally be settled by inquiring whether the word 'Altar' is associated with it. A sacrifice must have an altar. If the

word 'Altar' remained in our Book of Common Prayer it would be fair to say that the Church of England took the word 'Priest' in that sense, however inconsistent we might feel this to be with the New Testament. But as the case stands, the meaning of this term in the Prayer-book is narrowed to the other sense. Thus the Bible and the Prayer-book are in this matter consistent. The 'Priest' of our English Church services is the 'Presbyter' of the New Testament, as indeed must be the case if these Services are Scriptural."

Our space will not allow us to quote other words bearing on the non-sacrificial character of the Lord's Supper. They are very conclusive, and have a much wider application than the limits of this controversy. They express the doctrine of the English Church, read in the light of her best, her greatest writers, the champions alike of sound Biblical interpretation, of respectful regard for the earlier teachers in the Church, and of a clear, distinct, and unqualified protest against the fond things vainly invented by the Church of Rome; men who to-day could have but little patience, we will not say sympathy, either with that apostasy, or with them who (their ordination vows to the contrary notwithstanding) still truckle to her assumed authority, and mock her superstitious practices.

The pretended fidelity to rubrical exactness, which they who contend for the eastward position profess, would be ludicrous in the extreme were not the highest interests at stake. For be it remembered that a significant act involving doctrinal teaching on the most momentous article of our faith, is based on a doubtful interpretation of an ambiguous phrase, while the entire spirit and the plain teaching of so many clear and unequivocal affirmations of the Book of Common Prayer are directly contradicted. It is the old error of straining at the gnat and swallowing the camel.

We entirely concur in the Dean's determined opposition to "the fatal gift of choice." In matters unimportant (in which category this cannot be classed), it may be wise to avoid too great strictness; but on this truly vital question has the Church no fixed view? May every man choose and express his own? Granting a very large liberty to the pulpit, it is rightly contended as follows, that no such liberty is permissible in ceremony. "The doctrine of sacrificial presentation in the Eucharist not being hitherto an explicit part of the system of the Church of England, a ceremony understood to express this doctrine would make it explicit. The doctrinal basis deliberately adopted in 1662 would be disturbed. The lines which are now clear would at least be made obscure. The change would not precisely amount to the adding of a fortieth article to the Thirty-nine; but it would introduce a new element of obscurity among the Thirty-nine. The proportions of our religious teaching would be altered. That

which had previously been merely a permitted private opinion of individuals would now have found an official exponent. Something would have been introduced amongst us which we had not before. The centre of gravity of the Prayer-book would have been shifted; and it is probably the consciousness that this result would be secured which makes some so eager for the optional use of the eastward position." The following earnest words do not disturb the beautiful moderation observed throughout the book:—"If a religious opinion, which is not to be found in the words of the Prayer-book, is to be forced upon us by help of a ceremony, how can we be expected to submit without resistance? Something like indignation takes possession of the mind, when, with such ends in view, a point of ritual is first asserted, then persevered in, notwithstanding remonstrance, and then claimed from us under plea of conciliation." We can assure Dean Howson that his indignation is shared by a large number of Christian men outside the Established Church.

On the bearing of this question on the re-union of Christendom, Dean Howson justly remarks: "And ought we altogether to forget those other large Christian communities, by which we are surrounded? The drawing together of the English-speaking presbyterians from various parts of the world is becoming a remarkable feature of our times. Nor ought we to forget the vast organisations and spreading influence of the Methodists and Baptists in the New World, or the large amount of spiritual life which surrounds us in the nonconformist bodies at home. On the whole, if thoughts of ultimate re-union are in our minds (and surely such thoughts ought to be familiar and dear"—a sentiment we sincerely re-echo) "the adopting of Sacramental Orientation is more likely to be a hindrance than a help. Practically and popularly this ceremonial act will be viewed as an intentional resemblance to the modern Church of Rome." Most surely so. And whether the Established Church is in the struggles of the future to find in Methodism an ally, or an antagonist, or a mere silent spectator, we will not now discuss; but anything more likely to alienate the many of her sons who still tenaciously cling to the Church could not be named, than the Church's approximation in doctrine and ritual to what her own Articles declare to be blasphemous fables and dangerous deceits.

The appearance of this volume at this juncture is most opportune. Such a book from such a man, distinguished alike by office and scholarship, by Christian fidelity, by largeness of view and freedom from party bias, must be salutary and influential. It is free from all rancour and the bitterness of party-spirit; it is a calm and careful historical investigation, some of its historic references on important church questions being of much value. Throughout the book learning and candour combine with modera-

tion of tone, and exactness of statement, impaired but slightly by the few evidences of haste which are traceable. It is a demonstration that "Sacramental Orientation" is opposed equally to the spirit and the language of the Book of Common Prayer, and is contrary to the genius and to the history of the Protestant Reformed Church of England. It is a book which cannot be overlooked in this present painful controversy.

Lyttelton on the Future State.

Scripture Revelations of the Life of Man after Death, and the Christian Doctrines of Descent into Hell, the Resurrection of the Body, and the Life Everlasting. **Edited by the Hon. and Rev. W. H. Lyttelton, Rector of Hagley and Hon. Canon of Worcester. London: Daldy, Isbister and Co. 1875.**

The chief aim of Mr. Lyttelton in this simple and interesting volume is to clear away some popular misconceptions of the doctrine of resurrection and the future life, and to show what foundations exist in revelation and philosophy for right thought on these great subjects. That the notions generally prevailing amongst religious people are very conventional, and for the most part tame and uninspiring, must be admitted. They are, upon the whole, founded on Scripture, but on Scripture carelessly read and imperfectly compared with itself. On this, as on other great truths of revelation, representations which should be combined with others are taken by themselves, and the assumptions arising out of them, having once obtained currency, hold their ground for a long time to the disparagement of a close and more accurate induction.

It may be asked, however, in good faith, "Are we not warned off from inquiry into so mysterious a subject as the future life? Does not the Word of God itself teach us that our present faculties, even though aided by revelation, are too weak to reach any but the vaguest and faintest ideas on these great subjects of Christian hope? To this it must be replied that it is not inquiry so much as an improper spirit and method of inquiry that is discouraged by the Scriptures, whether in reference to the future life or any other mystery of our faith. By its own hints and suggestions on the subject the Word of God draws us with irresistible attraction to make inquiry concerning the future life of the redeemed; for the attraction of the subject is not due to our natural yearning alone, but to the encouragement of Scripture, and, above all, to the resurrection and ascension of our Lord.

A general question of extreme interest arises as to the parts of

our present nature which we have reason to think we shall carry with us into the unseen world.

Mr. Lyttelton's line of argument is that revelation itself suggests a much closer analogy between our life in this world and our life hereafter than is implied in our popular phraseology:—"There is good reason from Scripture, as well as from sound philosophy, for the expectation that the future life will be in a much wider sense than is commonly believed, a continuation and development (with, we cannot doubt, very many additions) of the whole of our present life."

It can hardly be conceived that our devotional powers alone will survive this life and be carried on towards perfection, all other parts and powers of our nature, emotional, speculative, and practical, being swallowed up and left behind. It may be easier for us to conceive how man's devotional nature can find endless employment in the presence of God, than how some other parts of that nature can be adequately employed, but the difficulties involved in supposing that out of the great wealth of powers bestowed upon man in this life, only a small selection will go with him into the more abundant life beyond the grave, are, in our judgment, insuperable. If, under all the disadvantages of his fallen and mortal estate, such exquisite results can be obtained by the cultivation of man's social and intellectual nature, is it to be conceived that in a perfect world human nature will be less many-sided than it now is, or that when delivered from all evil it will have a narrower range of capabilities than when crippled and marred by sins? Surely the life of heaven will be wider, not narrower—richer, not poorer—than the life of earth. Surely nothing will be left behind, as we pass the gateway of heaven, but what is evil, or else manifestly designed for temporary and conditional existence alone.

The argument in favour of the retention and perfecting hereafter of man's nature as a whole, finds support in the history of creation as well as in the doctrine of redemption. The whole of our human nature, with all its faculties and powers of body, soul, and spirit, is the work of Almighty God, of which it cannot be conceived, but that every part is "very good," perfect for its purpose, and in its place. By its original endowments, so rich and varied, our nature was equipped for a much wider life than that of devotion; or, perhaps, it may be better to say that the life of devotion for which man was created, includes service and employment of a thousand kinds, of which devotion, in the usual sense of the word, is but a part. The fact that the body, soul, and spirit in fallen man "serve sin," cannot alter the fact that in man unfallen they serve God, and affords no presumption that they will not again serve God in man redeemed. The strong probability that whatever belonged to human nature at the first will belong

to it at the last (with developments and additions that need not now be referred to), is raised to a kind of certainty by the doctrines of the Incarnation and Ascension. In the former, the Son of God, one with the Eternal Father and Maker of all things, assumed, not a part of human nature only, selecting, it might have been said, its more spiritual and enduring qualities, but the whole of it, not omitting one constituent element properly belonging to it. The value of this great fact is to mankind unspeakable. It repeats (with how much additional emphasis!) God's original benediction bestowed on the man that He had created and made. It gives profound assurance that nothing which has taken place in the long history of sin has caused the Divine idea of man's nature to change, that, although it has passed under every possible dishonour and defilement, it survives in His mind as precious and honourable, and once again, in the person of the Incarnate Son, it is declared to be "very good."

But how much more significant still is the witness of the Incarnation when completed by that of the Ascension. Our Lord not only sanctioned our nature (if we may say so) by wearing it on earth, but gave assurance concerning its future life by carrying it all up with Him into heaven. Henceforth, to be "conformed to His image," is the hope of all His servants, and the burden of proof must lie with those who would weaken that hope by subtracting from the perfect manhood of our ascended Lord any one thing which it ever included. It is on the Person of Christ that the Christian hope ultimately depends. The new creation not only proceeds from Him as its Divine author, "making all things new," but moves towards Him, seeking completeness in the perfect "conformity of image" between the First-born and His many brethren. Thus the perfect consummation and bliss of the redeemed, both in body and soul, has the perfected soul and glorified body of Him who died and rose again for its standard and pledge.

Mr. Lyttelton's remarks upon the doctrine of the Resurrection of the Body contain nothing new or striking, but they are put in a clear and intelligible way that many readers will find helpful. "By this doctrine we do not mean that the very same particles, or atoms, which we lay in the grave will be re-collected by the mighty power of God from the ends of the earth, to which some of them may have been carried, either in the air that circles the globe, or in those ocean-waters which are ever washing around it, and in which so many bodies of men have in all ages been buried, and re-united to the souls which were once clothed in them." It is very properly shown that the difficulty in the way of such a belief does not arise from the thing being too hard for God, but from its being opposed by facts already ascertained that point in another direction. A living body is not a fixed unchanging mass,

but one that comes and goes continually by processes of waste and restoration. Particles that once formed part of our body are leaving it every moment, while fresh matter is taken into their place either from the air we breathe, or from the food we eat. And this process of vanishing and growing again goes on in all living nature about us, plants and animals only living as long as they continue to appropriate new matter to replace the ceaseless waste. The spirit of any living man has therefore been already clothed in many bodies, seeing that the material constituents of the body have been renewed many times over. On the supposition already disclaimed it would have to be asked *which* of these bodies shall be raised again, that of youth, for instance, or of middle age, or of old age! But further, many of the atoms belonging to any one body will have previously belonged to others, and will again, in obedience to the existing laws of physical life, form part of other living organisations. They cannot possibly be restored to all these, and there is no reason to expect the innumerable stupendous preparatory miracles, which on this theory would be required, to preserve these several atoms in their distinctness.

Mr. Lyttelton points out that this theory which is loaded with so many difficulties is distinctly and strongly denied by the Scriptures. The great resurrection-chapter in the First Epistle to the Corinthians, though leaving us with deepened awe and unsatisfied desire of knowledge, would keep us free from at least one great misconception when it says, "That which thou sowest, thou sowest not that body that shall be, but bare grain, it may chance of wheat or of some other grain; but God giveth it a body as it hath pleased Him." "It is not, I think, probable that by this illustration from the seed and the plant St. Paul meant that the Resurrection body will *grow out of* the old and earthly one, strictly speaking as a plant does out of its seed. Surely not. He was only, I humbly venture to think, illustrating one great mystery by another, of a somewhat similar, though also of a somewhat different kind. He is showing how life altogether is a mystery—how many things there are in nature, and especially in living plants and animals, which it is beyond our power at present to understand; and among others this, that out of so simple-looking a thing as a seed there should grow up a glorious plant, with its many coloured blossoms, flowers, fruits. Can you, he means, explain that? Could you have expected such a thing beforehand? And yet there it is, one of the standing marvels of our every-day life." The "body that shall be" is not sown, or laid in the grave. Until the resurrection it does not exist. The relation between the body that is sown and that which shall be raised is set forth in such contrasts as corruption and incorruption, weakness and power, dishonour and glory, natural (ψυχικόν) and spiritual (πνευματικόν), but it is nowhere pre-

cisely defined. To the question, "How are the dead raised up, and with what body do they come?" we receive for answer another question, "How is the grain of wheat raised up, and with what body does it come?" and in the light of this suggestion we understand that the Resurrection of the Body is no mere gathering up again of the precise atoms laid in the earth, but something much more complex and wonderful, even as "the blade, the ear, and the full corn in the ear" are greater than the corn of wheat which died that it might bear fruit.

If it be desired to press St. Paul's comparison more literally, there are various conjectures which to different minds will appear to possess more or less of likelihood. Mr. Lyttelton refers, with some approval, to the theory of "the *formative* or *building* power, by means of which it is given to the soul to lay hold of and appropriate surrounding matter; which is continuously engaged, during life, in fashioning its atoms into a living body, or rather into a succession of living bodies. This power, or vital force, stands to our bodies in just the same relation in which the seed, or the seminal force in the seed does to the plant: it is its originating and controlling force, its law, the pervading and, subordinately, creative power of its life. If such a "building force," attached to the soul during its life in this world, was always, by the law of its nature, appropriating matter, and therewith building for itself out of the materials of this world a fitting body, then, when the soul is transferred to another world, or sphere of existence, carrying with it thither this "formative force," that force will, from its very nature, continue, in that world too, doing its proper work. *There*, too, it will appropriate and mould into characteristic forms the new material, whatever it may be, which will be placed within its reach."

But our notice of this work must close with a reference to the practical lessons which the writer seeks to draw from the subject. If the "spiritual body" is to be built by the soul, it will bear the impress of character, of that indestructible, unmistakable spiritual and moral likeness into which we have allowed ourselves to grow. There is a sense in which the most cautious thinker will surely allow the probability of this hypothesis. We who have seen the expression of the human countenance improve or deteriorate together with the moral nature of its possessor, who know how vanity, anger, discontent on the one hand, or humility, patience, purity on the other can make themselves seen and felt in feature and in bearing, can well believe that in this respect also men shall reap what they have sown, and clothe themselves hereafter in bodies that shall be the perfect expression of the spirit's life within. On the thoughts of warning and encouragement arising from this consideration we must not now dwell. The aim of this unpretending little volume is mainly practical, and for the

writer's wise and Christian counsels we must refer the reader to its pages.

Mr. Matthew Arnold on Biblical Translation.

Isaiah XL.—LVI. The Great Prophecy of Israel's Restoration. Arranged and Edited, with Notes, by Matthew Arnold. London: Macmillan and Co. 1875.

It was, we think, the *Spectator* newspaper which suggested that certain members should be added to the committees now revising the authorised version of the Bible, whose business it should be to take care of the English style of the new edition. The persons named were John Bright, William Morris, and Matthew Arnold. It might have been well to have carried out the suggestion. Mr. Arnold at least here gives us the benefit of his deliberate opinion on this delicate subject, and so we perhaps can speak with greater weight. These twenty-six chapters of Isaiah are put forth primarily as an attempt to render the sublimest portion of the Hebrew Scriptures available for literary instruction in schools. The original and much smaller edition was designed for primary schools, but it is here adapted for use in a higher class of education. The book itself, though very valuable for its purpose, does not call for much remark. We may simply note that the historical introduction and explanations are clear and well arranged, and the editor has honestly tried, and, to a considerable extent, succeeded in his endeavours to avoid raising the controversies with regard to the later chapters of Isaiah. The chief interest lies in the exposition of Mr. Arnold's views on Biblical translations and in the specimen of his own workmanship which follows. His object, he tells us, has been simply to remove obscurities which bring the reader to a standstill, and to correct the more important misrenderings. Change in the familiar language has been regarded as a thing in itself to be considered useless where good sense exists. "A clear sense is the indispensable thing. Even where the authorised version seems wrong I have not always, if its words give a clear sense, thought it necessary to change them. When, however, the right correction seems to give a sense either clearer or higher in poetic propriety and beauty than the authorised version, I have corrected." Mr. Arnold gives, as an instance of the first case, the verse (Isaiah lxv. 11), "That prepare a table for that troop, and that furnish the drink offering for that number," where no meaning at all is conveyed, and we can only conclude that the translators did not understand the passage. For this is substituted, "That prepare a table for Fortune, and that furnish the drink offering unto that which destineth," which not only removes the obscurity but preserves the circumstances of

the prophecy, "Therefore will I destine you to the sword." On the other hand, at verse 15 of the same chapter the words are allowed to stand, "And ye shall leave your name for a curse unto my chosen; for the Lord God shall slay thee;" though the last clause is better rendered, "So may the Lord God slay thee." There is a clear sense, and little but grammatical fidelity to the Hebrew is gained by alteration. Of course, in an amended version designed for public use as a common standard of appeal greater accuracy of translation would be requisite than in a school book intended for those who seek the general sense rather than the precise expression of the prophet. Still, even here it is well to make no sacrifices, whether of style or of association, to a merely pedantic correctness of construing, important only to juvenile Hebraists. Speaking more directly to the Revision Committee, Mr. Arnold makes some very valuable remarks on the true meaning of "respect for the English version." It is easy to profess but hard to render this respect, and the reason is that translators do not recognise where the difficulty lies in making alterations. "The English version has created certain sentiments in the reader's mind, and these sentiments must not be disturbed if the new version is to have the power of the old." Therefore all such corrections as putting *Jehovah* in the place of *the Lord* are inadmissible in a book intended for use in devotion and worship. The mere change from the consecrated expression would scatter for ever the old sentiments, beside that the substitute is itself a bad one. "To the English readers it does not carry its own meaning with it, and has even, which is fatal, a mythological sound." "But perhaps there would not be much difficulty if we had only to avoid such changes in these marked cases. There is a far subtler difficulty to be contended with. The English Bible is a tissue, a fabric woven in a certain style, and a style which is admissible. When the version was made this style was *in the air*. Get a body of learned divines and set them down to translate, the right meaning they might often have difficulty with, but the right style was pretty sure to come of itself. This style is in the air no longer; that makes the real difficulty of the learned divines now at work at Westminster. And exactly in what the style consists, and what will impair it, and what sort of change can be brought into it, and to what amount, without destroying it, no learning can tell them: they must trust to a kind of tact." No rules can be laid down at starting by the observance of which the style shall be preserved. Canons of criticism, often demanded in such cases, can seldom, and that very partially, be produced. "The subtilty of nature surpasses many times over the subtilty of thought and expression. To say, for instance, that you will introduce no words not already in the English Bible, that you will always give the preference to the Teutonic rather than the Latin

element of our language, that you will use the shorter rather than the longer is mere pedantry, and inconsistent with the style of King James's translators, who, it is capable of direct proof, did not follow any such rules, nor, indeed, any rules at all. What you have to preserve is the character of the diction and the balance of the rhythm, and, keeping these objects in view, to introduce corrections very sparingly, and express them in such language as shall best harmonise with the surrounding sentences. A test passage, in which Mr. Arnold's success is considerable, is: "He was taken from prison and from judgment, and who shall declare His generation? for He was cut off out of the land of the living; for the transgression of my people was He stricken." "This," he remarks, "needs correction, for it gives no clear sense; but it possesses a cast of phraseology and a force of sentence which are marked, which we all know well and should be loath to lose. Mr. Cheyne substitutes: 'From oppression and from judgment was He taken, and as for His generation, who considered that He was cut off out of the land of the living; for the transgression of My people He was stricken.' This is hardly clearer indeed than the old version; still the old version's cast of phraseology is, on the whole, maintained, but what has become of its force of sentence? Surely it is better to try and keep this too; and if we say: 'He was taken from prison and from judgment, and who of His generation regarded it, why He was cut off out of the land of the living? for the transgression of My people was He stricken!' we do at least try to keep it. It would be easy to translate the verse more literally by changing its words and rhythm more radically; but what we should thus gain in one way is less than what we should lose in another."

The principle just indicated of balancing gain and loss from different causes is of the utmost importance, and on the due observance of this will probably most really depend the literary success of the amended version. One correction which Mr. Arnold defends at some length strikes us as unhappy from the neglect of a consideration to which no allusion is made. You plainly must not introduce words so archaic as to be not popularly intelligible. In the verse, "She hath received at the Lord's hand double for all her sins," the ambiguity has long been recognised. It is here translated, "She receiveth at the Lord's hand double for all her *rue*." Two-thirds of an average congregation would certainly fail to take in the meaning of the unfamiliar word when it was read in the lesson. On the whole, however, this little volume contains an admirable specimen of alterations in the received translation, moderate in extent and consonant in language, as it is easy to find.

Dr. Reynolds on the Mission of the Baptist.

John the Baptist. The Congregational Union Lecture for 1874. By Henry Robert Reynolds, D.D. Hodder and Stoughton. 1874.

Though somewhat tardy in our notice of this volume, we are not slow to appreciate its merits, which have already received ample recognition in the periodical press. We look forward with satisfaction to the prospect of a series of Congregational Lectures, such as Professor Rogers, Dr. Reynolds, and Mr. Dale have already favoured us with; and while aware that not unfrequently the early numbers of such a series are the most brilliant, we hope that in this case the level of excellence thus set will be sustained, if not surpassed.

Dr. Reynolds' choice of subject is happy. The ground is, comparatively, untrodden, and yet is no outlying region of Biblical and theological study, but one of great intrinsic and relative importance. The treatment of the subject is copious and exhaustive. The author has felt his own strength, and put it forth. Here is no meagre and scanty setting forth of a great theme; but on each topic the writer leaves the impression of having enough and to spare. We cannot say that we are as well satisfied with the relative proportions of the various parts of the book. The discussion of John the Baptist's ministry involves allusion to so many topics, that much self-restraint is needed, if the laws of proportion are to be duly observed. The study of Luke i. introduces us to the interesting question of angelology, and the desert-life of John suggests his relation to the Essenes; and that these subjects are sufficiently cognate to require a passing notice, is undeniable, but more was hardly needed. And we might, perhaps, say the same of the discussion of the dependence of St. Luke's Gospel on that of Marcion, and some other sections we had noticed as occupying somewhat disproportionate space. We cannot, in one sense, regret this ample treatment, for ability and fine temper in controversy are everywhere displayed; and the author must, of course, judge on what parts of his subject he thinks it most necessary to lay emphasis; but we cannot help thinking the volume would have gained in unity and force had there been more compression and concentration. Doubtless a passage in the Preface is the explanation of many controversial paragraphs:—"My theme has, however, thrown me into the skirts of the great storm which is thundering over every idea and institution of Christendom. There are mighty currents of thought which compel us to handle our craft with circumspection, to put a reef into some sails, and to protect ourselves against new and,

at one time, uncontemplated dangers." And nothing can be better stated than our author's reply to the fundamental assumption which underlies so much of the work of nineteenth century scholarship. "I cannot understand why an hypothesis which tends to solve an historic difficulty, and to save the credit both of a document and of its author, is necessarily and *prima facie* untrustworthy and prejudiced; while an hypothesis which charges inadvertence, ignorance, partisanship, or gross miscarriage upon (say) the author of the Fourth Gospel, indicates breadth of thought and fine critical acumen." Surely if the Zeit-geist be to blame for this essential vice of modern criticism, it will not be long before a better "time-spirit" will make men wonder that such unwarrantable postulates were ever granted.

After setting forth the "Significance and Sources of the Biography of John the Baptist" in Lecture I., and an "Examination of the Biblical Record of his Nativity" in Lecture II., we are introduced to "John, the Exponent of the Old Testament Dispensation" in the Third Lecture. Here John is set forth as priest, Jewish ascetic, prophet, and "more than prophet," in a very interesting and instructive way. As, however, it is in these 230 pages that we most desiderate condensation, we only pause to wonder at the use of such words as to "bulk" and "conditionate," and to express surprise that Dr. Reynolds does not adopt the more correct spelling, "Nazirite," and pass on. The "Preaching in the Wilderness" contains what should be the pith of the book. Very admirable is the exposition as a whole, though we find the section on "the kingdom of heaven at hand" all too short, and that on "the elements of John's conception of the Messiah" interesting, rather on account of what it suggests than what it provides. There is also in this lecture an interesting catena of rabbinical authorities for the subject of repentance, taken from Gfrörer. The discussion of the important questions of Lecture V. would require more space than we have at our disposal, and while, of course, in such difficult details no author expects to carry all his readers with him, and we cannot give in our adhesion on every point, we must express our appreciation of the calm and masterly way in which the difficulties are dealt with as a whole.

We prefer making extracts from the latter portion of the book, as being the part we have most enjoyed reading, and representing Dr. Reynolds, as we conceive, at his best. Lecture VI. treats of the testimony borne by the Fourth Gospel to the Baptist, and we consider that one of the most valuable contributions which these lectures bring to the vexed critical discussions of the day, is the light thrown on the relation between the Fourth Gospel and the Synoptists in their account of John the Baptist. This subject is touched on in the first lecture, here we have the fuller treatment of it:—

"De Wette (as well as the Socinians and other modern interpreters) conceives that the perception of the sacrificial and suffering aspect of the Son of God, or King of Israel, was utterly foreign to all the other testimonies of John, and is incompatible with the message he subsequently sent from his prison.

"With reference to the first of these positions, it is enough to remark once more that the fourth Evangelist commences where the synoptic narrative closes. . . . The synoptic narrative describes the convulsive movement of his diffidence and altered thought, and then details the disappearance of the Christ for forty days of deep affliction and intense agony. He comes back to tell John the mystery of that conflict, and His own calm repudiation of those very courses, some of which might have naturally arisen out of the tone of John's earliest teaching, but which seemed to Him to be what indeed they truly were, temptations of the devil. The position of John is now clearer to him than it was before. Here is the root out of a dry ground, wounded, bruised, bleeding, but not for Himself nor for His own sins. He is as a sheep before her shearers, dumb; He is already led as a lamb to the slaughter, lifting, bearing, carrying away all sin, all ceremonial impurity, all curse and guilt. His atoning sacrifice has begun in the wilderness. The sins of the world have been laid upon Him, and now the cruel death, the silent grave, the ultimate victory, all float before the prophet's eye, and he cries, 'Behold the Lamb of God!' That John saw all that the Evangelist and Apocalyptist saw in after years, all that the Christian consciousness has crowded into his words, is not to be supposed. But we think it is clear that the germs of the idea are to be found in the Old Testament, and in the thoughts of the Jews, that they were suggested to the Baptist by special circumstances, and that he was inspired to communicate them to those who stood in intimate relations with him. One of the two disciples who heard John speak is, by friend and foe, supposed to represent himself to be the author of the Gospel. Upon him the word made deep impression. The "strong Son of God," whose eyes were as a flame of fire, seemed to him also to be the Lamb that was slain. From the baffled and wondering Baptist he learned his first lessons of the infinite mystery involved in the person and work of the Christ."—P. 375, &c.

The explanation of the question from the prison (Matt. xi. 2), is a cardinal topic in a volume on John's ministry. As satisfactory as could be expected is Dr. Reynold's solution. He holds that Christ's language does not warrant our supposing that John wavered in his convictions, rejects the views that incarceration had broken his spirit, or that his perplexity was akin to the spiritual doubts of Christians, and adopts a theory which we cannot give in full, but which the following sentences will sufficiently indicate:—

"We are too apt to put together our ideas of a coming Messiah, and to suppose them in their inception to have been more sharply definite, individualised, centralised, and personal than they really were. The Messianic idea was obviously as complete in John's day as the millennial idea is at this moment. It was made up of many parts and manifestations, of political and ecclesiastical elements, of physical and spiritual transformations, of angelic and divine revelations. John may have been perfectly, prophetically convinced that Jesus was the commencement of the sublime series of changes, and may have been eager to see Him accomplish the whole process of which he had spoken; and yet he may have been in doubt whether Jesus was or was not the completion of the series, whether or no there was a manifestation of another kind which would complete the Messianic hope."—P. 421.

We are obliged to pass over the exposition of Matt. xi. 12, but with Dr. Reynolds' view of the "violent" we find ourselves quite unable to agree. In the somewhat complicated discussion raised by the narrative of the Ephesian converts (Acts xix. 1), the refutation of Baur seems to us as easy and complete as his hypothesis seemed strained and perverse. In the last lecture we have the lessons and results of the ministry of John the Baptist, the most important of which appears to us to be the testimony borne by it to the originality of Christ, which is thus introduced:—

"Neither Pharisaic, nor Rabbinic, nor Essenic philosophy contained within itself the life-stream for the refreshment of the nations. They may have been needful conditions, without which the higher life, the mysterious teaching, and the unique work of Christ would never have taken the form with which we have become familiar. Let it be clearly perceived that a few isolated sentences or Gnomonic sayings of the Rabbis, that a mode of self-abnegation, which our Lord treated under certain circumstances as indispensable to the salvation of individuals, that a spiritual interpretation of certain Mosaic rites, that large and liberal views about the Sabbath and the Passover, and even that the emphasis laid in the prayers and teachings of some of the sects on holy love, do *not constitute Christianity*. These fragments of truth, these *parhelia* will not account for the brightness of the Sun of Righteousness, nor unravel the mystery of the love of Christ. We have endeavoured to review the noblest of these teachings, to summon their brightest representative, the highest exponent of the prophetic spirit of the old covenant before us; we have made a special study of all that has reached us as the outcome of his teaching and manner of life, and it has satisfied us that the wildest hyperbole could never have induced, even so rhetorical a mind as that of Apollos, to have exclaimed, "I count

all things but loss for the excellency of the knowledge of John the Baptist."—P. 488.

Very valuable, and timely too, are the closing words on revivals of religion. The thoughtful investigation of problems of Biblical criticism has in no degree impaired the fervour of our author's spirit, and we need in the Christian Church more frequent examples of the blending of qualities we find here admirably combined. We refer our readers to the book itself for the lessons which John the Baptist's ministry gives on "The method of revival, the law of deep impression, the way in which the heavens are opened to human vision." We close our notice of this able book with one paragraph on this practical subject of Christian earnestness :—

"Unfortunately, the one subject about which strong emotion is thought to be incompatible with common sense, concerning which enthusiasm is regarded as childish drivelling, and vehement opinion denounced as presumption, is that to which it is in reality more appropriate than to any other. In the politics of the senate and the municipality, in the arena of scientific research, in business and in love, boundless eagerness, consuming zeal, are applauded and defended; but if men are in deep dread earnest about the reconciliation of their own disordered nature with the infinite Power that sways their destiny, if they are in eager search after the salvation which would not only cover their earthly life with love and beauty, but would fill with peace and hope the eternity to which they have found that they belong, then men whose eyes are shut on the eternities babble to them of the evil of enthusiasm. The normal activities of the Divine life within us ought, in respect of intensity of conviction, to resemble those experiences that many are too prone to slight as 'revivals of religion.' It is the great function of the Church to attain such a continuous fervour of spiritual worship, vision, and services as shall make its daily and its constant influence on the world akin to the phenomena of revival."—P. 521.

II. GENERAL LITERATURE.

Some Recent Books of Verse.

1. *ΑΡΙΣΤΟΦΑΝΟΥΣ ΣΦΗΚΕΣ.* The Wasps of Aristophanes. Acted at Athens at the Lenæan Festival, B.C. 422. The Greek Text revised; with a Translation into Corresponding Metres, and Original Notes. By Benjamin Bickley Rogers, M.A., of Lincoln's Inn, Barrister-at-Law, and sometime Fellow of Wadham College, Oxford. London: George Bell and Sons, 6, York Street, Covent Garden.
2. *The Indian Song of Songs.* From the Sanskrit of the Gita Govinda of Jayadeva. With other Oriental Poems. By Edwin Arnold, M.A., F.R.G.S., of University College, Oxford, formerly Principal of the Poona College, and Fellow of the University of Bombay; Author of "Griselda and Other Poems," "Dalhousie's Administration of India," "The Book of Good Councils," "Hero and Leander," &c., &c. London: Trübner and Co., Ludgate Hill. 1875.
3. *The Two Angels and other Poems.* By Alexander Anderson, Author of "A Song of Labour and other Poems." With an Introductory Sketch, by Rev. George Gilfillan, Dundee. London: Simpkin, Marshall and Co. Edinburgh and Glasgow: John Menzies and Co. 1875.
4. *Songs Now and Then.* By T. Ashe. London: George Bell and Sons, York Street, Covent Garden. 1875.
5. *Poems.* By Emily Pfeiffer, Author of "Gerard's Monument. Strahan and Co., Publishers, 34, Paternoster Row. London. 1875.
6. *Poems and Translations.* By Philip Stanhope Worsley, M.A., Fellow of Corpus Christi College, Oxford. Second Edition, Enlarged. Edited by the Rev. Edward Worsley. William Blackwood and Sons, Edinburgh and London. 1875.
7. *Monacella.* A Poem. By Agnes Stonehewer. Henry S. King and Co., London. 1876.

Among the most important volumes coming under the head of recent poetry, we must certainly reckon one very old friend in a new dress, namely, *The Wasps* of Aristophanes, as presented to

English students and readers by Mr. Benjamin Bickley Rogers. The volume before us consists of a text, notes, and translation,—the text carefully revised in the light of that classical erudition which Mr. Rogers is known to possess, the translation done in a masterly style that may fairly be pronounced "in the manner of Frere," and the notes full of learning and valuable illustration. It is with the English version that we are concerned; and we have no hesitation in saying that the translator and the public are to be congratulated on the result of Mr. Rogers's studies of Aristophanes and Frere. The four comedies which the late John Hookham Frere translated were, at the time, things quite unparalleled; and they have remained so until the arrival of Mr. Rogers to follow upon the footsteps of that master of the technics of poetry, who was yet not a poet in the full sense, simply because his individual imagination was, as far as the world knows, barren. *The Knights*, *The Acharnians*, *The Frogs*, and *The Birds*, as rendered by Frere, presented quite new features in the way of finding English equivalents for Athenian comic metres and conceptions; and, while we cannot admit Mr. Rogers to have executed his versions of the Aristophanic comedies with the same degree of excellence, we find them amply well done, and probably as near to the requisite quality for filling up the blank left by Frere as we shall get. Mr. Rogers has previously published translations of *The Clouds* and *The Peace*: whether he will complete the list of extant Aristophanic work by giving us also the *Lysistrata*, *Plutus*, *Ecclesiazusae*, and *Thesmophoriazusæ*, we cannot conjecture. In some respects it were well that it should be so; but it will be a hard matter to render the filth to be found in some of these palatable or desirable for contemporary readers.

As regards the present version of *The Wasps*, we feel some compunction in qualifying our praise so far as we have qualified it above; and it is only the pre-existence of such truly magnificent models as Frere's that prevents our regarding this volume as a most important literary event. But that pre-existence compels us to admit that, great as is the dexterity and ease with which Mr. Rogers manages the comic iambic, while preserving the essential virtue of his author, Frere's ease and dexterity were greater, and furnished the method for the first time. In the invention of long-rhymed metres, Mr. Rogers is far less dependent on Frere, and no commendation could be too high for most of those portions of the translation done into those metres. The following passage seems to us quite incapable of being improved, being at once rich, easy, comic, and dignified:—

"When first he began to exhibit plays, no paltry men for his mark he chose,
He came in the mood of a Heracles forth to grapple at once with the mightiest foes.

In the very front of his bold career with the jag-toothed monster he closed in fight,
Though out of its fierce eyes flashed and flamed the glare of Cynna's detestable light,
And a hundred horrible sycophants' tongues were twining and flickering over its head,
And a voice it had like the roar of a stream which has just brought forth destruction and dread,
And a Lamia's groin, and a camel's loin, and foul as the smell of a seal it smelt.
But he, when the monstrous form he saw, no bribe he took and no fear he felt,
For you he fought, and for you he fights: and then last year with adventurous hand
He grappled besides with the Spectral Shapes, the Agues and Fevers that plagued our lands;
That loved in the darksome hours of night to throttle fathers, and grandsires choke,
That laid them down on their restless beds, and against your quiet and peaceable folk
Kept welding together proofs and writs and oath against oath, till many a man
Sprang up, distracted with wild affright, and off in haste to the Pole-marsh ran.
But although such a champion as this he had found, to purge your land from sorrow and shame,
Ye played him false when to reap, last year, the fruit of his novel designs he came,
Which, failing to see in their own true light, ye caused to fade and wither away.
And with many a deep libation, invoking Bacchus, he swears this day
That never a man, since the world began, has witnessed a cleverer comedy.
Yours is the shame that ye lacked the wit its infinite merit at first to see.
But none the less with the wise and skilled the bard his accustomed praise will get.
Though when he had distanced all his foes, his noble play was at last upset."

Any one who will take the trouble to compare this with cognate work in Frere, undisturbed by the magnitude of that great name, will find that Mr. Rogers holds his own here.

Mr. Edwin Arnold has bestowed his unquestionable poetic talents on a very worthy object in translating the Sanskrit Idyll *Gita Govinda* into English verse. Without committing oneself to the opinion that *Griselda* or *Hero and Leander* would entitle Mr. Edwin Arnold to rank among the creative poets of the day, we cannot but say that the quality of his original verse is so far excellent, as to make it a matter of course that, in dealing with any unworked exotic text for which he had the requisite special scholarship, he would produce a work that should be a new possession to the English tongue; and *The Indian Song of Songs* is, distinctly, a new possession for the lovers of English exotic poetry. The Song of Govinda, from which this poem is translated,

is a pastoral wherein the God Vishnu becomes incarnate in the character of Krishna, a symbolical character representing the human soul, and as played upon now by heavenly, now by earthly beauty. He is exhibited at the outset under the attractions of sensuous pleasures which are dramatically symbolised by certain shepherdesses, while the higher spirit of moral and intellectual beauty is personified by Radha, who attempts to reclaim him from the pleasures of the senses by inspiring a love for her own surpassing worth. The ground of the title adopted by Mr. Arnold for his volume, *The Indian Song of Songs*, is to be found in the very high colouring of the human imagery used by the old Hindu poet in depicting the relations between Krishna and Radha,—an image of which recalls inevitably the parallel treatment of the spiritual struggle set forth in the *Song of Songs* of our own Bible. Mr. Arnold has found some passages of the Sanskrit work too "glowing" for exact translation; and he has given us a work of chastened warmth, but of very high beauty and great interest. The metres which he has adopted are of course thoroughly English; and there is no slavish literality in any portion, such as disfigures so many translations from foreign works of art. The lament of Radha over the dallying of Krishna with the shepherdesses is a beautiful strain, full of tender and noble sentiment, and admirably rendered: we quote the following stanzas from it:—

"Ah, my Beloved! taken with those glances,
Ah, my Beloved! dancing those rash dances,
Ah, Minstrel! playing wrongful strains so well;
Ah, Krishna! Krishna, with the honeyed lip!
Ah, Wanderer into foolish fellowship!
My Dancer, my Delight!—I love thee still.

"O Dancer! strip thy peacock-crown away,
Rise! thou whose forehead is the star of day,
With beauty for its silver halo set:
Come! thou whose greatness gleams beneath its shroud
Like Indra's rainbow shining through the cloud—
Come, for I love thee, my Beloved! Yet

"Must love thee—cannot choose but love thee ever,
My best Beloved—set on this endeavour,
To win thy tender heart and earnest eye
From lips but sadly sweet, from restless bosoms,
To mine, O Krishna, with the month of blossoms!
To mine, thou soul of Krishna! yet I sigh

"Half hopeless, thinking of myself forsaken,
And thee, dear Loiterer, in the wood o'ertaken
With passion for those bold and wanton ones,
Who knit thine arms as poison-plants gripe trees
With twining cords—their flowers the braveries
That flash in the green gloom, sparkling gauds and stones.

"My Prince! my Lotus-faced! my woe! my love!
Whose broad brow, with the tilka-mark above,
Shames the bright moon at full with fleck of cloud;
Thou to mistake so little for so much!
Thou, Krishna, to be palm to palm with such!
O Soul made for my joys, pure, perfect, proud!"

The touching beauty of this, and the fine harmonious flow of the verse, might at first sight seem to entitle the translator to a high rank as a self-sufficing poet; but on the other hand it is right to caution the reader unacquainted with Browning's *Any Wife to Any Husband (Dramatis Personæ)* to compare the stanzas with that poem before pronouncing, while it is hardly necessary to point out that in appraising so notably fine a line as "Like Indra's rainbow shining through the cloud," a certain deduction is to be made on behalf of Campbell's splendid line in the *Pleasures of Hope*—"Like Sinai's thunder, pealing from the cloud."

We presume it is to the fact of Scotland's greatest poet having been a ploughman that we owe the wide extent, in the "land o' cakes," of that peculiar heresy which discerns so vast a multitude of poets among the lower classes; their Aberdeen policemen, and Edinburgh barbers, and Paisley weavers, and Glasgow pattern-drawers, being, we presume, encouraged by their narrow circles of admirers and their own native egotism in the belief each one of them is quite as likely to turn out a Burns as Burns was. The David Gray and Robert Buchanan genera are exclusively Scotch, and perhaps we may add to the cause already suggested the consideration that Scotland has produced no poet whatever of the highest order, and, unless she condescends to adopt a standard from this side of the Tweed, has none whereby to measure her bardlings. Perhaps a third cause of the plentifulness of the same is the diffusion of education, most men of education being able, if willing, to write verses quite as well, for example, as those of Mr. Alexander Anderson, the surfaceman. We can discern no qualities in *The Two Angels and Other Poems* to justify the separate existence of the book, much less the absurd laudations of the Rev. George Gilfillan. Some of the homelier Scottish verses are pleasant enough; and the most ambitious section of the volume, "In Rome, a poem in sonnets," shows sympathies wider than might be expected. Mr. Anderson writes feelingly enough of Shelley and Keats, for instance, not forgetting, it is true, to name himself a poet in the same breath, and coupling the august name of Keats with the insignificant one of David Gray. The following is one of four sonnets concerning the two great English poets buried at Rome:—

"Two of great England's singers, lying each
By each: one rose up wroth at human wrong,
And hung half-way to heaven in his song,
Till the heart burst in his desire to reach

The melody he heard from where he was.
The other wander'd to the early past
Yearning with a boy's ardour to recast
Its mythologic utterances. But as
The sun takes dews, so did their beauty him;
He pass'd, leaving behind sweet words that must
For ever keep him here. The other, too,
Left melody that still will float and swim;
Aerial mist with heaven shining through,
And here a foot or two divides their dust."

Perhaps the measurement of "a foot or two" for the whole distance across the old and new burial grounds which really "divides their dust" is to be regarded as a poetling's license; and we should prefer to regard it so rather than as an indication that the writer's experiences of Rome were obtained through the medium of some one else's eyes.

The difference between a man who writes verses because he is moderately well educated and *can*, and a man who sings because he *must*, is exhibited in the respective books of the above-mentioned surfaceman and Mr. Thomas Ashe, whose dainty little volume of *Songs Now and Then* is full of charming things of no very high ambition, but of an irresistible grace and delicate fancy. There is one set of poems to which the appellation of *Songs Now and Then* does not, and perhaps is not meant to, apply; but we see no "and other poems" in the title page. We refer to the three stories separated under the title of "Fair Women." That called "Plectrude" we prefer of the three; the story of the daughter of the Emperor Charles, who married her father's "favourite bard" and was sent away from Court disgraced, to live in obscurity, is told with great delicacy and poetic feeling; and the conviction brought home to the Emperor in the *dénouement* that love is greater than royal state, is admirably dealt with.

The domestic lyrics and songs of the affections will delight any reader who cares for the beautifying of ordinary life by means of real spontaneous verse; and the "Apologia" with which the book ends may, we should say, be taken as wholly unaffected.

"No rest save singing, but a song for friend
Have I, and sing, forgotten, to the end.
O world, for me ne'er care to weave a crown,
Who held your smile as lightly as your frown!
Yet I grow sad to think upon my songs,
For which no man, nor even a maiden, longs.
O my poor flowers, dead in the lap of spring!
I think it is too sad a harvesting
For such brave hopes, for such kind husbandry!
Yet I must still go singing till I die."

It is certainly true that Mr. Ashe's poems have no very wide

circle of admirers; and we hope the present volume will remove the reproach conveyed in the sweet lines just quoted.

Mrs. Pfeiffer, who seems by dint of importunity to be getting a little into repute, is by no means comparable to Mr. Ashe. There is a certain speciousness about her verses, and a power of holding the unwary reader by glitter, and jingle, and sentimentality; but underneath this lies a world of hollowness and mere ambition. "Loved Florimel," which may be considered the principal poem in the volume before us is hardly better than tedious; and "The Red Ladye" cannot be recommended as a model ballad. Even some of the best of the sonnets, concerning which so great a fuss has been made by one or two critics, who should have known better, will not bear looking into: the best we have come upon are those on *Lohengrin*, which read very much like a careful hollow echo of some Wagnerian critic or other, and very little like a lyric outburst of enthusiasm:—

"On hearing the Introduction to 'Lohengrin.'

I.

"Those fine-drawn catgut notes so inly smite!
It is as if the bows of sprites could strain
The sensitive nerve-fibres of the brain,
And tune them to an all too keen delight.
And still as they resound they gather might,
Seeming a new-born pulse of life to gain,
With each new bar, until the beating rain,
The deluge of quick sound, is at its height.
Then all our soul is drown'd as in a sea
Of glad sensation, and we faintly seek
A thought wherewith to shape our ecstacy:
In vain;—we are but carried down the wake
Of time, to throb awhile primevally
With the young world in passion's blind outbreak.

II.

"Is this the music that the wise presage
As of the 'Future?'—this that storms and seeks
To force each door of sense, and loudest speaks
Through organs that grow less from age to age?
Alas! its human burthens so engage
The human soul, that not for us there breaks
Wave-like, as on a life that first awakes,
The infant joy of Nature's infant stage.
We think, we toil, we hope, we love, we die,
We know and we foreknow, we doubt and fear:
Till 'neath thy spell, O Wagner! we put by
'Future' and Present too, and drawing near
The base of life, thy breath like the glad sigh
Of some Eocean 'Past' steals on the ear!"

"Fine-drawn catgut notes!" What next?

Poems and Translations, by the late Philip Stanhope Worsley,

is a new edition of some verses which have already received a fair share of notice. They are genuine and unpretentious, and form the record of a sad truncated life, instinct with true poetic aspiration, though not shaped for great deeds in the world of letters. Some few pieces have been added to this edition, which is, materially, a pretty book, and ought not to be lost sight of, though the time has gone by for dealing with the author's work in detail.

Monacella, by Alfred Stonehewer, is a tedious story in blank-verse, wholly inoffensive, except by virtue of an unjustified existence. The romantic life of a princess who refuses marriage and becomes a saint, done into "idyllic" blank-verse, by one who has no other conception of that sublime instrument than that it consists of words, arranged in metric length of five iambics, naturally results in a thing dear to "gentle dulness," and to no one else but the tradesmen who are paid for printing it.

Swinburne's Erechtheus.

Erechtheus. A Tragedy. By Algernon Charles Swinburne. London: Chatto and Windus. 1876.

When we reviewed *Bothwell*, we congratulated Mr. Swinburne on having freed himself from the seductions of a style which, beautiful in form, fuller not only of surface melody but of subtle harmony than that of any English poet save Shelley, was too often the handmaid of thoughts which indignant critics rightly denounced as "earthly, sensual, devilish." With *Bothwell* the sternest prudery could not have found fault. Contrasting it with *Chastelard*, we see how it is possible to treat a questionable subject in two wholly different manners, both of which shall, nevertheless, be thoroughly poetical. Mary Queen of Scots, her husband, the bold bad man who was her evil genius, John Knox, all become living realities to the student who has read *Bothwell*. While Mr. Tennyson's *Queen Mary* is in great part a versifying of old chronicles, a work in which the author seems almost to have put his originality under restraint, and to have been unwilling, even in working out his characters, to go beyond what is written, Mr. Swinburne in *Bothwell* clothes with full array of thought the dry facts of history, not in the least departing from the strictest historical truth, but "filling in," leaving perhaps too little to the readers imagination. That is why, while *Queen Mary* could, with scarcely any alteration be put on the stage, *Bothwell* is emphatically a play for the closet. It is a dramatic study rather than a drama; the characters show how their thoughts are moving, lay themselves open as men and women in real life seldom do. *Bothwell*, in short, is a thoroughly modern play, in

which we are forced to think of the author and his power and insight, at least as much as of the action; *Queen Mary* is rather after the mediæval mould, repressed, suggestive in style, but crowded with incident. Both methods are, in their way, excellent; Shakespeare sometimes in the same play gives an example of both. *Erechtheus*, on the other hand, is sternly classical. The incident is of the simplest; and though, after the Greek fashion, the persons make long speeches, there is very little visible play of feeling. Each acts as he or she meant to act; whatever there may be within of doubt or self-questioning is hidden from view, as under a tragic mask, showing itself, if at all, only in the choric songs, which are also used to explain how the present situation came about, and what is the impending crisis. *Queen Mary*, then, is a play of action; *Bothwell* a play of passion argued out to the uttermost; *Erechtheus* a play of passion kept in check as to its expression, and showing itself in deeds rather than words.

Whether such a form of drama can be really "popular" is very doubtful, but, anyhow, Mr. Swinburne has thoroughly succeeded in his work. He has given us a play which is Greek in thought, in form of phrase, in everything save the accident of language. His former essay in this direction, *Atalanta in Calydon*, was beautiful indeed, but, as a work of art, far less perfect; it was more Shelley-like, less Euripidean; fantastic to a degree which no Greek ever dreamt of. In *Erechtheus*, we fancy, there is scarcely a word for which "authority" could not be found in some classical dramatist. This is specially seen in the choric odes. We have purposely used the word Euripidean, for the word, to a considerable extent, characterises the monologues; Praxithea's grand speech, for instance, is in part literally translated from the long fragment of the *Erechtheus* of Euripides preserved by the orator Lycurgus. There is also a somewhat similar passage in the *Phœnissæ* of the same poet, where Menoikeus, Kreon's son, devotes himself to death for Thebes. But yet, though the words are sometimes borrowed or adapted from the youngest of the three great Greek dramatists, the spirit of Mr. Swinburne's play is rather Æschylean than Euripidean. Indeed, whole lines of the choric songs are often adapted, nay, translated, from the choruses of the *Seven against Thebes*. And very grand are Mr. Swinburne's reproductions. If anything can give the modern reader an adequate idea of a style of drama so different from that to which we are accustomed, these choric songs will do so. In them, too, comes out here and there, what has often been noticed in Mr. Swinburne, the happy knack of throwing into his verse a flavour of well-known Scriptural phrases. There is no profanity in this; he is biblical in language, as Æschylus is biblical, as all the highest poetry must more or less be.

But it is time to tell the story of the tragedy. Athens, in the time of her king, Erechtheus, son of the earth, and foster-child of Athena, the patron goddess of the city, is attacked by the people of the neighbouring burgh of Eleusis, under their king, Eumolpus, son of the sea-god Poseidon. The sea-god has never forgotten how he was worsted in his dispute with Athena as to who should have the naming and the charge of Athens: and this war is the outcome of his grudge. The oracle demands, as a condition of victory, the sacrifice of one of Erechtheus's daughters. Two of these, Procris and Orithya, have not been happy in their wedlock; Orithya, as the chorus in Mr. Swinburne's play tells us in, perhaps, the grandest of its odes, was carried off by Boreas, the king of the north wind, with no profit to her conntry except an obscure prophecy (fulfilled, said later historians, just before Salamis) that the north wind should help Athens in her distress. Another daughter, Creusa, is married to Xuthus; her son Ion becoming name-father to the Ionians. Three maiden daughters remain; the lot falls on Chthonia, who gives herself to death; her sisters refusing to survive her slay themselves at the foot of the altar whereon she has been sacrificed. In the battle which, meanwhile, has been raging, Erechtheus kills Eumolpus, and the men of Eleusis, with their confederates, are driven off in total rout; but Poseidon, angered at his son's death, prays to Zeus, who, in answer to his brother's prayer, slays the victorious king with a stroke of lightning.

That is the story of Erechtheus, so far as Mr. Swinburne deals with it. Those who care to read more about it will find, either in Smith's *Biographical Dictionary*, or in the elaborate chapter on myths in Grote's *Greece*, that, while Homer knows only one Erichthonius, or Erechtheus, later writers, beginning with Plato, mention two, the younger being grandson of the earlier primitive hero, who appears, in one account, as a form of Poseidon himself. In Apollodorus, quoted by Mr. Grote, the various myths are given in all their perplexity. Later still Diodorus is euhemerist enough to speak of Erechtheus as "an Egyptian, who, during a famine, brought corn to Athens, and instituted the worship of the earth goddess, Demeter, and the Eleusinian mysteries." But with these intricacies, of course, Mr. Swinburne had nothing to do. He takes the story as the remaining fragments make it probable that Euripides took it, in its broad outline, and uses it as the basis of what a few extracts will prove that we are justified in calling the most classical of English plays.

Here, in Erechtheus's opening speech, is a passage which will recall passages both from the Greek tragedies and also from the Hebrew poets:—

> "The note
> Rings as for death oracular to thy sons
> Full of this charge laid on me, to put out

The brief life kindled of my own child's life,
Or with this helmsman hand that steers the state
Run right on the under shoal and ridge of death
The populous ship with all its freightage gone,
And sails that were to take the wind of time
Rent, and the tackling that should hold out fast
In confluent surge of loud calamities
Broken, with spars of rudders and lost oars
That were to row toward harbour and find rest
In some most glorious haven of all the world
And else may never near it."

The following, again, from the first choric ode, is very Greek:—

"But the peace that was stablished between them to stand
Is rent now in twain by the strength of his hand,
Who stirs up the storm of his sons overbold
To pluck from fight what he lost of right,
By council and judgment of gods that spake,
And gave great Pallas the strife's fair stake,
The lordship and love of the lovely land,
The grace of the town that hath on it for crown
But a head-band to wear
Of violets one-hued with her hair;
For the vales and the green high places of earth
Hold nothing so fair,
And the depths of the sea bear no such birth
Of the manifold births they bear.
Too well, too well was the great stake worth
A strife divine for the gods to judge,
A crowned god's triumph, a foiled god's grudge. . . ."

When Praxithea comes in, her husband fears "to slay her *timeless*, with his proper tongue," in which line we note the appropriate archaism of the italicized word; for, he says,

"Such words
No mouth of man learnt ever, as from mine
Most loth to speak thine ear most loth shall take."

Here is the ἄκοντά σ' ἄκων of Æschylus; in whose grandest manner too, is the whole of the choric song beginning with line 1283. Take, for instance, the following:—

"With a trampling of drenched red hoofs, and an earthquake of men that meet,
Strong war sets hand to the scythe, and the furrows take fire at his feet.
Earth groans from her great rent heart, and the hollows of rocks are afraid,
And the mountains are moved, and the valleys as waves in a storm-wind swayed.
From the roots of the hills to the plain's dim verge, and the dark loud shore,
Air shudders with shrill spears crossing, and hurtling of wheels that roar,
As the grinding of teeth in the jaws of a lion that foam as they gnash
Is the shriek of the axles that loosen the shock of the poles that crash.
The dense masses darken and glitter, the mouths of the mad steeds champ,
Their heads flash blind through the battle, and death's foot rings in their tramp."

And so on for more than two pages of description, *sustained at the very point between grandeur and bombast.* That is the true Æschylean level; and though no one can read such a chorus without feeling the power of the poetry, he who knows the Greek tragedians has a vast advantage over the unlearned reader; for him what to the other is vaguely sublime becomes a marvel of adaptation; every word tells; it is as if the eldest of the three mighty Greeks had come back to the world and could discourse Elizabethan English. But this, though enhancing much the scholar's interest in the work, tells somewhat against its popularity with the many. It is not by the grand choruses (none of them fixing themselves on the memory like some of the "catchwords" in the choruses of the *Atalanta*) that *Erechtheus* will appeal to general readers, but by passages like the following, in which Chthonia cheers her mother:—

> Set this thought
> Against all edge of evil as a sword
> To beat back sorrow, that for all the world
> Thou brought'st thee forth a saviour, who shall save
> Athens; for none but I, from none but thee,
> Shall take this death for garland; and the men
> *Mine unknown children of unwounded years,*
> *My sons unrisen, shall rise up at thine hand,*
> *Sown of thy seed to bring forth seed to thee,*
> And call thee most of all most fruitful found
> Blessed; but me too for my barren womb,
> More than my sisters for their children born,
> Shall these give honour. . . .; for the wild dry vine,
> Scoffed at and cursed of all men that was I,
> Shall shed them wine to make the world's heart warm,
> . . . ."

Perhaps the tension is strained to the uttermost in Praxithea's answer to the messenger who brings news that the foe is beaten, their king cloven down by Erechtheus, and then Erechtheus himself struck by lightning. She simply says—

> "I praise the Gods for Athens. O sweet Earth,
> Mother, what joy thy soul has of thy son,
> Thy life of my dead lord, mine own soul knows
> That knows thee godlike; and what grief should mine,
> What sorrow should my heart have, who behold
> Thee made so heavenlike happy?

This is antique heroism almost pushed to extremes; it is not that Praxithea is hard-natured; her beautifully tender talk with her daughter, line 510 *seq.* proves this; she is simply a Greek and not a modern, accepting, not cheerfully but unrepineingly any sorrow to herself so she may save that city which she adores with an adoration undreamed of by us "citizens of the world."

Mr. Swinburne has written a noble play, without the least tinge of that false colour which marred too much of his earlier

work; he has done more, he has made Æschylus live for the English reader.

Gosse's King Erik.

King Erik. By Edmund W. Gosse. London: Chatto and Windus. 1876.

There is an undoubted charm in literary experiments. When a novelist writes a new novel, or a lyrist a new volume of lyrics, we experience, no doubt, a certain pleasure in reviving old impressions, in seeing what added skill he has brought to the old task. But if the prose of the novelist blossom suddenly into verse, if the lyrist deviate into any of the innumerable thorny paths of prose, we feel a pleasure of a totally different kind—keener, and more sharply critical. Even should the new be inferior to the old, it still has the advantage of being new. It has enabled us to form a larger and more complete conception of the mind from which the old emanated, and stimulated us to the task. While if it be better, or even only as good, there is the delight of enlarging the bounds of an old admiration.

It was with some such feelings as these that we took up Mr. Gosse's tragedy of *King Erik*. For Mr. Gosse had long been advantageously known to us in other walks of literature. We knew him as a critic of singularly varied knowledge—indeed, if one may venture to "hint a fault" without certainly "hesitating dislike," it seems scarcely possible that information covering so large a space should not, here and there, be beaten a little thin—a critic, too, of great delicacy of judgment, especially when dealing with that great literary world of the past, into which the enthusiasms and harsh rivalries of the present find no entrance, that world—

> "Where falls not hail, or rain, or any snow,
> Nor ever wind blows loudly; but it lies
> Deep-meadowed, happy, fair with orchard lawns
> And bowery hollows crown'd with summer sea."

We knew him also as the author of a volume of poems, "On Viol and Flute," full of much graceful thought, and finished and musical veraification, refreshingly superior to that brackish flood of verse that flows in upon us season after season. But from these achievements to the achievement of a tragedy was a new and interesting step. Nor judging, as one is so often tempted to do, and is so often deceived in doing, from the former work, should we have been altogether inclined to predicate success. Doubtless, Mr. Gosse's critical studies showed a thorough acquaintance with the Elizabethan drama. But the successful critic is not necessarily the successful artist. While as to the poems—

their beauties were not of the robust full-blooded kind. There was in them little of the glow of intense feeling, or the fervour of passion—little of what may be called the human as distinct from the artistic element. Culture, fancy, skill, command of metrical language and verbal harmony—all these were present obviously enough. On the chords of his "Viol" Mr. Gosse had proved himself a very sufficient virtuoso. Would the chords of the human heart prove equally responsive to his touch?

Such was the critical question with which we took up *King Erik*. Before giving our reply, however, we must say something of the plot; for though that is but a poor method of criticising poetry or fiction which consists in epitomising or retelling the story better told in the work criticised—yet as even "every school-boy" does not perhaps know the history of Denmark in the eleventh and twelfth century, a word of preliminary explanation may not be undesirable.

So we may premise that King Erik, returning from sea-conquest over the Wends, and being desirous, as a wise and good prince, of putting an end to the fierce feuds that prevailed among his lords, made a decree that whoever spilled Christian blood should be put to death. But by ill chance it so happened that he, first of men, broke his own law. For while he had been driving the Wends from the seas, one Grimur, a Skald, had conceived an evil passion for Botilda, the queen, though she, loving the king her husband with all her heart, returned it not; and the king finding the verse-maker singing his love ditties beneath her window, and misjudging of her faith, slew him. Whereupon Ossur, the archbishop, forbad the king from entering the Church of God, and rebuked him for his sin; and he smitten with sudden remorse, and finding moreover how he had wronged the queen, swore that he would make a pilgrimage to the Holy City, if haply he might so find peace. And the queen, of her great love and graciousness, forgave him. So they journeyed southward together to Constantinople, and thence to Cyprus. But at Constantinople it had chanced that one Gisli, being foster-brother to Grimur, heard how the king had slain Grimur, and he followed the king to Cyprus, and there, coming treacherously upon him, smote him with a sword that he died. And shortly after the queen, like a lily stricken in its beauty, died also. And they two lie, side by side, in a valley at the foot of Olivet.

So runs the story, which we have been tempted to clothe in a form somewhat more antique than Mr. Gosse's treatment would warrant. It is a story with good capabilities unquestionably, whether tragic or epic. Three characters stand out conspicuously in the version presented to us—we should say four, were it not that the fourth, the serving maid, Svanhilda, who is the maleficent genius of the piece, revealing Grimur's presence to

the king, and afterwards informing Gisli of the circumstances of Grimur's death—were it not that she, possibly from some fault of our own, appears to us to be little more than an indistinct sketch. Of the other three, the one drawn with the firmest hand is unquestionably the queen. In her simple entire love for her husband, which is at first almost girlish, her bearing under the cruel blow that falls upon her—a bearing as of one stricken to death, and yet not without pride—her forgiveness which is noble and entire, her identification of interest and penance with the husband who had wronged her—in all this there is a fine conception of womanly character, and good execution. At first we confess to have felt disposed to quarrel with the scene in which she bids farewell to Grimur, till we remembered the sympathy of sorrow for sorrow, as explaining the forbearance of her words; and even yet we think that in saying to him:—

> "Grimur, I never reddened when you came;
> Your presence never stirred the little pains
> That vex our idle hours; and never yet
> Those hours seemed leaden for the lack of you"—

even yet we think this to have been needlessly full of lingering detail. A frank, simple declaration that she did not love him, would have been more in accordance with her character—truer in every sense. No wonder that the poor butterfly, who in her presence—and this is a fine dramatic touch—had felt her purity, misdoubts that she may really love him as soon as she is gone, and so, instead of being nerved to depart, lingers, as one under a spell, to meet his doom.

This must perforce exhaust our reference to Grimur, though he is certainly the third most important character in the play. The second is of course Erik. Indeed, so far as amount of speech or action is concerned, he occupies a more important position than Botilda. But still he is the lesser creation—lesser in force and consistency of character, in distinctness of individuality, in power of manliness as compared with the power of her womanliness. And this, unless we are led away, as may so easily happen, by our previous conception of what Mr. Gosse is most qualified to do well, this springs from the poet's having in him greater gifts of sweetness than strength and fire. Just as Botilda is a finer delineation than Erik, so those scenes in which the idyllic or lyric element prevails, as when Botilda is embroidering with her maidens, or Grimur singing his love songs in her garden, or Anna Comnena's lyre-boy is chanting a fitful accompaniment while the story of Grimur's murder is being told in Gisli's ear, so are these scenes superior to that in which the Archbishop denounces the king's guilt, or Erik addresses the assembled "Thing."

One word of the execution. Mr. Gosse has not endeavoured to

follow Mr. Browning in his supreme achievement of making the past live again in its spirit and its speech. And here he has good precedent, and we have certainly no quarrel with him. So long as the men and women in a drama *are* men and women, archæological exactitude of sentiment is not necessarily a matter of moment. We confess, however, that there are occasional trivialities, colloquial homelinesses in the dialogue, for which we see no reason, as they do not appear to be used for the purpose of marking contrast, and that offend us, less as being out of date than as sinning against the stateliness of tragedy. For the rest Mr. Gosse's blank verse is sweet and varied, and full mostly of a graceful melody. If it has not the trumpet's power, neither has it the trumpet's bray, but rather a flute-like tone of its own. Here is a specimen passage, to which it is but fair to say that companion passages of equal beauty might easily be added :—

> "Yet am I a dead queen, and fitter far
> To hurry out of sight into the dust
> And deathly dampness of a twilight crypt,
> Than sit here in my dainty gems and veil.
> Think you that such a one as I can live,
> Having lost the spotless honour of my name,
> Dragged down into the mire, and made a jest
> For every pot-house churl to gibe against?
> What is it I have done? Ah me! Ah me!
> I am a helpless woman, soft as air,
> As frantic as a sea-wave, and as weak,
> Spent with the tempest of my own wild words,
> And fluttering when my heart should bear or break.
> Come death, and take me!"

Life and Times of William Godwin.

William Godwin: His Friends and Contemporaries. By C. Kegan Paul. With Portraits and Illustrations. Two Volumes. London: Henry S. King and Co. 1876.

William Godwin, the author of *Political Justice* and *Caleb Williams*, has certainly been in no danger as yet of complete oblivion; but he has long lapsed into the region of historical figures, and lost the hold he once had on the vital interests of readers. Even *Caleb Williams* is now little more than a tradition even among the more adventurous of those whose reading is mainly confined to novels; and it is an actual experience only to those who study the history of British fiction; while the living men and women who have read *Political Justice* might probably be counted up on but few sets of fingers. Notwithstanding this loss of hold on the more active sympathies of contemporary intellectual life, the fact remains, and is not forgotten, that here was a gladiator in the arena of political and social emancipation, —one who took in the main the right side, and who also added

to the immense influence he possessed on contemporary intellect, a long list of accomplished works in many departments of literature which afforded in their day a very widespread instruction and entertainment.

To the intrinsic importance and interest of his intellectual life, William Godwin adds the good hap of being personally associated in close ties of relationship with two of the most remarkable women of modern times, and connected, by the marriage of one of these, with the greatest poet the world has seen since Shakespeare. The fact that his first wife was the ill-starred author of the *Vindication of the Rights of Women*,—that noble-minded Mary Wollstonecraft whose life ended at the birth of a child destined to still greater eminence,—would alone suffice to distinguish Godwin among the many men of active intellect alive at the same time. His fatherhood to Mary Wollstonecraft Godwin, who at the age of eighteen produced that powerful and probably imperishable romance *Frankenstein*, and whose astonishing energy of intellect only the hand of death sufficed to quell, gives a further extraneous lustre to his own life. And the part his political works bore in shaping the immense conceptions of the immortal poet on whom his daughter's heart was subsequently bestowed, will never cease to give a special interest to those writings long after the general interest attaching to historic steps in human progress shall have ceased, in their particular case, to be prominently felt.

William Godwin was born at Wisbeach on the 3rd of March, 1756. His father was a dissenting minister in that town, not apparently a remarkable man; and his mother, to judge from the strange orthography of some of her letters, had less of education than native energy. Young Godwin was brought up in the rigidest traditions of Calvinism, and educated for the ministry, which he abandoned, not suddenly, but on arrival, step by step, at convictions that were incompatible with a continuance in it. His abandonment of the ministry led him to seek, partly as congenial, and partly as an obvious means of subsistence, a literary career; and after a good deal of preliminary work, which did not amount to much more than literary journeyman's labour, he established his reputation at one stroke by the publication in 1793 of his *Political Justice*, or, as we should say, to quote the title fully and correctly, *An Enquiry Concerning Political Justice and Its Influence on General Virtue and Happiness*, printed, according to the fashion of the time, in two magnificent quarto volumes. Here his veritable career opens; but his ability had so far commended itself beforehand that he had obtained an engagement in 1785 to write for *The Annual Register* his *History of Knowledge, Learning and Taste in Great Britain*, &c. Under circumstances which he has himself fully detailed in an

autobiographic preface to *Fleetwood*, one of his later novels, he undertook in the same year that witnessed the success of *Political Justice* the composition of *Caleb Williams*, a truly remarkable study in psychology, most dramatically carried out, and which, running through several editions, became not only one of *the* books of the day's popular reading, but served as a model and criterion for much of the more remarkable fiction of the younger generation of writers contemporary with Godwin. Among these we must mention specially his own daughter Mary, and the author of *Edgar Huntly*, an American of genius, now unduly neglected,—Charles Brockden Brown. This masterpiece was published in 1794; and the correct title, which should not be forgotten, is *Things as they Are; or, The Adventures of Caleb Williams.* It was followed by *The Enquirer* in 1797, *St. Leon* (a tale) in 1799, the *Life of Chaucer* in 1803, *Fleetwood* (another tale) in 1805, an *Essay on Sepulchres* in 1809, the *Lives of Edward and John Phillips, Nephews and Pupils of Milton*, in 1815, *Mandeville* (a tale) in 1817, *Of Population* (a demolition of Malthus) in 1820, *Cloudesley* (a tale) in 1830, *Thoughts on Man* in 1831, *Deloraine* (a novel) in 1833, and *Lives of the Necromancers* in 1834. This is merely a list of the landmarks in his literary life up to the date of his death in 1836. In the meantime he had produced a mass of minor work, avowed, anonymous, and pseudonymous, enough of itself to furnish forth a tolerably miscellaneous library.

Among the best of his minor writings was his memoir and vindication of his first wife,—a most remarkable composition, from which it is hard to say how much of deep and passionate emotion is smothered under a surface of frigid endurance that seems, at times, almost to amount to cynicism. That Godwin was a man of passionate sensibility we cannot reconcile with the explicit, almost indelicate, nature of some of his communications, or with the record of some of his acts. That he was a genuine and ardent lover of mankind, and striver after the general benefit, there can be no doubt whatever; and the personal life of the man, as now set before us for the first time by Mr. Kegan Paul, has in it much that is instructive, and still more that is interesting. The circle of his relations, connections, and intimates, was one of almost unparalleled variety and distinction. The Wollstonecrafts, and especially Mary, Mrs. Inchbald, Mrs. Reveley (afterwards Mrs. Gisborne, the friend of Shelley), Horne Tooke, Holcroft, Wordsworth, Coleridge, Lamb, Wedgwood, Lady Caroline Lamb, are but a few among the number; and up to the time of his second marriage he might be counted altogether a great man, greatly favoured by circumstances; but with the second Mrs. Godwin, the widow Maria Jane Clements (or, as she chose to call herself, Clairmont), a new order of things set in; and we learn from these volumes that this hard, coarse, unprincipled woman

became to Godwin what Leigh Hunt's wife was to him,—the fruitful source of ill-fortune, finally bringing about that state of things which led Shelley in 1820 to describe his father-in-law, the intellectual idol of his youth, in words which Mrs. Shelley in 1824 could not find it in her heart to print without first garbling them out of their grandeur,—

> "You will see
> That which was Godwin—greater none than he,
> Though fallen, and fallen on evil times, to stand
> Among the spirits of our age and land
> Before the dread tribunal of To-come."

The materials which Mr. Kegan Paul has been so fortunate as to have at his disposal at this late time of day were to have been worked into a biography by Godwin's daughter—Shelley's widow; and probably we should have had a finer book than the present, if a less accurate one. Indeed Mrs. Shelley had actually begun to arrange her materials, and she has left some most interesting notes, of which her successor has not failed to avail himself. The following passage on Mrs. Inchbald we cannot resist quoting, as both characteristic and interesting:—

"Nothing can be more singular and interesting than the picture of her life as given in her biography. Living in mean lodgings, dressed with an economy allied to penury, without connections, and alone, her beauty, her talents, and the charm of her manners gave her entrance into a delightful circle of society. Apt to fall in love, and desirous to marry, she continued single, because the men who loved and admired her were too worldly to take an actress and a poor author, however lovely and charming, for a wife. Her life was thus spent in an interchange of hardship and amusement, privation and luxury. Her character partook of the same contrast: fond of pleasure, she was prudent in her conduct; penurious in her personal expenditure, she was generous to others. Vain of her beauty, we are told that the gown she wore was not worth a shilling, it was so coarse and shabby. Very susceptible to the softer feelings, she could yet guard herself against passion; and though she might have been called a flirt, her character was unimpeached. I have heard that a rival beauty of her day pettishly complained that when Mrs. Inchbald came into a room, and sat in a chair in the middle of it as was her wont, every man gathered round it, and it was vain for any other woman to attempt to gain attention. Godwin could not fail to admire her; she became and continued to be a favourite. Her talents, her beauty, her manners were all delightful to him. He used to describe her as a piquante mixture between a lady and a milkmaid, and added that Sheridan declared she was the only authoress whose society pleased him."

From among the express utterances of Godwin, which might

be advantageously quoted at great length, we select the following remarks on poverty and riches, because the subject was one in which he was vitally interested; and his utterance has a fine self-criticism underlying its oracular exterior:—

"Poverty, I assure you, is a very wretched thing. The prayer of Agur in the Bible is excellent, 'Give me neither poverty nor riches, lest I be full and deny Thee, and say, Who is the Lord? or lest I be poor and steal, and take the name of my God in vain.' I should not of course express the reasons of my wish in my own behalf, or in behalf of any one in whom I was interested, in so pious and religious a manner; but my sense would be nearly the same. Riches corrupt the morals and harden the heart, and poverty breaks the spirit and courage of a man, plants his pillow with perpetual thorns, and makes it all but impossible for him to be honest, virtuous, and honourable."

Dawson's Dawn of Life.

The Dawn of Life; being the History of the oldest known Fossil Remains, and their Relations to Geological Time, and to the Development of the Animal Kingdom. By J. W. Dawson, LL.D., F.R.S., etc. London: Hodder and Stoughton. 1875.

This is a monograph on the subject of the (supposed) first, or "dawn animal," found in the existing strata of the globe. Its author's name is a sufficient guarantee for its scientific accuracy and excellence, whilst its thoroughly interesting and popular features we may vouch for.

The fossil is found in what are now known as the Laurentian rocks. These were first recognised as a geological formation in Canada. The name of the formation is derived from a range of hills to the north of the St. Lawrence Valley. They are the most altered or metamorphosed of all the metamorphic rocks. It was the custom to consider this formation "azoic," from the supposed absence of all trace of organic forms, but it is now known as the "eozoic" formation, it having been since discovered to bethat in which "the first bright streaks of the dawn of life make their appearance." The formation, as such, is confined at present to the New World; but there is good reason for supposing that the older genuses of the Old World are of as great antiquity.

The discovery of the fossiliferous character of this deposit was not coincident with the discovery of its geological value; it was generally believed from the very great alteration to which the rocks had palpably been subject that there was small chance of the discovery of organic remains, even if they had ever existed. It was eventually seen, however, that this formation must have

been made in conjunction with organic agencies, for it contains masses of limestone a thousand feet in thickness, extending for hundreds of miles. But inasmuch as limestone is a distinct organic formation, it follows that in the ocean of which this was originally the bed there must have been myriads of lowly animal-builders at work. If the action of the water, abrading the surrounding igneous rocks, had alone formed the bottom, it must have consisted solely of sandy and muddy *débris*, and no limestone would have been found. Again, graphite is found in abundance in the Laurentian rocks—that is to say, carbon. Now the only known agent for withdrawing carbon from the carbonic acid of the air, and forming such a deposition is vegetable life, from which it may be inferred that both vegetable and animal life existed in the Laurentian epoch, and that carbonic acid heavily charged the atmosphere.

These collateral evidences of organic agency were all that geologists hoped to be able to obtain from a so powerfully altered stratum as this. But Sir W. Logan made a discovery in 1859 of what he believed to be organic remains. A discussion of the question of the organic or inorganic nature of this so-called fossil ensued, in which the most prominent advocates of its organic nature were Dr. Carpenter and Dr. Hunt. It was after very careful examination—microscopical examination—declared at last, by the former, to be a true fossil, the skeleton of a creature belonging to the sub-kingdom *Protozoa:* indeed it was a gigantic *Foraminifera*, one of the class of creatures to which our chalk formations are due. This, however, has been very boldy challenged by Messrs. Rowney and King, as mineralogists, on the one hand, and by Mr. Carter, a profound student of lowly organic forms on the other. The specimens submitted as "fossil eozoon Canadeum" is declared by the mineralogists to be simply a peculiar mineral deposit; and Mr. Carter with remarkable acuteness finds microscopical evidence of its want of coincidence with the known characteristics of the *Foraminifera*, with the nature of which he is so accurately acquainted. To present the facts in their fulness Dr. Dawson writes this book, and with much force and effect maintains the true animal nature of the fossil: and it is only just to say that the most accomplished geologists of this and other countries present a very large majority in favour of Dr. Dawson's view.

That part of Dr. Dawson's book which is devoted to the consideration of "the dawn animal as a teacher in science" will have very much interest, not only for the zoologist, the geologist, and the general reader, but also especially for the theologian. Having reached the "dawn" of life upon the globe, as far as it is accessible to us, what are we taught as to its relation to the past and its connection with the future of the animal series with which

it must be—if evolution be a correct hypothesis—so closely linked? Our author is by no means hesitating on this question. He says plainly, "*There is no link whatever* in geological fact to connect eozoon with any of the molluscs, radiates, or crustaceans of the succeeding primordial. . . . At present these stand before us as distinct creations" (p. 227). Nay, it the rather has damaging negative testimony against the evolution hypothesis as usually held. There is no shadow of a link between it and vegetable forms, and it is incapable of giving the most remote indication of any connection with the organised creatures above it. So that the question of the origin of species is left in *statu quo*, after the most exhaustive scrutiny of the earliest form of life left—with any traces of organic structure retained—in the whole crust of the globe.

We recommend the careful perusal of this charming little book to all our readers, who have the least interest in the momentous question of the origin of life upon the globe, and its bearing upon theology.

Blake's Zoology for Students.

Zoology for Students. A Handbook. By C. Carter Blake, D.Sc. With a Preface by Richard Owen, C.B., F.R.S. London: Daldy, Isbister, and Co. 1875.

We are extremely pleased to see this book, because it is an accurate and carefully prepared exposition of animal classification as elaborated and brought to the minutest perfection of detail by Owen; and in these days of hasty generalisation in reference to zoological facts it is well that the student should be armed with facts from the conservative side, that he may the better be led to independent inferences. But we cannot hope, nor indeed wish, for this book a wide-spread adoption. The venerable name of Owen, subscribed to its preface, will go far to secure it success, and even circulation, while its own merits will command for it a place. But as a system of zoology it cannot hold its position. The embryological basis is the only true basis for classification; and however admirable the detail of the artificial classification of Owen may be, the accomplished zoologist, abreast of the facts of his time, must feel that the classification which nature herself has adopted should be looked for by embryological researches; and when once found it must not only supersede all other, but must be as lasting as the facts it records.

Nevertheless to the young zoologist, who is sure to be plentifully supplied with text-books of an adverse school, it will afford valuable and suggestive reading.

Huxley's Elementary Biology.

A Course of Practical Instruction in Elementary Biology. By T. H. Huxley, Sec. R.S., Assisted by H. W. Martin, B.A., M.B.D.Sc. London: Macmillan and Co. 1875.

This is the most thoroughly valuable book to teachers and students of biology which has ever appeared in the English language. It takes the student through a series of practical "demonstrations" in such a thorough manner, that he cannot fail to have a more complete comprehension of biological facts and phenomena than could possibly be obtained by any other method. Instead of a description of the leading characteristics of organic forms, a typical series, including animal and vegetable species is taken, and the student is directed how to proceed in the investigation of each successively, and is made to observe the results. In this way, beginning with yeast, the student is taken practically through all the different phenomena displayed by the Amœba, Bacteria, Molds, Stoneworts, Bracken fern, the Bean plant, the Bell animalcule, fresh water polyps, the fresh water mussel, the lobster and the frog.

The instructions given are such that an earnest student may, unaided by laboratory or lecturers, obtain more thorough knowledge of the science of biology than by years of study of "handbooks," "manuals," and "treatises."

REVERDGE AND CO. (SUCCESSORS TO R. BENDHAM), PRINTERS, LONDON.